



Division of Fish & Wildlife
402 W Washington St., Room W273
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Memorandum

To: Whom It May Concern

From: Amanda Wuestefeld

Date: June 24, 2022

RE: Proxy - MAFWA Annual Director's Meeting

I hereby authorize , Kendra Wecker to vote my proxy at the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Annual Directors' Meeting on June 27-30, 2022, and to act in my stead, authorizing this person fully to do all things that I could or might do if personally present. I also authorize this person to do every act whatsoever necessary or proper to be done in all matters that may lawfully come before the meeting or any adjournment thereof. Further, I hereby revoke any proxy or proxies previously given by me to any person or persons.

Signature:

Printed Name and Title: Amanda Wuestefeld

Director, Division of Fish & Wildlife

Send to MAFWA Secretary via email at sheila.kemmis@ks.gov



GRETCHEN WHITMER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
LANSING



DANIEL EICHINGER
DIRECTOR

June 21, 2022

TO: Whom It May Concern

FROM: Daniel Eichinger, Director

SUBJECT: Proxy - MAFWA Annual Director's Meeting

I hereby authorize Shannon Lott to vote my proxy at the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Annual Directors' Meeting on June 30, 2022, and to act in my stead, authorizing this person fully to do all things that I could or might do if personally present. I also authorize this person to do every act whatsoever necessary or proper to be done in all matters that may lawfully come before the meeting or any adjournment thereof. Further, I hereby revoke any proxy or proxies previously given by me to any person or persons.

Signature:  _____

Printed Name and Title: Daniel Eichinger, Director,
Michigan Department of Natural Resources

State of Wisconsin
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
101 S. Webster Street
Box 7921
Madison WI 53707-7921

Tony Evers, Governor
Preston D. Cole, Secretary
Telephone 608-266-2621
Toll Free 1-888-936-7463
TTY Access via relay - 711



Memorandum

To: Whom It May Concern

From: Preston Cole, WI DNR Secretary

Date: 5/31/2022

RE: Proxy - MAFWA Annual Director's Meeting

I hereby authorize Tamara Ryan to vote my proxy at the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Annual Directors' Meeting on June 27-30th, 2022, and to act in my stead, authorizing this person fully to do all things that I could or might do if personally present. I also authorize this person to do every act whatsoever necessary or proper to be done in all matters that may lawfully come before the meeting or any adjournment thereof. Further, I hereby revoke any proxy or proxies previously given by me to any person or persons.

Signature:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Preston Cole'.

Printed Name and Title: Preston Cole, Secretary

Send to MAFWA Secretary via email at: sheila.kemmis@ks.gov

THURSDAY | JUNE 30, 2022

7:00 a.m. - 8:00 a.m.

Breakfast Buffet - Pavilion

Sponsored by ACI Worldwide

Remarks by Justin Dull

7:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.

Conference Registration Desk Open

- Creekside Lodge

8:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.

MAFWA Business Meeting -

Creekside Lodge/Norbeck Room

Colleen Callahan, MAFWA

President

Call to Order and Roll Call

Agenda Review

Approval of 2021 Annual Meeting

Minutes

Treasurer's Report - Roger Luebbert

Audit Committee Report - Colleen

Callahan (IL)

Investments Committee Report - Dan

Eichinger (MI)

Bylaws Committee Report - Sara

Parker Pauley (MO)

Resolutions Committee Report - Sara

Parker Pauley (MO)

Awards Committee Report - Kendra

Wecker (OH)

Executive Secretary's Report - Ollie

Torgerson

Approval of Affiliate Members - Ollie

Torgerson

Old Business

R3 Committee Organizational Guides -

Megan Wisecup (IA)

Mid-America Monarch Strategy

Report - Claire Beck (MAFWA) and Et

Bogges (MAFWA)

National Wild Pheasant Plan Update -

Scott Taylor (PF)

Midwest Landscape Initiative - Sara

Parker Pauley (MO) Craig Czarnecki

(FWS)

Non-Lead Partnership

Recommendations - Lindsey Long

(WI)

R3 Coordinator Position - Megan

Wisecup (IA)

8:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.

New Business

CSS/HD Committee Organizational

Guides - Paren Woiters (SD)

Midwest Wildlife Health

Coordinator - Ollie Torgerson

Great Plains Fish Habitat Partnership

- Ollie Torgerson

2023 Budget Approval - Roger

Luebbert

10:00 a.m.- 10:15 a.m.

10:15 a.m.- Noon

Refreshment Break

Sponsored by D.J. Case & Associates

MAFWA Business Meeting

(CONTINUED) - Event Barn

Closing Comments - President's

Remarks

Wisconsin Spotlight (2023)

Minutes
MAFWA Annual Business Meeting
Wednesday, June 30, 2021
Virtual Meeting

Wednesday, June 30, 2021

Starts at 8:00 am

Warnke – Thank all of our sponsors again, played short video from Sovereign Sportsman. Thank you Meg and Delaney Event Management, meeting has flowed incredibly smoothly. All of sponsor videos are available on Whova. Photo contest is closed.

MAFWA BUSINESS MEETING

Keith Warnke, MAFWA President – Officially called to order at 8:04 AM

Call to Order and Roll Call

Ollie - Illinois, Kansas, Missouri did not answer roll call – came in later in the meeting. Manitoba and Saskatchewan were not present at any time. Warnke – Kansas and Missouri entered meeting. For Christie Curley in Ontario, I think this might be the first meeting in a while that we have had Canadian representatives present. You are a full voting member of this board so please bring action and input.

Agenda Review

Keith – On Executive Secretary’s report, we have Ollie loaded and sharing his Zoom screen this morning so while it is fresh in his mind we want him to go first right after minutes approval and before treasurer’s report. (*Agenda – Exhibit A*)

Approval of October 20, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Annual meeting minutes (*Exhibit B*); *Brad Loveless, Kansas moved to accept minutes as printed, Terry Steinwand, North Dakota second. Motion passes.*

Executive Secretary’s Report

Ollie Torgerson (PowerPoint - Exhibit C) –Gave a report in October. 2020 year of pandemic but also the year of Zoom. This year is year of vaccinations, and all of this caused us to postpone our meeting planned for Custer State Park last June, postponed it to October, then canceled it and decided to hold an in-person conference in June 2021 in Custer, South Dakota. This was the first time in our history since WWII that we did not have an annual conference. Virus impacts sustained, so executive committee met and decided to go virtual and here we are today meeting online. We did have virtual business meeting last October and you just voted to approve those minutes. In process we bid farewell to Dale Garner and Kelly Hepler, welcomed Pete Hildreth, Iowa and Kevin Robling, South Dakota. Had president transition from Kelly to first vice-president Keith Warnke. Jim Douglas stepped up to replace Kelly as co-chair of Midwest Landscape Initiative (MLI). They say change is good but I am getting tired of juggling. Steady

assistance of Ed Boggess and Kelley Myers to trudge forward with MLI as our liaisons and MLI continues to roll on as well as monarch work under Ed and Claire. MLI branched into value stream mapping by request of Director Pauley to learn if that was a useful tool to effectively deal with highly complex, multijurisdictional issues. Kelley Myers has been the guiding hand on this. MLI also branched into PFAS, the forever chemical, at request of Wisconsin and Kelley is the guiding hand on this under MLI. Minnesota DNR hosted successful Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference (MFWC) virtually in February, and registration numbers equaled in-person conference numbers expected. That surprised me as we thought we would have higher attendance virtually. Our foundation has assumed oversight responsibility of MFWC under the guidance of this committee, chaired by Sara, with Keith and Jim as members. Iowa is hosting next year in Des Moines, followed by Kansas and South Dakota. Grant and contract work continues to escalate, now managing 20 plus grants or contracts. Directors are making things happen and making things move forward. Discussions are underway to hire a contract manager. MAFWA is a small organization and we have an annual budget of \$159,165, I am half time and Roger is quarter time so more help is needed. Fully engaged with Director Robling and his staff to plan the postponed, then cancelled and now revived meeting in Custer State Park. It is a beautiful park but is on expensive side. Kevin and I will work hard to recover our sponsorships which were affected by COVID. We have come back but have a ways to go. Appreciate sponsors who are staying with us. We will meet in Custer SP, June 27 – 30, 2022. Wrap up by thanking Dale and Kelly for their stellar service to the Association and beyond. Thank Roger and Sheila for steady work and loyal commitment to the Association. Thank Keith and Wisconsin DNR for providing me office space and computer service. Thank directors for privilege of serving you. *Warnke* – Thank you, great to hear about changes and everything we have been able to do even with pandemic and vaccines. Looking forward to Custer SP next summer.

Treasurer's Report

Roger Luebbert – Passed out two reports, Treasurer's Report (*Exhibit D*). I want to give thanks, I am fortunate to be surrounded by a lot of very good staff, Ollie in particular who is always quick to respond, Sara Parker Pauley takes time out of her busy schedule to sign all of our checks. Ed Boggess and Claire Beck are project leaders for MLI. What I have learned over the years is that federal projects work well as long as you have good project leaders and we are fortunate to have that. That is also true of Megan Wisecup, with new R3 federal grant and Scott Taylor for pheasant plan, he helps a lot, we send invoices to many states and without Scott riding herd on that I would be spending a lot more time than I am. Thanks Sheila for everything she does, Cindy Delaney's staff, who are quick to respond, USFWS staff have helped a lot with grant solutions, John Lord and John Bloom with AFWA who are also quick to respond when I have questions and staff from all the states. Also, want to thank employees of Conservation Credit Union for use of space and technology. Without those people this would be a much tougher job. When CPA auditors were done they said we don't have a lot of money but we move in a lot of different directions. We keep ourselves organized, have good software and do a good job of staying on top of things. Historically this treasurer's report shows all transactions for MAFWA and CEF for most recent completed fiscal year. Our fiscal year is on a calendar year basis so this report shows all the transactions for calendar year 2020. First page is

summary of account balances and then it goes through each account. We have two tax entities, the first is our 501(c)(6), our Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife, MAFWA for short and our 501(c)(3), our foundation, Conservation Enhancement Fund or CEF for short. In MAFWA tax entity the first one is the Banking Services Account, this handles all special projects that do not involve federal funds, and the major player in this one is the National Pheasant Plan Coordinator. The next is the Conference Account, our main operating account, receipts are conference receipts for this annual director's meeting, membership dues and banking and administrative fees and federal indirect costs. The expenses come from this conference, executive secretary and treasurer pay and travel, recording secretary travel, insurance, tax preparation fees, website maintenance and that sort of thing. Southern Wings Account, as the names suggests, handles Southern Wings receipts and disbursements. Federal Account, handles all of federal grants we have going on. Credit Union Share Account, is where we have to maintain \$25 in that account to remain a member. The last one is the big one, the investment account, Money Market and Securities Account at the Broker, this is the account the Investment committee is going to be talking about. It was just under \$800,000 the end of December, now over \$800,000. It increased quite a bit in CY2020, about \$99,000, which represents a 14% increase. We did not make any deposits or withdrawals from this account, so this is earnings and change in market value; 2020 was a good year overall for investments. For example, the FNP 500, the index of the top largest 500 companies in the U.S., that index rose a little over 15% excluding dividends. In Conservation Enhancement Fund we have a checking account, a share account and we also have an investment account at the broker but it doesn't have much in it. This one may be something the investment committee might want to discuss as to whether or not we keep this account. Our current broker has mentioned more than once that for this small amount it is more hassle than what it is worth to have this account. We could move it into the share account and eliminate this account as there hasn't been much activity. The footnote at the bottom is that we have designations for these accounts and you will see them on the individual pages. Almost all of the banking services, all but about \$10,000, is designated for special purposes. The largest one is for national pheasant plan coordinator and almost all of the CEF accounts are designated. *Warnke* – CEF funds held at the broker you suggested perhaps we move that money elsewhere. Where would we put it. *Roger*– Since it is so small and such a hassle, a good discussion for investment committee. We could move that balance into the credit union share account and that would reduce the number of accounts we have. It did earn pretty good last year but when you have down years it would go down as well, so it may not yield many earnings. **Banking Service Account**, on receipts side we have National Pheasant Plan Coordinator contributions and then we transferred from the federal account remaining state contributions from NFWF III project we finished and moved them to this account from the federal account. The reason we did that was because these are state funds and we did not want to give the impression they were federal funds by leaving it there. We designated those funds, as approved by committee, for future monarch/pollinator or landscape conservation efforts. On disbursement side you see Conservation Leaders for Tomorrow, Pheasants Forever for pheasant coordinator, one Ohio project we finished up in 2020, then we transferred to CEF the monies left from previous Midwest F&W Conferences, which is now handled by the foundation fund. The balance as of December 31, 2020 was \$137,671.61 with all but about \$10,000 of that is earmarked with the big player being the National Pheasant Plan Coordinator. The **Conference Account**, is our operating account. Receipts are from sponsors, registrations from last year and as you know that conference was cancelled so these funds were received prior to cancellation. These funds are being applied to the budget for the 2021 year. Affiliate dues, membership dues, banking fees and indirect costs and a small donation and total receipts of just under \$107,000. Disbursements include expenses for the conference before it got cancelled, executive secretary pay and travel, treasurer pay and travel, insurance, tax preparation, CPA audit done in 2019 that

we paid for in 2020, website maintenance and miscellaneous items. Overall, the balance as of December 31 was \$105,000. Right now, about \$80,000 but a good cushion there. **Southern Wings Account**, we have contributions from the states that we turned around and paid out to the American Bird Conservancy. **Federal Account**, had federal reimbursements from the USFWS, a little from NFWF finishing up that project and on disbursements side USFWS state liaison and monarch coordinator pay and travel, NFWF III remaining state funds we transferred, Minnesota needed to have their contribution returned to them so we did that and we had WMI contract. Our balance as of December 31 was \$10,000. This is not really designated and is MAFWA funds there to serve as a buffer. The USFWS is extremely fast at reimbursing us which is one reason why we can carry such a low balance. **Credit Union Share Account**, maintaining \$25 in that account. The **Money Market and Securities Account**, there is interest and capital gains and we have some funds that were swept out of our cash subaccount within this fund and they were reinvested so it isn't really true disbursement. The market value of the securities we hold has increased significantly as the market overall has increased. Our balance as of December 31 was just under \$800,000. Now to the Conservation Enhancement Fund. **Conservation Enhancement Credit Union Checking Account**, we transferred money from share account so we could make some payments and on disbursements side we made some deposits for 2021 MFWC and for Illinois conference we paid the profit out to the Wildlife Society and American Fisheries Society in the north central section, tax preparation fees and trademark renewal and the balance as of December 31 was \$7,312. **Conservation Enhancement Share Account at Credit Union**, we had monies coming in from Illinois and we transferred monies from banking account those earlier balance from previous conferences, now all in CEF; and transferred from here to the checking account and transfer to MAFWA for MFWC fee. Balance as of December 31 was \$75,503. **Conservation Enhancement Account at the Broker**, not using those funds and it is very small, and this is the one we might consider eliminating, a topic for discussion. **Conservation Enhancement Fund Summary**, shows assets and designations, we talked about these balances and this is as of December 31. Receivables for deposits we made for conferences for Minnesota and Iowa total \$17,000, brokerage account total assets of \$106,098. Designations are listed and the big one is the \$5,000 the eleven states have contributed for a total of \$55,000 with total designations of \$99,000 and undesignated balance of \$6,404. For later discussion or by CEF board is we do have two designations here that we maybe can clean up and pay these out. We have \$5,000 for student travel grants and monies transferred from one state to another for conference and states involved said it was okay to designate that as student travel grant. I'm wondering if we ought to pay that out to Fisheries or Wildlife Society so it can actually be used rather than just have it sit here. Also, line 19, Wisconsin monies from 2018 conference they contributed to Illinois in 2020, it is only \$740 and maybe as we pay out the Illinois profits we could pay this out as well to take it off the books. The longer we keep it the less we are going to remember about it. *Jim Douglas, Nebraska* - Can you remind me and others what the genesis of that brokerage account was and the thought behind establishing it in the first place. *Roger* - That was before my time but I will tell you what I know. For the last six years I have been involved it has had very little activity. I think when we first set up the foundation we had hopes of getting a lot of contributions and investing those contributions. *Ollie* - Many years ago a man in Milwaukee, Wisconsin passed away and his estate distributed about a quarter million dollars to us, a quarter million to National Audubon and a quarter million to Ducks Unlimited. His name was Anton Jaschek, nobody knew him but he obviously had a heart for conservation. The MAFWA board at that time invested the money with the concept of letting it grow for special projects. Over time there has been a few special projects that have been funded from this, back in CARA days when we were trying to get a national bill for increased funding for state fish and wildlife agencies, we contributed a chunk of money for that; to AFWA's Aware program; funded CITES travel one year when we

