

## **Roll Call**

### ***Member State Representatives***

Richard Bishop, Iowa  
Tim Bremicker, Minnesota  
George Burgoyne, Michigan  
Mike Conlin, Illinois  
Steve Gray, Ohio  
Douglas Hansen, South Dakota  
John Hoskins, Missouri  
Joe Kramer, Kansas  
Randy Kreil, North Dakota  
Lauri Osterndorf, Wisconsin  
Kirk Nelson, Nebraska  
Glen Salmon, Indiana  
Jeff Ver Steeg, Colorado  
Thomas A. Young, Kentucky

### ***Conference Staff***

Sheila Kemmis, Recording Secretary, Kansas  
Lynn Hartog, Registration, Nebraska  
Ollie Torgerson, Coordinator, Missouri

### ***IAFWA Representatives***

John Baughman, Exec Dir, Washington, DC  
Brent Manning, President, Wyoming  
Len Sengel, Washington, DC  
Dave Walker, Washington, DC

### ***USFWS Representative***

Steve Williams, Washington, DC  
Robyn Thorson, Ft. Snelling, Minnesota

### ***Guest Speakers***

Bobby Acord, USDA/APHIS  
John Fischer, SE Coop Wildlife Disease  
Study, Georgia  
Ernie Niemi, EcoNorthwest, Oregon  
Dan Witter, Facilitator, Missouri  
Dan Zekor, Facilitator, Missouri

### ***Other State Representatives***

Rex Amack, Nebraska  
Marion Conover, Iowa  
Jim Douglas, Nebraska  
Don Gablehouse, Nebraska  
Dale Garner, Iowa  
Roy Grimes, Kentucky  
Scott Hassett, Wisconsin  
Tom Hauge, Wisconsin  
Dean Hildebrand, North Dakota  
Mark Holsten, Minnesota  
Terry Little, Iowa  
Dave Risley, Ohio  
Keith Sexson, Kansas  
Jeff Vonk, Iowa

### ***Other Organization Representatives***

Robert Hoffman, DU, Michigan  
Rob Manes, WMI, Kansas  
Jeff Nelson, DU  
Chuck Pils, MAFWA CITES Representative  
Gildo Tori, DU, Michigan  
Jodi Valenta, NSSF  
Don Young, DU

### ***Nebraska Staff (who helped on conference)***

Duane Arp  
Ted Blume  
Justin Boner  
Ken Bouc  
Mark Brohman  
Daylan Figgs  
Mace Hack  
Mark Humpert  
Noelyn (Butch) Isom  
Bruce Morrison  
Steve Riley  
Craig Stover  
Marv Westcott

*Thanks to above individuals and all other  
Nebraska staff who helped with Conference*

**TREASURER'S REPORT**  
**2002/2003 (FY 2003) Transactions**  
(As of June 30, 2003)

**Total Assets beginning July 1, 2002** **\$233,209.85**

Receipts

Annual Dues (FY 2003).....\$4,700.00  
Missouri Conference Registration.....900.00  
Nebraska Conference Registration.....5,250.00  
Interest-Checking/Savings/CD's.....7,306.05  
FY 2002 Income (cleared bank after 6/30).3,200.00

Total Receipts \$21,356.05

**Total Available Assets** **\$254,565.90**

Disbursements

Missouri Conference Expenses.....\$2,324.67  
Missouri Dynamic Solutions(funded by MO).5,880.00  
Missouri Conference (Sheila).....474.06  
Nebraska Conference Expenses.....1,691.42  
Nebraska Conf Registration Refund.....150.00  
Parsons Jewelry(plaque engraving).....80.32  
Donation IAFWA Aware Fund.....10,000.00  
Coordinator Expenses (travel to NE).....125.12  
The Trophy Shop (plaques).....287.15  
Bolens Office Supply (receipts).....11.32  
FY 2002 Exp.(cleared bank after 6/30)....2,044.81  
Merrill Lynch annual fee.....65.00  
Loss (if sold) M.Lynch.....905.08

Total Disbursements \$24,038.95

**NET ASSETS, JUNE 30, 2003** **\$230,526.95**

Accounting of Assets, June 30, 2003

Cash in checking account.....\$ 7,797.76  
Cash in Savings account.....22,534.30  
Cash in CD accounts.....159,534.44  
Merrill Lynch.....40,660.45

Total Assets \$230,526.95

**ASSETS, JUNE 30, 2003** **\$230,526.95**

\* Standard accounting practices do not generally show projected losses as part of the statement as no losses are actually incurred until the stock is sold. To show you where the money has gone this past year we have listed the projected loss if stocks had been sold on 06/30/03.

