

**North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference (2013)  
Special Session: Conserving Wildlife As If Public Trust Responsibilities Matter?**

**Meeting Public Trust Responsibilities for All Species: The Idaho Wildlife Summit**

**Virgil Moore**

*Idaho Department of Fish and Game  
Boise, Idaho*

**Gregg Servheen**

*Idaho Department of Fish and Game  
Boise, Idaho*

**Victoria Runnoe**

*Idaho Department of Fish and Game  
Boise, Idaho*

**Michele Beucler**

*Idaho Department of Fish and Game  
Boise, Idaho*

**Introduction**

In 1899, the Idaho Legislature created the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG). Thirty-nine years later, a 1938 citizen initiative created the Fish and Game Commission (Commission) to set policy for the department. That initiative embedded public trust responsibilities in law for all wildlife for the citizens of Idaho (*Idaho Code 36:103*), proclaiming “*All wildlife . . . is hereby declared to be the property of the state of Idaho. It shall be preserved, protected, perpetuated, and managed . . . and provide for the citizens of this state . . . continued supplies of such wildlife for hunting, fishing and trapping.*”

The Idaho of today is vastly different from that of 1938. More of Idaho’s population now lives in urban areas, and the overall population has increased from 525,000 in 1940 to nearly 1.6 million in 2010. Challenges to Idaho’s wildlife and its management have grown and changed as well. These challenges now include competition for available water; poorly planned development; increasing habitat loss; and decline of some of Idaho’s iconic species such as sage grouse, salmon, and mule deer. Changes in our social fabric have rendered changes to how Idahoans relate to wildlife. A lower proportion of residents engage in hunting and fishing while more are participating in wildlife watching activities. Idaho’s children are spending less time outdoors, thus missing opportunities to make critical connections with wildlife and wild places.

One thing that has not changed is the value Idahoans place in their wildlife. The 1938 citizen initiative was spearheaded by hunters and anglers. They were joined by garden clubs, landowners, bird watchers and many others interested in wildlife. This support from the broader citizenry allowed for the passage of the initiative by the second-largest margin in state history. Broad citizen participation again provided valuable feedback when IDFG’s strategic plan *The Compass* was developed in 2005. *The Compass* lays out strategic goals and objectives for the full spectrum of its public trust responsibilities.

A 2012 survey of Idahoans (Responsive Management 2012) found that an overwhelming 90% of residents are personally interested in wildlife, with 61% of those being *very* interested. Furthermore, 91% of Idahoans consider wildlife to be an important reason to live in the state, with the majority considering it to be a *very* important reason for residency in Idaho. Survey results show that the top wildlife values include: that fish and wildlife exist in Idaho (90%); that fish and wildlife populations are properly

managed (83%); that people have the opportunity to fish (83%); that people have the opportunity to view wildlife (77%); and that people have the opportunity to hunt (74%).

This large-scale interest in wildlife-related recreation translates into an important economic force in Idaho. Hunters, anglers and wildlife viewers generate an economic output of almost \$1.4 billion annually. This generates over \$105 million in state and local tax revenue (in 2006 dollars) along with nearly 18,000 jobs (Southwick Associates 2007a, 2007b; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2008).

It would seem that the support for wildlife along with the economic benefit derived from wildlife-related recreation would create a sufficient financial underpinning to allow the IDFG to fully meet its mission for all wildlife for its citizens. Like many similar agencies, IDFG faces an odd juxtaposition between overt support and funding. While many Idaho residents support and value their wildlife, it has fallen largely to hunters and anglers to fund wildlife management in the state through the purchase of licenses and tags. Participation rates of hunters and anglers in Idaho have remained fairly static with slight increases in both hunting and fishing participation since 2006 (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2012); however, because the funding derived from licenses and tags is largely directed toward management of species that are hunted and fished, the remaining 80% of Idaho's wildlife is managed using only two percent of the budget. Thus, although *The Compass* lays out IDFG's goals related to all wildlife, priorities and budgets are more aligned with revenue streams and expectations that are based in game management.

