PROCEEDINGS OF THE 43rd ANNUAL MEETING ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH & WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS

HOWARD JOHNSON MOTOR INN
RAPID CITY, SOUTH DAKOTA
JULY 19–22, 1976

PROCEEDINGS

of the

43rd ANNUAL MEETING

of the

ASSOCIATION OF

MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE

COMMISSIONERS

held at

RAPID CITY, SOUTH DAKOTA

July 19-22, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call to Order 1

Roll Call and Announcements 1

President's Address 2

Governor's Address 5

Keynote Address - Tom Heberlein, University of Wisconsin 7

Speakers - Remarks by Lynn Greenwalt
Director of Fish & Wildlife Service, Washington, D. C. 14

Comments and Observations by John Phelps
President, International Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies 18

"Sources of Congestion and Visitor Dissatisfaction in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area" by David W. Lime
Principal Geographer, USDA Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station, St. Paul, Minnesota 55108 22

"Attitudes Toward Hunting, A Study of Some Social and Psychological Determinants" by William H. Shaw
Presented by David H. Jenkins, MDNR, Lansing, Michigan 33

"A Private Approach To Land Preservation and Stewardship
by Grace McDermott, Director of Land Stewardship, Midwest Region, The Nature Conservancy 37

"The American Outdoors" A Television Venture of the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies
by Ralph A. Bitely, Former Administrator, Maryland Wildlife Administration, and presently South Central Atlantic Regional Director, Ducks Unlimited, Inc. 43

"The Need for a Positive Approach to Wildlife Management on Private Lands" by Keith Harmon, Wildlife Management Institute 46

"People Problems in the Cuyahoga Valley" Presented for Dale L. Haney, Chief, Division of Wildlife, Ohio Department of Natural Resources by Carl L. Mosley, Jr. Executive Assistant 52A

Business Meeting - Committee Reports: 52

Nominating Committee Report, Carl Mosely, Ohio 52

Treasurer's Report, Fred Warder, Kansas 52

Resolutions Report, Russ Stuart, North Dakota 53

Audit Report, Dave Vesall, Minnesota 59

Awards Report, Chuck Harris, Michigan 59

New Business 61

APPENDIX A - Attendance 70

APPENDIX B - Committee Assignments 72

RESOLUTIONS 73

PROCEEDINGS

of the

ASSOCIATION
OF
MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS

Howard Johnson Motel - Rapid City, South Dakota
July 19-22, 1976

First General Session - Tuesday, July 20, 1976

The meeting was called to order at 9 a.m. by John Popowski, 1976 President of the Association.

PRES. POPOWSKI: The first order of business will be calling the roll and I'm going to ask our Secretary to call the role of the provinces and states and those in charge will please answer.

CHUCK POST, SECRETARY: Colorado. Here. Illinois. Here. Indiana. Here. Iowa. Here. Kansas. Here. Kentucky. Here. Manitoba. Here. Michigan. Here. Minnesota. Here. Missouri. Here. Nebraska. Here. North Dakota. Here. Ohio. Here. Oklahoma. Here. Ontario. Here. Saskatchewan. Here. South Dakota. Here. Wisconsin. Here. There are fifteen present Mr. President for a quorum.

PRES. POPOWSKI: Thank you Chuck. We have a great number of guests, and I would like to go through that list and introduce them. I'm sure I'm going to miss some and I'll have you introduce yourselves as we get on down the line. First of all, I would like to introduce our commissioners from South Dakota, our Department Commissioners. Shorty Kellogg is our Commission Chairman from Watertown. Chuck Mateer from Belle Fourche in the back there and Deane Curry from here in Rapid City. I'm not aware of any other commissioners. Are there others? We have a number of agencies represented. Wade Hammer from the SCS is here. We have two fellas from the Corps of Engineers; Bob Berger and R. C. Green. And an old friend, Harry Woodward from Ducks Unlimited. Ed Kozicky from Olin Matheison. I'd also like to introduce these people from the Fish and Wildlife Service which is the largest group represented. Let me just go on down the line. Clarence Faulkner. Richard Huber. Chuck Hughlett. Lyle Schoonover. Jack Hemphill. Area manager from Pierre, South Dakota Rolf Wallenstrom. Dale Martin. Jim Gritman. Ray St. Ores. Tom Saunders. Tad Lane. An old friend, Bob Hodgins just wandered in. George Milias. And of course, last but not least, Lynn Greenwalt. Lynn, it's quite a lot to dump on you, but who did I miss?

GREENWALT, DIRECTOR OF U. S. FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE: I think you did fine.

PRES. POPOWSKI: We're glad to have all of you here. Also I would like to introduce the other officers of this association that are here also. John Keener from Wisconsin who is Second Vice President. And Fred Warders, our long time Treasurer from Kansas. I didn't ask those gentlemen to suffer in front up here.

WELCOMING ADDRESS

JOHN POPOWSKI, PRESIDENT

I welcome you to our state and more particularly to the Black Hills. While you are here, you will be seeing what I think is a uniquely beautiful part of South Dakota. An area that is visited annually by about 5 million tourists. They come primarily for two reasons. One to see the world famous Mount Rushmore and secondly to see as I said a uniquely beautiful part of this country and of South Dakota and to the extent that our business permits, we've arranged for you to see as much of these South Dakota wonders as possible.

Not many people realize it, but the Black Hills are older geologically than the Rocky Mountains. They are even older than the Alps or the Himalayas, but if you will permit me on anology, this doesn't mean that you are going to be seeing a gray haired lady. What you'll see in my opinion is an area made more beautiful by its maturity and more graceful by its age. In other words, the Black Hills are not just older, they are better.

Since all the wildlifers are inherently interested in things past when our land was more natural, less disturbed by civilization, I thought you might appreciate hearing some history of the Black Hills as it was written by author poet and amateur historian Badger Clark. Badger Clark is a guy who I don't think is known very widely out of South Dakota. He's a guy who as a year and a half old kid my dad picked me off a rock pile in his yard because there was a rattlesnake in it and as a teenager I used to hike from the summer cabin my dad built cross country to Badger Clark's place and he was and continues to be in his writing an extremely interesting individual. Clark lived for many years in a cabin in Custer State Park where he researched the Hills and did his writing. There is one piece of his that I particularly enjoy. It goes like this; Let me get out in the Hills again, I am myself alone, out through the wind and the lash of rain to find what we really own. Like a lot of people I suppose, I find in poetry what I want to find. To me Badger Clark was saying that we can't own beauty. We can't own the rush of a stream or the smell of a mountain meadow. These are free to those that appreciate them.

How much these values were appreciated by the first men to visit the Black Hills I cannot say. I can't even say who the first men were, since no one knows. The Indians were well aware of their presence of course but they considered the Black Hills as sacred or holy grounds. Occasionally they came to the Hills to cut pine trees for tepee poles or hunt deer for buckskins but mostly they stayed out of the Black Hills even though they were near them. There were several Indian tribes that at one time or another lived near the Hills. The Ponca's, the Kiowas, Crows, Cheyennes and Sioux. The Sioux in particular considered the Hills holy and preferred not to enter the dark canyons or climb the tree shrouded mountains. Even to this day, some people white and red from the open prairie feel insecure or shut in when they visit the Black Hills. Most people, however, are greatly impressed and thoroughly enjoy their visit which I hope you also enjoy.

The first report to the white mans world about the Black Hills came from the Lewis and Clark 1804 expedition up the Missouri River. They were told about the Black Mountains to the west by a French trapper, but the Hills remained pretty much Indian country until 1874 when General Custer brought a thousand soldiers with him to explore this area. Badger Clark described Custer's expedition like this; after riding hot and dusty trails over 300 miles of sun ground plains with scanty feed

and often only alkaline water for their two thousand horses and mules, the expedition struck into the Hills and found knee deep green grass starved with wild flowers with streams of cold sweet water in every shady canyon. For both man and beast, it was a sudden entrance into paradise. The forests were full of game and hunting parties from the command killed one thousand deer in ten days while Custer himself proudly had his photograph taken with a huge grizzly bear which fell to his rifle.

They established their permanent camp just west of the present boundary of Custer State Park and there in French creek the first gold was panned out and turned the whole camp into a frenzy of excitement.

I know that some of you feel that you have just traced Custer's steps through 300 miles of sun-ground prairie and it's been dry in South Dakota this year to say the least. I do hope that you won't form hunting parties and try to kill a thousand deer. The remainder of the Black Hills history follows a path that we are all familiar with. The discovery of gold brought thousands of miners and get rich quick types to the Hills where the natural beauty and bounty were quickly ravished. Several species of wildlife most notably Audubon big horn sheep and grizzly bear were eliminated from the area and Audubon big horn sheep were extinguished as a species.

It's been just over a hundred years since Custer's expedition and exactly 200 years since the birth of our nation. During that time a number of North American animal species have been extinguished. To many Americans perhaps a majority of Americans, this tragic loss of species just isn't important. As a matter of fact even to us as wildlifers it wasn't important enough to cause really effective action until 1973 and that was just three years ago, when the Endangered Species act was passed.

Self-criticism is healthy and I won't hesitate to indulge that that isn't my point. My point is that compared to the history and age of our country and of this area, the science of wildlife management is in its infancy. Not that man hasn't tried to manage wildlife for a long time; he has. In fact, he has tried to manage wildlife for centuries but only in the last 50 years has wildlife management deserved to be called a science. Some people say that age lends respectability and acceptance and if that's true then it would appear to me as a profession we have a long way to go. Our profession is young and born of necessity and thrust into an age where frontier attitude, market hunting, climatic catastrophies, and unrestrained land development have reduced this country's wildlife to a pitiful reminant.

Circumstances have never permitted our profession a happy adolescence and perhaps that is why so many wildlifers approach their work with almost religious zeal. I don't know. I do know that demands placed on us have aged us beyond our years. We were plucked from the pine green with no time to cure so to speak. Legions of scientific questions still beg for answers while armies of social political problems occupy our time.

In recent years one of the most nagging problems has been that of reorganization of fish and game agencies. Russ Stewart addressed himself to this at our meeting in 1973 when he stressed concern that fish and game commissions might have their power weakened by reorganization. I've lived through reorganizations. Internal reorganization of structure and external reorganization of authority as I know several of you have and I have to agree with Ken Doan who said last year to the International. Organization and reorganization are facts of life and social and political concepts are manipulated. Be not disturbed by reorganization, but adjust to it. The things

that need doing remain unchanged. As long as we recognize and act on the things that need doing and as long as we possess the intelligence, the ingenuity, the dexterity and yes the courage to manage resources under our authority with uncompromised integrity then reorganization need not be a fearful process. Leopold said it best as he so often did, when he wrote; experience seems to show that no particular form of organization has any inherent merit in and out itself. Meritwise only in personnel and any particular form is good or bad only in so far as it provides a good or bad mechanism for the personnel to work with.

Another area of problems that continued to plague wildlife agencies is that of federal water development and I suspect this will be a problem area for years to come. In South Dakota we are still trying to mitigate habitat losses sustained from the construction of the Missouri River Dams and the resulting reservoirs, specifically from Big Bend and Oahe. Between the two of them, they inundated 430,000 acres most of which was prime wooded bottomland. A rare asset on the high plains. Oahe Dam by the way was closed in 1959. That is now seventeen years ago. I don't believe I need to engage in any litany to understand the long delay. It's sufficient to say that such delay is not acceptable. Now we come to further power production. In both cases, these additional developments will effect wildlife. It's fortunate that we can look back at past developments and past efforts to mitigate wildlife loss as a guide to future actions just as I am sure you can look at your past for guidance.

There is an ever increasing public demand for a quality environment that includes adversity and abundance of wildlife, both game and nongame. This I believe is a mandate that challenges our determination as professionals to do a professional job. It's often been said that it would be easy to accept the short term solutions, the easy out approach. In many instances, the public demand could be translated into a demand for something now. Something for this hunting season, something for this fishing season. Next year or several years hence could be ignored; the easy out, but those of us who will spend their lives in this profession cannot settle for anything less than wildlife populations that represent a viable rewarding and lasting resource to our country. I have deliberately tried not to discuss specific issues in this presidents address. That after all is to be the purpose of the entire meeting and it would be presumptious to me to offer three paragraph solutions to six chapter problems. What I've done instead is to ring a bell for round 43. This is our Associations 43rd annual convention.

GOVERNOR'S ADDRESS

Richard F. Kneip
Governor, South Dakota

Thank you very much John. I had to call John out. I left my schedule at the office when I traveled to Sioux Falls last evening. As it turned out we were working on industrial prospects at a Litton Corporation and in this instance working to build a good sized facility and I think we finished with their people around twelve or twelve thirty last night in Sioux Falls and tried to head this way. The weather was somewhat bad, we had a fairly rough airplane flight. By the time I got to my home in the Hills it was around three, three thirty in the morning, so about nine this morning, I had my office call John and ask if I might come in a little later, but as it turned out, they didn't know where to call you John and maybe some people in this room know that I've been taking some months in getting another Supreme Court appointment out here in the West so I took most of the morning working on that Supreme Court appointment. So I apologize for my lateness.

I asked John quickly before I came into the room what the configuration of your regional makeup was here. As I understand it, you're fairly close to our Midwestern Governor's Conference makeup. Not exactly, I believe we have Oklahoma and Kentucky and Colorado in your region here and we reach into Ohio, West Virginia, Illinois, but we draw a line here at the West. Montana, Wyoming and those states belong to the Western Governors Conference. The reason I ask is that, there is some debate these days about regional configuration. I want you to know that I am one guy that supports activity such as this. I think that people who have mutual interest and mutual concerns should meet and air those things and more than all, I've even had to argue sometimes with the press like in the instance of the Governor's conferences that even in a social sense they are important; they can be very good, so I would applaud you for this action.

It's time all of us gave more interest and more concern for example the preservation of game species, if that might be the appropriate terminology. I like to make mention often at times some things we hear in South Dakota again and John told me I guess most of you are administrators. You probably heard of some of the controversy that we had here in South Dakota a few years ago when I went to the legislature and reorganized our executive branch of Government. We now have a cabinet form of government. In one of those areas where there was a great deal of concern some years back was in the area of Game, Fish and Parks. And when it was all done, everything in government, if you want to put it simply, we retained to the greatest extent a great number of Boards and Commissions that set policy and the executive branch of government administers that policy. I happen to agree that that's a good separation of power and very good policy and there is a good exchange I think that takes place in that separation of powers that I think can be healthy. I bet I could get an argument on that right in this room, but I also believe it's worth it. It was only a few days that my appointed Secretary and the commission disagreed on something I understand, but that's not all bad. It really isn't. I think that offers an excellent exchange and it can be a very healthy thing.

I want you to know that I am pleased with our operation here in South Dakota. We have good game commissioners. They fight hard to protect those things that are in their charge. John and his staff in the Department do a good job and I hope some of you from these states are able to exchange with my people some ideas that you

may have, some things that we should really be doing in government to do the best job possible in this all important area.

In that sense I come before you this morning, with my eyes about half shut. I just haven't woke up this morning, but I hope that you have a good time in the Black Hills. You surely shouldn't come to this part of the country without seeing some of the beauty of the Black Hills. Maybe some of you don't know that Mount Rushmore, our national monument here, was the very first officially designated national focal point as declared by the American revolution bi-centennial commission out of Washington. That was done even before the colonial states which most people thought would have the first official designation. If you haven't been there, I hope that you get there. I hope you take some time from this kind of convention to partake of the beauty here in the Black Hills.

We've had, I just had to share this with you John, when I think of the White House in the instance of our agriculture problem, we have a very severe drought from sixty counties out of sixty seven under presidential declaration, it just so happened when I ventured to Washington looking for this declaration and some federal assistance, I also saw on the same day assistance for a flood disaster here in the Black Hills and we did receive both the flood disaster and the agricultural drought disaster declaration at the same time and the President and some of his people said that they thought it was the first time that any state had come in for both a flood and a drought at exactly the same time, so, but to do that for the people you serve is one thing I mentioned.

To make sure that you get a healthy exchange at this kind of meeting. It could be good for all of us. And I hope that for people like me when I go to a future legislature that you can give us some idea of the things that need to be done and if it does take a law to do it, and many things don't take a law in my estimation, it just requires a little common sense and a little cooperation among reasonable people. Well, have a good day and a good convention and I'm very pleased to join you gentlemen.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

TOM HEBERLEIN, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Last summer I drove north about six hours away from the populated counties of southeastern Wisconsin. Still I arrived at my shack along the Schwanigan National Forest. This siding farmhouse sits next to a fire road where even a passing car is an unusual event. From here I drove my land cruiser seventeen miles further on fire roads eventually dropping down to four-wheel drive in low range fording two streams proceeding the last three miles. A faint trail led from this spot to a place called Morgan Falls. A beautiful ribbon of water which drops over, of course I discovered, into two hanging pools.

It was a hot day and the wine for lunch, the remoteness of this secret place prompted a lady friend and I to shed our clothes and plunge into the first of the hanging pools. No sooner had we gotten used to the cold water, when people became coming out of the woods. Several families on Sunday outings as well as some photo bugs, one with a tripod who set up his equipment immediately. Modesty prevents further discription of this particular scene, suffice to say that the quality of my recreational experience diminished due to crowding.

I cannot say for sure what impact I and the lady made on other visitors since I did not stay long enough to interview anyone. Judging from the reactions of some grandmothers who quickly retreated back down the trail, and from some men who opened cans of beer and sat down to enjoy the show I would say the reaction was mixed. I suspect that all of us have had similar, although I hope less embarrassing situations where the impact of others reduced the quality of our outing and we complained that it was crowded.

Thinking about carrying capacity of a particular resource for a specific human recreational activity is complicated business. It is however, important. Widely the most difficult and far reaching decision resource managers will have to make in the next decades involves managing access to particular areas. For the past several years, I've been involved as a sociologist with carrying capacity studies on a Colorado river in the Grand Canyon with a number who float the river went from a hundred in 1960 to fifteen thousand in 1972 for an average annual increase of 59%. Let me say that I'm not an economist, but if you can invest your money in 59% a year, it's a good deal. I also collected data on the Brule River in Wisconsin where the inflex of tubers has led to a development concept plan calling for ban on tubing and at the Apostle Islands National Lake shore where development is just beginning.

On the basis of these studies which are still largely in progress, I have some observations other than the usual platitude that more research is needed I have some observations which may be of some interest to you. First of all, what is carrying capacity? What do we mean by that term? I guess probably the best example of what we mean by carrying capacity is the number of people, or the amount of weight a girder or a bridge will hold before the girder breaks and suddenly it is no longer carrying its load and that's kind of a basic notion which we are working on in carrying capacity. Well, this is in a way very simple and a good place to start. It is clear when a girder is holding and it is clear when it's broken. Sort of a dichotomous event. Also we have very clear value judgements about girders and bridges. We believe that they ought to hold up and that they ought to hold people. There is no association that I know of for fallen and broken down bridges.

The value judgement here is very clear. We think bridges ought to hold, now thinking about carrying capacity and I will use many examples from the Grand Canyon. I know none of you manage the Grand Canyon, but it's one place that I'm very familiar with. First of all, you can think of physical carrying capacity. How many people can you physically get into a particular area? How many people could we get into this room? How many people could we get into the bottom of the Grand Canyon? You can think of people sleeping on a number of beaches where you make the bottom of the Grand Canyon say into a bedroom community. You map out every space that is 3 feet by 7 feet. How many bodies could you put into that particular area? This is a notion of physical carrying capacity. How many people could we put in this room? Well if we all stood up, we could get far more than are in this room at the moment. So we are no where near our physical carrying capacity. It's kind of a yardstick that we use to measure things at the outer limit.

You can also think of facilities carrying capacity. I suspect that many of the areas that you manage and have responsibilities for you may be up against the wall with facilities carrying capacity. The notion here is if we are in this room, we have reached one kind of carrying capacity when all the chairs are full. We fill all the facilities. Parking lots are indicators of facilities carrying capacity. In the Grand Canyon, the number of trips that can start a day at least vary, is determined by having an officer there to check the life preservers and check the trips out. Now facilities carrying capacity is a little bit different than physical carrying capacity because it can be influenced by money. In other words, you can go and build a bigger parking lot. You can put more personnel on. We can bring more chairs into the room. We can change the facilities carrying capacity quite easily. It is important to know that with any carrying capacity we're really besides making assumptions about values, which I will get to in more detail later, we're making also assumptions about levels of technology. It's what the carrying capacity of a particular area given a certain kind of technology. For example if this room were not air conditioned, it might have the issue we've been wrestling with for some time. If you had people sleep on their boats or the rubber rafts, the physical carrying capacity would be greatly enhanced or greatly increased. You could get far more people down into the canyon.

Coming down kind of a chain, the physical facilities, you can think about also the biological carrying capacity. I'm sure this is a notion that you are quite familiar with; it's been around for quite some time. It's one that managers of natural resource agencies feel comfortable dealing with although there are some very sticky issues. I remember once I was giving a lecture on carrying capacity and I said well, biological carrying capacity, that's no problem to establish that and I watched a naturalist in the back of the room start to turn somersaults, a guy by the name of Lloyd Loupers at the Tetons and he was saying, man I can't establish biological carrying capacity. I wish you would give me a hand if it's so easy and the issue in biological carrying capacity that makes it difficult to establish impact. If a person walks across a lawn, you can measure the impact; you can assess an impact, but the question is how much is too much? How much really changes things? There's a strong value component in biological carrying capacity. It's tied into what you really prefer.

Now generally, the value that the eco-system on to the balance of some sort and have some sort of diversity and integrity as one that serves as the guiding light. But if you think about ranchers that would like to see all wolves eliminated so that the livestock will not be bothered, they have a very good estimate of carrying capacity of predators for a particular piece of ranch. This based on a different value.

For what we are seeing in the hunting area now, with the rise of the anti-hunting unit, we're seeing new values coming into play and I think it will be shortly that biological studies will no longer be able to determine the estimates of the number of deer that are to be harvested. If you have a large segment of the population saying that deer ought not to be shot; that is not an appropriate legitimate behavior. Then any number of biological carrying capacity studies will not establish a harvest limit, so as new values move into play, this issue of biological carrying capacity really becomes a very slippery figure. It's also influenced by technology. In the Grand Canyon, the introduction of porta-potties and other means of disposing waste essentially changed the biological carrying capacity. A certain number were having a noticeable impact on the beaches. As soon as you brought in porta-potties, this group no longer had impact, so the number could go on.

The biological carrying capacity could change given the introduction of the new technology. Now we get down to the kind of carrying capacity that I've been interested in looking at and that's the notion of sociological carrying capacity. It's clearly something about the character of a recreation experience that is somehow modified; somehow limited by social and psychological characteristics. Certainly that place at Morgan Falls was not crowded for Sunday outings; it was a very nice and remote place, but for naked swimming in the pools up there, it became suddenly very crowded because of the nature of the particular activity. And I'd like to talk about that a bit. One of the notions which is widespread in literature on carrying capacity, sociological carrying capacity or human carrying capacity is what we call the satisfaction model. And this idea essentially stands out in economic tradition and the notion goes something like this that as you add a person to an area, particularly a wilderness area, he gets so many tons, so many pounds, of enjoyals, he becomes this satisfied. By the introduction of another person into an area, think of your favorite fishing lake or a good trout fishing hole, the guy who is already there his enjoyals drop, but they don't drop too bad, they just drop some so the net weight of the enjoyals for person A and person B are kind of heavy. There is more happiness going around in the world. So if you keep adding people, the economists keep telling us there ought to be some point where that total enjoyals reaches a peak and drops off and then all you need to do is drop a line down from an axis and you've got carrying capacity. Ten people the net enjoyals is maximum, eleven people, it's lower.

We're not very impressed with this enjoyals model and I called John Keener about this speech. I asked him what kind of a group is this; I hadn't had an opportunity to meet with you folks before and he said well don't get too technical. He's seen me in center ethics committee where I come in with the graphs and charts and numbers and all that sort of stuff and I said alright John, I'll try not to get too technical and I think to this point I haven't been too technical. I may have been a little too simple, but I had to make a brief degression into some kind of technical matters and I hope that you will listen and listen hard because I think this is stuff you are going to be seeing on in the future and you'll say; I remember in Rapid City wasn't some guy saying something about that? It might be useful. OK.

On the Colorado River in the Grand Canyon, we measured density. The number of people who started at these vary. We put observers on rafts and measured the number of contacts that there were. How often you saw people a day. How often you met people. On the Brule River we have measured a number of canoers, tubers and fishermen by using electric eye counters; by using time lapse photography,

by interviewing almost everyone that is on the stream during a three week period; 2900 people. And you get some days that are busy, 2 or 3 hundred folks; you get other days that are slow; ten or twenty people on the river. We've measured density in all these ways. In both studies; both on the Colorado River two summers and on the Brule River the summer of last year there was no corollation between the number of people on the river and the individuals overall satisfaction. People were just as satisfied on days that were not crowded or on trips in the Grand Canyon that ran into one or two other groups during the whole trip as they were on days that were very crowded; two or three hundred people on the Brule River as they were on the Grand Canyon when they were seeing trips for two and three hours a day running into other trips.

