



**Proposed Resolutions
National Wildlife Federation
79th Annual Meeting
March 27-29, 2015**

National Conservation Training Center, Shepherdstown, WV

Friday, March 27th 2015

4:30 pm –6:00 pm

Resolution Committee Meetings

- A. Endangered Species Act: Room 201, Instructional East Building, 1st Floor
Chair: *Dave Chadwick* Vice Chair: *Mike Bartlett*
- B. Game Wildlife: Room 111, Instructional West Building, 1st Floor
Chair: *Mike Butler* Vice Chair: *John Robbins*
- C. Public Engagement: Room 161 Instructional West Building, 1st Floor
Chair: *Janice Bezanson* Vice Chair: *Laura Bankey*
- D. Resource Development: Room 160, Instructional West Building, 1st Floor
Chair: *Lisa Pohlmann* Vice Chair: *Ellen McNulty*

Saturday, March 28th 2015

1:30 pm –3:30 pm

Conservation Resolutions Session

Resolutions Committee Reports and Final Votes on Resolutions
Resolutions Session Chair: *David Hargett*

Table of Contents

Introduction

National Wildlife Federation Conservation Policy Resolutions	1
Responsibilities of Affiliate Representatives and Alternate Representatives	1
Process for Considering Proposed Conservation Policy Resolutions	1
Resolution Committee Assignments	3

Endangered Species Act

ESA–1: Modernization of Endangered Species Act	4
ESA–2: Restoring State Management of the Gray Wolf in the Western Great Lakes States.....	8

Game Wildlife

Game Wildlife–1: Bighorn Sheep Disease Management.....	13
Game Wildlife–2: Conservation of Sage-Grouse and the Sagebrush Steppe	19

Public Engagement

Public Engagement–1: 2016 IUCN World Conservation Congress	24
Public Engagement–2: North American Conservation Education Strategy.....	28
Public Engagement–3: Support for Conserving Declining North American Pollinator Populations	31

Resource Development

Resource Development–1: Opposition to Mining within the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness Watershed	35
Resource Development–2: Impact on US Forests Due to Increased Demand for Wood Biomass	39

Appendix One

Credentialed Affiliate Representatives and Alternate Representatives.....	44
---	----

Appendix Two

National Wildlife Federation Board of Directors.....	60
--	----

Appendix Three

Resolution Committee Procedure.....	63
-------------------------------------	----

Appendix Four

Parliamentary Information for NWF Annual Meetings	67
Definitions	70

National Wildlife Federation Conservation Policy Resolutions

Since 1937, the conservation policies of the National Wildlife Federation (NWF) have been established by its affiliates at Annual Meetings through the consideration and adoption of resolutions. These resolutions provide the backbone of the conservation work of NWF and its affiliates by giving a voice to the interests, concerns, and motivations of our members and supporters. Ranging from the need for clean air and water to concerns about dwindling habitat for fish and wildlife, the Federation's conservation policy resolutions represent the full breadth of NWF's involvement in almost every major chapter of conservation history. NWF resolutions inform our governments, other organizations, the press and the public of our position on conservation issues.

The NWF Bylaws direct that resolutions can be proposed by NWF Affiliates, a member of the NWF Board of Directors and/or the NWF President. As declarations of policy, resolutions neither direct specific action by the Federation nor allocate NWF resources, as these responsibilities are vested in the Board of Directors.

Responsibilities of Affiliate Representatives and Alternate Representatives

In preparation for and in conjunction with NWF's Annual Meeting, the credentialed Representatives' responsibilities as members of the Resolution Committees are to:

- Be familiar with all proposed NWF resolutions regardless of what committee he or she is serving on; and
- Review with your affiliate organization its position on each of the proposed resolutions and represent the affiliate's views; and
- Coordinate as much in advance as possible with the committee chair if there are major concerns or extensive revisions to suggest; and
- Prepare in advance, including sufficient copies for committee members, any extensive proposed revisions.

Process for Considering Proposed Conservation Policy Resolutions

Booklet

This booklet contains the proposed conservation policy resolutions received on or before Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 (60 days prior to annual meeting as required by NWF by-laws).

Resolution Committee Meetings

Each Affiliate Representative and Alternate Representative is assigned by the Chair of the NWF Board of Directors to a specific policy area resolution committee as a voting member of that committee. These committees meet from 4:00pm—6:00pm on Friday, March 27, 2015. Affiliates submitting resolutions are urged to have a spokesperson at the committee meeting to which the

resolution is assigned. Committee members are expected to be prepared to discuss the particular resolutions assigned to the committee on which they serve.

Listserves

NWF has created a listserv for each resolution committee to provide a forum for affiliate delegates to discuss each committee's proposed resolutions in advance of the annual meeting. Delegates with email will be subscribed to and receive instructions for their committee's listserv. NWF encourages use of the listserv to begin discussion prior to the annual meeting.

Resolutions General Session

The resolutions general session will be held Saturday, March 28th from 1:30-3:30pm. During this time the Resolution Session Chair will call upon the chair of each resolution committee to report on the committee's findings and recommendations for each proposed resolution, whereupon there will be opportunity for discussion prior to voting. Only the seated delegate for each affiliate may vote in the Resolutions General Session.

In order to permit the delegates to see changes recommended by the committees, NWF staff will project a copy of the proposed resolution, with the recommended changes, on a screen.

Tips

Resolutions focus on conservation issues of national importance. Reasons for resolutions not being adopted include:

- NWF already has sufficient or similar policy direction on the subject; or
- The resolution may be premature – that is, the occurrence of the event or problem is not certain or perhaps even under consideration; or
- The resolution seeks to direct specific NWF action or allocate NWF resources rather than establish NWF policy; or
- The subject is simply too local for a national policy; or
- The resolution is not germane to NWF's conservation mission.

Emergency Resolutions

A proposed emergency resolution must be an issue of truly extraordinary importance. Unforeseen circumstances that may necessitate an emergency resolution include a serious event that occurred after the proposed resolution deadline or a change in policy that is necessary because of changed circumstances after the resolution deadline. The proposed emergency resolution must receive an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the delegates to be considered for deliberation.

Please submit any proposed emergency resolutions to the NWF Secretary, Ben Kota, prior to 3:00 p.m. on Friday, March 27, 2015. In order for an emergency resolution to be considered, two-thirds of the delegates must vote for consideration. If considered, a second vote is required to pass the resolution. One hundred twenty-five copies of each proposed emergency resolution must be presented to Ben Kota, Secretary, by the proponent.

Resolutions Committee Assignments - 2015

	Endangered Species Act		Game Wildlife		Public Engagement		Resource Development	
<i>Chair</i>	<i>MT</i>	<i>Dave Chadwick</i>	<i>TN</i>	<i>Mike Butler</i>	<i>TX</i>	<i>Janice Bezanson</i>	<i>ME</i>	<i>Lisa Pohlmann</i>
<i>Vice Chair</i>	<i>NH</i>	<i>Mike Bartlett</i>	<i>NC</i>	<i>John Robbins</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>Laura Bankey</i>	<i>AR</i>	<i>Ellen McNulty</i>
	MI	Dawn Levey	WY	Reg Rothwell	DE	Seth Ross	LA	Warren Singer
	WI	John Wagner	ID	Keith Lawrence	HI	Rick Barboza	MN	Joe Hoffman
	NV	Kevin Cabble	MO	Don Johnson	AZ	Bob Vahle	WV	Angie Rosser
	KS	Troy Schroeder	MT	Skip Kowalski	NM	Garrett VeneKlasen	MS	Jeanne Jones
	NC	Richard Mode	IN	Doug Allman	NE	Gene Oglesby	ND	Tom Sklebar
	VA	Jacob Powell	KY	Gordon Garner	AK	Anders Gustafson	WI	George Borchert
	OR	Bill Kremers	AL	Frank Boyd	ID	Michael Gibson	FL	Jim Schuette
	RI	Jamie Rhodes	GA	Tom Jones	PA	John Norbeck	SC	Dan Scheffing
	ME	Karen Herold	CO	Brent Miller	CT	Caroline Driscoll	VI	Michael Baron
	AL	Rebecca Pritchett	SD	Rich Widman	NJ	Dale Rosselet	IA	Rich Leopold
	GA	Todd Holbrook	NE	James Johnson	IL	Jon McNussen	TX	Mack Turner
	CO	Suzanne O'Neill	OR	Bob Rees	DC	Brenda Lee Richardson	CA	Sage Sweetwood
	WV	Bill Turner	AZ	Brad Powell	VI	Paul Chakroff	CT	Ruth Cutler
Board	<i>Resolutions Session Chair: David Hargett</i>							
	Brian Preston		Brian Bashore		Bill Houston		Jenny Brock	
Staff Advisor	Adam Kolton		Clare Bastable		Hilary Falk		Julie Sibbing	

Modernization of the Endangered Species Act

1 WHEREAS, for more than 40 years, the Endangered Species Act (ESA) has served as the
2 nation's safety net for imperiled fish, wildlife and plant species; and

3 WHEREAS, the National Wildlife Federation encouraged passage of the Endangered
4 Species Act and has long supported it as a bedrock environmental law, adopting 14 resolutions,
5 litigating numerous lawsuits, developing extensive educational materials, and advocating to
6 protect and conserve endangered species; and

7 WHEREAS, the Endangered Species Act has been tremendously successful, with
8 approximately 99% of all listed species still being in existence today, and species such as the bald
9 eagle, American alligator and others have recovered; and

10 WHEREAS, even when political officials charged with implementing the law have been
11 hostile to wildlife conservation, the ESA has continued to protect habitat, foster active
12 management and recovery efforts, and bring public attention, effort, and funding to stewardship of
13 the natural world; and

14 WHEREAS, as of January 5, 2015, while more than 2,200 species have been listed as
15 endangered or threatened, only 59 species have been delisted since the ESA's inception; thirty
16 due to recovery, ten due to extinction (seven of which are believed to have been extinct prior to
17 being listed), eleven due to changes in taxonomic classification practices, six due to discovery of
18 new populations, one due to an error in the listing rule, and one due to an amendment to the ESA
19 specifically requiring the species delisting; and

20 WHEREAS, while the vast majority of the 2,141 species still listed remain so because
21 they are not yet recovered, there is a great deal of controversy surrounding the Endangered
22 Species Act with regard to delisting of species, and even when species like gray wolf populations
23 in the Western Great Lakes and Northern Rocky Mountains are recovered and are success stories
24 under the ESA, lawsuits have prevented their delisting;

25 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the National Wildlife Federation, at its
26 annual meeting assembled **March 27-29, 2015 in Shepherdstown, West Virginia**, restates its
27 strong support for the Endangered Species Act and its objectives of recovering imperiled species,
28 and supports the narrow and specific legislative correction in the second “RESOLVED” clause to
29 improve implementation of the Endangered Species Act, provided that the Act must continue to
30 protect all animals and plants that are threatened or endangered for any reason by providing an
31 efficient means of listing based on the best available scientific and commercial data, by prohibiting
32 federally-approved or undertaken actions that might jeopardize listed species, by prohibiting all
33 activities that would result in a taking of any listed species, except as provided for already in the
34 Act, and by promoting recovery planning and identifying the actions and strategies needed to
35 recover a species and return management to the states; and

36 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the National Wildlife Federation urges the current
37 114th Congress and Administration to work together to clarify statutory language within the
38 Endangered Species Act to ensure that there is a clear, durable, and enduring process for
39 delisting once the species reaches its recovery goals and adequate management plans are in place
40 to continue the conservation of the species; and

41 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the National Wildlife Federation urges the federal
42 government, state agencies, and conservation advocates to focus on addressing the cause of the

43 decline of species so that recovery plans and listing and delisting decisions under the Endangered
44 Species Act can be rooted in the best available science and will actually lead to recovery; and
45 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the National Wildlife Federation urges the necessary
46 funding from Congress and the Administration to ensure the success of the Endangered Species
47 Act in recovering threatened and endangered species.

Affiliate Commentary

Despite landmark settlements adopted in 2011 requiring the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) to review the status of hundreds of species currently listed as candidate species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), environmental groups continue to file lawsuits to force listing decisions and to oppose delisting decisions.

At the very least, the ESA should be updated so that there is a clear, durable, and enduring process for delisting once the species reaches its recovery goals and adequate management plans are in place to continue the conservation of the species. However, through the process, NWF and its state affiliates could be leaders in reviewing the implementation of the ESA and identify ways to eliminate unnecessary procedural requirements; improve the clarity and consistency of regulations; engage the states, tribes, conservation organizations, and private landowners as more effective conservation partners; encourage greater creativity in the implementation of the ESA; and reduce the frequency and intensity of conflicts as much as possible. This would strengthen the public's support for the ESA and the need for conservation actions to prevent species from becoming threatened or endangered.

NWF Staff Commentary

The resolution reaffirms NWF's longstanding and strong commitment to the Endangered Species Act but also calls for adequate funding and reforms that would better enable species that meet recovery goals to come off the list. This is a sensible approach that could strengthen the Act and public support for it.

Unfortunately, the Congress is so polarized around ESA that strengthening the Act in this narrow manner may be a longer-term proposition. Staff knows of no serious effort to build a bi-partisan

coalition around ESA reauthorization; instead most proposals being advanced call for seriously weakening the law.

