

Minutes
MAFWA Annual Meeting
June 27 – June 29, 2010
Hyatt Indianapolis
Indianapolis, Indiana

Sunday, June 27, 2010

MAFWA Executive Committee Meeting 5:00 pm (*Program – Exhibit A*)

Welcome to Indiana Reception – Sponsored by the National Wild Turkey Federation

Hospitality Room – Sponsored by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Law Enforcement Officers

Monday, June 28, 2010

Breakfast – Sponsored by the National Shooting Sports Foundation

WELCOME to Indiana

Orientation

Mark Reiter, Indiana DNR – Welcome to Indiana, glad you could join us. Housekeeping: all meetings in this room, breakfast and lunch same place as this morning, hospitality in room 2007. Keep things moving, after breaks give away door prizes, have to be present to win. Introduce Rob Carter, my boss, lucky to have a director interested in services we provide.

Greetings & Introduction of Governor

Rob Carter, Director Indiana DNR – Welcome, Indy is a great town, enjoy your stay. DNR is big, we have 25 divisions and F&W is one, so there is a broad spectrum of authority. Our Governor is interested in conservation and trail development; he gets “quality of life” and the fact that it will attract people to our state. Set records on recreational trail development and protection of land to recreate on, again with a lot of support from our Governor; through innovative partnerships with TNC and USFWS, acquired 2,100 acres from IN Department of Corrections. Set records again with recent partnerships with TNC and USFWS, buying 4,300 and 2,600 acres in two different watersheds (Wabash and Muscatatuck). Introduced Governor Daniels, a good friend to Indiana DNR.

Welcome to Indiana

Mitch Daniels, Governor, State of Indiana – I need to find out what “further ado” is? I like door prize idea, I would like to use it with state legislature, but disqualify them if they show up. Excited to be your host, revere natural heritage and admire those who protect it and extend it. Enjoy bringing people in from other states to spend money in Indiana. We like things to move fast, (i.e. motor races, or on land, sea or air) we do it better and enjoy it more than anyone and extend that to Fish and Wildlife division. We have people here who are stewards of our newest and largest acquisition ever, the Goose Pond property in southwestern Indiana. It is 8,000 acres of habitat, wetlands which is in its third year is exceeding its stunning forecast that we were shown in terms of migratory birds, waterfowl and how many different species might come there. It has been tremendously exciting and rewarding, but I will never forget the day we finally consummated this; people literally had been working on this for a long time and as is my practice I looked around for some elderly person and sure enough at Goose Pond there was a gentleman there and I asked him if this was something he has been interested in for awhile and he said that all of his life, since he was a kid. I told him it was too bad it took this long and he said that so many times we were so close that one time we were so convinced we had this done we had a celebratory parade in the streets of Linton, but then events intervened, the Korean War. If it is a good idea, what are we waiting for and a few months ago I visited with Mark and Rob and the leadership of our

organization and said, Goose Pond worked out so well and I am noticing that we are setting records for total acres acquired and protected, but except for Goose Pond it seems to be in fairly small parcels and not sure we are getting the big bang effect. I asked if there were equivalent or larger opportunities out there that we could go for in a big way and leave major assets for the future. They left and came back and said they had a couple of ideas. We are so excited about Muscatatuck three use ponds or more and the Wabash project is more than eight. It will be possible to put a canoe or boat in the water up at one of our beautiful parks, somewhere up by Sugar Creek or Shades State Park and spend as long as you want camping, fishing, traveling for over a 100 miles down that river and never leave a protected area. We can't wait to get the whole thing put together. I will close by saying; Rob is right, we do think about the utilitarian aspects of conservation and protection, it is a big thing and if you want to build a prosperous state it is more important than ever to have beautiful spaces, protection of nature, trails and every kind of facility that makes life complete and fulfilling. It does serve an economic purpose, but that is not its highest purpose. We were given what we were given and I know each of your states has places that you love as much as we love all of the nature we've got. The most thrilling part is the hope and belief that we are leaving something much better than we found and an Indiana that is more beautiful and more enjoyable in all its nature than it has ever been. We know you are doing that in all of your states and sometimes there is no higher calling; sometimes I see our COs and people like that and you can see they are thinking, "God, they pay me for this, I get to do what I love most". You are in a place here in Indiana that what you do is esteemed like no other profession. Thanks; have a great meeting.

STATE REPORTS

Necessity: The Mother of Invention

Dan Zekor, Missouri DOC, Facilitator – Start off with state reports, 3-5 minutes to share successes, start off one side of room and go to next person around the room.

Full state-of the state reports can be found on the MAFWA website at: <http://www.mafwa.org/state/index.htm>

WI – Matt Frank, Secretary – Appreciate Governor's comments on land preservation and thought I would mention that in Wisconsin we are celebrating the 20th anniversary of our state stewardship fund. It has been an incredible opportunity for us to preserve public land and July 1 we will start the next 10 years; it was reauthorized by our Legislature and we got an additional \$86 million of funding per year for the program. We formed a climate change partnership between our DNR and the University of Wisconsin Nelson Institute, named after Gaylord Nelson and specializes in environmental studies; and we have formed a research partnership where we are linking research capacity with DNR to get best research developed that will inform our natural resource decision making, for short and long-term. We would like to extend that partnership to all of your agencies with your public research you have in your state. It is a great opportunity to work together. Request to think about coordinating on ballast water discharges on Great Lakes, and the Coast Guard is currently considering new rules and would like to see them come into effect with highest standards as soon as possible. Various states have already taken action, but it is an opportunity for fish and wildlife agencies to get involved and influence what is happening with those rules. Typically it is the Environmental Quality folks who are doing the tracking with this issue, but there is a great opportunity to work together. We had our first hunting heritage conference this year, spent time discussing and arguing about various hunting policies in the state. The great thing was to take the long view and we brought people in to talk about the future of this heritage and how we pass it on to future generations. It changed the nature and focus of the gathering and it was so well received we are going to do it again next year. It was supported in part by a grant from the National Shooting Sports Foundation (NSSF). One of the lead organizers was Randy Stark who is our Chief Warden.

MN – Dave Schad, F&W Director – Management of public land base, lot of public lands, 1.4 million acres, 1,400 separate wildlife management areas spread around the state and an expanding system of conservation

easements; in fact in two weeks closing on an 187,000 acre conservation easement in the forested part of the state, from one landowner and we will have to manage and enforce the terms of that easement as well as many other properties. We are grappling how we manage and support management of both fee title and conservation easement lands in the future. The passage of our dedicated funding constitutional amendment a couple of years ago has presented opportunities for additional land protection and has generated some debate in the legislature. To get ourselves better organized we are developing an automated system to inventory, monitor, plan and budget for these lands, so this will be a big deal to get all of these lands in this system to better manage them. Legislature has asked us to develop a report on how we will fund future management costs associated with these public lands. One of the ideas floating around is that we would escrow some money when we buy easement or land and put this additional money aside from the same source of money and use proceeds to fund future cost of managing those lands. You forgo protection opportunities, but ensure you can continue management. The third thing we are doing is setting up a formal and structured easement monitoring system. Have a large inventory of trout stream easements and haven't been doing a very good job of monitoring and enforcing terms of those easements and ask staff or contractors to annually check to see if easement terms are being complied with. Finally, we are having serious conversations with our wildlife folks on doing more outsourcing to private sector to do more of this work. We can be more nimble and flexible, we can increase or decrease the work easier and can be viewed as job creators by local communities and if there are small companies and individuals that have a stake in how those lands are managed we might have more support for those public lands. One more issue is aquatic invasive species, despite efforts to education and inform people about the threats we continue to see rapid expansion into more waters in state and more public concern. We had a bill in our legislature that would have put a moratorium on creation of new public accesses because of concerns that an access might allow entry of invasive species into private waters. We have had concerns expressed on fishing tournaments. Legislature passed a law this year, education route was not getting us there, so as of July 1, there is a new regulation that prohibits transfer of any water from any lake or stream. It doesn't apply to bait buckets, but there is some interest in going back and including that as well. This is a big paradigm shift for our anglers because they will have to learn how to maintain their bait, fish and remove drain plugs while in transport. The fact that Legislature was willing to do this an indication that there is an understanding of threat.

KY – Jon Gassett, Commissioner – Saw the perfect storm for the Legislature this year, the most contentious in 10-20 years. We had a legislative body and government that had no money and they like to meddle more when they have no money for their pet projects; like some boating enforcement issues as far as alcohol intoxication and boating under the influence; and some national NRA initiatives. We saw bills introduced which would have negatively impacted our agency. Things like forcing the Department of Fish and Wildlife to allow horse riding on all of our Wildlife areas (WA), which we do allow in some cases; allow counties to dredge streams on WA; require fish and wildlife agents to register voters any time a license buyer bought a license, which we don't have the technology for; allow people to kill bears within 30 yards of their house; and the most significant threat was a bill that came out of the House that would have gutted our statewide police power for our conservation officers, basically they would have only been able to enforce general law and fish and wildlife law on our property and it would have created a void on the water for boating enforcement, it would have placed the criminal culpability standard to knowingly committing a crime, the equivalent of a traffic citation, it would allow people to kill animals in self defense or injury, which we already do. There were some good components to the bill as well, like some of the NRA provisions we weren't opposed to, like no net loss of hunting lands, in concept we agreed to; carrying of firearms, we regulated what you could carry while hunting, but this bill would have allowed you to carry whatever you wanted to, but you just couldn't use it unless the specific season applied. Some other negative things would have been Commissioner term limits and required them to be confirmed by the Senate; removed boater registrants from definition of sportsmen, as this is a large boating state we count them now. A number of really negative things bundled into one package that they dropped in our lap. In middle of session, my Legislative liaison, got involved in some issues and I had to replace him with my

wildlife division director, who did a great job of finishing up the session with charisma and technical expertise (with what she lacked in Legislative experience). We managed to kill all of this stuff with the exception of one compromised bill that took the best components of the other bills. We ended up getting the carry provision on firearms through, not something we were happy with, but could live with; no net loss of hunting land, okay if they worked on our terms; boater registrations were removed, but we got a \$2 voluntary donation for hunter and angler recruitment and retention; cleaned up some captive cervid language; got a defined employment contract for me, which was a good thing especially after this session; we did give up Commission term limits which went into effect with Senate confirmation. We did protect our officers and protect our ability to enforce wildlife law and crawled out of a war with just a few grazes.

ND - Roger Rostvet, Deputy Director – A lot of states have economic challenges, but North Dakota has been fortunate for the last few years because our economy is growing strong and it has enabled our state employees and agency to get off the bottom of bad categories and our employees are finally being compensated at almost average levels. One thing that is troubling is our resource base because there is a public sentiment against acquiring land natural resources, not just for the Game and Fish Department, the USFWS, by state law, has had a lot of restrictions placed on how they can operate as far as land acquisition or easement acquiring; even Parks and Recreation is real limited and recently there has been a number of challenges to nonprofits. We have a corporate farming law, similar to what Nebraska had, which doesn't allow non profit corporations to own farm land for wildlife resource unless they go through quite an extensive public hearing process and get Governor's approval. It is very difficult, and DU has had a number of proposals turned down and TNC basically says they don't want to do business in North Dakota anymore because of this difficulty. Access is more and more difficult, whether a rural state like North Dakota or Indiana, we looked at how we were going to get the public a place to hunt. We were aggressive a number of years ago in starting a private lands program, we set ambitious goals, met them right away and had tremendous Legislative support for that. Finally we set a goal of one million acres to be set this year, but actually we reached that two years ago and now we are looking at turning that from quantity to quality. We will remain at one million acres and try to increase the amount of quality acres on each one of these plots. There have been some positive spinoffs of this as ND traditionally has been a negative state on public land ownership. Recently some of the NGOs have started looking at challenging the corporate farming law and we have also looked at some land acquisitions for the department. I think all of the contacts we made with the private landowners has given them more exposure to government as far as running a lands-type program. Attitudes are starting to loosen up a little bit and a couple of the NGOs hired pollsters, actually two firms, one Republican and one Democrat, and had them both run identical polls and the results came out the same with about 80 percent favoring NGOs being allowed to buy private land and state should be in business of conservation. It caught policymakers off guard because they had been pounded on by the farm groups that land acquisition was a horrible thing. I expect movement in the next couple of sessions to remove some of those antiquated easement laws and corporate farming for conservation areas. Just need to change attitudes.

MO – Bob Ziehmer, Director – A year ago we reported on the vacancy management plan as revenues continue in a downward trend, we moved forward with a strategic plan to reduce our work force by 11 percent, modifying several services and closing 13 offices across the state. We continue to implement that plan as we move forward during a tough legislative session, served us well. In 2003 worked on statewide contingency plan for CWD and what we would do if we had a positive; seven years later we got that phone call; had first positive this February in one captive whitetail deer in the northeast tested positive. Since then other animals in that confined facility have been tested and we tested 170 free ranging deer; and no additional positives. That contingency plan allowed us to move forward quickly with a number of stakeholder groups. Another contingency plan was for white-nosed syndrome in bats, completed in April and in less than 30 days later we got a call, the plan served us well and we could take action on bat caves that were located on state property. Efforts to increase education and communication inside and outside of the agency; updated website going out in

a few days which is more attractive and will allow staff to update and manage information more easily and will allow us to have a platform to take a website that has 3.1 million unique hits, 20 million total hits a year, and use it as a springboard to contact our citizens, which is something we have needed to do for a long time. If an individual voluntarily enters information we can contact them to remind them their permit is about to expire whether hunting or angling. Right now people have to come to us and now we can connect with them. The state has had a tremendous success on our Conservationist magazine-- Missouri is made up of 2.2 million households and the magazine goes into about a half-million every month free of charge. We started a new kid's magazine and the subscription is up to about 53,000 in conjunction with that is a website with video and interaction. We are piloting that and evaluating and look forward to reporting back in a year on the success of that effort. The last is Discover Nature Schools; we have been working with the department of elementary and secondary education putting together curriculums for elementary, middle and high school; developed to meet state testing standards for science; we offer the material free of charge and train the teachers; now in 241 public schools (1,200 total) and want to be the first state in the nation that offers a conservation course that teaches you about Missouri Conservation (consumptive uses, quality of life, various habitat) no matter where you live in the state. Term limits in legislature was mentioned and we have those, the first wave came right after 2002 elections, so in January 2003, of a legislative body made up of 197 members we had 105 new ones. Fast forward eight years and we are looking at doing something similar again. It has required a significant amount of time from the department educating individuals with various backgrounds as they come in. Technology; we have made a push to get smart phones into all the hands of all of our conservation agents in 114 counties across Missouri, allowing them real time access as we move towards e-permits. Continue to survey citizens as we work to solve natural resource challenges; knowing their viewpoint and social changes is more important than ever. One survey result that came back in 2009; we have asked the question for 30 years; every five years we ask what the interest, trust and support for Missouri conservation; and the survey came back at 91 percent of the adult population has an interest in forest, fish and wildlife; 85 percent indicated they trust the department; and 73 percent supports what we are doing and as we dug into that, some people wanted to handfish and some wanted a longer quail season. We have an effort going right now; program planning and budgeting and the goal is to know ourselves better for each major program area. We will not only know what we do, but why we do it so we can track and report back to Commission. Also, specific FTEs and dollar amounts that are tied to it; and we are going to roll it across division lines programmatically, which will help us look at expenditures, priority areas and how we are moving forward as an agency.

IA – Rich Leopold, Director – Like many other states the budget has been taking a lot of time and over the last 1 1/2 to 2 years we have taken about a 25 percent SGF from the state; gone through a statewide staff reduction program and reduced staff by 5 percent. At the same time looking at sustainable funding, looking at neighbors to north and south of us how to do that and have been doing that at a fast pace. The effort started in 2006 and the 2007 and 2008 legislators passed a ballad initiative to create a dedicated sales tax going towards natural resources spending; and this last legislative session they passed another bill that actually laid out the pie chart on how fund would work. It looks like about \$150 million a year with two-thirds coming to directly to our agency for conservation-related activities. Coming up on the ballot this November and we don't want to win with just 50% plus one, we want to win big with 60-65 percent so we can go next year with a mandate. Too much water, lakes programs moving forward with success. Secretary Vonk and Governor (now Secretary) Vilsack started a lake restoration program on which we have spent \$40 million; we have 26 lakes in process and planning another 12; and actually taking lakes off the impaired waters list, which is the first time ever in our state. We are not doing anything in a lake until they establish 50-year fix, we are looking at the sustainability, so this is not just dredging, you have to fix the watershed first. Some lakes are looking at 500 years for their planning efforts and watershed activities, which is exciting. We have a shallow lake initiative that are too deep to be a marsh, but not deep enough for waterskiing or viable game fish, where we are draining the lakes and leaving them dry for a year or two, installing carp control devices, allowing bottom sediment to firm up and allowing plants to come back in and bringing the water back in. It is working wonderfully, the

water is crystal clear; we are keeping carp out and reestablishing native populations of plants, flora and fauna; and Ducks Unlimited as been a tremendous partner on this and we are catching some national attention. The other water issue is the 2008 flood, which is number 5 or 6 in the country's worst economic disasters in U.S. history so we are still trying to figure out how to recover from that. We are at a crossroads, we have had a lot of aid pouring in and have spent about \$125 million in AWP money. Now a lot of cities and counties are making decisions and the question is, do we do it the same way we have always done it even though we know it doesn't work, or change it. There are a lot of decisions to be made right now and we have been able to tap into a lot of the stimulus monies. We had I-jobs, \$750 million bonding package to stimulate jobs and we were able to capture \$100 million of that for water quality purposes and a lot of that we were able to divert to habitat and conservation practice restoration and turned it into a half billion dollars using local and federal matches. Next year this conference will be held at Honey Creek State Resort Park, which is up and running. It is a gorgeous resort on Lake Rathbun, 105 room lodge, 28 cabins (upscale villas) and an 18-hole golf course. We welcome you next year to the state of Iowa.

IL – Marc Miller, Director – I would like to introduce, my number two, Assistant Director John Rogner (in audience) who is on loan from the USFWS and an outstanding employee and individual. We were asked to give one or two of our successful endeavors and I would say negotiating with the USFWS for John's appointment is probably one of our more successful endeavors. Never before have we had a number one and two slot with natural resource or conservation professionals and it has helped a great deal. Our state budget crisis leaves us \$13 billion in the hole and other things keep popping up. We brought John on to do wildlife and habitat work and now he has found himself the co-chair of Asian Carp Regional Coordinating Committee. Under his leadership he has been able to implement very intensive monitoring assessment plans to do the work in trying to locate and eradicate Asian carp from the Chicago waterway system. There has been a major point for us to improve the view of our agency as being one of natural resource, professional management and integrity. Our challenge is to work with our constituents and bring back that level of understanding and trust and we have been using our conservation congress process which we reinstated after a six-year process. Instead of having all of our constituents come to us to tell us what they want to see us have, we focused them on the three important issues of the day; funding, getting youth outdoors and public access. Public access is a problem. We are 48th out of 50 states in terms of public lands and in order to rise to that challenge we have to be very creative in trying to get people outdoors so we can maintain our heritage. One success was the passage of hunting and fishing fee increases. We have done that with constituent support and that was only the fee increase or anything close to a tax passed last year. One of our innovative programs is to use our point of sale system as way to disseminate information and send out emails. We have sent out to 221,000 people emails about the fee increases and encourage them to go out and get licenses and tags and tell them the rationale for the increases, insure them the money was going to stay in the fish and wildlife program and give them a little lesson on Pittman Robertson/Dingle Johnson (PR/DJ). We are trying to address budget by budgeting for outcomes and exploring fees for other state funds, looking at other states examples, and cutting costs in a lot of areas including going paperless on all of our permits. Back to public access, we have tried to address the problem by creating public access positions within our wildlife division that would help us with hunting heritage and combined some elements of our office of resource conservation to create a private lands and watershed division to help us do more outreach to private lands and perhaps help us gain access. On ballast water; I have a plea for all of us to work together to work on aquatic invasive species funding at the federal level. We have been able to gear up and do more work with the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative money that is addressing the Asian carp issue, but I feel some other states will be facing some of these same problems soon and we are going to have to work together to find a sustainable source of funds to work on this.

