

**Joint Federal/State Task Force on Federal Assistance Policy  
October 16 and 17, 2007  
Roscommon, Michigan**

---

Group Name: Joint Federal/State Task Force on Federal Assistance Policy (JTF)  
 Meeting Title: 17th Meeting of the Joint Task Force  
 Meeting Days/Dates: Tuesday and Wednesday, October 16 and 17, 2007  
 Travel Days/Dates: Monday, October 15 and Thursday, October 18, 2007  
 Start and End Times: 8:00 am Tuesday, October 16, 2007–5:00 pm Wed., October 17, 2007  
 Meeting Contacts: Tom Barnes at 703 358 1815, Kim Galvan at 703 358 2420  
 JTF Co-Chairs: Glen Salmon (IN) and Rowan Gould (USFWS)  
 JTF Staff: Kim Galvan, FWS, and Christina Zarrella, MSCGP Coordinator, AFWA

---

**MEETING NOTES**

**Tuesday**

**Morning**

- **Cochairs' welcome and review of agenda** – Rowan Gould and Glen Salmon  
 What is the best time to schedule small working groups? Is agenda repairing necessary?

Glen, Rowan and Carol Bambery welcomed the group. Rowan reported small groups would meet mid-morning on Wednesday and report back prior to the end of the meeting. Glen noted a short discussion of the 365-day hunting license issue was needed during the review of Action Items from the last JTF meeting in April 2007.

Absent JTF members included: Ed Parker and Keith Sexson.

- **Review of Action Items from the JTF's April 2007 meeting in Sonoma, California** – Tom Barnes

Tom gave an update of Action Items from the April 2007 Meeting (see handout.)

Rowan added on Action Items 2 and 5, a briefing document was put together for OMB, but a meeting never materialized due to several schedule conflicts. Also, the decision to have a smaller strategic plan with separate operational plans made this meeting less critical. However, a meeting with OMB is still needed, especially in regard to performance measures.

During the discussion of Action Item 3, Glen added that Georgia plans to appeal the decision. Rowan clarified Georgia felt the policy JTF developed was not legally sufficient, and the wording in the policy allows Georgia to count licenses in the manner they have. The JTF members embarked on further discussion of this issue. Tennessee also had a different method of counting their licenses. Steve Barton clarified that Tennessee possessed a signed memo stating FWS agreed with their method. However, the recent memo (July 25<sup>th</sup>) did away with this and Tennessee will now have to proceed as other states. Carol Bambery noted the lawyers for Georgia and FWS had a fruitful discussion, but did not reach an agreement. Lisa Evans and Tom Niebauer both emphasized apportionments are critical to the states, and this matter should not delay these apportionments. Rowan emphasized FWS will look for common ground so there would be little, if any, effect on other states. Glen stated the JTF created this sound policy and the issue is one of fairness; states should employ comparable, equal measures of licenses. The legal issues will be resolved outside of the JTF.

- **Update on Washington Office staffing, departing JTF member plaques, and update on SWG program review – Rowan Gould**

#### **JTF Member Plaques**

Rowan awarded plaques for departing JTF members including: Mitch King, Jim Greer, Kris LaMontagne, and Gerry Barnhardt. Mitch King was the only former JTF member present.

#### **Washington Office Staffing**

Rowan provided an update of the staffing of FWS's Washington office. Jim Greer's position was replaced with two positions now employed by Joyce Johnson and Steve Barton. Both will give brief updates on their work. FWS is making an effort to streamline staffing and make it more efficient. Also, Lori Bennett is working in a new position, Special Assistant, with a specific role to strengthen the relationship with industry, which has already proved beneficial. Rowan acknowledged this was also due to the previous efforts of Mitch King.

Joyce explained she oversees four branches: public access, the National Survey, policy, and a programs branch that deals with the implementation of policy. She noted they are working to update website to reflect these changes.

Steve explained he oversees the audit branch (both external and internal). Audit guides are being reviewed. He also oversees the FAIMS team. He noted the importance of FWS being easily able to report performance issues for industry partners. Also the training group at NCTC is being transformed into information management. As a result, FWS was able to get Jay McAninch of the Archery Trade Association the three years of data he was missing (which was discussed at the Fish & Wildlife Trust Funds Committee meeting in Sept.) Additionally Steve oversees the Branch of Administration and Budget, and is working on improving basic business practices and being as efficient as possible with funds. FWS will now budget 2.2 million a year to pay for state audits to ensure sufficient funds. There was more demand than there were administrative funds.

In regard to state audits, Lisa Evans inquired if the cycle could be changed to every 7 or 8 years as opposed to every 5 years to reduce costs. Currently expenditures are more than the revenue, and states are running their programs efficiently. Steve explained that FWS currently has a 5-year contract, but can consider changes for the future. Rowan noted that a best-management practices audit is being conducted for SWG and, when complete, could apply to other administrative funded practices. Michael Schwartz noted in regard to FWS audits, there are often findings related to state or single audits, which has an impact on FWS in general.

Kelly Hepler inquired about the new staffing structure and whether or not FWS regions had input on these decisions, and viewed the changes as efficient. Rowan acknowledged there are concerns still being resolved, mostly related to whom to contact for what - Joyce or Steve? He also noted the FTE count has reduced, but costs have remained the same. In regard to the reorganization, Chris McKay noted communication has increased, and regions have perceived it as an improvement.

### **SWG Program Review Update**

Rowan provided an update on the SWG contract. (See handout of RFP.) The process has been slower than expected because:

- 1) We wanted to make sure the team was comfortable, and
- 2) We wanted to make sure we had appropriate funds.

The RFP document reflects the view of the JTF. He instructed the JTF members to review the RFP again by tomorrow (Oct 17<sup>th</sup>) to ensure it is consistent with their perspectives. He explained that only processes different than PR/DJ will be examined. John Frampton and Kelly Hepler noted there was no cost identified in the RFP, nor any amount not to be exceeded; the amount for this work could be higher than initially thought. Rowan agreed he would follow up with the JTF on a cost estimate before the RFP is announced.

Kelly Hepler inquired as to whether or not the treatment of state and tribal SWG funds is consistent. He explained there is a nexus with the National Fish Habitat Board (NFHB) who are looking at tribes because they are part of the coalition receiving funds. NFHB would like to examine existing programs with tribes as a model. Rowan answered no; the treatment of state and tribal SWG funds is not consistent. He noted this could be an agenda item for the next JTF meeting. Gary Taylor asked if the tribal funds were audited. Rowan answered no; they are not audited and FWS has also had issues related to performance reporting.

- **Discussion of rules of policy making** – Michael Schwartz and Tom Barnes

Rowan explained when JTF was originally formed the goal was to write policies and have them approved. However, there are obviously other levels of review. Michael and Tom work closely together and will explain the policy process in further detail; everyone should understand the process of how policies are developed and approved.