It kind of flies in the face of logic and I'd like to talk about why it is not useful to measure peoples satisfaction as a measure of carrying capacity and that may seem very funny. Satisfaction is different from dissatisfaction. Obviously as managers you should be and are cognizance aware of dissatisfied users, consumers, etc., but there are problems with this satisfaction motto. Let me go into some of those in some detail. First, recreation behaviors are voluntary and therefore self selected. Therefore as a result, users choose activities which are in accord with their normative idea of a good time. They will thus tend to show high satisfaction levels as they do in the Grand Canyon, that people have voluntarily selected the activity and made a substantial investment of money and vacation time might lead to a positive evaluation of the experience as suggested by the theory cognitive distance. If people have got free choice, they are going to pick things that they like to do and even as it gets more crowded, they essentially just crowd out the people that wouldn't be there anyway so if you keep doing user surveys and talking to visitors, they are really always going to be happy. Second because recreation activities are self-selected and voluntary, those dissatisfied with crowding may move on to less crowded areas thus being displaced by those with norms more tolerant of higher densities. The result is that the aggregate satisfaction continues to climb with increased use and the carrying capacity; the point in which total satisfaction declines among the user population can never be reached.

This is what we are looking at in the Apostle Islands. When I tell people that I am studying crowding at the Apostle Islands, they get these funny looks; "what do you mean? There is nobody out there." That's right, there aren't too many people out there and we are dreadfully curious to see where the people that are there now get crowded out to and if they get crowded out. Third, increasing densities may cause a change in the definition of the experience. Increased use alters the character of the experience for example from zero contact wilderness to moderate contact semi-wilderness. As this happens, people probably change their normative definition to appropriate contact levels. Changes in the experience then cause individual normative changes and satisfaction remains high. This subtle product shift would again mean that satisfaction continues to climb as use increases.

Fourth, and I think again this is quite important. Satisfaction is related to a number of other factors other than crowding or visitor density, including expectations, personal benifit, social interaction; in the Grand Canyon at least, the wilderness character of the experience. In other words, we can explain why people are satisfied and why they are dissatisfied, both on the Colorado River and on the Brule River, but it's got nothing to do with density. If the folks they are on the trip with are bad apples, they don't have much fun. If it rains and it's cold they have less fun. If they see a lot of litter, it's not much fun. This means that if the resource is being managed for satisfaction, there are other variables other than density which should receive the attention of management. For example,

George Stankey, found wilderness visitors reporting that seeing litter is more disturbing than seeing too many people.

A management policy aimed at maximizing aggregate satisfaction leads to some interesting possibilities. For example a Grand Canyon parkway along the Colorado River would certainly increase the number of satisfied Canyon visitors. Dissatisfied seekers of wilderness might go elsewhere. The influx of people more tolerant of crowding would cause contact norms to change and a new product, "The Grand Canyon by Automobile," would be defined in terms of higher contact rights. A parkway sounds out of place in that it would dramatically change the character of the Grand Canyon experience. Visitors and managers think of the Canyon in terms of an undeveloped wild country and as a wilderness experience. A highway is antithetical to that experience. The satisfaction model is beguiling and its apparent objectivity that it's based on the assumption or value that the aggregate satisfaction of all individuals should be maximized. When we see that maximizing the satisfaction may lead to a Grand Canyon parkway, I think the value judgement here becomes more obvious.

Likewise biological studies can establish carrying capacities only on the basis on a value premis. For example, a carrying capacity for predators can be established under management objectives that value a diversified eco-system with no species eliminating another. With different values such as no lambs or calves should be eaten by wolves, a different carrying capacity will be selected. It often appears that expert judgement can establish biological or physical carrying capacity, but this is so only because the value premise is more likely to be shared than it is for sociological carrying capacity where there are many competing interests. What am I saying here? I'm saying a number of things. First of all scientists can't help you as managers establish carrying capacities. No kind of scientific study, be it biological, sociological, physical, can establish a carrying capacity. These studies can only give you more accurate information on which to establish a carrying capacity. Your capacity has to be based on the notion of your management objectives. The kind of experience to be provided is essentially a value judgement. It can be arrived at through the political process, public involvement, your own expert judgement. I believe the Grand Canyon ought to be a wilderness experience. Hunting ought not to involve certain kinds of conflicts. Value judgements. No study will prove to you ever that that's right or wrong or that should be or shouldn't be. Once that is done, then the carrying capacity can be selected.

If you think about normative concerns, you are what we call a character of the experience. This room or I think of my office as one place; if I'm writing a paper, the carrying capacity of my office is one. If anybody else is sitting there, even sitting there, I can't write the paper. If I'm having a meeting and I've got three chairs, I have a physical capacity so three of us can sit and have a meeting pretty well. If I were having a cocktail party in my office, which actually never happens but would be nice, the carrying capacity of my office is much larger, because more people would be there. If you are having a cocktail party all alone, it's kind of a funny cocktail party. If you are having a cocktail party with three, it kind of keeps the conversation going, but you really have got to have ten or so in a pretty small room before you can get the kind of conversation that needs to be going on.

Does it mean, think about it, what kinds of experiences are we trying to provide for people? Crowding in recreation activities, we figure a water based recreation, is merely due to an introduction of new technologies. Rubber rafts and innertubes

which have allowed those with less skill to cheaply and easily participate in river sports have dramatically been responsible for crowding problems on the Brule River and on the Wolf River in Wisconsin. As I say crowding problems, it's interesting to see what this rubber technology has done. As it's changed, it's just about, on the Brule, just about doubled the number of craft on the river. You count one canoe is equal in one tube. It hasn't increased the number of people by that much because you can't get as many people in a tube as you can a canoe, but all of the sudden it went from zero up to a number equal to the number of canoes and people are really struck by that. It's happened on the Wolf River. It's happened largely on the Grand Canyon, so you've got a new increase with the introduction of a new technology and those people who are affected, the previous guys who ran the Colorado River, the people who own land on the Brule are suddenly saying it's crowded. If you interview the innertubers they don't think it's crowded at all. If you look what happens on the River, it turns out that 40% of the people on the River never even see an innertuber. You go up to them and say gee is there a crowding problem with innertubers? They say what? They didn't even see an innertuber. I guess there are some around here. For those people who are familiar with the way the river used to be, it seems that way.

Automobiles and good roads have gone along with the change in Wisconsin's deer hunting population from rural to urban. Part of the hunter ethics activity I analyzed deer license sales over the past 25 years in Wisconsin and found a dramatic shift from the rural counties, where in the early fifties about 53 or 54% of the deer hunting sales came from rural counties and 25% from the most metropolitan counties of the state and now its shifted around so you have got over 50% from the metropolitan counties and 25% in the rural counties which goes a long way in explaining what kind of land use conflicts we're getting there. The technology of the automobile and good roads and lots of leisure time have created this particular combo, so as new technologies and new institutions are introduced and new conflicts come about and I hope, but I can't think of any examples where old conflicts might go away. The introduction of these increased numbers has led to people with less experience doing the things that experienced people used to do.

Worse than that in terms of the notion of crowding and conflict, it's led to a different kind of person. The people tubing on the Brule River appear to be quite a different social class, quite a different age group and seeking quite a different experience from those people who are trout fishing or who are out for a wilderness canoe trip. So it's put in the proximity of people who are seeking two different kinds of behaviors. One, kind of a part of Sunday afternoon party behavior, the other versus a more intimate experience in the natural setting.

Although those of you who haven't tubed, I did it this summer. I always feel that I have to do everything that I study. That's why I don't study some other activities I guess. I went tubing all alone and found it to be a very interesting way to get into almost a meditative state on the particular resource. I understand that most people don't in fact do that. So where do we go from here, how do we pick numbers, saying essentially that you guys pick numbers and scientists will help try to give you the date that you picked the number. I began this talk with a risky' story and I'll risk a scatological observation to make a point. The social organizer and activist Olynski, himself a PHD sociologist from the University of Chicago is quoted as saying that asking a sociologist to solve a social problem is like prescribing an enema for diarrhea. I hate to admit it, but that's largely true. Whereas a decision maker you felt there was one problem,

a sociologist will come in and show you ten without so much as identifying one solution.

This talk may follow in that one great sociological tradition, but let me make a few concluding observations. What I have tried to do in this speech has been to point out the complications of crowding so you become appropriately skeptical of simple observations such as there are too many people. There may only be new people doing the wrong thing in the wrong place using the wrong technology. Any decision maker and that includes us college professors who sometimes actually even make decisions tries to make the decisions, the situation simple so the decision makes itself. Decisions are not comfortable to make as you know. They are tough and you can always try to simplify it to make things easy. Making decisions about carrying capacity on the basis of biological or fiscal information. Difficult as that sometimes may be it is no longer adequate. Carrying capacities will have to be established on the basis of non-biological criteria. What kinds of experiences are you trying to provide? I am troubled that in the decision situations with which I am familiar I find decision makers seeking simple solutions. In the case of the Canyon, continuing to search for some biological limit no matter how trivial, rather than making hard decisions about the amount of time the boats should be in sight of each other. Fifteen minutes a day, or three hours a day to provide a high quality wilderness type experience. On the Brule River the proposal is to ban tubes which responds well I think to the relative political vote of Brule River landowners versus kids from Duluth who tube the river but which ignores the natural zoning which already occurs on the River. It may be safely said that nearly all of the tubing on the Brule takes place on a three mile section of the River between eleven in the morning until seven in the evening. It is more concentrated on hot summer weekends than on cold Tuesdays in March.

Decisions about carrying capacity are sooner or later going to have to move away from biological and political data to take in the more complicated issues involving the character of the experience itself. More numbers, more people, is not necessarily the solution. Your going to have to be thinking about certain kinds of limits to provide a certain character of the experience. In thinking about individual carrying capacity, it is necessary to consider providing individuals with a variety of experiences so that they can pick and choose what they prefer. The person who wants solitude may have to pay more and wait longer to get it so that the person who merely wants to see the resource or play in the resource can also have that opportunity.

An interesting proposal for allowing individuals to select such limits has been proposed in several journals. On the Brule River the fishermen who's dissatisfied is the one who didn't expect a hundred tubes and fifty canoes to rattle past him as he fished below the Winnibigi Bridge. If he had been given that information that this was to be expected, and information about what alternative locations to fish without such impacts a use conflict could have eliminated.

I was last in Rapid City immediately after the tremendous flood. I visit you again today to counsel you about a flood of a different type; a human flood. If you begin to look at the character of experiences you are tried to provide at the human dimensions of outdoor recreation at the people who use the resource. If you do this and establish clear specific management objectives about what is to be provided then it is possible to establish carrying capacities which can provide high quality recreation experiences for a diverse range of potentially competing interests. While floods, human and otherwise cannot be prevented; through careful management and thoughtful planning, flood losses can be reduced.

REMARKS BY LYNN GREENWALT

DIRECTOR, FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

John, I appreciate the opportunity to come and make some comments and observations. These ordinarily are associated at least in my mind with people who are greater veterans than I am. These are the things that are customarily reserved for people that are on the decline. People that can let other people benefit from their experience. And maybe you're more right than you really realize but in any event I have been asked to make some comments and observations and I have given it considerable thought.

Because I am concerned about certain things that our profession and combined efforts face in terms of todays needs and the changes that I perceive are going on all around us. The same kinds of changes that I suspect you perceive and understand, but perhaps see from a different point of view. We see major changes going on and I suspect that we have not been extremely good at reacting to those changes and I suggest that among the observations that I would make is that we have to get better. I can recite the list of things that represent the kinds of changes that we see going on and I need only mention such things as suits to curtail waterfowl hunting. The array of court decisions that have recently emerged and potentially have profound impact on the business of resource management. Court decisions, the impact of which have not been fully assessed. I think by most of us. Such things that have raised concern for example the recent supreme court decision on wild horses and burros. I'm not an attorney; I'm not prepared to analyze for you the portent of this, but I can say that it does not presage advent of total federal control of resident wildlife.

Fundamentally that court decision was one which attested to the constitutionality of the wild horse and burro act. It didn't say whether it was necessarily an intelligent or good act, but it's constitutional. It provides that in fact the federal government can exercise jurisdiction when and by that jurisdiction has been offered by some legislative action. I am quite confident that the Secretary will ask the Western next week to reinforce the idea that the Department of the Interior has no intention of usurping or preempting states rights and authorities and prerogatives and indeed responsibilities in this area. However, the potential remains there and as an observation, I suggest to you that states helped by the Federal govenment should take great pains to make sure there is no reason to force preemption through Federal authority on state activities. The potential is there presumably and all of us are acutely aware that there are a great number of people around who would be delighted to have the Federal government manage these kind of resources for a number of reasons. Among those reasons is that it is easier to twist a director of a chief of the Forest Service or a Secretary of the Interior than it is to deal with fifty rather independent, I'm glad to say, state directors. I think they realize the real key to coping with this kind of a problem.

People who would like to have the Federal government assume responsibility for these kinds of resources are in fact in the long term condemning the resource in my judgement because it is impossible for the federal government to properly do the job. It is going to be tough for both of us together to do the job but it certainly would be utterly impossible and in the long range a denial of the well being of the resource to push it off on the federal government in spite of the fact that there are people who would like to do this.

Recent legislation; legislation which is not so a reason in terms of chronology tends to reinforce the idea of a subtle and sometimes not so subtle move towards federal preemption. The endangered species act, you all know about that and its implication. The marine mammal protection act and its implications. Certain other interpretations of existing legislation tend to show that there is an influence being exerted that pushes the federal government into a role which I feel it should not have. How do you defend against this? First of all, I feel in my judgement a professional manager conducts his operations in such a way that there is no need to employ federal preemption and that's easy to talk about and difficult to do I admit but it's an important thing to keep in mind.

There is of course the problem, the issue, the concern that's related not only to anti-hunting, but today even to anti-management. I think many of you heard me talk to great length on this because I feel strongly about it. There are a lot of people that believe that the best way to serve the living natural resources of this country into the future is to leave them alone. Every time somebody intervenes, something goes wrong they say. All of us who are professionals in this business know that's not true and we cannot give up the intervention that was done for us two centuries or more ago. That to give up managing, manipulating, being for the leading resources as to deny again their future and this is a thing we cannot do.

It's clear to me that this is perhaps one of the most insidious moves the President of United States made; this conviction being held by an increasing number of people that you needn't manage wildlife to make everything alright. This isn't true and it represents the potential for the fact that a great many people are concerned about fish and wildlife but they don't know very much about it. We know that there are seventeen to 22 million hunters or 60 or 70 million fishermen or whatever the statistics are. There are 220 million people in the United States most of whom do neither, but are interested and are not committed. They have made no decisions one way or another.

My concern and an observation that I make to you is that they are very likely to begin to make committments and to draw conclusions in the not to distant future and it's very important that they reach the right conclusions. Among those they should not reach is the conclusion that management is so purposeless and unnecessary. Where hunting is somehow bad and evil and should be done away with, and this is very likely to happen unless we are extremely careful in influencing that uncommitted body of people who have yet to have their influence felt. My hair has grayed as I suspect some of yours has; not by the greater majority of people, but by the small very vocal groups, extremely active groups on either end of the spectrum who do not in fact represent the public at large. They purport to represent large numbers of people and unless we are careful they may be right. It's very important, therefore, that we begin to exercise our talents to continue the as of yet uncommitted, that rational management is the only guarantee for the preservation through generations long born of the living natural resources that we are responsible for and about which everybody has a great interest. This is an extremely important in my judgement to have only to see the actions being taken by people who are anti-hunting for example to understand that they are in fact active and very influential and can very easily I think take the valence of the as of yet uncommitted, uninformed but interested general public. This also tells me in no uncertain terms that all of us have a changing constituency. The people we work for are no longer limited as once was the case in simpler times to hunters and fishermen. This is perhaps as it should be.

This does not mean that we must deny hunters and fishermen fun, but we must recognize that there are a lot of other folks who are interested justifiably and legitimately in what happens to fish and wildlife and habitat resources in this country. There enlies a tremendous potential power in my judgement to further the kinds of things we know to be right. Citizens generally are interested; many of them disagree with the kinds of things that we have traditionally supported and I'll speak specifically of the anti-hunters. They cannot be ignored because they will attract your attention as you can understand by seeing you in court and by doing all kinds of other things. One cannot ignore them. This does not mean that we collectively acquiest to them, but they cannot be ignored. The general public cannot be ignored. They're interested and concerned and we should capitalize on this interest and concern and I think it can be done. We have the knowledge and certainly the committment; I think we have not quite yet taken all the steps that should be taken to achieve this first of all level of understanding among the general public. An understanding that leads ultimately to a committment that's appropriate to the preservation of the things that we are all interested in. How will we do this?

I don't want to steal Bud Phelps thunder because he is going to be very eloquent about this particular issue but I think that we have to get especially on the state level politically active. Don't react after things have happened. Things like the endangered species act which I must defend as one of the most powerful and potentially useful legislative tools that has ever come into the hands of a resource manager but contains all kinds of complications for you as well as for the Federal government. These things didn't happen because of the Fish and Wildlife service or of the states involved or of the International or anybody else. The Congress did it. The acts that were suggested, the legislation language that was suggested earlier on is quite different from that which emerged. This was done through Congressional action particularly at the staff level and ironically perhaps fewer people were involved in that whole transaction than there are in this room. Perhaps five or six people that formed and created and hammered into being that final endangered species act. It makes you wonder about how the government really functions in the long run, but that's the way it works in many ways. Most of you know how this works. It cannot be modified or changed unless somebody is in there in the front; the front end of the action. It's not possible to make effective changes after it's happened, but it is possible to become extremely interested and involved in the beginning.

The wild horse and burro act is another very good example where public pressure, thousands of letters untold from school children from all over the United States convinced the Congress in its aggregate to vote for this bill which was proceeded as being, it's got to be pretty good, look at all the kids who like it and I cannot go wrong voting for this, when in fact, it's one of the most bazaar pieces of resource legislation that was ever approved by anybody and the members of the Congress after the fact have concluded that maybe they didn't do the right thing that we thought was the right thing at the time. Nobody told them that it wasn't. No one would be listened to who was prepared to say that this isn't really rational. Basically it's a good idea, but this is not the mechanism; the way to do it.

We too often collectively stand around and wait for the finished product and express a disatisfaction because our custom made automobile has only three wheels or lacks an engine or some other part that's very important. I suggest that we have to begin to recognize that maybe in the long run the well being of fish and wildlife resources may be better served in the long run. Now I emphasize that in how we behave

toward proposed legislation and proposed activities of this kind in terms of on the ground activities because the inboard in the long run is often derived from what happens in Washington, the Congress, the reaction of your own congressional delegations to these things. The average congressman, not withstanding the revelations in the paper of late has very little time to devote to learning the details of these kind of things. It's interesting what they are doing when they ought to be devoting time to learning about these things, but that's beside the point. They in fact are not familiar with the details of these things and rely on their staff or somebody elses staff to give them the straight story. Sometimes that story is not altogether straight and they almost never, I am certain, hear from people like you who are around and know and can tell them what the real story is and I suggest you should not be afraid to talk unless it is not a good bill. Mr. Legislature, we urge you to lay off this one. That means that you have to learn to adopt it too, which is a wrong unaccustomed to the biologist, the wildlife manager, and even the administrator, but it's a thing that is very important to all of us. So you should get packing. I won't belabor that point because Bud tells me he is going to speak long and feelingly about it and of all the people I know, he is perhaps best equipped to say those things from pure experience. I believe that what we must do speaking as professionals is worry less about the relationships however good or poor they may be between the Federal government, the Fish and Wildlife service in particular and more about how we professionally are going to attack the kinds of problems that confront the country.

As your president has said, I believe that if we behave in a professional way and perhaps these problems whatever they may be with courage born of professional understanding and confidence, we can make things happen as we know they should happen to benefit this nation in the future. The alternative of course is totally unacceptable to any of us. We have to recognize that there will be modification and accommodation and compromise because that's the way the law works. We are to make those compromises and those accommodations and those modifications as fully on our terms, that is to say the terms that are beneficial to resource, as we possibly can. That's what we are paid for. Comments and observations? I suspect there are a thousand things that I ought to say to you in terms of comments and observations, but they tend only to reinforce the kinds of things that I have said to ycu earlier, and I don't pretend to be a director emeritus or one of the grizzled veterans, but I have been around long enough to understand that we are on the threshold point where we can choose one course or the other and I suggest that we must choose the course that however difficult yields for succeeding generations the very best assurance that there will be fish and wildlife and habitat resources available in the future and this in my judgement means rising to a professional level which we perhaps have never felt necessary before to deal with issues on their own terms and think into the long term future. As John said, don't worry about next hunting season, worry about a fishing or hunting season two decades down the pipe and as an administrator and a bureaucrat with a capitol B I can assure you that these subjects are easier to talk about than they are to do, but it is a thing, a concept and an approach that must in fact be made if we are going to discharge our responsibilities to future generations. These are rather harsh facts, but I think from my point of view they are utterly real ones, and cannot be denied. How and where we go from here is largely up to us, but remember, hinging on our decisions today of course are what we leave for the future and in the Bicentennial year, I think that is a thing worth thinking about. Not just next season, but for a great many seasons to come. Well thank you very much gentlemen and for the opportunity to make these comments.

COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS

John Phelps
President, International Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies

I start out with some old misgivings or trepedations when I talk about observations because you people are all in the same area and made the same observations as I have over the last few years and I think which Tom held up in front of us which I think we have been trying to keep behind us and not look at it too much and I'm sure that most of you are more eloquent than I when it comes to talking, however, my name is on the program and yours ain't and you are going to listen for awhile.

Lynn Greenwalt did point out that we have a large majority of people out there in an uncommitted role. I think this comes back again to the previous speaker. A lot of people out there were well aware of the large numbers out there and we have a changing constituency out there. What I felt was, well I guess it was nostalgic about not being able to backpack into some country and be by myself for a day or willfully alone for a day or two of hunting. Now I take my boys with me and we may see fifteen or twenty parties, so when they are talking to their kids they are going to say in the good old days we only saw 20 parties out here and their kids are going to say that in the good old days we had a hundred parties out there so I'm not sure where we are going to wind all this up talking about a changing constituency, I'm sure you have all faced. We've just gone through our board hearings. In Utah, we have to have six hearings around the state to set our big game seasons and we start out with our regular deer season and literally to a man they stood up in the audience and berated us in our inability to manage the deer; they were all gone. And then they would plead for a buck only hunt, a three day hunt buck only, mature bucks, three points or better for seven days. They made it a real plea that there were no deer so we'd go through this exercise and then our next would be our archery season and literally to the man the archer stood up, wanted a longer season and wanted two deer, one during the archery season and one during the rifle season so I think that a change in constituency could change in a matter of minutes from one position to another as it suits their personal feelings at that time and when I left yesterday morning, we were being threatened with three proposed I guess, restraining orders on our upcoming season again which causes frustration because it's certain that these hunters who are supposed to be sportsmen are adding to, in my opinion, to the nonhunters who wanted to stop the hunting season and right or wrong, this week if our board is right or wrong, either side will not make any influence on the deer population for next year whether we are talking about a seven day buck only or a nine day buck only or eleven day buck only season.

These large majority of people in Utah are being inundated with all kinds of requests and one that appears to be mounting about as fast as some of the OBS contracts and the EIS's and that are from school children and basically not from Utah and a lot of them are not from the western or midwest or from the eastern states wanting to know how we can justify hunting elk, killing of beautiful mountain lions and so on and so forth and you can read in the teachers image through this whole class of third and fourth graders. Well, I'm not sure if Utah's rotten enough so I am recommending it to you, but it has become somewhat successful for us. We now write back to the school district if we can find out what it is and say the attitude from a third grade class whoever it may be is questioned. We would be happy to answer it but we estimate that it's going to cost us $75 to prepare the information;

are you willing to reimburse us? And most school boards are not willing to reimburse us and locally in Utah, we write to the school principal and ask that we have an assembly with that class and other classes rather than getting into letter writing and this has proved very successful on some of these mounting problems that we are facing here that are, I figure, nonproductive time consuming, that I don't think that when we are talking to second, third or fourth graders and we are answering letters, we certainly haven't got the last laugh; the school teacherwho instigated it has and can counteract our parts. We are trying to more efficiently utilize our time.

Now last night Lynn and I spent a minute and a half and forty five seconds of that was spent telling stories to each other and the other fifteen seconds was what we are going to talk about and he has a better memory than I have because he remembered everything that I was going to talk about and did. But, I don't remember what he told me he was going to talk about. I think he should have told me a story in fact, and lent it to me. One of the items is of course this recent supreme court ruling on the wild horse and burro act and I think all of you have received from Paul Linzini his analysis of what the supreme court said and I have talked to the solicitor for the Interior, also to Lynn last night and to some of the AG's around the state and they all concur that this just says, yes the Congress has the constitutional right to pass these kinds of acts and I think all of us as state directors were well aware of that and we have over the years tried to have input into many of these acts and probably more often than not has not been as successful input as we would like to have and I think it now is going to behoove us that it's abundantly clear that this may be the sign of the times that the eastern people feel that Lynn could be easier to handle or that John McGuire can be in a little better control than. . .Lynn said independent, but quietly he spells that directive of the fifty states, but, we will have to actively suggest to the International these four regional outfits watch carefully proposed legislation; where it is usurping our state rights when it comes to our resident fish and wildlife.