IN – Mark Reiter, F&W Director – I will start where the Governor left off with the energetic project of protecting the acreage. With only 4 percent of the state in the hands of the public, if want to keep the heritages of hunting, fishing and trapping around we need to provide land where people can experience those activities.

This will encompass 75,000 acres if you just calculate what is in the 100-year flood area, but of course we are going to purchase associated uplands to provide for nesting, waterfowl and that kind of thing. It is very dependent on partners; USDA through the Wetland Reserve Program, and The Nature Conservancy (TNC); they both had an interest in those watersheds. WRP had enrolled a lot of acres which will pave the way for us to pick up a lot of that ground which has already been partially paid for by those federal programs. This project works on so many levels, right now if you flew over the Wabash it is all water because of all of the storms. Since we have announced this we have had 20 or so landowners calling us wanting us to buy their land. One of the things that got this started was a potential raid on our funding, we have a lifetime license account that has \$19 million in the account and the budget agency is looking at it and trying to get their hands on that money. The budget agency met with DNR looking at that and several other accounts and were trying to figure out how to get their hands on it and asked us why the statutes were written around these accounts and our Deputy Director said it was because they had spent 50 years watching you guys try to steal it. It did create a target, so we were looking for some type of project to spend that money down some and this will be a good project. We need to make some progress while Governor Daniels is still here (a couple years) because we need to create momentum that is going to carry us through the next administration. I think we the response we are getting we are going to make these acquisitions happen. In relation to funding, the amount of federal apportionment has come up the last couple of years, serious amounts of money in wildlife restoration money, so we are trying to think of a couple of projects to obligate that money and you have to talk to the DNR CFO about what you are going to do; and we came up with some enhancements and build and grow some programs that are very popular. The good part is that the federal government is going to pay for 75 percent of it, but the CFO is worried about the 25 percent the state has to come up with and that has never happened to us. We came up with a couple of ways to utilize and obligate the federal money; TNC over the years purchased a couple of tracts they knew we would be interested in and we had the federal money and TNC offered to leave the 25 percent of value of the land in there so we could purchase it. Also, our wildlife diversity people were working with local universities to buy research, with overhead cost of 40-50 percent. We talked some of the universities into donating 25 percent of that overhead and used the federal money. We are going to incorporate that in the state logo "no upfront money". We have had a shooting range grant program for a number of years and we feel that having good safe places to shoot is absolutely necessary to recruiting hunters. Because of this additional apportionment of money we put the word out that we were looking for a bigger project than we usually fund. For years have been looking at an archery program close to Indianapolis and in Marion County the local park system was thinking about doing one and when this is finished it will be a half million dollar facility and it will serve thousands of people.

MI – Becky Humphries, Director – I want to introduce our new MAFWA treasurer Sharon Shafer, from Michigan. It has been an interesting year after seven years of budget cuts our Governor found a way to double our budget and double our number of employees. However, it came with the dissolving of two other departments. The Department of History joined us in October; we now have the state archives, civil war flags, historical museum and historic state parks in addition to our regular parks in our new Department of Natural Resources and Environment. The other part was the environmental regulation side of state government that we were divorced from 15 years ago. Sharon's day job entails managing a \$7 million budget so she can probably handle what we have in MAFWA. We have 2,700 full time employees and up to over 4,000 during seasonal times. It is challenging and a work in progress as we build into a new agency. Something that has been helpful is we have history, arts and libraries moved over to us and they had quite a good marketing program. So, we have been able to take some skilled folks and add to our recruitment and retention unit and add that marketing expertise to it. In our department, 95 percent of our budget comes from user fees and licenses and only 5 percent is SGF; so we are in the competitive market of outdoor recreation. The Pure Michigan hunt is one of those which is a lottery system to allow people to buy as many choices as they would like in order to have a hunt of a lifetime. They can choose their top species and we have been fortunate that industry has supplied equipment for those folks. We awarded those first hunts last year and it is back this year. We do about \$1

million in land transactions and acquisitions every month and the reason we are able to do that is because for over 30 years now we have invested oil and gas revenue off of the tax reverted lands, not the game and fish or PR purchased lands that make up our land base. We have invested the minerals revenues into what is called the Natural Resources Trust Fund and is constitutionally protected. It can be used to do acquisition for recreational lands and 25 percent of that each year can go to development. This year we had our largest oil and gas sale ever, \$178 million and it looks like we will cap out the trust fund later this year with our second lease sale that will be coming up this fall. We already have half a billion acres nominated for that lease sale. It is one way to take a nonrenewable resource and turn it into a renewable resource. It has been strongly supported and when we cap out that it will go into the park endowment fund so we are looking forward to supplemental funding there. Something we have spent a fair amount of time on; as we merge these agencies, we had a natural resources commission who was my boss previously, a seven-member bi-partisan Commission appointed by the Governor who appointed the director oversaw policy for the agency. As we built this new agency the Governor took over the appointing authority for the director, but kept the Commission's oversight policy to game, fish and conservation; not the environmental component. One item we have been working with is how to bring that public openness to the environmental side. Don't want Commission involvement where they debate standards, but want to make clear the budget and we have used citizen advisory committees such as deer advisory groups and others; these are very popular. Highlighted in upper peninsula and Citizen Groups have helped to calm the waters and plan to grow that statewide.

OH – Jim Marshall, Assistant Chief for Division of Wildlife – Access is where we have seen some success or soon will; we are supposed to close on a 15,000 acre acquisition that we partnered with the Ohio Division of Forestry, several NGOs, and private industry on; which has been a challenge. Our portion of it will be about 3,500 acres we will own and it is the largest contiguous forest land left in Ohio. It is the oldest location of civil culture study east of the Mississippi and will be a big achievement financially. Limited access is what holds hunters and fisherman back and we have been able to complete two new accesses, one on Lake Erie and one on the Ohio river to offer opportunities for anglers, but money is tight. The other big success is our customer relation management system, we need to abandon our old point of sale system that has become antiquated and move to a web-based system, which we plan to pilot October 1 for this deer season. On schedule to implement full scale March 1, 2011 and we are looking forward to that. Recruitment, where the archery program has gone, particularly under the National Archery in the Schools Program (NASP) has been a tremendous success. For the national tournament this year nearly 10 percent were from Ohio and last year Ohio took home one of national championships. That program is growing by leaps and bounds and we plan to compete with Kentucky soon on a head-to-head basis. The big challenge has been a judicial case that has put five of our top administrators on leave, in short terms, in my opinion a miscarriage of justice. They cited them for obstruction of justice and are going through the judicial system right now and the next hearing is August 4 and we believe at that time, or shortly thereafter, they will be returning to work. When you lose five of your top people you really gain confidence in the farm system and the people who step up and do a great job has been remarkable. It gives you confidence in the selections that have been made in the past, the training the people have had, and the experience people have gained. I think Chief Graham would agree that some of the guys that have stepped up did it without blinking and are doing two jobs and I'm sure we will come out of this successful and see Chief Graham back in his chair soon.

SD – Jeff Vonk, Secretary (former Iowa DNR Director) – We have a unique parallel to North Dakota and SD is well-known for one wildlife resource, an invasive species particularly, a ground nesting bird. We haven't faced budget challenges that many of the other states have faced; we don't receive SGF in the budget, only a very small amount in state parks. Budgets are reliant with how many pheasants we have on the ground and as long as we do we have many nonresidents who come to chase them and we live off of those fees. No challenges other than the reference to legislators eyeing that fund. A program we updated you on in the past was using the conservation reserve program in an enhancement way to try and increase habitat for wildlife and also access to

that wildlife resource. A couple of years ago we put together a CREP proposal and finally that was signed off on by Secretary Vilsack and our Governor Rounds. This is focused on the James River valley in the eastern part of our state; the target is 100,000 acres to take under contract and we use our trust fund dollars to provide the 25 percent match so it didn't have to go through a legislative process to get approval. In about six months we will have 10,000 under contract with another 10,000 in process. We focused on this because there hasn't been a general sign up for CRP for a number of years and we have been losing acres under grass. That is our biggest threat to our native ground nesting birds as well as that invasive I mentioned. We looked at all opportunities to mitigate this loss of grass habitat and this CREP program seemed like a natural way to do this. Focus on private sector with habitat improvements; we have a number of game production areas, some which are not in the best shape, and we are concerned about our ability to hire folks to get our staff where we are able to manage all of that land, both public and leased land. We entered into an agreement with Pheasants Forever (PF) to hire habitat management teams; we have three of those teams on the ground, they are PF employees and it works well for us because money is not the problem but the ability to hire people is our problem. Those crews are working on our public lands to make those improvements. Also, we had an agreement this year with National Wild Turkey Federation (NWTF) who put an additional biologist focused on South Dakota and the same process with Ducks Unlimited (DU). For those of you who are looking our nonprofit partners are there and provide good help for us. We have a well studied and healthy mountain lion population in the Black Hills; it is so successful that we have come full circle like some of you with wolves have come and we are getting a backlash from some of our sportsmen because there are too many and we are losing deer and elk. We are updating our mountain lion management plan, had hunting season the last three years and I expect the quota will increase this year and we have warmed up the trucks to truck lions down to Iowa in the night.

NE – Kirk Nelson, Assistant Director – Rex has been here the last 4-5 years as well as a couple of our Commissioners which is new for the Midwest. It shows the interest level Nebraska is currently experiencing with a lot of our programs and our Commissioners are right in there. They are engaged in what we are doing, have elevated recruit and retain issue, embraced that and pushed staff to do everything we can to perpetuate and promote participation in hunting and fishing. We are doing expos all over the state, outdoor education programs, fishing clinics and become very engaged with our public. Not only are they promoting it within our staff now that we have gone all electronic this year, we are web-based now and it carries marketing components with it. Many of our licenses are youth orientated, we have a \$5 youth turkey and a \$5 youth deer permit for residents and nonresidents, but there is a little revenue negativity to that, but it is the right thing to do. We are also engaged in access, if don't have place to hunt and fish you are only addressing half of it. In Nebraska we are 97 percent privately owned, very little public land so we have targeted priority areas to develop access in and are starting to pay a premium to compete with private sources for leasing and it is moderately successful. It is in its second year and we will have to fine tune because it is going to be expensive. Our Commissioners want to tell our public that there is a place to hunt and fish and we will provide them. Proud of our Wildlife Action Plan, an interactive process statewide, it gave us a chance to integrate groups we don't normally work with such as Farm Bureau and cattlemen. We got their cooperation, were able to identify priority areas, priority species and species of concern and it has been a success. We are revising that plan this year and holding public hearings and using it as springboard for a lot of things. We are also moving into the outsourcing arena in a big way; our Commissioners are pushing this and we are going to outsource a lot of maintenance on our areas and doing more partnerships, anybody that will hold a position with us and accomplish similar goals; we open to that and willing to help fund it. That same group of Commissioners that is so engaged is reorganizing the agency and downsizing administration to move into an arena where they feel we are making more positive strides at the ground level and having an impact.

KS – Joe Kramer, F&W Division Director – Ordinarily Keith Sexson would be here, but we lost an employee Friday in an ATV accident, so he passed the baton. From a department standpoint we have been fortunate, like other fee fund state agencies, we are pretty healthy. In fact last year we had increases in both hunting and

fishing licenses. However, being a state agency we have to share the pain that the other state agencies share when budget times are bad, which is a challenge. One of the reasons why we have healthy fee fund is we have been fortunate historically because the pheasant paid its way, but now the big game is a big bonus, especially deer and turkey. Also being in a state that is not as populated as other Midwest states it is easier for us to get into the access game. We copied North Dakota and South Dakota access programs and it has been successful; we have a million acres of walk-in hunting. We have also been successful in growing partnerships with other agencies, both federal and state and the farm bill is still king and now because of our partnerships with NRCS and PF we are able to put millions of dollars of habitat on the ground on an annual basis; compared to a few years back when we were lucky to get \$100,000 on the ground. Success from the access standpoint, it is obvious you have to buy smart when acquiring properties because of the limited manpower and dollars that you have once you get those properties. We were able to acquire Louisburg Lake near Middle Creek which was a water supply lake near Kansas City. The City was going to sell the land to public and individual entrepreneurs would have bought that lake and you would have lost the water and land and we were able to use motorboat access funding and get that property purchased. Over 70 percent of the anglers are boaters from Kansas City and it is less than 30 minutes away. That was an excellent move on our part by a young Regional Supervisor who took the initiative, stayed with it and went through the political process to get that lake purchased. Another large property we are close to acquiring is the Parsons Ammunition Plant, 14,000 acres of prime tall grass prairie, which is going to close down; we are going to purchase 3,000 acres and try to get another 10,000 open to the public and that is also close to Kansas City. Because we have to share pain when it comes to budgets and salaries and because our baby boomers are leaving, we haven't been very fortunate in rewarding young employees with cost of living or merit increases. In fact the last time they got one was during the Korean War, so we struggle administratively to motivate and every couple of years we have new themes. Angler recruitment and retention was a big theme the last couple of years and this year and next year we have moved into conservation leadership ranks and are sending our young supervisors to Emerging Leaders Academy at KU, and it has been very successful. After they went to the classes for a year the number one concern was communication, which shocked me, with computers, cell phones and all of the technology out there. So we recruited a couple of these people and asked them what they would do; and reading books was a big thing. I asked what book they would give me to read and they said the Abe Lincoln leadership book or Death by Meetings. I started reading them; I love stories, and in the Abe Lincoln story the first thing I read was about the newspaper man Horus Greeley, a nemesis of Abe Lincoln's who called him the bumbling buffoon, and I figured that was why Lance wanted me to read that book, but I read the book and was motivated and also enjoyed Death by Meetings because it is a story about how to run meetings. You can't have meetings just to have meetings, they have to be good meetings; and we are requiring our supervisors to read leadership books.

Dan Zekor – Questions? Ollie – I'm interested in poll information from Rich on vote on conservation sales tax. Always been interest in country on alternative funding for fishing and wildlife conservation and we have been fortunate to have three states who have dedicated sales taxes (Arkansas, Minnesota, and Missouri) and wondering if there are other initiatives out there, not only in the Midwest, but in other parts of the country that we can learn about. The more ideas, the more initiative. Rich – Iowa DNR is not doing much of anything right now because we are such a strongly vested institution that we don't have an opinion by law, but if you want to find out more about there is an NGO that has sprang up to coalesce the efforts; Iowa's Water and Land Legacy (IWL) and they are a group of NGOs and farm organizations and business community and are doing polling and advertising and getting good responses and test words; and number one is water quality. The other stuff; hunting, fishing, forestry and state parks, okay, but water quality is number one. Polls are showing favorable response. When we have had these votes we have had an overwhelming majority of House and Senate, 92 percent approval as they went through for the constitutional amendment; 100 percent of the Republicans, the urban democrats have been the challenge. We have arrangements with the Center for Ag Research and Development out of Iowa State University doing research and we are doing a lot with water; lakes and rivers and establishing economic values of recreational activities and if things were better what those values would

be. Dave – The polling done in Minnesota preceding our vote found the same thing and that the clean water thing is a strong selling point; arts and culture is a part of ours as well. Marc - Illinois is working on it, but because of the \$13 billion deficit and not being able to pass any revenues that would fill that gap, this isn't the appropriate time to be looking at a tax increase. Looking to see how Iowa fares and follow up later on with that initiative. We are trying to utilize fees as much as possible that can be created without legislative approval.

Dave – Becky, your Citizen Advisory groups, do you staff those? Becky – Yes, they are 20 member groups, we asked all of the major constituent groups to nominate folks and put out advertisements for citizens who want to participate. We put together a selection team when we did it in the upper peninsula (UP), our two UP

Commissioners and my UP deputy director at the time and three leaders of major conservation organizations up there and they were the ones who did the vetting and actual selection of the two citizen groups and then we provide staff support, but they choose their own chair, call their own meetings. We gave them a template of by-laws, but they passed their own by-laws, but they set the agenda and let us know what they want to speak about. The public comes in and speaks to this group and they dig in and find the answers and get back to the public so it has worked out very well. Sometimes we hold the reins too tight and by giving them more license they have

been much more supportive on some tough issues. Dave – Increasingly using citizen advisory committees not only to deal with tough issues, but to help us manage programs better. We now have a walleye advisory committee, a group of walleye anglers, guides and a few resort owners and they have been pretty critical of some of our programs in the past; we shared information with them and they have helped us develop new stocking guidelines and new approaches. It is intimidating for staff to open up our science and involve people, but in the end they end up being strong advocates. Becky – We have done on it a species basis for years, but this group that expands the globe has been interesting because you tend to get discussions where one individual members interest is counter or has to balance another's and it is very helpful to have that public discussion.

Matt – Several states mentioned the challenge of managing of lands, a common theme, we have a great program to acquire lands, but then what do you do with them. We are going through an internal process looking at gap analysis, what it takes to manage public lands and projecting it over next ten years; looking at allocations of land management resources in department; can we leverage temporary LTE help; but idea is to go through as an internal exercise first before going to legislature for help because they are going to ask what we are doing to manage the resources we have. There might be a way to collaborate and connect staff working on these things to share ideas and funding sources. It might be another way to cooperate. Becky – We just completed land consolidation, have over four million acres of state managed lands and an equal number of federal lands; we used to run the tax reverted process and we wound up keeping anything that had water access or was close to a project areas. We had a lot of outlying areas and a lot of project areas that were not consolidated; we went through and redrew boundaries and rededicated them. In some cases we drew those boundaries in and other areas we realized we were too tight and enlarged them. After we finished we looked every parcel that fell outside those dedicated boundaries and made decisions on what we wanted to do with them. If we were going to dispose of them we worked with a conservation partner to keep it in conservation, get it to a local unit of government or sell it on the open market. We have a land facilitation fund so we can sell land and the money goes into a revolving account that gets reappropriated every year and we can invest that and buy in holdings. Those of you who do not have that authority you may want to look at it because it is really helpful as land trends change it gives you greater flexibility to control your destiny. Some of our user groups have asked us to slow down. It took away the argument when we went to legislature, it quieted the battle cry of; how much is enough or how much is too much; especially in Upper Peninsula.

Dan – What you just heard is on the website. Ollie – All except for two states. Dan – Look for themes for discussion and to develop next year's agenda. Noted, land acquisition/land stewardship (how buy, manage, partner, enough/too much,); feature best practices from revolving accounts; recruitment and retention things are starting to happen at state level; invasive species; dedicated funding, positive in MN, and hopes high in IA, carry message forward and share ideas; partnerships/citizen advisory committees. Good themes and opportunity.

MAFWA COMMITTEE REPORTS

Ollie Torgerson, MAFWA Executive Secretary, Facilitator – Thank you all for being here, appreciate directors, NGOs and federal partners being here. The backbone of MAFWA is work of committees and directors. Most committees have already met on their own schedule, not at this meeting. We will handle action items during committee reports because this is more efficient, so I will turn over the microphone to President Mark to handle voting of any items needed. During your State-of-the-State discussions there was interest in managing public lands and collaborations. We do have a public lands committee, perfect committee to utilize to work on those issues, send personnel to that meeting and so they can discuss issues going on and bring items back for your action.

Furbearers (Exhibit B) – Joe Kramer (director/liaison) – Whole report is on the MAFWA website. South Dakota did an outstanding job of hosting the meeting (last year Kentucky stepped up and got this committee back up and going). The meeting was hosted in the Black Hills at Deadwood on April 26- 29, 2010. A field trip was held in Custer State Park. Forty-eight participants attended the workshop, including state furbearer biologists from 10 Midwest member states (Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin) and from other organizations/agencies including: the Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation, New York State Division of Fish, Wildlife and Marine Resources, three affiliated Tribes Game and Fish personnel, Badlands National Park, US Forest Service, USDA APHIS Wildlife Services, Fur Takers of America, South Dakota Trappers Association, South Dakota State University, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, South Dakota Department of Health, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. A complete list of attendees is available on web. Two days of paper sessions and the mountain lion part was outstanding (three papers). Two open discussion periods in reference to tagging of traps, controversial on what to put on tags; and the other one was otters and how the states were dealing with them. There was excellent participation. Director Action Items (handed out two): 1) The Midwest Furbearer Working Group asks that the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (MAFWA) adopt the position statement in Appendix 5 pertaining to hound dog training (coursing) pens and associated commercialization, translocation, and use of wildlife within fenced enclosures. This is not the first time this has come before directors. 2) Resolution draft on management of gray wolves. 3) (no attachment) The Midwest Furbearer Working Group requests continued strong support and funding for Best Management Practices (BMPs) for trapping. The Furbearer Working Group would like to emphasize the need to maintain commitment to BMPs by AFWA and Directors. BMPs have been used by several states to defend trapping through science and even allow new types of traps which were previously prohibited. There are also some information items: on CITES and the need to send staff to the meetings, next year in Wisconsin. Mark – The position statement on hound dogs was requested by directors so if no concerns, vote. *Jeff Vonk, South Dakota moved to adopt position statement, Becky Humphries, Michigan second. **Approved.*** Mark - Resolution was sent to Resolutions Committee and will be discussed at business meeting.