The Endangered Species Act that was overwhelmingly adopted by Congress in 1973 includes language that calls upon Congress to reauthorize the law every five years. Throughout the 1970's and 80's Congress was attentive to this obligation and the law was reauthorized and amended with strong bi-partisan support, the last time being in 1987. Beginning in the 1990's, the debate surrounding the ESA reauthorization became increasingly partisan and polarized and despite serious effort to forge a consensus around ESA reauthorization in the Senate, no bill made it to the floor of either the House or the Senate in the last 23 years. Since the last of these efforts failed in the late 1990's, Congress has all but given up attempting to reauthorize the Act and has instead simply funded the existing law, which remains in effect, through the appropriation process.

If the delegates choose to adopt this resolution, they should understand that staff believes the outlook for positively addressing the acknowledged problems of the ESA are dim at best. Congress gave up on working to reauthorize the ESA more than a decade ago because no bi-partisan, broadly supported bill was politically possible. This reality has not changed and has arguably grown worse.

Given the need to defend the ESA in the current Congress, the delegates may want to consider modifying whereas clause 4 to delete all the statistics regarding species that have not come off the list. Although those statistics are accurate, unfortunately they are often misleadingly used by ESA opponents to suggest that the ESA is not working. The opponents use them to ignore the fact that most listed species are stable or are recovering which in and of itself represents important conservation progress. We suggest this as an option to be considered only because the statistics seem unnecessary to support the resolved clauses about delisting species that are recovered.

NWF Staff Recommendation

Notwithstanding these concerns, NWF staff supports the resolution and recommends its adoption.

Restoring State Management of the Gray Wolf in the Western Great Lakes States

1 WHEREAS, the National Wildlife Federation is a strong supporter of scientific and
2 professional management of wildlife species including the recovery of the gray wolf under the
3 federal and state Endangered Species Acts; and

4 WHEREAS, gray wolf populations in Minnesota, Michigan and Wisconsin have exceeded
5 their recovery targets by a factor of ten; and

6 WHEREAS, the Minnesota, Michigan and Wisconsin Departments of Natural Resources
7 developed wolf management recovery plans that were approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
8 Service and were successfully implemented by the respective state agencies; and

9 WHEREAS, as a result of this successful restoration of the gray wolf in the Western Great
10 Lakes, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, by federal rule, attempted to delist the gray wolf in the
11 states of Minnesota, Michigan and Wisconsin four times between 2003 and 2011; and

12 WHEREAS, each such delisting of the gray wolf was challenged in Federal Court on
13 technical grounds, not based on its recovery status but on administrative or legal technicalities,
14 which resulted in Federal Court decisions returning the gray wolf to the Federal Endangered
15 Species list and removing state management of the species; and

16 WHEREAS, the latest Federal Court decision relisting the gray wolf on the Federal
17 Endangered Species list occurred on December 19, 2014 with the court ruling that the gray wolf
18 could not be removed from the Federal Endangered Species list until it had been fully recovered
19 in its full historic range in 29 Eastern and Central states; and

20 WHEREAS, as a result of this latest court decision, state permits authorizing lethal control
21 of wolves depredate livestock are no longer authorized, state laws authorizing land owners to
22 kill wolves in the act of attacking domestic animals are no longer valid and state laws allowing
23 management of wolf populations through harvest regulation no longer are valid; and

24 WHEREAS, based on recent and extensive experience, without state lethal methods of
25 management, wolves will continue to cause significant depredation of domestic animals in the
26 states of Minnesota, Michigan and Wisconsin; and

27 WHEREAS, in 2011, in a similar situation involving state management of wolves in the
28 states of Idaho and Montana, the United State Congress passed a law which statutorily directed the
29 U.S. Fish and Wildlife to reissue its rule (from 2009) delisting wolves in those states and secondly,
30 prohibited any judicial review of such rule;

31 WHEREAS, although the National Wildlife Federation has historically opposed such
32 Congressional intervention in agency decision-making and judicial review, these are exceptional
33 circumstances, and without Congressional intervention the letter and spirit of the Endangered
34 Species Act regarding gray wolf recovery would be permanently thwarted by the courts; and

35 WHEREAS, this legislation recognizes sound professional management of wolves by state
36 and federal agencies while still upholding the basic intent and principles of the Federal Endangered
37 Species Act and ensures that states can assure the long-term recovery of the species while still
38 protecting domestic animals and humans;

39 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the National Wildlife Federation, at its
40 annual meeting assembled March 27-29, 2015 in Shepherdstown, West Virginia, hereby urges the

41 current 114th Congress to enact legislation directing the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to reissue
42 its 2011 rule removing the gray wolf from the Federal Endangered Species list in the states of
43 Minnesota, Michigan and Wisconsin and to provide that such rule is not subject to any judicial
44 review.

Affiliate Commentary

According to the USFWS, “Recovery criteria established in the Recovery Plan include the assured survival of the gray wolf population in Minnesota and a population of 100 or more wolves in Wisconsin/Michigan for a minimum of five consecutive years. The Recovery Plan identified 1,250 to 1,400 as a population goal for Minnesota. The Minnesota wolf population has been at or above that level since the late 1970s. The Wisconsin/Michigan wolf population has been above 100 since the winter of 1993-1994, achieving the latter numerical goal in the Recovery Plan. With this consistent expansion in numbers and range, the gray wolf population is healthy and recovered in the western Great Lakes region.”

However, the recovered Western Great Lakes population of wolves has languished under overprotection of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) now for more than 20 years, committing time and money from our agencies that might be better spent on populations that require more attention. The history of court rulings and status changes has weakened support for the ESA as people have lost confidence that a durable delisting might be possible.

This is not our preferred method of delisting. But sound scientific evidence has been repeatedly ignored over technicalities and the federal court appeal is a lengthy process that still may not provide a clear and durable delisting. This Congressional delisting would allow the states to resume their management authority while we also work on the modernization of the Endangered Species Act to clarify language.

NWF Staff Recommendation

National Wildlife Federation strongly supported the establishment and passage of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in 1973, and has fought diligently to support enforcement and improvement of it ever since.

The Endangered Species Act has been extremely successful preventing species from going extinct with more than a 99% success rate. But the ultimate goal of the Endangered Species Act

is not to keep a species on the list forever. The goal is species recovery. True success comes when a species or population that was once on the brink (nationally or in a specific region), comes back in strength of numbers to a level deemed by wildlife management professionals to be self-sustainable for the foreseeable future. In short, success equals delisting and National Wildlife Federation believes that such success stories inspire Americans to continue to support wildlife conservation efforts and the Endangered Species Act.. As but one example, Americans across the country recognize Bald Eagle delisting as a national success story.

As much as any conservation organization, NWF understands that funding for ESA conservation work is not infinite and recognizes that when one species achieves levels of recovery warranting delisting, the limited conservation resources available can then be refocused on other species that are truly in need of strong restoration support.

Under the Endangered Species Act - and with the support of NWF and other state and wildlife conservation organizations – research data demonstrates that the Gray Wolf population *in the Great Lakes Region* has recovered, exceeding their recovery targets by an impressive factor of ten.

As a result of this achievement, NWF and its state affiliates in the region have strongly supported the delisting of Gray Wolf populations in the Great Lakes region for the last decade and recognize this delisting as a true wildlife conservation success story. Simultaneously, NWF continues to work for the protection of endangered wolf populations in parts of the United States where the species still struggles.

The larger issue at hand is: who should be authorized to make delisting decisions?

NWF historically has opposed attempts to “fix” problematic ESA court decisions in Congress, where politics are often a higher priority than science. Our bedrock principle is that wildlife decisions should be based on science and proven best practices and be made by wildlife management professionals.

In this case, wildlife management professionals at the state and federal have all recommended delisting of the Great Lakes Gray Wolves – and have done so for several years. In fact, the experts at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service have attempted to delist the Great Lakes Gray Wolves several times in the last decade – and each time and for different and inconsistent reasons, a federal judge has overturned the recommendation of these experts.

This situation is bad for wolves, people and the Endangered Species Act and is precluding sound management by professional wildlife managers. This is creating an unnecessary but fierce backlash against this incredibly important wildlife protection law.

Despite all of this, there is a substantial likelihood that the most recent court decision putting the wolves in the Great Lakes back on the endangered species list will be subject to years of continued litigation and uncertainty, despite their recovery.

That's not good for the ESA or for building support for wolf reintroduction and recovery elsewhere. As a result, in this exceptional case, NWF supports this resolution calling for a very narrow legislative measure that restores the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's delisting decision in the Great Lakes. Such legislation would be supporting science, scientists and the agency decision – not playing politics with them.

As with any legislative matter, NWF needs the flexibility to choose when and how best to support congressional action for a narrow legislative provision to restore state grey wolf management authority. If the bill is attached to a broader legislative vehicle that has significant anti-wildlife provisions, NWF will continue to support the narrow provision, but may need to oppose the broader bill depending on the circumstances, provisions in questions and how they relate to other NWF conservation policy resolutions and positions.

NWF remains opposed to Congressional meddling with agency actions and court decisions -- but these are exceptional circumstances. Our support of this specific narrow fix should not be construed by Congress as lessening in any way our opposition to weakening the ESA or other bedrock wildlife management laws.

NWF Staff Recommendation

Within this context, NWF staff therefore supports the proposed resolution, “Restoring State Management of the Gray Wolf in the Western Great Lakes States.

2015 Proposed Resolution No. Game Wildlife - 1
Submitted by: Idaho Wildlife Federation, Arizona Wildlife Federation, Colorado Wildlife Federation, Montana Wildlife Federation, Nevada Wildlife Federation, New Mexico Wildlife Federation

Bighorn Sheep Disease Management

1 WHEREAS, Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep populations in the western United States are
2 estimated to have numbered between 1.5 and 2.0 million animals at the start of the 19th century
3 but have declined and today number approximately 80,000 animals; and

4 WHEREAS, the major causes of this decline were unregulated hunting and the
5 introduction of disease, principally pneumonia, associated with Euro-American settlement; and

6 WHEREAS, efforts to restore bighorn sheep populations are hampered by the persistence
7 and spread of pneumonia in both previously-affected and naïve populations; and

8 WHEREAS, extensive research and anecdotal data have documented the transmission of
9 pneumonia causing bacteria species from domestic sheep to bighorn sheep under both captive
10 and wild conditions and strongly implicate infection from domestic sheep as a primary
11 mechanism of introduction of pneumonia into bighorn sheep populations; and

12 WHEREAS, the historic and current range of remnant bighorn sheep populations in the
13 western United States is proximate to or overlapped by domestic sheep grazing allotments on
14 federal land in some areas; and

15 WHEREAS, notwithstanding future research and technological breakthroughs, separation
16 of domestic sheep from bighorn sheep has been determined to most effectively minimize the
17 likelihood of transmission of pneumonia from domestic sheep to bighorn sheep; and

18 WHEREAS, research on Best Management Practices (BMPs) to promote separation
19 between domestic and bighorn sheep has shown them to be ineffective partially due to human
20 management error and continued straying of domestic sheep; and

21 WHEREAS, the United States Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management have
22 developed a model to quantify the risk of contact between domestic sheep and bighorn sheep
23 with the support of three states (Oregon, Washington, and Idaho), four federally-recognized
24 American Indian tribes (the Nez Perce Tribe, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian
25 Reservation, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, and Shoshone-Paiute Tribes), and academic researchers;
26 and

27 WHEREAS, this model has undergone extensive academic peer review and been
28 developed into a user-friendly planning tool known as the “Bighorn Sheep Risk of Contact
29 Tool”; and

30 WHEREAS, the use of this tool, scientific data to date, and management decisions
31 associated with their use have been litigated and affirmed in Federal Court; and

32 WHEREAS, the U.S. Forest Service has initiated an assessment of the risk of contact
33 between domestic sheep and bighorn sheep within Region 4 of its lands using the Bighorn Sheep
34 Risk of Contact Tool; and

35 WHEREAS, the U.S. Forest Service and U.S. Bureau of Land Management have
36 designated bighorn sheep as a sensitive species in at least portions of their range; and

37 WHEREAS, both the U.S. Forest Service and the U.S. Bureau of Land management are
38 considering programmatic reviews of their bighorn sheep and domestic sheep management
39 policies nationwide; and

40 WHEREAS, researchers are developing tools to determine the source of bacterial
41 transmissions associated with discrete disease events, thus identifying parties responsible for
42 damages to public resources;

43 NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the National Wildlife Federation, in its
44 Annual Meeting assembled March 27-29, 2015 in Shepherdstown, Virginia, recognizes that
45 ongoing disease in bighorn sheep populations has compromised past restoration efforts and is
46 likely to continue to do so without changes in management; and

47 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the National Wildlife Federation recognizes that
48 separation of domestic sheep from bighorn sheep is the best available means to minimize the
49 likelihood of transmission of pneumonia from domestic sheep to bighorn sheep; and

50 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the National Wildlife Federation recognizes that the
51 Bighorn Sheep Risk of Contact Tool represents the best available science on the issue of
52 separation between domestic sheep and bighorn sheep; and

53 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the National Wildlife Federation recommends the U.S.
54 Forest Service and U.S. Bureau of Land Management amend their policies to recognize the
55 Bighorn Sheep Risk of Contact Tool as the best available science on the issue of separation
56 between domestic sheep and bighorn sheep, relevant to both identifying areas of concern and
57 developing strategies to reduce the risk of contact between the species; and

58 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, National Wildlife Federation recommends the U.S.
59 Forest Service and U.S. Bureau of Land Management use the Bighorn Sheep Risk of Contact
60 Tool to assess risk to bighorn sheep populations across their lands, nationwide; and

61 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the National Wildlife Federation recommends the U.S.
62 Forest Service and U.S. Bureau of Land Management, as they conduct their nationwide risk of
63 contact assessments, adopt a very low tolerance of contact risk as estimated by the Bighorn
64 Sheep Risk of Contact Tool; and

65 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the National Wildlife Federation endorses moving
66 domestic sheep away from bighorn sheep through the voluntary retirement of domestic sheep
67 allotments or conversion to domestic cattle on U.S. Forest Service and U.S. Bureau of Land
68 Management lands as a means of reducing the risk of contact between domestic sheep and
69 bighorn sheep; and

70 BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, the National Wildlife Federation recommends that U.S.
71 Forest Service and U.S. Bureau of Land Management staff work with conservation organizations
72 to engage domestic sheep grazing permittees with grazing allotments of priority concern, to
73 identify opportunities to either retire allotments or convert them to domestic cattle.

