

Minutes
MAFWA Business Meeting
July 1, 2015
Radisson Harborview Hotel
Duluth, Minnesota

Wednesday, July 1, 2015

Breakfast – Sponsored by National Wild Turkey Federation

Council to Advance Hunting and Shooting Sports Update

John Frampton (PowerPoint - Exhibit 37, Handouts – Exhibit 38) – Problems: (showed clips on PowerPoint) Ferguson, MO shooting, the press didn't know what earplugs were post said they were rubber bullets; Navy Yard showed AR15 which was not what was used. People actually thought guy went out and shot a dinosaur. Hunter Statistics: 13.7 million residents hunt, expend \$33.7 billion, create 680,000 jobs, produce \$11.8 billion in tax revenues and generate almost \$87 billion in economic output. Shooting statistics are different: 17.4 percent of adult population shoots (40,780,000 in some form), generating \$9.9 billion, 185,000 jobs, producing \$3.5 million in tax revenues and \$23 billion in economic output. Hunting and shooting together generates \$110 billion in economic input and supports 866,339 jobs. Median age of hunters in 1980 was 32 with median age of shooters at 38; now 46 with median age 45, steadily rising. Rural vs. urban, how do we get them to shoot in Washington DC when you can't even have a spent bullet in your possession. Last survey of hunters 2001-2011, half percent decline; long-term trend still a decline. What have we done so far; \$30 million spent each year by state agencies for recruitment and retention, but mostly single event programs, not coordinated effort. These are great photo ops, but have fewer participants, questionable return on investment, erosion of North American model, feel good programs that are a lot of talk. If we were in business we would be bankrupt if line kept going downhill like that. Businesses closing everywhere; obese youth, grandfather was last one hunting and guns would be in museums, that is the way we are heading. If we assume hunter is active for 50 years (age 18 to 68), it would take 14 million (280,000 a year, per state) just to maintain that number and 800,000 shooters. "Do the same thing over and over, get the same results. Change is not mandatory but neither is survival." Get your head out of the sand. The Council's Commitment – "Council with partners will develop national strategy for recruitment, retention and reactivation and will begin facilitating the implementation of a hunting and shooting sports national recruitment, retention and reactivation plan." The Council is a non-profit charitable educational organization; an outgrowth of AFWA's Industry/Agency Coalition and formed at the recommendation of major national conservation organizations and industry. We need partnerships like the Recreation Boating and Fishing Foundation (RBFF), with states putting in a set amount of money each year. Our funding base comes from state fish and wildlife base. Purpose is to "ensure support for and active participation in hunting and the shooting sports for future generations." Board made up of 32 members from NGOs, Industry, state, USFWS and IHEA members. The National Plan, why do we need it; to ensure hunting and shooting

sports in the future; promote positive aspects of hunting and shooting sports; ensure continuation of Wildlife Restoration Program. We have the National Plan Committee (Council Board) in place; Plan Development Workgroup (includes myself, Matt Dunfree and Jon Gassett, WMI; Mandy Harling, NWTF; Michelle Zeug, ARA; Steve Hall, IHEA; Samantha Peddler, NSSF; Brian Hyder, NRA; Mark Horobetz, DU; Paige Pearson, CAHSS; Ashley Salo, AFWA & CAHSS; and numerous state representatives), continues to work on the plan; framework presented November 5, 2014; Plan Advisory Workgroup (includes Dan Forester, Ross Melinchuk, Kelly Hepler, Ben Carter, Whit Fosburgh, Miles Moretti, Nick Pinizzotto, Brian Murphy, Ryan Bronson and John Eichinger) established to provide advice and help promote plan, who has had face to face meetings; Council will continue to seek partners to support and endorse this plan. Recruitment model, big difference between recruitment, retention and reactivation. It is a mentoring thing, not something that can be done overnight. Put all threats in four categories: lack of skills, lack of awareness, lack of motivation and lack of access. We identified 26 threats and looking at what caused them and why. For each threat identify social, cultural, economic and other factors; develop strategies; and look at desired outcomes and performance measures. Then work with organizations and agencies with the resources, expertise and vested interest to best implement the existing and needed strategies. Three action committees work hard on those threats (Plan content; Related content; and Communications). Looking at suite of effective proven strategies and tools that will result in more hunters and shooting sports participants and better return on investment. Sustained funding will most likely need to come from PR funds similar to the way RBFF gets funding from DJ funds. We have 49 states and meeting with the one remaining state later this month. Need to apply for \$3 million to \$4 million in multi-state grants and direct some of funds to R3 programs and the Council would apply for those funds. Plan must be implementable. What can you do? Appoint a R3 person to work at regional and national level from your state and communicate with staff; look at license data and query where hunters are going, look at the future; look at existing R3 programs in your state, are they meeting your expectations (good programs out there but they are not getting the numbers); and establish external stakeholder groups. You can't do this alone, need to build partnerships and provide for the future. Picture of three grandkids; want to make sure their grandkids have the same opportunity that they did. Thanks for support you have given us so far and committee members. *Bob Ziehmer, MO* – Thanks for what you are doing. Advice as past agency director, appoint a person for the R3. Staff needs to understand directors are behind them; crisis like 1900s; impacts everything in the agency so need an enthusiastic person in that R3 position, someone you know will get the job done and the person also needs respect within the agency.

