



**85th Annual
Directors Meeting
Proceedings**

**June 24 – June 27, 2018
Ramkota Hotel and Conference Center
Bismarck, North Dakota**

Hosted by:



**North Dakota
Game and Fish Department**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(page numbering follows paper copy, not necessarily website copy)

Page

1) Cover	
2) Table of Contents	i.
SECTION DIVIDER PAGE	v.
3) Action Items	1
4) Objectives and Mission Statement	5
5) Past Meeting Locations and Dates	7
6) FY 2017/2018 Committees and Appointed Representatives	9
7) Constitution and By-Laws (As approved June 2017)	13
8) Attendance Roster	27
9) Executive Committee Minutes (6/24/18)	33
10) Minutes (6/25 & 6/26/18)	39
11) Business Meeting Minutes (6/27/18)	97
12) CEF Meeting Minutes (6/27/18)	115
EXHIBITS DIVIDER PAGE	vi.
EXHIBIT 1 – Final Program	117
EXHIBIT 2 – Thanks for Generous Support PP	145
<u>MONDAY, June 25, 2018</u>	<u>vii.</u>
EXHIBIT 3 – Midwest Landscape Conservation Working Group Planning Document	151
EXHIBIT 4 – Mid-America Monarch Conservation Strategy PP - Beck	157
EXHIBIT 5 – North Dakota Perspective Monarchs and Pollinators PP – Johnson	161
EXHIBIT 6 – Strength in Numbers PP - Trego	163

TUESDAY, June 26, 2018..... viii.

EXHIBIT 7 – Economic Licensing and Tagging PP - Schaller.....	165
EXHIBIT 8 – State Agencies and AFS PP - Austen	167
EXHIBIT 9 – The Good Old Days of Fishing Are Now PP - Bailey.....	173
EXHIBIT 10 – North Dakota Prairie Moose Report PP - Smith	179
EXHIBIT 11 – The AFWA Strategist Newsletter June 2018	183
EXHIBIT 12 – Letter from AFWA to USFWS on Refuges	185

COMMITTEE REPORTS DIVIDER PAGE ix.

Committee Report List x.

EXHIBIT 13 – CITES.....	187
EXHIBIT 14 – Climate Change Committee Report.....	191
EXHIBIT 15 – Feral Swine Committee Report	197
EXHIBIT 16 – Hunter & Angler Recruitment & Retention Report (R3)	205
EXHIBIT 17 – Deer and Wild Turkey Committee Report.....	211
EXHIBIT 18 – Furbearer Committee Report.....	227
EXHIBIT 19 – Legal Committee Report.....	243
EXHIBIT 20 – Private Lands & Public Lands Committee Report.....	245
EXHIBIT 21 – Law Enforcement Committee Report	259
EXHIBIT 22 – National Conservation Needs Committee Report.....	265
EXHIBIT 23 – Wildlife Action Plan Committee Report	267
EXHIBIT 24 – Wildlife & Fish Health Committee Report	271

EXHIBITS DIVIDER PAGE..... xi.

EXHIBIT 25 – Climate Adaptation Science Centers PP - LeDee	285
EXHIBIT 26 – Overview of WS NWRC Bird and Predator Research PP – Eckery.....	287

EXHIBIT 27 – USFWS Hunting, Angling and Outdoor Recreation Recruitment, Retention and Reactivation Plan – Melius/Hodgson	291
EXHIBIT 28 – Tom Melius Happy Retirement & Award.....	305
EXHIBIT 29 – State of the State Reports	307
EXHIBIT 30 – The World-Class Leader in Conservation PP – Parker MO...	423
EXHIBIT 31 – Nationally Significant Wildlife Health Issues PP – Fischer	425
EXHIBIT 32 – Welcome to North Dakota PP – Paulson	429
EXHIBIT 33 – The Importance of Partnerships in the Prairie Pothole Region PP – Frerichs.....	433
<u>WEDNESDAY, June 27, 2018.....</u>	xii.
BUSINESS MEETING DIVIDER PAGE.....	xiii.
EXHIBIT 34 – Voting Proxy Letters for Business Meeting.....	437
EXHIBIT 35 – Business Meeting Minutes of 2017 Annual Meeting, NE.....	441
EXHIBIT 36 – Treasurer’s Report CY 2017.....	465
EXHIBIT 37 – Three Resolutions (included second one that failed)	475
EXHIBIT 38 – MAFWA Award Winner Report & Nominations (presented at lunch Monday)	479
EXHIBIT 39 – Constitution & By-Laws Committee 2018 Report with proposed changes	511
EXHIBIT 40 – Executive Secretary’s Report PP - Torgerson	525
EXHIBIT 41 – National Wild Pheasant Conservation Plan PP - Taylor.....	531
EXHIBIT 42 – National Wild Pheasant Conservation Plan Annual Report...	533
EXHIBIT 43 – Greater Prairie Chicken and Sharp-tailed Grouse Plan Update – Sexson.....	537
EXHIBIT 44 – RBFF Update – Chanda	539

EXHIBIT 45 – 2019 Proposed Budget.....	543
EXHIBIT 46 – MAFWA Steering Committee on Landscape Collaboration	
Handout	549
APPENDIX.....	xiv.
Appendix A – Photo PowerPoint Presentation	551
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	xv.
Sponsors 2019	557
Thanks.....	Inside Back Cover

**Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies
Annual Meeting
June 24 - June 27, 2018
Ramkota Hotel, Bismarck, North Dakota**

ACTION ITEMS

Wednesday

- < Accepted 2017 minutes from annual business meeting in St. Louis, Missouri (Completed 6/27/18)
- < Voted to accept Treasurer's Report (Completed 6/27/18)
- < Voted to accept Audit Committee Report (Completed 6/27/18)
- < Heard three resolutions and voted to approve two of three resolutions (Completed 6/27/18)
 - Regarding Baiting and Feeding CWD (failed, 7 no, 5 yes, one abstain, with changed passed)
 - CWD and Artificial Movement (approved, two abstain)
 - Thanks North Dakota for Conference (approved)
- < Voted to approve by-law changes as recommended (Completed 6/27/18)
- < Voted to approve Mid-Continent Strategy Report (Completed 6/27/18)
- < Voted to approve Proposed 2019 budget (Completed 6/27/18)

Items heard and/or discussed, but not voted on:

Monday

- < Heard comments from Lt. Governor Brent Sanford (6/25/18)
- < Heard remarks from Greg Sheehan, USFWS (Completed 6/25/18)
- < Heard Panel Discussion on Science Applications (Jim Douglas, NE; Greg Sheehan, USFWS; Dr. Benjamin Tuggle, USFWS; Kelley Myers, USFWS; Kelly Hepler, SD) (Completed 6/25/18)
- < Heard Monarch Conservation Report (Claire Beck, MAFWA Monarch Technical Coordinator) (Completed 6/25/18)
- < Heard North Dakota Pollinator Report (Sandy Johnson, NDGFD) (Completed 6/25/18)
- < Heard Report on Tribal Partnerships (Scott Davis, Executive Director, North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission) (Completed 6/25/18)

Items heard and/or discussed, but not voted on (continued):

- < Presented Awards to Edward McCann, Wisconsin, Law Enforcement Officer of the Year; Nancy Christel, Wisconsin, Wildlife Biologist of the Year; Bruce Drecktrah, Missouri, Fisheries Biologist of the Year; Spirit of the Shack, Danny Hartwig on CWD efforts, Missouri; two Excellence in Conservation were awarded to Michigan DNR Wildlife, Marketing and Outreach Division and Indiana DNR Grasslands for Gamebirds and Songbirds Committee; one Sagamore Award, Keith Sexson, Kansas (16 years); four Special Recognition Awards: Keith Sexson on 50 Years of Service to one agency, Tom Melius, USFWS, John Fischer, SCWDS and St. Louis Zoo for partnership in conservation and recovery of native species, MO; President's Award to Todd Porter, Chairman of ND House Natural Resources Committee; and Past President's Award to Terry Steinwand, North Dakota. (Completed 6/25/18 at lunch)
- < Heard Panel Discussion on Partnerships (Dr. Steve Adair, DU; Rachel Bush, ND PF; Keith Trego, ND Natural Resource Trust; Josh Dukart, former ND Grazing Coalition) (Completed 6/25/18)

Tuesday

- < Discussed and viewed PowerPoint on Electronic Licensing and Tagging (Todd Schaller, WI DNR) (Completed 6/26/18)
- < Discussed and viewed PowerPoint on American Fisheries Society (Doug Austen, AFS) (Completed 6/26/18)
- < Discussed and viewed PowerPoint on Missouri River Fish Research (Paul Bailey, NDGFD) (Completed 6/26/18)
- < Discussed and viewed PowerPoint on Prairie Moose (Jason Smith, NDGFD) (Completed 6/26/18)
- < Heard Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA) report (President Virgil Moore, ID Dept of Fish and Game and Executive Director Ron Regan) (Completed 6/26/18)
- < Heard Committee Reports (Completed 6/26/18)
 - < Heard CITES report (Ollie Torgerson, MAFWA Executive Director)
 - < Heard Climate Change Committee report (Ollie Torgerson, MAFWA Executive Director)
 - < Heard Feral Swine Committee report (Ollie Torgerson, MAFWA Executive Director)
 - < Heard Hunter & Angler Recruitment & Retention Committee report (Ollie Torgerson, MAFWA Executive Director)
 - < Heard Deer and Wild Turkey Study Group report (R.J. Gross, NDGF)
 - < Heard Midwest Furbearer Group report (Stephanie Tucker, NDGF)

Items heard and/or discussed, but not voted on (continued):

- < Heard Legal Committee report (Chris Tymeson, KS Wildlife, Parks & Tourism)
- < Heard Public Lands Working Group report (Kent Luttschwager, NDGF)
- < Heard Private Lands Working Group report (Kevin Kading, NDGF)
- < Heard Law Enforcement Committee (AMGFLEO) report (Bob Timian, NDGF)
- < Heard NCN Committee report (Jim Douglas, NE Game and Parks Commission)
- < Heard State Wildlife Action Plan Technical Working Committee report (Patrick Isakson, NDGF)
- < Heard Wildlife and Fish Health Committee report (Dr. Kelly Straka, MO Dept. of Conservation)
- < Had Federal Partners Session (Completed 6/26/18)
 - < Heard U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) report (Noreen Walsh, Region 6 Director)
 - < Heard U.S. Forest Service (USFS) report (Tracy Grazia, Region 9 Wildlife Program Director)
 - < Heard U.S. Department of Interior report (Olivia LeDee, Acting Director Northeast Climate Adaptation Science Center)
 - < Heard U.S. Department of Agriculture-Animal and Plant Health Inspection Services (APHIS) report (Dr. Doug Eckery, Assistant Director National Wildlife Research Center)
 - < Heard U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) report (Tom Melius, Region 3 Director)
- < Discussed and viewed PowerPoint on Nationally Significant Wildlife Health Issues (Dr. John Fischer, SCWDS) (Completed 6/26/18)
- < Heard Panel Discussion on The Importance of Leveraging Partnerships (John Paulson, USDA Wildlife Service ND; Todd Frerichs, USFWS project leader Audubon National Wildlife Refuge; Tim Sopuck, CEO, Manitoba Habitat Heritage Corporation) (Completed 6/26/18)

Wednesday

- < Heard Awards Committee Report (Completed 6/27/18)
- < Viewed MAFWA Executive Secretary's PowerPoint Report (Completed 6/27/18)
- < Heard update on National Wild Pheasant Plan (Dr. Scott Taylor, National Wild Pheasant Plan Coordinator) (Completed 6/27/18)

Items heard and/or discussed, but not voted on (continued):

- < Heard update on Greater Prairie Chicken and Sharp-tail Grouse Plan (Keith Sexson, KS Dept of Wildlife, Parks & Tourism) (Completed 6/27/18)
- < Heard report on Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference (Sara Parker Pauley, MO Department of Conservation) (Completed 6/27/18)
- < Heard update on Recreation Boating and Fishing Foundation (Dave Chanda, VP State Agency Engagement) (Completed 6/27/18)
- < Passed the gavel to Ohio (Completed 6/27/18)

Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies

Objectives

The objectives of the Association shall be to protect the right of jurisdiction of the Midwestern states over their wildlife resources on public and private lands; to scrutinize carefully state and federal wildlife legislation and regulations and to offer support or opposition to legislative proposals or federal regulations in accordance with the best interests of the Midwestern states; to serve as a clearinghouse for the exchange of ideas concerning wildlife and fisheries management, research techniques, wildlife law enforcement, hunting and outdoor safety, and information and education; and to encourage and assist sportsmen's and conservationists' organizations so that the fullest measure of cooperation may be secured from our citizenry in the protection, preservation, restoration and management of our fish and wildlife resources.

Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies

Mission Statement

Our mission is to provide a forum for state and provincial fish and wildlife agencies to share ideas and information, pool resources, and initiate action to benefit the management and conservation of fish and wildlife resources in the Midwest.

Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies

Meeting Locations and Dates

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Des Moines, Iowa - Savery Hotel
October 28, 1934 | 23. Springfield, Illinois - Hotel St. Nicholas
July 9 - 11, 1956 |
| 2. St. Paul, Minnesota - Hotel Lowry
June 29, 30, 1935 | 24. Park Rapids, Minnesota - Itasca State Park
July 10 - 12, 1957 |
| 3. Madison Wisconsin - State Capitol
June 16, 17, 1936 | 25. Bismarck, North Dakota - Grand Pacific
Hotel, July 10, 11, 1958 |
| 4. Sioux Falls, South Dakota - Carpenter Hotel
June 11 - 13, 1937 | 26. West Lafayette, Indiana - Memorial Center,
Purdue University, July 9, 10, 1959 |
| 5. Omaha, Nebraska - Paxton Hotel
June 8, 9, 1938 | 27. Rapid City, South Dakota - Sheraton
Johnson Hotel, July 17 - 20, 1960 |
| 6. Madison, Wisconsin - State Capitol
June 12, 13, 1939 | 28. Higgins Lake, Michigan - Grand Hotel
July 10 - 12, 1961 |
| 7. Mason City, Iowa - Hotel Hanford
June 17, 18, 1940 | 29. Omaha, Nebraska - Paxton Hotel
July 28 - 30, 1962 |
| 8. St. Louis, Missouri - Statler Hotel
June 4, 5, 1941 | 30. Columbus, Ohio - Neil House Hotel
July 8, 9, 1963 |
| 9. Duluth, Minnesota - Hotel Duluth
June 25, 26, 1942 | 31. Milwaukee, Wisconsin - Milwaukee Inn
July 12 - 15, 1964 |
| 10. Fox Lake, Illinois - Location Unknown
September 21, 1943 | 32. Toronto, Ontario - Westbury Hotel
July 27 - 29, 1965 |
| 11. Bismarck, North Dakota - Location
Unknown, Date Unknown, 1944 | 33. Wichita, Kansas - Hotel Lassen
July 12 - 14, 1966 |
| 12. Indianapolis, Indiana - Location Unknown
Date Unknown, 1945 | 34. Des Moines, Iowa - Hotel Savery
July 25 - 27, 1967 |
| 13. Rapid City, South Dakota - Location
Unknown, Date Unknown, 1946 | 35. Chicago, Illinois - Conrad Hilton Hotel
July 28 - 31, 1968 |
| 14. Roscommon, Michigan - Conservation
Training School, July 14-16, 1947 | 36. St. Louis, Missouri - Sheraton Jefferson
Hotel, July 27 - 30, 1969 |
| 15. Put-in-Bay, Ohio - Location Unknown
July 16, 17, 1948 | 37. Winnipeg, Manitoba - International Inn
July 29 - August 1, 1970 |
| 16. Lincoln, Nebraska - Location Unknown
October 3, 4, 1949 | 38. Aspen, Colorado - Stonebridge Inn
July 19 - 23, 1971 |
| 17. Milwaukee, Wisconsin - Hotel Wisconsin
July 24 - 26, 1950 | 39. Wichita, Kansas - Holiday Inn Plaza
July 25 - 27, 1972 |
| 18. Wichita, Kansas - Broadview Hotel
August 18, 19, 1951 | 40. Bismarck, North Dakota - Holiday Inn
July 16 - 19, 1973 |
| 19. Des Moines, Iowa - Hotel Fort Des Moines
August 15, 16, 1952 | 41. Duluth, Minnesota - Radisson Hotel
July 16 - 18, 1974 |
| 20. Dorset, Ontario - Ontario Forest Ranger
School, August 14, 15, 1953 | 42. Traverse City, Michigan - Holiday Inn
July 21 - 24, 1975 |
| 21. St. Louis, Missouri - Statler Hotel
July 8 - 10, 1954 | 43. Rapid City, South Dakota - Howard Johnson
Motor Inn, July 19 - 22, 1976 |
| 22. Estes Park, Colorado - Stanley Hotel
July 18 - 20, 1955 | 44. Lincoln, Nebraska - Villager Motel
Convention Center, July 18 - 21, 1977 |

45. Milwaukee, Wisconsin - Marc Plaza
July 16 - 19, 1978
46. Nashville, Indiana - Brown County Inn
July 16 - 19, 1979
47. Columbus, Ohio - Hilton Inn East
July 14 - 17, 1980
48. Des Moines, Iowa - Hotel Fort Des Moines
July 13 - 15, 1981
49. Springfield, Illinois - Hilton Hotel
July 12 - 15, 1982
50. Lexington, Kentucky - Radisson Plaza
July 18 - 21, 1983
51. Hannibal, Missouri - Holiday Inn
July 16 - 19, 1984
52. Wichita, Kansas - Hilton Inn East
July 15 - 18, 1985
53. Vail, Colorado - Manor Vail
July 7 - 10, 1986
54. Winnipeg, Manitoba - Holiday Inn
Downtown, July 13 - 16, 1987
55. Bismarck, North Dakota - Sheraton
Bismarck Galleria, July 11 - 14, 1988
56. Duluth, Minnesota - Radisson Hotel
July 10 - 13, 1989
57. Grand Rapids, Michigan - Amway Grand
Plaza Hotel, July 16 - 19, 1990
58. Rapid City, South Dakota - Hotel Alex
Johnson, July 8 - 10, 1991
59. Green Bay, Wisconsin - Embassy Suites
June 28 - 30, 1992
60. Ashland, Nebraska - Eugene T. Mahoney
State Park, July 11 - 13, 1993
61. Estes Park, Colorado - Aspen Lodge
July 10 - 12, 1994
62. Galena, Illinois - DeSoto House
July 9 - 11, 1995
63. South Bend, Indiana - The Works Hotel
July 14 - 16, 1996
64. Des Moines, Iowa - Embassy Suites Hotel
July 13 - 15, 1997
65. Lawrence, Kansas - Eldridge Hotel
July 12 - 14, 1998
66. Louisville, Kentucky - Embassy Suites
July 18 - 20, 1999
67. Petoskey, Michigan - Stafford=s Perry Hotel
July 16 - 18, 2000
68. St. Paul, Minnesota - Radisson City Center
Hotel, July 15 - 17, 2001
69. Springfield, Missouri - Marriott Residence
Inn, July 13 - 16, 2002
70. Omaha, Nebraska - Double Tree Hotel
July 12 - 15, 2003
71. Bismarck, North Dakota - Radisson Hotel
July 11 - 13, 2004
72. Sandusky, Ohio – Sawmill Creek Resort
July 11 – 13, 2005
73. Spearfish, South Dakota – Holiday Inn I-90
July 9 – 12, 2006
74. Minocqua, Wisconsin – The Waters of
Minocqua, July 15 – 18, 2007
75. Estes Park, Colorado – Holiday Inn
June 29 – July 2, 2008
76. Peoria, Illinois – Pere Marquette Hotel
June 28 – July 1, 2009
77. Indianapolis, Indiana – Hyatt Regency
June 27 – June 30, 2010
78. Centerville, Iowa – Honey Creek Resort SP
June 26 – June 29, 2011
79. Wichita, Kansas – Hotel at Old Town
June 24 – June 27, 2012
80. Lexington, Kentucky – Hilton Downtown
June 23 – June 26, 2013
81. Traverse City, Michigan – Park Plaza Hotel
June 22 – June 25, 2014
82. Duluth, Minnesota – Radisson Harborview
June 28 – July 1, 2015
83. Saint Louis, Missouri – Chase Park Plaza
Hotel, June 26 – 29, 2016
84. Ashland, Nebraska – Eugene T. Mahoney SP
June 25 – June 28, 2017
85. Bismarck, North Dakota – Ramkota Hotel
June 24 – 27, 2018

**MAFWA COMMITTEES AND APPOINTED REPRESENTATIVES
2017-18**

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Terry Steinwand (ND), President
Mike Miller (OH), First Vice President
Kelly Hepler (SD), Second Vice President
Jim Douglas (NE), Past President
Keith Sexson (KS), Member
Mark Reiter (IN), Member

AUDIT COMMITTEE:

Mike Miller (OH), Chair
Kurt Thiede (WI), Member
Dale Garner (IA), Member

AWARDS COMMITTEE:

Keith Sexson (KS), Chair
Terry Steinwand (ND), Member
Mark Reiter (IN), Member
Greg Johnson (KY), Member
Jim Leach (MN), Member

BYLAWS COMMITTEE:

Sara Parker Pauley (MO), Chair

INVESTMENTS COMMITTEE:

Kurt Thiede (WI), Chair
Wayne Rosenthal (IL), Member
Jim Douglas (NE), Member

NATIONAL CONSERVATION NEEDS COMMITTEE:

Jim Douglas (NE), Chair
Kelly Hepler (SD), Member
Dale Garner (IA), Member

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE:

Jim Leach (MN), Chair
Sara Parker Pauley (MO), Member
Bill O'Neill (MI), Member

PROGRAM COMMITTEE:

Terry Steinwand (ND), Chair
Jim Douglas (NE)
Mike Miller (OH)

Ollie Torgerson (MAFWA)

CONSERVATION FUND BOARD:

MAFWA Executive Committee (see above)

Kurt Thiede (WI), Member

MAFWA TECHNICAL WORKING COMMITTEES

<u>NAME</u>	<u>DIRECTOR/LIAISON</u>
MIDWEST PRIVATE LANDS WORKING GROUP	WAYNE ROSENTHAL (IL)
MAFWA PUBLIC LANDS WORKING GROUP	MARK REITER, IN
MIDWEST LEGAL COMMITTEE	KEITH SEXSON, KS
ASSN. MIDWEST F&G LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS	WAYNE ROSENTHAL, IL
MIDWEST WILDLIFE AND FISH HEALTH COMMITTEE	DALE GARNER, IA
MIDWEST DEER & WILD TURKEY GROUP	DALE GARNER, IA
MIDWEST FURBEARER GROUP	KURT THIEDE, WI
MAFWA WILDLIFE ACTION PLAN WORKING GROUP	GREG LINK, ND
MAFWA CLIMATE CHANGE COMMITTEE	DON PEREIRA, MN
MAFWA HUNTER & ANGLER RECRUITMENT & RETENTION	MARK REITER, IN
NATIONAL CONSERVATION	MAFWA President

NEEDS (NCN) COMMITTEE

MIDWEST CITES

MAFWA President

OFFICIAL MAFWA REPRESENTATIVES

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CLIMATE CHANGE & NATURAL RESOURCE
SCIENCE:**

Rick Schneider (NE)

AFWA CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE TASK FORCE:

Dan Grove (ND)

Tom DeLiberto (APHIS-WS)

AFWA FARM BILL WORKING GROUP:

Greg Hoch (MN)

Michael Parker (MI)

AFWA SCIENCE AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE:

Gary Whelan (MI)

Paul Telander (MN)

**AMERICAN WILDLIFE CONSERVATION PARTNER'S HUNTING &
SHOOTING SPORTS ROUNDTABLE**

Mark Reiter (IN)

CITES:

Carolyn Caldwell (OH)

ESA JOINT TASK FORCE:

Sara Parker Pauley (MO)

FEDERAL BUDGET:

Jim Leach (MN)

FEDERAL AID JOINT TASK FORCE:

Jim Douglas (NE)

HUNTER ACCESS:

Tom Kirschenmann (SD)

MONARCH JOINT VENTURE STEERING COMMITTEE:

Jim Douglas (NE)

NATIONAL BOBWHITE CONSERVATION INITIATIVE:

Jim Douglas (NE)

NATIONAL CLIMATE ADAPTATION JOINT IMPLEMENTATION WG

Vacant

NATIONAL COOPERATOR'S COALITION:

Ollie Torgerson (MAFWA)

NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE HEALTH INITIATIVE

Kelly Hepler (SD)

NATIONAL FISH HABITAT BOARD:

Jim Leach (MN)

NATIONAL GRANTS COMMITTEE:

Dale Garner (IA)

NATIONAL LCC COUNCIL:

Vacant

NATIONAL WHITE NOSE SYNDROME EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Mark Reiter (IN)

RESERVOIR FISH HABITAT PARTNERSHIP:

Doug Nygren (KS)

SOUTHERN WINGS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE:

Craig Thompson, (WI)

STATE WILDLIFE ACTION PLAN REVIEW TEAM:

Mark Reiter (IN)

WIND ENERGY:

Rob Manes (TNC)

PRESIDENT'S AD HOC COMMITTEES

FERAL SWINE COMMITTEE:

Steve Backs (IN), Chair

CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS



MIDWEST ASSOCIATION OF FISH & WILDLIFE AGENCIES

JUNE, 2017

CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS
MIDWEST ASSOCIATION OF FISH & WILDLIFE AGENCIES

PREAMBLE

The name of this organization shall be the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (Association). The Association shall be organized and operated as a non-profit professional association as described in 501(c)(6) of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code with the purpose of promoting the protection, preservation, restoration and management of fish and wildlife resources.

The Conservation Enhancement Fund (Fund) shall be organized and operated as a non-profit charitable organization as described in 501(c)3 of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code.

The Association and the Fund were incorporated in the State of Kansas on August 19, 2005. The Association and the Fund shall comply with K.S.A. 17-1759, et seq., known as the "Charitable Organizations and Solicitations Act." To the extent these bylaws conflict with a provision of the Act, the Act shall govern.

The objectives of the Association shall be:

- (a) to protect the right of jurisdiction of the Midwestern states over their wildlife resources on public and private lands;
- (b) to scrutinize carefully state and federal wildlife legislation and regulations and to offer support or opposition to legislative proposals or federal regulations in accordance with the best interests of the Midwestern states;
- (c) to serve as a clearinghouse for the exchange of ideas concerning wildlife and fisheries management, research techniques, wildlife law enforcement, hunting and outdoor safety, and information and education;
- (d) and to encourage and assist sportsmen's and conservationists' organizations so that the fullest measure of cooperation may be secured from our citizenry in the protection, preservation, restoration and management of our fish and wildlife resources.

The Association met for the first time on October 28, 1934 in Des Moines, Iowa. At that time the group was known as the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners. The Association first received its non-profit status in 1968. The Association's name was changed to the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Commissioners in 1972, to the Association of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Agencies in 1977, and to the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies in 2001.

ARTICLE I

OFFICERS

Section 1. The Officers of the Association shall be President, First Vice-President, and Second Vice-President. The President and both Vice-Presidents shall be the duly authorized voting representative of their member state or province and shall be selected on an alphabetical rotation basis, with the First Vice-President being from the state or province next in order of rotation following the President and the Second Vice-President being from the state or province next in rotation following the First Vice-President. The term of office shall commence 30 days following adjournment of the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies' (AFWA) annual meeting and conclude 30 days following adjournment of the succeeding annual AFWA meeting. The First Vice-President shall automatically succeed to President if he/she remains eligible. In the event that the President separates from a member agency (or is replaced by that agency), the First Vice-President shall fulfill the remaining term, followed by their regular term.

Section 2. The Board of Directors shall be composed of the officers identified in Article I, Section 1 and one representative from each state and province except those represented by the officers. Such state or provincial Board member shall be the chief executive officer of the fish and wildlife agency of his/her state or province, or his/her designee. A Board member may, by written notification to the President, designate a voting proxy from the Board member's state or province. However, Executive Committee members may not designate a proxy for the conduct of Executive Committee business.

ARTICLE II

OTHER ASSOCIATION POSITIONS

Section 1. The Association shall establish the position of "Treasurer." An Association member agency may provide an individual to serve in this capacity or the Association may contract with a member agency or an individual to fill this position. This is a nonvoting position.

Section 2. The Association shall also establish the position of "Executive Secretary." An Association member agency may provide an individual to serve in this capacity or the Association may contract with a member agency or an individual to fill the position. This is a nonvoting position.

Section 3. The Association may establish the position of "Recording Secretary." This is a nonvoting position.

ARTICLE III

MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. Membership shall be by states and provinces and representation of each state and province at meetings shall be by its duly authorized representative or representatives.

Section 2. The area of membership in the Association shall be the states of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin, and the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Ontario and such additional states and provinces as may request membership and be elected by majority vote of the member states and provinces in annual meeting.

Section 3. Membership in the Association of an individual shall terminate upon the expiration of the member's term of office as a state fish and wildlife administrator.

Section 4. Other professional organizations may be granted affiliate membership in the Association based upon demonstration that the Constitution and Bylaws of said organizations meet the basic standards of the Association. Application for affiliate membership shall be forwarded to the Executive Secretary at least 90 days prior to a regular meeting of the Association and shall include a current Constitution and Bylaws and a letter stating the organization's justification for affiliate membership. Affiliate membership shall be voted on by the voting representatives and must attain a majority vote of a quorum. Affiliated membership dues shall be \$75.00 per year; however, this fee may be waived by a majority vote of a quorum. The fee is automatically waived for affiliated conservation agencies or organizations that provide annual financial resources to support the Association through the following sponsorships: Major Sponsor (\$5,000 or more); Gold Sponsor (\$3,000-4,999); Silver Sponsor (\$2,000-2,999); Bronze Sponsor (\$1,000-1,999); and Sponsor (\$500-999).

ARTICLE IV

DUTIES OF OFFICERS and OTHER POSITIONS

Section 1. The President shall preside at all meetings of the Association, appoint all special committees, preside at meetings of the Board of Directors, and perform such other duties as are naturally incumbent upon the office to serve the Association and the Fund. Copies of the annual proceedings shall be forwarded to each member in good standing, with the cost of preparation and handling to be paid out of Association funds. All other copies are for distribution at the discretion of the host state or province.

Section 2. The First Vice-President shall perform the duties of the President in the

latter's absence, and specific duties may be assigned as deemed necessary by the President.

Section 3. The Board of Directors shall conduct the business of the Association.

Section 4. The Executive Secretary shall perform the following services for the Association and the Fund:

- (1) Function as the official "Executive Secretary" for the Association carrying out liaison services by keeping in communication via e-mail, mailings, phone contact and personal visits with member Directors, or their designated representatives, to enhance the viability of the Association.
- (2) Work to obtain direct involvement and commitment of member Directors and affiliate leaders to build strength in the Association as a leading force in the Midwest on behalf of fish and wildlife issues.
- (3) Assist the Executive Director of the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies in coordinating actions and communications relevant to the Midwest Association.
- (4) Respond to inquiries for information regarding the Association and the Fund and to routine correspondence.
- (5) Develop and maintain a web site for the Association.
- (6) Carry out directives of the President and/or Executive Committee of the Association.
- (7) Assist with the scheduling of meetings and conference calls and notify appropriate members.
- (8) Record minutes in the absence of the Recording Secretary.
- (9) Provide such other services as may be mutually agreed upon by both parties.

Section 5. The Recording Secretary shall perform the following services:

- (1) Record and publish the annual proceedings of the Association.
- (2) Record and retain the minutes of all meetings of the Association,

and perform such other duties as are naturally incumbent upon the office.

- (3) Assist other officers and positions with correspondence and record keeping.
- (4) Serve as the custodian of all permanent files and records of the Association.
- (5) Other duties as assigned by the President.

Section 6. The Treasurer shall perform the following services for the Association and the Fund:

- (1) Be custodian of all funds of the Association and the Fund.
- (2) Establish and have access to Association and Fund bank accounts.
- (3) Draw all warrants for payment of claims properly presented and expend funds necessary to pay appropriately invoiced bills, provided such warrants are signed by a director selected and approved by the Executive Committee.
- (4) Invoice members and sponsors and collect dues and funds.
- (5) Review monthly account reports and monitor income and expenditures.
- (6) Prepare reports to the Executive Committee detailing income, expenditures and asset values.
- (7) Prepare and present annual budgets, financial and audit reports.
- (8) Perform record-keeping, reporting and filing actions to ensure the Association complies with its governing documents and any other relevant laws or regulations, including but not limited to any required filings with the state of Kansas or the Internal Revenue Service to maintain the Association's status as a tax-exempt non-profit organization and legal entity, and provide a report of any such required actions to the Executive Committee at its next meeting.
- (9) Develop, present and oversee budgets, accounts and financial statements.

- (10) Ensure that appropriate accounting procedures and controls are in place.
- (11) Serve as liaison with any staff and volunteers about Association and Fund financial matters.
- (12) Monitor the Association's investment activity and ensure its consistency with the Association's policies and legal responsibilities; liaise with the Investments Committee and review reports submitted thereby.
- (13) Ensure independent examination or audits are executed and any recommendations are implemented; provide report of results at the regular annual meeting.
- (14) Make formal presentation of the accounts at the regular annual meeting and more frequently as requested by the Executive Secretary, the President or the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE V

MEETINGS

One regular meeting shall be held annually. The meeting will be held in and hosted by the state or province in which the President has administrative responsibility, or in such other locations designated by the Association. It is the intent of the Association that the costs of the annual meetings and related business functions may be paid by the Association. When necessary, special meetings may be called by the President or the Executive Secretary. Members shall be given 90 days' notice of regular annual meetings; 60 days' notice for special, in-person meetings; and five days' notice for special, telephonic meetings and telephonic meetings of the Executive Committee.

The Association may authorize members, affiliates and other groups to exhibit at its meetings, subject to the Exhibitor/Sponsor Policy approved by the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE VI

VOTING

Voting shall be by states and provinces, as units. Each state and province shall have one vote. All voting shall be by voice vote, except that a reasonable request by any member state or province for a secret ballot shall be honored. Any matters of Association business requiring action in the interim between meetings may be handled by the Executive Committee, by majority vote of that committee.

ARTICLE VII

DUES

Annual Dues shall be \$3,800 per member state and \$100 per province, payable in advance, at, or before each annual meeting; provided that annual dues may be suspended for any given year by a majority vote of a quorum. Dues shall be adjusted annually by the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) in the Midwest published by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. Dues shall be adjusted using the annual change in the CPI-U for the month of January of the previous fiscal year. The annual dues for the upcoming year shall be reported at the Association's regular annual meeting by the Treasurer.

ARTICLE VIII

FISCAL YEAR

The fiscal year of the Association shall be January 1 through December 31.

ARTICLE IX

QUORUM

A quorum is defined as a simple majority of the states.

ARTICLE X

AMENDMENT

The Constitution and Bylaws (Bylaws) of the Association may be amended at any regular meeting by a majority vote of a quorum; provided, however, a written copy of such proposed amendment shall have been received by the President and the Executive Secretary and sent to members at least 30 days before the regular annual meeting or special meeting called for that purpose; and provided that such changes shall be effective only to the extent they are authorized by applicable law. Proposed Bylaws amendments should be presented to, or generated by, the Bylaws Committee and reviewed by the Executive Committee prior to submitting to voting members of the Association for their consideration. With approval of the First Vice-President, the President may call for voting by mail (including electronic mail) in lieu of a meeting. In this event, the 30-day notice shall still apply, the date of opening ballots shall be previously announced, notice sent to each member within forty-eight hours of vote tabulation by the Executive Secretary and all ballots shall be kept for one year following the vote.

ARTICLE XI

TYPES OF COMMITTEES/BOARDS

Section 1. There shall be three kinds of committees: Standing, President's Ad Hoc, and Technical Working.

Section 2. The following Standing Committees shall be appointed by the incoming President within 30 days after assuming office, they shall serve during the period intervening between annual meetings and at such meetings, or until the purpose of each such committee has been accomplished and it has been discharged by the President.

- A. The Executive Committee shall be composed of six members of the Association: The President, First Vice President, Second Vice-President, immediate Past President, and two other members to be appointed by the President with specific consideration for geographical balance. Any state or province represented on the Executive Committee by more than one individual shall be restricted to a single vote on this committee. The Executive Committee shall have general supervision of the affairs of the Association between its business meetings, make recommendations to the Association as necessary and shall perform such other duties as may be specified in these bylaws. The Executive Committee shall be subject to the orders of the Board of Directors and none of its acts shall conflict with action taken by the Board of Directors. Special meetings of the Executive Committee may be called by the President as necessary. The Executive Committee may also act via conference call or by mail (including electronic mail). In the event that an officer of the Association or the immediate Past President separates from a member agency (or is replaced by that agency), their replacement in a member agency shall serve for the remainder of their term, with the exception of President. If the President separates from a member agency (or is replaced by that agency), their replacement in a member agency will serve in their place on the Executive Committee for the remainder of the term as a Special Board Member with voting rights, and the First Vice-President will succeed to President for the remainder of the term.
- B. The Auditing Committee shall be composed of three members: The First Vice President of the Association, who shall act as chairman, and two other members to be appointed by the President. The Auditing Committee shall audit the financial records of the Association annually and report the result of its audit at the annual regular meeting.

