

FINAL
Joint Federal/State Task Force on Federal Assistance Policy (JTF)
Meeting: June 25-27, 2012
Location: Alyeska Hotel, Alaska

JTF Cochairs: Kelly Hepler (ADFG) and Hannibal Bolton (USFWS)
AFWA Contact: Michael Marcum, AFWA, Multistate Conservation Grants Coordinator
USFWS Contact: Joyce Johnson, Special Assistant for Program Development and Analysis
JTF Members: Tom Barnes, Gary Armstrong, Mike Piccirilli, Lisa Evans, John Organ, Wayne MacCallum, Steve Barton, Jon Gassett, John Frampton, Larry Voyles, and Joyce Johnson, Absent: Stephen Guertin and Curtis Taylor.
Legal Counsel: Carol Bambery and Larry Mellinger
Guests: Amy Pinney and Larry Boyle from AG&F; Tim Smith and Sara Simrell from Paladin Data Systems; and Doug Alcorn and Steve Klein from R7, USFWS,

Monday June 25

1. **Welcome to Alaska and Introductory Remarks (8:15am)** – Bolton/Hepler
2. **Summary/Status of Actions Taken from January 2012 meeting** – Johnson
 - **Action Item:** Dan Hogan and the TRACS Outreach Committee will give a presentation about TRACS during several AFWA committee meetings during the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference in Atlanta, Georgia. **ACTION COMPLETED.**
 - **Action Item:** Michael Marcum will email the TRACS PowerPoint presentation to the JTF members. **ACTION COMPLETED.**
 - **Action Item:** JTF will investigate capability of providing a clearinghouse of planned state activities to celebrate the 75th Anniversary that would be accessible by the Regions and state agencies. Joyce will follow-up with Christina Zarrella Milloy by end of February. **ACTION COMPLETED.** The WSFR 75th Anniversary Web site currently has this capability and links to state and industry events.
 - **Action Item:** Michael Marcum will e-mail Mark Duda's recent hunting and shooting sports participation report ~~out~~ to the JTF members. **ACTION COMPLETED.**
 - **Action Item:** John Organ will solicit examples from Regions and Lisa Evans will solicit examples of grants that have not initially been approved from states by the

end of February. John and Lisa will meet during the North American conference and draft white paper for JTF June discussion. **ACTION COMPLETED** – Topic on JTF agenda.

- **Action Item:** Discussion About Email from Brian Bohnsack: Mike P. will follow-up with state (Louisiana). **ACTION COMPLETED** –Topic on JTF Agenda.
- **Action Item:** The JTF needs input and hard data from states relative to eligibility of boating access funds for nonmotorized boats. The JTF will discuss it by conference call. Then, the JTF will share input with the Sportfishing and Boating Partnership Council. **ACTION COMPLETED** – A survey of states was completed. Topic on the JTF agenda.
- **Action Item:** Appoint an Ad Hoc work group to work with WSFR Lands Team. **ACTION POSTPONED.** Need to assess the viability/practicality given the current status of the Lands Chapters.
- **Action Item:** JTF will solicit topics from the states and Regional offices regarding issues that the JTF should work on in the future. “Can license revenue and grant funds be used for wildlife damage and predator control?”; “Defining ‘Technical assistance’ and designating it in 50 CFR 80 as an eligible activity”; and “Redefine capital improvement” will go onto a list accompanying the Letter from the Director and AFWA President before the North American Conference. **ACTION NOT COMPLETED PRIOR TO THE NORTH AMERICAN.** Topic on the JTF Agenda.
- **Action Item:** Solicit input relating to the License issue discussed during the small group discussions and prepare a letter from the Cochairs to AFWA’s President Jon Gasset. A copy will be sent to AFWA’s Executive Director Ron Regan. This letter will be discussed as a part of the JTF update during the Trust Funds Committee meeting and Hunting & Shooting Sports Participation Committee meetings during North American Wildlife Conference. **ACTION PENDING.** License issues on the JTF Agenda for further discussion.

3. **WSFR 75th Anniversary Update** – Frampton

- This program continues to be the foundation of the work being done by all state fish and wildlife agencies. We have many good resources to explain the importance of WSFR but we need to do a better job spreading this message.
- Bass Pro will be highlighting the WSFR 75th Anniversary celebration in their fall catalogue. This catalogue will reach out to millions of hunters, shooters, anglers, and boaters. John Frampton has also been in contact with Cabela’s for a similar marketing opportunity.

- The WSFR 75th Anniversary message will be visible at the upcoming ICAST meeting, MAFWA meeting, SEAFWA, WAFWA meeting, and AFWA annual meeting.
- John has applied for a Multistate Grant for 3 years of funding for continued coordination of celebrating the WSFR program beyond this year.
- States are placing WSFR 75th Anniversary ads in magazines and brochures. Advertising postcards are also available for distribution.
- The plenary session during the AFWA Annual Meeting will bring together the four major trade groups (NSSF, ASA, NMMA, ATA) and will focus on WSFR funding and the importance of the excise tax to the future of hunting/angling. Theme will be enhancing the WSFR partnership between industry, state agencies, NGOs, constituents.
- John and the WSFR 75th Anniversary Work Group is working to get all of the governors and state general assemblies to sign on to a proclamation about the value of WSFR and its role in the future relationship between states, industry, NGOs, and constituents.
- There is an option to continue using the modern “75th Anniversary” logo beyond this year. But it’s expensive to change from the older, more established logo.

4. Use of Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration logo

What do states need to do to use 75th Anniversary Logo and the SFR/WR logos (50 CFR 80.99)?

- The regulations provide guidance for use of the WSFR logos.
- In the regulations, the logo says Sport Fish and Wildlife Restoration. All program guidelines, however, say Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration. We should try to maintain some consistency.
- States are authorized to use the logo and do not have to ask permission to use the logo. However, non-states have to get permission.
- Previous rule on logo use delegation of authority: The regulation at 50 CFR 80.100 provides that the approval of the Director or a Regional Director is necessary in some circumstances to display the distinctive symbols of the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Acts.
- 50 CFR 80.100 says:
 - (a) An agency [State fish and wildlife agency] may display the appropriate symbol(s) on:

- (1) Areas such as wildlife management areas, shooting ranges, and sportfishing and boating-access facilities that were acquired, developed, operated, or maintained with funds authorized by the Acts; and
- (2) Printed or Web-based material or other visual representations of project accomplishments. ...
- (c) The Director or Regional Director may authorize an agency to use the symbols in a manner other than as described in paragraph (a) of this section.
- (d) The Director or Regional Director may authorize other persons, organizations, agencies, or governments to use the symbols for purposes related to the Acts by entering into a written agreement with the user. ...
- (g) No one may use any of the symbols in any other manner unless the Director or Regional Director authorizes it. ...