Total as of 06/02 at Merrill Lynch	\$41,630.53
Total Merrill Lynch Priced Portfolio (06/03)	<u>40,660.45</u>

Loss on Portfolio (includes \$65.00 annual fee)	970.08
---	--------

<b>TOTAL LOSS (7/1/02 - 6/30/03)</b>	<b>\$ 970.08</b>
--------------------------------------	------------------

**Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies  
Guidelines for the Use of the Anton Walter Jaschek Fund  
July 18, 2000**

The Anton Walter Jaschek inheritance was an unexpected and unique gift given to the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies in 1996. The sum of money was considerable for an organization like the AMFWA. This gift affords the AMFWA the potential for long term financial participation in a variety of issues. The Association can utilize this fund for many activities rather than request contributions from individual states, thus helping to keep annual dues modest, and selected requests for other financial needs limited.

As determined by the Executive Committee, the principle of the Jaschek Fund will be invested in securities to provide long term stable income growth. Only the annual interest earned on the fund will be utilized for funding appropriate projects in a given year. The principle will remain invested and protected from expenditure to assure a steady source of investment income for future project use.

**Purpose and Use of the Fund**

The purpose and use of the Anton Walter Jaschek fund shall be to support activities of the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies which maintain and enhance the capability of all Midwest Association States to develop and implement comprehensive fish and wildlife programs for game, nongame, endangered species and their habitats.

1.) Activities that shall be given priority consideration are as follows:

Supporting the enactment of new national legislation which will increase the funding and/or enhance state authority for the development and implementation of fish and wildlife programs such as: Teaming With Wildlife, CARA (Conservation and Reinvestment Act). Support may take the form of: direct contribution to the IAFWA for information and education efforts, supporting the expenses of state staff who are assigned temporary duty on behalf of the AMFWA to work on these issues; supporting the collection, publication and distribution of information which will have a positive impact on Congressional decision makers.

Supporting re-authorization of existing national legislation such as the Farm Bill, Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, for the purposes of maintaining and/or strengthening these types of legislation. Support may include: contributing to IAFWA efforts to dedicate staff to work on re-authorizations, supporting studies and evaluations to provide background information reflective of Midwest states needs; paying the expenses of staff to participate on behalf of the AMFWA on national advisory groups or study groups related to re-authorization of these types of legislation; supporting the collection, publication and distribution of information which will have a positive impact on Congressional decision makers.

Supporting AMFWA participation in CITES. This should be limited to paying no more than the necessary travel expenses of state personnel who are working on behalf of the AMFWA.

Sponsoring and/or co-sponsoring conferences and symposia which provide a forum for the presentation, discussion and sharing of research findings and management programs of importance to AMFWA states. A condition of sponsoring such conferences should be the timely publication of the conference proceedings in some fashion, in a form useful to practicing fish and wildlife managers.

2.) Activities for which the Jaschek Fund will not be used include:

Habitat projects.

Fish and wildlife surveys and research not directly related to obtaining information or evaluating past programs pertaining to enactment of national legislation (i.e. Farm Bill, Clean Water Act, CARA).

Books and publications not resulting from workshops, conferences or symposia sponsored by AMFWA.

Buildings and interpretive exhibits.

3.) Other activities not specifically described herein may be considered if they have a direct relation to any or all of the items included in (1) above.

## **Procedures for Requesting, Awarding and Distributing Grants from the Jaschek Fund**

Annually, Joe Kramer, the Secretary/Treasurer, shall inform the President and the Executive Committee of the amount of earnings from the Jaschek Fund that are available for distribution. Any current commitments for funding for the coming year, already agreed to by the AMFWA, will be deducted and itemized.

### **1.) Requests for Funding**

Requests shall be considered on an annual basis.

Requests shall be submitted to the President of the AMFWA no later than April 1 of each year.

Requests shall include:

- the name, address, phone number and affiliation of the requester;
- a description of the activity and how it fulfills the purposes of the Fund in (1);
- the total cost of the activity;
- the amount of Jaschek Funds requested;
- date when the Jaschek Funds are needed;
- how the requestor will report back to the AMFWA on the use of the funds and success of the project or activity.

### **2.) Awarding the Grant:**

The President shall forward copies of all grant requests to the full Executive Committee of the AMFWA by April 20.

The Executive Committee shall meet, via phone conference call, prior to June 1 and develop a joint recommendation on grant funding priorities, utilizing the Jaschek Fund guidelines.

The President shall forward the recommendations of the Executive Committee to all members of the AMFWA no later than 30 days prior to the summer meeting of the AMFWA.

The AMFWA shall give final approval or modify the recommendations of the Executive Committee at the Business meeting of the AMFWA.

