

**Minutes**  
**MAFWA Annual Meeting**  
**June 26 – June 28, 2011**  
**Honey Creek Resort State Park**  
**Centerville, Iowa**

**Sunday, June 26, 2011**

MAFWA Executive Committee Meeting 5:00 pm (*Schedule – Exhibit 1*)

*Welcome to Iowa Reception – Celebration of Iowa’s Water and Land Legacy Amendment sponsored by Bass Pro Shops and National Shooting Sports Foundation (NSSF) (Exhibit 2)*

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

**Monday, June 27, 2011**

*Breakfast – Sponsored by Ducks Unlimited (DU) (Exhibits 3, 4)*

**GREETINGS and WELCOME to IOWA**

**Welcome to Iowa**

**Pat Boddy, MAFWA President** – Thanks to all the people who have been helping with the floods in Iowa. This year is a 120 years of Conservation Officers in Iowa, established in 1891. Thanked members of Executive Committee, Sharon Schafer as Treasurer and Sheila Kemmis as Secretary. Kim Rasler, who is working registration and Lisa Nissen, who helped put this all together. I would be remiss if I didn’t mention Ollie, on top of everything, could not have done this without him and he brought Cindy Delaney into the mix. In time of transparency and limited travel, grateful you could all come. This facility was possible in large part due to two former Iowa directors Rich Leopold and Jeff Vonk. This is the first season of normal pool; everything here is built including the boat ramp, docks and beach. We put in a high water beach, but it was under water and had buoys marking the golf course so boats wouldn’t run into it. (*Applause for mighty Honey Creek Resort.*) Visit Honey Creek activity center, it is new, a zero energy building put together by Iowa State University. Take tour of grounds, especially the high water beach. Hatchery is nearby and fishing is great at Lake Rathbun. Introduced Roger Lande, Director of Iowa DNR; he has spent 50 years as attorney and a lifetime on outdoor activities.

**Greetings**

**Roger Lande, Director Iowa DNR** – Spent well over 40 years practicing law, born in Muscatine, IA on the Missouri River. Spent six months retired and in December got a call from the Governor. Asked to contribute time to remake Government and I thought I would help by giving advice, but I ended up with a job even though I wasn’t looking for one. Looking forward to future and looking at accomplishments of our bureau and department. You will hear from Mike McGhee on lake restoration later. People have seen these restorations in process, but some have been going long enough to see what can happen to a lake. It is a political learning experience, but communities have decided it is the thing to do. On the river trails program, canoers and kayakers are using it. On urban fishing program, stock trout from hatcheries that we have had in place for over 100 years; have three dozen cold water streams that naturally produce trout, the rest are stocked; we will have 30 streams with spawning trout. We are stocking in urban lakes. Private lands and public access; program is trading habitat improvement for

public access. Person who owns land, who has a crop every three years or in wet conditions every eight years; can say I will post and permit public to hunt and will sign agreement to fix habitat on that property. This is the first year not only paying for access, but habitat. First year Iowa can hunt doves, front page story in Des Moines Register, had women convinced they shouldn't be hunted. In 2002, had bill, but Governor vetoed it. This year in coup, knew House would pass, not certain of Senate. Had three weeks of filled galleries; and Senator Brownstall brought it up on a day when gallery was not full and it passed. Had a non-controversial bill, but slipped in dove hunting and it passed. One Senator, Durdin, worked for 30 years to get dove bill passed. Hard feelings out there, he got an email from a woman who said "You are a mean old man and I hope you die out there while hunting doves" and he responded "so do I".

### **Introduction of New Directors**

Ollie asked new directors to introduce themselves. Roger Lande, IA just spoke so we will go on.

*Rodney Stokes, MI* – Started January 1, have 30 years experience in MI, 25 primarily in parks and buying and selling land and mineral rights; gone for two years, spent one year as Parks and Recreation Director in Detroit; spent one in Florida. Becky called and offered me a job, after three times then she called right after my first hurricane I decided to take the job. I worked as her legislative liaison, then parks director, then assistant, planned on retiring again; then offered this job. I was appointed director, been on job for 177 days, weekends full, going 900 miles per hour, but enjoying every minute of it.

Minnesota couldn't be here, Ed Boggess, grew up around here, wanted to come but MN government is about to shut down because of controversy between Governor and Legislature, if they don't settle by Thursday there will be a government shutdown. Ed was biologist in Kansas, then moved to MN as furbearer biologist under Dave Schad. No commission in MN so top person is called Commissioner, Dave Schad is now deputy commissioner and Ed is the new Director, he is a familiar face in AFWA.

*Dave Lane, OH* - Thanks for warm welcome, interaction has been great. My career path was different, born and raised in WV, moved to Ohio when 7 years old, went to college in WV, worked for Forest Service, not full time, then private industry for 15 years. I understood good work you did, but didn't understand interaction. My brother was a game warden and he told me it was the best job he had ever seen; I applied for the academy and was selected to become a game warden in state of Ohio. From private industry, profit oriented, wildlife resources is a passion and it has grown in me.

*Scott Gunderson, WI* - Representing Secretary Cathy Stepp, I am number three person in WI; call me Gundy. Secretary Stepp wishes she could be here. I spent 16 years in legislature on natural resources committee, have constitutional amendment under my belt, right to hunt and fish, youth mentor hunting bill I started 6 years ago. Look forward to meeting everyone and learning what other states are doing. Look around room, lot of directors not here, because of budget, learning to do more with less. Stepp is private business person and spent four years in legislature. I owned hunting and fishing sport shop for 25 years, involved in DU running banquets, very involved in community and state. Look forward to working with you. Stepp also served on natural resources board. The Deputy Secretary. Matt Moroney, is an Iowa native..

## STATE of STATE REPORTS

### Necessity: The Mother of Invention

*Ollie Torgerson, MAFWA Executive Secretary, Facilitator* – We do an evaluation of the conference every year, please fill out because it is important to next state doing meeting (*Exhibit 5*). From last year changed direction of state of state reports, full reports are posted on the website so changed to describe recent agency challenge and how you resolved it. Full state-of-the-state reports can be found on the MAFWA website at: <http://www.mafwa.org/state/index.htm>

*Marc Miller, IL* – Good to see familiar faces, hope to send more staff next year. Challenge is improving diversity numbers, urban legislators are mindful, testified before, aware of how poor numbers are hope not link to budget. Appropriations are relevant to society, addressing that when I became director in 2009, created focus on youth. Opening doors, create cultural shift in agency and reaching out and doing more on outreach. Challenge was met this summer with one milestone, urban universities and colleges, starting CANRIP program dealing with fisheries course, law enforcement, land management, wildlife biologist – opportunities for college students, gives them first step in natural resources career.

Challenging to pull together on something staff not used to working on. Funding is another issue, pulled internship together in short time. Teachable moment is cultural changes need persistence to overcome. Focus on youth recruitment and community outreach. Other challenge, proud of staff in last couple of weeks, funding was going to be a problem, thought we would use attrition numbers, proposed this to Governor to get larger youth numbers, Governor using his money to fund this program and sending 2,800 youth out into field to work in parks. Pay attention to staff, this is a \$10 million program.

*Mark Reiter, IN* – Deer management, all facing problems, thought I would do something, like watching hillbillies kill themselves. After several times of being drug to statehouse, thought we would take a stab at it. Not only problems but access; put together committee, landowners and other NGOs for several discussions, discussed facets of deer, hunting season, reduce number of days to hunt with gun in half and added some extra seasons at end of season in January for antlerless only. Visited with Commission, did preliminary adoption and then hit the fan. Started hearing from constituents who said they were not represented, Commission bought that up and threw me in the trashcan. It was a terrible experience in the end.

*Pat Boddy, IA* – Accomplish public access on private lands, had federal grant and voluntary program. Lot of support from hunting groups and thought slam dunk and then Farm Bureau spokesman came in; really bad idea, couple of things transpired that were teachable, hats off to Dale Garner and staff, they stayed the course, kept putting out the message, and got AG rulings on liability issues. Lande had meeting with Farm Bureau, told them they would represent their clients whether they allowed hunting or not. Had 3 to 4 last minute changes in language, etc. not been able to get through rules committee if we had not gotten Farm Bureau to back off. Kept addressing issues that they brought forth; will see how good it goes and see if it has longevity. We will keep trying.

*Keith Sexson – KS* – One good, one ugly; dealing with invasive species issues, Asian carp increasing issue, especially silver carp, which are entertaining for people on Kansas River and dealing with transportation through collecting of bait. Hit hard this year at Bowersock Dam at Lawrence, at base of dam well meaning lady with a net was trying to help baby carp up the dam; brought to mind, transportation of bait; been before Commission 3 to 4 times. The dilemma is what options to use to allow people to collect bait, let them collect some, but not carp or none; still wrestling with some type of solution. Public recognizes problem, not ready to accept solution of no transporting, but need education efforts. Still have zebra mussels showing up in new impoundments. Frustrating to deal with and have any impact. Positive on public access to private lands, WIHA and FISH, received two \$1.5 million

dollar grants to bump up these programs. Governor, in his roadmap, has addressed tourism as way to increase our economy, enjoying natural resources, public access big part of this initiative, taken our model and trying to apply that to equestrian trails in Tall Grass Prairie; helped stabilize hunting and fishing license sales in state. Support from budget and public. No problem with private landowners coming to get into program, 97% private owned. *Pat Boddy* – Did Farm Bureau ever oppose? *Keith Sexson* – No, started out small. Whole range of options for people to access hunting and fishing, keeping this program, had hunters and fisherman step up to support. *Ollie Torgerson* – Any liability issues? *Keith Sexson* – No, relative to recreation, if entered into agreement, covered under state statute for liability, different if leasing to private individual. Had walk in hunting access (WIHA) program since 1995.

*KY* – Kentucky is absent, Jon Gassett had court depositions and Governor called, been engaged in this Association, sorry he couldn't be here.

*Roger Stokes, MI* – In six months, had a lot of teachable moments. For agency, three years ago discovered CWD in private cervid herd, put in baiting ban for 3-years, brought in scientists for three months, provided science to Commission and I was watching them and they weren't buying it. Told wildlife biologists we needed to come up with plan B, give them alternative. Not give up until sure they were not going to put ban back in place; plan B included some type of baiting. Ended up with compromise, two gallons spread over 10x10-foot area; continue baiting passed on 4-3 vote. Lesson learned; provide science when you can, but still need to be able to count votes. On personal note, when accepted job, took a vacation, should have spent that week and a half in Becky's office. Russ Mason put in wildlife conservation order to kill trumpeter swans destroying habitat and attacking kids and causing harm to waterfowl. Problem with that was we would not allow rehabbers to rehab them if brought to them. That issue was on Commission agenda, when it came up all hell broke loose. I was getting so many letters from parents and kids who wanted me to allow rehabbers, less than 40 birds per year. Ended up going to North American in Missouri and had dinner with Russ and USDA wildlife services, talked about how they liked to kill. Wanted to bring up sandhill crane season and I have three people watching him to make sure sandhill cranes don't come up. Added ban in TB area.

*MN* – Minnesota is absent, Ed Boggess couldn't be here.

*Bob Ziehmer, MO* – Lot going on; worked through CWD, white-nosed syndrome, and continued on with reintroduction programs. Now have smart phone in conservation officer's hands, working with public and went to e-permits. Continuing economic uncertainty; 11 percent reduction of staff, closing 13 offices and modifying services. Maintaining and staying a leader, but need self assessment. Took hard look at workforce and we built training program to charge into future. Budget is \$165 million annually, self assessment and challenges and what is stretch goal and outlined in law enforcement. Across department, know how much we are spending and how many staff are tied to it. Four major goals, 1) increase communication and education within and outside agency; 2) boldly advance research and management; 3) increase citizen involvement and partnerships; and 4) grow quality staff. Challenge is to stay national leader, truth hurts. Made better MO, better and stronger because of staff's willingness to move forward, candor is essential, but keep professional. Huge issues over last 12 months. *Ollie Torgerson* – Hard to change, for biologists and LE, to do what you did, did you bring outside people in or do it internally. *Bob Ziehmer* – In 18 months, new directors, two deputies, etc.; basically, internally, three issues in regulations, realty and capitals (technological side). If you are wearing triangle on your chest your job is conservation! Have a lot to learn, all about improving, status quo will kill us in future. *Rodney Stokes* – Where was biggest opposition to close offices? *Bob Ziehmer* – Go through legislative process, but Commission does regulations; toughest was internally.

*Roger Rostvet, ND* – Weather is topic in Great Plains, one of the things is flooding, and last three winters have been tough. One of things is deer management and depredation last couple of winters,

1,000 active sites working (complaints) because of increased deer populations. Education is good; doing good program, third year of tough winter. Have bi-annual legislature and have 30 complainers you can't work with, they get frustrated and start shooting deer, LE starts writing tickets; took to Supreme Court because lower court said they could kill deer when depredating. This legislative session had several bills. Wanted department to pay for deer depredation; got small group of people that get hold of media, as bills progressed, one ugly hearing on House side, 30 guys lined up to testify against department, lined up a few on our side, but they didn't want to listen. House Natural Resource chair called us in, tired of phone calls and wanted a solution. Big challenge was 30 of 1,000 left, give us something to work with and we will help you out. Put out list of what we do and decided to put that into law; still hadn't addressed how to settle with small group of problem people. Have Game and Fish Advisory Board, four fish and wildlife people and four farmers. Decided on Ag Mediation Services, created when banks were foreclosing on farms in the 1980s; wonderful track record, never had a failure. Gave to subcommittee and he went through it, went into list and put the ones he liked into a bill and introduced as an amendment and it flew through, could appeal to Ag Mediation Services. Department will do what they are already doing, but there is someone independent to go to and lay out case to make recommendations. Turned out fairly well; they need an outlet. *Ollie Torgerson* – Was policy in law? *Roger Rostvet* – It will expend money on deer depredation and codified what we were doing.

*Rex Amack, NE* – Floods have taken over headlines, but hope it is momentary. *Introduced two members of Commission, Chairman Mick Jenson from Blair, NE; and past chair Jerrod Burke from Curtis, NE.* We can come together as an Association and address them as a group. Went through this last year, need Commission and legislative support. Governor announced \$700 million to \$1 billion short in budget. Governor thought 10 percent reduction in March 2010, talked about what Bob talked about, how we do business and if we can do it more efficiently; developed Administrative Internal Committee and internal process to do that. First email was from Ollie, we will survive in the end. We have two constituents, public and close constituents; are government run by special interests groups, that is what we are. Represent sport hunting and fishing, but when we deal with it, internal public is more difficult to work with. Our new chief of wildlife is Tim McCoy, Jim Douglas recently was promoted to Deputy Director, had three assistant directors now only one Deputy Director. Started in March 2010 with reorganization, expected to finish in 2012, 2013 or 2014, Commissioner Jenson wanted draft in May. Did all internally, only external was people we contacted. Gave opportunity, knew Governor wanted 10 percent reduction, built budget with reduction in it, which was not popular with other directors. Submitted budget with two major things, privatized food service at Mahoney State Park, reduced number of assistant directors, had six regions, or districts, and reduced to four, so now only four managers so eight went to different things, no pink slips, filled retiring jobs, etc. Trying to integrate work force; started with agency in 1967, by integration, hard to get people to do conservation like Bob said, thought law enforcement (LE) could help do fun things like shocking and netting and they are the most supportive now. Open fields and streams, officers know landowners, public loves it, landowners love it. Developed budget we would end up with anyway, didn't mobilize constituents. Have to keep molding ourselves to what economy and retaining and attracting people to our park lands, moves smoother if executive people are onboard. We are tied with a \$25 state park entrance. Have unicameral system, 49 members; takes 42 votes to override Governor for park fee increase. Huge endorsement of Game and Fish department, never happen if had not handed in budget the legislature wanted. *Ollie Torgerson* – Bought credibility up front. *Rex Amack* – We earned it.

*Dave Lane, OH* – In fifth week. Dealing with legislators, bills come up that are going to affect what you love. One issue that came up was drilling on wildlife areas. Division of Wildlife in Ohio funding is stable, but parks are having problem. Partnerships, without USFWS and other conservation organizations, even if bills are not perfect, without partnerships with constituent base, language in bills

can be detrimental, need to build partnerships. None of us are an island and will need help down the road. *Ollie Torgerson* – Association is all about partnerships, develop relationships with each other through these meetings, can't build relationships through teleconferences.

*Jeff Vonk, SD* – Habitat, used conservation reserve program to provide good grassland for game birds and other species. CRP declining in acres and effected ability to keep good pheasant population on the ground; down 40 percent, down to one million acres and see more declines. One effort to mediate that is conservation reserve enhancement, 25 percent of cost of program, we used game fund dollars, kicker was anyone signs up had to open land for hunting, targeted eastern part of state, James River Valley, goal is 100,000 acres; close to 60,000 acres enrolled. Very successful, confident we will reach 100,000-acre goal. Challenge with large predators, mountain lions is our problem, actively attempting to manage in Black Hills, tremendous amount of research through University system and staff for 10-12 years now; 10- to 30-percent had radio collar. We have experienced drought, not last couple of years, but previous seven or eight. Have too many elk and deer and adjusted our harvest for does to provide balance to what resource would support. Gotten lot of publicity, believe reduction in game due to mountain lions. At Custer State Park, can hunt deer and elk, but not mountain lions. Down to 200 elk there. Brought in helicopter and bringing in cow elk, put transmitter in cervix so when calves born we can go right out and collar calves, have collared 40, already six killed by mountain lions, not alarming, but could have a kill order on my desk in next few weeks to kill mountain lions. Have lot of waters, tremendous fishery near Pierre, no impact on fishery, but people cancelling trips because they believe it is impacted; only problem is right below the dam.