Tom Barnes explained the JTF has recommended 10 chapters for inclusion in the service manual. When recommendations are made to the director, they have to be reviewed and follow certain rules. These include: format, address only FWS employees (not states), and be written in plain language. In regard to plain language, the JTF has occasionally not been clear. Sometimes a term must be defined; an undefined term can create a misunderstanding. If there is no common understanding of the term, then the policy returns to the JTF for review. Therefore it is more efficient to clarify terms before leaving the meeting. Michael has been very helpful to the JTF in regard to clarifying policies.

Michael Schwartz gave a Power Point presentation.

Rowan asked how and when we would engage Michael as part of the policy-making process. Michael explained there is a bill in Congress that would require plain language, and said his office provides clarity to JTF policies and has value. He suggested it was adequate for the JTF to write a suggested policy and then have his office review it; their role is not to change the content, only to make it clear. Rowan clarified to the JTF how this has occurred in the past. When policies written in meetings were unclear, they are sent to Glen and him to review. This puts them in a position to make a value judgment on behalf of the group. Chris McKay and Lisa Evans commented this process has been adequate, and if the co-chairs believed a word change would be significant then the policy should return to the JTF for review.

Tom Niebauer noted an important difference in perspective: JTF is not writing for someone new to the process, but to an experienced person who would understand the specific issue requiring clarification. Michael commented that one of the plain language principles is to ask who the audience is. In the case of JTF it is threefold: FWS, states, and the general public. Lisa Evans noted the JTF needed to consider who the primary audience is. John Organ noted hearing inconsistencies in the discussion; these policies are supposedly written for FWS only, and cannot be addressed to states or the public. However, we need to make the policies clear to each of these audiences. Additionally, John noted there is employee turnover and interpretations must be clear. Also the public has a role in accountability, and needs to understand what we are doing and why. The more stakeholders can understand the better. The service manual is written for service employees, but he hopes PDM understands this entity is a Joint Task Force and we are writing for states too. Robyn Thorson added the investment in clear writing would be appreciated later because it might help avoid split interpretations that lead to audit findings, and clear understanding helps improve program management.

- **Cooperative farming** – Tom Barnes and Carol Bambery

Tom mentioned this issue was addressed previously at the JTF meeting in Wichita 2006. He asked the JTF to refer to pages 48 and 49 of their packets. He explained the language in #2 on pg.49 needed clarification. On pg.48 was language drafted at the Wichita meeting, and #1-4 on pg.48 summarized the changes made since. However, the initially proposed language is not consistent with this language. Although new language was offered, it became complicated, which is why it has been brought back to the JTF. A small group could finalize this.

Carol mentioned she was uncomfortable with the definition of cooperative farming that had been developed, and was unsure if the language captured all of the potential management tools. Other tools were suggested when she spoke with Michigan DNR employees. Steve from the MI DNR said language needed to be included that addressed issues including biofuels, grazing, etc., and some of this led to bartering goods. John Organ clarified the JTF wanted to focus on cooperative farming and not the broader issue of bartering. State wildlife managers needed to be protected so the system is not jeopardized. The current definition may not provide all the needed flexibility, but is a good step. The JTF has not written a policy that formalizes the process of bartering, although this continues to be an issue on audits. Rowan agreed that bartering is a large issue for the JTF to address, as there are different state laws and also federal regulations. Glen said he participated in the initial small group that worked on this and the term “services” was meant to be broad as was the term “wildlife management purposes” because situations are different. Cooperative farming is definitely more than crops, and as many tools as possible need to be put into the hands of the manager. A small group will work on this.

Chris McKay inquired about the issue of public involvement as it relates to federal policy. Michael Schwartz explained that, as an example, the FWS refuge chapter on wilderness would need to be reviewed publicly because it is a significant issue. Everyday policies do not get published in the Federal Register for public review. It is OMB that determines if the issue is significant by Executive Order. He did not think the JTF will need to go to a public review often, if ever, for their policies. John Organ stated if we are changing policy, it should go for public review, as this is an important check and balance. He thought there were some historic JTF actions that might have warranted public review, such as commercial/recreational use. Michael emphasized his office does not tell programs to send their policies to OMB, and it is OMB that decides.

Cooperative Farming Small Group:

Steve Barton, John Organ, Steve (MI DNR), Glen Salmon, Tom Barnes

- **When is it proper to pay for law enforcement activities out of FA funds?** – Carol Bambery

Carol explained this topic got on the agenda through WAFWA’s legal committee. At the WAFWA meeting, the lawyers could not offer a perspective on this topic to the chiefs. However, this issue has not been brought to the JTF in the typical manner, which would be a formal request by a state or federal agency. She questioned if the JTF wanted to discuss the issue. The regulations indicate that state employees cannot be paid through Federal Assistance funds, but what if it was part of a wildlife management or restoration plan? Rowan agreed typically, this issue would be brought first to the regions. Then if it required a broader perspective, it would come to the JTF.

Kelly Hepler stated he had not heard about this as an issue. John Frampton said he had dealt with this issue a lot in the Southeast, especially in regard to Homeland Security. In his experience, when the cost is incidental it is okay, but this has come up on audits. John Organ referred to a policy memorandum from 1983 that laid out the rationale for why law enforcement is not an eligible activity. Establishment and enforcement of regulations is the domain of the states, and federal government should not have any hand in that. If the activities are approved though, then it is fine.

Tom Niebauer referred to 50 CFR 80.6, which does not prohibit all law enforcement activities. In Wisconsin there was an instance related to elk restoration efforts and concern about poaching and illegal harvest. While it was never submitted, Wisconsin thought it would be a legitimate expense. John Organ agreed this is how it has always been approached; if the expense is reasonable, necessary, and a justifiable need it should be permitted. Wildlife Restoration was developed separate from Law Enforcement to address other issues and we need to protect this. Lisa Evans described a similar situation to Wisconsin's that was site-specific and an integral part of the project; the expense was allowed.

Tom Niebauer commented the JTF had addressed the issue and 50 CFR 80.6 was the appropriate regulation to use. Co-chairs Glen and Rowan re-emphasized the importance of utilizing the process to formally submit an issue to the JTF.

- **Review the subject of PR land and the regulations involving either a swap or the sale of land** – Glen Salmon

See Handout

Glen stated he wanted to have a general discussion and then form a small group to discuss this issue as it has been raised repeatedly, this time by Minnesota through MAFWA. He believed there was clear guidance as to what a state can and cannot do with land purchases, but wanted to verify this has been applied consistently throughout the regions.