- C. The Resolutions Committee shall be composed of three members, one of which shall be designated as Chairman by the President. Copies of proposed resolutions should be received by the President and the Executive Secretary and sent to members for their consideration at least 30 days before the regular annual meeting. Courtesy resolutions and resolutions of a last minute nature may be recommended to the Board of Directors at the annual meeting. Furthermore, proposed resolutions for which an urgent need arises between annual meetings may be presented to the Board of Directors for consideration via mail (including electronic mail), provided members are given a 15-day notice. Members shall be notified of the vote outcome by the Executive Secretary within forty-eight hours of vote tabulation.
- D. The Awards Committee shall be composed of five members, one of which shall be designated as Chairman by the President. The Awards Committee shall administer the official annual awards program of the Association.
- E. The Bylaws Committee shall be composed of at least one member, designated by the President. The Bylaws Committee shall recommend Bylaws changes to the Executive Committee for consideration.
- F. The Investments Committee shall be composed of three members. The President shall designate one of the members as Chairman. The purpose of the committee is to review investments, including the Jaschek portfolio, the Conservation Enhancement Fund, and other permanent assets of the Association and make recommendations to the Association per the investment policy statement. The Investments Committee shall make an annual report to the Board of Directors at the annual meeting.
- G. The Conservation Enhancement Fund shall be overseen by a Board of Directors. The Board of Directors shall be comprised of the Executive Committee plus one additional Association member appointed by the President. The purpose of the Fund shall be to support those activities of the Association which maintain and enhance the capability of all member states and provinces to develop and implement comprehensive fish and wildlife programs for all species of wildlife and their habitats. The Conservation Enhancement Fund Committee shall make recommendations for expenditures from the Fund for consideration by the Board of Directors at the regular annual meeting. The Committee shall report its activities, including no activity in the event there are no funds in the Fund, annually to the Board of Directors when making its recommendations.
- H. The Program Committee shall be comprised of four members, one from the host state of the previous annual meeting, one from the host state of the current annual meeting, one from the host state of the next annual meeting, and the Executive Secretary. The purpose of the committee is to assist the host state with

developing presentation and discussion topics and suggesting speakers for the non-business portion of the meeting.

Section 3. Ad Hoc Committees may be established as deemed necessary by the President of the Association or vote of the Members and shall serve until the purpose of each such committee has been accomplished and it has been discharged by the President or by vote of the Members.

Section 4. The Association may establish Technical Working Committees as deemed necessary to conduct the affairs of the Association. Upon establishment, these committees shall adhere to the following:

- A. Within one year from establishment, each committee shall submit to the Association for approval a Mission Statement, a list of specific responsibilities, and a description of operating procedures that will become part of the official minutes of the Association.
- B. All Technical Working Committees shall submit a written report electronically to the President and the Executive Secretary 30 days in advance of the annual meeting of the Association and may choose to conduct necessary committee business during the period between annual meetings as per their approved operating procedures.
- C. Each Technical Working Committee shall be automatically abolished by the first of August every three years unless reinstated by vote of the Association. As the end of the third year approaches, the Association shall assess the merits of reinstating the Technical Working Committee.
- D. Resolutions from Technical Working Committees for Association action shall be submitted to the Chair of the Resolutions Committee 30 days in advance of the annual meeting for consideration by the Board of Directors.

The Association recognizes the following Technical Working Committees (year of automatic abolishment in parentheses):

Climate Change (2019)
Legal Committee (2020)
National Conservation Need (NCN) Committee (2020)
Midwest Private Lands Wildlife Management Group (2018)
Midwest Public Lands Technical Working Committee (2019)
Midwest Wildlife and Fish Health Committee (2019)
Midwest Deer and Wild Turkey Study Group (2020)
Association of Midwest Fish and Game Law Enforcement Officers (2020)
Midwest Furbearer Group (2018)

Wildlife Action Plan Technical Working Committee (2018)
Hunter and Angler Recruitment and Retention Technical Working Group (2020)

A R T I C L E X I I

PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

The rules contained in the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised shall govern the Association in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with these bylaws and any special rules of order the Association may adopt.

Adopted 1936
Amended 1942
Amended 1944
Amended 1949
Amended 1954
Amended 1960
Amended 1964
Amended 1969
Amended 1971
Amended 1972
Amended 1975
Amended 1976
Amended 1977
Amended 1978
Amended 1980
Amended 1987
Amended 1993
Amended 1995
Amended 1996
Amended 2000
Amended 2001
Amended July 16, 2003
Amended July 13, 2004
Amended July 13, 2005
Amended July 12, 2006
Amended July 18, 2007
Amended July 2, 2008
Amended July 1, 2009
Amended December 23, 2009
Amended June 29, 2011
Amended June 27, 2012
Amended June 26, 2013

Amended June 25, 2014
Amended July 1, 2015
Amended June 29, 2016
Amended June 28, 2017

**Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies
85th Annual Meeting
Ramkota Hotel & Conference Center, Bismarck, ND
Attendance Roster**

Steve Adair
Ducks Unlimited
cmiller@ducks.org

Andy Alban
South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks
andy.alban@state.sd.us

Casey Anderson
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
canderson@nd.gov

Abby Arnold
American Wind Wildlife Institute
aarnold@awwi.org

Duane Arp
Nebraska Game and Parks Commission
duane.arp@nebraska.gov

Doug Austen
American Fisheries Society
dausten@fisheries.org

Paul Bailey
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
pbailey@nd.gov

Steve Beam
Kentucky Fish & Wildlife Resources
steve.beam@ky.gov

Claire Beck
Midwest Assn. of Fish & Wildlife Agencies
claire.beck@dnr.state.oh.us

Craig Bihrlé
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
cbihrlé@nd.gov

Todd Bishop
Iowa Department of Natural Resources
Todd.Bishop@dnr.iowa.gov

Ed Boggess
Midwest Assn. of Fish & Wildlife Agencies
edward.boggess@gmail.com

David Brakhage
Ducks Unlimited
dbrakhage@ducks.org

Aaron Buchholz
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
kelsey.pickart@wisconsin.gov

Rachel Bush
Pheasants Forever
rbush@pheasantsforever.org

Dave Chanda
Recreation Boating & Fishing Foundation
dchanda@rbff.org

Nancy Christel
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
nancy.christel@wisconsin.gov

Bill Creighton
Dakota Partners
bill.creighton@gmail.com

Craig Czarnecki
US Fish & Wildlife Service
tammy_mealman@fws.gov

Kevin Davis
Texas Parks and Wildlife
kevin.davis@tpwd.texas.gov

Evan Denning
Guest of Mitch King

Randy Doman
Missouri Department of Conservation
Randy.Doman@mdc.mo.gov

Jim Douglas
Nebraska Game and Parks Commission
sherl.henderson@nebraska.gov

Bruce Drecktrah
Missouri Department of Conservation
bruce.drecktrah@mdc.mo.gov

Doug Eckery
USDA/APHIS/NWRC
Douglas.C.Eckery@aphis.usda.gov

Marty Egeland
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
megeland@nd.gov

John Fischer
SCWDS
jfischer@uga.edu

Dan Forster
Archery Trade Association

Greg Freeman
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
gfreeman@nd.gov

Dale Garner
Iowa Department of Natural Resources
dale.garner@dnr.iowa.gov

James (Barry) Grand
U.S. Geological Survey
barry_grand@usgs.gov

Tracy Grazia
USDA Forest Service
tgrazia@fs.fed.us

RJ Gross
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
ragross@nd.gov

Rafael Gutierrez
Illinois Conservation Police
Rafael.Gutierrez@illinois.gov

Bill Hale
Oklahoma Dept of Wildlife
bill.hale@odwc.ok.gov

Brayden Hammock
Guest of Mitch King

Nate Harling
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
nharling@nd.gov

Willie Harris
USDA APHIS Wildlife Services
allen.t.boyer@aphis.usda.gov

Danny Hartwig
Missouri Department of Conservation
Danny.Hartwig@mdc.mo.gov

Kelly Hepler
South Dakota Game, Fish, & Parks
rachel.comes@state.sd.us

Kelsey Hersey
Brandt Information Services
kelsey.hersey@brandtinfo.com

Joel Hodgdon
Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation
jhodgdon@congressionalsportsmen.org

James Hodgson
US Fish and Wildlife Service
jim_hodgson@fws.gov

Mike Hubbard
Missouri Department of Conservation
Mike.Hubbard@mdc.mo.gov

Patrick Isakson
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
pisakson@nd.gov

Levi Jacobson
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
lcjacobson@nd.gov

Sandy Johnson
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
sajohnson@nd.gov

Jason Jones
Texas Parks and Wildlife
jason.jones@tpwd.texas.gov

Tisma Juett
National Shooting Sports Foundation
tjuett@nssf.org

Kevin Kading
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
kkading@nd.gov

Sheila Kemmis
Kansas Dept. of Wildlife, Parks & Tourism
Sheila.Kemmis@ks.gov

Dan Kemmis
Guest of Sheila Kemmis

Mitch King
Airgun Sporting Association
mitch@airgunsporting.org

Carla King
Guest of Mitch King

Page Klug
USDA-APHIS-Wildlife Service NWRC
page.e.klug@aphis.usda.gov

Bruce Kreft
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
bkreft@nd.gov

James Kurth
US Fish and Wildlife Service
roslyn_sellers@fws.gov

Jim Leach
Minnesota DNR Div. of Fish and Wildlife
Jim.Leach@state.mn.us

Olivia Ledee
Northeast Climate Adaptation Science Cntr
oledee@usgs.gov

Greg Link
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
glink@nd.gov

Eric Lobner
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
eric.lobner@wisconsin.gov

Jeffrey Long
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
jrlong@nd.gov

Melissa Long
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
malong@nd.gov

Roger Luebbert
Midwest Assn. of Fish & Wildlife Agencies
Roger.Luebbert@mdc.mo.gov

Jason Lupardus
National Wild Turkey Federation
jlupardus@nwtf.net

Kent Luttschwager
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
kluttschwager@nd.gov

David Malloch
Michigan DNR - Law Enforcement Division
mallochd@michigan.gov

Charlie Mattheis
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
cmattheis@nd.gov

Justin Mattson
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
jdmattson@nd.gov

Tim McCoy
Nebraska Game and Parks Commission
tim.mccoy@nebraska.com

Ross Melinchuk
National Wild Turkey Federation
rmelinchuk@nwtf.net

Tom Melius
US Fish and Wildlife Service
Tom_Melius@fws.gov

Michael Miller
Ohio Division of Wildlife
Michael.Miller@dnr.state.oh.us

Virgil Moore
Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies
virgil.moore@idfg.idaho.gov

Joe Morelock
Illinois Conservation Police
joe.morelock@illinois.gov

William Moritz
Wildlife Management Institute
bmoritz@wildlifemgt.org

Tiffany Muellner
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
tmuellner@nd.gov

Caroline Murphy
The Wildlife Society
cmurphy@wildlife.org

Kelley Myers
US Fish and Wildlife Service
kelley_myers@fws.gov

William O'Neill
Michigan Department of Natural Resources
oneillw@michigan.gov

Jason Ott
Kansas Dept. of Wildlife, Parks & Tourism
jason.ott@ks.gov

Chad Parent
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
cparent@nd.gov

Forrest Parker
Union Sportsmen's Alliance
forrestp@unionsportsmen.org

Sara Pauley
Missouri Department of Conservation
Sara.Pauley@mdc.mo.gov

Scott Pauley
Guest of Sara Pauley

John Paulson
USDA/APHIS/Wildlife Services
john.d.paulson@aphis.usda.gov

Samantha Pedder
Council to Advance Hunting and the
Shooting Sports
samantha@cahss.org

Scott Peterson
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
speterso@nd.gov

Alegra Powers
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
apowers@nd.gov

Ryan Powers
USDA APHIS Wildlife Services
ryan.a.powers@aphis.usda.gov

Tiff Quast
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
tquast@nd.gov

Ron Regan
Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies
rregan@fishwildlife.org

Alan Reile
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
areile@nd.gov

Dale Repnow
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
drepnow@nd.gov

Michael Reynolds
Ohio Division of Wildlife
Michael.Reynolds@dnr.state.oh.us

Eric Richey
Sovereign Sportsman Solutions
erichey@s3gov.com

Wayne Rosenthal
Illinois Department of Natural Resources
dnr.director@illinois.gov

Tiffani Santagati
Brandt Information Services
tiffanis@brandtinfo.com

Todd Schaller
Wisconsin Dept. of Natural Resources
todd.schaller@wisconsin.gov

Keith Sexson
Kansas Dept. of Wildlife, Parks & Tourism
keith.sexson@ks.gov

Gregory Sheehan
US Fish and Wildlife Service
gregory_sheehan@fws.gov

Dean Smith
Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies
info@woodwaterconsulting.ca

Rodmen Smith
Minnesota Dept of Natural Resources ENF
rochelle.day@state.mn.us

Jason Smith
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
jrsmith@nd.gov

Tim Sopuck
Manitoba Habitat Heritage Corporation
tsopuck@mhhc.mb.ca

Ray St. Germain
Kalkomey Enterprises LLC
rstgermain@kalkomey.com

Terry Steinwand
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
tsteinwa@nd.gov

Craig Stover
Nebraska Game and Parks Commission
craig.stover@nebraska.gov

Dr. Kelly Straka
Michigan Dept. of Natural Resources
strakak1@michigan.gov

Jason Suckow
USDA, APHIS, Wildlife Services
jason.suckow@aphis.usda.gov

Jeff Swearngin
Iowa Department of Natural Resources
jeffrey.swearngin@dnr.iowa.gov

Michael Szymanski
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
mszymanski@nd.gov

Scott Taylor
MAFWA/Pheasants Forever
staylor@pheasantsforever.org

John Thomas
Brandt Information Services, LLC.
johnt@brandtinfo.com

Susan Thomas
Guest of John Thomas

Bob Thompson
Colorado Parks and Wildlife
bob.thompson@state.co.us

Robert Timian
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
rtimian@nd.gov

Lynn Timm
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
ltimm@nd.gov

Ollie Torgerson
Midwest Assn. of Fish & Wildlife Agencies
Ollie.Torgerson@wi.gov

Keith Trego
North Dakota Natural Resources Trust
keith@naturalresourcestrust.com

Stephanie Tucker
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
satucker@nd.gov

Benjamin Tuggle
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
benjamin_tuggle@fws.gov

Christopher Tymeson
Kansas Dept. of Wildlife, Parks & Tourism
toni.tabor@yahoo.com

Noreen Walsh
US Fish and Wildlife Service
noreen_walsh@fws.gov

Jeb Williams
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
jwilliam@nd.gov

Scott Winkelman
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
swinkelman@nd.gov

Richard Wise
Brandt Information Services, LLC.
richardw@brandtinfo.com

Charlie Wooley
US Fish and Wildlife Service
charles_wooley@fws.gov

Amanda Wuestefeld
Indiana Department of Natural Resources
awuestefeld@dnr.in.gov

Rick Young
Pheasants Forever
ryoung@pheasantsforever.org

MAFWA Executive Committee Meeting
Sunday, June 24, 2018
Ramkota Inn and Conference Center
Lamborn Room
Bismarck, ND

Call to Order – President Terry Steinwand called the meeting to order at 5:03 p.m.

Quorum – Terry Steinwand, North Dakota; Mark Miller, Ohio; Kelly Hepler, South Dakota; Jim Douglas, Nebraska; and Keith Sexson, Kansas. Also present were Ollie Torgerson, Executive Secretary, Roger Luebbert, Treasurer and Sheila Kemmis, Secretary. Guests: Ed Boggess, Claire Beck, Bill Moritz, Amanda Wuestefeld (for Mark Reiter), Sara Parker Pauley, Dale Garner and Greg Sheehan.

Agenda Review – Terry – After proposed budget, Greg will say a few words.

Approval of May 29, 2018 Executive Committee Minutes – *Kelly Hepler, SD moved to approve the minutes; Mike Miller, OH second. Motion passes.*

Financial Report – MAFWA Treasurer Roger Luebbert presented the financial report - As of June 4: First page is **Banking Services Account**, beginning balance as of May 9 was \$151,383; receipts included Conservation Leadership for Tomorrow (CLfT) from Wisconsin \$10,626, Pheasant Coordinator contributions from Michigan and Missouri \$6,000, and interest of \$26 for total receipts of \$16,552; disbursement included Conservation Leadership for Tomorrow (CLfT) for Michigan and Wisconsin \$20,000, Michigan fee overpayment refund of \$36, and Pheasants Forever for National Pheasant Coordinator \$20,458, for total disbursements of \$40,624; for balance of \$127,312. Note: designations total of \$115,789. In the **Conference Account**, beginning balance of \$157,878; receipts included 2018 North Dakota conference registrations \$8,400 and sponsors \$19,500, and interest of \$29, for total receipts of \$27,929; disbursements included for ND conference - Delaney \$1,619, credit card fees \$627, other conference expenses \$6,465, Executive Salary: pay \$4,900 and travel of \$289; and Treasurer: pay \$1,904, for total disbursements of \$15,803; balance of \$170,004. In **Federal Account**, beginning balance of \$58,988; receipts from USFWS reimbursement for monarch state liaison \$9,399, NFWF reimbursement of monarch conservation strategy of \$10,530, and interest of \$10, for total receipts of \$19,939; disbursements to pay monarch technical coordinator \$12,630 and travel \$1,060, pay for monarch state liaison \$10,400 and travel \$2,124, and Monarch planning travel \$4,808, and National Wildlife Federation \$5,000; for total disbursements of \$36,023, for total balance as of \$42,905; designations of ending balance is state cash matching contribution for NFWA monarch conservation strategy of \$28,276. **Southern Wings Account**, no activity. **Credit Union Share Account**, no activity, required to keep \$25. The **Money Market and Securities Account**, beginning balance as of March 31, \$451,326, receipts include interest \$417, dividends of \$103, for total receipts of \$521; no disbursements; change in market value of \$537, for balance as of April 30 \$452,384. **Conservation Enhancement Account**, beginning balance as of March 31, 2017, only get quarterly statements so expect statement first part of July. *Jim Douglas, NE moved to accept the financial report; Kelly Hepler, SD second. Motion passes.*

2019 MAFWA Proposed Budget – Roger – Budget similar to what we went over in May, on page one, 2017 budget versus actual page, no changes. Page two is current year budget and actual disbursements as of June 4, 2018. Third page is 2019 proposed budget and the method we use is the best number available and the description column identifies the source we use for each line. On receipt side, line 2, is sponsors, in May \$47,000, now \$56,000; line 34 estimated receipts over disbursements is \$6,598, line 34, Overall the proposed budget for disbursements is \$152,567, which allows a positive balance of \$6,598, in May that was only \$800. Terry – This goes to full membership, need motion to send it to them. *Keith Sexson, KS moved, Mike Miller, OH second. Motion passes.* Kelly – Roger suggested review of budget in May as follow up in minutes.

Greg Sheehan – In process of working on evaluation or development of proposal to consider delisting of gray wolf, expect that later this year, range-wide across the U.S., here in Midwest in Great Lakes should be interested in that. Have a team involved for some time, targeted later this calendar year. Have already been some requests for data calls and could be more calls along the way. Always litigation that comes with apex predators, last proposal to delist range-wide was in 2013, came out for public comment and never saw the light of day, hope this one is resolved. Kelly – Thanks for doing that. What do you need from the states, last time you got hammered on this, to say this is a good thing? Greg – Public comments last time came back with states saying this is great and NGOs too, but environmental side came back with six reasons why this was technically, illegally, indefensible. Think out loud and get substance to the comments for those who can. Those that don't have wolves can also provide something with teeth to it, so it doesn't look like cheerleaders versus science. Ollie – When USFWS sued last time on wolf delisting, our Association filed an amicus brief to the court in support and we can do that again. Carol Bamberg helped us with that and we filed as a friend of the court. Greg – Helps and gets different people from Department of Justice involved. The one overturned by the courts a year ago in western Great Lakes said not big enough or broad enough conversations about the other populations across the country so couldn't support in western Great Lakes States without how this was range-wide. Range-wide now and covers all the species but does not include subspecies of Mexican wolf. Contact me if questions or comments. Working on lesser prairie chicken (LPC), supposed to have 12-month decision last September, have not issued that yet, working on species status assessment and other aspects involving LPC. American burying beetle working on down listing or delisting but will be tied up in litigation as well. Monarch, doing conservation for evaluation. LCCs, Jim Douglas and others have stepped up nationally to help the states and to revamp that program, landscape conservation program. The federal program didn't quite work as intended, in this case bring states to the table, never were in 2010 in my opinion, some states were, but not all, doing a redo on that. I wanted to recognize and thank Jim. President's budget and what Congress approved are quite different, still working through that. Starting on 2020 budget, but right now 2018 deviates by \$340 million from President's 2019 budget, a lot of money to figure out. Indications for 2020 will be for large reductions again, not out for many months, but working behind the scenes right now. Terry – What is total budget? Greg – About \$1.1 billion in PR/DJ balance, with a \$350 million cut. Congress raised budget in 2018 versus 2017, for needed maintenance. Continue to work through that. Sportsman's Act, want to make sure all of you have been contacted by USFWS to talk about needs and expectations for access and for regulatory comments. Kelly – Had discussions on where that is at, will update you on

that later. Greg – Movement to increase opportunities for fish and wildlife is intended to benefit you as state directors. As state director, 93 percent of my budget came from finding money and a big part of that was licenses to match PR/DJ. We are not trying to force anything on you, but lots of regulations out there, trying to follow some of your regulations where it makes sense. We had 248,000 acres, last year 132,000 and expect go up next year. A number of regulations in the works, ESA regulations, will be publishing proposed rule changes that will affect regions 4, 7 and 10; don't know if your organization will want to comment collectively or as states. ESA reform has been discussed for years, don't know anything will happen anytime soon because of the law, but have ability to reform them. Mitigation policies, we have two, one is service-wide policy, one is intensive mitigation policy that was finalized at end of last administration (end of 2016 and beginning of 2017). Went out in November for public comments, policy on mitigation requires a net conservation gain, not necessarily popular with this administration. Keep an eye out for that. Kelly – Not be interest at MAFWA, but longtime discussion, sense of what structure will look like? Greg – Two changes Secretary Zinke would like to see, and I agree with both of them, move U.S. Forest Service back to Department of Interior and second was to move National Marine Fisheries Service to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, proposal came from White House earlier this week, will need to be approved by Congress; two different departments who both work under ESA framework, but interpret it differently and that can be problematic at times. This regulates commercial fishing, right now in Department of Commerce and don't know if largely fits in. Kelly worked with that issue as much as anyone. Kelly – What committee? Greg – I have not heard, expect House Natural Resources. Terry – Thank you. Greg – Sorry I couldn't stay longer. This is my first trip to North Dakota, flew the countryside and looked at prairie potholes and grassland areas, beautiful country. Terry – Thank you for coming to the meeting. Greg – One thing I see here is close working relationship between your state and USFWS, working side by side. Talked to Todd this morning about funding positions, as I was driving around saw many wildlife management areas mingled around USFWS areas. Terry – Close with USFWS here. Greg – They spoke highly of you.

Budgeting for Annual Conference – Kelly – Had discussion on phone about budgeting for this annual conference, in Western we had an annual budget for conference, but we don't have that here. It looks like we make around \$32,000 a year and I think it would be a good idea at some point to have a budget target and that would be state's responsibility. Figure out a way to establish that rate, work with Ollie and Roger on how to do that. Terry – The \$47,500 in sponsorships, Ollie came up with, we had some local sponsors, but agree states need something to aim for and on the hook for over or under that budget. Jim – Target amount that would be returned after the conference. Terry – Yes, after the conference. Ollie – In the Western, I think there is a target the host state is expected to contribute, something like \$20,000; we don't have that. It is whatever you want. We will get draft budget together. Jim – Have target to return and expected amount state is expected to combine, makes it easier or harder, depending on how you look at that; makes it easier for state to decide what to do, how much to do and how much to spend. Sometimes there is conflict. Terry – Host state has to be integral part of balancing the budget, if going to be short need to raise the funds. We knocked on doors to get more money because we knew we were going to be a little short. Greg – Good idea for USFWS to be back next year; had guidance last year on how we spent grant money, more comfort in that and will be able to help again next year; wasn't able to help last year or this year. Terry – We were nervous, but it worked out this year. Mike – Starting off nervous already for next year's Ohio conference.

Kelly – Jim and I can help with budget if you need us. Terry – We will discuss in September conference when we next meet face to face.

DMEM/MAFWA 3-Year Contract – Terry – Contract up at end of September. There are some changes, but don't need to act on those today, but does need more discussion on what goes into that contract. We put more work in this year, Lynn, my assistant, put in a lot of work, need to increase communication. Meeting with Cindy and Ollie in September but need an executive meeting before that to get context behind this. Proposed contract went up 21% from last year, hurts to increase that much. Want to make sure we are getting our monies worth.

R3 Committee Discussion – Kelly – Had R3 meeting in Lincoln, thanks Jim for putting that together; it was an excellent conference. Talked about opportunity and worked with Greg's staff at USFWS and trying to get ahold of BLM and some others. We broke out in groups the second day into various Associations, Mark and Jim were there. Reason we want to bring this up, not sure how our R3 committee was formed, but disconnect on how directors view the world and how they do, which created tension in the room. I was trying to introduce how, when things come to our level, how we looked at it and how we processed it. Healthy discussion from my viewpoint, since this is so important to us we need more research on how we interact. Not fair for me to go to committee and ask what they are doing, and they have been working at it for years. Important this Association cares about it and passionate about it and people at policy level need to do this and talk about budget. I volunteer to help with that. Ollie – Mark is director liaison and he was at that last meeting and we need to have him communicate back to this body. Kelly – I think it would be good, Mark is in Alaska, but we need to work on that. Jim – Need more robust discussion with that group on this broader topic and work with that committee. Kelly – In Joint Task Force, had severe disconnect with technical committee and directors, that work group is frustrated with us and we were frustrated with them and we need to do that same thing here. Figure out a way to meet face to face or something close.

Monarch Governance Update – Bill Moritz – No update on governance since last meeting. On strategic planning, Claire is presenting that tomorrow morning. Last Thursday Strategic Planning board of directors met and approved strategy and ask Executive Committee to consider recommending that to full board.

Monarch Strategic Planning Update – Terry – Claire, I sat in on conference call, any changes? Claire Beck – Public review from May 11-31, 94 comments received, mostly commending, some substantial and Bill and Ed wrote formal responses and I sent those out yesterday. A few changes made to document since May, nothing major, explained benefits of no-till farming and more information on the importance of placement of monarch habitat and inclusion of golf courses, urban areas and solar power generation sites as potential habitat sites. Not a lot of changes. Chris Berens, Kansas, had formatting issues in Kansas section of plan and I fixed that. Final document is ready for approval by the Board. Kelly – Ed or Claire can I get copies of comment responses sent out to substantial comments to see where they were at? Bill – That was part of email. Ed Boggess – Covers it for updates and request for Board to approve on Wednesday, should have most up-to-date version except for few things Claire talked about. We are close. Kelly – Do you want action now? Terry – Recommendation from executive committee to go to full Board? Bill – That is correct. One thing I will add, we will have fuller discussion tomorrow on landscape

conservation. A successful project needs a steady hand at the helm and Claire has done an excellent job, technical committee has done a lot of work and public input worked well and we have a good document to bring forward. *Jim Douglas, NE moved to send to full Board, Kelly Hepler, SD second. Motion passes.* Terry – Ed and Claire have done a tremendous job.

Approval of Extension of Ed's Contract – Ed – Paperwork has been submitted, so it is somewhere in the process at USFWS. Terry – We did approve. Ed – After your meeting in May, contract was submitted.

Wildlife Help Organization – Amanda Wuestefeld – This organization occurred in partnership out of NEAFWA, in partnership with DJ Case and W9 to move calls and emails from staff to website. Website is global, so whenever an individual goes there they can pull from exact location or pick state pertinent to their location. Tailored content, working on it being adaptive. A lot of do-it-yourself solutions but offers professional solutions too. The goal is to reduce calls coming into states and provide consistent information on human/wildlife conflict; situation the same no matter what state you are in. Helps people with information as quick as possible in platform people are used to going into. NEAFWA invested \$150,000 so far and have ramped up their participation and are seeing increase in participation of customers from last year, probably due to content. Installing platforms and looking for other organizations to see if interested. If states individually buy-in or Association as a group, they proposed a budget which I am happy to share with you. Per region-wide participation for first year is just over \$5,000 to \$6,600 per state and ongoing support of \$2,000 to \$3,000 per year. Terry – Is that bigger based on every state in MAFWA? Amanda – Based on all the states in MAFWA. Bill has been involved a little bit. Bill – Started before I was at WMI, talked to Michigan about being part of that program a couple of years ago. More and more people are finding solutions to problems on the internet, DJ Case said build a platform that will pop up on first page, have individual state regulations in the platform, it will have specific solutions to issue based on state regulations. Relatively low-cost investment, to have state regulations put on platform and annual maintenance is relatively small as well. Indiana and Ohio are looking at it. Mike – A couple of years ago a private company put something out similar to NASBLA; something for boating regulation, another type of in-state and tells you rules and regulations. Amanda – Their information is in bigger prospectus, they were doing key word searches, better than some state websites so doing something right, getting 30% rate. Ollie – Thinking about how to get before the Board, program item for next year so all directors can hear about it; this has been brought to the executive committee, since all states need to buy-in and has a cost, have Dave Case or someone from NEAFWA come to annual meeting and make presentation during business meeting and let directors decide to move forward or not. Bill – That was intent for this meeting, but delayed bringing to executive committee, intent was to have presentation and discussion. Ollie – I will make a note. Mike – I will do the same.

Windfarms – Nothing to discuss.

2018 MAFWA Conference Final Details – Terry – We are through for this year, ask Mike to update on next year. Mike – Need to discuss this week to move the dates, I have sent some text messages here today, decide that this week, to move up a week or not. Ollie – Used to meet week after 4th of July, WAFWA kicked us out of that, now before July 4th. Question on evaluation was prefer week before or after July 4th; some years one way and some the other. The hotel Mike

wants is booked the week before. Any problem moving our annual meeting a week earlier than now, two weeks before July 4th? (Discussion and comments around the table). Sheila – Keith won't have a problem (he will be retired), but I will, that is usually our commission meeting week, I can work around it if I need to. Keith – End of fiscal year too. Dale – I might be in Canada fishing. It makes no difference to me as long as we know ahead of time. Jim – This year, you would have had it a week ago? Ollie – Yes. We should bounce it off during business meeting on Wednesday. Mike – I will have answers by Wednesday on what is going on. Kelly – I need to know in next couple days too because I need to book Custer State Park. (More discussion) Ollie – Formal action during business meeting on Wednesday.

Next Meeting Date – Ollie – Normally have executive committee meeting in August, cancel sometimes, but need to set one because we need proposed budget for conference looked at and Delaney contract to talk about. (Discussion) Set for August 7, 2018 2:00 pm CDT teleconference. Kelly – Need more detailed discussion on Delaney too.

Adjourn – *Keith Sexson, KS moved to adjourn, Mike Miller, OH second. Meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.*

Minutes
MAFWA Annual Meeting
June 24 – June 26, 2018
Ramkota Hotel and Conference Center
Bismarck, North Dakota

Final Program – Exhibit 1

Sunday, June 24, 2018

MAFWA Executive Committee Meeting 5:00 pm

President's Welcome Reception (MAFWA) – Sponsored by Sovereign Sportsman Solutions
Eric Richey made remarks

Hospitality Room – Sponsored by Bass Pro Shops

Monday, June 25, 2018

Breakfast – Sponsored by Archery Trade Association
Dan Forster made remarks.

GREETINGS and WELCOME to NORTH DAKOTA

U.S. and Canadian National Anthems sung by Randy Meissner, Licensing Manager, ND Game and Fish Department.

President Terry Steinwand – We've set a new MAFWA attendance record. The record was tied by Nebraska last year at 128, with the previous record being 128 in 1964. We are at 134. Like to give special recognition to Willie Harris, USDA Wildlife Services' eastern regional director and Abby Arnold, American Wind Wildlife Institute executive director. Pleased to introduce Brent Sanford, Lt. Governor of North Dakota, who has been Lt. Governor for 18 months but is no stranger to challenges. He was former mayor of Watford City, the epicenter of quail activity for years. Town grew from 1,500 to 10,000 and he had to deal with infrastructure and social challenges. Proud to call Brent a friend.

(Welcome to ND PowerPoint - Exhibit 2)

Welcome to North Dakota

Brent Sanford, North Dakota Lt. Governor – Good morning, great to see deputies or directors from all 13 of your Association states. Recognize special guests from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS): Acting Director Greg Sheehan, Science Advisor in DC, Ben Tuggle, Regional Directors Tom Melius from Minneapolis and Noreen Walsh from Denver; thanks for contributions to wildlife. Thanks to Terry and his staff and Scott Davis, tribal executive director for their hard work and cooperation. From the earliest Americans, pioneering farmers and ranchers, sportsmen who passed on love of outdoors from generation to generation; North Dakota has a rich history of fish and wildlife management. One of our country's most famous conservationists, Teddy Roosevelt spent time hunting and ranching in ND, which helped make him who he became as 26th president. He once commented, "I always said I would not have been the President I was if not for my experience in North Dakota". Roosevelt was the first President

to create a federal bird reserve and established 51 during his administration. These bird reserves later became National Wildlife Refuges managed by the USFWS; each state has at least one, but North Dakota has more than any other state. Our rural state and our rural roots have bred a strong culture of hunting, fishing and trapping. Even though we are becoming a more urban state, still large percentage of population who want to participate in these activities, rank second in hunting and sixth in fishing per capita. For fishing we have more managed lakes in recent years than any other time in state history; in early 1990s we had 180 managed lakes and reservoirs, now 425 providing some of best fishing for walleye and northern pike. North Dakota is important part of continental waterfowl production in the Central Flyway making it a paradise for waterfowl hunters and bird watchers. Any success story requires strong partnerships, with other states, federal government, private entities and with Canada; and as you will hear from Scott Davis partnerships with Native American tribes. Have five tribes represented, Mandan/Hidatsa/Arikara nation, Standing Rock Sioux tribe, Spirit Lake tribe, Turtle Mountain Chippewa and Ojibwa tribe that also extends into South Dakota. Made tremendous progress with tribes and many committees. All strategic initiatives based on partnerships and collaborations and all touch game and fish in some way. Main Street Initiative is based on three pillars of economic success: a skilled workforce; smart and efficient infrastructure; and healthy, vibrant communities. Our fish and wildlife resources and habitats are key assets for many communities in attracting and retaining residents and new workers. Activities are also important to keeping younger generation here. Making sure K-12 education system is modern and nimble enough to adapt to changing workforce in areas. In behavioral health progress provides more resources upstream to reduce rates of recidivism and drug and alcohol use which will make life easier for game and fish wardens. Working to raise technology to improve services to electronic licenses also working on pilot program for online hunter education program. As energy producing state, lot of challenges balancing oil and gas and now wind farms with wildlife population management. Being proactive trying to not impact wildlife or farmers and ranchers, another example of working together with partnerships towards solutions. We recognize North Dakotans are in the best position to protect our land, water and wildlife for current and future generations. As Theodore Roosevelt said, "Of all the questions which can come before this nation, short of the actual preservation of its existence in a great war, there is none which compares in importance with the great central task of leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us." Terry – Enjoy working with this Governor's officer who is very conservation-minded.

Remarks from USFWS

Terry - Greg appointed a year ago as the principal deputy director. When in Utah he used proactive approach to grow and sustain wildlife populations. He has worked extensively to recover threatened and endangered species protected by the Endangered Species Act. He is heavily involved in AFWA, and is a lifelong hunter, angler and wildlife photographer.