Affiliate Commentary

Bighorn sheep were extirpated from large tracts of the western United States. Excessive harvest, a cause of the population decline, was eliminated. Disease limits the success of current restoration efforts. State and federal agencies agree the most likely source of disease transmission is domestic sheep or goats. Domestic sheep transmit disease to bighorn sheep in clinical settings.

Agencies historically relied on "expert opinion" to recommend measures to create effective separation between species. In 2010, the Payette National Forest published a Record of Decision based on a newly created "risk of contact" model. The model uses bighorn sheep movement and habitat use data gathered from Hells Canyon to develop estimated risk of contact between the species.

The model was published in a peer reviewed journal. The Idaho Woolgrowers Association challenged the validity of the "risk of contact" model in Idaho Federal Court. The Court concluded the Forest Service used the best available science. The Intermountain Region of the Forest Service initiated a region wide review based on the "risk of contact" model to determine where domestic sheep are grazed too close to bighorn sheep. A benefit of the "risk of contact" model is that further/new agency use eliminates development of new analysis, or defense of such.

The Idaho Wildlife Federation resolution recommends bighorn sheep habitat and population managers make the "risk of contact" model the primary tool used to evaluate if there is adequate separation between domestic and bighorn sheep. Separation reduces the risk of disease transmission between species.

NWF Staff Commentary

North American bighorn sheep populations once numbered 500,000 to 2 million animals, according to estimates by historians and scholars. Bighorns also were widely distributed across the West.

European settlement of the West proved devastating for bighorns. With settlement came competition from livestock, habitat loss, disease and unregulated hunting. By the early decades of the 20th century, bighorn sheep trended toward extinction, their numbers estimated at no more than 15,000. Through the efforts of sportsmen and state fish and wildlife agencies in the West, bighorns began a slow comeback fostered through reintroduction of animals from remnant populations to tracts of historic range, starting in the 1930s.

Bighorn numbers grew slowly through much of the late 20th century, peaking at around 70,000 animals, albeit with periodic die-offs. Since the 1980s, however, Rocky Mountain bighorns have suffered steep decline, with populations falling as low as 30,000 animals by the beginning of the 21st century. The most recent (2012) population estimates for 12 states of the West are about 33,000 Rocky Mountain bighorns.

Today, bighorns occupy only a fraction of available and suitable habitat. Bighorn populations struggle despite the fact that hunting is limited and closely regulated, and despite tremendous effort and expenditures from state wildlife agencies aimed at promoting bighorn populations.

So, why don't we see more bighorns? Extensive scientific research confirms that disease transmitted to wild sheep through contact with domestic sheep is the primary limiting factor today for bighorn sheep populations. Even healthy domestic sheep can carry pathogens for which bighorn sheep have little or no immunity. Respiratory disease (viral pneumonia) stands out as the major disease of concern.

In much of the west, there is significant overlap between domestic sheep grazing operations on public and private lands and wild sheep populations. Separation of bighorn sheep from domestic sheep is the primary mechanism in minimizing risk of disease exposure. The Region 4 Forest Service (ID, UT, WY, and NV) is currently working on a risk of contact assessment that will highlight allotments where there is significant risk of disease transmission. This "risk of contact" model will be an extremely important tool in identifying high risk allotments.

Through NWF's adopt-a-wildlife-acre program, we have worked for the past decade to identify high-risk allotments and negotiate voluntary grazing retirements. This has proven to be an extremely successful approach and NWF has retired over 250,000 acres of high risk domestic sheep allotments on Forest Service lands.

This resolution complements existing NWF resolutions that address livestock / wildlife conflict resolution and bighorn sheep conservation efforts (e.g. "Wildlife Disease Management," 2000 and "Bighorn Sheep in California," 1989).

The delegates may wish to change the first three RESOLVED statements to WHEREAS statements, as they are statements of fact, not declarations of policy.

NWF Staff Recommendation

NWF staff recommends this resolution be adopted as submitted.

Conservation of Sage-Grouse and the Sagebrush Steppe

1 WHEREAS, the sage-grouse is an iconic species of the West, an indicator of the health of
2 sagebrush habitats and an important game species; and

3 WHEREAS, conservation of the sage-grouse and sagebrush habitats benefits other game
4 species, such as mule deer and pronghorn, and many Species of Greatest Conservation Need, as
5 well as lifestyles and the economies of western states; and

6 WHEREAS, sage-grouse populations across the West have been in decline for decades;
7 and across the range of the species, numbers have declined by approximately 50 percent, and
8 habitat has shrunk by a similar amount; and

9 WHEREAS, there are numerous causes of these population declines, including
10 conversion of sagebrush habitats by crop production, wildfire, overgrazing, West Nile virus,
11 invasive species, and energy development; and

12 WHEREAS, the sage-grouse has been petitioned for listing under the Endangered
13 Species Act, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has been directed to make a decision on
14 whether to list sage-grouse under the ESA by October 1, 2015; and

15 WHEREAS, the threat of listing has prompted states, federal land-management agencies,
16 the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), and many private landowners to take
17 positive action on behalf of sage-grouse and sagebrush habitats; and

18 WHEREAS, the Bureau of Land Management is amending its land-use plans across the
19 range of sage-grouse to develop stronger standards and guidelines for its management; and

20 WHEREAS, NRCS, working through the Sage-Grouse Initiative, has signed contracts for
21 protecting and improving sage-grouse habitat with over 6,000 landowners in the West; and

22 WHEREAS many states have developed plans for recovering and managing sage-grouse
23 populations; and

24 WHEREAS, the refinement, implementation and underwriting of these plans will take
25 many years;

26 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation supports
27 the efforts of state, federal and private entities to conserve both sage-grouse and sagebrush
28 habitats; and

29 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federations calls upon
30 Congress and the legislatures in states with sage-grouse populations to adequately fund
31 conservation and restoration efforts on behalf of sage-grouse.

Affiliate Commentary

The sage-grouse was once abundant and wide-spread in sagebrush ecosystems. Its historic range encompassed 16 western states and 3 Canadian provinces. The species has been extirpated from 5 states and 2 provinces, and its populations have become greatly diminished and fragmented. It is believed that just 100 years ago the species numbered in the tens of millions. Now, estimates are 200,000-500,000 birds. The sagebrush biome, upon which the sage-grouse is so dependent, is one of the most imperiled in North America. It once extended over 62 million hectares; now only an estimated 56% percent remains.

Sage-grouse conservation is as much about protecting the landscapes upon which it depends as it is about recovering the species itself. The lands and habitats so important to the sage-grouse are also important to people and other wildlife species. The sagebrush biome has for generations supported a way of life, including jobs, businesses and recreation that defines much of the West. Other wildlife dependent upon sagebrush include mule deer, pronghorn and a number of species listed as Species of Greatest Conservation Need in the State Wildlife Action Plans of many western states.

At a time when states within the species' historic distribution are working cooperatively and with great earnest to establish conservation plans to stem the losses of sage-grouse and the habitats upon which it depends, legislative and other forces are now reacting against these efforts. We believe it is important that the National Wildlife Federation show its support for sage-grouse conservation at this critical time.

NWF Staff Commentary

NWF supports passage of the resolution "Conservation of Sage-Grouse and the Sagebrush Steppe," submitted by the Wyoming Wildlife Federation. This resolution champions the efforts of federal and state agencies and private individuals across the West to conserve sage-grouse and the sagebrush habitats vital to sustaining these birds and many other species of wildlife. The resolution also urges Congress to provide necessary resources to encourage these efforts.

The resolution is an important companion to previous resolutions that recognized the decline in sage-grouse populations and the threat posed particularly by intensive energy development in their sagebrush habitats. Previous resolutions urged the development of effective, science-based strategies to conserve sage-grouse before authorizing oil and gas leasing or siting of wind turbines. (Energy Development on Federal Public Lands (2010), Responsible Oil and Gas Development on Our Public Lands (2008-04), Support for Using the Best Available Science to Conserve Greater Sage-grouse in Areas Scheduled for Intensive Energy Development (2008-05), Wind Farms and Wildlife (2004-11).) The current resolution supports ongoing efforts now

underway to develop and implement comprehensive conservation plans addressing all significant threats to these birds.

Sage-grouse are in trouble. The birds were originally plentiful across most of the western United States and Canada. Since the settlement era, however, sage-grouse have lost half of their historic habitat. They have been extirpated from several states, as well as British Columbia. Total population currently is estimated to be between 200,000 and 400,000 sage-grouse in the United States. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) calculates, however, that sage-grouse populations just 50 years ago in the late 1960s and early 1970s were likely two to three times larger than current numbers.

According to studies by USFWS and others, the primary cause of shrinking sage-grouse populations is the loss and fragmentation of their sagebrush habitat. The birds are dependent on large tracts of sagebrush containing a healthy understory of grasses and forbs, a landscape that is disappearing across the West. This “sagebrush sea” also supports more than 350 other species who call this landscape home, including elk, mule deer and golden eagles. Energy development and agricultural conversion are primary drivers of habitat loss in the eastern half of the bird’s range in Wyoming, Montana, the Dakotas, Colorado and Utah. In the Great Basin, conifer encroachment and the combination of exotic annual grasses and increased wildfire are the primary threats. Overgrazing and predation have also reduced sage-grouse populations in some localized areas.

In 2010, USFWS determined that both the Greater and Gunnison sage-grouse were candidates for protection under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), but that further action by the Service was precluded by higher priority listing actions. The Gunnison sage-grouse, found in southwestern Colorado and southeastern Utah, now numbers only about 5000 birds. In 2014, Gunnison sage-grouse were formally listed as threatened pursuant to ESA. USFWS has also agreed, as part of a court settlement, to make an initial determination on whether formally to propose the Greater sage-grouse for listing as threatened or endangered by September 30th of 2015.

The federal 2015 Omnibus Appropriations Bill contains a rider that currently prevents USFWS from publishing a proposed listing rule regarding Greater sage-grouse. The rider, however, does not relieve the Service of its obligation to determine whether the species still warrants protection under ESA, as the agency determined in 2010. USFWS is moving forward to either list the bird or approve ongoing recovery efforts by the states and federal land management agencies.

Federal and state agencies and private individuals have been working in an unprecedented partnership to put comprehensive plans and adequate protections in place to conserve sage-grouse and avoid the need for formal ESA listings. About 64 percent of current Greater sage-grouse habitat is on federally managed lands. BLM and the U.S. Forest Service are coordinating updates to more than 90 resource management plans to address identified threats to the bird.

Strong state plans and private landowner participation are also critical to conservation of the sage-grouse. State fish and wildlife agencies are finalizing state-based management plans. In addition, the Sage-Grouse Initiative, a program funded by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Natural Resource Conservation Service, has enrolled more than 950 ranchers in conservation programs that thus far have protected more than 2.6 million acres of sagebrush habitat.

Similar efforts on a smaller scale have also been underway with respect to Gunnison sage-grouse. Protections in place were sufficient to avoid the need to list the bird as endangered as originally proposed by USFWS. It is hoped that a little additional effort by state and federal agencies and private individuals may eliminate any necessity for the current threatened listing.

While it is often reported that "conservationists" want sage-grouse protected under ESA, a listing is never the goal. ESA was designed by Congress to enable recovery of species and their habitats before they need its protections in precisely the manner demonstrated by the cooperative steps being taken today to conserve sage-grouse.

The ultimate test, however, will be whether the birds protected on paper in federal and state plans become actual birds on the ground. That will require a continuing commitment and the National Wildlife Federation is right to adopt a resolution supporting the plans and calling for the resources to implement them.

NWF Staff Recommendation

NWF staff recommends this resolution be adopted as submitted.

