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*Remote Participation*

Join Zoom Meeting

**MEETING AGENDA**

1:00 1) Welcome and Introductions (Brad Parsons)

1:10 2) MICRA’s Policy and Government Affairs Work in 2023 (Ashlee Smith)

* Fishery Commission Initiative, Legislative, and Coalition Progress
* Next Steps for Congressional and Partner Outreach

2:30 3) Success! Now what? Operationalizing the Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission (Parsons)

3:00 Break / Refreshments

3:30 4) MICRA’s Draft 2024-2028 Priorities Document (Parsons and Greg Conover)

4:00 5) MICRA’s Draft MICRA’s Aquatic Habitat Action Plan (Parsons and Conover)

4:30 6) Proposal to Increase MICRA Member Annual Dues (Parsons)

4:50 7) Closing Remarks (Parsons)

5:00 Adjourn / Mixer

6:00 Mixer Closes
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# **ACTION ITEMS**

1. Delegates were asked to let Ashlee Smith or Ben Batten know if they would be willing to participate in the 2024 DC Fly-in tentatively scheduled for February 26 – March 1, 2024.
2. Delegates were requested to assist with providing two-sided state fact sheets with AIS issues on one side and interjurisdictional fisheries information on the other side (template to be provided by the AIS Committee) by the end of January 2024 for use during MICRA’s 2024 DC Fly-in.
3. The draft legislation to authorize a Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission and MICRA talking points will be shared with the delegates again following the meeting.
4. Delegates were asked to make sure their directors are briefed on the proposed Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission and the associated draft legislation ([Attachment 3](#_Attachment_3:_Draft)) that will soon be introduced into the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee.
5. Delegates may be requested by Ashlee Smith this fall to participate in remote meetings with staff in Congressional Offices in their states to discuss the proposed Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission.
6. Delegates were asked to let Ashlee Smith know if there are organizations in their respective states that should be briefed and invited to participate in the Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission coalition.
7. Delegates (and their staff) were asked to text (601-988-8577) or email ([asmith@sequoya.org](mailto:asmith@sequoya.org)) Ashlee Smith pictures with a short description of their field work, Mississippi River Basin scenery, interjurisdictional fish, AIS, etc. to be used on the coalition website and social media posts.
8. Delegates were asked to let Ashlee Smith know whenever there is an opportunity to invite Congressional staff out to observe large rivers field work.
9. Delegates were asked to contact Ashlee or Ben Batten if they are interested in participating or have staff that they would like to have participate in the Congressional briefing in DC tentatively planned for November 8.
10. Ashlee Smith will investigate the governance documents of existing fishery commissions.
11. The Executive Board will provide the Delegates with a final draft of the 2024-2028 Priorities Document later this Fall and highlight any major revisions or additions so they can be quickly and easily reviewed.
12. The Executive Board will share the final version of the MICRA Aquatic Habitat Action Plan with the delegates once it is finalized this Fall.
13. The Executive Board will consider adding information to the revised list of interjurisdictional rivers in the basin on federal authorities and ceded territories that result in interjurisdictional management of fisheries and aquatic resources.
14. The Executive Board will reconsider the amount of the proposed annual dues increase for state agency members and develop a justification that explains why the increase is needed and identifies what the states will get back in return for their investment in the partnership.
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# **Meeting Notes**

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair-elect Ben Batten called the meeting to order.

Seventeen state agencies and four federal agencies/entities were represented. A list of attendees is included as [Attachment 1](#_Attachment_2:_Meeting).

1. MICRA’s Policy and Government Affairs Work in 2023

Ashlee Smith provided a review of MICRA’s policy and government affairs work.

DC Fly-in

Considerable focus and success with invasive carp and other aquatic invasive species priorities over the past several years, however, recent outreach has been more inclusive of all interjurisdictional fisheries work. MICRA’s 2023 DC fly-in focused on the proposed Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission and associated draft legislation for authorization.

USFWS funding for Invasive Carp work in the Mississippi River Basin was increased from $25.2 million in FY22 to $31 million in FY23.

MICRA has been working towards appropriations of $4.4 million for state ANS management plan implementation (under the National Invasive Species Act) so that each state receives at least $100k to support implementation of their state’s approved ANS management plan. This funding remained steady at roughly $4 million in FY23.

FY24 Appropriations: The House budget bill reduces the USFWS’s Invasive Carp budget for the Mississippi River Basin in FY24 from $31 to $29 million. The Senate budget bill increases the funding level to $31.5 million.