Legal Strategy

Jeff Vonk – Working under contract with AFWA. I will get you caught up on schedule, thanks for meeting with me individually during this meeting and appreciate feedback. Four points, functioning well; introduced Parks Gilbert, who works with AFWA and works with Carol Bamberry. Legal strategy is part of overall AFWA strategy. First part: active law school outreach, talking to them about offering classes on NA model and NA wildlife law to educate law students who are also receiving animal rights

education, make it more fair and balanced. Second: Parks has put on webinars and seminars for actively practicing attorneys on wildlife law. Third: Historically available in support of internal council, will help with amicus briefs, keep that in mind if in a bind on legal help. Fourth: Strategy secured outside funding to place legal interns in state agencies; a couple at headquarters and a couple in state agencies this summer; talk to me, Carol or Parks about that.

MAFWA BUSINESS MEETING

Ed Boggess, MAFWA President – Officially called to order at 8:34 AM

Call to Order and Roll Call

All states present, except Illinois and South Dakota were not in the room. Have proxies for Dale Garner, IA for Kelley Meyers; Steve Beam, KY for Greg Johnson; Scott Peterson, ND for Terry Steinwand; and Kurt Thiede, WI for Cathy Stepp. (*Exhibit 39*); no Canadian provinces present.

Agenda Review

Copy of our agenda is listed in programs, a few items not printed in program: North Central Section Wildlife Society workshop potential sponsorship; MAFWA wolf committee establishment; 100th anniversary Migratory Bird Treaty Act; and Treasurer successor.

Approval of 2014 Annual Meeting Minutes

Annual meeting minutes (*Exhibit 40*); *Scott Peterson, ND moved to accept minutes as printed, Keith Sexson, KS second. Motion carried.*

Approval of Special (October 21, 2014) Board Meeting Minutes

Regarding NLEB (*Exhibit 41*); *Dale Garner, IA moved to accept minutes as printed, Scott Zody, OH second. Motion carried.*

Treasurer's Report

Sharon M. Schafer, MI – (*Exhibit 42*) – Summary as of December 31, 2014 \$55,864 in general account, used for banking services for all conferences; \$110,206 in conference account, which is MAFWA's business account; \$5 in Southern Wings; \$5,477 in federal grants; \$5 in share account, needed to be a member of the credit union. Investments are what Shane will provide an overview on later: \$367,804 in Jaschek account; and \$4,143 in conservation enhancement fund; for total of \$543,506 in all accounts. In general account: as of January 1, 2014, \$17,200; revenue: registrations from NLEB \$13,460, sponsors NLEB \$5,000, KS MFWC \$38,378, \$6,900 from MI MFWC, plus another \$1,000 from Deer and Turkey group (see note at bottom of page), deer/turkey conference \$2,066, member dues \$2,323 (from IN, through an ACH, we will work on changing that), and miscellaneous of \$29 for total \$61,257; *Mark Reiter, IN* – Is Kansas money MAFWA's or Kansas money? *Keith Sexson, KS* – It is Kansas money. *Sharon* – Holding money from you also. MAFWA is keeping the interest. On expenditures NLEB speaker \$634, NLEB hotel \$8,360 (partial payment because not enough money generated and MAFWA agreed to pay \$10,000), MI is next host of MFWC \$2,100 for venue deposit,

deer/turkey conference \$1,000 for venue deposit, DMEM \$10,079 for both of these conferences (mostly IN \$8,900 and rest to deer/turkey, and miscellaneous of \$428); for balance of about \$56,800. Conference Account, where MAFWA has business transactions: balance as of January 1, 2014, \$92,000; sponsors \$63,000 (includes some from 2013 about \$7,000), registrations \$23,000, member dues \$31,600 (some from next year \$3,400), affiliate dues \$1,400, exhibit fees \$650, 5% of administrative fee for Southern Wings \$750, hotel commission for MI \$2,400, and misc \$1,154 (Ollie error in dollar amount – so refunded money); for total revenue of \$124,734.50. Expenses: Ollie salary \$41,166, travel \$8,668 (Ollie, me and Sheila), DMEM for MI \$12,300, DMEM for KY \$38, insurance \$1,155, hotel MI \$14,657, hotel NLEB (includes \$10,000 MAFWA agreed to pay) \$13,786, awards \$1,300, accounting \$1,250 (for filing 990), MI conference gifts \$2,019, charter boat MI \$644, shuttles MI \$1,860, food and beverage MI \$6,300, credit card charges \$566 (through DMEM), and misc \$625; total \$106,414 in expenditures; balance of \$110,206. Southern Wings is a pass through account, work with Deb Hahn and AFWA to get those funds out \$15,000 revenue; expenses: administrative fee \$750, AFWA \$2,375, American Bird Conservancy (ABC) \$11,875, total \$15,000. Federal grant, plan to move this to conference account, no activity, because WAFWA taking over other federal grant administration. *Bill Moritz, MI* – Any strings attached to federal grant funds? *Sharon* – We have dispersed all funds, this is seed money we put in. Share account has \$5 to keep credit union account open. Investments: interest \$12,500, dividends \$8,543; total \$21,120; change in market value \$47 loss; for balance of \$367,804. Shane will call in at 9:00 am. Conservation enhancement fund interest, dividends and donations \$210 and \$35 charge (for inactivity, that we can't figure out when they charge), for balance of just over \$4,000. Next page is summary of budget we adopted and how we turned out in comparison. *Keith Sexson, KS moved, Bill Moritz, MI second. Motion carried.*

Audit Committee Report

Bob Ziehmer, MO – Had opportunity to provide audit service to Association, for calendar years January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2014 (*two years – Exhibit 43*), reviewed general ledger entries, bank statements, profit and loss schedule, balance sheet and supporting documents. No material differences or errors were noted and approved standard, according to the audit. *Kurt Thiede, WI, Scott Zody, OH second. Motion carried.*

MAFWA Investments Committee Report

Bob Ziehmer, MO – Shane is investor we hired in 2006 and Shane wanted a chance to call in. In compliance with strategy, asking Shane to take \$5,000 out of money market and move over into investments. While waiting for Shane asked Dave Scott to do short presentation.

