

AMFWA Director's Meeting Proceedings



July 14-16, 1996
South Bend, Indiana





The HUMMER Demonstration



TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Attendees	1-2
Meeting Agenda	3-4
Business Meeting Agenda	5
Business Meeting Minutes	6-33
State Reports	34-54
Resolution	55



Catching steelhead trout
(In the trap, N.D.-S.D. Style)



"Cruise" on the St. Joseph River East Race Waterway

1996 LIST OF ATTENDEES

Bruce L. McCloskey
Division of Wildlife
6060 Broadway
Denver, CO 80216

Allen Farris
Dept. of Natural Resources
Wallace Bldg., E. 9th & Grand Ave.
Des Moines, IA 50319-0034

Jeff Ver Steeg
Dept. of Natural Resources
524 S.. 2nd, LTP
Springfield, IL 62701-1787

Joe Kramer
Dept. of Wildlife & Parks
RR 2, Box 54A
Pratt, KS 67124-9599

Thomas Young
Dept. of Fish & Wildlife Resources
#1 Game Farm Road
Frankfort, KY 40601

George Burgoyne, Jr.
Dept. of Natural Resources
Box 30444
Lansing, MI 48909-7944

K.L. Cool
Dept. of Natural Resources
Box 30444
Lansing, MI 48909-7944

Rich Hassinger
Dept. of Natural Resources
500 Lafayette Rd.
St. Paul, MN 55155-4020

Ken Babcock
Dept. of Conservation
PO Box 180
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0180

Jim Wilson
Dept. of Conservation
PO Box 180
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0180

Dennis Figg
Dept. of Conservation
PO Box 180
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0180

Wes Sheets
Game & Parks Commission
P.O. Box 30370
Lincoln, NE 68503

Dean Hildebrand
Game & Fish Department
100 N. Bismarck Expressway
Bismarck, ND 58501

Michael Budzik
Ohio Division of Wildlife
1840 Belcher Drive
Columbus, OH 43224-1329

Doug Hansen
Dept of Game, Fish & Parks
523 E. Capitol
Pierre, SD 57501-3182

Steve Miller
Dept. of Natural Resources
Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707

Terry Z. Riley
Wildlife Management Institute
528 N. 7th St.
Chariton, IA 50049

Dick Pierce
Wildlife Legislative Fund of America
801 Kingsmill Parkway
Columbus, OH 43229-1137

Ross Melinchuk
Ducks Unlimited
One Waterfowl Way
Memphis, TN 38120-2351

Dr. Bob Hoffman
Ducks Unlimited
One Waterfowl Way
Memphis, TN 38120-2351

Roger Pederson
Ducks Unlimited
3720 Stonewood Ct.
Eagan, MN 55123

John Turner
The Conservation Fund
1800 N. Kent St. Suite 1120
Arlington, VA 22209

David Case
D.J. Case & Associates
607 Lincolnway West
Mishawaka, IN 46544

Phil Seng
D.J. Case & Associates
607 Lincolnway West
Mishawaka, IN 46544

Marvin Moriarty
U.S. F.W.S.
Great Lakes- Big Rivers Regional Office
1 Federal Dr., Federal Bldg.
Ft. Snelling, MN 55111

Max Petersen
IAFWA
Hall of the States
444 N. Capitol St., NW, Suite 544
Washington, D.C. 20001

Wayne Bivans
Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
5533 Egypt Valley Ave. NE
Belmont, MI 49306



Lunchtime at the Works Hotel



Banquet at Notre Dame University
(Lou Holtz in background)

**ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES
DIRECTOR'S MEETING**

**July 14 - 16, 1996
South Bend, Indiana**

Sunday, July 14

1:00 PM - 7:00 PM Registration (Oliver Room, The Works Hotel)

4:00 PM Executive Committee Meeting (Oliver Room, The Works Hotel)

6:00 PM President's Reception (Madison Room, The Works Hotel)

7:30 PM Evening Program and Social (Madison Room, The Works Hotel)
 7:30 Indiana Contaminants Program, Dr. Wayne Faatz
 8:00 Responsive Management, Christine McCreedy
 8:30 Conservation Fund, John Turner

Monday, July 15

7:00 AM Breakfast (danish and coffee provided)

8:00 AM Introductions (Oliver Room, The Works Hotel)
 Gary Doxtater - Moderator, Director, Indiana Div. Fish and Wildlife

8:15 AM Welcome, Mike Kiley, Chairman, Indiana Natural Resources
 Commission

8:30 AM Nuisance Wildlife, Melody Hartman

9:00 AM St. Joseph River Overview, Neil Ledet

9:30 AM Break

9:45 AM Walking tour of East Race Waterway (Paul McMinn) and South Bend
 Fish Ladder (Bob Bell)

11:00 AM Lunch

12:30 PM River Rescue Demonstration and Interactive Self Rescue
 (*Bring your swim suit, tennis shoes and towel*)

3:00 PM Return to The Works Hotel

- 3:30 PM AMFWA Business Meeting (Oliver Room, The Works Hotel)
- 6:00 PM Evening dinner and social (Monogram Room, University of Notre Dame)
6:00 Social
6:30 Dinner
7:30 National Point of Sale Systems Coordination, Kenneth Nettles
8:00 Watching Wildlife, Dave Case
8:30 Nuisance Wildlife's Far Side, John Russell

Tuesday, July 16

- 7:00 AM Breakfast (danish and coffee provided)
- 8:00AM AMFWA Business Meeting (Oliver Room, The Works Hotel)
- 12:00 PM Lunch (The Works Hotel)

AMFWA Minutes: July 14-16, 1996

The President, Gary Doxtater, gave the call to order.

Roll call

CO, IA, IL, IN, KS, KY, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI, no Saskatchewan, Ontario, Manitoba

Doxtater: On the second section in your book is your business meeting agenda; we want to knock out some things for some people who have to leave today or early tomorrow. The major part of our business meeting will be tomorrow. As far as president's remarks, I might just make a couple of comments. It has been a crazy year; it seems like we just left Galena; a lot of things have been going on and, in particular, at the international level. It's been a tough year in Indiana with cutbacks, budgets, craziness in the legislature and reorganization. As I'm talking to you folks, I'm hearing the same thing. It's kind of crazy everywhere with budgeting problems and so on; we hear it at the national level also. I want to thank Jeff for his help and guidance in taking over some of those responsibilities. He sat in a meeting for me in Washington, D.C. that I could not get to. Max gave me a lot of guidance. The thing that really impressed me by this position and on the executive committee at the international was that it gave me an idea of what is going on. I really appreciate having the opportunity to take this responsibility on.

We have the minutes from the Galena meeting to be approved. A super job on getting the minutes out with Illinois as our host. You have those, and I'm asking for a motion to approve them. We'll see if there are any changes. A motion was made to approve the minutes and seconded. The minutes are approved as read.

You also have in the packet the brief minutes from the informal meeting that we had in Branson in March; I'd like to dispose of those in the same way. Any questions, comments, changes. They are approved.

Legal Committee Report - Mary Ann Habeeb

Doxtater: At the Branson meeting, we kicked around the status of the legal committee. Since we hosted that meeting here a month ago, I came up and met with those folks. Mary Ann Habeeb is here I'll ask her to come up and give us a brief overview of that meeting. Mary Ann is our attorney; she is assigned and paid for by the division, not the department.

Habeeb: We had a very exciting meeting and included in your packet is my report to you. I'll not go through all of the details with you. The meeting was attended by members of eight different states and the U.S.F.S. We also patched in by a telephone conference call on the last day, two members of the solicitor's office of the USFWS out of Twin Cities who were interested in one of the agenda topics. Prior to the meeting, I sent out information to all of the states, including the Canadian provinces, to solicit information, request agenda items, and see what questions they might like to see addressed. The agenda that we prepared was based on those comments and I think that it was very well received. All requested topics were placed on the agenda and addressed in one shape or form. The association was enthusiastic, and we want very much to be part of this organization. Part of your packet shows a discussion we had of the importance of having a legal committee and how

we feel that we fit into this organization. We would like to be officially recognized as a part of this organization as a technical working committee. Traditionally, the committee has met the month prior to your meeting, and we have tried to address the meeting that the director's have. Traditionally, it is hosted by the state that is having the director's meeting that year. I want to thank Jim Christianson from Wisconsin who was very instrumental in this meeting; he also shared with me some draft bylaws and a constitution that were put together by the members of the committee. If you have any questions, I would be more than happy to answer them. We feel that we can serve this organization. In the year that I have been involved in it, it is hard for me to explain how many opportunities I have had to serve my director and other members by networking with the fellow persons who are on the committee. Since that meeting, I have had two contacts by various states with questions that we were able to circulate. I maintain a mailing list which includes telephone numbers, fax numbers, and e-mail numbers. My director had a question a month ago, and I got e-mail messages from two states. It was important for me to provide information to my director very economically and very timely. Other states have not hesitated to call me and ask for names and contacts. Last week I got a copy of a tape from Leslie Auriemmo from the USFS that was recently decided in Indiana dealing with takings issues and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. I'm going to be making it available to each of your attorneys. Following this meeting, I will be sending out to each of those states who had no representation some information that was available to us at the meeting, including the minutes and the updated mailing list. I spoke with attorneys in every state, and they were very much interested in being involved. I didn't hear a negative response from any of these attorneys regarding this organization; they all want to see it continue and flourish and want to be kept informed of what is going on.

Doxtater: I want to note that eight of our states were represented at your meeting. We need a motion and then discuss it and vote on whether it should be a technical working committee or a standing committee.

Farris: It is a technical working committee; there are two official ones so far - the private lands group and this one. It has been officially recognized by the organization.

Doxtater: I was under the impression.. I thought our instructions were to decide if we wanted that or not.

Farris: To see whether it's mission needed to be reconsidered or see if it was serving it's purpose given the lack of full participation. It's kind of a reassessment of the value of the committee. This serves the same purpose, at least from the committee's standpoint; they would continue to be even without the official sanctification from this organization because of the benefits of the individual states. What we haven't had is an outside review of that, I guess, from this group.

Doxtater: Let me open it up for discussion as far as the continuation. The records would show that it is a technical working committee. Any comments from the group? They raised a funding issue. I don't know what kind of funds it would require to maintain it. This meeting was self-sufficient.

Habeeb: Each person paid a fee of \$25 to pay for the lunches. The Division paid the bills for the binders; we had a binder for everyone. No other costs were associated with it.

Doxtater: I don't think we need to address the funding issue right now. Do we want to encourage their activities?

McCloskey: Are there any other associations with legal committees?

Petersen: The Southeastern association does but the western does not. The International has a legal

committee.

Babcock: The support is great; most of these issues are pertinent, and we are all very familiar with them. It would have been interesting to see some of the viewpoints, opinions and directions that the committee would take with regard to each of these issues. What is the relationship of the legal committee to the international legal committee. Each of these committees are being addressed by the legal committee of the international and if there are some redundancies, just a little twist from these and the international region.

Doxtater: Max, do you have any idea as to what kind of communications? Are you aware of anything that has come in from the International?

Habeeb: I have been in contact with Paul Lenzini. I invited him to attend, but he does not attend for funding reasons. I didn't understand going into the meeting that one of the things that perhaps was a charge to the committee was to make a recommendation on a particular issue. That would be a good thing and certainly be something that we could do next year. I could put that in a document so that next year we will know what needs to be done. I was not aware, personally, that that was something that the director's wanted. I think that is what this committee wants to know. As a group, what do the directors' want and how can we serve you? If that's one of them, that can be taken care of. I haven't done any other coordinating with the international. Paul knew that Indiana had charge of this, and he gave me a list of names of the attorneys in every state.

Petersen: I talked to Paul Lenzini this morning and he keeps turning up cases all around the country that he was not aware of. Hopefully, within a year, we will have e-mail capabilities in all of the states, so we can put that type of thing in a bulletin board. A lot of work can be done by e-mail. We need to enlist a state attorney to help; I don't know exactly how to do it; there is a need. Whoever chairs a regional committee should contact the international first. This is a growth industry, and we need to tie it together.

Habeeb: I was not aware of some of the issues that other states had that were important to them; by physically meeting, I got a chance to see who was out there. I think the meeting is important to know who is there so that you can develop networking. Between the meetings, e-mail and faxes helped pretty well as long as the mailing list I kept up-to-date. The new people came away thinking that this was a way to make my workload better and a way to help my state out by networking and communicating. We all came out with a lot of better ideas. Whatever the director's pleasure, we are willing to do it.

Doxtater: Any comments, anybody interested in a motion.

McCloskey: The feedback I got from one of our attorneys who has been participating regularly is that it is well worth the time. It is a little bit of a rest and relaxation trip, but I'm o.k. with that too. Quite frankly, it is for me too. I support the concept and the idea. We get our return.

Hildebrand: Could Jeff or somebody explain the difference between a technical working committee and a standing committee?

Ver Steeg: There are several standing committees- the executive committee, the auditing committee, resolutions committee, nominating/awards committee. By the bylaws that is what they are and they are appointed by the director annually. There are ad hoc committees that may be established as the president deems necessary. In addition, there are technical working committees that are there to assist the association and conduct affairs. The rules for establishing those are a little bit more rigid; within one year, they have to submit a mission statement and responsibilities, etc. We need a place

to keep a running list of the technical working committees so we don't have to dig through the minutes. They have to meet in advance of this meeting and submit a report and provide any resolutions through the chair of the resolution's committee. We designated a third one - the wildlife diversity technical working committee; they are the only three that we have officially recognized so far. We ought to keep a running list as an addendum to the bylaws of when they were officially sanctioned and so forth. We kind of lose that information otherwise.

Doxtater: It really is already a technical working committee. We don't have to have any action; I push for a continuation of it, whether we take any action on it or not. We benefit from it and the international can and it seems to tie are neighboring. It's really beneficial with the networking opportunities. With the international legal committee; we will have experts. Mary Ann has worked with the Indiana Department of Environmental Management and is a specialist in natural resources. You are dealing with your attorney general's office, and you have to re-train one every time you have a case; I guess I'm spoiled with the consistency in ours. Maybe we don't need to take any action on this.