With nine out of ten adult Idahoans saying that they care about wildlife, but only about 40% paying for most wildlife management, IDFG faces the important challenge of fulfilling the agency's public trust for all wildlife as laid out in the mission created in 1938. This challenge is both financial and social. Idaho's license-buying hunters and anglers were 42% of the adult citizenry in 2010 and continue to provide the bulk (98%) of state funding support for wildlife management. As a result, some hunters and anglers feel they deserve a larger say in how Idaho's wildlife is managed than those citizens who do not currently pay. Furthermore, current Commission policy is to "...use revenue generated by hunters, anglers, and trappers for programs that benefit hunting, fishing, and trapping" (*The Compass*, page 17). The question becomes how do we inspire a renewed enthusiasm and commitment to support the Public Trust responsibilities, embodied in the 1938 mission, for all of Idaho's wildlife by diverse wildlife interests? Additionally, how do we help these diverse wildlife interests explore their common ground to work toward the greater good of an abundant, vibrant wildlife resource for future generations?

The beginnings of answers to these questions were generated at the Idaho Wildlife Summit (Summit), held in Boise in August 2012. The Summit was not an endpoint. It was, instead, the beginning of a conversation amongst Idahoans who care about their wildlife. It was a reminder that the wildlife of the state is a public trust, and that our wildlife is the common ground that all wildlife enthusiasts share. Of equal import is our shared responsibility in protecting and managing Idaho's wildlife.

## **The Idaho Wildlife Summit**

### *Purpose and Desired Outcomes*

The purpose of the Summit was to convene and facilitate a conversation among Idaho hunters, anglers, trappers, and other wildlife conservationists about the current status and direction of wildlife management in Idaho and the need to keep it relevant to the changing values, needs, and interests of Idahoans. Our desire was to hear and understand what Idahoans expect from their state wildlife management agency so that Idaho Fish and Game can serve them better.

There were four desired outcomes of the Summit:

1. Create a renewed understanding, commitment, and enthusiasm for wildlife conservation in Idaho.
2. More Idahoans are motivated to support wildlife conservation efforts and to engage in wildlife management.
3. Idaho Fish and Game has a clear sense of what hunters, anglers, trappers, and other wildlife conservationists want from their wildlife management agency.

4. Idahoans better understand what Idaho Fish and Game does and how those efforts benefit wildlife.

Great care was taken to clearly articulate the public mission, in a manner that would embrace hunters, anglers, and trappers; yet, the outreach aspect of the Summit demonstrated a broader reach to all Idahoans relative to their public trust. The tagline of the Summit was “Idaho’s Wildlife Belongs to *You!*” Although clearly grounded in *Idaho Code* and the public trust doctrine (PTD), this was a powerful and overt demonstration. It is worth noting that some sportsmen and sportsmen’s groups felt that IDFG had notified and “invited” environmental groups prior to notifying sportsmen and were very upset. This fueled a campaign against the Summit that got traction among a few sportsmen’s groups (e.g., Lobowatch, Save Western Wildlife) and blogs (e.g., Skinnymoosie and Black Bear Blog) that had to be addressed.

A “sounding board” was put together to receive advice and feedback on designing the Summit from the spectrum of wildlife enthusiasts we were trying to engage. Representatives from 16 organizations (Table 1) participated. Helpful feedback was received from eight of the members and the sounding board was very useful on those aspects. However, it was initiated too late in the planning to fully realize its potential because of where we were in the process. We thus ended up using it as much an outreach tool as an advisory board.

Table 1. Sixteen organizations that were represented on the Sounding Board to advise and give feedback as IDFG designed the Idaho Wildlife Summit.