FY24 WRDA Reauthorization: MICRA will need to begin working on WRDA-related priorities right away as those requests are due in October.

A MICRA DC Fly-in is tentatively being planned for February 26 – March 1, 2024. Smith would like to have more delegates participate this year by attending for one or two days so that more delegates are present for visits with their respective state offices. It is critical to have someone from the state present when visiting the Congressional offices, particularly for some of the more senior and higher priority members. It is not necessary for MICRA Delegates to attend for the full week.

* Delegates were asked to let Ashlee Smith or Ben Batten know if they would be willing to participate in the 2024 DC Fly-in tentatively scheduled for February 26 - March 1, 2024.

The MICRA AIS Committee has been very helpful and has assisted with updating the state AIS fact sheets. The committee will be providing a template for updating the fact sheets for the 2024 fly-in with state specific AIS issues on one side and interjurisdictional fisheries information on the other side. The updated fact sheets will be needed in January. See [Attachment 2](#_Attachment_3:_State) for a list of state AIS fact sheets and most recent revision date.

* Delegates were requested to assist with providing two-sided state fact sheets with AIS issues on one side and interjurisdictional fisheries information on the other side (template to be provided by the AIS Committee) by the end of January 2024 for use during MICRA’s 2024 DC Fly-in.

Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission

Draft legislation authorizing a Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission has been developed with input from the states and assistance from partners [Attachment 3](#_Attachment_4:_Draft). Senators Wicker (MS-R) and Boozman (AR-R) have agreed to co-sponsor the legislation and Smith is in on-going discussions with Senator Duckworth’s (IL-D) office. The draft legislation will be introduced into the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, potentially within the next few weeks.

Representative Pete Stauber (MN-R) has agreed to co-sponsor the legislation on the House side. A number of other House offices have expressed interest but are waiting to see what Representative Westerman (AR-R) decides regarding the draft legislation. More work is needed with Rep. Westerman’s office.

Once the draft legislation is introduced, Ashlee would like to work with the Delegates to hold remote meetings with the individual offices to discuss the commission. It is possible that staff members may call their respective state agency’s director to ask if they are on board with the Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission that would be authorized by the draft legislation. Delegates all need to make sure that their directors are briefed on the commission and draft legislation. Ashlee offered to assist the delegates with briefing directors on the commission and draft legislation.

* The draft legislation to authorize a Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission and MICRA talking points will be shared with the delegates again following the meeting.
* Delegates were asked to make sure their directors are briefed on the proposed Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission and the associated draft legislation that will soon be introduced into the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee.
* Delegates may be requested by Ashlee Smith this fall to participate in remote meetings with staff in Congressional Offices in their states to discuss the proposed Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission.

The MICRA Chair and Chair-elect have been (and will be) briefing the directors at AFWA, MAFWA, and SEAFWA annual meetings this year. Talking points provided to the directors on the Mississippi River Fishery Commission can be reviewed in [Attachment 4](#_Attachment_5:_Mississippi).

Ashlee is planning to ramp up coalition efforts in support of the draft legislation to authorize the Fishery Commission. She hopes to have a Fishery Commission website and social media campaign later this fall.

* Delegates were asked to let Ashlee Smith know if there are organizations in their respective states that should be briefed and invited to participate in the Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission coalition.
* Delegates (and their staff) were asked to text (601-988-8577) or email ([asmith@sequoya.org](mailto:asmith@sequoya.org)) Ashlee Smith pictures with a short description of their field work, Mississippi River Basin scenery, interjurisdictional fish, AIS, etc. to be used on the coalition website and social media posts.

Congressional Outreach

A Congressional field visit was held August 8 in La Crosse, WI, to talk about interjurisdictional fisheries management issues, MICRA, and the benefits of a Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission. A Congressional field visit will be held August 31 in Vicksburg, MS. It will be important to find more opportunities to get Congressional staff from the state and DC offices out in the field to observe field work and hear about the issues, MICRA, and the Fishery Commission. These can be very simple outings, not major events. She will coordinate with the offices when she knows there is an opportunity to get them out with a state Delegate or their staff.

* Delegates were asked to let Ashlee Smith know whenever there is an opportunity to invite Congressional staff out to observe large rivers field work.