Streamlining the process for others (delegating authority?) – Frampton/Barnes

- **Proposed new rulemaking:** Would give USFWS Director authority to delegate authority as described at 50 CFR 80.100 to the Assistant Director of the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program (AD-WSFR). Also, it would clarify that the AD-WSFR, at his or her discretion, may dispense with the written agreement as described at paragraph (d). In its place, the AD-WSFR may use informal written communication, such as e-mail, to authorize use of the symbols under paragraphs (c), (d), and (g).
- This new rulemaking would delegate authority to WSFR Assistant Director to provide discretionary approval when someone requests to use the logo, would allow for a more informal logo use request process (e.g., a formal written request would not be required; an email request would be acceptable), and would make it clear that states do not have to seek approval to use the logo.

Small Group Discussion:

- Topics for small group discussion:
 1. Logo – when can it be used? Also, can a non-federal logo be used to solve our mutual concerns?
 2. Hold harmless requirement in federal regulations.
 3. Give Tom Barnes some guidance on the memo.
 4. Whichever logo we decide to use, we need to make sure everyone is comfortable using it.
- Goal of small group: Discuss need for non-federal logo, delegation, online disclaimer. Appoint someone to oversee this.

- Most streamlined approach: classify a group of people that have blanket authority to use the logo.
- Issue a memo from the Director to Regions with some level of blanket approval authority to State Directors, if possible.

5. **Hunting and Fishing License Certification:**

- **Follow-up on state license fees eligible for state tax rebate (LA) – Piccirilli**
 - Mike Piccirilli checked with state of Louisiana and determined that rebates going back to military personnel are coming through the Department of Revenue. The military personnel gets a tax credit after buying a full price hunting and fishing license. This was considered a good example of a clean way for the state to ‘buy’ licenses.
- **Participation Rates as a PR-DJ apportionment measure – Piccirilli**
 - **White Paper Provided: Background:** This issue focuses on the 50 CFR 80.31 Formulas for the Annual Certification of Paid License Holders, and the Calculation of State Apportionments of Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (WR) and Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (SFR) Fund. Georgia is concerned that rules in 50 CFR 80 used to determine the number of “certified” participants for annual WR and SFR apportionments do not accurately represent the intent of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669-669i; 50 Stat.917, as amended) and the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777-777k, 64 Stat. 430, as amended). Georgia supposes the intent of these acts is to count persons willing to pay for a license because they are truly participating and paying federal excise funds into these accounts through their purchases and activities.
 - Recent trends are to increase certification by developing creative strategies independent of user decisions that indicate intent to participate or contribute to the accounts. Current rules allow states to use strategies that count privilege holders rather than participants – state license strategies may force persons to purchase unwanted hunting or fishing licenses along with a needed privilege without the option to purchase desired single privileges at lower cost.
 - A comparison of certification data with the *2006 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation (2006 Survey)* may be an indicator of the resulting problems - 30 States have hunting license certifications that exceed their annual hunting participation and 16 States have fishing license certifications that exceed their annual fishing participation.
 - Many states are certifying more than 100 percent of estimated participants.

Although the 2006 Survey and national certification totals for states are about equal for hunters, certification percentages reported by states range from about 50 percent to over 200 percent when compared to the 2006 Survey. For anglers, percentages reported by states vary greatly from less than 50 percent to over 150 percent. Considering that virtually every state offers free licenses to certain individuals and free licenses lower reported certification compared to participation, expected percentages should be less than 100 percent (without other valid explanations).

- The Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669-669i; 50 Stat.917, as amended) and the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777-777k, 64 Stat. 430, as amended) are a means to collect federal excise tax funds from hunting and angling participants, and equitably apportion these federal funds back to states based on land area and participants. When these laws were passed, the best method for determining participants contributing tax funds to these accounts was to count holders of paid hunting and fishing licenses. This supposes persons willing to pay for a license are truly participating and paying federal excise funds into these accounts through their purchases and activities. Excise tax funds are distributed on an annual basis, and these acts require an annual count of corresponding paid license holders (participants). This simple concept has been complicated by state strategies to inflate the number of privilege holders even if these privilege holders are not participants, and by the August 1, 2011 regulations in 50 Part 80 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) that allows these strategies (titled *Financial Assistance: Wildlife Restoration, Sport Fish Restoration, Hunter Education and Safety*, in particular 50 CFR 80.31, 50 CFR 80.33; 50 CFR 80.35; and, 50 CFR 80.36). These regulations encourage state strategies to maximize privilege holders beyond participation, allow states to count persons that have not personally paid for a license, and preclude states from counting actively engaged paid license holders.
- **Issue 1:** Should there be a closer relationship between hunting participation and certified license sales? Margin of error is greater for survey of participants than for census of certified license holders.

Potential JTF Action: JTF could require surveys to determine actual hunting and fishing participants when privilege buyers cannot purchase single-privilege lower cost licenses, or privilege buyers receive unwanted bundled hunting and fishing privileges with park entrance passes or other required purchases;

- **Issue 2:** Combination license issues: Individuals are forced to purchase a license that they do not want. States should be able to survey constituents. When a state does not offer anything other than a combination license, the license certifications should not exceed their annual fishing participation.

Potential JTF Action: JTF could work to develop a process for decoupling state license year from federal certification reporting year and counting all paid license holders during a certification

period so that 365 day license states and license year states are on equal footing and neither are disadvantaged.

- **Issue 3:** Changing the regulations:

Potential JTF Action: JTF could provide assistance in changing the rules so that a state may not pay itself and count free privileges for persons that may not be true participants.

- The State fish and wildlife directors have a vested interest to maintain the integrity of the system which could be called into question when state fish and wildlife agencies begin taking advantage of the system.
- JTF and/or AFWA needs to respond to this issue. There needs to be a level playing field for all states. Any “fix” proposed by the states through AFWA Executive Committee will be vetted through the JTF.
- What is the JTF’s role?