*Scott Gunderson, WI* – Issue with wolves and in MI and MN, had conference call trying to work together, different tact than in the past; 850 wolves in WI, most in history of state, have bear issues also. When new administration came in, went from democrat to republican and looking at two former legislators. Had a meeting at central office in Madison the first part of the year and started traveling around the state to all five regions. Need employee buy-in, they are our life blood; asked for ideas for good changes to move forward. Had hundreds of emails, most good, some interesting, but some let us have it. With all of these ideas put together, hope to run better and more efficiently. New charter agency, talking with Governor's office, staff and administrators, not out in public yet, had leadership meeting offsite. One document became public, upset because we didn't know where it came from and we were not ready for public knowledge; caused anger from three on top and administrators. Employees are really upset because they don't know what is going on. When you Google, Iowa comes up, "charter schools – expect privatization", media jumped on it, not everything was spelled out in the document. Did live town hall meetings with our staff in a couple of days, allowed them to ask questions and changed whole attitude in one hour from negative towards administration to their ideas were part of the change. Now Enterprise agency, "charter" is gone. Not totally done, possibly have role out soon; will give us flexibility in hiring, vehicle fleet and a lot of different things and we are incorporating ideas from employees. The lesson is to be open and honest with staff. *Ollie Torgerson* – I am located in WI and listened to statewide meeting, openness is the key to acceptance. Went from 2,200 employees to 3,300 ten years ago, important to touch those folks. Been out second time to regions and done two town hall meetings and Secretary has done four video messages. It pays dividends.

*Pat Boddy* – Before you leave, I want to introduce Chuck Corell, he comes from regulatory background, law enforcement and biologist. He will be your new President.

*Break - Sponsored by DJ Case & Associates*

### **White Nose Syndrome in Bats**

**Mark Reiter, IN** – One day Jon Gassett’s assistant called me and asked me to do this update (*Exhibit 6*). The bad news is 16 states and 4 provinces confirmed with this disease. National plan released in May, to create organization, but no plan was written. Plan can be found on website. Jon Gassett and Wendy Weber are co-chairs and I represent MAFWA on Executive Committee and Erin Crane represents us on Steering Committee. Closing caves to prevent human movement seems to be the thought. There is \$3- to \$54-billion connected to this topic. The USFWS website <http://www.fws.gov/whitenosesyndrome/> will give you all of the information you need.

### **National Bobwhite Conservation Initiative (NBCI)**

**Joe Kramer, MAFWA Director Representative on NBCI** – Appreciate opportunity to give brief update (*Exhibit 7*). Jon Gassett chairs NBCI and I represent MAFWA on the board representing the Midwest. Don McKenzie is Executive Director and wants everyone updated. A complete overhaul of the original 2002 NBCI was completed and unveiled at the North American Wildlife Conference in Kansas City, Missouri in March 2011. The NBCI 2.0 involves 25 states, including 8 MAFWA states and engaged more than 600 biologists, to rank the entire landscape into high/medium/low potential for bobwhite restoration. NBCI 2.0 step-down plans are in development in Kansas, Missouri and other states. Because of expansion, first ever technical committee met in Wichita in August 2010 and Kansas will host Midwest directors next year. Had about 100 scientists at first bobwhite conference, but as most good conservation organizations it needs an arm or technical committee; those who put things on the ground. Jim Pitman has been appointed and is currently serving as MAFWA representative on that technical committee and does excellent work for us and Kansas. August 9, 2011, the National Bobwhite Technical Committee (NBTC) will hold a meeting in Tallahassee Florida. We have to be involved in Farm Bill activities, have a “natives first” policy proposal in CRP is being proposed wherever feasible; also making progress on center pivot corners. Quail VII is being hosted by Arizona Game and Fish and will be the seventh annual symposium scheduled for January 2012 in Tucson. Also, covering some other NBCI services and activities; we are trying to get quail back on the ground in most of the states. NBCI members are: Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, Nebraska, and Ohio; and pledged states Illinois and Indiana. We would like to get Colorado, Michigan, South Dakota and Wisconsin also. Don McKenzie wants to make sure states that are interested in quail that NBTC is for the states, a machine waiting to help who will do quail management. We will post Kansas 2012 for director workshop with Don McKenzie. There is a resolution that asks for reaffirmation of NBCI 2.0.

**Jeff Vonk, SD** – Effort behind this next topic was to bring energy wind/wildlife community together for more positive development of wind farms. It has been an effort I have been involved in as AFWA representative. Effort has had its starts and stops, but entities involved are committed to make it work. Fortunate to have Abby step forward as Executive Director, Abby lived in Alaska for 10 years and appreciates wildlife and the natural world, and spent past 20 years as mediator for energy and water fields. From 2008-2010 in Wildlife Working Group as facilitator; and Keith Sexson represented AFWA on the Wind Turbine Group.

### **American Wind Wildlife Institute**

**Abby Arnold, Executive Director** – (*PowerPoint – Exhibit 8; handout – Exhibit 9*). Most of you are dealing with wind energy and the interaction with wildlife. MAFWA is different than AFWA and it is a goal of mine to get to know you better and plan to stay for the whole meeting next time. The purpose of the American Wild/Wildlife Institute (AWWI) is to establish a unique collaboration of wind

industry, nonprofit and state agency leaders in a shared mission to facilitate timely and responsible development of wind energy while protecting wildlife and wildlife habitat. We have approximately 26 sustaining partners and friends as well as individuals who act as our Board of Directors, people who represent wind energy, states and NGOs. Part of the challenge is to crystallize what is going to be an issue and debate it. Our goal is to increase high-quality science which will reduce uncertainty and guide the best decision-making about difficult siting issues. The three main initiatives are: research, landscape assessment and mitigation strategy. Development of that collaboration is worked through step by step, takes time and resources. Education is the main thrust to take what we learn and share it. Our initiatives are: 1) the Landscape Assessment Tool (LAT) which was developed in partnership with The Nature Conservancy to provide preliminary wind-wildlife sensitivity screening. Hope to assess current state of mapping tools to evaluate strengths, challenges and gaps; and enhance functionality, working with Western Governors Association and developing pilots to improve and expand data layers encouraging consolidation of tools rather than proliferation. Planned LAT enhancements are to: update wind data; integrate additional conservation data layers like designated critical habitat and state species of concern; improve functionality to allow over-laying of custom project areas and individual, custom reporting. 2) Establish a comprehensive peer-reviewed research agenda; answer priority questions; identify future challenges; and build structure that engages experts in research and evaluation. Taber Allison's job is to build research. Each group is chaired by partners. Goal is to identify research needed. There are 5-10 gig watts (GW) of wind potential in each of your states. Trying to get research question, not laundry list, and figure out best way to answer it. Building instruction that engages experts. Set criteria for ourselves that emphasizes near term results to inform decision-making and regulation; applies across a broad geographic range or addresses a critical issue; leverages existing data (AWWI Research Information System); lays the groundwork to address long-term research questions; offers distinctive AWWI role; and attracts funding from public and private sectors. Priorities (Jeff Vonk is involved in several other groups): comprehensive, centralized database; focusing Golden Eagle understanding; and other projects that meet AWWI Research Plan criteria. 3) The Research Information System (RIS) is a pilot model for how gathering data from files of wind companies, put in this database and analyze it. This is \$120 million worth of studies we can get access to; working on confidentiality issue. I have been involved with this issue for 20 years. There has been a lot in press about impacts on wildlife; have good information on some, not great on others and need to document if that is right or not. Get information so you can make informed decisions. Hope to be in middle of pilot model by end of year to start putting in database and have analysis done by end of next year. RIS task force is guiding us on this. The goal is to integrate with RIS and be a resource for good information. The RIS will offer standardization, provide comprehensive data collection and documentation of impacts; and LAT provides viewing lens and platform to graphically depict analysis, combining species distribution models with wind energy impacts. The goal is to apply what we already know and evolve from 'impact' analysis to accurate predictions of project risk assessment. 4) Contracted mitigation and compensation (report on website); met with USFWS, informal conversations on helping develop the golden and bald eagles protection act. Manager for habitat species plan for USFWS is working on that. Another example as federal advisory committee, working on next steps, now AWWI is a resource, a place for people to develop relationship in constructive way. Our funds have come from wind industry; with partners my goal is to get foundation and other funds and get government funds; need that to get credibility. Now trying to raise funds and responding to potential funding. We know money is tight, but we need partners like MAFWA and AFWA, just with wind/wildlife, let's do some joint fundraising. Hired Stacy to help us with this; I work half time, got director of research and development director. We have a lot of goals and big vision and fabulous board and partner organizations. Get involved in AWWI by offering input, ideas, and insights to build a strong and vital collaboration; and participate by providing field expertise and data for design

of AWWI tools; and help get the word out about AWWI to other stakeholders and partners. Contact: Abby Arnold, Executive Director at [AArnold@awwi.org](mailto:AArnold@awwi.org) 202-535-7800; or Taber Allison, PhD. Director of Research and Evaluation at [TAllison@awwi.org](mailto:TAllison@awwi.org) 978-287-0977. *Roger Lande, IA* – I get the impression that the opinion is that wind generating windmills can be a problem for birds? Is there anything more you can add to base knowledge? *Abby Arnold* - Others in this room like Keith and Jeff who have been looking at these issues. Depends on habitat, geography and elevation, bats is a real question. There are a lot of statistics. Keith has sat through 2 ½ years on the board. Only one or two sites, like Altamont Pass, which is a unique situation. I don't have specific information with me but would be happy to get it. *Keith Sexson, KS* – Information that was used was based on peer review literature. Used a couple of different angles like direct mortality, but there are greater impacts in terms of landscape changes that occur from wind generating facilities; there is fragmentation of habitat and there is no good base of information. Spent a lot of time on prairie grouse and avoidance of towers, but there is a lot more to be learned about impacts. One thing was that industry, for the most part, wants to come to the table to discuss with conservation agencies and wants to make it a priority. Have made headway, if come and talk to us in early stages we can talk about the issues. Industry has been open to what they do on the landscape and moving individual towers if it comes to that. Communication is important. The other thing in states is they want some type of guidelines, have been waiting for final outcome of three-year effort that USFWS will put together to adjust guidelines to fit their needs. Got a model put together by NGOs, state agencies and other entities. If your Governor is interested in responsible development, looking for strategic placement of wind generating facilities and minimizing or avoid impacts on wildlife that helps. Transmission is the number one issue in impacts on wildlife; goes hand-in-hand. Work with transmission industry, who is completely separate, then we think industry will follow. Each state has unique issues. Playa lakes is a big issue now, industry embraced that and asked what they could do to minimize impact. They have a great interest in working with state agencies to do the right thing.

*Awards Luncheon* – Sponsored by Archery Trade Association (Nominations – Exhibit 10). **Keith Sexson, Awards Committee Chairman, Facilitator** – Introduced award winners and presented awards to state representative if winners were not present. Nominations can be found in the proceedings after the meeting.

Law Enforcement Officer of the Year – Ted Dremel, Wisconsin, accepted by Scott Gunderson

Wildlife Biologist of the Year – Lloyd Fox, Kansas, accepted by Joe Kramer

Fisheries Biologist of the Year – Tommie Berger, Kansas, accepted by Joe Kramer

Spirit of the Shack – Gus Raeker, Missouri, accepted by Bob Ziehmer

Sagamore:

Rich Leopold, Iowa

Becky Humphries, Michigan

Dave Graham, Ohio, accepted by Dave Lane

Scott Hassett, Wisconsin, accepted by Scott Gunderson

John Hoskins, Missouri, accepted by Bob Ziehmer

Dave Schad, Minnesota, no one present

Jeff Ver Steeg, Colorado, no one present

Dan Zekor, Missouri, accepted by Bob Ziehmer

Awards presented by Pat Boddy, Iowa:

President's Award – National Archery in the Schools Program, accepted by Tom Bennett

Special Recognition Award – Iowa Water and Land Legacy, accepted by Mark Langgin

## CLEAN LAKES PROGRAM

### History and Success of 314 Funds

**Mike McGhee, Iowa DNR Lakes Program and Board Member of NALMS** – For first session have Don Bonneau talk about 319 and where 314 has been; follow up with Mark Hoyer, University of Florida; then I will follow up. Second part of session will be Chris Horton and Maureen Gallagher. Trying to move these programs along, wrote letters but they didn't go anywhere. Try to move forward with action plan.

**Don Bonneau, Retired Iowa DNR Fisheries Research and former NALMS Board Member (PowerPoint - Exhibit 11)** – Honor to speak to you as a retired biologist; Joe asked me to do this. Background on 314, I will give Iowa experience. In mid 1970s, to make us relevant to our constituents, the fisherman, we were finding we had to explain why fishing wasn't getting better and it was because we didn't have relevance because lakes were not responding. Clean water act was passed because people tired of what was happening to their water. One section, 314, made sense to us, wrote in early 1970s, as fish people trying to manage fish in lakes with farmers and cities above it. Lakes have economic purpose as swimmable and fishable and that act said some of that. We went to Governor and told him it would fit into the program, he did sign it to fish and wildlife. It said EPA would help with 70 percent of cost, but we didn't have topographic maps to assess them or watersheds. The basic outline was there and then we had to list lakes and prioritize to restore to swimmable and fishable. When out to communities, too much good stuff coming off the land, but in one acre we can produce 400-500 pounds of game fish. Took funds and did that and restored 20 lakes, Clear Lake is a \$20 million project. Worked on urban and wetland areas under Section 314, can't think of anything you can't do, but they are competitive grants so we did economic assessments. Don't have Crater Lake or Lake Powell, but have a lot of small lakes in Iowa. Provide opportunities close to home; do it right and increase use of lake in magnitudes of five and six. Section 314 rolled over into 319. Iowa legislature has \$3-\$10 million appropriated, folks have a problem, everybody wants their lake restored and not all of them can be, but will figure that out in assessment. Did go to Missouri and Nebraska as they are working on theirs; several of us belong to NALMS. There is money for watersheds, but no money for lakes because they didn't have you folks on board. Wetlands produce ducks and have shallow lakes component, idea is to get them swimmable and fishable. Clean water is at hearts of people; if you could relate pheasants to clean water, you could get funding, but have to relate people to the clean lakes. If you want recruitment and retention, it is in urban areas and you need to fix those lakes. Not talking about just Iowa, but talking about lacking issue. This section needs to be reauthorized and we need your involvement.