Idaho Wildlife Federation	Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation	Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife – Idaho
Idaho State Bowhunters	The Nature Conservancy	Idaho Conservation League
Idaho Rivers United	Federation of Fly Fishers	Idaho Trappers Association
Golden Eagle Audubon	Idaho for Wildlife	Idaho Farm Bureau
Idaho Falconers Association	Walleye Unlimited	
Idaho Rangeland Resource Commission	Idaho Outfitters and Guides Association	

### *Structure and Design*

Staff had about 14 months to plan the Summit. A project leader, a project manager, and six committees (Outreach, Design, Technology and Logistics, Stakeholders, Research, Executive) did the majority of the work. We contracted a public participation specialist to help design the participatory elements as well as facilitate them during the actual event, and we contracted an emcee/moderator.

The Summit was designed as a statewide event based out of Boise (both the population center of the state and where IDFG Headquarters is located) with six concurrent, satellite events in each of the administrative regions. Additionally, we created an online experience knowing that many people either could not attend the event in person or that many – especially the younger generations – would prefer online participation. The Summit began on a Friday afternoon, ran all day Saturday, and continued Sunday morning until noon. Seven main elements of the design were used to achieve the four desired outcomes (Table 2).

### *Idaho Citizen Survey.*

A telephone survey was conducted by Responsive Management (Harrisonburg, VA) on behalf of the IDFG. The survey targeted completed interviews with 800 randomly-selected Idaho residents with an

oversample of 200 Idahoans between 18 and 34 years of age, and an additional 400 license holders. Although the survey was conducted in conjunction with the Summit, it built on our history of using surveys of not just license buyers but also a representative sample of the Idaho public to assess opinions related to wildlife management, recreation, and decision making.

#### Trading Posts.

Trading Posts were intended to inform the participants about the breadth of activities IDFG does in order to manage their wildlife. The format was informal, with posters and hands-on materials provided by IDFG staff to foster one-on-one conversations with participants and put a real face on IDFG. Posters were organized by the goals and objectives laid out in *The Compass*. Comment forms at each of the Trading Posts solicited feedback about strategic issues.

#### Keynote speakers.

Five keynote speakers were chosen to present a diversity of perspectives and stimulate thinking about the history of the conservation movement in the United States, the current status of wildlife management in Idaho, the changing values of the West, and the importance of working together for conservation.

#### Idaho Café.

We adapted The World Café technique (World Café Community Foundation, <http://www.theworldcafe.com>) to get participants in small conversations among themselves. We developed five compelling questions for these small groups to discuss:

1. What did you want to talk about when you decided to attend this Summit?
2. What wildlife legacy do you want to leave for future generations?
3. In order to leave the wildlife legacy that you think is appropriate for the future, who needs to be included in the conversation?
4. How can we engage that diversity of perspectives in conversations that matter?
5. What can all of us do, individually and collectively, to benefit wildlife conservation in Idaho?

Participants recorded agreed-upon perspectives on butcher paper. We also handed out a “personal reflections” form so that individual perspectives were not eliminated from the record of conversations.

#### Fishing Polls.

We hired Option Technologies Interactive (Orlando, FL) to run an audience response system. We asked a total of 70 questions to collect data on all participants, both in person and online, to cross-reference with the citizen survey as well as to generate enthusiasm among participants.

#### Panel discussion.

Questions from participants were collected throughout the event from all venues, and the emcee moderated a panel discussion with four of the five keynote speakers.

#### Closing.

The closing was intended to articulate the commitment of IDFG to review and analyze information collected, report back to the participants, and continue the dialogue that was started at the Summit.

IDFG officially requested technical advice and assistance from The Nature Conservancy (TNC) in connection with the effort to address new and emerging wildlife conservation issues while retaining core hunting and fishing programs. IDFG and TNC collectively agreed to use this opportunity to gain greater understanding of the younger generations including what about nature they find compelling and what might motivate them to participate and/or financially support wildlife conservation. TNC received a grant to conduct two focus groups of 18-40 year old Idahoans.

Table 2. Matrix of techniques used to achieve the four desired outcomes for the Idaho Wildlife Summit.

