

Property Of: \_\_\_\_\_



**Proposed Resolutions  
National Wildlife Federation  
72<sup>nd</sup> Annual Meeting  
May 14-17, 2008**

Keystone Resort and Conference Center, Keystone, CO

**Thursday, May 15, 2008**

**1:30 – 3:30 p.m.**

**Resolution Committee Meetings**

- A. Education  
Staff Advisor: Eliza Russell
- B. Energy  
Staff Advisor: Timothy Warman
- C. Land  
Staff Advisor: Jim Adams
- D. Water  
Staff Advisor: Andy Buchsbaum
- E. Wildlife  
Staff Advisor: John Kostyack

**Friday, May 16, 2008**

**8:00 – 10:00 a.m.**

**Resolutions General Session**

Resolution Committee Reports  
and Final Votes on Resolutions

**PLEASE BRING THIS MATERIAL WITH YOU TO THE MEETING.  
EXTRA COPIES WILL BE VERY LIMITED.**

**2008 Proposed Resolutions are also available for viewing on the  
Affiliate web site at <http://www.nwfaffiliates.org/ht/d/sp/i/8755>**

## **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

### **Education**

Education-1 Global Warming Education in American Schools .....	5
--	---

### **Energy**

Energy-1 Encouraging Conservation Groups to Reduce Global Warming Pollution.....	9
--	---

### **Land**

Land-1 Pascagoula River and Gulf of Mexico Water Protection .....	13
Land-2 Responsible Oil and Gas Development on Our Public Lands .....	17
Land-3 Support for Using the Best Available Science to Conserve Greater Sage-grouse In Areas Scheduled for Intensive Oil and Gas Development .....	22

### **Water**

Water-1 Avoiding New Water Storage Facilities .....	27
Water-2 Groundwater Protection .....	31
Water-3 Separating Ecosystem Restoration Authorizations from Water Resources Development Acts .....	35

### **Wildlife**

Wildlife-1 National Flood Insurance and National Catastrophe Insurance .....	38
--	----

### **Appendix One**

Affiliate Representatives and Alternate Representatives .....	43
---	----

### **Appendix Two**

National Wildlife Federation Board of Directors .....	61
---	----

### **Appendix Three**

2008 NWF Call for Proposed Resolutions .....	65
--	----

### **Appendix Four**

Resolution Committee Procedures .....	67
---------------------------------------	----

### **Appendix Five**

Parliamentary Procedure for Committees .....	70
Definitions .....	73



## **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 Saturday, March 15, 2008 (60 days prior to annual meeting).

#### *Committee Assignments*

Each Affiliate Representative and Alternate Representative is assigned to a specific policy area resolution committee as a voting member of that committee. These committees meet from 1:30 – 3:30 p.m. on Thursday, May 15, 2008. 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.

#### *Listservs*

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 Friday morning, May 16<sup>th</sup>. 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 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, Cynthia Lewin, prior to 1:30 p.m. on Thursday, May 15, 2008 so that a vote can be scheduled at the opening General Session on Friday morning. One hundred twenty-five copies of each proposed emergency resolution must be presented to Cynthia Lewin, Secretary, by the proponent.

March 19, 2008		Resolutions Committee Assignments - 2008									
		Wildlife			Land		Energy		Education		Water
Chair	WY	Harold Schultz	PA	Ed Zygmont	TN	Mony Holcomb	MO	Don Johnson	AZ	Ryna Rock	
Vice Chair	SC	J. Drew Lanham	TX	Mack Turner	FL	Daniel Kipnis	AR	Gayne Preller Schmidt	NC	Richard Mode	
	CO	Harvey Nyberg	AL	Rebecca Pritchett	AZ	Meg Buchanan	AL	Frank Boyd	AR	Jim Wood	
	FL	Janice Kerber	CT	Ruth Cutler	CA	Lynn Sadler	CO	Colleen Gadd	CA	Richard Hawley	
	GA	David Haire	ID	Russell W. Heughins	CT	Caroline Driscoll	DE	Seth Ross	ID	J. Kent Marlor	
	HI	Douglas Lamerson	IN	Dwight Shelton	DE	Richard A. Fleming	GA	Lynn Haire	KS	Don Snider	
	IA	Doug Thompson	KY	Vikki Rawe	HI	Nelson Ho	IA	Joe Wilkinson	LA	Edgar F. Veillon	
	IL	Steven Davis	MI	Julia Meixner	MA	Steve Leonard	IL	Jon McNussen	MA	Bernard J. McHugh	
	KS	Matthew C. Nowak	MN	Steven C. Maurice	ME	Dr. Lani Graham	IN	Janet Ryan	ND	Clarence A. Bina	
	LA	Gina L. Stanton	MS	Jeanne Jones	MI	Dawn Levey	KY	Rick Allen	NY	Edna Sussman	
	ME	Lisa Pohlman	MT	Tim Aldrich	MN	Kieth Blomstrom	NE	Russell Souчек	OR	Debra McQueen	
	NC	Alen Baker	ND	David Brandt	MO	Abe Phillips	NV	Robert Gaudet	PA	Peter Dalby, PhD	
	NE	Steven R. Kryger	NY	Leslie H. Jacobson	MS	Jimmy Bullock	OK		PR	Maria Rivera-Vasquez	
	NM	Ed Olona	OH	Larry Mitchell, Sr	MT	Chris Marchion	OR	Art Israelson	RI	David Brunetti	
	NV	Anita Wagner	OK		NM	Gene Tatum	PR	Shelda Diaz Mendez	SD	Bill Antonides	
	SD	Lanny Thompson	VA	Chris Miller	OH	Andreas Caito	RI	Jack Schempp	TN	Joanne Holcomb	
	VA	Martha Wingfield	WA	Kyle Smith	VT		SC	David Benjamin	TX	Janice Bezanson	
	VI	Carla Joseph	WY	Mark Winland	WI	Lil Pipping	VI	Carlos Tesitor	VT	Carolyn Kehler	
	WI	Jack Nissen									
<b>General Session</b>		<i>Resolutions Session Chair - Steve Allinger</i>		<i>Resolutions Staff Advisor - Doug Inkley</i>		<i>Parliamentarian - Cindy Lewin</i>					
<b>Board</b>		Virginia T. Brock		Clark Bullard		Liz Hamilton		Steve Allinger		Richard Baldes	
<b>Advisors</b>		Mark W. Heckert		Mike Dombeck		Paul Beaudette		Mason Bryant Howard		Lyvier Conss	
		Earl B. Matthew, MD		Jerry Little		David Carruth		Craig D. Thompson		David L. Hargett	
		Gene Oglesby		Kent Salazar		Kathy Hadley		Spencer Tomb		Jerry Meral, PhD	
		Paul Rose		Deborah A. Spalding		Jerome C. Ringo		Rebecca L. Scheibelhut		Leslie Shad	
		Beatrice Busch von Gontard		<i>Jess Sixkiller*</i>		Lise Van Sustern		Christine P. Thompson		<i>John Grant*</i>	
						<i>Shelley Cohen*</i>					
		<i>*pending election to the board on 5/14</i>									
		<i>Tom Gonzales - Ex Officio all committees</i>									
<b>Staff Advisor</b>		John Kostyack		Jim Adams		TimWarman		Eliza Russell		Andy Buchsbaum	
<b>Scribe</b>		Amanda Howard		Myra Wilensky		Zoe Lipman		Claudia Malloy		Derek Brockbank	



**Global Warming Education in American Schools**

1           WHEREAS, due to global warming, over the next several decades children in America’s  
2 schools will be faced with an unprecedented environmental threat not only to wildlife and its  
3 habitat, but also to the security, safety and prosperity of people worldwide; and

4           WHEREAS, global warming education will enable children and their families to learn  
5 about the human induced and human controlled causes of global warming, including population  
6 increases, carbon emissions caused by outdated building technologies, inefficient transportation,  
7 and life styles that demand high energy consumption, and to take action by making informed  
8 energy choices; and

9           WHEREAS, due to global warming higher average temperatures will cause many of the  
10 existing premises of environmental science to be recalculated and rethought, altering current  
11 conditions and issues related to ecosystem sustainability, to support healthy habitats and wildlife  
12 species; and

13           WHEREAS, effective education on the science, societal, and economic effects of these  
14 changes will be essential for the next generation to comprehend and address them; and

15           WHEREAS, leading climate scientists have concluded that the world must reduce  
16 greenhouse gas emissions by 30% of current levels by 2020 and by 80 percent below 1990 levels  
17 by 2050 in order to avert the most serious consequences of global climate change, and to meet  
18 these targets our nation must have a well-educated population that is knowledgeable about  
19 existing methods for addressing our nation’s energy consumption; and

20 WHEREAS, nature deficit in children, demonstrated by the fact that children today spend  
21 half as much time outside as children did 20 years ago and spend about 6.5 hours per day  
22 plugged into electronic media, increases the need to connect children to the natural world around  
23 them and for immediate global warming education programs linking outdoor activity in every  
24 school to benefit the cognitive abilities of children, fostering an appreciation for their natural  
25 world and a sense of stewardship; and

26 WHEREAS, every American child should have a "Green Hour" every day, a time for  
27 unstructured play and interaction with the natural world; and

28 WHEREAS, community-based conservation organizations play a vital role in engaging  
29 children in nature and promoting environmental education; and

30 WHEREAS, hands on environmental education incorporating outdoor activity reconnects  
31 children to the natural world and yields academic benefits including higher math, reading, and  
32 language arts scores and also increases children's critical thinking skills, self-confidence, and  
33 academic motivation while addressing the growing problems of childhood diabetes, obesity and  
34 attention deficit; and

35 WHEREAS, National Wildlife Federation's commitment to creating a new energy future  
36 for future generations focuses on providing sound, age-appropriate global warming education for  
37 all ages by: training professionals, organizations and individuals to educate the general public,  
38 reaching out to future leaders via college campuses and providing sound education materials and  
39 training for school age teachers and students;

40           NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation, at its  
41 annual meeting assembled May 14-17, 2008, in Keystone, CO, hereby urges Congress and state  
42 legislatures to pass legislation that supports comprehensive global warming education in  
43 American Schools and ensures that children and families have positive opportunities to connect  
44 with the outdoors and nature; and

45           BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation encourages  
46 government at the federal, state and local levels to effectively incorporate global warming  
47 education into the existing structure of American education (grades 4 to 12); and

48           BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation and its affiliates  
49 support school students receiving effective, scientifically rigorous education about global  
50 warming, its solutions and its long term implications for wildlife, the environment, health and the  
51 economy (in accordance with the national guidelines developed by NWF in consultation with the  
52 North American Association for Environmental Education).

### **Affiliate Commentary**

The greatest threat to our natural world is global warming and its impacts on habitats and impacts to wildlife and ecosystems we all depend upon. Congruent with this, another major change is being thrust upon our children. Nature deficit, or the lack of exposure to outdoor activities including consumptive and non-consumptive activities, is a new phenomenon. Children today spend more time indoors on electronic media than any preceding generation. This is having major impacts on their health, their understanding of nature, biodiversity, and how ecosystems function to supply materials required to support life. The interconnectiveness of the natural world is a “lost Eden” to them.

Until we begin a national effort to alter this nature deficit problem through experiential school based environmental education programs to bring our children into a closer connection with the outdoors we will not be able to fully address the challenges ahead of us to change the impacts of global warming. These impacts will continue beyond most of our lives. Today’s children need to have all the tools and understanding to advance the programs we start in addressing global warming. They also need to fully comprehend how the world’s natural systems function like no other generation ever has.

The need to have a national program for environmental education has never been greater. Environmental education needs to be seen as the cornerstone to science literacy.

### **NWF Staff Commentary**

Children in America will be faced with a new set of environmental issues and concerns as a result of overall higher average U.S. temperatures in the next several decades. These higher average temperatures from global warming will cause many of the existing premises of environmental science to be recalculated and rethought. This will be true of basic atmospheric conditions and will also relate to ecosystem health, habitats and wildlife species. Effective education on the science, societal, and economic effects of this change will be essential for the next generation to comprehend and address them. Nature deficit in children, demonstrated by the fact that children today spend half as much time outside as kids did 20 years ago and spend about 6.5 hours per day plugged into electronic media, increases the need for global warming education and out door activity in every school to benefit the cognitive abilities of children, fostering an appreciation for the natural world and a sense of stewardship.

This resolution is consistent with existing resolutions and with current NWF strategic vision and plans. NWF has declared “Connecting People to Nature” a strategic focus with goals that include reducing nature deficit disorder and creating a public understand of global warming. For many decades, NWF has issued resolutions to support environmental education for children and to underscore the importance for connecting children to nature. Specific resolutions include: “National Need for Reducing our Nature Deficit” in 2007, “National Environmental Education Act” in 1990, “Environmental Education” in 1980, “Conservation Education” in 1983, “Federal Environmental Education Act” in 1978, and others. These resolutions promote the need to connect children with nature and advocate at the federal, state and local level for environmental education.

This resolution, “Global Warming Education in American Schools,” is timely in that it addresses rightful concerns of the National Wildlife Federation that the future of conservation and the environment lies with generations that are disconnected from nature and unprepared to address the societal impacts of global warming. I recommend this resolution be adopted as submitted.