ACTION ITEM: JTF members will draft a letter from JTF to Georgia (Carol Bambery, Larry Voyles, Mike Piccirilli) regarding concerns raised by Georgia about state actions that create an uneven playing field for all state fish and wildlife agencies.

- **50 CFR 80 - Continuation of discussion on Certification of Paid License Holders – Barton/Barnes**
 - To avoid the need for constant regulation changes and potential state law changes, Larry Voyles and Jon Gassett will work with Dan Forster to establish a subcommittee under AFWA’s Executive Committee to consider issues about leveling the playing field regarding state actions that take advantage of the system. JTF will create rules of practice regarding how it wishes to implement the recommendations of AFWA’s Executive Committee.

6. **Hunter and Aquatic Resources Education:**

- **Eligibility of hunter and angler recruitment/retention – Use of Wildlife Restoration subaccounts: 1) Wildlife Restoration (Section 4a), 2) Basic Hunter Education and Safety (Section 4c) and 3) Enhanced Hunter Education and Safety (Section 10) – follow-up from previous JTF meetings - Evans/Organ**
 - Issues were raised at JTF two years ago.
 - Several states want to use regular hunter education dollars (rather than enhanced section 10 funding for hunter safety) to fund National Archery in the Schools Program (NASP).

- If we want to use broader funding to include skills development, we must go through the appropriate process (i.e., add something to the Sportsmen's Amendment currently in Congress).
- Programs must be able to show a nexus to hunting to receive Section 4(c) money.
- There is a need to make changes because a larger percentage of PR money is coming from shooters than hunters.
- In terms of a national scope, the NASP is generally not eligible for Section 4(c) money because the program does not include a significant nexus to hunting. However, some Regional or state specific NASPs have included a nexus to hunting which makes them eligible for Section 4(c) money.
- If more NASPs were tweaked to show a significant nexus to hunting, they could be eligible for Section 4(c) money. Perhaps these programs should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
- **Group Discussion:** This issue could be further discussed by a small group. This group will discuss clarifications or potential changes to the regulations. In addition to NASPs, this issue also involves shooting clays. (John Gassett, Lisa Evans, Gary Armstrong, John Organ). What is the best delivery method to achieve consistency?

Consideration for the Small Group: Consider the importance of introductory shooting programs as a tool for hunter recruitment and possibly tie it back to conservation education best practices. Existing regulation (50 CFR 80.50(b)) on 4(c) includes language that speaks to teaching skills as well as language that speaks to "necessary to be a responsible hunter" which creates an ambiguity in the regulation.

ACTION ITEM: Small group will report back to JTF in early August.

- **Renaming of Section 4 and Section 10 programs** - 2011 Final Apportionment changes that were not discussed with JTF – Frampton
 - Some concerns that this has not been vetted by the JTF. However, no comments were submitted for clarification regarding renaming Section 4 and Section 10 programs.
 - Concerns that calling it Section 4 and Section 10 does not provide any guidance regarding what the money can be used for. Also, what does "enhanced" mean as it relates to hunter education? Committee comments

indicate that Section 10 money enhances hunter education beyond the funding provided by Section 4(c).

- **Hunter Education Programs and TRACS** – has there been dialogue with Hunter Education Program Coordinators/Instructors – Frampton
 - We need to let Hunter Education Coordinators/Instructors know if implementing TRACS means they will have additional responsibilities.
 - Under TRACS, grant reporting will change but will probably not include any additional work for the coordinators/instructors.

7. Excise Tax Status - Barton

- PR Estimate for FY12: \$533 million. In FY11, it was \$484.8 million.
- SFR Estimate for FY12: \$621.5 million compared to \$626 million in FY11.

8. Tracking and Reporting Actions for the Conservation of Species (TRACS):

- **TRACS Electronic Data Collection** - Proposed 50 CFR 75 and interim measures to address WSFR grant program needs - Barton/Barnes
 - Data TRACS release still on schedule. But full implementation has been delayed from October 2012 to January 2013.
 - USFWS will be focusing on its training program for TRACS to aid in the implementation of public TRACS.
 - Wildlife Tracking and Reporting for the Conservation of Species (Wildlife TRACS) Regulations and associated actions.
 - We will propose the use of Wildlife TRACS for performance reporting in all WSFR-administered grant programs effective January 1, 2013. We will request OMB approval for the information collection and give guidance to WSFR Regional Offices.
 - The DOI has adopted a new financial and business management system (FBMS). It replaces FAIMS for financial reporting, but FAIMS will remain active for performance reporting through December 31, 2012.

PROCESS:

- 1. OMB Information Collection** – We currently have OMB approval for collection of information for performance reports. We will request approval for the additional information collection, such as State Wildlife Grant effectiveness measures and electronic reporting, to be

collected using Wildlife TRACS. This process requires us to publish notices and request public comments in the Federal Register.

2. **Rulemaking** – We will eventually propose general administrative requirements at 50 CFR 75 for WSFR-administered grant programs. We plan to start this process in 2012 by addressing only the use of Wildlife TRACS for performance reports. The rulemaking process gives States the opportunity to review and comment on the draft rule before we publish a Final Rule.
3. **Director’s Memorandum/Request for Application and Grant Award Conditions** – We want applicants to be aware, and grantees to comply with the requirements to use Wildlife TRACS. Currently, we plan to draft a memorandum for the Director to send to WSFR Regional Offices instructing them to include specific language in all Requests for Applications and grant awards for 2013 funding. These notices and award conditions will implement Wildlife TRACS requirements until we publish the final rule.

ISSUES: We will propose that States, tribes, Commonwealths, territories, the District of Columbia, and other grantees use Wildlife TRACS for performance reporting. States currently send in performance reports to Regional WSFR Offices, and Federal staff review the reports, select information, and enter summary data in FAIMS. The process is inefficient and can result in misinterpretation.

Burden: Some States have voiced concern that requiring information to be entered directly into Wildlife TRACS is a burden on their staff. We are confident that once we have the opportunity to train State staff, reporting will be more efficient for both Federal and State employees. The performance information entered directly into TRACS by State staffs is expected to replace hard copy performance reporting documents.