Greg Sheehan, Principal Deputy Director, USFWS – Honored to be here. Talk about how USFWS is going to continue to work together and partner on many great conservation efforts. Thank Terry and staff as well as Lt. Governor Sanford who shared message of challenges and opportunities for North Dakota. This is not number 50 for me, but one of last two or three states I have visited. I want to acknowledge Terry, he chairs NAWCA and done an amazing job for us for some time; thank Ollie Torgerson who keeps things lively; as well as Lynn Timm and Scott Peterson. As former state director I know how important meetings like this are, to help build and strengthen ties between, federal, state, tribal governments and conservation organizations. Recognize states and tribal agencies have expertise and authority over wildlife within their region. The USFWS also has many responsibilities for management and we are working to help bridge the gap to link across state boundaries to benefit North American wildlife. Part of our mission is to work with our state and tribal partners to manage federally

protected species, to make sure you have a voice surrounding their management. That is why I am here today and why the USFWS has been a part of MAFWA since the beginning. Not sure better area in the country that has such strong working relationship and better partnership; can't thank Tom Melius enough for his leadership over last 15 years, he will be retiring this Friday. We can't succeed at conserving fish and wildlife populations or expanding opportunities to all Americans unless we work together. As Lt. Governor pointed out, 63 wildlife refuges here in North Dakota, more than any state in the country; 120 grassland and waterfowl production areas and many state-managed properties and wildlife management areas. No place more important for waterfowl than here; whether you hunt or watch birds. Joined USFWS team yesterday and visited a few areas and flew over prairie potholes; also saw amazing fisheries too. Funding and partnerships; from NAWCA, migratory bird stamps, land and water conservation funds, WSFR, license sales, NGOs, NRCS and fish and wildlife service partners and many others who continue to provide for conservation pathway to funding. By working together, we can accomplish far more, even sports men and women, servicing at-risk and working together for shared solutions that are transferable, scientifically sound and a solid return on investment. Our partners have an outstanding record of volunteering and leveraging ratio of 4:1 on our dollars. Relationships make partnerships work. With continued collaborative partnerships we can achieve lasting results. Organizations like Ducks Unlimited, Delta Waterfowl, Pheasants Forever and many others are always there to back up both states and federal agencies. Another great example of this collaborative approach is the Asian carp regional coordinating committee which includes over 20 federal, state, native and non-government partners working together to help prevent the spread of Asian carp into the Great Lakes. These include early detection and population monitoring, rapid eradication, maintenance, research assistance and active preventative measures including improvements to dispersal barriers and targeted fishing to help reduce threats. In addition to Asian carp, many of you in this room have worked to help reduce the threats to monarchs, through strong conservation strategy which is recognized nationally. These are the kinds of proactive partnerships we need to replicate. Glad to see MAFWA directors, Jim Douglas in particular, come together to help reinvent our Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (LCCs). The USFWS is working aggressively to help states shore up funding foundation of wildlife conservation in America, hunting and fishing and that is why we are expanding public access for hunting, fishing and outdoor recreation across the nation; a high priority in our agency and the Department of Interior. Following the lead of conservation groups and state wildlife agencies we have fully embraced the R3 movement. USFWS recently hosted a workshop at national conservation training center with representatives from more than 30 state agencies to discuss how we can accelerate recruitment, retention and reactivation of hunters and anglers. We also participated in Council to Advance Hunting and Shooting Sports R3 summit in Lincoln, Nebraska; at the summit signed an MOU detailing our intent to collaborate with states on hunter and angler recruitment, retention and reactivation activities. This year we mapped out 400 R3 events to help women, youth, veterans and disabled citizens to discover and reconnect with our passions, need your help to fine tune these programs. For many sports men and women, it is often about having a place to get out and we have assigned 12 employees across the nation to work on hunting and fishing access; recently proposed opening 228,000 acres on national wildlife refuges for this year's hunting season. Working with Archery Trade Association and others to find refuges to support archery ranges and already have many managers who have stepped up and expressed interest. Aligning our hunting and fishing regulations with states to eliminate confusing contradictory regulations that make it harder for hunters. The Secretary of Interior's new hunting and shooting sports conservation statement will provide advice about integrating hunting and shooting sports considerations into all of our operations. In February, Secretary Zinke initiated Secretary's Order 3362, designed to improve habitat in western big game winter migration corridors, an order to capitalize efforts in USFWS and other DOI bureaus

to work with states to identify migration corridors for mule deer, antelope, elk and other species to facilitate migration of these herds across federal, state and tribal lands. There are many great efforts underway and our employees are eager to work with all of you to reach more Americans, from all backgrounds and get them hunting and fishing. In addition to our commitment to state trust species we want to see state and tribal wildlife agencies take a greater role in management and decision making of listed species. I know from my many years in a state agency that state agencies are the experts on species of their own. Working towards recovery of species must begin with listening to state wildlife agencies and landowners where species occurs. We are looking at internal regulations and policies to determine whether we could be limiting our ability to help insure cooperative recovery programs. Coming together as partners, but still have many challenges; diseases continue to occur, as well as invasive species. Our pollinators are struggling to get ahead of the game for many reasons and we continue investigate and address those and your efforts are making the difference. Few places in the country have so much at stake with reauthorization of the Farm Bill; we have outlined some principles for this reauthorization and are working hard with our allies on the hill to continue to include fish and wildlife conservation as co-equal resource consideration along with soil and water conservation in development, implementation and evaluation of all farm bill measures. We want to magnify the impact of conservation programs by focusing conservation work on rare species and habitats by insuring needs of multiple fish and wildlife research, including pollinators and bats are considered in implementation of soil and water conservation work. We want to be sure NRCS and agency partners have the resources necessary to assist farmers, ranchers and foresters in conservation plans as well as program implementation and deliberating management activities. Our goal is to increase communication among USDA, the Service and our state partners to maximize fish and wildlife benefits for Farm Bill conservation and forestry program success. This part of the country is known for its wildlife incredible landscapes and woods, water and great plains. Quote, “if you want to go somewhere fast go by yourself but if you want to go somewhere far go with me”, it is no different in conservation world, so together as a group. Thanks for great work and look forward to going far.

Terry – Thank you Greg. We cut into Hot Topics, some of us gave up our time to have this panel discussion. Jim Douglas will facilitate, 40-year plus career veteran in Nebraska Game and Parks; he has been director since 2012 and has done a tremendous job. On the panel are Jim, Greg Sheehan, Dr. Benjamin Tuggle, Kelley Myers, LCC coordinator and former director of Iowa and Kelly Hepler.

MAFWA/USFWS Panel and Progress on Science Applications

Jim Douglas, Nebraska Game and Parks Commission, Facilitator – Dr. Tuggle is assistant director for science application for USFWS, as well as regional director in the southwest for many years. Pleasure to have you on panel. Kelley Myers is most recently LCC Coordinator for the USFWS and was leader at Iowa DNR and part of MAFWA community. As we go into discussion, a lot of good work has been done. Kelly Hepler, Secretary of South Dakota has been actively involved in large partnership and large landscape conservation, he was formerly in Alaska. Greg Sheehan has been introduced, he loves to fish for bullfrogs and cut his teeth on it in Nebraska. We definitely wouldn't be here today if not for Greg's influence in his new role as Principal Deputy Director of the USFWS. He was instrumental in inviting Executive Committee of AFWA to a special series of discussions on issues concerning the states and USFWS, not the least of which was large landscape conservation. A desire for new direction in collaboration between states and Service and AFWA felt good to assign a working group to look at it across the nation. To look at successes in partnerships, also in places where things could be better and look for commonalities. Discussed all of that in a white paper which will be presented

at the North American. That white paper ended up with some important insights. Going forward it is important to recognize unique authority between the Service and the states to make sure those authorities are looking at processes as we move forward in collaboration. The Service also put forward statements that we need to have peer to peer relationship with USFWS and the states. There were some recommendations in the white paper. The AFWA's executive committee asked the working group to continue to work and the charter would be extended to continue dialog and develop additional resources for policy makers to access and provide direction on conservation to invite success. Also, mandate to expand list of best practices, ongoing. Third recommendation, was to gather input from broader audiences like NGOs about specific policy recommendations related to funding. Mark August 8 for forum to be held in Omaha, Nebraska; held with NGOs to discuss that. Last year at this same meeting had the discussion just beginning, if not LCCs, then what? We are looking at the "then what" phase, moving forward with regional associations priorities. For many years states have said that they wanted role in decision making, be careful what you ask for because you may get it, lot of work to be done on how inputs given to the Service. I like the quotes on back of name plates, Ollie read quote on back of mine. Ollie – "There will come a time when you believe everything is finished, that will be the beginning" Louis L'Amour. Jim – Looking over more recent discussions related to LCCs, we will start out by asking Greg to say a few words.

Greg Sheehan, Principal Deputy Director, USFWS – As we talk about landscape conservation, everyone in this room works for state, federal agency or NGO, we know where money comes from and what their expectations are and where you need to spend it; and you build work programs around what needs to get done in a year. When talking about landscape conservation, we enter into agreements with other agencies and now work plans and dollars have to meld with their work plan and dollars which can be a difficult process. Work harder and explain to people funding us how we are going to do something different; go to the table and have difficult conversations which might require us to go back to lawmakers and leaders; to talk about landscape conservation, we may not get everything we want but need your help to back us up. How do we identify issues, answer questions and implement efforts? A few big efforts around the country: New England cottontail, wasn't listed; Greater Sage grouse, Lesser Prairie Chicken and Monarch Conservation Strategy are just a few of the efforts. The Department of Interior is looking at big game migration corridors in the west, they don't know state and international boundaries; a big undertaking and not easy, it takes time and commitment to move down the road. The group here in the room as done that and will continue to do that. Appreciate Jim taking the lead on this. Looking at how we build a framework for funding, people and processes to export model for science, conservation and delivery throughout species in the Midwest.

Kelly Hepler, Department Secretary, South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks – Thank you all, had discussion with Director Ashe in Memphis at partnership meeting and Dan talking about revisions of LCCs. I like getting engaged and had no problem talking about implementation and what role we play. How do we get engaged, all on birds or fish, this reenergized or reestablished, what we are doing with LCCs? Appreciate the opportunity to talk about landscape scale not driven by species or political boundaries, but conservation on the ground.

Kelley Myers, LCC Coordinator, USFWS – Thank you for your leadership, a value to us, last year focused on conversation on what we value and want to move forward. Thank you to leaders for supporting this conversation and team and MAFWA, good dialog about where our priorities and values are.

Dr. Benjamin Tuggle, Assistant Director for Science Applications, USFWS –

Emphasize, started career in science and understand fundamental part, but science is not good if its dueling science. We make better decisions if we level the playing field; this transition started out in that direction, but frustrating part when I was regional director, start with good conversations on how to do that better. With leadership in place, have opportunity to reset that button. Conversations with AFWA and regional associations will be critical in terms of understanding and how we want to step into this opportunity. We talked about endangered species at risk and this particular approach can give us opportunity to get ahead of decisions we have to make instead asking the question of having to make decision tomorrow. We want to lead science conversation in that direction establish capacity on both sides. If talking about science, even from the Service's standpoint and being sure states have capacity to level the playing field. We understand states often have better science than we do. We also need to understand that states need to feel comfortable sharing science with us. If we can make mutual decisions about resources the better off we are in the long run. Appreciate Jim's leadership and thanks Terry for inviting me. This conversation is going to go a long way in guiding the other associations; MAFWA is ahead in terms of how they are handling this discussion. It doesn't happen at my level it happens at yours; we can understand at executive level; confident other players will put it in place.

Jim – National AFWA working group established regional leaders; some state directors and some Service personnel. We recognized in white paper discussion that there were some differences in regions; nature of large landscapes in the west, history and evolution that has already taken place on LCCs and history and evolution of partnership and collaboration. Asked regional leaders to go back and gather what they could for regional priorities and be sure from perspective of the states were expressed to the Service and reach out to the states. In the Midwest, Kelley helped develop a template for states to send out for input and from that point forward, there were smaller and different work groups that got together.

Kelley – On white paper broke into four regions, in eastern side of AFWA, in MAFWA, areas overlap and is challenging and doesn't fit with geography. One of conversations we had, four regions asked questions around collaboration, MAFWA key driver of that collaboration. With monarch or other conflicts, explain why working together and how to inform why and how we are working together. All driven by same couple of factors, protecting species or whatever it might be. Perfect storm of conversations and appropriations, federal budget, science application, white paper being published, and in our region no LCC structure to distribute the funds. A message was needed to look at shared priorities and work from there. Put together spreadsheet in MAFWA region and shared nationally. Wanted to prepare for this meeting to show we are working and moving forward on work plans. Listed information from states, in MAFWA, states in Region 4, some of Regions 3 and 6; and started to identify priorities going on in the Service. We are having a series of meetings internally to see how we are working on it too and collecting information. We are fortunate with MAFWA committees, putting meetings together on monarchs and we spent half a day working on this. Lot of information going into series of meetings. We could have met in person, but met by conference call, had technical staff calls leading up to that; trying to determine where we overlap and sharing information. All of the work produced, key priorities: looking at habitat, assessment tools to gauge health and leverage; at risk species and conservation need, in terms of monarch, tremendous and a lot of work around one species; and need method to prioritize efforts and share. In critical habitats and mutual issues, like wind energy development, valuable economic driver for the states, but some negative wildlife interactions. It came up in conversations that we don't know what we are doing with wind but needs to be backed up with science needs and sharing. Need long term structure for us to work together, made great strides, but how do we continue to do this. Need to respond to

budget appropriations, shared priorities, create venue and start working toward it; how can we do that. Through all of those priorities, working with wildlife directors and USFWS technical staff, putting meat on those bones to meet those needs. With the approval of this group we will start working through questions and working on plan.

Jim – Discuss contents of draft white paper (Exhibit 3), important for audience and full board on how we might start vetting that. In that regard, do habitat inventory and assessment, recognition of existing support tools, such as CHAT, and look for developing other tools.

Sara – Part of habitat assessment work, delighted to be part of that discussion. Missouri has been working with the USFWS to develop a landscape health index; we call it comprehensive conservation strategy. As we are losing habitat, have limited resources, where are those priority geographies that layer, not only state wildlife action plans, fish priorities, public priorities and forest priorities to fully engage with partners. We have taken all of our COAs and prioritized those into priority geographies. The health index is so critical because how do we know if we have achieved success and what data do we need to have in place to ensure we are moving the needle. Working for some period of time to develop landscape health index and to have application across our region with the model and hopefully across the country. Already in partnership with the Service in moving in that regard on that important habitat assessment.

Jim – Discussion of cross-walking and prioritizing MAFWA state wildlife action plans (SWAP) and their implementation. There has been great work already started by MAFWA committee; to strategically determine the species and habitats that would be considered MAFWA priority targets. Important element of this since so much work has already gone into state wildlife action plans. The next priority is wind energy development support, had a lot of input.

Kelly – In South Dakota seeing a lot of wind energy development with no mitigation policy in place, looking to partners and outreaching to see what Nebraska and North Dakota are doing. Our state supports renewable energy, but it is challenging for us and the industry. They operate from Mexico all the way to Canada and there is no consistent approach with states on mitigation; is it one-to-one replacement or value-added enhancement or what? Staffers are looking at science and how we use it. What is behind the science, there are models out there, but on the mitigation side no consistent regulation format. What can we bring to our Governor's office? An important discussion at national level and state level and having industry at the table is important. We have had some discussions and Noreen reached out to the state directors in Region 6, so this is not a new effort.

Jim – Draft goes into more detail about next steps, for example on wind and science policy; we recognized communication pathway needs to be expanded on wind energy. Ask Bill Moritz to come up and introduce the next topic. Next, we want to share priorities and develop governance structure and look toward processes moving forward, not just matter of governance structure, but getting the right group of people together to look at longer-range needs and science. As we progress, if governance needs to be in regional association and collaborate across regional associations. I asked Bill to be available because monarchs continue to be priority in Midwest region and he helped develop governance structure with partners that works well, and we could borrow from that model moving forward with science application. Considering structure of monarchs; have a steering committee including states involved with other like-minded participants and layers under that with technical working group, see model like that and are working towards that.

Bill Moritz, WMI – Structure we developed for monarchs worked well for group as a whole. We had a lot of work to do in short time. We knew it would take active engagement and in looking around the country at other examples, like cottontails and lesser prairie chickens, several key points were important to pull together. Make sure you have a leader for that effort and had opportunity to get a grant. That took care of funding needed to hire Claire Beck. She did a great job of keeping focus on the structure and the outline and necessary parts to have decision

makers involved to be sure included essential elements. Also, important to form technical committee that had the expertise across the spectrum of issues. Research and communication were a key part of that, not just science even though that is the foundation to build on. We had a lot of players come together; it took time to figure function and roles and structure but put a lot of data together that will stand the test of time. That sort of structure seems to be working well for other efforts across the country. There is a huge landscape conservation effort that state agencies are in a background role on, like Chesapeake Bay initiative, Yellowstone/Yukon, a bunch of those. We still have a lot to learn in governance, but don't need to invent a new process.

Jim – Start with Greg and Ben and the whole panel to ask the basic question what you think the potential role and process we are starting, do we want to continue or are we on the right track.

Greg – On the right track, we can't roll out major new conservation strategy every time, we have to figure out ways to adapt to species and conditions on the landscape rather than chasing every one of these. Looking at wind energy, European Companies are coming in and looking at wind energy on the Great Lakes, in Lake Erie. How do we make them aware of wildlife impacts on birds and bats, putting structures five to seven miles out? The way we normally look at mortalities is you walk around and look at the ground, but these are the types of interesting questions that keep popping up that we have to respond to quickly and people expect us to know all of the answers. Looking at new ocean- lake-based wind energy and frameworks and whether they exist within regional associations or within smaller partnership of states, that is what we are talking about. How can we quickly respond to a landscape problem that we haven't been able to before; you are aiming us at the right place. What you are going to have to do is plug in your staff or organization into this process to quickly answer science needs and to answer questions in thoughtful but not over-burdensome way. How do we fund this sort of thing? We all recognize we have to get there, we live in big broad landscape, not look at only what we can control.

Ben – Science application perfectly positioned to not only initiate but foster that dialog along as we start to talk about these new processes across these landscapes. We cannot and do not have the resources. We are figuring out the problems are far more complex and require more of us in terms of resources and science applications. The Service is in a position to initiate that conversation in this type of forum for these types of conversations; instead of giving you a 90-day notice. This type of forum could be imitated again, try to get an idea where science is and where to point resources, so we can make better decisions. Wind is the perfect example of how a landscape problem, independent among all of the different states; using the knowledge we have to come up with a consistent model, put in place the foundation and modify standards according to where they are on the landscape. Right now, we don't have that, we have to have that forum. From the Services' perspective, be responsible to foster dialog and bring additional resources to the table as Congress or Administration provides and direct resources in the proper direction.

Kelley – With wind energy, it is not just leveraging but unintendedly compromising each other. There are so many great initiatives around the country and a number of tools under development, how do we plug into existing resources. We can start looking at data coming in and how that data is to be used and also take opportunity to take from other systems to build what we need here in the Midwest. The role USGS science centers and University Coops have provided has been great, those valuable relationships can be used in coordination among the coops.

Kelly – Some of conversations are similar to AFWA, primary is funding but a lot of same discussions. There are two questions. Why do we need this source of money if going after LCCs? There are 63 refuges in North Dakota, in Alaska we didn't share nearly as much. What we hear talking to Congress and Senators, is federal oversight. Whatever we do with this process needs to be clear that it is a partnership. In the past if some idea to have feds come in, from state

perspective, that was death of that conversation. This is a partnership, we need to talk about how this initiative will mesh with other discussions.

Ben – Emphasize foundation of relationship is peer to peer. As we move forward MAFWA needs to be comfortable on how they see this relationship, this partnership. In different regions of the country it is different. How governance and partnership is structured is critical, so you are comfortable; partnerships are built on relationships, may be different but can serve the same purpose.

Jim – Questions from audience?

Abby Arnold, Executive Director of American Wind Institute – We are made up of state fish and wildlife agencies, nine conservation organizations as well as staff and scientists of the USFWS. I know some of you from my background as a mediator helping the USFWS. I am fascinated by this conversation. AWI is private, public partnership, a 501(c)(3) and our whole mission and focus is to understand the risk of wind on wildlife and develop solutions. We are here to serve, partner or collaborate any way we can, we are a small organization. Thank you for engaging this conversation this is a priority to our board and our mission. There are organizations ready to serve if you want a partner.

Jim – Ask panel, what comments do you have on how non-government organizations, where are their entry portals in this process?

Ben – Partnerships are partnerships, primary and secondary, when have opportunity to reshape science application in primary partnerships. State fish and wildlife agencies through partnerships with federal agencies are primary because we are the ones with fundamental authority to responsibly manage wildlife, we need to start the conversation here. There are a number of partners willing to join that conversation as we see fit, not as broad in discussion but doesn't mean we can't bring some of them to the table. Reaching out to NGOs and foresters, welcoming regions because we recognized we manage a great deal of property, but a lot of property is in private hands, industry that is working landscape. Even though more comfortable with state partners we are starting to bring some of them to the table to share responsibility from management standpoint; solidifying relationships with state partners but expanding.

Kelley – The Service and states need to engage others. Working in LCC, tremendous opportunity to broaden talk to non-traditional partners, not just conservation partners; talking across sectors, industry and landscapes. Interested to see how we can incorporate traditional partners and non-traditional partners as well.

Kelly – Once you see the document we are referring to you will understand. NGOs need to be involved in the process, incredible wealth and power, want them as partners; on technical side as well.

Greg – NGO partners can be the voice of the people in many cases. We have training, but people trust those they have affinity with. Sometimes the sin of government is we are good at talking amongst ourselves, but not good at reaching down. NGOs can bring to table, and keep at the table, the public at grassroots level, whether organization we work with every day or others at the table, like Farm Bureaus, and others. We can lever it well but partnership organizations at NGO level help sell effort to public at large, as government not always highly trusted. Let's let others do that for us. Have them at the table to share information as well as resources.

Jim – One of reasons we looked towards governance model in draft, the reason it worked for monarchs was it did a good job of recognizing USFWS and states and other partner groups were brought in later. At the meeting on August 7 in Omaha I will put more information out. I have received correspondence from conservation network who are concerned we would leave them out, a lot less trepidation now. We need to reach out to all traditional and non-traditional partners who realize what we are trying to accomplish.

Terry – Greg answered question I had already, but we talked about state partners and NGOs, but at what level do we bring industry partners in? Working with energy partners, but

they don't agree with impacts although good science. Farm Bureau is part of it, but at what point do we bring industry in?

Jim – In whole arena of collaboration, whether industry or conservation groups, states can be receptacle for that, some states prepared in different ways, Nebraska has conservation round table approach, a forum for communication and deciding next steps; states are key in this regard.

Kelley – Kelly's idea of working group, looking at monarchs, when reaching out we all grapple at some point. We had LCC council which included non-traditional partners; we can inform nationally as we establish this.

Kelly – Change of how we are approaching this up to your leadership and what role we play. As far as national conservation, one place to do it, the sooner the better off we are. The time is now, should have been ten years ago honestly, but people will impact this. Need to have engagement now and look for others to tell us how to do that, we are highly motivated particularly in this Midwest corridor.

Ben – In conversations with industry, looking for consistency. I think it is okay to want to relate to industry, but in conservations it is necessary to have commonality in our thoughts to provide guidance and conversation takes off from that. Uncomfortable without foundation of conservation. It still isn't too late, putting on landscape list. Abby and I have known each other a long time and we started talking about wind ten years ago and they have caught up on the time to put fundamental items in place, earlier is better.

Jim – Thank everyone on the panel and for work everyone has put into moving things forward in realm of collaboration. Ask for your consideration Mr. President for direction moving forward and consideration of recommendation.

Terry – Handout to directors, last page is proposed draft governance; what Sara, Bill or panel discussed. We haven't talked to Greg about this but would like motion that we want to agree and move forward with this working structure and have three to five directors that can make policy decisions work with Region 3 and 6 of USFWS staff on this.

Keith – How does draft structure tie into national approach?

Jim – Similar efforts undertaken in other regional associations; in northeast identification of priorities has taken place and southeast and in west contact with Service and states is moving forward. At WAFWA meeting in July there will be more discussion.

Ben – One of things in recommendation is certainty of partnership has to be carried at association level but did talk about national oversight with AFWA with Jonathan Mawdsley. We were waiting for feedback before going forward with national oversight committee. We wanted opportunity for all of the associations to review it and get their idea on how they wanted the regional association partnerships to go.

Terry – MAFWA took the lead on monarchs, WAFWA takes the lead on others. We can see wind energy bearing down on us for next 3-4 years; to have commonality and recommendations would be helpful. We see same impacts in other political climates, united we stand and divided we fall. It is important to have steering committee. How do we fit nationally and regionally?

Kelley – In terms of conversations, early on we broke into regions. We are all working on relationships, but the difference is geographies. Regional approaches, haven't wanted to dictate what other regions should do, we share stories and updates to inform the west but certainly didn't want to tell them how to do it. We are looking at governance structure, with steering committee in place but we can adapt over time, as we go forward we can make final adjustments.

Jim – A suggestion would be to have the President appoint director members of steering committee and may be evolution over time. Standing committee, important to know whether we should continue.

Terry – Ready to appoint a steering committee but I want membership to approve we are going the right direction on the right track.

Keith Sexson, Kansas moved to go forward with work plan; Sara Parker Pauley, MO, second. Bill O'Neill – I heard a couple of different times Dr. Tuggle talking about his being a different endeavor and Kelly talked about it being unique. Were you talking about the from governance perspective? What is different? *Ben* – Governance structure is different than LCC governance structure, talking to states who partnership with us and having those conversations about where to point priorities. Those conversations will spin out into what NGOs invited to the table or whether they will see themselves as partners. That is what I was referring to, different than the past. ***Motion approved.*** *Terry* – I will appoint members after the break after I discuss with Jim. Thank you panel, an important discussion and we do need to plug in partnerships. We appreciate you coming to North Dakota for this discussion.

Refreshment Break - Sponsored by D.J. Case & Associates

Terry – Steering committee members: Kelly Hepler, Dale Garner, Jim Leach and Sara Parker Pauley.

Monarch Conservation Report

Claire Beck, Monarch Technical Coordinator, MAFWA – Most of you have seen presentations on this over the last year and a half, so will do quick review of monarch project, where we are on timeline and funding; give information on strategy document we are hoping to finalize this week and next steps. Funding not possible without support and staffing: three major sources of funding from NFWF, NFWF I to support state level and regional conservation workshop in 2015/16; NFWF II to contract technical coordinator, my position and to support travel for meetings, 2016-2018; and NFWF III is to contract implementation coordinator phase and for larger partner conference this fall and workshops for state technical staff. Other funding came from MAFWA for scoping workshop, did not occur until 2015; and USFWS has been very supportive with monarch conservation liaison, Ed Boggess, and travel money for states to come to meetings. Ed Boggess put cover together; content similar to other regional species conservation plans. It goes from introduction: statement of problem; how strategy administered; how it got listed, importance of states and why they are driving conservation, species information; distribution and population; and threats. Part 2 is population goals and habitat goals to support population. Part 3 is longest part and is habitat creation and management, current and future: private lands, agriculture; protected natural lands; rights-of-way; other energy infrastructure; and urban conservation and engagement. Remaining part of strategy is outreach and education, important to leverage other species on landscapes as well. A section on research, monitoring, adaptive management and information management. Part on capacity of funding needed and implementation of regional strategy. Finally, each of 16 states participating submitted state plans telling what they have done and what they plan to do for monarchs. There are major commitments and documents a regional habitat goal with north core goal of 1.3 billion additional milkweed stems; the south core has no habitat goal yet, will with next grant. Most states in north core have developed state level stem/habitat goals for monarch conservation; they are carving up 1.3 billion stems into each state to reach overall goal. Commitment to work with partners to develop goals by sector, not just by states. Looking at how much in rights-of-way, how much in energy, etc. As mentioned earlier can't do single species management, incorporate monarch habitat into broader conservation plans and actions; part of grassland and prairie conservation. Governance structure is robust and parts of it will be until 2038, part of structure is staffing, got funding for myself as coordinator and Ed. Beyond 2019 not sure where that will go, but rest of governance structure will move forward with technical working group. It is important

to note it does have an adaptive management strategy in place, what needs are, where they are, so structure in place to be implemented by technical steering committee staffed from states and will change things as needed in the strategy as result of monitoring. In the public input process, we had three formal rounds, final round was in May and had help of state agencies to get word out, 94 unique comments, from individuals mostly, minor changes to the document, feedback was positive. Eighty-three came from individuals and 11 from organizations. Majority said they were glad someone was doing this, supported roadside habitat, agriculture and importance education and outreach. Next steps, finalize document this week, will be changed throughout process as necessary. Have conference scheduled for fall in Nebraska City, Nebraska to define actions and come up with next steps for document finalization into implementation. May need to adjust as needed after meeting and after listing decision. Will be having workshops with state agencies and have funding for technical staff to attend to better define goals by sector and move into implementation.

North Dakota Pollinator Update

Sandra Johnson, Conservation Biologist, North Dakota Game and Fish Department –
I'm sure we are not the only state here where dealing with insects is pretty new. Last year we put a simple survey on website to gauge the public's view on our monarchs. One comment was, "I can't believe your using our money for butterflies! I thought this was a game and fish dept. By the way what is the bag limit on monarch butterflies and will this be a lottery application or an over the counter license?". Our answer to that was that invertebrates are included in fish and wildlife and we do have authority over all fish and wildlife in the state, however there are no laws and statutes. They don't fall under category of protective wildlife but could issue proclamation on them, but I don't think we will. In 2016, led effort to begin North Dakota Butterfly and Native Pollinator Strategy, a living document asking for updates from partners every year up to 2020. There is a two- to three-page summary in the back of the document that provides information. We have had one planning meeting and invited agriculture community and NGOs, about 30 groups showed up. In North Dakota we have eight counties in the north core area, 2.2% or 35 million stems is our goal. Can find monarchs anywhere in North Dakota, but more in the east, so focusing goal there. We have identified a lot of different opportunities on private and public land and places on landscape where we can put some monarch habitat. Trying to get more education out there, have program with schools with North Dakota Pollinator Program. Insects bring new challenges, we are funded by hunting and fishing dollars, but responsible for all wildlife; different challenges for management as well, looking at nesting season and if haying after August 1 benefits monarchs. There is perception from state citizens and landowners that milkweed is a noxious weed so why are we planting it; it is not state noxious weed but is listed as county noxious weed in four counties and one is in north core area; so, working with county weed boards. Funding, where will that come from to grow 35 million stems. There is a lot of uncertainty, you will see milkweed at the ranch tonight, questioning why we need to plant more, it is out there, and this is going to be a really good year for it. Is milkweed the limiting factor, maybe it is better management of milkweed, educating the public to not mow entire ditch or go around patches of milkweed. It comes down to same issues as other species, loss of habitat at top of list; we need to maintain healthy diverse habitats. NDSU has taken on big project for insects, 2017-2020 they are doing a massive survey on insects on both public and private land, with 39,000 unique butterfly observations and 10,000 bee observations, which is good baseline information. USFWS and NRCS have undertaken big project focusing more on listing decision process. USGS is working on pollinator libraries and also tying back to plants they are using. Most people were open to other programs out there or things they have done, like removing trees. A buzz with pollinators. *Kelly – How do we plan to engage the Farm Bureau? Greg Link (ND) – Since we have 90% of land in agriculture stakeholders are very*

important to us in everything we do; Farm Bureau is part of that and it is something we do every day, week or month. In about a month interfacing with them on wind and there may be opportunities like that to talk about bugs and other topics. We have communicated with them and give them opportunity to weigh-in. *Sandra* – Had positive meeting with North Dakota Weed Association; there used to be six counties where common milkweed was listed as noxious and one of those counties, Ramsey County, removed common milkweed. People are realizing that is a plant that monarchs need. *Greg (ND)* - As we move forward with agriculture constituency on grasslands, hearing from every direction, if we don't do our job internally and proactively together, there are forces outside that will dictate how things are done. Start working on it together or things will change, and they won't be part of it. North Dakota has some progressive agriculture groups like the North Dakota Grazing Coalition where we are looking at those to help drive this work.

Keynote Speaker

Scott Davis, Executive Director, North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission – My relationship with Game and Fish is good. Terry has become a good friend as well as his staff working with Standing Rock Sioux and Chippewa. In early 1990s worked for water resource department, worked with Game and Fish and water resources. When I took this job, I knew a little bit about game and fish. I am a hunter and fisherman and over the years was curious about relationship with the tribes and what is in it for us. When you look at relationship regarding treaties, of 16 states with tribes, 11 states in this room have first nations. You start with government treaties; fishing, water, land rights, etc., a big thing. Treaty is beginning of everything, then state laws, statehood, etc. and can get into the weeds quickly on rights. Through Terry's leadership, he recognizes that and agrees tribes are sovereign. Work together but share resources, whether fish or wildlife, shared responsibility with jurisdiction and licensing works well. Currently have two agreements with tribes, one with a tribe in New Town. It began with wildlife hunting seasons and access to the lake with boating and fishing. We got into weeds on what licenses are required, did a good job with that and if you have a license you are free to fish and hunt forever. A few hiccups here and there, but able to talk and communicate immediately whether a big or small issue. We are thankful to Terry, his staff and tribes and our relationship. Second one is elk season. This has been in the works for a couple of years. Around Standing Rock, for years no tribal season, but state season for rogue elk. We decided to address that, put in shared responsibility of this resource. Animals don't see borders or fences, but when it came to licenses it was apparent we needed to do something. We did a year study with the tribe and aerial surveys and came up with numbers. Made sense to the tribe and began to build a trust relationship that the numbers are true. An important factor is private landowners are also on this landscape--how do you allow a licensed hunter to roam free throughout this territory. Agreed on proclamation and numbers and had first season last year. Season went well but success rate wasn't as good as we thought. Now in process of looking at numbers, may be too high and need to revisit it, but important part is we are communicating. It has been a very good process and we want to continue that. On seasons, with my tribe, some seasons start earlier, some later, but consistency is a big thing. If want to get on list to hunt with elders I can do that. Still have strong cultural well-being of subsistence in North Dakota. It is important to me and tribal elders. The other part is cultural. Right now in season of ceremonies, sacred or religious, and at times an elk or deer may need to be slaughtered--this is an important key to who we are. The other thing is access to private or tribal land. There is a lot of technology out there now to see where you are at and see that you are legal which is important. You have a confluence of other jurisdictions, like Army Corp lands, grasslands, park-lands, so what are the rules and relationship of that; for us it is Army Corps relationship. From coal management to access, river, parks and recreation, tourism, etc. all combines into the realm of game and fish and outdoorsmen, always a balance.

Everyone at the table when you talk about policy in states or federal government, important for communication whether on left or right side, keep in mind this is shared responsibility and there will be give and take; like water rights, cultural sites and other big federal policies. How to you balance those in day-to-day work. Commitment to communication and consistency. Been there, done that to agree to disagree, even if back to drawing board and pick out a different way--we need to achieve shared responsibility. I am here as a commissioner and agree to do that. It is important to communicate with multiple agencies and policies and go from there. In reading literature from court documents a judge said, "every sovereign owes its solemn duty to its citizens, not to subject them to additional tradeoffs that will happen if they do not resolve to their mutual benefit". A lot of work for us to do. I can only thank how lucky we are in North Dakota to have the water, the abundance of game and fish, etc. and I can only contribute that to state, tribes and partners. *Terry* – With three affiliated tribes that was a two to three-year process to get first MOU signed. There were some uncomfortable meetings but if not for Scott we would still be in those meetings with private landowners. This all occurred within that time frame.

Compromised on both sides, whole county is in Standing Rock Reservation and we struck a deal and if you hold state lottery for elk all you have to do is contact the tribe, which never happened before. We are working with the other two tribes now and trying to get a meeting started.

Appreciate Scott very much, his predecessor was not a hunter or angler and not interested in this.

Jim – Is there an agreement or MOU between your agency and each of the tribes? If so is it facilitated by Indian Affairs? *Terry* – It is not a MOU, it is signed by Governor and sovereign nation. *Jim* – Is there disparity for licenses between state and tribes? *Scott* – Mostly fishing, can be in middle of waterway. Tribes were formed, then statehood came along, and you had four or five counties, then game and fish with different zones so how do you create that science of tribal tag for North Dakota? Then two to three game and fish zones so how do you manage that resource effectively. Aside from MHA at Standing Rock we have one pending with Spirit Lake Reservation at Devils Lake and the river is north shore versus south shore and it is complicated, but we always find a way for consensus on MOUs. *Jim Leach* – Curious about treaties in North Dakota, assuming there are reservation rights; is there cede of territory rights and how is that treated differently? *Scott* – Haven't gotten into off reservation or tribal established lands. The biggest one would be Turtle Mountain, a big tribe 6x12, have land scattered. Big plots are 40, 80, 160 acres and was created by Executive Order back in 1920s; complicated there about how state views, tribal trust lands and counties. If I get a tag for a pheasant and hunting off 6x12, or want to hunt by Trenton on trust land, what is state's deal on that? We need to figure out a way to address that. Complicated MOU when it comes down. Have executive order from President back then, but have 6x12 nation, it is those things I want to figure out. *Terry* – We have been working with Scott and Turtle Mountain tribe for four or five years now and don't have a handle on it.