Kramer: We need to recognize them and encourage these meetings; I have been more hamstrung by legal issues than I have by other problems. I perceive we are more in a learning curve. How we can establish that working relationship that we aren't use to?

Hildebrand: We aren't use to it, but they have been a big help.

Farris: Our attorneys work exclusively for the environmental protection division, not for anybody else; they handle these cases. We have no control over him, but we need to get a commitment from him.

Hansen: If this would be the appropriate time to consider the recommendation for funding support ; I make a motion to provide recognition and support.

Doxtater: The group through their registration has been able to fund their meetings.

Hansen: Maybe it's not an issue.

Doxtater: I think it is something that, as they get organized and there is a lot more administrative mailing; I would hope that each state could fund their own.

Miller: From our perspective, keep it low key. Each state should have it's own registration fee; it is a mush smaller group than us. Our travel budgets for attorneys is quite limited.

Doxtater: All in favor say I - no opposition.

Habeeb: Feel free to get in touch with me.

The motion to support the committee and provide recognition was approved.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Report: Midwest Region - Marvin Moriarty

Doxtater: Reports from the USFWS; the service gives us an update of what is going on, what the issues are, how we can help them out or how they are going to help us.

Moriarty: My presence here is courtesy of Steve Miller and Ken Babcock - thank you for rescuing me today. Bill Hartwig sends his regards; he got orders from a higher level - his wife. The FWS is mourning the loss of Molly Beatty; You can sense that loss when you call the Washington office; there is a minimum leadership void right now and people are feeling pretty low. The good thing is that Mr. Babbitt stepped in, at least until the election, and he is going to ask John Rodgers to take over the direction of everything. Many of us have worked with John, so we were glad to hear that. The Budget: as you know when the Clinton administration came in, we were treated with the

National Performance Review, and with that review we were going to have more efficient government and spend less money. We were going to cut our Washington and regional offices in half by 1999. Region 3 is about halfway there so far; we've gone from 212 people to 153. The National Performance Review is driven by the number of people that we have. That was overtaken by the 1994 elections and all the budgetary bologna. Now we are budget-driven and we have no idea if the National Performance Review standards are going to stick or not. I think the elections will decide that. We've been on a real roller coaster, and we have a plan to get down to 153 people in the regional office if we have to. That would be headquarters personnel. What's basically happening is that our middle management is disappearing. We're going to things called self-directed work teams, empowerment, mentors, and stress. We have had various consultants come in and help us get rid of all the stress, and I think the most fitting thing is that once you get over one obstacle, another one comes along. From 1993-1996, our refuge program has been pretty static, no significant increases nor any significant decreases. What that means is that inflation is eating away at us, which is about 12% for that time period. Fisheries is in the same boat, but most of the cuts were in the 80's. They are kicking up right now because they were so low to begin with; they are surging right along. Ecological Services has gotten the biggest bump; they have gone down \$2 million in the last year. A lot had to do with things in the budget, such as endangered species. Base reallocation done in the FWS took from regions 3 and 6 and moved them to the coastal regions. This was reallocation of work due to internal things done in Washington. Regions 3 and 6 vigorously fought this because of the nature of the workload. Unfortunately for the director, we ran into furloughs and FY 96; we ran into a complete mess with regard to the budget this year. Ecological services is looking at riffing about 60 people. Because we did not have to take base reallocation, we wound up losing only 7 people, and that still hurts. It went to various offices, usually the most junior member of the group lost the job, which was usually a member of the private lands group, which is one of our highest priorities. The private lands is still a high priority for the FWS; there are attempts by some of our field supervisors to get some of the people back by soft money or whatever. Regional office administration, another hit there; we don't fill what we lose. You know about the loss of NBS to USGS; we have been servicing NBS for this last year in administrative areas. Contracts are going out to do their service. They are only going to give us half of what they were originally going to give us. Region 3 said they would cut all support as of right now, so they are working on it. We are doing no more work for them right now until we find out more about this budget situation. Mr. Babbitt took on the naysayers all around the country; it's a bit of a reprieve to the budget process for us. He also recently visited the Great Lakes and just came back to us last week and gave us four hours to come up with a 10 million dollar budget increase for Great Lakes activities- that included the NBS and the FWS. We built upon the report that was prepared for the Great Lakes Fish & Wildlife Restoration Act that was done in partnership with the states, the NBS and the FWS; that 10 million coincides with the Great Lakes Restoration Act amount, so we are pretty well set. Our folks will be contacting your folks about what happened; we have no idea whether that will go any place, but we appreciate Mr. Babbitt's interest. We are always reorganizing; there is never a point in time we are not reorganizing. We are implementing the ecosystem approach; that's still alive; John Rodgers has made several commitments to that as acting director. We are also doing a geographic-based reorganization which never got a chance in FY 96; that budget mess did not give us a chance to push it very hard. We will get together in August and figure out how to make it work

in FY 97; Bill Hartwig told us last year that we broke up the region into 3 geographic areas. Each area has it's own assistant regional director; we call them mini regional director's because they have cross program responsibilities. You report to one person who handles all of the programs. That is the only way we can make it work without having so many people to report to. In region 3, we've taken the approach that are there are too many examples of how good it's working. We want the states to join in; find a well working system, join it; don't try to start one. We still try to focus on the prize. We can at least put a little work into the resource, which is why we are all here. Doxtater: Maybe Skip can come up and talk about the western region, and then we will open up for questions.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Report: Western Region - Skip Ladd

Ladd: I'll hit a few of the more specific issues in the mountain prairie region. Region 6 is based in Denver. Five of your Midwestern states are within our regional boundaries. The reorganization in our region is proceeding, similar to region 3; we have organized with state boundaries for each of the 3 assistant regional directors. The National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act (HR 1675) passed the house in April. We have a difference with the international; our organization opposed that legislation. It would be potentially detrimental to the refuge system to have elevated recreational activities as equal purposes with fish and wildlife conservation. We felt that the refuge system has always dealt with recreational activities that are compatible with fish and wildlife objectives; it also authorized an open-ended process that refuges could be used for military purposes. We have some significant difficulties with military operations on refuges, and we didn't think that was in the best interest of the refuge system.

It created a mechanism to remove refuges from the refuge system by calling them coordination areas, and we felt that was not appropriate. Our director is sending a packet stating why we oppose HR 1675. President Clinton signed the executive order for the refuge system, laying a priority on habitat protection and restoration and partnerships as well as enhancing recreational activities. We are implementing that executive order in a variety of fronts; we are looking at opportunities throughout the refuge system to enhance recreational activities that are compatible with the objectives of the refuge. We are accelerating the comprehensive management plan on the NWR and looking for other partnerships in helping to manage the refuges. One other large issue in my region is the Missouri River; our major issue is dealing with the CORE on their annual operations on the Missouri as it relates to endangered species. We have been trying to work with the CORE on interim measures that they can implement prior to completion of the master manual review for conservation of terns, plovers, and sturgeons. The Missouri River coordinator that the FWS had for a number of years will be retiring in January. We have decided to fill the position of Missouri River Coordinator that would be under the Missouri River Natural Resources Committee. We are preceeding to look for candidates. We are hoping to have that filled by October 1st. We will also refill a FWS Missouri River Coordinator position to do internal coordination on Missouri River issues. The North American Waterfowl Management Plan is a high priority for our region. It is the highest priority joint venture in our region, and we share it with region 3 in the prairie pothole joint venture. It is a super job of planning and implementing on the ground habitat activities. At the Southeastern Association meeting, a presentation was made to the directors seeking financial assistance for the Prairie Pothole Joint Venture. The Southeastern Association committed support to the Prairie

Pothole Joint Venture; the breeding grounds are still a priority. Concerning the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, CORP decisions on the Hoosier National Forest have ruled that forest harvesting was not a violation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. In Georgia in the Chatahoochee Forest, a judge ruled that the same type of harvesting was a violation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The whole issue of take of migratory birds is coming to the forefront. There are a lot of things going on around the country regarding take of migratory birds that has led the FWS to begin a process to look at that big picture and determine whether or not there is a feasible way of bringing the issue of take into a legal framework - incidental take is what I'm talking about. For example, in offshore fisheries, migratory birds are being taken in fishing nets and also in timber harvesting - those kinds of things. I think you will be hearing more about this very soon. Those of you who participate in Flyway Council meetings will hear a lot about that later this month. An issue paper is being put together that will be shared with the states on this whole issue of take of migratory birds- incidental take. Whether we get into a system like the Endangered Species Act where there would be a certain level of incidental take permitted, I don't know; that will be an option that will be looked at. Concerning the black-footed ferrets, SD is in the forefront of reintroduction; with this geographic reorganization, I have become the head for that state. CO and UT are coming on line; MT and AZ are also doing reintroductions. It's looking up in captive breeding and reintroduction; several other sites are coming on line on reservations in MT and SD. Private lands are always the priority. We are proud of the partnerships that it involves. The dollars that FWS puts into the fish and wildlife program are leveraged 2 to 1; \$2 comes from other sources to \$1 from the FWS. We are jointly implementing private land programs in CO, KS, NE, SD, even ND. A grant came in for SD to use emergency money to restore wetlands as an alternative way of flood control, a positive force along the Missouri. Our service has been working on a non-native fish stocking policy. The service in our region asked CO, WY, and UT to come up with a policy of stocking non-native fish were it could influence listed species of fish. The Upper Colorado River is a major area of concern right now. In the law enforcement arena, we have a number of things going on. Oil sludge pits are identified as a major issue in our region. There are 100,000 in region 6 based on the studies of migratory birds getting into sludge pits in the Texas panhandle. That probably represents a million of migratory birds a year. Law enforcement is working with companies on implementing procedures to try to minimize migratory bird take in those areas. There will be prosecution if they don't comply. The key leach gold mines also cause a loss of migratory birds. As far as the budget goes, the FWS has received a 3-4% increase in operational dollars in 1997, but that doesn't keep up with inflation, although the slight increase is better than expected. Indians were asked to take over some of the NWR lands; the one at that time was the bison range in Montana. There has been extensive negotiation over that with the tribe over the last year. It's in recess right now. Some other tribes have begun to make inquiries in ND and SD that will probably lead to self-governing requests to take over those lands.

Doxtater: Take a few minutes, but we need to push on; some issues can be worked out one-on-one.

Farris: The Missouri River position is to be filled but work with MRNSC?

Ladd: The FWS is to have a subcommittee; a part-time position to the NRSC. We are trying to fill that commitment. The position will still work under the structure of the FWS but is being turned over to the MRNSC to utilize as a coordinator position for the coordinator states.

Hansen: Will that be a half time position?

Ladd: Right now, it will be a full time position, but that will have to be negotiated. Then we will fill

a position for the FWS coordinator position which will be an internal coordinator position. We will actually be expanding by one person; we have never really lived up to the commitment in that agreement and we are trying to do that now.

Hildebrand: Those positions will work in the same office?

Ladd: Probably not. The MRNSC will be in the Region 3; there have been offers to put in in Omaha. The FWS Coordinator position will be here, but not necessarily where the other one is.

Babcock: We had situations where regions other than our region had a better lead; I think that it is very important that coordination occur. Our situation is that the DNR has the lead and not our agency. The government determines what is important to the DNR.

Ladd: We think this MRNSC position will really help make that coordination work.

Petersen: On the issues raised on the NWR- When it was come to be signed it had a whole bunch of errors in it. Whoever reads it needs to read the final bill and not an earlier version. That bill was changed. It does not force other uses on a refuge; it gives taxpayers authority to stop any use any day he wants to, except if the new refuge is established, he can continue to use it there, contrary to the present position. If a new refuge is established, everything is stopped until the plan is done. The refuge has done this for 5-7 years and is still closed to public use; it's pretty hard to explain to the public why the refuge that was open to public use is now in the hands of the FWS, and the only reason is that we haven't finished our plan yet. The second thing, the present executive order for the NWR was without any public involvement; a new president can change that 180 degrees. An executive order is no good; an organic act is needed. The third thing, the executive order itself says that there are three principles that manage refuges. The first principle is it be open to appropriate public use. Dingell is the father of the refuge system and says that wildlife-dependent recreation has always been a primary purpose of the refuge system. The recreation act of the 1960's said that campgrounds, etc. were secondary uses, but non-wildlife dependent recreation has never been a secondary use. There is no question that it forces any use anywhere any time.

Ladd: I think the issue is that it elevates the recreation as an equal purpose to fish and wildlife; that is the concern of the FWS.

Petersen: So does the executive order; it says the same thing. It lists the three principles. We've spent a lot of time working this bill through to the point where it is very close to what everybody wanted. The enemy of the good is not necessarily the bad; it may be the best the FWS is going to get.

Doxtater: I think we better hit them one-on-one at Notre Dame tonight; we'll try to get through this private lands issue. Mark Sargent is here to give us a brief overview and summary.