### **NWF Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends this resolution be adopted as submitted.

**Encouraging Conservation Groups to Reduce Global Warming Pollution**

1           WHEREAS, the threat of global warming is the most serious threat to the natural and  
2 man-made environment humanity has ever confronted; and

3           WHEREAS, eminent scientists have stated that the world must reduce its rate of emission  
4 of global warming gases by no less than two percent a year to prevent catastrophic changes in  
5 sea level, climate, and other environmental factors; and

6           WHEREAS, most scientists agree that the level of existing emission of global warming  
7 gases must be reduced by about 80%; and

8           WHEREAS, the National Wildlife Federation has urged Congress to adopt a climate  
9 change program which will result in the reduction of emissions by the United States at a rate of  
10 no less than two percent a year; and

11           WHEREAS, it is incumbent on the National Wildlife Federation, affiliate members, and  
12 the conservation community at large to lead by example, by reducing emissions associated with  
13 its activities as quickly as possible and investing in meaningful offsets to cover the remaining  
14 emissions;

15           NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation and  
16 affiliate members, at its annual meeting assembled May 14-17, 2008, in Keystone, CO, hereby  
17 challenges each conservation organization, to commit to the reduction of emissions associated  
18 with all its activities by three percent per year, until emissions are reduced by at least 80%; and

19 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation encourages the  
20 conservation community to determine their carbon footprint, using guidelines from organizations  
21 such as the World Resources Institute; in order to establish a baseline to track their efforts going  
22 forward; and

23 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that National Wildlife Federation encourages the  
24 conservation community to track the business travel and commuting mileage of employees to  
25 purchase offsets; and

26 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation encourages the  
27 conservation community to identify carbon offset providers that have been reviewed and rated  
28 highly with the proceeds going toward renewable energy programs; and

29 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation encourages the  
30 conservation community to switch from coal-produced energy to alternative and renewable  
31 energy sources to supply electricity needs; and

32 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation encourages the  
33 conservation community to support the “green industry” by selecting vendors and providers who  
34 are also making efforts to reduce their carbon footprint; and

35 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation encourages the  
36 conservation community to begin instituting fundamental infrastructure changes in their  
37 programs, policies and practices to diminish dependence upon carbon, such as:

38 Travel

39 Encouraging and providing employee incentives for public transportation, carpooling, bicycling,  
40 hybrid and electric vehicles. Promoting telecommuting. Providing on-site childcare and electric  
41 fleet vehicles. Increasing the use of conference call technology for organizational meetings to  
42 reduce travel. Inventory employee travel for purposes of reduction, mitigation, or offset actions.

#### 43 Buildings

44 Encourage retrofitting organizational facilities for green energy and conservation. Reduce  
45 standby mode electronics. Site new organization buildings on mass transit lines, near affordable  
46 housing. Provide incentives for employees to reduce the carbon footprint of their homes.

#### 47 Investments

48 Directing organizational investment portfolios into more green energy investments.

#### 49 Publications

50 Reducing organizational printed publications and paper use through electronic alternatives,  
51 unnecessary waste, and more efficient technologies.

### **Affiliate Commentary**

#### **NWF Staff Commentary**

Science tells us that we must reduce global warming pollution by 80% by 2050 or 2% per year for the next forty years to avoid the worst impacts of global warming. NWF and other local and national conservation organizations have adopted the 2% per year goal as the standard by which national global warming legislation should be measured. NWF has made considerable progress persuading other conservation organizations of the value of the 2% per year message. A growing number of state, local, and national organizations are now using the 2% per year goal in their communications with their members, activists, and policy makers.

NWF's overarching strategy is to reduce global warming pollution by enacting a national cap on greenhouse gases (GHG) that reduces U.S. emissions by 2% per year. This will provide

incentives for renewable energy and conservation to facilitate a transition to a cleaner energy future.

NWF also aims to motivate individuals, households, businesses, community organizations and the conservation community at large to help demonstrate that 2% per year is doable and to reinforce the call for national legislation (e.g. NWF's new Good Neighbor program). NWF is also seeking to lead by example through our own Cool-It! program to reduce our own energy use and global warming pollution. NWF has conducted an inventory of the emissions associated with our operations, and is implementing a reduction strategy. These efforts are guided by the best practices established by the World Resources Institute and the World Business Council on Sustainable Development.

This resolution is generally consistent with several existing resolutions on solving global warming, including 2007-07 "Hunters and Anglers Leading Efforts to Solve Global Warming" and with current NWF policy.

### **NWF Staff Recommendation**

NWF staff recommends this resolution be adopted with the following amendments:

1. In line 18 change "by three percent per year" to "at least 2%" per year".

Focusing this resolution on a reduction goal of "at least 2% per year" will encourage leadership on the part of conservation groups while remaining consistent with our messaging of a national global warming goal.

**Pascagoula River and Gulf of Mexico Water Protection**

1           WHEREAS, the Pascagoula River is the last unimpeded major river system in the  
2 contiguous 48 states and is uniquely representative of the early southeastern landscape; and

3           WHEREAS, the River system’s bottomland forests, marshes, savannas and aquatic  
4 habitats support rare and spectacular wildlife such as the Gulf sturgeon and 23 threatened or  
5 endangered species; and

6           WHEREAS, many species of birds use its extensive north-south forested corridor as a  
7 critical area for foraging and resting during intercontinental migrations; and

8           WHEREAS, the Pascagoula River is utilized extensively as a natural resource by citizens  
9 throughout the region and beyond for fishing, hunting, ecotourism, water sports, bird watching,  
10 and as an inspiration for other endeavors; and

11           WHEREAS, the Pascagoula River, its associated estuary and the Gulf of Mexico serve as  
12 nurseries and habitats for commercial and recreational fin- and shellfisheries that provide jobs  
13 and have important economic impacts for Mississippi’s coastal counties; and

14           WHEREAS, activities that alter the functional dynamics of this floodplain river  
15 ecosystem and associated flora and fauna also impact local citizens; and

16           WHEREAS, the Strategic Petroleum Site at Richton proposes to take 50 million gallons  
17 of water per day for a five-year period from the upper reaches of the Pascagoula River; and

18           WHEREAS, extractions of such large volumes of water from the Pascagoula River (up to  
19 25% of seasonal flow) will have harmful effects on this pristine southern river ecosystem, its  
20 renewable living resources, and human interactions with these resources; and

21           WHEREAS, transport of nearly 80 billion gallons of hyper-saline water (brine) from the  
22 Strategic Petroleum Site at Richton for approximately 100 miles of pipeline to the Gulf of  
23 Mexico off the State of Mississippi increases the risk of catastrophic pollution of the Pascagoula  
24 River ecosystem as well as harm to the state's coastal marshes, marine species and their essential  
25 habitats, and near shore marine environments, including a treasured National Seashore; and

26           WHEREAS, this discharge of brine has potential to negatively impact commercial and  
27 recreational fisheries that contribute significantly to the region's cultural and socio-economic  
28 well-being, particularly during the lengthy recovery from Hurricane Katrina;

29           NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation in the  
30 annual meeting assembled May 14-17, 2008 in Keystone, Colorado calls upon the U.S.  
31 Department of Energy to address seasonal aspects of flow reduction resulting from its proposed  
32 water withdrawal from the Pascagoula River with a principal focus on determining impacts to  
33 floral, faunal, sociological, and economical dynamics of this incomparable river system; and

34           BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the National Wildlife Federation in the annual  
35 meeting assembled May 14-17, 2008 in Keystone, Colorado calls upon the U.S. Department of  
36 Energy to evaluate project alternatives as per the guidelines of the National Environmental  
37 Policy Act that fully address potential impacts to the cultural, social, socio-economic, biological,  
38 and anthropologic values associated with the Pascagoula River ecosystem, its associated estuary

39 and Gulf of Mexico. Results of this evaluation should be presented to the Governor of  
40 Mississippi, all state and federal natural resource agencies, and the general public.

### **NWF Staff Commentary**

In compliance with the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPACT 2005) the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is planning to expand the nation's Strategic Petroleum Reserve from 700 million barrels to 1 billion barrels. The DOE plans to design a new 160 million barrel underground crude oil storage site at the Richton salt dome in Perry County, MS. The salt dome cavern will be enlarged to 160 million barrel capacity through solution-mining the salt formation. Plans include the fresh water intake from the Pascagoula River to provide water for cavern development and oil displacement in the event of a drawdown. The proposed facilities include 330 miles of pipelines for water supplies, for brine disposal in the Gulf of Mexico and for oil distribution.

The construction and operation of the Richton site and associated infrastructure would potentially affect 63 water bodies. The primary raw water source for cavern development, maintenance, and drawdown would come from a tributary of the Pascagoula River, the Leaf River, which has a highly variable flow. A secondary raw water source would withdraw water from the Gulf of Mexico at Pascagoula and transport it to the Richton storage site for cavern development, maintenance, and drawdown during low flow conditions in the Leaf River. If low flow conditions exist in the Leaf River during a drawdown event for a national emergency declared by the President, DOE would withdraw water from the Gulf of Mexico and from the Leaf River to reach the necessary distribution rate. DOE would not withdraw water below the minimum in stream flow that is protective of aquatic resources, except for a drawdown for a national emergency declared by the President.

The Richton site and associated infrastructure may affect two federal listed species (the yellow-blotched map turtle and the Gulf sturgeon) and a federal candidate species (the pearl darter, considered by DOE as a "listed species"). The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) acknowledged that withdrawal of water from the Leaf River might have an adverse effect on the yellow-blotched map turtle, Gulf sturgeon, and the pearl darter. The Leaf River and Mississippi Sound are designated critical habitat for the Gulf sturgeon.

The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the project acknowledged potential groundwater contamination along the pipelines from brine, oil and associated chemical spills. The drawdown of water to during the cavern solution-mining will have a significant impact on water resources ranging from 2% - 11% of the river flow or 50 million gallons per day. The discharge of the brine from the solution-mining into the Gulf of Mexico will result in increased salinity ranging from 1 – 4 ppt in a plume extending 2.2 miles and could result in elevated salinity through accumulations at the bottom of the dredged shipping channel.

The protection and conservation of our nation's surface waters have been a concern for the National Wildlife Federation and affiliates for decades. This resolution is consistent with several existing resolutions and with current National Wildlife Federation policy. Numerous existing

affiliate resolutions call for the protection and conservation of our surface waters and their habitats. These resolutions include a resolution passed in 2005 titled “Restoration,” which calls for efforts to restore America’s coastal, marine and freshwater habitats; calls on the reformation of federal government programs and policies that permit the destruction of wetlands, coastal, marine and freshwater habitats; and calls on federal agencies to implement policies only for activities that protect, enhance and restore – not destroy – aquatic habitat. A resolution passed in 2000 titled “Diversion of Water from Natural Watersheds” urges governments to adopt standards for managing water resources based on conservation, reuse, protection and restoration of freshwater ecosystems and the recognition that fresh water is a finite resource; restoration and protection of fresh water resources must guide future decisions about water use; and wise water use and conservation must become commonplace. A resolution passed in 1999 titled “Coastal Habitat” advocates for the protection and restoration of coastal and estuarine habitats, so that coastal resources are functional and sustainable. A resolution passed in 1980 titled “MX Missile System” acknowledges a federal project that will demand large amounts of water, to the detriment of in stream uses and strongly recommends that all feasible alternatives, including systems and sites, be vigorously evaluated in an Environmental Impact Statement.

This resolution, “Pascagoula River and Gulf of Mexico Water Protection,” addresses the rightful concerns of the National Wildlife Federation regarding the proposed expansion of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve at the Richton which threatens the human and natural resource values of the Pascagoula River and the Gulf of Mexico ecosystem. The resolution calls on the Department of Energy to address the impacts of the flow reduction from the proposed water withdrawal and to evaluate project alternatives in accordance with the National Environmental Protection Act.

### **NWF Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends that this resolution be adopted as submitted.

**Responsible Oil and Gas Development on Our Public Lands**

1           WHEREAS, the public lands managed by the United States Forest Service (USFS) and  
2 the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in the Rocky Mountain West support world class cold  
3 water fisheries, provide important core habitat and migration corridors for big game species,  
4 contain critical winter range for elk, mule deer, and pronghorn antelope, and support struggling  
5 populations of sage-grouse; and

6           WHEREAS, more than 26 million acres of big game habitat, an area the size of Ohio, as  
7 well as millions of acres of sage-grouse habitat already have been leased for oil and gas  
8 development and more than 126,000 new oil and gas wells have been proposed on public lands  
9 in the West over the next 15 to 20 years; and

10           WHEREAS, hunters, anglers, and other members of the public who value wildlife have  
11 been denied meaningful participation in the decision-making process about where oil and gas  
12 development on public lands is appropriate and how this development can be conducted to  
13 minimize impacts to wildlife and fisheries resources; and

14           WHEREAS, oil and gas development has been exempted from common-sense laws and  
15 policies that were originally put in place to protect wildlife, fish, water, and habitat from the  
16 adverse impacts of energy resource extraction; and

17           WHEREAS, the state and federal agencies that manage wildlife and fisheries and oversee  
18 oil and gas development do not have adequate resources to monitor, plan, and properly manage  
19 the expanding number of oil and gas projects occurring on our public lands; and

20 WHEREAS, the great tradition of public lands hunting and fishing, as well as other  
21 outdoor recreation, on public lands in the Rocky Mountain West currently is threatened by short  
22 sighted and often irresponsible oil and gas development;

23 NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation in the  
24 annual meeting assembled May 14 -17 in Keystone, Colorado, calls upon the USFS and the  
25 BLM to adopt and implement a more balanced approach to the development of energy resources  
26 on our public lands, one that will ensure the conservation of wildlife and wildlife habitat now  
27 and in the future; and

28 BE IT FUTHER RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation calls on the federal  
29 land management agencies to employ the best available science regarding the wildlife impacts of  
30 oil and gas development and the efficacy of wildlife mitigation measures in order to ensure that  
31 wildlife and other important public lands resources are protected for future generations to enjoy;  
32 and

33 BE IT FUTHER RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation calls on Congress to  
34 repeal the onerous provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 that frustrate public oversight  
35 and fast-track oil and gas development on our public lands at the expense of fisheries, wildlife,  
36 and communities in the Rocky Mountain West.