didn't have a multistate grant to fund that; might have been something else but I can't remember but those are the projects funded out of this account. In recent years have not funded anything, the objective has been to let it grow to get a sizeable corpus which to utilize in future years. Investments committee will report on this later. A good hearted man from Milwaukee Wisconsin who decided to give us a chunk of his estate. *Douglas* – That is good information but the question I actually had, was that broker account, \$5,000 that Roger indicated that we might need to transfer those dollars. Why do we have that account? *Ollie* – When we set up the foundation Pheasants Forever gave us \$5,000 as a sponsorship designated for this and it was invested. Is that correct Roger? *Roger* – Thought we would get a lot more donations and we didn't. *Douglas* – Do you want to consider prospect of transfer now or Investments committee to deliberate that? *Roger* – That was before my time. That makes sense that was when we set up that foundation. We probably thought at the time we were going to get a lot more donations but we haven't. *Ollie* – I am pretty sure my memory is accurate. *Douglas* – Do you want us to consider that prospect of transfer now or do you want investments committee to further deliberate on that and create a future recommendation. *Roger* – From my opinion it would be good for the investments committee to have a discussion and not make decision right now. *Warnke* – What would it take to pay out the two accounts you suggest getting those paid out? *Roger* – To get brokerage account off the books may not be that difficult. When investments committee gives their report there is some talk we may bid out brokerage services and that might be a good time to move that money. We can see what new investment broker says, see what his thoughts are in terms of keep it or not. If it is not worth keeping move it into savings account and only move big investment account over to the new broker. Not hard to move money either way. *Warnke* – I meant those two small accounts, one was Wisconsin and one was student travel, do we need investment committee to recommend that or motion from the board to eliminate those two accounts? *Sara Parker Pauley, Missouri* – Or is that a CEF board decision? *Roger* – You are right Sara, that is a CEF decision. *Pauley* – We will call a meeting and make sure those are agenda items.

Audit Committee Report

Keith Warnke, WI – Roger will have to refresh me on when next CPA audit is but we did do a desk review with our CFO here at Wisconsin DNR. She reviewed 20 transactions back in February of this and found everything was really in order and our finances looked good. It was a short report. She had question about 5% banking fee which initially her review assumed we were paying and not that our accounts were charging and receiving these fees. That got cleared up with Karen who did the desk report. Other than that, all things positive in her eyes. *Roger* – That review she did was for last six months of 2020, so I will give them another report in July or August, it is on a six-month cycle.

Investments Committee Report

Jim Douglas, NE – Committee also consists of Dan Eichinger who is going to assist in the call, Brad Loveless and Roger. Thanks to them for great work going on with the committee and thank Roger. He has a good handle on finances and accounting for us. Essential for investments committee to also do good work. A year ago, investments committee decided to take a deeper dive looking into our investments, investments

strategies and communication with our investment advisor, Shane Hessman in Kansas. Going into this I want to make the statement that we have had good performance from current investments as conducted by Shane Hessman. The fact that we want to take a closer look at everything doesn't reflect poor performance from Shane. I will say as we took a look at investments and strategies there was one aspect of service from Shane Hessman that we wished was stronger, on the reporting side. Not that reports weren't forthcoming upon request but reports weren't made as a matter of course that were really robust to the extent that it was easy to ascertain not only what current investments were, what quality of those investments and what overall state of affairs in investment climate in the nation was. Investment advising companies and financial service companies provide more robust reporting. That is one thing we should look for since the investments committee acts in a fiduciary role. It is important that investment committee, executive committee, full board and treasurer have good understanding of investments. In looking at investments we currently have we began with an end in mind. In that regard we started with review of what our corpus was, where it came from and what it's purpose was. As noted by Roger, it has grown substantially over time. In looking at the strategy we have to look towards how we may want to use earnings in the future. You have to establish a philosophy and a purpose for the fund and any earnings from the fund that are expressed in an investment policy statement. We have had an investment policy statement but we should refresh it and enhance it. Dan Eichinger did a great job of investigating from similar entities how their investment policies were stated and how much background information was included, etc. We would like for all of you to potentially ratify the refreshed investment policy statement that Dan will go over. It does include some of the distribution of investments in a broad sense. We ask that you discuss and potentially, as you look towards ratifying investment policy statement, ratify distribution of funds portfolio statements as well. In addition to that we would like you to ratify our current endeavors, which involves looking towards creating requests for proposals. Look at what investment advisors may be interested in applying to represent MAFWA. That will include a direct invitation to current investment advisor who would reapply and without any preconceived notions that we are necessarily going to change. There will be, in the request for proposals, certain provisions related to reporting aspects we think are important. We anticipate, with ratification of current efforts, we would begin immediately to develop a list of potential firms to solicit proposals from.

Dan Eichinger, Michigan – As Jim mentioned the Investments Committee has undertaken a review of our current policy statements. We felt it was important for us to consider some updates to that. Policy statements do a couple of important things, especially if considering issuing requests for proposal of advisory services it articulates to those prospective respondents what it is that we, as an organization, are going to be looking for in terms of their stewardship, reporting and management of our resources. A good investment policy statement gives direction to investment committee and executive board about what their responsibilities are with respect to managing and overseeing an advisor, the funds and use of those funds. We as a committee endeavored to develop a policy statement that did that (*Exhibit E*). I will go over highlights only. The introduction is self-explanatory, we were beneficiaries of Mr. Jaschek's benevolence and at this time we are in a good position where we have a good amount of money in those accounts. We articulate the duties and responsibilities of the investment committee, akin to the charge

the committee has for what our objectives are, what policies of our funds are going to be and what the role of the committee is for reviewing the investment policy. We are directing or charging the investment committee with reviewing this policy on an annual basis but then identifying that changes to this policy can only be effectuated by the MAFWA board upon recommendation of investment committee. What is the point of our investment and what are our spending policies? We proposed language that says the fund is to be invested to the objective of preserving a perpetual and permanent endowment for MAFWA. What this reflects is the good position we are in; we are not operationalizing any of the funds we have in our investment. We don't need to live off of our interest and earnings, we don't operationalize any of that into our operating budget. Any investments and earnings we currently accrue get reinvested back into the fund. The fund currently essentially exists as permanent endowment. If we get to a point where we want to make any distribution of funds, we set up a sideboard that we can't erode the corpus. We envision that we have a principal amount in our investment account and we are never going to spend that principle. The organization, the board and whatever our spending guidelines might ultimately be we only have our interest or earnings available to us to spend or disperse. What that does is preserves in perpetuity the corpus or integrity of that fund. We identified the role of the MAFWA board as retaining sole discretion for authorizing and determining the distribution of fund assets, so, only MAFWA Board of Directors can make a decision about how, what policies or guidance we are going to use for distributing fund assets. This put an asterisk by this item, that is not a hill we have to climb today, the MAFWA board doesn't have to make any decisions about disbursement policies or anything along those lines today, we are not proposing that. This simply identifies that when we get to a point where the board wants to come up with policy or guidance for how we would distribute interest and earnings that the board is going to need to adopt a policy to direct those activities. Portfolio investment policies gets into what kinds of things we are comfortable investing in and how we would like to be invested. Subsection A talks about that broad allocation of assets and sub-asset categories to account for risk, return; essentially we want to have a diversified portfolio. We understand that returns and return volatility are going to vary depending on market conditions on some kind of temporal scale. That we retain flexibility to make changes to portfolio asset allocation, but that is not something we intend to do on a regular basis. The investment committee retains the prerogative to say our allocation matrix isn't quite right and we need to take another cut at that, our investment objectives have changed and we need to review that. That is not something we anticipate doing, even on an annual basis, only do on much more periodic basis. Primarily we intend to invest our funds into two major components, equity and fixed income portion. The purpose of the equity investment is to maximize long term growth of portfolio assets. If we are in agreement that this is a permanent endowment you can tilt heavier towards equity side of asset allocation. The role of the fixed income is to provide for underlying stability in the fund so we can weather variability in the market. We don't foresee holding any investments in cash categories but we reserve that as an option if we are liquidating out of one asset and into a different one we can temporarily hold some in cash if needed. E is area we wanted to draw everyone's attention to. Right now, the majority of investments are in corporate bond categories. What we are proposing is different from that. Consistent with what we outlined earlier, the idea of permanent endowment, we have a corpus that we only ever

intend for it to grow, we do not intent to spend that down to zero. That would suggest we could be invested more aggressively on the equity side. We propose allocation of 70% equities, pretty aggressive, but it is consistent with idea that corpus to grow and make money for us. The temporal scale is from now to time immoral so consequently we can be invested heavily in equity side because the variability in the market at the end of the day we are going to net out and be fine. In fixed income side, propose 30% allocation to ensure we guard or check against extended periods of volatility or periods of decline in the market that might impact the value of our equity assets. F talks about that we are not going to get into weird kinds of investments, not going to play in venture capital or advisors can't purchase hedge funds, real estate investments or trusts or anything along those lines. There is some opportunity to do that but it is well controlled within this policy. Diversification this gets into what we mean by diversified investment strategy, gives direction to advisor that we don't want to be over-invested in one single fund or type of asset. We have some limits on that. You can't represent within a single investment security or single mutual fund; we can't put more than 5% of our portfolio into a single fund. We need to spread investments in an asset category across a variety of different vehicles so we are never over-exposed. If one mutual fund goes belly up and we lost 30% of our assets, you never want to be in that position so we will never expose fund or assets to more than 5% exposure in any single investment. B and C are variations on the same theme, talking about passively managed investment vehicles, like index funds and bond index-type funds. You can't allocate very much of the portfolio below investment grade, so no junk bonds or anything like that. We will rebalance from time to time and that investment manager is directed to provide a recommendation to the committee regarding rebalancing portfolio. This is an important delegation of authority that we have nested within the investment policy where the MAFWA Board of Directors is authorizing investment committee to approve rebalancing recommendations. This isn't asset allocation where we are going to change 70% to 60% in equities what this is if through market performance we are allocated at 70% but through market performance our actual asset allocation ends up being 75%, this gives the committee the authority to rebalance portfolio back to target allocations. Other policies, is good behavior stuff we want from our advisor. We are not going to invest in shorts, pledge on speculative securities or loans or other types of things like that, we are going to stay out of speculative investing. Monitoring portfolio investments and performance sets out expectations for how frequently the committee will meet with the investment advisor and receive updates and information on portfolio performance and investments. The kinds of things we want to see in terms of those reports include things like what long-term real return objectives are, how we are doing relative to a bunch of different benchmarks used to evaluate investment performance. C talks about how frequently we are going to evaluate the performance of our advisor. When we pick an advisor, we intend to enter into a long term relationship but we are going to evaluate that performance at a minimum of five year basis for what is considered a full market cycle. Investment reporting, important for the investment committee to be seeing a little bit more regular and normal reporting for our investment performance. We will receive those reports on a quarterly basis and at least once per year our investment manager is expected to meet with the committee to review our portfolio structure, strategy and investment performance, other items contained in section eight. Because investment committee has talked about this for

several months I probably skipped over some things you may have questions on. Pause and see if Roger, Jim or Brad have anything they want to add. *Douglas* – Excellent job articulating. I believe everyone needs to know Dan did a lot of legwork on investigating what a really good investment policy statement needs to include and providing examples on how others articulate all of these important elements. He deserves a lot of credit for his work on this. We consulted with other informed persons as well including staff from AFWA, thanks to them for helping on this.

Brad Loveless, Kansas – Appreciate Dan’s work in pulling together this thoughtful document. A couple of things Dan mentioned, we can defer until later to figure out how we are going to spend this money. This is a pretty aggressive approach because we are going to set aside the corpus but still aggressive. The benefit of that is that it is going to produce money for us. As a board we need to decide what good things we are going to do with that. If at some point we decide we have a small need for revenue each year to disperse then we might recommend we adjust this policy. On the other hand, if we say we have some big disbursements that are important to us to promote conservation in the Midwest then we may add fuel to the fire as far as being aggressive. It will be important for the board to start to develop that vision for how this money is going to be put to good use for conservation. We talked about us going out and sending out an RFP for investment entities to work with us on this. One of the things that complicates this that we anticipate people saying they want to work with us because we want to support conservation, so we won’t treat you like an ordinary business. It may be a little complex to navigate the responses we get, it may not be the normal level playing field because they may say they want to donate a portion, or all, of their time to support MAFWA and the good things we are doing. It will be interesting to see where that comes out once we get to that stage where we can send out requests for proposals. *Douglas* – At some point today, worthy to have that discussion. We would like to see more eyes on evaluation of proposals that we get and that will take the form of keeping in close contact with executive committee for example but also wise to consider asking for volunteers or President to assign additional persons to work with investments committee on the evaluation aspect of proposals we receive. *Loveless* – We had discussion on this in committee, Dan and Jim have good grasp on these financial issues and how they work, to evaluate these proposals we get some of you might suggest people like Roger or people in your organization who have talent when it comes to investments and may give us good advice. *Roger* – Dan did excellent on this and on the investment committee you have strong individuals and I support what is in front of you right now. *Warnke* – Echo that, great work, a lot went into this and we appreciate the detail. When you were discussing mutual funds and other potential index-type funds, does proposal consider expenses related to those funds? They can vary a lot and end up costing a lot of money in the end and that might be an important consideration. *Douglas* – An important consideration as we move forward. It all points backward to what our expectations are for growth level of the fund and in consideration of that expenses are part of that equation. *Warnke* – Difficult to even exceed cost of expenses with a good returning fund sometimes. From my own personal experience, I have always looked around for low expense funds in mutual funds and other types of investments. That is in addition to what brokerage or advisory expenses we might incur too. *Loveless* – That is a great point. In figuring out how to navigate this we visited with an investment person that I worked with on another