Tom Niebauer explained this issue was brought to MAFWA's public lands committee, which is how it came to the JTF. However, the letter is a draft from Minnesota and has not been reviewed by the MAFWA. The fundamental issue is that federal regulations allow for the sale of land when it is no longer needed. This letter suggests a new regulation, or changes to the current regulations, may be needed to permit the sale of land that will result in a purchase of property with higher conservation value.

Glen inquired if these regulations are consistently applied. John Organ replied, "yes." Tom Niebauer stated Wisconsin agreed the current regulations are clear and consistently administered. Carol emphasized the land had to be "not needed" or "not useful" in order to be sold. Glen said a review of the original agreement when the land was purchased would determine the original purpose. John Frampton inquired as to how much discussion was given to the political ramifications of this. He could think of situations involving coastal property in South Carolina with high property value that could be sold to acquire more land, which would not necessarily be higher in conservation value. If there were a change to the regulation, the repercussions could be swift. Rowan emphasized the cornerstone of this program is to obviate things that will erode it. Chris McKay felt this proposal requested a new classification and posed an interesting question: "Since states have completed their State Wildlife Action Plans, might there be an opportunity to swap land as it relates to other opportunities identified in those plans?" He felt this might be an emerging issue. Joyce Johnson stated she has not seen this as a problem, and if the state makes the value judgment, then the regulations are already in place and uniformly administered.

Robyn Thorson commented that although there appeared to be consensus among the JTF, the issue should go to a small group. She posed that, in some instances, the federal government is positioned to ask hard questions about a land swap that the state has signaled it might not want but is being pressured to address, and the rules help make sure checks and balances are in place. John Organ proposed another important consideration. The state needs to consider its responsibility to the user who is paying the fees for the property. Tom Niebauer put forth a legal question and voiced a perceived inconsistency between two regulations: 43 CFR 1271(c) (which addresses real property) states the grantee must request disposition instructions, while 50 CFR 80.14 (b) 3 says property that is no longer needed or useful could be sold with prior approval. John Organ clarified 50 CFR would take precedence over 43 CFR because it is specific to the Acts. Tom Niebauer noted Minnesota needed to propose a rational argument to explain why the land is not useful or needed. Steve from MI DNR agreed states need to work with their federal regional partners, and ask how states can achieve their goal in regard to land acquisition and disposition. Glen emphasized we want to protect the integrity of the program and each individual land parcel needs to be considered. The process of land disposition cannot be opened to political whims. Rowan agreed that states manage lands with huge property value, which is an enormous pressure. States need to use their federal partners as support when they come under pressure. Glen suggested a small group address this issue.

Land Swap Small Group:

Tom Niebauer, John Frampton, Kelly Hepler and Rowan Gould.

#### Noon

- Break for lunch

#### Afternoon

- **Evaluate the Bingaman Bill (climate change) in terms of the effect on the Federal Assistance program, as well as what it would take (within the Federal Assistance program) to implement the Bill** – Rowan Gould, Glen Salmon, Gary Taylor (AFWA), and Shawn Finley (FWS)

Rowan explained he and Glen had formed a small group to examine climate change bills, their implementation and potential effect on Federal Assistance programs. This small group included: Joyce Johnson, John Organ, Lisa Evans, and Tom Niebauer. Joyce said the group met during the September 2007 AFWA meeting. The group generated a list of questions (see handout - pg.63 of JTF packet) but realized they were unable to assess the effect without more information. John said some of the questions are grey areas; other questions may not have answers, but represent issues that need to be addressed. For instance, in regard to WCRP, have the current discussions included only the conservation portion or also the education and recreation components? Kelly Hepler inquired about the JTF's role in this discussion and what needed to be accomplished. Rowan answered he planned to open a dialogue on those points after Gary and Shawn provided more context.

Gary provided the JTF with an overview of climate change bills in the policy arena. He said there remains uncertainty whether this Congress can pass a comprehensive climate change bill this White House would sign, but there is bi-partisan recognition that conservation funding for state and federal wildlife agencies needs to be included in any climate change bill. Most bills have some mix of money going to states and federal agencies; however no final percentage has yet been decided upon. It appears certain in the Senate that Senators Lieberman and Warner will be the lead sponsors in drafting a bill for floor consideration, which may be introduced as early as Thursday this week and potentially reported (to the floor) by the Environment and Public Works Committee by the end of the year. We have made some recommendations to Lieberman and Warner about the utility of using existing programs, including PR/DJ and WCRP, and acknowledge additional conditions are needed to ensure money derived from climate change be used for adaptation strategies. A House staffer earlier this year remarked they did not want money spent on “boat ramps,” which is indicative that PR/DJ are often perceived as only recreational programs. Congressmen Dingell and Barton (House Energy and Commerce Committee) will draft a comprehensive climate change bill, which will ultimately become the vehicle for House floor consideration. Given Chairman Dingell’s commitment to wildlife, any bill originating from his committee will have a provision for funding adaptation strategies for wildlife. The auction of carbon credits would be the source of revenue for these bills.

Gary suggested additional statutory language needed to be provided, which would ensure there is no co-mingling with excise tax funds and statutory obligations of the PR and DJ larger funds. It is also important to clarify the design and delivery of such a system. We have not yet seen draft legislative language. It appears the Senate is likely to write a more general and less prescriptive bill. However, Dingell’s staffer said his legislation would be more prescriptive; Dingell wants the details of any climate change program to be deliberated by Congress. He wants to get the structure of the program right to make it successful. From Gary’s perspective, the Hill understands the political base that is the foundation of PR/DJ and WCRP constituency.

Gary amplified this Congress would likely not come to a decision on a climate change proposal the current administration would sign. It is unclear if the Democratic Congressional leadership wants climate change to be a bill, or to be left an issue for the 2008 elections. While we have time to develop our recommendations, and even if this Congress does not bring this to conclusion, whatever is accomplished will be the foundation for a future Congress. Therefore it is important for us to formulate our recommendations expeditiously and get them to Congress.

Shawn explained each of the bills before Congress allocate emissions allowances (or credits) differently. For example, under the Bingaman Bill, the majority of all allowances are initially distributed to industry for free. However, by 2030, the Bingaman Bill directs the majority of allowances be available for auction, and the proceeds from the auction of 22% of these allowances are applied to adaptation. In general, most of the bills apply the proceeds from 10% of the auctioned allowances to fish and wildlife purposes. Under all of the bills, no revenue would be gained initially.

Gary said we (a coalition including AFWA, NWF, and TNC, among others) have recommended a minimum of 10% of auctioned credits should go to state and federal natural resources agencies. The amount depends on how many credits are given gratis, and the treatment of credits by different bills, vis-a-vis how soon the regulatory impositions on emissions would be fully realized. The full amount of money will not flow immediately and it may be 2011 or 2012 before any funds are seen; this will also depend on the stringency of the caps.