### **Affiliate Commentary**

The New Mexico Wildlife Federation is New Mexico's first and most effective conservation advocate, founded in 1914 by Aldo Leopold and other conservation-minded sportsmen. We are dedicated to protecting New Mexico's wildlife, habitat, and outdoor way of life. We bring diverse groups together, focusing on common interests, to make the big changes that make a difference.

The New Mexico Wildlife Federation has led the way in bringing back elk, Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep, wild turkey, and other wildlife species to New Mexico. We spearheaded efforts to save species like pronghorn from extirpation and were also instrumental in designating the world's first wilderness area: the Gila Wilderness. Now we're leading the way to a balanced energy future where sensible oil and gas development practices are implemented and irresponsible policies are addressed to conserve and protect land, wildlife, and water.

A lot has changed since Aldo Leopold had his vision for conservation in New Mexico. Rampant energy development and the irresponsible pace of unchecked oil and gas leasing and drilling in the west weren't challenges our founding leaders envisioned. They certainly weren't those that the National Wildlife Federation and Ding Darling were faced with back then either.

This resolution empowers the National Wildlife Federation and its affiliates to unite in addressing the increased threats to our public lands, wildlife, and heritage as sportsmen, outdoor enthusiasts, and stewards of our natural resources. The impacts of oil and gas development and the rapid pace of leasing and drilling demand that we call upon federal land management agencies to incorporate current science and evidence based data to augment current policies and industry requirements to ensure habitat and wildlife values are protected. Recent changes in federal management authority through the Energy Policy Act of 2005 have compromised federal land management agencies' ability to properly review leasing applications, provided industry with exclusions from NEPA, excluded the public from participating or submitting comments, and jeopardized our wildlife and natural resources favor of fueling the energy boom. Critical habitat, migratory corridors, and iconic species like Mule Deer, Sage Grouse, Prairie Chickens, and Pronghorn are at risk as a result.

### **NWF Staff Commentary**

The federal public lands are part of America's great legacy - a glimpse of what the early settlers and Native Americans must have seen. These lands are rich in cultural and natural resources. They provide habitat for more than 600 species of fish, wildlife and plants that are threatened, endangered, or otherwise considered sensitive or rare. Herds of mule deer, elk, and pronghorn antelope still roam across open landscapes on federal public lands in the West. Most of the federal public lands are also "working lands". The lands managed by the United States Forest Service (USFS) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) are available for private commercial uses such as livestock grazing, mining, timber, and increasingly, drilling for oil and natural gas. Many of these uses can be compatible with conservation of wildlife if conducted in a manner that preserves the function of important wildlife habitats.

Oil and gas activities on federal public lands currently pose a significant and growing threat to important wildlife habitats. Traditionally, the federal land management agencies have been deferential to oil and gas activities. In recent years, however, they have been under additional pressure to revise their land use planning documents to permit more oil and gas leasing, to remove lease stipulations intended to protect wildlife, and reduce enforcement of those stipulations.

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPACT) contained several provisions that make it more difficult for federal land managers to consider the needs of wildlife in decisions to permit oil and gas activities. For example, Section 366 of EPACT established a 30-day permit deadline. Pressuring federal land managers to take quick action on permits hamstring their ability to thoroughly review permits and protect other resources. Section 390 of EPACT excludes many oil and gas permit decisions from adequate review under the National Environmental Policy Act. This provision effectively removes these decisions from any public participation or oversight. Repealing these provisions of EPACT would restore the requirement that federal land managers consider fully the impacts of additional oil and gas development on public lands. Repeal would also restore NEPA's policy of encouraging public review and comment of proposed actions by federal agencies.

Wildlife already has been severely harmed by oil and gas development in the Rocky Mountain West. For example, according to new research, there has been a 46 percent decline in the mule deer abundance on the Pinedale Anticline in Wyoming since natural gas development intensified in about 2000. Sawyer *et al.* 2005 at 45. Evidence shows the deer are not using alternative habitats and they are not emigrating in substantial numbers. So, this decline is not explained by the deer simply moving somewhere else. Another study conducted on the Pinedale Anticline has shown that pronghorn exposed to oil and gas development had only 69.3 percent survival rates while those not exposed to natural gas development had 95 percent survival rates. *Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Pinedale Anticline Oil and Gas Exploration and Development Project* (December 2006) at 3-108. Sage-grouse are on the verge of requiring listing under the Endangered Species Act. A federal court recently concluded that energy development in the eastern reaches of sage-grouse range, including Wyoming and Colorado, may pose a significant threat to sage-grouse survival. *Western Watersheds Project v United States Fish and Wildlife Service*, No. CV-06-277-E-BLW, slip op. at 13 (D. Id. December 4, 2007).

Thus far, the federal land management agencies have failed to respond to the growing evidence that wildlife populations have been placed at risk by the current energy boom. BLM, the federal agency with primary responsibility for authorizing oil and gas activities on federal public lands, continues to issue more oil and gas leases and more permits to drill wells on lands that provide vital habitats for mule deer, elk, pronghorn, and sage-grouse.

This resolution is consistent with several existing resolutions and with current NWF policy. In prior resolutions, NWF has called for federal land management agencies to "assure that wildlife and other important environmental values are fully protected from the adverse impacts of oil and gas exploration and development activities." Land and Minerals in 1990 (1990); *see also* Mineral Leasing and Mining on Public lands (1981) (NWF "urges the federal government to prudently approach energy and mineral extraction to ensure that wildlife and recreation will not be unnecessarily sacrificed in a rush to extract energy and minerals from the public lands."). Energy development is an important component of federal public lands management, but it should not trump all other resource values. This resolution from the New Mexico Wildlife Federation is timely in that it correctly raises concerns that our federal public lands are under a greater threat today from oil and gas development. Further, the resolution calls for specific remedies that could help to address this situation. It calls on the federal land management

agencies to employ the new science regarding wildlife impacts of oil and gas development. It also addresses recent changes in federal law that has made it more difficult for those agencies to ensure that wildlife values are protected on public lands.

**NWF Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends that this resolution be adopted as submitted.

2008 Proposed Resolution No. Land-3

Submitted by: Colorado Wildlife Federation, Idaho Wildlife Federation, Montana Wildlife Federation, North Dakota Wildlife Federation, Nevada Wildlife Federation, Wyoming Wildlife Federation

**Support for Using the Best Available Science to Conserve Greater Sage-grouse in Areas Scheduled for Intensive Oil and Gas Development**

1           WHEREAS, Greater Sage-grouse is a highly sensitive species native to sagebrush  
2 ecosystems throughout the West which has experienced a substantial loss of habitat resulting in  
3 population declines in recent decades; and

4           WHEREAS, Greater Sage-grouse were petitioned for listing under the Endangered  
5 Species Act in 2000, were found “not-warranted” for listing by the US Fish and Wildlife Service  
6 in 2005, and a Federal District Court in 2007 remanded that Finding to the USFWS instructing  
7 the agency to issue a new Finding by mid- 2009; and

8           WHEREAS, the National Wildlife Federation and its western affiliates with Greater  
9 Sage-grouse in their states are committed to the long term conservation of Greater Sage-grouse  
10 and ensuring that Greater Sage-grouse populations are not allowed to decline to a point which  
11 would support listing as Threatened or Endangered; and

12           WHEREAS, the National Wildlife Federation and its western affiliates with Sage-grouse  
13 in their states support the preservation and improvement of Sage-grouse habitat, as well as  
14 grazing and agricultural practices that are not detrimental to Sage-grouse habitat; and

15           WHEREAS, the National Wildlife Federation and its western affiliates with Sage-grouse  
16 in their states support the responsible development of oil and gas and other energy resources

17 which take into account the requirements of Sage-grouse and their habitat, as well as other  
18 wildlife and their habitat needs; and

19 WHEREAS, all state wildlife agencies with Sage-grouse have expended a great deal of  
20 time and resources to develop Sage-grouse conservation plans for their respective states; and

21 WHEREAS, these state Sage-grouse conservation plans identify similar risk factors for  
22 Sage-grouse conservation, including energy development, invasive plants, uncontrolled wildfire,  
23 habitat fragmentation and other landscape level impacts; and

24 WHEREAS, the pace of energy development on public lands has increased substantially  
25 since 2000, and is the only government-authorized action negatively affecting Sage-grouse  
26 which is increasing exponentially; and

27 WHEREAS, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) manages the majority of federal  
28 Sage-grouse habitat and has been actively leasing and permitting energy drilling of this habitat;  
29 and

30 WHEREAS, recent scientific studies on the effects of conventional oil and gas and coal  
31 bed methane development in Wyoming and Montana show that the BLM's standard stipulations  
32 and mitigation to protect Sage-grouse are ineffective at sustaining local Sage-grouse populations;  
33 and

34 WHEREAS, representatives of fish and wildlife agencies from a five-state area including  
35 Colorado met recently, reviewed the most current published scientific studies and issued a  
36 consensus report stating that core Sage-grouse habitat areas need to be designated where no  
37 energy development will occur on the surface, that low density (<1 drilling pad per square mile)

38 surface development aids local grouse population persistence, and that geographically-phased  
39 development can be used to maintain large functioning blocks of Sage-grouse habitat; and

40 WHEREAS, these State fish and game agencies concluded that implementation of the  
41 best available science “may enhance the likelihood that Sage-grouse populations will persist at  
42 levels that allow historic uses such as grazing and agriculture and maintain their current  
43 distribution and abundance, thereby avoiding the need to list Sage-grouse under the Endangered  
44 Species Act.”; and

45 WHEREAS, the agencies responsible for conservation of Greater Sage-grouse habitat  
46 and populations now have the opportunity to develop conservation plans that incorporate the best  
47 available science, and provide the greatest opportunity to ensure that Greater Sage-grouse  
48 populations are not allowed to decline to a point which would support a listing as Threatened or  
49 Endangered; and

50 NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation, at it’s  
51 annual meeting assembled May 14-17, 2008, in Keystone, Colorado urges that the BLM and  
52 other land management agencies defer energy development within occupied Sage-grouse habitat  
53 until new effective stipulations, on and off-site mitigation practices, Resource Management  
54 Plans, and other planning documents incorporate the best available science, and

55 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that NWF encourages state and federal agencies  
56 permitting energy development within occupied Greater Sage-grouse habitat, and the energy  
57 industry itself, to implement the findings of the five-state panel regarding the best available  
58 science on the impacts of energy development so as to ensure the long-term conservation of  
59 effective core habitats, and sustainable populations of Greater Sage-grouse.

## **Affiliate Commentary**

Greater Sage-grouse (GSG) populations and habitats have declined throughout their range and in Colorado. In 2000, The Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and federal natural resource managing agencies adopted a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) requiring each state to develop a conservation plan for GSG. In 2002 and 2003 the US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) received petitions to list GSG as Threatened or Endangered under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) across their range in eleven states. In 2005, FWS issued a finding that listing of GSG was not warranted. The BLM has accelerated the pace of oil and gas development on public lands in the west. In Colorado, approved Applications to Drill (APD's) increased 50 percent between 2004 and 2005. Much more energy development, including oil shale extraction, is being proposed and planned for areas with important GSG habitat.

The Colorado Wildlife Federation (CWF) has participated in a collaborative process to develop the Colorado Conservation Plan for Greater Sage-grouse (GSG). The Steering Committee for that plan identified oil and gas development as the only factor affecting GSG to be increasing exponentially. Concurrent with that process, scientific studies of the effects of oil and gas development on GSG have been completed in Wyoming and Montana. These studies concluded that the current stipulations (like no new wells within ¼ mile of breeding leks and timing restrictions on drilling), best management practices (like invasive weed control), and mitigation measures (like 1-to-1 replacement of habitat acres directly lost under the footprint of road and pads) to protect GSG on lands with intensive oil and gas development are not effective at conserving GSG populations. CWF is concerned that if oil and gas development proceeds as planned with only those ineffective stipulations and mitigation measures currently required, GSG populations in those areas would decline threatening long term population viability. If GSG populations decline to a level that support listing under the ESA, it would have significant social, economic and political consequences for the state of Colorado and many other parts of the West. CWF is committed to the long term conservation of GSG and their habitats. This resolution encourages the responsible agencies to develop mandatory stipulations and mitigation measures that will effectively conserve GSG, including the designation of core areas where management will prioritize the conservation of sage-grouse and other sensitive wildlife, and if necessary exclude incompatible energy development.

## **NWF Staff Commentary**

Greater sage-grouse were petitioned for listing under the federal Endangered Species Act in 2000, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service found the species "not warranted" for listing in 2005. A federal court recently ruled that this finding was flawed, and the agency has agreed to publish a new Finding by May 2009.