Jim Leach – In Minnesota it is always with public tribes, same in Michigan and many states in this Association. *Scott* – Spirit fishing is one I read about, another one that gets the headlines is bison in Montana and working with landowners, producers, cattle ranchers and the territory. It can be contentious but with commitment to communications, it is both sides leadership, takes a good chairman and committee to understand treaty rights and figure out how we can work together managing a resource. There are plenty of court cases out there. We are neighbors, we live here, and our kids go to school here, so we need to figure out a way. *Jim D.* – Beyond harvest regulations, are you contemplating agreements for habitat management and things like that? *Terry* – We have not gone beyond regulatory playing field, but most of reservations are habitat wise and are managed better for wildlife than outside those lands. *Kelly* – Thank you for your work last year, we used some of it as a model. We did something different in South Dakota with Lakota, working with MOUs. Working on cross between regulatory, talked about transport of animals, transported turkeys from private land to reservation, talked about training them and working with COs to work close together. Active as on predator control, if apply for coyote,

apply for sovereign nation. If not using GPS it happens. Typically, we want to alert tribe that you are on their land, but alert after the fact if that happens. We talk back and forth to go after someone. There is a lot of years of mistrust built up and forcing our governor to put gloves on with tribal liaison who was in tourism department and that sent a message to the tribes; now cabinet person. I would like to see your MOUs, still working on South Dakota side of Standing Rock, this brings us hope. Thank you for your work. *Terry* – Thank you Scott

Director Group Photo

AMFGLEO Group Photo

Awards Luncheon – Sponsored by Ducks Unlimited and Canadian North American Waterfowl Management Plan (NAWMP) Partners

Terry Steinwand – Short presentations from David and Tim Sopuck, then Awards Committee Chairman Keith Sexson will present the awards. We want to thank Ducks Unlimited and Canadian Wildlife Partners for all they do.

David Brakhage, DU and Tim Sopuck, Canadian NAWMP – made remarks.

Keith Sexson, Awards Committee Chairman, Facilitator – Introduced award winners and presented awards to state representative if winners were not present.

Law Enforcement Officer of the Year – Edward McCann, Wisconsin; award accepted by Todd Schaller.

Wildlife Biologist of the Year – Nancy Christel, Wisconsin; award accepted by Nancy.

Fisheries Biologist of the Year – Bruce Drecktrah, Missouri; award accepted by Bruce.

Spirit of the Shack – Danny Hartwig, Missouri; award accepted by Danny.

Excellence in Conservation – Wildlife, Marketing and Outreach Division of MI DNR; award accepted by Steve Chadwick.

2nd Excellence in Conservation – Grasslands for Gamebirds and Songbirds Committee, IN; award accepted by Amanda Wuestefeld.

Special Recognition – John Fischer, SCWDS; accepted by John.

2nd Special Recognition – St. Louis Zoo, MO; accepted by Bob Merz

Past President's Award will be presented to Terry Steinwand, North Dakota at business meeting on Wednesday.

President Terry Steinwand presented remaining awards.

Sagamore – Keith Sexson, Kansas; award accepted by Keith.

3rd Special Recognition – Keith Sexson, Kansas; award accepted by Keith.

President's Award; given by President Steinwand – Todd Porter, North Dakota Legislature, Chair of House Energy and Natural Resource Committee; Todd accepted award.

Partnership Panel

Terry – Introduced speakers.

Steve Adair, Director, Great Plains Regional Office, Ducks Unlimited – Thank you for work you do and for inviting me. When asked to do this I tried to think of one thing we do that was not with state and federal government and not one thing came to mind that is not with these partnerships. For example, our biologists are working on-the-ground with landowners to enroll them in conservation programs; when looking at acquisitions and leases of lands or long-term

easements we are working hand-in-hand with agency partners. Even in research and science on the ground we do share staff, resources and expertise to guide our programs out there. Just a few examples of how we work together and that amplifies the impacts. From Ducks Unlimited perspective, we fill a niche that adds value to the landscape out there, not trying to be redundant. One thing with state and federal agencies is we provide a stable foundation with funding that mandates you will be there for a long time. With our small size we can raise private funds or provide staff. We may come and go with opportunities, but important to complement each other. Be careful of political consequences. We can speak out on issues but need to choose our battles wisely. We can seek out issues and be more vocal. At our best when we all come together and bring unique experiences, perspectives and skills to develop programs and together are more effective. Our diversity comes together to build programs. Our topography continues to change so we can broaden services we provide as possible. Thank you for your partnership.

Rachel Bush, North Dakota State Director, Pheasants Forever – Echo some of what Steve said. Most of you in this room have worked with Pheasants Forever or Quail Forever at some time. We use a lot of partners and state agency and federal entities. How we utilize those partnerships in North Dakota is a little bit different. Building strong partnership with precision agriculture partners and bringing new partners to the table. Working with Department of Health focusing on water quality. Working with private groups, for-profit companies to utilize some of the software available. Our chapters are the life-blood of our organization, so we try to loop them in on whatever we are working on. Again, that is part of our precision ag partnership. We work with same entities that other groups favor, as far as USDA, NRCS and FSA on a limited conservation coordinator position and reaching out to private landowners. Primarily non-operator landowners as we know that demographic is growing throughout the Midwest. We are seeing aging populations and women are inheriting land and not making the management decisions. But if we can provide them with the education and information to help them realize stewardship goals we can impact private farm land. Tweaking partnerships and making them unique to North Dakota.

Keith Trego, Executive Director, North Dakota Natural Resources Trust – The trust is a non-profit 501(c)(3) started in 1986 as part of the Garrison Diversion Act by Congress under North Dakota state law. We have both federal and state dollars through a trust fund. We have a 6-person board, three are appointed by the Governor and three appointed by conservation groups (PowerPoint - Exhibit 6). Our partners are the usual suspects; game and fish state and federal agencies and lots of NGOs. Everything we do is from partnerships. Unique partnerships we have that some others don't is a group called the American Foundation for Wildlife, their charter is based on conservation. They have a small staff and we provide technical work and they provide the money. They have helped us with 4,400 acres of land acquisition, provide things we could not have done without their partnership--they are our money machine. Another one is NAWCA. We provide staff for Central Flyway Rep on the Council. Terry Steinwand provided (Sheila—check again to see if this is Randy Kreil) Ken Kreil who did that for about 10 years and Rick Warhurst has been in that position for about three years; it has been a good partnership that helps state agency in many ways and helps our office with the knowledge of the NAWCA program. We can sit around and brainstorm. North Dakota tried the ballot initiative for funding and was not successful but did get a statutory fund to assist with conservation work. The Trust has been successful getting nine grants, a total of about \$5.5 million. This is a tremendous source of dollars, a new source that we didn't have access to in the past. We have three phases now working on the grasslands partnership, focused on expiring CRP and associated land, just got third phase. Started with focus area in northwest to help them keep land in grass and looking to spend \$4.2 million dollars, 300 miles of fence, 42,000 acres in pasture expired CRP. Working on

grazing system and water development, hopefully to permanently stay in grass. Another project we just got funding for has to do with oil development which has had a big impact on landscape and wildlife. About three years ago the Trust and several other partners put together a project to initiate biggest funding partner. We hired a consulting firm who interviewed people from all over the western part of the state; ranchers, farmers, county commissioners, ag agency folks, people who live and breathe energy development to see what public impact was. Study showed what a lot of people knew or suspected; most North Dakotans think energy development is pretty good. But everybody thought we could do a better job of taking care of the land, especially farmers and ranchers who don't have mineral rights only surface acres. One of the things the study group asked was to put together a habitat concept and recently took that to the Lt Governor who was involved in a lot of these discussions. We asked for a little over \$2 million to start implementing this habitat project and we were successful with that grant. The controlling council, Department of Energy Resources, ND Resources is a private energy company headquartered in Denver are our partners on this project. We have not had a lot of this type of partnerships but need to have a lot more. The energy companies do want to be part of these kinds of projects. For example, on an abandoned energy site, mineral resources have the money to fix that and we go in and use Outdoor Heritage money to go out to work with the landowners to put in grazing land, reseed back to grass and a lot of that. On urban sites, parks and recreation Outdoor Heritage funds, we need people in urban efforts as partners; projects to better the community. Our interests are from conservation standpoint to have outdoor education, pollinator habitat, something that gets people outside and exposes them to our efforts is major part of this project as well. One thing trust has done is have small grant program. Started program with educational focus, in last 8-9 years we have done almost \$300,000 in small grants, focused on education, things like duck stamp contest, soil health workshop, pollinator gardens, social media, North Dakota Envirothon and gateway to Science Center; something we are not able to do with our staff. We have a tremendous amount of flexibility, we are not a government agency and can move quickly on some things. We are very skilled and work with PPJV, ND Action Groups, Great Plains Fish Habitat Partnership and Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program; we handle a lot of their dollars, they are not 501(c)(3) and can't handle their own money. What we provide is ability to warehouse money, work with contractors in two weeks rather than months when going through federal system. Since 2011, we have handled over \$2 million a lot of which goes directly to farmers and ranchers; a unique thing we are able to do. We have staff who are skilled and can help when linked to our mission. Anything is possible, and we are always looking for new ways to help our partners leverage staff hours and other things; working with many of you and looking for new partners.

Josh Dukart, North Dakota Grazing Lands Coalition – I am the former executive director of North Dakota Grazing Lands Coalition and I appreciate the invitation to be part of this. In some states this might seem to be an oddity, but not in North Dakota and not with the pro-partnership mentality that we have been a part of the last several years. I have been part of the Grazing Coalition since in 2009 up until a few months ago. The reason I am not any longer is I have a private consulting business, a ranch, a new baby and two other young kids. I am honored to still represent the Grazing Coalition to share with you what they do. Most states have a forage council, grazing coalition or grassland coalition or something similar. In North Dakota this coalition started in 1996. Private landowners, farmers and ranchers who had been through some challenging times (these men and women had learned some things) gathered information they had personally endured and came out on the other side. They decided to share tools, knowledge and experience at their disposal with other land managers which became core of what they do. The mentorship network they have extends across 26 management units across the state of North Dakota. Their contact information is available to anyone interested in having them come out and speak for grazing coalition and provide technical assistance. One of the things I

found over the years as an agency working for universities, NRCS, individuals, soil conservation districts and others, as a government employee I could talk about grazing plans, cropping, soil health, or managing finances and talk until I was blue in the face. But if I could bring another farmer or rancher with me, have farmer-to-farmer interaction, all I had to do was step back. I think that is because of, been-there done-that, then partnership between organization and individual is what built relationship and trust and carried that torch even further. What still carries them in a strong way is the number of opportunities that has come their way and some they sought out. They have built a number of different partnerships, a financial connection, technical assistance connections or simply teaming up to coordinate and develop educational activities and policy. These educational activities and partnership that facilitate relationships has led them through last few years--through strategic planning and things like Prairie Pothole Joint Venture and Grasslands Policy Tour. You'll have opportunity tonight going out to Black Leg Ranch. Jerry currently serves as the Vice President of the Grazing Coalition and provides more tours, maybe even more than what their schedule allows, but they believe in sharing that information. So, they rarely say no even though they have plenty going on. We have a winter conference and summer tour every year and anything else they see as a need or desire based on positive improvements to the landscape. Whether it's for ranchers, absentee landowners, wildlife emphasis or conservation emphasis, they think holistically and bring all that together. Everything they do is tailored to specific audience, but rarely does it include a narrow message--broad, but effective. One of the things they have taken on recently is the Aldo Leopold Conservation Award; the ranch you will be on tonight was the inaugural winner in 2016 and they also won the National Cattlemen's Stewardship Award in the same year. Whether from conservation-specific standpoint or livestock standpoint; whatever angle you are playing you can accomplish all of those goals. Throughout my career I have heard you can have this or that, but you can't have both--but, it is possible to accommodate both. Before you compromise you try to accommodate because if you compromise too far nobody gets what they want. I never would have moved back to the family ranch if it wasn't for groups like the Grazing Coalition who can show you how things could be, not how they have to be, not stereotype. The reason I list all of those things is because all of those things happen, not just because of specific individuals in the Coalition but because of people, the organizations they have partnered with over the years, a constant evolution. The partners with the Leopold Award has been the North Dakota Stockman's Association, North Dakota Soil Conservation and The Sand County Foundation based out of Wisconsin, the founding agency of the award and sponsors. They are the life blood of a particular activity because it requires a specific amount of dollars year in and year out and that is why many of the organizations represented here have played a role. In some cases, we have had to go through organizations and ask and then there are agencies that realize the importance of that and help without even asking. In addition to that, other partnerships we have had is the Natural Resources Trust small grants program and we have not only appreciated the funding, but support behind the activities of what we use funding for. We had funding agreement with Natural Resources Conservation Service for a number of years; North Dakota Prairies RC&D who cooperates on educational activities; North Dakota State Health Department, water quality division as well as other grassland or grazing coalitions across state boundaries. It is called the North Dakota Grazing Coalition, name is narrow on how this group thinks and I have had the privilege of being able to sit back and take it all in for nine years. It has been awesome for me from business and professional standpoint. We have accomplished individuals from around the state on speed dial on my cell phone. These particular individuals are pro-partnership individuals and are able to accomplish things quicker and that is how they see accomplishing greater things in the future. There is plenty of conflict when you start talking about soils, plants, animals, agriculture, but if we focus on what we can agree on, too many assumptions made but if can get

through those there is so much more in common than we think. I appreciate being able to contribute to this discussion.

Terry – Thank you panel. Josh, do you think there is capability, you mentioned wrong assumptions made, it seems conservation and agriculture communities are almost constantly at odds about something. Do you think that rift will ever narrow given philosophy of Grazing Lands Coalition? *Josh* – It can narrow and come closer, doesn't have to be exactly the same, good if not the same, but has to do with how we have those respectful conversations and discussions on both sides of a particular issue. How we share the ideas and how we put together what we can and can't do makes a big difference. Something not long ago happened and we can admit some of that, but a lot of good things built up to that point, even though we separated for a bit we have come back closer and quicker this time; plenty of common ground. Assumptions are dangerous, be willing to have accommodating attitude in terms of what you see and want and then answer the question, if both sides can do that; I am big believer in having a facilitator. At end of the day people didn't like the facilitator, but they liked each other, and I am fine in that role. I have done that with our own family and our business and have moved forward, rather than sitting on opposite sides of the table and waiting to see who wins; that never accomplishes near as much as the alternative methods. *Kelly* – Comments on partnerships, first one for Steve. When I first came back to South Dakota and tried to reach out to the agriculture community on concern with corn borer; the only one they hated more than us was DU. We brought up Dale Hall and had a conversation and worked our way through that and corn is moving forward, they hired a conservation director and are committing money to Pheasants Forever and DU. For people in South Dakota the world has turned over; partnerships work, and communication does happen. The second part is for Pheasants Forever. When we had a downturn of pheasants in South Dakota a few years ago the Governor got people together to talk about what to do about habitat and a number of things came out of that Conference. Set up a Habitat Foundation and one of the members, Ness, has a big ag banking business. We had a meeting two weeks ago in Chamberlin and we put a precision ag person into the bank with intent to build business plans with farmers and ranchers and have them at the table. That is the model to be successful. When you talk to bankers it is all about money, so they are very excited about that--these partnerships are working. Reaching out to ag community takes time, but it does work. *Sara* – In Missouri, once a year we bring a number of partners together; ag, environmental, conservation and local government in part so they can understand the role the agency has concerning these diverse perspectives. Sometimes we meet a sector at a time. When you have the ability to bring partners together, use turning point technology, you can gage these 70-plus partners and get to see diversity of answers and see where folks are in agreement. On some issues you may not think there is agreement and there really is, so it has been a valuable tool for us just to get diversity together and better understand where agencies are at and where the commonalities are. *Terry* – When you have those discussions you find out how much you do have in common. Two months ago, held meeting with two very diverse communities and had honest and frank discussions. In the past we have had partnerships, but because of some wrong assumptions by some folks those partnerships were forced to be dissolved. So, you had to adapt and improvise and the partners found a way to move forward again. We thought the old system was working well, but not able to go that route anymore and this shows how strong partnerships are and we are not going to give up on the landscape. We know there are important issues out there. We gave a grant to a rancher, Brian, running 400 cattle on his operation, with fencing and water resources he was able to increase his herd to 600 and supports wildlife habitat. It does work on both sides, both can't win, but can coexist.

Josh – In Missouri, if you have ever been handed the goals you are supposed to achieve but didn't get to be part of creation, you have less ownership. But when get to be part of discussion, everybody is in there and lets group itself educate the rest of the group rather than

you playing middle person, there is a lot of power in that too. We use that scenario with several groups that we have done conflict resolution for my wife and I were to do consensus building, but to have consensus have to resolve some conflict first. By having discussion, the creation of anything developed by that group that impacts them is a real positive and there is ownership, instead of creating it and then giving it to them. The second thing is, Brian had perfect example of where things can go, but if they can contribute to that as well as help the landscape driving wildlife, how is that not a win/win. As many wins as there are partners in the group should be what we are part of. One of the roles the Grazing Coalition plays with private landowners and land managers are tremendous programs and partnerships. Everything from cost sharing to technical assistance, but once those things are in place, the infrastructure, there needs to be ability to manage it where management follows the tools. Somewhere we need mentors and they have decided that is the initiative they can fill as partners. Decide if we can defer something based on what wildlife species are targeted like nesting season, etc. but if they have never considered those variables before it is nice to have someone who has and won't have to reinvent the wheel. We can't accomplish by ourselves, don't know of any agency that can.

Keith Trego – Because agriculture is so important to our part of Midwest, noticed over last few years that the players in the ag world have changed. In North Dakota ag partners were the North Dakota Farmers Union, North Dakota Farm Bureau and others, now when do collaboration we are talking to Grazing Coalition, North Dakota Soybean Council and North Dakota Corn Growers. It is interesting to watch the ag boards. I attribute it to the fact that they are watching what is going on in other states, watching Iowa on water quality issues, watching Nebraska and South Dakota and everywhere in the Midwest. I get these groups' magazines and they are full of terrific articles about sustainable ag and marketing and about products that come from well-managed land. Great stuff and so different in last few years--a whole turn over. Some states are lagging back and still looking backwards; commodity groups are amazing. *Terry* – We have worked with a lot of those that fight us constantly and we will be looking to Grazing Coalition and asking how we can do better, how can we understand, taking a look at that, they don't trust us, but they do trust you.

Jim Leach – Applaud efforts made with ranching community, a natural fit with grassland conservation and even wetland conservation. For us that have to deal with row crop agriculture it is a totally different scenario; thoughts on how we crack that nut? The federal government, NRCS spent millions of dollars on conservation but looking at row crop agriculture it is hard to pick out where that money went. Ranching community is easier than row crop agriculture. *Steve* – Your observation is spot-on, it is a bigger challenge for us. DU has been a little more involved in soil health effort and long-term sustainability with crops the way they are today. It has to do with decline in organic matter and there are some wildlife practices like cover crops or introducing livestock into operation or winter wheat, so we are hopeful that may help. Small right now, good work done in North and South Dakota and is more progressive side of row crop producers trying new things. Common ground that ensure long-term sustainability on soil and how wetlands and livestock and all of those things can play into it. *Rachel* – We are working with precision ag and looking at data with row crop producers. If it is going to be sustainable, it has to be profitable so that is the attitude we are taking and assisting with that effort. We are looking at their data and numbers and having them identify acres that are unprofitable. A lot of them are not putting pen to paper or penciling those numbers out so we are working with producers to go through software and then show them side-by-side comparisons. Which may mean introducing cover crops to see economic benefits to that practice before going out onto the landscape. We are not changing landscape practices but changing mindset of producers who are in conservation and show them how it can become more profitable as opposed to something that sacrifices profit. *Josh* – Agree with both of these comments. Steve's comment about the soil is where it starts and having worked in several other states, you can take the ranch-kid out of us but

east of us is definitely a different environment and mindset. The considerations and variables and competition, all of the things that go along with that are different. To take that and level the playing field is go back to the soil, whether using organic matter, biological tests to see what kind of life is in soil like bacteria or fungi or whatever. Once your land manager starts there, it doesn't matter if grassland or cropland, forest, or garden, if start with soil health first as their priority. They start building it up from there and begin to realize what they don't have in their system by using a specific tool and everything that is part of that equation they begin to build a system that does fall into sustainability. That is tough because we don't necessarily want to sustain something that is already degraded, we want to regenerate to a greater level than what it is. If we start with soil and build it up from there and it becomes a human physiology thing to get your mind wrapped around focusing on the soil rather than focusing on the crop, the cow or the dollar. To be sustainable all of those things have to be part of the equation. We can take one and run a long way with it but if we leave any of those other components behind it is going to break. If not profitable, not going to be sustainable. You can have great landscape and good profitability but if it falls apart it is not the same. The people, financing and the resources have to work in unison. As we build up from the soil it doesn't matter as much if we have that as focal point.
Terry – Thank you panel.

Refreshment Break - Sponsored by Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation

Offsite Dinner Event: Black Leg Ranch with entertainment by Blind Joe

Sponsored by Brandt Information Services

Kelsey Hersey made remarks.

Board Buses depart at 3:30 pm

Board Buses to return to Park 9:00 pm,

Hospitality Room – Sponsored by National Shooting Sports Foundation

Tuesday, June 26, 2018

Breakfast – Sponsored by National Wild Turkey Federation
Ross Melinchuk made remarks.

Electronic Licensing and Tagging

Todd Schaller, Chief Conservation Warden, Wisconsin DNR (PowerPoint - Exhibit 7) – A lot of states are talking about and looking at electronic licensing and tagging for a variety of reasons. Wisconsin started conversations in 2013 and implemented them in 2015 and carcass tags weaved into the changes we were going through. Wisconsin has long history of different type of hunting systems, but I will talk mainly about deer, our cash cow. We had metal tags that had to go on each carcass and were assigned to you. As technology changed we had back tags that went away in 2014 which was not only a hunter identifier, but part of carcass tag. When you harvested a deer, you had to put a part of your back tag on the deer and that would indicate from a distance if had tagged out or not, so there were some advantages to that. We moved into Tyvek tags with back tags and separate tag that was part of the license and had to be attached to the deer upon harvest. In last version of that, not only do you have to tag you have to validate it by punching holes in, cutting it or other method and write date and time of kill. In 2013, we were coming to an end on with our current license contract so we explored other license options. The contractor we currently use is Wisconsin Interactive Network (WIN), vend for us and licenses for other agencies in the state. Did outreach and asked customers what they wanted to see in licenses, ramped up since then; younger people wanted on phone or web, wanted quick, easy access. Not only access for how to buy one, but how to display it; wanted to know why they had to carry paper license. So, we developed an electronic license system. Customers thought it was completely electronic, but it wasn't, still had some paper that went with it. We went away from durable carcass tags to a plain paper system. We still maintained having to validate a tag and attach it to a deer. Through our wildlife program we developed plastic bags to encourage hunters to stuff paper into a bag to protect it, but still required hunters to write the date of harvest. In addition, when you registered deer you had to write registration confirmation number on the tag. We made some rule changes, used to have to tag immediately upon harvest, changed to when you physically left the animal. In 2015, went to electronic registration system. Prior to that had partners that registered deer for us. You took your deer to local business, were handed tag or they put it on the deer. Now no longer had to go to a place, could phone in or go to website to register harvest online. Under current license system, four ways to display proof of purchase: Wisconsin driver's license; conservation card (a \$3 additional charge to license purchaser which uploaded their data); plain paper they could print at home; or, digital pdf file saved on phone. In order for wardens to check driver's license or conservation card, officer scanned them, and it pulls up their customer profile. One of the challenges is connectivity, no internet everywhere. We could scan it and it may not show data right away, but when connected it would come up. I might be five miles away but not have their information if enforcement was necessary. Same with conservation card, officers have scanning apps on their phones. The most common and popular method is the driver's license. Another challenge is boundary water fishing, you could not show another states' warden your driver's license, so you would have to carry paper license; we need to find fixes for that, because neighboring state officers can't scan their license. In 2017, budget eliminated carcass tags for deer and turkey, that was a rule put upon us. One challenge of that was the budget passed part way into the season. Changed from carcass tag to authorization, which would tell hunter what sex they could shoot, whether on private or public land, but accountability is at risk. If we are checking a deer we need to know whose deer it is and should be able to find a tag for that deer, but we don't have that component of it now. This has caused changes in the hunting community for part of the public concern is that without that accountability it would increase

poaching, violating or taking multiple deer; difficult for law enforcement too. Officers are good with people and determining whether they are cheating the system or not. I am comfortable that we are catching the people that need to be caught, but a few always slide through regardless of what system you have. Almost all aspects of deer hunting tied back to carcass tag so an ongoing process. It makes it easier to violate and the last piece of challenge was border states or law enforcement partners and not having access to that license data. A lot of opportunities, rule simplification ties back to every state and continued conversations about R3. Challenges you to go find someone who does not hunt in your state and explain to them what they have to do to hunt deer, it is a complicated system to explain. Simpler in this system; buy authorization, harvest deer and register deer. Immediate access to electronic data. It used to take months to find out what harvest was. Advantage to this system is data access is on the spot. With scanning app, officers get to know more about customers than they probably want us to know. We get to know who they are, what authorizations and licenses they have, what recreational vehicles they registered, what harvest record had been and whether there are prior law enforcement arrests. So, from enforcement perspective a powerful tool. Customer trends aspect, people want to use their phones and most of deer registrations are on phones. The change your staff and customers have to go through is key, but benefits of instant data is great. R3 making it easier for our customers and still have appropriate level of accountability. The other benefit of our license systems is we have tools within it now as far as outreach and marketing to license buyers that we didn't have before. *Randy* – Do you still tie carcass tags to an individual, do we make them label it at their camp or residence? *Todd* – No we don't, managing deer like we manage pheasants; we have tags for pheasants and a bag limit and if we talk to an individual, through conversation we are able to determine if they exceeded their bag limit; so, we use the bag limit thought process with deer and turkey.

American Fisheries Society Report

Doug Austen, Executive Director, American Fisheries Society (PowerPoint - Exhibit 8)
– Thanks for encouraging AFS to be more involved with MAFWA. We are a typical professional society, the same as The Wildlife Society and your involvement with us is equally important. Four things we do to add value to the states. We have four regional associations, have joint chapters in almost every state, about 65 chapters; and we are working on a new chapter in the Mideast, so international as well. Seeing new programs and new schools coming onboard, not typical land grant universities, through USFWS a lot of new undergraduate programs are being developed. We have sections where people move around specific areas and educate on fish management, aquaculture and genetics. Last year, established science communications; so, we can talk better and more effectively to the general public. Our membership is mixed; 30% are academia, students and professors, and 70% state biologists; also have affiliates to chapters but not members to the society, a lot of state biologists fall in that category. Have a mix of state, federal and tribal members, about 8,500 in states. Have official membership category, primarily for states agencies and have about 30 in MAFWA area. Revitalizing membership with states, there are some benefits, but some of those have changed, but love to get all states on board. Primarily what we do is about science; we publish six journals, the bread and butter of science publications; and big books program, mainly textbooks authored by agency biologists and academia. We do meetings all the time, that is how we share, learn about and collaborate on science, important to have face-to-face interactions. Business and industry use conferences more and more and it is a vital part of who we are. We build events to let people learn the science. We have over 7,000 students who attend meetings collectively and have a lot of opportunity to pay for travel to these events. Our meeting is coming up in New Jersey, expect about 2,000 people; major session on wind power. The Wildlife Society is meeting later this fall and will be in Columbus, Ohio. Encourage your staff to come to these meetings as they are the singular place

where they can find out about their profession. Working on first joint meeting between The Wildlife Society and AFS, breaking ground and learning a lot, conversations that haven't happened before. We can work on things to partner on, work to break down barriers and bridge the gap across these professions and bring in new people. This will likely be the largest gathering of fish and wildlife professionals ever; 4,000-5,000 people in Reno. Put this on your calendars, you have small groups of people going to meetings, but now will have twice as many going to a single meeting, rather than half to two meetings. One of the challenges will be approval and paying for this. The value will benefit your people and presents a unique opportunity. Four things value-added, what we can do for you or with you: industry standards, what we do help encourage collaboration across states and watersheds; science-based policy initiatives, adoption by states through AFWA; professional and society diversity, a challenge you are all dealing with; and professional development, how you can become more effective or professionally adapted to keep up to speed and learn about things to help them do their jobs better. Industry standards we develop to make things work better. Three examples: publications for fish and mussel kills which utilizes information from the states and others to standardize and estimate monetary value. Without standards everyone goes their own way and it leads to chaos. Standards allow for acceptable procedure; these can be developed with latest technology. Standardization of sampling: started back in the 1980s in the Midwest, working across states and sharing fisheries information. Even more important when talking about impacts on watersheds and across jurisdictional boundaries. Standardization allows us to do things we can't do otherwise. Yet, dealing with challenges where states want to do it their way, but if you can change things a little bit and use standards protocols that is better than individually. About 10 years ago Standard Methods book was put out and we are updating that, with DNA and other new technology which allows biologists to enter data to the website and compare to other states. Going through multistate grant process to see if we get funding or not for renewal of this. If not will try to find other funding. Similar to this is information, each state has reports that don't make it to published literature. A lot of reports sitting in files or maybe on the server that is essentially unfindable data. So, we are working with broad group of partners to allow states to upload information and search it. Information on channel catfish or white bass or whatever. This is also going through multistate grant process. Challenge for you is what else should we be doing? These ideas came out of WAFWA and continued on by Midwest and others. This clearinghouse could be easily applied to wildlife literature as well. Science-based policy is important in DC right now in terms of showing that good decisions were made and were well-informed by science, to protect the resource. We get involved a lot of ways, we work with agencies on agreements and with states as well. Talk about common issues, create conversations that don't happen right now. We host forums with non-profit partners in fisheries and partnerships with federal agencies and policy politics. We have been developing an opportunity for people to come to DC and work with AFS on policy issues. Working with partners is key. We work directly with several groups and host a group called CASS (Consortium of Aquatic Science Societies). They all gather together to identify issues like diversity and science. AFS is working on four key issues defined by leadership, these will change next year; Recovery of America's Wildlife Act, Water of U.S., Magnuson-Stevens Act and Coop Units are the four areas we are focusing efforts on. Last Thursday we had a briefing on the Recovery of America's Wildlife Act in DC about the importance of this act in terms of protected species of greatest need; 72 co-sponsored the bill, 49 republicans 33 democrats. The societies are really getting involved in this, chapters are writing to representatives encouraging them to sign on we have 11 co-sponsors and hoping to get over 100, maybe 150, making great movement right now. AFWA is key lead on this process and working with them to try to identify partners for this. AFS chapters can be vehicles for doing this as well. We get involved in policy and congressional issues right in their own back yard. Where do we go next, love to have your input on this. Where we can best use our limited resources. Professional

diversity is a challenge for us, green 2.0 report is coming out and we are not as green as we need to be. Diversity is core part of where we should be but are not. Have Hutton Junior Fisheries Biology Program focused on High School junior or seniors interested in working on summer internships; working in Wisconsin for a number of years, Missouri just signed on have 28 students right now. If other states are interested we would love to talk to you about it, a fantastic opportunity for your staff to get engaged with a young person. Professional development is a big part of AFS and is part of what we do with all of your staff and others. Building strong credentials and help them become better professionals. Need to grow with their job and get additional training, that is where professional societies can come in and fill the gap of state training. We offered over 100 courses last year on all sorts of topics, like rotenone application, electrofishing, R statistical method, GIS, fish passage and others. We had a webinar before Christmas, a fun way about learning to talk about science in a way that doesn't create diversity. Professional certifications are part of this as well, it is a changing market but shows value in science and certification will be even more important in the future. It covers things like what we need to know to become effective professionals, brings cohesion, a level of competency by training these people in skills they have and credibility to the public. Certifications can assure members of House and Senate that these are true professionals. Provides clear guidance and direction to educators through course work lined up to become a certified wildlife or fisheries professional. We will continue dialog to continue to support your staff to make them more professional and get training needed. The best professionals were those engaged in societies, the ones seeing new ideas and bringing ideas to the table to transform their agencies. Involvement and engagement with AFS not only helps us, but helps you do good things as well.

Missouri River Fish Research

Paul Bailey, District Fisheries Supervisor, North Dakota Game and Fish Department – (PowerPoint - Exhibit 9) – Positive things happening in North Dakota fisheries right now, our anglers have never had it better. In 1992, we had 140 recreational fisheries managed by North Dakota Game and Fish department, now almost 450. In 1993, Mother Nature turned on the faucet and hasn't been turned off yet. North Dakota is the heart of the prairie pothole region, important for waterfowl production in the Central Flyway. A lot of those wetlands now are important fisheries in the state. A little dry in early 2000's but after spring of 2009, 2010 and 2011, had hard winters so that refilled a lot of these lakes. We have about ten times the number of fishing waters and some of them are really impressive water bodies that are key component of fishing opportunity. Lakes didn't happen by accident, even though Mother Nature lent us a big hand, but we have been aggressive in efforts to establish these fisheries and one of the keys is our partnership with our two federal fish hatcheries (Garrison Dam and Devils Lake) as North Dakota does not own any fish hatcheries. In 1995, we stocked 300,000 fingerling walleye in 38 different lakes; in 2017, 7.5 million in 140 lakes and couldn't have been accomplished without that great partnership. We are also developing fishing access, have one crew who do a fantastic job, they are putting in boat ramps. When you put all of that together with creating angling access our license sales have expanded. In late 1980s, early 1990s, we were selling 110,000 fishing licenses, and now are up to 220,000 fishing licenses. North Dakota is a destination for nonresident anglers as well. Rugby is geographic center of North America. We have a lot of neighbors who give us the opportunity to work with surrounding states and provinces on managing some of our border fisheries. In northern and eastern North Dakota is the Red River basin which contains the world's greatest channel catfish fishery, 15- to 30-pound cats are common. In west, the Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers enter from Montana and we have a spectacular paddlefish population there that provides unique angling opportunity. South of us is Missouri River which is world renown walleye fishery. I get to participate in research in Missouri River and Lake Oahe; a record walleye caught recently was 15 lb. 13 oz. which beat the

record that stood for 15 years. Good trophy opportunity and provides food for the table as well. There are 126,000 people that live in metropolitan area here and 30% of residents age 16 and older buy a fishing license. Research projects we recently wrapped up in partnership with South Dakota Game and Parks and South Dakota State University was a walleye tagging study, conducted between Garrison Dam and Oahe Dam near Pierre (320 river miles on the Missouri River). The goal was to gain information on walleye movements and mortality rates and angler harvest. This was the largest tagging study ever conducted in the Dakotas. We tagged 34,000 adult walleye from 2013-2016 and have had over 8,000 reports back from anglers. One thing that became apparent is that walleye aren't very mobile. 90% of the tagged walleye caught were within 20 miles of where tagged. We found regional populations where fish moved around within regions but didn't leave regions. We did see spawning sites and walleye were most likely to return to same area to spawn year after year. From fisheries management standpoint, we knew walleye didn't move much, but didn't know scope of walleye regions, so we can be more precise with management. The real meat and potatoes of study is on total mortality. We got total mortality estimates with combination of angling and natural mortality. In 2013, in all regions had high mortality, approaching 80%.. We don't like to see above mortality above 55% or 33% angler mortality which was a result of the 2011 flood which had devastating consequences and led to large imbalance between predators and prey. As predator and prey brought back into balance, below accepted levels, confirmed current regulations we have in place are right for this fishery. Second was a study to answer where walleye are coming from. Natural reproduction, none stocked from Garrison to South Dakota border since 1981 Having that understanding is important. One tool that can answer that for us is trace metal analysis. Water is more than just H₂O, there is a lot of stuff in that water, like barium, calcium and strontium that allows us to identify where fish are coming from. The idea is to look at barium to calcium or strontium to calcium ratios that are present in water. Primary productivity takes up those minerals at same ratio as present in the water and that follows up the food web into the fish. We looked at tributaries entering the Missouri River between Garrison and Oahe Dams to see those ratios. We do have significant differences in water chemistry which allows us to identify where fish are from. Looking at otolith, ear stones in fish, they are calcified structures that live in a calcified sack lined with cilia. When sound waves travel through the water, it vibrates to brain that sound out there. Another neat thing otolith do, if look at it in a microscope, at northern latitudes fish grow fast in summer and slow during winter so they are used to age fish. The process for determining elemental composition is what was present when fish was born. Use sophisticated equipment to shoot tiny laser beam at focus of otolith, vaporizing that material and determining mineral ratio. We did this in several hundred fish and compared ratios to water samples to match up fish. Found Monroe River in South Dakota to be where fish hatched. Beaver Bay is most important spawning site in North Dakota and other important sites for walleye production were identified. We identified areas we don't want to see altered and investigating areas we do. Both of these projects were great cooperative projects between those three entities. *Jim Douglas* – Rivers you were discussing, do they go back up into the river? *Paul* – The mouths of these tributaries are historically where we find spawning aggregation in the spring; it seems that is where fish are returning to reproduce. These clearly are some of the most important spawning sites. *Kelly* – Neat research and outstanding job of presentation. Thank you for the work, good presentation.