2016 IUCN World Conservation Congress

1 WHEREAS, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) World
2 Conservation Congress is the world's preeminent and largest conservation gathering, bringing
3 together thousands of leaders and delegates every four years to discuss the world's most pressing
4 environment and development challenges with the goal of conserving wildlife and the
5 environment and harnessing the solutions nature offers to society's global challenges; and

6 WHEREAS, IUCN has been successful in influencing, encouraging, and assisting
7 societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature by (1) influencing
8 governments, business, and other stakeholders to support wildlife conservation efforts, (2)
9 implementing several international agreements on nature conservation and biodiversity,
10 including the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
11 (CITES), and (3) assessing the conservation status and conservation needs of species worldwide
12 through the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species; and

13 WHEREAS, the upcoming World Conservation Congress, to take place in Honolulu,
14 Hawai'i, September 1-10, 2016, will be the first time that a U.S. location will host the Congress;
15 and

16 WHEREAS, the National Wildlife Federation, a founding member of the IUCN in 1948,
17 and its Hawai'i state affiliate, Conservation Council for Hawai'i, have worked closely with
18 conservation leaders, Native Hawaiian cultural leaders, and the State of Hawai'i to help bring the
19 2016 World Conservation Congress to the United States; and

20 WHEREAS, at the World Conservation Congress, IUCN member organizations are able
21 to influence the global conservation agenda, and guide IUCN's work plan for the four years to
22 follow; and

23 WHEREAS, the 2016 World Conservation Congress offers the National Wildlife
24 Federation, its state affiliates, and many other like-minded conservation organizations and
25 stakeholders around the globe an unprecedented opportunity to focus attention on issues of
26 importance to NWF and its affiliates, and to highlight on the world stage the important
27 conservation challenges and achievements taking place across the United States, and especially
28 in Hawai'i;

29 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the National Wildlife Federation, at its
30 annual meeting assembled March 27-29, 2015 in Shepherdstown, West Virginia, hereby
31 welcomes and supports the 2016 World Conservation Congress, as well as other like-minded
32 conservation organizations, in their efforts to promote common solutions to the world's most
33 pressing environmental threats, including wildlife and habitat conservation; and

34 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the National Wildlife Federation encourages
35 participation in the 2016 World Conservation Congress by U.S. conservation organizations and
36 natural resource management agencies; and

37 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the National Wildlife Federation urges President
38 Obama and/or Vice President Biden to attend the 2016 World Conservation Congress for the
39 purpose of demonstrating U.S. leadership in the international conservation arena.

Affiliate Commentary

The Conservation Council for Hawai‘i (CCH) proposes the Resolution below – titled “2016 IUCN World Conservation Congress” – for consideration at the 2015 Annual Meeting of the National Wildlife Federation. CCH, along with NWF, have worked closely with conservation leaders, Native Hawaiian cultural leaders, and the State of Hawai‘i to help bring the 2016 IUCN World Conservation Congress to the United States. The Resolution is not only a way to formally welcome the IUCN World Conservation Congress to the United States, but it also endorses the involvement of the NWF family in the World Conservation Congress, and engagement with IUCN more generally.

NWF Staff Commentary

NWF supports passage of the resolution “2016 IUCN World Conservation Congress,” submitted by the Conservation Council for Hawai‘i (CCH), in its current form. This resolution complements efforts by the NWF family to support action to conserve the world’s nature and natural resources. NWF was a founding member of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) in 1948. Historically, NWF has played an important role, working with IUCN, to advance conservation goals in the United States and around the world, including clamping down on the trade in endangered species, and promoting protections for tropical forests and other key wildlife habitats, such as for migratory birds. This resolution is consistent with previous NWF resolutions, including: “International Wildlife Matters” 1979; “Conserving Biological Diversity Worldwide” 1983; “Expanded International Activities” 1989; “Diversity in the Conservation Movement” 2010; “Hawaiian Islands Endangered Species and Climate Change” 2011; “Emerging Leaders in the Conservation Movement” 2012; and “Endangered Hawaiian Monk Seal Conservation and Recovery” 2012.

Wildlife conservation in the United States and across the globe faces unprecedented threats, and effective conservation action cannot be achieved by conservationists alone. The IUCN’s World Conservation Congress is a major event that happens only every three years, where government agencies, scientific experts and conservation groups meet to debate policies, and the means and mechanisms to implement them. The key topics of the Congress will include the status of endangered species, land protections and wildlife law enforcement in different countries, and the best ways to share both the responsibilities and the benefits of wildlife conservation. The 2016 World Conservation Congress is the first time this significant event will be hosted in the United States. It offers NWF and any interested state affiliates a great opportunity to highlight on the world stage the important conservation achievements and challenges taking place across the United States, and especially in Hawai‘i. It will also provide an opportunity for NWF and interested affiliates to engage with like-minded wildlife conservation allies from around the globe.

More importantly, by participating in the 2016 IUCN World Conservation Congress, NWF and interested affiliates will be able to strategically position themselves to contribute in a meaningful way to the global conservation agenda under debate during the proceedings. IUCN has a “resolution” process similar to that of NWF, which provides an opportunity to highlight our conservation priorities on the international stage, and seek consensus and support from allies around the world. This timely Resolution proposed by CCH welcomes the upcoming World Conservation Congress, and recognizes the benefits of engagement with the IUCN, to promote the protection of wildlife in the United States and across the globe.

NWF Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the resolution be adopted as submitted.

North American Conservation Education Strategy

1 WHEREAS, research demonstrates that children in America receive a wide range of
2 science education benefits from programs and lesson plans that teach them about nature,
3 ecosystems, wildlife species, water and natural resources; and

4 WHEREAS, natural areas and the outdoors offer excellent and practical laboratories for
5 learning about the science and the complexity of ecosystems, plant and animal communities and
6 species, water systems, geology and soil; and

7 WHEREAS, the time young people spend learning about and interpreting nature also
8 helps to connect them to a lifelong appreciation for wildlife and the natural world; and

9 WHEREAS, these outdoor learning experiences also provide opportunities for young
10 people to develop and appreciate outdoor skills such as hunting, fishing, camping, hiking,
11 orienteering and wildlife observation; and

12 WHEREAS, the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA) in cooperation with
13 its member agencies and other nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) has addressed these
14 opportunities through the development and the publishing of a comprehensive program of
15 principles, materials, curricula, skill guides and other useful educational tools under the auspices
16 of the North American Conservation Education Strategy (NACES); and

17 WHEREAS, NACES offers schools, educators, non-formal educators, parents, mentors
18 and childcare care-givers an important tool for educating children about nature, wildlife, and
19 outdoors skills and developing a lifelong connection to the outdoors;

20 THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the National Wildlife Federation supports the
21 content, intent and implementation of NACES by public and private conservation interests, to
22 encourage outdoor skill development in young people across America.

Affiliate Commentary

The North American Conservation Education Strategy developed by the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, its member agencies and other organizations, offers an opportunity for young people to learn about the science of fish and wildlife and the natural world and to understand sound management practices. It also is an organized educational program that provides significant opportunities for young people to learn about individual stewardship and conservation action. The science of wildlife management is an excellent subject for strengthening the scope and effectiveness for American scientific education and scientific inquiry under the auspices of the 2013 Next Generation Science Standards which have been recommended by the National Research Council and the National Academy of Sciences.

Importantly, the North American Conservation Education Strategy offers young people in America a significant opportunity to strengthen their personal connection to nature. The curriculum and associated educational activities encourage young people to understand and spend time in nature when the national trend is for them to remain indoors making use of electronic entertainment media. Research shows that a lack of time spent in nature erodes a young person's affinity for the natural world and diminishes his or her sense of stewardship.

Finally, the North American Conservation Education Strategy goes beyond natural science and wildlife management principles by focusing on the development of outdoor skills including wildlife observation, fishing and hunting. These skills are important to the long term future of American wildlife conservation and management and outdoor activity participation.

For these reasons, encouraging the National Wildlife Federation to participate more robustly in the Implementation of the North American Conservation Education Strategy will provide significant support for a nationwide effort among many agencies and organization to help fish and wildlife education and management within future generations.

NWF Staff Commentary

The formal K-12 education process today teaches relatively little about the science of North American wildlife and management. Only a very small percentage of the 60 million young people in our schools are exposed to the principles and skills of traditional fish and wildlife management. The lack of widespread scoped and sequenced conservation education can result in young people growing up with a lack of meaningful knowledge of wildlife and habitats and with a lack of affinity for nature and the outdoors.

The Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA) engaged in a multi-year effort to remedy this shortfall in American education by developing the North American Wildlife Conservation Education Strategy (NACES), which is a comprehensive curriculum and set of lesson plans for use in the classroom with grades 4, 6 and 12.

More than a dozen state wildlife agencies from across the U.S. participated in the development of NACES over the past ten years and each year new educational modules are added to the core curriculum including educational modules for teaching outdoor skills such as wildlife observation, tracking, fishing and hunting. In addition to state agency education expertise, a number of nongovernmental education organizations, including National Wildlife Federation, participated in the design and development of NACES.

The focus of NACES on educating students on wildlife science and management and exposing them to the development of outdoor skills, makes it a much needed program for young people today. And, it will be vital for the future of American wildlife management and outdoor program participation.

The National Wildlife Federation and its many state affiliates share common goals with NACES and could, through more applied effort, support the adoption of the program in U.S. schools and via other educational opportunities such as youth camps and educational outing programs.

This resolution will authorize NWF to work with AFWA and the NACES program on implementation through its existing school programs, such as Eco Schools and Schoolyard Habitats, and toward longer term goals such as including NACES in efforts to implement the Next Generation Science Standards in the states.

NWF Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends this resolution be adopted as submitted.

Support for Conserving Declining North American Pollinator Populations

1 WHEREAS, recent scientific data from many government, public and academic sources
2 show significant declines of the populations of many plant-pollinating insects, such as bees and
3 butterflies, and other pollinators in North America; and

4 WHEREAS, having a sufficient number of plant-pollinating insects and other pollinators
5 is necessary for the health of major North American ecosystems, water quality, air quality,
6 coastal stability and wildlife populations; and

7 WHEREAS, the North American scientific community attributes this decline in the
8 number of pollinators to multiple factors including habitat modification and clearing, reductions
9 of the availability of native food plants, use of insecticides and herbicides, truncation and
10 interruption of migratory routes and other physical, chemical and biological factors; and

11 WHEREAS, one-third of the nation’s food crop is dependent upon insect and other
12 pollinators, the decline in pollinators is a threat to one-third of our nation’s food supply, as well
13 as a long-term threat to the future of our agricultural economy; and

14 WHEREAS, the President of the United States has issued a Memorandum, June 20, 2014
15 to federal public agencies and a request to other public agencies, nongovernmental organizations,
16 private businesses, volunteer groups and individuals to take needed steps to reverse this decline
17 in pollinator populations; and

18 WHEREAS, such steps can include a variety of measures such as, but not limited to
19 changes in agricultural and forestry policy and practices, land planning, planting more native

20 pollinator food plants on public lands and along public transportation routes, an increase of the
21 use of native plants in private gardening practices; and

22 WHEREAS, bee, butterfly, and other pollinator abundance in public and private
23 landscapes are an indicator of biodiversity, are aesthetically pleasing and engage people of all
24 backgrounds as an accessible way to connect and support wildlife where they live, work, play,
25 learn and worship; and

26 WHEREAS, the National Wildlife Federation, its state and territorial affiliated
27 organizations and other partners working together with the public and private sectors can make a
28 significant impact on increasing and sustaining populations of North American pollinators;

29 NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the National Wildlife Federation at its
30 annual meeting assembled in Shepherdstown, West Virginia, March 27-29, 2015, supports
31 increasing and, in the long term, sustaining North American pollinator populations such as bees,
32 butterflies and other species through a variety of means including policy and practice reforms,
33 government/private partnerships, scientific assessment, public education, grassroots activation,
34 volunteer program development, species-specific campaigns and home, school and community
35 initiated habitats.

Affiliate Commentary

Recent scientific data from numerous government, public and academic sources show significant declines of plant-pollinating insects, such as bees and butterflies, and other pollinators in North America. The North American scientific community attributes this decline to multiple factors including habitat modification and clearing, reductions of the availability of native food plants, use of insecticides and herbicides, truncation and interruption of migratory routes and other physical, chemical and biological factors. One-third of the nation's food crop is dependent upon insects and other pollinators, which means that the decline in pollinators is also a threat to our nation's food supply, as well as a long-term threat to the future of our economy.

The Delaware Nature Society has become acutely aware of the threat that declining pollinator populations poses to Delaware's diverse natural habitats, agricultural community, and eco-tourism industry, all of which have a tremendous effect on the State's economy. The Delaware Nature Society is addressing the decline of pollinators through its educational programming, native plant sale, and through the Certified Wildlife Habitat™ program that it implements in Delaware in partnership with the National Wildlife Federation. In addition, pollinators are a central focus of the Delaware Nature Society's work in 2015 as the organization commemorates its 50th Anniversary.

We recognize the importance of pollinators not only to the Delaware economy and ecosystems, but to economies and ecosystems across the United States. A national conservation policy resolution is needed to ensure a coordinated and cohesive effort to confront this national (and international) crisis.