NWF and our affiliates have been engaged in sage-grouse conservation efforts throughout this period, whether through participating in state-based conservation planning efforts (Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Wyoming) or participating in monitoring populations a field via NWF's Adopt-a-Lek program (Montana, Nevada, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Oregon).

Oil and gas development is underway or planned across much of the sage-grouse's remaining habitat on public lands in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and Montana. Recent rigorous scientific research is showing high levels of sensitivity by sage-grouse to such development, demonstrating that current Bureau of Land Management (BLM) stipulations to protect the species from energy development are ineffective, instead resulting in local population declines and extirpations. Concurrent studies are showing declines in wintering mule deer herds, strong avoidance by American pronghorn of key migratory corridors, and that many other wildlife species may also be at risk from this type of intensive and poorly planned energy development. However, these impacts may be reduced if agencies defer further development until the best available science is incorporated into planning documents, used to modify and strengthen protective stipulations, and for designation of "core areas" prioritizing the long-term conservation of sustainable sage-grouse populations.

This resolution is consistent with existing resolutions and with current NWF policy. Three existing affiliate resolutions passed in 2004 and 2007 cite concerns for sage-grouse due to habitat degradation from global warming and erection of wind farms in important habitats, and also call for designation of "Areas of Critical Environmental Concern" by the BLM to conserve sage-grouse.

This resolution, "Support for Using the Best Available Science to Conserve Greater Sage-grouse in Areas Scheduled for Intensive Oil and Gas Development" is timely in that it addresses proven concerns of the NWF that poorly planned energy development threaten the wildlife and habitats of the interior West. Further, the resolution calls for two specific remedies that could help to address this situation.

#### **NWF Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends that this resolution be adopted as submitted.

2008 Proposed Resolution No. Water-1

Submitted by: North Dakota Wildlife Federation, Texas Conservation Alliance, Association of Northwest Steelheaders, Arizona Wildlife Federation and Washington Wildlife Federation

### **Avoiding New Water Storage Facilities**

1           WHEREAS, an overwhelming majority of the world’s scientists agree that human  
2 activities, particularly the burning of fossil fuels, cause carbon dioxide and other greenhouse  
3 gases to accumulate in the Earth’s atmosphere resulting in global warming and disruption of the  
4 planet’s climate systems; and

5           WHEREAS, this climate disruption is projected to significantly alter the quantity, timing  
6 and quality of freshwater resources; and

7           WHEREAS, rivers and streams that provide important fish and wildlife habitat and water  
8 supply for growing human populations have been significantly altered for water supply,  
9 irrigation, energy production, and flood control; and

10           WHEREAS, once altered and disconnected from their wetlands and floodplains, these  
11 rivers and streams provide degraded habitat for fish and wildlife, and are rendered more  
12 susceptible to the impacts of global warming; and

13           WHEREAS, several United States Governors, responding to predicted population  
14 growth, and the threat of reduced water availability resulting from global warming, have  
15 announced programs to plan new water storage and conveyance facilities; and

16           WHEREAS, new dams, reservoirs, and other water storage and conveyance facilities  
17 would likely result in the further degradation of imperiled habitat for fish and wildlife  
18 populations as well as inundation of high value wetland, floodplain, and in stream habitat; and

19 WHEREAS, efficient use, conservation, reuse and recycling of water resources can  
20 reduce the need for additional storage facilities such as reservoirs, and natural storage maximized  
21 in forested headwaters, floodplains, braided channels, and wetlands can keep water resources  
22 available to fish, wildlife, and people while minimizing the need for storage facilities;

23 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation, at its  
24 annual meeting assembled May 14-17, 2008, in Keystone, Colorado, supports the following prior  
25 to the siting and development of water storage projects:

- 26 1) Performing detailed needs assessments that incorporate demand management and  
27 full-cost pricing in projections of future demand;
- 28 2) Maximizing use of existing water supplies through efficiency, conservation, and reuse  
29 of wastewater in both non-potable and potable applications;
- 30 3) Adopting integrated water resource planning and management approaches, in order to  
31 optimize the performance of existing water infrastructure;
- 32 4) Analyzing the effects of climate variability and climate change on the reliability and  
33 performance of existing freshwater supply systems, as well as on water needs for fish  
34 and wildlife: and
- 35 5) Protecting and restoring fish and wildlife habitat and populations as part of the  
36 projects, well beyond that needed to mitigate the direct environmental and social  
37 impacts of siting, constructing, and operating the projects.

38 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation supports new water  
39 storage facilities only when the "beneficiary pays," that is, when identifiable beneficiaries of  
40 water supplies or other benefits pay a pro rata share of the costs associated with the project.

## **Affiliate Commentary**

Human influenced climate instability, development, and poor utilization efficiency have increased the pressure to capture and exploit more water from rivers and streams throughout the country. This has resulted in a rush by states to propose the impoundment of many areas which have irreplaceable value as fish and wildlife habitat; accentuating the value as water sources while minimizing habitat and recreation value. Too often these projects ignore the common loss resulting from these projects, and derive a benefit to a limited few.

This resolution demands that the responsible government entities first make concerted effort to conserve and husband existing supplies and take conservation savings into account when determining the need for these projects. Then, proponents must make a true and accurate definition of the benefits and costs of these proposed projects, identify the beneficiaries, and assign the costs to the beneficiaries.

NWF adoption of this resolution will encourage thorough examination and consideration of water storage projects, and promote evaluation of the true costs to our fish and wildlife resources.

## **NWF Staff Commentary**

Among the most robust and certain of predications coming from climate change science is that hydrology will change – weather patterns, precipitation, and storm intensity will be different. These predictions add significant impetus to the ever-present interest in developing new water supplies from cities anticipating population growth and irrigated agriculture. Further, because aquatic ecosystem restoration efforts often require additional, manageable water supplies, new water project proposals frequently include dedication of a portion of the project yield to the environment, resulting in the paradoxical concept of “dams for the environment.” The results are new and serious proposals for building surface storage reservoirs and other water infrastructure.

While building new storage is often the first response to these issues, it is often not the cheapest, most effective, or environmentally beneficial response. Some water managers are beginning to recognize the benefits of a variety of policy responses ranging from conservation to complex integration of floodplain management, groundwater basins and more effective use of existing water infrastructure. They are also beginning to recognize the energy used to store, treat and distribute water; saving water saves significant quantities of energy. The resolution proposed encourages these new approaches by adopting the following approaches: creating realistic demand forecasts; maximizing use of existing supplies; integrating water supply with other water management (such as flood control, hydropower, and wastewater); recognizing the effects of climate change; and restoring damaged ecosystems.

This resolution is consistent with many adopted by NWF through the years. In 2002, NWF adopted the “Flows for Fish and Other Aquatic Life” resolution that called for promoting “water conservation legislation as an important strategy to relieve the demand for new and expanded water withdrawal and allocation requests... [and encouraging] states to establish comprehensive

water resource planning that incorporates storm water, wastewater, and drinking water management to preserve adequate flows in streams.” In the 2000 resolution on Diversion of Water from Natural Watersheds, NWF opposed most interbasin diversions and “urge(d) governments to adopt standards for managing water resources based on conservation, reuse, protection and restoration of freshwater ecosystems.” In a series of Water Resources Conservation resolutions adopted in 1989, 1990, 1991 and 1992, NWF called for increasing water use efficiency and conservation, reducing unnecessary federal subsidies, adopting nonstructural water management solutions, and restoring floodplains, and fish and wildlife habitat and populations.

### **NWF Staff Recommendation**

The proposed resolution is timely given pending proposals for new reservoirs. It encourages the developing concepts of integrated water resources planning and realizing the energy and environmental benefits of conservation and efficiency.

Staff recommends adopting the resolution.

### **Groundwater Protection**

1           WHEREAS, healthy ecosystems function as a unit; and

2           WHEREAS, groundwater is an integral part of the aquatic interface among surface  
3 waters, wetlands and streams; and

4           WHEREAS clean, ample groundwater supplies are essential to both human and  
5 ecological health, vital to the nation’s economy, drinking water supplies, recreation industries  
6 and a vital part of the “commons,” which should be accessible to all for the public good; and

7           WHEREAS, groundwater is a finite global resource, increasingly threatened by drought,  
8 over-consumption, contamination and an inadequate legal regime to protect groundwater and  
9 surface water; and

10           WHEREAS, diversion of groundwater is occurring more frequently worldwide,  
11 triggering dewatering of wells and springs and degrading surface waters; and

12           WHEREAS, authority over groundwater resources often comprises a patchwork of state  
13 and local statutes in many cases unrelated to broader needs and demands; and

14           WHEREAS, the burgeoning effects of global warming suggest that better management of  
15 water supplies, including keeping flows underground, is one way to protect water resources from  
16 inordinate warming; and

17           WHEREAS, identification and protection of aquifers and recharge zones is a crucial step  
18 in protection of groundwater resources; and

19           WHEREAS, technological advances continue to offer new, potentially effective methods  
20 of managing groundwater, e.g. pumping into closed aquifers, capturing runoff in place, directing  
21 it into the aquifer and allowing groundwater reserves to feed to the surface under a natural  
22 Regime; and

23           WHEREAS, groundwater protection and management is an important component of  
24 overall water resources management, and recognizing the interconnectedness of groundwater and  
25 surface water and the impacts that groundwater withdrawals may have on surface water bodies  
26 and public rights should be considered a part of this process;

27           NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the assembled affiliates of the National  
28 Wildlife Federation at its 2008 annual meeting in Keystone, Colorado acknowledge the  
29 importance of groundwater and surface water resources to environmental, public and economic  
30 health; and

31           BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the above urge NWF to aggressively support proper  
32 long-term management and protection of groundwater resources, including the recognition that  
33 groundwater and surface water are interconnected and that groundwater withdrawals may impact  
34 public rights, other water users, and damage natural resources including surface water resources;  
35 and

36           BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation supports protection  
37 and management of groundwater as essential to the health and prosperity of the nation and

38 recognizes the importance of managing groundwater resources so that both groundwater and  
39 surface water resources are protected and so that groundwater withdrawals are not allowed to  
40 harm or impair public rights or natural resources.

### **Affiliate Commentary**

The Vermont Natural Resources Council (VNRC) presents this Groundwater Resolution for consideration at the 2008 NWF Annual Meeting and requests adoption.

VNRC has worked hard for several years to press for policies that will safeguard the state's groundwater resources – the fresh, cold water that flows beneath our feet. Nearly two-thirds of Vermont's population depends on groundwater for their drinking water supply. Groundwater, and its interconnection with surface water, provides an essential function by recharging Vermont's rivers, lakes, wetlands and streams, thereby helping to maintain surface water quality and support habitat for fish and other aquatic species.

VNRC's goal has been to remove Vermont from its precarious position as one of the last states in the nation to inadequately protect this increasingly valuable natural resource by passing a comprehensive groundwater protection program. Any meaningful groundwater protection program, at a minimum, must include a regulatory program that protects existing uses of groundwater and natural resources, recognize the public nature of groundwater and an obligation for governments to responsibly manage groundwater and recognize that groundwater is connected to surface water.

Groundwater protection is obviously not unique to Vermont. All states throughout the country must protect their groundwater resources. As a leading national conservation organization, this resolution places NWF squarely in the right policy position, promoting:

- Comprehensive protection for groundwater;
- Recognition that groundwater and surface water are connected; and
- Recognition that groundwater a vital, finite, public resource that is increasingly at risk due to the growing demands for fresh water and climate change.

### **NWF Staff Commentary**

Freshwater resources are vital habitat for plants and wildlife and provide necessary drinking water for human consumption. The critical connection between groundwater and surface water is undeniable. Groundwater is a finite resource, increasingly threatened by drought, over-consumption, contamination and inadequate legal regimes in many states. More and more, competing uses are vying for access to these water resources and creating cause for concern about the future of our water resources and the natural resources that depend on them. Overuse, mismanagement, and the diversion of groundwater resources can put important drinking water resources at risk and may also lead to impairment of surface water resources and the natural

resources that depend on them. It is imperative that water managers recognize the interconnectedness of groundwater and surface water and manage these resources accordingly.

This resolution does not conflict with existing resolutions and is consistent with current NWF policy. A resolution adopted in 2000 recognizes that all parts of the ecosystem are dependent on water and that land, groundwater, and surface water are interconnected and encourages better management of our water resources. The 2000 resolution, however, does not focus as much on groundwater. Given the increasing threats to groundwater across the country, a resolution focusing attention on the need to protect this vital resource is appropriate.

This resolution is timely given the impending threat of climate change to water supplies across the nation and given the increasing use of groundwater as a source of water for a variety of sometimes competing purposes. It encourages water managers to look at groundwater and surface water as an interconnected system and to manage water withdrawals so that they do not cause harm to public rights or to natural resources that depend on ground or surface water.