### **3.) Distributing and Evaluation of Grants:**

On behalf of the President, the Secretary/Treasurer shall notify the grant recipients of the AMFWA action within 30 days.

The Secretary/Treasurer will arrange for the funds to be sent to the requestor.

Successful grants recipients shall be requested to provide a report back to the AMFWA on the use of the funds as requested by the President.

## **Audit Committee Report**

The Audit Committee, comprised of George Burgoyne (Michigan), Jeff Vonk (Iowa), and Dean Hildebrand (North Dakota), met to review the financial status of the 2003 Midwest Association during the Omaha meeting. After reviewing the expenses, income, and investments of the association with Joe Kramer and Sheila Kemmis, the committee found the 2003 financial statement to be satisfactory. The association is in excellent financial condition. The committee discussed in detail the Merrill Lynch investment account, which had lost significant value during the past two years. The committee was concerned about the investment loss and requested that Joe Kramer meet with the Merrill Lynch representative. Kramer agreed to review the current investment strategy and make a recommendation on whether or not to continue with Merrill Lynch. The investment is up for renewal at the end of 2003 so the association has time to review its options.

# ***Draft Resolution***

***Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (MAFWA)  
Annual Meeting, Omaha, Nebraska  
July 13-15, 2003***

## ***RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF A MISSOURI RIVER ENHANCEMENT and MONITORING PROGRAM***

**WHEREAS:** The National Academy of Sciences<sup>1</sup> in 2002 concluded that degradation of the natural Missouri River ecosystem is clearly evident and is continuing to the point of jeopardizing its fundamental natural processes and subsequently the loss of increasingly valued ecosystem goods and services; and

**WHEREAS:** The Missouri River spans seven states over a distance of 2,300 miles and currently consists of seven large reservoirs covering approximately one-third of the river, a number of unchannelized reaches equal to about one-third of the river's length, and a lower channelized reach below Sioux City, Iowa equal to one-third of its length; and

**WHEREAS:** The Missouri River, originally valued as a national treasure and transportation route, was subsequently modified for multiple uses including flood control, hydro-power generation, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation, recreation, and navigation; the cumulative effect of which has allowed encroachment onto the flood plain and its erosion zone and the institutionalization of repetitive taxpayer bailouts ranging from hundreds of millions to billions due to frequent flooding, especially in the channelized reach; and

**WHEREAS:** Some of the original uses and values for which the river was modified have not appreciably materialized and since the values of the American people have now shifted toward sustaining healthy and more natural riverine systems and recognition of such ecosystem goods and services as becoming more of a recreational destination with associated economic benefits to local communities; and

**WHEREAS:** Alteration of the Missouri River form and function has profoundly impacted essential habitat for many riverine species, resulting in three species being federally listed as endangered or threatened (least tern, piping plover, and pallid sturgeon) and numerous other species of native fish (sturgeon chub, sicklefin chub, flathead chub, silver chub, speckled chub, plains minnow, western silvery minnow, blue sucker, and lake sturgeon) which could potentially become listed because their life cycle needs are not being adequately met in the system they inhabit; and

**WHEREAS:** The Corps of Engineers, other federal and state natural resource agencies, water quality management agencies, and the general public have all expressed the need for scientifically collected, system-wide, long-term, biological, physical, and chemical information to identify, evaluate, prioritize, and implement cost-effective restoration and management actions



that would benefit the entire river ecosystem; and

**WHEREAS:** The Missouri River Basin Association requested that the Missouri River Natural Resources Committee develop a system-wide monitoring and assessment program for the Missouri River to provide long-term scientific information required for measuring system responses to adaptive management actions as well as the natural variability of the river for future river management decisions; and

**WHEREAS:** The Missouri River Natural Resources Committee, working with the United States Geological Survey-Biological Resources Division, developed a comprehensive monitoring and assessment program for the river in cooperation with 11 state and 6 federal agencies with fish and wildlife, water quality, water supply, flood control and power generation responsibilities for the Missouri River; and

**WHEREAS:** Federal legislation in the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate has been introduced, there is a strong need to assist passage of this legislation in order to assist basin states and their federal partners fulfill responsibilities in managing public trust fish and wildlife resources and the ecosystem supporting them, and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies recognizes that sufficient information from a number of disciplines is needed to ensure that decision makers at all levels and the public have the information required to restore and protect the ecological integrity and functioning of the Missouri River ecosystem; and

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the **Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies** assembled on July 13-15, 2003 in Omaha, Nebraska, unanimously support passage of Congressional legislation authorizing and funding *a Missouri River Enhancement and Monitoring Program; and*

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (IAFWA) for endorsement, and subsequently distributed to appropriate members of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate, Missouri Basin Governors, and other interested conservation organizations and individuals.