Prairie Moose Report

Jason Smith, Big Game Biologist, North Dakota Game and Fish Department – (PowerPoint - Exhibit 10) – Moose are native to the state, but rare and are limited to small quantities of natural woodlands in the Turtle Mountains in central part of state. But over past several decades moose have expanded past what we consider native range. A lot of that has to do

with landscape alteration, diversion of prairie to crop land, planted tree rows and farmsteads and wood blocks for fire suppression and damming Missouri River. Lake Sakakawea has highest density in the state with just over two moose per square mile. There is a nice wetland complex there. We also find recent changes with habitat loss and loss of CRP, removal of trees, draining wetlands with drain tiling and maturation of aspen forests in northeast North Dakota and all of that may be contributing to moose declines. We have had some movement coming from northwest Minnesota and southern Manitoba. The Turtle Mountain region which was considered habitat for moose, populations are low in those areas. We did have hunting units in those areas, but now do not. We opened an area south of Bismarck a couple of years ago due to expanding moose populations along the Missouri River corridor. Moose can be found statewide. We have had reports in southwest North Dakota on South Dakota line and in the Badlands, but highest density is in northwest in Units 9, 10 and 11. We back up these observations with aerial surveys using fixed-wing aircraft and our first specific moose aerial survey was done in 1974 in northeast Pembina area of state. First count was 19 moose. The high count was 261 in mid 1990s, one moose per square mile. In 2017 only two moose. Along with other traditional area, Turtle Mountains first count was in 1978 with three moose, 112 in mid-1990s, and 10 in 2017. Aerial surveys are done with a foot of snow after the first of the year, specifically more toward winter whitetail work we do. We can get away with less snow for moose because they stand out better in winter. Over time we expanded aerial survey area to the west as well as moose management units and in central ND. And most recently in upper Missouri River area in northwest survey blocks which is 65 square miles and Kenmare is 1,500 square miles. Population trends from 1974 to present, aerial counts low in beginning, peaked in mid-1990s and then decline and then uptick of moose numbers in northwest corner; a shift from east to west. We do hunt moose in the state, first season since 1901 was 1977 with ten permits issued for bows only. There has always been good hunter success, about 90%. The hardest part is drawing a license, it is competitive. They are considered special big game along with elk and big-horned sheep and are open to ND resident only and landowners, a once in a lifetime draw. Over time had shift to nontraditional habitat and with that changes in number of licenses and size and distribution of hunting units. In the traditional habitat, the Pembina Gorge, has hardwoods and riparian corridor through there, but over time had shifts in range. Big increase east to west, so not uncommon to see moose in cattails, crop lands, sunflowers, willow aspen islands or lowland areas in hay-dominated landscape. Areas that aren't able to be farmed because they are too wet in certain parts of the year. Greatest numbers in northwest in nontraditional areas like aspen, some hardwoods and willow that moose love; comparable to what you find in Alaska. Little is known about mortality rate or reproduction or seasonal movements in this part of the state but has been open to hunting since 2000. Due to staff reports, comments from landowners we knew we had increasing population in that part of state. Moose are not all doing the best. In southern ranges of other states populations are declining and a lot of research being done at that time. We decided to do study in this part of state and get some bio rates. Speculated that this was winter density and moving in seasonally. We conducted research March 2014 to May 2016. Pembina Hills closed in 2007 and Turtle Mountain which closed in 2013 since numbers were low. So, study area was in Kenmare study block and Missouri River area. We looked at annual survival for adult female moose (which drives population), mortality, reproduction rates and annual and seasonal movement. The other thing we were interested in looking at was climate conditions that impact moose density and habitat use. In other northern states with moose, climate was having an impact on populations. We collared 40 adult cow moose, fitted them with GPS collars, 20 in each study area and watched them with helicopter. Collars were set to collect location every four hours and give us indication of mortality if animal didn't move after 12 hours. At the time of capture we collected blood samples to determine pregnancy and disease strain and I went back with aerial surveys to look to see if they had calves and again late winter to see if calves were

still with cows. On climate, we do data loggers to collect micro-climate data. We knew we had an increase statewide, had high adult survival 97.5% and good reproduction with pregnancy rate of 95%, calf production also good 36% and 80% recruitment. Moose in North Dakota are faring better than other populations in lower 48 states. One of the reasons is we lack any major predators, no wolves or bears, and minimal disease. Based off collar locations, most moose are not migratory, but some movements in Kenmare area due to habitat distribution. Potential effects of climate, expect exposure to heat stress, but results demonstrated temperatures close to northeast Minnesota. We found temperatures that could have caused heat stress didn't and vital rates showed different, so no direct relationship between climate and population trends. We had shift from traditional to non-traditional habitat. Why the westward shift? Contrary to popular opinion we did not move them. Theory goes back to previous research from 2002-2006. That work was looking at north central and northeast populations and potential effects of parasitic disease. Part of findings from this work, we were collecting whitetail deer heads for CWD study and looking for brain worm. From that we looked at adult worms and tied back to deer units and generated relative risk map that shows risk of transmission of brain worm to moose, which tends to drop off as you move west. Canadian provinces seeing same thing, brain worm drops off in Saskatchewan. Fortunate to be able to do a couple studies on moose and they are doing well. In 2015, USFWS was petitioned by Center for Biological Diversity to list the northwest subspecies of moose in North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan as threatened. Based on that petition in June 2016 and as part of that they allowed a 60-day comment period. We sent in comment and they are currently in 12-month status review and are developing a five- to seven-year work plan. They have over 500 petitioned species awaiting 12-month findings, so in process based on priority. They have a heavy workload they are dealing with and it sounds like they are planning to revisit this finding in 2020. Our response was we have successfully been managing moose in state for 40 years; increasing population and licenses; increasing in northwest, even though declines in some of traditional habitat it appears to be related to brain worm. Climate does not seem to have an affect but may have effect on distribution of the parasite. We have adequate regulatory mechanisms and recent scientific research with good information on bio-rates in the state which allows us to properly manage a healthy moose population. Currently harvest does not appear to be impacting moose numbers. In balancing act with landowner tolerance limits and high hunter demand. Currently over 12,000 applicants for once-in-a-lifetime licenses. For 2018 have 330 licenses. The majority of increases of licenses are in northwest and are primarily antlerless with a bow. We continue to monitor with aerial surveys, look at population trends, continue to monitor impacts of parasites such as winter tick issues and monitor other impacts of brain worm or liver flukes. *Ollie* – I understand whitetails are moving west too? *Jason* – A lot of decreases in moose population were related to an increase in whitetail deer population. *Unknown* – Impact of oil drilling in that part of state? *Jason* – Doesn't appear to be; no direct impact on moose at this time.

Refreshment Break – Sponsored by National Rifle Association

AFWA Report

Virgil Moore, AFWA President and Idaho Department of Fish and Game Director – Ron is working with Western Governors Association (WGA) director and between WAFWA and AFWA we have a good relationship with WGA and staff which is very useful. I have not been to a MAFWA meeting before. Came in from Rapid City last night and had sunset as we drove north that contrasted against green grass and pronghorn. The picture was perfect. Doug spoke about Recovering America's Wildlife Act, 68 sponsors currently and have letters from over half of the states' agencies and commissions. Keep those coming and keep working on your congressional to get a sign on. The senate version of this bill is where the action is right now. Had things keyed

up a couple of times for introduction but for various reasons it backed down. Through Jim's work and meetings with staff it is apparent that the appropriation folks are not comfortable with permanent appropriation approach the House had. Didn't want to give up control of that much money. We had active discussion in executive committee meeting about what to do; stay true to Blue Ribbon Panel recommendations or go with different version in the Senate of annual appropriations. You know we fight for state wildlife grants, fighting for money that we know we need and lack of certainty makes it tough. If we don't go along with this, bill is not going to move forward. This keeps us on the playing field, but don't know how it will come together in conference. Concepts are still there rather than dead for this session and Senator Risch from Idaho will see if he can get introduction of the bill. Also, had congressional sportsman caucus and had sporting clay shoot in DC in May. One of the enjoyable trips I have made to DC and gave us a chance to meet a lot of folks from the House there. Senator Risch did show up as one of the leaders on this caucus. Have the Strategist (Exhibit 11 – The AFWA Strategist) and will go over some of the items in there. One is chronic wasting disease (CWD) and is a hot topic for all of us. I was in the Southeast for their directors meeting in February. Hunted squirrels with dogs, had a great time but were talking about CWD. AFWA CWD white paper was not finalized yet but Mississippi said they had their first positive. The take home from that, is they had coordinated with their human health services folks to have a consistent statement that was based on Center for Disease Control statements. They were wrong on that and their health folks came out with a statement that basically said you can't eat the meat, period, and had public guidelines associated with it. I went back and got our act together (we don't have CWD in Idaho yet) we made sure had meeting with our human health folks and got exactly the statement we needed. Mississippi is still trying to back that up. It's those kinds of things, if don't have it, you might want to take a look at strategy plans and your statements. If have not seen AFWA white paper, look at it and compare it to what you have in your state. It is a good document, not 100% complete for all states, allowed us to modify Idaho's strategy. Under Migratory Bird frameworks, a real concern, Congress is trying to set the season length and bag limits and set a special season for youth, veterans and disabled folks and it sends the wrong message. We are trying to communicate and states are doing the same. I urge you to stay on point with that. We need to follow Flyway guidelines, not dictated by Congress. Refuge hunting and fishing activities, recently sent in a letter thanking the Service for their leadership on moving with refuges. There are rules for 30 different refuges and there are comments in the letter on taking deeper dive on comprehensive management plans (CMPs to be sure they are consistent to original Act that created them). You will get a chance to see that letter soon. Shout out to Jim Douglas. He took over the Landscape Conservation working group this winter and has really done a great job and is mentioned in the Strategist. They have had input and interaction with USFWS on their LCC plan and helping to move that forward; thanks for your leadership. I assume you have reported on that? *Jim D.* – Yes, Terry might want to comment on action on that. *Terry* – We had panel discussion on that, I appointed four members to steering committee to refine that work plan. *Virgil* – Our hope is at the September meeting to bring forward action to the full board--appreciate your work on this. Midwest is ground zero. Wildlife Services is important to many of our agencies, they do a lot of work for us in Idaho. Recently had legal challenge in federal court in Idaho; without conducting scientific review and how it effects the ecosystem. It stated Wildlife Services has acted in arbitrary and capricious manner and ordered them to sit down with plaintiffs and come up with a method to ensure ecosystem needs are addressed. The judge's rule didn't say what they did was wrong just ordered them to sit down. An interesting ruling because the plaintiffs came out with a statement that said it was time for Wildlife Services to pull head out of the ground and accept non-lethal coexistence mandate for how we manage predators on the landscape. This is a continuous item, new ruling from judge in Idaho that has been a conundrum for states. A continuation to remove or federalize species

management around any federal nexus they can get their hands on--any game and regulated animal that Wildlife Services does work on with a permit from our agency. There are predators not regulated, coyotes and badgers, but it gets at the relationship we have with federal agency. new need to keep close eye on it and may be need for states to be involved. Haven't talked to Ron yet. Another thing AFWA is working on is a legal response to the law review article last fall published in Journal by some academics. They basically took their selection of legal rulings that stated that a federal land manager has population management on the land and got this published in Law Review and it has been cited now by a couple of judges in court cases. Under Carol Bamberg they have been putting together a response and will hopefully get it published in that Law Review, so we have that balance there. If something is put out that is a little different than what we think our information is, we get in front of it and provide good legal thinking on it. Carol has a draft for future court cases to have counter information out there to balance that out. A continuation of an attempt, which AFWA paid attention to, to federalize wildlife management on federal lands. This warrants paying attention to by all of our states because of our responsibility and public trust and our ability to manage. Signed on to House bill 2083, the endangered salmon and fish predation prevention act, it is more of a local issue. It does not easily allow for sea lions and they are decimating some steel beds in the Columbia basin and have taken a loss. The sea lion populations are at an all-time high. They have figured out how to get at salmon and steelhead that are below dams and barriers and congregate at fish banks. Having a huge effect on those and the Marine Mammal Protection Act does not have easy flexibility so trying to get this act through to provide additional flexibility. States have signed on, AFWA has signed on, and tribes have signed on; it is important piece of legislation, getting at need to manage populations relative to mortality effects. Greg Sheehan mentioned National Marine Fisheries Service move to USFWS, we issued statement from AFWA that was neutral. Simply stated we would work with Interior on this to be sure that the needs of the states are covered. Looking for more support but given diversity of the states that was the best we could do. It is a positive statement, but not total endorsement. Mainly west coast and northeast coast but a big step for the USFWS. There are some benefits to it but need conversations. ESA legislation and discussions and budgets, contacted by Senators asking for confidentiality for responses back on legislation. It turns out it is not a small group, at least 16 states, including Florida and North Carolina were contacted. Assembled responses yesterday, haven't had chance to review it. What we do know is it is likely to result in a lot of discussions over next week and may lead to some sort of hearing, not at liberty to reveal details. If you are one of states contacted, don't think the deadline passing is the end of this. Jen and AFWA staff are looking into it. It is mostly consistent with what AFWA and WGA under Governor Meade's initiative worked on, consistent with that. It has some other stuff in there, not sure why. One of good things from being at WGA yesterday, spent time with Governor Meade's staff and got a better understanding on that. We are top of it. If ESA important to your state, you were contacted for comment. We will continue to look at and figure out how to properly communicate from AFWA back to all the states affected by this. Under previous USFWS director, comment was make relative to federal hatchery. Idaho is in process of working with the director to transfer operation to our office to better coordinate programs in our state. I don't know of any other states with that on your screen, management not transfer of ownership, proceeding and hope to be completed late summer or early fall. Wyoming and Idaho are planning a grizzly bear hunt, but don't know if hunt will occur or not because of court case on the delisting of grizzly bears which takes place two days prior to the hunt. Montana chose not to hunt this year but looking forward to first controlled hunt once-in-a-lifetime draw in state of Idaho.

Ron Regan, Executive Director, AFWA – Say thanks publicly for Virgil's leadership, he makes my job easier and we have been on the road a lot together the last 8-10 months. I asked him if

being the AFWA president was what he thought it would be and he said it took more time than he expected. Refuge letter, Caitlin is making copies; we submitted them this morning and I will circulate copies (Exhibit 12). As early as this afternoon you will get an email from me on waterfowl framework legislation. Jen met with House Natural Resources staff last week. Mr. Bishop would like to know what the states think, in general they aren't real thrilled with most of legislation and it was unlikely that the Association would get to a place to support the bill in either the House or the Senate. What we are trying to do is have AFWA end up in neutral position, prefer not to irritate Mr. Bishop too much since he controls the fate of the PR modernization bill and Recovering America's Wildlife Act in the House. On the other hand, we have to stand up for what's right and trying to say things in a way that doesn't actively oppose the bill. The email you are going to get from me is going to have a red line of the bill. What we want from directors is whether or not the language we are trying to use makes sense or not. Regarding CWD, this past weekend there was a retreat in the Adirondacks of New York and they have hired Jay McAninch to take lead in DC to advance our legislative agenda for funding for CWD, research, surveillance and management. So, Jen Mock Schaeffer and Jonathan Mawdsley, on behalf of the AFWA team were at that retreat. It was a positive meeting with some concrete action items to move ahead on your behalf. Virgil mentioned Recovering America's Wildlife Act, there was a call this morning with Jen, Colin O'Meara and Jeff Crane; we know Mr. Risch has produced a bill with annual appropriation language. One of the things we might suggest is that maybe we can manage a bill in the Senate that has 10 years of annual appropriations and then pivot to permanent appropriation. Making assumption that if states can demonstrate concrete actions and outcomes for the 10 years then Senate would revisit that issue and transition to mandatory or permanent authorization; that remains to be seen. On Farm Bill, Andrew Schmidt, our Farm Bill coordinator, has gone to work for DU. Jen is under increased pressure to keep up with that in addition to CWD and a few other things. Kelly Hepler and Curt Melcher from Oregon are co-chairing a President's task force on what future national surveys would look like. Sara and Dale are part of that process. Kelly had a meeting on Friday with 8-10 directors on the call, representatives from three major trade associations plus a senior executive from USFWS and there was agreement on four things. If we do a survey in the future it needs to be simple, reduce from 40 pages to 5 pages for example. Focus on top tier needs of national participation and economics and if enough cost savings could be replicated more frequent than every five years. People are giving up notion that we have to protect trend information at all cost. What we will see under Kelly's leadership, which will be handed out at AFWA annual meeting, are those four things and working group will begin to design survey for 2021. See you in Tampa.

MAFWA COMMITTEE REPORTS

Ollie Torgerson, MAFWA Executive Secretary, Facilitator – You will get email from Delaney to evaluate this conference, hope you fill that out because it will help us plan next year's conference and also ask what topics would be good for agenda for 2019. These committee reports fire off quickly but does not devalue the work of committees, they do a lot of good work for MAFWA. Director action items are voted on at this time except for resolutions which we will discuss but will be acted on tomorrow during the resolution's committee report. Sheila printed committee reports and state of the state reports. Each committee has a director liaison assigned to them to establish a formal connection between committees and the board. I get to present first four reports, either North Dakota doesn't have committee person, or like first one, CITES representative Carolyn Caldwell couldn't be here.

Ollie – Our President is director/liaison to the CITES representative.

CITES (Report - Exhibit 13) – ***Ollie Torgerson, MAFWA Executive Director*** – CITES is the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. This is an

international trade agreement among 183 countries to ensure that trade in specimens of wildlife animals and plants does not threaten species survival. It is important work and we have supported it for years. We work through USFWS and each region has a representative who works with Deb Hahn and Don MacLaughlin of AFWA. The USFWS has the vote and we work through them. There are no Director action items, but Service did solicit public comment on some species to be considered as candidates for proposed listing. Comment period closed last month. Some of our friends like the Center for Biological Diversity and the Humane Society International submitted 250 plants and animals for consideration for listing so we are overwhelmed by legal action. Snake trade is taking a lot of time in CITES, particularly in Asia. There needs to be better control efforts. CITES 30 is meeting next month in Geneva and Carolyn will be attending. She assures us snake trade and turtles will be most active parts of that meeting.

Ollie – Director/liaison position is currently vacant.

Climate Change (Report - Exhibit 14) – ***Ollie Torgerson, MAFWA Executive Director*** – Peter Jacobsen, Minnesota DNR is chair of this committee. Director liaison is vacant since Don Pereira from Minnesota retired, so we have an opening for a director/liaison. This committee met by teleconference last December and nine states participated in the call with primary focus being public administration of federal budget for Climate Science Centers. We will hear more about that in the federal partners report. There was also considerable discussion on how state agencies can provide input to research priorities on climate change. Ohio is scheduled to provide a chair for this committee; a lot of committee chairs rotate as our meeting rotates from state to state.

Ollie – Our President is director/liaison.

Feral Swine (Report - Exhibit 15) - ***Ollie Torgerson, MAFWA Executive Director*** – In 2013, President Jon Gassett appointed an Ad Hoc committee on feral swine and that committee has been active. Steve Backs from Indiana DNR has chaired this committee ever since its creation. There is no ND representative on this committee. This is one of newer committees. They met in conjunction with 2018 International Wild Pig Conference held in Oklahoma City in April and six states participated. There are a number of feral swine removed and number has decreased substantially in Midwest in last couple of years to the point where some states are in detection mode with no known established populations. Good news in some states. One of the charges of this committee was to develop a feral swine management plan and they keep postponing it because of the evolution of control techniques is happening so fast that as soon as they develop a management plan it is going to be obsolete. They are getting better at handling this and doing a lot in cooperation with Wildlife Services. One of their problems is resistance or lack of cooperation of some landowners who continue to be an obstacle for eliminating feral hogs. Some of the landowners seek federal assistance for conservation practices. They recommend MAFWA directors continue to support funding in Farm Bill for wild pig elimination efforts. They will meet next in 2019 at Wildlife Damage Management Conference in Starkville, Mississippi. *Jim D.* – Point out that AFWA's wildlife resource policy committee has part of agenda at AFWA meeting a report from Wildlife Services on feral swine research and anyone who attends AFWA meeting should keep that in mind.

Ollie – Mark Reiter, Indiana is the director/liaison.

Hunter & Angler Recruitment & Retention (now called R3) (Report - Exhibit 16) – ***Ollie Torgerson, MAFWA Executive Director*** – Keith Warnke, Wisconsin DNR is the chair. There are no director action items. They had successful meeting at Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference in Milwaukee last January. I attended part of it and they had 50 people attending, several NGOs, Dan Forster was there and Mark Reiter, quite a robust meeting. There were a lot of reports on techniques and things different states were trying. Six states in Region 3 of USFWS

are currently using step down efforts from national R3 plan. More states are submitting R3 activities as part of grant applications. Seven out of eight states in Region 3 are in process of hiring R3 coordinators. The next meeting is a combined meeting with WAFWA R3 committee next January in Tucson, Arizona

Ollie – Dale Garner, Iowa is director/liaison.

Deer and Wild Turkey (Report - Exhibit 17) – ***R.J. Gross, North Dakota Game & Fish Department*** - Held meeting at last year at Lake Rathbun in Iowa in August; 49 participants and speakers, including state deer and/or wild turkey biologists from 12 Midwest member states (Indiana, Iowa, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Wisconsin). Also in attendance were biologists and researchers from the National Wild Turkey Federation, Quality Deer Management Association, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, USDA Aphis, Iowa State University, South Dakota State University, and Michigan State University. There are no action items. We talked about disease, CWD, deer behavior, surveys, survey responses and had good presentations on technology using apps and smart phones to record data for surveys. We had breakout sessions on turkeys trying to standardize game reports, brood surveys. Turkey have declined across the area. On deer, already had a lot on disease management. The only other big thing from business meeting was a lot of other Midwest states want to add elk as there were a lot of elk issues at this meeting and we needed to get permission. *Ollie*—Elk are in the deer family, so I don't see a problem unless Directors do.

Ollie – Kelly Hepler, South Dakota is the director/liaison.

Furbearers (Report - Exhibit 18) – ***Stephanie Tucker, North Dakota Game & Fish Department*** - The North Dakota Game and Fish Department hosted the Midwest Furbearer Workshop in May in Medora, the heart of the Badlands region. We toured south unit of Theodore Roosevelt National Park. Fifty-one (51) participants attended the workshop in 2018, including 11-member states and provinces furbearer biologists. In last year's workshop in Iowa we identified we need to do a better job collaborating on harvest effort, harvest surveys and head-per-effort unit data to take advantage of some of the new laws. States felt getting channeled more on furbearer issues all of the time and sometimes harvest trend information isn't efficient anymore. Want to use modeling tools to take advantage of more abundance and things like that. Focused on harvest surveys and what we need to know from step one to the end on collecting data and how to use it. No action items but several information items in report. Other topics or presentations included general furbearer management, research and trapping. Most of you know trapping is a pretty small group of constituents. Regulations and the management surrounding it is often complicated and contentious. Find it beneficial to get together with folks experiencing the same issues. A couple of years ago directors asked us to report on large carnivore issues and outlying lions, wolves and bears in the Midwest region. There is a spreadsheet at the end of the report on status of those three large carnivores. Next meeting will be in with Southeastern Furbearer Working Group in Oklahoma.

Ollie – Tamara McIntosh, Iowa is the chair, but she is on maternity leave and Chris Tymeson from Kansas will report. Keith Sexson is the director/liaison and we will need a replacement as Keith is retiring.

Legal – (Report – Exhibit 19) – ***Chris Tymeson, Kansas Department of Wildlife, Parks and Tourism*** – I am vice chair of AFWA legal committee and WAFWA legal committee. We met in 2017, in conjunction with the Director's Meeting in Ashland, Nebraska. We had updates on monarchs, pollinators, wildlife criminal law, two case studies on CWD and discussion of impacts of special river designations. We had eight attendees, representing five states, the federal partners and one NGO partner. The primary focus of the meeting is CLE, continuing education that all of

your attorneys are required to have annually. It is difficult to find in the Midwest education that is on point for wildlife. We did not meet this year, too many conflicts with attendees. I am trying to set a meeting date with Jenny Frazier of Missouri and we are going to co-host in Kansas City next May, still need to discuss with Tamara. I want to publicly thank Keith, who has been a good friend and mentor for the last 19 years About 10 years ago today, I was in Pratt and my appendix ruptured. I was in the hospital and he opened his house to my family, so they could come stay that week I was in the hospital. *Ollie* – We keep hearing about these petitions for listing and its relation to the Equal Access to Justice Act. We need to amend that act because it allows NGOs like Center for Biological Diversity to bring all of these lawsuits at tax payer's expense paying their legal fees. What are chances of our Legal Committee bringing some kind of action to this Board that we could forward to AFWA to move forward with amending that Act? A recommendation to get NGOs out of it and back to what it was intended to do in the first place. We have 500 species listed for petition and another 250 just submitted and taxpayers are paying their legal fees to sue us. *Chris* – Lot of people like to see that fixed but don't know the reality of it and we have discussed it at AFWA many times, but difficult when limiting opportunities to sue and that is what you are advocating for. *Terry* – What Ollie is saying go ahead and let them sue, but we shouldn't have to pay for it.

Ollie – Mark Reiter is director/liaison.

Public Lands (Combined Report - Exhibit 20) – ***Kent Luttschwager, North Dakota Game & Fish Department*** – Joined this group four years ago. We discussed what our biggest challenges are and the different states facing them. In my part of western North Dakota, it is the Bakken oil field. I had slides and pictures. All had heard about it, so our tour and meeting was in Williston this year. We got on rig site and oil and gas people talked with us, an impressive tour. The big thing we wanted to stress was the importance of this MAFWA committee meeting. The overwhelming consensus is this is beneficial, and we encourage directors to continue to support staff members to attend the public lands working group meetings. Another big challenge is balance of compatible uses and staying relevant for outdoor use. Wildlife areas are managed traditionally for wildlife management purposes and continue to see an increase in nontraditional uses like hiking, biking, wildlife viewing, horseback, ATV trails and other activities which may not be compatible but continue to be requested. Many non-traditional users think wildlife areas should be managed with park-like atmospheres which tends to conflict with habitat management. General public use is encouraged but habitat and wildlife management remain our top priority. This is especially important because we are partners in federal aid and PR funds are critical to management. Discussed much needed opportunity for gun ranges and managing gun ranges on wildlife areas, state park properties, MOUs, friends' groups and concessionaires. The original intent of gun ranges was use by hunters preparing for the hunting season however we see an increase in recreational shooting and increase in demand for ranges. The collective concern was how to address this. Continued wildlife habitat funding with PR funds and still address needs of recreational shooting. It is particularly concerning because ranges are often expensive to construct, time consuming and expensive to manage and operate. Other discussion topics were drones, pesticides, partnerships, land acquisition, contracting for services, staffing, cooperative farming agreements and federal land management requirements. In 2016, the public land working group submitted a resolution to consider encouraging evaluation of neonicotinoid pesticide treated seed use on public lands. States continue pursue wildlife friendly alternatives. The group reaffirmed their plans in 2017 and would like to continue support in 2018. The majority of habitat and public use management activities implemented on state wildlife areas is funded by 75% federal aid PR dollars and 25% match from states. In some states wildlife staffing and funding for operating is limited due to state legislation and political leaders who may not fully understand or appreciate the source or mechanism by which wildlife funding

management is derived. The group discussed possible approach to this including need for increasing communication to legislators and other political leaders to better explain all the aspects of WSFR PR/DJ funding and how this equates to local spending authority by on-the-ground managers--possibly develop a video to distribute to legislators and other leadership explaining the issue.

Ollie – Wayne Rosenthal is director/liaison.

Private Lands (Combined Report - Exhibit 20) – **Kevin Kading, North Dakota Game & Fish Department** – We had our meeting held jointly with public lands working group in Williston, North Dakota. The private lands committee is traditionally heavily involved in Farm Bill discussion and we track what is happening with that because CRP and other programs are relevant to private landscape in MAFWA states. At the time of our meeting we had only seen a draft of the House bill and we dove into that the best we could not knowing where that was going to come out. That bill failed but we got a glimpse of what was happening and an idea of where we should be focusing some efforts. We spent quite a little time looking at provisions of the Farm Bill related to CRP, not knowing where that was going to go. We put placeholders in and decided to come back when we knew more. The House bill has been re-introduced and passed and the Senate has introduced their bill, so we know a little more. Still a lot of work to be done. We had discussion on monarch and pollinator updates from each state, specifically talked about the Mid-America Strategy. There was some discussion that private lands staff that deliver Farm Bill programs, conservation and state and federal programs need to be more in touch with what is happening with the monarch strategy to help implement that. We had a good discussion and presentation on partnership with Pheasants Forever and other partners. You heard a little about it yesterday; precision agriculture which has gained a lot of interest from states. We heard positive feedback and follow up from several of my counterparts asking for more information on how that is working and what it took to get to the partnership level we have. Also, talked about working grassland partnership and if any of you were at the tour with Jerry Doan on Black Leg Ranch you heard some of that. The importance of utilizing cattle, working landscape for CRP and other grassland practices so we highlighted that partnership in our state. A lot of states interested in that and a lot of pieces fit right into Farm Bill discussions and increased flexibility, mainly grazing on CRP programs. We had an update from Scott Taylor on National Pheasant Plan. Then we had a field tour that started on the same drilling rig with public lands group and we then went different directions. We took in private land projects that we have in state-run programs, projects we are working on with different partners. We looked at oil and gas impacts, direct and indirect, and had good discussions on how to offset some of those impacts and what we are learning from dealing with that up there. We met with some of our partners, USFWS and focused on some of practices they are putting on the ground and ended up at Missouri River and Yellowstone Confluence Center for supper that evening. No action items but do have some informational items. Our next meeting is in Ohio, not sure of dates yet.

Ollie – This committee has been in force since 1944, a long-standing committee which is larger in geography than our Association but has been a very effective committee.

Wayne Rosenthal, Illinois is director/liaison.

Law Enforcement (Association of Midwest Fish and Game Law Enforcement Officers (AMFGLEO) (Report - Exhibit 21) – **Bob Timian, North Dakota Game & Fish Department** - The Association of Midwest Fish and Game Law Enforcement Officers (AMFGLEO) was chartered in 1944 and currently has 23-member agencies from Canada and the United States. We meet every year about this time. We meet on three-year rotation: one year is stand-alone; next year is with Investigators committee; and, then following year we meet again back with this meeting. Last year at our meeting we had nine members in attendance and this year 17 which is

essentially all the states minus Canada. In general, we produce main focuses on doing investigations, current trends in law enforcement, sharing problems and issues. We have an annual report every year with reports from each state that we provide to this committee and Ollie--it is 77 pages long. One other item is years ago we started Interstate Violator Compact. There are now 47 state members, only Delaware, Massachusetts and Hawaii have not entered--encompasses over 90% of United States. *Ollie* – A good example of strength of our committees, they have almost the entire country covered; a huge deterrent for violators.

Ollie - The President is director/liaison.

National Conservation Needs (NCN) (Report - Exhibit 22) – ***Jim Douglas, Nebraska Game and Parks Commission*** – In February of this year Ollie assisted NCN committee which includes myself, Dale Garner and Kelly Hepler in soliciting for proposals for NCN priority submission consideration by the National Grants Committee. We did not receive any submission ideas from Midwest directors directly but again we were approached by AFWA's Bird Conservation Committee and asked to co-sponsor submission entitled "Grassland Conservation and Awareness: Enhance, Protect, Conserve and Restore a Diminishing Ecosystem". We were afforded the opportunity again this year to approve language related to that proposal. A copy of proposal is in report. This joint proposal was approved by MAFWA's executive committee and submitted on time to national grants committee. It was one of the NCNs approved by state directors in March; these help establish state funding priorities in grant funding cycle. USFWS solicited letters of intent to address selected NCNs and Ollie helped committee make the May 4 deadline on intention to submit a letter of intent relative to the NCN and grassland letter of intent was submitted on time. Also, the executive committee agreed that should they prepare a full project proposal and MAFWA has agreed to be banker/administrator for that. Ollie – It would be nice to get this one funded. Those full proposals will be due August 3 and go to AFWA for decision by AFWA board and then goes to director of USFWS for approval for next year. Then we start all over again. That is the second year we submitted same one, a good grassland project. Let's hope it gets green light this time.

Ollie – Greg Link, is director/liaison. There is draft letter for your consideration in your packet. Wildlife Action Plan (Report - Exhibit 23) – ***Patrick Isakson, North Dakota Game & Fish Department*** – We met in early May in Omaha and we also meet quarterly on conference calls. We had a good meeting this year and had 21 attendees. Our committee originally started out as state wildlife grant staff from each of MAFWA states and were often running into questions we couldn't answer so we opened committee to both threatened and endangered species staff and wildlife diversity staff, which strengthen our committee. We had a number of information items. One was an ask by directors that committee develop better synopsis of working process including when states had the opportunity to submit information to USFWS. We are close to a product. A draft was circulated amongst committee last week and hopefully will get that too you shortly. We have one action item for consideration. In December 2017, the Department of Interior's solicitor issued an opinion that the Migratory Bird Treaty Act would no longer prohibit incidental take. In April USFWS followed along with policy guideline to mirror that. This was concerning to our committee. We believe Migratory Bird Treaty Act is an important tool to help bring partners together, conservation and NGO, people out there that can affect birds. The loss of incidental take provision we think can put some of those bird species in jeopardy. So, our committee drafted a letter for your consideration asking Secretary Zinke to reconsider that opinion and once again include incidental take as part of Migratory Bird Treaty Act. ***Kelly Hepler, South Dakota moved approval, Dale Garner, Iowa second.*** Terry – The definition of incidental take is evidently that you go up and purposefully kill an endangered species, but incidental take is not accidentally hurting something. An example of what occurred in ND because

of previous rule on this; with oil activity, especially a lot of open pits and birds would fly into there and there was one company charged but not convicted, thrown out of court. As a result of that the companies and industrial commission went to dry cuttings, there are no pits out there. Even though this rule, as previously interpreted didn't have the intended consequences, it had the desired result at the end. I totally agree with this; the way it is being currently interpreted is totally wrong. *Ollie* – List of carbon copies here should include other three regions. *Dale* – On second paragraph, third line, take “s” off of hunt; third paragraph, period after “S” in U.S. *Terry* – A comma after that period. Patrick – Since we submitted our report the Audubon Society and a number of other NGOs has filed suit against the Department of Interior for this listing. *Kelly* – Ron and Virgil, is this letter consistent with stance we have in other Associations at national level? *Ron* – Haven't seen it, hard to respond. AFWA has yet to weigh in on this issue, chair of bird committee who is also on executive committee is Gordon Myers from North Carolina. When we went to North American in March his preference was, be deliberate and careful about how AFWA would present themselves on this issue. We have convened some calls with attorneys to talk through the issue and there are attorneys who believe that opinion was the right opinion or that there was good legal reasoning behind the end opinion. If you want to fix it the remediation is not with Interior, but through Congress who give the authority to USFWS to manage incidental take. Then you have others among them that feel this is a mistake for reason being applied here. Where AFWA is right now, still attorneys working with Carol, haven't taken a formal position on it. *Terry* – Not having letter in front of you doesn't help. All this letter is asking for is them to revisit the interpretation of it and saying here is what we think it should be; it is implied how we would like to have it. *Virgil* – If MAFWA wants to take lead, proceed on that and bring up at AFWA level and see where we are at that time. This is not the first time a regional Association has done this without waiting for AFWA. *Jim D.* – I am going to vote in support of this letter because important to ask them to revisit this, likely will be a lot of requests to do that, maybe legal requests too. I don't know if our legal committee has taken a look at this issue or not. It would be appropriate to cc the Association and other regional associations on this letter. *Dale* – One more correction. ***Motion passed.*** *Jim D.* – I wanted to make a comment on reports by wildlife action plan committee and public lands committee. Individuals from those committees were instrumental in assisting and putting together some priorities that were submitted to the joint committee of Fish and Wildlife Service directors in defining the Midwest priority including for science application. They will be important.

Ollie - Dale Garner is director/liaison. Dr. Kelly Straka is chairman. There are two resolutions for discussion.