Waivers and Exemptions: Small tribes and other entities may not have the technological resources to access and support Wildlife TRACS. The proposed rule will authorize waivers for entities that can demonstrate their inability to use Wildlife TRACS effectively.

The FWS would also draft our rule to exempt from Wildlife TRACS certain small grant programs or grantees that have minimal numbers of grants. We will do this if it is inefficient for us to provide support and train entities for what will be a minimal need. Federal staff will manage Wildlife TRACS for those exempted from the requirement.

CONTACT: Tom Barnes, Division of Policy and Programs, Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration, 703-358-1815

Proposed Timeline:

OMB Information Collection

Publish 60-day Notice in Federal Register	July 1, 2012
Publish 30-day Notice in Federal Register	October 1, 2012
OMB Approval	January 1, 2013

Rulemaking

First draft	August 1, 2012
WSFR comments due	September 1, 2012
Second draft	November 1, 2012
State comments due	December 1, 2012
Draft for Federal Register	February 1, 2013
End of 60-day comment period	April 1, 2013
Final rule published	July 1, 2013

Director's Memorandum / RFA and Grant Conditions

Draft for Review	June 15, 2012
Route for Approval	July 1, 2012
Director's Approval	July 15, 2012

- **Public TRACS** – Invited speakers from Paladin Data Systems (Paladin)
 - PowerPoint Presentation by Tim Smith and Sara Simrell from Paladin Data Systems. PowerPoint will be made available for distribution after the meeting.

TRACS will allow for the following:

1. Project effectiveness improves;
 2. Program performance improves;
 3. Stakeholder support expands;
 4. Congressional and legislative support expands;
 5. Appropriated funding increases;
 6. Leveraged funding increases;
 7. Lawsuits, challenges, complaints, and State FOIA requests declined; and
 8. Operating costs decline over time.
- States will need to be trained to use the system. Short term will require additional effort by the states. But staff will become more efficient once they are trained. The system is very intuitive.

- USFWS has a perpetual license to use the system. Paladin will provide technical support and training for 5 years. This applies to the support and not the availability of the system to the states.
- Will there be continued support beyond 5 years? USFWS will continue to update Data TRACS and run it after 5 years.
- Can NGOs purchase access to Public TRACS log-in to provide their information to enhance the information added to the state collected data?
- Data is located in the cloud.
- State agency users log-in to Data TRACS to enter information about WSFR-funded projects as required by the USFWS. Data TRACS “restricts” certain data so it is not viewable by the public (species locations, private landowners, land acquisition info). States can override the restrictions. Public TRACS Viewer views unrestricted project data stored in Data TRACS and publishes it to the public website. States have portals inside the national map. States may choose to add non-WSFR projects and data in a state controlled, secure portal. Public TRACS State log-in. Each state will have a separate contract with Paladin.
- Demonstration about Public TRACS.
- JTF could get involved in the rulemaking and drafting the regulations that guide how much data and what data gets entered by the states in data TRACS and what information is available for viewing in Public TRACS.
- Standard Terms and Conditions could be placed in the grant awards which would govern the initial requirements for the grantees to input data. This would be an interim solution until a rulemaking could occur.
- What additional information is being asked beyond what we have already required grantees to report? Also, what is the authority to ask for additional information.

9. Monday wrap-up and any necessary Agenda Repair - Bolton/Hepler

ADJOURN (5:00pm)

Tuesday June 26

1. Call to Order (8:15am) – Hepler/Bolton

TRACS Q&A

1. Why do we need to change 50CFR80 specifically to address reporting? It already contains general reporting requirements. **Answer:** No. We do not want a rulemaking to occur.

Note: At this time, regulations require states to submit a grant progress report to meet their reporting requirement. If we issue a procedure manual (collectively written by the states and USFWS) to clarify the issues discussed in this Q&A, this is equivalent to telling the states what we would like them to do. Absent a regulation, we cannot force them to use Data TRACS.

Note: There are certain states that may still need the Service to enter the data into Data TRACS on a temporary basis after January 2013. The states that request the Service to enter state data need to be aware that this could lead to grant processing delays as limited WSFR staff is available.

Note: There will be a Federal Register notice about TRACS (which is an OMB requirement any time the federal government is collecting data).

Note: Unlike FAIMS where the data is being entered by Federal employees, TRACS data will be entered by non-federal employees – the State grantees.

Note: Effectiveness measures for the state and tribal wildlife grant program will be reviewed by one or more of AFWA's committees. Effectiveness measures will be entered into TRACS.

Note: The FWS is not going to tell the states to use Data TRACS through the use of terms and conditions at this time. At the next JTF meeting, we will discuss using grant terms and conditions to manage some of these issues.

ACTION ITEM: Letter from Cochairs to Director of USFWS and President of AFWA outlining the general agreements and advantages of Data TRACS and Public TRACS (viewer).

2. Are grant proposals going to look different than they have in the past? **Answer:** Yes and No. This will depend on the future government requirements to submit grant applications through Grants.gov.
3. Who can view the grants on grant.gov? **Answer:** Everyone can see the announcement of a grant opportunity, but you cannot see specific grant applications that have been submitted.
4. What are the grantees' responsibilities? **Answer:** Contained in 43 CFR 12.80. 50 CFR 80.82. 50 CFR 80.90.

5. What specific elements will be required for reporting under TRACS? Summary data only. No elemental data. **Answer:** Ok to report summary data only.
6. What elements do we report in FAIMS can we drop? - helps with workload. **Answer:** States are not going to drop any of the present requirements except a full written performance report which will not be required when data is entered through TRACS.
7. For any geo-referenced data, can the states determine level of resolution (i.e., for a specific point - put a 5 or 10 mile radius; for a polygon - report at a county level; for a regional level - report as statewide)? **Answer:** Yes, it is at the states' discretion for data resolution.
8. What elements will be viewable by the public in the TRACS system? **Answer:** Public TRACS will display the same information that is currently reported through iFAIMS except for information determined by the states to be sensitive.
9. Who is responsible for erroneous public reporting of data? For example, a state inputs the data correctly into the system but the bug, flaw, glitch, technical error, crash on the USFWS/Paladin side causes the data to be displayed improperly and the state gets brought into litigation? **Answer:** The information is used to meet federal reporting requirements only, and the Federal Government and the states will not be held liable for any other use of this information. No one in the federal system can override to change the state sensitive field. A statement will be added to the TRACS website indicating that the information being presented is for grant reporting purposes and that any other use was inappropriate, prohibited or whatever the standard disclaimer language is.