board here in Kansas. He got right to that point, to be successful you've got to keep expenses low, even lower than you and I do in our personal investments. He was top of that and I fully expect, as we entertain proposals, others will get to that exact point because it is such a key point. You can take away all your gains if those rates aren't low enough. We will make sure they are extremely low and that will be part of what we will see in terms of proposals. *Warnke* – Glad to hear that. In discussing balance, that brought to mind conversations I have had over the years, there are many balanced long term index funds out there. Some that plan for retirement out to 2075 and they automatically rebalance as you get near the goal end date. I wonder if we would be open to considering, when we talk about those kinds of funds, we could always invest in one of those automatically rebalancing funds with up to 20%, or whatever is approved. The guidance here, as that automatically rebalances as they get close to maturity date can then switch that investment out into a longer automatically rebalancing fund with a longer maturity date. Those are the kinds of questions I would have for any firm we bring on board. How are they going to manage those funds? That controls expenses too when you are automatically rebalancing. Something to think about for the future. *Eichinger* – Good to think about, are there different temporal scales that MAFWA wants to think about for investing, like the funds you are talking about. As you get closer to those dates, what happens in those funds, the genesis is you might be heavy, maybe 80% on equities and as you get closer to that long term date you have way more shifted into fixed assets and start lacking those gains. Those are all kinds of things we will want to unpack with our advisor. We can always be talking about those things. The thing about this policy, the MAFWA board is the owner of the baseball team here, so if future boards want to view income differently or a need arises for us to address there is nothing here that precludes that. We want to compel that act of ongoing conversation through annual reviews of our policies to make sure everybody sitting in these seats understands what we have historically tried to accomplish and be able to graft into whatever future goals might be as they define it. *Warnke* – Great policy and prudent move to institutionalize MAFWA's investment strategies. The reality is we are all short timers here and there is so much turnover and we need to have this policy in place. *Ollie* – Has the Investments Committee considered recommending a corpus goal to the board? You mentioned you are not going to spend below the corpus, but what is the goal of the fund? Is that something worth doing? *Douglas* – Current proposal is we start now considering the balance of \$800,000 as the corpus. I know at one time there was a thought from MAFWA board to grow that to a \$1 million and consider that the corpus. Our proposal is \$800,000 but that doesn't preclude future decisions that might come from earnings, which could go back into the corpus or might go into grants the committee decides they want to make on a regular basis. Those future decisions policy doesn't preclude that but it is not our proposal that we do nothing different until we get to \$1 million. We are proposing we proceed with activities we are talking about, \$800,000 as current corpus. *Eichinger* – In my mind when I think about the fund there isn't a goal for the corpus, the goal is continued growth. If we set a million dollar objective what that implies is once we get a million dollars we are always going to spend trying to preserve that. In order for that same million dollar corpus, say we hit that in 2025, in order for that money to spend the same in 2045 that has got to grow because that million dollars is not going to be worth the same 25 years from now as it is five years from now. We don't have to worry about that right now. The

near term actions are considering adopting the policy, get investment RFP out the door and then consistent with what the policy would adopt, get our funds reinvested according to those asset categories. Let's get a couple of years of fund performance there for us to know what the market is doing, what kind of income, interest and earnings we are generating and then once we have a sense of that then what the board would want to do is see if investment interest and earning we are generating off of our portfolio. Say we were going to take 50% of that and reinvest that into corpus, half of what we earned and put it right back into the corpus so we are always growing it. Then we can put 50% on grants, fellowships or scholarships or whatever it is we want to do. But we are always paying ourselves and corpus first. Not discussion we have to have today. We don't have to operationalize any of the interest or earnings from our investment. That is kind of conversation we want to have in two to three years, once we have everything reestablished then we can look at what we want money to do for us and if we want to start taking disbursements then how do we keep feeding the corpus and what are our other spending objectives we want to have. That is not a Rubicon we have to cross today.

Loveless – We have been working with WAFWA on lesser prairie chicken (LPC) problem for years to try and straighten out the finances. One of the problems we had early on was we didn't have enough money set aside to generate revenue to keep administration going so we have had to rebalance that. Right now, we have come up with a number, for about \$1 million you can expect to generate, on an average year, \$50,000 a year investment-wise. If we said we had \$50,000 worth of grants we wanted to disburse every year that would help us see where that target is, what minimum amount we want to keep in that.

Warnke – What we would like to do, as Jim talked about earlier, is have some volunteer directors to review this policy and help review the RFPs when they come in. We want to take action in the future on how to issue an RFP. That is my request for volunteers interested in participating. Keep that in mind and send your volunteer information to Ollie and he will coordinate that. Do we need to take any action?

Douglas – Defer to Ollie but you may want to approve this policy statement.

Ollie – This is definitely a change in board policy so it does require board action. The board meets once per year so if board members comfortable with what the investments committee has presented then a motion is in order.

Brad Loveless, Kansas moved to accept report and recommendation, Dave Olfelt, Minnesota second.

Eichinger – Ollie, was this document shared with the board?

Pauley – I don't believe it was, I think this is the first time we have seen it.

Douglas – We shared with executive committee earlier this year but not with full board.

Pauley - Could we do an email vote so full board was given an opportunity to review it.

Ollie – That is my mistake for not sharing with the board in backup materials. Yes, the bylaws do allow for board action by electronic mail with the president's approval. If you would like to recommend a date for that it would be helpful.

Warnke – Do we need a friendly amendment to Brad's motion to make it an email vote or can we just say we are making this an email vote and by July 15 we want to have this resolved.

Pauley – I will offer that friendly amendment to Brad's motion to July 15.

Warnke – Any opposition to friendly amendment? Brad accepts friendly amendment so we are going to authorize email vote on approval of this policy by July 15.

Motion carries.

Warnke – Don't forget to volunteer to help out with the investments committee in reviewing RFPs.

Douglas – Can I presume that investments committee plan, once policy is approved, assuming it is, that we utilize the RFP process that we continue to have

permission of the board to pursue an RFP? *Warnke* – I think so. Do we need discussion or motion on that? *Ollie* – I don't think so. *Warnke* – Pursue the RFP once the policy is approved. *Douglas* – Do we have anything in our founding or bylaws that requires us to have an advisory entity stationed in Kansas where incorporated? *Ollie* – I don't have the answer to that question. I assume you can have a financial advisor anywhere in the country. Interesting question. Sheila Kemmis, Recording Secretary – I don't believe we do have to have it tied to Kansas. I think it was that way because that is where the main force was, Joe Kramer and myself who had control of the books that is where it was set up. *Ollie* – I can ask Lane Kisonak from AFWA and get a legal opinion if financial advisor has to be in state incorporated and let you know. *Douglas* – Appreciate patience and consideration of the board and again want to thank all the people contributing and those that will as time moves forward. There will need to be new chair appointed in the near future and perhaps an addition to the board. *Warnke* – Thank you for your service and to the entire investments committee as well for all your hard work on this. Very much appreciated.

Bylaws Committee Report

Sara Parker Pauley, MO (*Constitution and Bylaws with proposed changes - Exhibit F*) – Easy, friendly revisions to the bylaws, changing date on cover page and changing dates on committee lifespan which we do on three-year cycles. Amend private lands management group to 2024 and for Midwest furbearers group and Wildlife Diversity committee and revision date amended to June 30. ***Sara Parker Pauley, Missouri made a motion to accept revisions; Dan Eichinger, Michigan second. Motion passes.***

Resolutions Committee Report

Sara Parker Pauley, MO (*Resolution to promote awareness of and preparedness for rabbit hemorrhagic disease – Exhibit G*) – Appreciate Lindsey Long, chair of wildlife health committee yesterday presenting this resolution from that committee on awareness for rabbit hemorrhagic disease. I hope our members had the opportunity to go through the future resolved clauses. Obviously nothing mandated just strong encouragement for our members to develop appropriate response plans, encourages members and provinces to consider appropriate development of informational materials, encourages member states and provinces to consider working with agricultural authorities as appropriate to develop and implement appropriate restrictions on movement of domestic and wild rabbits and asking for adoption of this resolution. Nothing mandated, strong encouragement. I am just beginning to work with this committee, they are very engaged and involved committee and focused on their responsibilities related to wildlife. ***Kendra Wecker, Ohio moved to pass resolution, Pete Hildreth, Iowa second. Motion passes.***

Awards Committee Report

Terry Steinwand, ND (*MAFWA Award Winner Nominations – Exhibit H*) – Thanks to committee members Jim, Kendra, Brian, and Pete. We had 23 nominations which is about the same as last year. Encourage directors to encourage their staff to put those in. There were some great nominations and some were tough to choose. Thanks to Sheila, she does a lot of heavy lifting on this. Other than what I said yesterday, great people and I think we need to do more to recognize great people working in this field. *Warnke* – What

tremendous choices we have and opportunities to recognize great staff around the Midwest. I agree that if we can do more to recognize people that goes a long ways in the end. Future award committees can be thinking about what we might do for future awards.

Break

OLD BUSINESS

Angler R3 Update

Dave Chanda, RBFF – I can't wait for virtual meetings to stop and we can all get back together again and catch up. Thanks for time on agenda. We just finished our annual survey of how participation is going (Exhibit I). It is posted online. Had banner year, 55 million people went fishing and we all know the pandemic gave people free time for people to get out there. We have been active promoting and that is one of the reasons we were successful in that. When we count anglers, our surveys at RBFF are counting people six years and up, not same as the Service is counting. Boating was just as productive, new boat sales reached a 13-year high and the industry was doing well as a result of that. One of the most rewarding things we saw last year is that participation is up in some of the segments we are all interested in, youth up and female anglers up to 35% of all anglers and Hispanics and African American participation is up as well. These are all demographics we are interested in. Based upon the research we found it is a mixture of new participation and reactivated, which is really good news. The bad news for directors, RBFF focuses efforts on recruiting new anglers and the fact that you are getting new and reactivated and you have to retain, you have to focus on all three buckets, recruitment, retention and reactivation. We are still having trouble with churn rate. The last couple of years we have been losing anglers at significantly higher rate than we would like to see. Some of that is coming to fruition, from reports you have all seen, we are beginning to age out, seeing older population. Back in 2017, we were losing on average five million anglers and the last three years it has been 9 million, 9.3 million and during COVID it was 8.8 million that did not fish. We still have a lot of work to do on retention rate and churn rate. As we start to understand who these people are and where they come from it is not entirely the elderly population. Another thing we saw in demographics, which is good news and something we have all worked hard on, we are seeing these participants skewing younger, more diverse audience, which is important and is also trending more urban. All good demographics we are happy to see. You probably had the same happen for you as we did with our website, the views and hits to our website skyrocketed last year. One of the things our website does is if people are interested in fishing, especially when it comes to getting a fishing license, we drive them directly to your site, we don't sell anything, we connect them to you. Last year during COVID we know that nationally you sold over three million more licenses and I would like to think we helped in some small way because from our website we referred over two million people to your websites, those asking or interested in acquiring a license. The only thing I don't know is once they jump off our site on to yours if they went through to purchasing a license. Your teams are all working hard on this and going back to the new normal, whatever that might be. I have seen that soccer opened back up, baseball and all the other activities you compete with on time. What we are seeing is great opportunities for us because in the

surveys we have done we know Americans have gained a much greater appreciation for the outdoors. They realize it is a great way to get out, do it safely and decompress. As we see people now doing a hybrid, work from home and work from office, here at RBFF working from home since March and not going back until September and may be hybrid where we are in the office three days and home two days. That is going to give me more time to do what I want in the outdoors and I think your customers/constituents will be the same. They are going to have more time, have money and looking to do things outside. We have great opportunities to grow or maintain growth we had. I want to bring to your attention because some of the states are participating in this program. I have two programs going on right now. One I am getting ready to try and roll out nationally, great opportunity to you folks, like to pitch to directors so you will know if you want to participate and you will find the commitment from your staff to do it. The first is mobile first catch center project, Kansas and Nebraska have active trailers and I am working with Illinois and Wisconsin to develop trailers. The whole idea behind the program is that RBFF, along with Cabela's for the first ten trailers, have put together a trailer package full of all the gear you need to take the show on the road. We have given that to states I have just mentioned. I have actually worked with 16 states that have operational trailers, by the end of the year we will be over 21 states operating close to 30 trailers. Our only ask was that they try to do at least eight programs in urban environment where big part of audience can be. The District of Columbia is going all over the tidal basin all summer doing fishing education programs and reaching out to a good audience. We are going to grow and expand the program the best we can, given our limited resources. We are in every region of the country on that program. The other program that presents an opportunity for you as directors is I have piloted a what we call adopt a lake or adopt a stream program. I piloted it with the Virginia Department of Wildlife Resources in the city of Alexandria. This isn't your typical highway project where you are picking up trash. What we have done in Virginia is we adopted a small lake right on the edge of town, Virginia puts in trout in the spring and catfish in the summer and the whole idea behind the partnership is we do a cleanup, a couple a year, but we also do habitat projects and fishing education and it has been successful. I now have the capacity where I can help states develop this type of project. When you think about it, a great opportunity to focus on urban areas, get agency brand out there, great opportunity to reach a more diverse audience. Anyone who goes to Lake Cook at Alexandria now knows, because of signage there, that Virginia Department of Wildlife and RBFF have partnered to try and bring something to the urban community. Not difficult for states to take on because you all have volunteers that could run a program like that for you. I could see states with mobile trailer being able to set up an adopt a stream or lake anywhere you want in an urban area. My capacity would be for states with a mobile catch center, I have about \$5,000 set aside for any states that would like to participate. I would love to see a program set up with you partnering with your local community, with volunteers where you are visibly in that environment. Perhaps set up a fishing rod donor program and that is where the capacity on my end could come in with that \$5,000 I have budgeted for each state that comes into the adopt a stream or lake program. That would cover the cost of either habitat project, acquiring fishing equipment, putting signage up or whatever you would need to engage in the program. An innovative way to reach into urban environments, make your agency more relevant to that community, whether putting fish

in there or not, every area probably has an area close by where people want to go fishing. Give thought to that and anyone who wants more information, shoot me an email and I will give you a two-page summary of what the adopt a stream/lake program is all about. I already have the District of Columbia interested in developing the program, Anacostia Park, across from Nat Stadium, right along the river, you can imagine the exposure to be in an environment like that in front of all of those people that know what great work they are doing with conservation. I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you, I wish it was in person, have a discussion over a drink and talk about expanding your programs, but that is coming soon. *Douglas* – Comment, shout out to Dave and RBFF, Nebraska has worked with Dave and staff for a number of years, many of you have. Shout out to personal attention you can get by communicating with Dave and staff there. Somewhat unique to RBFF that they have a discussion about how you can work together and are offering their programs and assistance into your desires to enhance and develop fishing programs. It is a lot more than the dollars they also bring to the table. It is personal discussion and attention and strategic direction discussions you can have. I want to thank Dave, staff and leadership for what they do. *Chanda* – Thank you, I appreciate that. You are heavily engaged and we are coming out in August helping you develop your R3 plan. For any of the states in the Midwest that don't have an R3 plan if you need help developing one RBFF has set aside money and will bring in facilitators to help you do it. In Nebraska in August, Jim's team is already pulling all of the players together and Matt Dunfee with WMI and Phil Seng with DJ Case will be out there. We are not telling them what to do or how to do it but just facilitating the conversation between their group. Nebraska is doing the comprehensive plan, fisheries, wildlife, shooting sports and have advantage with their parks system. The money I can bring to the table covers costs on fisheries side, so if doing a comprehensive plan other funding comes in to cover shooting sports and hunting side. We are funded with sportfish money and can't spend it on helping develop a shooting plan. Keep that in your mind if you are a state that doesn't have an R3 plan and want help getting there we will help. Thanks for kind words. *Warnke* – Ditto what Jim said, we have had a super strong relationship in Wisconsin with RBFF. I came from R3 program into this position. There has been a lot of transition but we have at least one of the mobile fishing trailers and also have a television show called, Wisconsin Foodie that every year does an episode or two with DNR staff and we take them out hunting or fishing and create a nice meal afterwards. The mobile fishing trailer will make an appearance on the program we are filming in early July. Deploying that trailer around the state and urban centers are especially important as we hire two more urban educators near the Milwaukee area that may become important and we will have an even bigger need. Thanks again Dave for partnership and time. *Chanda* – In Wisconsin I am helping you build another one to get on the road. There are states thinking outside the box so don't think in terms of not having capacity to do this. I am working with Arizona on developing a trailer. I am learning most of you have trailers and I am amazed by how many are already on the road, we are just trying to steer you into urban environment. Arizona put their trailer in parks section, a separate entity, they will own trailer and gear, will train parks staff in Phoenix area to do fishing education. What I found interesting in dealing with staff and if this is really successful next year we will move trailer to Tucson. I told them no, if it was really successful we were leaving it in Phoenix and we will figure out a way to get another trailer for Tucson. There are creative ways to get this done, it

doesn't have to be all on your team, it can be volunteers with oversight by your team. Give me a shout or send me an email. Again, thanks for time on agenda.