Wildlife and Fish Health (Exhibit 24) – ***Dr. Kelly Straka, MI DNR Wildlife Veterinarian*** – Met April 24 and 25 in Traverse City, Michigan, a tight-knit group. We had 12 state fish and wildlife agencies and one provincial wildlife agency, Ontario; a total of 24 people. Five people participated in the meeting remotely, including an invited speaker from Pennsylvania, and representatives from the Southeastern Cooperative Wildlife Disease Study (SCWDS), Michigan State University, and the Michigan DNR staff. Encourage states to send a representative to committee meetings; we are a support group to each other. Our first day started with disease reports, each state representative gave a full disease report covering a number of issues, both aquatic and terrestrial. The second day started with cervid diseases, not just CWD and Bovine Tuberculosis and switched over to West Nile Virus looking at grouse population concerns and whether or not it is having an effect on grouse species. We are looking at a multi-state resource grant project to look at impacts these viruses are having on grouse populations. Had an invited speaker from Pennsylvania, Dr. Brown, PA Game Commission on West Nile and how they are responding adaptively to harvest of grouse populations in the face of West Nile Virus. Shifted gears again back to deer and had a presentation by Dr. David Williams, Michigan State

University (and is also associated with Boone and Crockett Quantitative Wildlife Center (QWC) who gave overview of Michigan's deer initiative. Summary in report. We work closely with QWC, great researchers on that group. We had update on CWD from Bryan Richards, USGS National Wildlife Health Center who gave a good overview of CWD. Director information items included: 1) MAFWA Fish and Wildlife Health Committee is working with the Midwest Deer and Turkey Working Group and looking at forming an Ad Hoc Committee to look at recommendations for adaptive management approaches to CWD. This committee is being assembled for action later this fall. 2) Discussed appropriations for 2020 federal budget. 3) Time and place of next meeting is April 2019 in Minnesota. Action items; our committee is adaptive. The first item is that Dr. Dan Grove, who is chair is stepping down, so I will become the chair, he will be leaving to go to Tennessee but still plans to participate with us. Dr. Nancy Boedeker, IN was nominated and will be new vice chair. That brings us to two resolutions. *Kelly Hepler* – Go to last whereas. *Kelly Straka* – Resolution in Opposition to the Baiting and Feeding of Cervids to Reduce the Risk of Disease Transmission and Establishment (Exhibit 25). There are a number of Whereas statements, skipping down to: Whereas, baiting and feeding may both change social dynamics among animals and increase contacts between otherwise disparate individuals, groups, or species-another risk factor for disease transmission; Whereas, peer-reviewed research suggests the effects of baiting for increasing harvest is insignificant; Whereas, diseases such as CWD and TB can result in devastating economic losses and/or significant ecological impacts; Whereas, effective communication, education and enforcement are enhanced when rules and regulations are consistent across state and provincial boundaries; Now Therefore Be It Resolved, the banning of baiting and feeding of cervids is a practical and justifiable best management practice to reduce the risk of disease transmission and establishment in light of nationwide concerns of CWD and Bovine TB; And Be It Further Resolved, the Midwest Fish and Wildlife Health Committee encourages the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (MAFWA) directors to adopt this resolution at their annual meeting in Bismarck, ND on June 27, 2018. *Ollie* – We discuss it here and vote on it tomorrow at the business meeting.

Sheila, we need an explanation here about where this next alternative to the original “Now Therefore” came from. Please check the tape and write in an explanation (for instance, did the committee present this alternative, did a Director?). Right now, there is no explanation.

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (MAFWA) acknowledges the social and political sensitivity associated with restricting baiting and feeding cervids.

And Be It Further Resolved, MAFWA agrees with the current wildlife research and expertise that illustrates the negative effects of baiting and feeding of cervids on disease transmission and establishment.

And Be It Further Resolved, MAFWA recommends advancing this issue of baiting and feeding restrictions to AFWA for development of a national position on baiting and feeding of cervids to reduce the risk of disease transmission and establishment.

Kelly Hepler – The concern I have with this one and the following resolution is we have ongoing discussions between western states and are discussing at WAFWA meeting. I am not prepared at this time as we are still developing our positions, so it would premature. My gut tells me this is a good thing and I understand that, but a large jump. For example, sometimes we will feed deer from a particular landowner to get them away instead of just shooting the deer. I need to think this thing through as this is fairly encompassing. I also want to make sure that we are consistent on our approach at nationwide level. It is thought provoking and maybe by tomorrow morning things could change, but I will abstain from vote. *Terry* – We have same issues here in North

Dakota, in fact we are dealing with an issue in the northwest part of the state where we were just informed of a CWD positive. Biologically we know it is the right thing to ban baiting, but there is political kickback, so in same position Kelly is talking about. *Wayne* – We had legislation introduced in Illinois for supplemental deer feeding, our agency was opposed but it was introduced last year, and it died, but this year proponents came with the veterinarians from the universities and they talked about supplemental feed for EHD and positive effects feeding would have because of lack of some nutrients. When talking about legislators you have the wildlife biologists on one side opposed and highly regarded veterinarian scientists on the other side. We have come to the conclusion that we need to do a study to see the facts one way or the other. As it is a toxic environment politically because you have people on either side; then when you look at industry of farm stores there are all sorts of things out there for baiting and feeding. We are not ready to vote on this tomorrow. *Mike* - Ohio would be similar, we wouldn't be ready to vote on it either. Along with political concerns we have legislators still wanting to introduce elk and just started purchasing a large area for that purpose. On top of that, under current administration, anything that affects small businesses has to run through our CSI process to see if any effect on business and since we allow baiting there are many small businesses in rural areas that sell bait. Internally in our division we are formulating plans on how to deal with the issue. *Jim D.* – In Nebraska we have regulations against hunting over bait for big game, but it has a caveat, so don't have outright ban on feeding. It would take statutory change, but commission hasn't formed a position on that and I don't know if ready to vote or not. *Bill* – Appreciate Dr. Straka bringing this conversation to the forefront. In Michigan it is very complicated and getting more complicated. We have areas of the state where baiting and feeding are illegal, have proposal to make baiting and feeding illegal in the Lower Peninsula leaving baiting and feeding legal in the Upper Peninsula. We have recreational feeding also acceptable in places and have emergency feeding that the department permits mostly in the Upper Peninsula in a bad winter. So, having a blanket statement like this makes it difficult to find solutions for all of those different segments. *Aaron* – Same story, I don't remember specifics of resolution from this group last year, but Wisconsin abstained. Our administration doesn't take positions on things that are statutory in nature. We had pending legislation last year that has been cut, but for similar reasons would have difficulty voting as well. *Keith* – Inevitable we will have to deal with this, but with CWD issue boiling up some of these kinds of things are going to be on our plate at some point in time. It is too early to jump out with resolution of this sort, but inevitable to deal with how animals are congregating. *Terry* – I agree. This issue has been brought up twice in legislature and we were beaten up pretty badly. We do have some areas in the state where baiting is legal and with CWD detected the question is, why do we have to always react, why can't we be proactive. It seems like our educational efforts are falling on deaf ears, they don't get it. Kelly, we appreciate you bringing it forward. *Dale* – I am liaison to this group and been involved for a long time and had opportunity to work on national level with John and on his retirement, I am not doing it a third time. I understand this is very political, but directors across the country are dealing with CWD and talking about these very issues. I have a great working relationship with my state vet in Iowa, we are locked arm in arm on this. We understand not only from wildlife perspective, but from livestock as well. It would take legislation in our state as well, it is illegal to hunt over bait, but know it is a problem for everybody else, but I don't have a problem supporting this. *Bill* – I appreciate committee bringing issues at the forefront that everyone is struggling with, sometimes in a different way than others; that is why we have committees, the work we expect them to do, so in the case I think it is really good work. Is there a statement we can make about baiting and feeding? It will be watered down and not acceptable to others but make a statement short of saying we won't support in our own states that gets us in a pinch. One that will serve us and provide leadership from this group. As a comment for tomorrow's conversation there might be some direction we could provide. Ask them to go back and craft something understanding some

of the challenges around this language. *Dale* – One of the things I always tell that group and deer and turkey group is their job as biologists is to bring the science forward and then it is up to us to decide what to do with it. I hate to have them put a foot on it and say we can't bring this because it is uncomfortable. We understand that policy is uncomfortable but at the same time we should encourage them to bring the science forward. *Jim L.* – I understand potential political ramifications, but many of us are looking at strict interpretation of this resolution. It does not ask us to take action to ban recreational baiting in our states, it is just a recognition that these two functions contribute to the spread of disease. Biologically we all would agree that it is an accurate statement. The concern that could be perceived is we are going to take action if we support this resolution, but nothing in this resolution says we must take action. All we are doing is adopting a resolution that says that these activities contribute to the spread of disease. *Kelly H.* – Getting into debate we will have tomorrow, but concern is in front of commission and this is a discussion we are taking seriously in South Dakota. Working closely with other states and we are going to take some major steps, but this is premature from my viewpoint. Director Leach, I understand what you are saying in the literal sense is true but if you read this to the common person, they will take a different viewpoint. This is a discussion we have to take on a national level. I like committees bringing challenges, they wanted to get us stimulated and they did. I want to know where other nationwide discussions are going too because we want to be consistent. I am not opposed to this but need more time to bring it before my commission. *Sara* – Wanting to find ability to compromise at this point, I am struggling with second one, not first one because we already have bans. The second one I absolutely, biologically agree with, but struggling because it would be hypocritical because we had benefitted from elk restoration program. We were struggling with the irony of knowing the biological truth and understanding political reality. So, I wonder if there is a way, before tomorrow's vote, we could discuss and recognize the work of the committee because we are already behind the eight ball. When we say we need to wait, it is so late in the day on this issue. The more we can have the science out there, our experts out there, is there a way we can recognize the work of the committee without taking a vote on the resolutions at hand? I don't know if possible before then but seems worthy of a conversation. *Jim D.* – The resolution on banning, baiting and feeding talks about supporting banning, which implies further action by somebody. It doesn't say MAFWA recognizes the biological implications of baiting, it supports banning which implies further action by the states. If that verbiage was recognizing biological detriments. Also, it says practical and justifiable best management practices. I would argue that is may be justifiable, but not always practical. *Terry* – I am sure we will discuss it more tomorrow. *Kelly S.* – I would like to say that the committee has talked about these resolutions and have vetted through our deer group. A couple of things, we feel as committee it is important that we get you started on this conversation and that is a big part of it. The awareness just isn't there, it isn't practical for all states and if it is not on your radar it should be. We feel we need to do that. I anticipate discussion on the next resolution as well. It is a culture shift that needs to happen, we talk about culture shift in hunters and stakeholders, but we don't have a culture shift in our agencies we are not going to see the shift that we need. We need these discussions; they are well warranted. Resolution number two; Resolution in Opposition to Artificial Movement of Non-endangered Cervid Species (Exhibit 26). This resolution went through a couple of different reiterations and I want to highlight that technically this would cover carcass movement, important to CWD, and live animal translocations, which I am fully aware of political ramifications. It would also apply to rehabilitation, which is a stakeholder group which is not always brought to the forefront in these discussions. We are fully aware of ramifications. As I move forward we will jump to; Whereas, effective communication, education and enforcement are enhanced when rules and regulations are consistent across state and provincial boundaries; keep in mind a lot of our hunters don't hunt in our states, the more consistent the better. Now Therefore be it Resolved, the banning of the artificial movement of

non-endangered cervid species is a practical and justifiable best management practice to reduce the risk of disease transmission and establishment; And be it Further Resolved, the Midwest Fish and Wildlife Health Committee encourages the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies directors to adopt this resolution at their annual meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota on June 24-27, 2018. *Aaron* – Wisconsin has two concerns with resolution, one year away from completing elk restoration with Kentucky's assistance which is influencing our position on this, the same boat as Missouri a year from now. The other one is rehabilitation of deer. We discussed that last night, biologically maybe not necessarily really important but in our state, it is important to our citizens. Specifically, the language about moving across county lines, problematic for us because we don't have rehabilitators in every county. Another primary concern would be our health restoration project. *Dale* – We knew this was politically charged but know in fight with CWD often states are gaged on what captive cervid producers do. Missouri is in that boat right now because as an agency, when you are doing something you are telling the private individual they can't that is where you get into problems. CWD is something that has been talked about for a number of years now. It has gained traction in national health committee and is a difficult thing. But every day we do nothing is one more day we are not going to get back toward recovery if that is at all possible. These are tough decisions, but we are going to have to figure out how to deal with them or forget about working on CWD and save us all a lot of money. *Terry* – More robust discussion tomorrow.

Lunch – Sponsored by Kalkomey Enterprises
Remarks by **Ray St. Germain**

FEDERAL PARTNERS SESSION

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Noreen Walsh, Region 6 Director – Region Six overlaps MAFWA and WAFWA and there are four great plains states in Mountain Prairie Region. In hunting, fishing and R3 activities, update on Topeka Shiner and the overall grassland conservation effort that partners are working on. Secretary Zinke's Order 3356 has provided us an opportunity to expand our hunting and fishing on national refuges and national fish hatcheries in coordination with the states. Every region has established a position that is dedicated to doing these assessments. In our region that person is Otto Josie, a long-time employee in sportfish restoration program and long-time hunter education instructor. He is assessing whether, or not, we are in alignment in national refuges with regulations that states have. The parameters he and his counterparts across the country are looking at is what species are hunted on each refuge, what are season dates, method of take and bag limits. They will take that information out to each refuge and visit with each refuge manager and staff to talk about parameters and see if we can bring them into alignment with the state. Otto and I have reached out to our directors looking at issues, making assessments and seeing what desires directors may have. Region Six staff is looking forward to working with the states on this. Since we had such a great presentation on expansion of moose in North Dakota this morning and we were able to open a refuge to moose hunting last year. On a related note in regard to R3, wildlife refuges and hatcheries in region, are to increase participation in hunting and angling, to foster interest. But also, under old red model we are working on continuing to support wildlife education, photography, environmental education and other outdoor recreation at our facilities across the region. For example, in South Dakota, DC Booth Historic Fish Hatchery every year hosts Onion Creek Kids Fishing Day, which is attended by every 6th grader in Spearfish school district. Kolm Wetland Management District in North Dakota and Valentine National Refuge in Nebraska, are among others who host an annual hunter education class. Several of our refuges and hatcheries put on events for veterans, people with disabilities and

youth. Huron Refuge in South Dakota, on opening day of youth waterfowl season, hosts events to teach you about habitat, hunting basics, waterfowl ID, gun safety and hunting with dogs. In outdoor recreation sites, in Kansas, our Great Plains Nature Center holds full moon hikes to get people out at night to observe wildlife under the stars. At Garrison in North Dakota we sponsor a canoeing the refuge event. Later this week headed to Garrison National Fish Hatchery to tour the facilities there. They recently hosted their hatchery fun day and also host a fish facts day and a fishing derby for physically challenged folks. We have a lot of activities going on across the region and will continue to support activities with increased interest in hunting and angling and all parts of outdoor recreation. My invitation to directors is if you see an opportunity to partner to greater benefit to both of us we want to do that and if you see something please contact me. The ESA listed species, Topeka shiner is endangered; the Services is working with six state agencies including South Dakota to complete species status assessment for this fish and last year signed a recovery outline for this fish. A couple of weeks ago we hosted a meeting with the six state agencies to discuss what should be the objective measurable criteria for recovery of this species which will go into our long overdue final recovery plan. General agreement around a persistence metric, that measurable criteria to listing, which could be biologically meaningful while still allowing states to continue to use ongoing monitoring to inform that metric, ended up in a good place. There was agreement around designation of recovery for that species, so making progress. Our lead biologist is retiring now but we are moving forward on recovery plan and will have draft of public comment period by end of this calendar year. I have directed my folks in Kansas and South Dakota to make this a priority and continue to rely on states. Issues associated with grassland conservation of interest and priority in our region. Conservation of grassland, waterfowl, grassland birds and pollinators, all of those are a priority to USFWS and we are contributing to those by supporting research, acquiring conservation easements, using partner USFWS program to do voluntary habitat restoration and providing technical assistance and advice to projects that may impact this. We have talked about shared interests. When I reached out to state directors in Region 6 to talk about high priorities for scientific research, high priorities for science information needed to inform our landscape scale collaboration, two of my directors from the Dakotas both said the effects of wind energy on grassland, especially scientific information to drive appropriate designation was a high priority for them and for us too. Many of the areas in the Dakotas that have high wind energy potential still have native grasslands and intact wetlands and support high densities of waterfowl and other grassland birds, so it is in those areas where the Service has been focusing our conservation easement program with landowners to prevent the destruction of wetlands and loss of those grasslands. Wind energy development in the Dakotas looks like it will be significant and is a growing concern because it can overlap with biologic high priority areas. As we go forward in the Service to work on those issues with state counterparts we need to think about development of scientific information, what the effects are and how to mitigate those. From management side of USFWS, we are constantly working to balance our desire to be good neighbors and to maintain community support for our perpetual conservation easement program, and balance that with safeguarding our investment with easements already on the ground which sometimes calls for discussion. Also, conscientious of discerning where we have obligatory role versus where we just have an advisory role and use to best advantage where needed. I look forward to more discussion with all of our partners in the Dakotas about how we can develop that scientific information about the effects of wind energy development, direct and indirect effects, and use that together as we talk about how we drive the next generation (post LCC generation) of strong federal/state partnerships, on developing scientific information. This is the top of list for me on priorities. Grassland nesting birds over the last 40 years, in the great plains states, call out grassland birds and pollinator species have significant conservation concerns. The Migratory Bird program in my Region has been working with over 20 partners. A team of federal, state and NGOs came together to form National

Grassland Birds subcommittee under Prairie Pothole Joint Venture. In developing a grassland conservation plan, a full annual cycle conservation plan for several species with the goal is to develop those plans as a framework for future conservation that is needed to improve populations of those prairie species, identifying research needs and management actions as well as monitoring. A near final report went out to partners on June 4. We are accumulating the comments and the committee will move towards a final version of that report thanks to funding from Prairie Pothole Joint Venture we will be able to do layout, printing and distribute copies before end of summer. The real work will not be over but will be better informed by this report and overarching strategy focused on those four species. Casey Stemler, Prairie Pothole Joint Venture coordinator for last 12 years, has moved onto another position and is working directly with Greg Sheehan overseeing Secretarial Order focusing on big game migration corridors. Shawn Fields, science coordinator for Joint Venture, is acting in that capacity and we will move forward with back filling that position. Steve Adair of Ducks Unlimited is one of the co-chairs of the Joint Venture. They are working on assessment across entire great plains from northern Canadian prairies to the Chihuahua Dessert where we still have native grasslands remaining--an important use of information to the conservation strategies. We are happy to report six joint ventures have come together to support that effort with a grant from Conoco Philips. Thank you for your work and the invite to MAFWA. Two very special collages of mine will be moving on, Keith Sexson and Tom Melius will be moving onto other endeavors, it has been a pleasure to work with both of you, appreciated your partnership. *Jim D.* – Mention that yesterday the priority science application went through a vetting process in the Midwest, they were approved by this board and the first one is wind. In the Midwest, not only wind on the grasslands but wind on Great Lakes in Ohio, a broad topic. *Noreen* – Sorry for missing that discussion yesterday.

U.S. Forest Service

Tracy Grazia, Regional Wildlife Program Manager – Thank you for opportunity to provide an update. Unlike Noreen this is my first MAFWA, I am a newcomer, a lot of you worked with my predecessor, she left to go back to law school in November. In the Eastern Region 9, we have 22 states from Minnesota to Maine, geographically and socially diverse area as well as ecologically. It has about 12 million acres of public land and takes in 40% of U.S. population. There are eight states in MAFWA that overlap in our region, that contains 10 national forests and one national grassland. A lot going on in Forest Service. Focus this year and next four years is improving forest conditions, part of restoration and resiliency work. This year we have only two performance measures assigned to us from Washington Office and we consider them our flagship targets. Aphids treated to reduce fire risk and increase timber volume sold. Expect timber volume sold number to increase in next five years so that has been our focus. For me as a wildlife biologist that means I have to sit down at the table and help determine where restoration should occur, so we can help restore habitat for wildlife. In the 2018 omnibus bill we had our fire funding fixed. Each year our budget has been going to fire funds and the other funding has really diminished so we saw a fire fix in 2018 bill, but it doesn't occur until 2020 and goes until 2027. Basically, this gives us new budget authority of over \$20 billion in fire-fighting activities in addition to regular appropriations. This will allow us to continue non-fire missions uninterrupted for on the ground forest improvements to prevent these wildfires. Also, did a fix for next two years. We still have 10-year fire average that is used for base for funding but then an additional \$500 million in emergency suppression funds. This fire funding fix will help us with the flexibility to better manage non-fire programs, fuel reductions, recreation, fish and wildlife habitat and watersheds. With that will require greater accountability on these restoration efforts. Along with the omnibus bill that expanded some of our authorities it allowed us to do restoration efforts. One of the big ones is the Good Neighbor Authority (GNA), which allows the National Forest Service to delegate responsibility to state agencies for restoration

projects on national forest lands. GNA is helping the Forest Service build partnerships with state agencies to enable more efficient, effective cross-jurisdiction for restoration. Since 2015 several national forests in the eastern region have taken advantage of this flexibility to engage successful restoration with state partners. Within MAFWA footprint we have five master agreements and eight supplemental agreements with Departments of Natural Resource agencies in Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana, Ohio and Minnesota. Some of the work around these agreements: partnered on fish and wildlife habitat improvements, done fish surveys, invasive species surveys, partnered on shared positions, rare plant surveys and monitoring, early successional habitat creation and wetland restoration. We have a lot of opportunities with forestry agencies and have state agencies removing timber. Within the omnibus bill that expanded that authority as well as stewardship contracting authority; in the past we have partnered with state wildlife agencies on that in 10-year agreement venue. Looking at GNA as road we will take with state wildlife agencies. We are still working on landscape scale restoration, heavily involved with Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, which is multi-agency effort dealing with target threats to Great Lakes ecosystem to accelerate restoration efforts. We are looking to do habitat restoration and connectivity, looking at threatened and endangered species issues, aquatic organisms, invasive species and addressing potential impacts. The Forest Service has several committee members involved in these work groups as well as state, private forestry arms. Our northeastern area is closing its doors in New Town Square, Pennsylvania relocating to Milwaukee office; researchers housed out of that office will be moving to Madison. Our interim forest service chief came from private forest service arm. We have first forest in Region 9 going under forest plan revision under 2012 planning rule, in Ohio. A lot of forest plans in our region are relatively new so not going to be having whole-scale forest plan revision process. In 2017, we revised our regional forester's sensitive species list and we will maintain those until our forest transition to the new planning rule. In 2017, completed monarch conservation strategy, basically it identifies goals and actions that provide best management practices. This will be the first year that all of our forests will be providing North American bat monitoring program, doing at least one grid; coming together to look at how we are going to standardize and analyze that data. Still committed to Kirkland's Warbler even with proposed delisting, have MOU in place for continued coordination. The sharptailed grouse translocation, just finished project and wanted to thank Minnesota and Wisconsin DNRs for their coordination on that project, a lot of restoration efforts in that area; still funding restoration efforts through GLRI in that area. The EADM, our environmental analysis in decision making, we are changing efforts around that. Goal of efforts is to increase health, diversity, resilience and productivity of national forests and grasslands by increasing efficiency of our environmental analysis. This is ongoing at national level, regional level on units as well as creating problem solving team. Hoping to streamline our decision-making processes working with USFWS and hopeful we will be able to implement more restoration activities for wildlife and fisheries.

U.S. Department of Interior

Olivia LeDee, Acting Director, Northeast Climate Adaptation Center – (PowerPoint - Exhibit 25) – A new federal acronym out there, now Climate Adaptation Science Centers, we had a name change but same science, same research, slightly new name. Working with natural and cultural resource managers and Department of Interior, states and tribes to pull together best scientific information to inform resource management. We have eight regional centers, most of MAFWA in northeast region, but some in north central. Most of work done through cooperative research agreements with land grant universities, but also funding research at other USGS research centers. Science covers everything from forest management under drought to climate change to extreme flooding in southeast to impacts of climate change on sea level rise. In northeast region we have done a lot of work on fish and wildlife impacts from climate change.

We have funded 95 projects in five-year start; in seventh year of program. The Northeast is in five-year cooperative research consortium that is about to be rebooted starting this week. In north central, focusing on SWAP assessments--an integrated scenario we are planning to implement. Looking at farmers choices and standing work on prairie pothole systems relative to climate change in grasslands, crops and field switching and standing work relative to climate change. On state side looking at climate science priorities of states and other federal agencies. Focused on lake systems and fish habitat, stream systems, deer, moose and elk and habitat restoration. There is a whole portfolio of work going on. One of my favorite projects we funded was work done by USGS with Wisconsin DNR and Minnesota DNR on thermal conditions on inland lakes. Looking back at lake data we can then record future conditions and what that means for walleye and bass populations. Not only did they get great publications they identified areas for future analysis. Rather than just identifying the problem they showed a set number of lakes, if protected what lake would sustain, focusing on adaptation opportunities. That work has been well received so working with Midwest Glacial Lake partnership and expanding to North and South Dakota on understanding changing temperature profile on lake systems. We are also funding that same team to understand thermal hyperscale to improve modeling of high priority lakes and producing lake temperatures at lake, state and regional scale, which will be helpful to estimate distribution and abundance of fish species. Climate impacts on deer and moose, talked about what components we should prepare, what is the best available science out there on climate change. Looking at changes to snow conditions, from extreme temperatures, what has happened on negative 40-degree days, frequency of those. Forecasting going forward on changes in forest systems and also addressing regional variation in trends in Dakotas and the rest of the region. Another one we thought was important was we spend a lot of time on restoration and enhancement of our lands. We have sourced plants for conservation and restoration. Looking at changes in growing season in seed zones. Working with Prairie Reconstruction Initiative Advisory Team with state, federal and NGO partners to think about if the status quo makes sense and are there risks to that. Risks to sourcing seeds from other districts. What are risks of maintaining status quo with risk of unintended introductions of pests and invasive species. Primarily with North and South Dakota but also Iowa and Minnesota. We are working in prairie potholes to see how they respond to climate change. Working with folks at Michigan DNR to synthesize what we know about population levels in response to climate change based on best available science. We will be doing workshops in several states, starting in Wisconsin and Michigan this fall. Another one we are excited about is climate change and botulism and what is on horizon we should be concerned about and direct additional research towards that. Opportunities going forward include: continued engagement on Stakeholder Advisory committees; new priorities to and develop new science plans. We also have opportunities for workshops, training and webinars. There is a lot more information on our website. *Jim L.* – Research in Wisconsin on changing lake environments, some of that information can be extrapolated to our large lakes in Minnesota. Do we have anything in Minnesota that correlates with what is going on in Wisconsin? *Olivia* – They were the start of the attention so a hyperscale model was focused on Minnesota, but resilient densities, no not yet.

Overview of WS NWRC Bird and Predator Research

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service – Wildlife Services

Dr. Doug Eckery, Assistant Director, National Wildlife Research Center (NWRC)
(PowerPoint - Exhibit 26) – Our mission is to provide federal leadership and expertise in helping resolve wildlife conflicts. NWRC is research arm of Wildlife Services so we extended the mission a little to apply our scientific expertise to help resolve human/wildlife conflicts. Things

we produce have to be compatible with the environment. There is a wide variety of diverse things we can do, from basic science like wildlife biology as well as capabilities in chemistry, chemical registration and transfer; all important components of NWRC. We apply that expertise in many ways; we have a lot of expertise but not very big, only about 30 research-grade scientists. We rely on partnerships and collaboration, last year over 450 organizations so able to leverage expertise and get a lot of work done. Lot of things we produce are tangible, but we also produce methods utilized by management or policy, a whole variety of products. Chosen to talk about couple of different projects we are involved in. One of those is blackbird research. A lot of research here in North Dakota. The prairie pothole region has a lot of blackbirds, particularly in sunflower district and they cause a lot of damage and loss. About two percent regionally, but some producers locally can suffer 20%. Another research project we have is on repellents, on achenes, and lab studies show birds don't like them. One of challenges in not only this instance but every one we do is delivery. We can have a compound that is great, but how do we get it to where it needs to be to have the effect necessary. Moved from lab studies to field. Achenes are in sunflower head, so we can expose the whole seed as they imbedded in the head. We can only coat 25%, on top of that sunflower head is facing down so when you spread repellent it would only hit backs of sunflowers. So, in collaboration we figured out how do we deliver this, so it has the desired effect. We decided to spray from the bottom up to have affect desired. Another new idea is sonic nets, essentially a speaker system that produces a frequency that is disruptive to communication of the birds. We want to be the guy with the obnoxious voice that makes birds want to move, we want to disrupt communication of the birds to disperse them, place on hotspots where birds are. Unmanned aerial systems is another, drones. This technology is moving fast so we are looking at different ways to utilize them to haze or disperse birds. We are using a drone that looks like a raptor. Not there with technology yet, but not far away. Drones could carry payload to disperse over the crop or birds; innovation there and good progress made. On predator research, one of more successful ones is livestock protection, non-lethal method of protecting livestock is using big dogs. Some are effective with coyotes, and some have problems with bears and wolves and there are different breeds brought in from Turkey and Bavaria, really big dogs. Interestingly some of these dogs have protective characteristics, some like to stay close to animal they are trying to protect while others work investigatory. Different breeds, so no silver bullet or one solution that will solve everything. It is possible have compatible breeds where some stay close to the herd and some patrol perimeter to protect livestock. We are heading up research. Working on more comprehensive report on that to come out later in the fall. Toxicants, some around for a long time, like sodium cyanide and 1080, but there is room for more. We have been looking at sodium nitrite, a feral swine toxicant and pursuing registration for that toxicant. The other is, acronym is PAPP; both operate under same mechanism, decrease ability for blood to carry oxygen, so first symptom under poisoning with that is to go unconscious. Also, interested in developing new pesticides. There is different standard we may be held to, whether lethal or non-lethal; and, different criteria to move forward, like species specificity (which is difficult), but important for a number of reasons and humane reasons. There has to be low environmental burden and have to be able to deliver these things on large landscape scale. They have to be cost effective, have social acceptance so there is human dimensions research, which can go against what I have always thought that it is around education. To educate themselves then understand what problem is, but human dimension research has been showing there are extreme views--the more we eradicate the more against they might be, it doesn't happen that way. We have to appeal to the values of people. Last, it needs to regulatory cleared, have patent to process. On species specificity, one of the technologies we are pursuing is called siRNA, potentially silencing genes. We know the code of the genes of different proteins and there are certain ones that might be important for an organism to live. We can identify those by finding that sequence cord and develop one of the siRNA to develop toxicant that might be lethal control or utilize technology

for non-lethal management for reproductive control. There are other technologies around that. This area of science is moving fast and we think there are possibilities there. Department of Ag Secretary visited Fort Collins a few weeks ago and we took him on a tour. At one of last stations there was a bucket of toxicant for feral swine and he got one of Senators to hold bucket up to show people and let them know help is on the way. And that is how we feel with this science research we do. Proud of staff we have, commitment and innovative people we have working for us.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

Tom Melius, Region 3 Director – On ESA on wolves, in the Great Lakes wolves have been on the list, off the list, and back on the list. USFWS is moving forward with status assessment on where we were are with wolves. As before we felt they were at the point of recovery and moved them off the list only to have the courts put them back on the list. Working on status assessment, what that will provide I can't predetermine at this point other than we are collecting information to hopefully have a proposal by end of the year. On moose, as Jason mentioned, spread throughout a few states in Midwest, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota and North Dakota and we have been petitioned to look at whether moose are also at a status in their population that would require some sort of ESA protection. We have more than a few head of moose that the agency is looking at, 492, but is coming up in 2020 cycle. We will be gathering information as best we can to be sure best science in making whatever recommendation is to be. On monarchs, involved with since 2014 when petitioned to list that species. Enjoying the relationship the Service has had with MAFWA states in getting organized because that listing process requires the Service to make a final determination, four years late, in June of 2019. Two things that will help us making the best decision in that determination is collecting the data, with help from state people, and having a database pulling in information from individuals, states, organizations on what they have been doing since 2014 in restoration and enhancement of habitat. Encourage state and other individuals to go out to our website, so when you look for what is being done you have the most current information on what restoration has taken place in the last four years. Our SSA, species status assessment process is where we have our scientific and state folks looking at what is going on with this species. Since this is an insect, within rules of ESA we have to look throughout its range, which is far beyond North America. Our folks are collecting that information while the petition has been focused on eastern population and migration from Canada through U.S. to Mexico there is also a western population that is showing more declining numbers than the other populations. Other populations are found in 31 other countries, so all that information is being collected and brought into the final recommendation. Thank you to Ed Boggess, Ollie and MAFWA for willingness to step up and be involved with helping USFWS make sure we had the best foundation in making decision by June 2019. Tracy mentioned we have proposal out there for delisting the Kirtland warbler, thanks to Michigan for work done, for forest management for bird management and getting us a compilation that we feel is well worth delisting. Proposal open to public comment until July 11, hopefully will be quickly able to move towards the final determination on that proposal. A great example of collaboration that USFWS has received from many states involved, specifically Michigan. USFWS looking at internal lands, where we can find more opportunities for sports men and women to enjoy hunting and fishing. We needed to get internal review done first before going out to talk to states to make sure we are streamlining those relations. In the Midwest, Deb Beck has been assigned to oversee review of 56 refuges and 12 fish hatcheries that have some lands that might be opened for hunting. She has completed review in Ohio and Michigan and setting up meetings with state directors offices and points-of-contact you have provided to go over results we have found. We are moving into other states. Doing on national basis using same kind of template in gathering information. You will be hearing from Deb and others as we set up those meetings. Other issue,

in process of developing a plan to work with states as R3 is being implemented. Jim Hodgson has worked hard with his staff to look at ways we can assist with state coordination and ways we can work internally with our own staff in trying to best we can to make sure we have opportunities available. Ask Jim to come up and say a few words of where we are at. Developed a report we are passing out to the members.

Jim Hodgson – Handing out draft of R3 hunting, fishing, outdoor recreation R3 plan (Exhibit 27). It is a Midwest focus plan that we have been working with state R3 coordinators on in the Midwest region. When you read Secretary's Order 2356 there is a clause in there that says states are to do R3 activities. I challenged my staff and asked states what that meant besides typical funding mechanisms. We do hunter education and aquatic education, what other R3 activities could we be doing in Region 3 to help our states. Started gathering input from folks that work with us and your R3 coordinators on what we could do to push the ball to assist states and tribal governments in doing their R3 efforts. Put together ideas to provide thoughts as we look at more nontraditional efforts. One thing we haven't done a lot of is our role with tribes, do better job of R3 with tribes who are facing entirely different set of circumstances. In addition, Tom and Noreen talked about our outdoor access and coordination on Service lands. One of the things we are looking at trying to do, an example in Iowa with DeSoto, how do we make our Service lands more accessible to the states. Through good luck our staff attended R3 summit in Iowa, had refuge, wildlife and sportfish staff in the room and an idea came up during discussion for a project related to hunter education at DeSoto and within three to four weeks they had a program; basically, because we had all the right people at summits to have conversations. We plan to have Service personnel from every state and wildlife and sportfish at every R3 summit that we know about. We think we can have an impact by being there. As part of other outdoor recreation analysis related to Secretary's orders, what Service land we can make available. We will also be visiting with industries and will be coordinating with your R3 folks on that. This is a draft, take a look at it and make comments on any of the activities, we are looking for ideas.

Tom – Rumor going around about new regional director in Region 3; I am stepping aside at the end of this month. I have had a great run, last 20 years had opportunity to work with USFWS overseeing the largest land refuge in Alaska to smallest in Minnesota. Had the opportunity of working on endangered species listing process; on polar bears, bats, bees, butterflies and mussels. I have had the opportunity working on setting the waterfowl seasons through Service's Regulation Committee and work closely with all four Flyways and state representatives. Worked with salmon as well as controlling sea lamprey as well as fighting the invasion of Asian carp. In all of that had opportunity to work on professional peer relationship with state directors. I have tried to do that, so our employees see leaders working in that fashion and hopefully they are also working peer to peer. It is time to step aside, I believe an announcement will come out where current deputy that I have worked with for several decades, Charlie Wooley, will be asked to be Acting Regional Director, a great spokesman for the USFWS. He will be stepping into my shoes, but time for me to set my own schedule; opportunities to spend more time on the water fishing, in the field hunting, training a new pup and spoiling my two grandsons; as well as a few things on my honey-do list. Thank you all. *Terry* – Couldn't have done a better job than what you just said that encapsulates your career. It has been a pleasure working with Tom. I am lucky enough to be MAFWA president and get to give you this special recognition award to thank you for 40 years working with fish and wildlife.

David Brakhage – Tom and I were at a project dedication a few weeks ago and one of his staff retired and had the opportunity to present them with a retirement decoy. It is a tradition of Ducks Unlimited to give a duck decoy as a sendoff and have an opportunity to do that here for Tom. This canvasback drake was hand carved and painted by Brian Bauth of Churchville, Maryland. It was signed by staff in our regional office. It has an important number on the bottom, in Tom's 10 years as regional director it shows how many acres of wetland habitat has been conserved in

partnership with USFWS. I had staff run the numbers, in 10 years of supporting partnership with Ducks Unlimited we have been able to impact 46,172 acres of habitat.

Refreshment Break – Sponsored by The Wildlife Society and The North Dakota Chapter of The Wildlife Society

STATE HOT TOPICS

Terry Steinwand, Facilitator – We cut back on this issue this year to allow time for panel discussion yesterday. North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas agreed we would not be presenting hot topics. Steve from Kentucky agreed to do that also just before the break.