Now right after I went to work for the division of wildlife resources, at that time it was the department of fish and game, and when I had parties, of course, all the guys would get on one side and all the wives sat on the other and I'm sure it was like in every car going home afterwards, my wife would say, all you guys, you talk about fish and game or sex when you go to these parties, but I'll say they appear in areas where all we talk about is fish and game. And in part of the times we talked about on fish and game, one of them was that we got election coming up here in November and if Doctor Gallup is correct, we will have a change in administration as one Senator from the South said the other day, he says, for the first time we are going to have somebody in that White House without an accent. So we must know who's going to be in there and I think that the International, the leadership of the International, with the help of the four regional organizations, we will have to without a doubt have an effective means of having input into who will be the new, if probably, the assistant Secretary of the Interior. We worry a lot about the Secretary of the Interior but actually our day to day contacts, the guy who's called along the way and does it. The assistant Secretary and I think that as of right now we should start putting our minds to I guess first to the good Democrat who's got the muscles and that we should be picking a man who I think actively hunts and fishes. Who believes in it, loves it, and will take the time to hunt and fish. We have to pick a man who is willing to stand up and protect our wildlife management policies and not trade them off for preservation and we're going to have to pick a person in my opinion who will support Lynn and his staff and administration. Lynn, I'm not sure where you stand as it comes to change of administration back there, but as far as the International, I can't speak for Ken,

he's not here, and John we're all behind you and we want you there for whoever it may be, but we do need a Secretary of the Interior who's firm, who believes in game management. I think we are all adults; we can understand when there has to be a political decision, but let's understand that it's a political decision and not try to tell us that ther's a correct biological assumption, but we do have to have input into the right man in this job.

This past winter, late in the winter, I read a EIS from Glen Shoup on the refuge management and Glen will know how upset I became over this silly quirk and I really tied over it. I thought it was a terrible job and after I calmed down, I didn't reread it all again, but I looked at parts of it. I guess I'm saying that Glen probably was asking, crying for our help in saying hey you guys, get off your duffs. Get up there and get me some money so we can run these refuges the way we used to run them. So if we don't actively support Glen's program for refuges, I think it's going to be like a lot of these antique shops; they look but don't touch. Our hunters are going to be looking and not shooting if we don't give Glen the money he needs to run these areas for game management and for hunting and so forth.

I think that if your organization can count out what the resolution to all of the states in your organization and tell them to get ahold of their congressman, now and give him the money so it isn't a look and not touch situation. I'm sure you are aware that the International, and I noticed today that Ralph is on the program, has a proposed 26 TV series coming up and he will tell you more about it. All I'd like to say is that I commend Ralph for sticking to this job and trying to take the criticism he has received. He needs your, I guess both financial and moral support to see that this comes off and every one of you would have done it differently if you'd have had the chance but you had the chance and didn't take it and Ralph is doing it so let's support him when he brings the new programs up.

Recently I read the Charles Manson story, Helter Skelter, and I honestly feel that todaymost of the state fish and game directors feel that they are running helter skelter and we are running away from game management and into these areas that Lynn talks about, the uncommitted multitudes on how we are going to handle the people, how many people can we handle and that and again, follow my own inability, but I am tremendously frustrated that in our division we are putting, in some cases, game management in the back and doing these other jobs. Now I am sure they are not our own designs. It's nice to blame the federal government, it's handy and convenient. I notice that your government is a little different than we are. We go so far that we run for aid from the federal people, but our own state laws are changing.

We in Utah, here a few years ago were brought into this new department of natural resources and we fought it tooth and nail and told them every reason why it wouldn't work and all its pitfalls and that, however, I think that Ken was right. We went ahead and did our jobs. It really hasn't been all that convenient to us but we are getting many new administrative rules and procedures that are making it difficult and that on top of it we have had your Nepo laws, endangered species laws and OBS, Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers, etc., etc., etc. which are adding on in my opinion in many cases non-productive wildlife chores on us that aren't doing a lot of; to put wildlife out there. And like Charles Manson, I occasionally have entertained homicide on some of these letters from an outfit. And recently I set up a new file. This one a couple of weeks ago. I told my gal to start a new file and she said what do you want to head it. And I said the

Stupids Letters. I am very serious and this is true. In less than ten days I got seven or eight letters, transmittal letters, on EIS's or something and the longest turnaround time that we have got in this file is nineteen days. Now some of them are eight date calendar days. It was the longest one we had and it was a big one on a power plant. We had nineteen days turn around time and so I am just hanging on to these until the next session of our state legislation and see if I can't fatten our coiffures for some additional money for additional people with these stupid letters that we are getting in but being a sharp administrator I decided here about a year ago to find out what was expected outside of our normal area of work and I wrote to the Bureau of Reclamation, the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, all the agencies that do ask us what they expect of us and I received back and this is for July 1 to June 30th of 77' and I received my 172 major type EIS's habitat management plans and then immediately the Forest Service said they had forgotten to mention the ORB, and the BLM wrote and said we'd forgotten all our habitat management plans that were going to be required by law and so on and so forth.

The attempt I had when I wrote the letter was to see if I could put some priorities on these things and send them back to the Forest Service and who would say; here is how we can handle your load and beyond this you are going to have to help us or something of this nature and myself and the staff are unable to actually put priorities on it. We just mind boggled what was expected of us. We didn't even know where to start so we all faced with the crisis and recently all received a letter from me, from the International about what to expect and I hope on EIS's and whatever it may be that you feel is not the responsibility of the license buyer to accomplish and I've got most of the answers back and it's rather astounding what the people think should be financed through other than the license buyers fund.

I hope that early in August that I can meet with members of the OMB and government congressman, Gun McKay, assistant chairman for appropriations to the Interior and see if we cannot shake loose some money for the state for a lot of this work and what we were talking about is that we will be contacting you through the International to give us support to your congressmen and at that time if you feel that we should get this kind of egg, be sure you tell them, hey, put this in the budget for these stakes and be sure that it gets to the stakes and not retained in different federal agencies.

SOURCES OF CONGESTION AND VISITOR DISSATISFACTION IN THE BOUNDARY WATERS CANOE AREA

by

David W. Lime
Principal Geographer, USDA Forest Service,
North Central Forest Experiment Station
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

There is much concern about the growing recreational use of our Wilderness Areas and the impacts of this use both on natural resources and experiences of visitors. These concerns are felt not only for the Boundary Waters Canoe Area (BWCA), but for many of the other 95 Federally administered Wilderness Areas throughout the country.

Concern for the growing recreational use of the BWCA is certainly justified. It is the only lakeland wilderness in the National Wilderness Preservation System. It is second in size only to the Sellway-Bitterroot Wilderness in Montana. And, it receives more visitors than any other Wilderness in America. Use has grown at a rate of about 8 to 10 per cent annually since the early 1960's. Approximately 163,000 people visited the BWCA in 1974, representing more than 42,000 sep rate groups.

There is a danger in over-simplifying recreational use figures. Because the Canoe Country has traditionally served more visiters than any other Wilderness Area, there is a tendency to think of wornout campsites and congestion everywhere, with few opportunities for solitude. But, as we shall see, throughout much of the BWCA overuse is not a severe problem.

Recreational "carrying capacity" is a common term used to talk about how much use an area can support over a given period before managerial controls are necessary to offset problems. Carrying capacity refers to environmental as well as social constraints. For the physical environment constraint, we need to know how much use can be tolerated without serious deterioration to the natural environment. For the social constraint, we need to know more about where visitors go, what they come to the Wilderness for, and their sensitivity to crowding, litter, campsite wear and tear, campsite facilities, and other factors.

A major effort of the North Central Forest Experiment Station's Recreation Project has been to study the social carrying capacity of the BWCA. Over the past 15 years, several studies have focused on understanding patterns of use and visitor attitudes and perceptions regarding various aspects of use. (See Bibliography at end) In this paper, I would like to summarize trends in use since the advent of the "wilderness permit" in 1966, and summarize selected results from a 1971 study focusing on visitor attitudes and perceptions of crowding.

TRENDS IN BWCA USE

Information on the recreational use of the Canoe Country is available from BWCA Travel Permits, first issued by the Superior National Forest in 1966. These data plus other use data collected by the North Central Forest Experiment Station, indicate a number of interesting shifts in use.

Two significant conclusions regarding conditions and recent use trends in the BWCA are:

1. There is heavy use and general congestion in much of the BWCA, but this use is concentrated in both certain locations and certain time periods.

2. Shifts in use suggest that the significance of the BWCA as a national wilderness resource is increasing.

Amount of Use

Although data on use between 1966 and 1974 are not always comparable, the number of visits during that period increased about 66 per cent - or about 8 per cent per year. In 1974, number of visits and groups were down slightly from 1973 (for example, number of groups dropped from 44,000 to 42,000). From 1973 to 1974, there was an increase in the number of visitor-days[1] of use (from 1.0 million to 1.1 million). This increase suggests that although there were fewer visits and groups in 1974, those that came tended to stay longer on the average than their 1973 counterparts.

Mode of Travel

The trend is toward more canoe paddling. In the early to mid 1960's, visitors traveling by canoe (paddle and motor) barely outnumbered motor-boaters. Today, almost 70 per cent of the groups as well as visitors using watercraft canoed. Nearly 60 per cent of the watercraft users travel by paddle canoe, and slightly more than 70 per cent of the visitor-day use is by paddle canoeists. As a general trend, paddle canoeists represent a greater proportion of total use, travel greater distances to get to the Area, penetrate deeper into the BWCA and stay longer than other types of users. Paddle canoe use has increased about 15 to 20 per cent per year since the mid-1960's, whereas motorboat use has increased only about 10 per cent annually and motor canoe use has stabilized or declined slightly.

---

[1]A 12-hour use period. That is, one person visiting the Area for about 12 hours. For example, one group of four persons staying one night would be 12 visitor-days, assuming one 12-hour period the first day, one for the night, and one for the last day.

Seasonal Use Patterns

Most recreational use occurs during the ice-free season--May through September. However, there has been some spreading out of use into early May, and especially into fall and winter. The three heaviest use periods are still Memorial Day, Fourth of July, and Labor Day, with the Memorial Day weekend being by far the most popular. In 1974, for instance, about 2,000 groups entered the Area on Friday and Saturday before Memorial Day--more than twice the number entering on Friday and Saturday before Labor Day.

Geographic Distribution of Use

Use is unevenly distributed between entry points and throughout the backcountry. For instance, most people enter the BWCA through only a few of the Area's 70 access points. In 1974, about 70 per cent of the groups entered through only seven of the entries; one-third entered through two entry points (Moose Lake and Fall Lake). In the mid 1960's, more than 80 per cent of the groups entered through these same senen antry points. Clearly, some spreading out of use has taken place, especially by paddle canoeists.

Another way of describing use in the BWCA is to measure the number of other parties a group would meet per hour or day in a given portion of the area. Data collected from Trip Diaries during the main summer season in 1971 (May 14 - September 5) by the Station revealed wide variation in the frequency of encounters by lake. Groups reported the number of other parties they saw on individual lakes each day and the number of hours they spent on the lake. Visitors to some lakes encountered more than 40 times as many groups as did visitors to other lakes! Often, only one or two portages separated congested and lightly used lakes. (Figure 1).

On nearly 25 per cent of the surface water acreage sampled (238 lakes representing the major use-area), the mean number of groups encountered per 8-hour period was 16 or more:

Mean Number of Groups Encountered Per 8-Hour Period	Percent of Total Water Acreage Sampled[a]
24 or more	10
16-24	14
12-16	24
8-12	18
4-8	14
0-4	20
	100

[a]Total surface acreage sampled was 126,000, Or 66 per cent of estimated 190,000 acres in the BWCA.

Hourly encounters were multiplied by eight to represent a typical day's experience. On almost half the acreage, the encounter rate averaged 12 or more groups per 8 hours. For only 20 per cent of the acreage sampled was the encounter rate 4 groups or less; 7 per cent showed a high level of solitude with 0-2 groups per 8 hours. The great congestion experienced in much of the Area is disturbing because several studies of paddle canoeists attitudes suggest that when the daily encounter rate exceeds 3 or 4 groups, satisfaction drops sharply.

Groups Entering Canada

The Canoe Country is becoming more a major destination and less a travel-route to Canada. The percentage of visitors going to Canada has dropped greatly since the mid 1960's--from about 30 per cent in 1966 to 12 per cent (4,846 groups) in 1974.

Party Size

About 75 per cent of all groups have between one and four individuals. The overall group average has remained at about four persons per party; paddle canoeists tend to travel in larger groups, averaging about five per group. During the past 10 years, only about 10 per cent of the groups have had more than eight persons.

Length of Stay

Average length of stay has been about 4 days, but that is misleading because many groups are day-users. For example, in 1974, 41 per cent of all groups spent no nights in the Canoe Country. For camping groups, more than half (53 per cent) stay two to four nights. There has been a general trend towards more overnight or camping parties. Today, about 60 per cent of all groups are campers and about 70 per cent of all campers are paddle canoeists.

Places of Residence

Each year more visitors come greater distances to the BWCA -- from the Minneapolis - St. Paul area and especially from neighboring states (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, and Wisconsin) -- so that the percentage of non-local visitors is increasing.

VISITOR PERCEPTION OF CARRYING CAPACITY

Although resource protection in Wilderness is essential, visitor attitudes, perceptions, and satisfactions also introduce important constraints on use. The Wilderness Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-577) states explicity that Wilderness Areas should have "outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive or unconfined type of recreation." Social research during the past decade or so has provided a base for understanding visitors' perception of crowding and other factors influencing the quality of a wilderness experience.

Updating of past trends as well as more detailed information was sought during a 1971 study by the North Central Forest Experiment Station. In this research we sought to determine how recreational users perceived a high quality wilderness experience and how various aspects of recreation use affected satisfaction. In particular, we hoped to learn how the type of experiences sought by users related to various amounts, distributions, and types of use in the BWCA. We especially needed to know more about visitor use and distributions throughout the Area, the number and types of encounters visitors had with each other, their reactions to these encounters, in terms of whether or not their experience had been impaired, and their perceptions

of optimum use levels that would not destroy their sense of being in the wilderness.

Our study was conducted during the open-water season between May 14 and September 6, 1971. Nearly 1,400 groups were intefviewed at access points outside the BWCA before they began their trip. They were given a "BWCA Trip Diary" to keep a daily record of their experience. Approximately 1,100 (80 per cent) of the Diaries handed out were returned to us.

Two important conclusions resulted from the survey of visitor attitudes:

1. General overuse and congestion are major sources of dissatisfaction. However, important factors other than amounts of use influence visitor experiences and overall satisfaction.

2. Paddle canoeists (as well as some motor canoeists and motorboaters) strongly object to meeting motorized parties.

What are some of these aspects of recreational use that affect visitor satisfaction?

Amount of Use

The amount of use one encounters in the wilderness has an obvious impact on the visitor experience. Generally, the quality of the experience declines with increased numbers of encounters.

Parties traveling by paddle canoe were especially displeased by frequent meetings with others. About 70 per cent of the paddle canoe groups complained about seeing other visitors on at least one day of their trip. Nearly 50 per cent of the motor canoe parties noted dissatisfaction; only about 20 per cent of the motorboaters felt that way.

On the average, about three parties encountered per day was the maximum visitors would accept before their sense of being in the wilderness was impaired. Paddle canoeists preferred the fewest meetings per day (two) while motorboaters would tolerate as many as five.

Type of Use Encountered.
Method of Travel

Another influence on experiencs is the conflict that exists between non-motorized and motorized parties. (The use of motors is permitted on 19 designated routes in the BWCA, or on about 60 per cent of the total water acreage.) As previous BWCA research uncovered, we found continued dissatisfaction on the part of paddle canoeists with meeting motorized parties. The conflict is generally one-sided and appears to be much more severe than previous research has shown (Robert Lucas in the early 1960's, and by Stephen McCool and George Stankey in the late 1960's.) Nearly half of the motorboaters said it wouldn't matter how many other parties they met per day. Significantly fewer motor canoeists (29 per cent) and paddle canoeists (13 per cent) felt that way.

Paddle canoeists had the lowest threshold of sensitivity toward encounters with motorized parties. For example 93 per cent of the paddle canoe parties preferred to meet no motorboats per day; 83 per cent of them preferred not to meet any motor canoes; but, only 10 per cent of the paddling groups preferred to meet no other paddle canoes.

Parties Preferring to Meet No
Groups per Day by Mode of Travel

Travel Mode	Prefer Not to Meet		
	Paddle Canoes	Motor Canoes	Motorboats
	per cent	per cent	per cent
Paddle Canoeists	10	83	93
Motor Canoeists	10	37	84
Motorboaters	5	29	22

Impacts of Large Parties

Past research, both in the BWCA and other wildernesses, has found that large parties have a significant negative impact on user satisfaction. Stankey's research in 1969, for example, found that over 50 per cent of the respondents opposed meeting groups of more than 10 people. In spite of the fact that large groups (more than 10 persons per group) represent only a small proportion of total BWCA use (less than 5 per cent), they do have a disproportionate impact on the experience of other visitors.

Additionally, many wilderness managers believe that large groups may also cause excessive campsite wear-and-tear. Large parties particularly threaten campsites where tent space is limited. In parts of the BWCA, it has been extimated that about 60 per cent of the campsites should be limited to no more than three 7-by 9-foot tents because of the rocky and irregular terrain. This would suggest a maximum limit of nine per group, assuming three persons per tent.

Location of Encounters

Encounters vary not only in number and type but also in their location.

Campsite Encounters

Several wilderness studies have found general opposition among campers (regardless of their mode of travel) to camping within sight or sound of others. Stankey found that about 80 per cent of the BWCA campers preferred not to camp near other parties. Persons traveling by motorized craft were the most tolerant to others camping nearby. Nearly all paddle canoeists, however, preferred to locate out of sight and hearing of others.

Encounters on the periphery versus the interior locations.

Several studies have shown that perceptions of crowding change as the visitor penetrates into the backcountry. Most visitors are more tolerant to meeting other people at the periphery of the area as opposed to interior

locations. For most BWCA visitors (especially paddle canoeists), tolerance to encountering others dropped sharply agter crossing the second portage or so. On the first few lakes, visitor sensitivity to crowding is perhaps fairly low because they know "something better" is coming up several portages ahead. This probably does not mean that they enjoy meeting others on the first few lakes, but that they can at least accept it for a time. As they penetrate the interior, their expectations of solitude rise and they are especially sensitive to encounters once they have selected a campsite.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS TO OFFSET VISITOR DISSATISFACTION

Managerial actions to offset the widespread congestion and general loss of solitude for many visitors to the Quetico-Superior Canoe Country are complex. Managing amount of use is one challenge but it is complicated by other aspects of use that cause dissatisfaction.

Rationing the number of people, groups, canoes, etc., permitted in the wilderness at any one time is often suggested as a means to offset both environmental and esthetic impacts of use. In the BWCA and certain other wildernesses, restricting use may be desirable and even necessary in certain areas, but I would strongly recommend that such action be considered as a last resort after less regularory, more subtle, actions to alter use have been tried and evaluated. "Across the board" rationing may very well fail to distinguish the disproportionate impact certain aspects of use have compared with others on visitor satisfaction and experiences. Actions should be considered that offset particular sources of dissatisfaction rather than simply restricting use generally.

In the BWCA, rationaing or use restrictions may be defensible now at some of the most heavily used access points. But even at these locations, rationing may be needed only during certain periods, wuch as holidays, peak weekends, and certain weeks of the openwater season.

Studies of visitor attitudes toward use rationing and other measures to control wilderness use suggest that visitors will accept the concept of restricting use to preserve wilderness qualities. However, the findings also suggest that rationing cannot be applied in the absence of sound judgement. Managers will need good evidence to support their actions. Visitors strongly rejected being assigned routes of travel and camp locations. This degree of managerial control restricts individual choice and curtails the wilderness user's freedom. Amore palatable approach to most visitors was to restrict use by access point as needed, and then let the visitor go where he or she wants in the backcountry.

Redistributing use or spreading use out more evenly throughout the wilderness is another commonly proposed solution to congestion. Some redistribution of use in the BWCA would certainly be desirable, but a uniform distribution of use is neither desirable nor possible. Trip lengths differ among users as do abilities and interests. Some areas need to be, and will, remain lightly used unless authoritarian measures are taken by managers.

Telling visitors about BWCA attractions, use patterns, and alternate "wilderness" recreation opportunities outside the BWCA would be appreciated and the information would be used by many visitors for trip planning. Many visitors follow familiar routes and have limited information about alterna-

tives. Many apparently do not know what to expect on alternative routes nor do they know where to go to find out about alternatives. Thoughtfully presented information could have two important benefits. First, use patterns might be modified to more closely conform tomanagement objectives. The resulting change in visitor behavior from using this information could result in more use during the "off-season", more use on lightly used routes, greater use of lightlyused isolated campsites, and greater use of areas out of the BWCA for "wilderness" recreation. Second, such information could serve to enhance the experience of visitors by advertising specific attributes of the wilderness and improving people's understanding of basic wilderness ecology and care of the environment.

Rationing, restricting, or redistributing BWCA use to reduce congestion probably will do little to offset the general dissatisfaction of canoeists who meet motorized parties, especially those parties encountered in interior locations. Data from our research and from previous studies speak for themselves--the conflict generally one-sided. Motor craft use is inconsistent with most paddle canoeist's (and many motor canoeist's and some boater's) perception of Wilderness. And, the conflict appears to be worsening.

Previous research on carrying capacity in the BWCA has concluded that elimination of motors beyond the second lake from the boundary would greatly increase satisfaction. On many of the 19 motor routes, motors are relatively scarce beyond the first portage. Additionally, on many of the motor routes, motor use is relatively light after July 1. Still, although the total amount of motor use is small, it has a disproportionate impact on the experiences of others.

Research by McCool in the early 1970's concluded that the elimination of motors might not be as vigorously opposed as previously thought. He found that about 35 per cent of the motor canoeists and 25 per cent of the motorboaters would, in general, prefer traveling by paddle canoe.

Motor use, then, is a significant source of dissatisfaction for many BWCA visitors. Opportunities for similar wilderness experiences elswhere are severely limited. Use of the BWCA is sure to increase as will pressure to eliminate uses inconsistent with the concept of Wilderness. As the Act says, Wilderness should have "outstanding opportunities for solitude: in a primitive environment. Despite the language of the Wilderness Act permittingthe use of motors, managers may be forced to consider further restricting or eliminating motorcraft use. Such pressures have, in fact, recently (1975) led to the elimination of motors on most of the lakes in Quetico Provincial Park, with a 10 horsepower limit on remaining waterbodies (including lakes on the International Boundary). Permitting motor use to continue reduces the carrying capacity of the Area and can only result in an earlier need to restrict the number of people permitted in the BWCA.

Efforts to reduce the party size limit to 15 persons in the mid 1960's, and more recently to 10 have greatly aoffset the adverse effect of large parties on visitor satisfaction and the naturla environment. It is uncertain if a further reduction in the party-size limit would result in some parties not visiting the Area at all, or if most would re-adjust their size to comply with the rule. If they did continue to come, it would mean more groups but the same total number of visitors. Supperior National Forest managers report that the recent reduction in the limit to 10 people per group (1973) has been well accepted and supported by the public.

CONCLUSION

Managing the recreation use of the BWCA to protect the natural environment and to enhance the experiences of visitors has been and will continue to be complicated and challenging! Deciding what uses are acceptable, and when and where they should be permitted requires considerable information on both patterns of use and visitors' perceptions of wilderness carrying capacity. Our research has been designed to help managers better understand these issues and to provide facts to help them make important decisions.

Obviously, studies of visitor attitudes and desires cannot dictate wilderness policy. Thoughtful management requires the use of facts coupled with management experience and good judgment. Also, there are legal and administrative constraints to what the manager can do--the Wilderness Act itself limits certain managerial actions, some desires are technically impossible to provide, funds and personnel are often limited, and frequently visitors disagree as to what they want. In spite of these apparent limitations, studies of visitor behavior aid the wilderness planning process by indicating what the consequences of various management actions will be. Thoughtful social research can obtain an accurate, unbiased cross section of views that can help managers set objectives <u>and</u> may suggest potential changes in policy.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF VISITOR STUDIES IN THE

QUETICO-SUPERIOR AREA

Bultena, Gordon L., and M. J. Taves. Changing wilderness images and forestry policy. J. For. 59(3):167-171. 1961.

Gordon Lusty Survey Research Ltd. A study of visitor attitudes towards Quetico Provincial Park. Conducted for the Parks Branch, Ontario Dept. of Lands & Forest, Torotno. 1968.

Gorman, Gilbert C., George L. Peterson, and David W. Lime, Toward a model of travel behavior in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. Environment and Behavior. 4(2); 131-157. 1972.

Hutchinson, Jay G. and David W. Lime. In search of campsites. Naturalist 23 (3 and 4); 18-23. 1972.

Lime, David W. Wilderness-like recreation opportunities adjacetn to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. Naturalist 20(1): 36-41. 1969.

Lime, David W. Reasearch for determining use capacities of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. Naturalist 21(4): 8-13. 1970.

Lime, David W. Factors influencing campground use in the Superior National Forest of Minnesota. North Central Forest Experiment Station, St. Paul, Minn. USDA For. Serv. Res. Pap. NC-60, 18 p., illus. 1971.

Lime, David W. Large groups in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area--their numbers, characteristics, and impact. USDA For. Serv. Res. Note NC-142, 4p. 1972.

Lime, David W. and Roland G. Buchman. Boundary Waters Caanoe Area visitor-use estimates from mandatory travel permits: 1972. (Office Report). 91 p. USDA Forest Serv., No. Central For. Exp. Stn. St. Paul, MN. 1973.

Lime, David W. and Roland G. Buchman. Putting wilderness permit information to work. J. For. 72 (10):622-626. 1974.

Lime, David W. and Grace A. Lorence. Improving estimates of wilderness use from mandatory travel permits. USDA Forest Service Research Paper NC-101. 7 p., illus. 1974. North Central Forest Experiment Station, St. Paul, MN.

Lime, David W., and Roland G. Buchman. Boundary Waters Canoe Area visitor-use estimates: 1973 and 1974. (Office Report). 76 p. USDA Forest Serv., No. Cent. For. Exp. Stn., St. Paul, MN. 1975.

Lucas, Robert C. Visitor reaction to timber harvesting in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. Lake States For. Exp. Stn., St. Paul, MN. USDA For. Serv. Res. Note LS-2, 2 p. 1963.