Ollie – Private lands and Public lands committees meets together at request of directors. We will be combining both reports to be presented by Bill Bean, Indiana DNR. There are several action items to be dealt with.

Private Lands (Exhibit C) – Bill Bean, DNR – Gary Langell, our private lands program director is on vacation in Florida – Had four action items: 1) of utmost importance is securing permanent funding for AFWA Agriculture Conservation Policy Analyst Position currently held by Jennifer Mock Schaffer. Since its creation in 1999 this position has illuminated what can be done with focused attention to the evolution of the farm bill, making each successful farm bill more wildlife friendly. The Agriculture Policy Analyst Position has been effective in addressing many of the state's needs associated with such highly successful programs as CRP, WRP, WHIP and GRP. Recently new practices under CRP, like CP33, buffers for upland birds; CP37, duck nesting habitat; and CP 38, state acres for wildlife enhancement have specifically targeted USDA conservation

programs towards wildlife concerns. Having a full time staff position has allowed AFWA to consolidate state views, keeps states informed, advised states of upcoming issues at the national level, coordinates actions with other conservation partners, creates a direct and trusted line of communication with NRCS and FSA, and lobbies key legislators and staff in House and Senate Ag Committees on behalf of the states when crafting new farm bills. In 2009 alone over \$61 million was allocated to farm bill program contracts in Indiana and reflects average allocation going to landowners in the MAFWA states to restore and maintain habitat, reduce sediments and nutrients entering our streams, protect threatened and endangered and at-risk species, and provide millions of acres of huntable habitat. Many of these programs require 10-year contracts thus total dollars committed over a decade will exceed billions of dollars, dwarfing all of the state wildlife agency budgets combined. In 1999 the directors of MAFWA realized the need, supported and encouraged the funding of a full time Agriculture Policy Coordinator Position dedicated to farm bill implementation and policy development. This position was initially funded through contributions from the regional associations, it was agreed MAFWA states would fund 50 percent since MAFWA states typically benefit from 50 percent of farm bill allocations. Following the 2002 farm bill a USFWS multistate grant was secured to fund the position, however these grants are not appropriate to provide long-term funding and more importantly can't be used for advocacy programs on the hill, thus limiting a very important aspect of this position. As a new round of hearings and listening sessions gets underway in preparation for the 2012 farm bill it is even more imperative to MAFWA states that this position be permanently housed and funded within AFWA. This position will be vitally important and biofuels, wind energy and climate change policy and program implementation are crafted within current and future farm bill programs. It is currently estimated that this position will cost AFWA \$184,000 per year for salary, benefits and travel. Although MAFWA previously provided 50 percent funding for this position, regional equity provisions in the 2008 farm bill provide for greater participation by other regional associations and those associations have benefited tremendously from Jen's work. The MAFWA Private Lands Working Group praises the excellent work that Jen Mock Schaffer has done in this position and strongly urges the MAFWA directors to take the lead in seeking a permanent funding mechanism for her position. It is critical that her position's funding allow her full freedom to lobby for AFWA on behalf of all state fish and wildlife agencies. **Action Item:** Letters were drafted for the Directors to consider sending to the other regional associations and the AFWA Executive and Budget Committees requesting support for maintaining the AFWA Agriculture Conservation Policy Analyst position and finding a long term funding solution through state membership dues or other non federal sources.

Kirk Nelson, Nebraska moved, Marc Miller, Illinois second to send letters. Discussion: Jeff Vonk, South Dakota – What are we asking for in the letter to USDA, one to AFWA and other regional associations-- asking for their support? Is there a specific number in that report? Mark – There doesn't seem to be. Jeff – Are you just asking for support? Ollie – MAFWA has covered 50 percent in the past and the other associations the rest. Letters are asking for nonfederal funds to fully fund her position so she can lobby. Whether we go back to regional associations or ask AFWA to figure it out, there is interest of committee to get off federal dollars. Jeff- Asking for \$184,000 a year for salary, travel and benefits? Ron Regan –Twenty-five percent of her total salary allows lobbying, with reauthorization, but is that enough time? Jeff – What Jen does has grown in recognition and I don't have a problem with the letters. Challenge is for funding and AFWA is in no better position. Matt Frank, Wisconsin – Jen does a great job and we are looking for ways to fund that position and it is great we are weighing in. Ron, if you got letter from us, what would our options be? Ron Regan – No, tough managing right on the edge, not a lot of extra money and the competition is still heavy. We have a budget meeting in August and we will take this under advisement at that time. We are working on sustainability of funding for AFWA too, but I can't tell you there is any silver bullet with our resources alone. **Approved.**

The second and third issues pertain to growing concerns with expanding feral swine populations and also reflect the concerns and recommendations of the MAFWA Public Lands Working Group as well. Free-ranging populations of feral swine currently exist in at least 32 States. Most experts estimate the current U.S. population of feral swine at between 4 to 5 million animals and are considered an invasive or exotic species,

meaning they are not native wildlife. Localized feral swine populations can triple in a single year and they are more firmly entrenched in some states than in others. In the absence of quick and concerted attention, control of feral swine populations and repair of damage will be increasingly significant to society. Although USDA APHIS Wildlife Services (WS) provided technical assistance to ranchers, farmers, and other landowners in 24 States in fiscal year 2008, the majority of their efforts have been focused on disease surveillance, disease control and monitoring through their National Wildlife Disease Program. A number of federal and state agencies, animal health and wildlife organizations, and the domestic swine industry have expressed a need for a more comprehensive WS feral swine program that maintains the necessary disease surveillance and monitoring components, but provides increased funding and personnel to substantially address feral swine eradication, damage management, and public outreach, education, and communication needs particularly in high risk areas, such as the Southeast, Midwest, and California. The MAFWA Private Lands Working Group and Public Lands Working Group fully endorse a more comprehensive APHIS Wildlife Services' feral swine program that places more personnel on the ground in high risk areas to address eradication, damage control, and outreach needs and provides the additional funding to do so. It is important for governmental agencies and stakeholders such as private landowners to work in unison to eradicate feral swine because, otherwise, feral swine under eradication pressure in one place will simply go to another and then return when eradication pressure eases. It will take additional staff resources and funding to get the job done and APHIS is the logical agency to take the lead. Immediate attention is needed to bring feral swine under control, particularly where populations are newer and can still be eradicated at much less expense than if allowed to increase through inattention. **Action Item:** We encourage the Midwest Director's to work with other regional associations to secure increased funding for APHIS Wildlife Services. We have developed draft letters that can be signed and forwarded to other regional associations and to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry and the House Committee on Agriculture to assist you with this important issue.

Similarly, in much of the Midwest, feral swine are a growing issue on private land. Unfortunately, private landowners have little assistance in their efforts to address the problem. Efforts to date to utilize USDA cost-share programs to address this issue have been met with considerable resistance within the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)—both within individual States as well as nationally. Currently one state (Alabama) has utilized Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program (WHIP) funds to address this, but the environmental impacts caused by feral swine go well beyond wildlife habitat. The USDA Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) affords cost-share assistance to landowners to address a multitude of resource concerns on their property, and appears to be a much better fit for this issue. Feral hog impacts on water quality, soil erosion, domestic livestock and wildlife all argue for inclusion in a broad-based program such as EQIP. In addition, the NRCS' Conservation Innovation Grant program could be used to explore new and innovative techniques to control feral swine. Another source of contention within NRCS is what is the appropriate Conservation Standard to be used when addressing feral swine problems? Due to the nature of the issue, our recommendation is that the 595 Integrated Pest Management Standard be the vehicle by which States could address this problem within their borders. We believe use of this standard to control a problem animal that is clearly not native is a sensible decision. The MAFWA Private Lands Working Group and Public Lands Working Group fully endorse the usage of the EQIP cost share program as one additional 'tool' in the suite of options available for landowners to address feral hog problems on their property. **Action Item:** We encourage the Midwest Directors to work with other regional associations to secure NRCS approval to allow this option within EQIP policy for individual states. We have provided draft letters that can be signed and forwarded to other regional associations and the NRCS Chief to assist you with this important issue.

Mark – There are four letters, first to regional associations (read request – attached to report); second letter to APHIS to implement feral swine program (read request – attached to report); third to regional associations on feral swine (read request – attached to report); and final letter to NRCS for EQIP for feral swine control (read request – attached to report).

Marc Miller, Illinois moved to send letters, Rich Leopold, Iowa second. Discussion: Becky Humphries, Michigan - Dave is working on the national policy. Are feral swine considered game in any states? Gary

Taylor – Not in Midwest, but in some others like Utah who did a report. Becky – It should be noted we are asking them to use federal dollars to manage what are considered game species in some other states.

Approved.

We would like to bring to the Directors' attention that this year marks the 25th anniversary of the Conservation Reserve Program. The Conservation Reserve Program has been the cornerstone of all conservation programs administered by the United States Department of Agriculture by providing critical wildlife habitat, improving water quality, and protecting soil and forest resources across America. With over 31 million acres currently enrolled, CRP has been a wise investment of taxpayer funds by promoting balanced ecosystems addressing declining populations of threatened and endangered species while providing significant nesting and brooding habitat for millions of waterfowl, pheasants, quail, and neo-tropical species of birds. Over the years, the Conservation Reserve Program has also provided recreational opportunities to hunters, anglers, and wildlife enthusiasts, contributed millions of dollars in outdoor related expenditures to rural economies and private landowners, addressed essential pollinator habitat, and sequestered millions of tons of carbon. **Action Item:** The Private Lands Working Group has drafted a resolution, paying tribute to the Conservation Reserve Program and recognizing the USDA for its administration of the program. The Private Lands Working Group is requesting the Directors adopt the resolution and forward a copy to Tom Vilsack, USDA Secretary of Agriculture. Mark – Resolution is going to Resolutions Committee and will be discussed on Wednesday.

Public Lands (Exhibit C) – Bill Bean - The Committee needs to be reinstated for another three years. Since all recommended by-law changes have to be distributed to the directors 30 days in advance of the annual meeting the committee made the recommendation during the 2009 annual meeting. The Public Land Committee again discussed the benefits of the working group and feels it is in step with the mission of the Midwest directors, which it to provide a forum for state and provincial fish and wildlife agencies to share ideas and information, pool resources and initiate action to benefit the management of conservation of fish and wildlife resources in the Midwest. Benefits include sharing benefits and information on strategies for addressing mutual management issues, update of current projects via state reports, networking and the opportunity to pool collective resourcefulness, if not resources, to solve problems. The committee is recommending to the directors to initiate and approve the reinstatement of the committee for three years or longer. Mark – That is something we can't handle right here, it will have to be dealt with at the meeting on Wednesday. Ollie – It will be handled in by-laws. Bill – Concerning restrictions on consumptive uses of national wildlife refuges. The committee noted and discussed that they are seeing more restrictions imposed on hunting on some of the national wildlife refuges in their respective states. This isn't something that was 100 percent agreed on because a lot of the representatives said they have real good relationships with their national wildlife refuge staff, however there was enough concern that we wanted to bring it up. The group again noted the irony that states are expected to adhere to the allowable uses to insure that wildlife dependent activity such as hunting and trapping are not compromised by activities that conflict with the purpose the state acquired the land with federal funds, yet it appears that USFWS might be moving towards more restrictive regulations on hunting and other consumptive activities on their properties. **Action Item:** The committee has drafted letters to USFWS Region 3 and 6 offices for the MAFWA Directors to consider. The letter will point out the dichotomy between the compatible issues that state wildlife management areas are required to operate under per federal aid regulations and the compatible and allowed uses on national wildlife refuges throughout the Midwest. The letter will ask the respective regional offices to investigate the inconsistencies and consider revamping the rules that NWR's operate under concerning public use. Draft letters for your consideration have been attached to the reports you received prior to this conference. Mark – I will read the request so you know what we are being asked to sign. These are letters to Region 3 and Region 6, both Tom Melius and Steve Guertin, regarding consumptive uses on wildlife refuges (read paragraph of letter starting with "Therefore..." – attached to report). *Discussion: Matt Frank, Wisconsin – The letters have some language that there is a perception that hunting and trapping opportunities on refuges is declining and then it says, "this trend, if real..."*, was there some discussion at

committee on what we are dealing with factually? Did people come up with actual examples? We all deal with perceptions all the time, but could we get more information? Bill – In general, what we were concerned about was in a lot of instances NWR and state owned properties are adjoining and private lands and NWR are adjoining and that the state rules people operate under on private land or state-owned ground can differ if they get over onto federal ground. It seems to be confusing to customers who are using the resources. A specific example that I experienced in Indiana, they were holding a controlled deer hunt on a refuge. In Indiana during firearms deer season you are allowed to use shotgun slugs, muzzleloaders, handguns (certain calibers) and centerfire rifles with handgun calibers and if you go to the refuge hunt they don't allow handguns and centerfire rifles and the public wants to know why. We are looking for a little bit of consistency on regulations. The group feels the decisions are made at the refuge level in many instances, not something coming from the region or DC, and it is confusing to the customers. We feel you should be as lenient as you can possibly be unless you have real good reasons to be more restrictive. Jeff Vonk, South Dakota – Of the two points made in that paragraph I am a little uncomfortable with the first one that broadly goes to the Service and says we would like you to review all this. I know as a director I don't like getting letters that cause a lot of internal review and work with no specificity attached to it. I could support the second one to ask regional directors to contact state directors about specific examples then we are going to boil it down you specific states. I request we change the wording of that letter and hone in on dialog between a director and the region to allow that discussion around specific problems that have been identified. Mark – Rewrite that taking into account what Matt and Jeff are saying and bring it to the business meeting. Ollie – That would be the most efficient way. Bill can work with Matt and Jeff to get the language the way you want it. Otherwise the Executive Committee can handle it at their August meeting. Kirk Nelson, Nebraska – Tom, is there anything else we could put in the letter that would help you with this

Bill – No more action items, the other issue was the feral swine issue and we already handled that through private lands. A couple of informational items I wanted to bring to your attention that we will be discussing further throughout the year via emails and at our meeting next year. Compatible uses on state wildlife management areas is amazing how much we differ on how much is allowed and not allowed on our areas. We are putting together a database or spreadsheet to compare activities that are allowed or not and reasons why not so we can further discuss those and maybe even get some consistency among the states. Also, we touched on lead shot for hunting, this issue is growing in importance nationwide and most states have been phasing in a requirement for nontoxic shot for dove hunting with fairly good success and acceptance by hunters. Indiana is phasing in on requiring nontoxic shot for upland game on areas where spent shell is likely to be picked up by waterfowl and other birds. Hunter acceptance has been fairly good, once they understand the reasoning behind the change. Indiana will continue to expand wildlife areas requiring nontoxic shot and report back to the committee and hopefully other states will join in as manufacture of nontoxic shot grows and becomes more economical. We touched on wind farms and whether they are allowed on state properties and if not can we keep them far enough away from the properties where they won't have any impact. The big issue is what is the impact and there needs to be more studies done on that. We encourage the directors to support research throughout the Midwest to better define the impacts of wind farms on wildlife. We will be discussing that again at the next meeting. The last thing is the attendance at our public lands and private lands meetings. I have been in public lands for 30 years, I am not a charter member because I did not go to the first meeting in Ohio back in 1990s, but they held a second meeting there which was hosted by Pat Ruble and Bill May and I have been attending ever since (except for the last couple of years because of budget reasons). I would like to encourage you to send representatives to these because in my 38 years, I have attended a lot of meetings, training, seminars and workshops, but I have never attended one that is more meaningful and has a better group of passionate dedicated individuals. Regardless of the action items, the interaction among the members is very valuable. Find money to send people to these meetings every year. Ollie – Heard that many times and it is true. The ability of these professionals to get together, to share and learn; and the ideas they bring back is well worth it. Pleased to see public lands has sprouted wings in last couple of years. Thank you for report.

Law Enforcement – This committee was not able to meeting during the past year because of travel restrictions. Have a meeting planned for this year in Illinois, so no committee report. We thank the group for their sponsorship, they host the hospitality room each year.

Legal (Exhibit D) – Carol Bambery - Met earlier this month in Topeka, Kansas and only three states represented, including the host state. There are no action items or information items. I would like to brief you on two other things. An hour ago, the United States Supreme Court released an opinion which we have been waiting for a long time. That opinion is in the case of McDonald versus the City of Chicago. The City of Chicago had handgun ban for decades, the case went to the court and the court in a five to four opinion upheld the second amendment. This means that cities can no longer ban handguns. It does, however, beg the question of what is reasonable regulation. A lot of state constitution right to own firearms is subject to police power and that question is on its way back up to the U.S. Supreme Court. An opinion that was reached in the District of Columbia, and will be reviewed, is what is reasonable regulation? The District of Columbia also had a handgun ban and that was challenged in District of Columbia versus Heller and the U.S. Supreme Court, in May of last year, ruled that the District of Columbia could not preclude an individual from owning a firearm. So now you have two U.S. Supreme Court opinions directly squarely on the meaning of the second amendment. I wanted to brief you on that because if we had not won that case this morning I believe we would have seen some states that did not have the constitutional right to bear arms could have attempted to regulate even further as it relates to hunting. I have not read the opinion, but I am assuming it is based on due process. The second thing is the Conservation Law Clinic, which we talked about last year and Michigan State University College of Law was in attendance at that meeting and we spent some time talking about it. Fundraising is the issue keeping us from starting the program. We believe we needed \$7 million to start the program so we could use the interest to hire staff and to put curriculum together. Boone and Crockett Conservation Club is the key fundraiser and the money isn't there yet, however the Law School has advertised for the Conservation Law Clinic Director. I was invited to put together the first course on the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation and I have prepared the syllabus and the course materials and that class will start in January of this next year. Ollie – We would like to have more of our state legal advisors get to this committee meeting. Again travel restrictions have impacted attendance. No meeting is scheduled for next year, it is hard to get information out of attorneys.

Wildlife Action Plan (Exhibit E) – Ollie Torgerson – This committee met last July in Colorado, their second meeting. They had nine Midwest states represented. They do not have any action items, but spent a lot of time discussing climate change and how to weave climate change objectives into state wildlife action plans. They were going to meeting again April 2010, but I don't have a report and don't know if they met or not. Katy Reeder (IA) is chair and co-chair is Dennis Figg (MO). It is off and running and has good participation.