NWF Staff Commentary

On June 20th, 2014 President Obama signed the Presidential Memorandum on the Pollinator Crisis, which recognized major declines in pollinators and the need to take action. The North American scientific community attributes this decline to multiple factors including reductions of the availability of native food plants, use of insecticides and herbicides, truncation and interruption of migratory routes, and habitat conversion, modification and clearing, among other possible factors.

The President's MOU directed federal agencies, and requested other public agencies, NGOs, private businesses, volunteer groups and individuals to take needed steps to reverse this decline in pollinator populations.

This resolution is focused on increasing and, in the long term, sustaining North American pollinator populations such as bees, butterflies and other species through a variety of means

including policy and practice reforms, government/private partnerships, scientific assessment, public education, grassroots activation, volunteer program development, species-specific campaigns and other needed actions and opportunities.

It is entirely consistent with NWF's long-standing programs to protect and restore wildlife habitats, as well as the Backyard, Schoolyard and Community Wildlife Habitats programs.

One pollinator in particular, the monarch butterfly, has experienced a major population crash over the past decade. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is currently evaluating whether or not the monarch butterfly should be declared a threatened or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act. NWF supports this review and encourages FWS to take the necessary steps to conduct a comprehensive status review on North American monarchs. The decision on whether or not to list the monarch butterfly, as per the ESA, must be based on science rather than politics. There are, however, legitimate questions as to whether listing is the best tool at this time to bring the results needed to put monarch populations back on solid ground.

The collection and analysis of the scientific data to evaluate whether or not listing is merited will take at least a year, and likely longer. Meanwhile, monarchs and other pollinators need immediate help. This resolution sets aside the ongoing scientific question of whether listing is warranted, and instead focuses on what can be done now. It calls for a broad range of actions across the country, including policy and practice reforms, government/private partnerships, scientific assessment, public education, grassroots activation, volunteer program development, species-specific campaigns and home, school and community initiated habitats.

NWF and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, in February of this year, signed an agreement to collaborate on actions to help recover the monarch butterfly. And, National Wildlife Federation and many of its affiliates are also engaged with leading monarch and pollinator conservation organizations, such as The Monarch Joint Venture, Xerces Society for Invertebrate Research, Monarch Watch, and others. The NWF/FWS partnership will help create and preserve habitat, in collaboration with the Department of Transportation, on the Interstate 35 "butterfly corridor", which largely tracks the mid-continental migration route. NWF/FWS are also focused on getting milkweed re-established on much of the 26 million acres of Conservation Reserve Program lands, on field borders, fence rows, buffer strips, and on other suitable conservation lands (wetlands and grassland easements) and promoting that farmers not spray at the edges of their fields so that milkweed (and monarchs) can survive there.

NWF Staff Recommendation

NWF staff recommends this resolution be adopted as submitted.

Opposition to Mining within the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness Watershed

1 WHEREAS, the citizens of the United States of America are the owners of our federal
2 public lands and, by law, have a say in how our National Wilderness Areas are managed; and

3 WHEREAS, the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness (BWCAW) is one of the
4 great, intact, freshwater wetland complexes left on the planet, encompassing over 1 million
5 acres; and

6 WHEREAS, the BWCAW is home to more than 230 animal species, including numerous
7 endangered, threatened or protected species; and

8 WHEREAS, the BWCAW is America's most popular Wilderness Area, attracting more
9 than 250,000 people annually from around the world, contributing \$100 million annually to the
10 local economy (\$500 million if you include the Superior National Forest); and

11 WHEREAS, BWCAW's 1,500 miles of canoe and kayak water trails fuels the local
12 economies of many northern Minnesota communities and is dependent on an intact and fully
13 functioning ecosystem; and

14 WHEREAS, sulfide ore mining has been proposed within the watershed of the BWCAW;
15 and

16 WHEREAS, sulfide mining has been shown to be universally destructive to the
17 environment wherever such mines are constructed, operated, or closed; and

18 WHEREAS, TwinMetal's proposed sulfide mine within the BWCAW watershed,
19 encompassing 100 square miles of habitat, poses the gravest risk ever to the wilderness area's
20 survival; and

21 WHEREAS, TwinMetal's mine would risk the water quality and quantity of the
22 BWCAW and Voyagers National Park, potentially altering the hydrology of thousands of acres
23 of wetlands and wildlife habitat, including endangered species habitat, and damage the
24 wilderness experience for countless visitors and therefore hurt the local tourist economy;

25 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the National Wildlife Federation in its
26 Annual Meeting assembled March 27-29, 2015, in Sheperdstown, West Virginia, hereby calls on
27 Congress and the President to remove from mineral development all federal lands within the
28 watershed of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, thereby preventing the exploration
29 and development of mining operations within the BWCAW watershed.

Affiliate Commentary

The BWCA is an institution in Minnesota. The Wilderness designation was a battle to the finish. However, most hunters and anglers support the need to keep motors off some lakes and provide for special hunts for moose. Our anglers enjoying catching walleyes and bass for a canoe or base camp and frying them up for shore lunch—three meals per day! Our sportsmen and sportswomen understand the need for balance. They understand that we don't need to mine so close to an institution. As sportsmen and sportswomen we treasure the quality of outdoor life in Minnesota and the BWCA is a major component of that quality of life!

NWF Staff Commentary

NWF supports passage of the resolution "Opposition to Mining within the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness Watershed," submitted by Minnesota Conservation Federation. The resolution is focused on protecting the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness (BWCAW) from the potentially disastrous effects of sulfide-ore mining.

BWCAW is America's most visited Wilderness Area, attracting more than 250,000 people per year to the Northern Minnesota destination. Birders, canoe and kayakers, hunters, anglers, and adventurers of all shapes flock to the boundary waters for a taste of wilderness, a look into the past and to what once was. Much of the boundary waters is non-motorized, meaning you must paddle or hike in. No boats, no ATVs, no engines. The outdoor-tourism bonanza provided by the Boundary Waters and the surrounding parks and forests is dependent on a healthy, thriving, and intact ecosystem.

As the resolution notes, sulfide-ore mining has been proposed within the watershed (just outside the park's boundary) of the BWCAW. Environmental modeling has shown that contaminated waters from the mine will flow through the boundary waters as well as Voyageurs National Park, forever damaging two of America's most beautiful parks. The full blueprint for the proposed mine is still being developed, but early designs have pointed to a mine 5 miles wide and 20 miles long, adding up to 100 square miles. While early designs have suggested that the mine would be a traditional underground mine, new proposed designs have it as an open-pit mine, a 100 square mile wasteland at the entrance to America's most loved wilderness area. Beyond the aesthetics, the mine will invariably become an environmental disaster forever changing the BWCAW. Mine tailings high in sulfide will be stored at the site. Those tailings must be kept protected from rain, snow, and any other source of moisture. If the tailings come in contact with water, they have the potential to leach sulfuric acid. If released into the watershed, those tailings and associated leachate, will have a disastrous effect on the surrounding wildlife and habitat. Worldwide, sulfide-ore mines have demonstrated an inability to avert ecological harm or disasters. No sulfide-ore mine has been operated, closed, or maintained, without harming the environment around it.

This resolution serves as an important complement to existing NWF resolutions in support of protecting critically important wilderness areas and parks from mining (e.g. "Protecting Habitat, Wildlife and Water Resources from Uranium Mining," 2011; "Opposition to the Pebble Mine Project in the Bristol Bay Watershed of Southwestern Alaska," 2006; "Opposition to Mining Near Ofekenokee Swamp," 1998).

NWF is not anti-mining or exploration. We believe it should be done in a sustainable manner and in conjunction with reduction, reuse, and recycling options as well as other opportunities to reduce our dependence on mineral extraction. Similarly, there must be places so valuable to wildlife, people, and our outdoor heritage, that we cannot allow environmentally degrading

activities to go on there. The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness Area is one such area. The precedent has been set for Presidential action such as that requested in the resolution. Previous administrations have protected the national treasures such as the Grand Canyon and Yellowstone from mining exploration. NWF concurs with the resolution authors in asking that BWCAW also be protected.

NWF Staff Recommendation

NWF staff recommends the passage of this resolution as submitted.

Impact on US Forests Due to Increased Demand for Wood Biomass

1 WHEREAS, the United States has experienced rapid growth in biomass production; most
2 notably, wood pellet exports from North America to Europe doubled 2012-2014, with the U.S.
3 South accounting for 63% of the volume; and the US International Trade Administration projects
4 American pellet exports to Europe could grow from 5 to 15 times 2012 levels of 4.5 million
5 metric tons, to between 25 and 70 million metric tons by 2020; and

6 WHEREAS, this growth is driven largely by government incentives both domestic and
7 abroad that fail to require sustainable sourcing or accurate carbon accounting, such as the
8 European Union’s climate-driven renewable energy requirements; and

9 WHEREAS, while many of these policies say that forest biomass harvests will protect
10 biodiversity, existing U.S. laws and regulations do not in fact protect forests, sensitive
11 ecosystems, water quality and wildlife from the impacts of this industry; and

12 WHEREAS, an independent scientific study commissioned by NWF, entitled “Forestry
13 Bioenergy in the Southeast United States: Implications for Wildlife Habitat and Biodiversity”,
14 found that without additional protections, woody biomass operations in the Southeast will likely
15 result in the harvest of threatened forest types and adversely impact biodiversity; however, that
16 implementing certain sustainable sourcing criteria, such as avoiding conversion of natural stands
17 to plantation, could minimize threats to biodiversity without making operations economically
18 infeasible; and

19 WHEREAS, biomass market demand (if managed properly) could make certain targeted
20 harvesting practices that improve wildlife habitat (ecologically-beneficial thinning of forest
21 stands including those in easements, removal of encroaching trees from native grasslands) more
22 economically feasible; and

23 WHEREAS, biomass market demand could spur plantings of potentially invasive species
24 for bioenergy; more than 200 scientists and the federal Invasive Species Advisory Committee
25 have warned of the substantial risk that some of these plantings will escape cultivation and cause
26 socio-economic and/or ecological harm; and invasive species already cost more than \$120 billion
27 dollars a year in damages in the United States and are one of the primary threats to North
28 America's native species and ecosystems; and

29 WHEREAS, an independent scientific study commissioned by NWF, entitled "Biomass
30 Supply and Carbon Accounting for Southeastern Forests", found that cutting healthy
31 Southeastern forests to generate electricity in inefficient power plants actually increases carbon
32 pollution in the atmosphere for decades, well past the point at which scientists have determined
33 we must be shrinking greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, and that more efficient technologies,
34 such as Combined Heat and Power in smaller-scale applications for individual projects and
35 buildings, can produce lower carbon emissions;

36 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the National Wildlife Federation, at its
37 annual meeting assembled March 27-29, 2015, in Shepherdstown, West Virginia, urges U.S.
38 federal and state agencies, as well as international governments, to establish and apply strong,
39 specific, trackable biodiversity and other natural resource protections to sourcing of forest
40 bioenergy, requiring responsible harvesting practices, prohibiting conversion of natural

41 ecosystems, prohibiting harvests in ecosystems of high conservation value (such as forested
42 wetlands), making use of the most credible third party certifying systems that require these
43 protections; and

44 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the National Wildlife Federation supports incentives
45 for biomass operations that improve wildlife habitat; and

46 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the National Wildlife Federation calls for a
47 moratorium on the use of high-risk invasive species for bioenergy, and for establishment of best
48 management practices for those of moderate- and low-risk; and

49 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the National Wildlife Federation urges U.S. federal
50 and state agencies, as well as international governments sourcing biomass, to require that
51 electrical generation from biomass be demonstrated to reduce net carbon emissions on a
52 timetable relevant to best addressing the worst impacts of climate change.

Affiliate Commentary

The United States, particularly the southeast, has experienced rapid growth in production of biomass from forests. New large wood pellet plants are being built in several states, including in Louisiana and neighboring Mississippi. In the absence of policies to ensure sustainable sourcing for this industry, there are concerns about potential impacts to bottomland hardwood forests and other important ecosystems. This resolution for the consideration of all NWF affiliates follows a resolution passed at LWF's recent annual convention, calling for monitoring of the sourcing of wood for wood pellet plants.

NWF Staff Commentary

NWF supports passage of the resolution “Impact on US Forests Due to Increased Demand for Wood Biomass,” submitted by the Louisiana Wildlife Federation. This resolution calls for enforceable protections for wildlife and other natural resources in wood biomass harvests.

Forest harvests for energy have expanded rapidly in recent years. This material is feeding an explosion of large new facilities for pelletizing wood—primarily for export to Europe--as well as domestic power plants burning wood alone or co-firing with coal. Wood pellet exports from North America to Europe doubled 2012-2014, with the U.S. South accounting for 63% of the volume; and the US International Trade Administration projects American pellet exports to Europe could grow from 5 to 15 times 2012 levels of 4.5 million metric tons, to between 25 and 70 million metric tons by 2020.

The growth is being driven by government incentives intended to reduce greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, particularly the European Union’s Renewable Energy Directive, which requires a 20 percent contribution from renewable energy to the energy use of all EU Member States by 2020, expected to be extended to 2030 with an increase in the bioenergy portion. Domestic efforts to reduce carbon emissions, such as the EPA’s proposed Clean Power Plan and the state plans that will be developed to implement it, could pile-on with an additional increase in demand for power from wood biomass.