#### **NWF Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends adoption of the resolution as submitted.

**Separating Ecosystem Restoration Authorizations from Water Resources Development Acts**

1           WHEREAS, since 1974 Congress has principally chosen Water Resources Development  
2 Acts (“WRDAs”) to consider and enact legislation to guide and authorize policies, programs and  
3 projects of the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers; and

4           WHEREAS, while these bills are purportedly intended to be passed biennially, they have  
5 often become mired in disputes and controversy and have been delayed sometimes for multiple  
6 congressional sessions; and

7           WHEREAS, in recent years Congress has increasingly begun to view WRDAs as  
8 ‘omnibus’ public works bills, which have resulted in increasingly large backlogs of unfunded  
9 and un-constructed projects and which include large numbers of projects and project  
10 modification authorizations, often for which no previous studies or justifications exist, and which  
11 are subject to little or no scrutiny to determine whether they are priorities or in the national  
12 interest; and

13           WHEREAS, increasingly the Army Corps of Engineers is being called upon to assist in  
14 ecosystem restoration activities such as the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan in  
15 Florida, Great Lakes restoration, the Louisiana Coastal Area Plan, the Upper Mississippi River  
16 and Illinois River Ecosystem Restoration, restoration projects in numerous bays and estuaries,  
17 and others, and the success of such programs require sustained multi-year planning efforts and  
18 authorizations of related elements where costs and bringing about the restoration of ecosystem  
19 health depends especially on timely implementation of plans that are based upon adaptive  
20 management principles; and

21           WHEREAS, the delays associated with WRDAs in recent years have adversely affected  
22 the pace, success and ultimate costs of critically important ecosystem restorations, where federal  
23 obligations are failing to be met, sometimes with years of delays;

24           NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation, in its  
25 annual meeting assembled May 14 -17, 2008, in Keystone, CO, hereby calls upon Congress and  
26 the Administration to develop new legislative or other mechanisms to separate from the current  
27 omnibus WRDA approach ecosystem restoration projects; and

28           BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that NWF calls upon Congress and the Administration to  
29 exercise greater legislative oversight and attention to expedite critical ecosystem restoration  
30 projects so as to maintain regular and reliable authorizations and funding and to provide greater  
31 support for the ultimate and timely success of these important national interest programs.

**Affiliate Commentary:**

In recent years it has become apparent that the WRDA process in Congress has broken down. The relevant authorizing committees in the House and Senate have begun to view these bills as opportunities to deliver pork barrel water projects to virtually every state and congressional district, and as a result the legislation is increasingly becoming bogged down in disputes and criticisms over “earmarks”, while at the same time critical ecosystem restoration authorizations are being delayed, sometimes for years. In the most recent instance, it took seven years between the WRDA 2000, which authorized the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan and the WRDA 2007, which authorized construction of critical additional elements of CERP to be enacted, which has materially slowed the progress of Everglades restoration. Similarly, the critically important authorization to enhance the barrier system to block introduction of invasive carp species to the Great Lakes from the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers through the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, a key element of Great Lakes Restoration, was delayed for nearly four years, due to the unwieldy nature of WRDA. This resolution calls upon Congress and the Administration to develop new legislative or other mechanisms to provide timely authorizations and funding for important Corps of Engineers-related national aquatic ecosystem restoration programs.

### **NWF Staff Commentary**

The current legislative method of combining environmental restoration, navigation and flood control projects into a Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) has resulted in major delays, and the process has become an unpredictable means for authorizing and eventually funding the restoration of our nation's "great waters." Due to the comprehensive nature of WRDA, urgent restoration projects in the Everglades, Great Lakes, Coastal Louisiana, and others elsewhere in the country are held hostage and face insurmountable political pressure to accept a bloated WRDA bill that often threatens to do as much environmental harm as good.

For example, while WRDA 2007 contained important restoration authorizations for the Everglades, Coastal Louisiana, upper Mississippi, and Great Lakes, the bill overall authorized \$23 billion in some 900 projects - many of which were fiscally and environmentally unsound. These new authorizations were added to an already \$58 billion backlog of projects. With only \$2 billion in construction funding each year, it would take at least 35 - 40 years to fund these projects. And, discussions have already begun on a WRDA 2008. As such, WRDA no longer offers a dependable process for time-sensitive ecosystem restoration projects.

This resolution is consistent with existing resolutions and with current NWF policy. Several existing resolutions call for the protection and restoration of our waters. In addition, resolution "Restoration" adopted in 2005, specifically addresses the need for authorization and funding for our nation's "great waters." This resolution specifically calls on Congress to authorize and provide adequate long-term funding to protect and restore aquatic habitat in regions including the Everglades, Coastal Louisiana, and others.

This resolution, "Separating Ecosystem Restoration Authorizations from Water Resources Development Acts," is timely in that it addresses concerns of the National Wildlife Federation that these restoration programs like those in the Everglades, Great Lakes, Coastal Louisiana, upper Mississippi and elsewhere, need to be addressed in a timely manner or risk failing altogether. In addition, the current process for authorizing these projects is broken, necessitating a new way to authorize projects.

### **NWF Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends adoption as submitted.

**National Flood Insurance and Natural Catastrophe Insurance**

1           WHEREAS, the Congress established the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) in  
2 1968 to provide otherwise difficult to obtain flood insurance for residences and businesses that  
3 are located in flood prone areas in exchange for the participating communities' agreement to  
4 guide new development away from flood hazard areas; and

5           WHEREAS, since its inception the NFIP has grown to more than 5.1 million policies  
6 providing more than \$1 trillion in annual flood insurance coverage, and the vast majority of the  
7 nation's communities are currently participating; and

8           WHEREAS, global warming is causing sea level rise, increased storm surge and  
9 intensified tropical storms and other changes in climate and weather patterns, which in turn  
10 threaten people and wildlife along the coasts and in floodplains; and

11           WHEREAS, coastal and floodplain development, in part facilitated by the NFIP, has  
12 degraded critically important fish and wildlife habitat, water quality, open space, groundwater  
13 recharge areas, and has reduced recreational opportunities; and

14           WHEREAS, in implementing the NFIP, the Federal Emergency Management Agency  
15 (FEMA) has given virtually no attention to the dangers to people and wildlife posed by global  
16 warming and excessive coastal and floodplain development; and

17           WHEREAS, nationally, average annual flood damages have continued to rise at an  
18 alarming rate, now exceeding an average of \$6 billion yearly, triple the adjusted rate of the early

19 20<sup>th</sup> Century, and this is before considering the catastrophic losses of the hurricane years of 2004  
20 and 2005; and

21 WHEREAS, today the NFIP is more than \$17 billion in debt to the U.S. Treasury, with  
22 virtually no possibility of overcoming the debts and large interest payments without a massive  
23 federal bailout; and

24 WHEREAS, Congress has begun considering legislation that would add wind insurance  
25 to the NFIP as a new federally-insured peril and otherwise expand federal subsidies for natural  
26 catastrophe insurance programs, without reforming the well-known problems in the existing  
27 programs;

28 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation, in  
29 annual meeting assembled May 14 -17, 2008, in Keystone, CO, hereby expresses its opposition  
30 to any legislation that would exacerbate the financial instability of the NFIP and fail to address  
31 the risks to people and wildlife of development in high-hazard, environmentally-sensitive areas,  
32 such as coastal barrier islands, estuaries, ocean, lakeside and riverine shorelines and floodplains;  
33 and

34 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the National Wildlife Federation calls on the  
35 Congress and FEMA to shift the focus of federal flood insurance programs onto the  
36 identification and mitigation of hazard risks, including the risks posed by global warming, rather  
37 than subsidization of insurance rates.

**Affiliate Commentary**

In the wake of the major hurricanes that repeatedly struck the Gulf States in 2004 and 2005, it has become increasingly clear that many of the already existing problems with the National

Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) will likely be further exacerbated by the effects of global warming – increasing sea-levels, storm surges, more intense coastal storms, and wider fluctuations in hydrologic cycles. One result of a growing recognition of risk has been increases in insurance rates associated with storms and coastal hazards. There has been, however, a lack of attention focused on measures to manage and reduce risk – such as moving back from high-risk, environmentally sensitive shoreline and floodplain areas and improving building safety – while the bulk of governmental attention has focused on increasing subsidies in order to reduce insurance rates.

Congress is currently considering updating and reauthorizing the NFIP, yet as one response to Hurricane Katrina, the House of Representatives recently voted to expand the program to include insurance for wind-related hazards at what are likely to be subsidized rates. At the same time the House failed to substantially expand efforts to reduce flood and wind-related risks through requirements for stronger land use and building codes and other means.

With the flood insurance program already facing an essentially insurmountable debt of over \$17 billion along with major Treasury interest payments which cannot be eliminated without a massive federal bailout, it is important to focus much greater attention on “hazard mitigation” (the wide range of mostly non-structural methods of reducing risk which include voluntary buyouts and relocations, protection of open space, building elevations, flood-proofing, improved building codes, erosion and shoreline setbacks, establishment of greenways, and other methods that emphasize the protection and restoration of natural and beneficial floodplain functions). The resolution is intended to urge Congress and other levels of government to refocus attention away from encouraging risky development with insurance subsidies and to focus much greater attention on reducing risk (and insurance costs) through greater “hazard mitigation”.

### **NWF Staff Commentary**

The National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) was originally established to make otherwise hard to obtain flood insurance available in exchange for communities’ commitments to “guide new development out of harm’s way.” Unfortunately, in its 40-year history the NFIP has focused mostly on providing insurance at often below-market rates, and it has too often failed to discourage – and in some cases it has actually encouraged – risky development, often in important, environmentally-sensitive areas, such as on coastal barrier islands, in or near wetlands, bays and estuaries, and on lowlands along rivers and streams. With increasing global warming and the flooding and other threats associated with more powerful storms, sea-level rise and storm surge, the NFIP is currently ill-equipped to remain solvent, let alone to meet its original goals of controlling and reducing flood losses.

Since the aftermath of the Great Midwest Flood of 1993, there have been expanding calls for fundamental reforms of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) to increase the emphasis on reducing flood risks, to substantially reduce subsidies for unwise development, and to greatly increase emphasis on wise floodplain management for public safety and the environment. Many of these issues were raised in the landmark federal *Sharing the Challenge* report (“Galloway report”) in 1994, the Federation’s own *Higher Ground* report in 1998, and a steady stream of National Academy of Sciences, Department of Homeland Security Inspector General,

Government Accountability Office and other reports, and more recently culminating in the FEMA-funded comprehensive “*Evaluation of the National Flood Insurance Program*” (2006). While Congress made some improvements in 1994 and again in 2004, they were entirely insufficient, and currently we find the NFIP remains over \$17 billion in debt to the Treasury with unsustainable interest costs, and facing rapidly increasing flood risk levels, especially along coastlines and in many growing urban areas.

To make things worse, Congress is continuing to treat the NFIP primarily as a service to constituents and developers, rather than as the nation’s principal program to control and reduce flood losses. Now, after Hurricane Katrina, the Congress is considering proposals to expand the NFIP to include federally-backed insurance against wind-related hazards (i.e. hurricanes, tornados and wind storms), an area that has always traditionally been a private-sector responsibility. The impetus is primarily a reaction to the combination of wind and storm-surge-related damages that occurred on the Gulf Coast during Katrina and recent substantial increases in private wind insurance costs in coastal states, as insurance companies react to the increasing awareness of hurricane damage potential. With rising risks from hurricanes and threats of increasing global warming impacts along with exploding and uncontrolled development, the consequences of Congress’ and Administrations’ past failures with the NFIP are becoming more apparent.

The NFIP urgently needs strengthening to require FEMA to anticipate reasonably foreseeable climate change and sea-level impacts and to identify future conditions from development in watersheds. These should be implemented through flood hazard mapping and improving NFIP land use management and building code requirements, working with state and local governments. Failure to make such changes will continue to result in more damage to fish and wildlife, wetlands, and sensitive coastal, shoreline and riverine ecosystems, as well as spiraling increases in property damages.

In addition, Congress’ failure to move the NFIP toward actuarial flood insurance rates, has itself been a significant factor for continuation of increasing losses, most notably for repetitively flooded properties, which are often rebuilt after disasters without mitigation. In 1998, NWF’s *Higher Ground* report found that essentially all NFIP rates were below actuarial levels, and more than 1/4 of insured properties (today, approximately 1.1 million) are being charged only 40% of true actuarial levels. While the recent House-passed version of the NFIP reauthorization bill (H.R. 3121) would begin to move “grandfathered” flood insurance rates upward for vacation homes and commercial properties, most would not reach actuarial rates under the bill for at least another decade. The Senate Banking Committee bill (S. 2284) would accelerate rates toward actuarial levels for these properties and repetitive loss properties, but neither bill addresses subsidies for primary residential properties, nor considers a “means-test” to address equity concerns.

NWF staff agrees with the concerns of Florida Wildlife Federation that the expansion of the NFIP to include insurance against wind hazards or initiation of new federal subsidies for catastrophic natural hazards could significantly increase the risks and development in high-hazard, environmentally-sensitive areas. Staff also agrees the principal direction of federal policy should be to focus on hazard mitigation with wise land use, improved building codes and

environmental protection and restoration, rather than continuing and increasing subsidies for insurance. A critically important way to control insurance costs is to control the risks.

The proposed resolution is consistent with previous NWF resolutions on flood insurance, including NWF's Floods, Floodplains, and Disaster Recovery Issues resolution from 2006 that called for "reduction and elimination of subsidies and biases in federal programs that promote high-risk floodplain development," and Water Resources Conservation resolutions from 1992 and 1989. This resolution is very timely, given Congress' attention to reauthorization of the NFIP with the possibility of its expansion to include wind hazards and Congress' consideration of other proposals to provide taxpayer subsidies for natural catastrophe insurance.

### **NWF Staff Recommendation**

NWF Staff recommends the resolution be adopted as submitted.