Private Land Wildlife Management Group Report - Mark Sargent

Sargent: We were sanctioned five years ago by the Midwest and we've met for 6 years. All 14 states made it to the meeting in Michigan this year. We've been close to 90% all 6 years; we do a lot through the mail, E-mail, fax and phone. We're interacting weekly on the Farm Bill and other activities. We do need to come together once a year to wash out issues. We focused on three major topics - the Farm Bill, native plants and genotypes, and urban sprawl. We did want to make sure to mention that we appreciate the support from the association. We appreciate the opportunities to increase the understanding of the issues; it allows us to be visionary and helps solve problems with the private lands program in our own respective states. Based on our tradition, we have been coming

here for 3 years to report to you. Our recommendations are here for the association. The 1996 Farm Bill was the most important piece of environmental legislation impacting private lands in the next decade. This goal will have a major influence on grassland and farmland wildlife throughout the Midwest. For example, in my own state, the CRP has more acreage in Southern Michigan than we own in public state game areas. We have seen our major duck factories back in production with the rain, and CRP has grown at a rate that hunters and young biologists have never seen. It's an amazing thing! We always said that if we had the water and the grass we could do it, and we've done it. We have new and old provisions. There are two key comments - state technical committees and conservation priority areas. We can't over-stress the state technical committee, which was first conceived in the 1990 Farm Bill as a method of developing state level guidance for Farm Bill provisions. Our group developed this process as being a good process in identifying Nebraska as one of the states that has a leadership role in implementing state technical committees. In the past, the state technical committee has focused on the Wetlands Reserve Program, but since this 1996 bill, that committee will also focus on conservation reserve, flood protection and cost-share practices. This can mean that we will have a larger impact. We developed three recommendations which we strongly encourage. Start the state technical committee based on the example in Nebraska. We recommend that the state technical committee be given new consideration in developing Farm Bill programs for that state. If the state conservationists would reject those proposals, then some type of feedback with a justification is necessary. A lot of states are meeting, but they are ad hoc. They are not getting a lot of respect. Lastly, our group developed a draft letter to Secretary Dan Glickman outlining our recommendations, and we submitted it for your consideration, review and approval, if possible. That letter says three things: there has been a lack of clear direction from USGA concerning the state technical committees, and there is a lack of opportunity in the management of CRP. We recommend that at a national level, they use Nebraska as a template of implementing a state technical committee. That Nebraska process has three things going for it. One is that they use wide, diverse groups that are very well balanced; they have state and federal agencies, public and private organizations, agriculture and conservation interests. They use a system with an advisory committee that oversees it. Specialized workgroups develop recommendations. They do the research and work it all out before they bring it to the advisory group with their approval. That recommendation goes to state conservationists. When necessary, they use a professional facilitator to ensure group consensus and that can't be overemphasized. The other issue we addressed is conservation priority areas; conservation priority areas are of continued importance in the 1996 Farm Bill. They were implementing the past bills, and the priorities have been based on the Great Lakes Watershed and high erosion areas; these sites have in the past focused on CRP, but now will use conservation priorities and will impact wetland reserves and cost-share practices, etc. (all of our programs). This Farm Bill opportunity provides us with an opportunity to focus efforts on targeted landscapes. This may be the best and only method to halt the march of some species towards the endangered and threatened status. We must, however, as a group, develop a logical process to identify these targeted areas, while a conservation priority area should be identified by state natural resource agencies because they are closest to the problems and the needs that need to be addressed. Our group recommends the development of conservation priority areas while using a team approach throughout the Midwest. Furthermore, in 1995, we presented the development of a deed for an ecosystem development working group which was highly endorsed by this association. At that time,

the association decided to take the concept of an ecosystem working group, combined with several other important issues, to establish a biodiversity and endangered species working group, at least that is how we understood the title. The product of a working group would be beneficial in identifying conservation priority areas. Our recommendation includes the fact that conservation priority areas will provide a significant opportunity with the Farm Bill to target landscapes and the private lands working group can delineate those areas. We encourage the association to continue efforts associated with the endangered species working group to be available to this group to identify conservation priority areas. The last thing our group decided on was the prairie pothole joint venture as a consideration as a conservation priority area for the Midwest. That area affects all the states within the Midwest and has major ramifications. The second issue - use of native plants and genotypes-heightened interest in planting appropriate genotypes and restoration management as a common outgrowth of the state efforts to conserve biodiversity. Lately, there is a specific interest in the talk about prairie grass and prairie restoration, etc. Private land biologists are sympathetic to the interests of planting local genotypes and are sympathetic to the local planting on both public and private lands; we do believe that local genotypes should not be planted at any cost. Native local genotype seed is generally very costly and in short supply throughout many of the states. With limited budgets, we need to have cost effective measures to establish wildlife habitat measures, and local genotypes are presently very expensive. Out of the 14 Midwest states, only Illinois has a policy of planting local genotypes and forbes on public lands. They presently have 2 state run nurseries that provide the seed, but they do not have a policy for planting local genotypes on private land. Most states understand the need to use local genotypes but often lack a local seed source. Our states are using native species when conducting prairie grass plantings and acquire their seed locally when possible. We recommend, in the long term, that we should be using local genotypes on both public and private lands. The planting should only occur when seed is available at a reasonable price from state run nurseries as long as costs are minimized and availability is maximized. The last issue is urban sprawl. Michigan is facing this right now with major land uses, and every other state has admitted to having the same problem. Issues include new housing development, conversion of farms to rural estates, changes in values and issues in what used to be rural America, rural fragmentation, conflicting land use, and wildlife habitat degradation. The urbanization has been prevalent for 10-20 years; whereas, in the Midwest, this has recently become of increased importance. Urban sprawl has intensified due to increased distance between work and home sites with emphasis on rural living. Living near outdoor recreation areas and scenic landscapes and changes in office communications, reducing the use of a centralized office also add to urban sprawl. Urbanization can significantly impact wildlife populations. Rapid growth in deer and geese populations in larger cities illustrates how easily certain populations can adapt. Over time, the landscape is changing from large farms to small rural estates, with wildlife as a priority. They are willing to pay for wildlife habitat development. Big tracts owned by adversaries are now smaller tracts owned by our friends; this may be a harsh statement, but it illustrates opportunities. This change has positive and negative impacts. Adaptable wildlife populations flourish in this new ecosystem, but we will continue to see negative interactions between wildlife and humans. Nuisance wildlife populations will grow with or without our guidance as professional wildlife managers. Being proactive and integrating ecosystem management into land use planning and zoning is the way to increase positive outcomes and lessen negative interactions. Past wildlife planning focused on game production can be in direct conflict

with urban settings. We must focus on wetland and rural estates and urban management. Target rural estates in urban areas through workshops, videos and publications. Increase emphasis on integrating wildlife habitat design and wildlife habitats together; we may have to offer different levels of services to different landowners. Provide the farm community with one-on-one services. In urban areas we might do workshops. We need to be proactive in addressing urbanization in wildlife issues; we need to be up-front, leading the issues. The wildlife diversity initiative is probably one of the best key things in the future as far as a funding source for wildlife management in urban areas. It is a great opportunity for us to get ahead of the game. We need emphasis on using videos and brochures on wildlife management ideas, and methodology to educate those who live in urban areas. We need to address wildlife concerns through land use tools such as easements, space zoning, and land trusts. Share information on wildlife habitats and populations with local decision-makers so that they can make wise decisions; demonstrate increased profits from incorporating wildlife into decision-making. Urbanization and urban sprawl will continue to have a major impact on our landscapes; this land use will provide us with many increased opportunities for wildlife habitats, although there will be a chance that we will create negative interactions between wildlife and humans along the way. Be pro-active with ecosystem management and land use planning, generating wildlife habitats. Decrease the rate of species and habitat degradation, and reduce the consequences of nuisance animals.

Doxtater: Another year of a lot of work. We have a problem of how to take action on this. There are a lot of recommendations there, and some specific things to Glickman that we need to discuss. I think we need to have a chance to absorb that to see how the directors feel on it.

Miller: A very good report. The committee is addressing some very important issues. We need some discussion on how to approach the next step at our level, but suggest that we take the recommendations one at a time and act on them. Accepting the report means that we accept all of the recommendations, and we need to take them one at a time.

Doxtater: To accept the report as is would commit to all of the recommendations. Our concern is that Mark has to return to Michigan tonight, and we need to separate the items.

Farris: There may be only one or two we have a problem with. Why couldn't we accept the whole report?

Doxtater: I have problems with the letter. I need a chance to look at it. Some overheads were not in the packet. We need an opportunity to input into various things.

Sargent: Everything on the overheads is in the packet, but not everything in the packet is on the overheads. I can rearrange my schedule if necessary. Terry Riley sits in our group and has been with us and can communicate to you. All recommendations were approved by e-mail from 12 of the 14 states with a group consensus.

Miller: From my standpoint, I could accept the whole report. There were no problems with the letter to Glickman.

Petersen: I have a problem with the letter. We have worked very hard to make this a state technical committee, not an advisory committee. The USDA Reorganization Act specifically excluded these committees from forming advisory committees.

Sargent: We want a response from that organization as to why that recommendation was not accepted.

Petersen: Concerning the letter to Glickman, advisory committees require appointments by the

Secretary of Agriculture with funding and clearing, etc.

Sargent: The only thing advisory in there is on oversee; that word could be left out.

Petersen: My recommendation would be to leave out the whole 3rd paragraph.

Miller: The real key is state conservation.

Petersen: Formalize everything in the rule-making process.

Farris: The letter is a draft only. The recommendation is to send a letter, not this specific letter. I make a motion to accept the report and its recommendations.

Seconded by MO.

Doxtater: We are accepting the report, but we are not necessarily going to act on their recommendations.

Farris: My motion was that we accept the report and the recommendations.

Doxtater: Any other discussion?

Hildebrand: I ran into this last week because our state technical committee ran out of CRP on the 16th of June. The USDA would not overrule the state technical committee.

Doxtater: Ready for a vote?

The motion that the report and recommendations be accepted was carried with no opposition.

Farris: I want to thank this group for doing a really good work; most of these people came up on real short notice in Washington, D.C. and went through the training session about the Farm Bill. They made very valuable comments as to what the rules should look like.

Doxtater: We will not take on the next topic until tomorrow; I do have a letter that the association had requested from the regional office about expenditures- discretionary federal funds to come to the region- and we just got that in. The request came out of the International. Each association should find out where some of the discretionary money is coming from. We have a report from Marvin; I don't know if Skip got that letter or not. We will forward it on to the International. Skip might want to take a look at this.

Tuesday, July 16

Doxtater: Terry Riley mentioned that Mark Sargent called about one item this morning.

Riley: One of the recommendations talked about conservation priority areas; some states are going to identify conservation priority areas within each state, but some of the language in the original Farm Bill was dropped by the end. States could get together and write to the Secretary of Agriculture and petition to identify multi-state conservation priority areas that they were concerned about- where they wanted certain conservation dollars and acres focused. You want the private lands working group to get together and identify those conservation priority areas. We mentioned the Prairie Pothole Joint Venture Area as one of them. If you do want the private lands working group to do it, do you want them to start that process soon to identify those areas and then drop letters for you to sign? Or do you want us to wait until next year or do you want us to do it by e-mail and faxes or do you want to identify the conservation priority areas yourselves and then delegate it down to the private lands working group? We had a long discussion about this at the meeting.

Doxtater: That was an area I was confused on because Mark showed that slide, and it wasn't in the report. It mandated us to do some things like that, and that is where Al was a little uneasy about it.

Farris: Here's what is recommended: conservation priority areas provide a significant opportunity to focus Farm Bill programs on targeted landscapes. The private lands working group is well suited to key and delineate the potential; that is what the report says and that is the report that we accepted. It would be logical for this group to depend upon this technical working group that we have constituted to do things for us and work together and make recommendations for identifying these conservation priority areas. Whether they do it by a meeting or e-mail or faxes-that is a detail they can figure out themselves. I don't feel comfortable with my level of knowledge to make a recommendation on conservation priority areas.

Doxtater: That one overhead was something in addition to what you just read; it said that we would recommend something to Glickman that a committee be formed to do that. It's covered in that recommendation you just read. We need to give the committee some guidance.

Miller: Didn't Mark say that you all reached a consensus in 10 minutes on the Prairie Pothole Joint Venture?

Riley: We decided that the Prairie Pothole Joint Venture was one; we did talk about needing one for every joint venture, but I don't know specifically about the conservation priority areas. Some said the Prairie Pothole Joint Venture, and that be the only one in the Midwest. Iowa is the chair next year.

Miller: Were we going to meet at the international meeting at all?

Doxtater: That is an item that we need to give Al some guidance on.

Miller: I don't know how fast your group can work, but a recommendation by the international meeting would be great. Al's ideas are good.

Babcock: I agree with Al; I would point out from my perspective that this area and any area related to the Farm Bill is acceptable. If we direct the committee to address the areas, we should give them the latitude to do that in what ever form is necessary. I, personally, don't see how they can do this in that short turn-around time without a meeting. That is the highest priority; there is a lot to gain by having this group get back together, and if they could before the international meeting in Nebraska, that would be a great advantage. They may not be as definitive as the Prairie Pothole Joint Venture as far as laying our priorities, but they could be fairly definitive in giving direction with regard to ecosystem types. This might be the head priority that the states could utilize, and then develop their priorities within the states. There may be some areas (Mississippi River and other joint venture areas) that are within the Midwest that could clearly be of impact. I think we ought to give this group a lot of latitude over the next few weeks to try to work this out. Nothing is more important.

Doxtater: My suggestion is to have the group get in touch with Al, and come to us with the way you would like to do it. You are the group to do it.

Petersen: Let me point out that there were four original priority areas named; they were in the 1990 Farm Bill. There has been some thought that they put all of the joint ventures in as priority areas. We are going to be reallocating land that comes out of the CRP, not just new land. The state technical committees had talked about doing that. This is an important undertaking and needs to be done in a very timely way, but there are some implications. This is very, very important.

Wildlife Diversity Technical Working Committee Report - Dennis Figg

Doxtater: We go to discussion about wildlife diversity/ecosystem management and the endangered resources technical working committee. We have a letter from Deanna Glosser, and Dennis will give us a report on that. I'm confused about the title; she calls it the wildlife diversity technical working committee. I'm confused about where that has come from, but Dennis is going to square me away.

Figg: I thought Deanna Glosser had the starting pistol, so when I came to this meeting, I asked her for it, but she said that she didn't have it. We think Dave Roth has it, but he retired; basically, this race hasn't started yet, so the report can be brief. The only two people that have spent some time on this in the last year are Deanna Glosser and myself. She did struggle with getting this group together and getting assignments from the various states. She spent a good deal of effort on that. That should be a topic of discussion today. When we have that solved, we can have some assignments resolved. The only assignments we have is to make an assessment or make a definition about diversity/ecosystem management. Find out what the states have, and Deanna did that. This just arrived in the last week, and it is a collection of everything that we got from the states that stated a definition from related federal agencies - what their definitions are. Deanna and I don't have a recommendation on this yet, but at least we have everything here in one document that we can share about what those definitions are, and how to arrived at a definition for biodiversity. The mission and title of this group has evolved through time. It became the wildlife diversity technical working committee, but it has the same mission that you were thinking of. We really haven't gotten started, and that may be the first place to start. I have some ideas that this committee should be discussing, but I think it might be appropriate to have some discussion first on what you have in mind and how to get this committee filled out with members.