<sup>1</sup> *The Missouri River Ecosystem, Exploring the Prospects for Recovery. 2002. Committee on Missouri River Ecosystem Science, Water Science and Technology Board, Division on Earth and life Studies, National Research Council, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.*

## **MIDWEST PRIVATE LAND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT GROUP**

### **ANNUAL REPORT**

**July 15, 2003**

Submitted by Steve Riley, NGPC

The 13<sup>th</sup> annual meeting of the Midwest Private Land Wildlife Management Group (Group) was held March 9th through March 12th in Kearney Nebraska. The meeting was held in conjunction with the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies' Public Wildlife/Private Lands Committee. In addition, both groups shared a symposium on 'Capacity Building' with the Nebraska Partnership for All Bird Conservation. States in attendance included Colorado, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Ohio. The International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (IAFWA) was represented as was, United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Pheasants Forever (PF), Quail Unlimited (QU), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), Farm Service Agency (FSA) and The Nature Conservancy (TNC). Other organizations were well represented at the symposium.

There was much to discuss at the meeting with the then upcoming CRP signup and the other expanded offerings of the Conservation Title of the Farm Bill. As you already know, even in these austere budget times, conservation programs saw widespread increases in the Farm Bill; old programs were expanded and new ones created. At this point, many of the rules governing the various programs also have been promulgated. The list of acronyms is growing and includes CRP, EQIP, WHIP, CSP, CREP, CCRP, WRP, GRP, and FPP.

But the Conservation Title of the Farm Bill is no longer the only game in town. Wildlife diversity funds that were 'spun-off' from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act effort have private lands programs whirring. State Wildlife Grants, the Landowner Incentives Program and expanded Section 6 funding are providing other opportunities and pressures for everyone. Topics of interest are infrastructure, delivery, non-federal match, and intra-agency cultural 'adjustments.'

Because of the urgency and timing of major issues and efforts that competed for time this spring, we are not at this time bringing forward any action items. The following is a list of action items that were identified at the meeting and the status of each item.

1. CCRP Grazing Green Wheat—This is an issue in wheat country related to enrolling field buffers associated with wheat fields and 'incidentally grazing the entire field. Currently this is not acceptable under CCRP even though grazing wheat in the fall is a normal practice. Incidental grazing is currently acceptable with other crops in the winter and spring, but done in the fall it prevents acres from being enrolled in CCRP. Troy Schroeder (KPWD) drafted a letter that was handled—due to the urgency of the matter—through other channels.
2. Pivot Corners and Field Borders as a Component of CCRP—Pivot corners and field borders are now eligible, but there's no way to enroll them. There is currently no practice. An effort to get this problem addressed was headed up by Tim McCoy (Nebraska). This was another urgent effort that had to be dealt with prior to the MAFWA Summer Meeting.

3. 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Technical Service Providers—This has been a hot issue and has been handled through IAFWA and was headed up by Bill McGuire (Missouri).
4. Field Office Technical Guide Wildlife Specifications—Efforts are underway to influence the Wildlife Specifications of the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide (FTOG). The FTOG is the implementation 'bible' of NRCS. If techniques are not in it, the field offices can't use them. Many of the techniques that currently are employed have been borrowed from general ag and range methodologies, which are rooted in production agriculture. As these are not always optimal for achieving desired wildlife results, we are working with NRCS to make changes to the FTOG. Ritch Nelson (Nebraska) is heading up this effort.
5. Emergency Haying and Grazing vs. Managed Haying and Grazing—These are two separate issues associated with CRP. One allows the President to release CRP lands for haying and/or grazing in the case of an emergency, the other was authorized in the 2002 Farm Bill to allow producers to hay and/or graze CRP acres on a planned schedule by agreeing to accept a lower annual rental payment. Each state was encouraged to send letters ASAP and to inform partners of the need to understand the differences.
6. Practices for Managing CRP—Inform Directors that CRP management is now a reality and begin preparing for how and what they can do with this tool. Bill McGuire is taking the lead on developing a state by state matrix of how this is being implemented. Other efforts are underway to help states deal with this opportunity and to help each other. Examples: practices such as CP5A and CP23, disking and interseeding, burning and timing, chemical, reseeding, shredding, invasive tree removal, shrub planting, prescribed grazing, prescribed haying.

The group also was engaged in a session to identify roadblocks that impede us from doing wildlife work on private lands. The following is a summary of this exercise.