Dave Scott, USFWS, Region 3 – August 16, 1916 was the date the Migratory Bird Treaty was signed with Great Britain on behalf of Canada, so next year will be the 100th anniversary (*Exhibit 44*). Great vehicle to take to general public. Taking opportunity to talk to eight states in the Midwest about opportunities like State Fairs, Migratory Bird hunting events, bird festivals and meetings, and bird conservation campaigns. The kick

off will be in May 2016 in Chicago area at the Midwest Centennial Celebration.

Encourage participation.

Bob Ziehmer, MO – Account for and reflect back to when you started giving conservative approach? *Shane Hessman (via conference call – handouts Exhibit 45)* – In past year, due to world events, extremely happy with way fund performed, bonds went down small amount in market value, didn't do as well as in the past. Last year we added one \$10,000 bond and by doing that it raised the annual interest rate from 5.97% to 6%. Consistently tripled or better. Market values went down because markets are leveling out. On Monday had correction, below where it was January 1 of this year. Took over account August 2006, averaged 6% and we are averaging 8% return now; equity index more potential, but you have a higher risk; bonds allow us to be conservative, market value may have fluctuated, but interest rate has not. We have \$220,332 in bonds, concerned with interest rate returns. Looking at actual prices we paid, one paid premium for, but majority 5% when we purchased them, which I did not factor in. Mutual funds had a decent return. Money market has grown, keep between \$10,000 to \$15,000 for immediate access to fund a project or in case something else comes up, that is available, right now we have \$23,000, which pays very little interest. Suggest moving \$5,000 to \$10,000 to mutual fund portfolio. *Bob Ziehmer, MO* – Questions for directors for Shane? *Shane* – Any questions as far as bonds we hold, concerns with any of that? *Scott Zody, OH* – What is SLM Corp? *Bob Ziehmer, MO* – We hold three bonds with them. *Shane* – That is Sallie Mae, which is basically college loans, Sallie Mae was bought out Nevient; like them because they are directly guaranteed by federal government but that is one type of loan that even if borrower declares bankruptcy they can't get rid of it (still owe it). College loans may be forgiven, which is true, but miniscule to parts that are guaranteed and backed by the federal government. Most of secondary education notes will be paid, at market value of 70 to 80 percent of face value, lower interest paying bonds. Media scared people off of college loans, a joke that they have caused so many issues. *Jim Douglas, NE* – Could we listen to amount currently in money market and how we want to change that? *Bob Ziehmer, MO* - \$23,502.21, Shane wants to move \$5,000 to \$10,000, may be a need to take it down that far because of Monarch butterfly issue. *Jim Douglas, NE* – If there is a new recommendation for new amount, how do we populate that? *Bob Ziehmer, MO* – Predates me, originally where did we come up with number to keep between \$5,000 and \$10,000? *Shane* – Came into effect when I took over, no investment guidelines, when with the bank, managed an endowment fund and they used the rough number of \$15,000 to \$20,000 because that was the amount of college scholarships they funded every year. Federal fund rate like t-bills and bonds, amount a bank pays to borrow money from other banks overnight. Fund is at \$0, hold money to keep it liquid and gave bank money to use towards overall balances, no incentive for banks to pay a higher rate for a money market; speaking to other analysts, don't see any interest higher than half a percent until 2021. Keep as little as possible in a money market, discussed five years ago to be able to be used to fund a project, would take mutual fund or bond at least four days or more to liquidate; keep amount available to fund projects. *Ollie* – Previous direction was to build fund to \$500,000 (*Bob repeated*)? *Shane* – That was the original goal, we have had some big hiccups in the market, but hope doubled in two years, will be a full ten. Shooting for a half million, but not hold up the committee if project comes up. *Ollie* – We can reinvest to grow to half million and take annual earning for operation, or take

some of money for Monarch butterfly conference or hire a treasurer? *Shane* – Correct. *Bob Ziehmer, MO* – Preference, move an action item to move dollars into mutual funds, investment committee thought \$5,000 or should we hold that action item and determine if we hold that action item until later in the meeting? *Ed Boggess, MN* – Final agenda is approval of next year's budget; may bring back later in the meeting. *Bob Ziehmer, MO* – Shane, Association appreciates your help on this, thanks for calling in; I or Ollie will get with you later on our decision. *Shane* – I will try to be in Springfield next year. *Ed Boggess, MN* – Investments are doing well, decide what to invest and what to spend later.

Resolutions Committee Report

Ed Boggess, MN - We have two resolutions I am aware of; one on 30th anniversary of Conservation reserve program, “**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, in adopting this Resolution in assembly on July 1, 2015, pay tribute to the Conservation Reserve Program on its thirtieth anniversary and extend congratulations to the United States Department of Agriculture for its efforts during those years.” (*Exhibit 46*). *Bill Moritz, MI moved to accept resolution, Bob Ziehmer, MO second. Scott Zody, OH*– Sent to where? Resolution should accompany letter and once adopted we could distribute more widely. **Motion Carried.**