Climate Change (Exhibit F) – Ollie – This new committee was formed last year and got it going and they have had two meetings by teleconference. Their recommendation for your consideration; members of this committee share concern of overlapping roles between the climate change committee and the state wildlife action plan committee and at same time the USFWS is bringing forward Land Conservation Cooperatives (LCCs). Because of these initiatives they are asking directors about the wisdom of keeping this committee going. There is concern that it is a duplication and ask for you to reevaluate the need for this committee. Rich – I am the official representative of that committee and Katie Reeder, our SWAP person, talked to me about this. Seeing the rational, USFWS is taking the lead, but many other federal agencies are getting in the game, which is a good thing. When the the state wildlife action plans were going into effect climate change was not interwoven into them. I know when took charge of this, great to see coordinating of science at regional and national level. Seeing statewide action plans, not interwoven at that time and many states are going through the vulnerability assessments. I have a concern because climate change is the same, but different than anything else we have ever faced. It doesn't have its own unique set of problems, but takes every other problem and exacerbates it. The

order of magnitude and speed of the shift that we are going to be seeing is something we have never experienced before. When I look at what the wildlife action plan is doing and I continue to see that one of their top priorities is under shifting climate then I am comfortable with not having another committee looking at just that. **Jeff Vonk, South Dakota – Made motion to look at committee recommendation on whether they continue to exist. Let Executive Committee review it and come back to the full body with a recommendation.** **Dave Schad, Minnesota second.** Discussion: Last week directors were sent letters from AFWA inviting them to send participants to a climate change workshop in mid-December in Minneapolis; in conjunction with the Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference; it is a 2-day workshop intended to talk about issues specific to the Midwest relating to climate change; how we can work together and tools that states can use to plan better. It is funded with a multistate conservation grant so travel costs are covered. Encourage you to identify two people on your staff at fairly high levels within your agency to participate. A further suggestion would be to defer this decision until after that workshop. There might be some needs that might be identified that could benefit from this committee's discussion. After the meeting maybe we could have folks touch base, is there a need to continue discussions and could the Midwest Climate Change Committee serve in that role? **Dave Schad, Minnesota - Amendment to Jeff's motion is to defer Executive Committee discussion until after Midwest Climate Change workshop and discussion following that, Becky Humphries, Michigan second.** Matt – It was a good thing we set up this committee, it doesn't replace our work, but parades it; and is definitely a long-term issue. Don't want to duplicate work, concerned of symbolism that we had a climate change committee and got rid of it, concerned on perception of that. Need to keep climate change on our agenda and have a place, within our staff, to go with these issues. Rich – I like this discussion. Thinking of what we have been doing thus far, since baton was handed to Iowa, finding directors and seconds and thirds are two busy and it ended up being the same people doing the wildlife action plans. Agree with symbolism and we need a communication strategy around that. Okay with back burner, feel compelled to meet as committee chair to do something. I am willing to wait until after December meeting. Jeff – One of the options is to change the title of committee and include climate change as part of the committee name. Support idea that Executive Committee discussion could occur after that meeting. Dave – The Climate Change committee might help us get better organized around USFWS LCCs which are new and we are trying to figure out how to staff them. A major focus will be climate adaptation and there might be some benefit to having a state forum from the Midwest for state agency folks to talk and get themselves organized to engage LCCs and this could be a place to do that. Additional discussion after workshop and challenges we are going to face as states participating. Rich – Iowa is the same agency as Michigan and a few other states here where you have both a natural resources and environmental services in the same agency and it has pluses and minuses. One plus is I am involved in water quality and quantity and permitting decisions and when I talk to my natural resource folks they are looking at protecting their wildlife area or fish; when you talk about frequency and magnitude of flood events, last year 13 feet over levees that is a whole other level of thinking that my natural resource folks don't do. That is an advantage of having a committee like this, to bring in those global issues. **Approved motion. Approved amendment.** Ollie – Executive Committee will deal with this after December meeting. Just a reminder that this will take a by-laws change, to take away the committee, the same as adding one. No by-laws committee because Colorado dropped out and our by-laws committee of one, Jeff Ver Steeg, is no longer here. We have several by-laws to deal with that takes a 30-day notice before a vote of directors. We have recommendations to extend Public Lands Committee; Wildlife and Health Committee, but can't because of 30-day notice. All it takes is one person and Marc Miller is shaking his head, but president appoints committees. With a 30-day notice from president we can vote electronically, don't have to wait until next year. Dave Schad – Gary Taylor asked me to provide an update. State folks are working with USFWS and NGO partners developing a national fish and wildlife climate adaptation strategy. The purpose is to link the work state, federal and big organizations are doing. To move forward on how deal with climate change; how to advocate for funding; and apply funding on the ground. There is a distinction between a federal climate change strategy and a national climate change strategy. There have been two meetings, one at Shepherdstown in

NCN (Exhibit G) – Dan Zekor – This committee is a key part of multistate grant program and years ago you created the committee to help members be aware of process; inform you of process; and to assist you in development of National Conservation Needs that this Association would like to advance. This year we did not submit anything. Put the word out twice, but did not get any recommendations. If multiple needs are proposed we work with Ollie to make sure those get placed before you and help you make your priority selection. Needs are being addressed by other committees. Not looking to advocate or advance any needs, but stand ready to advise you or help you in preparation of those. Members on the committee: myself, John Buhnerkempe and Rex Amack.

Pheasant (Exhibit H) – Ollie – This committee met at the end of September in Fort Ransom, North Dakota. Had nine state members attend and they are drafting a National Pheasant Conservation Plan to be completed by this September. The committee will meet in Indiana and will seek funding for a plan coordinator. No action items at this time.

Deer and Wild Turkey (Exhibit I) – Ollie – This is an active committee which has been in existence for about 20 years. Kansas hosted this year. Dale Garner is the director liaison for this group. Joe Kramer – He was there, but I was not able to attend. I have a brief report, but when I first came on with the department, deer and turkey were not on the radar and now they are a cash cow for a lot of our states so this is an important group. There are some really good scientists working on this committee and we appreciate states that are sending people to the meetings. Wildlife and Parks (KDWP) hosted the meeting at Rock Springs 4-H camp, an outdoor camp where we hold our Becoming an Outdoors Woman event each year and other conservation meetings. There were 27 people attending the meeting with representatives from nine member states, the National Wild Turkey Federation (NWTF), and one retired group member. Invited speakers from South Dakota State University, the University of Wisconsin, and the Colorado Division of Wildlife also participated in the meeting. As in past years, this year's meeting started with a general session with presentations for the entire group. Speakers were from the KDWP, University of Wisconsin, South Dakota State University, Missouri Department of Conservation, Colorado Division of Wildlife, Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Kansas State University, Emporia State University, NWTF, and Iowa Department of Natural Resources. Topics included ongoing research turkey research in Kansas and South Dakota; marketing turkey hunting in Kansas; deer tags; hunter compliance; and population monitoring. Break-out issues included: feeding and baiting; interaction with CWD and TB. That issue was lead by Dale Garner; and Bruce Trindle and Robert Rolley gave presentations from their states. Tom Litchfield gave a presentation and led a discussion on quality deer management and state deer management objectives. Tom Micetich led a discussion on private lands leasing for big game hunting. Brent Rudolph led a discussion on human dimensions issues in deer management. Lonnie Hansen led a discussion on sharpshooting and sterilization in urban deer management. Brian Haroldson led a discussion on aerial and ground surveys. Bill Jensen provided an update and led a discussion on lead bullet fragments in venison and its impact on food pantries. It is interesting that all of those are issues in Kansas that we dealt with this past year; either brought before our Commissioners, leaders or legislature. Some of these may come back in presentation form in the next few years. On the final afternoon, the meeting a joint business meeting was held. The group was asked by a representative of the Northeast Deer and Wild Turkey Study Group to discuss the possibility of a joint meeting in the future. The group chose to defer that idea to a later date. The North Dakota Game and Fish Department was selected to host the next meeting during the fall of 2010 in September in Devils Lake, North Dakota.

Mark – Glen Salmon would like to talk to you before we go to lunch. Lunch is sponsored by ATA so Mitch King will be speaking to us. Also, this is our awards luncheon and Jim Marshall will be handling that.

Glen Salmon – This Association has meant a lot to me both personally and professionally and I would like to invite anyone that is going to be around Tuesday evening out to my house for dinner. I have a flyer, but my house is at Lake Lemon, a 1,600-acre lake where we just built a house. It is about an hour south of here. I have

a 15 passenger van, and I would like you to work with Cindy Delaney on that. Directions are pretty simple and we will have signs out. Leave at 6:00, dinner at 7:30.

Awards Luncheon – Sponsored by Archery Trade Association (Nominations – Exhibit J)

Fisheries Biologist of the Year – Dr. John Lyons, Wisconsin DNR, accepted by Matt Frank

Law Enforcement Officer of the Year - Darren Unreiner, Brooks, Alberta, Canada (will send)

Wildlife Biologist of the Year – John Niewoonder, Michigan DNR, accepted by Becky Humphries

Spirit of the Shack – Rex Amack, Director, Nebraska Game & Parks Commission, accepted by Kirk Nelson

Sagamore – Joe Kramer, F&W Division Director, Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks (for service as MAFWA Treasurer)

Past President's Award – Mark Reiter, Indiana DNR

President's Award – National Wild Turkey Federation, accepted by Randy Showalter, NWTf

PARTNER UPDATES

AFWA Update –

Ron Regan – Executive Director, AFWA (Exhibit K) – Familiar with the issues you are going through. John Frampton will be here later, also would like to have Carol Bambery and Gary Taylor speak also. Have begun recruitment for a Director of Operations which closes the end of this month taking my old position and turning it into a chief operations officer, something we have never had on paper, but in an Ad Hoc way; Don MacLauchlan, International Resource Director, who was with us for 20 years has decided to retire. He had a complicated funding structure and we are committed to filling it, but need to find funding to do so. Annual meeting is end of September in Grand Rapids and the website for the meeting is operational. As a director, we have funding available if you haven't burned them up already. Issues we are actively involved in: 1) Great Outdoors Initiative, chance to show Obama Administration the strong role of state fish and wildlife agencies in land conservation, outdoor recreation, and connecting children with nature. Listening Sessions are being scheduled in several states across the country. If one of regional listening sessions comes your way it makes sense to get there and make those same points. The more frequently the Administration hears from the states about the work they do, the better to advance that agenda. There is a meeting confirmed for Denver and they are thinking about listening sessions in Chicago and/or Minneapolis. Sometimes making decisions and setting meetings without a lot of advance notice. 2) Oil Spill, we are monitoring the situation with a great deal of interest. We are advocating for state funding in any supplemental or emergency appropriations legislation. We invited Secretary Robert Barham from LA Dept Wildlife and Fisheries, to testify before a House Natural Resources Subcommittee on impacts to fish, wildlife and habitat. His written statement was provided to directors in the Directors Line. On Ad Hoc basis we sat down with NRCS to grant back out funds from BP on short-term and long-term basis and states along Gulf coast would be eligible, \$5 million in hand with tens of millions available over time. Working extensively with DU and trying to figure out how it can be used by partners, state fish and wildlife agencies to keep birds away from those oil-infected areas. 3) Working with USFWS on ESA issues. In early April the FWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service and a number of state directors met to talk about ways to improve coordination between the states and those two federal agencies in addressing issues of mutual concern. The group concluded that joint federal/state task force on Endangered Species Policy is good ground to craft a charter. Hope for a conference call in near future to craft next step. 4) Lead, AFWA has a Team led by Dave Schad, addressing this issue all this time. California has passed a bill that would regulate lead shot on wildlife management areas and California Fish and Game Department has decided to oppose that legislation because on merits that there is a conflict of power authority. They are already empowered to manage that issue and don't need legislation to do so. Had interest from industry to weigh in on that that issue and decided as an Association that was a local issue and was in hand in California and we deferred. 5) Noticed in furbearer report there was mention of bobcat and otter tagging and the report mentioned AFWA having a meeting with senior Interior officials to talk about that, John Frampton

and Curtis Taylor flew in and we met with Tom Strickland, Dan Ashe and others to talk about our interests in removing the requirement to pelt tag bobcats and otters. It is something the states have been interested in for about a decade. A year ago the states and the feds struck an agreement, but at the annual meeting in Austin it was decided to not move forward with that until we saw the CITES outcome. Bobcats were not downlisted from Appendix II to Appendix III, so we want to go back to table and try to get rid of tagging requirement. Another meeting coming up on July 8 with technical folks from FWS, DOI and solicitors to start to move the ball forward. 6) Jen Mock-Schaffer has been working behind the scenes to look out for state interests on the voluntary public access program to be sure the states are in the best possible position to compete for those dollars once they are available. There are plans to hold a webinar in July to help the states learn the best way to produce a proposal that might succeed. We want to see this program grow and become operational and to help make that a reality we have been talking to Southwick and Associates about doing some economic work for us on pre-implementation and post-implementation. Rob Southwick is providing some services pro bono, but we still need to raise about \$10,000 and are reaching out to all four regional associations to see if they would be interested in cost sharing that. It is on the agenda under new business tomorrow. It is a privilege to work with MAFWA and interact with you.

John Frampton, Director, South Carolina and AFWA President – Appreciate opportunity to be here. It has been a busy nine months as the Association President. I am concerned because Ed Parker, then Corky Pugh, and now Rex, your previous AFWA Presidents-- and you don't see them anymore. I hope that is not the case, I am not ready to retire. In December we had an Executive Committee meeting and I made comment that I wouldn't be surprised if Matt Hogan would go west to USFWS and the next morning Matt told me he was leaving. You had two members from Association on that selection committee, Jeff and Jon. We went through a tough selection process, but I think we made the right choice; and Ron is busy and has hit the ground running. AFWA started in 1902, so in 108 years it has positioned itself and is highly respected in Washington. We have a great team doing wonderful work. Dave is heading up our lead committee, our credibility in future is going to depend on how we address this issue. It is emotional and controversial and we have to take the right position and it has to be based on factual information. Industry's credibility is on the line as well. We have 12-13 committees working on that. The farm bill, nothing is more important than that because there is more money there than all of the conservation programs put together and we are finally getting recognition. Multistate conservation grants, changed directions the last couple of years and used some money for the Association that we hadn't in the past. Survey will eat up all of those funds if we don't make some changes, that cost could go to \$20 million on the next survey and we only get \$3 million on each side. We are in the process of the next survey, but the one after that we will have to make a decision on. The three most important things we do are: legislative work, legal work and our relationship with our federal partners and NGOs. We are blessed to have Gary Taylor in there. You work hard at the state level, but if we don't have somebody like Gary in Washington monitoring what is going on that is impacting state agencies we are going to be at a big disadvantage and Gary has done a wonderful job. Carol is doing great legal work, if it wasn't for the second amendment and the position NRA and the courts have taken we wouldn't have hunting programs in our states. It is critical we monitor that situation and be ready to be more involved with legal issues. Third thing is relationship with our partners and I have to rely on the staff to work with them, wouldn't have happened without AFWA; joint task force and Steve Williams work on federal aid partners has brought consistency across country on how we handle federal restoration programs with DJ and PR and other federal taxes we deal with them; North American Wetlands Conservation Act would not have happened without AFWA. We have all benefited from these things, especially the farm bill. I am proud to be associated with AFWA and proud to be the president. I remember when I was wildlife biologist and Ray Evans told me these guys were no different than you, just directors; without those opportunities to attend meetings and watch how directors work I wouldn't be in this position today; the highlight of my career. Association is in good shape, all work directors do is important, but for every dollar and hour of staff time spent, the return is great.

Talk about Council for Advancement of Hunting and Shooting Sports, three years ago we put together an

industry steering committee because we saw a gradual erosion of funding occurring and we saw diversions occurring. The reality is that industry has political clout in Washington and could have a tremendous negative impact on this program if they wanted to. As statewide fish and wildlife agencies we don't share the vision that industry had and didn't share our vision with industry. We worked well with NGOs who worked well with industry. We also realized that the dollars that come into PR programs don't come through direct hunting activities, they come from shooting activities and industry is aware of that. Industry wanted to know what we are doing for shooting and archery ranges in our states. The reality is that those dollars come from shooters so we need to work with industry. We came up with the idea to put together a Council, similar to the Recreation Boating and Fishing Foundation, and took that model to develop one for the hunting and shooting sports. Just recently South Carolina submitted a grant to Atlanta to put money in that Council and I understand that grant has been approved and we have a solicitation agreement that will be sent to you soon. Put some of the bump from your PR funds and put that in to keep this Council moving forward. It puts us together with industry for a shared vision of where we are going to go with recruitment and retention (R/R). As a director I am putting a lot of money in R/R and I don't know if it is working or not. We are trying to evaluate some of that and this is something this Council can do. It can help evaluate those types of things and can be very successful. As we all know PR/DJ is the life blood of most of our agencies. I challenge you to come up with funds, I know there is a bump this year and again next year, but not quite as much. We can work through the match for those that don't have it and there are a couple of states are putting in cash and not using PR funds. We have an opportunity now and it could be now or never. We have the momentum, Hannibal and the staff and Sam Hamilton, before he passed away, are 100% behind this. We would like to see all 50 states involved.

Carol Bamberg – Expect two documents, cooperative agreement (MOU), once approved by Service and letter from John which would include both documents. Template grant available to all states. John – Hope to commit for \$2- to \$2 1/2 million and we think that will carry this program for five years. South Carolina had to cut 61 percent of appropriated dollars; I have 240 vacancies and have closed 16 offices, but we still see this as one of the most important things we can be involved in. In last Executive Committee call, a number of organizations are umbrellaed by various state fish and wildlife agencies; like International Hunter Education Association, Marine Investigators, etc., so AFWA is going to try getting a list of all of these to get copies of charters and see what commitment we are making as state fish and wildlife agencies. We pay over \$200,000 a year in various fees and memberships and this has been brought to our attention by a number of directors. We will take a look and brief the directors.

Ron - I didn't introduce one other staff member, Dean Smith from Saskatchewan, on detail with AFWA for three years and he is the NAWMP and wildlife liaison to Canadian provinces and Canadian wildlife directorate; happy to have him on board. I would like to have Gary say a few words about legislation.

Gary Taylor – Thanks to directors for your continued engagement with your congressional delegation and federal executive branch agencies. The success of Association is due to involvement of directors and contact between you and congressional delegations. On the hill, several congressional committees are having oversight hearings on gulf oil spill and working on legislative remedies. Two committees are having hearings on bills that would address tighter regulations for offshore drilling, safety and prevention consideration and things like that. In the House Natural Resources Committee, which is one of many committees that has jurisdiction over offshore activities, the bill is much broader than a gulf response bill. It has to do with energy development in general on federal public lands and waters and would reform practices that relate to onshore energy development like gas and oil, renewable like solar and wind and consolidate into the DOI some of the permitting functions and would dedicate full funding at \$900 million for the LWCF, which is source funded from offshore receipts, it would fully fund National Historical Preservation trust fund; implement revisions to organization on how DOI approaches regulation of offshore gas and oil drilling; the reorganization of what used to be the Minerals Management Service. There is a creation of a gulf restoration fund and ocean trust fund so it has a number of activities particularly on public land. The Senate bill is more narrow in focus and application is restricted to further regulation on offshore siting and development of gas and oil; further provisions on safety of workers and prevention methods; and embraces the President's and Secretary Salazar's

reorganization of the Minerals Management Service. There is no funding affiliated with Gulf restoration funds that are created in both bills. The reason is that the Hill, like the executive branch agencies, are very cautious of any step they take, or give perception that they are absolving BP from obligations they have under Oil Pollution Act. While there will be funding attached to these bills as they proceed there are no funding streams attached. We have been having discussions with committee staff about the potential for when those bills link up with some funding sources to consider making funding available to state and federal agencies to better inform decisions about siting energy development and recommendations that would avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to fish, wildlife and their habitats as a result of energy development or possibly link funding to implementation of State Wildlife Action Plans. No commitments on how they will move forward on that. Congress will conclude a legislative fix to siting and development of offshore gas and oil. Comprehensive energy and climate change bill, passed a year ago, which was an economy-wide cap and trade approach to regulating green house gas emissions. The Senate has been trying to find the right combination of approach to climate change that will identify a path to the required 60 votes. There are draft bills in circulation and Democratic caucus has been meeting several times in the last two weeks to try and find an approach to a comprehensive energy bill. It is clear that there are not 60 votes in Senate for an economy-wide cap and trade protocol so they are looking at an emissions cap on power generating industry or no carbon cap yet. President has called 16-18 Senate Democrats and Republicans to the White House tomorrow to discuss whole issue looking for a path to pass a national energy policy. Congress is running out of time and should Senate be able to pass some type of energy bill it would still have to be reconciled with what the House passed last year. It doesn't seem practical that they can be reconciled in this Congress. The good news, from the aspect of resource adaptation programs, every major climate bill that has been considered in Congress, has a natural resources adaptation policy architecture to deliver dedicated funding to state and federal natural resource agencies to remediate the affects of climate change on fish, wildlife and their habitats. That has brought bipartisan support and has shown up in all of the major climate bills, is a strong suggestion that it is fairly well settled in Congress. Will be part of a bigger comprehensive climate change bill which will have natural resources architecture to deliver dedicated funding to state and federal agencies. On fiscal year 11 appropriation, House subcommittees starting to have markups of some of the appropriations bills, but not clear if any bills will be brought up on House floor before November elections. We are looking at a continuing resolution at end of fiscal year for most of appropriation bills. Even though they most likely will have a post-election session, depending on outcome of elections, most likely the outcome will end up with one or more really big omnibus bills. President has directed executive branch agencies to make significant cuts in FY12 for spending bills. National Fish Conservation Act authorizing bill that creates the structural architecture for the National Fish Habitat Action Plan has been heard in both Senate and House committees and expect, after the August recess, Congress will start bundling second tier bills that relate to public lands and natural resource conservation and it is our objective to get this included in one of the omnibus bills.