A Congressional briefing in DC has been tentatively planned for November 7-8. Ashlee would like to have a state agency representative from each sub-basin and partner federal agencies participate to discuss how Federal appropriations are being used throughout the basin and the benefits that a Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission would provide to interjurisdictional fisheries management. A mix of administrators and technical level participants would be good to have participate in the briefing.

* Delegates were asked to contact Ashlee or Ben Batten if they are interested in participating or have staff that they would like to have participate in the Congressional briefing in DC tentatively planned for November 7-8.

1. Success! Now what? Operationalizing the Mississippi River Basin Fishery

Commission

Ben Batten started the discussion by recalling that when the MICRA partnership was formed in 1991, the vision for the association at that time was the establishment of an inland fishery commission for the basin.

MICRA finalized *A Joint Strategic Plan for Management of Mississippi River Basin Fisheries* in February 2021. To date, 26 of 28 state agency directors have signed a Memorandum of Acceptance in support of the Joint Strategic Plan. Although the Joint Strategic Plan identifies the MICRA member agencies’ desire to establish a Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission, it does not imply or commit any basin state to joining the commission although the hope is that all MICRA member agencies would choose to participate. The intent of establishing the commission is to develop a more formal governing body with increased support from the states and Federal government for a collaborative, inter-agency approach to managing shared fishery resources in the basin. The draft legislation includes an authorization for $1 million in the first year to stand-up the commission, hire essential staff, etc. The authorized funding level would then increase to $30 million for the next 5 years and $50 million for the next 5 years.

The Executive Board has had some initial discussions about what getting the commission started looks like. The intent is to be efficient and keep staffing levels lean. The board is looking at four key positions to get the commission going during its first year: 1) Executive Director, 2) Communication Director, 3) Administrator/Grants Manager, and 4) Fishery Biologist. There will be legal, accounting, human resources, and additional communications needs that are proposed to be handled by contracting.

There has been some discussion that the Communications Director could also be considered a Deputy Director with a succession plan. The right person to come in and get the commission off the ground may be a different skill set than what is needed to run the commission long-term once it is established. Operationally, the MICRA Executive Board would hire the Executive Director; that person would also report to the Executive Board until the commission governance is fully approved by the commission members.

Each state’s “Fish Chief” (or equivalent) would serve as the delegate to the commission. This would be consistent with the existing MICRA membership and the Great Lakes Fishery Commission’s Council of Mississippi River Fishery Agencies. The existing MICRA Executive Board structure would be used for establishing the actual Commissioners. As proposed, the Commissioners would be identified by the member agencies and not be political appointments. The governance, rules, and procedures are intentionally not specified in the draft legislation. Developing the governance documents will be critical first steps during the first year. It will be important to hire an Executive Directly quickly. There may be a period of time between the authorization of the commission and initial appropriations to support the commission.

* Ashlee Smith will investigate the governance documents of existing fishery commissions.

Is there an expectation when the commission will be authorized by Congress? More work is needed to secure primary sponsors on the House side before the legislation is introduced. Smith is hopeful that it will be introduced and passed during the current session, but it may not happen until the next session.

The Department of Interior is proposed as the host agency for the commission. Federal appropriations for the commission would be administered through the host agency. The fishery commission would establish a non-competitive grant program to provide funding to the state agencies to participate in the commission and support the commission’s interjurisdictional fishery management priorities. The non-competitive funding will be worked out in the initial governance documents. This will allow the states to know how much funding they will receive each year for commission work. A competitive grant program will also be established that commission member agencies, universities, or non-government organizations can compete for to conduct priority management and research needs identified by the commission.

The intent of the non-competitive funding is to enable the state agency commission members to increase their capacity for commission and interjurisdictional fisheries management related work. The board is interested in learning the states’ ability and interest to add staff to participate in the commission and work on large river interjurisdictional fisheries management if they were to receive non-competitive grant funding each year through the commission (e.g., $100,000 or $250,000). In preliminary discussions, about 50% of the agencies would be able to add staff if the funding appeared solid, 25% would need legislation to add positions, and another 25% might be able find a different approach (e.g., reclassify an existing vacancy or use contract employees). The board has also had initial discussions about the possibility of the commission hiring additional staff to work for those states that are not able to add positions but are interested in the additional capacity.

MDWFP: Number of agency positions is set by the legislature. Agency would have to prioritize these positions over other needs. To increase the number of positions would require approval of the legislature. Other than that, the state could potentially pay as contractual labor. Having dedicated funding through the Commission and a 10-year authorization would help.