Shawn explained many different climate change bills are being discussed. While it is unlikely the Bingaman Bill will be adopted, Congress will be looking at its language. The provisions in the Bill relating to PR/DJ are portable and can be incorporated in other bills, such as the Lieberman/Warner bill in the Senate and the Dingell bill in the House. Even if Congress does not enact legislation to regulate greenhouse gas emissions this year or the next, it is important for the JTF to examine this language and consider its potential effects. The bills introduced during this Congress, and any activity related to these bills, would set the stage for when Congress does enact comprehensive climate change legislation.

Rowan inquired as to what other sources of dedicated funding are being considered that would potentially affect PR/DJ and related programs as delivery mechanisms. Gary explained Senator Stevens wanted to create two trust funds: coastal and oceans. Sources of the funds would be OCS revenues; unlike CARA it would not be tied to production. On the coastal side, a significant amount of money would go to Alaska, however all other coastal states would also be eligible for funds. There is an undeveloped section of the bill that would send a small portion of funds to WCRP, however the Commerce Committee does not have jurisdiction over that. Stevens's staff assured us that section would be embellished to include approximately \$40 million for all fish and wildlife agencies through WCRP. There are some other possible sources of dedicated funding, but Gary does not see anything with more potential. If Congress were to pass an energy bill, they would have to reconcile the differences in the existing bills.

John Organ inquired if the items in the Bingaman Bill would have traction, and noted the absence of apportionment. He asked if there would be different formula than those used for PR/DJ and WCRP, and also, in regard to co-mingling obligations, if any funds would be included in a distinct sub account. Gary answered the Bingaman Bill does not include the level of detail of separate sub-accounts, and it is important to get that information to the Hill. The 90/10 match will have resonance, and the conservation community is supportive of it. While apportionment is not yet included in the bill, we would like it based on the WCRP formula. We think education is a critical component of any climate change program, which is necessary in getting citizens to engage in adaptation strategies. John asked if, in regard to the WCRP aspect, education was included. Gary responded none of this has been clarified, but we have an opportunity to get it included. John emphasized the importance because some organizations have said there was no need for funds to go to PR/DJ because of WCRP, which is not the case. Gary emphasized the need for an appropriate allocation between state and federal; a 50 state/50 federal allocation has been suggested. If WCRP is used as the only delivery mechanism, the eligibility of all species of wildlife affected by climate change, and not only species of greatest conservation need, must be clear.

Partnerships and other initiatives (NFHI, Partners in Flight, NAWCA etc.) must also be included. Robin Thorson emphasized regional collaborative approaches need to be included; acknowledgement of the ability to work at the landscape level, and not just state by state or within designated regions should be included. Shawn indicated the FWS Director believes wildlife adaptation activities should be directed on a landscape/ecosystem basis. From a federal perspective though, if legislation contains language that directs climate change funds to specific programs (i.e. Joint Ventures) the potential reduction of future appropriations to these existing programs is possible and has occurred in the past. Lisa Evans suggested the JTF examine the critical needs items and get these to Gary to bring to the Hill. Gary thought a 90/10 match would be well received, but some of these other questions need to be considered and clarified by the JTF before moving forward.

Rowan inquired what kinds of pressures and other entities (EPA, BLM, USDA, etc.) were involved. Gary explained there are unlimited numbers of agencies and organizations that want these funds, however our recommendation is that only federal agencies with natural resource responsibilities be eligible (USFS, BLM, FWS, NOAA, USDA, etc.) The hunting and fishing communities along with Teaming With Wildlife are vocal and visible political forces, and we need to make sure the design of the program satisfies these constituencies. John Organ commented the Bingaman language and the foundation of the bill has real benefits to the wildlife profession and unites constituencies that relate to State Wildlife Action Plans. Gary further explained that in their recommendations a defined plan on spending the climate change derived funds needs to be developed by the state and federal agencies but, pending its completion (which should be an eligible use of funds), money also needs to be made available quickly to get conservation projects working on the ground. Also it appears some funds will need to be made available for research at the federal level.

Shawn explained she put together a side-by-side comparison of the climate change bills (included in JTF packet and she can also provide via e-mail,) and regardless of whether the bills being discussed are enacted, eventually a bill will come through Congress and the possible implications need to be considered. John Frampton raised the issue of carbon sequestration and credits, which have to be dealt with even before any bill passes; would this be considered program income? Kelly Hepler inquired if there had been any discussion from NGOs and tribes? Gary did not believe NGOs will be eligible to receive funds, and the issue of tribal eligibility and apportionment has not yet been dealt with. The Hill will definitely want to include tribes, who have a lot to contribute, especially regarding sequestration, and Gary is willing to take any recommendations the JTF has to the Hill.

Gary emphasized a bill will be passed at some point; examining the potential implications and making recommendations soon is very important. John Frampton asked what the appropriate group was to be examining this issue, as there are also Association committees working on this. Rowan explained the issue was brought to the JTF because Dale Hall and Matt Hogan specifically asked about the potential implications to the PR/DJ programs.

The JTF embarked upon a discussion of how any new program would be administered. Lisa Evans asked if an apportionment would put authorized funds at risk, how carbon sequestration will be treated, and also how such a program would be administered. John Frampton suggested it needed to be a whole new program and not go through PR/DJ and WCRP. Lisa asked how WCRP became a suggested delivery mechanism. Gary answered this was grounded in the Association's effort to find a source of assured and dedicated funding in addition to PR/DJ. State fish and wildlife directors understand their responses and adaptation to climate change needs to be comprehensive. Some states have written their State Wildlife Action Plans around a habitat-base and others around a species-base. The states are comfortable with the wildlife action plans and PR/DJ. We did not want to create a whole new bureaucracy at the state and federal level. Lisa Evans asked why a new program would be attached to State Wildlife Action Plans. Gary suggested it could even be set up as another account under PR/DJ. John Frampton suggested utilizing the same infrastructure as PR/DJ to administer the funds, but to consider not referring to it when we talk to Congress, as it will suggest that delivery mechanism. Gary clarified it was the Executive Committee of the Association that made the decision to base this in PR/DJ. Kelly Hepler asked what the pros and cons were of putting it under PR/DJ, and also the pros/cons of making a separate program. John Organ stated he did not see these bills linking to existing programs, but that existing infrastructures could be used to expand a program. He asked what would be better; develop an entirely new program, or work within existing programs.

Glen recognized that there is a delivery system that works but it is a concern that excise tax dollars might be revoked if additional funds are received. He emphasized the need to be clear that PR/DJ is needed in addition to other programs. Gary emphasized being attentive with new program design so liabilities and obligations that come with climate change money do not bias obligations coming out of other parts of these programs. He noted the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration account (under PR) has only been used once since its adoption into statute under the FY2001 Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations bill. Rowan emphasized the need to work cooperatively, and to identify things that could harm the program so Dale, Shawn and Gary can be aware of those problems. He would also like to see a separate program with separate rules. Lisa Evans agreed we do not want to open PR/DJ and need to suggest a different fund along with criteria.