Mark – Randy is the Chief Game Warden in Wisconsin since 2002; began career in 1984. Attended inaugural class of NCLI and has served as vice president of NCLI Alumni Association; and is current president of National Association of Conservation Law Enforcement Chiefs.

Learning from the Past: Turning Points in Yesterday's Success and the Challenges of Our Time

Randy Stark, Chief Warden, Wisconsin DNR – (PowerPoint, Exhibit L) Randy – Not here to tell you what to think, but things to think about. Daniel Boorstin, former Librarian of Congress said, "Trying to plan for the future, without a sense of the past, is like trying to plant cut flowers". We have to have some sense of where we came from. Abraham Lincoln said, "The past is the cause of the present, and the present will be the cause of the future". We are going to take a look back at what we can take from historic leadership; what were the turning points; and how did past leadership interventions make a difference? Five big things that drive anything are: social changes, changes in technology, changes in environmental challenges, economics, and the political system which is driven by the first four. At the end of the day I would challenge any of you to something that

doesn't fit in those five areas, because it tends to drive a lot of events and our reaction to them. Significant changes are occurring in the world. Take all the problems in the world and put them into two baskets: technical problems and adaptive challenges. Technical problems can be solved through knowledge and procedures already in hand. Although complex, the application of expert knowledge and routine management can solve the problem. Adaptive challenge is the part that is tough. This requires new learning, innovation, and new patterns of behavior. Things that involve long standing habits and where we get our identity from and if you look at things that keep us up at night, it is not that we don't know how to do them, but how do we find the needed 60 votes, but do we have the will to do that, that is the adaptive work. Addressing these challenges requires thinking our way down to the root of problems, attitudes, opinions, and behaviors. Adaptive challenges can't be solved in a technical group. One of the instructor's Marty, whose mother is 92, shared this story that Mom derives all of her identity in that she still drives a car. After three weeks of putting dents in the car and calling to get it fixed, which is trying to solve an adaptive solution with a technical solution (which is not solving the problem); the mom needs to stop driving. Historian David McCollough said, "There is no such thing as a self-made man or a self-made women, we're all shaped by people we've never met". People and events of the past influenced patterns of thought, what we think, how we think about it and what we value. When Theodore Roosevelt and John Muir were standing there in Assembly over 100 years ago, do you think they were wondering if they looked funny in their old clothes (from the past), we live in our own present. They didn't know back then any more than we know now how things are going to end. Thomas Jefferson understood that the key to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness was land; and he bought the Louisiana Purchase from Napoleon, all the land between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains for 13 1/2 cents an acre; if you read the book called "The Wilderness Story Events" it reminds me of our stewardship debates in Wisconsin. He was criticized for it and told he didn't have any authority for it, but how would the U.S. be different today if he hadn't made that purchase?. He bought it sight-unseen and sent Lewis and Clark out. The other thing is the Northwest Ordinance, the idea that the waters are forever free for commercial use and rolled into the public trust document. We are the generation that is filling the canvas in terms of collaboration. Next is George Perkins Marsh and his most important contribution was the book "Man and Nature". He couldn't see very well, but was a brilliant person, spent several sessions in Congress, eventually being appointed to the Mass Review League where he learned a lot about how we use our land. He learned that how we treat our resources will have a big implication for society. He saw what was happening in Europe and what would happen in the U.S. so he wrote a book advocating sustainability, science of future generations so he was cutting against the grain, but the best quote from his book was, "Our natural resources are not limitless, our own self interest dictates we cannot afford to be short-sighted in how we use those resources, and if we believe that future generations deserve a natural inheritance undiminished by present generations, we must conserve those resources through sustainable practices that strike an appropriate balance between human industry and nature's capacity". That was written in 1864 and he was way ahead of his time. George Bird Grinnell's fingerprints are everywhere in conservation work and there is a book about him called "The Last Stand". He went on a marsh expedition out west and fell in love with the west. He had an opportunity to go out west with General Custer in 1876, but he turned the opportunity down. His biggest contribution, a magazine called "Forest and Stream" and for 30 years he had an endless stream of articles that shaped thinking on conservation. Eventually he founded the Boone and Crockett Club with Theodore Roosevelt and created the Audubon Society. Never underestimate the impact of getting kids involved in the natural world; the widow of Audubon, when Grinnell moved to her neighborhood she took him under her wing and he would look at his collections after Audubon died and got a tremendous interest, so you never know the impact you will have when you take a kid out hunting, camping or fishing. The person who fired the most important shot in conservation history was the shot that assassinated McKinley; which made Theodore Roosevelt the President of the United States. The biggest legacy of Roosevelt was land; he put conservation in the dictionary and designated over 230 million acres of public land. In the depression era, the Civilian Conservation Corps was significant. We think about it in terms of creating jobs, but there is a book

PARTNER UPDATES

Mark - Dan Ashe, USFWS Deputy Director can't be here because he was caught up in a budget meeting. One of the things he wanted to talk about was first hand experiences in the Gulf oil spill and both Tom Melius and Glen Salmon have both been there and want to share a few thoughts.

Fish and Wildlife Service Updates

Tom Melius, USFWS Regional Director (Region 3) – Dan wanted to talk about two major things: one was the crisis in the Gulf and the other was an update on climate change activities within the agency. Glen and I have both been at the Gulf oil spill and I just returned from my second detail and we thought it would be good to talk about what is going on there. I wanted to lay out a structure of what is going on there; this is day 70 into an unending spill. When a natural catastrophe happens and the federal government comes in it is usually under an Incident Command Structure, a structure where the government comes in and the Coast Guard steps forward and takes control on behalf of the government to start organizing and that is what we are working under. We have one office in New Orleans, where Glen worked, and four smaller offices spread throughout the feeder, as they refer to it. Over in Texas, which hasn't had to start an office yet, Houston/Galveston is ready just like the other three. The one with the most attention is Houma LA, about 50 miles; then Mobile, AL because it is starting to wash up on some of their beaches; and then Miami which has three sub-branches in St. Pete, Tampa and Key West. All offices are all set up the same way; you have a Coast Guard leader, a BP person who has several staff members, Federal personnel like Glen and myself and a state person, MMS, EPA and 10-15 people who run various departments, like air logistics, admin, boat needs, planning and security. Those four offices, being led by New Orleans, meet throughout the day and direct where people go and how to effectively stop it, prevent it, clean it up, burn it or whatever. They are running 24 hours; 12 on and 12 off. It is very intense. We are rotating, within the USFWS, people working for 2-3 weeks and then bringing them back. We have 565 FWS people there and we are planning on training about 1,800 people to help because this is not going to be over in the next 6 months. There are some dedicated state folks down there, LA has cancelled all leave and vacations or any out-of-state meetings to help. The USFWS is being used in the wildlife operations aspect, we have hotlines set up where the public can call in with reports of oiled bird or other wildlife and needs care and we respond to every one of those calls within an hour or two. FWS and state people are to be sure any wildlife that is in harm's way that can be collected or picked up dead we do that under the proper techniques and we have rehab centers in the four offices where we take animals, clean them, and release, if possible, or euthanize. We have had 214 brown pelicans already released; a small number of terns and turtles cleaned and released. We have captured about 800 birds, 250 have been cleaned and released; a little over 1,000 collected dead and kept because of ongoing restitution effort that will follow this. Our employees have gone down and worked with state biologists to identify what was there before the spill; what is going to be coming here; and what the potential threat is. It is the Natural Resource Defense Act (NRDA) that is the process where we get restitution for wildlife loss and habitat that is degraded. I have had a number of calls from northern directors in the MS flyway that send a lot of birds that way who want to know what they can do. Most of our people we are training on the HASWOPER 40 hour course, so they know how to handle oiled birds properly. Folks in Louisiana are starting to reach out and I have a number for our regional coordinators who are working with volunteers. There is probably a role for more fish and wildlife trained people to work down there. We are fortunate that the huge oil spill that is in the Gulf is not right on the coastline. Louisiana delta is very marshy coast, not white sandy beaches like Mississippi and panhandle of Florida have; there it is going to go up on the beach and they are going to try and stop it with skimming and various types of buoys, but if it does get on the beach they can clean it and pick up tar balls. Over in Louisiana when the tides come in with a sheen on it that floats through and gets onto the stems of marsh grass and is eventually killing it. There is no way to go in and clean every sprig of grass. Fortunately we haven't had a huge influx of oil, but the way the weather is developing it wouldn't be a surprise if there is more devastation there, which causes concern for those birds that will soon be migrating down there.

Glen Salmon – This is not Katrina, so many people want to come and do something and we are constantly being barraged by people who want to help, but unless you have had the training and know what you are doing, you are not an asset. Under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, BP is responsible by law so they are responsible to clean it up and pay for it, and pay for the staff. If you have a lot of volunteers that takes BP off the hook and that is not part of the plan either. It was long hard work, but it was an honor to go down there. There will be a role for state guys down there, but unlike Tom and I we work a 14-15 day shift, cycle out for a few days and go back; but the Louisiana boys are staying home and eventually they may need to bring in other folks to come in and spell them.

Tom Melius – Dan wanted to talk about a climate change strategy we are developing, it is not a federal strategy, but a national strategy. There are handouts (Exhibit M) that goes into depth about it. Dan was at the North American at Milwaukee that gave a lot of talks about that. It is a strategy with a lot of state, NGO and a number of federal agencies are working on it. Under that structure we also have a nationwide series of LCCs and after break, Steve Guertin and I will discuss that and then have a panel discussion tomorrow. Really appreciate an opportunity to visit with each of you one-on-one on what we are doing as an agency and with state partners to carry out response in the Gulf the best we can.

Break – Sponsored by Mule Deer Foundation

Tom Melius, USFWS Regional Director (Region 3) (PowerPoint – Exhibit N) – There are eight states in my region. We have already covered oil spill in Gulf so going right into LCCs in Region 3 of which there are 4: Plains and Prairie Potholes; Upper Midwest and Great Lakes; Eastern Tallgrass Prairie and Big Rivers. All of these are in different stages in development. We are also assisting with development of two LCCs outside our region, one from Atlanta and one from Hadley regions. The Plains and Prairie Pothole also goes north into three provinces. We initially started out with identification of interim coordinators and science coordinators; Kelly Hogan and Pat Hegland. To date we have already had one meeting of our steering committee (April 15) made up of executives from states and provinces, state agency and provincial agency and executives from other federal agencies (Park Service, BLM, etc) and several NGOs that are active within that LCC and obligated \$500,000. We recently hired Rick Nelson as permanent coordinator and will hold second steering committee meeting July 17 during the WAFWA meeting and will look at obligating the remainder of the money, about \$2 million, look at adopting a governing structure and determine how we want to go forward in selecting projects in future years. The LCCs looked at how to figure out, through a technical structure within the states, what are the greatest needs and conservation priorities that this PPP LCC can move forward. The next one is the Upper Midwest and Great Lakes LCC, also started with an interim coordinator Craig Sarnecky who was our project leader in Michigan and now is our permanent coordinator. Along with Illinois Natural History we were able to work in an interim basis with Brian Anderson to start surveying the science needs. We are now scheduled to have our first steering committee meeting this Thursday and a number of you will be participating via conference call webinar. Funded through Great Lakes Initiative and we have a \$1 million to obligate towards projects this year. The Eastern Tallgrass Prairie and Big Rivers LLC: we appointed several individuals from the FWS to help in the interim process to inform people of what we are doing and scoping out some of the needs. We have not identified permanent participants or funding, but hope to with big Omnibus bill that Gary Taylor mentioned earlier. We have an invasive species that has generated quite a bit of time working with a good partnership with Illinois (Asian carp); there has been a lot of work at the state level to develop the right response and strategy. I would like to recognize Shawn Logan and folks in Ohio who have been involved with the Rex East Migratory Bird Mitigation Fund. They have been helpful in making sure we restore some of habitat for Kirkland's warbler and other migratory birds. Rex East is a pipeline where we were able get funding to restore some of the habitat. Also, appreciate work in Ohio on the Lake Erie watersnake recovery effort, which has paid off with us proposing to delist that species. Iowa DNR has been helpful in ramping up with Plains and Prairie Pothole LCC and other things going on in that area. Had folks there from our refuge program to talk about opportunities to work together on CCPs that are underway, particularly watershed and wetland

restoration. Minnesota has been thinking outside of the box with the passage of their new funding initiative. The Lasard Sam Outdoor Heritage Council grant program has been very successful at expanding public land opportunities which FWS has been able to help leverage some of our funding. Appreciate being able to work with Minnesota staff, PF, DU and TNC as we look for opportunities to invest and make sure people of Minnesota will be able to enjoy the benefits of that grant for a number of generations. Had an opportunity here in Indiana, Atterbury needed some expansion and we have worked through federal aid folks to transfer and come up with lands that were a win/win situation. Working with Michigan on Great Lakes piping plover recovery to have right outreach and management and work on mass marketing project that all fish stocked into Great Lakes are tracked and marked. Wisconsin, good news with whooping cranes, six chicks born in the wild and hopeful we will be able to add them to the flock that is slowly increasing. Wisconsin staff has been great to work with. Working on pallid sturgeon/paddlefish work in Missouri to collect young fish and take them to hatcheries and seeing some reproduction and show some recoveries. Some folks have mentioned wolves, exploring way to get through legal challenges and biological interpretation, trying to get them back into state management, but are frustrated, but keep trying to come to a place where it doesn't come back again. Trying to get stimulus dollars out and spent. I serve on the Service's Regulation's Committee, which is made up of representatives from states and four flyways; expect an announcement in federal register next week that things look good for this coming fall with conditions in north and prairie pothole area should have a good year.

Steve Guertin, USFWS Regional Director (Region 6) (PowerPoint - Exhibit O) – Look forward to this meeting it is one of the more effective meetings I have been involved with. We encompass the western range of your organization and some of our issues will be further west, but might be good for you to see what is going on in WAFWA region as well. Tom mentioned we are moving forward with landscape conservation cooperatives (LCCs) which were built to form science-based partnerships to prioritize all of the conservation efforts within these areas. We have six of them and there is a lot to manage. We have had good process with initial scoping meeting, initial prioritization and participation from states, other federal agencies, tribal representation and provinces. I will focus my comments on the Great Plains; Southern Rockies; and Great Northern. We have unique opportunities in the two western LCCs; in the Great Plains we turned to PLJV to stand up and become nucleus for the steering committee; existing joint venture and organizational boundaries largely overlapped and this group has had a couple of organizing meetings in Denver already. A lot of other conservation entities come to the table because the joint venture was organized around bird issues and there are many other issues to be addressed. In the Southern Rockies we are partnering with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) which will largely pick up priorities in Utah and Colorado; working with them to be sure BOR knows that is not going to be only about the Colorado River, but headwater stream issues and montaine species. No funding was provided in first round, so BOR and FWS found some funding to hire an interim coordinator position and are meeting with him to set up larger term priorities and turning to existing partnerships with universities in Colorado and federal agencies there. A lot of the issues there will be climate related. The Great Northern is our 800 pound gorilla, we are co-hosting with the National Park Service and colleagues in USFWS Region 1, based in Portland. We are working on Columbia basin to sit down and prioritize large scale objectives. We had initial steering committee meeting in Bozeman about three months ago and we have another one coming to Boise and have conference calls nearly every week. We did get funding for first year and have allocated \$1.5 million to address research needs that are vetted and prioritized by the steering committee and are going to convene a workshop for our five state partners to work on ways of integrating work already done on state wildlife action plans. We are also putting a large focus on tribal participation and doing a lot of individual outreach and have had a number of tribes already join us. At operational and regional level working forward on a number of fronts instead of getting bogged down on prairie dog wars, trying to focus on larger themes like healthy grasslands and a full suite of species like: hawks, owls, fox, prairie dogs and predators all in these areas. We did conduct two findings on black and white-tailed prairie dogs and determined they did not warrant federal protection under Endangered Species Act because of outstanding leadership and on-the-ground conservation action at state, federal and tribal levels; and had some unfortunate incidents with the black-footed ferret restoration and were petitioned by Wild Earth Guardians to

reclassify them from under non-essential experimental designation to full listing protection and we denied their petition because of outstanding work at state level and partnerships. Last year we had first reintroduction site in Saskatchewan and looking at other states, including Texas; and working with the Department of Defense on vaccine research to get oral vaccine rather than time consuming capture and inoculation. The Prairie Pothole region is a large energy development area, for both fossil fuels and wind energy and have a large easement program and it is quickly emerging as their LLC priority. Heavily involved in Missouri river recovery program and there are two big studies going on: the Missouri River Authorized Purposes Study, the Pick Sloan Act established priorities for management for all of the trust resources in the basin, 70 years ago and the purpose of this study is to take another look at what has happened in the basin since then and see if there might be other priority areas of emphasis such as natural resources. Right now it is largely centered around navigation and irrigation for agricultural commodities. Ground breaking ceremony, \$140 million over a couple of years trying to open 160 miles of Yellowstone basin for spawning habitat for pallid sturgeon. Work with western regions on sage grouse finding which involves a couple of states on western edge of your organization. This was a huge issue for western states and after scientific analysis available to us it was warranted, but precluded because it fell further down on the list. Many people are taking it as a warning sign; need to dust off plans and commitment, have to reevaluate status of species every year. Once again this is about energy development and fragmentation of habitat so we are trying to be proactive working with all federal agencies and trying to follow leadership from Wyoming of resolving around core areas. Growing interest in Montana species in mountain states; have growing interest because of climate change, been petitioned on American pika, wolverine, fisher, bull trout, etc. and have just been petitioned to evaluate the status of the white bark pine which will pick up most of the west. We partnered with Noah Boulder Labs and did thorough analysis and downscale projections of what would happen to the American pika. We found that even though we might lose some populations at low elevations they didn't warrant protection under Endangered Species Act. Looking to see what comes in for wolverine, fisher and other species; expecting more interest in grassland bird species. A lot going on in wolf front; heavily involved in Northern Rocky Mountain issue and just had hearing before Judge Malloy two weeks in federal court in Missoula, MT. About two years ago went forward with rule that delisted wolf in Idaho and Montana and retained Endangered Species Act protections in Wyoming due to inadequate regulatory mechanisms in place, which were subsequently challenged by at least five different avenues. It hinges on interpretation of significant portion of the range and a previous Administration wrote what was called the M Opinion that allowed the agency to focus in situations like that. Working with states on larger structured decision making process that is underway; we will be having workshops at NCTC later in August to evaluate the status of the wolf in the lower 48 in its entirety because we also have them in the Midwest, southwest and southeast. We now have packs established in Oregon and Washington and expect Colorado next. Also, on bear, we did move forward with delisting centered around Yellowstone National Park, but we lost in court and they were put back on the endangered list, hope Administration will send forth our appeal on them. It is a big issue for us and Montana as they have over 800 bears in northern continental divide ecosystem and just two weeks ago they were documented back on the Missouri River, the first time in 60-70 years. Working with Kansas on conservation easement program; also done in Montana along Rocky Mountain front, in Blackfoot valley and hope to do in Swan valley; to block out opportunities for these animals around national forests and parks so they have protected wintering habitat on mostly private land, working with TNC, Trust for Public Lands and others to prioritize the acquisition of ranches, families stay on the land, most take proceeds from easements payment and put it toward blocking up more land; in preliminary scoping in Kansas to bring model to Flint Hills area; had site meeting last month. Moving forward to aggressively implement the American Recoveries and Investment Act (ARRA); establishing rebuilding visitors centers, fish passage projects; obligated about 96 percent of our funding to date. It is all about partnerships to the FWS and asking you to join us in these landscape conservation cooperatives think it will be worth your time and efforts as we address climate change and other issues.