Desired Outcome	Survey	Trading Posts	Keynote Speakers	Idaho Café	Clicker Poll	Panel Discussion	Closing
-----------------	--------	---------------	------------------	------------	--------------	------------------	---------

Create a renewed sense of understanding, commitment, and enthusiasm for wildlife conservation in Idaho		X	X	X	X	X	X
More Idahoans are motivated to support wildlife conservation efforts and to engage in wildlife management		X	X	X	X	X	X
Idaho Fish & Game has a clear sense of what hunters, anglers, trappers, and other wildlife conservationists want from their wildlife management agency	X			X	X	X	
Idahoans better understand what Idaho Fish & Game does and how those efforts benefit wildlife		X					X

*Idaho's Wildlife Belongs to You!*

About 600 individuals participated in person at one of the seven locations. In addition, approximately 3,000 people from 33 other states and six foreign countries watched the live-stream online. We broke new ground for not only IDFG but also for public participation in Idaho by enabling online participation throughout the 3-day event, during which they could watch the live-stream from Boise, participate in the Fishing Polls, submit questions for the panel discussion, and participate in online chats among themselves.

Results from the Fishing Polls compared to the Idaho Citizen Survey (Responsive Management 2012) indicated that the Summit drew in very avid wildlife enthusiasts (Table 3). Because we also were interested in people's values towards wildlife and not just their participation in wildlife-based recreation, we asked Summit participants to self-identify their wildlife value orientation (Teel et al. 2005) after Dr. Tara Teel's presentation. Results indicated that the Summit drew in more Pluralists and fewer Utilitarians, Mutualists, and Distanced than in Idaho's general population (Table 4).

Table 3. Characteristics of Idaho Wildlife Summit participants compared to the general Idaho population (Responsive Management 2012).

Characteristic	% Idaho Citizens (Responsive Management 2012)	% Summit Participants August 2012
% who have hunted in the last two years	35	61
% who have fished in the last two years	53	75

% who have trapped in the last two years	NA	7
% who have viewed in the last two years	78	90
% who purchased a hunting, fishing, or trapping license in Idaho in the last two years	NA	82
% who, in the past two years, have been a member of or donated to any conservation or sportsmen's organizations	28	88
% who contributed, in 2011, to the Nongame Wildlife Check-off on state income tax form	10	40
% who contributed by purchasing a bluebird, elk, of trout vehicle license plate in 2011	11	46
% who contributed by a direct donation to the Nongame Trust Fund in 2011	4	3

Table 4. Percent of people among the four wildlife value orientations (Teel et al. 2005) in the Idaho general public and those who attended the Idaho Wildlife Summit (August 2012).

<b>Wildlife Value Orientation</b>	<b>Ideal World View</b>	<b>% Idaho Citizens Teel et al. 2005</b>	<b>% Summit Participants, self August 2012</b>
Utilitarian	Wildlife should be managed for human use	49	35
Mutualist	Humans and wildlife are meant to live in harmony	18	13
Pluralist	Have both Utilitarian and Mutualist and which one becomes salient depends on the situation and context	26	48

Distanced	Generally less interested in wildlife; more concerned about safety around wildlife	7	0
Not Sure		Not applicable	4

The Summit was a huge endeavor. About fifteen staff dedicated most of their time over a 12 month period to planning the event, with an additional twenty-five individuals assisting when needed. During the event, we estimate about 300 staff were involved over the weekend. An accounting system showed 13,865 hours were coded to the Summit, worth about \$437,000 in personnel. Total direct expenditures for the Summit were about \$239,000. Almost 50 organizations and individuals gave about \$119,000 in sponsorships and donations to help cover the costs of the Summit. The Idaho Fish and Wildlife Foundation was the title sponsor by giving a very generous donation. Also notable was a large donation from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. In-kind donations were received from P2 Solutions (who was our contracted public participation specialist) and The Nature Conservancy – Idaho for the focus group research.