Mid-America Monarch Strategy Report

Ed Boggess – (PowerPoint – Exhibit J) – Claire Beck will be helping me with this. I have been working with monarch issues since my retirement from Minnesota DNR in early 2016. Started part time as a liaison on monarch conservation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and MAFWA. This issue has raised back up on radar with recent developments. Current status and background, for some of you this is a refresher and for newer ones I want to emphasize how engaged AFWA and MAFWA have been with this issue and member states, some before concerns of listing in 2014. What is driving reemergence of this issue? Work with people who care about monarchs and pollinators, who get excited that they can do something to help and a great issue to engage people in conservation. In my career haven't seen anything that engendered excitement this has gotten to try and do something for a species. Unfortunately, the species is continuing to not do well. The eastern population represents most of the monarchs in the world although they are found in western populations and in several dozen countries around the world. The high 90% of monarchs in the world are in this eastern population. The primary breeding area is the Midwest but breed in eastern U.S. and southern Florida but strongest production is in upper Midwest. An important species in terms of our responsibilities in this region. Unfortunately, it's been in long term decline; the tri-national goal is six hectares occupied in over-wintering habitat in Mexico over a long term basis. Population bottomed out in 2013-2015, some increase since then but just when it looks like we are making good progress we take a couple steps back. Western population is in worse shape; there has been some extrapolation backwards that estimated that at one point there were over three million monarchs in this population but last fall/winter they only found around 2,000, which is an amazingly strong decline. A quick retrospective for you. A lot of you realize that in 2014 there was a petition to list, USFWS responded to that with a 90-day finding end of December 2014. They set about doing species status assessment, a complex and big project to do. There was a lawsuit to compel them to do a 12-month finding, which is listing as warranted to make that finding more rapidly. There were settlements, originally to make it by June 30, 2019, there was another settlement in 2019 that moved that to December 2020, which is what actually happened. They found them warranted but precluded, which Claire will talk about later. I want to talk briefly about evolution of how we got to where we are now and the development of the strategy and the key role MAFWA played in that, also the Service, AFWA and all the member states. Within a few weeks after listing petition I was chairing AFWA Wildlife Resource Policy Committee and USFWS brought this issue to the policy committee and we worked with Ron and Jonathan Mawdsley and the resolutions committee. Within three weeks after listing petition AFWA issued a resolution supporting monarch conservation and Jonathan told me that was the first resolution by AFWA on an invertebrate species. That was followed up the following March by a joint memorandum from AFWA and USFWS to all the states encouraging collaborative efforts to conserve monarchs and other native pollinators. This was also a time when there was a lot of concern about pollinators and pollinator conservation, both native and honeybee. Also, AFWA commissioned a report, Jonathan led production of the report that surveyed

state's efforts for monarch butterfly conservation. A lot happening right out of the gate. There was also funding to support of work for monarch conservation. In 2015, I happened to be in the rotation cycle to be president of this organization and we were just coming off of a lot of good collaborative work across the range of the northern long-eared bat, which extends far beyond the Midwest, 35-40 states. Worked very well with USFWS. So, in 2015 we jumped into monarch issue. At the annual meeting in Duluth, we voted to support funding for a monarch conservation workshop which Iowa volunteered to host, Kelley Myers was the Iowa director at the time and Dale Garner was also involved in that. We upped money for that and also applied for, with Pheasants Forever, the National Wildlife Federation (NWF) and AFWA, a NFWF planning grant to do regional strategy for monarchs. That was partially successful, we got money to do some state support for monarch conservation summits and templates. The following year, after I retired, Kelley Myers picked that up and we resubmitted for a second NFWF grant that was successful for developing a regional strategy to hire a technical coordinator and we brought on Claire Beck at end of 2016. We had our first organizational meeting in January 2017 which coincided with Kelley Myers leaving Iowa and going to the USFWS. She is still very much engaged with all these issues. We got a third NFWF grant to do technical implementation and we hosted big monarch conservation partners meeting in Nebraska and had technical meeting in Missouri for state staff from Mid-America region which includes the southcentral states of Texas, Oklahoma and Arkansas plus the Northeast Association. There has been a lot of support. With all the turnover I thought it was important to emphasize the role this organization has played in monarch conservation. The Mid-America Strategy figured heavily in the USFWS finding and with renewed interest with the decision being made that it is warranted but giving us a little time to work on it, that is where our focus is shifting now. Claire and I have moved on under USFWS grant to MAFWA through a cooperative agreement to continue working a little on monarchs but mostly now on Midwest Landscape Initiative (MLI) work. We are trying to scope out where we go and do we need additional resources to work on capacity.

Claire Beck – The USFWS did make their listing determination in December 2020, warranted but precluded. This means monarchs are candidate species and their status will be reviewed every year until 2024, where they are on listing workplan where they will decide to move forward with rule making process if they are still warranted. The Mid-America Monarch Conservation Strategy was completed in 2018 and part of that strategy includes commitment to update it every five years, which puts us at official update and revision of the strategy in 2023. With all of that in mind we held a 2-day virtual meeting in May of this year with all, or most, of the participants of the Strategy. We reconvened everyone involved in the process throughout 2017 and 2018. We wanted to discuss several things including what the implications of that listing decision are now that monarchs are candidate species. We got updates from the Service on science behind monarch species status assessment and their modeling efforts and what that suggests for monarch conservation strategy going forward. We heard updates on other current monarch science research that has come out since we did the strategy. We also heard about regulatory assurance options and what options states and other partners have moving forward. We wanted to talk about what states foresaw for how we should revise the Mid-America strategy going forward. What kind of timeline do we need, hurry and do

it so Service can take a look at that as they are coming to their 2024 deadline for the listing decision? What capacity do we have for updating this strategy as we no longer at this point have someone dedicated to just organizing monarch work in the Mid-America region? We didn't summarize outcomes of that meeting and we didn't get to answer all the questions we had. We are still in the process of identifying what our call to action is from all the information we heard at that meeting. What is the role of Mid-America strategy in Mid-America states in addressing the listing finding? What impact can we have from that finding and is there a way we can influence the monarch population and conservation efforts to get a not-warranted finding? Still working on that conversation. Talking through a timeline and approach for how we would like to update the strategy document or strategies themselves. We have already been holding follow-up discussions with small groups of state agency folks and the Service on potential next steps on how we can work together in terms of implementation, monitoring and reporting of conservation efforts. We are planning to reconvene the Mid-America Monarch Strategy Board, which is the 13 MAFWA states plus Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas and a representative from the Northeast Association as well as some ex-officio partner members. That board hasn't met in quite some time so we will need to reconvene them as we have proposals for how to make changes to that Mid-America strategy over the next few years.

Ed – As Claire said this board has not met in person for a couple of years, we used to meet in conjunction with North American and AFWA meetings. We were in a wait and see mode for where finding was going to come down. This board was created by MAFWA, there was a resolution passed that created this Mid-America board. It is the 13 Midwest states, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas and the Northeast representative out of West Virginia as a group, their directors did not choose to do individual state plans but as a region they offered their contributions. For Christie, who is on call from Canada, there is obviously implications for monarch conservation in Canada and I know there is trilateral discussions going on. That is something where climate projections could be more important in the future as the range of milkweed right now is slim and the range of monarchs is projected to move farther north in Canada. We have state directors or their designees in the 17 states, the ex officio members are other agencies or conservation partners, USFWS, USDA, Monarch Joint Venture, Keystone Monarch Collaborative, National Wildlife Federation and Pheasants Forever. This structure was approved and it has functioned. The executive committee and technical steering committee. The technical working groups were formed to create the strategy and they are no longer active and the technical steering committee is functioning as part of state's monarch team and Claire meets with that team every other month. That group has continued to meet but we need to get this board back together when we have a clearer idea of what sorts of actions we are going to follow up on. Bill Moritz was chair of this board when a Michigan director and for a little while after he left, so we need to have board select another chair. The way the governance is set up is that this is not an official committee of MAFWA but it is an existing structure from the plan that was approved by MAFWA. When we get this board together it will be the people on this board plus. We are going to be looking for volunteers to be the chair, which according to the guidance document, is selected by the Mid-America board itself. Be thinking about that. *Warnke* – Thank you Ed and Claire. Great work and look forward to getting restarted and seeing action items we can begin to implement.

National Wild Pheasant Plan Update

Scott Taylor, Executive Director – (Exhibit K) – We have a funding partnership to support my position as plan coordinator and that is run on 3-year terms and my second term is coming to an end at the end of this year. We did some fund raising last summer to garner support for funding a third term which would start next April. That happened at the height of COVID nervousness so we weren't sure what sort of responses we would get back but almost everyone hung in there. The only state we lost out of our funding partnership was New Mexico who has about 500 pheasant hunters and probably 500 pheasants in their state so no hard feelings there. Everyone else was very supportive, all of MAFWA states in pheasant range agreed to another three-year term. Thank you for that support. Thanks to Pheasants Forever (PF), who is also a funding partner, and MAFWA, our banker, Ollie and Roger and everyone on financial side of PF who make everything work surprisingly smoothly, it has gone very well. Shout out to retiring directors, Terry has been a supporter of the partnership from the beginning and your staff, Jay and Jeb, have been in the mix from day one and we appreciate that. If there is a godfather of Pheasant Plan partnership it is Jim Douglas, he did all the hard work at the very beginning in 2015 and 2016 contacting state directors, twisting arms and cajoling or whatever it took. The strength of our partnership today going forward is a testament to that hard work and vision. A big thanks to Jim for setting this in motion and mentorship during my career at Nebraska Game and Parks. The original national pheasant plan was approved by AFWA in 2013, two farm bills ago, before coordinator and management board. Our management board is made up of administrators from funding states as well as PF. We got together in October of 2019 in North Dakota to discuss directions for the partnership and to lay a path going forward. We had two days of conversations with 17 states represented. In weeks and months after that we turned conversations into a problem statement, three objectives, six issues and 25 work items for the partnership and me as the coordinator to push forward. We wanted to encapsulate our thoughts into a revised plan, so we have been working on that since. The technical committee is made up of pheasant biologists across the pheasant range and myself have been hard at work on that. We wanted to not only prioritize those 25 work items but wanted to do some of those and incorporate some of the results into the plan itself. Over the last year the tech committee and I have been working on those items and those include current estimates of hunter participation and expenditures in each state and nationally; some key considerations for estimating return on investment, pheasant management interventions; and estimates of pheasant habitat contributions at selected ecological services, carbon sequestrations. Those three bullet items are in our pheasant economics chapter. We also wanted to ascertain the state specific and national trends of nesting habitat and pheasant populations during last three years of CRP era and locate relationships between those variables. We wanted to produce state specific and national estimates of individual habitat contributions. For each state, how much of pheasant production is coming from CRP as opposed to small grain pastures or other habitats. Nesting habitats states have in their portfolios. Finally, state and national estimates of habitat acres needed to meet our state determined conservation goals. We had a process by which each state determined what their goal was, in terms of pheasant conservation, and created a model to estimate habitat quality and quantity needed to meet those needs. The main policy implication of all this is

how much national CRP acres do we need enrolled to satisfy those state and national nesting habitat goals. That was a product of model we created as well. The tech committee and myself produced a first draft of the plan this spring, management board reviewed and provided comments and I just sent the second draft, and hopefully final draft, to the management board yesterday. We are scheduled to meet on July 26 to discuss that draft and with any luck approve that draft with minor revisions. Once we get that done those figures we have calculated can then be turned loose in policy debate running up to the next farm bill and interjected into AFWA's platform discussions as well that are currently taking place and will come to a head this fall. After that we will be working our way down through identified work items. *Warnke* – Definitely a landscape scale endeavor. We can see CRP is going to be very important. *Robling* – What is final enrollment goal number going to be for CRP? Is it 40 million acres, do we have that quantified or do you have a recommendation? *Taylor* – There is a recommendation in the draft and I think that is going to be one of the major points in discussion amongst the management board at our July meeting. I don't want to get out ahead of that discussion. I will say there is virtually no enrollment level, national level, that will completely meet every state habitat goal. Several states with lofty goals and some states which CRP isn't a big part of their habitat portfolio. That makes it difficult to reach their goal through CRP. The recommendation in the draft is somewhere in the neighborhood of 45 million acres and that is a long way from where we are now but not all that far from where we have been historically at our peak. That is a topic of conversation for the board, where do we want to set both our realistic goal and a goal that gets most of the states where they want to be. *Warnke* – Look forward to seeing the final product and interested in discussion in July.

Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference (MFWC)

Sara Parker Pauley, MO – Ollie provided some background during his presentation. We are appreciative our colleagues in Minnesota for hosting of first ever virtual conference. We did see quite a profit, about \$86,000 in surplus, about \$67,000 in net profit from that conference, on the positive side. We were hoping for greater attendance since virtual but there were 936 professional full time conference registrants and another 218 registered as students. Students was one area we were hoping to see greater attendance and that is even with offering of scholarships. We had about 19 sponsors with a total of 45 sponsor registrants. We had fewer contributed papers with this conference probably related to low student numbers, fewer posters as well. Attendance was up for Fisheries Society members, which was promising. Good return on the investment but I do think we were hoping for greater attendance as a virtual conference. Some nuggets for next members in Des Moines, Iowa for the 2022 conference February 13-16. In the conference report their will be some nuggets there for next committee to consider. I appreciate Keith and Jim Douglas serving on the Foundation board with me and we will be looking at conference numbers and making decisions on how much to provide in way of scholarships for the upcoming conference in 2022. Expecting conversation in the next few weeks on that. *Ollie* – Very successful conference, Minnesota did a good job. Comment from chair of the conference from Minnesota was that the student attendance, it appears the lack of engagement that you get with an in person conference is one of the things that kept student attendance down and also there was Zoom meeting fatigue by students, another

reason perhaps why student attendance had declined. *Warnke* – Additional contributing factor to attendance of students was that so many universities were all online at that point and people’s schedules were different and they didn’t have time to block out the amount of time for Zoom conference.