Lucas, Robert C. The recreational capacity of the Quetico-Superior Area. Lake States Forest Experiment Station, St. Paul, Minn. USDA For. Serv. Res. Paper LS-15, 34 p., illus. 1964.

Lucas, Robert C. The recreational use of the Quetico-Superior Area. Lake States Forest Experiment Station, St. Pauk, MINN. USDA For. Serv. Res. Paper LS-8, 50 p., illus. 1964.

Lucas, Robert C. "Wilderness Perception and Use: the example of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area". Natural Resources Journal 3(1):394-411. 1964.

Lucas, Robert C. The importance of fishing as an attraction and activity in the Quetico-Superior Area. Lake States For. Exp. Stn., St. Paul, MN., USDA For. Serv. Res. Note LS-61, 3 p., illus. 1965.

Lucas, Robert C. The changing recreational use of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. North Central Forest Experiment Station, St. Paul, MN. USDA For. Serv. Res. Note NC-42, 4 p. 1967.

McCool, Stephen F. and Lawrence C. Merriam Jr. Travel method preferences of BWCA campers. Sch. For., Univ. Minn., St. Paul, MN. For. Res. Note-219, 4 p., 1970.

McCool, Stephen F. and Lawrence C. Merriam Jr. Factors associated with littering in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. Sch. For., Univ. MN., St. Paul, MN. For. Res. Note 218, 4 p. 1970.

McCool, Stephen F. and Lawrence C. Merriam Jr. Camper-outfitter interaction and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, Superior National Forest, Minn. Sch. For., Univ. Minn., St. Paul, MN For. Res. Note 225, 4p. 1971.

Merriam, L. C. Jr., C. K. Smith, D. E. Miller, Ching tiao Huang, J. C. Tappeiner, II, Kent Goeckermann, J. A. Bioemendal, and T. M. Costello. Newly developed campsites in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area: a study of 5 year's use. Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 511, 27 p. 1973.

Nelson, Ernest E. and Jay M Hughes. Travel distance and joint visitation to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area and adjacent Canadian wilderness. School of Forestry, Univ. Minn., St. Paul, Minn. Forestry Research Note 185. 1968.

Peterson, George L. A comparison of the sentiments and perceptions of wilderness managers and canoeists in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. Journal of Leisure Research 6(3): 194-206. 1974.

Peterson, George L. and David W. Lime. Two sources of bias in the measurement of human response to the wilderness environment. Journal of Leisure Research. 5(2):66-73. 1973.

Stankey, George H. Wilderness: carrying capacity and quality. Naturalist 22(3): 7-13. 1971.

Stankey, George H. Visitor perception of wilderness recreation carrying capacity. Intermt. For. and Range Expt. Stn., Ogden, Utah. USDA For. Serv. Res. Pap. INT-142, 61 p. 1973.

Taves, Marvin, William Hathaway, and Gordon Bultena. Canoe country vacationers. Agricultural Experiment Stn. Misc. Report 39, 28p. 1960.

Wildland Research Center. Wilderness and recreation--a report on resources, values, and problems. Outdoor Recreation Resour. Rev. Comm. Study Rep. 3, Washingtion, D. C., 352 p., illus. 1962.

ATTITUDES TOWARD HUNTING

A STUDY OF SOME SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL DETERMINANTS

by

William H. Shaw

Presented by David H. Jenkins, MDNR, Lansing

Carl Noren, who among other things, is Chairman of the Association's Pro-Hunt Committee asked that we present a brief synopsis of Bill Shaw's doctoral thesis which has been published in a boiled-down form as Wildlife Division Report No. 2740 - "Attitudes toward Hunting."

It would be better if Bill were here to do it but he's a "professor" now in Tuscon and probably would freeze to death if he had to travel to the far northern regions of the Dakotas. Bill's work was done at "The University of Michigan" and financed by the Wildlife Management Institute, the American Petroleum Institute and by a Wildlife Division fellowship that included Pittman-Robertson money.

I promised my boss, Chuck Harris, that I would summarize Bill's report and not do any of my own editorializing, and I promised my wife that I would not be diverted into delivering "Lecture #21" -- both promises being most difficult to keep considering my own feelings on the subject. These certainly were not made any less intense by a personal encounter with Cleveland Amory on a Detroit TV show.

The idea of the study was:

1. To learn the relative importance of some social and psychological forces that determine an individual's attitude toward sport hunting.

2. To figure out what this means to wildlife managers.

When we consider Bill's conclusions, many of us will say, "Heck, that's nothing new. I knew that before." OR "I've thought that for a long time." Maybe so, but in important management decisions it's a lot better to "know" something based on some good data than to "know" something via a gut feeling. Gut feelings are valuable mainly in the absence of solid data.

Shaw sees the problem as one of declining public interest in and support for wildlife management with hunting license fees <u>if</u> the increasing rate of nonparticipation continues and if the anti-hunting interests continue to generate support among the non-hunters. To this end he focuses his research on the phenomenon of hunting opposition and its implications for wildlife managers. He cites evidence that hunting, <u>relative to other forms of recreation</u>, seems to be decreasing in importance with an aspecially marked decline among the younger people. Before someone who has read the Wildlife Management Institute News Bulletin of June 18, 1976, rises in objection, I'd point out that the WMI reports that the percentage of all hunters in the population seems to be holding up but the report predicts that the number of hunters will probably not keep pace with the population.

In addition to the almost certain decline in the hunting participation rate now comes the growth of orginized and subliminal opposition to sport hunting along with opposition to trapping, vivisection, use of laboratory animals, livestock raising and slaughter house practices, and other concerns of the "animal liberation" movement.

In Shaw's literature review he underlines the fact that the characteristics of the hunter have been researched to death -- you know, he's of medium income, moderate education, 35-40 years old, mostly male (I guess that isn't "exactly" the way to say that) and in the middle occupational social class. But, much less is known about those opposing sport hunting.

Shaw also briefly capsulizes the hunting--anti-hunting controversy and points out that, to date, much has been given to name-calling on both sides. Hunters are callous, illiterate, blood thirsty, and sexually inadequate (I've heard more colorful expressions used). Anti-hunters are seen as illogical, biologically ignorant, militant without cause, neo-sentimental, sadistic, naive, misled, and politically motivated (and I've seen more colorful language use here too).

The point for wildlife managers to realize is that this approach is not productive -- or worse. We should get on with finding out exactly what makes the anti-hunter an anti-hunter. Knowing this could save a lot of wasted time, money, and energy in our battle to save huntingand perhaps even the hunted resources themselves. We seem to be bent on trying the easy solution that doesn't work. The report is a good first step toward proper understanding of what we're up against.

The Study Method

Shaw used a mail-back questionnaire to three groups of people -- Michigan Deer Hunters, Fund for Animals (the Cleveland Amory group) -- the two extremes -- and to Michigan Audubon Society (a moderate group).

Two hundred people were randomly selected from each group and mailed a detailed questionnaire. The responce rate was interesting -- 90% for Michigan Fund for Animals, 79% for the Michigan Audubon Society members, and 63% for Michigan Deer Hunters. Bill is cautious about generalizing from these rates but my gut feeling possibly outlines one of our problems -- apathy.

We don't have time nor the inclination to go into the statistical systems and methods used but it is obvious that when you compare anti-hunters, anti-hunters tend to: -- in order of signigicance

1. Be less tolerant of killing.

2. Be more likely to consider some acts of hunting as cruel.

3. Be less exposed to killing and bloodshed.

4. Be more in favor of so-called gun "control."

5. Be more in disagreement with biologists on hunting and wildlife.

6. Be more supportive of the ecology movement.

7. Be more from urban backgrounds.

8. Be more highly educated.

9. Bemore supportive of non-game wildlife management.

10. Be more of a preservationist.

11. Attribute a higher capacity for pain to animals.

12. Attribute a higher capacity for emotion for animals.

A detailed multivariate analysis of these attitudes shows that no one simple parameter or attitude about biology or hunting stood out as the primary reason for the anti-hunting attitudes. The anti-hunter's position seemed to be determined by a broad range of background experience, beliefs and attitudes.

Other analyses showed several interesting things:

*68% of the anti-hunters would like to see sport hunting actually made illegal.

*Of all the reasons for being opposed to sport hunting -- dislike for the type of people who hunt was least important.

*While the human, biological, and ecological reasons are important to anti-hunters the issues that concerned them the most were animal suffering and cruelty to the animals.

*While most anti-hunters have always been anti-hunting -- 28% had become so, and of these 30% had changed in the last five years.

*There were five times as many vegetarians among anti-hunters as among the deer hunters and Audubonites (15+% vs. 3+%) and fully 2/3 of the anti-hunters had considered becoming vegetarians. At the price of steak, I've considered it also -- sorta almost.

*All groups -- hunters, anti-hunters and moderates -- rated legal hunting as unimportant to the future of "animals." All groups rated loss of habitat, pollution and poaching as very important. Thus the anti-hunters agree that hunting really isn't wiping out animals; they just don't approve for other reasons. Keep this fact in mind.

*Also of interest is that when all three groups were asked why wildlife was important to Americans, all three ranked non-consumptive values -- aesthetics, existance, and ecological values -- high. They enjoy wildlife and wildlife is part of our ecosystem and heritage and therefore is valuable. Sport values, economic values, and food values are down on the value list of the three groups.

Most Important Conclusion

Shaw points out that it would be seriously wrong to think that the anti-hunter is biologically naive and that if we educate him -- or her -- to the biological facts of life -- harvestable surplus, limiting factors, annual crop, etc., he will agree with us. 'Taint so. His study underlines the fact that the anti-hunting attitude is due to a wide range of interrelated factors and as such the attitude is difficult to change -- very difficult.

It is not a simple:

> I like wildlife -- I believe hunting reduces the number of wildlife. Therefore I am opposed to hunting. This would be an easy attitude to change.

It is more of a situation like:

> I like wildlife -- I believe hunters kill for pleasure. It is wrong to derive pleasure from killing wildlife; hunting is cruel; I don't like cruelty. Therefore I am opposed to hunting.

That is a more difficult can of worms to untangle.

While Shaw studied three groups and concludes that influencing them is difficult -- if not almost impossible -- he recognizes that the great mass of uncommitted Americans -- those who have no commitment to either position -- are the most subject to being influenced by the extremists and we should keep that in mind.

Bill suggests that the continued population growth, continued loss of habitat and continued urbanization of people -- more than 1/6 of all Americans live in Boswash alone (Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington corridor)-- have great potential for convincng the uncommitted that wildlife is a scarce resource that must be cherished and preserved and then (subconsciouly) not hunted.

He goes on to say that wildlife managers should staff up to deal with these non-committed, non-consumptive users. They should employ people who can understand and communicate with people of differing views and that's not easy. It is not to say that any <u>strong</u> <u>opponent</u> of hunting should be employed by a wildlife agency, but we need special help from talented people and they are hard to come by.

Further, more emphasis on non-game wildlife is a must for wildlife agencies. Again it is a question of funds, and if I may editorialize there probably is a limit to what the hunters will pay for although he is tolerant, generous person. It is a shame that many legislators -- state and federal who say they are "friends" of hunters don't vote more positively when it comes to funding non-game activities with non-game money from all of us. Correcting that situation would almost guarantee them a complimentary license to hunt in the Great Beyond -- forever.

7/14/76

A PRIVATE APPROACH TO LAND PRESERVATION AND STEWARDSHIP

GRACE MCDERMOTT, DIRECTOR OF LAND STEWARDSHIP, MIDWEST REGION

THE NATURE CONSERVANCY

It's really a pleasure to be here because the first experience that I had with any member of a conservation organization was a conservation officer in New Jersey where I was manageing some land trying to kick some hunters out and you all as hunters, I assume you would find it difficult to tell me no if I asked you to leave when your hunting. Guys seem to find it difficult to leave the only woods and say no I'm not going to go hunting. Well, we did find one man that had shot a deer, he gutted it on our property, was on his way out on his tractor with the deer behind him; a conservation officer caught him and got him for not tagging it. We got him into court and he won. Because he said the deer was on his property and he merely shot it. So a seventy year old man beat us out of this, but I'm happy to say that in the last six years I've come to appreciate you all much more. I know, it took awhile.

My region covers from Ohio to the Dakotas north to Wisconsin and Minnesota and south to Iowa, Kansas and Missouri, so I feel like I know most of you because we transferred a lot of land to your organization. A major concern to me was certainly created in 1917 by the Ecological Society of America. They said all inventory on land in 1917 cannot be booked in 1937 and we are still beginning new inventories to find out the natural areas in the United States. In 1951, conservancy was created and since that time they have either preserved or assisted in the preservation of over 900,000 acres of land in the United States. The conservancy maintains a low profile and I think due to that reason we are able to go into the Corps land and donors who may get a little leary of state organizations but are willing to give it to a private non-profit land conservation organization which a conservancy is.

It is volunteered based and has 25,000 members and most of those members are active workers. Everything from posting and burning and fencing to the experienced volunteer from the biology department, or ecology departments of Universities coming out and inventorying for us. I think it's interesting that the conservancy acquires lands and fritters away a third of it's acquisitions or gifts. Originally we had gifts that were mined under and logged over in adjacent acid-mined drainage ditches, but they were gifts and they were considered natural areas twenty or thirty years ago. But now we are looking toward ecologically unique areas. The most ecologically unique areas in the United States. We were able to purchase a third of our acquisitions at a third of the cost, the government cost.

Now after we acquire land, the question is what we are going to do with it. For the past twenty years a conservancy has been acquisition oriented and will always continue to be acquisition oriented. But I think that there is a new feeling within the conservancy in this calss that if we acquire land, we have to be able to manage it. In the Midwest, we do have over two hundred preserves. The conservancy now maintains a management of six hundred areas. Some are four and five acres; the largest one that we are maintaining now is 7,600 acres here in South Dakota up in McPherson county.

Now those of you who do know the conservancy, know that there are a lot of businessmen related to it. When it started it was scientists, then businessmen came in because they had a business acumen and had to get out and raise the money to purchase the land and now we are going full cycle in getting back to the ecologist, to the land managers, to the wildlife resource people who can help us

manage the land, but the conservancy isn't able and isn't capable and really isn't going to at this point manage all the land that it acquires. Therefore we look to organizations like the department of conservation in Missouri or the department of conservation in Illinois or the D and R in Minnesota to help us with that management. It's difficult for us to acquire land and ask you to take care of it. And I do ask you if you could prepare a few who would rather have the land and have the responsibility for managing it or not have it at all and the consensus is that you would rather have the land so I guess it concerns who will continue to acquire it.

But when Jeff Byers, who is my boss, was asked to come and speak, the discussion was the use of our lands; how we use it and how we manage it and you don't really prologue hunting or fishing on conservancy reserves. I know that's a question you'll ask. If there is an over abundance of a herd of deer, than we can go in and harvest it. Controlled hunting. There are areas where fishing is allowed like the conservancy of grass land for the preservation of biological diversity as looking for specific eco-systems in different areas that have been preserved in the past. It's looking for areas of research and scientific education, for passive recreation and I know there are areas that are hunted too. I tried to get a permit here in South Dakota last year up on our preserve and I was told that I wasn't a state resident. Can anyone do anything about that? Well, I tried.

I know that you are tired of seeing slides, but I brought some and I would like to go through them and I'll show you a little about how we manage the areas. It is active management. It gets into burning and haying and grazing and that's primarily the management. It gets into burning and haying and grazing and that's primarily the management motive in the midwest because most areas are prairie, but I'll let you see a few slides. If I talk too fast, remember I'm from the East and you have to, slow me down. Can I have the lights please? And can someone flip on the machine?

As I said, the majority of the preserves in the midwest are prairie. Minnesota at this time manages over sixty preserves, two thirds of which are prairie. Any of you involved in that preserve that takes active management? These slides happen to be in South Dakota. I thought that I would be safe it I showed you South Dakota slides. This is the Ore Lake area up in McPherson county. Minnesota, home of the prairie chicken; Illinois, home of the prairie chicken is one of the main reasons the conservancy's going out for prairie lands in Minnesota is for the prairie chicken habitat. The sandhill cranes in Nebraska. And sometimes we don't get there in time. There was a prairie that was promised to us. We went out to get the option money and by the time we came back it had been plowed over. Or else they were taking it up for sod on the adjacent prairie up in northwestern Minnesota. We have to get in there fast and that is one of the things that we, the conservancy, is lucky for. It has good lines of credit and has a project revolving fund of over four million dollars. So the conservancy can go into government organizations and preacquire anew, resale it to the state at a bargain sale or a flea market value or even donate it at different times. Once a conservancy aquires the land, as I said, we have to look into the management of it. In some states such as Minnesota, which does have a large endowment at this point for management of the areas. We can get into some aerial photography. And even some infrared work. But when we don't have the ability to manage, let's say in this area, the Missouri Department of Conservation has been going in doing some aerial photography and taking pre-existing aerial photos, doing some ground checking, checking the soil for us, doing some plant work and then coming up with a management

plan. This is something that we really need in most of our states. We have to have a very good inventory before we can determine how the land is going to be managed. And we are going to use grazing and haying for the most part although we are trying to talk Tom Tony into burning. I think this is a question in some states. We are pro-burning as far as the management control is concerned and I'm not sure how you all feel about it.

Grazing in the foothills in Kansas is a 2,100 acre prairie that we do maintain ourselves and would hope that we can get some of the colleges and Universities to work with us there. Most of their efforts going into Conda prairie which is up by Manhattan, Kansas.

This is also, in Kansas, the biggest natural area and the reason I threw the slide in is to tell you that we don't only lease entrance areas to state organizations, but in this case it's to the Kansas ornithological society. When we do lease a piece of land to an organization such as this we ask them to prepare a management plan for us and the management plan has to be consistent with the by-laws and the philosophy of the conservancy and it's sort of a dual protection for both of us. I think that you are probably familiar with Kansas. It's one of the larger prairie research stations in the United States. It's university oriented and Dwight Halvert and his staff up there are doing a great job with buring management and they have opened up new fire break techniques. I don't want to sound like a piromaniac. During the last few years in the Midwest, I've been involved in a lot of burns and it seems that since we are a volunteer organization, everybody from whatever level you are at, you don't sit behind a desk in a collegiate conservancy.

This is in Kansas. We haven't attempted anything like this on our part, but what we have found within our conservancy in Minnesota is that we can't just go out and expect volunteers here every day. You can't expect college students or families to go out and burn for you. First of all it's dangerous. Liability is very high and people do get hurt. We need organized volunteers, experienced volunteers and we are now in the process. Minnesota has a director of preserved management. It's one of the two states in the United States in the conservancy that has a full time director. He's into the researching, the best management techniques, burning and how we can obtain volunteers. The area up front, this green areas, is the area that was burned this spring. I'd say these four people here are all either ecologists or wildlife biologists. And I think I've carried that with me. I've got a lot people to work for. Sigley State Park in Minnesota has volunteered on several occasions to assist us either with equipment or personnel or moral support. In Indiana where they defined the natural areas years ago, we would be able to systematically acquire lands such as Platehills nature preserve. We know areas that we can't preserve. This is transferred to the Department of Natural Resources in Indiana. But they are having as many problems I think as we are right now. This natural bridge is a hazard. I walked over it this past spring and I don't know how people do it. It's pretty high, it's pretty dangerous, but it's the base attraction in the area. I guess it's a case of when a conservancy has transferred a piece of land out, but we still have a moral obligation to the land. We have the responsibility to see that the land is managed in the way that we had agreed upon. We are now working with the Department of Natural Resources in Indiana to see if we can eliminate the problem and just change the trail system in some way. There is another area in Indiana that we transferred to the Department of Natural Resources and we are very happy that they have this area. It is one of the

largest, the best rock climbing area in Indiana. Several people have fallen and broken their necks and broken their backs. The state is intelligent, the state is really considerate, they know that rock climbers need places to rock climb and they are coming up with an enlightened and directed use of the area for rock climbing. Recent actions in the various departments of conservation or natural resources allows us to get a lot of labor. We receive the employees and they have attached that every time you put the sign up, the sign comes back down so once a week we are putting up these signs. Besides research, environmental education has been an important part of the environmental movement. In the last five or six years the conservancy has not really been involved in it, however, in our 1980 and 1982 plans we are required to look into environmental education and environmental education exists on different levels from the kindergarten heights to research to senior citizen type trips. Illinois and Ohio are probably two main areas where we are concentrating on environmental education.

This area, which is in Lay county Illinois up by Lake Forest has developed environmental education materials on it's own prior to our acquisition of the area. They did all the maintenance on the trails and on hte bridges, led all the field trips. I had a really good response and it was so good that we are now working with another private organization to whom we would lease the land. We would be able to give them some money and they have got money from the garden clubs to come up with a three year, $50,000 project whereby they would develop environmental education materials for that area and have utilized conservancy preserves.

In Ohio I was interested in hearing about that project because the institute of environmental education is working on a grant with the conservancy to come up with education programs on conservancy preserves in northeast Ohio and if they work they will be replicated on areas throughout the Midwest.

You all recognize congressman Abdnor from here in South Dakota. Pat Newman is on the right, the president of the nature conservancy. This is a dedicated bicentennial area read to you under the Horizon program for South Dakota. The 7,600 acre prairie in McPherson county is the beginning of a research center for prairies in the Midwest. There are four hundred potholes up in this area which is probably an invitiation to hunters and luckily we have a full time range manager up there, Paul Vohs so if you have any questions on hunting or fishing, talk to Paul. There is over fifteen miles of fencing up there so in addition to this job as research manager up there he also has to get out there and mend the fences.

This will be the center of a research station up there and will be divided into laboratories. We do have a bunkhouse up there now. There are four research projects available for researchers from not only in South Dakota but throughout the Midwest who are interested in grazing hay and burning techniques, wetland prairie research programs and money will be available through SDSU and through the conservancy so if any of you are interested please don't hesitate to contact Paul.

These areas are available for research by the local colleges and universities and are totally maintained by volunteers in South Dakota. These next few slides, cover a new program of the conservancy, well the conservancy is directing it, you may have heard of it. It's called the American Land Trust and a group of prime businessmen, prime financial movers and wizards and conservationists throughout the United States have set themselves a goal of two hundred million dollars to aquire the most unique conservancy, or the most unique natural areas in the United States. And several of them are in the United States. Over thirty of them identified in the Midwest and

I have just put in a few slides for you. This is in Wisconsin, it's Oak Ridge. On the sand hills in Nebraska conservancy this time has only one preserve in Nebraska down on Red Cloud. It's a 660 acre prairie down in Will Kellers home area. What we are looking for, something in the Sand Hills, something on the level of 1,280 or 1,300 acres which would be the center of a University of Nebraska field station. Another one in the American Land Trust which has been acquired by the conservancy in fund raising for analysis; Little Black slough in Illinois which will be transferred to the department of conservation. These are valued anywhere from $150,000 to $350,000 dollars so when the American Land Trust and the conservancy sets a goal of two hundred million dollars, I don't really feel that they require that many pieces of land because the unique ones seem to be the most expensive.

This is Creeling Lake in Minnesota for those people that are here. A seven hundred acre that was transferred to the department of natural resources this past winter. In transferring areas like this, this area that is a fish and wildlife management area, which will be open to fishing and I am not sure about the hunting aspect of it, but with all the Minnesotans here, I am sure that they can answer that question for you so when the conservancy transfers areas or works with co-ops, there aren't always restrictions placed on it. It depends how the conservancy went into the acquisition. This was finally found in Indiana and I wondered if you put these on your areas and if the conservancy considered that too. Can I have the lights? Can you flip off the machine? You all must have been good students. You listen well.

What I think the conservancy, for all it's done in the last twenty five years and what it plans to do in the future is a good organization to compliment all the work that you are doing and vice versa. If we can go in with you and have you help us pre-identify areas; assist us in the management and assist us in the research of it, I think that we have a pretty good partnership going and I know you know about the conservancy, but if I can answer any questions for you or if you want to visit our regional headquarters in Minnesota, in Minneapolis, please do. Thank you.

Question by Stuart: How are you taxed? By the landowner or how?

We're taxed on a state by state basis. We are eligible for tax exemption, but in many cases can't get it. We have to send for it in Wisconsin or Minnesota. In South Dakota one preserve is 7,600 acres. We pay taxes on it because if we didn't it would take such a. . . .they put such a strain on the taxes on the community and the schools that we don't do it. So we have to look to each case. We like to get exemptions whenever possible.

Popowski: I might just say too, over the years I think from a person standpoint, one of the most satisfying things that I have been involved with is land acquisition. That somehow gives me quite a little satisfaction to go back to an area and look at it and realize that maybe I was the one that initiated some work and see a piece of land now in public ownership. We've got to the point in this state now where our land acquistion program, and I know Russ does the same thing in North Dakota, that it's just for all practical purposes out of existance and I think you acquire certain of these very unique areas. It's great to have an organization that can do it. There may be some differences on how exactly a piece of land should be utilized between the conservation agency and the nature conservancy, but I think the first thing is to get it into some type of ownership that people can enjoy it. Your right Grace, it takes ninety days to become a resident of South Dakota and there isn't such a thing here as a complimentary license. You'll have to stay awhile.

Question: One area in Perkins county is just a few miles from the North Dakota line, come across there and I will sell you a license for three bucks. I've been interested for a long time in getting a grassland park. We have Yellowstone and Glacier and so on and so forth and we never developed a real grassland national park in the United States. I know that places in the four states, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas and Nebraska. I think they tried it in Kansas and it failed.

It takes twenty five years to acquire all the land. Would your agency be interested in sponsoring something like that? You know it could involve the fish and wildlife service and the national park service.