Kelly asked what role the JTF had, and suggested the Executive Committee meeting in December 2007 as a possible venue to provide information. Rowan said the questions the small group has come up with have already been helpful and are of value to Shawn, Gary, Dale, and the Executive Committee. However, he noted we are not at implementation yet. John Frampton agreed this was a good discussion because it provided direction, and highlighted the need for more work to be done. Gary restated the Lieberman and Warner bill will not go into a deep level of detail, and there is time to develop recommendations to give Congress. Chris McKay suggested that should be the goal for JTF: to develop the program and consider the implication. Then this could be shared with Congress as a starting point. Gary agreed, but also suggested we not minimize the value of having the hunting and fishing communities identify with PR/DJ; identity must be maintained, but we also need to consider and settle on language to protect existing programs.

Robin Thorson asked how we could take this discussion to the next level, and if there was anything JTF could do to propel this discussion for the next group that needs to tackle it. Lisa Evans suggested the JTF write a white paper. John Frampton noted this discussion would carry to Executive Committee and leadership. He suggested we develop a strategy and consider the PR/DJ and SWG templates and also engage the hunting and fishing constituencies. Rowan suggested starting by answering the questions the small group formulated. John Frampton agreed and suggested composing an ad hoc committee of people already working on this issue.

Glen suggested the JTF formulate and facilitate a decision regarding the use of existing programs versus starting a new program by examining pros and cons. Robin Thorson questioned what the administrative challenges would be if a new program were based on the PR/DJ template. Gary explained the Hill has been hearing from us that program/template already exists; we can be helpful fine-tuning existing programs or in the development of a new one. We have expressed an interest in using existing programs. However, currently the Hill has no interest in getting into this level of detail, although as bills mature they will. He said if we communicate what we agree on, and get the support of the community, they have every reason to use it. Rowan said it might be premature to flesh out a structure before the Executive Committee comes to the JTF to ask for its insight; we need to have a clearer charge and then we can give assignments as necessary and make recommendations. Kelly Hepler inquired as to what the Executive Committee has and has not made decisions about. John Frampton explained the Executive Committee did not have an in-depth discussion about using PR/DJ as a delivery mechanism or template, however he thought it was assumed it would be the tool. Gary said the state directors have spent a fair bit of time on this discussion. Robin Thorson emphasized the utility of brainstorming these administrative issues, possibly in a small committee.

Glen said this was a helpful discussion, as we understand the context, where the Executive Committee is, and know we have the expertise to contribute. He asked what the best use of the remaining 20 minutes of time would be. Chris McKay suggested forming a small standing committee to consider the existing questions, identify additional questions, and remain available for answering future questions. A small committee was formed.

**Climate Change Bill Small Committee:** Lisa Evans, Chris McKay, John Organ, Gary Taylor, Joyce Johnson, Kelly Hepler, Shawn Finley, and Glen Salmon  
Chris McKay and Lisa Evans will co-chair this group

Glen emphasized to John Frampton the importance of the Association's Executive Committee informing the JTF of their expectations. Gary said Senate subcommittee meetings start next week and we may have an opportunity to testify at the subcommittee level. He also said we can always submit a statement for the record. Once the Subcommittee has hearings, the full Environment and Public Works Committee will conduct a bill mark-up with the intent of reporting a bill to the floor.

Glen asked Gary if there were any potential political difficulties before the December 2007 Executive Committee meeting. Gary felt the only potential problem is the language in the House energy bill that would authorize SWG, but it's challenging to predict the ultimate fate of the attempt to reconcile the differences between the House and Senate energy bills. The House language only authorizes the program but does not direct funds to it, and Congressman Norm Dicks will not be favorable to a lack of support of his provision. This may be resolved because the House and Senate may be unable to agree on an energy bill. There may be some political fallout of not supporting the Dicks authorizing language.

#### **4 PM**

- **Start field trip – Kirtland's warbler habitat, elk viewing, and Pigeon River country**

#### **Wednesday**

##### **Morning**

- **Review of Federal Assistance Strategic Plan and operational planning – Rowan Gould, Glen Salmon, and Christy Kuczak**

See handout of Christy's Power Point presentation

Rowan explained Jay West of The Meridian Institute, who had been working with Christy, had taken a new position and is no longer working on the strategic plan. This means FWS will need to consider the existing contract with Meridian. After incorporating the input from the April 2007 JTF meeting, the plan has evolved to include a more general strategic plan with two specific operational plans (PR/DJ and SWG), which will be discussed. Initially we planned to complete this by early 2009. Rowan asked Christy give her presentation and then the JTF could have a discussion. Glen said the JTF comments would be brought to the strategic plan writing team for inclusion and revision.

Christy shared two printed examples of strategic plans including: National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and The National Zoo.

Slide 8: Strategic Plan Key Messages - Mission and Vision. Kelly Hepler asked why the mission and vision had been combined; these are two distinct concepts. Christy said she thought it was done to make the plan concise. Robin Thorson asked if this was the first mission statement developed. Christy answered one had previously been developed in 1998. Tom Barnes said historically there was a mission statement, but it focused on the Division of Federal Aid and not Federal Assistance programs. Rowan said in the late 1980s an EIS was completed prior to the Improvement Act. Robin Thorson stated these historic documents might be helpful in regard to formulating a mission and vision. Christy said the writing team also reviewed legislation to examine what the original purposes of these programs were. John Organ emphasized the importance of the historical program context and heritage of hunting/fishing statements.

After some discussion, the JTF agreed to split the mission and vision again and also add a core values section. Christy commented the writing team had already developed values, which were discussed at the April 2007 meeting, but there was discomfort with these. Glen recalled there was consternation about values, but thought these could be edited with the writing team. Lisa Evans suggested that FWS include the concept of the states' right to manage resources. Glen said these core values have to be fundamental and easily understood. Christy agreed the core values would include two or three main items.

Slides 10-11: Strategic Plan Key Messages: Key Program Outcomes (1 of 2.) Glen said the acknowledgement of important partners including shooting sports etc. must also be included.