Meanwhile, numerous studies raise questions about current and potential harm from these harvests on the ground to wildlife and ecosystems of conservation concern, as well as the fundamental question whether they help address climate change in a timeframe relevant to avoiding its worst impacts.

NWF commissioned an independent scientific analysis of biodiversity impacts associated with forest biomass in the southeast, one of the first of its kind. The resulting report is entitled “[Forestry Bioenergy in the Southeast United States: Implications for Wildlife Habitat and Biodiversity](#)”. The team of researchers from the University of Georgia, University of Florida, and Virginia Tech, analyzing the sourcing areas for a diverse set of facilities, found that without additional protections, woody biomass operations in the Southeast will likely result in the harvest of native and threatened forest types, including conversion of native forest to plantation pine, and adversely impact biodiversity in some locations. The analysis also showed, however, that implementing certain sustainable sourcing criteria, such as avoiding conversion of natural stands to plantation and harvesting in forested wetlands, could minimize threats to biodiversity without making operations economically infeasible.

On the other hand, biomass market demand, if managed properly, could make certain targeted harvesting practices that improve wildlife habitat (for example, ecologically-beneficial thinning of forest stands including those in Farm Bill conservation program easements, removal of

encroaching trees and understory from native grasslands such as pine savannah) more economically feasible.

Another independent scientific study commissioned by NWF, entitled “[Biomass Supply and Carbon Accounting for Southeastern Forests](#)”, found that beyond current levels of biomass development, cutting healthy Southeastern forests to generate electricity in inefficient power plants actually increases carbon pollution in the atmosphere for 35-50 years compared with burning coal, well past the point at which scientists have determined we must be shrinking greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. More efficient technologies for converting this material to energy, such as Combined Heat and Power in smaller-scale applications, can produce lower carbon emissions that might be more quickly re-sequestered.

NWF’s report “Growing Risk” highlights the very real threat of plantings of invasive species for bioenergy. At least one proven highly invasive plant species, *Arundo donax*, has been approved for use as a biofuel by the EPA under the Renewable Fuel Standard and is being intentionally grown, while many other potentially invasive species are under development. More than 200 scientists and the federal Invasive Species Advisory Committee have warned of the substantial risk that some of these plantings will escape cultivation and cause socio-economic and/or ecological harm. Invasive species already cost more than \$120 billion dollars a year in damages in the United States and are one of the primary threats to North America’s native species and ecosystems.

Despite industry claims to the contrary, existing U.S. laws and regulations do not in fact protect forests, sensitive ecosystems, water quality and wildlife from the impacts of this industry. State-level Best Management Practice guidelines for forestry operations are not designed to protect biodiversity at the stand or landscape levels, but were instead designed for compliance with regulations associated with the Clean Water Act. The forestry sector uses a number of forest management certification programs, which are voluntary, and only about 17% of lands in the Southeast are currently certified under one of the major programs. While all of the major certification programs have biodiversity protection criteria, Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) forest management certification and Roundtable for Sustainable Biomaterials (RSB) may be the most protective of remaining natural stands and associated wildlife habitat and serve as the best current models for biomass sustainability.

This resolution is consistent with and complements existing NWF resolutions related to renewable energy (e.g. “Renewable Energy,” 2001; “Promote Sustainable "Next Generation" Bioenergy to Address Global Warming,” 2007-08). It reflects advances in understanding of the specific natural resource threats and opportunities associated with wood biomass development.

NWF Staff Recommendation:

NWF staff recommends this resolution be adopted as submitted.

Appendix One

Credentialed Affiliate Representatives and Alternates (February 24, 2015)

Renewable Resources Coalition and Foundation (AK)

Representative: Anders Gustafson

Committee: Public Engagement

605 West 2nd Avenue

Anchorage, AK 99501

Email: anders@renewak.org

Employer/Profession: Renewable Resources Foundation/Executive Director

Alternate Representative: Melissa Heuer

605 West 2nd Avenue

Anchorage, AK 99501

Email: melissa@renewak.org

Employer/Profession: Renewable Resources Foundation/Deputy Director

Alabama Wildlife Federation

Representative: Frank Boyd

Committee: Game Wildlife

1242 Pinebrook Circle

Auburn, AL 36830

Email: boydfra@auburn.edu

Employer/Profession: retired wildlife biologist

Alternate Representative: Rebecca Pritchett

Committee: Endangered Species Act

P.O. Box 361074

Birmingham, AL 35236

Email: rebecca@pritchettlawfirm.com

Employer/Profession: Environmental Lawyer

Arkansas Wildlife Federation

Representative: Ellen McNulty

Committee: Resource Development

7809 Cross Road

Pine Bluff, AR 71603

Email: awf.ellen.mcnulty@gmail.com

Employer/Profession: retired watershed coordinator/environmental outreach consultant

Alternate Representative: Jared Schluterman

200 Cane Creek Road

Paris, AK 72855

Email: jrsluterman@hotmail.com

Employer/Profession: Subiaco School System/Education

Arizona Wildlife Federation

Representative: Bob Vahle

Committee: Public Engagement

P.O. Box 1533

Pinetop, AZ 85935

Email: bvpinetop@frontiernet.net

Employer/Profession: reitred wildlife biologist

Alternate Representative: Brad Powell

Committee: Game Wildlife

12274 E North Lane

Scottsdale, AZ 85259

Email: bepaz2006@yahoo.com

Employer/Profession: Trout Unlimited/Southwest Regional Director

Planning and Conservation League (CA)

Representative: Sage Sweetwood

Committee: Resource Development

1107 9th Street, Suite 901

Sacramento, CA 95814

Email: sage@pcl.org

Employer/Profession: Planning and Conservation League/Executive Director

Colorado Wildlife Federation

Representative: Brent Miller

Committee: Game Wildlife

14360 W. 56th Place

Arvada, CO 80002

Email: brent.miller@earthlink.com

Employer/Profession: graduate student

Alternate Representative: Suzanne O'Neill

Committee: Endangered Species Act

1410 Grant Street, C-313

Denver, CO 80203

Email: cwfed@coloradowildlife.org

Employer/Profession: Colorado Wildlife Federation/Executive Director

Connecticut Forest & Park Association

Representative: Caroline Driscoll

Committee: Public Engagement

959 Pequot Avenue

New London, CT 06320

Email: ckdri@conncoll.edu

Alternate Representative: Ruth Cutler

Committee: Resource Development

P.O. Box 88

Ashford, CT 06278

Email: ruth.cutler@att.net

Earth Conservation Corps (DC)

Representative: Brenda Lee Richardson

Committee: Public Engagement

2000 Half Street, SW

Washington, DC 20024

Email: brendarichardson724@gmail.com

Employer/Profession: Earth Conservation Corps/Executive Director

Alternate Representative: Robert Nixon

2000 Half Street, SW

Washington, DC 20024

Email: rhnixon@me.com

Employer/Profession: Filmmaker

Delaware Nature Society

Representative: Seth Ross

Committee: Public Engagement

358 Greenbriar Lane

West Grove, PA 19390

Email: ross.seth@gmail.com

Employer/Profession: retired engineer

Alternate Representative: Jeff Pantazes

150 Hamilton Road

Landenberg, PA 19350

Email: jpantazes1957@gmail.com

Employer/Profession: AKRF Inc./Environmental Consulting

Florida Wildlife Federation

Representative: Jim Schuette

Committee: Resource Development

16736 94th Street

Loxahatchee, FL 33470

Email: fwfschuette@yahoo.com

Employer/Profession: S. Florida Water Management District/Biologist, Land Manager

Alternate Representative: Rick Abbott

3233 Heather Hill Road

Tallahassee, FL 32309

Email: richard.j.abbott@ml.com

Employer/Profession: Merrill Lynch/Investment Advisor

Georgia Wildlife Federation

Representative: Tom Jones

Committee: Game Wildlife

163 Osner Drive

Atlanta, GA 30342

Email: tdjfin@gmail.com

Employer/Profession: Financial Advisor

Alternate Representative: Todd Holbrook

Committee: Endangered Species Act

11600 Hazelbrand Road

Covington, GA 30014

Email: tholbrook@gwf.org

Employer/Profession: Georgia Wildlife Federation/Wildlife Administration

Conservation Council for Hawai'i

Representative: Rick Barboza

Committee: Public Engagement

46-403 Haiku Road

Kaneohe, HI 96744

Email: rick.ck.barboza@gmail.com

Employer/Profession: Hui Ku Maoli Ola/Habitat Restoration Specialist

Alternate Representative: Bianca Isaki

1656 Kanalui Street

Honolulu, HI 96816

Email: bisaki@gmail.com

Employer/Profession: JLS Consulting/Consultant

Iowa Wildlife Federation

Representative: Richard Leopold
Committee: Resource Development

11407 NW Jester Park Drive
Granger, IA 50109
Email: buddysport@yahoo.com
Employer/Profession: Polk County/Interim Director

Alternate Representative: Joe Wilkinson

116 Lakeside Drive, NE
Solon, IA 52333
Email: wilk116@southslope.net
Employer/Profession: State of Iowa/Information Specialist

Idaho Wildlife Federation

Representative: Michael Gibson
Committee: Public Engagement

P.O. Box 6426
Boise, ID 83707
Email: mgbibson.iwf@gmail.com
Employer/Profession: Idaho Wildlife Federation/Conservation Advocate

Alternate Representative: Keith Lawrence

Committee: Game Wildlife

P.O. Box 6426
Boise, ID 83707
Email: kmmplaw@cableone.net
Employer/Profession: retired wildlife biologist

Prairie Rivers Network (IL)

Representative: Jon McNussen
Committee: Public Engagement

1902 Fox Drive, Suite G
Champaign, IL 61801
Email: jmcnussen@gmail.com
Employer/Profession: Paul's Machine Shop/OSHA Officer

Alternate Representative: Glynnis Collins

1902 Fox Drive, Suite G
Champaign, IL 61801
Email: gcollins@prairierivers.org
Employer/Profession: Prairie Rivers Network/Executive Director

Indiana Wildlife Federation

Representative: Doug Allman

Committee: Game Wildlife

16124 East 126th Street

Fishers, IN 46037

Email: allman@indianawildlife.org

Employer/Profession: Dot Systems/sales

Kansas Wildlife Federation

Representative: Troy Schroeder

Committee: Endangered Species Act

1785 CR 390

Albert, KS 67511

Email: troyas@gbta.net

Employer/Profession: farmer

Alternate Representative: Angela Anderson

853 Road 300

Allen, KS 66833

Email: mystery_barnowl@yahoo.com

Employer/Profession: Morris County Conservation District/Watershed Restoration & Protection Strategy Coordinator

Kentucky Waterways Alliance

Representative: Gordon Garner

Committee: Game Wildlife

7300 Happy Hollow Road

Prospect, KY 40059

Email: ggarner@ch2m.com

Employer/Profession: CH2MHill/Environmental Engineer

Alternate Representative: Judith Peterson

2995 Hammons ville Road

Munfordsville, KY 42765

Email: judy@kwalliance.org

Employer/Profession: Kentucky Waterways Alliance/Executive Director

Louisiana Wildlife Federation

Representative: Warren Singer

Committee: Resource Development

40138 Autumn Meadow Avenue

Prairieville, LA 70769

Email: warren@icscla.com

Employer/Profession: Sales/Consulting

Alternate Representative: Katie Brasted

11900 Willow Drive

New Orleans, LA 70131

Email: katie@woodlandsconservancy.org

Employer/Profession: Woodlands Conservancy/Executive Director

Environmental League of Massachusetts

Representative: Seth Jaffe

176 Grove Street

Newton, MA 05466

Email: sjaffe@foleyhoag.com

Employer/Profession: Attorney

Alternate Representative: Veronica Eady

119 Florida Street, #1

Dorchester, MA 02124

Email: veady@clf.org

Employer/Profession: Conservation Law Foundation/Director

National Aquarium (MD)

