US States' Native bee Conservation Efforts in State Wildlife Action Plans from 2005–2025 Brandon Adeshaken, Truman State University
Damon M. Hall, Ph.D., University of Missouri

US states are responsible for managing the wildlife populations within their borders. Because wildlife cross state lines, the US Fish and Wildlife Service federal coordinates states' management efforts via the recently established State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP)—a document written every ten years by each state's conservation department (2005, 2015). SWAP planning documents detail management and conservation efforts of the game and nongame species within the state. With the growing global conservation concern of insect pollinators, US states are working to advance conservation efforts within their borders. The 2017 Federal listing of the Rusty Patch Bumble Bee (*Bombus affinis)* as an Endangered Species offers an opportunity to examine how a selection of state conservation departments are doing as articulated in their SWAPs. Using *Bombus affinis* as a proxy of management of native bee populations, this research examines: (1) How 2005 and 2015 SWAPs document their conservation efforts of *Bombus affinis* pre-listing and (2) what are the changes in these documents over time.

We systematically analyzed all 2005 and 2015 the SWAPs of the 11 states in the *Bombus affinis* historic range. We first searched for associated keywords such as "bumble bees" or "pollinators." This information was then quantified and analyzed. We found state to state attention to insect pollinators varied widely. Only three of 11 states mentioned 2 or more threats to native bees. Concerning direct mentions of *B. affinis* only 4 of the 11 states in *Bombus affinis* historical range mentioned the species within their 2015 SWAPs with 0 states mentioning it in 2005 SWAPs. This indicates either a lack of knowledge about a species' conservation status or perhaps a rapid decline of the species. Overall, US state conservation agencies' action planning for native bees became more sophisticated from the 2005 to 2015 SWAPs. We end this paper with discussion of the implications of these findings for the 2025 SWAPs.