## *Appendix One*

### **Affiliate Representatives and Alternate Representatives**

#### **Alabama Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Rebecca Pritchett

**Committee: Land**

2001 Park Place North, Suite 810  
Birmingham, AL 35203-2778  
Email: rebecca@pritchettlawfirm.com  
Employer: Pritchett Law Firm  
Profession: Attorney

**Alternate Representative:** Tim Gothard

**Committee: Education**

3050 Lanark Road  
Millbrook, AL 36054-3616  
Employer: Alabama Wildlife Federation  
Profession: Executive Director

#### **Arizona Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Meg Buchanan

**Committee: Energy**

2026 E. Linden Street, Apt 1  
Tuscan, AZ 85716-3058  
Email: megbuchanan6@hotmail.com  
Employer: GeoSystems Analysis, Inc.  
Profession: Environmental Consultant

**Alternate Representative:** Ryna Rock

**Committee: Water**

2990 North Shady Lane  
Camp Verde, AZ 86322-8032  
Email: rynaken@swiftaz.net  
Employer: Self Employed  
Profession: Art Framer

#### **Arkansas Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Jim Wood

**Committee: Water**

56 Delaware Bay Rd  
Dardanelle, AR 72834-2622  
Email: jrmiacijim@arkwest.com  
Employer: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Profession: Retired

## *Appendix One*

**Alternate Representative:** Gayne Preller Schmidt

**Committee: Education**

402 South Third St., P.O. Box 527  
Augusta, AR 72006-2612  
Email: gayne555@centurytel.net  
Employer: State of Arkansas-CRVT  
Profession: Instructor

**Planning and Conservation League (CA)**

**Representative:** Lynn Sadler

**Committee: Energy**

P.O. Box 1896  
Sacramento, CA 95812-1896  
Email: lynnsadler@mountainlion.org  
Employer: Mountain Lion Foundation  
Profession: Executive Director

**Alternate Representative:** Richard Hawley

**Committee: Education**

P.O. Box 1505  
Cambria, CA 93428-1631  
Email: rick@greenspacecambria.org  
Employer: Greenspace-The Cambria Land Trust  
Profession: Executive Director

**Colorado Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Colleen Gadd

**Committee: Education**

13488 West 25th Place  
Golden, CO 80401-6809  
Email: cgadd@co.jefferson.co.us  
Employer: Jefferson County Open Space  
Profession: County Open Space - Manager

**Alternate Representative:** Harvey Nyberg

**Committee: Wildlife**

2300 Osceola Street  
Denver, CO 80219-5206  
Email: henmt1@juno.com  
Employer: Retired  
Profession: Montana Fish & Wildlife

## *Appendix One*

### **Connecticut Forest & Park Association**

**Representative:** Caroline Driscoll

**Committee: Energy**

995 Pequot Avenue

New London, CT 06320

Email: ckdri@conncoll.edu or carolinedriscoll@netscape.net

Employer: Connecticut College

**Alternate Representative:** Ruth Cutler

**Committee: Land**

PO Box 88, 42 Pease Road

Ashford, CT 06278-0088

Email: batfarm@earthlink.net

Employer: University of Connecticut

Profession: Cooperative Extension

### **Delaware Nature Society**

**Representative:** Seth Ross

**Committee: Education**

907 Pickett Lane

Newark, DE 19711-2641

Email: sethross2001@yahoo.com

Employer: Retired

Profession: Engineer

**Alternate Representative:** Richard A. Fleming

**Committee: Energy**

19 Quail Crossing

Wilmington, DE 19807-1138

Email: rfleming80@comcast.net

Employer: Retired - DuPont

Profession: Chemical Research and Development

### **Florida Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Janice Kerber

**Committee: Wildlife**

16086 East Stallion Drive

Loxahatchee, FL 33470-4150

Email: janicekerber@bellsouth.net

Employer: Palm Beach County School Board

Profession: K-5 Science Teacher

## *Appendix One*

**Alternate Representative:** Daniel C. Kipnis

**Committee:** Energy

3156 Royal Palm Avenue  
Miami Beach, FL 33140-3938  
Email: kipnisd@atlanticbb.net  
Employer: Florida Billfish Inc.  
Profession: Boat Captain

**Georgia Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** David Haire

**Committee:** Wildlife

121 Zebulon St.  
Milner, GA 30257-3451  
Email: dhaire@gwf.org  
Employer: Georgia Power Company  
Profession: Environmental Compliance Officer

**Alternate Representative:** Lynn E. Haire

**Committee:** Education

121 Zebulon St.  
Milner, GA 30257-3451  
Email: lhaire@lamar.k12.ga.us  
Employer: Lamar County School System  
Profession: Secretary for Student Services

**Conservation Council for Hawaii**

**Representative:** Nelson Ho

**Committee:** Energy

198 Hoku Street  
Hilo, HI 96720-3845  
Email: nho@co.hawaii.hi.us  
Employer: County of Hawaii  
Profession: Deputy Director, Environmental Management

**Alternate Representative:** Douglas Lamerson

**Committee:** Wildlife

1711 East-West Road #578  
Honolulu, HI 96848-1711  
Email: lamersod@eastwestcenter.org  
Employer: East-West Center  
Profession: Facilities Manager

## *Appendix One*

### **Idaho Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** J. Kent Marlor

**Committee: Water**

2979 West Highway 33

Rexburg, ID 83440-3733

Email: marlor@byui.edu

Employer: Retired

Profession: Political Science, Ph.D.

**Alternate Representative:** Russell W. Heughins

**Committee: Land**

10370 West Landmark Court

Boise, ID 83704-5482

Email: idahowildlife@gmail.com

Employer: Idaho Wildlife Federation

Profession: Administration

### **Prairie Rivers Network (IL)**

**Representative:** Jon McNussen

**Committee: Education**

1505 North County Road, 1550 East

Villa Grove, IL 61956-9606

Email: jmcnussen@gmail.com

Employer: Paul's Machine & Welding Corporation

Profession: Environmental, Health, and Safety Director

### **Indiana Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Dwight Shelton

**Committee: Land**

9438 West Windsor Road

Farmland, IN 47340-9446

Email: shelton@indianawildlife.org

Employer: Retired

**Alternate Representative:** Janet Ryan

**Committee: Education**

228 South 10<sup>th</sup> Street

Chesterton, IN 46304-2127

Email: ryan@indianawildlife.org

Employer: Retired

## *Appendix One*

### **Iowa Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Joe Wilkinson

**Committee: Education**

116 Lakeside Drive NE

Solon, IA 52333-9092

Email: wilk@southslope.net

Employer: State of Iowa-Department of Natural Resources

Profession: Information Specialist

**Alternate Representative:** Doug Thompson

**Committee: Wildlife**

3931 Mehaffey Lane NE

Solon, IA 52333-8942

Employer: Self-Employed

Profession: Recruiter-Medical Field

### **Kansas Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Don Snider

**Committee: Water**

2319 W. 60<sup>th</sup> Street North

Wichita, KS 67204-1713

Email: drsnider@cox.net

Employer: City of Wichita

Profession: IT/IS Manager

**Alternative Representative:** Matthew C. Nowak

**Committee: Wildlife**

1007 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street

Lansing, KS 66043-1152

Email: matthew.c.nowak@us.army.mil

Employer: U.S. Army, Ft. Leavenworth

Profession: Forester/Natural Resources Director

### **League of Kentucky Sportsmen**

**Representative:** Vikki Rawe

**Committee: Land**

10906 Pleasant Ridge Road

Alexandria, KY 41001-8087

Email: vikki@outofcontrolwildlife.com

Employer: Kentucky Dept. of Fish & Wildlife Resources

Profession: Aquatic Educator

## *Appendix One*

**Alternative Representative:** Rick Allen

**Committee:** Education

1009 Rain Court  
Lexington, KY 40515-1017  
Email: rallen@insightbb.com  
Employer: Insight Cable  
Profession: Communications

**Louisiana Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Edgar F. Veillon

**Committee:** Water

905 Harrison Avenue  
Metairie, LA 70005-2105  
Email: edgarv1@bellsouth.net  
Employer: Self Employed  
Profession: Insurance Sales

**Alternate Representative:** Gina L. Stanton

**Committee:** Wildlife

306 Point Aux Chenes  
Lafayette, LA 70507-4839  
Email: gstan311@bellsouth.net  
Employer: The Panagiotis Firm  
Profession: Office Manager & Bookkeeper

**Natural Resources Council of Maine**

**Representative:** Lani Graham

**Committee:** Energy

P.O. Box 10368  
Portland, ME 04104-0368  
Email: lgraham@maine.rr.com  
Employer: Self-Employed  
Profession: Physician

**Alternate Representative:** Lisa Pohlmann

**Committee:** Wildlife

NRCM  
3 Wade Street  
Augusta, ME 04330-6317  
Email: lpohlmann@nrcm.org  
Employer: Natural Resources Council of Maine  
Profession: Deputy Director

## *Appendix One*

### **Environmental League of Massachusetts**

**Representative:** Stephen M. Leonard

**Committee: Energy**

Brown Rudnick Berlack Israels  
One Financial Center  
Boston, MA 02111-2621  
Email: sleonard@brbilaw.com  
Employer: Brown, Rudnick, Berlack, Israels LLP  
Profession: Attorney/Partner

**Alternate Representative:** Bernard J. McHugh

**Committee: Water**

219 Old Concord Road  
Lincoln, MA 01773-3602  
Email: bmchugh@massland.org  
Employer: Massachusetts Land Trust Coalition  
Profession: Coordinator

### **Michigan United Conservation Clubs**

**Representative:** Dawn Levey

**Committee: Energy**

6048 North Lusk Road  
Elsie, MI 48831-8730  
Email: leveyd@voyager.net  
Employer: Ovid-Elsie Area Schools  
Profession: Teacher

**Alternate Representative:** Julia Meixner

**Committee: Land**

11731 South Lake Side Drive  
Jerome, MI 49249-9651  
Email: juliameixner@comcast.net  
Employer: Wayne County Dept. of Environment (Retired)  
Profession: Soil Erosion Inspector

### **Minnesota Conservation Federation**

**Representative:** Steven Maurice

**Committee: Land**

1224 Hickory Street  
Fairmont, MN 56031-4403  
Email: smaurice@frontiernet.net  
Employer: USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Svc (Retired)  
Profession: Soil Conservationist

## *Appendix One*

**Alternate Representative:** Keith Blomstrom

**Committee:** Energy

1830 Knollwood Drive  
Fairmont, MN 56031-2302  
Email: ecoranger@gmail.com  
Employer: Self-Employed  
Profession: Master Plumber

**Mississippi Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Jeanne Jones

**Committee:** Land

1323 Singleton Church Road  
Louisville, MS 39339-8006  
Email: jjones@cfr.msstate.edu  
Employer: Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, Mississippi State University  
Profession: Associate Professor and Certified Wildlife Biologist

**Alternate Representative:** Jimmy Bullock

**Committee:** Energy

1115 Posey Drive NW  
Brookhaven, MS 39601-9190  
Email: jbullock@resourcemt.com  
Employer: Resource Management Service, LLC  
Profession: Wildlife Biologist & Forester

**Conservation Federation of Missouri**

**Representative:** Albert Phillips

**Committee:** Energy

15 Berry Wood Drive  
Saint Louis, MO 63122-3100  
Email: abe.phillips@charter.net  
Employer: Retired  
Profession: Retired

**Alternative Representative:** Don R. Johnson

**Committee:** Education

110 Jackson Trace  
Festus, MO 63028-4707  
Email: don.johnson@suddenlink.com  
Employer: Suddenlink Communications  
Profession: Vice President, Human Resources

## *Appendix One*

### **Montana Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Tim Aldrich

**Committee:** Land

3340 Rodeo Rd.  
Missoula, MT 59803  
Email: cartim@bigsky.net  
Employer: Retired  
Profession: Forester

**Alternate Representative:** Chris Marchion

**Committee:** Energy

2105 Garfield  
Anaconda, MT 59711  
Email: chris.marchion@northwestern.com  
Employer: Northwestern Energy  
Profession: Security

### **Nebraska Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Steven Kryger

**Committee:** Wildlife

1215 Cork Dr  
Papillion, NE 68046-3027  
Email: steve.kryger@ubt.com  
Employer: Union Bank & Trust  
Profession: Trust Officer/Attorney

**Alternate Representative:** Russell Soucek

**Committee:** Education

420 Roberts St  
Seward, NE 68434-1857  
Email: rs33904@windstream.net  
Employer: Doane College  
Profession: Professor, Biology & Environmental Science

### **Nevada Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Anita Wagner

**Committee:** Wildlife

2280 Armstrong Lane  
Reno, NV 89509-3806  
Email: awag@gbis.com  
Employer: Retired  
Profession: Elementary School Teacher

## *Appendix One*

**Alternate Representative:** Robert Gaudet

**Committee:** Education

6870 Soldela Drive  
Las Vegas, NV 89156-6076  
Email: rpcjtag@embarqmail.com  
Employer: Embarq Telephone Company  
Profession: Cable Splicer

**New Mexico Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Ed Olona

**Committee:** Wildlife

Box 184  
Springer, NM 87747-0184  
Email: eagle87747@yahoo.com  
Employer: Retired

**Alternate Representative:** Gene Tatum

**Committee:** Energy

Email: gtatum@msn.com  
Employer: Albuquerque Wildlife Federation  
Profession: President, Albuquerque Wildlife Federation