McDermott: We'd be interested in participating in one. We participated in the one in Kansas and we got lots of grief from it. They still have the land down there and I think they would be interested in it especially because through the thrust we have acquired so many pieces throughout the midwest that we want to have some sort of continuity. I was thinking maybe 15 or 20 dollars an acre for cost. Altering the eco-system that can occur in that period.

Popowski: Are there any other questions for Grace? We are all aware of the conservancy's nature and in one form or another have worked with it in the past. In fact I just got some mail a week ago about a Vermillion piece down in the southeastern part of South Dakota that they are starting to raise funds for. Thank you very much.

"THE AMERICAN OUTDOORS"

A Television Venture of the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies

by

Ralph A. Bitely
Former Administrator, Maryland Wildlife Administration,
and presently South Central Atlantic Regional Director,
Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

Fellow wildlifers, for several years certain special interest groups and individuals have been at work diligently attempting to put a stop to the consumptive uses of wildlife, especially sport hunting, trapping, and fishing. The implication being that killing wildlife for sport is immoral and aboriginal. More recently, even the deliberate manipulation of wildlife habitat, in their opinion, represents an abuse of our natural resources and that we humans should let mother nature do the managing - that somehow, if we quit tampering with our natural environment everything would revert to the way things were before 1492. Unfortunately, when our ancestors settled this part of the world, they not only deliberately brought their domestic livestock, cereal grains, and other food crops with them, over the years they also brought a good many other plants and animals, such as Russian thistle, apanese honeysuckle, carp, English sparrow, starling, and the Norway rat, to name a few. Therefore, it's just nearly impossible to expect our natural communities to restore themselves to the primeval state which existed on this continent 500 years ago. However, the general public doesn't know that, particularly those who do not hunt, fish, or trap. With the shift from a rural population to an urban/suburban population in recent years, we have seen public attitudes shift from the farming/hunting way of life to the urban/suburban preservationist philosophy. It seems that as poeple lose contact with the land and become engrossed with city living, they also lose contact with the realities of our natural world.

They no longer have the opportunity to observe nature's profligate abundance in the spring gradually dwindle to her ragged few by late winter, nor do they understand that regulated harvest simply substitutes one type of mortality for another just as inevitable end.

In the fall of 1973, I had the distinct pleasure of sharing a goose hunting blind with a person by the name of Chuck Woolsey. We were guests of Remington Farms on Maryland's Eastern Shore. I'm sure many of you are familiar with the facility. During the course of the day, the discussion inevitably came around to the subject of anti-hunting, anti-manegement, and the fact that if somebody didn't do something positive pretty soon, we could high well anticipate the end of such experiences as we were enjoying at the time. Chuck was working with NBC News then, in Washington, D. C., and suggested that a television program which was designed to educate and entertain the urban public was entirely feasible. It could not be a typical hunting and fishing program, however. Subsequently, during a conference in February 1974, The Directors of the Northeast Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies adopted a resolution which brought the subject before the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners. For those who may not be familiar with the International, it is the principal association of state and provincial fish and wildlife agency directors and their colleagues at the national level in the

United States, Canada and the Republic of Mexico. Our purpose is to foster sound fish and wildlife management through educational, legislative, and judicial activities. The International, therefore, in March 1974, appointed a committee to see if something could be done. I had the misfortune of being the message bearer and ended up as Chairman of what was then Television Committee. We met several times during the spring and summer, interviewes a dozen or so television producers and finally agreed that perhaps a series of four, one-hour specials, similar to the National Geographic Specials might be feasible. However, we were also advised that the costs would range from $400,000 to $500,000 to produce and broadcast each show at prime time. So... we mounted an ambitious campaign to search out a company or corporation which might be willing to subsidize such a project -- we certainly couldn't produce that kind of money ourselves. Needless to say, we were unsuccessful. However, during the course of all this commotion, we interviewed a fellow by the name of Don Higley who had an intriguing idea. He could produce and market a series of half hour shows if we would work with him, providing stock film footage where possible, providing editorial talent, story suggestions, and the moral support of our Associaiton. In fact, he already had a couple of pilot shows completed as examples of what could be done. Thus, by September 1975, we had put together the potentials of a show and were instructed by the Association to proceed with developing a formal agreement for consideration at our next meeting. In March, 1976, an agreement between Taber/Higley and the Association for production of a show called "The American Outdoors" was approved and signed. Since that time, the original Television Committee has been assigned additional tasks and has been renamed the Communication Committee. In order to provide the guidance needed, therefore, a five man Television Subcommittee has been established with Bill Goudy from West Virginia serving as Chairman. Each of the four Regional Associations of the International has a representative on the Subcommittee. Your Midwest Regional Coordinator is with us today. He is Dave Jenkins, Chief, Division of Wildlife, Michigan Department of Natural Resources. Not with us today are --- Bill Goudy, Administrative Assistant, West Virginia Division of Fish and Wildlife; Red Hunt, Chief of Wildlife, California Department of Fish and Game; Pete McLain, Federal Aid Coordinator, New Jersey Division of Fish, Game and Shellfisheries; and Aaron Pass, Information Specialist, Georgia Department of Fish and Wildlife. Lonnie Williamson, Wildlife Management Institute, Washington, D. C., is serving in an advisory capacity to the subcommittee. One person who has given substantial assistance with our publicity is Dick Lattimer, National Director of the Fred Bear Sports Club, Grayling, Michigan.

This committee provides the editorial control for program content and supplies suggestions for stories to Don Higley. Each state fish and wildlife director has appointed an agency representative who will suggest story topics to the Regional Coordinator and select Topic Chairman. The Topic Chairman will pull together all available facturl material and available films to be used in developing complete programs. Phase I of the project has been virtually completed with the production of 26 half-hour programs which are adaptations of existing motion picture films, many of them contributed by state fish and wildlife agencies. These have been edited by the Subcommittee and with final touches will be ready for release this fall.

Phase II of the project involves production of a series of 52 half-hour shows, similar to Mike Wallace's 60 Minutes, but in a 30 minute timeframe. It is scheduled for release in the Spring of 1977. Each week's lead-in feature will run 8-12 minutes. All will consist of ongoing scientific fisheries and wildlife management activities as topics. This material must come from the field, and the individual responsible for coordinating and assembling the subject matter for a specific topic is sensibly called a "Topic Chairman."

The second segment of each show(6-10 minutes)will be a mixture of current outdoor information and national news. This wildlif e gazette will consist of such items as: "What happened last week?" ... There was a big Coho Salmon run in Lake Michigan; ... or, "What is going on right now?" ... Thousands of Canada geese are staging in Canada and should be moging south with the next strong cold front! ... or, "What is happening next week?" ... Next Saturday is National Hunting and Fishing Day ... Timely bits and pieces of outdoor current national events.

The third segment of each Phase II half-hour program will be the most difficult to developsince it requires active participation at the local level. Therefore, fish and wildlife agency staffs will be requested to provide maximum assistance. This segment will present local news in each television station's viewing area. Ideally, this segment will have on camera, a fish and wildlife agency representative (i.e., an information specialist, a wildlife biologist, or a conservation officer) plus an outdoor writer, and the station's sportscaster or news analyst. Neverthless, it should be done on a local basis, with local personalities, utilizing local news. There will be many stations and some agencies who cannot or will not get that personally involved initially, so the producer will provide stations with "evergreen" material to fill this three minute segment.

A pilot program following the Phase II guidelines is being produced for viewing at the International's Annual Conference in Dearborn, Michigan, this September. The Topic Chairman is Pete McLain from New Jersey and the subject matter involves Snow Goose Management. Production is on schedule and the script is being developed by Jameson Brewer, a California Television Writer who recently won an Emmy Award for his ABC Television Special entitled "The Last of the Curlews."

As a means of encouraging participation in the Phase II program and to insure excellence of work, it gives me great pleasure to announce that through National Director Dick Lattimer, the Fred Bear Sports Club has made a committment to present four $1,000 Honorariums annually to those Topic Chairmen who Develop superior programs in the wildlife and fisheries scientific management area.

This is a major and historic undertaking. There will be many problems develop as the program progresses, but together, with a positive approach, we can make it work. If we fail, the alternative may be to read about hunting and fishing in our history books, and to dream about the "good old days." Let's look to the future. Thank you.

THE NEED FOR A POSITIVE APPROACH

TO WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT ON PRIVATE LANDS

KEITH HARMON, WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

I suspect that when I get through here this morning that I'm going to get somewhat the same reaction that I did several weeks ago at a meeting in Volasky, Mississippi, where I had a chance to be on the program for the National Watershed Congress and essentially they were looking for recommendations on how to improve fish and wildlife in watershed projects and I dealt primarily with the topic of channelization and as a final recommendation I said the only way to protect fish and wildlife in a watershed project at least as it relates to channelization with the fact that the federal government should get the hell out of channelization all together and as you might suspect I met with a revolving dead silence.

Not that I'd try to conclude this talk the way that I did then; they had a podium or a little stage up off the floor about five or six feet high and this was made up of a series of tables. And when I went back to my chair and I'm sure most people enjoyed this more than my talk, was that two of these tables had seperated and when I sat down one leg of the chair went down through the crack and I lit on my rear end. I think the applause that I finally did get was for going through the leg turn rather than the talk. So possibly some of you may react the same way. I guess I'm trying to get a new thought here. It may not necessarily be new. I don't think it's been dealt with to the extent that I personally think it needs to be involved with. At least it is a pleasure to be here today since it's been several years since I've actually been on the program for the Midwest and as I recall the last time that I was on the program was in Bismarck where I reported to this group some of the activities of the Farm progress committee and some of the progress that that committee has made as related to the 1973 farm legislation that was being heard before congress at that time. Now many of you are familiar with that and even though we were what I would consider highly successful in attaining these authorities to enhance wildlife particularly from land being retired from agriculture production, we fail to take into consideration the few events that took place just shortly after that law was passed. Such small things as an oil embargo and a very massive wheat sale to Russia and these activities pretty well wiped out all that we had attempted to do at least in terms of getting cover on land being retired from agricultural production. But I do think that we did learn some lessons from that type of effort in one of these, everything else being equal, the oil embargo and the sales of wheat to Russia, I think we pretty well showed that state fish and wildlife agencies if they have well defined goals and a rather united effort can make rather significant achievements.

Another thing that this pointed out to me and I've been involved in agricultural programs for a good number of years is that Fish and Wildlife agencies, the state agencies in particular, are going to depend solely on other agency programs or manipulation programs to meet the states legal mandates for management and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources. Even when those efforts are successful, they are going to be often at times short term and in fact may even be reversed overnight. In such situations, what this boils down to is that the state fish and wildlife agency is really along for the canoe ride and they are doing very little of the paddling. And I get a little uncomfortable in that situation over a period of time. I'm not saying these efforts aren't necessary because they obviously are.

And the third lesson that came out I believe and this may be less than palatable to many people is that the system of free hunting is in as far as private land is concerned, has somewhat been our biggest detriment I believe and I know this goes again against the grain of many of us and I feel too that we have spent a considerable amount of our career trying to maintain the system of free hunting. I guess I'm basing most of my remarks today on the experience of a number of years on the prairies in the Midwest and looking at wildlife from a number of vantage points and some of these are directly from the farmers barnyard on pheasant census routes and check stations. Working with sportsmen's clubs, working for and with state and federal agencies, for and with private organizations and also for and with land grant colleges and extension services and experiment stations. And frankly I can only see two options after this overview and that is one to, and I'll restrict my remarks at least as an example as it relates to pheasants, is to design and implement and finance the program of pheasant management at least and this would benefit all farm game I believe or all farm wildlife, that actually puts the fish and wildlife agency in the driver's seat. And the alternative of this is to essentially admit that we are unable to produce pheasants or other farm wildlife; and are just simply in a business of selling licenses or holding violations down to some acceptable level. And again I feel rather uncomfortable with this type of a situation. At least within the institute we've discussed for a number of years actually, what would be the most productive use of our limited staff time as it relates to farm wildlife management and as you might suspect, the opinions range from, there is just simply no way to compete on private prime agricultural land to at least let's give it one more try. And for the near future at least I favor this give it one more shot approach. Maybe this is because I'm reluctant to admit that fifteen years of work has essentially gone down the tube or else I'm just too hardheaded to face facts. But most important, I see the wildlife profession or wildlife management as a committment on everyone involved in it. We simply keep banging our heads against the wall until somebody, and that would be the consumer of that farm wildlife tells us just to hell with it, forget it. Until they tell us that, I believe it is our job to keep trying. And essentially to date as far as I know, the consumer has not told us to do this.

This is a little bit, if any of you watch the Democratic national convention, a fellow made a remark that I think is an anology of this and he said, when you're dancing with a gorilla, you don't stop dancing when you are tired, you stop dancing when the gorilla gets tired, so I contend at least that the decision to keep trying or throw in the towel is essentially not ours as professionals. And I also contend that the consumer has not really been asked what he's willing to do in terms of a very positive farm wildlife management program and essentially what I'm doing today is proposing that this decision be dropped squarely in those individuals laps. But before we can do that, I think that there are a number of things that need to be done.

One is that the state fish and wildlife agencies have to face one fact and that is that the consumptive or nonconsumptive use of farm wildlife is essentially not a free good and in fact has never been a free good. And we're also a number of economic principal that essentially guides the use of private land and the decision that the landowner makes and how he manages the land in a free market system and even though we may disagree with that, these economic principals do in fact operate. In fact they operated long before Leopold's land ethic was proposed. They've operated since Leopold's land ethic was proposed and they will operate a hell of a lot longer after this point in time. The main principal I believe that needs consideration in developing a positive approach is that, and any of you can read this in any economics book, is that land will in fact be put to that use that has the greatest potential for some economic return and in the Midwest it boils down essentially to in the case of pheasants, either pheasants or agriculture from the standpoint of the landowners decision.

Figures aren't available for the Midwest on exactly how well we are competing in this situation, but there are some national figures that I dug out that I think give some insight to how competitive we have been.

Land use for agriculture also has a capacity to produce wildlife. While respectable quantities of both are possible, the point in fact has reached when agricultural output is increased to the extent of wildlife and I'm sure that this comes as no surprise to anybody. If it's true that the landowner holds that land to maximize his return on his investment, then also it follows that the landowner will increase agricultural production or wildlife whichever promises the greatest economic return. So at this point, it's useful to look at the income potential of agriculture and wildlife, and in fact, some of these figures get a little scary. In the Department of the Interior's 1970 national survey of fishing and hunting the estimates were given on the income received from selling hunting leases on private land. Now these fees of privileges for both annual and daily amounted at least in 1970 to an estimated $58,000,000 dollars per year. Now in addition to that, of course state fish and wildlife agencies provide incentives for maintaining habitat on private lands such as free technical assistance and enforcement of state trespass laws and some providing plant materials for habitat planning, but whether this approach sells, our funds are actual hard dollars used as cash payments for providing habitat and I believe it's important to make a distinction here. Leases represent income from wildlife. It's pure and simple. This in turn can or should influence a landowners decision relative to land use and on the other hand sharing costs for trees providing technical assistance or enforcement against trespassing on private land simply does not represent income to the landowner. These types of incentives have little direct influence on private lands. Really about all they do is reinforce somebody who is already pro-wildlife. And we are interested I believe in influencing those people that are maybe not negative, but at least kind of neutral on the subject. So as commendable as these types of services are that the Game and Fish agencies provide, the fact remains that in 1970, I'm sure the figure has gone up, that about 58 million dollars was spent in 1970 to influence the use of five hundred and seventy four million acres of farm land which includes pasture and 380 million acres of range. And if you divide this out this means that hard cold cash from the American public. If you spread this evenly over all those acres, I know this is a little bit of a broad assumption, but this comes out to about six cents per acre. This is the amount of competition that we have been able to generate on private land for wildlife. On the other hand crops and livestock are also produced on this private land. About three percent of the livestock forage comes from the public land but the livestock using this forage are also associated with private land so you can actually credit the two private land produces from heirism? The use of total production costs and returns from farm land, and any other method would just merely be time consuming and the gross income from the whole agricultural production on private land again in 1970 amounted to 58 billion dollars. The production costs in that same year were 41 billion dollars and this leaves a realized net income to the landowner of 17 billion dollars so essentially in 1970 farmers and ranchers received about 58 million dollars for hunting leases and privileges while income from farm and ranch wildlife management averaged about six cents per acre and this compares with six cents per acre for wildlife to 18 dollars per acre for agricultural production. This is essentially the degree that we have been competing from the economic standpoint.

The wildlife on private lands has traditonally been accepted as a bi-product of agriculture. A fellow by the name of Fred Brinkman who was at that time Washington representative for national grange said and I quote, "Any policy for replenishing and maintaining the supply of game in this country depends upon securing the wholehearted support and cooperation of the farmer." And he made that statement

forty years ago and even today this concept of wildlife being a bi-product of agriculture ranks right along with the ten commandments, but I believe this is going to be essentially a millstone around the neck of a professional and it's often the crutch we use rather than getting on with a rather, what it should be, a rather aggressive job. Now this cooperation that this gentleman referred to was essentially solicited in the 1950's through the Pittman-Robertson program which involved tree planting in many of the Midwest states. I'm sure many of you were involved in this program. In that effort the state fish and wildlife agencies provided trees and shrubs to landowners as an incentive for developing wildlife habitat and the landowners contribution was essentially the land and the care of the stock that was planted. And as nearly as I can determine, any analysis that was made of that program has shown that there was virtually no measurable effect on the wildlife populations. So if agencies are going to depend entirely on increasing and enhancing farm wildlife with tree planting as the sole component of that program than we really aren't going to get too far. Also I believe efforts to provide habitat on private lands have in many cases in desperation I believe, attempted to ride the coattails of soil conservationists and you have all heard the statement that good soil conservation is good wildlife conservation. Don't necessarily misinterpret my remarks because true soil conservation of course is valuable in itself. However, the essential wildlife habitat. . .if the wildlife habitat is included in the process of soil conservation service or soil conservation effort than by and large it's made mostly on accident.

I think you can take one example that in the Midwest the Department of Agriculture figures show somewhere in the neighborhood of fifty million acres of strip-cropping which obviously produces a very large amount of edge and we are presently shooting in the Midwest 20% of the pheasants that we shot about twenty years ago, so something doesn't quite stack up here. If all that edge produced pheasants, we would have pheasants coming out of our ears and we just don't have it. Now whether one believes in the economic system under which the farmer operates, it's really not too relevant at this point, although these pros and cons make for a rather lively discussion at the bar after hours. As a substitute, the land ethic followed by Leopold may have long range merit. In fact, the future hunters may find rather abundant wildlife with the acceptance of this philosophy. However, hunting opportunities at the present, and success for the next several decades hinges primarily on the economic system. Education, the incentives of this tree planting and the land use ethics has yet to halt or even reverse habitat losses. These efforts certainly need attention and they need to be aggressive but again it's a part only of the total package. If we hope to establish habitat on private lands by providing planning, developing of land ethic or providing technical assistance, little will be accomplished in the forseeable future.

Now we've been down this road a hundred times. Just offering a landowner a five dollar bundle of trees to take a thousand dollar per acre cropland out of production is really no program at all. I've stood in too many farmyards and tried to convince landowners of this and I still have the scars to prove it. So sweep aside the technical, biological and philosophical jargon associated with wildlife and private land and you will find one single common denominator and that's the dollar. Unless this common denominator is dealt with head on, habitat will continue to decline. Beyond the landowners personal enjoyment and use which does not require a population level of a hundred packs per section, the public is the primary beneficiary of wildlife produced on private land, therefore the landowner does not require that level of production and if he does attempt to provide it, he actually begins to forego income.

Even a very liberal interpretation of what the hunter contributes to his or her license fee makes it impossible for me to conclude that the cost of producing wildlife on private land is being paid. I don't want to take any credit away from the hunter because it's true that they have essentially footed the bill to this point. But in my opinion at least, the three dollar contribution for a pheasant hunting license really is not much of a contribution. And I think that in many cases that if they didn't have to pay it they probably wouldn't pay that either. But I don't believe that it is the responsibility of the wildlife manager to determine whether or not it's too expensive to produce wildlife on private land. I believe that it is our job to determine the level of service that the consumer wants, say for example, if we are going to give the state, to shoot, a million cocks per year and also find out those that are going to participate. It's also their responsibility, to the wildlife manager in this case, to design programs that will produce the level of service that the consumer wants and also to display the full cost of providing those services. With adequate knowledge of program cost, and the expected returns, the consumer must accept the fact that the ultimate level of service to be provided depends essentially upon his willingness to pay and provide those funds for the agency to do the job. Full services require bank full service costs and as far as I'm concerned there are no shortcuts to this approach. On the other hand I'm convinced that we haven't really given the consumer the opportunity to pay what may be some equitable costs for producing wildlife on private lands and to go back a little bit and fall back on my experiences on check stations in the state of Minnesota and at that time the small game license was three dollars and one dollar out of that went strictly to land acquisitions so in terms of actual on the ground management of private land the individual pheasant hunter in the state of Minnesota was making a grand contribution of two dollars per year and many people that I talked with at the check station were complaining about a rather declining and my only response was that if I go out on a state wildlife management area and drive one steel fence post in the ground, I've used up your total contribution to the pheasant management program in the state of Minnesota.

About two years ago on the other hand, I had a chance to hunt the pheasants in South Dakota. Not on a courtesy license, John. I paid my $25 bucks. I stopped in the town of Yankton to buy a nonresident license and at that time the streets were virtually filled with station wagons full of dogs, dog kennels, shotguns, hunters, and many of those same cars had Minnesota license plates on them. And those people who had made the gigantic contribution of two dollars a year for pheasant management in the state of Minnesota and had lost their pheasant hunting were over in South Dakota paying twenty five dollars to hunt and it seems to me that this would be a very fruitful area in research to find out why those people whouldn't pay twenty five dollars at a time in Minnesota when they might have been able to preserve their sports and once it is gone, then suddenly they are willing to pay it. Yet, on the other hand the beneficiaries conclude that they only wish to pay half of the total cost or a fourth of the cost or a tenth of the cost, then they must also be willing to settle for a corresponding level of service. The final decision on how much wildlife is produced on private lands rests squarely on the shoulders of the consumer. Only after the user indicates the level of production desired and a willingness to pay does the agency have the responsibility to conduct a program. Now we indicated earlier, the number of successful private land wildlife programs has really been very limited. In fact, almost nonexistent. With the exception of the soil bank, and that was basically an agricultural program, we've really seen very little in the Midwest that's actually reversed any decline in habitat for wildlife on private land. The day of the tagging along picking up agriculture crumbs are over I believe if they ever really existed at all. Further success depends upon the consumers

willingness to pay full price for services rendered in the competitive market just as it does for any other product. This may be a rather bitter pill to swallow I realize because it's a 180° out of phase with rather idealistic approaches that many of us have had in the past. But to resolve this mental anguish, one should essentially ask himself whether we really want to maintain wildlife on private lands or whether we just want to maintain these rather purists concepts.

For those wanting more wildlife, I believe the basic solution lies in realistic approaches, to take into consideration the landowners economic needs and his desires whether we agree with those or not. As you recall there were a lot of rather brutal arguments particularly within the profession when the water bank was developed and about 90 percent of the time was spent on arguing wheterh or not that landowner had the moral obligation to keep those wetlands out there or whether we should pay him and many people thought he as an individual had this moral obligation. But the fact remains that the landowner didn't accept the moral obligation because he was out there systematically draining these areas and the only approach that we could finally come up with was to recognize that this was what he was doing whether we agreed with it or not; face it as a problem and get down to paying some of the cost of preserving it. For those of you who may have thought that I was going to present a total program to you, you may be disappointed, because I don't have all the answers either, but I do know under the present license fee structure and the competitiveness of land that we're just simply not cutting the mustard.

Now many people of course and rights resolved, said that these types of efforts on private lands benefit more than pheasants and that's correct. So the part of determining who the consumer should be we also need other sources of income to help pay these costs. I'm not necessarily proposing that the pheasant hunter pick up the total tab because other beneficiaries need to be identified and also be brought into this paying situation. The only alternative to this approach as far as I see and as it indicates, we had discussed within the Institute just the need for pulling people out of prime agricultural land and just writing it off the books and it's either getting into the situation and pay the cost to develop the programs that provide that level of service or just simply tell people that we just can't hack it, we're out of business and forget about it.

PEOPLE PROBLEMS IN THE CUYAHOGA VALLEY

Presented for

Dale L. Haney, Chief
Division of Wildlife
Ohio Department of Natural Resources
by
Carl L. Mosley, Jr.
Executive Assistant

Thank you John. Dale Haney is so busy dealing with the anti-trapping issue in Ohio that he was unable to be with us today. That issue and the subject of my talk have a relationship so I want to first briefly describe the situation that Dale is working with.

Last year the anti-trapping interests organized a major effort to outlaw trapping through legislation in the Ohio General Assembly. A concerted effort by the Ohio sportsmen and the Division of Wildlife brought sufficient factual information before that legislative body to thwart the drive of the anti-wildlife conservation organizations.

The anti-wildlife conservationists are presently making a major effort to obtain a constitutional amendment to prohibit trapping by the process of an initiative petition for a referendum to that effect. The antis do nothing for wildlife conservation of which I am aware, but they seem well funded to run expensive ads in newspapers throughout Ohio; such as this one I hold before you. It reads in part, "Ban the Leghold Trap." It goes on to say,

> "For those who are not familiar with the leghold trap:
>
> The steel-jaw, vise-like trap clamps shut with force on the leg or paw of any animal stepping into it. Sometimes the leg bone

---

Presented at the 43rd Annual Convention of the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, July 19-22, 1976, at Rapid City, South Dakota

of the animal is broken. As the animal struggles to free itself, the jaws of the trap tear into the flesh, causing extreme pain and fear. The animal is held in the trap fully conscious until the trapper returns to bludgeon, stab or shoot it to death. The trapped animal is denied food and water and is exposed to all weather conditions. Often in a frenzy of fear and suffering the poor creature will chew off it's own leg to escape. Young children can and do purchase leghold traps --- set them in woods and then forget to revisit. These traps are not selective --- they can and do catch our pet dogs and cats and wild birds.