Representative: Laura Bankey

Committee: Public Engagement

501 East Pratt Street

Baltimore, MD 21202

Email: lbankey@aqua.org

Employer/Profession: National Aquarium, Inc./Director of Conservation

Alternate Representative: Eric Schwaab

501 East Pratt Street

Baltimore, MD 21202

Email: eschwaab@aqua.org

Employer/Profession: National Aquarium, Inc./Conservation

Natural Resources Council of Maine

Representative: Karen Herold

Committee: Endangered Species Act

6 Wild Apple Lane

Cumberland, ME 04021

Email: herold.k@gmail.com

Alternate Representative: Lisa Pohlmann

Committee: Resource Development

3 Wade Street

Augusta, ME 04330

Email: lpohlmann@nrcm.org

Employer/Profession: Natural Resources Council of Maine/Executive Director

Michigan United Conservation Clubs

Representative: Dawn Levey

Committee: Endangered Species Act

6048 Lusk Road

Elsie, MI 48831

Email: dawndelightlevey@gmail.com

Alternate Representative: Ron Burris

3890 Lacey

Bellvue Road

Email: rhbhunt@pearsrealty.com

Minnesota Conservation Federation

Representative: Joe Hoffman

Committee: Resource Development

7351 125th Avenue

Clear Lake, MN 55319

Email: gamebirdjhoff@gmail.com

Alternate Representative: Rylee Main

2443 3rd Avenue S., Apt. C14

Minneapolis, MN 55404

Email: remain1986@gmail.com

Employer/Profession: Project Manager/Lake Pepin Legacy Alliance

Conservation Federation of Missouri

Representative: Don Johnson

Committee: Game Wildlife

110 Jackson Trace

Festus, MO 63028

Email: don.johnson@suddenlink.com

Employer/Profession: Suddenlink Communications/VP Human Resources

Alternate Representative: Ron Coleman

P.O. Box 594

3552 St. Albans Road

St. Albans, MO 63073

Email: colemangroupsstl@gmail.com

Employer/Profession: retired

Mississippi Wildlife Federation

Representative: Jeanne Jones

Committee: Resource Development

1323 Singleton Church Road

Louisville, MS 39339

Email: jjones@cfr.msstate.edu

Employer/Profession: Mississippi State University/Associate Proessor

Alternate Representative: Brad Young

517 Cobblestone Court, Suite 2

Madison, MS 39110

Email: byoung@mswf.org

Employer/Profession: Mississippi Wildlife Federation/Executive Director

Montana Wildlife Federation

Representative: Skip Kowalski

Committee: Game Wildlife

1287 Wheelbarrow Creek Drive

Stevensville, MT 59870

Email: skipmwf@bitterroot.com

Employer/Profession: retired

Alternate Representative: Dave Chadwick

Committee: Endangered Species Act

5530 N. Montana Avenue

Helena, MT 59602

Email: dchadwick@mtwf.org

Employer/Profession: Montana Wildlife Federation/Executive Director

North Carolina Wildlife Federation

Representative: G. Richard Mode

Committee: Endangered Species Act

206 Woodlawn Drive

Morganton, NC 28655

Email: grmode@earthlink.net

Employer/Profession: realty

Alternate Representative: John Robbins

Committee: Game Wildlife

1255 Odell School Road

Concord, NC 28027

Email: johnr@greathornproperties.com

Employer/Profession: developer

North Dakota Wildlife Federation

Representative: Tom Sklebar

Committee: Resource Development

8065 51 1/2 Street, SW

Montpelier, ND 58472

Email: tsklebar@daktel.com

Employer/Profession: Retired USGS Wildlife Biologist

Alternate Representative: Dale Patrick

9440 Cedar Lane

Bismarck, ND 58503

Email: dale_patrick@hotmail.com

Employer/Profession: ND State Department of Health/public health management

Nebraska Wildlife Federation

Representative: Gene Oglesby

Committee: Public Engagement

650 J Street, #400

Lincoln, NE 68508

Email: oglesbylaw@windstream.net

Employer/Profession: Oglesby Law Office P.C./Attorney

Alternate Representative: James R. Johnson

Committee: Game Wildlife

8110 Regent Drive

Lincoln, NE 68507

Email: jj-johnson3345@gmail.com

Employer/Profession: Nebraska Wildlife Federation/President

New Hampshire Audubon

Representative: Michael Bartlett

Committee: Endangered Species Act

84 Silk Farm Road

Concord, NH 03301

Email: mbartlett@nhaudubon.org

Employer/Profession: New Hampshire Audubon/President

Alternate Representative: Paul Nickerson

7 Sparhawk Drive

Londonderry, NH 03053

Email: pnickers9@comcast.net

Employer/Profession: retired wildlife biologist

New Jersey Audubon

Representative: Dale Rosselet

Committee: Public Engagement

NJA Center for Research and Education

600 Route 47 North

Cape May Court House, NJ 08210

Email: dale.rosselet@njudubon.org

Employer/Profession: New Jersey Audubon Society/Vice President for Education

Alternate Representative: John Cecil

Wattles Stewardship Center

1024 Anderson Road

Port Murray, NJ 07865

Email: john.cecil@njudubon.org

Employer/Profession: New Jersey Audubon Society/Vice President for Stewardship

New Mexico Wildlife Federation

Representative: Garrett VeneKlasen

Committee: Public Engagement

PO Box 2146

Santa Fe, NM 87504

Email: interangler@newmexico.com

Employer/Profession: New Mexico Wildlife Federation/Executive Director, fishing guide and outfitter

Alternate Representative: Bennett (Ben) Brown

P.O. Box 66

Animas, NM 88020-0066

Email: ben@nmwildlife.org

Employer/Profession: retired professor of wildlife biology

Nevada Wildlife Federation

Representative: Kevin Cabble

Committee: Endangered Species Act

8711 Amber Autumn Street

Las Vegas, NV 89131

Email: kjcabble@cs.com

Employer/Profession: U.S. Department of Energy/Scientist

Alternate Representative: Thomas R. Grimm

3731 Yellow Jasmine Drive

Las Vegas, NV 89147

Email: trgrimm1@cox.net

Employer/Profession: retired Field Services Engineer

Association of Northwest Steelheaders (OR)

Representative: Bill Kremers

Committee: Endangered Species Act

29606 NE Pheasant Avenue

Corvallis, OR 97333-2429

Email: bkremers@comcast.net

Employer/Profession: retired fishing guide

Alternate Representative: Bob Rees

Committee: Game Wildlife

P.O. Box 1196

Tillamook, OR 97141

Email: brees@pacifier.com

Employer/Profession: Association of Northwest Steelheaders/Executive Director

Citizens for Pennsylvania's Future (PennFuture)

Representative: John W. Norbeck

Committee: Public Engagement

610 North Third Street

Harrisburg, PA 17101-1113

Email: norbeck@pennfuture.org

Employer/Profession: PennFuture/Acting President and CEO

Alternate Representative: Joy Bergey

1500 Walnut Street

Philadelphia, PA

Email: bergey@pennfuture.org

Employer/Profession: PennFuture/Federal Policy Director

Environment Council of Rhode Island

Representative: Jamie Rhodes

Committee: Endangered Species Act

342 Warwick Neck Avenue

Warwick, RI 02889

Email: Jamie.Rhodes@gmail.com

Employer/Profession: Planned Parenthood/Lawyer / Government Relations

Alternate Representative: Greg Gerritt

37 6th Street

Providence, RI 02906

Email: Gerritt@mindspring.com

Employer/Profession: Environment Council of Rhode Island/Activist

South Carolina Wildlife Federation

Representative: Dan Scheffing

Committee: Resource Development

112 S. Rosemary Avenue

Andrews, SC 29510

Email: dscheffing@sabinc.net

Employer/Profession: Sabine and Waters/Forester

Alternate Representative: Don Moorhead

706 Click Springs Road

Greenville, SC 29609

Email: drm306@hotmail.com

Employer/Profession: retired attorney

South Dakota Wildlife Federation

Representative: Rich Widman

Committee: Game Wildlife

929 8th Avenue

Brookings, SD 57006

Email: rwid1@swiftel.net

Employer/Profession: Financial/Investment Representative

Alternate Representative: Chris Hesla

P.O. Box 361

Pierre, SD 57501

Email: sdwf@mncomm.com

Employer/Profession: South Dakota Wildlife Federation/Executive Director

Tennessee Wildlife Federation

Representative: Mike Butler

Committee: Game Wildlife

300 Orlando Avenue, Suite 200

Nashville, TN 37209

Email: mbutler@tnwf.org

Employer/Profession: Tennessee Wildlife Federation/Chief Executive Officer

Alternate Representative: Kendall McCarter

56 Willowridge Circle

Jackson, TN 38305

Email: kmccarter@tnwf.org

Employer/Profession: Tennessee Wildlife Federation/Chief Development Officer

Texas Conservation Alliance

Representative: Mack Turner

Committee: Resource Development

6312 Chesley

Dallas, TX 75214

Email: mack@tcatexas.org

Employer/Profession: Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART)/Management, public agency

Alternate Representative: Janice Bezanson

Committee: Public Engagement

1605 Mission Trail

Salado, TX 76571

Email: bezanson@texas.net

Employer/Profession: Texas Conservation Alliance/Executive Director

Virginia Conservation Network

Representative: Jacob Powell

Committee: Endangered Species Act

422 E. Franklin Street, Suite 303

Richmond, VA 23219

Email: jacob@vcnva.org

Employer/Profession: Virginia Conservation Network/Executive Director

Alternate Representative: Kelley Galownia

422 E. Franklin Street, Suite 303

Richmond, VA 23219

Email: kelley@vcnva.org

Employer/Profession: Virginia Conservation Network/Com Manager

Virgin Islands Conservation Society

Representative: Michael Baron

Committee: Resource Development

PMB 359, 6002 Diamond Ruby

Christiansted, VI 00820

Email: minoradjustments@gmail.com

Employer/Profession: Caribbean Design Group/Graphic Artist

Alternate Representative: Paul Chakroff

Committee: Public Engagement

6002 Diamond Ruby

Christiansted, VI 00820

Email: paulchakroff@gmail.com

Employer/Profession: Environmental Consultant

Wisconsin Wildlife Federation

Representative: George Borchert

Committee: Resource Development

7240 U.S. Hwy 45

Oshkosh, WI 54902

Email: geoff@charter.net

Employer/Profession: retired

Alternate Representative: John Wagner

Committee: Endangered Species Act

828 S. Silver Lake Street

Oconomowac, WI 53066

Employer/Profession: Oconomowac Memorial Hospital/Maintenance Engineer

West Virginia Rivers Coalition

Representative: Angie Rosser

Committee: Resource Development

3501 MacCorkle Avenue SE, #129

Charlestown, WV 25304

Email: arosser@wvrivers.org

Employer/Profession: West Virginia Rivers Coalition/Executive Director

Alternate Representative: Bill Turner

Committee: Endangered Species Act

111 North Jefferson Street

Lewisburg, WV 24901

Email: ichthyocentric@hotmail.com

Employer/Profession: Turner Law Firm, PLLC/Attorney

Wyoming Wildlife Federation

Representative: Reg Rothwell

Committee: Game Wildlife

3501 Dunn Avenue

Cheyenne, WY 82001

Email: rrothw@hotmail.com

Employer/Profession: retired

Alternate Representative: Steve Kilpatrick

P.O. Box 12

Moose, WY 82012

Email: stevekilpatrick@wyomingwildlife.org

Employer/Profession: Wyoming Wildlife Federation/Executive Director

Appendix Two

National Wildlife Federation Board of Directors

CHAIR, PAST CHAIR, and VICE CHAIRS

DEBORAH SPALDING, Chair
45 Graves Avenue
Guilford, CT 06437-2625

BRUCE WALLACE, Chair Elect
126 S Main Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48104-1903

STEPHEN K. ALLINGER, Past Chair
263 South Main Avenue
Albany, NY 12208-2317

PAUL BEAUDETTE, Vice Chair (Eastern Regions 1-4: AL, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, MA, MD, ME, MS, NC, NH, NJ, NY, PA, PR, RI, SC, VA, VI, VT, WV)
72 Sawyer Drive
East Greenwich, RI 02818-4835

CLARK BULLARD, Vice Chair (Central Regions 5-9: AR, IA, IN, IL, KS, KY, LA, MI, MN, MO, ND, NE, OH, OK, SD, TN, TX, WI)
509 W. Washington Street
Urbana, IL 61801-4051

KENT SALAZAR, Vice Chair (Western Regions 10-13: AK, AZ, CA, CO, Guam, HI, ID, MT, NM, NV, OR, UT, WA, WY)
1621 Vassar Drive S.E.
Albuquerque, NM 87106-3110

BRIAN BASHORE, Region 9 Director (IA, KS, NE, ND, SD)
2000 S. Mary Beth Ave.
Sioux Falls, SD 57106

TAHLIA BEAR, At-Large Director
7372 Mt Sherman Road
Longmont, CO 80503-7142

JENNY BROCK, Region 4 Director (AL, FL, GA, MS, PR, VI)
311 Old Magnolia Road
Crawfordville, FL 32327-6003

Appendix Two

REGIONAL and AT-LARGE DIRECTORS

RON CLAUSEN, At-Large Director
Clausen Law Group
1160 Brickyard Cove Road, Suite 201
Pt. Richmond, CA 94801

SHELLEY COHEN, At-Large Director
3640 Everett Street, NW
Washington, DC 20008-2933

DIANNE DILLON-RIDGLEY, At-Large Director
2204 Macbride Drive
Iowa City, IA 52246-1722

JOHN GRANT, At-Large Director
100 Black Men of Atlanta, Inc.
241 Peachtree Street N.E., Suite 300
Atlanta, GA 30303-1423

DAVID L. HARGETT, Ph.D., Region 3 Director (NC, SC, VA, WV)
408 Deepwood Drive
Greer, SC 29651-6868

WILLIAM HOUSTON, Region 1 Director (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT)
PO Box 145
Kingfield, ME 04947-0145

RAMON LOPEZ, At-Large Director
5 Canyon Court
Newport Beach, CA 92660

BRIAN PRESTON, Region 7 Director (MI, MN, WI)
12131 Lulu Road
Ida, MI 48140

JULIA REED ZAIC, Region 12 Director (CA, HI, NV, Guam)
Heaviside Reed Zaic, A Law Corporation
312 Broadway Street, Suite 203
Laguna Beach, California 92651-4335

Appendix Two

REGIONAL and AT-LARGE DIRECTORS

NORM RITCHIE, Region 11 Director (AK, OR, WA)
2834 SE 166th Avenue
Portland, OR 97236

TRUMAN SEMANS, At-Large Director
1514 Hermitage Court
Durham, NC 27707-1635

LESLIE SHAD, Region 6 Director (IL, IN, OH)
1110 Judson Avenue
Evanston, IL 60202-1315

MARY VAN KERREBROOK, Region 8 Director (LA, OK, TX)
Van Kerrebrook & Associates P.C.
712 Main Street, Suite 720
Houston, TX 77002

NICOLE WOOD, Region 5 Director (AR, KY, MO, TN)
PO Box 180
Bonne Terre, MO 63628-0180

Appendix Three

Resolution Committee Procedures

Pre-Meeting Preparation for Chairs and Vice Chairs:

Prior to the Annual Meeting, the National Wildlife Federation (NWF) staff advisor for each resolution committee contacts the committee chair to review the resolutions, discuss any potential problems, and go over the resolution process. In addition to a pre-Annual Meeting conference call with the chairs and vice chairs to review parliamentary procedure, NWF staff conducts a briefing for all chairs and vice chairs at the Annual Meeting itself, prior to the convening of committee meetings, to review the process and answer any questions.