Second one is from the Wildlife and Fish Health Committee (*Exhibit 47*) conceptual support but concerns of definitive nature of resolution (**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Directors at its annual meeting in Duluth, Minnesota on June 28 – July 1, 2015 support discontinuing use of neonicotinoids on State managed lands.) - no timeline attached to this, may be some hurdles or lack of supply until adequate substitutes to replace that use, cooperative farmers here in Minnesota and would have to work with them to see they had the seeds. *Steve Beam, KY* – We have some concerns in terms of where we are, on my list and intend to look at limiting or stopping use on Ag. lands, but we are in range of Eastern Hemlock because they are dying and uncomfortable with saying we will stop them because we use them for conservation use. *Terry Riley, The Grouse Partnership* – People trying to monitor use into the future, a lot of concern in both directions, say decrease use and end eventually, but monitor it, find out who is using it and what used for. Some other groups are dealing with this same issue. *Ed Boggess, MN* – **WHEREAS**, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service have already implemented a program to phase out the use of neonicotinoid pesticides in agricultural practices on National Wildlife Refuges by January 2016. *Terry Riley, The Grouse Partnership* – Manage before you say you are going to end it. *Ed Boggess, MN* – My personal feeling is this is a conceptual agreement. *Bill Moritz, MI* – Table until the next meeting. *Ed Boggess, MN* – No need to table if no one moves. Continue to have committees report. *Scott Peterson, ND* – I read resolution, should support more research, but a lot of farming is through cooperators and don't want to paint them in the corner. Want to research the list, includes three insecticides, need to know more about what we are talking about. Also, felt resolution should have come from Public Lands committee. *Ron Regan, AFWA* – USFWS put out that statement a year ago, looked into that and did exploratory work, in principle support for their direction, but question timing of getting there. Possibly some intermediate discussion at our meeting

would help. *Ed Boggess, MN* – Get all of our interests together, no motion to adopt so pass on that.

Awards Committee Report

Keith Sexson, KS – (Exhibit 48) Thank members of committee and thank states for sending in nominations, deserving winners. Thanks to everyone involved. *Ed Boggess, MN* – Scott brought up point for NLEB, hard-working team and only one plaque, interest in getting three other plaques at cost of \$127.50 each; look at our budget to see if that can happen. *Keith Sexson, KS* – If the will of the Board to do that we could make it happen. *Ed Boggess, MN* – Need three or four more, I think four and give one to Scott; approximately \$500. ***Bill Moritz, MI moved to buy four additional plaques, Scott Peterson, ND second. Motion carried.***

Bylaws Committee Report

Dale Garner, IA on behalf of Kelley Myers – (Exhibit 49) – Limited changes this year; proposed changes in red, date change is first; for business functions an increase of \$1,000; removal of Midwest Pheasant Study Group and date changes on those committees that are sun-setting; and amended date added. For next year, like to do more thorough review, clarifications and clean up, committee roles, electronic voting options, notices and removing other possible committees; be mindful of what is working. *Ed Boggess, MN* – We voted on removing fish chiefs committee and there is a potential new committee on wolves. Discussion on Sunday on dues changes based on Midwest Urban CPI from January to January or something like that and Ollie's contract, Executive Committee felt like cost of living raise, but CPI went down. Need to discuss that. The Executive Committee can make a recommendation, not worried about dues going up and down, but do worry about salary. Decided to treat salary like social security, \$0 cost of living increase if CPI goes down so that is how we are handling Executive Secretary's salary. Need to discuss dues and see if we treat that the same, this year will go down a little because that is what bylaws state. *Terry Riley, The Grouse Partnership* – 20 years ago we added Midwest Pheasant Study Group and talked about adding Prairie Grouse Technical Council, assumed it did happen, was that group never considered part of this body? *Ollie* – I invited them and they rejected us, don't want administrators looking over their shoulder; wanted to be independent. Came to North American Grouse Partnership, so they need tax entity and they have a budget, president is responsible for the money so they came to us because we are a non-profit. Believe, because of the work they are doing it is time to look at that again. *Ed Boggess, MN* – Or they can approach us. ***Bob Ziehmer, MO moved, Kurt Thiede, WI second. Motion carried.***

Executive Secretary's Report

Ollie Torgerson – (Exhibit 50) – Each year I give a snapshot of activities during the past year. Active year, right in middle had change of officers, 30 days after AFWA annual business meeting Keith Creagh transitioned to Ed Boggess, who both provided capable leadership. Lost three directors: Jeff Vonk, Marc Miller and Scott Gunderson. Welcome three new: Kelly Hepler, Wayne Rosenthal, and Kurt Thiede. Keith Creagh isn't here but he is still director of Michigan, but he assigned Bill Moritz as representative to MAFWA. Every state in the U.S. currently has a sitting director. This is not common these days. At

meeting in Traverse City, decided to tackle NLEB workshop in a short period of time because USFWS was facing December 12 deadline to respond to a listing petition; contracted DMEM to find a hotel, established planning team, invited interested parties and pulled it off in time to develop science-based plan and submit it, done in record time. To pull off a workshop and have it done by fall is not an easy task, a real credit to this Association and its members. We were also able to collaborate with the other regional associations as well as forestry associations. MAFWA was awarded an \$854,000 multi-state conservation grant on human dimensions wildlife values. We learned our indirect cost rate of \$40,000 would not be honored but only \$5,000 would be allowed and then Sharon let us know she was leaving; our Executive Committee offered WAFWA a chance to administer this grant and they agreed. We were asked to underwrite a coordinator for the National Pheasant Plan, most states stepped up (asked all 23 state in pheasant range) and are moving forward with the hiring, announcement ready to go out as soon as Jim Douglas tells me we are ready; hope to have person on board by September. Monarch Butterfly Conservation Initiative, monarchs are in trouble, as well as other pollinator species; this is on our front burner and we will be discussing today under New Business. Also, greater prairie chicken and sharp-tailed grouse also need help and we will hear from Director Sexson on this today. You directors are making a difference through this Association. My duties include: working on this conference, welcoming new directors, managing website, raising sponsorships, assisting the President and Executive Committee, working with committees, NGOS and federal partners and other duties as assigned. Honor to serve you, in thirteenth year as your Executive Secretary. The Resolution Committee failed to thank Minnesota for this conference. *Ed Boggess, MN* – That is my fault. *Ollie* - Thank volunteers Sheila Kemmis and Sharon Schafer and KDWP and MI DNR for providing them; and WI DNR for supplying my office space, computer services and office support and MO DOC for providing professional audit. Next meeting will be in Springfield, Missouri at the Holiday Inn and Suites, June 26-29, 2016. *Ed Boggess, MN* – Ollie does a tremendous job for our Association; definite shift in resources and ability to get work done. Only had volunteer staff before, thank you, you do a tremendous job.