Doxtater: We may ask Colorado; I know you were one of the states that had questions about participating in that activity. We have a letter here that states the reasons. Has anything changed on that or are there other states that have reasons?

Figg: Kansas recommended Jerry Horack; Missouri recommended Dennis Figg; Colorado got a recommendation in, but it got spliced. Other than that, there were no other recommendations to be on this comm., and it was approved a year ago when you made that call for recommendation. Every state should have a representative appointed to this committee, and that group of people would come up with their own four member steering committee. So far, it has just been Deanna and I. We are not very effective yet.

Doxtater: But this letter says that our conclusion is that we will not participate in this effort at this time. That was Colorado's.

McCloskey: That was sent while we were looking for a new director, and I was the acting director. My designated director sent that, and I never saw it or had any input into it; it was one of those deals where he was moving mail for me. We are certainly interested in participating; our issue is that a lot of our species are more appropriately being handled through the western association. We belong to both associations so the ecosystem approach that we would share with the Midwestern states really is not the species that are fighting us right now. We are working with the western association on those species. We like to stay involved, and we will be players.

Miller: We will be players but we have had trouble getting people and getting organized. There will be some new staff assignments.

Doxtater: Are we clear on the mission and the overlap of these two?

Farris: No, I'm not. It seems like it has changed from what it was.

Doxtater: We have on a letter from June 5, 1995 that Deanna prepared to Jeff that the mission statement was to provide a mechanism for the Midwest to evaluate and address issues related to diversity conservation, including endangered species recovery, ecosystem management, public information, and education. There are some objectives, also.

Ver Steeg: Specifics on assignments last year was a carry over from the private lands group. They had a recommendation for a definition for ecosystem management that we tried to use within the region. One of the first charges we gave to this group was to take that and see if it was alright the way it was. We felt that the private lands working committee could let go of that. What Deanna has been doing up to this point is to compile. The objectives are still valid and needed for this group: synthesize and develop recommendations to give this body on issues dealing with biodiversity policy and endangered species and other related issues and provide an avenue for the states for communication. They haven't had an opportunity to do that yet.

Young: Is there is a way to let the private lands committee take this to fulfill the mission?

Figg: One of the requests of the group was that this group do some work for them.

Doxtater: We don't want to overload their plate, with the activity of the Farm Bill.

Babcock: There were two issues that we arrived at 2-3 yrs ago - ecosystem management and endangered species, both leading to the teaming with wildlife issue which is another issue which gives more of a need for this group. Our discussion was last year, in looking at those two issues and considering the need for two working groups; it was the same people in many instances. There was no reason not to merge them into a single group. I understand what Tom is saying, and private lands is going to be important and will deal with endangered species, but on the other hand, dealing with those issues, specifically, is why we have the private lands group dealing with Farm Bill legislation and trying to sort that out and give us direction from a regional standpoint. We are trying to do it on a state basis - related to ecosystem management, endangered species- the teaming issue, etc. The key is that we got a reacclamation from the group in Galena to form this group. When the call went out to get people signed up, nobody responded. Dennis and Deanna aren't going to do this for the group, and we need to disband this group if we can't give them some help. Teaming with wildlife probably has 100 million dollars on the table; teaming with wildlife deals with endangered species and biodiversity issues, and we ought to have this group provide guidance to this association on all of those things.

Figg: We want to know if this just isn't high enough on the priority list, or if you want to commit resources to it. Nobody has fired the starting pistol. I sat down with Katie Smith from Indiana and we came up with a short list of some things that we think you might want direction on- things we could report on. Let me tell you some of those things - biodiversity programs are being scrutinized. Conserving biodiversity of forests - organizational programs of how forestry programs should be responding to biodiversity programming; whether you agree or not, we could give someone an assignment. Multi-species recovery planning- there haven't been that many initiatives in the Midwest to try to lump things together. Coordinators should get together on a regional basis and decide what issues should be addressed and commit to species-based to fill in the gaps. Some species are going to be a part of ecosystem management and respond and recover; others aren't. We need to be working on performance measures for ecosystem management, so we know when existing fish and wildlife management activities achieve those ecosystem management needs. How to measure

that and what programs do we have to make those achievements. With the Endangered Species Act, there is a greater role for states to reauthorize ESA. The international and the western governor's association are putting more responsibility onto the state programs. The reauthorized ESA will provide that opportunity; our states are evaluating how they are going to respond to this. Maybe they don't need to yet, but at some point, when ESA is reauthorized, we will have to respond to that. As a group, we want to know how to respond or how will a program respond and change. How will you hold in your endangered species programs? How will you fold your endangered species program into biodiversity? I think we need to determine whether we are going to proceed with this. If we are, who will be your representative to this committee. In many states, it probably is your endangered species coordinator. If not, evaluate how to keep your endangered species coordinator in this.

Doxtater: I hear a lot of positive things right now; I assume we need to go on with the support of the director's, unless I hear a motion that we ought to deactivate the committee.

Babcock: I offer a motion that this association endorse the idea of this committee. Having a meeting between now and the time we meet again in Des Moines, and that each of the states be encouraged to provide a name and be encourage to participate in that meeting to the extent possible allowed.

Farris: Maybe the December Midwest meeting might be a good time. Some people go to that meeting. Surely, everybody knows who there endangered species person is so that they could give the name today.

The motion that we endorse the idea of this committee carries with no opposition.

Figg: We will recontact everybody and state who is your person.

Doxtater: The new president will take that over, but you will hear from me also.

Treasurer's Report - Joe Kramer

The transactions go by calendar year, so this first sheet does not have the \$150,00 on it that the Midwest received in January of 1996. The executive committee is seeking guidance on the \$150,000 that was willed to the Midwest by Antone Jessup. It came via Jeff Ver Steeg, and we deposited it on January 9. We are sitting on about 5% interest. Over the last 6 months, it has collected \$3045 in interest. In March, the Midwest chose to send \$30,000 for teaming with wildlife efforts to the international; at that time the president said that the states would send \$2,143.00 a piece to make up the \$30,000. Everybody has paid up except for 6 states; one has told me that the check was in the mail; I'll make sure you know who you are. What that has done is it has left a total amount (July 12) of \$140,187.84, with 6 states that have outstanding payments to make; if you add that; that will be \$12,858 added to the \$140,000; which will give the \$150,000 account - \$153,000.84; we are getting 5% interest. I handed out a perspective for handing out the \$150,000; I was asked by the executive committee what my thoughts were. I think that we should lock the money in with some investment, whether it is a 3, 4, or 5 year investment; lock it and don't spend it, unless we decide on something important such as teaming with wildlife or the Farm Bill. Up until this time, the Midwest has always spent money on the Farm Bill - for the last 10-15 years; this gives us a lot of flexibility. We shouldn't spend it all. We can generate \$7-10,000 a year. Create a committee to oversee the projects, so that the \$7-10,000 could be spent annually. According to Jeff, there is additional monies that have not come.

Doxtater: Do we have a motion to accept the treasurer's report?

Miller: I accept the motion.

Sheets: I second the motion.

The motion to accept the treasurer's report carries with no opposition.

Auditing Committee Report - Doug Hansen

Hansen: The auditing committee consisted of myself, Al Farris, and Tom Young. We scrutinized the books very carefully, looking at the checking account and bank balance statements. They are in order, and the report provided by Joe is accurate and reflects the financial condition of the association. It's obvious that he has a very astute secretary when it comes to managing the checkbook. All of the bank balance statements reconcile with the checkbook and the report. I move that the association adopt the auditing report.

Motion carries with no opposition.

Doxtater: The executive committee met and discussed the situation with this money. It was the consensus of the executive committee that we need to take advantage of that money and keep it and use it to generate some working capital on an annual basis. Then, establish a committee to establish some guidelines for how to give out the money, such as for grants. We have already received several requests for spending the money, but we have to look long range. Use the \$150,000 as a cap and work with the generated interest for spending. There may be times where we worked out of it such as with teaming with wildlife, reacting to something quickly, but replacing it as time went on.

Budzik: What kind of fund do you mean for 3,4,5 years? Mutual funds or...

Kramer: Mutual funds; I would not recommend that we go with this one, maybe something better. One was a bond proposal, the other was a trust, with 6% or 8% interest. The committee would have to decide on a money market or whatever. You have to be able to get that money out once you make that decision. Lock in something for 5 years, and they make the money available to you quarterly or even quicker than that. That is something for the committee to decide.

Budzik: Mutual funds as a general rule are 5-10 years; you don't want them on a short term basis, and get burned. I would recommend a lesser amount going into mutual funds and keeping the balance to draw on. Mutual fund should be 10 years.

Doxtater: If the new president appoints a committee to make a recommendation on this. It is something that could be done and a recommendation given at Tulsa.

Farris: What if we split this into 2 issues? Hold the idea of whether we want to spend some of this \$150,000 or whether we want to use the interest money. The other issue is where to put the money to make interest. What do we want to do with that interest money? My motion is to keep the \$150,000 and not spend that, but keep it and use the interest on it to fund various activities, unless there is a situation like the teaming with wildlife issue where we give the money and it is paid back. The association approved the use of the money for that.

MN seconded.

Doxtater: Does everybody understand?

Hansen: We look at this like a trust.

Farris: We never want to spend that long term.

Hansen: We want to have a portion of that liquid enough so that we can use it.

Doxtater: That is number 2 or 3 of Al's; we just want to say that we will set it aside. We haven't decided where we will set it.

Miller: What opportunities have we missed in the last 5 years because of the lack of money?

Kramer: We sent money for the Farm Bill every 5 years to the international. that was around \$5,000.
Doxtater: The idea is that the committee would set up some kind of guidelines as to what projects that would benefit all states in the Midwest that groups could apply for and set some criteria for types of projects.

Hansen: What are you going to accomplish in the region with \$10,000 that could be of significance or could that be better spent at the international level?

Doxtater: The committee could decide that.

Babcock: Typically, the money that the association has made available has been to the international for teaming with wildlife and other activities, sometimes at a matching level.

Doxtater: We've got a motion to cap that \$150,000 for interest-bearing funds.

Hansen: I don't think that the two ideas here are mutually exclusive; we should recognize that we do accept some risk when we loan out a portion of it, with the idea that we'll get paid back, when we may not. If we don't get paid back, we don't satisfy the other part of the equation. I think we can do both, just as long as we understand that we are at risk.

Doxtater: I think that is something that when the decision is made to loan out money, it is agreed to by each state or the association, and it is understood as a loan, although it is still some risk.

Hansen: I feel more comfortable if there are some specific criteria as to how much and what portion can be made available on a loan basis.

Babcock: I support this motion. We don't want to restrict the committee too much; we'll receive a report back from this committee. This committee is not constrained by this motion; we are not putting our money on a first-come,first-serve basis.

The motion to cap the \$150,000 with interest-bearing funds carries with the exception of Ohio.

Doxtater: We need a committee to try to set up some guidelines to report back.

Farris: There are a couple ways to handle and reach this objective; we can either try to reach a consensus ourselves to decide where it is to go, or this body can direct me as the new incoming president to appoint a committee to come up with a recommendation for what to do with that money. We have had some good ideas here; you can feel free to direct me to when you want that committee to report. Instead of 5%, I make the motion to have the executive committee decide

Motion is seconded by WI; no opposition.

Farris: The third issue is like the international uses, where we establish a committee to accept proposals and review them and make a recommendation to them.

Babcock: This committee couldn't do its work until at least after September. We should defer action until we have this report; there is no reason to move until we see what the executive committee recommends.

Nominations/Awards Committee Report - Bruce McCloskey

McCloskey: We agreed on one award. The Midwest association will recognize Jerry Presley at the September meeting for his outstanding service, and it will be presented by Al in Omaha. We need to recognize those who worked on the Farm Bill.

Hansen: I think this is an effort worth recognizing, but picking individuals is difficult.

Farris: I think we could recognize the states of Ohio and Wisconsin as an organization, because they allowed those individuals to go to Washington ,D.C. on short notice. Recognize the individuals and the organizations.

McCloskey: We don't want to present so many that they lose meaning; we don't have any means of soliciting names to this committee.

Kramer: We've invested about \$600 in plaques; we need to be more aggressive with these. Historically, we have lost some states, Oklahoma and Arkansas.

Doxtater: Is there a way that we can combine a recognition to the state with their individuals, recognizing both the organization and the individual?

Babcock: That is essentially what the Seaton Award is to the international. It's impossible.

I agree that we need to make awards more significant, without some formalization. The Southeastern association has a committee that solicits nominations for their award. The international has a special award and has the privilege of giving to others. Wisconsin and Ohio and two individuals are worthy of recognition. We need to formalize the award so it carries meaning.

Doxtater: Would there be interest in a motion to follow that concept of recognizing these people, especially with the Farm Bill this year? Take Ken's suggestion and move early on in the next administration to get the awards committee more structured and prepared.

Petersen: I agree with what you are saying and think it is a good idea. A certificate could be done for all the other people who helped out. Every state here contributed a lot of people.

Doxtater: The problem with the certificate is making sure that you have covered all of the bases.

Petersen: You can either recognize nobody or everybody; that is always a problem.

Let the states give you the names of those who helped with the Farm Bill.

Kramer: I would be more than happy to work on the certificate part.

McCloskey: I can do the second part. Have a page to establish criteria to present awards, etc. I am volunteering to be on the committee.

Babcock: I think it might be a good function for the nominating committee to become more of an awards committee and be given a clearer responsibility.

Kramer: I agree with a certificate of recognition, but we may want to recognize other organizations outside of the association in the Midwest.

Doxtater: That responsibility could be left up to the director's in the state to look outside.

How should we address the awards? A motion for these 2 states or what?

Sheets: I move that we recognize the 2 states on plaques, Ohio and Wisconsin, and do the certificate program for individuals; that state would turn around and recognize their people in some way. The certificates would come from the association, not the states.

Babcock: I second the motion.

Ladd: We ought to be pretty liberal with these certificates because there were a lot of people involved that are worthy of recognition.

Sheets: That would include other non-governmental organization's such as Terry Riley.