**Mark Hoyer, University of Florida** – First time at this meeting, have degree from Iowa State, and Masters in Missouri so am familiar with Midwest and I helped graduate students get help with my project. (PowerPoint – Exhibit 12). I will talk about lake management and funding sources 319 and 314. I am NALMS upcoming past president and one of my goals was to get fisheries aspects in NALMS and last year in Oklahoma had a presentation. Need more working together; dollar value is great enough to put money in. There is a website available with questions and answers <http://water.epa.gov/polwaste>. Section 319 is nonpoint source program funded since 1990; it can be used for: nonregulatory or regulatory programs for enforcement, technical assistance, financial assistance, education, training, technology transfer, demonstration projects, and monitory to assess the success of specific NPS implemented projects; most notably controls in watersheds and to monitor the effectiveness of such controls. It can't be used for harvesting aquatic vegetation, chemical treatment, operating or maintaining

lake aeration devices or providing similar palliative methods and procedures such as dredging except where pollution in the lake watershed has been controlled and where methods and procedures are necessary during project period. Funded 1972 to 1994 (314) and reauthorized in 2000 without funding. It was in three phases: feasibility and diagnostics; restoration and protection; and monitoring. Know lot of people in EPA, not a lot of support to refund 314. In 319, caveat in the end was 5% for eligible activities similar to 314. Discuss watershed issue or use for lakes. Nine elements needed to get 319 funded. For instance lake in Indiana has huge population of common carp, able to get 319 money to do rotenone to get restoration of lake. Talking about average of \$7 million/year since 1976. Nationwide not a lot of money, but great seed money. Funding for 319 money since 1990, around \$200 million (not including 2010), about \$2 million per state. Shortage of money out there for things we need to do. Current 319 is 2 percent of EPA's budget. In lake management example, Lake Tohopekaliga in Florida (showed graph from 1942 to 2002); did feasibility study, drew down lake, moved mud which cost \$6.5 million. Lot of people are fighting for that money, we need a bigger pie. Section 319 money appropriated in Florida is about \$7.5 million/year which was used to write Florida Lake Watch, avoided big cuts this year; mentioned nine levels to get funding approval, 62 projects in 2010, only 22 accepted. Florida DEP used to hire people to do bioassessments, I don't think it should be used for positions, but not many management programs; good projects at Lake Jessup and Lake Worth. Need to move forward, have standing committee, need to get NALMS more motivated to get that money. Show to state and federal legislators the actual value of lakes, how many millions of dollars spent; how we do it and who is going to do the work. Here in Iowa survey was done, great presentation on economics was done. Map showed great map of lakes studied. Need to show what people think and how much lake is worth. In mission statements of NALMS, AFS and APMS, and there is not a lot of overlap; need to get groups together like Mark Langgin spoke about last night. With your help MAFWA is another group we could add. Shortage of money in every state; manage lakes, get more creative, develop comprehensive plans and leverage money. Get stakeholders together in one room. Make sure you find all of the players to not get blocked at the end. *Gildo Tori, DU – You said 314 was reauthorized in 2000? Mark Hoyer – It is open, but there is no money in it.*

### **Iowa Highlight – Lake Restoration Successes**

***Mike McGhee, Iowa DNR Lakes Program and Board Member of NALMS*** – Lake restoration in Iowa (*PowerPoint – Exhibit 13*). – There are 131 significant public lakes, 90 constructed; 25 natural, nine surface mines; six oxbows and one COE reservoir in Iowa. How do you define significant publically-owned lakes: maintained for public use, capable of supporting multiple benefits, surface acre of at least 10 acres, and watershed to lake surface of not less than 200 to 1. The Center for Rural and Ag Development <http://www.card.iastate.edu/lake> did a survey and six of ten Iowan's visit our lakes multiple times a year. Recent survey (2002-2005) on the value of lakes was updated in 2009, showing number of household trips had increased by 30 percent, water quality equals improvement efforts and recreational spending increased by \$397 million dollars. Primary problems facing Iowa lakes are eroding land equals more potential for phosphorus input and sediment deposits. Des Moines lobe is where glacial lakes are and lands are: 60 percent crops, 30 percent grassland, 7 percent forest, 1 percent water, 1 percent urban and 1 percent other. Prioritized significant public lakes using water quality, public benefit and feasibility of restoration; adopted plan for legislature in 2006, under gun to do something about water quality; had research for 5 years, had 6 hours to put together white paper, came up with 35 priority lakes. Have lake and watershed assessment, can be contracted out; watershed controls in place before restoration begins; propose dredging to achieve water quality, so look at shallow lake management options. At 10 feet and larger, noticeable water quality (for dredging) or use shallow lake goals. Cost effective, get money back in 2-5 years, historically, but guilty of not getting community

involvement. Majority of constructed lakes don't have private ownership, state has land around lakes. Water clarity is significant at 4.5 ft 50 percent of the time from April to September, beaches meet recreational use standards, healthy lake system and lakes are removed from impaired waters list. Community based planning is important, work with local stakeholders and let the people identify goals because it is their lake. Equate to dog owners, you can yell at it, but you don't like someone else to yell at it or tell you it is no good. Lakes have potential and not related equally. May not be best lake, but maximize potential and make your lake best it can be. Identify concerns, build support and create goals; inventory secure support and funding and gather data and analyze problems; and investigate (sometimes groups are 180 percent apart) explore and evaluate solutions, present findings at public meetings, create watershed management plan and select alternatives and solutions. And finally, implement the plan by putting it into action, evaluate the project and share the successes. In 2007, got \$9 million and varying levels of funding since; in 2012 hope to get \$8.6 million. Invested \$50 million in state money, \$30 million from partners, but need federal dollars. Need to slow down and mitigate damage of agriculture and land-use. Have 8 projects completed and in maintenance phase; 26 projects underway; 13 projects in planning or initial outreach phase. On DNR webpage have lake restoration site. We are running our program with two people, George and I; and 25 percent of fisheries biologists' time is dedicated to lake restoration, we are working together as a unit. Have to have plan in place to spend money. *Roger Lande, IA* – Describe before and after on shallow lake projects? *Mike McGhee* – Lizard Lake was intensively row cropped, only lake in 25 miles of this town, spent 40 years trying to improve the lake; had maximum depth of 7 feet and mean depth of 4 feet; Iowa State did a study on that lake, it will cost \$150,000 and we asked them to come up with \$30,000 and they did. Told them they would have to look at University's proposal. Also, needed to look at what we can afford and dredging would be very expensive, fought about this for 40 years and we suggested shallow water lakes management, new control structure, drained lake will let it sit for 1½ years, aggressive stocking with yellow perch and northern pike and will do periodic checks. Did contracting with NGO; had winter kill at lake and a void in the lake and had yellow perch, and explained that this happened, but won't last. Have number of shallow lakes, (between watershed and lake, call them tweeners) all have fish and good duck hunting. Turned into a positive for us. *Unknown person* – What other local equipment did you use, other than cash? *Mike McGhee* – Address 45% of water quality by homeowner education in watershed. Some homeowners may not work with DNR but locals in working group may be better. *Roger Rostvet* – How much state general fund did you use? *Mike McGhee* – No money from wildlife fee fund, occasionally used DJ or fish stamp money. Worked closely with parks, adjusted budget and upgraded campground at same time lake is empty to get ready for opening lake again. Don't have large numbers of lakes, but passionate Friends groups and they make legislative contacts. It is satisfying and challenging work. Goes beyond lake restoration it establishes relationships not only about lake, but with department.

*Break - Sponsored by Pheasants Forever*

## **PANEL DISCUSSION**

***Maureen Gallagher, USFWS Region 3 Coordinator, National Fish Habitat Action Plan, located in NW Missouri (PowerPoint maps – Exhibit 14, Action Plan – Exhibit 15)*** – Extend responsibility to five areas, 16 partnerships and 17<sup>th</sup> is Reservoir FHP that Jeff will be talking about. Tremendous amount of overlap, particularly in Midwest, but goal is to put habitat conservation on the ground. Talk about national goals. Provided you all a copy, is up for revision right now. Work with Great Lakes Basin and Missouri River Basin, on five partnerships. Created Ad Hoc committee of all fish

chiefs and meet by phone and once a year in person. There are multiple partnerships in states simultaneously and we developed science advisory network that supports individual fish habitat partnerships to also help guide to provide consistency. Received multistate grant in 2010, leveraged through Prairie Plains and Potholes; three models were developed and have gone through review process. In next 8-9 months all models will be completed to target where we want to do activities.

**Jeff Boxrucker, Coordinator for the Reservoir Fish Habitat Partnership** (*Newsletter - Exhibit 16*) – Spent career in Oklahoma, native of Wisconsin, boys live in Ohio. – Brought copies of reservoir partnerships newsletters. As part of quarterly issues, highlight aquatic habitat program in each issue and an individual lake project, Lake Havasu in Arizona. We won't deal much with body of plan, but new objectives in next 5 years. Change in focus from original. Funding comes up first, need to focus on sharing resources, staff and understanding. Get hold of existing funds, put together suite of funding programs, I have that available, but is not complete. Make directors and senior staff know what is available. Focus on rewrite on outreach to state partners, an oversight of last few years. Need to have economic assessment of efforts; Iowa did a wonderful job on lake restoration return, critical if going to get federal support. Reservoir partnership, late getting to table, until fish chiefs stamped feet loud enough. One advantage reservoir partnership has is we can really garner support of angler. Took awhile for fish biologists to get message, but now they are taking it to the public. We have established a Friends of Reservoirs (FOR) 501(c)(3) partnership and are ready to go; starting to solicit funding, totally non-federal, so states can use it. Continue to use Bass Pro Shops to support the partnership. Four levels of membership to foundation: individual; chapter (sportsmen club level); lake associations or watershed groups (system-based approach); and industry. Most habitat problems stem from watershed problems. There are also two levels of affiliate memberships: one for individuals (using PayPal) and one for organizations using corporate sponsorships. There will be a website available soon at [www.waterhabitatlife.org](http://www.waterhabitatlife.org)

**Chris Horton, Midwestern States Director of Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation** – worked with BASS. Don educated me on 314 funding. Community involvement is so important. Went away in 1994, got me excited about getting it restored. After last lake reports EPA contacted me, realize we still have a lot of lakes in peril wanted help from BASS clubs to educate the public. Told him we would help get 314 restored. Asked him for new appropriation and we never heard from them again. Best answer we have gotten is “we will look into it”. Everybody is in dire budget constraints. No new appropriations with this Congress so that is the reality. With EPA and 314B could get it to work if we keep working on them. We have data to do it but getting to the right people to recognize it. At action plan, on board, different because act of Congress we have to get passed. Important to get bill passed. Local cooperative partnerships have been developed. No new appropriations, all conservation funding is in jeopardy. Dig in heels and get conservation dollars. It will take individual state involvement. Get with members on the Hill and bring NGO representatives. In dire straits, protect what we have. Started out as fisheries biologist and will always be a fish and wildlife guy.

**Mike McGhee** – Called for questions. How can MAFWA help us, any ideas? **Maureen Gallagher** – Talked about 314 and it is important, but have a lot of programs on the chopping blocks. Look at it as a package - how do we do this for many programs and maintain until we get out of budget situation. Suggestion is Ad Hoc group of fish chiefs and we try to deal with loftier issues; 2011 was going to be the year for outreach and we have been doing that. Could we solidify that group into your committees to bring before groups. **Jeff Vonk, SD** – Seems like a couple of fundamental points and ways to approach this. Money not going to flow just because we think it is a good idea. There is a template out there to do

return on investment to take back to your directors in terms of values of what investments have been. Education of sportsmen, who fishes and boats and outreach to them to let them know what is lost. There is value in having some regional and national ideas. *Jeff Boxrucker* – Short answer, no template, some economists and social scientists on first rewrite call. Look at Iowa for ideas. Could be something of value that NFHAP could provide. *Pat Boddy, IA* – Capitalize on water quality message like we have in IA. How are elected officials really supposed to know where to put their eggs? Talk about water quality and then list programs that lead to water quality and how interested our partners are. Get message out. MAFWA could pass resolution, water quality in the Midwest and create marketing strategy around that. *Chris Horton* – Talk about healthy waters; that always resonates. On 314B don't even waste your time even going to them, heard from partners already. Obviously some of those communications it doesn't hurt to copy to some Congressional members. *Maureen Gallagher* – Fish habitat partnerships are ones who know where fish habitat restoration needs to be done. Need to get messages to the people who make the decisions to align resources to targets where we need to do habitat restoration. Have opportunity to engage federal caucus but need specifics from all partners. *Roger Lande, IA* – Message from Pat, name of campaign to get constitutional funding, flying under a theme of “pure water”, water is more important than oil and has a capture in the public eye. Fly under umbrella of clean water which has big appeal. *Jeff Boxrucker* – Agree, water quality is number one issue, but my department wasn't responsible for the water. *Bob Ziehmer, MO* – Look at Missouri, all of us around table have priorities, everybody on panel should get with agencies. On federal documents, 40% of state is priority and too big of bite to take at one time. Developing best of best, 36 month bite and then another 36 month bite, no acronyms, come up with something people can understand. What you are talking about is important, but from state perspective can't do it all at once. What has effort on communication been to this point? What feedback and what doing to fix that? *Maureen Gallagher* – Midwest Fish Habitat partnerships work individually, did survey last year to find out how we were doing and how messages were getting across. Got some feedback on how we can improve communications. Great at communicating at fish chief level but don't know if communication to director is occurring. With roll-out of fish habitat assessment used to increase communications, putting together a communication plan. Developing webpage, one page fact sheets, etc. (something we can hand out). Also, have a plan for travel resources, to have sit down meetings and identifying different agencies and priorities you already have. How can we use that, get closer to best of the best and narrow down focus. *Jeff Boxrucker* – Marginal outreach efforts. In Midwest, Doug Nygren serves on steering committee; work group has other state representation. It is a real challenge, prepared slide presentations for staff to use. I would like to see NIFHP document what dollars are available for fish habitat work. Will cross paths with other groups doing the same thing, need to do outreach that is needed. *Chris Horton* – Outreach is something we struggle with. It is difficult to write about anything conservation; have to have some sort of success story; and difficult to get to average angler. *Mike McGhee* – Hearing same thing. Is there action steps or committee that needs to be developed? Contact EPA or look at all conservation programs. *Jeff Vonk, SD* – Have fish chiefs engaged and mine could carry any message forward. *Bob Ziehmer, MO* – Agree with Jeff's statement. Encourage panel to not assume message is getting out. What is the one bullet you would leave us with to make us go out and talk about it? Challenge the fish chief's with that. *Jeff Vonk, SD* – In my state make decisions on priority system, nothing will happen in South Dakota unless my fish chief comes back and says this is a priority because frankly I don't know. *Keith Sexson, KS* – From Kansas standpoint I agree, we rely on them. *Rodney Stokes, MI* – Getting opposition from anglers who are opposed to fish hatcheries supplying fish and taking money from them. *Roger Rostvet, ND* – Not sure how other states are set up with water resource boards, but North Dakota has one. Need to involve state water commissions, municipal water supplies. Need to formulate some way to get them involved, don't rely on fisherman dollars and DJ monies. Looking at going after other agencies that have responsibilities to state resources.

*Jeff Vonk, SD* – Several states combined. Umbrella talking point ought to be water. *Jeff Boxrucker* – Fish and Game doesn't control the water. Hoping reservoir partnerships will bring municipalities who will bring water controlling agencies to the table. There is a long history of not getting along, need push from another direction. Have a plan to do that but it is an untested plan. *Mike McGhee* – I will work with Joe and get him to get letter out to fish chiefs.

### MAFWA COMMITTEE REPORTS

*Ollie Torgerson, MAFWA Executive Secretary, Facilitator* – Need to vote on action items as presented.

Furbearers (Exhibit 17) *Joe Kramer, KS* – Put on by Wisconsin at Crex Meadows Education Center. Were 28 participants from 10 states. If you look at executive summary it was a busy three-day meeting. Allison Thomas gave us a presentation on visitation. Numerous speakers presented information on issues relative to furbearer research and management. Professional presentations were given on the following topics: Marten research in northern Wisconsin and northern Minnesota; Fisher research in northern Minnesota; River otter management in Kansas; Bobcat management in northern Wisconsin; Bobcat research in southern Wisconsin; Bobcat genetic research in Ohio; Cougar management in North Dakota and Missouri; Best Management Practices for Trapping in the United States; Scat Detector Dogs and Genetic Analysis of Lions in Northwest Nebraska; Trapper Education in Kentucky; Citizen Science and Endangered Marten in Wisconsin; and Furbearer Management on the Upper Mississippi River National Wildlife and Fish Refuge. Also, shared Aldo Leopold's "Green Fire" documentary film. Kansas passed first river otter season with no opposition. Forums such as the Midwest Furbearer Workshop provide valuable opportunities for state furbearer biologists to become acquainted with emerging issues and exchange information and ideas related to furbearer research and management. The need for state fish and wildlife agencies to establish and maintain furbearer biologist positions and support travel of furbearer biologists to the annual Midwest Furbearer Resources Workshop is imperative for exchanging information to promote quality furbearer management and research in each state. Director Action Items: 1) 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. (Tied to #2 support and funding) 2) The Midwest Furbearer Working Group, with the aid of Bryant White, AFWA, has developed and supported a resolution on continued funding for science-based trap research in the United States. *Ollie Torgerson* – **Put into resolution for adoption which will be reported on Wednesday at business meeting.** 3) The Midwest Furbearer Working Group requests continued support and funding for furbearer management and research positions. Increased involvement by several components of today's society has increased the need to carefully manage species and habitat in addition to sharing our knowledge and information with other organizations, agencies, and the public (**no vote required**). Director Information Items: 1) Actions taken at the CITES Conference of the Parties in 2010 resulted in no action on a global scale relative to transfer of bobcat from Appendix II to Appendix III. This prompted an AFWA letter to the Department of the Interior requesting that they implement the joint recommendation stemming from the work of an AFWA/USFWS work group to eliminate the existing physical tagging requirement for river otter and bobcat. Meetings were held in August of 2010 and January of 2011 at the NTA Annual Rendezvous and the AFWA Trap Research Group, respectively. Representatives of the USFWS, AFWA, states, national trapper organizations, and the fur industry were present. Although various alternatives were suggested little to nothing has happened to date. Gordon Batcheller, Director of Fish and Game for the New York

Division of Fish, Wildlife & Marine Resources and past chair of the Trap Research Group, continues to lead the discussion with the Service and a CITES sub-committee of the Trap Research Group. 2) The Midwest Furbearer Working Group thanks state Directors for their continued support of travel of state furbearer biologists to the annual Midwest Furbearer Resources Workshop. With tight budgets and restricted travel this annual workshop continues to be a critical component of sound resource management in the Midwest. Annual meetings allow for an open, thorough exchange of information and knowledge resulting in efficient, effective, and sound management of these unique species. Time and place for next meeting is Missouri, 2012 in early May in a remote location.

Law Enforcement – *Ollie Torgerson* – Strong law enforcement committee (AMFGLEO), 28 states, but has not been able to meeting during the past couple of years because of travel restrictions. They will meet with us in Kansas next year.