Approval of Affiliate Memberships

Ollie Torgerson – We have 28 affiliate members and two have dropped out, Audubon and Ray Evans, so now 26 and have no requests for affiliate memberships. Cost is only \$75 a year.

Refreshment Break – Sponsored by National Rifle Association

Old Business

America's Wildlife Values Project

Ed Boggess, MN - Working on Phase II, now national project.

Dr. Tara Teel – Colorado State University – (Exhibit 51) - Appreciate MAFWA and WAFWA for starting this, nationwide assessment of wildlife values. Worked with Ollie Torgerson and Jeff Vonk, former chair of WAFWA human dimensions committee. In addition to Mike Manfredo and myself, have Mark Duda, Responsive Management, Dave Fulton, MN Coop F&W Research Unit and Jeremy

Bruskotter, OH State University on the research team; and project managers Andrew Don Carlos, CO State University, Lou Cornicelli, MN DNR and Loren Chase, AZ Game and Fish department. The national conservation need (NCN) attached to this read “Strengthening state fish and wildlife agency capacity to understand and respond to changing trends in constituent values and demographics”, to help us understand why it happened and understand the future. Pre-proposal submitted by MAFWA and WAFWA through NCN; glad WAFWA on board to administer the funds. Recap history and study options to summarize study background, describe study options for each state, provide brief update on process and timeline and respond to questions. Project allows for replication of WAFWAs multistate grant in 2004 on wildlife values in the western states and establishes a baseline for the other 31 states . Unique, across state lines and across time and values allow prediction without conducting another survey. Values are linked to attitudes toward wildlife-related issues and management strategies as well as behaviors like wildlife-related recreation participation. Two wildlife value orientations: utilitarian, who manage for human enjoyment and benefit; and mutualism, who care for wildlife and believe animals should have rights like humans. From 2004 study, looked at geographic distribution, percent of people who are utilitarian’s, the darker the shade (on slides) the higher percentage. Looking at how certain factors like urbanization linked with changes and move towards mutualism and current study will allow us to more fully explore along these lines. States like HI, CA, WA and AZ more mutualisms, direct relationship to urban areas and percent residing in the city. Disconnect with children in nature so that plays out. If adult moves from rural to urban areas, doesn’t say that person’s value changes, but their children and grandchildren most likely will. This played out in previous project, linked to perceptions of trust. Finding links between mutualism to trust of state fish and wildlife agencies, important to researchers. When emerging public (mutualisms) comes forward there is a disconnect; looking more closely. Looking at different forms of state governments across the states, with interview and governance of trust questions. Another snapshot we were able to look at, strong latent demand for hunting in certain areas, those more likely to support and participate in hunting and fishing. Previous project had an extension, follow up to look at regional value differences, look at county level SD, AZ and WA; demonstrate and test at finer degrees of resolution for on the ground issues. For instance, wolf mgmt in Washington drastic differences in counties. Objectives: 1) identify trends in wildlife values in the western region/create baseline in other states, 2) show how values are geographically distributed across the landscape at state, regional, and national levels, 3) assess characteristics and approaches to agency governance and how they relate to values and levels of public trust, 4) provide current data on public attitudes and behaviors regarding key management issues of interest to participating agencies, and 5) identify and model the underlying causes of value shift to depict future scenarios. Approach is to partner with Responsive Management. I was PhD student at time of last study, we hired undergrads and had huge storage rooms for boxes and it made sense to contract out. Targeting all 50 states, develop web/mail survey for research methodology; also looked at phone survey, but decided not to; consulted with Dr. Don Dillman at WA State University and he has advised us on approach. Target random sample of 400/state, estimate at 95% C.I and do non-responsive check via wave analysis. Agency participation options: Level 1 – basic value information plus limited descriptive questions at no direct cost to states; Level II - would require level I and state-specific set

of questions (10 questions), state gets state-specific report, and cost per state would be \$10,000; Level III, strata level data collection at county level, urban vs. rural, hunter/angler; state gets state-specific report; cost depends on number of strata. General timeline; started before official start date of January 1; in December assembled 50 state committee state representatives; kickoff with Ron Regan at AFWA and communicated to states; since then developed study design and by July 15 will have states let us know what level of commitment they want. Beginning to work on data collection in January 2016. Have created a website (<http://www.wildlifevalues.org/>) and provided my email address (tara.teel@colostate.edu) if you have questions. I do have the list of state representatives if you are interested. *Ed Boggess, MN* – Look forward to seeing the results.

National Wild Pheasant Plan Coordinator

Ed Boggess, MN – Thank Jim Douglas for leading Ad Hoc task force to work on this, also Keith Sexson and Scott Zody who worked on that.