Chairs are strongly encouraged to use the listserv for their committee well in advance of the Annual Meeting to introduce themselves to the members of the committee and request comments and possible amendments to the resolutions assigned to the committee.

Conduct of Resolution Committee Meetings:

The following suggestions/order of events for committee chairs and vice chairs should give participants attending their first resolution committee meetings an idea of what to expect:

1. Call the meeting to order.
2. Ask members of the committee to introduce themselves by name and affiliation.
3. Ask others in the room to introduce themselves by name and affiliation. To facilitate committee deliberations, the chair has the option of limiting those sitting at the table itself to members of the committee and, if desired, NWF board members.
4. Be clear that only credentialed Affiliate Representatives and Alternate Representatives assigned to the particular resolution committee may make motions and vote. NWF board members have the privilege of the floor but cannot vote.
5. Remind committee members that committee meetings are relatively informal, to facilitate open discussion. There are no limits on the number of times a committee member may speak, and no motions to cut off debate or call for the question. Motions do not require a second.
6. Inform committee members of any members of the committee who reported a possible conflict of interest, and ask the affected member to explain the conflict. (A conflict of interest does not prohibit the person from participating in committee deliberations; he or she must only declare the conflict of interest.)

Appendix Three

7. Note that the purpose of NWF conservation policy resolutions is only to set policy positions. Resolutions cannot give financial direction or mandate actions to be taken by NWF staff; that is the responsibility of the NWF board of directors.
8. Ask people to seek recognition by raising their hand. Vice-chairs can assist the chairs by keeping track of the order in which hands are raised.
9. Non-committee members may be recognized by the chair to speak. They should give their name and affiliation before commenting. At the chair's discretion, non-committee members that wish to speak may be asked to state if they have a conflict of interest with the resolution that they are addressing (this is because only actual committee members are required to file statements of conflict of interest). If time is short, the chair may limit or deny participation in the discussions by non-committee members.
10. Focus on the "Therefore be it resolved" clauses first, especially if time is short, as they are the substance of the resolution.
11. Proposed resolutions are reviewed by NWF staff for grammar and punctuation. If a committee member sees minor editorial changes (typos, awkward word phrasing, etc.) that do not affect the substance of the resolution, he or she should speak with the staff at the end of the committee meeting so as not to distract from discussion of the resolutions on substantive matters.
12. As a proposed resolution is taken up, ask if a representative from the sponsoring affiliate can briefly describe the reason for the proposed resolution. If not, the NWF staff advisor to the committee should do so.
13. If there is more than one resolution on an issue, ask the committee to vote on which resolution the committee will use as the basis for action. There should be a brief description of each of the resolutions by the proposing affiliate or staff member prior to the vote.
14. Ask everyone to use line numbers to facilitate edits. Committee members who want to recommend edits should put them in the form of a motion with exact wording.
15. Ask if anyone has questions or changes.
16. If there are no objections to a motion, to save time, the chair may choose not to take a vote and simply declare the motion adopted by unanimous consent. A vote must be taken on each resolution as a whole, however, as presented or as amended by the committee.

Appendix Three

17. Affiliate and NWF staff commentaries with each resolution are included for explanation only and will not appear in the final resolution if the resolution is adopted. Therefore, discussion on the commentary should be discouraged.
18. Motions must be adopted by majority vote.
19. Explain that no minutes of the meeting will be taken, but the scribe will be recording resolution language changes as they are made by the committee.
20. If an emergency resolution is assigned to a particular resolution committee, that committee should discuss and vote on the emergency resolution at its committee meeting.

Preparing Resolutions for Presentation at the Resolutions General Session:

Each resolution committee will be assigned a National Wildlife Federation (NWF) staff scribe equipped with the necessary computer tools to efficiently record the committee's amendments and prepare the approved resolution copy to be presented at the Resolutions General Session. Chairs and vice chairs (as well as any committee member involved in suggested changes that were adopted at the committee meeting) meet with the NWF staff scribe and committee advisor immediately after the conclusion of the committee's meeting to ensure that the committee's amendments are accurately reflected on the computer file. Prior to the Resolutions General Session, committee chairs must review and approve the final copy of all of their committee's proposed resolutions. There should be no discrepancy between the resolution committee action and what is presented in the Resolutions General Session.

Reporting the Committee's Work at the Resolutions General Session:

Committees will generally report on resolutions in the order of their listing in the Proposed Resolutions Book. When called upon, the resolution committee chair and/or vice chair should proceed to and stay at the microphone until all of the committee's resolutions have been addressed in the general session.

Resolution committees should report each resolution referred to the committee separately to the delegate assembly in one of the following four ways:

1. The resolution committee recommends adoption of the resolution as referred to the committee.
2. The resolution committee recommends adoption of the resolution as amended by the committee.
3. The resolution committee recommends that the resolution not be adopted.
4. The resolution committee has no recommendation regarding the resolution.

Appendix Three

Each proposed resolution will be projected on the screen so that the delegates can view any changes. If there are extensive changes to a resolution, a hard copy may also be distributed to delegates to facilitate presentation of amendments. Chairs or vice chairs should report on substantive word edits only; there is no need to walk the delegates through changes in grammar or spelling. They should also explain to the delegates why a change was made in the resolution to give delegates a sense of the discussion by the committee.

Final Resolutions:

After resolutions are adopted at the Annual Meeting, the NWF staff compiles all final resolutions for a given year in a booklet. The commentary and the sponsor's name are not included with the final resolutions as they are now policy of the National Wildlife Federation as a whole. All final resolutions are archived at NWF and available for inspection. They are also posted on the affiliate web site (<http://affiliates.nwf.org/affiliatesonly/>). Affiliates will be e-mailed a link to download a copy of the final resolutions booklet to use in their conservation efforts. A hard copy of the final booklet can be mailed upon request.

Appendix Four

Parliamentary Information for NWF Annual Meeting

Below is a quick review of parliamentary procedure for the National Wildlife Federation conservation policy resolutions process at the NWF annual meeting. These simple, general rules should help you participate both in your resolutions committee meeting and in the full general resolutions session with all the delegates. Please note that different procedures apply in committee than in general session, as described below.

Overall, the purpose of parliamentary procedure is to facilitate discussion of the issues, keeping a discussion moving along while allowing those with different views a reasonable chance to be heard. Knowledge of the technical rules themselves is not the point and procedure should not be the focus of the discussion. It is the responsibility of all participants to be respectful to each other and to work together to focus on the substance of the issue being considered.

Parliamentary Procedures in Both the General Resolutions Session and Committees

1. Robert's Rules of Order apply unless otherwise noted.
2. The chair of the committee or general session will rule on points of order, parliamentary inquiries, and points of information without discussion or vote by members of the committee.
3. Only one main motion at a time may be considered. The chair and the members are all responsible for ensuring that the discussions are kept limited and germane to only the motion under consideration. Anyone trying to bring up another topic is out of order.
4. In general, a motion requires a majority vote of those present and voting to be adopted. The exceptions are that if the effect of the motion is to limit discussion (not allowed in committees) or to change an action previously taken (such as amending or rescinding a motion that has already passed), then a two-thirds majority is required.
5. Speakers must be recognized by the chair before speaking and must address the topic at hand.
6. The resolutions committees refer resolutions to the general session as amended by the committees (if the committee made amendments); the general assembly does not need to act on the committee amendments separately. Once a resolution has been referred from committee to the general session, all motions and votes must then be from the floor because the committee no longer controls the resolution.

Appendix Four

Special Parliamentary Procedures for Committees

Even if you are familiar with the use of parliamentary procedures for meetings, did you know there are special rules for committees? Parliamentary rules are more liberal for committees, because the intent is that committees have the opportunity to discuss an issue thoroughly before presenting it to the general resolutions session. For this reason, motions to limit discussion are not permitted in committees.

Below are the most pertinent special rules for committees:

1. Informal discussion of a topic is allowed while no motion is pending.
2. Motions to close or limit debate, such as a motion to call the previous question, are not allowed.
3. Motions need not be seconded.
4. There is no limit on the number of times a member can speak to a question.
5. The chair may enter into the discussion, make motions, and vote on motions without relinquishing the chair.
6. Members may remain seated while making motions or speaking, and the chair may remain seated while conducting the meeting.

Frequently Asked Questions:

1. *What are the rules around a motion to call the previous question?*

The purpose of a motion to call the previous question is to stop ongoing debate and immediately proceed to a vote on the motion under consideration. This motion cannot be debated or amended, and it must be voted on immediately, before the motion it addresses is voted upon.

A member wishing to call the previous question may not simply interrupt a speaker or call out the motion without first being recognized by the chair. A second is necessary, and a two-thirds vote is required to adopt the motion. If the motion is adopted, the chair puts the question to which the motion to call the previous question was directed to an immediate vote of the delegates. (Reminder: A motion to call the previous question is out of order in a committee meeting as it is a motion to limit debate, which is not allowed in committee meetings.)

Appendix Four

2. What are the rules around a motion to table?

The purpose of tabling a motion (such as a motion to amend a resolution or to adopt a resolution) is to temporarily set it aside during the meeting to take up more urgent business. Its purpose is not, as frequently thought, to “kill” a motion by removing it entirely from further debate and a vote. Instead, a *motion to postpone indefinitely* should be used when the speaker wants to kill a motion without taking a vote on it. (A *motion to postpone definitely*, which would postpone discussion of the resolution until the next meeting, cannot be used at the annual meeting because the next meeting is not for a full year, which is too long under *Robert’s Rules of Order*.)

Appendix Four

Definitions

Adjourn: End the meeting.

Amend a pending motion: Offer an amendment to the motion under consideration.

Amend a previously adopted motion: This can apply to a motion adopted during the current meeting or a previous meeting. Requires a two-thirds vote.

Commit (or refer): Refer the main motion to a committee or subcommittee so that the question may be carefully investigated and put into better condition for the assembly to consider.

Lay on the table: Enable the assembly to set aside a question temporarily in the same meeting when another matter of immediate urgency has arisen. The motion can be taken up again (“removed from the table”) by majority vote. The motion to lay on the table is often misused in place of the motion to postpone indefinitely (described further below). Out of order if the chair believes it is being misused to end debate.

Limit debate or extend limits of debate: Set a time limit for discussion in general or limit the amount of time each speaker may have. A motion to limit debate is out of order in a committee.

Main motion: A motion to bring business before the assembly.

Parliamentary inquiry: A question posed to the chair when the speaker is not sure how to proceed under parliamentary rules.

Point of information: A question addressed to the chair, or through the chair to another member, for information relevant to the business at hand but not related to parliamentary procedure. No discussion is allowed.

Point of order. A request to the chair for enforcement when the speaker thinks the rules of the assembly are being violated.

Postpone definitely (or postpone to a certain time): Puts off discussion until a specified time or meeting, or until after a certain event. This motion cannot be used to postpone discussion until the next annual meeting, because that time period is too long under *Robert’s Rules of Order*.

Postpone indefinitely: Kills the main motion for that meeting without taking a vote. Used to dispose of a motion when the assembly does not want to actually vote against it.

Appendix Four

Previous question: Also known as “calling the question,” “question,” or “closing debate.” This motion ends the debate and brings the assembly to an immediate vote on one or more pending questions. It must be approved by two-thirds vote before the question at hand is itself voted upon. A motion to move the previous question is out of order in a committee.

Recess: A temporary break in the meeting that does not close the meeting and after which business will be resumed at the point at which it was interrupted. A recess can be as short as a few minutes or can be overnight.

Reconsider (or renew) a main motion: A motion to reconsider a motion that was previously voted on and not adopted. The purpose is to permit correction of hasty or ill-advised action or to take into account new information that has developed since the original vote.

Rescind: A motion to strike an entire action, such as main motion, that was adopted at some previous time. Requires a two-thirds vote.

Rise to a question of privilege: A request or motion relating to the rights and privileges of the assembly or any of its members brought up for possible immediate consideration because of its urgency. Examples include a heating or lighting problem, noise making it difficult to hear, or other disturbance or safety issue.