#### *Summit Report, Take-Homes, and Next Steps*

The *Wildlife Summit Report* was mailed to all participants and pre-registrants in December 2012 (Idaho Department of Fish and Game 2012). Reporting on an experiential, conversational event was challenging. With every single voice at the Summit as valuable as the next, we visually displayed “what the conversation sounded like” by using Wordle™ and other graphical representations (Figure 1). Some recurring themes did stand out and were written in the cover letter accompanying the *Wildlife Summit Report*:

- You and your fellow participants all care deeply about wildlife.
- Hunting, fishing, and wildlife-based recreation is overwhelmingly important to you.
- You are eager to help IDFG improve wildlife conservation through direct participation and volunteering.
- Conservation education is important to you as is connecting youth to the outdoors and wildlife-related activities.
- You recognize the costs of conserving and managing wildlife, and most of you are supportive of exploring more diverse funding sources.
- You believe that wildlife cannot be taken for granted and want conservation issues to be solved by working together with a diversity of perspectives.

The Summit showed Idahoans feel that the strategic goals in *The Compass* remain relevant and on track. A series of questions were asked about strategic issues in both the Citizen Survey (Responsive Management 2012) and the Summit Fishing Polls as a measure of whether or the direction and goals laid out in *The Compass* remain relevant. Both Idahoans and Summit participants strongly indicated that 16 of the 17 strategic issues were quite important—about 78 to 99 percent said very or moderately important. The one issue that stood out was providing diverse trapping experiences for which 42% of Summit participants and 59% of Idahoans said was either very or somewhat important.

Given the breadth of IDFG’s mission and the support the Summit participants indicated for more robust wildlife conservation activities, the Commission directed IDFG to seek broad-based funding to better address the full breadth of responsibilities under Idaho’s Wildlife Policy (Idaho Code 36:103). To

address these responsibilities, three efforts are being pursued: 1) establish new state revenue (approximately \$1 million annually) to compensate for recent and continued funding declines in the Wildlife Diversity Program; 2) review hunting and fishing license sales to determine if a fee increase is prudent or if other measures can be taken to sell more licenses and tags; and 3) “go big” by pursuing options and opportunities for dedicated permanent, stable funding for all conservation in Idaho. Regional working groups of citizens are currently established to tap citizens’ ideas on possible mechanisms for stop-gap funding for the Diversity Program (#1 above). A License revenue committee is working on reviewing license sales (#2 above), building upon work by the existing License Restructure Committee and, at the appropriate time, will coordinate a public involvement process.

As previously mentioned, current Commission policy is to “Continue to use revenue generated by hunters, anglers, and trappers for programs that benefit hunting, fishing, and trapping.” (Page 17 *The Compass*). We were interested in hunters’, anglers’, and trappers’ opinions on using a portion of license revenues towards programs addressing species that are not hunted, fished or trapped. That notion is supported by the majority of the Idaho hunters (66%), anglers (75%), adult Idaho public (72%), and Summit participants (68%). Hunters tend to oppose this idea more than the other subgroups, with 8% moderately opposing and 15% strongly opposing.

### **Challenges: Threading the Needle for Public Trust**

By calling for and carrying out the Summit, the Commission and IDFG have made a commitment to enhancing fish and wildlife management in Idaho by more fully preserving, protecting, perpetuating and managing all wildlife in trust for the citizens of Idaho. However, as trust managers, we face political, cultural, organizational and fiscal challenges that will require us to thread some narrow needles of opportunity to realize what the Summit began. Idaho, like many states, requires that the legislature assess fees for the execution of the state’s wildlife policy. That policy, and the entire public trust, while focused for the most part on IDFG, is realistically a shared responsibility. For example, IDFG is given authority over all fish and wildlife population management, but that does not extend to authority related to the management of their habitats. To fulfill the public trust responsibilities and perpetuate fish and wildlife habitats, other agencies whose responsibilities and funding overlap the fish and wildlife public trust, must collaborate. In Idaho, this would include such agencies as The Office of Species Conservation (coordination), Agriculture (noxious weeds, and disease), Water Resources (stream protection), Lands (forest and range management), and Highways (connectivity) and the federal land management agencies