Jim Douglas, NE – Update, we have, with cooperation, developed vacancy announcement and will put out as soon as I get back and check with committee; referred on MAFWA website and point of contact will be one of the people on technical committee. Applications will be submitted to him for review and selection will take place and will be shared with Ed, Ollie and Executive Committee. We have had offers to house this position and hope to have the coordinator in place this fall; Pheasants Forever has offered to administer the position and a office at their new facility in Brookings, SD and MI DNR also offers to house the position; and Wildlife Management Institute has also offered to administer the position and provide match, for a slight administrative charge. We have not decided, depending on pool of applicants, where to house the coordinator. Appears from pledges that there is no particular financial issue at this juncture. *Ed Boggess, MN* – Ollie and I were talking and we are collecting the funds and charging our standard 5% banking fee for that.

New Business

Greater Prairie Chicken and Sharp-tail Grouse Plan

Keith Sexson, KS – Asked Terry Riley to give a thumbnail sketch again for greater prairie chickens and sharp-tails and logistics of getting involved. We discussed this a year ago at Executive Committee level. *Terry Riley, The Grouse Partnership* – We talked about this last year and talked about possibility of moving forward with variety of options. Twenty years ago there was a rumor floating around that sharp-tail grouse were going to be listed and conservation plan was finally completed and USFWS did get petitioned last year. We have conservation plans and by September 30, 2015 the USFWS has to make a decision. We wrote a letter to those states with populations and got positive responses from all of those states and asked for people to sit on two committees, Sharp-tail and Sage Grouse, or a combined group. Met in March, two-hour meeting, and there are lots of issues we weren't even aware of. Keith made sure we stayed on track and he shares info with other people. Looking for your support and Grouse Partnership will help. We heard rumors on listing of greater prairie chicken (GPC) and now looking on that species. We need to get ahead of the game, so we are not reacting but approaching in a positive way. Formerly put together an interstate working group and whether that should be housed under WAFWA or MAFWA. WAFWA has

considerable role already on lesser prairie chicken (LPC) and other grouse species. We need help to move the initiative forward. *Keith Sexson, KS* – This is important, it is a trust species and learned lesson on working with LPC and GPC and tall grass prairie itself might be target for some type of listing. Interstate Working Group, scenario worked well when we got it clicking for LPC, but only five states, and now it is to be implemented under a listing scenario. In Habitat Committee, have grassland initiative and have a coordinator, Bill Van Pelt, and states in the Western support his position; other staff have been brought in to address LPC and that works well, with states in lead of state trust species. If listed, states will be called upon again. With group effort we can get ahead with these two species of prairie grouse and action for conservation and monitoring these species. Astute on what needs to be in place if listing comes down. FYI, for this group and consensus of forming interstate work group; feeling two groups needed because of differences in these two species. Look at who your representatives are who will bring most science to the table. Most of you have been a part of the council who would come together in this effort. We will present the same thing at the Western. If WAFWA amenable to this could bring two species under grassland initiative and have existing coordination and look at that now, productive to have someone leading the effort at that level. *Jim Douglas, NE* – I agree totally that the timing is right to think about doing this and have such a group formed. If we don't have a coordinator in the beginning you will soon find the need for one. Hard for this group to make a decision with facts we have now, WAFWA has similar fatigue with the heavy lifting they are doing now. *Keith Sexson, KS* – We are trying to handle LPC currently in WAFWA, have program director and four field biologists and it is time for Bill Van Pelt to transition out of that detailed role to more of coordinated effort. He has indicated it is a role he could play if WAFWA directors give concurrence. *Terry Riley, The Grouse Partnership* – Confounding factors on whether WAFWA or MAFWA should handle this, there is a lot of sharing in both areas; some states suffering the issue in the Midwest are Minnesota, Michigan and Wisconsin and they are concerned with declines and have isolated populations, not as concerned toward the west, like Nebraska and Montana; if in West, concern in not getting Midwest states covered; different issues and habitats. Not same as sage grouse and LPC. We have Sage Grouse working group in place working on those groups. Someone from this area needs to be involved to cover needs in the Midwest. *Ed Boggess, MN* – Don't have a good feel for interstate working groups, how different, for example, if we formed Prairie Grouse Committee at AFWA, how would that function differently? I'm not sure who was appointed or attended that meeting you mentioned. Need group of our own staff or someone to propose something we can look at. How would this function differently than committee or task force? *Keith Sexson, KS* – We have in place the mechanism to discuss and bring back more formal structure. Not sure we want to appoint another committee, all of our states have someone in their state assigned. *Ed Boggess, MN* – What is difference? *Keith Sexson, KS* – Semantics, those that are on interstate working group are practitioners who can bring together the science, quantify and identify the issues. *Ed Boggess, MN* – More operational charge? *Keith Sexson, KS* – Correct, some of ground work has been laid, have individual who was part of process and you may have had biologists as well. At stage to begin putting meat on the bone. We have talked to same people at the Western. *Ed Boggess, MN* – Awareness for us and if something substantial comes forward we can look at it. *Keith Sexson, KS* – We can identify things.

Ollie – No reason two Associations couldn't cooperate on this, when presented to Western, we could provide vice chair or something like that, just a thought. *Keith Sexson, KS* – Will report back after Western and provide something in writing. Be thinking about who could serve.