Mark – Both Region 3 and 6 were major sponsor of this event. This is the first time we have had someone from

NRCS with us and we appreciate Tom Christensen coming to talk to us.

NRCS

Tom Christensen, Central Region Director (PowerPoint – Exhibit P) – Another initiative was announced today; on the oil spill situation in regards to migratory birds; we are going to make \$20 million available this fiscal year in eight states (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri and Texas). It will be in EQIP, WHIP and WRP and the objective is to maximize bird habitat and resources for the migratory species. The goal is to assist private landowners with 100,000-150,000 acres. There are three essential practices in combination with others: developing a managing wetland habitat; inundating late to provide habitat; and managing for early plant succession. Sign up started today and closes August 1. Dave White, our chief has been working with a number of partners including the FWS on this effort. Looked at Midwest region to see how it correlated with NRCS's central region; we have 15 states in the central region which goes down to Texas and Louisiana, so we have quite a bit of overlap; the only three states not in central region are Ohio, Kentucky and Colorado. Conservation initiatives have always been there in one form or another in my 30-year career, but a lot of credit goes to Dave White, our current chief, for being proactive about establishing landscape scale initiatives in the last year. We have done it to stimulate interest, general partnerships and enthusiasm for voluntary action. In addition, they give us a chance to increase our efficiency and effectiveness; hope to optimize results and demonstrate environmental outcomes better. In addition, all initiatives have a common core set of conservation practices and systems that we are trying to establish; they may vary from initiative to initiative, but consistency carries through along with issues related to ranking and funding pools, etc. It also helps us with the issue of transparency. We are also interested in the initiatives creating greater flexibility and innovation. Initiatives come from many different sources, some from Congress through the Farm Bill, for example Chesapeake Bay as does the air quality initiative; the Great Lakes comes from Congress, funding through EPA; some inter-agency such the coral reef in Puerto Rico; departmental, such as the one announced today in South Carolina which is related to the long leaf pine, which goes all the way from Virginia to Texas and is with the Forest Service. Our chief has strong interest so he has generated some; and some swell up from the ground, state conservationists in Kansas, for example, were originators of our recent efforts to fund lesser prairie chicken habitat opportunities. Some initiatives are issue-based, such as one with organic producers and those transitioning to organic; some are landscape scale or watershed-based such as our Mississippi River basin healthy watershed initiative; some are species based; and some are eco-system-based like the long leaf pine; and more recently have had a practiced-base one with high tunnel practice. There are 14 operational initiatives, but when you add all of these up it is less than 10 percent of our available funding and covers a large geographic representation. The projected funding opportunity for this year, for these various initiatives which in most cases include financial and technical assistance; the biggest one is the Mississippi River basin initiative, which we did through an RFP process and just announced the results about two weeks ago. We were hoping to have \$80 million of interest, but only had about \$40 million because the time period was short and we have to have funding obligated by October 1. We do these initiatives because we can dedicate funding on top of our base level of funding to accelerate activities; we try to focus on resource or geographic landscape; want partner involvement; use RFPs to bring in additional partner contributions. One of the provisions we use, the Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative (CCPI) came out of the 2008 Farm Bill and that allows us to introduce some flexibilities into EQIP, WHIP and CSP that we can't do through the normal programs so we are excited about that. We have done some things with the way we pay for practices; 2008 Farm Bill allows us to account for income foregone when you are applying a conservation practice which it makes it more attractive as cost share to the producer. Interested in accountability and know we are going to have to demonstrate results. The President's budget for NRCS for 2011 also calls for \$25 million to establish technical teams; 5-7 people per team, which will work on watersheds and priority landscapes and supplement capabilities in staffing that exists already. One of the other things these teams will do is to outreach to 100 percent of the people in the designated area because it depends on their voluntary partnership and participation. The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative many of you are aware of we have three priorities; invasive species, non-point source

pollution control, and habitat protection and restoration; we received \$34 million from EPA this fiscal year to do these activities; we are using existing program authorities, so we are running it through our existing program processes; Conservation Technical Assistance (CTA), EQIP, WHIP, Farmer Ranchland Protection Program (FRPP) and Emergency Watershed Protection Flood Plain Easement (EWP-FPE). We have had a sign-up period underway since June 1 which closed July 1 and then we will go in and do rankings and begin process of obligating funds to individual landowners. We concentrated on particular watersheds in the Great Lakes area, covering about 33 percent of basin. When you look at the Great Lakes basin, focusing \$34 million on priority watersheds, so Ohio and Michigan get most of the funding and Illinois has a small amount of funding because it is mainly urban land. We decided to focus Mississippi River Basin Initiative (MRBI) on 12 states that follow the main stem of the Mississippi as well as the Ohio River, rather than parts of 31 states which is the whole Mississippi basin. Identified 8-digit hydrologic units and identified 41, with help of state technical committees and those became the eligible areas for this year for partners to submit applications in response to our request for proposals. We also said, in RFP process, we wanted them to focus on small 12-digit hydrologic units, which range from 10,000-40,000 acres in size. We want to accelerate and focus resources in small geographic areas and hopefully see results. Went through whole RFP process and about \$30 million through EQIP, WHIP and CSP and also have WRP and have some conservation innovation grants to award. We funded 58 CCPI projects and 18 Wetland Reserve Enhancement Projects (WREP). The distribution across the states includes multi-year proposals in MO, KY, IA, AR and WI which are the ones that submitted the best proposals therefore they ended up with the lion's share; in contract Wisconsin submitted very few proposals. WREP, a piece of WRP, is where we can concentrate WRP resources in about eight states where we funded projects. Our objectives in MRBI are: nutrient issues, wildlife habitat and wetland restoration. The same approach where we defined a core set of conservation practices and system that these resources will be devoted to. We are interested in avoiding nutrient application in the wrong manner, controlling it once it is applied and trapping it before it leaves the fields, wherever possible and practical. Our outcomes are for improved water quality, improved wildlife habitat and restored wetlands. Our challenge will remain for years to come, always dealing with economic situations that change how we do agriculture; we have complex landownership patterns; getting new information and technology which helps us to improve the solutions through adaptive management; and always are going to have new opportunities. Collaboration such as what you folks bring to the table is extremely important to the success of private lands conservation. If Chief White were here he would talk about the 70/30 rule; meaning 70 percent of the land is under private ownership and our future as a nation depends heavily upon what we do on those private lands in the way of conservation. Windshield surveys, a quote from Hugh Hammond Bennett, the bottom line is he recognized the value of technical assistance way back at the origins of our agency and today that is very much in the forefront. We appreciate the efforts you bring forward.

U.S. Forest Service

Logan Lee, Deputy Regional Forester, Region 9 (PowerPoint – Exhibit Q) – My talk could have been the same conversation as this morning: budgets, lawsuits, conflict and could also celebrate partnerships between the national forests and the states and decided to spend some time on the primer of Forest Service because we are different and the things we are asking questions about regionally. We have a new mission statement: sustaining health, diversity, and productivity of the Nation's forests and grasslands now and into the future; an updated version of everything for everybody. We do that in three ways: by managing the national forest system lands, 193 million acres; providing assistance to states, tribes and private landowners through our state and private forestry program; and through research and development program. We have new national strategic objectives being developed and they use the new buzz words, but in essence come back to the foundation of the Organic Act where we are looking as sustaining viable healthy forests and water supplies. Trying to manage our wild fire budgets because they are eating us alive; the five years we have averaged 45-50 percent of our budget going to wild land fire suppression; and the Flame Act from last year helped us out greatly. We are looking at responding to the current economic times by creating jobs in sustainable communities. The northeastern unit of the Forest Service does not align perfectly with MAFWA; four of our regions are reflected

in this group; the northern Rockies, the Rocky Mountain Region, the Southern Region and the Eastern Region, which tells you if the Midwest is part of Eastern Region that our agency has a distinct western focus. If you look at the delivery of our programs across the 20 states of the Eastern Region the coordination of our state and private forestry program was deemed to be a little too much for our regional forester to manage, so we have a separate Northeastern area state and private forestry program. We combine the northern and north central research stations into the northern research station and also have active engagement from our international programs, in particular with migratory birds and monarch butterflies. If you look at national forest system our region covers 20 states, we have 17 national forests and the only national tallgrass prairie, we manage 12 million acres and a population we serve of 115 million people. We are trying to manage change and not doing it very gracefully, but not creating new initiatives. None of these issues fits our traditional performance metrics; we have been rewarded and budgeted to accomplish tasks on the ground. Doing more with less without needing to demonstrate that what we are doing is our highest priority treatment, is most effective public service, or provides greatest good to the conservation objectives we have. We pick off cheap acres in order to meet targets instead of doing what we think might be more important work at higher cost. Climate change is driving us to change our internal conversation about the way northeast area, National Forest System and Northern Research Station work together. State and private forestry and their redesign has driven update of statewide assessments and priorities that the state foresters have been working on. The secretary came up with an all-lands vision and says he expects NRCS and USFS to deliver our programs differently to get more bang for the buck and provide more service to the public. The Northern Forest Futures Project takes a region-line approach to take a look at all of the forested landscapes, do a current situation assessment and project what if scenarios including the climate projects. Landscape Scale Conservation, not sure where we are going with that. We are in competition with the FWS on climate change strategy, we have one too. Ours looks at forested landscapes, adaptation and mitigation, but they are not connected yet, but we hope they will be because we need to integrate these efforts. Have full engagement of all Forest Service mission areas and Northeast Association of State Foresters engaged in climate change strategy; we have reached out and Trust for Public Lands and TNC are also on board and have a framework we are working from. The Northern Forest Futures project is going to be one of the tools we use for climate change impacts. We have a unique pilot program on Chequamegon-Nicolet national forest in Wisconsin where we have put about \$2 million to link science, intensive monitoring and outreach together to look at how forest management practices influence and need to adapt to climate change impacts on vegetation. We hosted a shared landscape initiative and the Great Lakes Forestry Alliance has agreed to facilitate that would take that pilot across province 212, so a lot of lake states would be involved in the evolution of that

Mark – Thank the Forest Service for being a Gold Sponsor and we are going to hear from another of our Gold Sponsors, Charlie Brown, the Eastern Regional Director for USDA/APHIS Wildlife Services.

USDA/APHIS, Wildlife Services

Charles Brown, Eastern Regional Director (Exhibit R) – Speaking on behalf of Jeff Green and myself; the Wildlife Services program has two regions, eastern and western. I cover the eastern 31 states, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and the western regions covers 17 western states, Alaska, Hawaii and Guam. Jeff is on vacation this week. Deviate from prepared remarks which gives a highlight of activities state-by-state in 13 states in MAFWA; speak in summary fashion on issues we have or could deal with you on. Mission is to provide federal leadership in dealing with human/wildlife conflicts. As we have increasing human populations, and in most cases increasing wildlife populations, we have increasing conflicts, especially with more urbanized society. I will cover services provided because we manage no land, have no regulatory authority, but we provide a service developed over decades. Most common is invasive species with feral hogs being the biggest issue, last year worked in 30 states from a damage standpoint, damaged natural resources, livestock as well as disease issues; done a lot of work with nutria in Louisiana and in Chesapeake Bay work with USFWS to try and get rid of them; also starlings. Threatened and endangered (T&E) species protection is an area we are getting more requests: piping plover; least tern; sea turtles; and we have wildlife taking wildlife. We do a lot of work

with airports in every state, both civilian and military; since Flight 1549 went into the Hudson we have been taking a lot of calls, people realize birds can take down planes; we have known that for years, but the general public was unaware. FAA is getting a lot of Congressional scrutiny now, the bigger, certificated airports are the ones most concerned, but we are getting a lot of calls from smaller general aviation airports. Livestock protection is one we have been involved in for many years, primarily in the west; coyote predation on sheep, cattle and goats mainly in the west, but growing in the east. Beaver damage management is another one, fur prices down and populations are up, and beavers are good at building dams and flooding things; they impact trout streams, working with Wisconsin; working Department of Transportation in many states on roadway flooding; Agricultural producers for flooding crops and flooding timberlands. Urban/suburban deer damage management is also a big issue; the best way to deal with this is through regulated hunting, but getting more requests to come in and do sharpshooting removals, also doing some of that work with USFS and NPS on ecological damage to sensitive species. Work on reducing wolf damage in WI, MI and MN; Minnesota highest damage and this year second highest complaint year and may surpass that. Also, work in Wisconsin assisting with bear damage; Canada goose problems; great success story, we reestablished them, but unfortunately they like to live in urban/suburban areas, golf courses and community ponds and we get a lot of requests to help relieve problems with those birds; double-crested cormorants are coming back, aquaculture industry concerned about them, sports fisheries issues and natural resource damage where they are actually defoliating some of the islands and are negatively impacting T&E species trying to share those islands. Wildlife disease damage management is big for us and we now have 46 biologists and Dr. Joe Caudill is our wildlife disease biologist here in Indiana and we have one almost in every state to work with you on a wide variety of disease issues. The list keeps getting longer: CWD, West Nile virus; rabies; pseudo rabies; bovine TB, swine brucellosis and many others. Have worked with most of you on monitoring and surveillance on high path avian influenza, for four years and have had opportunity for cooperative money to pass to you and for the first couple of years every state got some level of funding, not found high path, but a lot of other issues like low path avian influenza is higher than we thought and some other diseases. We have scaled back funding, had tier system put in place the first year, three tiers, and last year we could no longer fund the Tier 3 states, but Tiers 1 and 2 got funding, same this year for a biological sampling period that runs from April 1, 2010 through March 2011. After that year we will not do any more high path sampling; we will scale back and concentrate on morbidity and mortality issues, will still work to get samples run after 2011. Comments made by two directors this morning was about concerning outsourcing of services, like property management. One of the things I would encourage you to think about, outsource some of that to us on issues we have discussed. Talk to me or your state director. On the deep water Horizon oil spill, heard government was not as responsive as they

National Park Service

Gary Vequist, Associate Regional Director of Natural Resource Stewardship & Science, Midwest Region – Three public land management challenges at NPS. Listen and move forward together on climate change. Most interaction is state park level. 1) Ecological restoration is biggest challenge in parks, fish and mussels and some plants. Most of our terrestrial invasive species are plants, have teams in three areas. 2) New emerging issue is forest insects and diseases. We have to work with neighbors, other federal agencies and states. In South Dakota at Mt. Rushmore, we are concerned with bark beetle and looking at prescribed fire there. Problems with pathogens like plague; wildlife health, supporting one health issue dealing with sunotic; 75 percent of diseases that affect humans have start in wildlife populations; and increased additional concerns in park, deaths because of hantavirus and plague. We are perfecting techniques on tissue sampling. 3) The last issue is overabundant wildlife. Heard about a variety of issues like Canada geese, we are looking at whitetail deer and elk in four parks. We have management plans set for Wind Cave, Cuyahoga Valley, Theodore Roosevelt and Indiana Dunes and implementing plans to deal with overabundance. We have planned a good solution for Theodore Roosevelt national park; it is a fenced area and during hunting season they all come back over fence. The south unit of has 950 elk and we want less than 400. Have range they are looking at a new concept of having skilled volunteers; five teams, four people per team, 13 weeks starting middle of October, 260 skilled volunteers for

elk reduction, primarily cows. The elk will be tested for chronic wasting disease. The state is going to take the elk and hold them and distribute the meat. Requiring volunteers to find their own lodging and transportation and use non-lead ammo. On Monday they show up and must qualify so we can be sure they can shoot accurately. There will be a survey form going out for people who want to apply and they can apply via email. We are going to stir things up there; some of the bull elk may leave the park when the volunteers come in. Basically, you have to be in good shape. It is Tuesday through Friday and we will identify areas where the volunteers will go. They will have an assisted guide (a park service employee) going with them. Roger – Impressed with NPS because we goaded you into doing that. You put a lot of time and effort into this and it is efficient and came up with a far superior plan and logistics then we did. Gary – Can apply for all 13 weeks, but only qualify for one. First week one of my staff will go out there and see if he can help. One of better actions I have seen. Volunteers have to field dress the animal and we will have horse packers on call to come in and pick up the animal because this is very rugged country. Website: www.nps.gov/

Off-site Event – Indiana State Museum, Dinner - Sponsored by Bass Pro Shops

Hospitality Room – Sponsored by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Law Enforcement Officers
Tuesday, June 29, 2010

Breakfast – Sponsored by the National Archery in the Schools Program

John Frampton (budget process) – If for every \$1 spent you could get back \$20,000-\$30,000; or if staff could develop a relationship with congressional delegation and congressional staffers, get their home and cell phone numbers and when competition for budget came around, they wanted to come visit you because they knew you would take them hunting, fishing or out on a boat or do something that didn't involve powerpoints; would you do it? If you have over one-third of your budget come from federal funds; would you assign somebody to that? The answer to that in South Carolina is yes. We have gained our Marine Resources Center in Charleston which has over \$200 million of infrastructure that NOAA put into our complexes; our federal grants and marine resources are stable at more than \$15 million a year; and we receive several hundred thousand dollars a year through joint enforcement agreement which we started at the national level years ago. Our staff has written language for the Water Resources Development Act. We created a trust fund working with FWS on one of our fish lists and transferred over 10,000 acres of Corps land to our state that was mitigation land with a trust fund of \$4.85 million, actual cash they transferred to us. We wrote language for the Coastal and Estuary Land Protection Act when Senator Holland was in office and from that program we got \$51 million for one land acquisition deal over a three-year period. We have gotten over \$250 million for land acquisition, and keep in mind we are a small state, 22 million acres. In Forest Legacy we have gotten over \$36.5 million and we are the lead agency and we don't have forestry in our agency, but because of our working relationship in DC we were the lead agency with the U.S. Forest Service. Our estuary research project area we got over \$20 million for one land acquisition deal and that has 3,000 monkeys on it and we lease that property for \$800,000 a year and we get all of that money. We put language in one of the NOAA budgets that authorized us to maintain the commercial function within that estuary research area, which is unusual. We had another acquisition that we utilized over \$44 million in NOAA funds. Our Ace Basin project, down south of Charleston, we have protected over 203,000 acres and had \$150 million of federal funds go into the land acquisition. We have been able to do this by developing our relationship with our congressional delegation and staff over a long period of time. We have six Congressmen and two Senators and we can basically walk in any of those eight offices and generally see the chief of staff instantly; that took a lot of development and time. We have all heard about the three R's they used to talk about in school; reading, writing and arithmetic; we have developed the five R's in South Carolina, we have five divisions and any of those deputy directors has the ability to go to Washington whenever they need to go. I have sat down with our last two Governors and told them what our history shows and told them that we needed the ability to work independently of their office with our congressional delegation

and they have allowed us to do that because they have seen what we have brought in. My current Governor, his legacy is going to be land protection, during his eight years more land has been protected than by any other Governor. If you can show successes and benefits they will allow you to do things. We changed the three Rs to **five Rs: relationships** (based on trust, they have to know you are not going to put your agency in front of them or their boss, you get one strike and you are out; bring the staffers to your state and take them in the field, no powerpoint, and develop relationships); **repetition** (area off coast called Charleston Bump, basically an elevation change, and talked to Senator Holland about research we needed to do and one year we received \$1.5 million to do research; over the years \$10-\$12 million dollars in that one little area); **respect** (they have to know you are not going to give them advise that is going to lead to controversy, we actually draft language for them), **response** time (when they start writing the budget, if you can give them the language and all they have to do is cut and paste it, they will use it frequently and my secretary knows that if one of them calls she is to get in touch with me immediately, no matter where I am and that has paid off); and **recognition** (given decoys to House members and Senators, they like to see their name in the newspaper). It has worked for us and I know some of you live in states where your Governor won't allow this, but if you can work it out it pays off. We develop a budget sheet every year with 20-30 items and we identify an area where we want to see funding, identify appropriations committee or subcommittee that will deal with that and we will put a brief synopsis of what it is and add another section that has the justification and they will cut and paste that, we don't prioritize across the board, but in each of the congressional districts and that pays off. South Carolina is a small state, but we have gotten a lot of money from the federal government and with budget cuts we would have to close our doors if we didn't have these opportunities. Put the right staff dealing with your congressional delegation and it will pay off. The federal process we have in Washington through AFWA was started years ago and when the President's budget comes up we have a meeting in DC where staff comes in and looks at the budget and writes up recommendations from AFWA. Encourage you to have staff attend that meeting in February if possible. Gary does a tremendous job of working with staff in AFWA and getting everybody working together in the states putting those recommendations together. I have given you a challenge here, but I hope you don't do it because you will be competing with South Carolina.