Midwest Landscape Initiative (MLI)

Jim Douglas, NE – Most of us listened to presentation by Kelley Myers yesterday, she did an excellent job of bringing people up to date on where we have been and where we sit on the planning process, on governance development over time, and leaving the correct impression of where we stand with MLI. We are in a good position but are also coming up to some decision points we need to make. Personally, I am a great advocate of good planning, I tell my staff they need to have a plan or you are going to be in somebody else’s plan and you won’t like it. If you don’t know where you are going then any road will get you there. One interesting thing to me is how much benefit that has accrued from all the planning that has gone on so far in the MLI world. I was looking for a quote the other day when looking at history of Dwight Eisenhower and he said something to the effect, a plan might end up being useless but the planning process never is. I don’t think the plans we are developing and will develop in the future will be useless but it is certainly true that the planning process so far has provided tremendous benefits. Not only all of the information has been selected, sorted and in oration for being in a good position for actions in the future but also relationships between the Service, states and all of the technical and working group personnel. The collaboration across states, so far even in planning process, is one of greatest collaborations I have seen in my career. Kudos to Kelley Myers for being the facilitator and glue that keeps all of this going along with Ed and Claire and kudos to Craig and others in the Service participating in this effort. The relationship developing will serve us well as we get farther into picking our priorities moving forward. The relationships are building upon the strong relationship with states and USFWS in the Midwest and are only getting stronger and developed more fully in my mind. Knowing where you are going, it was Craig who used the term that we have a north star; a long ways into developing our vision statement thanks to the work of Bill Moritz at WMI and facilitating with everyone involved. That will be finalized in near future with both steering committee and great technical teams and work groups oriented around our priorities, at-risk, wind, governance and habitat assessment. We have a lot of strengths, Ken Elowe is great addition by AFWA to the whole process, not only with what is going on in MAFWA on large landscape initiatives, but in other regions as well. Our strengths, he mentioned, we have a lot of trust and great structure development, governance and planning development going forward. There are other strengths other regions have, Craig and I and others discussed the ability to put in something visualized, like Southeast SECAS project has. Visualize what opportunities are moving forward which will help a lot of our potential partners as we move towards not only development of priorities, but implementation to allow people to see what opportunities are across the whole region. We plan on looking at recommendations and continuing the communication with other regions, Ken and other Service personnel to add to strength in MLI and move forward. Some of the things that have developed so far in MLI, as far as actions, are relative to early items. Efforts on monarchs gave us an idea of governance models that emphasized the unique responsibilities the Service and states have in species

management and the model that created personnel that are shared financially and structurally between the Service and the states, such as Ed's and Claire's positions. We are bridging communication and planning gaps to make sure we are both on the same page. These have been tremendously influential in developing governance model for MLI and they continue to be successful. Some of the questions we are going to be facing in near future, in full steering committee and full MAFWA board, we need to consider opportunities with identification of species of greatest conservation need that are shared across the region. And with issue development shared across the region to work in both kinds of arenas, large landscape level community and ecology and species directed initiatives and a combination of those two but also issue management like CWD. As we move forward we will need to decide if we are issue-based or landscape-based or both and if both, how much bandwidth do we have to tackle all the priorities you might develop within those arenas. Another favorite saying of mine is if everything is a priority then you have no priority. One of the big questions that I have discussed with Craig, Kelley and others, is what process we will use moving forward to develop our priorities. I think we are going to push questions a lot in next couple of months. We will have meeting in August and will have more discussions in the meantime. How much capacity we will need moving forward depends a lot on how we decide we are going to develop priorities. How are we going to allow, invite and welcome participation in MLI for other government agencies and non-government entities that can be instrumental when helping to choose priorities but even more so, influential in helping us implement priorities we choose. That on-ramping of others is a big question mark. It is my view that sooner rather than later we need to have a forum and meeting where we invite interested parties to answer that question, how and when do they want to be on-ramped into the process. You can be afraid of that answer because we have unique responsibilities and authorities as states and as the Service and the guiding principle as we look back towards large landscape conservation, reflect on the need to recognize that and keep that uppermost. It complicates things a little on how and when we on-ramp some of the other partners into the process and where we allow them to intersect with the process. An important question we have to start dealing with sooner rather than later. Along with how we are going to create our priorities moving forward and what does that mean for our capacity building in MLI and MAFWA.

Craig Czarnecki, FWS – Most comprehensive and articulate ramble I have ever heard, I appreciate it Jim. I had notes in front of me and Jim hit all of them. It did make me recall something Kelly Hepler said several years ago as MAFWA was contemplating a what comes next moment after LCCs. He used the line; it is a second chance at a first impression. The idea of this kind of collaboration is sound but maybe the second iteration may be what we are about to launch here. We take some lessons from the past and apply them, I think that has been the case. We heard from USFWS standpoint, Martha, Charlie, Noreen, Matt and USFWS is all in on how we are approaching this. We understand this is an adaptive challenge. There are a lot of experiments going on as we proceed and a lot of learning. The work of Kelley, Ed, Claire, Bill Moritz, Katy Reeder, Kate Parsons and the more people you mention the more you miss. All these folks are setting the conservation table for providing input to tough decisions and something that hopefully becomes durable. Ollie, you have always noted, as many of us have, the relationships as they have

related to northern long-eared bat or monarch butterflies, regional species of greatest conservation need effort gives us a sense of the landscape of the future that keeps us working in between those moments where we rally to a single species. To Jim's point about the choices we have, are they issue-based or landscape of the future based or are we both? I think we are both and able to juggle that pretty well. More input needed from everybody on the phone but it seems there are things that eat our lunch that we have to attend to that MLI can assist with and then there is that longer view that all of us know we have to do and something to focus on and I think MLI can help us there. I have heard the phrase, "cognitive overload", all of our employees weathering the last year and half and learning how to work in a different way, now transitioning to hybrid models and lots of question marks and it has been tough for employees to pick out a consistent path forward sometimes. But is saying that I think about Kelley's slide where she lists all the employees from across the states and Fish and Wildlife Service and despite that cognitive overload they are all in. Across technical working groups and they are preparing us for the next steps Jim has noted. *Douglas* – Welcome questions or comments. *Warnke* – Important initiative.

Forming Ad Hoc (Chronic Wasting Disease) CWD Committee

Kelley Myers, FWS – Invite members of value stream mapping implementation team and original task force on the call and Sara was our sponsor through this whole event and I welcome any and all of them to speak. I am the spokesperson of this but this was thoughts and work of this group (*Exhibit L*). As I mentioned on Monday this was a really challenging effort in so many ways, from logistics and transitioning through pandemic and trying to use a business process improvement structure that is very structured, providing flexibility for us across the distance. We were able to use it. Is this value stream mapping process something that is valuable when we are trying to take a big complex issue and find some organization to it? Yes, we had to modify it a bit and will continue to do so across regional expanse but the tools we used were valuable and we arrived at a strong result. I showed you in my presentation who was on the team and who did what but I want to run through where we have arrived. This is more evidence, as Jim said, we find MLI in struggle of are we forward focused and looking at broad landscape level planning or do we work on issues we are encountering that are urgent and emerging, something important and we need to get more coordination on. We find ourselves in both and working hard to make sure we don't let one take over the other. We look forward to conversations about for MLI, what our scope is. For now, we are working on CWD. In trying to scope the problem and trying to figure out what problem we are trying to fix, we never got together thinking we were going to cure CWD. This wasn't about how can we get more science or what research is needed, this was how do we as wildlife professionals, people who are responsible for some aspect of fish and wildlife health, how do we work together in the most coordinated way possible. There was an extra challenge which is the whole world around CWD and wildlife health has been shifting as well. How do you take the orbits we are creating and make sure they tie into these national and international discussions? CWD is deer disease but also the larger health issues. We found ourselves spinning in a lot of different spheres. These conversations weren't always easy and we are not in complete agreement but from that good discourse came a good plan forward. From my seat with USFWS I get pulled into national

discussions on CWD, health issues and different frameworks we are trying to put together and I have appreciated being in all of these different seats. To be part of different conversations and recognize that having unified position in the Midwest is not competitive with what is happening across the nation, it is meant to supplement to make sure the voice and needs of the Midwest are represented. None of the members lose their voices. There are a lot of different national initiatives going on and they are open to state and different organizational participation. It is meant to recognize the Midwest is in a different place than maybe some other states or organizations dealing with CWD and it is important. And how the Midwest works together is important. It is not meant to compete; it is meant to flow into conversations on CWD and health. I would be remiss if I didn't mention the opportunity we have right now, however horrible and whatever loss we have experiences through this pandemic, our population has a much better sense of health and what it's like to respond to health crisis. We are able to work across these boundaries better than ever in terms of being able to me. I know we all want in-person meetings but I appreciate that we have been able to have so many robust conversations because we figured out this virtual world. It isn't a replacement for in-person but certainly a tool we can add to our toolbox. All that comes together to where we landed as a team. The team came up with recommendation last year and you asked us in October how we were going to implement this. All signs at that point were pointing to how we figure out how to fund a coordinator and that is where we started our dialog in implementation team. Thankfully, several of the members challenged that assumption and wanted to know what we can do with better direction from MAFWA board and what would be possible. Maybe we do need to have a coordinator, this issue or health in general is just so big we do need the coordinator, but maybe we don't. Maybe we can do a lot coming together and trying to develop what we think we need. The question of a coordinator was put to the side and we looked at what we need to do to be better coordinated. The first recommendation was that this board would establish a CWD working group. As mentioned before we talked to Ollie and the way we can do this is you have the authority to create an Ad Hoc committee, not a standing committee, that would establish this working group that essentially would be a super group with members of health committee, deer and turkey committee and newly formed social science committee, if that happens, and come together to come back to you with additional recommendations and actions you can take. Always looking at this collectively as MAFWA and individually as states. Sara, as sponsor of our event and staying involved all throughout the process has agreed to serve as the initial director liaison and one of her staff members, I assume, would lead the committee. They would have the responsibility to make regular reports to MAFWA executive committee, opening communication to say this is important with big issues happening over the next year and big conversations with CWD task forces and different funding mechanisms that might come available. Make regular reports for next year with executive committee and the board. They would have authority to seek advice, talk to experts in the field, work with AFWA working group and all the different people working on it. But they have no authority to spend funds. They can come to you with ideas on what more could we fund, maybe coordinator or research position, but that would be this group coming together to say that. We took recommendations we had originally proposed that were organized around outreach and engagement with hunting publics, industry and others and in-reach and internal coordination and planning and took

those ideas and put them into this charge. These are the types of things we want this group to work on. Assisting MAFWA with change management, support public engagement, looking at how we do CWD management strategies and looking at public engagement communications and there is no shortage of surveys that have been done; taking a look at those again with input of social science community to evaluate management actions and maybe identify some additional science needs. Really working through the lens of knowing what management professionals and disease professionals think, but what do our publics think and how do we incorporate that into how we manage. Working more with landowners and industry groups and really looking to use industry group media personalities and how can we use hunting shows to get messages across so it is not just government talking. Some of these types of ideas and how they can pursue that. We had great presentation yesterday from John Fischer and Matt Dunfee of WMI about information resources. Matt was part of our original event and we talked about early ideas of that system they have created. How can we make sure we are using systems like that to share and what does that mean? Some states have other systems coming online and how will they integrate and how can we make sure we are utilizing the best systems in trying to share information around CWD. Using that as a guide, how can we make sure we are sharing what research is happening and what is going on out there and tie into research consortia. That is a lot of looking outward. Looking internally at how this group can create more formal forums for those groups to be talking. What we have found is that we have some shared membership across committees but don't have a chance with ANS, deer managers to just come and talk to deer health people on a regional scale. How can we create some of those opportunities for more enhanced learning and sharing? Some of that has started to happen since this event but how can we really formalize that? Also, talking about committee roles. This is a challenge in coordinator for anything big where you have all of these different committees, like climate change, but CWD is no different. There are any number of these groups working on CWD and going through exercise to clarify the roles and remove some of that duplication and ensure those groups are talking the way they need to. Creating additional opportunities for feedback with all of you and also working with USFWS, USDA, Forest Service, EPA and everyone has something they are doing with respect to CWD and making sure federal partners have a mechanism. When we were putting together this original VSM we had EPA and Forest Service dying to be there, it didn't work with schedules but there is a lot of interest in work they are doing to coordinate. Facilitating reviews of existing and ongoing research. We know there is some consortia arising in the region and making sure we are touching base with them and part of prioritization process. Also giving you an opportunity to endorse some of those to bring to this group and say this is the kind of thing we need to be looking at in Midwest. Talking about funding looking at funding and capacity needs in long term. There is already an economic impact analyses ongoing that was not there when we started this. We started talking about the need to understand all of the resources going into CWD in the region and what do they need to be? Jump in on some of those activities and made sure Midwest interests are accounted for. Looking at long range CWD management plans. Something we have heard a lot about during this pandemic is how important it is for the public to have trust in government leaders who are making decisions. We all look to point in the future where it is possible, no one wants to talk about it, but it is possible that there could be a public

health implication to CWD. What are we doing to prepare for that moment if that occurs? This group would look at what long term preparations are and how are we planning for changes that might happen in hunting deer management world, if that should happen. There are a couple of prescriptive information items the group is going to bring back to you. Creating an official position in MAFWA with respect to CWD, so this group will work over the next year to May executive committee meeting and this full board meeting on either a resolution or statement to adopt about the position of MAFWA. Also looking at utility and value of establishing a CWD coordinator position. The group also talked about wildlife health since it is bigger, stay focused on CWD or stay bigger and allow it to grow, that is all part of the discussion going on. The rest of the document talks about away from the committee. Talking about engaging with big information sharing resources and investigating how that can happen and give to committee to come back with recommendation. Endorsing multistate grants as they are brought to you. Engaging in emerging CWD research consortia. Use different groups and hear from them what is going on. Then building on some of work individual states can take. The item before you is recommendation to create this Ad Hoc committee to pursue items like the ones this group came up with. *Pauley* -Outstanding job, the only think I will add is to Jim's point on scope of MLI. I will say that MLI and human dimensions has created this safe space to have more challenging conversations that do impact landscape level conservation. Here we are suggesting we come back to form this Ad Hoc committee within MAFWA and MAFWA structure but the space to have that conversation at landscape level was appropriately done in MLI construct. I am appreciative of Kelley and her leadership throughout. *Jason Sumners* – Kelley has done a super job of summarizing the struggles the group went through and Jim's comments earlier about it being as much about the process as the end point. In my mind it has highlighted how we can more effectively work together and try to make Tonk's (Mike Tonkovich) life easier as well as all the folks in the field that is struggling with this issue. I am pleased, regardless of what the decision is, I think we all have better understood the framework we are working in and how we can better operate inside it. We couldn't have done this without Kelley, she continued to kick us along and we challenged each other but she challenged us to test some of our assumptions. Greatly appreciate the opportunity to have her help us. *Pauley* – Highlight one other point Kelley made. The Service, we heard from Martha earlier this week and she is leading the charge to bring USDA and others together on the CWD task force and how to collaborate and coordinate nationally. We really are in good position to have structure to allow regional association, for communication, identifying priorities and pathway forward. *Mike Tonkovich* – Support Kelley and put plug in for creation of Ad Hoc committee. I think it would help if I shared about my background as I think it will lend some credibility to my remarks. I am in year 26 as deer program administrator for the Ohio Division of Wildlife but I had the privilege if spending a few working years with folks like Amanda, Megan and Keith on R3 issues, a temporary thing. I enjoyed it and would have traded deer if I could have but that wasn't an option. The other thing I have had the pleasure of doing is sitting on the Midwest Fish and Wildlife Health Committee for the last 6-7 years. I think I bring a unique perspective to this position. I struggled immensely in Missouri when we first met in December 2019. I had my mind made up on how we were going to solve CWD. It evolved and I latched onto coordinator position and resigned myself to the fact that the real need is what we are about to propose