### **Identifying Roadblocks To Private Land Habitat Work—Facilitated Discussion** Clayton Stalling

This session was conducted by first brainstorming basic ideas of things that create roadblocks to private lands habitat work; nearly 60 different roadblocks were listed in this quick-fire exercise. Secondly, the group selected the top five items by voting on the subjects to assign an importance factor to each. Finally, these top score recipients were discussed at length to articulate concerns and problems associated with the 'roadblock' and to then formulate potential solutions. This was a good exercise to provide baseline thinking for problem solving and to create a common perspective regarding the idea of roadblocks to conservation of private land habitats.

### **Communication (among agencies and landowners)—21 votes**

#### Solutions:

1. Target communications efforts to the appropriate audience
  - Appropriate way to target
    - Databases—can use for direct mailings
    - GIS
2. Develop better listening skills
3. Coordination between states, agencies, etc via:
  - Conference calls

Annual meetings

4. What tools are best to communicate with landowners?  
Let the situation dictate which tools to use
5. Strengthen contact with NRCS—be available, approachable
6. As much as possible, use one contact for landowner representing multiple agencies
7. We speak in “different languages”  
Coordinating meetings—learn other agency jargon
8. We need to paint a picture of program acronyms
9. Establish honesty, credibility, continuity between agencies and landowners  
Take our time  
“The seeds we plant today may not germinate until tomorrow”—Wessel 2003
10. Take *personal responsibility* to do a better job!

**Maintenance on Long Term Programs—12 votes**

1. Getting ability to do maintenance into agreement—emphasize the need for contract language that talks about maintenance.
2. Providing maintenance practices to with landowners farming opportunities and interests.
3. Add on performance-based-incentives
4. Develop longer term management plans
5. Develop innovative ideas—grazing coalitions (partnerships)
6. Develop fact sheets—outlines maintenance for each program, review with each cooperator
7. Understand and convey the difference between maintenance vs management

**Lack of Flexibility—12 votes**

- Too much flexibility can cause problems too!
- More flexibility can add landowners / projects that provide benefits, but now they don’t fit in.
- Programs with strict national guidelines

Solutions:

State technical committees need more flexibility to set rules within federal programs to address local conservation needs.

Example: Planting trees along prairie streams to meet federal guidelines to riparian buffers

Possible Product:

\*A letter to USDA in Washington citing specific examples of how national guidelines fail in some areas / situations

**Landowners Get Mixed Messages from Different People—11 Votes**

When?

USDA Programs

Wildlife agency employees

Conservation organizations

Coffee shop

Solutions:

1. Multi-agency meetings (state level)
2. Local agency meetings (on the same page)
3. Focus on landowners objectives
4. Identify proper habitat possibilities

5. Wildlife education
6. Insure habitat improvements are designed to achieve multiple resource/wildlife benefits
7. Improve trust among partners

**Perceived Conflict Among Agency Objectives—11 votes**

- Ongoing Communication between agencies!
- Make Sure we understand the objective of the other entity (do conflicts exist?).
- Is the conflict with specific individuals or the entity as a whole
- Search out “commonality” with the objectives between the two entities to mutually promote
- Agree to disagree on components that cannot be resolved
- Determine if any of the existing conflicts can be modified to an extent that they are mutually beneficial
- Associate with those other entities regularly
- Especially on positive issues—not just negative ones
- Clearly communicate all of the above from both angles to the landowners
- Document and publicize results to associated entities and public

**Integrating Conservation Principles into the Development of  
Accounting Rules and Guidelines for Terrestrial Carbon Sequestration:**

**A White Paper of the  
International Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies**



**444 North Capitol Street, NW, Suite 544  
Washington, DC 2001**

**JULY 2003**

## **Integrating Conservation Principles into the Development of Accounting Rules and Guidelines for Terrestrial Carbon Sequestration: A White Paper of the International Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies**

### Introduction

This paper is intended to serve as a guide to the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies' (IAFWA) member agencies, as well as the conservation community in general, in developing and articulating positions relative to pending and future policies and legislation pertaining to carbon sequestration. Specifically, this paper will deal with the issue of accounting rules and guidelines that are to be developed for terrestrial carbon sequestration, and how conservation principles can and should be integrated into those rules and guidelines. We will offer the view that carbon sequestration is, in essence, a conservation issue, with tremendous potential to not only offset the emissions of greenhouse gases through the storage of carbon, but also to restore the ecological functions of terrestrial ecosystems and their capacity to store carbon.

Much in the same way that Farm Bill conservation programs have had a tremendous impact on the nation's wildlife and fish habitats since 1986, carbon sequestration programs are likely to be as influential, if not more so, on the landscapes of tomorrow. Therefore, the conservation community must devote the same level of attention to the development of these new programs as we have to the Farm Bill conservation programs that we are already familiar with. Considering that land in the United States is a finite resource, which is being subjected to increasing pressure to provide a variety of societal needs, it is essential that carbon sequestration initiatives accomplish as many additional environmental purposes as possible. It will be a poor bargain for society if efforts to offset greenhouse gases through carbon sequestration result in a diminishing of other natural resources for which society would have to pay separately and additionally to correct.