PANEL DISCUSSIONS

Mark – There was a desire among Directors to have an opportunity to discuss topics of interest so we put together four panel discussions and I have asked Ollie to facilitate those. Ollie – John Frampton came to speak with us as president of AFWA and how he works with federal budget, but asked him to talk to us about how he does that because we don't do that very well on this. MAFWA has done okay on Farm Bill, but not anything other Federal budget items. Working on this for last year and a half and we had Gary come and talk to you last year and had committees put items on their reports and we did get some recommendations. Process is starting within our Association and we have to decide where we are going with this. Put Federal budget needs in priority order and submit and send someone to Washington to help work with other regions and partners and help Gary develop and push our list. This is an important item for us. We are going to take some of your money, John, if there is any money left.

Have evaluation sheet for you to fill out at the end of the conference; we want your perspective on what topics for next year so if things come up today, we need you to write them down so we can put them on the program for next year. Previous evaluations have said that we don't want to sit and listen to talks for two days, so developed four panel discussions on issues that were important to you. Guest speakers come up and introduce topic and then let you discuss.

Tom Melius talked to me over a year ago and he wanted the states to know about the new LCC initiative so we have asked Tom to come and talk about this. Tom is a longtime federal agency employee, and he became our Regional Director in 2008 replacing Robyn Thorson; came from Alaska, but previous to that he was an

Assistant Director of External Affairs in Washington DC for the USFWS.

Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (LCCs)

Tom Melius, Region 3 USFWS Director – (PowerPoint – Exhibit S) - Had a little discussion about this, so I am asking colleagues to join me; Craig Sarnecky, the permanent coordinator for the Upper Midwest Great Lakes LCC and Doug Austen, not a full-time USFWS employee, but will be the National Coordinator for LCCs (a new position).

Craig – My goal is to introduce the premise behind LCCs and from my perspective as well. We all wear a couple of hats, I am a FWS employee so when I talk to you I wear that hat, but the other hat I am learning to wear is a conservation community hat. Everyone will have their own perspective, but hope you will see this as a conservation community as well. Premise: Charles Baxter was the coordinator for the Lower Mississippi Joint Venture and Gary Meyer, when we think about landscape conservation we are standing on their shoulders. There is a long line of evolution that has led us to a point where we are starting to think about landscape conservation in comprehensive way. Gary's idea was blending resource interests for a unified approach and Charles' idea was your focus was on output and your own job and it is hard to think about what your neighbor is doing in the conservation community. I accompanied Charles Baxter to DC to talk about landscape conservation; a couple of quotes he used; "21st Century resource challenges are formidable and complex..." everywhere he went he started with that quote. Think about your agency and the challenges you face with your mission pursuit. He also provided another point, it wasn't that we needed more money or people, but the challenge was "A Way-of-Working Challenge", how we work interdependently across the conservation community for shared objectives. The way of working challenge is to secure landscapes that sustain fish and wildlife resources and what that will require. All of us bring expertise, capability and mission to a common conservation endeavor. If one of our goals in the 21st century is securing landscapes that can make sure fish and wildlife resources continue to exist, that requires an adaptive management cycle that we need to learn from success and failure; and an interdependent conservation community, no one single organization can succeed by itself. It is hard to work that way when we are often set up in a competitive fashion. Why are these thoughts occurring now? They are not the thoughts of the FWS, not the invention of this organization, but occurring all across the conservation community. There is increasing awareness of importance of landscape context to site scale function; more science-intensive approaches to planning, model based, spatially explicit, predictive and decision based monitoring and research, moving away from being alpha-based to being outcome-based; and an ever increasing emphasis on biological accountability which is a key point if you think about the past on conservation mission. In the 1960s and 1970s when we would make a decision, it was rarely unquestioned and with instant access to data online today, if we show up with decision that is only alpha-based it is more easily challenged. If we apply adaptive research management and work together on how we have arrived at a decision, what the assumptions are upfront that we worked with, and what our uncertainties are, it helps support the decisions we end up making. Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (LCCs) are applied conservation science partnerships; fundamental unit of planning and adaptive science; and a network with similar methodologies and approach. To me it is a rallying point for the conservation community, a tacit agreement across that community that we have an opportunity to do better with our decisions; there are certain products we can produce that are helpful to all of us. It is not conservation delivery itself, it is putting together those decision support tools that can help us with sustaining landscapes for fish and wildlife resources, with the challenges we have, especially climate change. The Upper Midwest and Great Lakes LCC has a place where science capacity comes together to produce those decision support tools to assist conservation community; that is one area, but we are talking about a network with common methodologies and approaches. Think about that in climate change perspective, as species begin to disassemble and reassemble across the country it becomes key that what is going on in the south becomes more important to what we are doing in the Great Lakes, so decision support tools produced in one area are not good enough, but the ones that have accessibility across the country make sense. Each LCC doesn't have to look the same because it depends on leadership that makes up the steering committees, but for Upper Midwest and Great Lakes, and Plains and Prairie Potholes this

perspective structure is what we are thinking about. The perspective structure is a steering committee and a couple coordinators for science and overall LCC, but the steering committee is what drives it; it is the leadership and that is you, it is not agency driven or FWS driven. It is not owned by a single agency, not for FWS, but for the whole conservation community, but in the end it should belong to everybody. Similar to Lake Committee structure in the Great Lakes where early on the Great Lakes Fishery Commission drove that process, but as years went by it was self run and a successful LCC will reach that mark where it belongs to the conservation community as led by a steering committee. The technical committee is made up of folks with expertise across all agencies to come up to some type of proposed agreement for the steering committee on what priorities to get overall objective of a landscape that is sustained for fish and wildlife resources. All that goes down to the individual entities that can use those products. LCCs has challenges in 21st century; capacities are scientific and technical and have to be directed towards resource practitioners focused on conservation application; shared management science partnerships; national and international network, not individual administrative units, maps are just areas where science capacity comes together, but that should be interactive. Conservation partner ecosystem should work as a system; recognize our functional interdependence; strive for functional connectivity; niche recognition and support, a lot going on, conservation community is evolving, learn how to integrate the approach, it is not about competition; and system sustainability, how we work together to leverage assets as a conservation community. Tom – We were in a position of receiving appropriations to begin quickly to implement eight LCCs. The Plains and Prairie Potholes was one of those, we had \$2 million, through EPA funding to the Great Lakes, through GRLI monies we indentified \$1 million to work with the Upper Midwest & Great Lakes LCC and planning to continue that appropriation as money is available. The Eastern Tall Grass Big Rivers we are hoping to get money to get that one started as well. Some of the LCCs are still in various stages of implementation; some have interim coordinators; some permanent coordinators; and some have steering committees that have already met. We as an agency are trying to make sure these are partner driven and as needs within that geographic area are identified by the steering committee are the ones that should be discussed and eventually supported.

Kirk – We've got partners, successful in implementing groups and need to prioritize if broadcasting money, but a lot of work is already done for you. Tom – Send letters to state directors to get statewide action plans and what directions, may want to develop theme, area, or establish highest priority and discuss at upcoming meetings. We're addressing needs and people on the Hill and wanting to know what this gets; trying to get answers on the ground. Becky – Biological and social, how do we build cooperatives, make them more than a federal initiative? Craig – Steering committee and other entities it is insular, made up of states, agencies, tribes, etc. colleagues are thinking about Atlantic States Marine model. In the end, spoke to private lands committee, without landowner stake this becomes business as usual. It won't be value-added if just government oriented. Roger – Difficulty getting buy-in from staff, federal twist, small group in most states, clientele and private landowners, first talk their language (hunting and fishing), core group of people in agency, disconnect down to base level. Start talking resident species, worried about getting in our way. Tom – Boils down to work load, full plate and this is one more thing. Science needs when addressing habitat can cover suite of migratory and resident birds, changing climates and whole host of things. Believe ways to be supporting proposals. Roger – Staff will decide if it works or not, seems to be state agency staff, disconnect as you go down the line. It will go away if you wait long enough. Doug – Will be starting my new job on Sunday, come from state perspective (was PA and IL), wondered why they didn't come to state as long as they can, so will keep state perspective as long as I can. How to move ball forward, action plan was one of my roles in NE. Move the needle, how do we move this forward, PA has interesting group of conservation organizations, go back to John Frampton's role, small agency, complicated set of situations. Can't deal with assets we have on our own. Develop partnerships to bring different assets to the table. How do we develop, utilize and implement those tools, not on our own, but with partnerships that can make that happen. Will listen to and be sensitive to bring these tools together. Ensure these tools are ones asked for, more targeted. Challenge of limited time and capacity, listen to gaps and fill those, can't do on our own, but do collectively as a group. Jeff – Complement Tom on outreach he has made to the states, but still healthy amount of skepticism, top decision, foisted on everyone. Give you a lot of credit at

keeping this at high cut and involve states, basically research and do in LLCs and I don't see any doing in LLCs, we don't have the time and I don't think you have the time to redo the implementation process. See value of bring in extra resources. Not asking for overwhelming commitment. Tom – Enjoyed getting out to all states to visit about initiative. It is about you, others who can take the ideas and implement them. Doug – I don't see these as delivery tools, they should provide tools to do the delivery better, our job is not to usurp that role at all. How can we take advantage of this with conservation challenges? We have people who can work with landowners, don't want to replicate, do better with information and science and more effective in their decisions. Jeff – Need to get together with USDA and work this out. Forest Service has whole set of initiatives, dedicated work load from state agencies getting involved in that. They are trying to figure out how they fit into this and there are departmental silos and you have to bridge that. Craig – With Logan and Ex staff of Forest Service, different vocabularies, learned to say “from my perspective” from Forest Service, fish and wildlife conservation important, but one of many. If really talking about sustaining landscaping then find common vocabulary. Dialog begins to help, the more the lines intersect we will make progress but it will take time. Dave – How much doing is envisioned with LLCs, I get science piece, collaborative approach is critical, don't understand planning for LLCs. Having plans underway, how envision LLCs doing planning or helping with planning, developing models or what. Craig – When we talk about adaptive science lot of research that adds to body of knowledge, shift to day to day management needs, not just FWS, we as conservation community, check research and see what we all use, biological planning and what are overall perspectives. We often hear folks, we are using the JV model, common table and everyone goes to table and come up with tools, still up to you whether you use the tools. Don't do conservation authority. Go home to mission and decide whether use in collective manner. Jeff – I am all about the science, if going to try and duplicate JV then become more of a burden and staff investment, doing several plans already, all staff involved, okay with steering committee and science priorities and throw in money, but if larger JV I start to get nervous. Tom – partner fatigue and too much on plate, have unique product, but want consistency within LLCs. Joint ventures have been around for 20 plus years and weren't perfect in beginning, but have matured and that is how I see the LLCs progressing. Collectively helpful to have this discussion, it will make us more effective.

Ollie – Focus on research, who does research and where is the money is coming from. Doug – Trying to have foot in a lot of different worlds and build those coalitions, partners all have an interest in challenges we have and trying to find sweet spot in order to address the challenges that none of us can handle alone. Not emulating JVs, different construct and will take some time. Early in maturing process, FWS dedicating a lot of time to this, so handing football off over time, consistency in thinking, listen to concerns and act upon them. Spend lot of my time as 70 percent external, lot of time listening to what the needs are and identify science need. Make sure tools add value to your staff. Planning interpreted in several different ways. Can spend lot of money on science, but not translated to things we can do on the ground. Dave – One of models impressed with is HABIT offices (think tanks), one in MN, ND and other places, offer support for planning and look at that model to build LLCs. Look at that as you develop and hope capacity still be there from waterfowl and grasslands standpoint. Tom – Joint venture, specific to migratory birds, continue to provide science, that is the think tank and those are the folks we will be going to, our office in their office in Bismarck, hope to gain as much as we can through them.

Kirk – Showing coordinator and science coordinator in each LLC, build from there, new paradigm is fewer people, states, industry doing, allocate towards research instead of personnel. At some point all doing with fewer folks. Tom – Outsourcing, cooperative agreements with other organizations, keep staff size at minimum and directed that each LLC will have those two positions filled, had position descriptions that will bring other roles, but up to steering committee on what we need and how we get that staff, from other agencies, etc. Keep low staff and overhead and move forward with as much money for research. Logan – Dialog tiptoeing around what you want LLCs to be. Tension between what Jeff is saying and what Kirk is saying; the decision model or collective sense of shifting priorities? Look at directors and what impact or influence you want it to have and how does it influence what we do (i.e. forestry). Tom – Thought I had is that each steering committee is made up of people around the table, expectation that we will move needle forward in next 5-10 years with changing

climate. If we just put dollars in research and don't use it, will ask where the value added is. Collectively address that topic. Becky – Ideally, you would hopefully get to point of you buying into it (long way down the path). Set field managers to set budgets, if anteing up, need to be involved. Can get there, but a matter if that is where you are starting from. How do we get to a point where I want to bring money to the table, share and participate? Rich – In discussions I have had, climate change plays out in the stories so having hard time seeing around the corner, doing studies, but not giving me direction, how does that impact what I do on the land, what am I going to do with armadillos and flooding events, from natural resource standpoint, research questions my staff don't have. Need to coordinate answers that I have to be responsible for; all conception right now, but looking forward to stories from others. Matt – Think there are concerns on how this will all develop, once on the table you can work on it. Trying to design how this is going to work, alternative is to all take this on with existing structure and science, tremendous value in collective efforts. Lines had to be drawn somewhere. Ability to gather research and share across state lines, not figure this out in year one and I think important we work together. Longer term federal funding, all short in resources, credit AFWA and Gary Taylor and the staff and attach funding stream for adaptation in every climate change bill. Not see money just flow to the states, it is competitive and we are going to have to show results. Having some capacity to build that in our states will be helpful. Figure out a way to make this work. Gildo (DU) – Chosen to embrace LCCs and on several steering committees. Have to proof how many acres restored, carbon sequestration, this gives us creative capacity which will hopefully produce more dollars on the ground. Together Each Accomplishes More (TEAM). Trust is important, when JVs got started had to put away some of organizational pride, time for cultural shift. Ollie – Interested Craig, showing steering committee and technical committee developed in each LCC, developed by partners, how is steering committee set up and who is it and the same with technical committee? Craig – Perspective structure, need for consistency across the country, but up to steering committee in each LCC how that works. To start with, especially with upper Midwest and Great Lakes, start with interim steering committee, state DNR directors, feds with landscape impact, NGOs (DU and TNC) to use first setting to rally ourselves. Not dictated by LCC coordinator or FWS; receive guidance from steering committee on how I will grow and technical committee will grow. Doug – Not force structure on these LCCs, some more mature and have tremendous capacity, some don't have pieces in place right now, just like kids; need to be inclusive and move the ball forward. Concentrate on themes of what you want to do and less on the structure. Will be some consistencies there? Find balance; that will be the trick. Ask everyone to be involved, but be patient with us. Ollie – Will USGS be on steering committee or technical committee? Tom – Yes. Rich – Like seeing coordinator rather than director because they imply different things. Lot of emphasis towards federalism, so many strings attached to some of the money. Attitude and early conceptions of what is going on, looks like you are holding everyone as equal partners, it had to start somewhere, feel that is happening and looking forward to seeing that. Ollie – Good discussion, no matter what the topic, bigger than all of us here and have to work together in partnership.

Break – Sponsored by D.J. Case & Associates

Federal Aid Reversion (shared PowerPoint – Exhibit T)

Glen Salmon, Deputy Assistant Director, Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program (WSFR) – Bring everyone up to speed, I'm not drinking the Federal Kool-Aid but swore an oath. Come at this from a healthy perspective. Two parts to federal aid program, money coming in since 1937 and partnership with industry and the feds, write the money and get that money on the ground and the other side, and discussions on diversion. Assent language says that to pass legislation assenting to the provision that hunting and fishing license revenue will be used exclusively for the administration of the State fish and wildlife agency. This assent legislation remains one of the eligibility criteria for States to receive grant funds under the Acts. In dire situations like we have in the states right now, the money that is protected is a target and Governor is always coming after that money. Having talked to all federal agents, hallway discussions are as important as big things that make the paper; the earlier we can help the better. Conversations that are formal and many more informal, want to use

that money. Diversion language, Willis Robertson (VA F&G) because VA Governor took his money a couple of different times to balance the budget, wrote in 1950s. Joint Task Force is working on clarifying what is license revenue. When state in diversion, only Secretary FWS can say state is in diversion, happens quite a bit, letter from federal aid chief to state director. No handbook on informal process, but once formal process and letters start that is handled by a series of letters. Don't wait if you think something is happening.

Jim – Typically regional review, get call from DNR staff saying we have a situation in legislature (almost always starts there). Removed decision from agency to trails group or whatever so we send letter to director and in a lot of cases that is where it ended, but in some cases had to negotiate with legislators and ultimately get to a situation where we get to a point we can live with. 2009 a bad year, 16 attempts to game and fish pots, in 2010 only 6 attempts. From Midwest perspective, only one state, compared to 6 in Midwest in 2009. Hoping we can keep that message clear. Did have a process where we had to take state to point of FWS recommending placing that state in diversion, letter set to go out on Friday and solved on Thursday. People are aware of every step along the way. Think of this as a partnership with states to protect resources. Glen – Structure is interesting, have regions and folks in DC and allows a two-step process and having lived this that step is important. Let's keep it in the region, if it goes to Washington who knows what is going to happen. If there is a situation where you think you can lean on us, you work for Governor or Commission and they are involved with legislature, not difficult to let us know what is going on, in a couple of situations came from NGO, not state agency. This is a draft bill that we get a copy of and asks us what we think about it.