The motion that we recognize the two states with plaques and individuals with certificates carries with no opposition.

IA: Could I present those awards at the international meeting and the state director give the list of recipients by September 1? Do a written request.

Change in Bylaws - Jeff Ver Steeg

We made 3 proposed changes; we talked about the various committees that the organization has. We made the change from director to the word president, and we clarified the responsibility of mailing

proceedings. The most significant change is to increase the amount of money allowed to the host state to conduct the meeting - from \$500 to \$1,000 annually. Donations from non-governmental organizations help, but the costs of copying, etc. are high, so the \$1,000 is not unreasonable.

Miller: I move to accept the 3 proposed changes.

Babcock: I second the motion.

Farris: The \$1,000 - does that include the money for the proceedings?

Ver Steeg: No, the money is only to run the meeting. Related business functions are not to exceed \$1,000. The bill for the publications comes later to the treasurer to pay for the proceedings.

The motion to accept the three changes carries with no opposition.

Babcock: I was wandering; I was surprised that our annual dues are \$100; I think that is too small; We need to retain for the record the technical working groups. The bylaws might not be a bad place to do that. Consider establishing a standing bylaws committee, then an ad hoc bylaws committee, just for discussion.

Goose Symposium Funding Report - Steve Miller

Dr. Rusch at the National Canada Goose Symposium in 1991; Dan struggled to get the money to print the proceedings, and it was not in the original budget. I'll send it out to the directors. It would be inappropriate for them to pay the total cost of the proceedings. Later, the income from investments, if we receive a request, will be up to \$5,000. The president will dispense that. There is lots of worthwhile information in it, and the biologists should have this information available to them.

Babcock: The sponsors of the symposium should give \$1,000. This association or the states could be the sponsors. It's unfortunate that this money was not given up front. There was lots of information given with papers presented on the Canada goose issue; the association should support and encourage state committees to reconvene and get the money available to them. States with representatives there, the FWS, the Canadian FWS, and others with strong interests should contribute. This association should not pay the entire amount.

Doxtater: We should draft a letter of response to Dr. Rusch.

Miller: We will carry this information back. What type of publication is being made - one with slicky covers or a fancy \$10,000 model. \$500 from individual states to get the information out would be great.

Sheets: The project appeals as a revolving fund, so we will get it back.

Baiting Issue Status Report - Max Petersen

It was formed by Jerry Presley. Brent Manning was charged to chair the committee with George Meyer. These are biological and law enforcement questions. The charges are understandable to law enforcement and to landowners. In setting new rules, we wanted to be friendly to the conservation of wildlife; we want to continue to do things that benefit wildlife. There has been a request for each of the flyways to appoint up to 2 members for each flyway; we ask that the flyway council chairs come up with a regional association chair. Then, we've asked 4 or 5 non-governmental organizations to provide representation, everybody from the NWF to the WLF, so that we have outside look at this whole thing. It's a little deeper than the service had in mind. They had hoped to restrict it to soil and water management, but there are a whole lot more questions. There are 36 million acres in CRP - that is not normal agriculture. That is the foundation for the regulations out there now. We are asking to plant food

that would be good for wildlife; we don't want people to plant food good for wildlife and then tell people they can't hunt their land. To add some urgency to this whole thing, Congressman Young has an interest in the bill; one of the things that they are attempting to do in the bill is to have landowners have responsibility if they are inviting people to hunt. Guides have responsibility if they take people hunting. The guide may have known about baiting and did it anyways; he'll take you somewhere to hunt and you have no idea where you are; then you get cited for baiting and get fined. Another question has been raised by the Southeast region - how this relates to dove hunting. Are they going to have to determine if this is for dove vs. waterfowl hunting? Brent will meet Aug 29 at the flyway council meeting.

Farris: Live decoys are another question, with people who are feeding and have live birds. You really can't separate them. Sometimes that could be called baiting, sometimes that is using live decoys. Maryland raises and releases mallards; we need to identify the difference between a pen-raised and a wild mallard when they fly over or land on a lake. We ought to let them get through the first part of this before we get to the second issue.

Ver Steeg: That is the first time I have heard that; the committee is 20 people strong, and the requests went out for nominations last month, and they are still trickling in. People want to put issues on the table; moist soil and other game bird issues are getting broader all the time. How many issues can they realistically handle and get them done by the end of this calendar year. All of those issues are interrelated; some people will take it all the way and say do anything.

Petersen: We have a lot of people looking over our shoulders; the media is very interested in what we are going to do. Add David Hall to the committee (former federal agent); there are 20 people on the committee and it is real broad-based. I suspect you will get a real high quality project with a lot of horsepower. It won't be a rushed judgment.

Doxtater: Along with that, with Tim Moser, we have a recommendation for Dick Bishop (IA) and David Hadden(AL) to represent us. I told him that I would run that past you all and see who we would recommend to be on that committee.

Babcock: Is that from the flyway council or the Midwest?

Ver Steeg: The intent is that the flyway council wants 2 representatives from the regional association; the person on the council should hold the regional perspective. Don Acres is the chair of the council and he has already submitted the names to the council.

Kramer: The central flyway one from TX and one from SD would represent.

Farris: We would really be recommending 2 people.

Miller: I move to endorse 2 people.

Babcock: I second the motion.

The motion to endorse two people carries with no opposition.

Nebraska Trapping Video Status - Wes Sheets

Most of you have been party to this issue, and the production is 98% complete. There were 2 products of that video production - the 23-24 minute addition suitable for a 30 minute TV slot or other purpose. We melted it down to an executive summary which is 6 minutes long, with the intent being that we want to get our senators to see this. They won't stay for a 23 minute version, but their staff might watch a 6 minute version. I will show you this 98% video cut; the final edit goes tomorrow with any suggestions. The only thing left to do is to decide who will be on the credits and

who won't be.

(Played the video)

Farris: Very well put together, but I have a question. Should the biologist be dressed in casual clothes or in uniform? What is the image that you want to project?

Sheets: The trust was to try and make people feel as comfortable as they could with this issue.

Figg: The message was good; her dress didn't fit, especially with her in her heels talking to the trapper. It was too much for me. It's demeaning to professional women who are out there doing things.

Kramer: I like how all of the different interests were involved, but the vet is a real risk to me. The AVA is opposed to trapping; vets are, in general, opposed to trapping, and a lot of impact is possible.

Sheets: Most of your organizations have somebody who has been involved. That is a pretty valuable comment and some is maybe overdone. I don't know where this is going back to at this point; we are developing a distribution and a use plan at this point. The recommendation of our resources people will be how to use this. We have a lot of cable TV companies with a public service channel that this could be used for exposure. We need to work hard on how to send this message out.

Doxtater: I'll comment on this. I'll assume that the dress of the reporter was intentional to represent that 60-80% of our population who would do the very same thing, like a lot of our reporters who come out in the field to do an interview. They come out with no idea; now, the outdoor woman type ought to know better. This was by design from a person who was biased and did not know enough to know not to wear heels.

Sheets: We have shown this to a number of our secretaries with no wildlife background, and they were very favorably motivated by this video. It was positive in most or all cases.

Meinchuk: Don't include those 2 parts that we have mentioned here in that 6 minute summary.

Sheets: The 23 minute version can be cut to fit the network program anyways; our next issue is how to use this.

Petersen: That was a good video; remember that we are primarily addressing an urban audience that is anti-trapping. You have to have people in there that an urban audience relates to; the woman was fine because she was an urban woman out here as a reporter. There is some possible risk with the vet, but they have not taken a position against trapping as the AVA; some groups have. I want to express some real appreciation for some of the things that you have helped out on in the last 2 years. We have already talked about the Farm Bill; the Midwest was the key to the conservation title of the Farm Bill. Chairman Roberts finally agreed to a conservation title thanks to your efforts. We are indebted to Al Farris for 15 years of service to this. I have enjoyed 3 Farm Bills; I have enjoyed about as much of these as I can stand. This was a real victory, and we are indebted to a lot of non governmental organization's who did hang in there. There is a good effort on Teaming with Wildlife. The western governors will taken up this issue formally with their meeting in November. They have four governors who are on board; we have a total of eleven governors on board right now. The western governors are the closest to being on board because of the great plains initiative. Nebraska continued to work with one governor. Good things have happened, but we still have a long way to go. The grazing bill has passed the Senate finally and is in the house. We are trying to convince them that if it passed now, it will get a sure veto. Either change it or kill it; we prefer to kill it if we knew how to do it for sure. It's now being proposed to being put on the parks omnibus bill that has all kinds of goodies on it for all kinds of people. It has an expansion for the winter olympics in Utah,

etc. They want to attach the Grazing Bill on to there; we are in a great bit of notoriety now. They might improve it enough to get it to pass, but it might still be a bad bill. One of the things we did to reduce that chance was we said that if title 2 of the grasslands bill remains, we will oppose it; we have asked for several other changes in title 1. We can't predict the outcome. We need to decide if we can negotiate something; we would prefer that the whole thing die and we start over next year. We need professionals to negotiate; we have some credibility there.

Wildlife Refuge Bill - We have a substantial difference with; I've never been so disappointed in a long time. There are some valid differences for how you want to specify use; the executive order does call for three principles to be observed and one of them is use of the system, then wildlife habitat, and ecosystem management. We think it is a good bill. Gary Taylor worked significantly with that group and with the WMI and the WLF. It is as good as you are going to get; people who oppose that bill really don't want hunting on wildlife refuges. Some people oppose it on the basis that it is dangerous to consider public use as an objective of the system; other systems - NPS, NFS - they all have multiple purposes. There are great opportunities for environmental education. There are many other opportunities besides hunting and fishing; the standards that determine whether there will be hunting and fishing are the same standards that are in the FWS regulations right now. Why is it a big deal? We can change that, they said, so I said that you wanted an organic act; an organic act by definition has things that can't be changed except by legislation, depending on the executive order, which can be changed tomorrow. We are in disagreement and there won't be a wildlife refuge bill again. We almost had one 2 years ago, and this version probably won't pass, so the service will still be looking for an organic act for the wildlife refuge system. This is one of those cases where the enemy of the good is not the bad, but the perfect. A perfect bill won't happen. The FWS better realize that they are not the only players. Concerning the ESA Reauthorization and Clean Water Act - I don't think either one of those will go anywhere this year; they are working on both of them in the House and Senate. There is still too much disagreement. The takings legislation which is in the Senate now would compensate people if their property values are reduced by a third, generally. I don't see that passing this year either because there is too much disagreement. There is going to be a federal law having to do with takings; that will depend on the constitution. It costs too much money to have somebody review the subject of takings. Obvious cases have been brought before Congress; and other cases don't have enough money to take it to court. Congress is going to set up some mechanism to look at takings questions; we are trying to get an exemption for fish and wildlife regulations to be considered a taking. Just trying to evaluate whether your regulations change a property value would be a nightmare; we are trying to look at some exclusions of some kind. The Endangered Species Act and wetlands conservation are what is doing this, which means we need to get back to new endangered species legislation and make the ESA more user friendly and provide more incentives. They may complete the revision and reauthorization of the Superfund Act. Teaming with Wildlife has really mushroomed or accelerated; we have now almost 1100 groups that have signed on and written official letters supporting teaming with wildlife, representing almost all of the traditional fish and wildlife organizations. Only 2 traditional groups have not signed on and they are the Safari Club and the NRA. Eleven governors are on board. Bass Pro Shops and several optical companies have been important, but we are still weak on some of the big industry groups that sell a lot of outdoor equipment such as REI, L.L. Bean, and Cabella; we'd like to get at least 1 of the 3. They are very uncomfortable and opposed to this, but they see that it is moving and they are trying

to figure out how it is moving. They are trying to figure out how they are going to come out a winner; I think we will come out with the support of the Sportsmen's Caucus in the end. The finance committee in the Senate and the ways and means committee in the House is going to tell us that they are not going to move any tax legislation this year; neither side wants to give the other credit for passing this bill. With only 20 working days left in the session, chances are that they are going to tell us that they can't move it this year. We will try to continue the momentum and get more industry people on board; we will send out a new suggested 6 month plan, maybe early next week. It doesn't help us to get it past one house; we want to go through both houses quickly so people can't build opposition. Don't get the bill introduced until you have the horses to pass it. The three big organizations will publish to their members to write Congress to oppose it. I think it will go this year or next.

Some bigger items of concern: we don't have adequate understanding and support for Wallouf-Breaux or Pittman-Robertson; I don't blame people for not understanding. One minute we are calling it the Sportfish Restoration Fund, the next the W-B program. We have so many names; the most of the public don't know that they support these when they buy these items. The industry is changing - at one time it was a family organization. Now they are part of conglomerations where they are only looking at the quarterly bottom-line. Without knowledge of industry leaders, in this climate, you could have people cut the tax in half or eliminate it. It is seen by some as an entitlement program, and these programs are under the gun now as a source of problems. Look at sportsmen and women, industry leaders and political leaders and make sure all three understand these programs at the state level. Some of the dedications I have attended haven't included the source of funds, such as WB-PR funds. That is dangerous not to tell people that their sportsmen's dollars are being used for conservation. We don't have a crisis here, but we want to do something before we have a crisis. Are you inviting your members of Congress to those dedications routinely, or at least the local representative? When you recognize a new class of people attending a hunter education class, do you think of having a picture taken and point out the source of funds? There are a lot of ways to let political leaders know what happens; there are some good omens - a 20% increase in license sales in the last 3 years. The industry state coop loaner programs for loaning out tackle have gone over really well, especially in urban areas. Give a youngster a rod and reel and show them how to use it. Becoming an outdoor woman has really blossomed in every state that has tried it - it recruits people who want to do something but don't have the skill. Women should have the opportunity to learn those skills. Next year is the 60th anniversary of P-R; we need to decide about doing some things. Recognize some people who were the original conservationists; people who put their money where their mouth is. We are reluctant to recognize people; we are reluctant to celebrate things. This would be a real good time to celebrate - in the hunter education class or whatever. Sherry Twang is working on this for us. Give some thought what you might do. Wes has the annual meeting in September, and I hope you all come. It is important because we will know by then how much of this legislation will carry over, and we will know more about the regulations for the Farm Bill.