Private Lands (Exhibit 18) – *Kelly Smith, IA DNR* - Keith Sexson is director/liason. The 20th annual meeting of the Midwest Private Lands Working Group and the annual meeting of the Midwest Public Lands Working Group convened in Decorah, Iowa on May 1-4, 2011. The Private Lands Working Group meeting covered the following topics: Private Lands Program tracking systems, Midwest wetland and tile drainage, Farm Bill program updates, conservation compliance, sodsaver, Midwest priorities for the 2012 Farm Bill, and Federal Budget Priorities. The committees will meet May 6-9 in Kansas next year. No location yet. Director Action Items: Private Lands Working Groups – 1) Midwest wetland and tile drainage: The committee discussed its concern with the volume of NRCS wetland determination requests in the Dakotas. Encourage you to look at letter and submit the letter to Director of Agriculture. We remain greatly concerned over the impacts of tile drainage to remaining natural wetlands in this area, the methodology being used by NRCS to determine tile setback distances from existing wetlands, and the use of conservation program funds such as WRP, EQIP or CSP to incentivize tile drainage. The committee fully supports and endorses the MAFWA Private Lands Working Group's letter to the Chief of NRCS to encourage tile installation to follow the tiling plan designed by NRCS, GPS tile locations, conducting an assessment of hydrologic models and utilizing a model that ensures setback distances are sufficient to protect wetland functions and considering that any use of conservation funds should be aimed at best management practices that address water quality. The committee also fully supports the expedited implementation of the Northern Plains Migratory Bird Habitat Initiative (NPMBHI). Draft letter was prepared for the Directors to consider sending to Tom Vilsack, Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, Kathleen Merrigan, Deputy Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, David White Chief of Natural Resources Conservation Service, and Paul Sweeney, NRCS State Conservationist. The committee encourages the MAFWA Directors to endorse this letter and submit it to the respective offices. **Bob Ziehmer, MO moved, Roger Rostvet, ND second; friendly amendment to send to Ron Regan, add AFWA as cc to letter, Motion carries.** 2) Iowa Drainage Plan: The committee has several concerns about a recent effort to improve agricultural drainage in several upper Midwest states and treating this increased subsurface runoff with nitrate removal wetlands (Iowa Drainage and Wetland Landscape Initiative/CREP Pilot, attachment 1 – part of report). The initiative proposes created wetlands would serve as in-kind mitigation for farmed wetlands. If implemented across the Midwest it would remove any incentives to restore existing farmed wetlands in programs like CRP or WRP. The proposed benefits of this initiative are reduced surface runoff, reduced nitrate levels delivered to the Gulf, and improved crop efficiency. We remain greatly concerned over the use of conservation program funds such as WRP, EQIP or CREP to incentivize engineered wetlands.

Draft letters were prepared for the Directors to consider sending to the Tom Vilsack, Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, Kathleen Merrigan, Deputy Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, David White, Chief of Natural Resources Conservation Service. The committee encourages the MAFWA Directors to endorse this letter and submit it to the respective offices (letters are attached as Appendix 4.b. Lead: Todd Bogenschutz – IA DNR). **Rex Amack, NE moved, Marc Miller, IL second; controversy in Iowa, Pat asked to table until Wednesday to look at better; Marc Miller, IL moved to table, Keith Sexson, KS second. Pat, Marc and Kelly will meet to revise before Wednesday. Approved to table.** 3) Shifting available CRP acres to Continuous Signup practices: It is expected that the 41st General CRP Signup will not fully subscribe all 4 million acres available. The MAFWA Private Lands Working Group request that the acres available due to 2011 expirations be made available for Continuous CRP practices, including SAFE at the request of individual states. Draft letters were prepared for the Directors to consider sending to the Tom Vilsack, Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, Val Dolcini, FSA Administrator Brandon Willis, Deputy Administrator for Farm Programs, President(s) of SEAFWA, WAFWA, and NEAFWA. This was a time sensitive issue that was acted upon by the directors prior to their annual meeting (letters are attached as Appendix 4.c., Lead: Bill White – MDC). **Bob Ziehmer, MO moved, Keith Sexson, KS second. Motion carries. Ollie Torgerson – will require introductory paragraph as included on other letters.** 4) General CRP Wildlife Conservation Priority Areas: The committee discussed its concerns with the changes made to the rules for wildlife Conservation Priority Areas (CPA) points during the most recent Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) signup. In previous signups states were able to limit Conservation Practices (CP) that support the wildlife issues attempting to be addressed through CRP when determining it to be a wildlife CPA. Landowners were only eligible to receive wildlife CPA points if they agreed to utilize one of those specific practices. During Signup 41 the EBI was changed to allow any site within a CPA that agreed to enroll in a minimum of a 40 point cover to receive wildlife CPA points. This took flexibility of targeted specific wildlife needs away from the states. The MAFWA Private Lands Working Group would like to request FSA revisit the decision for this change so the intent of the wildlife CPA points is restored prior to the next CRP signup. A draft letter was prepared for the Directors to consider sending to the Tom Vilsack, Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, Val Dolcini, FSA Administrator, Brandon Willis, Deputy Administrator for Farm Programs, President(s) of SEAFWA, WAFWA, and NEAFWA. This was a time sensitive issue that was acted upon by the directors prior to their annual meeting (letter is attached as Appendix 4.d. Lead: Tim McCoy – NGP). **Keith Sexson, KS moved (lot of stuff in letters), Rex Amack, NE second. Motion carries.** 5) 2012 Farm Bill Priorities: Discussion of reauthorization of the 2012 farm bill has already begun with House Agriculture Committee holding several farm bill hearings across the country. The committee discussed the programs within the conservation title that it feels are of highest priority. It is imperative that state personnel assigned to AFWA Farm Bill related committees work closely with Jen Mock Schaeffer to make sure wildlife needs continue to be incorporated and refined in the next Farm Bill. A draft letter was prepared for the Directors to consider sending to Curtis Taylor, AFWA President. We encourage State Directors to make sure appropriate personnel are assigned to the AFWA Agricultural Conservation Committee and participate to the fullest extent possible in crafting State, Regional Association, and AFWA committee comments and recommendations as they apply to the Farm Bill (letter is attached as Appendix 4.e. Lead: Kelly Smith – IDNR). **Bob Ziehmer, MO moved, Marc Miller, IL second, slight change in year, correct from 2111 (typo) to 2011, discussion on last paragraph to read clearer what the intent is. Motion carries with changes.** 6) General CRP Environmental Benefits Index Adjustment Recommendations: Committee members shared several ideas regarding tweaks to the Environmental Benefits Index (EBI) that would improve benefits for wildlife. ACTION: A draft letter was prepared for the Directors to

consider sending to the Tom Vilsack, Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, Val Dolcini, FSA Administrator, Brandon Willis, Deputy Administrator for Farm Programs, President(s) of SEAFWA, WAFWA, and NEAFWA (letter is attached as Appendix 4.f. Lead: Luke Miller – OH DNR). **Marc Miller, IL moved, Scott Gunderson, WI second, friendly amendment to simplify. Marc Miller, IL moved to table motion, Scott Gunderson, WI second. Tabled until Wednesday. Rex Amack, NE requested it be removed from table. Keith Sexson, KS moved to pass, Rex Amack, NE second. Motion carries.** Director Informational Items – Private Lands Working Groups: 1) Tracking private lands efforts and accomplishments as a tool for evaluation and planning was discussed. The states shared various methods used to obtain this information. Many states have implemented or are moving towards tracking this information spatially which will aid in evaluation of individual accomplishments, identify hurdles, help with landscape level planning and tie private lands accomplishments to SWAP implementation efforts. No action for the Directors at this time. 2) The committee understands that all states are facing budget issues that often dictate attendance, but also feels that representation from each state is vital to the optimal functioning of this group. The committee encourages the MAFWA Directors to continue in their support of representation from each state being allowed to attend each year. Director Informational Items – Private and Public Lands Working Groups: The Private and Public Lands Working Groups’ asked federal budget priorities.

Public Lands (Exhibit 18) – *Katy Reeder, IA DNR* - Met with Private Lands Committee. Private and Public Lands Working Group attendees participated in a joint field tour highlighting landscape level management efforts. The tour looked at incorporating wise forest management on larger public land complexes and focusing similar management on adjacent private lands. A positive regional impact to “wildlife species of greatest conservation need” was the shared goal. Wednesday morning’s business meeting focused on the discussion and development of action items for the MAFWA directors’ consideration. The committee spent time discussing topics intended to help run state programs more efficiently and effectively as well as ways to ensure the Federal Farm Bill provides the maximum benefit for wildlife. Topics discussed included approaching USDA about adopting a “Do Not Plant List”. At this time the committee agreed not to pursue this. Ohio shared its process for implementing CRP Mid-Contract Management. The committee discussed the possibility of suggesting that in the 2012 Farm Bill that WHIP be made available as block grants to the states. While some states felt block grants would be positive for the delivery of WHIP, other states did not feel they would have the capacity to deliver such a program. This discussion will be shared with the other AFWA regions to determine their opinions before this discussion moves forward. The committee had quite an extensive discussion about providing some suggestions for the 2012 Farm Bill on using portions of CRP to be more working lands friendly. The committee discussed the potential of working with USDA to develop a natives first policy which would encourage looking at using native plant material as the first option with developing conservation plans with producers while keeping in mind objectives and feasibility. Director Action Items - Public Lands Working Group: 1) Many state EPA agencies have been mandated to develop state smoke management plans to improve air quality, particularly in non-attainment areas. These smoke management plans have the potential to impact prescribed burning in the state since burning generates particulate matter. State EPA agencies may not have much experience with prescribed burning and thus may be poorly informed on the techniques used and the planning involved by land-managing agencies to minimize smoke. Most land-managing agencies already develop extensive burn plans which include smoke management. Prescribed burning is actually a minor contributor to particulate matter as assessed by EPA agencies for air quality. A letter was drafted for the Directors to send Lisa P. Jackson, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. **Ollie Torgerson – lacks proper introductory**

**paragraph and will need to cc Ron Regan. Suggest last paragraph change AFWA to MAFWA. Rodney Stokes, MI moved to accept with changes, Keith Sexson, KS second. Motion carried.**

Director's Information Items - Public Lands Working Group: 1) The MAFWA working group discussed the new Department of Justice ruling which allows the use of power-driven mobility devices to be used on trails. It is our interpretation that this new ruling will allow the use of OPDMD's on trails located on fish and wildlife management areas. The working group's desire is that this rule be implemented in a manner that will not sacrifice or alter the primary management objectives of these public lands. The creation and enhancement of wildlife habitat and the protection of native flora/fauna are primary management objectives that should not be compromised by this ruling. The development of trails on wildlife areas is incidental to overall management goals and only intended to facilitate management or provide limited access. Public fish and wildlife areas are managed in a primitive condition and lack public use facilities such as drinking water, restrooms, formal trails, and other similar amenities. Most state agencies currently provide limited motorized access to wildlife areas to people with disabilities. Funding sources used to manage these areas (license fees, PR/DJ) dictate management for wildlife dependent recreational users and uses deemed compatible by the managing agency. The use of OPDMD's on state wildlife areas must be evaluated and approved by state wildlife agency managers to insure that management goals and objectives are maintained. No action for the Directors at this time but this item needs to be monitored across the region and conflicts addressed as they arise. 2) The Public Land Work Group would like to highlight some interesting efforts that have occurred in some of the states this past year. Online links to these efforts is included below with more detail included in the respective state report. Iowa – Forest Management Initiative

[http://www.iowadnr.gov/wildlife/wmamaps/forest\\_stewardship.html](http://www.iowadnr.gov/wildlife/wmamaps/forest_stewardship.html). Illinois “Living with White-tailed Deer in Illinois” a tool for landowners and constituents <http://web.extension.illinois.edu/deer/>

Michigan Strategic Planning

[http://www.michigan.gov/documents/dnr/Amended\\_GPS\\_Strategic\\_Plan\\_350544\\_7.swf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/dnr/Amended_GPS_Strategic_Plan_350544_7.swf)

South Dakota Interactive Public Land Maps <http://arcgis.sd.gov/Server/GFP/HuntingAtlas/>

Wisconsin Climate Change <http://climatewisconsin.org>. 3) Wisconsin Lead Issue

<http://dnr.wi.gov/org/nrboard/2010/October/10-10-8B2.pdf>. No actions required, States are sharing ideas

and information on important issues in the region. 4) The perennial topic of prescribed burning training requirements generated discussion among member states. Most states in the Midwest manage land for Federal agencies such as the US Army Corps of Engineers, US Bureau of Reclamation, US Fish and Wildlife Service and perhaps several others. There appears to be a trend for federal agencies to force state partners to adopt federal prescribed burn training guidelines. States do not have the time or resources to keep up with the constantly changing training requirement resulting in less fire on the ground. Burning is a grassland management tool that is used by resource managers for a number of reasons including noxious weed control, invasive species management, or to keep native prairie ecosystems diverse and vigorous. The various states in the Midwest have traditionally adopted their own respective prescribed burn training guidelines. While these guidelines may vary somewhat from state to state, there is at least a minimum standard set to help ensure the safety of personnel and property.

Prescribed burning produces results in a native prairie ecosystem that no other management tool alone can produce including grazing or haying. It is vitally important to keep fire as a tool for managing our landscape. The committee urges the Midwest Directors work with our federal partners to limit mandatory training and accept each states fire training qualifications. 5) Only nine of the thirteen states attended this year. The committee understands that all states are facing budget issues but feels the representation from each state is critical to the optimal functioning of this group. Several states sent private land representatives but no public lands reps. The committee encourages the MAFWA Directors to annually send representatives for both public and private lands. 6) The committee supports wind as an

alternative energy but the turbines and transmission lines associated with wind farms are concerns of many committee members. The impacts of this infrastructure to wildlife management areas are not clearly understood and need to be better defined. The committee encourages the MAFWA Directors to work with the energy companies to support research to better define the impacts of wind farms on wildlife. 7) The committee recommends a standard format for the public lands state reports. It will be a one page document consisting of the brief overview, top three issues, and highlights of the year both good and bad. No action required. 8) As a direct outcome of the 2010 Public Lands Committee meeting, an Allowable Use Survey was developed and deployed among committee members to assess how each state deals with the “top 12” public use issues identified by the committee: horseback riding; ATVs; field trials; wind turbines; biomass harvest; geocaching; guide hunting; paintball; dog trials; camping; disabled access; and dog training. State by state responses and the associated comments were summarized and are available to committee members interested in more detailed information from an individual state. The survey results serve as an overview of the ways in which MAFWA states deal with these activities and their assessment of the impacts (or potential impacts) of accommodating these activities. Responses of particular interest included: whether or not each state allowed a particular use on a state wildlife area; each states assessment of the likelihood that an activity would interfere with the primary purpose of the state wildlife area; the assessment of whether the activity would increase user conflicts; and perhaps most insightful, the future trends for various activities – how likely the interest in participating in activity will increase, decrease, or stay the same. The committee also identified the next 12 public use issues to be addressed in a similar survey in advance of the 2012 meeting: baiting; mountain bikes; designated hiking trails; tree stands; target ranges; trail cameras; target practice/clay targets; oil and gas; earth caching; snowmobiles; shed hunting; and seed collecting/fern fronds/roots/tubers/wild ones. No action required at this time. The committee will identify the next top twelve and add to the matrix. This matrix is a valuable tool in recognizing how each state deals with similar issues and helps identify different ways states can deal with these issues. 9) The committee continues to recognize lead as an important issue in many of the states. It is controversial among resource agencies, industry, and outdoor recreational users. No action required but the committee is aware this issue is on the Directors agenda. Each state has varying regulations regarding lead yet the committee recognizes lead as toxic and efforts should be made to reduce the impacts to wildlife. Director Informational Items – Private and Public Lands Working Groups: The Private and Public Lands Working Groups’ asked federal budget priorities.

Legal – *Ollie Torgerson* – They have not met for a couple of years, last full meeting in 2008; report available on MAFWA website.

Wildlife Action Plan (Exhibit 19) – *Katy Reeder, IA* - Struggling with travel authority also. Met October 5-7, 2010 in St. Joseph, MO with 10 attendees representing six Midwest member states. The third meeting of this technical working committee provided a valuable opportunity to discuss several topics of relevance to the region, including threats to State Wildlife Grant (SWG) funding, the effectiveness measures framework being developed for SWG by AFWA and several state representatives, the impending switch to the use of a system called Wildlife TRACs to report SWG programmatic information to the US Fish and Wildlife Service, and approaches to climate change adaptation. The meeting provided a forum for sharing information about wildlife action plan implementation, interstate collaboration, and to discuss issues related to effective action plan implementation. No actions by the directors are requested at this time. Director Information Items: 1) The State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP) technical committee wishes to convey how critical State Wildlife Grants program is to implementation of SWAPs. In these times when budgets for state and federal government are

experiencing reductions, SWG is a cost-effective, accountable program. This federal-state partnership program proactively protects species before they require the costly protection afforded by threatened and endangered status. Furthermore, an effectiveness framework has just been developed for SWG, which facilitates states' efforts to evaluate their programs and fosters continuous improvement of the program on a national scale. A few secondary points: The match requirement was changed from 50:50 to 65:35 for the FY10 appropriation. This is a cost-free way for the federal government to assist the states make the most effective use of their allocation. In recent years, a portion of the SWG apportionment has been used for a nationally competitive grant program. This committee feels that the competitive portion of SWG funding should remain a small proportion of the overall funding level for the program. An increase in the proportion of money set aside for a competitive program is not desirable because it lessens the amount of funds available to appropriate to states by formula, and with limited staff it is difficult to develop the proposals. By requiring states to develop State Wildlife Action Plans, and by implementing a ten year minimum revision timeline, Congress established SWG in a way that is both transparent in its design and responsible in its required evaluation. The annual appropriation process does not really support adequate implementation of such an accountable program. The current budget realities threaten the first evaluation and revision of the plans. Due to the unprecedented design of the SWG program, it will be critical for Congress to follow through with funds for one complete cycle, (one cycle = ten years after the plans were approved and the completion of the evaluations and revisions). The SWG funds and the Action Plan process promote cooperation and coordination between many of the conservation efforts Congress funds and makes them all more efficient. This committee asks that the directors keep the stage set for seeking dedicated, stable funding for conservation of fish and wildlife diversity. The committee emphasizes the importance of State Wildlife Action Plans to the US Fish and Wildlife Service's Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (LCCs).