Monarch Butterfly Initiative

Ed Boggess, MN – Draft document submitted to Executive Committee yesterday, but we don't know if any updated versions exists. In the grant proposal to National Fish and Wildlife Foundation we need to decide what our role might be. Briefing mentions what is to be in the grant proposal. Three or four phases to be included in proposal: 1) fall workshop of 2015, before grant money could be awarded, would have to be self-funded, but could count toward one-to-one match; 2) follow up workshop in Spring 2016, to share action plans being developed, identifying obstacles and partner contributions, mechanism to work together at regional level; 3) state plan implementation of action plans modeled after MO, TX and IA; and 4) on the ground actions, proposed staffing would be coordinator for two years who would share and coordinate with joint venture and offices. Open for discussion. *Jim Douglas, NE* – Observation, presume no dollars coming from granting source to cover fall meeting, if consensus to support, would that be a separate decision? *Ed Boggess, MN* – Yes, separate than grant proposal. *Jim Douglas, NE* – Since a lot of planning needs to take place, asking for support activities dependent on the plan, coordination, sub granting for on-the-ground activity, could ask for that, then identify dollars that would go for implementation. That might be the way to approach this uncertainty. *Ed Boggess, MN* – Fairly adequately describes what would have to happen. *Kurt Thiede, WI* – Yesterday's discussion identified what was going on, we need to find out if Department of Ag. is developing pollinator plan; share what folks are doing something in their states. Benefit of workshop would be inclusive, make sure NGOs and other agencies involved, also involve Ag. agencies. Workshop first, then help us see what coordination is needed. *Scott Zody, OH* – Same questions. Naomi, does initial workshop, sharing science and looking at critical needs, what did you envision in participation and levels? *Naomi Edelson, National Wildlife Federation* – This could go two ways; get 50 people in room, key wildlife agencies and key partners, or have 100 or 150 and have Ag. and others. Maybe for the second meeting, they all would need to be there. Comfort level and where you are now. Hard to pull off all of them by September, but ultimately need all of the players together. *Scott Zody, OH* – Had doubts in NLEB workshop, included others, then they stepped out of the room, helpful to have Forest Service there. Encourage park service, forest service, BLM, etc. Struggling to decide where you draw the line on private groups out there. Provide for representatives from National Farm Bureau, etc., those groups that are critical partners moving forward with monarch initiatives. They are leery of putting themselves on the hook if it ends up listed down the road. Make them part of putting plans and initiatives together, overarching regional approach. *Rick Young, PF* – Be inclusive, many other groups you didn't mention who would be interested in coming. Different groups felt huge need and want to be involved, right now a shotgun approach across the country, often times left and right don't know what each other is doing. *Scott Zody, OH* – Want to get our thoughts together before including them, include in round two. *Rick Young, PF* – States are subset, multifaceted agenda needing to happen. A lot of interest out there. *Bob Ziehrer, MO* – Appreciate Scott's comments. We would

benefit from workshop to see what other states are doing, who is committed. In Missouri, offering programs through public schools, major part of St. Louis and many other groups to make sure we are not surprising good partners. Don't want to come at this perpendicular want to work together. Missouri has our path, we are already engaged, operating at state level, good or bad, we have positive partners. Don't know what is right or wrong, don't want to put good partners in awkward spots and bring in national people. *Scott Zody, OH* – We are trying to engage at state level too. *Larry Voyles, AZ and AFWA* – Look at chasing money before a lot of work is done. Monarch Joint Venture is federal agencies, classic is combination of state, federal and private who play a role in pulling together dollars. Joint Venture could pull national group together to bring together a plan, discuss with Service on that level and that could be the body. *Naomi Edelson, National Wildlife Federation* – There are two national efforts going on; Joint Venture – researchers in Minnesota, but they don't do what you asked, not main plan yet; want state wildlife involved, but not yet, Iowa is also involved. Another group, Monsanto, has pulled together a lot of players, but still disjointed efforts, which is part of the issue. *Ed Boggess, MN* – Joint Venture is based out of University of Minnesota. *Dale Garner, IA* – Appreciate Pheasants Forever and Naomi trying to bring something together, July 15 is not far away. Iowa is willing to host the meeting. Concerns with where states fit in, bring in Service to see what is going on, and other groups to see what is going on, like Missouri. When talking about national, have consortium we have state level corn growers, etc. something different than we have in mind. Need to be brought up to speed first, need to get on same page. A lot of other states not where Iowa and Missouri are. *Ed Boggess, MN* – Not too big of meeting, especially without funding source. Not same interests out there, bring together state agencies first to see what our niche is; will be minor player, but need to understand what that role is. *Jim Hodgson, USFWS* – State wildlife action plans are due on October 1 and we are coordinating with some states, working on template for monarchs and other pollinators and make them SINC so you can access some of those monies. Not sure how this is working out in individual states, Missouri is leading and Iowa is close behind. We need broader coordination meetings on species. *Ron Regan, AFWA* – Disjointed efforts seems to be popping up a lot, try to get something good out of this; message to knead dough quicker is being brought about by NFWF grant. Ask them if that is a firm date. *Ed Boggess, MN* – Not making all money available right now. *Rick Young, PF* – Maybe not ask on other monies. *Ed Boggess, MN* – Seeking grant for something we don't know enough about. Would have to be vague at this point, things are still fuzzy. Not sure if way to work this out. *Bill Moritz, MI* – Strikes me that past conferences, on NLEB provide input in project underway. More like CWD conference, uncertainty on how to tackle and those 300 plus conferences took a lot to pull off. More narrow scope for agencies and significant partners, but not all open input, scheduling large conference is too difficult; 50-60 people would be good. Support smaller Midwest effort with invited partners. Other funding sources are there that could be beneficial. *Naomi Edelson, National Wildlife Federation* – To ask NFWF, extremely unlikely they would change the date, would be delay of a year for funding, a certain amount of money each year, unless states willing to put up their staff to move forward. Question if you want to be involved. I think we can do something very quickly. *Bill Moritz, MI* – That could be match for second workshop (looked at budget \$50,000 for 2nd workshop, and \$50,000 for travel). *Jim Hodgson, USFWS* – Couldn't hear comments.