ACTION ITEM: A statement will be added to the TRACS website indicating that the information being presented is only to be used for grant reporting and that any other use was inappropriate, prohibited or whatever the standard disclaimer language is.

10. What guarantees do we have that the data we provide, that are not designed to be viewed by the public, are protected from FOIA? Can we do state-specific use agreements that limit USFWS ability to release? **Answer:** All information is subject to FOIA.
11. What assurances do we have that other USFWS programmatic data (JV's ESA, LCC's, etc.) do not get piggybacked into the TRACS database? **Answer:** Only Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration grant programs will be included in the Data TRACS. On the Public TRACS side, input of Non-WSFR programmatic data will be voluntary and based on contractual agreements with Paladin.
12. Is the TRACS system funded with PR/DJ funds? Is so, then why allow other data (even that approved by the states) to be stored in the database? **Answer:** Multiple WSFR funding sources were used to build the system. Also, if an activity is eligible, PR/DJ money can be used to fund the contract with Paladin for Public TRACS.

13. In the interim (prior to mutual agreement or reg promulgation), why not continue reporting as usual (FAIMS style) until TRACS is operational? Solves the question of authority and uncertainty of what final report version looks like. That data could then be input along with the legacy FAIMS data. **Answer:** This question is no longer applicable and has been answered in subsequent discussions.
14. Who maintains and services the TRACS system after the 5 year contract? Is there a guarantee that this won't be an additional cost or burden on the states? **Answer:** Data TRACS will continue to be managed and maintained by the WSFR program with no costs to the states. Regarding Public TRACS “plus,” the cost of maintaining will depend on the contract between the state and Paladin. The mechanism for maintaining the entire system beyond five years to be determined.
15. Can states use 3rd party vendors to build public access point to TRACS or do we have to use Paladin? **Answer:** Yes. 3rd party vendors can access data from TRACS. Paladin will not restrict the content that is viewed in Public TRACS. Non-WSFR data can be entered into the system by a 3rd Party vendor and will be displayed in Public TRACS. In Public TRACS plus, can states charge a fee for non-WSFR data that is viewable in Public TRACS?
16. Can a state give a 3rd party one of its two licenses to populate Public TRACS? Yes.

ACTION ITEM: How to help states monetize biodiversity program.

ACTION ITEM: There needs to be further discussion among the states through AFWA on use of the two perpetual state licenses under the existing Paladin contract.

17. Is it mandatory for states to provide data into the Public TRACS? We have already answered this.

ACTION ITEM: Materials are needed (expanded version of these Q&As) to address these identified TRACS issues that reflects the JTF discussion/FWS agreement.

2. **.50 CFR 85 - Updated Schedule and Clean Vessel Act proposed regulations** – Barnes

Clean Vessel Act Program and 50 CFR 85

The Branch of Policy has begun work on a draft for revising CVA based on input from a CVA Team consisting of representatives from the Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council, States Organization for Boating Access (SOBA), BoatUS, AMI, a natural resource consultant, and WSFR Regional and W.O. staff. WSFR Branch of Policy will work on the CVA rule after we revise the Boating Infrastructure Grant Program Proposed Rule at 50 CFR 86 and meet schedules for the Wildlife TRACS proposed rule.

The main emphasis for changing the CVA rule is to reflect Public Law 109-59 (2005 – TEA-21) that removed the priority for Coastal projects. WSFR has modified the CVA Request for Applications to make scoring more consistent with the law.

- For 2012, the CVA Program awarded \$ 11,359,272 (34 grants to 24 States – 17 Coastal and 17 Inland projects).
- This year we had \$3,662,157 in carryover money. \$2,164,961 of that was unspent money from 2011. Some of the carryover and unspent funds are because Regions returned money to the program for projects that States did not or could not complete during the grant period. This is the second year the program didn't fully allocate the available funds. In 2010, requests were \$ 1.4 million more than available funds.
- We received \$11,976,489 in new money for 2012.
- Several larger States did not apply for funds in 2012.
- We will suggest SOBA include a CVA session at their annual conference to help States better understand: a) eligible activities, b) how to conduct O&M programs, and
c) how to reduce the administrative costs of the program.

3. Update on State Wildlife Action Plan Revision Process – Alcorn

STATE-USFWS COORDINATION: The table below displays differences in the joint USFWS/AFWA “Guidance for Wildlife Action Plan Review and Revisions” (2007) requirements for the different types of review and changes to a State’s Wildlife Action Plan, and provides Best Practice recommendations for several processes.

Guidance	Section A. Comprehensive Review	Section B. Major Revision	Section C. Minor Revision
Deadline	October 1, 2015 (or) Ten years from date of last approved comprehensive review (or) Other date specified in last approved comprehensive review	No deadline: a state may choose to do a major revision at any time The major revision does not restart the 10-year clock, nor change the comprehensive review date	No deadline: a state may choose to do a minor revision at any time The minor revision does not restart the 10-year clock, nor change the comprehensive review date

Guidance	Section A. Comprehensive Review	Section B. Major Revision	Section C. Minor Revision
<p>USFWS Notification Requirements</p>	<p>State agency director notifies USFWS Regional Office (RO) [RRT member, see attached roster] by letter of intent to <u>review or revise.</u> [instead, substitute “initiate the Comprehensive Review”</p> <p><i>Best Practice: State’s letter of intent outlines the timeframe for completing the Review, public review and response to comments, and companion documents delivery.</i></p>	<p>State agency director notifies USFWS RO by letter of intent to make major revisions.</p> <p><i>Best Practice: State’s letter of intent establishes the timeframe for completing and delivering the Major Revision, including all companion documentation delivery.</i></p>	<p>State agency director notifies USFWS Regional office by letter of intent to make minor revisions. The letter should include a statement that addresses why the change is considered a minor revision.</p>
<p>Is a meeting or teleconference with USFWS RO required prior to state action?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p><i>Best Practice: Schedule a meeting in person or via teleconference, before the review process is initiated, with the WSFR RO contact; during this meeting, verify the actions, timeline for actions by all parties; document this meeting with written minutes reviewed by all participants in meeting.</i></p>	<p>NO</p> <p><i>Best Practice: following USFWS RO acknowledgement of intent to revise, communicate with RRT members throughout process and prior to plan and companion document delivery; in each communication, verify the timeline for actions by all parties; document this meeting with written minutes reviewed by all participants in meeting.</i></p>	<p>NO</p> <p><i>Best Practice: Following notification letter, a teleconference with USFWS RO and possibly the RRT is valuable to keep all parties apprised of changes; document this call with written minutes reviewed by all participants in meeting.</i></p>
<p>Road Map Required?</p> <p><i>The Road Map is the guide to Eight Elements in all documents</i></p>	<p>YES</p> <p>Road Map outlines or tabulates the location of the Eight Elements in the documents</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>Road Map outlines or tabulates the location of the Eight Elements in the documents</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>Road Map outlines or tabulates the location of the Eight Elements in the documents</p>
<p>Must a state Demonstrate the Entire Action Plan Was Reviewed?</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>NO</p>