Sara Parker Pauley, MO (PowerPoint Slide - Exhibit 30) – Even though we are blessed with a dedicated sales tax revenue it has been static and will be into foreseeable future. We haven't increased permit fees in over a decade and federal reimbursement is about the same. At same time seeing significant increase in issues we hadn't budgeted for, like CWD and feral hogs and a host of other things. We were trying to find some space within our budget to respond. At about the same time our commission said, what is plan of action for infrastructure? We have a million acres we are responsible for, 1,000 conservation areas, \$2 billion in infrastructure. We believe we have a minimum of \$200 million in infrastructure needs, but we had no idea. Eighty years of good abilities but no inventory of our assets, no ability to determine operation. We have amazing staff, but having more and more difficulty recruiting at entry level positions and retaining them as well, we weren't competitive. Our Commission said don't plan on increase in FTE, after losing 100 positions in 2009. We had an organization that was 80 years old and over time a significant increase in responsibilities and so many things on our plate that there is no room left. How do we begin to prioritize? Our aspiration is to be the World-Class Leader in Conservation, a national treasure for natural resources in Missouri. I will tell you how we are approaching it and would love to hear how you are approaching it as well. Let's start with world-class staff because you cannot deliver conservation without our people, they are our greatest asset. When I came in we had contracted a company to do a job study to look at how we were paying our staff based on market; we looked at other states, federal agencies, NGOs and others and we asked them to expedite that. They came back in about six months and we found we had work to do, especially in entry level positions. We have been trying to implement this in two-year period of time with year one starting July 1. Impacted positively half of staff and concern is what happens now. Every year we will evaluate the market to fund the job classes we can. We are also doing a lot of leadership development, moving toward pay for performance. By FY2021 have that in place with a lot of scary things and concerns related to that. This is a way to move our best and brightest further up that scale. To make room for additional revenues to go to staff we are having to make room in other parts of the agency. What are our priorities, our department logo includes a raccoon which in the 1930s meant something very different, it was a species on the decline 80 years ago but isn't today. We talked about operational excellence to identify priorities. For 2018 and next five years what are those priorities and we did that across the agency. This strategic plan is now aligned to our budget, going through pilot process where work plans have to be aligned to outcomes. Holding quarterly meetings with administration where teams tell us how we are moving the needle with these priorities. So now the strategic plan is beginning to drive the work we do and driving the budget. Iowa DNR has been incredibly helpful to us in training green belts and we now have staff in the department who have been conservation trained as green belts. In past year at least 10 green belt events, everything from vehicle log book to our CWD process; making processes as efficient as possible. Strategic natural conservation, knowing we have habitat and limited resources, how are we being sure we are applying our resources to highest priorities. Talked yesterday in landscape conservation discussion about comprehensive

conservation strategy where we work with divisions within the agency and partners to figure out where priority geographies are and where should we start first to ensure we are applying the tools we have in our toolbox. Next year going through process of tiering conservation areas, tiered habitat management; looking at what areas we don't have to mow every time, parking lots and how we are tiering maintenance and habitat. We have a commission adopt-a-land strategy, looking at new properties we have acquired and got no additional FTE to go with them. We have a land conservation strategy to prioritize as we look at new properties to assess if those are something we want to go after. Superior customer service, increased use of social media, started live streaming our Commission meetings about a year ago. Have a MO Fishing app and MO hunting app where you can get permits and tags online. At the end of the summer we will be launching a new app called MO outdoors and all of our conservation areas, trails, etc. will be on there. We are trying to use technology to increase customer service. We had a position in our internal team took a look at a person in charge of relevancy. To identify new audiences, how to bring them in and how to connect in ways that are meaningful and valuable to them and bring them in to believe it is their department as well. All of this also means is that we are an agency that hasn't had tweaks in organizational model in 80 years, looking at organizational model as well. That is scary, but it has to be done. Maybe we will come back and say the structure is perfect but show the model of where we want to be. These are tough, important conversations that can't wait but it has added stress to staff. All of these things are interconnected. A challenging time. Mike Hubbard, took Tom Draper's place when he retired June 1 as Deputy Director of resource management. Terry – Connect with me off-line tonight. Will talk about some of the things North Dakota has wrestled with.

Aaron Buchholz, WI – CWD, in May Governor Walker gave us a directive, not only our agency but the Department of Ag as well and requested three emergency rules; prohibition on movement of live deer in CWD affected counties (either a county with wild positive or captive positive, also a 10-mile radius of positive), enhanced fencing on all Wisconsin deer farms and a ban of movement of deer carcasses from CWD affected counties. Our Natural Resources Board is taking up scope statement tomorrow at their meeting and that would kick off rule drafting before it can go out to public meetings. We held public meetings as part of different legislative requirement which was well attended and have good support from our traditional stakeholders. Our southwest CWD deer and predator study (which is occurring in endemic area) the goal is a 5-year study to examine factors of survival on deer population looking at all mortality on that herd. Finished second season of collaring fawns. We have 91 fawns and in total 328 deer with GPS collars plus 21 bobcats and 39 coyotes. This project can't be done without public assistance and the 174 landowners allowing us to work on their property. We did good with our staff on coyotes, but bobcats were a real challenge. But trappers stepped up and we have enough now. One tidbit of first year information is we are using a rectal biopsy to determine if those deer are CWD positive. This is not accepted as gold standard but does give us a good indication if those deer may be positive. Of those 122 deer we had successful test on 12 showed up as positive and when we compared to non-positive animals in the study about 25% survived after deer hunting season compared to 75% of nonpositive animals. Small sample size, one year of information with many years to come. Not a surprise but information that is going to be important. There is other research on mule deer but in a high population whitetail herd this is the first study of this kind. Focus on how we manage the herd with CWD in that part of state. We will have CWD there for a long time. We have a quarterly newsletter focused on communication on this project as well. We have had some other deer research projects where we thought we were doing a good job and people didn't know it was happening. So, doing a newsletter, a lot of social media and a video. If interested, follow on our website and look at study and get access to communications we are putting out there. We had a lot of work on Lake Michigan salmon and trout stocking over

last year or so mostly related to trying to find balance between predator and prey for stocked fish. Allows interested stakeholders, Lake Michigan Business Association that was well-represented by lobbyists. We did a lot of public meetings and outreach to find the right balance for stocking programs and have reduced brown trout stocking, maintained chinook stocking and increased steelhead stocking. Part of that is to put more pressure on lake trout which are getting close to recovery. Moved bag limit from two to five and have eliminated season--can fish year-round now. Also working with net pens with local fishing clubs along the lake shore. Fish that are stocked are held in pens in water body to reduce predation from gulls, cormorants and other birds. Positive with groups who are part of what we are doing out there. We had funding allocated several years ago to reconstruct our Kettle Moraine Springs Fish Hatchery, which is where we do steelhead production. It took us until now to get it through the hurdles in the legislature, joint finance committee and building commission. Now funded, \$26 million project to have state-of-the-art facility. Also working with public/private partnership to raise steelhead for us as well.

Mike Miller, OH – Wind energy, Ohio, like many states, has been dealing with this. We are the exception, first with over-water wind development on the Great Lakes. We currently have three power windfarms, all in agriculture areas in central and northwestern Ohio, there are 10 additional projects approved or nearing approval. There are 285 active turbines, which generate enough electricity for 111,000 homes, approximately 600,000 megawatts. Most of the windfarms operate under seasonal curtailment, the blades are feathered in the spring and fall when wind speed is below 6.9 MS to avoid impacts with bats, from negotiations with USFWS. That is going on inland. In all of this development in Ohio we learned from mistakes, like having things set pre- and post- construction monitoring. In one case had large settlement with several companies dealing with song birds and bats and we are going to court. We have stumbled along the way but getting down to pretty good process using the best scientifically and statistically appropriate methodology. Standardized among all projects in state to determine if wintering facilities are causing unacceptable impacts with wildlife and make recommendations to minimize or mitigate damages caused. Now working with most of the new companies to make sure we have pre- and post-construction guidelines in place. We started that in 2009. What we look for is one-year pre-construction surveys that include pastoral and raptor surveys, bat acoustics, radar and high-risk areas such as migration routes. Then two-year post-construction mortality carcass surveys, nesting bird monitoring and bat acoustics. Statutory authority from construction operation in Ohio Siting Board and we hold a seat on that and offer recommendations to that Board. Working with several other state agencies in dealing with this issue. It is interesting, I never sat on anything like that, completely different level and never worked with anyone in energy industry so I have learned a lot. Almost all of the Ohio windfarms can get a USFWS incidental take permit for the Indiana bat, currently no such permit in our state. Estimated environmental impacts are 600 to 3,600 birds killed per year from Ohio wind turbines and most of those are various birds, but most songbirds killed are horned larks. 1,200 to 10,000 bats killed per year. Estimates are much higher than originally expected in agricultural areas. Right now, the project of interest in over-water is called Ice Breaker. Looking at putting in six experimental turbines 8-10 miles off of Cleveland shore in Lake Erie. This will be the first on the Great Lakes. We have been working closely with USFWS, looking to them to be experts on radar interpretation. The first fresh water installation in the U.S. will be at a depth of 60 feet of water. The aquatic and bird/bat surveys were required, and aquatic surveys generally show little effect on fish in the lake. Bird and bat surveys are still ongoing. Preliminary surveys indicate bat activity and bird migration pathway. Working with the company to develop a floating platform for radar that hasn't been done before. The USFWS and Ohio are excited to see if it works. Track record of fixed stationary radar on land and done preliminary work with fixed radar on the shoreline

looking out over the lake but having something out there in rotor sweep zone is new. Floating platform and bat acoustic data are expected to be done over next year. One other obstacle is there is no proven collision monitoring technology available at this time. Projection is 2020, so working closely with them and partners to come up with ways to monitor what is going on out there. One of things we do know that we didn't know before is the number of bats going out that far in the lake to feed at night was a shock. This is something big for Great Lake states. Look to future for this, in Europe they have a lot of offshore stuff. European companies did not look at bats and songbirds, they looked mainly at larger birds. Most of the surveys done were flight surveys, like counting pelicans out there. Over the next couple of years, we are looking forward to the challenge in Ohio dealing with this issue. Hopefully take some of this as an organization and other states, where time, money and effort has been spent because they are working on technology, "thunk" technology, several companies working on technology that can say when something hits one of their rotors. So far not very reliable, but interesting someone is working on being able to know if just 10 grams has hit the blade. I find that fascinating. That would be a tremendous benefit for wind energy people and us as planners and managers dealing with this issue to put things in place to move forward and have good information to make good decisions. Construction is due in 2020 in Ohio, will have more reporting on this in the future to make sure everybody can keep up to speed on what is going on with monitoring and what we are finding out as far as migration for birds and bats across the Great Lakes, particularly Lake Erie.

Terry – Crunching up against time frame – going to move ahead on the schedule.

Nationally Significant Wildlife Health Issues

Dr. John Fischer, Professor Director, Southeastern Cooperative Wildlife Disease Study (SCWDS) (PowerPoint – Exhibit 31) – On West Nile virus, Kelly covered this earlier when talking about committee meeting and number of states with growing concerns about impacts of West Nile virus on gamebirds such as grouse. A number of states are discussing possible surveys in hunter killed birds for antibodies for the virus, viral genetic material to get better handle on extent of exposure and possible population impacts. Also looking at doing some experimental inoculations, starting with wild turkeys and some other species; done on ruffed grouse in the past. This disease in California, Virulent New Castle disease (VND), documented in more than 20 backyard boxing areas which equates to fighting cocks. Nightmare trying to sort this out with the movement of birds. The big problem is if it gets into commercial poultry, which it did in California back in 2003, worked with APHIS Vet Service and other APHIS branches. It is very unlikely to be wildlife involved but APHIS personnel may disappear and their attention to issues like CWD will disappear with them. VND does occur from time to time in wild birds, particularly in cormorants, so not unusual, but if you have decent biosecurity birds that are in houses generally are not a problem. You don't see turkey on open ranges anymore like you did 45 years ago. Last November found several hundred exotic ticks on a sheep in New Jersey, the Longhorned Tick, which was believed to be a new introduction in the country. Have been doing a little sorting since then and it has been determined earlier this year that it had been found in May 2017 and some other detections in Virginia, West Virginia, Indiana and Arkansas. In reviewing archives of specimens from this genus it was found SCWDS collected the first one from wild whitetail deer in West Virginia back in 2010; it may go back further than that. Tick may be found in your neck of the woods before too long. It carries significant livestock and human pathogens so a concern to livestock producers and others. Now, chronic wasting disease (CWD), added two states since last year (found in wild animals). Found in 22 of those states with New York the sole exception who had two positive captive animals back in 2005, unable to find any additional positive animals to spite extensive surveillance. It is popping up in new areas in states where we knew it already occurred. Michigan, Missouri finding in remote new locations

and Wisconsin as well. Unmanaged these foci expand, prevalence increases. Document population impacts in mule deer and whitetail deer and effective management strategies for CWD remain elusive. Not a lot of room for optimism. Eradication is not feasible with tools we currently have. Control is generally concentrated on trying to reduce prevalence on number of affected animals in an area to slow the geographic spread. Heard earlier today the WAFWA recommendation on reductive management of CWD in the West, an accessible and adaptable plan with three basic tenants. One is to reduce artificial host concentration points, baiting and feeding. Increasing buck harvest or timing of buck harvest and also post-season target and sharpshooting where new foci identified in hot spots. Contemplating how this might be extrapolated to work in the Midwest. CWD and captive cervids, had something in newsletter in May, at that time for fiscal year that started in October. We've had nine positives since that issue went out two weeks ago we have had six more positive captive herds, 15 for fiscal year. Five were certified by USDA as low risk of having CWD. When it comes to updating this kind of material, I actually added the 100th captive cervid herd this morning, an elk herd in Sauk County in Wisconsin was identified and there was a press release late yesterday. Had first documentation of a positive animal moving from a certified herd from Pennsylvania to Wisconsin. Also had announcement of first captive reindeer in U.S. with CWD in Illinois. The chronic wasting disease program standards have been revised with a draft from public comment period that ended in the end of May. APHIS received over 300 comments. They are sorting through them and then will release final publication. CWD currently with locations in wild and captive since implementation in 2014, added Finland a few months ago, Norway a couple years ago and Korea received infected elk from Saskatchewan a number of years ago; those are the three countries outside of North America. Look at Norway with interesting situation. Since 2016 have found 18 positive reindeer, three moose and one red deer. The reindeer herd is physically isolated, so they exterminated them in an attempt to get rid of the disease. The disease is low prevalence and hopefully low environmental contamination and they think they have a chance at eradicating the disease. They will leave that area open for several years before they repopulate it with some centennial animals. Reindeer cases resemble what we see in North American CWD cases regarding the pathology of the animal and the protein patterns of the prions and contrasts with the three moose and red deer cases (which was in old animals with different pathological and prion protein profile). It is believed that those are spontaneous cases and that is why they are not concentrating on managing disease on moose and red deer. Update on recent research publications, one relates to post artificial concentration points, a study in CWD endemic area in southwestern Wisconsin. Assayed soil, water and deer feces at mineral lick sites, found prions at 7 of 11 sites in the soil; in 4 of 9 sites that had water; and fecal matter in prions of 6 of 10 samples there. Using fecal samples is hard because you are not sure how many animals that represents, but it does strongly indicate the animals visiting those sites are shedding prions in the environment. The conclusion of authors, mineral licks serve as reservoirs for proteins, facilitate transmission and provides opportunity for cross-species transmission. Another interesting study published recently out of Wyoming, the first author, Elizabeth Williams died with her husband in 2004. Some of the work she had gotten going continued on. Had cattle orally inoculated with CWD material from infected animals, other cattle were co-housed with infected animals. None of the animals showed signs of CWD after ten years of examining them; no evidence of prions. Conclusion is that transmission risk of CWD to cattle is very low. Last year we talked about macaque study in which the macaque did test positive for CWD after exposure to CWD material. This is a different study conducted in the U.S. where they follow macaques for 11-13 years after intracerebral or oral inoculation of CWD and no evidence of CWD transmission to those animals, which is different from previous study. It is not public yet because project is not completed, to be completed later this year. They felt there are differences in materials and methods between these two studies which could possibly account for the different results. I

would be inclined to not to disregard the study we talked about last year and advise against consumption of animals that test positive for CWD. Virgil Moore referred to a white paper on CWD from AFWA, which are best management practices developed by a working group, a lot of authors contributed to this big piece of work. A first draft was distributed to states for comments which have been incorporated and the final draft being put together. These will be forwarded to members well in advance of AFWA meeting in Tampa in September. There will be a resolution that will be developed in support of best management practices at that meeting. Thank you for great relationship we have had, honor and pleasure to work with you. My first love is state fish and wildlife agencies. Although I will retire from SCWDS at the end of the year there is no way I can turn my back on profession or resource and my colleagues and friends. So, you will continue to see me around in one capacity or another. *Scott Taylor* – Rationalization to harvesting bucks post rut? *John* – During rut animals would have greatest exposure to the disease and killing them after exposure would get them off the landscape before they actually develop far enough along to spread disease agent. In Pennsylvania last week, their harvest season runs post rut. That is rationalization used in that document. Encourage you to look at document online on NEAFWA website. *Wayne* – During rut did you study any scrapes? *John* – There have been studies on the scrapes, but I am not aware of them.

Terry – Similar to Tom, thank you for everything you have done for the states and MAFWA on disease, very helpful. Gave special recognition plaque. *John* – My pleasure.

The Importance of Leveraging Partnerships (panel)

For USDA Wildlife Services – *John Paulson, North Dakota State Director* (PowerPoint – Exhibit 32) – Reactive presentation so you will have to answer some questions as we go through this. Welcome to North Dakota (ND), blessed to have beautiful scenic places like the Badlands in our state. Talk about claim to fame for ND, talk about agriculture first. On beef cattle production we are fifteenth in the nation, number one in spring wheat production, number two in overall wheat production, number two in honey production and number one in sunflower production. Doug shared earlier some of the issues we have on blackbird damage. A little breakdown of our program. USDA Wildlife Services, fortunate to be part of working with talented people. Sara said earlier that you can't deliver conservation without your staff, in my line of work we can't deliver service without our staff. We have full time biologists at both air bases, Minot and Grand Forks; nine full time field specialists; seasonal staff that help with damage management; a disease biologist in office in Bismarck; and the district supervisor, Ryan Powers, he works with full time staff too. We also work with South Dakota folks and developed an important partnership with Kelly and his crew. Don't have near the presence there as they run their own state wildlife damage program. We help with aerial assistance with two pilots, crew members and technician that works with several plants, ethanol and Cargill plant on east part of state. In ND, regarding predator damage, beaver damage, goose damage and blackbird damage management; we have helped train all 139 airport personnel in ND and SD. We help on T&E species. Currently working on project with the Corps of Engineers on plover and least tern on the Missouri River. Work with Game and Fish department on sage grouse issue. Do a lot of disease related issues, very diverse. You never know when the phone rings what we are going to get, no different than any other wildlife services in any state in the nation. On long term partnerships, when Scott Peterson asked me to be part of this discussion got to looking at the history of our program in ND. From excerpt from ND Ag Experiment Station from 1915, first cooperative program put together between our agency, then Biological Survey, and the state of ND. In 1916 legislature made \$3,500 available to help producers and cooperative programs to do erosion control. A long history with state Game and Fish department. Keith Trego and I discussed this the other night. In 1992 or 1993 he and my predecessor sat down and decided to develop

something on USDA level service. That is how our relationship started. It wasn't a legislative thing but has since become that., We work closely with Terry and his crew and we have a fantastic working relationship. We have several partners we work with in ND and similar partnership with Kelly and his folks in SD. I talked to Noreen earlier about development of an MOU in place to assist producers with predator damage, working on refuges, a great thing for our program and producers. On quality of long-term partnerships: you need trust, collaboration, mutual respect, and a common goal identified. Reiterating a lot of what other people have said throughout the conference. Maintaining these partnerships takes communication, honesty and integrity. Admit when you make a mistake learn from them and move forward. Share in knowledge and expectations, and lots of beer, it is amazing what you can accomplish with that. See the term leverage in discussion we are having and there are lots of different definitions. The one that fits the best is "power to act effectively having knowledge and ability gives a person leverage". One of things Jerry Doan talked about, asked him what one take home message was, and he said, work with us. That is one thing that keeps me going to work every morning, it is the fact that we help people with problems. The fact that we can come in, working beside you guys, help them resolve problem in most effective means is what makes me proud of our agency and what we do. We will continue to work with all of our partners and develop new partners in ND and SD and throughout the U.S. *Introduced staff in the room.*

For U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Todd Frerichs, Project Leader, Audubon National Wildlife Refuge (PowerPoint - Exhibit 33) – Thank Partners for Wildlife program for pictures. The prairie pothole region encompasses several states and provinces, but I will focus on the Dakotas, especially North Dakota. Waterfowl migration is what makes this so important to the rest of the United States. Birds banded in this region have been harvested in every state and province and Mexico. Holcomb research emphasizes importance of prairie pothole region. He studied mallard and 91 percent of conservation all occurs here in the prairies in nesting grounds. Basically, wetlands and grasslands raise ducks. Eastern part of state also has a wetland range. Wetlands are being drained and we continue to lose grasslands. USFWS easements are designed to conserve wetlands and grasslands. The big plan is to develop an easement program that fits with farm and ranch operations. When talking to non-wildlife partners, we want to ensure diversified landscape and economy that includes crop, livestock and wildlife production. Wetland easement are perpetual, they last forever and transfer to the new owner and prevents burning, draining, filling or leveling of the wetland area. The grassland easement program also is perpetual; there is no haying, mowing or seed harvest after July 15. Essentially no destroying the grassland, or keep the green side up, and there are no restrictions on grazing. The thunderstorm map is the wetland area and shows tracking waterfowl. We have wetland and grassland easements all along that same track. Have to give credit to founders of this program who started in late 1950s and early 1960s who knew the place to put the work. With better technology and better landscaping technology, research shows we are putting the dollars in the right location. Have mostly been talking about ducks and asked if we care about anything else. Yes, we do, but lot of research is ducks. Once we put ducks on the landscape the same habitats are important for a lot of non-game species. What has been accomplished in Dakotas up to this point; we have a long way to go, still another 9.4 million acres of grassland we want to sign up and another 1.6 million acres of wetlands but making headway. From 2013-2017, with extra effort of trying to acquire easements, still interest out there and we were able to acquire 1,100 new wetland contracts conserving 72,000 wetland acres; and an additional 385 extra grassland easement contracts. It is critical when partners involved, in North Dakota when wetland easement program first started we needed permission from the state governor to acquire wetlands. We were given permission with caps on the counties. We can no longer use duck stamp to acquire wetlands in counties that are capped. Those 385 new grassland easements we are not allowed to use duck

stamp dollars for those either so that is where partners are critical to move forward with that acquisition. Our partner is the fish and wildlife program, they help us out by administering the NAWCA grant. The bookend approach is the model of how they look at things; whether it is refuge staff, meeting with landowners on grassland easements or private lands biologist. Regardless we try to move those folks back and forth and be available and not walk away from them continuing that stewardship into the future. Some of the work done in North and South Dakota, represents 10,000 different landowners, 400,000 acres of habitat. Emphasize that in those counties we have wetland and grassland easements, some shorter term but traditionally 15-year agreements within private lands program. NAWCA funding is administered for fee acquisition, 30% grassland easement acquisition and partner funding is one of few places we can do that. Leases acquired is 36% and a lot of that is North Dakota Game and Fish program. They use as match to help us acquire those. The bottom line is 1.6 million acres conserved or enhanced over a 26-year period; \$141 million in match. Partners include North Dakota Game and Fish, DU and NAWCA are big ones, but just about everybody who does conservation in ND. Most of those organizations and agencies have their own private lands programs and we share information back and forth and try to help out landowners. That is the key when 90% of the land is in private ownership. You have to figure out how to do things on their land that fits their operation. Thank partners for helping us keep this on the landscape to insure grasslands and wetlands are part of prairie pothole regions future.

For Manitoba Habitat Heritage Corporation – *Tim Sopuck, CEO* – Looked at topic and made quick switch to talk about leveraging important partnerships. Start off topic and talk about establishment of new fund in Manitoba, called Conservation Trust. This year in March the provincial government included a one-time contribution of \$102 million to an endowment fund named the Conservation Trust. This would be an irrevocable gift to a community foundation to support community activities, primarily agriculture and landscape. My organization will be the recipient of annual revenue, about \$5 million a year so we have an interesting question of what to do with it. When a trust fund has been established for habitat conservation activity all of the different provinces will interact proactively. In terms of my journey in leveraging important partnerships, visit to Doan Ranch yesterday helped incapsulate where we have been for the last several years personally and professionally. For me the epiphany came a few years ago when I saw a simple statistic for western Canada. One-third of landscape is in beef production and that maintains about two-thirds of biodiversity of the remaining habitat. We work with provincial organizations, never tight, they didn't exactly need us, but we needed them, an asymmetric relationship. I asked for a meeting with Board of Directors to talk about what we do and at that meeting I asked, "How do we help you sell more beef?" An odd question from a conservation organization. I explained that Manitoba recently suffered a decline in cattle of 25% is common decline is the same decline of perennial cover, range ground, wetlands and all of those other things. If you lose the reason on the agricultural landscape, it is tough to keep maintained. From that question and conversation, it broke down a lot of barriers and three years ago I convinced them to consider going after some federal funding through agricultural organizations to engage in conservation. In the end, it didn't take that long to convince Manitoba beef producers to take a role and secure funding. There are stewardship programs focused on grasslands in southwest Manitoba and we worked with beef producers to deliver that program; proposals come through our staff and the final signature is the executive secretary of the beef producers. To justify this program, it is an odd but a great place to be. We leverage up to national level, we convened a meeting last year of national conservation organizations to talk about areas of overlook. We talked about the idea of marketing and got into discussions about where the points of overlap were, and it changed the conversation. Interesting opportunity with Conservation Trust; one of the ways we intend to leverage this important partnership is by welcoming ag organizations on

shorter-term initiatives, we sign a lot of easements and programs are well received. We hope that one of the strategic outcomes of the trust fund will be to further grow that important partnership. Terry – Partnerships are important. Even though we don't work directly with Tim, the partnership we have is the prairie pothole region and USFWS runs their program and works together on that. On feral hogs, John and USDA have to go through some stringent requirements and they have been successful and cooperative in getting rid of a few infestations we have had. Every one of the people on this panel we have a great partnership with, we thank them.

Offsite Dinner Event: Nishu Bowmen Club

Sponsored by National Archery in the Schools Program

Roy Grimes made a few remarks Sheila, Roy did not attend, who was it???

Support from Kalkomey Enterprises

Beverages Sponsored by North Dakota Bowhunter's Association

Board Buses depart at 5:00 pm

Board Buses to return at different times

Hospitality Room – Sponsored by Airgun Sporting Association

Minutes
MAFWA Annual Business Meeting
Wednesday, June 27, 2018
Ramkota Hotel and Conference Center
Bismarck, North Dakota

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Breakfast – Sponsored by Pheasants Forever and Quail Forever
Remarks by **Rick Young**

MAFWA BUSINESS MEETING

Terry Steinwand, MAFWA President – Officially called to order at 8:10 AM

Call to Order and Roll Call

Ollie - All states present. We have three proxies, Wisconsin (Aaron Buchholz), Indiana (Amanda Wuestefeld) and Kentucky (Steve Beam). (Proxies - Exhibit 34); no Canadian provinces present.

Agenda Review

Terry – Copy of our agenda is listed in the program; do you have additions or corrections? I need to move people around, Dave Chanda will be right after the reports.

Approval of 2017 Annual Business Meeting Minutes

Annual meeting minutes (Exhibit 35); **Kelly Hepler, SD moved to accept minutes as printed, Dale Garner, IA second. Motion passes.**

Treasurer's Report

Roger Luebbert (Exhibit 36) – Passed out two reports, Treasurer's Report we will discuss now and 2019 Proposed Budget we will discuss later. This treasurer's report summarizes actual receipts, disbursements and account balances for all MAFWA accounts for the most recent completed fiscal year, MAFWA uses a calendar year so this report is as of December 31, 2017. The first page is account balance summary comparing 2016 and 2017, increases in all accounts except for Banking Services account. Page 2 is banking services account which handles banking services for any conferences or special projects such as national pheasant coordinator; this account balance decreased in 2017 as a result of closing out 2016 Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference held in Michigan, shown on third line under disbursements; another major factor is national pheasant coordinator contributions were less than disbursements, shown on first line under receipts and first line under disbursements. One of the reasons receipts were under disbursements was because Pheasants Forever paid their \$30,000 three-year commitment all in 2015, so nothing is included in 2017 receipts; one state followed the same process and paid their \$15,000 up front. Scott Taylor, the national pheasant coordinator does a projection of national pheasant coordinator balance and keeps that committee informed. The note at the bottom of the page lists the designations for the December 31, 2017 balance. Page 3 is the

conference account which is our main operating account; it receives dues from the states and receipts from annual MAFWA conference and main expenditures are MAFWA conference expenses, executive secretary and treasurer pay and travel expenses and other various expenses such as tax form preparation, fees and insurance. Line numbers were added to the left side of this page to facilitate easier reference; line one shows balance at beginning of calendar year 2017 and line 43 shows balance at end of 2017. Essentially the 2017 increase is \$25,774; one of the reasons is total conference receipts exceeded conference disbursements, receipts on line 6 and disbursements on line 28. Page 4 is Southern Wings account, a pass-through account, receives contributions from various states which are disbursed primarily to the American Bird Conservancy, typically balance is very small as was the case the end of 2017. Page 5 is the Federal account and the major revenue source is contributions from the states for Monarch Strategy conservation projects, reimbursements from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for monarch state liaison and from National Fish and Wildlife Foundation for the monarch strategy project which includes reimbursements for the monarch coordinator. Major disbursements are monarch state liaison, monarch coordinator and indirect costs. Page 6 is the credit union share account where we have \$25 required minimum balance at end of 2017. Page 7 is money market and securities investment account showing interest, dividends and capital gains income as well as positive change in money market value of underlying securities; 2017 was a good year for investments, a little over \$50,000 or 12.4 percent. There were no disbursements from this account. Page 8 is conservation enhancement fund account that is held with broker along with previous money market securities account. Receipts for this account shows interest, dividends and capital gains and positive change in money market value of securities. There were no disbursements; overall increase of a little over \$700. Concludes report. ***Keith Sexson, KS moved to accept Treasurer's Report, Wayne Rosenthal, IL second. Motion passes.***

Audit Committee Report

Mike Miller, OH – Dale, Bill, Roger, myself and Mike Luers, our assistant chief in charge of fiscal, had a conference call to review MAFWA records. Mike is chief fiscal officer for the division and he did a thorough review, he had conversations with Roger. We had over 40 questions and went through them thoroughly, Mike was impressed, and he is a 28-year accountant. Roger continues to do a fine job and he was prepared to answer any and all questions we had. Discussed mail being opened by someone other than Roger, particularly if checks involved, and we suggest keeping a register to say what comes in all envelopes, so we stay above board. Talked about audit control where we used new audit control, which wasn't necessary but much more thorough. We were very impressed, Roger did a fine job. ***Roger*** – It was very thorough. ***Terry*** – Having been chair last year, fun being biologist/CPA. ***Aaron Buchholz, WI moved to accept audit report, Dale Garner, IA second. Motion passes.***

Investments Committee Report

Wayne Rosenthal, IL – We did not schedule a call, so I have no report. I will call advisor, Jim Douglas and Jim Leach when I get home.

Resolutions Committee Report

Jim Leach, MN (Exhibit 37) – There are three resolutions, two we discussed partially yesterday, and I believe we have modified language to those. **Bill O'Neill**– Documents on the screen show the proposed resolution on the top of the page and three options. The first option is narrower and then gets broader and includes a couple of other points in options two or three. Part of discussion, rather than ban baiting, because you heard a number of states talk about the problems they would have, we recommended banning baiting in states that still allow it. This makes a statement about science of baiting and feeding without declaring our desire to ban baiting. **Terry** – Have original resolution discussed yesterday and three options. Start discussion with option one. On handout it is missing some of the whereas statements, are their citations or literature that show economic impacts? One of the things I feel is if you don't have the North American model to back it up you probably shouldn't be making that statement. Agree with concept and context, mechanism that would transfer this from individual to whole herd. Speaking on behalf of North Dakota, and every state would have to speak for themselves, want to be sure a politician or public doesn't read this and say we want to mandate the situation, we have to deal with science and do it fairly. I think I have my governor convinced on a baiting ban in northwest part of the state, been beat up by legislature in two past sessions. **Jim Douglas** – Like result of efforts put in to steer this away from a ban that is producing negative effects also, like you stated, what science do we have to back this up, not sure of that, recommendations made with practical application, rather than disease transmissions specifically. Should have explored with John Fischer, I think white paper coming out on CWD, don't know if it addresses baiting and feeding, but another option might be to wait to see what that says. **Ron Regan** – Best management practices document, we plan to bring that to Tampa for adoption. I talked to John Fischer about it yesterday and this sort of stuff is in that document with literature to back it up. It has had extensive review by wildlife professionals. **Kelly** – Thanks for looking at this and taking a run at it. It is interesting if passing it in a positive way I think it would be detrimental to some of the discussions we are having in our state. Not sure resolution will make a difference one way or the other if you are already moving down that road. With AFWA have more credence to these discussions, with timing also gives us a chance with transition report of best management practices after Tampa meeting would hold more weight. I said I would probably abstain, but I would probably vote against all three of these and it has nothing to do with respect to other states, but it is like being out front breaking the ground. In my state we are being more methodical than this. **Dale** – Appreciate what you said Kelly, even within the health group various states think about political end, the problem we have is CWD and we don't understand it, but if we wait for national the question is still going to come, it is not an individual state issue, it is national issue and until all states get on board we are not going to solve the problem, in fact it may be too late already. **Jim D.** – Do these three options flow well with what is immediately proceeded it? **Jim L.** – May be of value to have Bill explain what he has done here and what potential would be by adding one of these. **Terry** – Bill? **Bill** – Yesterday's conversation with a number of you and the audience talking about what our comments were and most had to do with reluctance to say we support banning of baiting. There was some agreement to make a statement about the science of baiting and feeding and disease transmission, so that is first option. There was also conversation about sensitivity of social and political

conversations regarding baiting, number two has that added. A statement acknowledging some of social and political sensitivities of baiting without taking a stand one way or the other and not obligating yourself. The third, after Ron's comments about upcoming meeting in Tampa and opportunity to talk more broadly at national meeting, we added a suggestion that AFWA pick this up and add it to the AFWA conversation coming this fall. Depending on where you stood, could have basic statement on baiting and feeding; could acknowledge political sensitivities; and ask AFWA to take up the conversation; or you could say no to all three or no to the original and move on; or edit any one of those.