McCloskey: Any thoughts on the Presidential election? Strategically, what discussion have you had?

Petersen: We have primarily worked through intermediaries with the Dole campaign to influence some of those; the same with the Clinton administration. We passed through some information on Teaming with Wildlife to Senator Dole in one meeting; his office was pretty influential in the

conservation provisions. We recommend that if you see promising people in your state that they are at least aware of natural resource questions as soon as they are elected. Make a point to provide information and let them know your name and where they can call you. They all have local offices that they establish; those local offices feed daily or weekly reports to the federal office and a lot of times they are looking for something to report.

Doxtater: I only have 2 representatives from Indiana on the Sportsmen's Caucus. Is there information that I could put into a letter that I could send and get you folks involved in it? I need some information, whether it is a brochure or organizational thing that they could send us.

Petersen: We could send you a list of the people who are members.

Doxtater: Let's get that out to all of our states.

Babcock: Can you give us an update on the NBS?

Petersen: On the house side, there were 3 proposals about what to do with NBS; whether to send it back where it came from or use the money to finance other things. The third one was to leave it where it was; it turned out that there was not a majority for any of those proposals. The default has been to leave it where it is, which is with USGS. With a director, it would be a division under USGS in the Senate. We were told early on that Senator Gordon who chairs that subcommittee was going to move back where it came from. The problem is that they were told that the president would oppose that; it appears that they didn't do anything in the Senate. If it stays in USGS, it will continue to lose funding. We will have to mount a major effort if we are going to try to do something to rescue NBS. For Mr. Babbitt, this has become his most important issue. Jerry Presley and I will set up a meeting; we have another issue with Interior right now on trapping. As you know, the European community has originally said no more importation; we are trying to set trapping standards. The Interior wants to use state representatives as advisors. If it is changed to a delegation, it would reverse a policy that the Interior has had for over 50 years.

Ladd: In the house report on the 1997 appropriations, the FWS will refrain from using steel leg hold traps for any purpose other than law enforcement means. This creates quite a stir on leg-hold traps on refuges; they have made this a major policy issue.

Petersen: The Interior will refrain from promoting or engaging in any activity in steel leg-hold traps except for law enforcement. One senator wanted to knock out leg-hold traps period.

Budzik: Have you had any contact with the new chairman?

Petersen: She's getting a lot of help from Congress; we will prevail but the Interior is not on the same side. The main issue is humane trapping standards, but some people don't want trapping at all, and that's what makes it an issue. We've got four years to work together on the NBS if the President gets reelected; if he doesn't get reelected, you can do what you want with NBS.

Doxtater: Let's go on; at the Tulsa executive committee meeting, we established a new hunter education and shooting sports committee and Steve (KS) is on that committee.

Miller: I can be very brief because we haven't had a committee meeting yet. We had one informal meeting at the National Shooting Sports Symposium in June in Orlando. It is an effort to provide a liason between the states and industry in terms of shooting firearms and archery, and also hunter education. It's more than a liason; we are willing to assist states in developing programs and facilities surrounding shooting sports and hunter education. We have neglected as agencies some of our constituents who contribute directly to our revenue, but they don't necessarily hunt or fish. This effort will increase some opportunities for shooters. Membership is in flux; we hope to have a

meeting prior to the September meeting. Outside the state representatives, we are looking at the NRA, WMI, National Bowhunter Education Council, National Hunter Education, Isaak Walton League and perhaps others.

Council for Environmental Education - Jim Wilson

Let me review the background of where we are; in 1970, a group of our colleagues in the western association got together with folks from the education department and thought they ought to have a regular way to meet and deal with environmental education in their state. They formed an organization called the Western Association Environmental Education Council. Through pooling their resources, they got some funds. They want the programs to be about the kids, the land and the future; build programs about how to do things and to participate. They formed a partnership with the American Forestry Institute, and they had developed an activity based program dealing with forests for teachers to use in school systems- that was Project Learning Tree. It was a pretty effective model built on a network, and they looked at a way to get a wildlife-based project going. Using that same network of resource agencies, they formed another partnership with a group called Watercourse from Montana University called Project Wet; these three programs are the most popular environmental education programs in the country and they are put on by resource agencies. We had a controversy with business management - an informal way of doing business with a half million dollar budget a year. In 1994, they became a national organization and appointed an interim transition board. This new organization had a new name, new bylaws, and a new board. This board was to have representatives from the state department of education, and 1 board member from each association. I represent you on it. We have a new name - the Council for Environmental Education; within the last week, a new logo was approved. The stated purpose of the council is to support environmental education through the development and implementation of the programs to publish and disseminate environmental education material, and maintain partnerships on environmental education. This transferred some names, but has the same projects. Project Wild completed a long-range plan with more of an emphasis on urban teachers in urban areas. Project Learning Tree and Wild are involved in environmental training partnerships; there were 20 grants provided to the states using teachers with Project Wild. Major evaluations of Project Wild will begin this year. Wild has trained over 50,00 teachers, and put over 30,000 through workshops. CEE exists and you are part of it. The new bylaws are about ready for final approval. Jerry Marchini is the newly elected president. The group is committed to undergoing a strategic planning process to solidify the direction. There is a need for environmental education beyond Wild, Wet and Learning Tree. CEE is a member of the coalition to Teaming with Wildlife, and we are very interested in knowing what your plans are for implementing teaming with wildlife and what be used for educational purposes. As you develop an implementation plan for teaming with wildlife, I hope you think about it. Some of you are evaluating how much effort you need to continue in some of the education programs that already exists or branching out to new areas like the ones Dave Case mentioned. I would encourage you to use CEE sponsored programs. It is important for me to know what your needs are and what your plans are for environmental education down the road. I'll be working to get that information from you probably with some letters. I'll be looking for better ways to get that kind of communication. If you have suggestions for how I can better serve you, I would like to know it. Your suggestions or comments are welcome.

Doxtater: Where does aquatic resources education fit in?

Wilson: Not directly with the council.

Petersen: Typically, it's in Project Wild.

Wildlife Legislative Fund - Dick Pierce

We are a non-profit organization financed by the Mellon Foundation. Our sole purpose is to tend to citizens rights to hunt, fish, and trap and wildlife management. As a part of that, most of our business is about lobbying and lawyers; it's an ugly, dirty business. It seems that we are at odds with everyone. We are expanding the service; it's tailored to state fish and wildlife agencies and the federal wildlife agencies. We are identifying components of that program; asking you to help us build that program. Our first part is the media relations seminars that we give; different ways for their professionals to deliver the message to the media, particularly the electronic media and TV through interactive work with them with our own TV cameras and interviewers. We teach them how to react, and those have been well received. More importantly, we are building a web site on the Internet, and we are up and running. We will update weekly on that web site, so you can designate someone at your work to visit that site on a weekly basis. Part of it will be a Washington, D.C. report. We work closely with Max and the international. We have a small staff of lobbyists; we have a state alert that gives you the most active conservation issues in all 50 states around the country as far as legislation, and we continually track them. We give our views of what the hot issues are around the country. The other thing is a status sheet - it's an update from all 50 states; it lists all of the bills going through all of the state legislatures around the country, including the latest action on that bill. Also included is a ballot issues summary with eight issues this year; one of them has already been resolved. This will give you a short description of where they are at. For instance, have they gathered signatures? Have they been submitted to the legislature, etc. We will identify for you who the committee is in that state; who's leading the charge. The main focus is on hunting with dogs, particularly hunting bear with dogs. The anti-hunter's feel that that is a weak part of hunting; if they are successful with this, the next thing to come will be quail, pheasant, and others. These people are after hunting and they are not going to quit. Baiting of ducks and geese, doves, bears and deer are also being scrutinized. We will be passing this state funding report out at the international in December. That's a list of all 50 states, and it shows all of the sources of funds for all of the agencies. The last time we published that was 1991. With that web site, it will give you a direct link to all other organizations and state agencies. We hope it will assist your state agency. It should be completed by September or October. There may eventually be some limited access to only state agencies; we offer legal help to all of you. Our expertise is in federal aid, hunter harrassment, environmental protection and shooting range protection.

Horse Use of Fish and Wildlife Areas

Doxtater: It is taken care of in our state; the federal government helped.

Ver Steeg: We have a case in the process of resolution; we are looking at the whole system now.

Budzik: Our issue was resolved on a local basis.

Miller: Our problems are not resolved; there is still a growing demand.

Doxtater: The Natural Resources Commission is on it, but it is quiet now.

Paul Lenzini wants to ask the directors about the risk for high profile agency representatives. For

instance, has anybody been threatened? He would like to hear from you if any one of your folks have been threatened or if any extra-ordinary measures were taken to protect people such as through the attorney general's office or the help of the FBI.

The gavel was given to Allen Farris of Iowa and he announced his committees. Steve Miller gave the resolution to thank Indiana.



Passing the gavel
(←)



Our new president!
(Self-rescue?)

COLORADO STATE REPORT

The Governor redirected approximately \$10 million a year and reduced mid-level management by 50% (supervisors reduced from 150 to 73). There were no lay-offs or FTE cuts, however. The keys to this process included accountability, reprioritizing, professional vs. bureaucratic, efficiencies, organizational culture, and a zero-based budget system.

Predator management was given to the Colorado Department of Agriculture rather than the Division of Wildlife. Requirements were increased for enforcement personnel. The legislature mandated the full implementation of the Management review. The political appointment of the Director was defeated. The Division of Wildlife is on the "hit list" for a handful of legislators. The November ballot will decide on a ban on trapping other than specific damage control by government agents and high water line fishermen access on streams.

License revenue continues to be solid (dependent on non-residents) and secure. Lottery revenues of \$5 million have been helpful to the threatened and endangered work as well as education. Furthermore, the governor supports Teaming with Wildlife.

ILLINOIS STATE REPORT

The Illinois DNR is celebrating its first birthday this month. The agency was created in 1995 by Executive Order of the Governor. The transition has been surprisingly smooth and service to the public has not been interrupted. Public opinion of the reorganization remains largely favorable.

The agency initiated this month a new and abbreviated planning process that is being characterized more as a process of agency "positioning" than planning. The effort focuses on the IDNR's core competencies and the unique blend of opportunities and challenges the organization faces at this particular time. This approach is intended to provide greater flexibility over the short term as the new organization explores its potential.

The U.S. Forest Service recently dedicated the Midewin (pronounced mi-day-win) Tallgrass Prairie, approximately 19,000 acres of the Army's former Joliet Arsenal just 45 miles southwest of Chicago.

An agreement has been reached that will transfer 9,300 acres of the Savanna Army Depot to the Fish and Wildlife Service. This includes 6,435 acres of floodplain forests, sloughs, and side channels along with 2,855 acres of high-quality sand prairie that provides habitat for numerous Illinois endangered and threatened species. The actual transfer of property at Savanna will occur within the next three years.

The IDNR's proposal to fund a "Point of Sale" licensing distribution system for 1997 or 1998 failed to receive the support of the states' Bureau of the Budget due to unresolved concerns about long-term funding sources. We will continue to push for implementation in the near future.

The Harvest Information System was instituted in Illinois in 1996. As of July, only about 4,000 of the potential 120,000 hunters have registered. The 1-800-WETLAND system is being used for registration. The first 4,000 calls have averaged less than 2.5 minutes each.

The IDNR has been asked to examine the feasibility of releasing elk in southern Illinois. A study of suitable habitat, potential disturbance factors, crop damage probability, economic impacts and public/landowner tolerance is underway. Surveys, public meetings and focus groups are planned.

The process for the third "Conservation Congress" has begun. The Congress will be held September 12-14, 1997.

The former Department of Conservation's "Macrosite" initiative has evolved into the new DNR's "Ecosystem Program." The goal of this program is to establish a cooperative process of public-private partnerships (by providing financial incentives and technical assistance to private landowners) that combines natural resource stewardship with recreational and economic values. The IDNR is identifying areas that are large enough to provide habitat for area-sensitive species and to allow management practices that reasonably simulate natural forces (e.g. fire). Furthermore, the areas would provide reasonable representation of the various ecotypes in Illinois. These areas are being called "Resource Rich Areas."

Sport fishing license fee increases that went into effect in 1994 made it possible to fully implement the "Fish Illinois" initiatives. The "Catchable Trout" program was resumed with annual spring and fall stockings of rainbow trout into 50 areas statewide. Fish production from the State Hatchery System as well as fisheries management on lakes and streams statewide have more than doubled. The "Urban Fishing" program was expanded from seven summer fishing clinics in northeastern Illinois to 24 sites statewide. The number of summer fishing clinic participants more than tripled to an estimated 36,000 participants per summer. Other special events and school outreach activities, conducted by IDNR Urban Fishing coordinators throughout the year, involve thousands of additional participants - mostly youths. This year, the Department, in cooperation with various public libraries and park districts, initiated a fishing equipment loaner program called "Access to Fishing." Currently this fast-growing program is in place at 26 locations statewide.

INDIANA STATE REPORT

Indiana's Division of Fish and Wildlife manages the state's fish and wildlife resources. From consumptive uses of recreational hunting, fishing and trapping to non-consumptive recreational uses and ecological balance, the division strives to manage Indiana's resources. The division's work varies from management, research, environmental reviews, hunting/fishing regulations, landowner assistance to land acquisition and maintenance of division properties. The division operates 17 fish and wildlife areas along with numerous related properties, all totaling more than 110,000 acres.

Land acquisition has been a major push for the division. During the past five years, the Division of Fish and Wildlife has acquired more than 8,700 acres in 73 sites. Funding has been derived from the Fish and Wildlife Fund of the Indiana Heritage Trust program, which is funded through the state's environmental license plate. In addition, to assist in fund development, the Indiana General Assembly created the public land acquisition stamp in 1996. This voluntary stamp is sold for \$5.50 to raise funds for public lands for public hunting and fishing. In the form of a decal, the stamp has been marketed to sportsmen and women along with conservation groups.