to you, the creation of this Ad Hoc committee which brings together three critical elements if we are going to have any success. Not that we haven't had success but if we are going to make forward progress in dealing with this issue I think we have come to realize that we have three separate groups, deer managers like myself and I like to consider myself wearing multiple hats, but we have had deer managers that feel we can manage the disease out of the herd. Then we have the health professionals in another room that are convinced if there is a risk, we should eliminate it, whether moving carcasses, prions and bottled urine, whatever the issue maybe we should just take it away and eliminate the risk. Then we need social scientists and human dimensions people to serve as referees. We all need to be in that same room talking about solving this because we are not going to do it separately for the reasons I mentioned. Brian Richards has said time and time again if we cannot make CWD relevant to hunters we are going to fail, but at the same time we have to convince the health folks that you can't take all the fun out of hunting because there is a potential risk. We desperately need to work together, in the same room, under the same roof if we are going to make significant forward progress. I think CWD is fitting analogy for dealing with this issue, the One Health approach. My wife is in medical profession, a nurse practitioner for 35 years and works with a lot of physicians. Patients will compare her or ask her if her job is different. Doctors and physicians rely heavily on medicine and my wife looks at the entire profile of the patient, physical health, mental health and what is going on at home or work, nutrition. That is the point I am trying to make here. If we are going to be successful we need to all not work in separate silos to try and solve this issue. We all need to be together and work this out. I am grateful to have opportunity to work with Kelley and the rest of the folks on this project. Kelley, thank you for your patience as I often times struggled through many meetings to not get agitated with the direction we were going. *Warnke* – About 12 years ago I traded deer for R3, a good deal, and now traded back. Thanks for report and directive that went a long way to help clarify some things. In my view good direction to take and it is an MLI issue. Input from directors? *Douglas* – Is Ad Hoc committee, Dr. Tonkovich, the perspective leader of such a committee? *Pauley* – As the director/liaison I would be appointing that position, I am likely to delegate to Jason Sumners initially, to make it easier for me. I am guessing as the chair rotates thus perhaps the director/liaison will as well. *Douglas* – I think proposal for Ad Hoc committee is good considering all the potential elements of a charge for that committee which were well stated by Kelley. It would make this a rather elegant proposal, in light of different proposals that have been discussed. Coordinator versus not a coordinator and how do we do this. I think it is also evident that the variety of activities and potential activities the committee could engage in would necessitate an engaged committee and engaged leader. Someone with depth of perspective we just heard. I was impressed with perspective and analysis of different perspectives that exist out there that have to be brought to bear together. Nebraska is one of the states that has had CWD for a long time. In early days Nebraska had a fairly high level position, the assistant chief of wildlife, that we devoted nationally to accomplish a fraction of types of things mentioned in the proposal. They spent full time, at that time it was west of Mississippi and almost west of Missouri condition. They spend full time working on trying to coordinate a lot of activities associated with CWD. Not many more states than represented by MAFWA now. It is a big job. I think proposed solution is good but you have to start out with good leadership. *Myers* – A couple of points there, Jason

and Tonk are both very engaged across the community. If you get a chance please go in and look at who on your staff are involved in this. We did have a lot of staff from around the region and appreciate that everyone participated and had a strong voice in the discussion. Something the group talked about as being important was having some new perspective on this committee but retaining consistency from participants going forward. There is a mechanism in there to try to get folks like Tonk to stay involved if Kendra approves that. Building on what this group, from first group to second group to now and what moves forward has been important and identified that we have that succession and consistency. I would also say something I heard a lot during our discussions was they are already spending almost 100% of their time on CWD. Hopefully what this will help do is give them some common direction so they can work better together instead of everyone duplicating. This was giving stronger recommendation they needed and you are right that this is a lot of work. If I could see into the future, not see ticker of already done, see progress to work and it is those discussions that are going to be happening. All of those relationships and testing of each other that are going to help to bring out new ideas and find bright spots that have worked and identify the challenges and have more help working through them. I don't believe work will be done and some may require additional investments on the part of MAFWA in terms of coordinator or additional outreach, support of research. This is a start of the story. *Pete Hildreth, Iowa* – In what you mentioned the first step would be to have an Ad Hoc committee but I also recognize there is conversations about a potential future coordinator. Have those conversations about what potential coordinator would cost and contributions from states? *Myers* – We didn't get that specific, but ballpark. What we tried to do in initial discussions was we created a job description and started working through what this person would do and all of these pieces, responsible to build or bring together a network of people to build those. Is this a scientist or a facilitator; short term or long term because could be a different skill set on what that person does, if building something versus executing something in the long term. That is where the conversation was in terms of coordinator and that is where the coordinator conversation dropped. We couldn't agree on short term coordinator to get the group going or long term and that is another reason why they wanted more time for group on their own to coalesce and then make some of those plans. So, I don't think we got that far. *Warnke* – Do we need action on this? *Ollie* – Need motion, second and vote to establish this Ad Hoc committee or our bylaws allow you, as president to appoint it yourself. Think it would be better if you had full board buy-in. *Warnke* – So do I. ***Jim Douglas, Nebraska, moved to form Ad Hoc committee as presented, Amanda Wuestefeld, Indiana second. Motion approved.*** *Myers* – Thank you to directors who had staff participate. I think almost every director in some way was involved by the time we discussed this out with all of the different committees. Also, a special shout out to Sara and Jim, who started this discussion a couple of years ago at MLI steering retreat, and to folks like Jason and Tonk who made conversations possible. *Warnke* – From MAFWA, thank you Jason and Tonk, I know it has been tough and I have had a lot of updates from our Wisconsin staff who participated. They are excited about this. A positive move.

Non-Lead Partnership Recommendations

Keith Warnke, WI – I will need help on background of this. I think it started when I started so I was in the dark. We did assign MAFWA R3 and Wildlife Health committees

to come up with recommendations. What I can't remember is if we passed a resolution on this early last year? *Ollie* – No, we voted to join the North American Non-Lead Partnership. I don't remember, would have to look and see if we passed a resolution. We asked health and R3 committees to get together and propose to the board at what level MAFWA should engage in this initiative. *Warnke* – They have gotten back to us with some recommendations that have been circulated to the board. The overarching goal comes from the Wildlife Health and R3 committees (*Exhibit M*). We are collaboratively to minimize the unintended impacts of lead ammunition on wildlife. We are talking about voluntary measures, supporting long-term viability of scientifically managed populations and use scientific evaluation to assess and improve programs related to risk of exposure to lead. In the document of recommendations, they gave us, there are two. An overarching initiative and each one has an approach and some finer details. The overarching recommendation number one is support and encourage state agencies to commit to using non-lead alternatives within their own programs when applicable. We have taken that approach in Wisconsin for some time and it seems to be well accepted. Second is to develop strategic approach to address needs, challenges and limitations surrounding lead alternatives for both angling and hunting. This looks like one we would toss back into a committee-type aspect to look at it from Midwest perspective and get back to us with a report on the challenges and limitations surrounding lead alternatives or non-lead ammunition. Without too much further discussion I want to stop and ask if I should go further into the approach and walk through some of these. They are straightforward, provide training sessions; utilize in hunter ed programs; learn to hunt workshops, etc.; provide information; and promote use of lead alternatives on state managed public hunting areas. If we are going to take action on this and I think we need to so we can make these official recommendations. *Ollie* – Yes, you asked for input from committees and depends on what the board wants to do with it. *Warnke* – I will stop there see if we have input from the board, or if folks have ideas or questions they want to bring forward. Do we have a motion to accept these recommendations for our states and MAFWA? Do you prefer more time to review recommendations? Do we need more information? What direction should we take? *Brad Loveless, Kansas* – These all seem like sound recommendations and we should endorse them. ***Brad Loveless, Kansas moved, Sara Parker Pauley, Missouri second.*** *Ollie* – The board did adopt a resolution on this issue in 2020 and I will send it to the board. *Warnke* - Thank you. ***Motion passes.***

NEW BUSINESS

MAFWA Banking Fee

Keith Warnke, WI – (*Exhibit O*) We had discussion at executive committee level for last couple of meetings and stems from additional interest we are getting on contracts and contractors. For example, potential for CWD coordinator and Midwest R3 coordinator and all of those would require our folks to manage money. Discussion has been on whether we need a grants coordinator to manage that money because right now it takes a lot of *Ollie's* and *Roger's* time for the contracts we have, Southern Wings, National Pheasant Coordinator, CLfT and a couple positions in Ohio. Right now, banking fee is 5%, this is what we charge for managing money, paychecks and being sure all of the grants are in place. So, the executive committee discussed increasing that fee somewhere

within the bounds of 8-10% and then considering going forward with a contractor position to hire a banking manager to handle those fees and take workload off of Ollie and Roger. There was substantial discussion around the level, 8% or 10% and how much money might be coming in from that and how much it would actually cost us to hire someone. Roger put out an estimate of 200 hours at \$40 an hour, \$8,000 a year. *Roger* – That is correct, that is in the proposed draft budget, that may be too low, but at least we have placeholder in the proposed budget at this time. *Warnke* – If we were to do this and go forward we could always start small. Start with 8% banking fee and hiring of the coordinator, we could see what kind of contractor requests flow in. Within executive committee discussion, states might be interested in hiring contractors because we can't get new positions. In Wisconsin we have at least half a dozen farm bill biologists that are hired as contractors through Pheasants Forever and it has been a successful program. We have a couple of R3 contractors hired through PF and National Wild Turkey Federation, so we have already done this in Wisconsin, we are comfortable with this and think it adds benefit to the resources we can provide to our customers. In the executive committee discussion, we did not take any position or action, we wanted to bring to full board to see if you wanted more information, additional exploration or if full board wants to take action on increasing current banking fee and using revenue from increased banking fee to hire a contract bank and grant manager. The caution Ollie issued is we want to be cautious about growing too big too fast. Executive committee recognizes that and feel that if we go into this as a pilot and issue shorter term series of contracts we can always pull back if this is not where we want to be. Bring that to you for input. *Kendra Wecker, Ohio* – I think you captured it accurately. This has been a beneficial service to us in Ohio, using contracts to hire specific project-based employees. If other states can take advantage of it, I encourage you to do so as well. It is a lot of work on Ollie and don't want to overburden staff. Getting someone to do this and to be sure we are hitting deadlines and are compliant is a wise move. *Warnke* – Particularly in federal grants, there is a lot of working going into making sure hit deadlines and have all the cost share and doing all the acronym soup that you need to complete. *Dave Olfelt, Minnesota* – You mentioned Ollie said we shouldn't grow too big too fast. Could you elaborate that? *Ollie* – I refer to Western Association as this happened to them, they grew too fast and overran their headlights and then they had to pull back. I know they got in a bind and don't want MAFWA to follow that example. *Pauley* – For clarification aren't you suggesting this person be a contracted position, not a MAFWA employee? *Warnke* – That is correct, we have no employees at MAFWA they are all contractor positions. *Ollie* – It is an "as needed" contractor, so if this is approved we will have to find a person willing to work on an as needed basis. These contracts ebb and flow. It is certainly clear the volume of contracting and grant management has increased significantly in the last few years, thanks to your leadership we are getting more involved, creating more action and getting a lot more things done. *Pauley* – Prospective from executive committee, there is support for this, but question was wanting to hear from full board on what the appropriate rate should be, double from 5% to 10% or sliding scale or something in between. *Douglas* – Sara's question is pertinent on whether this is MAFWA employee. In looking at total situation referred to with WAFWA, it was a combination of ingredients there, large share of situation was persons who were employees of WAFWA and grew in administration of some large national species- directed efforts. It also did include some contractors as well

that were being paid for with federal grants and the like. It was a combination of growth factors. The admonition is good to consider that Ollie brings up in long run and large picture. Those types of things will involve decision making as time moves forward, how many species-directed initiatives can MAFWA handle, large landscape or issue initiatives? At what scale do we have bandwidth to approach those things and what kind of associated administration will be required from MAFWA. This question before us is a small ask right now and seems prudent to pursue what is proposed. It is in the larger context it is prudent to be aware of what kind of administration is required as time goes forward. *Warnke* – Limited basis to start with. *Loveless* – Comments are good and caution deserved and no question about value this position would bring. One perspective from my WAFWA experience. We tend to be apologetic about charging for these positions and the value they add but one of the things that would be helpful to make these more sustainable would be to have as part of position figure out a way for them to advocate ideas to pay their own way in terms of grants and things like that. We get grants but we don't put in much for administrative overhead and in general we need to be looking for that money and be aggressive about the fact that it takes staffing to manage those. A small ask from the states is not a big deal and that is a reasonable way to get started but ultimately it is wise to transition to plan where funding comes externally. This is a broad enough issue that all of the federal agencies are invested in and something we should look at critically if we establish this position, see about that the funding comes to supplement the cost. *Warnke* – In general seems support of doing something like this. Take action and get started in coming year? See more information on Roger's proposed budget in a couple of minutes. Motion to endorse grant position and level of banking fee? *Pauley* – Roger or Ollie, would your preference be straight 10% or flexibility of sliding scale depending if it was a small entity or larger one? *Roger* – I don't know if I made a recommendation, but I made an observation, what we have for feds is 10% and if we did 10% that would be consistent. That is weak in terms that it has to be the same as the feds, it can be less as the feds do require more work than some states. 8-10%, it doesn't matter, it is just a number in terms of calculating bank fee. If we did a sliding scale we would need clarification on how we define that, some people would question why they are getting charged 10% when others are being charged 8%. We would have to have clear guidelines on what that is. One thing is we do have a couple programs going on that require very little work, one of those is the National Pheasant Coordinator Plan, Scott Taylor is doing a tremendous effort on that so our work is minimal. Another one is Southern Wings, very little work and we thought about grandfathering those at 5% but beyond that would be a different rate. *Ollie* - Does anybody else only charge 5% on grant administration, or less? I think we are the lowest. *Pauley* – Our foundation does, depending on the project. They may be the exception as well. *Ollie* – Is it a sliding scale? *Pauley* – It is a bit of a sliding scale, yes. *Ollie* – I think it is just up to the board. I wanted Roger to weigh in as he has a good feel for this. Starting small is a good idea, but once you set the rate it is hard to change it on somebody. *Douglas* – When would this change become effective upon action of the board? *Warnke* – I think it would be effective on new projects. *Roger* – That makes sense. *Douglas* – That is what I was wondering, you mentioned a couple of existing agreements and effort to ensure they have the pledges and follow through to fund their activities and they would need lead time if you were going to change the amount of overhead they are budgeting. We will make clear on motion

whether there is any grandfathering going on this is for new endeavors. *Ollie* – Roger and I talked about this and we agree we should grandfather National Pheasant coordinator, Southern Wings, don't think we can charge more but they don't require a lot of work. Conservation Leaders for Tomorrow (CLfT) is another program we charge 5% but is taking a lot of time and I don't feel comfortable about that program now, our contract is up for renewal, it has expired and it will be a point of discussion, when we renew, it has been 5%. and we charge Kendra 5% for her contractors that we are hiring. Those are limited terms, for two years, so would not change fee on existing contracts, we are talking about future contracts. *Pauley* – As Ollie articulates the contracts we are dealing with the level of effort is an important factor. Ollie and Roger if you had three options, a 5%, 8% or 10% based on level of effort it would take, would you prefer a range or one level based on criteria or level of work required? Wondering your preference? *Ollie* – If you want to set three levels and authorize Roger and me to set the level and you back us up because we may get some grief if charging one group 5% and another group 10%. That will have to be based on amount of staff work and they do vary a lot. We have spent an enormous amount of time on CLfT and that has not been worth the 5% charged. Southern Wings and National Pheasant coordinator is basically invoicing, accepting the money and Roger paying it out with Sara signing the checks. That is really relatively easy, but some get complicated. The federal grants are very complicated and we are restricted because we don't have an indirect cost negotiated cost agreement with the federal government, we can apply for one but we never have, so they give us 10% on federal grants. With your direction we could go to the effort of applying for a negotiated cost agreement with federal government and that would cover all grants we have with any federal agency. That would take some legal help because there is a lot of paperwork to apply for that. We may not get any better off than 10% we are getting now; I don't have a lot of experience with that but some of you may. *Warnke* – What is your direction? *Jim Hodgson* – Respond to Ollie's comments, the de minimis is set because a lot came in around 10%, standardized evaluation of the indirect rate, a lot of them came in at 10% and established that threshold. If you think you are going to be above that then it might warrant looking at that tool. From federal side that is why 10% is the de minimis and if you want advice from me you are probably good using de minimis on the program side. If you really get into it then we can talk about how to advise you to get into negotiated indirect cost rate. *Warnke* – Thanks Jim. Looking for direction from full board, you could punt this back to executive committee. *Ollie* – Whatever the board wants to do. *Warnke* – If you don't want to make a decision here or you want more information or want executive committee to make a decision that is all valid from my standpoint. *Ollie* – It is board policy so the board has to adopt or change it. ***Jim Douglas, Nebraska – To further discussion, I would make motion that we currently continue to operate on federal grants with de minimis 10% rule, grandfather anything existing at 5% and for future grant administration overhead to give director and Roger the option of evaluating administrative burden and administrative cost at 5% or 8%. This can be reviewed again as time moves forward to see if it is working. Sara Parker Pauley, Missouri second.*** *Warnke* – Motion to let director, Ollie and Roger set 5% or 8% on new contracts, maintain grandfathered 5% on existing contracts and de minimis of 10% as we move forward. ***Motion approved.*** *Warnke* – That gives us good direction. One thing your motion didn't cover Jim is hiring a contractor to manage contracts and grants. ***Jim***

Douglas, Nebraska – I move we move forward with a contracted position according to the Treasurer’s recommended hourly wage and projection, Kendra Wecker, Ohio second. Pauley – Just to clarify, this would be a contracted position? Douglas – Correct. Robling – Was that is for \$8,000 we projected? Roger – Correct. Warnke – Correct, on as needed basis but we projected \$8,000 potentially depending on the number of grants. Motion approved. Pauley – When Ollie is renegotiating when contract lifespan has been met, and negotiating a new contract term, is that considered a grandfathered, thinking of CLFT, new contract for purposes or renegotiation? Douglas – My thought was it was a new contract at that point. Pauley – If minutes should reflect that clarification that would be what I support. Clarifying that negotiating a new contract gives Ollie the flexibility. Warnke – Renegotiation of a contract is new contract. I agree.