Guidance	Section A. Comprehensive Review	Section B. Major Revision	Section C. Minor Revision
<p>Summary of Changes required?</p> <p><i>Different from the Road Map, the Summary of Changes identifies where all significant changes have been made</i></p>	<p>YES</p> <p>Include a tabular summary of any significant changes made as a result of the comprehensive review and where those changes can be found in the documents</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>Include a tabular summary of any significant changes made as a result of the major revision and where those changes can be found in the documents</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>Include a tabular summary of any changes made as a result of the minor revision and where those changes can be found in the documents</p>
<p>If no changes are made to the Plan or an Element:</p>	<p>Document and explain why no changes were necessary after review and describe the process used to make that determination</p>	<p>No explanation of unchanged parts of SWAP is required</p>	<p>No explanation of unchanged parts of SWAP is required</p>
<p>Must a State post the new Plan, summary of changes, and Road Map online?</p>	<p>NO</p> <p><i>Best Practice: Post Plan, Road Map, and Summary of Changes online in a searchable format, related to the way your constituents would use the document.</i></p>	<p>NO</p> <p><i>Best Practice: Post Plan, Road Map, and Summary of Changes online in a searchable format, related to the way your constituents would use the document.</i></p>	<p>NO</p> <p><i>Best Practice: Post Plan, Road Map, and Summary of Changes online in a searchable format, related to the way your constituents would use the document.</i></p>
<p>Is a Public Review Required?</p>	<p>YES (Elements 7 & 8)</p> <p>Note: A public review of the <u>entire plan</u> is required, <u>including those sections not changed.</u></p>	<p>YES (Elements 7 & 8)</p> <p>Note: A public review is required <u>for only the plan content that was changed.</u></p>	<p>NO</p> <p>A public review process is not required.</p>

ACTION ITEM: Prepare letter from the JTF to state directors asking them to review the table that summarizes procedures for review and revision of the State Wildlife Action Plans. Clarify that the table complements the 2007 guidance but does not supersede it.

4. Topics suggested by States and Regions for future JTF review – Johnson

a. Topics suggested by States and Regional staffs:

1. The issue of Federal funds to support competitive shooting events is not addressed. Could Federal funds be used to pay for prizes, scholarships, and awards for participants, as well as for staff time to support such events? Bear in mind that these events are not related to hunting, hunter development, wildlife, or the hunter education program, but may be intended to recruit. (TN)
2. The Enhanced Hunter Education section has added the word “recruit”, a broad term that has no foundation in the Act. “Public relations” activities are specifically prohibited. Will a state be allowed to market, promote, and advertise under the guise

of recruitment without being in violation for conducting public relations activities? These ambiguous terms, (esp. recruitment, retention, and outreach) could use better definition to avoid being misinterpreted by regional grant staffs and auditors.

3. The new rules do not address requiring hunt/fish licenses for persons that are not hunting or fishing. For example: if persons riding 4-wheelers or horses on state lands are required to have a hunting license; if persons using the firing range must have a WMA permit; if persons canoeing on an agency lake must have a fishing license; etc. Where a state is requiring the purchase of a hunting or fishing license by persons that are not intending to hunt or fish, it is not really a hunting or fishing license that should be included in the certification.
4. In the U.S. Caribbean, recreational fishing for some invertebrates, such as queen conch, spiny lobster, and whelk (Caribbean top shells) is very common. My suggestion would be to allow SFR funding for data collection and research on these non-fish species to facilitate their proper management. (PR)
5. Requiring equipment in 50 CFR 80 now to be identified in the budget narrative is understandable in pass-through grant situation. But, for state agency grants, such as O&M grants, it is too burdensome. There is no way to predict when replacement equipment will be needed. All this equipment is inventoried. The internal controls are more than adequate to ensure proper use and disposal. (OK)
6. The National Archery in the Schools Program should be allowed under Basic Hunter Ed (4c) as well as Enhanced Hunter Ed (Sec 10). The NASP program has been extremely successful in introducing youth to the sport of Archery at a time when license sales are flat at best. It is so successful in Oklahoma that it launched *Hunter Education in the Schools*, *Aquatic Education in the Schools*, and *Explore Bowhunting in the Schools*. It is the most successful educational tool we have. It drives archery sales in Oklahoma and is an important part of our future archery hunters. Please expand the eligible funding for Hunter Ed to include these recruitment activities. (OK)
7. There is lack of adequate WSFR guidance relative to predator control. Under what circumstances can hunting and fishing license revenues and/or PR-DJ grant funds be used to pay for wildlife damages and predator control. (MT and others)
8. Expand guidance for monitoring/making changes to assent legislation and eligibility requirements in Subpart B. (MT)
9. In addition to the boating access 15 percent mandated allocation, having a mandated set-aside/allocation for non-boating projects would go a long way towards meeting the needs of the non-boating sport angling public. The “non-boating” recreational sport anglers also contribute to the SFR and Boating Trust Fund through the purchase of a variety of sport fishing equipment and supplies and should be provided with guaranteed benefits from the program as well. (AK)

10. Auxiliary project funding: On an annual basis, we receive many project requests that would benefit sport anglers, but would not directly benefit recreational boaters. Projects providing parking, trails, ADA-accessible fishing docks, latrines, trash service, and related amenities are always in great demand, but do not qualify as “recreational boating access”. As all other SFR funds outside of the 15 percent allocation of boating funds are apportioned to other Alaska DSF programs; little to no funding remains for these “non-boating” types of projects (AK)

11. Need to better define ‘Technical assistance’ and designate it specifically in 50 CFR 80 as an eligible activity. Presently, the FWS Manual 522 FW 14.3 states that technical guidance is funded under two conditions, 1) Upon request or through normal review procedures, to governmental agencies having responsibilities for land management, land development, land use planning, land use incentive payment, and/or environmental protection;

and/or

upon request, to landowners and operators who can implement the advice and recommendations. This guidance is interpreted as not allowing activities such as technical publications and advice for the general public and urban homeowner about the importance of backyard habitat, effects of global climate change and other wildlife or fisheries management information as ‘technical assistance.’