Hunter and Angler Recruitment and Retention (R&R) (Exhibit 20) – Megan Wisecup, IA – Thank Ollie and directors. The inaugural meeting of the MAFWA Angler and Hunter Recruitment and Retention Technical Working Committee was a resounding success. Met in Bloomington, MN on February 16 and 17, 2011 and had 10 in attendance from 8 states. The primary purpose of day one was to establish the organizational guidelines for this new committee. In addition to this foundation work committee members provided short report outs on recruitment and retention activities in their perspective states and, discussed their greatest challenges as well as most successful programs. Day two featured presentations on recruitment and retention program evaluations as well as marketing and promotion of recruitment and retention programs. Need to get back to North American Model. Must create stewards and need broader funding stream, which needs to be entire agencies responsibility. There is competition to get outdoor education in youth curriculum. Marketing and technology is how they are communicating, YouTube and Facebook need to be used (read mission statement). Objectives: establish baseline; establish understanding of baseline; acceptance; define key terms; engage.... One tool we are using is basecamp to continue to communicate regularly and share documents. Submitted multi-state grant proposal but were not selected for this year, will work together – to come up with other avenues. Continue to communicate. Next meeting is in Kentucky in 2012. Director Action Items: 1) The Angler and Hunter Recruitment and Retention Technical Working Committee requests that Director Members of MAFWA review and approve Angler and Hunter Recruitment and Retention organizational guidelines. **Marc Miller, IL moved, Dave Lane, OH second, Motion carries.** 2) The Angler and Hunter Recruitment and Retention Technical Working Committee requests that Director Members of MAFWA allocate \$20,000 per member state to fund a 13 state survey of hunters and anglers in an effort to gain baseline data on sportsman's understanding, support, and acceptance of agency recruitment and retention programs. *Scott Gunderson, WI* – Seeing we don't have people traveling here and I don't know

exactly what our dues structure is and believe survey information is out there. *Marc Miller, IL* – Are we planning on having effort to pool money to do R&R activities or simply for the survey? *Ollie Torgerson* – Tried to get funded through multistate money so now coming to you for money. *Keith Sexson* – Important that group brought back prospectus of what they are going to do; who will do survey, need more defined and specific information. *Pat Boddy, IA* – Feel more affordable version might be available. *Roger Lande, IA* – Hard to look at everything, we do lots of surveys and don't want same stuff we already have. *Marc Miller, IL* – We need more information. *Ollie Torgerson* – New committee and is growing legs, need full project if want money from Directors and MAFWA has a deficit budget already. *Marc Miller, IL* – Need to see planned scope of work. *Ollie Torgerson* – I failed to mention that Marc stepped up to become director/liaison to this new committee. Director Information Items: 1) The Angler and Hunter Recruitment and Retention Technical Working Committee supports MAFWA Federal Budget Priorities as stated with one exception. The Committee would like to see Outdoor Recreation Participation funded in future at a level of \$25M. The Committee would like to see the funding dedicated to increased state recruitment and retention program staff and project budgets.

*Outdoor BBQ on the Patio – Sponsored by National Archery in the Schools*

*Guided Resort Tour with Focus on Wind a Solar Energy – Facilitated by DNR and Honey Creek staff*

*Hospitality Room – Sponsored by the All Farm Conservation*

**Tuesday, June 28, 2011**

*Breakfast – Sponsored by Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation (RBFF)*

**AFWA UPDATE**

***Curtis Taylor, West Virginia Director, and AFWA President*** – Thank AFWA staff in DC, all I have to do is call and they will make it happen quick. I have been going to all regional meetings and been to very important meetings with such groups as the Sportsmen Caucus. Making serious inroads into industry side of P-R, are corporate entities not mom and pop companies anymore. Met with Salazar and Vilsack, FICOR meeting, asked them to engage state agencies. Appointed myself to the Council to Advance Hunting and the Shooting Sports, a new committee. On joint task force who will meet in Eugene, OR to work on funding (old federal aid coordinator). Going to Madison, WI with Dan Ashe; then to WAFWA at Big Sky; and then Omaha and AFWA meeting to turn over the gavel. Asked for two things as President: white paper on Wilderness Act and what worked, fly-in in DC; and Teaming with Wildlife, to see if it worked if there was not secure stable funding for nongame.

***Ron Regan – Executive Director, AFWA (Exhibit 22)*** – Thank Curtis for all of his hard work; we should have bought an apartment for him in DC, he has been there a lot and traveled a lot. Jon Gassett is Vice-President right now and Dan Forester is the Vice-Chair of the Executive Committee; Dean Smith is here, he is on the NAWMP Coordinator and is the liaison with the states. Gary Taylor couldn't be here. Handed out summary this morning, highlight on treadmill with new directors, 15 new, a few still pending. Midwest one of regions had a lot of change, went to Wisconsin, Arkansas and need to get to Ohio. Annual meeting in September and there is travel support for senior proxy. If going to Omaha, make sure you keep receipts and send in statement of travel and we will reimburse you. Hunter Education issues continue, when in Kansas City in March the Executive Committee appointed a working group at Jeff Vonk's request to look at relationship with IHEA and Remington Outdoor Foundation, and online instructor training issue. Jon Gassett, John Frampton, Ken Mayer and Larry Voyles are on that committee along with Carol Bambery. Had meetings and conference calls, but not engaging states in developing legal or financial relationships, had learning curve. Bent over backwards to learn. On trajectory, at Executive Committee seek to void contract with Remington Outdoor Foundation. Sizzle will be reaching out to some of you to explore independent state contractual agreement. Working with them to make template to best address state needs. Not endorsing any particular product. Things have moved to something that comfort level is settling into a good place. Council To Advance Hunting and Shooting Sports, thought we had a CEO, but that fell through; looking at second person next week. Want Council up and running with more speed and aggressiveness, have \$28 million from states, need right leader on board. Working night and day on FY12 budget stuff; heard things are serious, conservation programs are going to be cut, direct hits to federal agencies, may flow back to states. Direct impacts through grants programs; signing on to every letter possible and meeting everyone possible. Conservation programs and rural America and the programs they represent can pull us out of this debt, so they should be the last programs cut. Fully staffed, anytime you need help we are there to help you.

## **PARTNER UPDATES**

### **The Nation**

*Dan Ashe, USFWS Acting Director (Exhibit 23)* – Interesting year at USFWS. Since Dale Hall walked out the door in November 2008, we have had a director for a total of 5 months (Sam Hamilton). Getting along well because of leadership in USFWS has been extraordinary and depth of partnership with state agencies and conservation community as a whole; you all helped us through this period of time. It is a sign of the times. Possibly nomination will move this week. The one thing I would like to highlight in time coming up is that we are anticipating marking up of conservation bills. We lost 9% of budget in FY11, \$144 million, biggest cut in total dollars and Park Service took 5%, because of biggest partner programs and quite likely they will try to continue that pattern in coming year. Want to protect operational capacity, but our capacity is partner-based. How can we strengthen partnerships in these difficult times? See across the board challenges for FY12 and FY13. Where are places we can build common capacity, trying to do this in Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (LCC), want to build this together. Not since Ding Darling and Co-op Unit have we seen this type of cooperative. We have to think of investments that will make organizations stronger in the future. Great partnership with Dave White at NRCS to sharpen delivery to bring forward objectives. Defense Department partnership is another one, buffer programs, went from \$39 million to \$100 million. Have \$.5 billion a year they can direct towards sustainability around military/defense installations, can support offsite acquisitions as well. Partnerships, and building shared capacities should be important to us all.

### **Region 3**

*Tom Melius, USFWS Regional Director (Region 3) – (PowerPoint – Exhibit 24)* – Thank you Roger and Pat and Iowa DNR for hosting this meeting, this is a great venue. Holding meeting while facing challenges of flooding of Mississippi, Missouri and tributaries feeding them going over their banks. I recently saw the impacts firsthand just down the road at DeSoto and Boyer Chute National Wildlife Refuges, now completely under water. Thank states for allowing us to meet in your states and explain America's Great Outdoors. I want to thank many of you for hosting the America's Great Outdoors sessions this past May. Opportunities to engage with each of you on your home turf is critical to helping me learn about specific natural resource issues, challenges, and find ways that we can work together to address our shared concerns on a landscape scale. We can expand the capacity of our individual agencies and achieve our shared conservation goals by leveraging our resources, solidifying our state-federal and NGO partnerships, learning from one another, and using new, innovative technologies to effectively and efficiently communicate. One important partnership has come to fruition in the era of renewable energy development. The states of Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Missouri and Ohio are working with the Service, the American Wind Energy Association, and more than a dozen signatory companies to evaluate, minimize, mitigate and monitor impacts of the growing wind energy industry in the Midwest. One way is through a comprehensive Habitat Conservation Plan that will outline measures to conserve threatened and endangered species, like the Indiana bat, that may be affected by wind energy facilities. Another example is illustrated in the effort to recover and delist the gray wolf in the western Great Lakes. The states of Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin have played key roles in this ESA success story. From developing scientifically sound state management plans to maintaining robust and efficient surveying and monitoring programs, these states have been the driving force behind wolf conservation and recovery and our current effort to remove ESA protection for gray wolves in the region. Similarly, the State of Ohio has led efforts that have resulted in another remarkable ESA success story: the upcoming delisting of the Lake Erie watersnake, worked with landowners and a number of partners to get it delisted. The concept of teamwork is also illustrated through the Asian Carp Regional

Coordinating Committee. The Committee integrates and unifies the actions of participating agencies to create a multi-tiered defense system to protect the Great Lakes. Over this past year, the Service's Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program (WSFR) worked in partnership with the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to coordinate an in-person discussion group with representatives from the hunting and angling industry in Minnesota - the primary payers of the Federal excise tax on hunting and fishing equipment, which funds the WSFR program. The objective for this meeting was to find out what manufacturers knew, and didn't know, about the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program. The gathering of industry representatives fueled a candid conversation about the hunting and fishing sports, the excise taxes paid by manufacturers on their products, and general knowledge about the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program and how it works. Working together, we gathered valuable data that will inform our communication efforts with industry representatives in the future. By sharing the tools used by the Service and Minnesota DNR to develop this listening session, other states can have the groundwork to gather this valuable information and insight from hunting and fishing manufacturers in their local area. All of these examples are illustrations of why partnership is one of the most important ingredients to achieving our shared conservation goals. Here in the Midwest Region, we are using Webcast technology to provide face-to-face interactions for our geographically dispersed workforce. We have the technology and capability to expand the use of these new technologies outside of our agency to regularly communicate with States and other partners. Let us take advantage of these available tools to work across both State and agency lines. When I became Regional Director four years ago, met eight directors in first three months, have five new and have tried to get out and meet most of you. You have made me welcome here the last few years and I want to say thank you. *Pat Boddy, IA* – Tom, is hardest working man, at 6:00 am while I was walking he would out there working.

*Exhibit 25 – MN DNR – Hunting and Fishing Heritage Initiative PowerPoint (prepared by Ed Boggess who couldn't be here).*

### **Region 6**

*Noreen Walsh, USFWS Regional Deputy Director (Region 6) (PowerPoint – Exhibit 26) – Steve couldn't come this week, will do his best to be here next year. Farm bill reauthorization, flooding and recovery of black-footed ferret are challenges. Farm Bill action of tile drainage is accelerating; as well as Swampbuster, an important point to look at. CRP is less competitive with high commodity prices; and we are seeing many acres coming out, looking at working grasslands to commensurate payment reduction. Continue to see native prairie broken and we will lose more; need to link Sodbuster with crop insurance. Flooding is a big issue, saw pictures of Minot, North Dakota on the front of the New York Times. Provides opportunity at all levels and the role of wetlands and floodplains can play in conservation arena. This is the thirtieth year of rediscovery of black-footed ferret in Wyoming, have 19 reintroduction sites and have more in wild than in captivity now. Made a lot of progress, most on federal land, but want to move to private land and will need to provide incentives, working with Dave White, NRCS, on working with landowners who are willing to provide prairie dogs and black-footed ferrets. Make sure MAFWA agencies aware of this and leverage partnerships. Thank you for the chance to be here.*

### **Region 9**

*Logan Lee, Deputy Regional Forester, Region 9 US Forest Service (Synopsis – Exhibit 27) – Unable to come, synopsis provided to directors.*

## **NRCS**

**Tom Christensen, Central Region Director** (*PowerPoint – Exhibit 28*) – Ollie is diligent in keeping us informed. Introduce Rich Sims, state conservationist here in Iowa, outstanding employee. Briefly talk about landscape initiative: which is partnership driven; has dedicated funding; and is science based. Working to stimulate greater interest through outreach; have entered into collaborative arrangements and system approach. Tried to identify most relative projects: Great Lakes restoration (EPA money); Mississippi Basin healthy watersheds; Ogallala Aquifer; and sage grouse. Some I didn't list, but we sent \$11.5 million in EQIP, WHIP, FRPP, EWP-FPE and CTA on enhancements in working lands on wildlife habitat restoration. Swampbuster is huge issue, desire certified wetland determination, we will get at back log, when in ND and MN, sending funding more to ND, SD, MN and OH and will give landowners certainty they need to know what they can or can't do on drainage of those lands. That should be \$16.7 million, not \$71.9 as shown on the slide. The Mississippi River Basin healthy watersheds initiative, hit \$83 million obligated through contracts this year. Ogallala Aquifer is a large scope project and will have \$12 million allocated this year. Sage grouse are in ND and SD in the Midwest and has \$48 million allocated to increase suitable habitat and expand current range. Strategic Watershed Action Teams (SWATs) are using partner contributions and partner assistance and has \$20 million that will be provided to nine and entered into agreements, grown to \$20 million so very excited about that. It is concentrated in certain watersheds and drainages. Good on science side, but Fish and Wildlife are experts, additional chance to consult with you. Reach out on monitoring and evaluation of each initiative's impacts on wildlife. Science and technology, funding some science advisors, expansion of this, help identify or designate that person. Outreach and information is important, use MRBI, CCPI and WREP to bring in partners. In capacity building, take what we have and marry up with what you have. Thanks for your partnership and all you do in the states.

*Roger Lande, IA* – There are direct flights from Des Moines to Reagan and back on Delta.

*Pat Boddy, IA* – Comes out of “The Greatest Good” first 100 years, Aldo's ideas still influence conservationists. During filming of that film decided to make this film about Aldo's life, maybe about the next 100 years.

## **GREEN FIRE Film**

Produced by Aldo Leopold Foundation, the Center for Nature and the US Forest Service

*Break – Sponsored by Mule Deer Foundation*

## **RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION – GETTING OUTDOORS – OUTREACH AND EDUCATION “FROM NEWBIE'S TO STEWARDS – HOW TO PROVIDE CONTINUITY”**

### **Overview of How it all Fits Together**

**Barb Gigar, Iowa DNR** (*Conservation Education and Strategies – Exhibit 29; PowerPoint - Exhibit 30*) – Long drawn out process, working at national level through multistate grants, working for decades but concerted effort for five years. Need to recognize the process. Best efforts will fail without finding common ground with a lot of people. Doing lots of things, but keep losing numbers, need to figure out how to move arrow down the road. Draw visible lines, talk about marketing and tie to river/watershed project, things are linked in stewardship and the process. Involve partners at a lot of levels. Provide excitement, skills, etc. Tie things together, how do we as agencies hit right places on arrow and who do we need to bring in.