Forming MAFWA Human Dimensions Committee

Kevin Robling, SD – (Exhibit N) Obviously human dimensions is important component of our day-to-day and we talk about wildlife management being defined as essentially using best available science and needs of people in wildlife. This is the people part and science part and where they come together. I have been in discussion with regards to putting together a committee. Through others and my human dimensions specialist, Faren Wolter, she has been highly engaged in MLI and CWD Ad Hoc group. This has already been laid out so don’t need to further describe the intentions here. Essentially what it comes down to, in April 2021 there was a lot of discussion among states and federal wildlife agency staff that were in the human dimensions field, they felt they were all dealing with same thing and handling them in states independently and not doing these things collaboratively across states, especially in the Midwest. There are human dimensions committees in other associations, SEAFWA, AFWA and WAFWA has them. There is desire here, from human dimensions staff, to establish a Human Dimensions Committee to take on these things in collaborative effort and address larger scale, broader initiatives, not just at state level. I might ask Faren Wolter is she wants to add anything, she is our human dimensions specialist in South Dakota.

Faren Wolter – This has been a year-long process, started originally as discussion with former Secretary Hepler. We worked with MLI committee and it grew from a handful of people to 35-40 professionals working across the Midwest states having this discussion. Those people formed a small steering committee, and we put this justification statement together and we are bringing that forward to you in hopes of forming Human Dimensions/Social Science Technical Committee. Again, to bridge gap between SEAFWA and NEAFWA and WAFWA groups. The Midwest is really looking forward to engaging the other regions collaboratively. Robling – We would need a motion to establish this committee. Loveless – Support this as we see this area growing and all of us as state directors would say we are behind on this and don’t have the resources we need. This initiative from Faren and South Dakota is a great first step to become more efficient as we figure out how to navigate these larger and larger human dimension issues. Brad Loveless, Kansas moved to establish Human Dimensions Committee, Brian Clark, Kentucky second. Robling – Offer up Faren Wolter to be chair of the committee to get things moving. Ollie – Kevin, would you be director/liaison or would you prefer to defer to someone else? Robling – I would be happy to. Clark – The document sent out had a listing of suggested initial members, or maybe complete members, but I would suggest,

as we often do, to have opportunity for state member, either director or appointee from each state to represent. *Warnke* – That is typical process, an appointee from each state to represent on committee. *Wolter* – That is our intention going forward. My understanding with MAFWA bylaws is that we will spend the next year developing those structures and all of those details and that will be presented to this board this next year in 2022 when everyone is here in South Dakota. We will offer it then for final approval. The intention is to have agency-type structure from leadership. We also want to ensure we are engaging all of our conservation partners, federal, researchers, universities and etc. The voting structure and all those details will be worked out. ***Motion carried.***

Warnke – Our last item under new business is 2022 budget approval. *Ollie* – We have one more. We have funding stream survey of state fish and wildlife agencies by Charles Booher, University of Montana.

Funding Stream Survey

Charlie Booher, University of Montana – I am a graduate student at the University of Montana studying wildlife biology, public administration and natural resource conflict resolution. I want to thank Ollie and Keith for giving me a few minutes to chat about a chapter of my thesis project. I have been working with Ron Regan and Mark Humpert at AFWA headquarters as well as Directors Eichinger and Parker-Pauley. This is on a topic that has been in the conversation about field of conservation for last few decades and many of you know this issue better than anybody else in the country. The decline, or rising uncertainty, in conservation funding. The mechanisms by which you are able to run and operate your agencies are facing new and diverse challenges as hunting, fishing and trapping licenses decline to spite rises in certain demographics and over recent years. There is a long term decline and different agencies have grappled with that issue in many different ways. It has been the topic of hearings, in your legislatures and in these forums for a long time. However, research on this field is focused on specific approaches. Case studies of Missouri's famed dedicated states sales tax or Michigan Natural Resources trust fund but hasn't really taken approach of building more comprehensive clearing house or portfolio of how conservation revenue is drawn into state agencies. That is my interest in this project, building that clearinghouse. In discussions with a group of directors, those I mentioned as well as Director Smith from Texas, and Director Wasley, Nevada. In the next few weeks, I will be distributing a survey to state agency directors. I have been working with this team to make sure this survey is gathering valuable information while minimizing, to the greatest extent possible, any burden on your staff. What the survey is going to ask is, generally speaking, for revenue over last three years in different categories. Ranging from dedicated sales from the sale of marijuana to the sale of conservation license plates in your states. What this is going to do for us is provide more comprehensive view of conservation funding portfolio in this country. Just like you spoke about earlier in this meeting, about your individual MAFWA funding portfolio. We want to get an idea of how diverse the nationwide funding portfolio for conservation at large looks. In a way that is easily comparable between states, among regions and nation as a whole. The immediate benefits is we should see some cross pollination of ideas, being able to show which states are having success and in which ways, of gathering revenue. What ways that revenue is being deployed with greater flexibility and how it can

be applied to different states? A scientific bench lab needs to share their findings I hope to act as a conduit between states in this forum to share those ideas more broadly and aggregate and distribute them back to states in a final report. The other immediate benefit we have identified, one that has been a topic of conversation in these meetings as well as AFWA executive committee meeting, is how agencies are working to respond should Recovering America's Wildlife Act (RAWA) pass and specifically identifying matching dollars used to match those federal grants and be available to multiple the conservation benefits of a program like RAWA. On our side of things being able to show federal decision makers that state agencies are working hard to make sure money is available should those federal partners be able to come up with that money and pass a new system of federal aid. I have included some more details in a letter that I dropped in the chat and I will drop that same letter and ask Ollie to send that out. It includes more detail about the data we will be asking for. The right people within your agencies who will be likely able to provide that information and more information about security of that information. I know that financial data is especially sensitive and we want to be respectful of that as well. Please be on the lookout for the survey in the next few weeks. *Warnke* – Important work. Look forward to the survey and the results as well to help us get that comprehensive look.

2022 Budget Approval

Roger Luebbert, Treasurer (Exhibit P) – This is conference account proposed calendar year 2022 budget with draft date of June 28, 2021. The executive committee made a change Monday and I have incorporated that change. The executive committee has approved moving this forward but that doesn't mean you can't make changes. This document has six pages, the first two cover 2022 budget versus the actual, the next two pages are the current year budget status; basically, background information. On pages 5 and 6 we will talk about the actual proposed budget. On page 1, receipts for last year, we thought we would have an in-person meeting which ended up getting cancelled, we budgeted conference receipts of \$85,000 and took in \$35,000. Essentially sponsors that paid before the conference was cancelled. What we did with that \$33,000, as well as the \$1,800 in registrations, is we reduced the budget amount for 2021, thinking we would apply these revenues to conference for 2021. On membership dues, the other negative variance we have is that we had two states that did not pay by December 31, they have paid now. Part of that is my fault, I didn't follow up as quickly as I should have in sending past due invoices. Overall, for receipts the budget was \$163,000 and we took in \$106,000 so we were short by \$56,000. All of that is conference that was cancelled and late dues. On disbursement side, with conference being cancelled we had \$54,000 budgeted but only spent \$8,000, \$45,000 not spent. The only major unfavorable variance was insurance, we paid three years all in one year. That will save us money in 2021 and 2022. Overall, we thought we were going to have a deficit but had surplus of \$3,300 but ended up with surplus of \$15,000. A lot of that had to do with getting sponsor money for conference we didn't have. For 2021, actual year to date is not meaningful, as of May 31, not a lot of activity. For sponsors, we normally had a budget of about \$50,000 to \$60,000 but we reduced it for the monies received earlier. In disbursements, we saved money on tax prep fees, saved about \$565. Overall, the budget we thought was going to be deficit. Kevin Robling asked in executive committee how we thought we were right now given

we are six months into the year, so I did ask for updates from Cindy Delaney as well as looking at some of these other categories, like travel, we are probably not going to spend those. The bottom line is I think we will end up at break-even and won't see the deficit. The two major reasons for that is we are not going to have Cindy's expenses that we would have had if we had an in-person conference, like rooms, food and beverages and savings on travel. Looking at 2022 proposed budget, we have historical numbers for reference, 2019 actual, 2020 actual, 2021 budget and actual proposed budget amount. The far column on the right tells us where we got those numbers. We picked the best number we thought we could from prior years with a few exceptions to that. First is sponsors, we are estimating that, the last time we had an in-person conference was 2019, took in \$65,000 for sponsors. We know some of our sponsors were hit negatively by COVID so we are pulling back on that. We feel it will be closer to \$56,000. Membership dues, consumer price index (CPI) increased by 1.19%. If you approve this budget, 2022 membership dues will be \$4,160.02 for state and provinces will be \$110.22 for an increase of roughly 1.2%. Everything else on the budget side is pretty much historical. Budget for receipts is \$165,209. On disbursements side, the first line, Delaney coordinator fees, this is the change the executive committee made, I had a number based on historical numbers but the contract is for a much lower number, \$4,120 so we used contract amount. The rest of these are historical numbers. For executive secretary pay increasing by CPI, treasurer pay adjusted based on March 12, 2021 executive committee action, about a \$3,000 increase. Line 26 is contract manager, this is the \$8,000 we talked about earlier, 200 hours at \$40 per hour. The CPA audit is on a five-year cycle, so we won't have it until 2025. Also, we paid three years of insurance, so nothing for that. Overall, we think our disbursements will be \$159,600, receipts will exceed by \$5,600. *Warnke* – Looks like good solid budget. *Eichinger* – A word of congratulations for Roger, Ollie and others. It has been difficult in the last year to try and project revenues and expenses. My hats off to Roger and Ollie and the rest of the team for bringing us budgets that are in balance against a whole bunch of uncertainties. Thanks. ***Brad Loveless, Kansas moved to accept budget, Kevin Robling, South Dakota second. Motion passes.***

Save the Date

Kevin Robling, South Dakota – We are finally here. Look forward to meeting in person. I think everyone is zoomed-out we have all had our fair share of virtual meetings. It will be exciting to meet in person at Custer State Park. Cool things about South Dakota, we do shoot and eat our state bird, we are the only state that does that. We have more shoreline miles than Florida. In all reality it will be a good time, Custer SP is beautiful and people are flocking there like we have never seen before. I just got a text message from our parks manager out there and he said it was 200 cars deep on wildlife loop road, jam-packed. Incredible, as far as visitation goes, we have about 2.5 million visitors there a year. We will have a great time, great meeting, great fellowship, great scenery and great activities after work gets done. I had staff put together this video, it was done all in-house and they did an awesome job (South Dakota Spotlight Video 2022). We are looking forward to having everybody, bring your families, book early and extend your stay. Everyone will

enjoy it, a lot to see and do. *Warnke* – Looking forward to it and I am in on trout fishing, so save me a spot.

Conference Adjourns

Warnke – Thanks to sponsors, Delaney Meeting Event Management, wonderfully done via Zoom. We have to meet in person next year. Thanks for sticking with it, we had a productive meeting, enjoyed seeing everyone's face but look forward to seeing you in person next year. ***Kendra Wecker, Ohio moved to adjourn, Dan Eichinger, Michigan second. Meeting adjourned at 12:57 pm.***



MIDWEST

Association of
Fish & Wildlife
Agencies

®

TREASURER'S REPORT

January 1, 2021 through December 31, 2021

June 28, 2022

MIDWEST ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES

Table of Contents

June 28, 2022

Account Balance Summary.....	1
Banking Services - River Region Credit Union Account.....	2
Banking Services - Conservation Employees Credit Union Account.....	3
Conference Account Summary.....	4
Southern Wings Account Summary.....	5
Federal Account Summary.....	6
Share Account Summary.....	7
Money Market and Securities Account Summary.....	8
Conservation Enhancement Account Summary at the Credit Union.....	9
Conservation Enhancement Account Summary at the Broker.....	10
Conservation Enhancement Fund - Assets and Designations.....	10

**MIDWEST ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES
ACCOUNT BALANCE SUMMARY**

	As of December 31		
	2020	Change	2021
MAFWA Accounts			
Banking Services-River Region CU	\$0.00	\$151,292.13	\$151,292.13
Banking Services-Conservation CU	137,671.61	(47,405.57)	90,266.04
Conference	105,247.72	64,269.03	169,516.75
Southern Wings	33.44	3.10	36.54
Federal Grant	10,330.95	49.43	10,380.38
Credit Union Share Account	25.97	0.12	26.09
Money Market & Securities Account	796,224.47	105,066.27	901,290.74
Total MAFWA Accounts	\$1,049,534.16	\$273,274.51	\$1,322,808.67
 Conservation Enhancement Fund (CEF) Accounts			
CEF Credit Union Checking Account	\$7,311.92	\$16,536.75	\$23,848.67
CEF Credit Union Share Account	75,503.68	(14,799.21)	60,704.47
CEF Funds Held at the Broker	6,282.26	793.17	7,075.43
Total CEF Accounts	\$89,097.86	\$2,530.71	\$91,628.57
 Total MAFWA and CEF Accounts	 \$1,138,632.02	 \$275,805.22	 \$1,414,437.24

Note: Designations of the account balances are shown on the detail pages and are an integral part of this report.