Please help, if you are a registered voter, call immediately (as instructed below). Your petition and simple instructions will be mailed to you at once. (Only 37 signatures per petition) If you can partially fill one or fill serveral --- you are needed. Your effort at this critical time can make the difference for Ohio's wildlife who face another year of torture by trappers using the cruel leghold trap. Signatures must be in no later than July 29th."

Included in this advertisement is a list of phone numbers to call in five major Ohio metropolitan areas where the reader may obtain petitions. The ad also solicits contributions to help the campaign of the Ohio Committee for Humane Trapping.

Dale, the Division, the Wildlife Legislative Fund and many Ohio sportsmen are busy communicating the role of trapping in Wildlife Conservation.

Now, back to the Cuyahoga Valley. The Ohio map on the wall shows a large circle along the Lake Erie shore. That is the megalopolis called Cleveland. The circle just to the south is Akron. The black band between the two circles is the Cuyahoga Valley.

Ohio has a human population of 11 million people. That is a population density in the same ball park with China and India. Within 30 minutes of the Cuyahoga Valley live four million people. That is more than double the population of several states represented here today.

I grew up within that 30 minute radius. I know first hand what it means to work in a rubber factory and a chemical plant; the stink of burning rubber, the hot sulphorus air in the ash pit of a boiler room. I was lucky though. My parents came from "Arnold Mitchell country" down in Kentucky and they moved out into the country southwest of Akron. Learning to hunt and fish and work in factories had a lot to do with my decision to obtain a degree in wildlife management.

The problems of the Cuyahoga Valley are the problems of Ohio. In one word, it is urbanization. It means:

1. Loss of wildlife habitat directly as well as the short term losses experienced in transition between land uses.

2. Loss of water quality ----------.

3. Loss of contact by people with the facts of life and death as it occurs in nature.

4. Loss of an understanding of managing the out of doors to perpetuate fish and wildlife resources for the benefit of people.

5. Loss of interest in and support for hunting, fishing and trapping as management tools and for direct benefits to people.

6. Most voters are urbanites who can readily support a preservation philosophy toward the wild animals that we all love.

Many urban people do not realize that the leghold trap is the only practical way available for harvesting fur animals which left unharvested will quickly destroy not only their own habitat, but that of many other wild species as well. These same people do not realize the economic losses which will occur to dams, dikes, waterways, marshes, highways and agricultural crops and the resulting higher prices which they will have to pay. They do not realize the potential disease outbreaks which can be expected with rabies, distemper and the like.

The first step in solving these problems is to provide places for urban people to reestablish meaningful contact with the natural world. This first step has been made in the Cuyahoga Valley. A 30,000 acre National Recreation Area was created here in December, 1974, when President Ford signed a bill passed by Congress.

It didn't just happen. A study was initiated in 1969. A federation of 53 organizations was created and support of three local Congressmen obtained. Land and water conservation act funds were used for land acquisition by local Metropolitan Park systems. The Ohio Department of Natural Resources bought 3,000 acres for six million dollars and transferred this to the National Recreation Area.

As a result of all this concurrent effort there is now in the valley 13,000 acres in outdoor recreation use. The National Park Service has 15 million dollars allocated for land purchases during the next

two years. It is estimated that this 30,000 acre National Recreation Area will have cost 34 million dollars when complete.

To best show you some of the beauty and problems of the valley I brought a slide series and tape commentary which was used in Congress to help gain support for the act which created the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area. (Slides were shown and tape played)

I want to thank you for being such a fine audience,especially for staying awake through a slide series right after lunch.

Dale Haney asked me to say "hello" to all of you, so "HELLO!". This morning I was working on thoughts to express how well Dale likes and gets along with people. I tried various ideas using my wife, Elaine, as a sounding board. A quotation of Will Rogers seemed appropriate --- the one, "I never met a man I didn't like", but my wife disagreed, she thought Liz Taylor said that.

Nominating committee report by Carl Mosely.

The nominating committee has selected the following stated candidates for your selection. The president Bill Bailey of Nebraska. The first vice-president, John Keener of Wisconsin. The second vice-president, Frank Lockard, Indiana. The treasurer, Fred Warders of Kansas and the secretary to be named by the President. As to the common place of the next meeting, I think Bill Bailey has some remarks to make on that.

Bill Bailey: There are a number of sights in Nebraska that I would like for this organization to attend. It will either be Omaha or Lincoln.

Popowski: Thank you Carl and Bill. Introduction of Lil Brewster and Laurel Ernst to conference members and guests. Thank you for all their assistance.

It's been moved and seconded that we accept the nominations and time and place committee report. Is there any discussion. All those in favor, say I. "I". All those opposed. No? The motion is carried.

Treasurers Report

Fred Warder: Thank you John. John I've got a report here that is very short. There is a number of figures in it. This is the report that I would like to have printed in the proceedings. I'll just make a few comments. I'm not going to read this report. I might point out that we're dealing with our business here of 1975 and during this particular period, dues were $35.00 per state. We have fifteen states and three provinces. All states and provinces paid their dues for this year and are in good standing. The income from this amounted to only $630.00 and we had $72.00 in interest added to that and we had a small amount of carry over. The carry over amounted to $772.53, the total amount we had to deal with. I might add the expenses from this period of time amounted to $1300 dollars from the Traverse City meeting which you can see ate back in to the cash balance leaving about $70.00 which I transferred to, I didn't transfer, but I told John that he had available for this meeting only $70.00 to put this on with. Needless to say, he was nervous for awhile, however, after January when the billing went out for the '76 dues which you remember we increased to $100, we now have, John, approximately $1400 dollars available for you for this particular convention. There are two states and two provinces that have not as yet paid their 1976 dues, and I assume they will before, at least before they close the business. So we will be in good shape having around $1800 available through this year, which puts us in good shape. Now you can see we would be in bad shape in this Association financially wise had we not went to a $100; raised our dues from $35.00 to $100.00. We can still now maintain the $1200 certificate of deposit that we had on hand that will draw some interest each year. There has been a question raised and I have talked to several people about it in regards to the printing of the procedures. This is one big expense that we have each year. The By-laws require us to print 300 copies. Ten copies have to be sent to each state. And we have 50 copies that we make available to libraries and so forth, however, in five years that I have been Treasurer, I have yet to sell a copy of the proceedings for $3.00. A number of the states are not utilizing the 10 copies that are sent to them. It's been suggested that maybe the by-laws committee must consider this printing of the proceedings in reducing the number to be printed from 300 to say half that many down to 150. Send each state five copies and make a few

available to the libraries and there won't be as many to throw away. Now this is not going to cut your expenses all that much. It won't cut it in half if you cut the number down, but if your printing half it will save some money. That's something that you can take a look at sometime. But if the President wants to take a look at this, I am sure as of now, we're printing more copies than we are utilizing. That's about all I have. There are copies of the Treasurer's report available for everyone.

John Popowski: Thank you Fred. Do you move acceptance of that report Fred?

Fred Warders: Yes.

John Popowski: Is there a second. Moved and seconded that the Treasurer's report be accepted. Is there discussion?

Comment: I have a question John. Fred mentioned two provinces that had not paid. I believe one of them I saw somewhere indicated its intentions to switch allegiance to the western association. Saskatchewan. Could we ask Colorado to check that out and let us know maybe if Saskatchewan is represented there and what their intention is. Probably Fred would be the one primarily interested in that.

Comment: Colorado has paid the Secretary.

Comment: They're going to be at the Western Association meeting a week from now. That's what I'm talking about and at that time they can check and see if Saskatchewan is there and what their intentions are and you would know what to expect.

John Popowski: Is there any other discussion? All in favor say "I". Opposed, "No". The Motion is carried.

Resolution Committee Report.

Russ Stuart : The committee reviewed a total of 33 resolutions and I believe every voting member has a copy of the resolutions. Now as we go along, you'll find some of the resolutions were tabled, but they are in there and they are numbered because not all the states and provinces were represented the night before last when we presented the resolutions and if those that are tabled you feel are important, we will give them an opportunity to defend it and consider it. Then we have resolutions, and I do not believe these are in your packet. When we get to those, that's Resolutions 22, 23 and 24, that were not in very good order and no one claimed to be the author of them so we will consider them and hopefully the state or province that did send them is in here and can give a brief explanation of them. Now to save time, I thought you would perhaps have an hour to review these Resolutions, but this did not come about. So, rather than read them, I will give each of you about 20 seconds as we go through them to make up your mind whether you have a question about them or not. If you do, we are going to set them aside and then come back to them later. With the idea being that if there are objections to the Resolution or questions in regard to it, we will go hurriedly through them and vote on the bundle that are apparently approved by the membership. So with that we will start with Resolution #1. Are there any questions or comments concerning that? Incidentally, we did have a very good representation at the committee meeting. Anybody want to hold up for awhile? If not, we will go on to Resolution #2. Speak up if you want to discuss it further. If not, we will go on to Resolution #3.

Comment: Say Russ, on that Resolution #2, on the second line we're protesting very important wetlands. Shouldn't that be protect?

Russ Stuart : I think that word should be protect. So if you will make that correction. Thank you.

Comment: Before you move on, I'm sorry we were not at the Resolutions committee meeting. Chuck Harris wishes to say the same thing. What particularly were the concerns of those there with the right ammendment itself? Could we have a little discussion so those states that hadn't reported the right ammendment as we had seen it come out. We would like to know what things in the right ammendment were objected. It is quite obvious that there is going to be some kind of bill in this area. Could I have some idea as to which state objected to it?

Comment by Russ Stuart: I do not recall which state submitted this ammendment. The discussion that I remember at the committee meeting states that the support of this resolution felt that the right ammendment limited the Corps of Engineers to only navigable channels and to only wetlands adjacent to those channels and that was a severe limitation of their authority whereas full forging was going on. I think the teamster states do not have the capabilities to control their wetlands which I understand Michigan does have this capability. And the support for this Resolution came from the states that did not have that ability within the state.

Comment: That's correct. The Resolution provides that if that state does have that authority then the Corps would not reserve it. There were no objections to that at the meeting?

Russ Stuart : No. As a matter of fact, this resolution was discussed rather thoroughly and then given to Keith Harmon and two or three others that could improve the language and put it in a little better form. Any other questions on Resolution #2? Resolution #3. Don't hesitate if you find something objectionable. Or if you don't think it's in proper form we can put it aside. Question on Resolution #2?

Comment: Next to the last line on Resolution #2, should that 494 be that or rather 404? I believe that is a typographical error. So it would correct that to read 404. Incidentally, there was a discussion by the Committee as to whom these resolutions should be sent and it was agreed that the whole state and Mr. Popowski in particular would make a determination as to if these should go to Congressional people, to Corps of Engineers and we will have to rely on John to take care of that.

John Popowski: If I could interrupt, I would like a consensus as to whom you prefer they go to. So that we decide here where they are to go and we will see to it then that they get there.

Russ Stuart : Chairman, that was my motion and I suggested that between the chairman of the Resolutions committee and John determine that you custom send them to places where they would do the most good. This scatter blanketing all of the resolutions to a set circulation wouldn't do as much good as sending them. I thought with long experience that you two should be able to determine and get them to the proper place.

John Popowski: That's right. This particular one you do specify to go to Senator Randolph.

Russ Stuart : The Senator is supposedly to consider the Bill, I believe on July 28th.

Russ Stuart : And that's one reason why we wanted to get this and have a copy in Senator Randolphs hands within ten days, or less. Resolution #3. Incidentally, some of these Resolutions do contain a Resolution as to whom they would like to have them sent.

Comment: Could you give us just a subject of the Resolution?

Russ Stuart : OK, maybe I should just read the results, and I will cut off the languages meeting in Rapid City and so on and so forth. Resolution #3 urges all who are responsible for conservation in fish and wildlife to actively go forth with the truth to the public which may otherwise be wrongfully deprived. And actually what they are saying is that we had better get on with support of Ralph Blitely and his committee to start spreading a little truth around the nation. Anymore questions on Resolution #3? Number 4? I will read the resolved. Purchasing Chief of Engineers of the U. S. Corps of Engineers to ammend the existing licenses and leases and provide the states broader opportunity to meet their obligations to the public by allowing sharecropping to produce wildlife habitat, not just food and to allow sharecropping closage to be used for operation maintenance in the development of these fish and wildlife areas. And here is another Resolution as to whom this should be sent. In other words, I think this is a nationwide problem that the Corps demands any money from agricultural crops be returned to the Corps rather than have the state agency that's managing it, qualify again for it and further development. Resolution #5. Resolved that the Association encourages the Congress of the U. S. to allow to increase from the annula plentage capability of loss in bend 26, preferably speaking of the Mississippi River, until studies have been completed to determine how increasing commercial navigation will affect the natural resources on the upper Mississippi and Illinois River. Again, the Resolution indicates to whom it should be sent and I believe Iowa perhaps sponsored this Resolution. Is that correct? Iowa or Illinois. Or Minnesota? Minnesota was the one. Any questions on Resolution #5? Number 6 is tabled. The agency that introduced this Resolution was here that wants to defend it. You are welcome to do so.

Comment: Resolution #2 probably covers the same subject adequately in detail. I suggest that we just leave that tabled.

Russ Stuart : OK. Resolution #7. Therefore be it resolved that the Association endorse the National coordinating committee revised land and the fish and wildlife coordination act ammendment as a substitute to Senate Bill #1727. Any questions on that? Resolution #8. The association urges the Congress and the president of the U. S. to authorize and provide immediate funding of 5.5 million dollars to complete the Iron River national fish hatchery to facilitate in advance restoration of the Great Lakes Fishery.

Comment: Make note to send Resolution #8 to the Great Lakes Fisheries commission.

Russ Stuart : Further comments on Resolution #8. None. Resolution #9. The Association encourages the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service to retain its present classification system. Now, this is referring to the classification of wetlands and there is concern experssed by a couple of states that they had heard rumors that the Fish and Wildlife service was considering a different classification system. It is pointed out that the classification that has been in effect for about 30 years has been pretty well accepted by all other Federal agencies and in some cases I believe it's been accepted by the courts.

Comment: Just one question for clarification. Shouldn't it read, the last line, maintain its present leveling classification system?

Russ Stuart : I think that would be excellent, and if there would be no objections, you can insert that blank. Any further discussion? Resolution #10. The Association endorsed the Fish and Wildlife service plan for the lower Minnesota River national wildlife refuge and recreation area and encourage legislative action to authorize establishment of said refuge. Any comment on that? Resolution #11. The Association hereby declares its support for the goals and objectives and continued operation of the youth conservation corps.

Comment: Chairman, I would like to request that you and John Popowski send a copy of that to Representative Tom Murray of Wisconsin. Superior, Wisconsin.

Russ Stuart : Any further comment? Resolution #12. The Association encourages a selection of a homeland disposal site which would be the least damaging to fish and wildlife and this is referring to the reserved mining controversy in Minnesota and their disposal of taconite tailings.

Comment: Mr. Chairman, this is a pretty short Resolution considering the stacks of testimony that have accumulated of this piece.

Russ Stuart : Well, is this resolution in this form acceptable. Any other comments on Resolution #12? Resolution #13. Tabled. Resolution #14. Tabled. Now if anyone objects to the committees actions on these, we'll permit you to have the floor. Resolution #15. The Association in cooperation with the Fish and Wildlife Service granted the appropriate legislation ammending the federal property in administrative services act of 1949 to authorize the granting of title to excess personal property to grantees upon receipt. Anybody wish to comment on that? Comment from Fish & Wildlife Service?

Comment: Mr. Chairman, I wondered if on those Resolutions that have been tabled, if you could advice what the substance of those are.

Russ Stuart : I will read them. Go back to Resolution #13. Read resolution. Dealing with anti-gun problem. Read Resolution #14. Trespass problems. Back to Resolution #15. Any comments? Resolution #16. Read resolution. Any comments? None. Resolution #17. Read resolution. Establishment of wildlife refuge in Minnesota. 4700 acres of land for waterfowl production. Resolution #18. Read resolution. Feel that ships and barges in the great lakes aren't large enough and it's about time to call a halt to any developments or implementing any plans to provide for ships of greater tonage. Resolution #19. Read resolution. Concerns exclusion of Minnesota as an area where the eastern timber wolf is considered endangered. I am sure many of you are aware of the problems that Minnesota Fish and Wildlife service had with this wolf population in northeast Minnesota. Comments on Resolution #19? Well, it's as simple as this, the timber wolf is not in any danger in Minnesota. It's not only in the northeastern part of Minnesota but all of Minnesota. A good healthy population.

Resolution #20. Read Resolution. Any comments? None.

Resolution #21. Read Resolution. In regard to depreciation schedules. Any comments?

Resolution #22. Read Resolution. Dealing with sites act. Really doesn't say anything. Does not say what we urge. Anyone familiar with this resolution?

Comment: I assume that they are talking about funding portions of the act. Having to do with writing the appropriations to implement the property plans.

Resolution #23. No author. Read Resolution. Moved that Resolution #23 be tabled. Is there a motion to table #23? Moved and seconded to table Resolution #23. All in favor "I". Opposed, "No". Back to resolution #22. Read Resolution again. Will resume action later.

Resolution #24. Read Resolution. Moved that Resolution #24 be tabled. Seconded. All in favor say "I". Opposed , "No"? The motion is carried.

Resolution #25. Read Resolution. Consensus that this was an ammendment to the By-laws. Moved that Resolution #25 be tabled. Moved and seconded. All in favor say "I". Opposed, "No"? Motion carried.

Comment: By-laws committee?

John Popowski: That and one other subject that came up earlier in Fred's comments should be and will be referred to the new president and his choice of a by-laws committee.

Russ Stuart: Thank you John.

Resolution #26. Read Resolution.

Resolution #27. Read Resolution. There is authority for advisory board both nationally and at the state level and I think Dave Vesall has more experience than anyone else here. The national advisory board has wildlife people on it. It's true that at the state level, the fish and wildlife representatives are not a voting member of the state board. Although they are supposed to be on the state advisory board. Any further comment?

Resolution #28. Read Resolution. Even with the developing of the procedure for evaluation of fish and wildlife for use in water resource projects. New criteria that the U. S. Fish and Wildlife service is developing.

Comment: Mr. Chairman, I didn't hear when you read it, but eight lines from the bottom. Please change list to test the procedures in second absolved. Thank you.

Further comments?

Resolution #29. Read Resolution.

Resolution #30. Read Resolution. Soil conservation survey. Urging the association appoint a committee to study and make recommendations to SCS. Resolution #30 is accepted. Up to resolution committee to appoint a committee. Did resolution come from Pheasant Committee? Yes it did. Fred Priewert discussed this. SCS said this is the property of the Soil Conservation Districts and therefore does not come under the public information act. To be more specific, it was really recommended by the President. Yes.

John Popowski: Suggestions for designation of other committees. Let's hold this off until the new business portion of the meeting this morning. And then Jim will you bring this up at that time, just for someone to get it on the agenda. We can decide at that time about the formation of either a committee or recommendation. Unless you want to make a recommendation to the International right now in Resolution #1.

Russ Stuart: I move that the Resolution #30 be tabled. It is moved that Resolution #30 be tabled. It is moved and seconded. All in favor say "I". Opposed, "No". Motion carried.

Resolution #31. Tabled. Read Resolution. This was again from the Pheasant Council and was presented by Fred Priewert and was determined that the work that the International was doing along this line made this resolution unnecessary.

Resolution #32. Read Resolution. I will accept no discussion on that Resolution. This is perhaps the Resolution #33 and I believe that the voting members have a copy of it. This is a problem that is developing in the Eastern portion of the central flyway. It is not perhaps pertinent to the entire area covered by the Midwest Association, however, it is a problem and we are hoping that you will give consideration to accepting it. Read Resolution #33. I am sure there are some members who wonder why the neccessity of this Resolution. Without going into a lot of detail, there is a problem in the particular states and what we are trying to do by this particular Resolution, is to give the director of this state agency a little support when he goes into a Commission meeting. Personally I will discuss the thing with you but not publicly. I would like to comment on this. Russ is talking about South Dakota and South Dakota did not author this, but this is an International situation. Our problem is one of these goose flocks really at the present time and our state and fish and wildlife people in particular have been involved in this particular thing the last couple of weeks and if you feel that this will be beneficial, fine. I am and South Dakota is concerned about it certainly. Thank you. Any comments from the membership? That concludes the reviewing of the Resolutions. I believe there were none that will have to be set aside for further consideration. John, I move the adoption of the Resolutions. I second the Resolutions as ammended. The approval of acceptance of the Resolutions has been moved and seconded. Is there any further discussion?

Tabled Resolutions?

There were some changes made from the recommendations of the Resolution Committee. The Committee moves that those they recommended be tabled and in addition the ones that you this morning moved to table, be tabled. It is an ammended motion from the recommendation of the Resolutions committee and that the ammendments accepted this morning be included. Is there any other discussion? All those in favor, say "I". All opposed, "No". Motion is carried. I have just one comment now. I am certain here as of now, that I will never serve as Chairman of the Resolutions Committee again. Thank you very much for your effort Russ. That notice can be put into effect by the new president who is sitting here.

Proposal of Resolution of special award and merit. By the way, we do have a special award for the recepient. It's what I refer to as the South Dakota frisbee. We picked it up yesterday at Custer State Park. It's in good shape and we will mail it to the recepient if you agree. Resolution states that whereas there is a demonstrative need for the recognition and acknowledgement of superior performance and accomplishment in the fields of professionalism, statesmanship, physical, etc. and whereas in this bicentennial year, it is felt to be most appropriate to select that individual who most typifies the standards of excellence in the above listed categories and whereas it is universally recognized that there is one among our midst who unquestionably excells in each category. Now, therefore let it be resolved that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners on this

third and finally peaceful day of the 43rd Annual meeting, 21st day of July at Rapid City, South Dakota does bestow upon one Fred A. Priewert an award for distinction of being chief of chip flippers, master of bow shooters and overall champion of that great fraternity of equal fellowship. Distribution will be to Priewert et al. and submitted by Ed et al. Adopted resolution. Thank you very much. It has been moved. Is there a second? It has been moved and seconded. In line with discussion, I recall that the recepient unfortunately is not here today. I recall some comments, four, five or six years ago in Bismarck when the president at that time referred to the recepient of this award as kind of a shy character, etc. Is there anymore discussion. All in favor, say "I". Opposed, "No."

Audit Report.

Dave Vesall. The audit committee met Tuesday with treasurer, Fred Warders and went over his books and his records and we find everything as in past years in good order and in good shape and OK.

John Popowski: I assume you move an acceptance of that report. I so do. Is there a second? Seconded. Moved and Seconded. Is there any discussion on the audit report? All those in favor, say "I", opposed, "No." Motion carried.

Fred Warders: Dues went up from $35 to $100, because we were in financial trouble or would be if the dues were not raised, and in submittal for these dues, low and behold the state of Minnesota sent two $100 checks. This was fine. I tried to trace both of these and the name of the state. I tried to cash it as a voluntary contribution from Dave Vesall and this didn't work either. They wanted to check that. So Minnesota got their second $100 check back and you will note that in the treasurers report.

Awards.

Chuck Harris: I talked about when we should do this, and one reason that we are doing it now is because I had to leave this morning and also the recipient had to leave and we debated about doing it the first thing, before Pete was on the program, but we decided that might not be appropriate and we wanted to wait and hear what he said first to see whether he earned during his talk our continued appreciation. Will you come forward Keith? It does give me tremendous appreciation on the part of the Association to recognize the great contribution that Keith Harmon has made particularly to all the members of this organization over the many years working with us as a partner and as a leader and as a helper sometimes between the states and federal agencies and I think his talk this morning was a real fine example of how he stimulates this and controversial issues get us to thinking and continues to do it and we think that it's time that the Association shows some kind of appreciation Keith for all you have done for us.

Keith Harmon: I guess all I can say is that I'm kind of dumfounded. Thanks a lot.

John Popowski: I would then like to turn it over to Mike Casey for another presentation.

Mike Casey: Thanks John. I know that many of you people here have had a part in the organizing and hosting these association conferences and really know what a hard job it is. The tremendous amount of effort includes input to put on a good program and it takes the combined efforts of a lot of people, so being that another one of our award recepients does have to leave, why John has asked me to make a

presentation to that gentleman. Those of you that were in Michigan last year, to our meeting, remember the real fine meeting, the real productive meeting that we had, the sidelights, the tours and things like that and all the fun we had and also I recall that through the efforts of a good many people on the Michigan staff including a couple of real beautiful gals that they had there that arranged some of the things and I'm not sure who arranged this money bit, but I know that these gals and some of the fellows were out and they danced practically till dawn. They just had a hell of a good time. I don't know really who arranged that, but I know that I wasn't part of it and so I've been thinking that maybe I'd withhold this award, but I don't feel that I should really do that, so Chuck Harris would you come up here please? Chuck, on behalf of the association, it gives me a lot of pleasure to present this award to you; it's the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners award. I think that many of you have seen it. It's a real fine thing and I think it's something that anyone can be real proud of and of course with that very fine outstanding job that you did Chuck, we would like to make this presentation to you and it's something that we who have worked with you alot, know you, always know that you always do a real fine job at anything. Congratulations Chuck.