## **Keeping Participants – Importance of Marketing**

*Stephanie Hussey, Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation (PowerPoint – Exhibit 31) –* Bigger picture in marketing is keeping participants. All things intertwine at national, state and local levels. Overall perspective: ad, marketing, communications and education. Ads on national integrated outreach campaign to keep fishing in the top of your mind; getting awareness level takes 7-8 multiple impressions to cause someone to take action. At national level, based on research and evaluate each year and evolve each year as needed such as Take Me Fishing campaign, change over time as we move forward. One piece is direct mail campaign evolved into email and social strategies. These are based on pilot programs, OK, OH, data mining; IA, ID building integrated programs; and MN the next year. Build integrated approach; rolled out nationally in 2006. There isn't one thing that will do it, try different things and test to see what will work and improve over the years as you are learning; 35 of ours are individual pilots, not everything will work the same in each state. From products and resources, have marketing kit, a how-to on what to do. Makes national campaigns and makes them customizable to state level. A number of resources and education products: best practices workbook and companion to that (evaluation components based on research); event planning kit and passport program are on the ground at events, passport is interactive tool, a 6-step program built on pilot test; angler's legacy evaluated each year and look at what ambassadors are doing and expanded as research dictates; free resources for your use all on rbff.org. Evaluate all we do and undertake research with partners and surveys. All are available online. In terms of specific research, conducted lapsed angler survey; what would motivate them to come back, fishing to spend time outdoors, likely fish more if 30-60 minutes away, buy a license if knew 100% of funds went to conservation and to ensure fishing opportunities. Expanded these and provided templates to states. With survey information, updated resources trying to engage those fishermen again and flexibility of direct mail, email and social media. Need to find out how to make things work; tools are technology, email searches from smart phones will pass computer searches by 2014. Make it as easy as possible for fishermen to be out there fishing. Partnerships are key. Have resources available online as well as staff. Be as relevant with culture, there are a lot of conflicting things out there for people's time.

## **Engaging Participants/Making Stewards Experiential and Relationship Marketing and Reinforcing Local Support Networks**

*Teeg Stouffer, Recycled Fish (PowerPoint – Exhibit 32) –* National nonprofit organization. We are stewards campaign, move culture of fishing a little bit, teach them to be stewards through water. You have learned from business sector, marketing works to sell outdoors. "Integration with non-profits, community groups, social media, grassroots and guerilla marketing cut through the clutter and drive results". Dicks Sporting Goods exploding, now #1; put a marketing person in small groups. Tons of competition in marketing, need to cut through clutter and messages our audience is always hearing. Share resources with groups. I am planting seeds for increased resources. Can't get outside guidelines; working with nonprofits gives you increased resources, flexibility, makes more cost flexibility, don't have to be complicated, but deeply integrated as events and programs. There are so many opportunities to work with others. Every week Recycled Fish writes a helpful hint. Work with network of ambassadors to put items out on social media pipelines. Successful partnerships have to be a two-way street (it doesn't have to be money, can be credit, a license or a pat on the back). Include a shared vision (big outcome – all citizens be conservationists), can't get all, but can get anglers, but can find other people who can get other groups. Partnerships exist that are unmeasured, can't succeed if you don't know what success or un-success is, don't do it if not measured. It is easier to justify measured partnerships. Involve ongoing dialogue, talk often. It has to be engaging, immersive all five senses,

experiential (something has to happen). Do programs that cut through the clutter. Example - go camping and share the load and wind up in a more sustainable place.

### **Wrap-up and Open Discussion**

*Jean Eels, PhD, Owner, E Resources Group (PowerPoint – Exhibit 33)* – Matrix on back page of handout, gave you a blank one to fill out yourself. We are talking about social ecological restoration here. In Cedar River watershed in IA, flood in 2008, folks who live there have varying opinions on what needs to happen. A coalition was formed and nothing has been done, 14 counties, contracted with our firm to work with messaging, quick and light of what was possible to pull together interpretive and outreach plan. Needed to start and agree. Been in meetings where you break into small groups, each group said we need to educate people, but educators were isolated and kept separately. Started by defining terms we would be using and that many different things needed to happen. Took global view of watershed project, working on the local level, did focus group research and saw what county board staff had available. Looked at ways of preparing consistent messages; surveyed them to see what they were already doing; and who they were reaching and tested four groups. Reached service clubs started there, brought in farmer participants and urban residents and generated list they would find acceptable. Bring in resources, people in upper watershed are disconnected from rest of people in lower watershed, needed to bring resources up, bring stories photos, people and share resources. Look at other shared partnerships. What was clear is that there are some things that confound you, have funding stream and someone doing that, but also have places with no funding stream, how do you fill that gap. Matrix may help you do some sorting, work together to make limited resources go further. What are core issues around continuity and stewardship that have been playing themselves out over the years? *Marc Miller, IL* – Geography and accessibility; *Bob Ziehmer, MO* - growing social disconnect, some 4-generations removed from the farm, need to know social side better; *Rodney Stokes, MI* – focus conservation groups to get kids out, focus on adults as well (multi-generations). *Jean Eels*– Dilemmas and paradoxes inherent in the process of trying to get R&R to go? Funding for staff on the ground (all have some staff who everyone loves and did all the perfect programs – how do you hire charisma?); *Stephanie Hussey* – Consumptive activities that there is no funding for that are happening on the same land (flow in order that makes sense); *Pat Boddy, IA* – the disconnect, for kids know we are not reaching parent at home. *Jean Eels* – Last question. What is the part you play in recurring story you have heard and keeps it re-told (where are leverage points)? *Scott Gunderson, WI* – We as agencies, legislatures, no matter what it is, continue to do what we are doing today, but not getting any answers, need to sit back and look at change in society, change in family unit, kids more involved in sports/computers/games. Got to get way outside the box, get folks in 25-35-age group, not just kids. Think about it totally different. Get outside the box. *Stephanie Hussey* – When we did marketing campaign in 2005, gave money to fund programs, have people who want to do things we just don't know it. Look different places and ask more questions. *Bob Ziehmer, MO* – Role of people in this room, look higher, look bigger, in Missouri, six million people want them all conservation stewards. Our thought is we are in it for the long term. Get in all public schools where some period science teacher an 8-week conservation course. In 300 schools but there are 1,200 schools. Tie-ins in ways we don't think about. *Scott Gunderson, WI* – It is about exposure, most of you grew up in rural area or had parents or grandparents who did. Expose them more in science, change curriculums in schools, we aren't doing that. Cable is full of hunting and fishing shows and we are tapping into that in the right ways. *Stephanie Hussey* – On social research, if don't have regional educators what do we need to do as an agency, we need to do the work or get partners. *Bob Ziehmer, MO* – Missouri citizens got it right in the 1930s, then 40 years later gave us dedicated funding. We have three publications. Credit the staff that has done it. I would be interested in other director's dialog. *Marc Miller, IL* – We have been trying to start effort, environmental literacy plan, one

staff brought together state board of education and others to devise plan for education goals, surprised one of few states to have gotten this far. Need to focus on opportunities, like federal government in form of education grants.

*Lunch – Sponsored by National Wild Turkey Federation (NWTf)*

### **HABITAT OF THE FUTURE**

***Richard Leopold, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 3, Facilitator*** – Not sure how we are going to capture habitat of the future. Plan panel discussion at the end.

### **Climate Change**

***Richard Leopold, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 3; Assistant Regional Director – Science Applications (PowerPoint – Exhibit 34)*** – Things are happening right now, we can chose to do something or pick up after. When Director of Iowa DNR, frequency and magnitude and events are happening more often. We haven't talked about - so what! Things we know, things we don't know and things we don't know that we know. Cedar Rapids flood 2008, 13 feet over the levee, not how high, but where? Phone calls about errant tanks floating, had no clue what they were talking about, we had 100,000 tanks over course of that flood and you don't know what was in the tanks. My guess is we didn't find most of them. Fringe of massasauga rattlesnake habitat, lost in flood, found breeding population after flood went down. Who is going to be the "God Squad" and pick what to save? Floods of 2010, Iowa State University under water, LCC is biggest effort to coordinate; 2010 flood cost \$50 million. Lake Delhi flood, backed up river, 7 miles of lake, 80 years of muck now down the river. Making decisions on the fly with little expertise; 3,300 dams and lakes in Iowa and have we thought through that. Tornados in 2008, more violent storms, what do you do with trees, etc.? Snow, sometimes too much. Ring necked pheasants disappearing because of weather, management may not be shifting. Hot humid nights are happening more often causing mold and fungus. Farmers spraying fungicides and hitting water, aerial spraying later than they should have, had fish kills. Mississippi kites, armadillos moving north. What are ramifications of climate change? What is the vulnerability assessment?

### **Vulnerability Assessment**

***Katy Reeder, Iowa DNR (PowerPoint – Exhibit 35)*** – Not climate scientist, but climate change has fallen into our laps. The first step in climate change adaptation strategy is to find a way to help with making decisions. Allocate resources; set management priorities; and develop effective adaptation strategies. It is a three-legged stool – sensitivity, exposure and adaptive capacity. Sensitivity: habitat, dependence on other species (like pollinators move and affects plant; ripple effect) and population growth rates. Exposure: temperature, precipitation, hydrology and salinity concentration. Adaptive capacity: dispersal ability, plasticity and evolutionary potential. Focusing on vulnerability assessment as states are approaching them, can be regional or just managers of a certain area. Will work together when states to get their plans together; can't picture all of MAFWA as a group doing it together. Sense of understanding based on climate models; sense sensitivity and exposure. Develop strategies you wouldn't regret no matter what the final outcome. Emissions scenarios are global; global climate models can be used to develop downscaled regional models. Response models, what do you want out of vulnerability assessment? General characterization model (both NE and IA have used), took expert opinion model to characterize, tool characterizes them as extremely vulnerable, moderately or presumed. Then can work on some strategies. Conceptual models may end up with maps like Kansas did. There is a lot being done with revision of wildlife plans and funds. Combination of ideas needs to be put together like: selecting

conservation targets; land protection priorities, informed management decisions and directing monitoring efforts. States need more time to get ducks in a row. Hope not to take state-by-state approach, need to get on the same page at some point. Need to do things on eco-regional basis and AFWA climate change committee will help MAFWA in general and work with LCCs. National Wildlife Federation and other partners put together a booklet “Scanning the Conservation Horizon” which is really useful if you are just jumping into climate change.

### **Farm Bill**

**Todd Bogenschutz, Iowa DNR (PowerPoint – Exhibit 36)** – The 2012 Farmbill is one of the biggest tools for addressing impacts of climate change. Federal funding for U.S. Department of Ag is estimated at \$1.1 trillion for FY11 – FY20. The budget funds 82% nutrition, 13% commodity/crop insurance/disaster and conservation 6% and renewed every five years. Allocations were \$271 million in Iowa for one year, our budget is \$21 million in the state and some for of that is for staff, none of that money was for federal staff. Entire Farmbill money came to Midwest states. However, when there is a federal budget deficit, conservation title and baseline is what they look at. In 2007, \$6.5 billion/year, expect \$4 billion/year in 2012; CRP \$2 billion/year (31.2 million acres), if PF/DU offered 20 million/acre you should take it; WRP \$500,000 to \$700,000/year, none in 2012. MAFWA had half of the CRP 15 million acres; WRP has 2 million, MAFWA had one-third of the 650,000 acres in 2008. Priorities for wildlife: high - (CRP, WRP, EQIP with wildlife qualifier); medium – WHIP and VPA. Jen put together a 9-page summary of 2012 Farmbill: maintain conservation title baseline; implement conservation actions that save dollars (sodsaver/HEL/swampbuster/tilling/crop insurance – don’t hurt other parts of Farmbill); conservation actions that have no cost (state partnerships/SWAP). Priority programs: CRP, WRP, VPA, WHIP, EQIP, GRP, HFRP, FRPP and CSP. Landscape level conservation, magnitude of what Farmbill programs can do for us.

### **LCC Update**

**Richard Leopold, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 3; Assistant Regional Director – Science Applications (PowerPoint – Exhibit 37, Climate Adaptation Strategy Fact Sheet – Exhibit 38)** – Jumped from state to USFWS, oversee three LCCs, largely made up of MAFWA states. What LCCs are doing is not rocket science, known for long time we should be doing something on the landscape. I think these are best way of getting together in talking about landscape level adaptation. Talking theoretically for years, show you some of what the LCCs are doing. Don’t know where we are, where we are going, but it is speeding up; why? Magnitude and sophistication of issue has to match magnitude and sophistication of answer and we are not there yet. LCCs can help. LCC map shows how states are split up, some states are in two different regions. We are working together to understand impacts of resource threats and working together to understand interactions of consolidation drainage and climate on water-level dynamics, wetland productivity and waterbirds. Respecting tribes, first nations and cultural resources in decision making. Linking science with conservation actions (greater sage-grouse response to wind energy development), identifying gaps and filling them and working in better partnerships. Compliment and build upon existing science and conservation, complete maps linking science and completing National Wetlands Inventory Mapping in upper Midwest. Serving as an applied science and rapid response laboratory, not good system to gain best information to make decisions; Plains and Prairie Potholes LCC held Missouri River flood conference call with NGOs, feds, states, etc. Twenty-one geopolitical boundaries, at local level assist in predicting ecological and habitat changes. Doing resource assessments of fish habitat conditions in northern Great Plains. Climate Models, down scaled climate data for upper Midwest and Great Plains LCC Region, including downscale climate modeling. Vulnerability assessments looking at birds of Upper Midwest Great Lakes Region, like bobwhite.

Inventory and monitoring protocols developing a standardized sustainable monitoring statement in Upper Mississippi Valley. Conservation plans and designs, regional decision support tool for identifying vulnerabilities of riverine habitat. Will not supersede agency decision making authority; or interfere with value and roles of existing partnerships and cooperatives (like joint ventures and national plans). What can you do for the LCCs? Partnership we both need help and how to best do that is what we are looking for.

**Panel Discussion:** *Roger Lande, IA* – Don’t have full appreciation of LCC, did you say federal partners and states? *Rich Leopold* – Yes, in states, but not only state agencies, but conservation chapters and universities. *Roger Lande, IA* – As a lawyer I want to know who the partners are and what process and structure is. *Rich Leopold* – Two years in, but still babies at this. Some organic, only operate by majority; some top heavy; some willing. Are coming up with “rubber hitting the road” that others are seeing and we are starting to evolve. *Tom Melius* – Have chance to make decision in Iowa, every state director can help make decision on how to spend money in your LCC, Iowa is unique in being located in three LCCs. *Unknown Person* – Work with Audubon and have national grant, looking at getting what’s going on at national level to regional level. Do we have a way of taking fruit, or share point to get data that spans national and regional to local level? *Rich Leopold* – Lot to do with standardizing communication, not doing that now and we need to do better. This is not a wait situation, in the beginning we thought everything was going to move north, but it doesn’t seem like it is that way, some will move some will stay, some will spread out. Learn to work on adaptation together. World-peace-kind-of-thing. *Tom Melius* – On vulnerability assessments, environmental species laws, climate change aggravates those types of things. Endangered Species Act may default them into list and fighting losing battle then; how do we retool regulations to deal with that. We have tried to access species already at risk to get a better handle on them, for instance SINC species. Not sure climate change planning will require us to retool our efforts. *Rich Leopold* – Endangered Species Act is effective, but has baggage, we know that. *Pat Boddy, IA* – Every time I see data as Farmbill spending I see a disconnect, I think of our water. Can you rift for all that money or is there anything else we could be doing? There is a lot of money, a lot of positive benefit coming out of it. Could we do better, yeah absolutely, look at state wildlife action plans for soil/water/wildlife to target those funds. Federal programs and federal officials get elected for what they can do for you. Most programs are voluntary, but some can get money and some can’t and it is all tax dollars. *Katy Reeder* – We have some flexibility to do some targeting, this past year, Action Plan used extra points CPA so good overlap for wildlife areas. *Rich Leopold* – The way we do it now is ludicrous, targeting is the way to go, end up living off crumbs. East and west coast sick of writing a blank check and it is going to fall on us to be truth tellers. Softened message we need to carry in Midwest. Truth telling is hard but need more of it.