**MIDWEST ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES
CALENDAR YEAR 2021 CASH FLOW SUMMARY
BANKING SERVICES - RIVER REGION CREDIT UNION ACCOUNT**

Line #			
1	Balance as of January 1, 2021		\$0.00
	Receipts		
2	National Pheasant Coordinator Contributions	\$91,255.00	
3	Transfer from Banking Services-Conservation CU Account :		
4	Monarch/Pollinator or Landscape Conser. Efforts	20,604.94	
5	National Pheasant Plan Coordinator Contributions	74,535.57	
6	Interest	<u>334.09</u>	
7	Total Receipts		186,729.60
	Disbursements		
8	Pheasants Forever - National Pheasant Coordinator	\$35,357.47	
9	Communications Software for Midwest Landscape Initiative Project	<u>80.00</u>	
10	Total Disbursements		<u>35,437.47</u>
11	Balance as of December 31, 2021		\$151,292.13
12	* Note: Designations of the ending balance are:		
13	\$20,524.94	Designated for MAFWA Monarch/Pollinator or Landscape Conservation Efforts	
14	<u>129,808.10</u>	National Pheasant Plan Coordinator Contributions	
15	<u>\$150,333.04</u>	Total Designations of the Banking Services-River Region CU Account	

**MIDWEST ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES
CALENDAR YEAR 2021 CASH FLOW SUMMARY
BANKING SERVICES - CONSERVATION EMPLOYEES CREDIT UNION ACCOUNT**

Line #			
1	Balance as of January 1, 2021		\$137,671.61
	Receipts		
2	Conservation Leaders for Tomorrow (CLT) Contributions	\$44,687.50	
3	National Pheasant Coordinator Contributions	21,375.00	
4	Ohio Projects	135,000.00	
5	Interest	<u>174.41</u>	
6	Total Receipts		201,236.91
	Disbursements		
7	Conservation Leaders for Tomorrow (CLT)	\$44,687.50	
8	Pheasants Forever - National Pheasant Coordinator	\$2,995.93	
9	Ohio Projects	55,538.71	
10	Communications Software for Midwest Landscape Initiative Project	279.83	
11	Transfer to Banking Services - River Region Account :		
12	Monarch/Pollinator or Landscape Conser. Efforts	20,604.94	
13	National Pheasant Plan Coordinator Contributions	<u>74,535.57</u>	
14	Total Disbursements		<u>248,642.48</u>
15	Balance as of December 31, 2021		\$90,266.04 *
16	* Note: Designations of the ending balance are:		
17		<u>\$79,461.29</u>	Ohio Projects
18		<u>\$79,461.29</u>	Total Designations of the Banking Services-Conservation CU Account

**MIDWEST ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES
CALENDAR YEAR 2021 CASH FLOW SUMMARY
CONFERENCE ACCOUNT**

Line #			
1	Balance as of January 1, 2021		\$105,247.72
	Receipts		
	Conference		
2	Sponsors	\$35,988.30	
3	Registrations	4,800.00	
4	Total Conference Receipts	<u>\$40,788.30</u>	
5	Affiliate Dues	1,125.00	
6	Membership Dues	57,912.45	
	Administrative/Banking Fees		
7	Southern Wings	500.00	
8	National Pheasant Coordinator	5,270.00	
9	Ohio Projects	7,105.25	
10	Indirect Cost - US Fish & Wildlife Service	35,760.75	
11	Conservation Leaders for Tomorrow (CLFT)	2,351.99	
12	2021 Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference	3,129.00	
13	Interest	105.09	
14		<u>Total Receipts</u>	154,047.83
	Disbursements		
	Conference		
15	Delaney Meeting and Event Management	\$9,965.38	
16	Credit Card Fees	486.74	
17	Virtual Meeting Platform	2,099.00	
18	Prizes and Awards	1,038.31	
19	Total Conference Disbursements	<u>\$13,589.43</u>	
	Executive Secretary		
20	Pay	\$3,141.25	
21	Travel Reimbursements/Registration Fees	1,841.12	
	Treasurer		
22	Pay	18,539.40	
23	Travel Reimbursements/Registration Fees	475.00	
24	Insurance		
25	Tax Form Preparation	1,110.00	
26	Web Site Maintenance	458.86	
27	North Central Section of the Wildlife Society	250.00	
28	Miscellaneous	373.74	
29		<u>Total Disbursements</u>	89,778.80
30	Balance as of December 31, 2021		<u>\$169,516.75</u>

**MIDWEST ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES
 CALENDAR YEAR 2021 CASH FLOW SUMMARY
 SOUTHERN WINGS ACCOUNT**

Line #			
1	Balance as of January 1, 2021		\$33.44
	Receipts		
2	Contributions	\$9,500.00	
3	Interest	<u>3.10</u>	
4	Total Receipts		9,503.10
	Disbursements		
5	American Bird Conservancy	<u>\$9,500.00</u>	
6	Total Disbursements		<u>9,500.00</u>
7	Balance as of December 31, 2021		\$36.54

**MIDWEST ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES
CALENDAR YEAR 2021 CASH FLOW SUMMARY
FEDERAL GRANT ACCOUNT**

Line #

1	Balance as of January 1, 2021		\$10,330.95
	Receipts		
2	Federal Reimbursements - USFWS	\$453,474.05	
3	Interest	<u>49.43</u>	
4	Total Receipts		453,523.48
	Disbursements		
	State Liaison		
5	Pay	\$69,495.09	
6	Travel Reimbursements/Registration Fees	750.00	
	Technical Coordinator		
7	Pay	88,121.28	
8	Travel Reimbursements/Registration Fees	680.00	
9	Midwest Landscape Initiative (MLI):		
	Web Site	8,880.00	
10	Other Disbursements	128,153.11	
11	R3 - Evaluation Project	6,345.01	
12	R3 - Toolkit Project	151,003.99	
13	Miscellaneous Expenses	<u>45.57</u>	
14	Total Disbursements		<u>453,474.05</u>
15	Balance as of December 31, 2021		\$10,380.38

**MIDWEST ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES
 CALENDAR YEAR 2021 CASH FLOW SUMMARY
 CREDIT UNION SHARE ACCOUNT**

Line #			
1	Balance as of January 1, 2021		\$25.97
	Receipts		
2	Interest	<u>\$0.12</u>	
3	Total Receipts		0.12
	Disbursements		
4	Total Disbursements		<u>-</u>
5	Balance as of December 31, 2021		\$26.09

**MIDWEST ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES
CALENDAR YEAR 2021 ACCOUNT SUMMARY
MONEY MARKET AND SECURITIES ACCOUNT**

Line #

1	Balance as of January 1, 2021	\$796,224.47
---	-------------------------------	--------------

Receipts

2	Interest	\$14,119.52	
3	Dividends	8,128.78	
4	Capital Gains	<u>33,084.77</u>	
5	Total Receipts		55,333.07

Disbursements

6	Funds Withdrawn/Swept	<u>\$39,563.68</u>	
7	Total Disbursements		39,563.68

8	Change in Market Value	<u>89,296.88</u>
---	------------------------	------------------

9	Balance as of December 31, 2021	\$901,290.74
---	---------------------------------	--------------

**MIDWEST ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES
CALENDAR YEAR 2021 ACCOUNT SUMMARY
CONSERVATION ENHANCEMENT FUND (CEF)
HELD AT THE CREDIT UNION**

CEF - Credit Union Checking Account
--

Line #		
1	Balance as of January 1, 2021	\$7,311.92
	Receipts	
2	2021 Midwest Fish & Wildlife Conference - MN	\$90,201.04
	Transfer from Share Account - See Below	15,000.00
3	Interest	36.75
4	Total Receipts	<u>105,237.79</u>
	Disbursements	
5	MN Chapter of the American Fisheries Society	\$22,045.53
6	MN Chapter of The Wildlife Society	22,144.17
7	North Central Div. of American Fisheries Society	13,191.17
8	North Central Sec. of The Wildlife Society	13,191.17
9	2022 Midwest Fish & Wildlife Confe.-IA-Deposit	15,000.00
10	MAFWA Admin. Fee-To Conference Acct-Pg. 4	3,129.00
11	Total Disbursements	<u>88,701.04</u>
12	Balance as of December 31, 2021	\$23,848.67

CEF - Credit Union Share Account

Line #		
13	Balance as of January 1, 2021	\$75,503.68
	Receipts	
14	Interest	\$200.79
15	Total Receipts	<u>200.79</u>
	Disbursements	
16	Transfer to CEF Checking Account (See Above)	\$15,000.00
17	Total Disbursements	<u>\$15,000.00</u>
18	Balance as of December 31, 2021	\$60,704.47

Note: See next page for CEF account designations.

**MIDWEST ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES
CALENDAR YEAR 2021 ACCOUNT SUMMARY
CONSERVATION ENHANCEMENT FUND (CEF)**

CEF - BROKER ACCOUNT

Line #			
1	Balance as of January 1, 2021		\$6,282.26
	Receipts		
2	Dividends	\$80.14	
3	Capital Gains	335.44	
4	Total Receipts	<u>415.58</u>	\$415.58
	Disbursements		
	Funds Withdrawn/Swept	\$465.49	
5	Total Disbursements	<u>465.49</u>	465.49
6	Change in market value		<u>843.08</u>
7	Balance as of December 31, 2021		\$7,075.43

CONSERVATION ENHANCEMENT FUND SUMMARY

8	Assets		
9	Credit Union Checking Account		\$23,848.67
10	Credit Union Share Account		60,704.47
11	Receivables - Deposits/Start Up Funds Paid by CEF:		
12	2022 Midwest F&W Conference - IA	\$16,000.00	
13	Total Receivables		16,000.00
14	Broker Account		7,075.43
15	Total Assets		<u>\$107,628.57</u>
16	Designations:		
17	Kansas - 2012 Midwest Fish & Wildlife Conference		\$22,471.61
18	Ohio - 2019 Midwest Fish & Wildlife Conference		15,482.38
19	Kansas Staff to Iowa Conference		4,500.00
20	State Contributions to the Conservation Enhancement Fund		55,000.00
21	CEF Operating Funds		2,740.00
22	Total Designations		<u>\$100,194.19</u>
23	Undesignated		<u>\$7,434.38</u>

CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS



MIDWEST ASSOCIATION OF FISH & WILDLIFE AGENCIES

JULY, 202~~1~~2

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 Association established a foundation, Conservation Enhancement Fund (Fund), to be organized and operated as a 501 (c) 3 charitable, educational and scientific corporation.

The Association and Fund were incorporated in the State of Kansas on August 19, 2005. The Association and 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 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. If 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. All Board members are required to annually sign a conflict of interest and compensation policy form.

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.

Section 4. The Treasurer, Executive Secretary, Recording Secretary and contractors are

required to annually sign a confidentiality form.

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:

- (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 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.
- (2) Establish and have access to Association 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) 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.
- (8) Develop, present and oversee budgets, accounts and financial statements and reports and present such records for auditing purposes.
- (9) Ensure that appropriate accounting procedures and controls are in place and comply with the Associations' Internal Controls for Cash Policy.
- (10) Serve as liaison with any staff and volunteers about Association and Fund

financial matters.

- (11) 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.
- (12) Ensure independent examination or audits are executed and any recommendations are implemented; provide report of results at the regular annual meeting.
- (13) 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 \$~~4,160.023,800~~ per member state and \$~~110.22100~~ 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, 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 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 semi-annually and report the result of its audit at the annual regular meeting. An external audit by a CPA firm approved by the Executive Committee shall be conducted every five years.
- 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 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 meeting.
- H. The Midwest Landscape Initiative Steering Committee shall be comprised of five Directors and three senior representatives from the US Fish and Wildlife Service in the MAFWA region. The Midwest Landscape Initiative is a collaboration of partners engaged in the conservation and management of fish and wildlife in the Midwest; it serves as forum to identify shared landscape-scale priorities and co-develop effective conservation actions to address them. The Steering Committee may include ex officio members and may form subcommittees, working groups, teams, or other collaborative approaches to aid in the development and implementation of effective conservation solutions for shared priorities.

G-I.

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. The Association recognizes the following Ad Hoc Committees:

Feral Swine (established in 2013)

Chronic Wasting Disease (establish in 2021)

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 (202~~5~~²)

~~National Conservation Need (NCN) Committee (2023)~~

Midwest Private Lands Wildlife Management Group (2024)

Midwest Public Lands Technical Working Committee (202~~5~~²)

Midwest Wildlife and Fish Health Committee (202~~5~~²)

Midwest Deer and Wild Turkey Study Group (2023)

Association of Midwest Fish and Game Law Enforcement Officers (2023)

Midwest Furbearer Group (2024)

Wildlife Diversity Committee (2024)

Hunter and Angler Recruitment and Retention Technical Working Group (2023)

~~Social Science/Human Dimensions Committee (2024)~~

ARTICLE XII

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
Amended June 27, 2018
Amended June 26, 2019
Amended October 8, 2020
Amended June 30, 2021
Amended June 30, 2022

|

DRAFT

|

..

**SUPPORT FOR ADDED STAFF CAPACITY AND RESOURCES TO RESPOND TO
FISH AND WILDLIFE HEALTH THREATS**

WHEREAS, health threats that can adversely impact fish and wildlife populations continue to expand across the United States and Canada, including chronic wasting disease, viral hemorrhagic septicemia, epizootic hemorrhagic disease, and white nose syndrome; and

WHEREAS, new zoonotic diseases have emerged, including highly pathogenic avian influenza and SARS-CoV-2, that affect humans as well as wild and domestic animal populations, and concerns are heightened over disease reservoirs and the role wildlife may play in future pandemics; and

WHEREAS, the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (MAFWA) States and Provinces are concerned that fish and wildlife agencies lack the capacity to respond adequately to these health threats due to a lack of staff capacity; and

WHEREAS, federal dollars have recently become available to support wildlife agencies working on chronic wasting disease and zoonotic disease threats; and

WHEREAS, the MAFWA States and Provinces see increased funding as pivotal opportunities for wildlife agencies to invest resources on establishing or expanding fish and wildlife health programs to meet the increasing demand for subject matter expertise, surveillance and sampling capacity, stakeholder engagement and public outreach on key disease issues

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Directors at its annual meeting in Custer State Park, South Dakota on June 30, 2022 support the need to invest resources into expanding fish and wildlife health programs in their States and Provinces.

ANNUAL MEETING, JUNE 27-30, 2022, CUSTER STATE PARK, SOUTH DAKOTA

WHEREAS, South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks has so efficiently and enthusiastically organized and conducted the 2022 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies after a 2-year COVID-19 delay; and

WHEREAS, Secretary Kevin Robling and staff have worked together with local and national conservation partners making all the participants welcome; and

WHEREAS, the members of the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies wish to express their gratitude for all the collaborative efforts of South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies at its annual meeting in Custer State Park, South Dakota, on June 30, 2022, acknowledges the hard work and hospitality of Secretary Robling and his staff from the Great State of South Dakota, and hereby passes this resolution in a showing of great appreciation.

MAFWA Award Winners:

**2022 MAFWA
Fisheries Biologist of the Year
Matthew Mitro, Ph.D., WI**

**2022 MAFWA
Law Enforcement Officer of the Year
Bruce Nachtigall, SD**

**2022 MAFWA
Wildlife Biologist of the Year
Zack Couch, KY**

**2022 MAFWA
Spirit of the Shack
Mike Hubbard, Ph.D., MO**

**2022 MAFWA
Excellence in Conservation
South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks Habitat and Access**

**2022 MAFWA
Special Recognition
Charlie Wooley
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service**

**2022 MAFWA
Special Recognition
Ed Boggess
Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies**

**2022 MAFWA
Special Recognition
Becky Humphries
National Wild Turkey Federation**

**2022 MAFWA
Special Recognition
Howard K. Vincent
Pheasants Forever**

**2022 MAFWA
Past President
Keith Warnke, Wisconsin**