12. The term capital improvement needs better definition – there may be an unintended consequence in 50 CFR 80.

ACTION ITEM: Lisa Evans, Joyce Johnson, and Gary Armstrong will draft a letter by mid-July requesting topics for future JTF discussion. The letter will be sent for approval and signature of the JTF Cochairs and then sent to state directors, Regional Directors, Federal Aid Chiefs, and Federal Aid Coordinators.

5. Real Property:

- **Draft Chapters 520 FW 6 and 7, Land Acquisition** – Barnes

2 basic land acquisition processes used:

Yellow Book Standard for land acquisition based on Supreme Court and Circuit Court cases and the Exception Process (this is a simplified process): you can exempt yourself from most of the procedures.

We have two chapters completed; will be submitted for editing. Chapters will be reviewed by the Regions and by the states. 30 day comment period.

Under the simplified process, when you make the offer to the landowner, you have to tell them what you believe the property is worth based on the appraisal. This takes place prior to closing.

See 42 USC 601.

If you have condemnation authority, you can focus on getting land in the general area but not a specific land tract. You must have a back-up tract of land. You cannot qualify for the simplified process if you appear to be targeting a specific tract of land.

- **Proceeds from disposition of real property – Mellinger**

Do the proceeds from the disposition of property have to be deposited into the Treasury's General Fund? The answer is no if the real property was purchased with money from the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Fund and the Sport Fish Restoration and Boating Trust Fund. These Funds are revolving funds, and they are exempt from the requirement that money from outside sources be deposited into the Treasury's General Fund. This is based on several Comptroller General's Opinion.

In the case of money received from the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Fund and the Sport Fish Restoration and Boating Trust Fund, the Regional Director may decide at his or her discretion to return the proceeds from the disposition of real property to: (a) the Fund for apportionment to all the States; or (b) the state that sold the real property .

We will leave the decision with the Regional Director. The JTF does not recommend a change at this time.

- **Process for State agencies to grant a third party easement (right-of-way) on lands acquired with federal grant funding – Mellinger**

What process must a State Wildlife Agency follow in order to grant right-of-way easement for access to a third party on State wildlife lands purchased in part with Wildlife Restoration grant funding?

Option 1: The granting of such a right-of-way easement over such lands (i.e. allowing the use of a road for access to an adjacent property owned by a third party) is the disposition of real property (defined at 50 CFR 80.2) that is no longer useful or needed for its original purpose (under 50 CFR 80.137) and in which the State must ask the Regional FWS Director for disposition instructions under 43 CFR 12.71 (which triggers a NEPA analysis).

Option 2: The granting of such a right-of-way easement is essentially a commercial, recreational, or other secondary use of a grant funded parcel of land,

that may or may not interfere with the authorized purpose of the grant which provided the funds with which the parcel of land was purchased (see 50 CFR 80.134(d)). If the easement does not interfere with the authorized purpose of the grant, then no further action is required. If the easement does interfere with the authorized purpose of the grant, then the State agency must restore the real property to its authorized purpose under 50 CFR 80.135.

Option 3: A range of right-of-way options could be provided which a State could utilize in granting a third-party access across State Wildlife lands, ranging from the least permanent to the more permanent:

1. A license
2. A lease, subject to negotiation after a term of years.
3. A term easement, subject to negotiation after a term of years
4. A perpetual easement, subject to conditions that would ensure that the easement did not interfere with the purpose of the grant.
5. A perpetual easement without conditions.
6. A fee title transfer.

The less permanent options, with provisions ensuring that the use would not conflict with the wildlife management purposes of the area (1-4) would not have to be approved by the FWS Regional Director and no NEPA analysis, while the more permanent, unrestricted options (5-6) would require the approval of the FWS Director.

ACTION ITEM: JTF recommends that issue will be run through AFWA's Fish & Wildlife Trust Funds Committee for further discussion at their meeting during the AFWA Annual Meeting.

6. Boating Access:

- **50 CFR 86 – Status of the Boating Infrastructure Grant Program Regs – Barnes**

Recreational Boating Access Survey Results

DISCUSSION: On August 31, 2011, we revised 50 CFR 80, which governs the Sport Fish Restoration program and its Recreational Boating Access subprogram. In November 2011, we had a conference call with members of the Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council. Some members opposed the new language at section 80.51(b) because it dropped the previous requirement that recreational boating access facilities must accommodate boats with any size of motor that could be reasonably accommodated on the body of water. We agreed to send a notice explaining the change to all States, Commonwealths, territories, and the District of Columbia (States). We also offered all recipients of the notice an

opportunity to comment through an online survey and tell us which version they preferred and why.

SURVEY: The survey contained 5 questions. The first question presented the exact language in the 2008 rule and the 2011 rule, and we asked survey takers to choose which they prefer. The second question asked survey takers to tell us why they preferred their choice in question 1. The third question gave an opportunity to comment on any other section in 50 CFR 80. Questions 4 and 5 asked only information about the person completing the survey and their contact information. The survey was available from February 22 – April 12, 2012. Letters were mailed to all State directors or designated contacts. WSFR Regional Directors also contacted their States. We sent several followup reminders through the WSFR Regional Offices.

Recreational Boating Access Survey – Summary of Responses:

Total Responses	State Responses	Unique States*	Other	In Favor of Current (2011) Language	In Favor of Prior (2008) Language
46	44	41	2(P.R. & D.C.)	42	4

*Three States had two respondents. In all cases, the duplicate responses from States agreed in preference.

Most states are in favor of the new language.