Ollie – Sounds like there is support for a MAFWA sponsored workshop for this fall, this is something we can accomplish. On NFWF proposed grant, what we need is to put together a monarch conservation plan for the middle of the country, not a national plan, by July 15. *Ed Boggess, MN* – This first step is coordination and implementation in a year, not sure that can happen in a year. Narrow workshop with state agencies and key partners. What do we put in a grant so we don't miss an opportunity; coordination involved in putting together a plan. Plan is tangible product identified in grant proposal. Somebody to coordinate that effort, but not necessarily implementation. *Rick Young, PF* – Keep in mind, at half way point right now and not sure it will go on beyond Tom's administration, not much has gone on in first half. Don't get President amendment signed every day and need to decide how to seize that; window will close. Narrow window to make headway and develop unique partnership, can't bring Ag. producers and Monsanto and groups like that into the room every day; monarchs give us that opportunity. *Ed Boggess, MN* – Opportunity now to get resources to pull act together on what we are going to do across state boundaries. *Dale Garner, IA* – Other groups out there applying for these funds, lead as an association or follow. Difficult to come up with in just 15 days; could we think about small group of one to three states, working with PF and NFWF within the next week. Work on proposal, Executive Committee could move forward on this and subset of that to work with Rick and Naomi and appoint someone who knows about butterflies. Not talking national, focus is in the Midwest, where butterflies are. *Ed Boggess, MN* - Will not resolve today. Volunteers are Dale Garner, IA; Bill Moritz, MI; and Scott Zody, OH (or a staff person). ***Dale Garner, IA moved to convene subset of Midwest directors (volunteers) to work with Naomi and PF to submit final grant application, second by Jim Douglas, NE.*** *Jim Douglas, NE* - We need a chair, decided on Iowa (Dale or Kelley) proposal to come back to Executive Committee. Discussion – *Kurt Thiede, WI* - Separate grant and workshop, just for grant application purposes. Dr. Jonathan Mawdsley could work with group also. ***Motion carried. Bill Moritz, MI - Move that MAFWA host fall workshop on monarch butterflies and support with monies from money market, up to \$10,000 and ask for support. Scott Zody, OH second. Bob Ziehmer, MO*** – Tom Melius offered \$5,000 to help workshop happen also. *Naomi Edelson, National Wildlife Federation* – Solicit funds from USGS and could be other partners too, match from USFWS or maybe \$10,000. ***Motion carried. Ed Boggess, MN*** – Can Iowa take the lead on this? *Dale Garner, IA* – Absolutely.

FY2016 Budget Approval

Ed Boggess, MN – There is one proposal to modify the budget to accommodate the monarch workshop.

Sharon Schafer, MI – (*Exhibit 52*) Because of timing of this annual conference is why we adopt a calendar year budget now. Based on Consumer Price Index (CPI) decrease an adjustment was made for both dues, states and provinces; affiliate dues \$1,200; sponsorships \$54,000, collected \$40,000 so far with \$14,000 outstanding; registrations \$22,000, higher because of AMFGLEO being included; hotel supplement, this varies from state to state \$1,000; exhibitors, usually only one, \$500; Southern Wings administrative fee \$500; and interest of \$75; just under \$110,000 for revenue. With discussion that was held in Executive Committee the other day Ollie's pay will remain as it is, it will not decrease because of CPI; travel for Ollie, mine and Sheila's travel

\$12,000; accountant fees for producing 990 and W9 \$1,500; insurance \$1,200; bank charges for credit cards done through DMEM \$600; web posting \$250; miscellaneous \$1,000; and conference expenditures (DMEM, rooms, gifts, awards (may be more with buying four additional plaques) \$46,015; for total expenditures of \$104,118 and surplus of \$5,500. *Ed Boggess, MN* – Have proposed budget. *Bill Moritz, MI moved to move \$10,000 from money market to cover cost of Monarch Butterfly Workshop, Kurt Thiede, WI second. Motion carries. Scott Zody moved to accept budget, Bill Moritz, MI second. Motion carried. Ed Boggess, MN* – Appreciate the time Sharon has devoted to this. We may need to amend next year's budget to possibly hire someone to replace her.

Ed Boggess, MN – Also, we will be hosting leadership professional development training, net cost approximately \$2,600; Executive Committee recommends that we cover half of net costs, not to exceed \$1,500. *Bob Ziehmer, MO moved to accept, Mark Reiter, IN second, Motion carried.*

Kurt Thiede, WI – Wolf stewards recently met and it was not just collection of best available science, objections were raised of HSUS being on the agenda. Discussed previously, asking for this time for MAFWA to consider establishing a committee to discuss within our states, to have more ownership of agendas that are set, and share management information between Minnesota, Wisconsin and the Upper Peninsula. *Ed Boggess, MN* – This may require bylaws change. *Bob Ziehmer, MO* – Could this be subcommittee of Furbearer Committee? *Ed Boggess, MN* – A good concept. *Bill Moritz, MI* – It could be for bear, wolf and mountain lions. *Ollie* - Suggest a motion to ask Furbearer committee to set up subset. *Motion to ask them to set up subcommittee. Kurt Thiede, WI moved, Jim Douglas, NE second. Motion carried.*

Passing of Gavel to Missouri

Ed Boggess, MN passed gavel to Bob Ziehmer, MO. Ollie – We look forward to an exciting meeting in Missouri.

Bob Ziehmer, MO – Thanks for pulling together this conference and we appreciate your staff and all of their hard work. All of us directors understand the sacrifice and the conference calls it takes to do the job of President; also your skill set has been a great value to the Association. Thank you for your time and service.

Conference Adjourns

Bill Moritz, MI moved to adjourn, Scott Zody, OH second. Conference adjourned at 12:15 pm.

Appendix A – PowerPoint Photos