MN DNR: Not under a position number constraint. The agency receives X amount of dollars and can generally do with it as sees fit. This would be the same for external dollars. The agency has hired crews to work on invasive carp using the pass-through dollars from USFWS.

WI DNR: The agency operates under a position authority cap. Three options: 1) reprioritize existing positions, 2) short-term project positions that generally max out at 6 years but could be extended with continued funding and approval by a finance board, and 3) contracts. The agency provides computers and equipment for contract employees and makes payments to a third party (e.g., University of Wisconsin) to pay salary.

IA DNR: It depends on how the money comes into the agency. If it comes into the Trust Fund, the fund is capped at a certain amount. The agency would have to reprioritize or request the legislature for a cap increase. The agency is not restricted on the number of positions, just the funding cap. The agency is not likely to request a cap for a $100,000 increase. There are multiple potential increases, e.g., RAWA and NESP, that the agency may consider requesting a cap increase for. Depending on timing, the fishery commission could be packaged with a different request.

IL DNR: The agency can hire but it takes a long time. In the short-term, it would be difficult for the state to commit to having an additional position in 6 months for example. Could spread the duties across multiple existing positions. The agency can contract with universities. The agency has some existing vacancies that could be tweaked but it would take at least 18 months before a position could be added with the commission funds.

MDC: The agency is still working through its restructuring from a few years ago. More focus is being put on programs; AIS and big rivers are both programs for the agency. The opportunity is there but the agency does have a cap that it would have to work through. There is some prioritizing that would be needed with the agency’s existing work. This could be handled similar to the pallid sturgeon work that the agency completed using USACE funding that was administered through USFWS. It would not happen quickly.

TPWD: Texas has a certain number of positions; it would take legislative action to add a position. The agency has repurposed vacant positions in the past.

WV DNR: Operates under a position limited cap. Can reallocate or repurpose vacant positions.

Batten summarized that the consensus appears to be that although it would take time, it sounds like most agencies have options to pursue. It was brought up that HR departments are another consideration in how long it may take to fill these positions, whether new or repurposed. It may be necessary to contract out initially while the agencies work through their internal processes.

Parsons described the intended use of the competitive grant funding that is proposed for the commission above and beyond the non-competitive grant funds to increase the states’ capacity. Once the commission is up and operating, there will be interjurisdictional fisheries management or research projects that a state or multiple states will want to implement that will require additional resources. A coordinated creel survey throughout multiple pools in the Upper Mississippi River was provided as an example project need. In addition to the states, the competitive funding would be available to universities and NGO’s to conduct work in support of the states. Roe fishery and catfish data were brought up as additional project needs that the competitive funding could help address.

Will the competitive grant funding have a 75:25 cost-share requirement? The draft legislation does not include any cost-share requirements; however, the commission will likely need to consider potential cost-share requirements above and beyond Federal requirements. Cost-share could be a limitation for some states.

It would be interesting to hear from the agencies how many are fully obligating their sport fish license fund to match their Sport Fish Restoration funding. That would speak to the overall ability to meet an additional match requirement for a new (competitive) funding opportunity.

1. Draft 2024-2028 Priorities document

Conover thanked the delegates for the comments provided on the first draft of the 2024-2028 Priorities document that was provided to the delegates for review in June. All comments received from the delegates were supportive of the draft document and there were no recommended changes. There was a concurrent review by MICRA standing committees. The AIS Committee is developing proposed priorities to address baitfish and organisms in trade. The Executive Board will also be considering the proposed addition of priorities related to native mussels. The board is working to finalize this document before the end of the calendar year for implementation beginning in 2024. The revised draft will be provided to the delegates for final review in November at the latest.

* The Executive Board will provide the Delegates with a final draft of the 2024-2028 Priorities Document later this Fall and highlight any major revisions or additions so they can be quickly and easily reviewed.

The priorities document is intended to be a living document since it spans a 5-year operational period and priorities can quickly shift. Delegate input is welcome on partnership priorities at any time.

The Executive Board is also working on tracking accomplishments for the 2019-2023 priorities document. A draft of that document, which will be included as an appendix to the new priorities document, was also shared with the delegates in June. No suggested changes or additional accomplishments were recommended to this document. That document will continue to be updated with accomplishments through the end of the year and will be finalized in early 2024.