Under the Wildlife Section, the division's most significant program is its white-tailed deer management. With growing deer population numbers and growing harvests, the division has revised its bonus antlerless deer program from a permit drawing to a bag limit system. For the 1996 deer seasons, hunters were no longer required to apply and be selected to receive bonus county permits for antlerless deer. Instead, the division established individual county bag limits for antlerless deer, allowing any hunter to purchase bonus licenses and to take up to four statewide. Furthermore, four urban deer zones were established to help reduce the growing populations around major cities, and seven of our state parks were hunted.

In the division's Fisheries Section, an outstanding number of steelhead trout returned to the St. Joseph River at South Bend, almost doubling the highest year so far. Angler interest in the program has been steadily growing. This cooperative project between Indiana and Michigan developed from an interest in expanding fishing opportunities in an area where the resource could support a long term commitment by both states.

The division also cooperated in the distribution and production of an award winning, first time ever, comprehensive fishing and boat guide for the Ohio River in 1996. Indiana, along with four other Ohio River states who are members of the Ohio River Fisheries Management Team, jointly prepared information and published the Ohio River

Fishing Guide as a federal aid project under the Sport Fish Restoration Program. Free copies of this 16 page, full color, newspaper style publication are available to boaters and anglers needing detailed information about navigation and fishing on the Ohio River. The guide contains fishing regulations for all six Ohio River states, a physical description of the river, safe boating guidelines and detailed shoreline maps showing fishing areas, boat ramps, marinas and camping or picnic areas.

In an effort to help save the declining yellow perch population in Lake Michigan, all commercial fishing for yellow perch is banned for 1997 and the sportfishing bag limit is reduced to 15. Biologists believe that the decline in perch is caused by the lack of spawning and survival of young perch, perhaps due to alewife predation.

Indiana's Nongame and Endangered Wildlife Program is managed by the Division of Fish and Wildlife. Through the program, the division has conducted reintroductions of bald eagles, peregrine falcons and North American river otters through funding from a state income tax refund checkoff. However, 1995 checkoff revenues to the nongame program declined almost 40 percent due to a reduction in the number of state taxpayers receiving state tax refunds. Seventy-five river otters were released in Indiana this year with a goal to reestablish otter populations in six priority watershed units through 1999.

KANSAS STATE REPORT

The department has resolved issues associated with diversion of federal aid funds. This has been accomplished with support from Gov. Bill Graves and the Kansas Legislature. Among actions taken by KDWP Secretary Steve Williams to resolve the problem were reorganization of the department to allow for more effective use and segregation of various funding sources, and improved accounting procedures (approved by the U.S.F.W.S. and Office of the Inspector General) which enable KDWP to monitor potential diversion of funds in time to take corrective action on a monthly basis. The diversion amounts for the period FY 89 through FY 96 will be corrected by the end of FY 97. No further diversion findings are anticipated, and only routine maintenance audits are planned. In addition, these actions are complemented by operational procedures which will ensure the department obtains and uses its entire federal aid apportionment annually.

Kansas Wildlife & Parks has initiated a new program to increase public hunting opportunities and its associated economic, tourism, and quality-of-life benefits. The "Walk-In Hunting Areas" (WIHA) program increases the amount of private property available for public recreation, and benefits landowners by leasing private property during the hunting season. Approximately 175,000 acres have been leased for the 1996-1997 hunting season.

The department has developed an action plan to more aggressively manage deer populations. This plan features increased control of deer numbers via annually-authorized hunting permits, and allows removal of deer that are causing destruction of private property. These two strategies are designed to maintain deer populations at levels appropriate for habitat availability, landowner tolerance, highway safety, and recreational opportunity.

The department's Community Lakes Assistance Program has developed partnerships with private interests and local government entities to provide and improve public fishing opportunities. These efforts include development of fisheries facilities at Wolf Creek, Banner Creek, and Bone Creek lakes, as well as numerous other partnerships in communities across Kansas in the past 18 months.

Department officials have responded to a request from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to resolve the issue of recreation facility development costs at El Dorado State Park. The department has met with the Corps and, with support of Gov. Graves, has proposed a settlement to the Corps which would satisfy repayment obligations of the state.

In response to constituent interest and concern for adequate facility maintenance, the Kansas Wildlife and Parks Commission has created a Task Force on Outdoor Kansas to review new, long-term funding sources to finance improvements to outdoor recreation facilities and programs provided by the department for public use.

The department has worked closely with watershed districts in the Flint Hills to reduce impacts of development projects on stream ecosystems and protect Topeka shiner populations. Cooperative agreements to achieve both ecosystem protection and flood control goals have been completed with two of the region's five affected districts. Work is continuing to reach agreements in three additional districts.

The department's Environmental Services Section assembled field crews, comprising 20 temporary staff, to conduct surveys of fish and aquatic invertebrate life at about 180 sites along Kansas streams. This project meshes with the Governor's Water Quality Initiative, a multi-agency effort to evaluate the effects of development on riparian, stream, and wetland resources in Kansas.

KENTUCKY STATE REPORT

The Fish and Wildlife Commission held an historic meeting July 15, 1995 to discuss improving landowner relations with hunters and anglers. The meeting brought people together from across Kentucky to discuss programs for hunters, anglers, and landowners. 190 people discussed issues and ideas. A program is being developed by the Department and will be implemented over the next several years to improve landowner/sportsmen relationships.

The Kentucky Partners for Wetland Wildlife (KPWW) Program was introduced in the spring. The voluntary program will offer technical guidance, cost-sharing and other incentives to private wetland owners. The program is wetland-oriented and complements the Habitat Improvement Program and the Stewardship Incentive Program.

KDFWR completed its largest single land acquisition ever in December. KDFWR took possession of nearly 34,000 acres of premier wildlife habitat in Ohio and Muhlenberg Counties. The Richard King Mellon Foundation purchased the property from Peabody Coal Company for more than \$5 million and then gave it to KDFWR to manage.

KDFWR developed a computer licensing system for hunting and fishing licenses at more than 1,000 locations across Kentucky. Customer information will be electronically stored and transmitted to the Department on a weekly basis. The new program will ensure that vendors don't run out of licenses. Licenses will be printed for each customer, providing improved service.

After seven years of planning and development, the James C. Salato Wildlife Education Center opened in October. The facility features wildlife and fish exhibits, native plants, outdoor exhibits, and a gift shop. The development of educational exhibits is ongoing.

MICHIGAN STATE REPORT

A group called the Friends of Ducks and Geese sought a temporary Restraining Order against the rounding up and euthanization of nuisance resident Canada geese. The Federal Judge did not grant the Temporary Restraining Order, and the round-up was carried out without incident. The Judge gave both sides time to further develop their case and action is still ongoing. This group appears to be linked to other protectionistic groups around the country.

In 1994, a 4-year old male deer with bovine tuberculosis (TB) was taken by a hunter in the northeast portion of Michigan's Lower Peninsula. To assess the extent of the bovine TB infection in the deer population, a 200 square mile area was surveyed. Nearly 1,000 deer were examined, and from the fall of 1995 to the present, over two dozen have tested positive. Ongoing surveys of deer from Michigan's 83 counties have not identified any other bovine TB infected deer outside of the initial 200 square-mile survey area. The presence of bovine TB in Michigan's white-tailed deer is a serious problem. At risk is Michigan's deer herd with its many social, ecological, and economic values, Michigan's livestock industry, and most importantly, the health of Michigan's citizens. To address the problem, a multi-agency committee has been developed which includes representatives from state and federal governments and Michigan State University. Special management plans developed include education, surveys of the wildlife populations, testing of livestock, reduction of supplemental feeding of deer, and population reduction of deer during the hunting season. The Department is getting pressure from agricultural interests to reduce the deer population. The Department is exploring innovative ways to put more hunting pressure on private lands.

The Sault Ste. Marie tribe of Chippewa Indians is planning to open more than two million acres for its members to hunt and fish subject only to tribal rules. The Tribe's Conservation Committee is writing rules to govern the program which will likely mirror state regulations. The program may start on public and some private lands as early as the first of the year. The Tribe plans to sell licenses to its members which would only be subject to tribal courts. The Tribe has about 12,000 members mostly in the eastern Upper Peninsula. The area to be opened includes the area covered by the Treaty of 1836, the eastern Upper Peninsula and the northern Lower Peninsula of Michigan. The Tribe wants the same privileges enjoyed by 1842 Treaty members in the western Upper Peninsula. Little River and Little Traverse Bands, two newly recognized tribes in the Lower Peninsula, are also looking into similar rules for their members.

The Lake Carriers Association is working with the Michigan Departments of Natural resources and Environmental Quality, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to explore

the feasibility of using the chemical rotenone in ballast water tanks to control the spread of Eurasian ruffe (*Gymnocephalus cernuus*). A vessel operating between Thunder Bay (Alpena) on Lake Huron and Green Bay (Escanaba) on Lake Michigan is being looked at for possible treatment. Ruffe were first detected in Thunder Bay in 1995, and studies this year show the population may be reproducing. Ruffe were first identified in the Duluth Harbor area of western Lake Superior in 1986. Ruffe numbers there have increased dramatically since the mid-1980's and are believed to be impacting perch and walleye fisheries. Ruffe had not been detected in any of the lower Great Lakes until they were recently found in Thunder Bay. It is illegal to possess or transport live ruffe or goby in Michigan.

MISSOURI STATE REPORT

The past year has been one of transition for the Missouri Department of Conservation. In July 1995, the Governor appointed two new members to the four-person Conservation Commission. Because of the staggered schedule for Commission appointments, as mandated by the State Constitution, potential for turnover of one-half of the Commission membership occurs every six years. These occurrences bring new leadership, challenges, and opportunities for Department staff and they stimulate new thinking.

In addition, in March 1996, Director Jerry Presley announced his plans to retire after some thirty-eight years of service to the Department. His retirement is effective December 31, 1996. The Commission has retained the firm of EFL Associates in Overland Park, Kansas to assist them in a nationwide search to replace Director Presley. The application period closed on June 30 with many applications. The Commission hopes to select a new Director by September 1. The Department made excellent progress during Jerry's nine years "at the helm."

Another major change within the Department was conversion of the paper-driven hunting and fishing permit distribution system to an automated point-of-sale system. This new system came on-line on February 1, 1996. After a few "glitches" in the early phase of implementation, the new system is working fine and promises to meet or exceed expectations for enhanced hunter/angler data bases, improvements in resource management, hunter/angler convenience, and improved efficiency for vendors. Some refinements in the system are anticipated as the second year of operation begins, but overall performance has been satisfactory. The Department will be pleased to share our experiences with any state anticipating development of a point-of-sale system.

Other current issues/activities being addressed by the Department are summarized as follows:

- 1) The Coordinated Resource Management (CRM) program continues as an effort to better coordinate resource management responsibilities of all state and federal government agencies and to integrate public and private land programs. We are encountering problems with lack of public trust of government, particularly federal agencies and a fear of regulatory infringement on private property rights. CRM is non-regulatory and totally voluntary, but overcoming these fears presents major challenges.
- 2) After two to three years of testing and development, FY 97 will be the first year of full implementation of the Department's Integrated Management System (IMS) which links planning, budgeting, and program evaluation. IMS is a fully automated system designed to provide information on costs and outputs related to Department

priorities and objectives. This system promises to be a major benefit to the Department in allocating limited resources.

3) Confined Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO's) are a major issue throughout our state. Concerns exist among many of our constituents about the effects, both acute and chronic, on water quality, vegetative composition, disease transmission, and other factors impacting fish and wildlife resources. As managers, we are challenged to seek answers to these concerns.

4) Conflicts between coyote hunters and rural landowners continue to escalate. The Department initiated a Respect Landowners Initiative (RLI) in an attempt to find common ground between dog owners and landowners. An Advisory council representing several constituent groups on both sides of the issue was formed to assist the Department in dealing with this issue. After an early period of polarization, it appears that we are making some minor progress. RLI is looking at needs in four areas: regulation, legislation, education and enforcement.

5) In spite of progressively more liberal hunting regulations during recent years resulting in record harvests, deer populations remain high in some parts of the state, particularly in agricultural regions. Landowner tolerance is being severely tested and the Department is developing strategies to reduce populations in the problem areas.

6) After successfully restoring river otters in Missouri, the Commission approved a trapping season for 1996-1997. This decision has brought major protests from several animal rights and anti-trapping groups.

7) The Department's turkey management program is a monumental success. The Director has appointed a *Blue Ribbon Panel* of citizens interested in wild turkeys to review this program both past and present and to advise the Department and the Commission of their views of how we can continue this success or even make this program better in the future.

8) Farm game and grassland wildlife in general continues to decline in Missouri. Special emphasis is being placed on determining the cause of this trend and implementing programs on both public and private land to reverse it.

9) The Department and Missouri state government in general, have fallen behind in employee salaries compared to other states. Efforts began this year and will continue next year to bring salaries more in line with the market.

10) Environmental education is a priority for the Governor and he has asked the Department to lead an effort to enhance and better coordinate efforts in this arena. The Department has enthusiastically accepted this challenge.

In Missouri, and throughout the nation, citizens are demanding government to be responsive and provide opportunities for involvement and input. The Department welcomes these demands and will continue tailoring programs to meet them.

NEBRASKA STATE REPORT

Water continues to be the number one issue in the State of Nebraska. During the most recent year, several initiatives have begun to take significant shape. The most important one consists of completing and proving up five applications for protection of instream flow which have been requested by our department. These implications involve roughly two-thirds of the Platte River linearly, which is the main stem tributary to the Missouri, traversing Nebraska from Colorado/Wyoming to the east boundary. The instream flow process involves a lengthy notification comment and hearing phase which has now entered the last days of hearing. This relates to a 10-year old law providing for protection of flows for fish, wildlife and recreation. This department action constitutes the first major request to reserve substantial flows that remain in the river and, consequently, many varied agricultural interests have become concerned to the extent that we expect a major challenge in our next legislature to repeal the protection law. Unlike many other states' protection laws, our law provides for the protection of habitat as can be described and documented to currently exist and its current value. This is in contrast to many instream flow laws that protect survival flows for an individual species. The conclusions of the hearings should occur early in 1997 with a determination sometime during the ensuing year.