Terry – That helps. *Wayne* – As we talked yesterday we had legislation introduced in our House for supplemental feeding, the approach the proponents take is that there are elements missing in whitetail diet and they are supporting and increasing strengthening the immune system. When you talk to biologists and ask for data that it doesn't work, when present to legislators and nobody can say no because there isn't any research on it. We want to do a study and agree to support study because then we have input. When you talk to the public and whitetail hunter, approaching as EHD, not CWD, they say we need to increase the immune systems and it would have effect on CWD also. When you talk to the public and these guys are promoting that we can increase health of the deer herd, public hears that is what they want to hear. Consideration on how you go forward. ***Jim Douglas, NE moved to accept resolution as originally written, Bill O'Neill, MI second. Roll call vote: IL – no, IN – no, IA – yes, KS – yes, KY – abstain, MI – no, MN – yes, MO – yes, NE – yes, ND – no, OH – no, SD – no, WI – no (7 no, 5 yes, 1 abstain).***

Terry – ***Motion fails.*** *Sara* – I would like to see vote on number three, third option (*read*). ***Sara Parker Pauley, MO moved to accept option 3, Jim Leach, MN second. Jim D.*** – Would it be out of line to ask Ron Regan whether he thinks this is proper motion? *Ron Regan* – Whole section on baiting and feeding in document. Number three is fine from my perspective. *Sara* – This would be substitute language from original resolution, replacing all of the other now therefore and be it further resolved. *Terry* – Ollie, do we need last now therefore on MAFWA? *Ollie* – No. *Bill O.* – Suggest edit to the title of this, reads “in opposition of baiting and feeding”, suggest striking “in opposition to” and replace with “regarding”, “Resolution regarding the baiting and feeding of cervids to reduce the risk of disease transmission and establishment”. *Terry* – Suggested amendment? *Bill O.* – Yes. ***Bill O'Neill, MI moved to amend title in addition to Sara's motion, Dale Garner, IA second. Ron*** – Think motion is fine, when directors from other parts of country exercise the BMP document that is 75 pages long and 2 pages devoted to baiting and feeding, will be position on whole host of issues on CWD. I think this is fine. *Terry* – Action in Tampa? *Ron* – Yes. *Terry* – First motion on amendment? ***Motion passes.*** On original motion? ***SD and IL abstain, Motion passes.***

Jim L. – Two more resolutions proposed, the second one was one we lumped in with first one yesterday but is distinctly different. We need to discuss as individual resolutions and decide what the board would like to do. It talks specifically about artificial movement of non-endangered cervids. *Terry* – It received some discussion yesterday. *Kelly* – Need to have in form of a motion for purpose of discussion. ***Motion to accept as worded by Kelly Hepler, SD, second by Dale Garner, IA.*** *Kelly* – I have greater concerns with this one than the other one, spoke with Kelly (Straka) yesterday, discussions around carcasses and things and I am two weeks out of a commission meeting where this is central part of discussion which is a concern. We also have an active cervid industry, which we need to

engage on how to get in front of that. From South Dakota perspective I would abstain on this. Would like further discussion. *Dale* – Carcasses is covered in that. Those of you that sat on national director's call this topic came up and we heard the same from West Virginia and we all understand that. When you are dealing with CWD and working with captive industry this will get shoved down your throat. This is an attempt to bring out, hard to get into discussions with someone who tells you they can't do something unless we do it ourselves. I understand science is one thing but both of these resolutions from the health committee is an attempt to bring it forward to help on national scope. *Aaron* – Repeat statements I made yesterday, from Wisconsin's perspective we are close to finishing an elk restoration project, to support this would be counter to completing that project. Understand and appreciate what the committee has done but we can't support it as written. *Wayne* – Within Illinois, pen-raised cervids are under Department of Ag, not our department so I would feel uncomfortable supporting something we don't control. *Steve Beam* – I would echo Wisconsin, don't have CWD in the state but there are other things in this in addition to the big issue, getting ready to send elk to Wisconsin. It is so broad it is difficult like orphan deer across county lines, we just dealt with this regulation and we tightened it up but there are people with position that there should not be rehabilitation of whitetail deer until you look at what will happen if you do that, there will be barns and basements full of whitetail deer and could make the problem way worse. Sometimes some practicality but I don't think this resolution is it. *Terry* – Ron, is this issue addressed in that white paper? *Ron* – Yes. *Mike* – Ohio would act similar to Illinois and Wisconsin, we are having internal discussions and at same time our Department of Agriculture oversees captive deer industry in Ohio. We do restrict movement of carcasses with at least mandatory reporting but at the same time we don't rehabilitate fawns. Taken number of steps to moving carcasses, looking at officially classing ourselves as a red state for CWD even about our hunters going out of state and bringing carcasses back but fact that we don't control the captive industry and looking at reintroduction in next five to ten years, we wouldn't be able to support this. *Terry* – From North Dakota perspective, we don't allow any transport of deer from states with CWD. We have some control over captive herds, we are doing what we can within the law.

Motion fails.

Jim L. – Third resolution is to thank you and your staff for exceptional three days here. Everybody had a great time, you and your staff did a superb job. ***Sara Parker Pauley, MO moved to pass resolution, Mike Miller, OH second.*** *Terry* – As directors we get credit for stuff we didn't do and blamed for stuff we didn't do. In this case I get credit for something dedicated staff did; Lynn Timm, Scott Peterson and others, thank you all.

Motion passes.

Awards Committee Report

Keith Sexson, KS (MAFWA Award Winner Nominations – Exhibit 38) – Thank members of committee, Terry Steinwand, Mark Reiter, Dale Garner and Jim Leach. We had 20 nominations for the awards we presented and encourage directors that when solicitation comes take a little time. We all have our own awards programs within our states, always encourage solicitation, I am sure we all have deserving employees and appreciate the nominations. Looking for a new chair for this committee, the incoming president will have the honor of selecting that, there are fine people on existing

committee that would make great chairs. The only real task of the chair is to give this report and break ties. *Terry* – Thank you Keith and Sheila, you do an excellent job of keeping everybody informed. *Keith* – I was derelict in my duties, I should have had Sheila in this first part of this list, she knows her way around this award program and how to get them done and I think she will continue to do that for the awards committee. *Terry* – Lynn can be a bulldog, but Sheila can be too and that is good. Thank you, Keith and Sheila.

Bylaws Committee Report

Sara Parker Pauley, MO (Constitution and Bylaws with proposed changes - Exhibit 39) – Go through changes quickly, Ollie's email of May 30 outlines the changes clearly. Mainly we are separating Conservation Enhancement Fund (CEF) and making two separate sets of bylaws; inclusion of recently adopted internal controls document; and three-year rotation of technical working committees. In the preamble we took out reference to CEF. Made a few editorial changes, added additional language to budget and reports, added internal controls for cash policy, editorial change on resolution committee, changes of dates to add three-year extension to committees and amended date at the end. *Aaron* – Private lands group extended to 2021, they meet in conjunction with public lands, are you extending them too? *Ollie* – Formed at separate times, so public lands sunsets on a different year. ***Dale Garner, IA made a motion to accept revisions; Keith Sexson, KS second. Motion passes.***

Executive Secretary's Report

Ollie Torgerson (PowerPoint - Exhibit 40) – Each year I report highlights and each one is different, in 2015 northern long-eared bats; in 2016 national pheasant committee and established paid treasurer; last year it was all monarchs and bringing Ed and Claire onboard and renegotiating my contract; and this year full bore on monarchs and engagement with USFWS, the science application priorities. Talk about our relationship with federal agencies, especially USFWS, we have had good history with excellent cooperation with Region 3 and now Region 6 of USFWS. In the last couple years some of our directors now engaged with USFWS, Kelley Myers and Ed Boggess, and we have a director who is former USFWS person, Jim Leach, and our relationship has strengthened over time. Work with the Service on how we go forward, more than just USFWS, any agency with natural resource responsibilities. It is important for states to work cooperatively with the federal agencies, they face the same challenges and have same common enemies and we don't have time to fight amongst ourselves. Picture (of federal partners) exemplifies relationship, proud of how you directors work well with federal partners. Left Nebraska and found out we were going to lose two more directors, Ray Petering, Ohio and Bill Moritz, Michigan then later Kurt Thiede, Wisconsin and Greg Johnson, Kentucky. Ron Regan and I team up to meet with new directors when appointed, been doing that for a number of years; went out and met with Mike Miller, Ohio, Bill O'Neill, Michigan, Dan Meyers and Sanjay Olson, Wisconsin. These trips are well worth it, we not only greet them but explain who we are and what we do and get directors engaged beyond state borders. A lot of behind-the-scenes work went on for monarchs this year, standing up the strategy at this meeting which is one of the major highlights of the year. The USFWS provided grant money to keep Ed on board, and

successful in third application for NFWF grant to keep Claire Beck on board to implement the strategy. When we were in Spokane, Larry Kruckenberg shared a story of employee misconduct which caused substantial heartache for WAFWA, so our board established three new policies to protect us. Internal controls for cash was the first one; a confidentiality policy for employees and contractor volunteers; and conflict of interest and compensation policy for our directors. In October we changed officers went from President Douglas to President Steinwand. In November renegotiated my contract, extended six months to end of this year. Learned about hunting and fishing chiefs' initiative to align federal hunting and fishing regulations to state regulations on refuges, expand recreational access on refuges and promote R3 activities, was another highlight. Talked about priorities of science applications and Jim Douglas and Kelley Myers provided a lot of leadership on that. There are a lot of other people engaged as well. First of year we start our push for annual conference, give North Dakota credit, they started way before that. Worried about money because we lost USFWS sponsorships, but we were able to maintain at same rate as last year. If would have had USFWS sponsors we would have topped out on this graph, thank our sponsors when you get a chance, very important to hear from directors. Learned a new term here in North Dakota, "bombdiggy", which means you are incredible, beyond anything you can imagine and awesome to the fullest extent, and that is how I describe North Dakota Game and Fish and especially their planning team. Several member states urging us to enter into cooperative agreement with Max McGraw Foundation, so they can funnel money through us for the Conservation Leaders for Tomorrow (CLfT) program, so we executed that in March. Our executive committee decided in Norfolk, after years of discussion, to take responsibility of Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference, a big move on our part. Many people thought this was our conference, but it has never has been; initiated in 1935 and has been around since then. Due to struggles and issues in recent years to sign hotel contracts, set up banking accounts and sole-source meeting event planner contracting we have taken on fiscal oversight for that conference. That resulted in bylaw changes to officially and legally separate our Association from our Foundation because our Foundation will be managing that oversight service. Mike hosts that conference in Ohio in January and this conference in June. Delaney presented us our third three-year contract to manage this conference and executive committee is negotiating with Cindy. There has been a lot of contracting this year as well as behind the scenes coordination. Thank North Dakota Game and Fish and Delaney Meeting and Event Management for putting on such a successful conference; it takes a lot of people to put this on, lots of details, a great team Terry and Scott. Shout out to Sheila who does a lot of behind-the-scenes work for us, and her partner Dan with her and helping out. Sheila updated MAFWAs past 10 years of history this year. She will combine this 10 years with total history and get updated later this summer. Thank Roger for his work, Claire and Ed, we have staff, it used to just be just Sheila; then me and Sheila; then me, Sheila and Roger; then me, Sheila, Roger, Ed and Claire. We will meet next June in Ohio. *Mike* – Maumee Bay State Park is where we will be meeting next year.

Approval of Affiliate Members

Ollie Torgerson – When I came on board we had one, Wildlife Management Institute, we have 27 affiliate members now. Last year the Wildlife Society and the American

Fisheries Society came on board. We have no applications this year, but one coming next year, Northern Bobwhite Initiative is going to apply I believe. If you have organizations, you feel should be an affiliate member let me know and I can go recruit them.

OLD BUSINESS

National Wild Pheasant Plan Update

Scott Taylor, Executive Director – (Power Point – Exhibit 41). In 2013 the National Wild Pheasant Conservation Plan was approved by AFWA directors, fund raising effort began to hire a coordinator and concluded in 2016 and I was hired in April 2016. I completed second full year and our management board consists of 14 members from 15 state agencies and Pheasants Forever, a number of board members here, Wayne, Keith, Jim, Jim and others in this room. I have given you a copy of annual report (Exhibit 42). The report is available on our website, nationalpheasantplan.org. Our current chair is Tony Leif, SD, appreciate his help and guidance, particularly early on. The mission of our partnership is to foster science-based policies and programs that benefit pheasants, hunters and communities. On policy front, spend a lot of time on Farm Bill priorities of partnership and pushing to decision makers in Washington through a variety of methods. We are fortunate to be included in Association visits and fly-in events, oral testimony, listening sessions on House side, written testimony on Senate Ag committee side as well as personal letters detailing our priorities and recommendations to each House and Senate agriculture committee member. On senate side that bill will move by end of the week. Try to keep in touch with Pheasants Forever partners who are in Washington providing input to Congressional staffers. On science side, tried to aggregate information out there, synthesize it and make it easier for partners to use; a great deal of literature is available on our website organized by topic. Also, asked to synthesize the existing science on the effects of diversion programs like soil banking or CRP on pheasants historically and make recommendations at request from USDA-FSA at Washington level; published yesterday in Wildlife Society bulletin, serve as resource for policy makers for years to come. Not well covered because of lack of space in the annual report, took a look at pheasant hunter component of our mission, want to look at state data and compare annual participation and see if that led us to action items. Provided a few slides looking at results of 25 years of national surveys, wanted to point out, with regard to increased emphasis on R3 activities and concern for hunter declines it is obviously that is driven by losses in small game hunter participation. On average nationally lost over 160,000 participants a year, from Midwest perspective like losing state worth of participation every year for 25 years. Coming from an individual state, we know that's true individually, but haven't seen it aggregated this way, a common problem. Regarding pheasant hunting participation, follows same trend and we were interested in how habitat, in particular CRP, affects hunter participation. That information helps when communicating why we need CRP to policy makers. In heydays of CRP hunter participation climbed and ever since had statutory reductions in CRP see loss accelerating. It is not only birds we are trying to promote through CRP, but end users as well. National decline in hunter participation is mostly driven by small game hunter declines. CRP acreage clearly influences pheasant hunter participation, habitat is an R3 issue. At national wildlife symposium in Lincoln last month, habitat didn't come up because we all understand it,

but it helps to say it out loud every once in a while. Hunter losses likely to continue as CRP acreage caps are being discussed at Washington level, more acres is a good thing, but even we get a few more acres still have R3 challenge to overcome. Need to start giving more emphasis to other approaches beyond CRP, still a centerpiece as long as 20 million-acre range but need to start adding things to the table. Managing pheasants in an era of diminished CRP, in partnership talking about ways to more evenly distribute CRP enrollments, develop tools to do that within states and among states, don't want to create winners and losers. As an example of those tools Nebraska developed a habitat program and a number of states are prioritizing enrollments. At partnership exploring ways to help states and we submitted a letter of intent to develop some of these tools through multi-state conservation grant program; partners on application were Prairie Pothole Joint Venture, Playa Lakes Joint Venture and USDA-FSA who all have interest in developing these types of plans for a number of bird species. FSA has funding interest in developing these plans, in next 3-4 months funding picture will be clearing and we can move forward in developing those tools. Talked about promotion of soil health in certain ag. approaches, selective because there is some that have a lot of promise for conservation but also have potential to be used in a negative way depending on the landscape. Kansas has current research project looking at pheasant use of cover crops. Depending on way cover crops are managed could be negative productivity. In precision ag, good to know where non-profitable acres are because we could point out to landowners that they could make more money by converting some grasslands to crops. As we learn more about these approaches and innovate delivering hunter satisfaction. One of issues that came up at R3 symposium was there is diminishing participation because feeling of overcrowding and we want more hunters, could be message problem there. Need to be innovative on how we put hunters, habitat and access to the field, can accommodate more hunters without overcrowding. Last management board meeting, talked about innovating ways to come up with funding for habitats, potential changes to PR policies and statutes to make them beneficial as well as a way to direct some of that money to farmland habitats. Underlying premise of partnership is to speed the rate of which we learned by cooperating rather than state-by-state approach. The National Pheasant tech committee meeting this year is in Pennsylvania the week after the AFWA meeting, encourage you to allow your pheasant biologists to attend, very valuable in talking about these issues and moving forward. Terry – If Farm Bill passed that will help more with state cooperation.

Greater Prairie Chicken/Sharp-tail Grouse Plan Update

Keith Sexson, Kansas Department of Wildlife, Parks and Tourism – Two-page summary of what activities has been taking place with this group (Exhibit 43). This effort to develop an interstate working group to address greater prairie chickens and sharp-tailed grouse came about in 2014, at a special meeting at the North American. A large group got together to talk about developing a strategic plan spearheaded by the North American Grouse Partnership. As state representatives started to communicate with them and suggest an approach to put states out front with Grouse Partnership alongside them on these issues. In 2015, WAFWA directors approved establishing the Interstate Working Group and then came to this group for additional support from MAFWA because crossing two regions. We ended up with representatives from 14 states to serve on the two committees, states are listed, and Oklahoma is included because of range of chickens

in tall grass prairie and they wanted to be a part of this. Appreciate director's support for your folks attending, we have had five in-person meetings and six conference calls. Holding meetings in the Omaha area because central location. Your people are engaged in this process. Some states don't have populations of greater chickens that Kansas, Nebraska and the Dakotas have, but they do have aggressive grassland restoration efforts underway in addition to reintroductions. When they come to talk they know how many chickens they have and what the range looks like. Working Groups focus is mainly on maintaining and restoring sufficient amounts of native grassland and shrubland ecosystems across the range to support sustainable populations. To date have operated joint efforts under WAFWA Western Grassland Initiative and also with help from Ecosystem Management Research Institute (EMRI). John Haufler (EMRI) and Bill Van Pelt, who was coordinator for Western Grassland Initiative, who have been guiding and coordinating this. In Kansas we put forth a PR proposal to submit for funding but could only fund efforts under greater prairie chicken and think we did one time release some sharp-tails, but we haven't claimed those as species. The grant is going to help with coordination of planning process, meetings and to help participants attend and match is coming from states. We have engaged USFWS as well and have some of their folks attend this meeting. Part of this was putting together information so if petitioned we would have foundation of information. We learned that from lesser prairie chicken (LPC) and planning efforts of sage grouse which are planning efforts that provide good guidance. It is a different situation here, not under listing threat, but put information in order, should it occur. Have a number of bullet points that are tasks completed to date, a fair number include compilation and examination of data states have, including distribution of species, habitat, compilation and harvest information. Working on having consistent monitoring methods across state lines within range of species. There have been a number of occupancy and habitat models done that is giving us information to pull in and determine what we need to do. Important part is identification of additional species of concern that can be addressed with management of two grouse species. While these species are flagships of this conservation effort, a number of other species like grassland birds will benefit. Grasslands are one of most endangered ecosystems in the world. Bringing these other species to the table is important and this group recognizes that as a result of SWAP plans. An important source of information is how they integrate into this effort. Another important part is identification of additional partners and how to engage them in process like NGO community, industry, other scientists and folks interested in this area of conservation; working on integrating these folks into planning effort. They weren't included in the beginning because states and other partners felt they needed to get their arms around it and decide how to move forward. Realize other folks have valuable information that can go into this process so integrating other potential partners. Also want to establish a science advisory committee comprised of experts on each species and others to help develop landscape considerations for grassland conservation. It is good to have science and scientific community together on these efforts and if in conflict could work out those issues. We soon recognized we were missing the science needed to fill the holes that is where we are the weakest; having good science foundation. When USFWS is petitioned they look to states for information. Working together we can develop a research plan to address questions that come our way from petitioners. Five ongoing tasks are: modeling and habitat conditions for each species; developing process to set

population habitat goals, eco-regional concept similar to LPC (like flint hills and sand hills and different eco-regions that need to be identified that deserve special attention); funding mechanism as we reach out to partners and begin to look at funding some of these efforts and particularly habitat conditions, when bring information to the table in such a way to identify needs and how addressing those needs can move the needle then folks will put arms around it in a financial way. Imperative to insure linked to other conservation efforts with species of greatest conservation concern, while grouse species are flagship, iconic species for agencies entities outside the conservation arena is limited and need to address other species that exist within that landscape. We took a look at and supported planning document from Midwest landscape conservation working group and many things highlighted crossed right into what we are trying to do in that grassland landscape (like prioritizing at risk species conservation and wind energy). While wind is out in front there are other industrial impacts with oil and gas, transmissions, pipelines and transportation that seem to have an effect on these grouse species. In support of having better information on impacts of wind towers on our grouse species. On the right track, like idea that this effort at a lower level and landscape they exist in nests in very well with purpose and objectives of landscape conservation efforts. These can be adjusted, not set on one path, as priorities change we can adjust our programs. Other impacts in the Kansas in GPC range and tall grass prairie, while we have been able to keep wind out of there and not a lot of oil and gas formation, we do have rangeland management that has some impact, annual burning and more people are starting to look at rotational burning programs. We need landowners to engage in management programs and a need to change cultural aspects of range management. If one can begin to show cattle production and ranching can benefit from management programs that benefit grouse, we are headed down the right path. As rancher said the other day, lets engage in conversation. In work with landowners that have entered into contracts with us they recognize that well. The programs come with financial benefit are also equally good or better for their ranching and cattle operations. It has been a pleasure and being involved in these kinds of things keep you young and vibrant because so many good things yet to come. The future is bright for wildlife conservation and we have great young people taking these things on, they are thinking about the science, population modeling and monitoring. Can have a lot of energy, but something up here (head) too. The Midwest has come a long way.

Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference

Sara Parker Pauley – Missouri Department of Conservation – A charge was given to me as chair of this committee and board of MFWC on May 29. The approved charge is “to provide CEF oversight managing the cooperative agreement between MFWC host states and CEF, monitor host state succession and coordinator selection and performance, hotel contracting and finances. Annually recommend to CEF board of trustees a MFWC proceed distribution budget and execute auditing of conference coordinator and accounting records. Direct preparation of conference operating manual and best management practices and present a report of committee accomplishments at each annual meeting of MFWC board of trustees”. My first charge of business was to identify a couple of additional committee members and I am grateful to Dale and Kelly who have agreed to be committee members. If any other directors are interested in this important

charge I would love to have your involvement. Also looking to identify some doers and go-getters for a subcommittee to look at an operating manual for the conference; Norman Murray from Missouri is going to chair that subcommittee, also Kendra Wecker, Ohio and Vicki Brown, Michigan have agreed to be on that subcommittee. We have cooperative agreements signed by all 11 states who agreed to host the conference; four states already paid their \$5,000 in start-up funding, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri and South Dakota, Indiana and Iowa payments are in the works. There may be additional work that has gone on this week, so we are eager to have startup funding complete and ready to go. Preparing for 2020 conference in Illinois, which will be the first time we will be able to provide funding, grants and scholarships, have operating manual ready to go and have oversight in place. Proceeds from conference we have agreed to split between the Wildlife Society and AFS to administer student travel grants to attend the conferences.

NEW BUSINESS

RBFF Update

Dave Chanda, Vice President State Agency Engagement (PowerPoint – Exhibit 44) – We have been working with AFWA about a bogus website that is at least misleading, it is an advertising site. A lot of people are buying a \$24 electronic guide that tells them nothing about fishing, thinking they are buying a fishing license for your state, if you googled fishing that recreationallicenses.com would come up first. It says it is an ad, but many people have complained to us and your states about that; Doug Grann formerly of Wildlife Forever fell for it. The strategy we took was that we asked state directors to give us letters of complaint, we received 36 letters, thank you. It is with our lawyer right now and we are going to work with AFWA to see how we want to send it out, jointly or just RBFF. We know a few states have sent a complaint to FCC and got a nice blow off letter, saying to take it up with your AG but our lawyer believes the magnitude of 36 states and RBFF coming together might be able to draw the attention of FCC to take action, hopefully take down the site. They make a lot of money, they do it on marriage licenses, engineering licenses, they have it figured out. For any of you who do anything with paid engine search, it is costing you more money. They are not appearing on a google search because they didn't put money into it, guide costs \$19.99 and \$4 electronic processing fee and if you complain they might give you a \$20 reimbursement and they keep \$4. This also tells me how undervalued some of our licenses are if people are willingly to shell out \$24 for a fishing guide. We all know challenges we are facing out there with R3. Fishing is a little different, been seeing an increase in participation, but we face issues because vast majority of license buyers are approaching 50 years old and if we don't bring in anglers behind them in 25 years we will see a significant decline; working hard to see that doesn't happen. We do that through resources we provide states, like planning documents, doing marketing work to help you assess where you are with R3 work. Help with management plans and Stephanie Hussey has been working with your staff on how to implement or step-down the national plan. Council to Advanced Hunting and Shooting Sports had done a great job and we have picked up Wildlife Management Institute and DJ Case Associates on contract to come in and help states develop their plans, take a look at existing plan, to train you, work with you or do whatever you need; we will pay for it.

Texas has DJ Case helping them bring their plan down the home stretch, we are covering half the cost and Turkey Federation the other half. We provide a lot of good tools; many states are working hard on churn rates. Figure out a way to collect emails, sending out all kinds of useful information on marketing, etc. Seeing a huge interest in R3, yet no training available from R3 practitioners. Held first four-day training session two weeks ago, had 60 people including 30 states, USFWS employees and had Guam and Puerto Rico represented. They spent four days going into how to develop a market and evaluate planning process. It is clear the states are all over the map on delivery of these services, so marketing component was boring to some states, but a great, tip your toes into the water, presentation for staff there. This could lead into some more advanced courses being offered, on advanced marketing or helping evaluation. It was a good start and look forward to follow-up meetings. RBFF invests in marketing and driving recruitment for states, all about awareness and interest and ultimately pushing folks to decide they want to participate in angling. We have developed whole program around that, have very specific target audience we are after and work hard targeting multicultural families, like Hispanics, women and grandparents who are taking over families and have time to take kids fishing. Targeting people who have kids 6 to 17 and we developed a whole media blitz around that. It is a 12-month effort to drive traffic and interest and hopefully drive people to your website to pick up a fishing license. Heavily involved in social media, have Carlos Carrera and had him do a couple of public appearances for us right after he won the world series, he was a hot commodity. Most have seen PSA we developed, one of my favorites tells value of your fishing license, in 60 seconds or less, which helps you with resource and pays for conservation. We received over \$18 million of in-kind play on that. Just recently received top one percent award from Nielson Media for public PSAs we put out there, proud of that work; thank states that put their tags on it and helped push it out. Trying to figure out which states are taking advantage of those PSAs to leverage efforts we have out there. Within our target audience we are going to focus on women. If looking at state data will see more and more participants are female I like to think that is result of state efforts over the last 20 years with Women in the Outdoors programs, magnify 50 states for last 20 years and believe states are responsible for seeing more women in the sport. Also, we know from research we are doing, women are important component from teaching sons and daughters to fish, more than the dad. One thing we are seeing is that only 19 percent of them feel like they belong or look like an angler, we need to do a better job of changing that visual. I went to iCast last year, big show that shows all of fishing gear coming down the road and saw stereotypical older white guy with fly rod, some are changing that. We developed media messaging around this, hope states will grab, put tags on it and run with it. This campaign kicked off Mother's Day weekend and will continue throughout next year (*played video*). This is called "get your fish on" and we have made it available, generating a lot of excitement, there are shorter versions of it and we hope it will change the mantra out there and let women know they are a big part of it. We are seeing visuals coming out of state agencies with that message as well. To help push national boating and fishing week was to list top places to boat and fish, every state nominating top five places to go and put a twist it, we took list and used firm to survey women to give their top 50 mom-approved places to go. We will whittle that down to top 10 and ultimately come up with top 10 mom-approved list of places to go anywhere in the country. Guys have some catching up to do because the last I checked

Nebraska's Lake Ogallala is in the lead right now. We appreciate the way states have embraced this and are helping push the message out. We are seeing improvements in work we are doing with the Outdoor Foundation who has done survey for us 10 years in a row. Seen increase in youth anglers and Hispanic participation around the country, due to efforts of states and targeting those audiences. The most recent report, which will be available shortly from Outdoor Foundation, tracking 49 million anglers ages 6 and above; the bottom line is the trend is going up, a good thing. When Nick Wiley was president of the Association he put together a task force to figure out how to implement R3, the report was adopted at the North American and has five steps to follow. One of the first recommendations is to develop a plan on where you want to be on Hunter R3 or Angler R3, if you want to grow, if no plan, how do you know you are getting where you want to be. We will be happy to help develop plans in the states. This is not any one person's job, needs to be integrated throughout the agency, it takes a lot of people. If we believe in recommendations in the report, we need to reallocate resources to be sure the program is a success. The third is to have a manager, somebody needs to be responsible and in charge and report to you. The ideal in the report, is it needs to be somebody that has access to you, high enough in chain to implement or affect some of your policy decisions. If you bury that person three people removed from you, you will get filtered information and not be able to react to opportunities out there. May not be high level position but give them access to you or your policy makers. The fourth recommendation is relationship management system, states getting better at that. Anything bought online you immediately get a message, that leads you to other products, we need to be better at that and tracking customers. If you host an outdoor event, those are potential customers you need to grab them and get them into database, they showed an interested in what you are doing. That is all connected to fourth R, relevancy. The final recommendation was to develop a repository where states share successes and failures, so you can replicate what works and avoid what didn't work. We have that on our website, any time we give a state grant they have to provide summary of, did it work, why didn't it work, was it a great success. So perhaps a mechanism; don't have arms wrapped around that yet, how do you get information out to all 50 states. We are all doing great stuff, but don't always share so well, maybe there is a role for RBFF to help facilitate that repository. December 4-6 is our state marketing workshop, we will pay for travel expenses for two staff to travel. If you came to workshop and didn't go home with an idea for your state changes to make, I will take you for a steak dinner. I never heard one leave without ideas. Last year, 14 directors indicated they wanted to come, ended up with nine and five assistant directors. So, after morning plenary we took those folks and spent three hours talking about how RBFF could help them, what was going on in their states and we would be more than happy to do that same thing--to exchange information and bring in speakers to facilitate that conversation. Specifically targeted those dates because AFWA has their Executive Committee meeting in town and can fly from DC to Atlanta, December 5 is plenary session and workshop for the directors. We put out request for bids, probably Southwick Associates, for someone to work with us and take a look at Fish and Wildlife Service data, multiple years of data from state agencies. We are going to have them look at four to six states that have shown consistent growth in license sales versus five or six states that have gone flat or declining. We are going to look at everything from weather patterns, talk to staff and see if commonalities that show good management practices to

grow license sales. One of the conditions of the grant is want information by state for marketing workshop so we can discuss it in plenary and be happy to give to directors after that. *Jim Leach* – Dave, is there information on hotels, or agendas for the workshop? *Dave* – We will be getting “save the date” invite to come from our deputy director and I will follow up with a message. I try not to inundate folks with emails. I probably did on the phony website stuff, but at the end of the day we got 36 letters. We would love to have you down there and see it; contact me if you want a person in director’s-only retreat.

Refreshment Break – Sponsored by Mule Deer Foundation and North Dakota Petroleum Council

Mid-Continent Monarch Strategy Report

Bill Moritz, Wildlife Management Institute – As chair of the Midwest Monarch Strategy Board of Directors I would like to bring forward the monarch strategy for your consideration and approval. We have already talked about everything that has gone into it. There will be a meeting concerning implementation of the strategy, November 29 and 30, in Nebraska City, Nebraska. *Terry* – The executive committee approved the monarch strategy and we need a motion for the full board to consider. ***Dale Garner, IA moved, Kelly Hepler, SD second. Motion passes.*** *Terry* – Ed, we have a letter to sign? *Bill* – We have a letter to insert into the document for the record that shows it was approved by the monarch board of directors as well as the MAFWA board of directors. I will sign as Chair of the monarch board and *Terry* will sign as President of MAFWA. *Roger, Ollie, Claire and Ed observed (picture of signing).* *Terry* – Thank Bill, Ed and Claire for all of your work on this.

2019 Budget Approval

Roger Luebbert, Treasurer (Exhibit 45) – On 2019 budget, page one is budget versus actual which shows how account did compared to last year. Page two is budget status for current year and the last page is actual proposed budget for next year. On 2017 budget versus actual page, line numbers on left for easy reference. On line 14, total receipts were \$130,221 for 2017 versus \$157,046 actual receipts, about \$26,800 higher than the budget; line 5 shows budgeted conference receipts of \$70,500 and actual receipts of \$84,825, which is about \$14,300 higher than budgeted; line 11, indirect cost USFWS for NFWF is one reason total receipts were high, nothing was budgeted but total receipts were \$15,249. The budget was prepared seven months before the year starts so we weren’t sure of the status of these grants at that time. Line 31, total budgeted disbursements, \$122,762, actual \$131,272 which is over budget by about \$8,500; line 20 total conference disbursements is one major player for this variance with a budget of \$49,730 and actual disbursements of \$52,878, a little over \$3,000 higher than the budget; keep in mind actual conference receipts were over by \$14,000. The other variance was executive secretary and treasurer pay, which are lines 22 and 25, budget did not include cost of living or other adjustments made in the middle of calendar year 2017. Overall, line 34 shows actual receipts exceeded actual disbursements by just under \$26,000. The next page is current year budget and actual disbursements as of June 4, 2018. As called for in internal cash control, I will continue to give status reports on this at future meetings. Third page is 2019 proposed budget and the method we use is to use the best number available and the

description column identifies the source we use for each line. On receipt side, line 2, conference sponsors; line 3, conference registration; line 10, national pheasant coordinator; line 11, indirect costs; and line 12, interest; are based on 2017 actual amounts rounded up to nearest \$5. Line 4, hotel commissions is the same as 2017 budget. Line 8, affiliate dues and line 9, Southern Wings are the same as the 2018 budget. Line 6 and 7, annual membership dues for states and provinces are increased based on consumer price index (CPI) of 1.642 percent and show what the dues would be for each state or province membership for calendar year 2019. Overall proposed budget receipts of \$159,165. On disbursement side, line 15, Delaney, is based on draft contract amount. Other conference disbursements, lines 16, 17 and 18 are based on calendar year 2017 actual or 2018 budget amounts. Executive secretary pay on line 21 is contract amount and treasurer pay on line 24 is adjusted for inflation of 1.642 percent. Travel lines 22, 25 and 26 are same as 2018 budget. Lines 27-30 and 32 are calendar year 2017 actual or 2018 budgeted amounts rounded up to nearest \$5. Line 31, leadership workshop is same as 2018 budget. Overall the proposed budget for disbursements is \$152,567 as shown on line 33; on line 34, shows estimated receipts exceed estimated disbursements by \$6,600. *Dale* – Appreciate line numbers, makes it easier to follow. ***Kelly Hepler, SD moved to accept proposed budget, Dale Garner, IA second. Motion passes.***

Terry – One item not on agenda, clean up from Monday. We appointed steering committee on landscape conservation collaborative and I neglected to appoint a lead on that. The committee appointed Kelly as a lead on this, which is what I was going to do. Also, I did not provide a charge for this committee (Handout – Exhibit 46). Jim Douglas developed this and gave it to me. *Jim Douglas* – There were other people who had input in this as well and are on national group. *Kelly* – It is necessary to work with other regional associations, we want to be clear to committee members. *Terry* – Great latitude to the committee.

Ollie – Had discussion of timing of this meeting, maybe moving this a week earlier. Looked at previous conference evaluation surveys and it doesn't seem to matter to people whether a week earlier or nearer to July 4. In the meantime, Ohio decided to stick with this week next year and Kelly also decided to stick with this week in South Dakota, correct? *Kelly* – Yes, we will have 2020 meeting at Custer State Park June 21-24, a week earlier is Father's Day. *Ollie* - Both of those are at state parks. Then Wisconsin will be next in line. It looks like we are going to stick with this week. It is the week before the July 4 weekend, last week of June starting on Sunday and ending on Wednesday. For Ohio, June 23-26, 2019. *Mike* - Toledo is closest city.

Closing Comments

President's Remarks – Terry Steinwand, ND – Don't talk a lot, not in my nature, but I want to thank all of you for making this a successful conference. One thing I enjoyed the most was meeting old friends and making new friends. We all have partners, some uncomfortable partners, like Farm Bureau, maybe just want to fight; we are addressing issues and direct impacts of wind energy right now and have some traditional non-partners that are now supporting us. Always great to have partners, we all do partnerships across the board, but Josh Dukart talked about accommodation part, not sure I agree but

sitting down and discussing and knowing what differences are. Hosted meeting three months ago between conservation groups and Stockman's Association, but all groups went away saying they got it and they understood better, be willing to listen, some like to talk and some like to listen, but hope I am both. I don't want to be totally accommodating but will listen to their point of view and have them listen to mine, changing attitude a little. I told Lt. Governor when I go into a meeting I try to hack both sides off, but tired of getting beat up by both sides. Mike, I know you and Mike Reynolds are going to do a great job in Ohio. Blue shirts, stand up (staff), *(received applause)*. These people are the core of making this a success and Lynn Timm was the glue that held it together; I had 549 emails just on this conference and I had to tell Lynn to back off. Lynn, you deserve major credit for pulling this thing together, thank you.

Passing of Gavel to Next State

Terry – It gives me great pleasure to transfer gavel to you, Mike (Ohio).

(Mike read plaque) “2018 Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Past President's Award presented to Terry Steinwand”.

Terry – Need motion to confirm the actions we took on Monday and yesterday outside the business meeting. **Sara Parker Pauley, MO moved, Bill O'Neill, MI second. Motion passes.**

Terry Steinwand, ND passed gavel to Mike Miller, OH.

Conference Adjourns

Bill O'Neill, MI moved to adjourn, Sara Parker Pauley, MO second. Meeting adjourned at 11:07 pm.

Appendix A – PowerPoint Photos

Minutes
MAFWA CEF Board of Trustees Meeting
Wednesday, June 27, 2018
11:10 a.m. CDT
Lamborn Room
Ramkota Inn and Conference Center
Bismarck, ND

Call to Order – President Terry Steinwand called the meeting to order at 11:10 am

Quorum – Terry Steinwand, North Dakota; Mike Miller, Ohio; Kelly Hepler, South Dakota; Jim Douglas, Nebraska; and Keith Sexson, Kansas. Wayne Rosenthal, Illinois was not present. Also present were Ollie Torgerson, Executive Secretary, Roger Luebbert, Treasurer, Sheila Kemmis, Secretary.

Approval of May 29, 2018 Board Minutes – *Jim Douglas, NE moved to approve the minutes, Keith Sexson, KS second. Motion passes.*

Election of Officers – Ollie – We need a motion for president to be Terry Steinwand, first vice-president to be Mike Miller and second vice-president to be Kelly Hepler. *Keith Sexson, KS moved, Jim Douglas, NE second. Motion passes.*

Adjourn – *Adjourned at 11:11.*