1. MICRA’s draft Aquatic Habitat Action Plan

Conover briefly reviewed the draft MICRA Aquatic Habitat Action Plan. About 10 years ago, MICRA developed *An Action Plan to Minimize the Ecological Impacts of Aquatic Invasive Species in the Mississippi River Basin.* The Executive Board decided to develop a complimentary action plan for native interjurisdictional fish. Discussions on this topic led to the decision to develop an Action Plan focused on aquatic habitat. This led to more discussions about MICRA’s role with aquatic habitat restoration.

MICRA’s Aquatic Habitat Committee developed a draft action plan and provided it to the Executive Board to finalize and share with the MICRA Delegates for review. However, while finalizing lists and figures identifying interjurisdictional rivers in each sub-basin, it was decided a side project was needed to update MICRA’s list of interjurisdictional rivers in the basin that was originally developed in the early 1990s. A list of 6th order and larger rivers was provided to the delegates for review earlier this year. Those comments are being addressed and the board is working to finalize the updated list.

The plan introduction includes high level, basinwide information on the Mississippi River Basin, interjurisdictional fisheries, and aquatic habitat. Following the introduction, the action plan includes two broad goals and five priority needs with recommended management strategies for each. This information is then followed by a chapter for each sub-basin. Each sub-basin chapter includes a high lever overview of the sub-basin’s geography, economic value, greatest needs related to aquatic habitat, exiting partnerships (to highlight opportunities for continued work), examples of completed projects, and an overview of implementation needs in the sub-basin.

The Executive Board considers MICRA’s role in restoring aquatic habitat in the basin’s interjurisdictional rivers as one of raising awareness on a basinwide scale and helping to bring attention and additional resources to this issue. There are multiple regional efforts throughout the basin, but no other entity is addressing aquatic habitat on a basinwide scale. To accomplish this, the draft Action Plan was developed to provide a tool for the MICRA member agencies and their partners to communicate aquatic habitat protection, enhancement, and restoration needs and opportunities at both basinwide and local scales. After stepping down from the basinwide overview to the sub-basin focused chapters, the Action Plan contains an appendix with specific examples of project needs within each sub-basin for each of the five priority areas. The example projects for each sub-basin are further identified to state.

Once the draft Action Plan is final, the next step will be to develop sub-basin fact sheets to distill the information down to something that is simple and concise for decision makers. The appendix will provide a resource for anyone talking about habitat restoration needs in the basin to identify local level projects that their audience can identify with.

The only steps remaining to finalize the draft Action Plan is to complete the revisions to MICRA’s list of interjurisdictional rivers in the basin that will be used to develop the sub-basin level lists and figures for each chapter. The final Action Plan and sub-basin fact sheets will all be posted on the MICRA website once complete. The Executive Board is planning to have the Action Plan finalized by the end of 2023.

* The Executive Board will share the final version of the MICRA Aquatic Habitat Action Plan with the delegates once it is finalized this Fall.

It may be beneficial to identify where these rivers have a nexus with federal lands such as National Parks, National Forests, and National Wildlife Refuges. There are federal authorities (e.g., navigable inland waterway system, national wild and scenic river system) that increase interjurisdictional management within these rivers. This may bring in additional opportunities at the Federal level to enhance aquatic habitat at the local level. Similarly, it would be good to identify the ceded territories within the basin.

* The Executive Board will consider adding information to the revised list of interjurisdictional rivers in the basin on federal authorities and ceded territories that result in interjurisdictional management of fisheries and aquatic resources.

1. Proposal to increase MICRA member annual dues

MICRA dues have not increased since the partnership’s inception in 1991. For MICRA to continue to be active, productive, and effective, if and until a Fishery Commission is authorized, the partnership needs additional financial support from the membership. Consumer Price Index estimates $1,500 in 1991 is equivalent to approximately $3,500 in 2023. There are several examples of additional financial needs related to MICRA’s recent increase in Congressional outreach, e.g., travel support, food and refreshments during events, etc.

The Executive Board has discussed potential annual dues increases for the state agencies from $1,500 to $3,000 or $5,000. Federal agency members already contribute $5,000 annually; the Executive Board is only proposing an increase in annual dues for the state agencies. Consensus among the agencies represented on the Executive Board was that an increase to $5,000 would not be insurmountable. MICRA dues are optional so states would not be held to the increased amount and could continue to pay $1,500 if preferred. Batten asked for input from the delegates on an increase in annual membership dues to $5,000.