**Environmental Advocates of New York**

**Representative:** Edna Sussman

**Committee:** Energy

20 Oak Lane  
Scarsdale, NY 10583  
Email: ednasussman@optonline.net  
Employer: Hoguet Newman & Regal LLP  
Profession: Attorney

**Alternate Representative:** Leslie Jacobson

**Committee:** Wildlife

400 East 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, Apt. 3-D  
New York, NY 10022  
Email: lhj400@nyc.rr.com  
Employer: Retired  
Profession: Media Executive

## *Appendix One*

### **North Carolina Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Richard Mode

**Committee:** Water

206 Woodlawn Drive  
Morgantown, NC 28655  
Email: [grmode@earthlink.net](mailto:grmode@earthlink.net)  
Employer: Self Employed  
Profession: Furniture Sales

**Alternate Representative:** Alen Baker

**Committee:** Wildlife

13400 Haiwasee Rd  
Huntersville, NC 28655-3656  
Email: [alenandscottie@aol.com](mailto:alenandscottie@aol.com)  
Employer: Retired  
Profession: Retired

### **North Dakota Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Clarence Bina

**Committee:** Water

512 Lansing Lane  
Bismarck, ND 58504-6562  
Email: [clbina@bis.midco.net](mailto:clbina@bis.midco.net)  
Employer: Retired  
Profession: Educator

**Alternate Representative:** Dave Brandt

**Committee:** Land

8485 25<sup>th</sup> St SE  
Buchanan, ND 58420-9687  
Email: [grusman@juno.com](mailto:grusman@juno.com)  
Employer: United States Geological Survey  
Profession: Wildlife Biologist

### **League of Ohio Sportsmen**

**Representative:** Larry Mitchell, Sr.

**Committee:** Land

1048 Geneva Avenue  
Columbus, OH 43223-2832  
Email: [president@leagueofohiosportsmen.org](mailto:president@leagueofohiosportsmen.org)  
Employer: Retired  
Profession: Contractor

## *Appendix One*

**Alternate Representative:** Andrea Caito

**Committee:** Wildlife

365 Sturbridge Rd  
Columbus, OH 43228-1251  
Email: [nwfalt@leagueofohiosportsmen.org](mailto:nwfalt@leagueofohiosportsmen.org)  
Employer: Career Staff Unlimited  
Profession: Occupational Therapy Assistant

**Association of Northwest Steelheaders (OR)**

**Representative:** Art Israelson

**Committee:** Education

202 NE 202<sup>nd</sup> Ave  
Portland, OR 97230-8119  
Email: [kisraelson@juno.com](mailto:kisraelson@juno.com)  
Employer: Retired  
Profession: Fire Fighter, Paramedic

**Alternate Representative:** Deborah McQueen

**Committee:** Water

33887 SE Patricia Way  
Scappoose, OR 97056-3819  
Email: [dlbmcqueen@yahoo.com](mailto:dlbmcqueen@yahoo.com)  
Employer: Self Employed  
Profession: Retail Rep. for Fishing/Boating Industry

**Pennsylvania Federation Of Sportsmens Clubs**

**Representative:** Ed Zygmunt

**Committee:** Land

RR #1 Box 1682  
Laceyville, PA 18623  
Email: [perennialacres@epix.net](mailto:perennialacres@epix.net)  
Employer: Federal Government  
Profession: Congressional Field Representative for Congressman Chris Carney

**Alternate Representative:** Peter Dalby

**Committee:** Water

221 Ponds View Lane  
Marble, PA 16334-1337  
Employer: Retired  
Profession: Professor of Biology

## *Appendix One*

### **Sociedad Ornitologica Puertorriquena**

**Representative:** Maria Luisa Rivera-Vazquez

**Committee: Water**

P.PMB-241, P.O. Box 1345  
Toa Alta, PR 00954  
Email: mluisa@libertypr.net  
Employer: TerraMare & Associates (Owner)  
Profession: Biologist/Environmental Consultant

**Alternate Representative:** Sheylda Diaz

**Committee: Education**

P.O. Box 2329  
Utuaado, PR 00641-2373  
Email: otoarina77@yahoo.com  
Employer: Universidad del Este  
Profession: Biology Professor/Biologist

### **Environment Council Of Rhode Island**

**Representative:** Jack Schempp

**Committee: Education**

47 Arbor Drive  
Providence, RI 02908-3532  
Email: jschempp1@msn.com  
Employer: Self Employed  
Profession: Sales & Marketing

**Alternate Representative:** David Brunetti

**Committee: Water**

935 Sherman Farm Road  
Harrisville, RI 02830-1156  
Email: david.brunetti@clariant.com  
Employer: Clariant Corporation  
Profession: Chemist

### **South Carolina Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Drew Lanham

**Committee: Wildlife**

112 Kirk Dr  
Seneca, SC 29678-4218  
Email: jdlanham@nctv.com  
Employer: Clemson Univ. Dept. of Forestry and Natural Resources  
Profession: College Professor/Certified Wildlife Biologist

## *Appendix One*

**Alternate Representative:** David J. Benjamin

**Committee:** Land

200 Worthington Pkwy  
Columbia, SC 29229-7923  
Email: davidbenjam@yahoo.com  
Employer: Self-Employed  
Profession: Realtor

**South Dakota Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Lanny Thomas

**Committee:** Wildlife

1060 Colorado Avenue S.W.  
Huron, SD 57350-3232  
Email: lthomas@huronsd.com  
Employer: City of Huron, South Dakota  
Profession: Engineering Technician

**Alternate Representative:** Bill Antonides

**Committee:** Water

514 N Arch St  
Aberdeen, SD 57401-2951  
Email: billantonides@abe.midco.net  
Employer: Self-Employed  
Profession: Wildlife Biology Consultant, Writer

**Tennessee Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Monty Halcomb

**Committee:** Energy

149 Renegar Branch Road  
Wartrace, TN 37183-3308  
Email: monty@mhalcomb.com  
Employer: Retired  
Profession: Federal Wildlife Agent

**Alternate Representative:** Joanne Halcomb

**Committee:** Water

149 Renegar Branch Road  
Wartrace, TN 37183-3308  
Email: joanne@mhalcomb.com  
Employer: Middle Tennessee Ambulatory Surgery Ctr  
Profession: Registered Nurse

## *Appendix One*

### **Texas Conservation Alliance**

**Representative:** D. Maxson “Mack” Turner

**Committee: Land**

6586 Chicory Court

Dallas, TX 75214

Email: mack@dart.org

Employer: Dallas Area Rapid Transit

Profession: Real Estate

**Alternate Representative:** Janice Bezanson

**Committee: Water**

PO Box 6295

Tyler, TX 75711-6295

Email: bezanson@texas.net

Employer: Texas Conservation Alliance

Profession: Executive Director & Alt Representative

### **Vermont Natural Resources Council**

**Representative:** Carolyn Kehler

**Committee: Water**

PO Box 626

Woodstock, VT 05091-0626

Email: carolynkehler@gmail.com

### **Virgin Islands Conservation Society**

**Representative:** Carlos Tesitor

**Committee: Education**

P.O. Box 1750

Kingshill, VI 00851

Email: ctfree@viaccess.net

Employer: GEC, LLC

Profession: Construction Manager

**Alternate Representative:** Carla Joseph

**Committee: Wildlife**

P.O. Box 502661

St. Thomas, VI 00805

Email: azanda@hotmail.com

Employer: Government of the Virgin Islands

Profession: Civil Servant

## *Appendix One*

### **Virginia Conservation Network**

**Representative:** Martha Wingfield

**Committee: Wildlife**

9011 East Patrick Henry Road  
Ashland, VA 23005-7418  
Email: marlridge@aol.com  
Employer: Virginia Conservation Network  
Profession: Board President

**Alternate Representative:** Christopher G. Miller

**Committee: Land**

PO Box 460  
Warrenton, VA 23005-7418  
Email: cmiller@pecua.org  
Employer: Piedmont Environmental Council  
Profession: President

### **Washington Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Brad Johnson

**Committee: Land**

4821 75<sup>th</sup> Ave NE  
Marysville, WA 98270-6948  
Email: habitatsnw@comcast.net  
Employer: Boeing  
Profession: Programming/CADD

**Alternate Representative:** Steve Phillips

**Committee: Water**

15406 21<sup>st</sup> Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98166-2010  
Email: sphillipsv2@comcast.net  
Employer: Boeing  
Profession: Marketing

### **Wisconsin Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Lil Pipping

**Committee: Wildlife**

562A Crestwood Dr  
Elkhart Lake, WI 53020-1952  
Email: lpipping@wi.rr.com  
Employer: Kohler Co.  
Profession: Planner, Scheduler II

## *Appendix One*

**Alternate Representative:** Jack Nissen

**Committee:** Wildlife

1811 W. Ottawa Ave.

Dousman, WI 53118-9359

Email: countyhighway@yahoo.com

Employer: Waukesha County Public Works Dept.

Profession: Highway Maintenance

**Wyoming Wildlife Federation**

**Representative:** Harold Schultz

**Committee:** Wildlife

1502 E. LincoLane Avenue

Riverton, WY 82501

Email: harolds@wyoming.com

Employer: Prison Health Services

Profession: Mental Health Counselor

**Alternate Representative:** Mark Winland

**Committee:** Land

5303 Van Ripper St.

Gillette, WY 82718-5111

Email: mwinland@ccsd.k12.wy.us

Employer: Campbell County School District

Profession: Science Teacher

## *Appendix Two*

### **National Wildlife Federation Board of Directors**

#### **CHAIR, IMMEDIATE PAST CHAIR, PAST CHAIR, and VICE CHAIRS**

THOMAS GONZALES, Ed.D., Chair  
9 Madrona Circle  
Santa Fe, NM 87506

JEROME C. RINGO, Immediate Past Chair  
P.O. Box 144  
Lake Charles, LA 70602

REBECCA L. SCHEIBELHUT, Past Chair  
14789 Day Road  
Mishawaka, IN 46545

STEPHEN K. ALLINGER, 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)  
263 South Main Avenue  
Albany, NY 12208

CRAIG D. THOMPSON, Vice Chair (Western Regions 10-13: AK, AZ, CA, CO, Guam, HI, ID, MT, NM, NV, OR UT, WA, WY)  
Western Wyoming Community College  
P.O. Box 428  
Rock Springs, WY 82902-0428

SPENCER TOMB, Ph.D., Vice Chair (Central Regions 5-9: AR, IA, IN, IL, KS, KY, LA, MI, MN, MO, ND, NE, OH, OK, SD, TN, TX, WI)  
Division of Biology  
Kansas State University  
232 Ackert Hall  
Manhattan, KS 66506-4901

## *Appendix Two*

### **REGIONAL and AT-LARGE DIRECTORS**

GREGOR BAILAR, At-Large Director  
6653 Sorrell St.  
McLean, VA 22101-1523

RICHARD BALDES, At-Large Director  
P.O. Box 888  
Fort Washakie, WY 82514-0888

PAUL BEAUDETTE, Region 1 Director (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT)  
72 Sawyer Drive  
East Greenwich, RI 02818-4835

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

CLARK BULLARD, Region 6 Director (IL, IN, OH)  
509 W. Washington St.  
Urbana, IL 61801-4051

DAVID CARRUTH, Region 5 Director (AR, KY, MO, TN)  
P.O. Box 91  
Clarendon, AR 72029-0091

LYVIER CONSS, At-Large Director  
Community College National Center for Community Engagement  
1025 Country Club Dr.  
Suite 320  
Mesa, AZ 85201

MICHAEL DOMBECK, Ph.D., At-Large Director  
University of Wisconsin  
College of Natural Resources  
800 Reserve Street  
Stevens Point, WI 54481

KATHLEEN HADLEY, Region 13 Director (ID, MT, WY)  
P.O. Box 3838  
Butte, MT 59702

## *Appendix Two*

### **REGIONAL and AT-LARGE DIRECTORS**

LIZ HAMILTON, At-Large Director  
16524 S. Bradley Road  
Oregon City, OR 97045-8803

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

MARK HECKERT, Region 11 Director (AK, OR, WA)  
13708 124<sup>TH</sup> Avenue Court E.  
Puyallup, WA 98374-5406

MASON BRYANT HOWARD, At-Large Director  
6161 Hardy Drive  
McLean, VA 22101

JERRY LITTLE, At-Large Director  
12101 Wolf Valley Drive  
Clifton, VA 20124-2240

EARL B. MATTHEW, M.D., Regional 8 Director (LA, OK, TX)  
81 Griffith Drive  
Rockport, TX 78382

GERALD MERAL, Ph.D., Region 12 Director (CA, HI, NV, Guam)  
P.O. Box 1103  
Inverness, CA 94937-1103

GENE T. OGLESBY, Region 9 Director (IA, KS, NE, ND, SD)  
650 J. Street, #400  
Lincoln, NE 68508-2924

PAUL ROSE, Region 7 Director (MI, MN, WI)  
18555 Glacier Trl.  
Hillman, MI 49746-7911

KENT A. SALAZAR, Region 10 Director (AZ, CO, NM, UT)  
1621 Vassar Drive S.E.  
Albuquerque, NM 87106

*Appendix Two*

**REGIONAL and AT-LARGE DIRECTORS**

LESLIE SHAD, At-Large Director  
1110 Judson Avenue  
Evanston, IL 60202-1315

DEBORAH SPALDING, At-Large Director  
300 Vineyard Point Road  
Guilford, CT 06437

CHRISTINE THOMPSON, At-Large Director  
4084 Richardson Road  
Virginia Beach, VA 23455

LISE VAN SUSTEREN, M.D., Region 2 Director (DE, MD, NY, NJ, PA, DC)  
6909 Radnor Road  
Bethesda, MD 20817

BEATRICE BUSCH VON GONTARD, At-Large Director  
1042 Milldale Road  
Front Royal, VA 22630



NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION®  
11100 Wildlife Center Drive  
Reston VA 20190-5362  
703-438-6000  
www.nwf.org

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** National Wildlife Federation Affiliate Presidents, Executive Directors, Representatives, Alternate Representatives and Board of Directors  
**Cc:** Regional Representatives  
**From:** Cindy Lewin, NWF Secretary  
**Date:** January 8, 2008  
**Re:** Call for Proposed Resolutions

---

### 2008 NWF CALL FOR PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

**Submit by February 15, 2008**

This memorandum is the formal call for proposed Conservation Policy Resolutions for consideration at the National Wildlife Federation's 72<sup>nd</sup> Annual Meeting on May 14-17. We request that proposed resolutions be submitted by **February 15, 2008** to provide sufficient time for review. Please email them to me as Secretary of the National Wildlife Federation at [resolutions@nwf.org](mailto:resolutions@nwf.org).