### Background

Carbon sequestration can be defined as the capture and secure storage of carbon that would otherwise be emitted to or remain in the atmosphere. As the Department of Energy's third approach (in addition to increased fuel efficiency, and alternative technologies) in managing greenhouse gas emissions in the United States, carbon sequestration is believed to have immediate potential to reduce greenhouse gases in ways and at a cost that is both economically feasible and environmentally acceptable. The Department of Energy in its "Carbon Sequestration Technology Roadmap" has identified two goals for carbon sequestration, one of which is to demonstrate environmental acceptability. However, some in the environmental community have expressed ideological resistance to carbon sequestration as a greenhouse gas management tool,

primarily due to its being seen as solely an emissions-offset issue, and a way around other strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as increased efficiency of automobiles, or the use of alternative technologies to produce energy.

In addition to the release of atmospheric carbon through the emissions of fossil fuels, another major cause of the loss of stored carbon, as much as 50 percent over the last 50-70 years, has been the wide-scale alterations in the landscape through de-forestation and conversion to agriculture, urbanization, and other activities. According to USDA (2002), "The dominant drivers in terrestrial carbon emissions have been the conversion of forest and grassland to crop and pastureland, and the concomitant depletion of soil carbon from conventional agricultural management practices." This has resulted in increased carbon emissions to the atmosphere and reduced capacity of the terrestrial ecosystem to capture and store atmospheric carbon.

On February 14, 2002, President Bush announced his Administration's Global Climate Change Initiative, which is aimed at reducing the growth of GHG emissions in the U.S. while sustaining economic growth. The President established a target of reducing the greenhouse gas intensity of the U.S. Economy (a measure of the ratio of GHG emissions to Gross Domestic Product) by 18 percent over the next 10 years. As part of the Global Climate Change Initiative, a range of new and expanded domestic energy policies will be implemented, including carbon sequestration. To accomplish this aspect of the initiative, President Bush "directed the Secretary of Agriculture to provide recommendations on further, targeted incentives for forest and agricultural sequestration of greenhouse gases. The President further directed the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency and Department of Energy, to develop accounting rules and guidelines for crediting sequestration projects, taking into account emerging domestic and international approaches."

Through terrestrial carbon sequestration, the Department of Energy has established "regional improvements in ecosystem stability, biodiversity and water quality" as expected outcomes of the ancillary or collateral benefits of terrestrial carbon sequestration. In other words, conservation benefits are seen only as a potential by-product of terrestrial carbon sequestration. However, there is also potential and the need to create a paradigm whereby terrestrial carbon sequestration is seen as an ecosystem restoration tool, providing both carbon storage benefits and ecosystem restoration benefits. Without this new paradigm becoming an integral component in the development of carbon storage programs, the potential for programs with harmful impacts to natural ecosystems and their health will increase.

### Conservation Issues

As the development of accounting rules and guidelines moves forward, there are a number of issues that the conservation community should be prepared to address. The resolution of these issues will greatly influence whether carbon sequestration will be viewed as an environmental asset or an environmental liability. To strengthen carbon



sequestration's potential as an environmental asset, public agencies with fish and wildlife population management responsibilities must be brought into the decision-making process.

- Terrestrial carbon sequestration, as the third approach in managing greenhouse gas emissions, will become a conservation catalyst, much the same way that farm policies and other major land use policies have been catalysts for large-scale habitat change in the past. This force for change has both positive and/or negative potential impacts on ecosystems and their habitats.
- Terrestrial carbon sequestration will introduce an economic variable into land use and land management decisions that will likely be unprecedented in scope, and unknown in effect. In essence, carbon sequestration programs will affix an economic value onto an ecological function, a value which heretofore has never been part of the equation in making land use or land management decisions.
- Without appropriate guidelines and restrictions and/or incentives, economic forces of carbon sequestration could negatively influence the ability to restore native habitats and ecosystem integrity. Non-native species may be shown to possess greater carbon storage capability than native species, thus creating an economic market force that will provide cheaper carbon storage methods, but yield no ecological benefits, or perhaps even cause further degradation of ecosystems.
- Within the environmental community, a number of organizations harbor an ideological resistance to carbon sequestration programs, seeing these programs as ways to avoid other alternatives for reducing greenhouse gases. Without incorporating conservation principles into the development of guidelines and accounting rules, ideological resistance to carbon sequestration programs is likely to become stronger and broader among many mainstream conservation organizations, especially if carbon programs result in adverse impacts to floral and faunal communities.