WI DNR: Permission is required from the head of the agency to pay dues for anything. The agency is not in a good financial position. It is doubtful the agency would get approval to pay an increase in dues from $1,500 to $5,000. It wouldn’t be as a big of problem to request an increase to $3,000. The state hasn’t had a license fee increase since 1997, so the agency’s income is also going down along with increases in dues across the board. Agree that an increase is warranted, but it would be a struggle to get that large ($5,000) of an increase approved. Having a justification or explanation of what the state will get back in return for paying more would be a big help.

LDWF: It would be difficult to justify an increase to $5,000, but it might be possible. The Director would get some pushback so it would be important to have a list of what the agency will get in return to justify the increase.

SDGFP: May be able to justify an increase to $3,000 but $5,000 would be very hard to get through.

TPWD: $1,500 has never been an issue but not sure how an increase to $5,000 would be met.

IL DNR: Identifying the deliverables associated with the increase will be important regardless of the amount of the dues increase.

IA DNR: It has been easy to pay the $1,500. An increase to $3,000 would not be difficult to justify and $5,000 may be possible.

MICRA has invoiced member agencies separately in the past for additional policy support. A similar approach could be used to request additional dues above an increase to $3,000.

The Executive Board will revisit this discussion and develop a justification for any proposed increase in annual membership dues. The new Joint Strategic Plan and the Aquatic Habitat Action Plan that support interjurisdictional fisheries management, and MICRA’s recent success in getting money back to the states to support AIS management plan implementation and invasive carp management and control are things that we should highlight when explaining what the states get back from supporting the MICRA partnership.

* The Executive Board will reconsider the amount of the proposed annual dues increase for state agency members and develop a justification that explains why the increase is needed and identifies what the states will get back in return for their investment in the partnership.

An increase in membership dues requires an amendment of the By-laws and approval by ¾ of the membership. This will be handled by a mail vote once a recommendation is reached by the Executive Board. There will be some additional updates to the By-laws that will be addressed at the same time.

1. Closing Remarks

Parsons thanked the Delegates for taking time away from the AFS meeting or their work schedules to participate in the meeting. MICRA’s policy work has proven very valuable to the states. Fisheries and protecting aquatic resources are issues that generally have bipartisan support. MICRA has an opportunity to do something very meaningful.

Batten stressed that MICRA is the Delegates’ partnership and the importance of the Delegates’ engagement. The Executive Board’s purpose is to carry forward the issues that are important to the Delegates. Delegates were invited to communicate with the Executive Board any time and to participate in future Executive Board meetings as the opportunity presents itself.

# **Attachment 1: Meeting Attendees**

1. Ben Batten, Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, MICRA Chair-elect
2. Dave Smith, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
3. George Scholten, Iowa Department of Natural Resources
4. Rich Zweifel, Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Ohio River Sub-basin Representative
5. Ken Cunningham, Oklahoma Division of Wildlife, Arkansas-Red-White Rivers Sub-basin Representative
6. JC Nelson, U.S. Geological Survey
7. Dave Dreves, Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources, Tennessee-Cumberland Rivers Sub-basin Representative
8. Greg Conover, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, MICRA Coordinator
9. Justine Hasz, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
10. Angie Rodgers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, LMRCC Coordinator
11. Allan Brown, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
12. Raynie Harlan, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries
13. Ashlee Smith, Sequoya Strategies, MICRA Contractor
14. Kevin Irons, Illinois Department of Natural Resources
15. Brian Schoenung, Illinois Department of Natural Resources, MICRA Past-chair
16. Tim Bister, Texas Parks and Wildlife[[1]](#footnote-1)
17. Aaron Woldt, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service1
18. Katie Zipfel, West Virginia Department of Natural Resources1
19. Christian Waters, North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission1
20. Bob Caccese, Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission1
21. Heather Smiles, Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission1
22. Clint Jones, Tennessee Valley Authority1
23. Bruce Drektrah, Missouri Department of Conservation1
24. Jerry Brown, Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Parks1
25. Mark Thurman, Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency1
26. John Lott, South Dakota Game Fish and Parks1
27. Brad Parsons, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources1

# **Attachment 2: State AIS Fact Sheets**



# **Attachment 3: Draft legislation authorizing a Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission**

# 

# **Attachment 4: Mississippi River Basin Fishery Commission Talking Points**

1. Remote participants [↑](#footnote-ref-1)