Slide 13: Strategic Plan Key Messages - Key Program outcomes (2 of 2). Lisa Evans asked why the term "public" was included and not "hunters and anglers." Rowan explained the need to reach out to audiences wider than hunters and anglers. John Frampton noted the environmental educational and interpretive use components had also not been included. Joyce re-emphasized the importance of including shooting sports. Kelly Hepler agreed these programs are user supported, which needs to be recognized. Rowan stated Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration are conservation programs involving the sustainable use of species. The laws are written around a conservation focus, not only hunting and fishing. Kelly Hepler agreed with Rowan, but suggested a change to the word "public." John Organ agreed for the need to reach out beyond hunters and anglers, but also noted the importance of recognizing that hunters and anglers have funded this, and all Americans have benefited. Glen emphasized the need for consistency in our statements. Robin Thorson questioned the audience for this document, and suggested it was hunters, anglers, and the American public. However for the operational plan, PR/DJ is hunter/angler focused and SWG is more for public benefit.

Slide 14: Strategic Plan Key Messages - Key Program Outcomes (2 of 2). John Frampton suggested changing the language of the sentence including: "species support hunters." Carol Bambery suggested changing the word "ethical" to "responsible."

Slide 16: Strategic Plan Key Messages - Historical Program Context. Rowan mentioned John Organ and Shane Mahoney recently wrote about the historical context and how this is embodied in the North American Model. He asked John to share this document with the writing team and he agreed. John Frampton noted shooting sports should also be included in the historical context. Glen explained the writing team had decided to not mention all industry groups, however shooting sports did need to be included. Steve Barton asked if it would be appropriate to include the public trust doctrine. Christy answered yes, portions would be included. Joyce reemphasized the importance of highlighting sporting shoots. Christy stated the inclusion of photography was in response to the results of the 2006 National Survey. Joyce agreed that, based on the National Survey, the importance of shooting sports would be lower but suggested the need to address our publics and Congress. Christy said a voice needs to be brought to the program, and also emphasized it is not just a federal program but also a state program. Lisa Evans agreed; we must capture the concept that this program was created so states could manage fish and wildlife resources. This is an important context that cannot be lost; it is the states that manage these resources and John Organ's public trust article articulated this excellently.

Slide 18: Strategic Plan Key Messages - Heritage. Christy suggested the heritage section, could also look towards the future and include some developing issues: climate change, re-connecting children with nature, etc. This must be an enduring document. Chris McKay expressed interest and agreed to send Christy some bullet points to include.

Slide 19: Strategic Plan Key Messages - Quotes. John Organ offered to share some rich quotes from legislative history. Tom Niebauer suggested removing the quote from Hoover.

Slide 23: Strategic Plan Key Components - Federal Assistance Program Names. Glen suggested the information on this slide would make a nice graphic. Descriptive pictures could serve to get key messages across to the American public. After some discussion the JTF decided there were too many program names, and images could be a better way to convey what the programs do. Three main programs should be highlighted: Wildlife Restoration, Sport Fish Restoration and State Wildlife Grants. WCRP might also be highlighted, as it may be a mechanism used for climate change funds. John Organ agreed to write some words about the value of the WCRP that points us towards relevant issues.

Slide 25: Strategic Plan Key Components - Regional Office Contact Information. Glen suggested instead of providing telephone numbers etc., to provide the Federal Assistance website along with the Association's. These sites link to other relevant websites.

Slide 26: Strategic Plan Component - Questions. Tom Niebauer emphasized the need for the words "hunting and fishing" to be repeated throughout the document. Lisa Evans agreed there was a need to tie hunters and anglers to U.S. conservation. Glen said he was unsure how to fit in industry, but they will be included as they pay the excise tax. John Frampton suggested the source of the funds be addressed somewhere in the document. Carol Bambery emphasized the importance of including state management of resources as a key message.

Slide 27: Strategic Plan Design - Photos. Christy requested the JTF members forward appropriate photos or resources to her. Christina Zarrella suggested Rachel Britton, the Association's Public Affairs Director, as an additional resource. Lisa Evans suggested looking at RBFF for photos. Christy emphasized she wants images that look "fresh."

Slide 28: Strategic Plan Review. John Frampton asked when the target date for completion was for the strategic plan. He noted ASA, NSSF, ATA, and Boating will attend the Association's Industry Summit in DC Dec 13-14, 2007 and this may be appropriate to put on the agenda. Chris McKay suggested focusing on key messages. Glen said industry is interested in when they will have an opportunity to review the strategic plan and provide input; this was mentioned at the September 2007 meeting of the Fish & Wildlife Trust Funds Committee. Lisa Evans asked if the JTF would be developing these messages. Rowan answered, no and explained that once writing team meets in November 2007 a draft will be sent to the JTF for revisions to return to Christy. Then we will have something to share at the industry summit, although it will not be the entire document. Robin inquired about OMB's expectation and whether or not FWS had a deadline to meet. Rowan said FWS would not be reviewed until 2009, however they want to complete this prior to the administration change.

Slide 29: Operational Plans. Chris McKay suggested three operational plans might be necessary: PR/DJ, SWG, and administration. Rowan explained the operational plans would include specific, identified, and agreed upon outcomes/measurables. Also a plan for measuring and reporting to the American public would also be formulated. Joyce asked why three operational plans were needed; instead, the differences could be addressed within one operational plan. Rowan explained the initial rationale for two operational plans was addressing the two different audiences for PR/DJ and SWG. It would be easier to address the differences if each were treated separately, which is also consistent with source of funding. Joyce understood, but thought the strategic plan would be used to address both groups and was concerned that different operational plans might but cause confusion with administration. Robin suggested the audience be determined first and suggested borrowing language from other conservation organizations to promote unity. She noted multiple messages would be difficult for the writing team.

Kelly Hepler reminded the JTF this was previously discussed at the April 2007 meeting. He noted the same questions were wrestled with. After the last meeting, he was clear about what messages relate to which audiences, but did not recall deciding on two different operational plans. Steve Barton commented there would be one strategic plan, but two operational plans permits you to target different constituents. Rowan reminded the group that while each program had different interest groups, outcomes and outputs also needed to be separate for both programs. John Organ said there are separate funding sources, but hoped not to address different groups with the plans and promote the schism and dichotomy within conservation. While it is appropriate to focus the operational plans on different funding sources, it is important to acknowledge we are all one community. Glen agreed that John's statement reflected the real world. Robin Thorson said this document could be used to show we do not exclude any groups from conservation. We could also utilize the key value words to strengthen our base of support. Glen noted the difficulty in regard to performance measures and metrics, which will be different for each program. Initially only for the administration of the programs was planned to be measured, but was not sufficient for OMB.

Robin Thorson announced she, unfortunately, had to leave the meeting early due a prior obligation. She left the group with a few ideas:

- The NFWF strategic plan looks great. We should assert our values about states, users, the historic contribution of hunters/anglers, and conservation. Maybe add a section to tie this together.
- In regard to "wise and responsible use..." We also do protection and have been criticized for not doing it. Can we include this? We need to listen to the critics of the program in Congress and the NGOs, and address their concerns.
- In regard to Sport Fish and Wildlife Restoration – this title itself is not defined.
- She is willing to assist with writing and review.