#### **PURPOSE OF THE CONSERVATION POLICY RESOLUTIONS**

Conservation Policy Resolutions formally approved by NWF's affiliate organizations establish the National Wildlife Federation's position on conservation issues. They inform other institutions, the press, and the public of our position on conservation topics.

#### **PROCEDURES**

Proposed resolutions and accompanying commentary may be submitted only by NWF affiliates, NWF Board members, and the NWF President.

*Proposed resolutions and commentary should be submitted by February 15<sup>th</sup> and emailed to [resolutions@nwf.org](mailto:resolutions@nwf.org).* Proposed resolutions will be assigned for consideration to one of the five Resolution Committees meeting on May 15, 2008. Affiliates or NWF Board members proposing resolutions should be prepared to speak regarding their proposed resolutions at the appropriate

## ***Appendix Three***

Resolutions Committee meeting or have a representative speak on their behalf. Each proposed resolution reviewed by committee will then be open for discussion and voting by all affiliates during the General Resolution session on May 16, 2008.

### **RESOLUTION DRAFTING AND CONTENT**

Resolutions should be clear, concise, fully edited and ready for adoption. We recommend keeping resolutions to one or two pages.

Resolutions are to be drafted in standard NWF resolution format with declaratory WHEREAS statements followed by an appropriate THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED statement. Existing policy resolutions may be found on the affiliate website at <http://affiliates.nwf.org/>.

As declarations of policy, they neither direct specific action to be taken by NWF nor allocate NWF resources. The establishment of the budget and the management of affairs of the Federation are vested in the Board of Directors.

Proposed resolutions must be accompanied by both a cover sheet (form attached) and a commentary (250-word maximum) explaining why the proposed resolution is needed.

### **EMERGENCY RESOLUTIONS**

Resolutions not submitted within the time prescribed by the NWF Bylaws will not be considered unless two-thirds of the voting delegates consent. This “emergency” procedure is reserved for last minute issues of truly extraordinary importance, such as a serious and unforeseen event occurring after the deadline for submission.

The originator of an emergency resolution must provide 125 copies for distribution to all delegates and NWF Board members in attendance.

### **RESOLUTIONS TIPS**

Do not rely on NWF staff to propose a resolution on issues of concern to you. However, NWF Regional Representatives can assist with any questions you may have concerning content or form of proposed resolutions.

When two or more originators submit similar resolutions, the text of only one will be transmitted to the Resolutions Committee with the resolution reported as jointly submitted.

The most common reasons resolutions are not adopted include:

- NWF already has sufficient or similar policy direction on the subject.
- The resolution may be premature -- i.e., the occurrence of the event or problem is not certain or perhaps even under consideration.
- The subject is simply too local for a national policy.
- The proposed resolution is not germane to NWF’s mission of “Inspiring people to protect wildlife for our children’s future.”

The resolutions process is critical to NWF policymaking and we look forward to receiving numerous resolutions this year.

## *Appendix Four*

### **Resolution Committee Procedures**

#### **Resolution Committee Chairs and Vice Chairs - Pre-meeting preparation:**

Prior to the Annual Meeting, the National Wildlife Federation (NWF) Staff Advisor for each committee contacts the Resolution 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.

#### **Conducting Resolution Committee Meetings:**

The following suggestions/order of events are offered to committee chairs and vice chairs for the efficient conduct of their meetings:

1. Ask members of the committee to introduce themselves by name and affiliation.
2. Ask others in the room to introduce themselves by name and affiliation.
3. Be clear that only committee members (credentialed Affiliate Representatives and Alternate Representatives assigned to the particular resolution committee) may make motions and vote.
4. 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.
5. Inform committee members of any members of the committee who reported a possible conflict of interest.
6. Note that the purpose of NWF conservation policy resolutions is to set policy to guide NWF activities. Resolutions cannot give financial direction or mandate actions to be taken by NWF staff; that is the responsibility of the NWF Board of Directors.
7. Ask people to seek recognition by raising their hand.
8. Non-committee members may be recognized by the chair to speak. They should give their names and affiliation before speaking. If time is short, the chair may limit the ability of guests to speak.
9. 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, s/he should speak with the staff at the end of the meeting so as not to delay discussion of the resolutions on substantive matters.

## ***Appendix Four***

10. 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 should do so.
11. 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.
12. Ask everyone to use line numbers to facilitate edits.
13. Ask if anyone has questions or changes.
14. 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. A vote should be taken on each resolution, however.
15. If a committee member wants to make a change, ask that it be put in the form of a motion by line number, with exact word changes, then ask for a second to the motion. Keep the discussion organized and moving. If there are objections to wording changes, ask for an explanation, but press for action on the motion. Commentary is included for explanation only and will not appear in the final resolution if the resolution is adopted.
16. Note that adoption is by simple majority.
17. Explain that no minutes of the meeting will be taken, but the scribe will be making resolution language changes as we go along.
18. 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:**

Each resolution committee will be assigned a National Wildlife Federation (NWF) staff scribe equipped with the necessary computer macros to efficiently process the committee's changes 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) should meet with the NWF staff scribe immediately after the conclusion of the committee's meeting to ensure that the committee's decisions 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 as prepared by the Staff Advisor. There should be no discrepancy between the resolution committee action and what is presented in Resolutions General Session.

## *Appendix Four*

### **Reporting at the Resolutions General Session:**

Although every effort is made to have the committees report on resolutions in the order of their listing in the Proposed Resolutions Book, it is not always possible. When called upon, Resolution Committee Chairs should proceed to and stay at the microphone once called upon, as each committee's resolutions will be dealt with in order. When reporting on a resolution, Resolution Committee Chairs should indicate to the delegates where they can review a copy of the resolution (i.e., in the Proposed Resolutions Book, on the screen, or in hard copy). Report amendments line by line (see below).

1. If there are no changes to a resolution, indicate the page number in the Proposed Resolution Book where it can be found and report that the committee recommends adoption as proposed. **The resolution will not be projected on the screen nor will a hard copy be distributed.**
2. If there are minor changes (single word or single phrase edits), indicate **the changes are being projected on the screen. No hard copy** will be distributed. Report on word edits only.
3. If there are substantial changes, the resolution will be **projected and a hard copy** will be distributed. In this instance, chairs should 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. 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 Five*

### **Parliamentary Procedure for Committees**

Even if you are familiar with the use of parliamentary procedures for meetings, did you know there are special rules for committees? Whether you are a novice or a pro, here is the basic information you need on parliamentary procedure to facilitate your participation in the National Wildlife Federation (NWF) Conservation Policy Resolution Committee meetings: some general rules, special rules for committees, most common mistakes, a chart of the most common motions and instructions on how to use it, and definitions.

The whole point of parliamentary procedure is to move the discussion along without trampling the rights of the minority. These simple, general rules should help you to participate in the general session and your committee meeting.

#### **General Rules:**

Points of order, parliamentary inquiries, and points of information are handled by the chair without discussion or vote.

Only one main motion at a time may be discussed. Anyone trying to bring up another topic is out of order.

Normally a motion requires a simple majority to be adopted. However, if the effect of the motion is to limit discussion or to change an action previously taken (amend or rescind a motion), then a two-thirds majority is required.

The chair should not hesitate to rule a speaker out of order. Speakers must be recognized by the chair before speaking and must address the motion at hand.

The chair normally serves as parliamentarian. If the chair is not comfortable in that role, the chair can appoint someone else to serve as parliamentarian. The chair will still need to know the basics in order to effectively run the committee meeting.

#### **Committees:**

Parliamentary rules are more liberal for committees.

Informal discussion of a topic is allowed while no motion is pending.

Members may remain seated while making motions or speaking.

Motions need not be seconded.

There is no limit on the number of times a member can speak to a question.

Motions to close or limit debate are not allowed.

The chair need not rise while putting questions to vote.

The chair can enter into the discussion and is allowed to vote.

## *Appendix Five*

### **Common Mistakes:**

A *motion to call the previous question* must itself be voted on before the motion it addresses is voted upon. It takes a two-thirds majority vote to end debate. NOTE: A motion to call the previous question is out of order in a committee meeting as it is a *motion to limit debate*. The whole purpose of the committees is to allow topics (called “questions”) to be thoroughly discussed.

A *motion to table* is out of order unless the speaker intends to temporarily set the motion under discussion aside to take up more urgent business. A *motion to postpone definitely* should be used when the speaker wants to postpone discussion of the motion until a later time. A *motion to postpone indefinitely* should be used when the speaker wants to kill a motion without taking a vote on it.

### **Chart of Motions:**

The following chart lists ten of the most common motions in their order of precedence. There should only be one main motion on the floor at any time but you may have a number of subsidiary motions. If there are a number of motions on the floor, the chair takes them up for discussion and vote in the order in which they appear on the chart. The chair must dispose of the motion that is highest on the chart before going to the next one on the chart. The motions listed in the chart are defined on the definition page.

For example:

Speaker #1 has introduced the main motion and speaker #2 has made a motion to amend it. Both motions are in order.

Speaker #3 wants to move to postpone discussion indefinitely. Since a motion to postpone indefinitely is lower on the chart, it is out of order.

Speaker #4 makes a motion to lay the main motion on the table to take up more urgent business. This motion is in order.

Speaker #5 rises to a point of information (that wants to ask a factual question about the main motion). Points of information have no precedence so they can be made at any time. Speaker #5 is in order.

Speaker #6 wants to introduce another main motion. Since there is already a main motion on the floor, Speaker #6 is out of order.

The chair should handle the motions this way:

1. Rule speakers #3 and #6 out of order.
2. Answer the point of information raised by Speaker #5.

## ***Appendix Five***

3. Take a vote on Speaker #4's motion to lay the main motion on the table.
4. If that passes, the chair takes up the urgent matter and returns to this motion later if there is a motion to remove it from the table.
5. If the vote fails, then the chair:
  - Takes a vote on Speaker #2's motion to amend.
  - Takes a vote on Speaker #1's main motion.

### **Motions in Order of Precedence**

<b>Motion</b>	<b>Second?</b>	<b>Debatable?</b>	<b>Amendable?</b>	<b>Vote?</b>
Adjourn	Yes	No	No	Majority
Recess	Yes	No	Yes	Majority
Lay on the Table	Yes	No	No	Majority
<i>Previous Question</i> (Call the question)	Yes	No	No	2/3
<i>Limit Debate</i>	Yes	No	Yes	2/3
Postpone Definitely	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority
Commit	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority
Amend a Main Motion	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority
Postpone Indefinitely	Yes	Yes	No	Majority
Main Motion	Yes	Yes	No	Majority

### **Motions with Precedence**

<b>Motion</b>	<b>Second?</b>	<b>Debatable?</b>	<b>Amendable?</b>	<b>Vote?</b>
Renew a Main Motion	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority
Rescind	Yes	Yes	Yes	2/3
Amend a Previously Adopted Motion	Yes	Yes	Yes	2/3
Point of Order	No	No	No	Chair
Parliamentary Inquiry	No	No	No	Chair
Point of Information	No	No	No	Chair

*Motions in Italics are not used in committees.*

## *Appendix Five*

### **Definitions**

**Adjourn:** End the meeting.

**Amend a previously adopted motion:** This can apply to a motion adopted during the current meeting or a previous meeting.

**Amend a main motion:** Offers an amendment to the main motion under consideration.

**Commit:** Refers the main motion to a committee or subcommittee.

**Lay on the table:** A motion to set aside a question when another question of immediate urgency has arisen. The motion can be removed from the table by majority vote. Often misused in place of the motions to postpone definitely or indefinitely. Out of order if the chair believes it is being misused to end debate.

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

**Main motion:** A motion bringing 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 of fact addressed to the chair. No discussion is allowed.

**Point of order.** A question posed to the chair when the speaker thinks the rules of the assembly are being violated.

**Postpone definitely:** Puts off discussion until a specified date, time or meeting.

**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.

**Previous question:** Also known as “calling the question,” “question,” or “closing debate.” This motion ends the debate. It must be approved by 2/3 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 with intent of continuing the meeting. A recess can be as short as a few minutes or overnight.

**Renew a main motion:** A motion to reconsider a motion that was not previously adopted.

**Rescind:** A motion to change a previous vote to adopt a main motion.