#### The Farm Bill and Carbon Sequestration

The President's Global Climate Change Initiative has identified the Farm Bill and its conservation provisions as a primary vehicle for accomplishing significant carbon sequestration benefits in the next 10 years. In his FY03 budget, President Bush requested a \$1 billion increase in Farm Bill funding "as part of a ten year (2002-2011) commitment to implement and improve the conservation title of the Farm Bill, which will significantly enhance the natural storage of carbon."

Activities and program objectives pertaining to carbon sequestration are identified in three titles of the 2002 Farm Bill:

- Title 2, Conservation. Sec. 1240H. Conservation Innovation Grants – *“implement projects, such as” ..... “(B) innovative conservation practices, including the storing of carbon in the soil”*
- Title 8, Forestry. Sec. 4. Forest Land Enhancement Program – Program Objective #4 is *“Increasing and enhancing carbon sequestration opportunities.”*
- Title 9, Energy. Sec. 9009. Cooperative Research and Extension Projects – Purposes:
  - Developing data addressing carbon losses and gains in soils and plants (including trees) and the exchange of methane and nitrous oxide from agriculture;
  - Understanding how agricultural and forestry practices affect the sequestration of carbon in soils and plants (including trees);
  - Evaluating the linkage between federal conservation programs and carbon sequestration;
  - Developing methods, including remote sensing, to measure the exchange of carbon and other greenhouse gases sequestered, and to evaluate leakage, performance, and permanence issues.

It is clear that the Farm Bill will be of emerging importance as a vehicle for delivering a significant portion of the nation’s carbon sequestration efforts. Coupled with the Secretary of Agriculture’s responsibilities “to provide recommendations on further, targeted incentives for forest and agricultural sequestration of greenhouse gases” and “to develop accounting rules and guidelines for crediting sequestration projects”, conservation organizations must be prepared to become engaged in this process to ensure that sound conservation policies are considered and incorporated into carbon sequestration program development.

#### Operating Principles to Guide the Development of Accounting Rules and Guidelines

The following principles are offered as guiding principles for IAFWA and its member organizations in developing positions and recommendations relative to carbon sequestration accounting rules and guidelines.

- Adopt a Conservation-based Vision of Terrestrial Carbon Sequestration
  - The vision should recognize that carbon sequestration is a conservation issue in a fundamental sense, and not just in an ancillary or collateral sense.

- The vision should be eco-regionally based (temperate forests, forested wetlands, prairies, grasslands, etc.), recognizing that different ecosystems have inherently different carbon storage mechanisms and capabilities, and carbon sequestration activities should be tailored to those capabilities while recognizing the priority fish and wildlife habitat needs unique to each eco-region.
- Apply the *Principle of Concurrent Restoration* to determinations.
  - The *Principle of Concurrent Restoration* seeks to restore the natural ecological capability of the terrestrial ecosystem to store carbon by promoting policies and guidelines that will restore that ecosystem in an environmentally sustainable way. Carbon sequestration activities should not diminish other natural resources, including fish and wildlife.

*Principle of Concurrent Restoration: Whereas the process of terrestrial carbon sequestration involves the restoration of a degraded ecological function, the restoration of that function should not come at the expense of other ecological functions and values and should in fact produce concurrent restoration benefits.*

- Identify fish and wildlife as public resources that are managed by states for the benefit of present and future generations.
  - These public resources make significant contributions to the nation's economy through fish and wildlife-related recreation, with 82 million participants spending over \$100 billion in 2001. Because terrestrial carbon sequestration has the potential to alter the current landscape and habitats that fish and wildlife depend on, states occupy an important and unique role as a stakeholder in the development of these programs. Rules and guidelines that assign value to land use and that may result in large-scale conversions of habitat require consultation with state fish and wildlife agencies.

#### USDA Accounting Rules and Guidelines

As the USDA moves through its process of developing accounting rules and guidelines, as directed by the President, there are a number of issues and questions concerning their development that should be addressed relative to the *Principle of Concurrent Restoration* for terrestrial carbon sequestration. Therefore, we offer the following conservation principles that should be considered in evaluating and developing recommendations relative to Accounting Rules and Guidelines:

- **Qualifying activities** for terrestrial carbon sequestration should provide benefits to both carbon sequestration and ecological restoration. Under Section 1605(b) of

the *Energy Policy Act of 1992*, the Department of Energy developed a Voluntary Reporting of Greenhouse Gases Program, including voluntary reporting of carbon sequestration projects. Within this program, a number of forestry and agricultural activities are listed with potential carbon sequestration benefits. Some activities, such as afforestation of agricultural lands, have the potential to provide ecological benefits if conducted with an ecological restoration objective. Likewise, such activities could also adversely impact wildlife habitat if, for instance, exotic species were used or a monoculture plantation forest were established. The Department of Energy also recognizes that prairie and grassland ecosystems hold great promise to provide carbon storage benefits, though less work has been conducted in these systems compared to forested systems. Therefore, carbon sequestration programs designed for prairie and grassland ecosystems should be carefully constructed to maintain and/or enhance the ecological integrity of the system while providing carbon storage benefits.