After a short break, Christy suggested to finish the presentation of the operational plan section and then have more discussion. Rowan said the JTF could give some direction on the operational plans, and provide Christy with the messages that need to go to the writing team. He said there is some logic to having three plans (PR/DJ, SWG, and administrative), especially when considering the different measures of output and uses. States do not want their PR/DJ money included in the government GPRA process because it is not the Secretary's money. Carol Bambery suggested also considering the framing of the operational plans. These are not policy documents; they are internal "bookkeeping" documents. NEPA and public review in the Federal Register are not required if there are no actions. Rowan requested the JTF review the documents from this standpoint, as the operational plans are mainly for internal use. Christy resumed her presentation.

Slide 30: Operational Plans. Christy inquired how much information regarding grant administration should be included. Lisa Evans commented the administration piece is key to both programs and that is the role of Federal Assistance – to provide good support to the states to get the funds on the ground. Chris McKay clarified the need to describe how these three major outcomes are accomplished, but not call for specific actions. Carol Bambery added this is how FWS would be measured. Lisa Evans said it is important to be clear that states will not be affected if FWS does not have a satisfactory review. Glen cautioned about putting anything into the operational plan that there is no measure for. Rowan commented the administrative part is necessary, but FWS also needs the states to agree to measurables. Lisa Evans stated FWS cannot be responsible for how the funds are spent, only how they are administered. John Organ reminded the group OMB did not find that sufficient, and wants measurable information from states too. Carol reminded the group that unlike the strategic plan, this was an internal document. After discussion the JTF agreed the operational plan would be one document with three different components.

Christy asked if, other than performance measures, anything else needed to be included. Rowan answered in the administrative section, FAIMS can be mentioned for collecting and reporting information. Operationally, the American public must know how they will get the information. We have put special categories in FAIMS but currently there is no commitment from states to complete these. Lisa Evans asked if FWS was going to request information from the states that are not already collected. She also suggested the use of a customer satisfaction survey to satisfy the administrative component. Glen suggested it's easiest to include information states are already collecting, and mentioned OMB said whatever measurements we agree to would be satisfactory. Rowan clarified the JTF has not yet agreed upon measures, and will have another chance to vet those once the operational plan is drafted. Christy asked how to best accomplish this. Kelly Hepler suggested it would be better to do as a group and have discussions. This needs to come to the JTF again before it is finalized. Rowan said there would be the need for another meeting in Jan/Feb 2008. Chris McKay asked what the right measures are, how we measure them, and what the cost would be. John Organ suggested the feasibility of measures be dictated by whether they can be derived from FAIMS, the National Survey, or items states already report. These measures must be realistic and not require outside data. Rowan added measures could also be a class of measures states agree to report on and enter into FAIMS. Joyce Johnson noted without states setting up their grants in a particular way, certain information would be unavailable. Lisa Evans suggested this message is delivered clearly so it does not appear as an additional burden to states. Glen said all states have recently needed to undergo performance measures and this should not be unexpected.

Steve Barton suggested examining criticisms of the programs as suggested by Robin Thorson. When he considered state legislation, the protection component was included. He asked why those same types of words could not be included. Kelly Hepler said we do not protect wildlife specifically, but habitat. John Frampton said if the word "protect" is included, then it needs to be defined. John Organ suggested these concerns are best addressed in the core values component. Historically protection did not work and restoration moved beyond protection, which was unique and different.

Slide 32: Process Questions. Glen emphasized partnership is important and industry cannot feel excluded. Rowan agreed that industry should be included in the development of the operational plan, especially in regard to agreeable measures. Industry will need to know these outcomes and we need to be responsive, but we cannot burden states with collecting additional information. Lisa Evans suggested one measure of industry be if the excise taxes are being collected in compliance with the regulations. We are working with IRS to ensure funds are deposited appropriately. The states are not necessarily aware of this effort by industry to make sure the funds are collected efficiently.

Christy inquired about the comment period. Glen suggested the Federal Aid Coordinators Working Group headed by Jimmy Anthony would be a good review group. Joyce Johnson suggested the Chief Meeting in April as another venue. Lisa Evans noted the chiefs would need the product a head of time in order to come to the meeting prepared. Glen suggested the group develop a timeline for both the strategic and operational plans.

### **Strategic Plan Timeline:**

Oct 2007 – Chief’s Update: update on October JTF meeting

Nov 2007 – writing team meeting: develop key messages; words that will go into strategic plan, first draft of measures and operational plan (1 document with 3 components.)

Nov 2007-Dec 6 – Send key messages from writing team to JTF for review and OK for Glen to present in Dec.

Dec 13-14 2007 – Industry Summit: Share messages from strategic plan with industry. Allow industry to identify key and/or missing messages or components and possible measures. Operational plan not ready for discussion.

Feb 11-12 2008 – JTF Meeting in DC (start meeting at 8am): review draft (content, w/o graphics)

March – release strategic plan to Chiefs, State FA Coordinators, and State Directors; charge FA coordinators and chiefs to review documents and collect comments (only looking for serious concerns – manage expectations appropriately.) We have already worked with state and federal staff to develop these messages. Tell them operational plans are coming.

March 24-30 2008 – North American Meeting and F&W Trust Funds Committee briefing. Glen will brief Director’s at Business meeting and hand out key messages.

April 2008 – Chief’s meeting – FA Coordinators present and finalize comments.

May/June 2008 – layout and approval of the “look and feel” by the JTF

June 2008 – printing and distribution

Sept 2008 – AFWA meeting unveiling of the strategic plan and operational plan

### **Operational Plan Timeline:**

Oct 2007 – Chief’s Update: update on October JTF meeting

Nov 2007 – writing team meeting: develop key messages; words that will go into strategic plan, first draft of measures and operational plan (1 document with 3 components.)

Mid Dec – Send operational plan draft to JTF for comments – use these to develop document for consideration at Feb 2008 JTF Meeting

Feb 11-12 2008 – JTF Meeting in DC (start meeting at 8am): review draft and provide substantive comments

March – release operational plan to Chiefs, State FA Coordinators, and State Directors;

March 24-30 2008 – North American Meeting and F&W Trust Funds Committee an update on operational plan.

April 2008 – Chief’s meeting – comments on operational plan due

May 2008 – Consolidate comments into a list and send to JTF for review. Co-chairs will consider and then we will have JTF conference call. (Week of the 12<sup>th</sup>?)