Chuck Harris: Thank you very much.

Mike Casey: And now we have another one here. Like I said, it does take the combined efforts of a lot of people in any state or any unit that puts on an affair like this and in Michigan, as I mentioned, it took the efforts of a lot of people and Chuck has advised us and called me and said that he just had outstanding service from one of his people and he thought that he was due for an award, and so the Association at this time would like to make a presentation, a certificate of appreciation to Gary Boushelle. Gary? This is like a little insurance policy, there is some fine print here. The Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners give certicicate of appreciation to Gary Boushelle for his assistance to the president and to the state of Michigan in organizing the 42nd meeting of the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Commissioners signed by the president, John Popowski, July 21, 1976. Congratulations.

Gary Boushelle: Thank you Mike.

John Popowski: I don't know if all of you are aware of what a chip flip is, I think that maybe South Dakota was the originator of that type of an operation. The chip flip is a contest to see who can throw a buffalo chip the furthest you know, and with the advent of all the frisbee work and so on, well some people really have it down pat. Now Custer State Park, as most of you are aware, has a relatively famous buffalo herd. A lot of those animals have gone to other private operations around the country and we had fully intended to have a chip flip down there this afternoon on this tour, but in disucssing it with some of my staff people, we finally decided against it because we figured that there's one guy that would win it hands down, and that was Priewert. We're not going to hold it and just wanted to let you know that. At this point we'll have a coffee break.

New Business

I have a couple items of new business. One of them is a letter that all of you have received regarding financing International's TV program. All received letter from John Gottschalk in regard to the need for money. Ralph Blitely commented on that. You are perhaps aware that the Northeastern Association gave a $1,000. The Southeast gave a $1,000. The Western will be giving a week from now. That money is not going to be used for the production, but will be used for a stensus of personnel from our various states. The feeling was there as you have heard it expressed before, that the states who have given an individual to work on this project, like Dave Jenkins here, should not carry the whole front. I would be interested in any discussion that you may have on this and what your feelings are as far as the direction the Association should go and Dave feel free if you have some comments.

Question: Mr. Chairman, if we were in a position to donate some money for this cause, that might be something that we would consider. I think our treasurer will have to inform us as to whether or not we have the funds to donate.

I bring it up because it is a subject that has been presented to us. You are all aware of the financial situation of this Association and I just want your opinion and discussion as to do it or not to do it. I think we are aware of our financial situation. I think for the record we probably should make an official decision. Fred, do you have any comments?

Fred Warders: We have $1,200 dollars in certificate of deposit. We will have $1,700 to $1,800 cash balance in September. So use that to base your decision.

Russ: I am on the executive committee for the International and of course this came up in a lot of dsicussions in the last year or two. I think Ralph and his buddy are doing a tremendous job in that field.

However, I will point out that it states that it is not a voluminous Association. I raised a point with John Gottschalk about a month ago. The states were asked to contribute money for this committee, that is somewhat of a precedence situation in that in the past committees in the International have served without any compensation or expense money and I have no objection that this association wants to contribute to that. I point out that maybe this is unique enough to justify this, but I think that knowing the financial status of the International too, I think that we are going to have to be careful as to whether or not this is precedence and we will eventually become involved in a situation whereby either the regional associations or the International can greatly foot the bill. As I say, I feel that this committee is perhaps unique and some expense money is warranted. I will point out and that was a few years ago, that Gene Gadsley was the legislative chairman of the International and that poor fellow made many, many trips to Washington on behalf of the International and this was done at either his own expense or at the expense of state officials and I would just like to throw that out.

President, I would like to add to Russ's comments on this. I don't think that Clyde Hatten would mind being identified as the author of this letter, and I certainly agree with him, that the precedence that is being set is not a good one. This thing is so far down the road now that perhaps we're talking to ourselves about it but it has been in the history of the association. Our people fund themselves to various meetings at various times and as Clyde said, he has been president of the International and served in many capacities and he always felt it an honor to try to help and cooperate and he did, I know. I am of the minority on this movie thing. I expressed

some adverse views of the operation in the beginning so I said that I wasn't going to comment on this today, but I think that it is so far down the road that perhaps we don't know where to go. But I think that we are open to a bad precedence. I have a very practical question and that's how much money is allocated for the expenses say of this composte and I assume the treasurers report is certainly not flush, although because of the expenses that we have been having, we're in reasonably good shape. What should you do then to a thousand dollars; should the Association donate a $1,000 or $500 towards this status when there are other activities appearing in our Association?

President: Well, don't misunderstand the intent of the chair in raising this question. It's a subject that I felt that we should discuss and make a joint decision on. We are going to be asked individually by states to do the same thing and that's something that each one of us are going to have to decide by ourselves. But other regional associations have taken action and I and the Chairman don't feel one way or the other is necessarily going to work, but it's something that I thought we should kick around. If Dave wants to comment, fine.

Dave Vesall: With this movie thing, individual states are going to be asked to put up a small to a large amount of money and effort in the production costs. I think we have to keep that in mind. We also have to keep in mind that not all states have indicated willingness to participate in the movie program. And some states want to participate full blast and some states want to participate at a lower rate and I would like to ask Russ in the International discussions in the executive committee, was there any talk of a special assessment to this individual state to make this contribution in that way?

Stuart : Well, Dave, yes there was, but there wasn't any official action taken, and I believe that the figure of $250.00 per state. They requested this from 50 states; $250.00 additional to their annual fee of $1,500.00. And this in itself concerns me in that I recall that when the international went from a $1,000 annual dues to $1,500 that there were some states that were trying to scrape up the additional $500. I have one fear, I think that the regional associations and the International are very very important and what I'm afraid is going to happen is that if we start putting too much financial stress on the individual states that either the Commission in the state or the Director is going to say well, listen, the financial burden is just too great; we're going to have to withdraw to save for the International and this is the last thing we want and personally this is my side, we were discussing this in March in Washington perhaps it would have been better if we would have perhaps asked each of the 50 states directors to contribute a $100 to it. But I think your committee has done a tremendous job and we all recognize individually and perhaps as states that you have assumed a financial burden which was not contemplated when this committee was set up. I just want to point out that these are problems and I think that we should be very very wary both in the regional association and International of setting up this type of committee when it is going to require additional funding beyond what the organizations are capable.

Vesall: I'm not disagreeing with you and that's the exact reason that why I brought up the fact that each state is going to be asked to contribute time and money effort in the production costs, which in my opinion is more important than to pick up the property expenses of the various people within the region. Which may be able to be picked up by the different states. In the real hard cruel world, I think that is a fact. If you have some extra money lying around, you ought to put in production costs, which you will be asked to do. Of course the states have been asked to contribute

$50 to the committee and of course I think that most states generally agree that they will put in perhaps from their I&E section a considerable dollar amount in footage that can't be used in setting up the program. I don't think that the states object to that, but what they do object to, and that came from the North Carolina, is the question raised; are we setting a precedence as far as the International is concerned of financing a committee or committees? Actually what this is, is financing an effort.

Hemphill: I made the suggestion in the record meeting of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the opportunity to set up either regional or even a national federation budget that would support the objectives. It could carry such elements such as the coordination within the associations as being an expense of total states that either engage in it or chose not to be a part of it. This is legal. We approved these for Ohio, at least in our region the attitude on making movies and that sort of thing is quite different than it was a few years ago. It could be approached PR, Hunters Safety or accommodations committee so the states could forget cost-sharing on that activity. When you get some of these activities and you get a number of states involved, in a single effort, the state portion goes down. This is something that we would be glad to explore and report back. We just had Martin back to the region after his rotation in Washington and this was subject to be discussed in accord sometime near. But it's a way out of this financial problem.

Popowski: It might be a good idea if that's the case for just a note to that effect to come from the service to the various states. Pointing in this direction, if they have an interest to do this. Is there any other discussion ?

Vesall: Mr. Chairman, there are two problems here. There's the precedence and the practical problem too. The cash balance according to the 1976 account for $70.00. Of the 15 states and 3 provinces, we could take in $1,800 in 1976. The cost of the proceedings in Michigan were $1,200, so that would be $600 at the most. We are just at the point now possibly where we are building possibly a few hundred dollars conserved for emergencies.

Popowski: I think that we have discussed it thoroughly enough, and in the absence of many motions pro or con, we will just go on and it has been discussed.

By-Laws Report

Mr. President, no there is not a by-laws committee report. I did contact members of the by-laws committee and we had no ideas for the committee to consider, so we did review the need, there was none at the time, but there have been several things at this meeting for consideration at the next by-laws committee meeting.

New Business (continued):

Popowski: Thank you for pointing that out. I guess I jumped to a conclusion. There is another item that has been proposed and this is another one of those things that got off the ground in a sense. I think you are aware that there is an International; I don't know if it's called a fur resources committee, but anyway, that's the intent. They set up by a Duane Perselly of Maryland and he has been encouraging regional associations to form a fur resources committee in their organizations. I have had some correspondence and some telephone discussion with Perselly and some other individuals. I understand also that there is in some states quite a little interest

in forming a committee. What would you gentlemen or what has been the procedure as far as committee formation? It's a subject that I think we have talked about at numerous times and a subject which we as directors are most interested in keeping a handle on. Is there interest in pursuing this type of committee formation?

Popowski: I think these kinds of committees, I think that rather than document the standing committees you might use a little discretion and let the president appoint adhoc committees and if the chairman determines that there should be standing committees, to come back and accept recommendations. From time to time, there's a need for adhoc committees to be formed on particular subjects progressively. Really this kind of organization could let the president find some willing member to head it out and see if there is enough interest to generate a report from that committee, rather than form an established committee not knowing whether or not participants are really going to spend the time on it.

Well, I've gone far enough to be informed that there is some interest from certain states. I don't know how many. In fact in Iowa, you have a guy by the name of Ron Andrews who is very interesting in going this route. It's been proposed for one thing. Some of you know about Henderson in Kansas who does not work for the agency down there and I think that if the committee was to be formed, it should be within our agencies or responsibility of somebody to head it up within our agency and if, I am perfectly willing and have no objection to naming an adhoc committee and to the best of my knowledge, Ron Andrews who is a furbearer biologist in Iowa would be my choice to head it up and bring back a report in a year from now. While we are on the subject of committees, there is a proposal for another one. A Midwest deer and wild turkey committee. This one would, there is no longer a standing committee. What did it used to be called? Forest Resources or something like that. I'm not too sure what. There is some interest and this is generated mainly from Missouri to again pursue this type of committee. Are there any comments on that possibility? Well, a lay is on now between this organization and the committee for the work that they would be doing. I have a letter from John Lewis from Missouri and I think all you gentlemen have a copy of that. They have listed in this organizational meeting that I don't think any of us were aware of until after they had it, but which is perfectly fine. Some pretty good objectives and structure that they would go. My understanding is that they are not talking about their annual get together and it's pretty limited number of individuals that they are talking about. It would be I guess up to the states as to who would attend and how many they would be interested in sending. I can do the same thing on this one and appoint a committee to report back to us a year from now. The Board of Directors has accepted six guys and now we have need to fill three slots. I make a motion that we not accept this slate. How would that be? That we start our own slate. Then we have some nominations from the floor. Or perhaps I'm confused.

Comment: All you have to do is accept nomination for the Board of Directors, the three of them named and then you accept additionals.

Popowski: OK. The names that have come from the floor in addition to the slate recommended by the Board has been Larry Davis. I'll second that for Davis. Write that down for the file.

Comment: It wasn't too many years ago when I was approving travel authorization for travel to my member of the Pheasant Council in Pennsylvania. And it worked for me because I thought this was going way beyond the bounds of the Council that was set up. But they without really consulting with the Association elected to accept

membership from other states and to attend annual conferences outside of the declines of the Midwest Association and I became a little leary when other committees were being formed that I still prefer that if you are going to set up a committee, there would be an adhoc. So if this is a continuing thing, someday I'm going to raise the question, not today, but someday I'm going to raise the question of how long are we going to continue to sponsor the Pheasant Congress.

Vesall: I believe that each state's director has been asked to comment on this concept. As I recall, reading the original correspondence, this was supposedly an organization of professionalism. As you say, very limited type, rather specific objective statements in order to report from the professionals, or from the technical people to the administrators of this organization. I believe each director has been asked to make a comment about this. So apparently each state has the opportunity to express themselves. I think that when an adhoc committee is appointed, why then we can have someone here next year with an up to date discussion and they can do some interim work.

Popowski: Any discussion?

Irizawa: I got a little bit disgusted with the fact that there seems to be a proliferation of various professional groups. For instance there are pilots or law enforcement groups or something else and we're going to get so we have a pheasant biologist group, a turkey biologist group and deer or moose, you name it. Speaking just for ourselves as pessimists, we already have sent people to the Great Lakes deer group in Wisconsin or Minnesota I believe, to the Northeast deer group. We looked at that letter too, and I believe we did with it that we did with one letter that we shouldn't have authored. If you know what I'm talking about.

Stuart: John, one comment; I agree with Ken, and sometimes I look back about 30 years ago when we would have maybe three or four states that geographically had quite a bit in common and climatically a lot in common and get together at some very convenient point, John if you recall we've had an antelope group working and they used to meet at Camp Crook in Northwestern South Dakota, or Baker, Montana or Bohlman, North Dakota and the expense involved was very minimum to the State agency and a great deal was accomplished because you were working with a very small group that became a workshop type of thing and exchange of ideas and this is the type of thing that John I recall back that just North Dakota and South Dakota used to meet a day every year discussing the pheasant problems. This thing is pretty much along wayside again, but I still think that more was accomplished by that than having a committee covering a vast portion of the North American continent with some very very real differences in problems, geographically and everything else, and I'm just wondering, as Ken says, if we aren't allowing this stuff to proliferate.

Popowski: I think we all understand exactly what you are saying Russ, and we've all had experiences with, I guess close to the earth committees that didn't have to go so far and really that's the ones that get the most done. Is there other new business?

Comment: What's the result of this discussion?

Popowski: The result is that I am going to appoint an adhoc committee and we will then have something a year from now to base whether you want a standing committee or you want a very limited committee. I think that we can make the decision at that time if that's satisfactory at that time. Are there any objections? Does that

answer your question? Dave, do you have anymore new business?

Jenkins: I don't know if this is new business or not but I would just like to welcome the Midwest group to the International meeting in Dearborn, Michigan this September. It's the week of the 19th. Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday will be the American Fisheries Society and Wednesday, Thursday and Friday one day is the joint meeting of the International meeting. It's a good program and it looks like a very good program. Excellent accessibility to the place in Dearborn, excellent facilities, very good facilities and some real good opportunities for the ladies to have some fun and for us too with the outside activities there and on a more personal note, I think that the waitresses in attendance around the Piatt regency are ex-centerfold people. It has to be that way, so I would encourage everyone to attend because it will be a good meeting.

Popowski: Thank you Dave. Russ?

Stuart: This is one thing, and perhaps selfish on my part, but we've been promoting the sport of predator hunting in North Dakota. We did manage to sell the legislature on the idea that primarily fox and coyote in our state, however, we have others, but primarily these two that there is a tremendous recreational resource in these two species and we not only are promoting the citizens of North Dakota, but we would like to invite nonresidents to participate. We ran into one problem in that we do sell licenses but the legislature deemed it advisable to make it a trapping license or a furbearers license rather than make it a hunting license. Then we have another law that's been on the books since about the turn of the century in that we cannot sell this trapping license to a nonresident unless that state has reciprocity and I'm asking you people to consider, maybe it's not important to you, consider going to your legislature asking for reciprocity in trapping or hunting of these particular species. Right now, we do have people coming in from Ohio, Colorado, Iowa, but there are three surrounding states; Minnesota, South Dakota and Montana that do not have reciprocity so we have to tell the residents of these states that they're not welcome in North Dakota and it's really embarrassing, so that's just something I'm throwing out so that maybe you can consider going to your legislatures in session.

Popowski: That's part of a considerably bigger problem I guess than the whole licensing structure. I was also going to have Bud Phelps comment on a subject and maybe Colorado could help me out a little bit. There's evidently going to be discussed in the western the subject of wildlife in the wilderness areas, and Bud was wondering about a representative from this Association on that subject. Really the only state that we have that gets into the Rockies is Colorado and again are you aware of anything on this? Al, this subject is also going to come up in the western I guess and as our really only representative in that part of the country, I would ask someone from Colorado to represent us and keep us informed as to what the situation is and does it affect other states? Things of that nature and I don't; I should have dug further with Bud, but he was called home because of a funeral of a wife of one of his staff people and left in a rush this morning so I don't really have as much information as I should have on this. Is there other new business?

Comment: What about the by-laws?

Popowski: Well, in sitting and listening to that, how do you want to do this? Do you want me to appoint someone or should that be up to the new president to bring that up and have a recommendation for next year or do you want to do it in the interim?

Comment: The by-laws probably will change somewhat.

Comment: The changes should be effective for consideration at the next annual meeting. The way to do this would be to contact the membership ahead of time.

Popowski: I have forgotten exactly how much it is, but there is certainly time from the first of the year on. There is a change over of officers within the next year and as a result it seems to me a little bit that if the new set of officers or new president does this, why he has done it and he is aware of what has gone on, now change my mind if that's not right.

Comment: I just think that so it wouldn't come up at the next meeting not having been circulated that those proposed changes at this meeting simply go out on notice before the next meeting so at least they can be voted on at the next meeting. You want to do that?

Popowski: OK. If it's satisfactory with you. I will pass that information on and it will be noted and Bill then can proceed with how he wants to do it for the next annual meeting. Other new business?

Comment: Mr. Chairman, getting back to the Resolution that was tabled, the thought behind the thing I thought was excellent.

Popowski: Which one are you referring to?

Comment: Resolution #30 which states that the soil conservation service be directed to make a survey of wildlife habitat on farms and that they be given certain criteria. The problem, is that this was once attempted and it ran and then it was abborted because the soil conservation service people even refused to let our technicians go into their records saying that they were the property of the soil conservation districts. I really believe they are taking credit for our work they did not do or had not been done in a way of wildlife habitat restoration. And I will ask the association through the International to try to have some survey made and we lay out the criteria. These wildlife technicians put out criteria which to me is not a strong enough survey to be made.

Popowski: This was generated, am I correct, from the Pheasant Council?

Comment: I think there are two parts to this, first of all, to encourage the soil conservation service to conduct an up to date conservation service meeting inventory which I do believe has not been done since 1967 am I right? Yes. And to include in this second part, to include in this conservation meeting inventory an adequate accessment of wildlife habitat that exists. This is where we should hopefully be giving our influence to the soil conservation service on how we would like to see wildlife habitat evaluated as conservationists.

Popowski: I think earlier our discussion was that the intent of this has broader than Midwest interest, and as such it would be a logical subject for the International and if that's the case than one of our states without the Association as such has been. I think the proposed is necessary to the International and there is yet time. Now, how do you want to handle that?

Comment: Could we ammend this particular resolution to recommend an action point committee at the Midwest and pass that on to the International meeting?

Popowski: You have it Jack. Do you want to come on up and make a proposal in wording on it and we can if it's accepted relay it to the International meeting as a proposal.

Bails: Sorry, I'm not directly familiar with the problem. Maybe there is some words in the whereas that you would like to add, but that does not change those, just to whereas as reading as they did, it is therefore recommended that the Association of Midwest Fish, Game, and Conservation Commissioners urge the International to appoint an adhoc committee to study and make recommendations to the SCS as to methods and survey techniques necessary as to estimate wildlife habitat on the land.

Comment: I would like to propose some changes at the beginning. Whereas the Soil Conservation Service should be conducted, a current conservation needs inventory, and whereas this survey could supply and estimate of wildlife habitat on the land; just change the first whereas. Whereas the Soil Conservation Service should be conducting a current conservation needs inventory and whereas this survey could supply an estimate of wildlife habitat on the land, it is therefore recommended that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners urge the International to appoint a committee to study and make recommendations to the Soil Conservation Service as to methods and survey techniques necessary to estimate wildlife habitat on the land.

Popowski: Jack has moved, is there a second? Moved and seconded. Would you put that down on a clean sheet of paper as correct wording so that we'll have that. Mine is scratched up and I'm sure everyone elses is. Is there other discussion? All those in favor, say "I". Opposed, "No". The motion is carried and we will relay it to the International. Other new business? Is there any business that any of you feel should be taken up at this time? If not, I'm going to ask Bill Bailey to stand up here and present to him even though he doesn't take over until January 1, next year the symbol of the office of president of the Midwest Association and wish him well. I also will say that it's been our distinct pleasure to host you here and I hope you have enjoyed yourself. I think I can speak personally that I think this group is one of the most enjoyable for me to be associated with. It is a good group. We've enjoyed having you here. Is there anymore business before we adjourn? Have I forgotten anything? Are there any announcements? Gentlemen, we are adjourning.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS

Rapid City, South Dakota

July 19-22, 1976

The status of the Association's funds at the close of business for the year 1975 relate total assets of $2,501.85. Total receipts for this period, including a 1974 cash balance of $599.85 brought forward -- $1,301.85. Total expenditures for the Traverse City Conference -- $1,231.32. Certificate of Deposit #101576 in the amount of $1,200.00 was renewed with the First National Bank, Pratt, Kansas at 6 percent interest. Balance of 1975 cash account forwarded to the 1976 account -- $70.53. IRS income tax exemption form #990 prepared and submitted.

The status of Association funds as of this date (July 22, 1976) relate total assets of $2,670.53 which includes the 1976 dues from thirteen (13) states and one (1) province. No expenditure claims have been made on the current 1976 cash balance of $1,470.53 to date.

The official Association financial ledger showing receipts and expenditures has been made available to the Auditing Committee.

Fred Warders, Treasurer
Association of Midwest Fish and
Wildlife Commissioners

APPENDIX A

ATTENDANCE

Place	Name	Agency Represented
Colorado	Robert L. Evans	Division of Wildlife
	James C. Gritman	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	Harry Woodward	Ducks Unlimited
	C. E. Lane	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Illinois	Edward L. Kozicky	Olin Corp.
	James M. Lockart	Department of Conservation
Indiana	Frank R. Lockard	Division of Fish & Wildlife
Iowa	Allen Farris	Conservation Commission
	Fred Priewert	Conservation Commission
Kansas	Fred W. Warders	Fish & Game Commission
Kentucky	Arnold Mitchell	Fish & Wildlife Resources Dept.
Maryland	Ralph Bitely	
Michigan	Jack D. Bails	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Gary Boushelle	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Arlow P. Boyce	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Charles D. Harris	Dept. of Natural Resources
	David H. Jenkins	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Henry J. Vondett	Dept. of Natural Resources
Minnesota	Mike Casey	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Clarence E. Faulkner	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	Jack E. Hemphill	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	Robert A. Hodgins	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	Richard T. Huber	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	Charles A. Hughlett	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	W. Ellis Klett	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	Dale N. Martin	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	Raymond L. St. Ores	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	David B. Vesall	Dept. of Natural Resources
Missouri	Allen Brohn	Department of Conservation
	A. C. Hoefelman	Department of Conservation
	Dean A. Murphy	Department of Conservation
	Carl Noren	Department of Conservation
	Thomas A. Saunders	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	Vernon E. Sievert	Department of Conservation

Place	Name	Agency Represented
Nebraska	Bill Bailey	Nebraska Game & Parks Commission
	Wade Hamor	Nebraska Game & Parks Commission
	H. B. Kuntzelman	Nebraska Game & Parks Commission
	Keith W. Harmon	Wildlife Management Institute
New Mexico	Ladd Gordon	National Rifle Association
North Dakota	Lyle J. Schoonover	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	Russell W. Stuart	Game & Fish Department
Ohio	Carl Mosley	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Dale L. Haney	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Oklahoma	Robert H. Berger	Corps of Engineers
	R. C. Green	Corps of Engineers
Ontario	Ken Irizawa	Ministry of Natural Resources
Pierre	Lil Brewster	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	Jim Claar	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	Deane Curry	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	Hoadley Dean	Western S. D. Development Company
	Laurel Ernst	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	Bob Hauk	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	Warren Jackson	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	Lawrence Kellogg	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	Chuck Mateer	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	Jack Merwin	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	Ken Moum	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	Ed Nielsen	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	Harvey Pietz	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	John Popowski	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	Chuck Post	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	Marlin Scarborough	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	Jim Schroeder	Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
	Rolf Wallenstrom	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Utah	Bud Phelps	Dept. of Wildlife Resources
Virginia	Phillip B. Summers	U. S. Forest Service
Washington, D. C.	Lynn A. Greenwalt	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
	George Milias	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Wisconsin	John M. Keener	Dept. of Natural Resources
	Les Voigt	Dept. of Natural Resources

APPENDIX B

ASSOCIATION

OF

MIDWEST FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS IN 1976

AUDIT COMMITTEE

Fred A. Priewert, Iowa - Chairman
Richard C. Goulden, Manitoba
Dave Vesall, Minnesota

AWARDS COMMITTEE

Charles D. Harris, Michigan - Chairman
Milo Casey, Minnesota
George Wint, Oklahoma
Frank Lockard, Indiana

BY-LAWS COMMITTEE

David B. Vesall, Minnesota - Chairman
Larry R. Gale, Missouri
Fred Warders, Kansas
D. R. Johnston, Ontario
Arnold Mitchell, Kentucky

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Larry R. Gale, Missouri - Chairman
Jack D. Bails, Michigan
Robert L. Herbst, Minnesota
Dave Vesall, Minnesota
P. T. Barrows, Colorado
Anthony Earl, Wisconsin

LIAISON PHEASANT COMMITTEE

Willard R. Barbee, Nebraska - Chairman
Fred A. Priewert, Iowa
(Each Committee member is to appoint a staff level man to maintain contact with the Council.)