On November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2012, Idahoans voted on a legislative proposition to amend their constitution by adding language that says, “the rights to hunt, fish, and trap...shall forever be preserved.” This amendment, endorsed by the Commission, was one of four such “right to hunt” amendments passed by several states in 2012 (Kentucky, Nebraska, and Wyoming). In Idaho, the vote was 73% in favor and 27% opposed, which was similar to the support shown for the 1938 Initiative that created IDFG and the Commission. Such an affirmative vote at the state constitutional level assures hunters, anglers, and trappers that their legacy cannot be lost short of a constitutional revision. The amendment protects hunting, fishing, and trapping as part of Idaho’s heritage and “...as the preferred means of managing wildlife...” The amendment can also be viewed as affirming IDFG’s traditional role in providing these hunting, fishing, and trapping rights. The question is, would Summit-related activities be viewed as in conflict with the recently affirmed constitutional right to hunt and fish and trap, especially by those paying users who are concerned that IDFG is proposing to become broader? Or would such activities be viewed as necessary to meet the full intent of the public trust responsibilities and constitutional amendment while maintaining IDFG’s traditional activities pertaining to hunting, fishing and trapping?

A recent political action in Idaho may help illustrate this complexity. The Governor’s recent nominee for Fish and Game Commissioner was not confirmed by a narrow vote of the full Senate. The reasons are politically complex, but they do touch upon perceptions of the Commission in terms of its mission and public trust. First, concern was expressed that she was not qualified because she was not an avid enough hunter or angler, and because she had not regularly bought Idaho licenses. Second, she was



opposed by a sportsmen's group that felt its own nominee should have been the Commissioner instead of the person chosen by the Governor, in spite of support by over two dozen other sportsmen's groups. Third, questions were raised because the nominee was a woman in a traditionally male-dominated arena (she would have been only the Commission's second female member had she been confirmed). The resulting public disagreement and political debate made it clear that what the agency does and why it does it is still a matter of discussion and disagreement despite our 75 year old mission and code.

The concerns about the agency broadening its funding and its relevance to match its public trust responsibilities come from a minority. At this time we are unsure whether or not their underlying values align with small government in general, whether it is a fundamental disagreement of what Idaho Code 36:103 and/or the PTD means, an ongoing mistrust of IDFG, or a combination of these reasons. Although the results of the Summit and the Citizen Survey (Responsive Management 2012) suggest that most hunters and anglers are supportive of the agency broadening its activities for all wildlife, we need to better understand the reasons for this opposition as well as better communicate with the public about the PTD and the breadth of our mission.

Providing a coherent strategic vision for new fiscal and conservation capacities will take a commitment of IDFG and all our professional staff. It will also require an objective process by which the agency can evaluate and implement these new capacities. Our strategic plan, *The Compass*, offers a structure through which we can best undertake a process to evaluate the organization, justify funding, identify conservation outcomes, and improve our business model.

### **Wildlife Diversity Program**

The Diversity Program is a microcosm of the larger issues affecting IDFG. This program receives about \$1.8 million annually in funding from state wildlife grants (30%), partner grants (22%), automobile license plate monies (45%), and other donations (3%) including a state income tax check off. Within the organization, a Diversity Program biologist is in each of seven administrative regions. The former Natural Heritage program and nongame programs combine to form our Diversity Program staff within the Wildlife Bureau of IDFG.

Our near-term post-Summit strategy is to find additional dedicated funding to replace the shortfall and continued loss of USFWS state wildlife grant funding that provides 30% of the Diversity Program budget and helps develop and implement the state wildlife action plan (SWAP). The initial proposal is to find a mechanism(s) that will generate approximately \$1 million with new monies from Idahoans. Such a change in funding would signal to our legislative trustees and existing constituents that the agency would fulfill its Idaho public trust responsibilities by relying mostly on state revenue versus declining federal funds.