Many of Nebraska's recreational sport fisheries occur in reservoirs and impoundments constructed in the period of 1950 to 1970. These impoundments have begun to show significant effects of wear and tear of 40 to 50 years of their life, manifested by deteriorating fisheries habitats. Recognizing these ills, our legislature did pass and provide for fisheries habitat restoration work to be financed by an Aquatic Habitat Stamp. This stamp, which will be effective in 1997, is dedicated to the rehabilitation and restoration of deteriorating fisheries habitats. It will be required of each licensed angler with the exception of young anglers up to the age of 17 and the elderly free permit holders. This new potential income source may be supplemented with matching grants made from state lottery proceeds which are administered from an Environmental Trust Fund for the State of Nebraska. We are hopeful that these two sources of income can serve to slow down the continuing aging and deterioration of the most important impound recreational sport fishery habitats.

Not unlike a number of other states, Nebraska has had substantial deer population growth in recent years as a result of a combination of mild winters, limited epizootics and perhaps a conservative permit allocation for harvest. Given these factors, conflicts with our human population seem to be escalating as is common in the Midwest. Liberalized hunting seasons, even to include Nebraska's first urban hunting proposal, may be expected to soften the human conflicts. However, only time will tell whether the

approaches have been liberal enough to reduce considerable negative commentary which has resulted from increased deer/car collisions, even some vehicle accident fatalities which seem to stir emotions dramatically, and landowner deprecations.

Spurred by the necessity of finding the most efficient permit delivery system to be accomplished with static and reduced staff, our department has requested Requests for Proposals to develop an automated permitting system. RFP's received this summer have resulted in a conditional contract (pending legislation) to the Central Bank of Missouri, supported by ENVOY to develop and put in place an automated permitting system in Nebraska. It is hoped that a pilot issuance of permits can be accomplished during 1997, and that is assuming passage of favorable legislation with the goal of being operational in 1998. An overwhelming percentage of our sportsmen and permit vendors alike are very favorably looking forward to this new system. This, like so many other programs, will require passage of enabling legislation that would allow such things as acceptance of a credit card in payment of permits and the establishment of a transaction fee to help finance the operation. The outcome of all this is yet to be seen when you consider that in the current year, we had a substantial across-the-board 12% increase on all permit and license fees for the state. Some of the existing permits had not had a fee increase since 1979. Finding ways to meet dedicated Game Cash Fund expenses which seem to continually escalate with inflation when we see only steady or declining permit sales has become a real management challenge.

The agency just this year has completed its first major strategic planning effort involving a high majority of the entire staff and numerous citizens, constituent groups and other NGO parties. The Strategic plan itself is currently being reviewed by our Board of Commissioners. However, from a practical point of view, operationalizing the plan has already begun. The very existence of the plan document itself has provided a wealth of information from which to develop ensuing budget documents and, in several cases, has already guided the development of focused programs in areas such as our outdoor educational efforts, our focused big game management programs and, as previously mentioned, the aquatic habitat restoration and rehabilitation programs.

NORTH DAKOTA STATE REPORT

We continue to promote public awareness of natural resource issues through a variety of means. We utilize a permanent facility at the North Dakota State Fair featuring Pathways to Hunting, Pathways to Fishing, a kids fishing pond and a variety of related educational activities. We provide a weekly video news magazine to most networks in the state, which they run during prime time news spots. In addition to publishing our North Dakota Outdoors magazine, we provide a copy of Falcon Magazine to every 4th grade student in the state.

We continue to specifically promote hunting and fishing participation by youth. We provide a special, early youth-only deer season enabling youngsters who have not previously had a deer license to harvest any type of deer anywhere in the state. We continue to manage a number of our small reservoirs adjacent to population centers as "special fish management" areas, with regulations favoring youth participation. We promoted and got enacted a law that allows nonresident youths less than 16 years of age to hunt for resident fees if their state of origin allows North Dakota youth to do the same. At this time, three states, Minnesota, Colorado, and Tennessee qualify based on their hunting laws. We'd like to challenge all other Game & Fish agencies to initiate needed law changes to accommodate more young hunters with reciprocity status on license fees.

Two major pieces of legislation captured a good deal of our attention in 1996. The Farm Bill, which has more impact on fish and wildlife in North Dakota than any other single issue, consumed much of our time, as it likely did yours. We ended up with a very good farm bill. We continue to be involved in the rule making process in hopes of keeping most of our CRP acres and taking advantage of the other innovations in the bill such as EQUIP, WHIP, etc.

The second legislative issue requiring extensive staff time was the grazing legislation. This took many different forms during the past Congress, and all were bad. This legislation would have severely compromised the ability of resource management agencies all over the country to do their job for their constituents and provide sound resource management on Forest Service and BLM lands.

While 1996 was filled with challenges, including the departure of former director K.L. Cool and the challenges that go along with changes in leadership, it has been, all in all, a phenomenal year. We issued a record number of deer licenses (93,900), recorded all time record counts for most species of ducks breeding in the state, and have strong

populations of our major upland bird species. Pheasants and sharp-tailed grouse. With the return of moisture in the past two to three years, our small lakes have rebounded, fishing license sales have increased, and fishing success has been very good in all parts of the state. Our populations of moose, elk and bighorn sheep are all doing well, with hunter interest strong and landowner tolerance excellent. Now, with the solid conservation provisions of the new farm bill, prospects of continued strong fish and wildlife populations is enhanced. While certain fish and wildlife species have had better individual years in the past, when the picture is viewed in total, the combined hunting, fishing and wildlife enjoyment opportunities have never been better. The good old days of hunting and fishing in North Dakota are now!

OHIO STATE REPORT

We must develop and implement projects that will help the people of Ohio live comfortably with the state's wildlife. The urbanization of Ohio and the expanding wildlife populations in many areas have caused conflicts. These problems occur in both urban and rural areas and include nuisance problems, property damage, and captive wildlife. We must fill our leadership role by developing the necessary policies, procedures, and projects to help Ohioans deal with the wildlife conflicts.

It is important that we provide more opportunities for the people of Ohio to enjoy our wildlife resources. We must provide additional places and facilities for both traditional and nontraditional customers to use. These could include: wildlife areas, observation sites, private land, lake and river access, and shooting ranges. Increased opportunities can also be provided by expanding seasons and making sure people know about available opportunities.

The Ohio Division of Wildlife needs to review and adjust, as needed, its organizational structure and decision-making process to ensure the effective implementation of wildlife diversity projects. We will continue to expand our efforts in this area. Our strategic plan identifies numerous needs, and we are currently seeking additional funding via the special auto tag and the national initiative Teaming with Wildlife.

We must find ways to introduce more Ohioans to the wonders and delights of being involved in our rich fish and wildlife resources. This can be accomplished by developing projects that will provide individuals the needed skills so they can enjoy Ohio's wildlife resources. We will develop specific projects that provide introductory and advanced skills to hunters, anglers, bird and wildlife watchers, and other wildlife enthusiasts.

For the first time in Ohio, legislation was passed for a wildlife conservation license plate. An estimated \$1-3 million/year from the sale of the license plates will be directed to endangered species and our wildlife diversity fund. Our first release of trumpeter swans and osprey occurred this year. A population of purple catspaw mussels was discovered in eastern Ohio. This is probably the only remaining viable population of this species in the world.

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE REPORT

Amidst the pervasive administrative challenge of becoming more efficient and effective with fewer people and doing more with less, the past year was full of positive things for the wildlife resources of South Dakota and the people who enjoy them. State government experienced a significant FTE reduction. The Division of Wildlife was not significantly affected, although we did decrease by about 13 FTE's. Most of those were vacant positions or seasonal positions; however, we did have a few people who were laid off or had hours reduced.

Organizationally, the most noteworthy change was the integration of our Animal Damage Control (ADC) program into our regional operations. This was, in part, an efficiency move, but also reflects an evolving philosophy that these activities need to be recognized more as a legitimate part of our wildlife management responsibilities. At times, some of our staff struggle with this. We hope the organizational move will help.

License fee increases for nonresident hunting and fishing licenses were approved by our commission (yes, our commission has that authority) to be effective calendar year 1997. This is the first major adjustment of most fees since 1982. For instance, the 10-day nonresident small game license will increase from \$65 to \$95. This makes Al Farris happy and will also provide substantial new revenue for our division. Come on CRP! We are still stymied in our ability to offer point-of-issuance licenses because of a legislative requirement to use county treasurers as license distribution centers. There's more to it than that, but it's too complicated for this report.

From a resource perspective, the picture has been bright. With optimum water conditions, we have experienced some of the best statewide fishing conditions and success in recent history, and likewise with waterfowl. Pheasant numbers, as well as other upland game, have continued to be at high levels. Big game populations have also thrived across the state, with our Black Hills elk herd being a bright spot. About the only down sides to all of this are the Black Hills turkey population, which has suffered through several years of poor reproduction due to weather, and Black Hills deer, which struggle due to forest habitat changes.

Of course, along with abundance comes other challenges. Canada goose depredation was a severe problem this summer, prompting a somewhat controversial September hunting season. Deer, antelope and elk damage are also straining relationships with some landowners.

On the human dimensions side, we initiated a citizen task force to address complex

issues related to Black Hills deer management and deer management in western South Dakota. As a result, our last over-the-counter deer hunting opportunity, the Black Hills deer season, is now a limited-number, lottery-draw season, much to the chagrin of many nonresident deer hunters and some resident hunters. Major changes are being considered for western deer management. Another major issue is access to public hunting opportunities. As more and more private land becomes incorporated into commercial hunting ventures, resident hunters are becoming increasingly frustrated and vocal. They expect us to do something about it.

Our staff expended considerable time working to ensure that the new farm bill was favorable toward wildlife. For South Dakota, that means CRP had to be a strong component. On the surface it appears positive. Our good wildlife fortunes are highly dependent on that program. All in all, it's been a great but challenging year. With continuation of CRP, we are ready for the challenges.

WISCONSIN STATE REPORT

The period from July 1995 to the present has once again presented the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources with some major challenges as well as some significant accomplishments. A few highlights are:

The Department is undergoing a major restructuring including the downsizing of employee numbers (loss of 232) and the reduction of supervisory layers. A major facet of the reorganization is organizing field staff administratively on the basis of landscape units (water basins) rather than on political boundaries. A major goal is that this reorganization will allow the Department to effectively implement its programs on an ecosystem basis.

Hunting and fishing fees were last increased in 1991, and for many years have been routinely increased on a four year cycle. However, due to Legislative concern about tax and user fee increases in general, a fee increase proposal was not approved in the last biennial budget (June 1995). An effort by key legislative and sportsmen supporters to obtain an increase in March of 1996 also failed. As a result, the Department is implementing program cuts in fisheries, wildlife, law enforcement and associated support services. It is possible fees will not be increased till April of 1997 and this would necessitate even further reductions in program. Support exists to correct this problem as soon as possible after the legislature reconvenes in January 1997, but the situation is still tentative. It is doubtful that any increases will be sufficient to fully restore all the program cuts.

The inability of the regular nine day gun season to achieve adequate antlerless harvests was studied by a select group of sportsmen and DNR staff. Their analysis and recommendations prompted the Natural Resources Board to designate, without public comment, 16 management units for antlerless-only hunting in 1996. This created a huge uproar, the legislature took over, and the compromise was to initiate an "Earn a Buck" hunt for 1996. The objective is to have hunters in the most over-populated units shoot an antlerless deer before being able to shoot a buck. A four-day late October hunting period was set up which finally breaks Wisconsin's tradition of no gun hunting before the regular nine day deer season.

In addition, in Fall 1995, the Department was forced to prepare a very Comprehensive Environmental Assessment on deer management as part of a rule-making procedure in which we were modifying population goals and management unit boundaries. It is the first comprehensive compilation of deer management information in Wisconsin in many decades and should also be a valuable reference for deer management programs in other

states.

Staff have been working on this for over two years. It is Wisconsin's first voyage into the realm of HCP's, and it is an eye opener. There are over 30 major partners from the private and public sector working as a team (use the word loosely), and they have really wrestled with issues of federal-state-private jurisdiction. The forest products industry has been very fearful of federal dictates and of losing control of their land management to environmental groups via this process. However, progress is being made and we're hopeful to yet apply for the incidental take permit this fall.

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST
FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES
63RD ANNUAL MEETING

RESOLUTION

THANK YOU TO INDIANA

WHEREAS, the great state of Indiana has provided excellent meeting accommodations in the home of the "Fighting Irish" - South Bend, Indiana, and

WHEREAS, the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Fish and Wildlife, has provided a highly informative and entertaining program, and

WHEREAS, Gary Doxtater and his staff have been gracious and generous hosts, and

WHEREAS, all Midwest Association Directors, and other guests successfully survived basic instruction in interactive self-rescue river training, save for a few bumps, lumps, bruises, scrapes and several gallons of involuntarily swallowed St. Joseph River water.

Now therefore be it resolved that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies assembled this 16th day of July, 1996 in South Bend, Indiana, thanks and acknowledges the Indiana Department of Natural Resources for hosting the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association in such an exemplary manner.

And be it further resolved that the motto for this meeting shall be: Keep your feet pointed downstream, keep your butt up, float like a cork, and go with the flow.

Al Farris, President
Association of Midwest Fish & Wildlife Agencies
July 16, 1996

CONTRIBUTORS AND SPONSORS

Ducks Unlimited
Northern Indiana Quail Unlimited
D.J. Case and Associates
The Conservation Fund
Indiana Chapter, The Wildlife Society
Indiana Chapter, American Fisheries Society
J.F. New and Associates
Indiana Department of Natural Resources
Indiana Conservation Officers Organization, Inc.
National Wild Turkey Federation, Inc.
Catalyst Marketing
Michiana Steelheaders
Louie Stout
Mishawaka Lure and Tackle
Hildebrandt Tackle
Mishawaka Hardware
Madison Center
Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
National Muzzle Loading Rifle Association
Pope and Young Club
Boone and Crockett Club
Hook, Line, and Sinker



Hosted By Indiana Division of Fish and Wildlife
Gary Doxtater, Director
402 W. Washington Street, Rm. W273
Indianapolis, IN 46204

*Special thanks to Brian Breidert, Linnea Floyd and the staff at Bodine State Fish Hatchery
for organizing the conference*