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Dale Haney, Ohio - Chairman
Fred A. Priewert, Iowa
Ken K. Irizawa, Ontario

PRO HUNT COMMITTEE

Carl Noren, Missouri - Chairman
Milo Casey, Minnesota
Fred A. Priewert, Iowa
(Each Committee member is to appoint a member to serve on a subcommittee.)

PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Arlow P. Boyce, Michigan - Chairman
Larry R. Gale, Missouri
Anthony Earl, Wisconsin
Ken K. Irizawa, Ontario

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Russell Stuart, North Dakota - Chairman
Jack R. Grieb, Colorado
Jim Lockart, Illinois
Frank Lockhardt, Indiana
Fred A. Priewert , Iowa
Richard Wettersten, Kansas
Arnold Mitchell, Kentucky
Richard C. Goulden, Manitoba
Charles D. Harris, Michigan
Milo Casey, Minnesota
Carl Noren, Missouri
Willard R. Barbee, Nebraska
Dale Haney, Ohio
George Wint, Oklahoma
Ken K. Irizawa, Ontario
G. E. Couldwell, Saskatchewan
John Popowski, South Dakota
Anthony Earl, Wisconsin

WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Richard Wettersten, Kansas - Chairman
Carl Noren, Missouri
Willard R. Barbee, Nebraska
Jim Lockart, Illinois

RESOLUTION #1

WHEREAS, the National Park Service has endorsed a policy of "self-regulation" for wildlife populations within National Parks which would only subject animals to natural mortality factors, such as predators, parasites, disease and starvation; and

WHEREAS, such a policy usually results in gross deterioration of the forage and soil resources upon which these wildlife populations depend long before death or emigration brings the populations in balance with their food supplies; and

WHEREAS, natural migrations to and from the Parks, as well as forced emigration from the Parks, would result in damage to forage and soil resources outside the Parks, and would expedite the transmission of parasites and disease to healthy animals; and

WHEREAS, the National Park Service, in an endeavor to make the "self-regulation" policy succeed and to capitalize on the wave of anti-hunting sentiment, is advocating major expansions of National Park boundaries to completely encompass wildlife ecosystems; and

WHEREAS, the expansion of National Park Service boundaries in many instances would encroach on national forest lands and preclude sport hunting that has been demonstrated to be the most effective means to adequately control overpopulations of wildlife, especially larger herbivores; and

WHEREAS, this loss of control over wildlife populations would result in a substantial loss of recreationsl hunting, as well as a waste of a renewable resource of animal protein.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 43rd Annual meeting this 21st day of July, 1976, at Rapid City, South Dakota, that the National Park Service be reminded that its mission by law is to conserve wildlife within national parks and not to expand boundaries solely for the purpose of encompassing the ecosystem of one or more species of wildlife agencies of the several states; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that before any future expansions of national parks is permitted, the National Park Service shall demonstrate it has consulted with adjacent landowners, all affected agencies and resource user groups and, furthermore, that jurisdiction over fish and resident wildlife, as well as the management thereof, in the proposed expansion areas shall be expressly reserved unto the state or states within which the said expansions will occur, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Interior.

RESOLUTION #2

WHEREAS, Section 404 of the 1972 Water Quality Act provides the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers with authority to protect many important wetlands; and

WHEREAS, this authority is necessary in that a number of states lack specific authority to protect important wetlands; and

WHERAS, the U. S. House of Representatives has passed the Wright Amendment to the 1972 Amendments to the Water Quality Act that would restrict the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers to Activities on those waters that are manageable in fact or could reasonably be made manageable; and

WHEREAS, removing the Corps Section 404 Authority would leave over 80 per cent of the nation's wetlands unprotected; and

WHEREAS, the Wright ammendment as passed by the House of Representatives greatly restricts the definition of nagavable waters as traditionally applied to the River and Harbors Act of 1899; thereby removing protection through the Corps of Enginners Section 10 permit procedures to many hundreds of thousands of acres of wetlands; and

WHEREAS, the preceeding restrictions prevent the State and Federal agencies from effectively commenting upon actions designed to destroy and degrade wetlands through authority of the Fish and Wildlife coordination act as ammended; and

WHEREAS, the House of Representatives passed the Wright Amendment without conducting public hearings;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled in Rapid City, South Dakota in an annual meeting on July 19-22, 1976 request the U. S. Senate reject the House passed Wright Amendment; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Congress hold oversight hearings on Section 404 with the objective being to refine and improve the administration of the Corps authority not eliminate it; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that retainment and refinement of Section 404 include as an option the delegation of the Corps authority to those states that have the legal and regulatory capabilities to administer dredge and fill activities in rivers, lakes, wetlands, and coastal areas defined in the 1972 Water Quality Amendments and the Corps interim final regulations.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of this resolution be sent immediately by mail-o-gram to Sen. Jennings Randolph and the White House.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners urge the individual state directors to immediately contact their respective Congressional delegations, Sen. Jennings Randolph, and the White House indicating support of Section 404 along with a need for public hearings to evaluate and improve Section 404.

RESOLUTION #3

WHEREAS, fish and wildlife conservation means wise use of fish and wildlife resources for the benefit of people; and

WHEREAS, government agencies have been established by law to conserve these resources for the benefit of people; and

WHEREAS, there are misguided forces which would unnecessarily restrict or stop wise use of fish and wildlife resources,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, assembled at its 43rd annual meeting, this 21st day of July, 1976, at Rapid City, South Dakota urges all who are responsible for the conservation of fish and wildlife to actively go forth with the truth to the public which may otherwise be wrongfully deprived.

RESOLUTION #4

WHEREAS, there is need for more efficient and economical means to manage fish and wildlife habitat and to maintain and operate public use facilities on public property to enhance the use and enjoyment by the public of their fish and wildlife resources; and

WHEREAS, the States ability to meet these needs is restricted by language presently in leases of public property to the States which read:

> "That the leases, in exercising its governmental or proprietary functions, may plant and harvest crops, either directly or by service contract or under sharecrop agreements with local farmers, to provide: (a) food and cover for wildlife, and (b) necessary compensation to farmers under any sharecrop agreement. Recognizing that a poor crop season may result in lack of food for wildlife in a given future year, the leases will be allowed to provide a reasonable surplus which will be held in reserve against a future poor crop season or may be disposed of by the State and the proceeds from the sale held in reserve against a future poor crop season. In any event, the lands will not be used by the State for the production of crops or any other purpose solely to produce revenue to defray costs of management of the wildlife area. Lands within the leased area, available for lease for agricultural or grazing purposes, will be leased by the District Engineer. Moneys collected by the State and not used to provide food for wildlife in a poor crop season shall be paid to the District Engineer at five-year intervals. The leases will establish and maintain adequate records and accounts and render periodic statements of receipts and expenditures in furtherance of its wildlife feeding program, as may be required by said District Engineer."

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, assembled at its 43rd annual meeting, this 21st day of July, 1976, at Rapid City, South Dakota urges the Chief of Engineers of the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers to amend the existing licenses and leases and provide the States broader opportunity to meet their obligations to the public by: allowing sharecropping to produce wildlife habitat (not just food) and to allow sharecropping proceeds to be used for operation, maintenance and development of these fish and wildlife areas.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this resolution be sent to Chief of Engineers, Seantor John Stennis, Senator Mike Gravel, Congressman Reuss, Congressman Oberstar and John Dingell. Direct President John Popowski to send all resolutions to Paul Lenzini.

RESOLUTION #5

WHEREAS, the Upper Mississippi River and its tributaries are of unquestionable value to the citizens of the United States for their social, economic, and natural resource values, and

WHEREAS, the United States Corps of Engineers is currently seeking authorization to rebuild Locks and Dam 26, and

WHEREAS, the direct result of such proposed construction would provide for a significant increase in navigation of the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois River systems to the detriment of natural resources, and

WHEREAS, such construction would facilitate 12-foot navigation on the Upper Mississippi River thus prociding for a further increase in the number of tons that could be transported by barges annually, and

WHEREAS, little is known regarding the effects of increased commercial navigation on the natural resource values of the Upper Mississippi and Illinois River Systems,

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, assembled at its 43rd annual conference in Rapid City, South Dakota on this 21st day of July, 1976, encourages the Congress of the United States to allow no increase in the annual tonnage capability of Locks and Dam 26 until studies have been completed to determine how increasing commercial navigation will affect the natural resources on the Upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers,

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, Sen. Mondale, Sen. Gaylord Nelson, Sen. Proxmier, Chr. of Public Works Comm., UMRCC, Upper Mississippi Commission, that the United States Corps of Engineers and the Congress of the United States use the results of the proposed studies to guide them in their deliberations regarding the best use environmentally of this tremendously significant natural resource.

RESOLUTION #6

WHEREAS, for a number of years the several states have sought to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act so as to strongly protect fish and wildlife resources, and

WHEREAS, the National Coordinating Committee on Fish and Wildlife in Federal Water Resources Projects has intensively sought to have the Act amended for at least the last five years, and

WHEREAS, Congress has periodically considered amendments but has chosen not to adopt any, and

WHEREAS, it is imperative the Act be strengthened both executively and legislatively to ensure the existence of a viable wildlife resource, and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 43rd annual meeting this 21st day of July, 1976, at Rapid City, South Dakota, endorse the National Coordinating Committee's revised language of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act amendments as a substitute to S. 1727,

AND, FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED, to get a similar bill introduced into the House and to encourage Senators Phillip A. Hart, Michigan, Frank Moss, Utah, and Lowell Weicker, Jr., Connecticut, to schedule public hearings on the proposals.

RESOLUTION #7

WHEREAS, the Great Lakes and the Great Lakes fisheries are a natural resource of uncomparable national importance, and

WHEREAS, the economic value of the Great Lakes fisheries is of profound importance to the Great Lakes states and the nation, both as a recreational and commercial resource, and

WHEREAS, the fish populations of the Great Lakes, particularly lake trout and white fish were decimated by the early 1950's through the invasion of the parasitic sea lamprey, and

WHEREAS, the sea lamprey decimated climax predators which resulted in serious predator-prey imbalances, thus permitting the exotic alewife to become overly abundant, resulting in serious economic losses, and

WHEREAS, the cooperative effort of the United States, State and Canadian governments to rehabilitate the Great Lakes fisheries, under the auspices of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, has been successful in controlling the sea lamprey and restocking lake trout in the upper lakes, and

WHEREAS, stocking required to restore the lake trout populations to original self-sustaining levels far exceeds the capabilities of the existing nationsl fish hatcheries operated for production of lake trout,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, assembled at its 43rd annual conference in Rapid City, South Dakota, on this 21st day of July, 1976, urges the congress and President of the United States to authorize and provide immediate funding of 5.5 million dollars to complete the Iron River National Fish Hatchery, to facilitate and enhance the restoration of the Great Lakes fisheries.

RESOLUTION #8

WHEREAS, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is proposing to issue a new wetland classification system, and

WHEREAS, the majority of people who must work with wetland classification are not research-type individuals nor in many cases biologists or botanists, and

WHEREAS, we believe that the proposed classification is too complicated and difficult to the majority of the users to understand,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, assembled at its 43rd annual conference in Rapid City, South Dakota, on this 21st day of July, 1976, encourages the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to retain its present wetland classification system.

RESOLUTION #9

WHEREAS, the Minnesota River is the second largest river in Minnesota and an important national natural resource, and

WHEREAS, efforts are needed to protect the natural habitat for wildlife in the Minnesota River valley, thereby protecting wildlife not only for the enjoyment of the people of Minnesota but also for the people of this nation, and

WHEREAS, the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the U. S. Department of the Interior, in cooperation with the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources and local units of government, has prepared a plan which would provide for wildlife and waterfowl production and maintenance, preservation of open space, environmental education, recreational trails and natural flood control in the Lower Minnesota River valley, and

WHEREAS, legislation to establish a National Wildlife Refuge and Recreation Area was introduced in the U. S. Senate (Bill No. 2097) on July 11, 1975, by Senators Humphrey and Mondale, and in the U. S. House of Representatives (H.R. 13374 on April 26, 1976 by Crongressman James L. Oberstar,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 43rd annual conference in Rapid City, South Dakota, on this 21st day of July 1976, endorse the Fish and Wildlife Service plan for the Lower Minnesota River National Wildlife Refuge and Recreation Area and encourage legislative action to authorize establishment of said refuge.

RESOLUTION #10

WHEREAS, the Youth Conservation Corps (YCC) is a nationwide program that provides summer employment and environmental work/learning experiences for youths 15 to 18 years of age, and

WHEREAS, a grant program administered by the U. S. Departments of Agriculture and Interior provides up to 80 percent of program costs to participating States, and

WHEREAS, the program provides for the accomplishment of needed conservation work on public lands and increases environmental awareness in the nation's youth,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 43rd annual conference in Rapid City, South Dakota, on the 21st day of July, 1976, hereby declares its support for the goals, objectives and continued operation of the Youth Conservation Corps.

RESOLUTION #11

WHEREAS, the discharge of 67,000 tons of taconite tailings daily into Lake Superior by Reserve Mining will soon be halted, and

WHEREAS, these tailings must be accomodated in an inland area, and

WHEREAS, the need to accommodate such vast amount of tailings daily will destroy environmental values wherever they are deposited,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 43rd annual conference in Rapid City, South Dakota on this 21st day of July, 1976, encourges the selection of an onland disposal site which would be the least damaging to fish and wildlife resources.

RESOLUTION #12

WHEREAS, in cooperation with State Fish and Game Departments, the Fish and Wildlife Service conducts a program of excess Federal personal property utilization for Sport Fish and Wildlife Restoration, Anadromous Fish Conservation, and Endangered Species grant programs, and

WHEREAS, the excess property program has proved a valuable addition to these grant programs, primarily in expanding capabilities for accomplishing approved and approvable work, and

WHEREAS, present regulations in Title 41, Chapter 101, Part 43, Code of Federal Regulations, are cumbersome and costly to administer for the above-cited programs, and

WHEREAS, there is a precedence for conveying title to property upon receipt by grantee (for use in furtherance of the purposes of the Water Resources Act of 1964) which would alleviate the problems,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, assembled at its 43rd annual conference in Rapid City, South Dakota, on this 21st day of July, 1976, in cooperation with the Fish and Wildlife Service, draft appropriate legislation amending the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to authorize the granting of title to excess personal property to grantees upon receipt.

RESOLUTION #13

WHEREAS, illegal shootings of bald eagles throughout the Midwest have created undue harassment, wounding, and mortality on the bald eagle population, and

WHEREAS, it is the resposibility of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service to work cooperatively with the states in enforcing the Bald Eagle Act for the protection of band and golden eagles, and

WHEREAS, during the past year sixteen apprehensions resulting in convictions of eagle trappers and shooters have been accomplished by cooperative enforcement efforts of agents of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service and state conservation officers in the Miswest Association states,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of the Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 43rd annual conference in Rapid City, South Dakota, on this 21st day of July, 1976, encourages continued cooperation by the states and the Fish and Wildlife Service in aggressively pursuing law enforement activities to deter persons inclined to shoot, trap or harass bald and golden eagles.

RESOLUTION #14

WHEREAS, there exists in Becker County, Minnesota, north of the Town of Audubon, approximately 7,600 acres of land that is a highly desirable waterfowl conservation area, and

WHEREAS, both state and federal conservation agencies have recognized the potential of this area as an outstanding waterfowl area for a number of years, and

WHEREAS, the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service has recently proposed to establish the Hamden Slough National Wildlife Refuge on this area, and

WHEREAS, the establishment of this refuge would preserve this area for future generations and for the production of waterfowl,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 43rd annual conference in Rapid City, SouthDakota, on this 21st day of July 1976, endorses the establishment of the aforementioned Hamden Slough National Wildlife Refuge.

RESOLUTION #15

WHEREAS, there is not question regarding the tremendous environmental values associated with the Great Lakes, and

WHEREAS, the fish and wildlife values associated with the Great Lakes must be protected for future generations, and

WHEREAS, there is detected agitation to lengthen the locks connecting the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seawya to accommodate longer vessels, and

WHEREAS, the stability and ability of these longer vessels to transport raw materials safely, in particular, petroleum products is questionable,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 43rd annual conference in Rapid City, South Dakots, on this 21st day of July, 1976, discourages any action to lengthen the locks associated with the five Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway beyond their present capacities.

RESOLUTION #16

WHEREAS, the State of Minnesota petitioned the Department of the Interior in October 1974 to be excluded from the range where the eastern timber wolf is considered endangered; and

WHEREAS, the Minnesota DNR has presented evidence to the Department of the Interior to substantiate the position that the timber wolf is neither threatened within the state; and

WHEREAS, the problem of livestock predation has increased to where the Fish and Wildlife Service has had to trap problem wolves and transplant them to other areas already carrying maximum wolf numbers; and

WHEREAS, the federally appointed Eastern Timber Wolf Recovery Team has recommended the removal of an annual quota of wolves by hunting and trapping as well as the lethal removal of wolves causing livestock losses; and

WHEREAS, although the Wolf Recovery Team recommends a "threatened" rather than a delisted status it does recognize that the wolf population seems secure and bases retention of the wolf in the "threatened" status only on the basis of possible mining or other developments in the wolf range; and

WHEREAS, developments of the kind that might affect large areas of the wolf range must submit Environmental Impact Statements that in themselves will be the ultimate deciding factor on whether such developments occur; and

WHEREAS, Minnesota timber wolves are not an isolated population but are an extension of the Canadian timber wolf population and its range, which is not considered endangered;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners Assembled at its 43rd Annual Meeting this 22nd day of July, 1976, at Rapid City, South Dakota, requests the Secretary of the Interior to exclude Minnesota from the range over which the eastern timber wolf is considered endangered.

RESOLUTION #17

WHEREAS, The U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Missouri River Division is investigating a Multiple Purpose approach for solution of complex resource management problems in the last remaining unchannelized reach of Missouri River below the mainstem reservoirs, and

WHEREAS, This multiple purpose concept includes: designation of the 58 mile Yankton, South Dakota to Ponca, Nebraska reach, as a Recreation River under the Wild and Scenic River Act; Bank Stabilzation compatible with such designation; improved public access, and acquisition of scenic easements to maintain economic land use to that consistant with social values placed on this unique corridor, and

WHEREAS, Serious degradation of agricultural and environmental resources have occurred and will continue unabated in the absence of a project, and

WHEREAS, A single purpose bank erosion control project could accelerate the losses of features of great historic and environmentla importance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 43rd Annual Meeting this 21st day of July, 1976, at Rapid City, South Dakota does hereby commend the Army Corps of Engineers, Missouri River Division for adopting this exemplory approach to solving complex problems on this last remaining unchannelized reach of the Missouri River below Gavins Point Reservoir.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of this resolution be forwarded the the International Association of Game, Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Mid-Continent Region, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; Missouri River Basin Planning Commission; Governor's of Nebraska, South Dakota, Montana, Missouri, North Dakota, Iowa and Kansas, and U. S. Congressional Representatives for South Dakota, Nebraska and Iowa.

RESOLUTION #18

WHEREAS, Department of Interior auditors have ruled that rental-rate schedules previously provided to the States by the Fish and Wildlife Service are no longer acceptable; and

WHEREAS, complex records involving depreciation and expenditures for operation and maintenance of the various groups of equipment must be maintained by a grantee to document all annual use-charges; and

WHEREAS, the Fish and Wildlife Service has always favored the rental-rate procedure and discouraged States from acquiring equipment with federal-aid funds; and

WHEREAS, other federal agencies are still utilizing federally approved rental-rate schedules;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, assembled at its 43rd annual meeting this 21st day of July, 1976, at Rapid City, South Dakota, urges the Department of Interior to develop a nationwide rate schedule (with appropriate regional variations) which is acceptable to its Audit and Investigations staff.

RESOLUTION #19

WHEREAS, there are 1,480 man-made reservoirs over 500 suface acres in area in the contiguous United States with a total of 9,693,000acres, and

WHEREAS, food and rough fish in these reservoirs probably exceed 400 million pounds production per year in these impoundments, and

WHEREAS, less than 75 million pounds of fish per year are harvested commercially in inland waters.

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 43rd annual meeting this 22nd day of July, 1976, at Rapid City, South Dakota recommend that the Eastland Resolution passed unanimously by both Houses of Congress in 1973 include resource allocation and time for inland as well as coastal states to conduct surveys with fishermen, biologists, processors, and distributors to determine major problem areas hindering full utilization of inland commercial fish stocks, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that inland commercial fisheries be given due consideration in any Federal assistance resulting from the Eastland Fisheries Survey.

RESOLUTION #20

WHEREAS, the Agricultural Conservation Program (ACP), a costsharing program administered by the Secretary of Agriculture and originally established in the mid-1930's, under the Agriculture Adjustment Act, has not realized its potential for causing long-term conservation practices to be installed on the nation's farmlands; and

WHEREAS, the majority of the resources of this program has been expended on production oriented practices; and

WHEREAS, Title X (also known as the Rural Environmental Conservation Program) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973, Public Law 93-86 charges the Secretary of Agriculture to issue contracts with eligible farm, ranch, wetland and nonindustrialforest owners and operators or owners and operators "in enlarging fish and wildlife and recreation sources; in improving the management of nonindustrial private forest lands; and inproviding long-term wildlife and upland game cover;" and

WHEREAS, nofunds have been earmarked for use solely in encouraging long-term wildlife, fish and recreation source improvement on farmlands; and

WHEREAS, by contrast, such funds as have been earmarked under the similarly administered Forestry Improvement Program have resulted in an intensified application of forestry practices on farmlands; and

WHEREAS, certain production oriented practices are eliminating more wildlife and upland game cover than can be replaced by existing permanent wildlife habitat practices;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, assembled at its 43rd annual meeting this 21st day of July, 1976, at Rapid City, South Dakota, hereby recommends that the ACP be reoriented into a program designed to encourage long-term conservation practices which are in the interest of the greater public as intended by Title X - Rural Environmental Conservation Program of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973, Public Law 93-86; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that at least one percent (1%) of the ACP funds apportioned to each of the states be allocated solely for use in establishing cost-sharing contracts with eligible farm, ranch, wetland, non-industrial forest owners and operators, or other owners and operators, to implement practices to enlarge fish and wildlife and recreation sources; and to provide long term wildlife and upland game cover; and that the national and state advisory boards, established under Section 1007(a) and 1007 (b) of Title X - Rural Environmental Conservation Program of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973, Public Law 93-86, meet annually with the authority to review and modify existing ACP practices to avoid unnecessary wildlife habitat losses as are now occurring under current application of this program.

RESOLUTION #21

WHEREAS, the Fish and Wildlife Service is developing a procedure for the evaluation of fish and wildlife for use on water resources at the best of the several states and certain national conservation organizations, and

WHEREAS, the procedures being developed have the potentiol of being consistent with the effort to evaluate, compensate and mitigate wildlife losses, and

WHEREAS, the Water Resources Council is expected to adopt the procedures as proposed and certain states are already using the procedures, and

WHEREAS, adoption of the final procedures will ensure the use of a standardized procedure rather than the useof a number of procedures,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled in anuual meeting this 21st day of July, 1976, at Rapid City, South Dakota, urges the Service to complete the Fish and Wildlife Evaluation Procedures, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that theService thoroughly tests the procedures on a variety of projects, and

BE IT FURHTER RESOLVED, that before the Service submits the procedures to the Water Resources Council that they be reviewed and approved by the National Coordinating Committee,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of this resolution be sent to the Director of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Chairman of the National Coordinating Committee.

RESOLUTION #22

WHEREAS, the Soil Conservation Service recently estimated that wind erosion damage in the Great Plains increased 65 percent during the last year, and

WHEREAS, the Council of Agricultural Science and Technology stated that over one-third of the cropland in the United States can not sustain production over time due to excessive rates of erosion, and

WHEREAS, the Soil Conservation Service presently uses a land use inventory that is over 10 years old and has no well defined objectives or directed program, and

WHEREAS, the Soil Conservation Service presently employs a reporting system that is inadequate,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled in annual meeting this 21st day of July, 1976, at Rapid City, South Dakota, urges the House of Representat ives to pass S. 2081, that directs the Soil Conservation Service to make a national inventory of private land use, develop a national program to protect nation's soil and water resources, and develop a reporting system that annually measures the year's accomplishments as they relate to defined objectives.

RESOLUTION #23

WHEREAS, the Soil Conservation Service should be conducting a current conservation needs inventory, and

WHEREAS, this survey could supply an estimate of wildlife habitat on the land,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled in annual meeting this 22nd day of July, 1976, at Rapid City, South Dakota, urges the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies to appoint an ad hoc committee to study and make recommendations to the Soil Conservation Service as to methods and survey techniques necessary to estimate wildlife habitat on the land.

RESOLUTION #24

WHEREAS, the 43rd Anual Convention of the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Commissioners was held in Rapid City, South Dakota, July 19-22, 1976; and

WHEREAS, the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks served as the host agency;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners wishes to express appreciation to the State of South Dakota, to John Popowski, President, and to the staff of the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks for their hospitality.

RESOLUTION #25

WHEREAS, the Missouri River is playing a more important role in the migration of Canada geese, and

WHEREAS, more information is needed to professionally manage (1) the Western Prairie flock, (2) the tall grass prairie flock and (3) the restoration flocks of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota, and

WHEREAS, the major harvest of these flocks occurs within the state of this Association,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Commissioners assembled at its 43rd Annual meeting this 21st day of July, 1976, at Rapid City, South Dakota, encourages its members to adopt regulations and procedures necessary to provide data for population management of this important international resource.