- Qualifying activities should be eco-regionally based, to ensure compatibility of carbon sequestration practice(s) with the climate and soil characteristics of the area. Incentives should be established to promote and encourage carbon sequestration projects that include an ecological restoration component.
- Qualifying activities should require or provide incentives to use native species rather than exotic or invasive species in carbon sequestration projects.
- Qualifying activities should require or provide incentives for carbon sequestration projects to promote diverse landscapes utilizing endemic species as opposed to exotic or monoculture systems (except in cases where restoring natural forests favor monoculture systems, e.g., longleaf pine ecosystems). These incentives should be developed for both forested and prairie ecosystems.
- Qualifying activities should encourage and promote the development of carbon sequestration projects utilizing natural vegetation systems, as opposed to “enhanced” vegetation.
- Qualifying activities for primary and secondary existing forests should include provisions that allow and encourage thinning and other forest stand improvement practices, when needed, to reduce excessive stocking levels. This will result in benefits to many wildlife species, with the added benefit of increased timber quality at the end of the rotation.
- Careful consideration must be given to the integration of carbon sequestration benefits and credits into existing Farm Bill conservation programs such as the Conservation Reserve Program and the Wetlands Reserve Program. Likewise, new Farm Bill conservation programs, such

as the Conservation Security Program and Grassland Reserve Program have the potential to significantly influence conservation on private lands, and provide further carbon sequestration benefits. If carbon sequestration benefits are included as part of the ranking process for these programs, they should not detract from other intended conservation benefits to wildlife habitat, soil conservation, and water quality, and in fact should be structured to enhance these benefits. **If carbon sequestration credits are to be allowed within these publicly financed programs, then practices should be required to provide concurrent environmental benefits.**

- **Addressing the issues of additionality, leakage, permanence, and verification**
  - To ensure that carbon sequestration programs result in a net gain of stored carbon within an environmentally sustainable context, the issues of **additionality** (carbon storage benefits accrued in addition to what would occur in the absence of a carbon project), **leakage** (migration of carbon emitting activities such as logging or land clearing to other areas outside the project area, effectively offsetting carbon sequestration benefits), **permanence** (duration of carbon storage methods), and **verification** (methods for measuring and verifying carbon sequestration benefits) should be addressed with careful consideration of their ecological impacts.
- **Addressing the issue of scale**
  - **Scale** refers to the land area that will be used to determine baseline carbon storage capacity (no carbon offset programs in place), and also to evaluate additionality and leakage as carbon programs are established. The scale for carbon sequestration programs should be of sufficient size to enable effective monitoring of additionality and leakage. At a minimum, carbon programs should be accounted for and reported at the county level. This would allow for state and region-wide summaries with minimal effort. However, consideration for an ecological scale is also warranted, which will require more sophisticated measurements and analyses. Therefore, carbon projects should be geospatially referenced, to allow for GIS analyses utilizing remote sensing data and other technologies.
- **Development of demonstration and research projects**
  - In the energy title (Title IX) of the 2002 Farm Bill, emphasis is placed on developing demonstration and cooperative research projects to further the understanding of carbon sequestration on the carbon cycle, increase the understanding of how agricultural and forestry practices affect the sequestration of carbon in soils and plants, develop cost-effective means of measuring and monitoring changes in carbon pools in soils and plants, evaluate the linkage between federal conservation programs and carbon sequestration, and to establish benchmark standards for future carbon

programs. However, none of these objectives will lead to an evaluation of environmental acceptance of carbon storage methods, or whether concurrent restoration benefits will result. **Therefore, in addition to these objectives, demonstration projects should assess concurrent restoration benefits and the environmental acceptability of carbon sequestration methods.** Demonstration projects should also promote additionality, and not result in the conversion of native grasslands to forests or other non-native systems.

- **Monitoring and evaluation** should address not only the carbon response, but also the ecological response.
  - A monitoring and evaluation component for a carbon sequestration program should be able to evaluate the following: 1) Sequestration estimates and measurement; 2) Baseline development; 3) Leakage assessment; 4) Permanence; 5) Ecological benefits, including habitat restoration, water quality, flood storage, etc.