*Break – Sponsored by National Wildlife Federation (NWF)*

### **MAFWA COMMITTEE REPORTS (continued)**

***Ollie Torgerson, MAFWA Executive Secretary, Facilitator*** – Second half of reports.

**CITES (Exhibit 39)** – *Ollie Torgerson* – CITES (Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora) is an international trade agreement among countries to ensure that international trade in specimens of wild animals and plants does not threaten species’ survival. Each regional association has regional representative, Carolyn Caldwell is our representative and Deb Hahn is new AFWA staff person. Tagging requirement on bobcat and otters, hard time convincing other

countries that these look-alike species are a problem. Federal aid workshop on turtles in St. Louis last September. High demand for turtles in world, we have 51 species in the US. Proceeding forward with Appendix III for hellbenders. 1) Bobcat and River Otter Tagging, 2) Freshwater and Terrestrial Turtles, and 3) Hellbender CITES Appendix III Listing. Director Action Items: We greatly appreciate your response to requests throughout the year that have required immediate attention. **No items are in need of action** by the MAFWA Directors at this time. Director Information Items: 1) Bobcat and River Otter Tagging - CITES regulates the international trade of river otter and bobcat because these common North American furbearers have a close resemblance to rare species native to other countries. For 34 years, USFWS has used a plastic pelt seal to confirm that any given bobcat or river otter pelt could be exported out of the U.S. This means that state wildlife agencies have been required to use CITES tags to mark bobcat and river otter taken in their states for export outside of the U.S. Beginning in 2003, the AFWA and the USFWS established a “work group” to address the CITES obligations pertaining to river otter and bobcat. The work group’s final report was issued on September 15, 2005, and included the elimination of the specific requirement to use federal CITES tags for river otter and bobcat. This report continues to have the strong support of the Association’s Executive Committee. While a number of the work group’s recommendations have already been implemented, we have not yet eliminated the unnecessary tagging of river otter and bobcat. This requirement is very costly to state agencies, is not mandated by CITES, and provides no “added value” for the sound management of these two abundant furbearers in the United States. During the summer of 2009, the AFWA and the USFWS reached agreement on an acceptable method of eliminating the tagging requirements while fulfilling the obligations pursuant to CITES to document the legal acquisition of exported river otter and bobcat. It was the States’ understanding that this recommendation would be adopted and effective for the 2010 trapping season. However, at the AFWA annual meeting in September 2009, the USFWS informed the States that the Service desired to postpone implementing the alternative tagging methodology as a result of concerns raised by the U.S. Department of the Interior Office of the Solicitor. Essentially the USFWS could only agree to eliminate tagging if an alternative “chain of custody” process could be substituted. However, no other chain of custody process could be devised that the fur industry did not feel was equally cumbersome to them. Even though chain of custody is not a requirement of CITES, the USFWS felt it necessary due to the risk of litigation associated with any perceived “de-emphasis” on controlling bobcat and otter fur movement within the U.S. In August 2010, Gordon Batcheller (Fur Resources Technical Committee) and Craig Hoover of the USFWS met with representatives of the fur industry in Wisconsin to discuss alternative tagging. The fur industry believes at this stage, the tag is the simplest and most efficient way to mark legally obtained pelt for export from the U.S. The USFWS, with the assistance of the Fur Resources Technical Committee, is developing a clarification document for state wildlife agencies concerning the purpose of the tags, acceptable distribution methods and use. Gordon Batcheller is also developing a document summarizing the history of this issue and future steps being undertaken. This document should be completed and distributed in June, 2011. The Fur Resources Technical Committee and the CITES Technical Work Group will continue efforts with the USFWS to streamline the furbearer export permit program for state wildlife agencies and develop a nationwide non-detriment finding for river otter similar to what was implemented for the bobcat. 2) Freshwater and Terrestrial Turtles - With the assistance of PARC and the CITES Technical Work Group, the USFWS International Wildlife Trade Program hosted a state-federal agency workshop entitled “Conservation and Trade Management of Freshwater and Terrestrial Turtles in the United States in St. Louis, September 21-24, 2010. Ninety people representing 36 states participated to discuss the pressing management, regulatory, scientific, and enforcement needs associated with the harvest and trade of freshwater turtles in the United States. The USFWS was responding to a significant increase in the export of native turtles, particularly to Asia, and has been monitoring this situation closely. All the state wildlife agencies were

invited and funding was provided for all state government participants. In addition, the Service supported a number of government, academic, and conservation group turtle researchers with specialized knowledge for this four-day meeting. The IUCN Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group provided technical advice and prepared draft revised assessments of native turtle species for the workshop participants to consider. Participants developed three sets of recommendations pertaining to conservation, management, and law enforcement in the turtle trade. As a result of the discussions and presentations the states were in consensus that there will continue to be high international demand for wild-collected turtles from the United States. The USFWS launched a webpage to provide the workshop's results and recommendations to the general public and the conservation, scientific, and wildlife law enforcement communities ([http://www.fws.gov/international/DMA\\_DSA/CITES/animals/turtles.html](http://www.fws.gov/international/DMA_DSA/CITES/animals/turtles.html)). The Service hopes to facilitate implementation of as many of the recommendations from the workshop as possible. Some of these recommendations are being integrated into the AFWA Amphibian and Reptile Subcommittee regulatory assessment recommendations that will soon be available. During the 76th North American Wildlife and Natural Resource Conference the USFWS International Affairs Program, the CITES Technical Work Group, and the Amphibian and Reptile Subcommittee invited State Directors to an event to hear about and discuss conservation of native U.S. turtles. The event included a presentation on the status of turtles in the US and worldwide by Anders G.J. Rhodin, M.D., Chair of the IUCN/SSC Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group. Dr. Rhodin noted that the U.S. has the highest species richness of turtles and tortoises in the world (57 species). 3) Hellbender CITES Appendix III Listing - The USFWS proceeded with a CITES Appendix III listing for the hellbender [*Cryptobranchus alleganiensis* sp. (Eastern & Ozark subspecies)] published September 8, 2010 in the Federal Register (75 FR 54579). A CITES Appendix III requires any person wishing to export any hellbender, live or dead whole specimens or readily recognizable parts, products, and derivatives to apply for a permit and provide proof of legal acquisition. This listing will also provide a mechanism to monitor trade worldwide. An Appendix III listing is not a panacea that will sustain the species by itself, but it is a means of reducing the incentive of poachers to remove hellbenders from the wild. In Asia people have paid up to \$1,700 for a single hellbender. Also, on September 8th in a separate but related action, the USFWS' Endangered Species Program published a proposal to designate the Ozark hellbender as endangered throughout its entire range (75 FR 5461). Curtis – Thank MAFWA because Carolyn works hard on that. Lot of praise on our intervention on bobcats, kudos on work on bobcat. Thanks to Ohio for providing Carolyn.

Climate Change (Exhibit 40) – *Katy Reeder, IA*; Pat Boddy is the director/liaison. This technical committee was new last year and is working to define its mission and role within MAFWA. Not every state has appointed a member. Committee didn't officially meet, but six states attended AFWA's Midwest Climate Workshop which provided a forum for discussion of the most effective use of this newly formed technical working committee. Director Action Items: **No action** by the directors are requested at this time. Please appoint someone from your state. No meeting set yet, but would like to get one next April in Missouri.

Deer and Wild Turkey (Exhibit 41) – *Ollie Torgerson* - Formed in early 70s. Have a resolution which will be given tomorrow. Dale Garner is director/liaison to this committee. *Dale Garner, IA* – 34<sup>th</sup> meeting in Devil's Lake at Lake Grafton in North Dakota, August 23 to August 25. Nice history of Devil's Lake area. Spent large portion of time on resolution of baiting and feeding. Came out of Kansas a few years ago. Felt that science is there. A draft of the resolution was handed out to all participants. After a brief introduction the floor was open for discussion. Most of the comments were in regard to

formatting, and length of the resolution. After about 20 minutes of discussion, Lloyd Fox (Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks), made a motion that the resolution be accepted and that a committee deal with any grammatical or formatting changes that may be needed. Tom Micetich (Illinois Department of Natural Resources) seconded the motion. There were no additional remarks. The resolution was accepted by a unanimous voice vote. All were comfortable with the modifications made by the committee. The next meeting is September 25-28, 2011 at the MI DNR conference center near Higgins Lake hosted by Michigan DNR.

NCN (Exhibit 42) – Ollie Torgerson - This past year Dan Zekor resigned from the NCN committee, John Buhnerkempe (IL) assumed chairmanship and Rodney Stokes (MI), and Rex Amack (NE) are the other members. *Rodney Stokes, MI* - The NCN Committee was created in 2004 and charged to become familiar with the NCN and Multi-State Conservation Grant Program (MSCGP) processes and annually counsel the MAFWA on a recommended course of action for submitting NCNs. For the 2012 grant cycle, the MAFWA Executive Committee did not receive any NCN proposals for our consideration. As stated in last year's Committee report, the lack of participation in this program may be due to past topics of interest being previously accepted. However, the NCN committee needs to continue to actively work with the members of the MAFWA to encourage them to take advantage of this opportunity, to make them more familiar with the MSCGP process, and to keep them informed of deadlines for submittals. The committee also continues to stand ready to assist any MAFWA member with the development of draft NCNs. Director Action Items: Reaffirm support to MAFWA members for direct participation and engagement in the NCN and MSCGP processes; **no action required**.

Pheasant (Report - Exhibit 43, National Wild Pheasant Conversation Plan PowerPoint – Exhibit 44) – Ollie Torgerson - They don't meet in this calendar year, met in fall 2010. Working on a national pheasant management plan, sent to you on June 2. Todd Bogenschutz will report; Rex Amack is the director/liaison. *Todd Bogenschutz, IA* - Kudos to Bud Veverka, IN for drafting the plan. The meeting was September 20-23, 2010 in Indiana. Reviewed process for writing the National Wild Pheasant Conservation Plan (80 pages long) mainly focused on private lands; federal policy; long-term population declines in most states; huge economic impacts when doing well; impacts agriculture; policy needle. It is not a plan for game farm pheasants or plan to help states get out of game farm pheasants. It does not tell where to buy land. Next steps are to find out if it useful and get comments. Developed bobwhite plan in southeast and hit snag when other states didn't get input; haven't pulled in western or eastern states yet and plan to get their input before we submit it. Meeting this fall should have a resolution. *Ollie Torgerson* – Three states missing data on. Todd could meet with individual directors and bring final back a year from now. *Todd Bogenschutz, IA* - The meeting wrapped up with presentations from Todd Bogenschutz of the Iowa Department of Natural Resources and Travis Runia of the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks. Todd presented information on chick imprinting techniques developed during recent research projects, and Travis presented information on methods developed for survey data collection using geo-referencing. Following these presentations, the group selected South Dakota for the next meeting in 2011, and a few final thoughts and items were addressed. The meeting adjourned just before noon. Director Action Items: **No action items**. Director Information Items: Update on the timeline for organizing, editing, and releasing National Wild Pheasant Conservation Plan. The next meeting is scheduled for autumn 2011 in South Dakota.

Wildlife and Fish Health (Exhibit 45) – Ollie Torgerson - Dale Garner, IA will present, Ed Boggess is director/liaison. *Dale Garner, IA* – Met April 19-20, 2011, Keystone, SD. Representatives from eight state fish and wildlife agencies (MI, NE, SD, ND, KS, IA, KT and MN) and the United States

Department of Agriculture - Wildlife Services (USDA-WS), Wind Cave National Park, three affiliated tribes of North Dakota, Oglala Sioux Parks and Recreation Authority, South Dakota State University, and the South Dakota Animal Industry Board attended this year's Midwest Fish and Wildlife Health committee meeting. Had webinar available for those who couldn't attend (WI, IL, MN, and IN), furnished by the United States Geological Survey-National Wildlife Health Center, and USDA-WS (MO). Updates on: White-nose Syndrome in North American Bats, Anne Ballmann; NWHC Major avian mortality events in the Midwest in 2010, LeAnn White; USDA-WS, Tom DeLiberto - avian influenza funding is likely coming to an end; and SD State University, lamb survival and disease prevalence of bighorn sheep, Josh Smith. CWD group discussion on surveillance systems, funding and captive cervid testing. Paul Shelton, IL discussed that Illinois is fortunate that the areas with CWD are not the most popular deer hunting areas, thus the use of sharpshooters was made possible without a lot of public push-back. They are seeing success in controlling CWD prevalence by sharpshooter harvesting. Tami Ryan, WI further explained how they intend to use a weighted surveillance system and what a management response might look like if positives were detected outside the current CWD Management Zone. Brian Richards, USGS cautioned that the weighted surveillance system is based on data from WI and CO where there has been a long-standing infection and those demographic patterns have been established for a long time. This may not be fitting for new states that are monitoring a more recent outbreak. In these new detection situations, all age/sex classes should be sampled because these demographic patterns may not have time to become established. Federal CWD funding has been at a \$16-17M level. In the current USDA budget request for FY13, USDA suggested an elimination of the CWD funding to states and tribes entirely; only \$1.8M would be retained to keep on 30 CWD staff to administer the rule. There may still be CWD funding in FY12 for states and tribes, the level of which is currently uncertain. A discussion on funding for CWD, independent of federal funding, continued. Some states have some dedicated funding for wildlife health whereas others do not. Disease spending needs to be driven by biological impacts to the resource versus impact to agriculture (e.g. CWD vs. TB). Steve Schmitt, MI asked what states that currently do not have CWD will do with a lack of federal funding. Indiana plans to continue CWD surveillance regardless of federal funding, but the scale may be reduced. Iowa would continue surveillance also, but probably scale this back and concentrate efforts on the most high risk areas. Other states suggested they will only test animals showing symptoms of CWD. The group discussed the need to continue testing captive cervids. If federal funding goes away, does the monitoring of captive cervids disappear with it? Currently, Brian Richards pointed out that the CWD-positive captive herd in Missouri is still not depopulated. There continues to be new cases of CWD detected in the captive cervid industry, notably 6 premises in Saskatchewan and 1 in NE this year alone. Steve Schmitt and Dale Garner, IA agree that they would rather see DNR funds being spent on testing captives than testing hunter-harvested wild deer at random. Brian Richards informed the group that Idaho had a bill passed through both houses that would reduce the amount of required disease testing in the captive cervid industry. This new rule will reduce testing requirement to only 20% of testable mortalities once every 3 years. This greatly alarmed the committee. If Idaho passes this bill, this might be a slippery slope that other states would reduce their testing requirements and thus import requirements. Currently, most states will not allow importation of captive cervids from a herd without 100% testing of testable animals for 3-5 years. Dan Grove (ND) suggested the captive cervid industry pay their own testing fees, as it should be a small price to pay on the expensive shooter bucks or the need to transport these animals for marketing opportunities. Other updates - Bovine tuberculosis update in Minnesota - Michelle Carstensen provided an overview of the bovine tuberculosis (bTB) outbreak in cattle and wild deer in the northwestern corner of the state. To date, they have found 27 wild deer with the disease and 12 infected cattle herds. Fall 2010 hunter-harvested surveillance efforts yielded 1,639 samples and no obvious cases of bTB (final culture results are pending). This could mark the first year

that no new cases of bTB were detected in wild deer. The last bTB positive deer was found in fall 2009. The DNR has committed to conducting deer surveillance for bovine TB for 5 years of consecutive zero positives detected. However, Minnesota DNR may be working to renegotiate the current sampling requirements with USDA. The state was granted Split-State Status in 2008, following a cattle buy-out program that removed 46 of 68 herds from the endemic area. In 2010, the state was upgraded to TB-Free everywhere except within the split-state component, which remained Modified Accredited Advanced. In 2011, the Minnesota Board of Animal Health will be applying for TB-Free status within the split state zone as well, and if achieved, it is uncertain how this may affect future surveillance requirements for deer. It is likely that cattle testing requirements and movement restrictions will remain in place within the bTB Management Zone until such time that state and federal agencies agree the disease has been eradicated in the deer population. Bovine tuberculosis update in Michigan, Steve Schmitt - Bovine tuberculosis (bTB) testing in fall 2010 included nearly 5,000 deer and found 24 positives. Most of these positives came from DMU 452, the endemic bTB core area. What drives bTB transmission? Deer density and concentration. Strategies are simple, keep deer from concentrating by eliminating supplemental feeding and baiting, and reducing deer numbers through hunting to a level supported by the natural vegetation. There has been success in bringing prevalence down from 4.9% in 1995 to 1.8% in 2010. However, disease prevalence appears to be stable over the past 8 years, averaging just under 2%. Recent modeling work is suggesting that if management of the disease continues as is, prevalence will remain just under 2% for the next 30 years. It will take more aggressive management strategies to eradicate the disease. The model was developed to compare different management scenarios. Even under the most aggressive scenarios with increased harvest, 100% compliance on the feeding/baiting ban and use of bTB vaccination, it would take a minimum of 13 years to reach eradication of the disease. The model suggests that without baiting there is a 1.6% probability the disease would become established in a new area and a 10% probability with baiting. Michigan is putting a lot of effort in the continued development of an oral vaccine for bTB. South Dakota bovine tuberculosis review - State Veterinarian, Dustin Oedekoven provided an overview of national bTB eradication history. In the 1900's, bTB caused 10% of all human deaths; 20-30% of this was *M. bovis*. In 1917, about 5% of cattle in the US had bTB, which was the start of the bTB Eradication Program. By 1935, this was reduced to 3%. In the 1950s, this was further reduced to 0.1% of all US cattle. By the 1960s, primary surveillance became slaughter surveillance. bTB is NOT going away and recent cases have been detected in numerous states, including SD, NE, TX, IN, OH, KT, and CO. In South Dakota in 2009-2010, there has been one slaughter trace of a bTB-positive cow from a SD feedlot (no animal ID at slaughter) and one slaughter trace from a SD auction (brucellosis vaccination tag with no records on file). Traces implicated both infected and exposed herds in NE, as well as an infected dairy in TX. A bTB-positive heifer was found in a feedlot in southeastern SD (no animal ID was collected at slaughter, but the specific feedlot was identified). There was a breeding herd on the feedlot that tested bTB-negative and records show 38 possible producers and 7 auction markets. The genotype found the strain of bTB to be similar to the NE captive elk herd (Jan 09) and an IN beef herd and 3 IN captive elk herds. There was a link to NE- a producer had pastured his cattle 0.5 miles from the bTB+ cervid herd in NE. This herd of 300 head (commercial cow-calf operation, annually buys 200 yearlings) was tested and they found 2 bTB-infected animals (considered to be the Index Herd). Subsequent trace in/trace outs found 1 herd in SD and 1 in NE that were bTB-positive. All 5 of these cows were the same age and all pastured near the bTB-positive captive cervid herd in NE. Now with the new Federal Order, every state is for themselves- no requirements are applicable to accredited-free and modified accredited advanced states or zones. Wildlife surveillance was done in Yankton County, including 50 sharp shot deer and 22 hunter-harvested deer; no bTB was found. The NE side has also not found bTB in wild deer to date. Action Item: **Dale Garner, IA brought forth a resolution in support of feeding and baiting restrictions to**

**the committee. The Midwest Deer and Wild Turkey Study Group has recently voted to support this resolution and Dale, as the liaison, will be bringing this to the upcoming AFWA Director's meeting.** The request was made that the Health Committee also weighs in on the importance of banning these activities due to inherent risks in disease transmission. The committee discussed the resolution below. All committee members voted in favor of the resolution, no nays. AFWA Federal Appropriations Recommendations for 2013 Federal Budget for USDA-APHIS: Ranking #1, Chronic Wasting Disease for \$20M; Ranking #2, Bovine Tuberculosis for \$20.6M (\$10M should go to monitoring and management of this disease in free-ranging wildlife); Ranking #3, Aquaculture/VHS for \$18M; Ranking #4, Invasive Species for \$30M (e.g., increasing incidence of feral hogs); Ranking #5, Avian Influenza for \$10M (for wild birds); Ranking #6, Brucellosis for \$13M. We recommend funding be continued for \$250,000 for Southeast Cooperative Wildlife Disease Study. We also recommend funding for USDA-APHIS-WS for the Wildlife Disease Monitoring and Surveillance program for \$8.0M. This program funds wildlife disease assistance to states at no cost, such as CWD and bovine TB surveillance, and participation of wildlife disease biologists in state agency wildlife disease management activities. AFWA Federal Appropriations Recommendations for 2013 Federal Budget for Department of Interior - Ranking #1, White-nose Syndrome in Bats for \$10M. Tom Hauge, WI has suggested letter relative to CWD funding, decreasing to \$1.9 mil and none to help with states to deal with, only for captive herd certification. House finished markup, action on Senate side. Uphill battle, but worth doing. Midwest states have a lot vested in this disease.