Jim Hodgson, USFWS Federal Aid Chief Region 3

Dave – Getting more creative on managing dollars, creating enterprise accounts like fleet account, pay a per mile rate for use of vehicles, put into account used to maintain vehicles. Co-mingles account becomes a target, but hard to tease out how much is federal dollars. As we get more creative with money, a challenge to figure out what is diversion. Jim – Similar situation with another state and they went in and took money and there was no way to determine what was federal and what was not. In process of practicing forensic accounting to trace it, but if we can't trace it we have to go through corrective plan. Need to be able to track money that goes into those types of accounts, potential problem either on audit or diversion. Glen – If you can find ways to streamline and help you figure out a way to account for it. Auditors work for us. Jim – Challenging us, relating to potential eligibility, if you think it is gray, challenge my staff really early in the process and we will evaluate it and run it through the staff in Minneapolis, if guidance run it up and see. Last year ran something through solicitor. Will benchmark with what other regions are doing too. Glen – One of the things that makes the Midwest special is active people at that level, so knowledgeable about that program. Becky – How many states are having trouble? Jim – Six and 17 the year before. Glen – One region wrote 15 informal letters. The other part of question is this, biggest struggle is where you have creative financing and the other is land values. They struggle with bundle of rights, has implications, as we start talking about carbon sequestration and wind energy and how to make those things works for the states; all snarled up in thought processes. Those are assets of the department just like vehicles. Going through interpretation and it is tough sometimes. Jim – I agree, and no answer for you, our land records not reconciling with our land records, seeing more and more because of severed rights and mineral rights and don't have easy answers and dealing with them one at a time. Open to any suggestions that will help make it easier. How do we deal with land and land records, if piece that no longer meets it's purpose, it is difficult, when don't meet why they were acquired, there is some solutions there. Glen – Get all records straight between states and Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) continue to struggle with that, but we will be as consistent as possible with Joint Task Force. Jim – Always allow uses on primary purposes of land, keep dominant purpose, creep uses causes you to lose control. Looking at this issue within staff and federal aid coordinators; looking for consistency and trying to draw the lines. Don't want to get out there and find you in potential diversion. Dave – Follow up on land thing, 1400 units and drowning in federal aid easements, wide spread feeling not tying federal aid to land because it becomes a burden. Hopefully take steps to streamline some of that. Glen – Appraisal service director program is being looked at. That is a conscious decision. Jim – Looking at that partly because grappling with the same on how to make that efficient to you, like to see federal, but understand your perspective. Update of something that is going on (perfect storm),

Region 3 office is moving next spring, records since 1937 we are packing up and moving and FWS at national level is implementing financial management system, they have their own bugs, will start next spring. What that means for states no phase, will be converted to FDMS, payment methods will go to Dept of Treasury, due at same time as grants due. Expect system to be down from a month to six weeks. As part of contingency plan, if you have grants on July 1, start getting them in by March for the following year and get it through the system so you can draw down your money on July 1. If system down and can't get grants approved it may be August before you can start drawing down. Glen – Keith Sexson has been long time member of Joint Task Force. Make note of what Jim said, the whole way we do grants is going to change. Have top people working on it. Ron Regan – Comment on how well states are obligating their SWIG dollars? Glen – Lot of people went to bat to get 65 percent/35 percent split and two days after money goes out they want to know what you did with it. Get back to region on how that money worked, small conversations make all the difference, whether it changes to 75/25 or 50/50, bar can change depending on conversations. Let us know how important that was. Jim – Region 3 states haven't had a lot of problems or seen much money revert. Easier to come up with match when 65/35, looking for stories to pass along to Washington to keep that money coming off the Hill. Pessimist about financial system changeover, SWIG dollars disappeared, what they did is notify us that they had money

Feral Hogs in the Midwest

Seth Swafford, Assistant National Coordinator, USDA/APHIS/WS National Wildlife Disease Program

(Exhibit U) – working on feral swine, promoted to come to Midwest for State Director for wildlife services for IA and MO. Asked to give this presentation, gave similar to health committee, (named people there). Feral swine are personal to me, fell out of treestand and broke back shooting feral swine. Some states will never get rid of this curve, but some good will come from management. Not native, introduced to US in 1500 by Desoto, seen photos of sows with individual markings leave and come back with 7-8 sows, so extremely productive so you don't want that. IA and IN are commercial swine industry states. Facility based PP to allow you to watch TV. Took verbatim discussion state ag agency worried about losing PRV/SB status because of wild pigs and veterinary services said don't look at me, industry said diseased, local producers said do something, state wildlife agencies say not wildlife, Wildlife Services says we are here to help. Seen public health offices get involved because of things being passed from pigs to humans or dogs. Showed pictures of hogs (feral or commercial), 3 generations from being feral, especially with high productive rates. Not too cold in northern states for these animals, become established if left alone. Three part presentation: where is responsibility and how we address it, creation of partnerships including landowners who play a huge role in the issue, from access, education and ethics standpoint; don't know if everyone in Midwest truly believes these issues: crop damage, livestock predation, habitat destruction, endangered species predation, game species competition, and disease threats (real and emerging). Showed pics of crop depredation where pigs ate corn that was still under the ground (AR); showed habitat damage; balance of hunters finding value in these and natural resource managers (NJ – proud of shooting deer and feral hog). Different group of individuals, move pigs at night, bring from other states and let go on uncle's farm so place to hunt. Problem from disease transmission, eat out of trough or share same pasture. Biggest problem is illegal movement of illegal swine be moved and how you control this with regulation. Kansas done great job, not wildlife and said everything about these animals is bad. Have been eradicated in Kansas, there 10 years ago, beat back and now gone. Solution is not signs on the road (crossing), heavy traps is the solution, requires a lot of baiting with sweet potatoes, carrots and corn; good program for a local entity (good tool in toolbox) or suppressed firearms (that we use), don't cause bigger problems; black helicopter is a solution in the Midwest, especially if looking at CRP land (or fixed wing aircraft). Landowner cooperation is key, WS is not going to enter any state where we are not welcome, where landowner doesn't allow us to come, need to do this hand-in-hand. Challenges – continued interest and involvement (Midwest can still get ahead of the game); funding (hard to get); expanding feral swine population (naturally and illegally); and law enforcement and regulation. Task Force approach is best approach for passing additional regulations or laws, implementing effective outreach campaigns, integrating various control methods and leveraging expertise. If all else fails we can bring in alligators. Steve Backs, IN, dealing with feral hogs

from early 1990s, trying to get law in place, Class D felony to transport, not aware of anyone trying to infiltrate this group, poor man's grizzly bear, helpful if someone goes to jail for this. If USDA trying to get in with it. Seth – Not aware of any covert operation, some do get in with them because hunt with dogs. Wildlife Service (WS) is not the one to address that question to. How do you enforce this thing, nothing beyond state's passing legislation? Ollie – Have no authority to do that? Charlie – No. Randy – Had a case in WI where brought up from TX, but had hard time proving that. Sweeping invasive species laws. Had guy in north that had several hundred of these on his farm, working with him on licensing them, now what do we do with them? Filed injunction against us and passed that now but don't know what to do with them. Rich – Have case and plan on making an example of them. Bob – Hard to make cases and last session penalties were increased and it is hard to get them to take the case. Seth – Working with groups that are influential, get judges to take case seriously. Get prosecutors on board and get a judge, can't risk disease free status, right now swine industry is disease free; would be battle if disease jumped. Bob – What process for documenting test results, how is information collected and reported out. Seth – A couple of avenues, if foreign animal disease very different, flows to state veterinarian from state down; endemic diseases go with official notification. Steve – Our experience with state veterinarian is that they don't want reports floating around and don't want a ban on IN swine. Rich – That is good for leverage too. Seth – Started working with industry in 2004, lot of concern, made lot of progress, few states holding out. Use this to our advantage, declared freedom from pseudo rabies, Mexicans wanted us to prove it, leveraged it by having it in place; second example is EU, think of pork or bacon, but wanted boar semen, had program in place to show EU compartmentalized reports showed not in swine herds. Kirk – Had several outbreaks in NE, strategy is control measures in staff, want landowners who want a posse and resisted that up to this point. We have been able to handle that more effectively. Is anybody using hunters? Seth – Hunters are playing a critical role; some education occurring with hunters and landowners. Rich – take care of them professional. Becky – When you hear of first one, have more than you knew, using hunters to get to some of those and have strong mixed problems, don't want to start a tradition. Problem in captive herds instead of trucks, they are escaping. We passed a law to take them anytime while out hunting. Categorized as livestock and trying to get Ag community to work with us. Rich – Mentioned three generations, flooding caused pigs to get loose. What do you do with them, now have contingency plan. Seth – Touched on PR now have, control and eradicate feral swine. We are lucky in Midwest and U.S., number one vertebrate pest and need to act quickly. Rich – Pictures on internet and adopt a pig programs. Ollie – Invited to MO annual meeting and had presentation on feral hogs. Get with states that have dealt with them and learned a lot by working on these animals. Ron Regan – Ben West from MS State, published eradication guide for feral hogs and if you missed that we can make sure you get a copy. Ollie – Compliment WS and welcome you to Midwest.

Lunch – Sponsored by U.S. Sportsmen's Alliance

Evaluation of Hunter Recruitment/Retention Programs & Data Mining (shared PowerPoint – Exhibit V)

Phil Seng, D.J. Case & Associates – On behalf of Dave, we welcome you to IN and on behalf of Cortney and Southwick thanks for letting us talk to you about this. There has been a long personal and professional interest in this topic and working on it for 10 years formally, and more informally. Interested in hunting and fishing and have raised our kids as hunters and fisherman. Working on best management practices (BMPs) for several groups and have to have agency commitment from top to bottom, do recruitment or retention, but rarely the same thing. Not big enough to do on your own. Doing anything is better than nothing. Evaluate to see if you got there or not. Don't expect positive return on investments right out of the box.

Cortney Mycroft, Southwick Associates – Need buy-in from people all through the company. Need to know not a passing fancy, trying to keep base going. Make part of plan, but also part of budget. Must have clear objectives, pulling in a new hunters is harder/different than pulling back previous hunters; working with partners, can't do it yourself, find partners doing similar work, don't reinvent the wheel and save as much time and effort as you can, work with people who can bring info to table; work with NGOs. Phil – Regarding partners, NGOs already have marketing experience which can be leveraged or used directly. How do you know

if you are successful? Evaluate, anything you do is fine, but doesn't have to just be at the end, evaluation can be done all along the road, not just at the end. Did print ads and came up with campaign that did not work. Do ongoing evaluation. Isolate the variables, compare treatment vs. control. Identify improvements for following years, evaluate and hone in and your best success. Leads into marketing, don't expect money right out of chute. Use year one to identify who responded best, give time to find out what those elements are and keep pushing it, is rare, but in ideal world this is what you should do. Cortney – Argue to consider looking at lapsed hunters as a large group, not all purchase every year. Know who people are if we have electronic databases, know where they live and demographics. They are low hanging fruit, have equipment and know-how to get out and hunt. Also, can be a mentor by proxy and bring in other hunters. Prioritize lapsed hunters to targets. Use to evaluate the campaign. Classify lapsed hunters by life styles (everyone has been identified by different factors i.e. demographics). Know how to connect with these people to target that audience, now have tools in toolbox to get to the people we want to reach. Use prior experiences and marketing in your state; also look at agency needs and budget. Phil – When we worked with Southwick on collaborative efforts, they do data mining and we handle implementing the campaign, then Southwick comes back and analyzes the data. Set specific goals and objectives; identify target audience; develop message and test it; implement treatments and see what happens. Go back and measure against objectives you set in the beginning. Look at data after the fact, set objectives, things that came along may not be what you wanted, but use those things. No measurable differences between the two; focus on those that responded best and see where it leads us after that. What campaign was most important and what can we do better next year. What have you done or what is working or isn't. Ollie – One of topics you put on evaluation forms last year. Becky – Agree wholehearted that retaining the ones you got is important, but how do you deal with churn, are you discounting for multi-year licenses? Have new passport system where if you hunt for 3-4 years you get a break. What is going to be meaningful? Phil – Has anyone had bundling of licenses and compared that to before they bundled? Don't know of any research that compares previous data. Roger – We bundle everything on combination license. Ollie – Buy patrons license and then I have it. Becky – Earned discount, keep as long as you continue to buy. Phil – Encourage people to use price points, but you can gain hunters and lose money; huge hurdle to changing license structure. Randy – Have patron license in WI, anything from DNR and in watching that over last couple of years, more money, but convenience factor, seeing individualized licenses again now. How are you allocating patron money and splitting that out, so that created a little issue so had to figure out a formula for that. Ollie – You have 3-year fishing license? Becky – Issue 3-year or 5-year discount; trying to capture churn rate. Jeff – have you done an upfront analysis and determined that people aren't buying for whatever reason? Becky – Trying to figure out incentives through opportunity, how it affects buying habits and whether you get opportunity or not. Think of themselves as hunter whether going out or not. Jeff – When you are looking at bundling, what are you putting together? Rich – Everything but deer. Kirk – Contracting with Southwick, doing conjoint analysis to determine if interested audience for combo permit and what price should be for it. Cortney – I don't work on that, but that is something you can do. Kirk – Be careful not to undermine yourself. Everything you add to your electronic system costs you money so be careful what you do. Phil – Look at price points and privileges to determine best return. Roger – Have husband and wife fishing license and have been asked to make one for hunting and get some churn on couple's license. Dave – We have that, but have had question of whether same sex couples qualify. Randy – Pitch idea along these lines. Know age structure is late 40s, biggest opportunity to bring people in now. Started to give thought, 1) bring them in and 2) bring them back. If you bring someone with who has never bought a license get discount for both (so recruiter discount) or bring someone who has lapsed along, give a discount to both. Bob – As we are charging into e-permits, how does that combine? What about drift, make sure you set clear goals. Keep ideas coming! Rick Young, PF – Conversation on resident hunters, look at recurring nonresident and use them to bring new hunters through their state. Cortney – About 7 percent come back, tremendous potential. Gary Vequist – License price may motivate, more has to do with social connections and resource or accessibility is a problem. Sell social thing, get people in the outdoors. Greg, IN DNR – Selling 3 licenses and getting 4th free, like antlerless deer. Kirk – Increased nonresident by 30 percent, offered opportunity to bring youth for \$5, a loss, but goal was participation. Ollie – Can count for federal aid,

but can't count free licenses. Tom Bennett – Give free licenses to seniors and disabled, sold to legislators, charging \$5 and if someone complained at Commission meetings, took \$5 out of pocket and it never went any further. Gary Vequest – I think \$5 youth is a good idea to get kids out there, do as a group. Tom Bennett – It netted us 65,000 licenses the first couple of years, but you can price yourself out of the market. Staff couldn't explain to me why hunting licenses have declined, said okay because had budget then, but price point in there and formula for that somewhere. Phil – No direct relationship. Ollie – See one year drop and then see people come back on price increase. Jim – Looking at more combinations Phil – No difference what surrounding states are charging, analysis of Southwick is where you can optimize. Gary Armstrong, IN – Started talking about R/R and talking about pricing; is there a drive away point? Dave – Ready to look at another fee increase, need to generate revenue, looking at structure, use tapestry analysis and other options and try out some different options like 1 or 2 day licenses. New deer license a few years ago, buy three: muzzleloader, archery or firearm – still only get one deer, but people willing to pay for opportunity to hunt all three seasons. Interesting discussion and learn from each other. Phil – Are talking about different things, mantle of R/R is disguise for need to raise license fees. Some don't care about revenue, just want hunters, but need clear objective and need to root those things out. Joe – About every four years have internal revenue task force, difficult to change, frustrating because decisions are political rather than “the right thing to do”. You can dust them off, successful with revenue task force. In state report, did turkey permit combo package (read paragraph from KS state report). Had trout stamps for 10 years now, youth paid also, pay as you go program, let youth fish for free, so three years ago, didn't have to buy trout stamp, revenue and participation went up. Have free fishing weekend. Have you done studies on loss of income on those types of things? Free park days, target for special events (not tied to one weekend). We are doing marketing for free fishing weekend. Phil – Not done any data on that, my gut is it is a good idea. Gary – Analysis they did was interesting, license buying complicated will not help retention. License is requirement, try to make it simple. Ollie – Can't follow complex regulations. Roger – Has any state done regression study and how that affects license sales? Do stable license fee

Featured Sponsor, National Archery in the Schools Program (NASP) (PowerPoint – Exhibit W)

C. Tom Bennett, NASP Vice President of Operations – Jim Martin started off North American model of wildlife conservation is broke, he was talking about money. NASP is pure recruitment (gave numbers from handouts). We struggled for years on how to get women and minorities out hunting. This idea started in a duck blind with Commissioner of Education when I was Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, used Step Outside and brought 12 people from KY Dept of Education and took them outside and within an hour of doing that, agreed to write curriculum. Started with 1,200 schools, now have over 7,400 schools. Have DE, RH and VT left. One of programs that is pure recruitment, 79 percent never touched a bow before the class. We didn't get into hunting aspect, but 4th–12th graders are learning a lifetime skill, being taught by the teachers at no cost to us from license buyers. Half kids said school was better for them and Mark Duda did a study for us. Impressive that it is pure recruitment, kids more confident, better behaved and do what they are told and helping change kids in the way they do things. Leadership for NASP is right here in this room, showing leadership. When you get bump in federal aid, prioritize what you are going to do decide to build a range or put money in the school. Failure of mine, original target was High School kids, missed a generation and wanted to do something for that generation, now have to take hunter education (HE) folks, took 10 years, put budgets together and couldn't get education folks to buy-in and Roy Grimes got them going. Have to talk HE program, excuses are that they don't know how to get volunteers, etc.; but future of shooting sports. Over 500 kids shoot twice (1,100 kids at national championship). Don't have to be tall, pretty or strong, but have focus to archery shoot. Have 6,784 from 38 states, expect archery tournament at Disney World, 40 percent girls. Get equipment for \$3,000, goes to school for \$3,000. We couldn't do it without you or without teachers and industry. This is a model to think about in other things and way to tweak the model. Market slips away about 2 percent a year (licensed buyers). Have NWTF, SCI, MDF, QDMA, PF, QF and RMEF will give money to schools (\$500 a chapter), connected on website. NWTF has helped with \$750,000. Matt – Great program, appreciate everything you have done in WI, now have full time coordinator. You said working at DC school system? Tom - Doing schools district-wide

in DC (121 school districts) treating as state. ATA is funding half of \$30,000 pilot program; expect 20-30 schools by end of year. If you don't go look someone else will. Also, working with the National Guard. Glen – Invited group to come to national shoot (fly fishing group), shooting range was always busy; National Guard came; and 40-50-foot long line with kids learning to fly fish; trying to get exposure. You have broken down the door of getting sharp sticks in school, why not fly fishing rods? Tom – Dana and Katie Cole (father/daughter) and have 50/60 schools, out of Lincoln, NE.

MAFWA COMMITTEE REPORTS (continued)

Ollie Torgerson, MAFWA Executive Director, Facilitator – sending letter around that was rewritten from yesterday. Ohio has offered Carolyn Caldwell for years and she is here today.

CITES – Carolyn Caldwell – Committee consists of: Buddy Baker, Louisiana, SEAFWA; Bob Broscheid, Arizona, WAFWA; Jack Buckley, Massachusetts, NEAFWA; myself, Ohio, MAFWA; Don MacLauchlan, AFWA; and Curtis Taylor, West Virginia, chair of International Relations Committee of AFWA. International treaty of plants and animals, nothing to do with trade of species (not domestic) internationally (spoke about what was in Appendices and partner groups). More than just impact treaty has on states, but on NGO pressure. I am available anytime by email or phone and same with colleagues. Split up different aspects of CITES, Jack Buckley focuses on fisheries. Working on a couple of items, attempt to get bobcat delisted in 2002, lack of identification manual; developed manual for ID, web address is there. In terms of materials available in past, this new manual is great. Other item is North American (NA) population, no good handle on estimate. Brought up by Humane Society of America and can't identify, and don't know how many bobcats there are. Did survey and will be publishing this year in Journal of Wildlife Management, double estimate from 1980; 1.4 to 1.6 million is estimate in NA population. Conference of the Parties meeting detailed report happens once every three years and had 1500 participants, 170 countries, 2/3 majority vote to get anything added or delete and it is a political nightmare when battling. Gildo – Who votes, one vote per country, US Humane Society can't vote? Carolyn – Right, but having block votes, 23 countries. Submitted the bobcat to be removed from Appendix II, were not successful. In introduction stated that well managed and maintained in states and state agencies recognized for that. Polar bear for Appendix I listing based on climate change, it is really important that this treaty is about trade, nothing to do with climate change so that was unfortunate because Alaska and Canada and would have deluded original reason for CITES. Reported last year, close to alternative for plastic tags for bobcats, but FWS has asked to put that on hold. Can sell pelts within your own state, added burden, because only need tag when going outside US. Have valid alternative to plastic tag and still in negotiation. Have meeting next week with Frampton, Curtis Taylor and Strickler so not there yet. Need to be patient, Gordon Bachelor with Furbearer Working Group has been great partner on this. Amphibian and reptile fresh water turtle being put together by FWS encouraging you to participate; this is a free seminar and I encourage you to send someone to participate. Fisheries issues are big, most items in pet trade. We make rules based on populations for harvest. Ron Regan – Thank Ohio and MAFWA for Carolyn's work. With Don's retirement we have seen that she is the glue that holds this committee together. Ollie – The MAFWA President is Director/Liaison to CITES.

Wildlife and Fish Health – Becky Humphries - The Midwest Fish & Wildlife Health Committee conducted its annual meeting April 6-7, 2010 at Bismarck, ND. Had 13 at meeting and six by telephone. This is an active committee in spite of travel restrictions. We need a resolution or something to keep this as a committee in by-laws. The steering committee also recognized a need for staff support to keep the activities of the Initiative moving and may consider bringing on a Master's student if \$30,000 in funding can be identified. The committee is also moving forward with developing a white nose syndrome workgroup (Jon Gassett of Kentucky as chair), and would like to encourage participation by interested parties. The Initiative also called for both a federal and NGO caucus, but the federal component may be challenging, due to data privacy issues, and may need to be reconsidered. There will be a meeting on August 25, in Georgia between USDA-Veterinary

Services and state directors to discuss health issues.
There is a resolution in support of animal identification.

Ollie – Action on two letters, one to Region 3 and 6, wording reworked. *Joe Kramer moved, Kirk Nelson second to send letters. **Approved.***

Break – Sponsored by Ducks Unlimited (waived done for day)

Free Time/Dinner on your own

Hospitality Room – Sponsored by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Law Enforcement Officers