JTF sustains the current language but recognizes the need to meet directly with the Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council leadership to discuss the change in language and their concerns.

- **50 CFR 80 - Using 15 percent boating access set aside for nonmotorized boat facilities - Results of state survey – Barnes**

Hannibal would like his Chiefs to keep count of the access infrastructures for nonmotorized vehicles.

- **JTF Involvement with SFBPC Boating Access Recommendations – Armstrong**

Recommendation 2, 3, and 5 are feasible for the JTF to tackle.

Recommendation 2: The Service should convene a working group of state agencies to investigate the desirability and feasibility of calculating the five-year regional average expenditure on a rolling basis as opposed to the current fixed-period basis.

Recommendation 3: The Service and states should explore more innovative solutions to assist states in developing non-federal matching funds to meet new boater demands. These should include fostering partnerships with local communities and the private sector to provide match, and developing projects and training/mentoring for state personnel and Service personnel on innovative match solutions. The Service should request the assistance of states and other partners in developing a publication on innovative matching solutions, best outreach practices, and partnering with local communities.

Another issue that has precluded the full development of recreational boating opportunities in some states is the federal ownership of land surrounding bodies of water.

Fees collected by concessionaires on these lands may be considered federal funds and therefore are ineligible to be applied as part of the 25 percent non-federal match required for SFR boating access projects.

Recommendation 5: Recognizing that the strength and integrity of the Sport Fish Restoration Program is anchored in the user pay/user benefit concept, the Assessment Subcommittee recommends:

a. That the Service's Washington office of the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program clarify the eligibility of the use of SFR 15 percent boating access funding for projects benefiting primarily electric-powered boats, and communicate that clearly to the Regions and states. Such clarification must include whether the guidance pertains to electric outboard motors, electric inboard motors, or both.

b. That the definition of "power boats" in the Service's administrative manual chapter for this program be clarified to include electric-powered boats so that projects on lakes or reservoirs with "electric-motor-only" restrictions can be eligible for funding.

c. That manufacturers of boats powered by electric inboard motors as well as manufacturers of nonmotorized canoes, kayaks, drift boats, and other paddle craft consider means to contribute to the Sport Fish Restoration Program in order to develop access facilities that are specially designed and built to serve users of those products.

ACTION ITEM: Talking points will be developed that will be used to direct future conversation between the leadership of the Council and select members of the JTF on the issues identified in Recommendations 2, 3, and 5. Gary Armstrong, Joyce Johnson, and Lisa Evans.

7. Identify Small Group Topics and volunteers – Bolton/Hepler

8. **Tuesday Wrap Up and any agenda repair** – Bolton/Hepler
9. **Small Groups Meet on Identified Topics**

ADJOURN (5:00pm)

Wednesday June 27

1. **Call to order (8:15am)** – Bolton/Hepler
2. **Small Groups Report Out on Identified Topics w/Recommendation(s)**
3. **Alaska Hatchery Opening and WSFR 75th celebration** – Hepler/Evans
4. **Parking Lot issues**
5. **Future JTF meeting: Costs/Schedule for upcoming JTF meetings** – Bolton/Hepler

Joyce and Kelly will work on saving money and resources by making the meeting documents available electronically. Next Meeting – Denver, Colorado – Week of November 7 (Wednesday) and 8 (Thursday- noon). Location: Hyatt House Denver Airport; April 2013.

6. **Review of JTF Meeting Action Items** – Marcum/Hepler/Bolton/Johnson

ADJOURN (12:00pm)

Summary of Action Items for June 25-27 JTF Meeting:

1. **ACTION ITEM:** JTF members will draft a letter from JTF to Georgia (Carol Bambery, Larry Voyles, Mike Piccirilli) regarding concerns raised by Georgia about state actions that create an uneven playing field for all state fish and wildlife agencies.
2. **ACTION ITEM:** Consider the importance of introductory shooting programs as a tool for hunter recruitment and possibly tie it back to conservation-education best practices. Existing regulation (50 CFR 80.50(b)) on 4(c) includes language that speaks to teaching skills as well as language that speaks to “necessary to be a responsible hunter” which creates an ambiguity in the regulation. Small group will report back to JTF in early August.
3. **ACTION ITEM:** Letter from Cochairs to Director of USFWS and President of AFWA outlining the general agreements and advantages of Data TRACS and Public TRACS (viewer). Letter to include the Q&As developed during JTF meeting.

4. **ACTION ITEM:** Prepare letter from the JTF to state directors asking them to review the table that summarizes procedures for review and revision of the State Wildlife Action Plans. Clarify that the table complements the 2007 guidance but does not supersede it.
5. **ACTION ITEM:** How to help states monetize biodiversity program.
6. **ACTION ITEM:** There needs to be further discussion among the states through AFWA on use of the two perpetual state licenses under the existing Paladin contract.
7. **ACTION ITEM:** A statement will be added to the TRACS website indicating that the information being presented is for grant reporting purposes and that any other use was inappropriate, prohibited or whatever the standard disclaimer language is.
8. **ACTION ITEM:** Materials are needed (expanded version of the Q&As) to address these identified TRACS issues that reflects the JTF discussion/FWS agreement.
9. **ACTION ITEM:** Lisa Evans, Joyce Johnson, and Gary Armstrong will draft a letter by mid-July requesting topics for future JTF discussion. The letter will be sent for approval and signature of the JTF Cochairs and then sent to state directors, Regional Directors, WSFR Chiefs, and Federal Aid Coordinators.
10. **ACTION ITEM:** JTF recommends that issues related to the process for State agencies to grant a third-party easement (right-of-way) on lands acquired with federal grant funding be run through AFWA's Fish & Wildlife Trust Funds Committee for further discussion at their meeting during the AFWA Annual Meeting.
11. **ACTION ITEM:** Talking points will be developed that will be used to direct future conversation between the leadership of the Sportfishing and Boating Partnership Council and select members of the JTF on the issues identified in Recommendations 2, 3, and 5. Gary Armstrong, Joyce Johnson, and Lisa Evans.
12. **ACTION ITEM:** Next Meeting – Denver, Colorado – Week of November 7th (Wednesday) and 8th (Thursday) (until noon). Location: Hyatt House Denver Airport. Joyce and Kelly will work on saving money and resources by making the meeting documents available electronically.