*Moved outside for rest of afternoon meeting.*

## **HUNTING ISSUES**

**Dale Garner, Iowa DNR Wildlife Bureau Chief, Facilitator** (Each presenter will have 15 minutes – followed by open discussion) – Opportunity to talk about couple of issues. Tim McCoy, NE in old role was involved in this.

### **Public Access to Private Lands**

**Tim McCoy, Agriculture Program Manager, Nebraska Game and Parks Commission (Exhibit 46)** – Public access land is mostly in the Midwest, states are paying an average of about \$2/acre for a total of \$30 million being spent each year. Iowa talked about voluntary access was \$50 million program and is insignificant in Farmbill. Was part of open fields to get funding and was accepted well in Midwest states. Developed like block grant program, over half from Midwest, six had programs and three new (IA, MN, KY), about \$10 million of program, allocated \$25 million; it has done well in Midwest. Huge variety on how developed, in Midwest there is a lease, some do habitat improvements, some do both. Nebraska did both. Some states that have more public land and are working on leases to get better access to public from private land. North Dakota has done the best. Variety of ways to pay for this, most utilized cash funds and PR and user fees, Colorado did access stamp. Some programs are delivered by small set of staff, some all staff approach. No set way to do it. One thing we noticed, use outreach, hunters and fishermen are our people. Did marketing in Nebraska and took cue from Ag folks and used landowners standing on their own property and followed up with contacting people on USDA list, lead-in from another landowner helped. Got help from marketing firm. Issues: liability is main one (to protect landowner); some landowners want more control of who comes onto their property; Kansas is doing limited access hunts or special hunts also. Now we have limited funds, need to measure those effects. Need to look at NCN multistate grant; been able to work together with AFWA on that. *Roger Lande, IA* – Trying to develop materials to educate hunters, some don't understand, don't know how to

be good hunters, what is reasonable for farmer to expect from hunter. *Tim McCoy* – Haven't found out why farmers refuse, nothing formal and PF/mentor thing makes sense. *Pat Boddy, IA* – For farmer video, are there scripts we can rip off? Probably could, but needs to be need-specific. *Tim McCoy* – I&E folks can help with that. *Unknown Person* - Have you noticed people jumping the fences a lot? *Tim McCoy* – A few, and lost some property because of it. Problems are usually people down the road. We lose when property sells; transfers to someone else in the family; or is enrolled in CRP and it comes out. Some enroll because too many deer. *Chris Horton* – Access is a priority, would impact Missouri, making public lands public for purchasing easements to purchase land on locked land.

*Dale Garner* – Introduce one of our commissioners, Margo Underwood from northern Iowa. If you go to health meetings at AFWA, spend lots of time on lead; also on MAFWA committee. I chaired national committee and looked at it in Wisconsin. Not going to talk about “the Great Debate – Pros/Cons”, veterinarian and avid hunter. Give his thoughts on it.

### **LEAD – the Great Debate – Pros/Cons**

*Dr. Dave Clausen (Exhibit 47)* – Shortly after I became a member of the Wisconsin Natural Resources Board, a long time hunting acquaintance came to me and said “Doc, you need to do something about the use of lead in our fishing, hunting and the shooting sports. That stuff is toxic and if we do not show some leadership and do something, some environmental group will do it for us and we are going to look pretty bad in the process.” As a veterinarian I had dealt with lead poisoned animals including dogs, cats, cattle and eagles but hadn't given much thought to use of lead in my leisure activities. As I looked into the issue, I could see my friend was right and that in the court of public opinion we were pretty vulnerable. As you are no doubt aware, lead is again emerging as an issue of concern for the hunting, fishing and shooting sports communities. That this should be happening now comes as no surprise to anyone who has been following the issue. The recent petitions to the EPA to regulate the lead components of ammunition and fishing tackle, while generating a lot of controversy and reaction from within the sporting community, are far from the whole story. Lead and lead poisoning is a public health and societal issue that has been generating a significant amount of renewed attention. The headlines read: “HUD announces 120 million dollar grant to help cities with lead paint removal”, “Reusable shopping bags contaminated with lead”, “CDC misleads District residents about lead levels in water, House probe finds”, “Mattel settles lawsuit over lead-contaminated toys”. The list goes on. Every headline or editorial in papers like the Washington Post or the New York Times, such as “Get the Lead out of Hunting,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/16/opinion/16prito.html> and public service radio advertisements by groups such as “Lead Free Kids” reinforces to the public that lead is toxic and is something to be avoided. As we move forward in confronting the lead issue, the debate is not about whether or not lead is toxic to wildlife and humans. That part of the debate is over. There is no one in this patio, or elsewhere, who can make a scientifically supported claim that lead, in any amount, is beneficial to any bird or animal. To the contrary, a bibliography compiled by researchers from Minnesota lists over 500 peer reviewed articles published in recognized scientific journals that document the toxic effects of lead on over a hundred species of wildlife. The facts cannot be controverted: lead pellets in wetlands and waterways kill, lead pellets left on uplands and dove fields kill, and lead bullets and bullet fragments left on the landscape kill. Rather, this debate is about the ethical and moral responsibilities that are part and parcel of our right to hunt and fish as protected by the Wisconsin, and many of your states' Constitutions. How we assume and carry out those responsibilities is a matter of great importance to the future of hunting, fishing and the shooting sports. With deference to Jack Ward Thomas for borrowing some of his words: “If hunting is to continue in nations that are increasingly urbanized – and in which most citizens have no first hand familiarity with hunting – it is

critical that the public's perception of hunters and hunting be a positive one." The image of hunters and hunting is bound up in the development, continued evolution and adherence to a code of ethical and moral principles. The world we live in is changing. The general public is becoming more concerned about lead and its associated toxic effects on both humans and wildlife; activists among the populace are becoming better organized, more effective in getting their message across, and are discovering the power of "social media." Failure to recognize this movement and act accordingly will adversely affect our public image. For decades we have been using the same old arguments to defend our continued use of lead. Whether we believe our own arguments or not is of little consequence. It is whether or not the public believes those arguments that will ultimately determine the outcome of this issue. When I take off my waders and my hunting hat and put on my veterinarian, wildlife/animal enthusiast and environmental hats, I see some holes in our arguments. It is regularly argued that "wildlife agencies manage populations, not individuals." And perhaps, in part, that is true. In 1932, Aldo Leopold defined Game Management as "the art of making land produce sustained annual crops of wild game for recreational use." In that era, management was largely centered on restoring populations; "populations" were of prime concern. But even in 1932, Leopold identified "control of disease" as part of management. Management has evolved. Game management became wildlife management, then wildlife ecology and conservation biology. What constitutes "acceptable losses" must evolve as well. The argument that "any action to limit lead is unwarranted unless there is undisputed scientific evidence of population level impacts" is simply no longer realistic or defensible. Wildlife management is not and has never been strictly about "population level management." Regulatory agencies often take actions and impose regulations that have nothing to do with "population level" impacts. Instead, sustaining biodiversity is an important aspect of natural resource agencies' activities (for example, endangered species programs). Here's an example: most states prohibit the hunting of big game with 22 caliber rim fire rifles. Is that because of scientifically valid evidence of "population level" impacts? I think not. Rather it is because we have an ethical and moral responsibility to kill cleanly, quickly and to avoid unnecessary waste of a resource. Definitions of "populations" and "population-level impacts" vary as well. Is it the population of a species in the whole of the US, or in your state, or in a particular management unit? Or is it, as defined by many of our deer hunters, the number of animals under their tree stand? The answer to that depends. To the lady from Northeastern Wisconsin who wrote me about the two eagles living on her lake that died as a result of lead poisoning, those deaths were an unacceptable local "population level" impact and she puts the responsibility for those deaths squarely on our shoulders. Since those deaths were completely avoidable because of the availability of proven alternatives, how should an ethical sportsman respond? How should a natural resource agency respond? How will the public view our response? Over the past few years there have been various studies attempting to quantify the number of mourning doves poisoned by spent lead shot. I have seen numbers like 6 million, 14 million or more. At the recent Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference, information from a paper was presented that estimated the yearly mortality from lead toxicity to be nearly the same as the estimated 20 million doves that are harvested each year by legitimate hunting. When the clever little YouTube videos start to appear demonstrating that spent lead shot is poisoning millions of doves and that hunters are condemning those birds to a senseless and completely unnecessary death, how do we justify that? What will be the ethical or moral basis for that justification? It's hard to claim any "high road" when a byproduct of our activities includes millions of unnecessary mortalities. Raptors are a poster-child of the lead debate. Data collected by our own agencies show that significant numbers of eagles succumb to lead poisoning every year. But eagle populations are sound and even increasing in most areas. It is often alleged that, as long as eagle populations are increasing, lead toxicity is not an important issue for them. Natural Resource agencies - "we" - authorize the use of lead ammunition for hunting. A byproduct of hunting is the unintended "take" of eagles, and eagles are a protected species. We must be clear; this is not an issue of numbers.

Can we really justify our actions by saying “we don’t poison too many?” Look at what happens in other areas of commerce when lead contamination becomes an issue. Manufacturers and retailers issue recalls and distance themselves from that product as fast as possible. They don’t make excuses and attempt to down play the risk by saying things such as “I’ve been sucking on my “hot wheel” car since I was three years and look at me – I’m fine”. While tongue in cheek, my comment about “hot wheel” cars does make a point. No one who has absorbed or consumed lead can accurately say that they were not affected because it is impossible to tell what would have been the result had that lead not been consumed. As a child I spent a lot of time playing with lead solder in my dad’s electronic store. I was fascinated by the way it melted and splattered on the work bench and by way the splatters could be folded and bent into different designs. I also discovered that my eye teeth were the perfect tool for clenching lead split shot while fishing and that a split shot between the cheek and gum was much easier to find than that one in my pocket. So, did that exposure affect me? Would my IQ be a few points higher? Would my blood pressure be a few points lower? Would my attention deficit disorder be a little less pronounced? I can’t answer that, nor can any of you. Would I encourage my grandkids to incur the same exposure? Absolutely not! My friend Marty loves his guns and he loves shooting. We share a lot of common interests including our 284 caliber rifles. When the lead in venison thing first arose, I x-rayed some of my home processed venison and found significant lead contamination in 3 of the 20 packages I tested. I shared those x-rays and the bullet fragmentation study with Marty and suggested he consider using copper. He went a little ballistic and forcefully told me this was all a bunch of anti-hunting BS. Besides those copper bullets were no damn good. In fact, he had 4 boxes of 284 ammo handloaded with Barnes Triple shock bullets that were given to him by a relative. If I wanted them, I was welcome to them. Marty and I both deer hunt in northern Minnesota about 15 miles apart. I called him after the 2010 season to compare notes. First thing out his mouth was, “Doc, I want you to know that I am shooting copper. The ballistics are great and the killing power is awesome. “What changed your mind Marty?” I asked. He replied, “This lead thing is serious. If we don’t do something ourselves, we are just going to be handing ammunition to the antis that want to put us out of business.” I use copper bullets to hunt deer in northern Wisconsin and I am completely impressed with their performance. But it’s not just me. The US ARMY decided several years back to design and implement so-called “green ammunition.” For the last year, the Army has been using steel tipped copper 5.56 mm bullets in Afghanistan. In a military press release from June 2010, the Army describes some of the enhancements in this ammunition: “improved hard target capability, more dependable, consistent performance at all ranges, improved accuracy, reduced muzzle flash, and a higher velocity.” They even identified that this new “green” 5.56 mm round outperforms lead-based 7.62 mm rounds against certain types of targets [quote] “blurring the performance differences that previously separated the rounds.” Imagine that, a non-toxic .223 that outperforms lead-based .308s. The Army cites the environmentally-friendly aspects of their switch – eliminating the discharge of up to 200 tons of lead per year. As of today, it looks like the US Army is more forward thinking and environmentally conscious than many hunters and natural resource agencies. Many landowners have and are deciding to take this issue into their own hands. I am personally aware of numerous landowners in the state of Wisconsin who no longer allow the use of lead ammunition on their properties. They have seen the data. They are aware of the issues. They have made a conscious decision to never again put a piece of toxic lead on their properties, and are requiring their guests to do the same. They are tired of waiting for natural resource agencies to do the right thing and are taking action on their own. Natural Resource agency leaders: we have a choice. We can continue to circle the wagons, deny and stonewall much as the tobacco companies did with cancer, as Nixon did with Watergate or as Bill Clinton did with Lewinski. Or we can demonstrate leadership and become part of the solution to an issue that is not going to go away. *Teeg Stouffer* – On bandwagon, spend two weeks at ICAST workshop and they will raise this, there is no market for it. *Dr. Clausen* – Much like steel shot, first was not good and

expensive, but has come down. When I x-rayed venison, my Christmas present was non-toxic shot to everyone. It is even cheaper in some point. I am more efficient killer with copper. Because I believe in this I switched to nontoxic for fishing about two years ago. It will come, will come slow, but market is going to dictate and it will lead to development of better products. *Margo Underwood* – What are other states doing? *Dr. Clausen* – Wisconsin did lead action plan, looking at nontoxic for their training and park people are using nontoxic and sharpshooting on CWD would be nontoxic. It is a matter of education, nothing mandatory. I have talked to different groups, they wanted handouts, Chris Thomas is on this bandwagon. Quality deer management area of 12,000 acres also talking about that. *Roger Lande, IA* – It helps me be more effective in discussing the issue. Lead is poison, that is not the issue, separation of issues is important. *Dr. Clausen* – You can lead, but that doesn't mean we have to sit silent, we can make little steps in hunter education and our own programs. *Ron Regan, AFWA* – Share observations from AFWA, Dale is right if you wanted to see fireworks the committee to sit on would be the lead committee. Believe we need to preserve independent authority of the states through method of take, so recommend no blanket regulation. When state does change to nontoxic they need to be transparent about it. *Dr. Clausen* – Not sure if left to states we would have nontoxic shot for waterfowl. *Gary Vequist* – We ought to bite the bullet and get this thing moving, go slow or ramrod. When removing elk at Roosevelt National Park in North Dakota required them to not use lead. *Dr. Clausen* – Friend uses it because it kills better, not as much time chasing. *Roger Rostvet, ND* – In North Dakota, nonconformists try to defend switching to nontoxic, North Dakota is a waterfowl state, bring up dove loses, worked well on doves didn't it. It is a good trap question they use. *Dr. Clausen* – Have more waterfowl than they did back then, but sometimes you can't win. *Teeg Stouffer* – Classic sales, overcome seven objections. *Roger Lande, IA* – Duck club members, for first weekend members were complaining, 18 year-olds with heavier shot were hitting more than older guys were. *Dr. Clausen* – If we can get an edge, I can sell this stuff because it just works better. *Dale Garner* – He will be around tonight. *Pat Boddy, IA* – I would like to share your talk, is that okay? *Dave Clausen* – Yes.

*Outdoor BBQ on the Patio – Sponsored by U.S. Sportsmen's Alliance*

*Free Time OR Guided Activity (Fishing trip, Lake cruise, or Golf outing) – Your activity guide will meet you on the patio.*

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