May 2008 – final draft of operational plan

June 2008 - layout and approval of the “look and feel” by JTF

July 2008 – printing and distribution

Sept 2008 – AFWA meeting unveiling of the strategic plan and operational plan

Christy discussed the status of Jay West. She suggested considering if we want to hire someone else from Meridian, or if we want to try somewhere else; it is not yet known if the funds Meridian has will be available to use somewhere else. Glen asked for clarification as to what responsibilities Jay performed that still need to be completed. Christy said in addition to facilitation in meetings and conference calls he assisted with editing and other tasks. John Organ deferred to Christy in regard to the importance of this role and Jay in particular. Jay seemed to enhance the efforts of the writing team and was able to steer them efficiently. Christy said she would like help with facilitating conference calls, and mentioned the possibility of contacting someone in region 2. The group agreed it was likely that New Mexico had a facilitator that could be used for the writing team meeting in November.

Glen reminded the JTF that if they had any revisions to the SWG RFP to give these to Steve Barton.

### **Noon**

- Break for lunch

### **Afternoon**

- **NEPA and communication strategy regarding Strategic Plan** – Carol Bambery

Previously discussed:

During the strategic plan discussion, Carol Bambery suggested the JTF consider the framing of operational plans. These are not policy documents; they are internal “bookkeeping” documents. NEPA and public review in the Federal Register are unnecessary if no actions are included.

- **Small working groups** - Time for small working groups to meet (as necessary) on all topics discussed so far.
  - 1) Review the subject of PR land and the regulations involving either a swap or the sale of land (Tom N., John F. Kelly, Rowan)
  - 2) Cooperative Farming (Steve, John O, Steve (MI DNR), Glen, (Tom B. will talk to Michael)
  - 3) Climate Change Bill Small Group (Chris, Lisa, Joyce – will meet separately to discuss climate change bills)
- **Large Group** - Interim reports of small groups to large group and continued work by the small groups; review small group recommendations; make changes; finalize products.

### **10/17 Small Working Group Report: Minnesota Land Swap**

Tom N, John F, Kelly, Rowan

- 1) How are we responding?

The response will be a phone call from Glen from the JTF. If Minnesota wants to submit a formal request to the JTF through MAFWA, it can be addressed then. However, the answer will not change.

- 2) Discussion Points:

- The JTF believes that the language in 50 CFR 80.14 (b) 3 (“When such property is no longer needed or useful for its original purpose and with prior approval...”) is adequate to guide the disposition of property. Specifically the JTF feels that there is adequate flexibility built into 50 CFR 80.14 for the states to resolve land disposition issues.
- After a discussion with the JTF, there appears to be a consistent application of 50 CFR 80.14 through all regions.
- The JTF also discussed Minnesota’s suggestion to add new language regarding “net habitat benefit.” The JTF also felt that this type of language could introduce the potential for political influence in decision-making, which would be detrimental to a desired outcome by the state fish and wildlife agency.
- There is a process already in place to resolve differences of opinion.
- If you need a more formal response, then submit a request from Minnesota to MAFWA.

### **Small Working Group Report: Cooperative Farming**

Steve, John O, Steve (MI DNR), Glen, Carol (Tom B. will talk to Michael)

Examples of income that should not be treated as program income include:  
Cooperative farming or grazing arrangements.

Cooperative farming or grazing arrangements are when an agricultural producer farms or grazes part of a grantee’s land in exchange for providing wildlife management benefits as determined by the grantee. Cooperative farming or grazing arrangements are routine wildlife management activities that result in a benefit to the sportsman and the fish or wildlife resource.

### **Climate Change Bill Small Group**

Chris, Lisa and Joyce:

The group had a discussion of how they will answer the climate change policy questions in a timely manner. Chris gave a deadline of Dec 14<sup>th</sup>. The questions will be put on the web and participants can propose answers between Nov 19-30<sup>th</sup>. Lisa and Chris will actively manage discussions. Based on that interaction, answers to the questions will be formulated by Dec 10<sup>th</sup>, and given to the JTF co-chairs to use if necessary. The results will also be transmitted to the JTF in preparation for February 2008 meeting. In addition, Shawn and Gary will be carbon copied (cc'd) on all deliberations. Lisa Evans said they also started to answer some of the questions. She suggested the new program would benefit from the current PR/DJ model.

- **Future meetings and challenges of JTF** –Identify a meeting date and location for next meeting(s) – Rowan Gould and Glen Salmon

February 11-12 2008 in DC (start at 8am)

Kim Galvin will research reimbursing the JTF participants for airfare, because of the expense of the government non-refundable tickets.

- **Finalization of unfinished business**

Tom Niebauer commented the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of PR program is five years away, and asked if the JTF could consider a way to acknowledge this. We could look at the notes of Robertson and bring to light some of those great discussions that crafted the PR legislation. The Virginia Wildlife Society Chapter has an interest in this. He asked 1) if we are going to do anything, and 2) if this is a project that could fit. John Organ agreed the Robertson archives represent a golden opportunity and include ten file boxes that each represents a year when Robertson was commissioner in VA. There, he developed game policy in 1930 that set the stage for PR. These files include letters to Leopold and constituents that illustrate his philosophy. He said if we were going to do something for the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary, this would be a great opportunity. Glen said it would be nice to have this as a theme for the North American, and suggested we could kick off a display that would go around the country. He asked what the next step would be and suggested forming a committee. John Organ explained VA already put a proposal together, and we could go work with them and collaborate. The Association would be an important partner. VA has identified some potential sources of funding. He will be meeting with them in Richmond later in October 2007.

Chris McKay commented a comprehensive collection of artifacts would be an important part of the information component of the wildlife and sport fish restoration programs. He said the future is cast from where you have been. John Frampton commented the same thing could be done for many past conservationists. Chris McKay said a small percentage of funds could be dedicated to it, and the project could be scoped to fit available dollars. Tom Niebauer suggested the JTF:

- 1) Start thinking about the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary, and
- 2) The Robertson component. University of Wisconsin Dept. of wildlife and forestry and Leopold Foundation both exhibited interest.

**5 PM**

- **Meeting adjourned.**

### **JTF Action Items From October 2007 Meeting**

- 1) Agenda for next meeting - the consistent treatment of state and tribal SWG funds.
- 2) Rowan will get back to the JTF with cost for SWG Program Review RFP
- 3) Climate Change Small Group will contact the JTF with suggested answers to questions just before the next meeting in February.
- 4) John Organ will share North American Model/historical context document with the strategic plan writing team, and also some quotes from the legislative history. He also agreed to write some words about the value of the WCRP that points us towards relevant issues.
- 5) The JTF will send photos or resources to Christy. Christina will give Christy Rachel's contact info.
- 6) Chris McKay agreed to send Christy some ideas for looking forward issues/ideas for the strategic plan.
- 7) Christina will get Christy the list of issues that the EOD committee developed at the Annual Meeting
- 8) Kim Galvin will research whether or not FWS can reimburse JTF members the cost of airfare to save money on non-refundable government tickets.