This strategy would ask for more state revenue from our citizens with little or no change in IDFG services, outcomes, or activities. We do not know if agreement to use new Idaho funding sources to support the declining federal funds for the Diversity Program is possible with little in terms of new conservation outcomes being provided. However, discussion at the Summit gives us a strong foundation for moving ahead the idea of the broad public trust.

Current Commission and Executive branch policy is to ask for no annually appropriated general funds for funding any IDFG activities. The Idaho Legislature established the Non-Game Trust Fund in 1993 that is supported by fees from wildlife specialty plates and an income tax check-off donation that are used for Idaho's Wildlife Diversity Program. These revenues are inadequate for Idaho to realize an ability to stabilize existing funding and provide for the long term needs for conservation, as was clearly heard at the Summit. It will require legislative action, Commission policy change, citizen initiative or all of these to address Idaho conservation needs. This is the reality of the political and social landscape that Idaho efforts must navigate through.

The next step is to take up a larger 3-5 year campaign and funding effort that would not come to term soon enough to address cuts in federal budgets that are impacting the IDFG. Given our near term concerns, we believe it is important to move ahead on both the short and long term strategies.

Idaho's Diversity Program has, to date, largely been focused on the survey and inventory of Idaho's nongame species, development of species plans and the SWAP. This program is the means by which Idaho and its citizens "preserve, protect, perpetuate and manage" our state's species, as well as help forestall management under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). Preserving, protecting, perpetuating and managing all Idaho's wildlife is the goal of the state's Wildlife Diversity Program, rather than just safe guarding against listing under the ESA. This important difference will need to be addressed as we communicate and propose funding options and conservation outcomes in Idaho.

## Conclusion

Our vision for the near-term and for generations into the future will be judged and measured through the implementation of public, Commission and legislative actions. To fulfill the public trust responsibilities given us by our legislative trustees, we must seek funding and collaboration upon which we can act to ensure we address both the immediate needs and long term future of Idaho's fish and wildlife. Whether it is through education, wildlife habitats, public access, survey and inventory, fish and wildlife information systems, administration, or enforcement; we must strive to put forth a need that is, first and foremost, measured in terms of Idaho wildlife public trust and its conservation. While the immediate answer lies in funding, the long-term outcome is fundamentally about the difference we hope to make in the conservation and management of Idaho's public trust resources for future generations.

## Reference List

- Idaho Department of Fish and Game. 2012. Wildlife Summit Report. Boise, ID. 56pp.
- Responsive Management. 2012. *Idaho residents' and sportsmen's opinions on wildlife management and the Idaho Department of Fish and Game*. Responsive Management, Harrisonburg, VA. 552 pp.
- Teel, T. L., A. A. Dayer, M. J. Manfredo, and A. D. Bright. 2005. *Regional results from the research project entitled "Wildlife Values in the West."* Project Report No. 58. Project report for the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. Fort Collins, CO. Colorado State University, Human Dimensions in Natural Resources Unit.
- Southwick Associates. 2007a. *Hunting in America: An Economic Engine and Conservation Powerhouse*. Produced for the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies with funding from Multistate Conservation Grant Program, 2007.
- Southwick Associates. 2007b. *Sportfishing in America: An Economic Engine and Conservation Powerhouse*. Produced for the American Sportfishing Association with funding from Multistate Conservation Grant Program, 2007.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2008. *Wildlife Watching in the U.S.: The Economic Impacts on National and State Economies in 2006*. Report 2006-1, Addendum to the 2006 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation. Arlington, VA:U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, July 2008.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2012. *2011 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation State Overview (Preliminary Estimates)*. Arlington, VA.

Figure 1. A Wordle™ representation of conversations during the Idaho Café when presented the question, “What can all of us do, individually and collectively, to benefit wildlife conservation in Idaho?” Wordle™ is based on a word count, so words of larger size were those mentioned more frequently than words of smaller size.

