Response Summary on Public Comments Received on the Proposed Notification of Treatments, Posting of Treatments and Rotenone Treatments on Private Ponds.

A. Overview

Thank you to everyone who provided comments to the aforementioned proposed guidance changes. There were three separate set of comments received on the proposals to change/clarify guidance for posting and notification of herbicide treatments and one for rotenone treatments on private ponds. During the comment period, the DNR received consistent comments regarding the proposals. Those germane to the guidance are included below:

1. Mail receipt should only be required for notifications sent via e-mail.
2. Allow for electronic notifications
3. Elimination of Large-Scale Treatment Worksheet
4. Allow use of letter to notify riparian owners of treatments
5. Public notification requirements

B. Status of Recommendations

After careful consideration of these comments the Department's proposal is modified as follows:

1. Clarify in our guidance that a return receipt is recommended for e-mails only and allow the use of electronic notifications:
    a. Our intent is to recommend return receipt for e-mails only. We will clarify this in our guidance.
    b. Our intent is to allow the use of electronic notifications. We will clarify this in our guidance.
2. Elimination of Large-Scale Treatment Worksheet:
    a. This would require a change in Administrative Code NR 107. This is something we may consider in the future if an adequate Aquatic Plant Management Plan can be used to satisfy the objectives of large-scale reviews.
    b. At this time, the copy of the Large-Scale Worksheet is part of the permit application which is required to be in the notification.
3. Allow use of letter to notify riparian owners of treatments:
    a. It is clearly stated in the guidance that this method is approved for use in "off-shore treatments".
    b. Notification can be sent via e-mail or to a website for review.
4. Allow the use of a tear sheet or clipping of the newspaper article for proof of publication
    a. There is no change needed. A tear sheet or clipping with date is sufficient for proof of publication
    b. A signed affidavit of publication is not required if a dated clipping is included.

C. Additional Clarification

The Department will clarify when a version of notification other than the permit application is permissible (specify this in Section III. Small-scale Public Water Offshore Treatments).

D. Other comments received

The DNR also received numerous recommendations and comments on other aspects of the aquatic plant management program which do not relate to the specifics of this draft proposal, but may be considered in future guidance or policy development.

E. Further Contacts

Questions on this matter should be forwarded to Scott Provost , 715-421-7881 or scott.provost@wisconsin.gov.

Final guidance will be posted on http://dnr.wi.gov/news/input/documents/guidance/

Following is a compilation of the comments received by the Department on this matter.

Brown, Kelsey M - DNR

From: Aron & Associates <aronasoc@tds.net>
Sent: Friday, April 11, 2014 10:15 AM
To: Provost, Scott M - DNR
Cc: Gunderson, Scott L - DNR
Subject: Proposed Changes in Chemical Treatments from DNR
Attachments: COMMENTS REGARDING Aquatic Plant Management Guidance.pdf

Hello Scott,

I have attached my comments on the proposal for the Notification of Pesticides Application.

Kathy Aron
262-514-3234

COMMENTS REGARDING Aquatic Plant Management Guidance proposed by WDNR

April 11, 2014

Submitted by:
Kathy Aron, Consultant
Aron & Associates
30910 Royal Hill Rd
Burlington, WI 53105
262-514-3234
aronasoc@tds.net

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources staff has announced proposed changes to the chemical treatment program in lakes, regulated by NR107 of the Wisc. Admin. Code. Bypassing the Administrative Rule process means there will be no legislative oversight into the proposed changes that are in the form of a "Guidance". This paper presents the position of the author and requests DNR to reconsider its "Guidance".

There are a number of concerns about the "Guidance":

1. It doesn't simplify notification as claimed in the proposal.
2. I see no relationship between DNR staff time and these changes.
3. Makes changes ("clarifications") that will be very costly and time consuming, without resulting in better chemical applications or control of invasive species.
4. It doesn't address Program problems and issues that Applicators and Applicants have discussed with DNR staff over the past.
5. Broad statements are made in the document to support the need for the new "Guidance", but I doubt they would hold up to scrutiny.

Notification. While it is one step forward to allow electronic notification of treatments, other portions of the proposal go at least two steps backward.
Email: This helps get the information out – and although return receipts here are a no-brainer, many people do not allow return receipts, many people do not understand what that is; and email address lists are notoriously inaccurate. I consider this a secondary, "accessory" notification. None of the organizations can say they can rely on email notification – its just not going to reach everyone. A percentage of people do not have email or a computer.
Mail: Most organizations distribute a newsletter with the permit application in it now. What's backwards? A return receipt by postal mail costs time and money, even for a postcard. Getting return receipts implies that someone is going to log and track them to see who didn't return them, and then do follow-up. If that postcard directs someone to a website, that excludes a portion on the

public (including residents) who do not have internet access will be excluded. To include a form like the large-scale treatment worksheet, which has pretty much been ignored by DNR staff, is wasteful and confusing from the public's perspective. The questions will be endless. Do not require that it be distributed with the permit application form and map. Mailing, publishing or posting more sheets of paper; and making the requirements so that the costs for postage, printing, and labor increase – neither of which go towards improving the quality of the resource. It's just wasteful.
The proposal penalizes SE Wisconsin lakes, which will almost always treat more than 10 acres because of invasive species. Even small lakes for example, like Bohners Lake (135 acres) in Racine County, always treats more than 10 acres and they have never submitted a large-scale treatment worksheet. If there is EWM (milfoil) in these lakes, the lake communities HAVE to treat it to keep the EWM under control and the lakes usable by residents and the public.

Large-Scale Worksheets: The large-scale worksheets are redundant and vague. A community that has an approved, published Plant Management Plan, has already spent a lot of time and money putting their Plan together. They have evaluated the management impacts in much more detail, have debated the management options at length and have reached agreements on what should or should not be done. Form 3200-4A should be eliminated and Form 3200-004 Section IV should be updated to include a statement indicating where a copy of the DNR approved Aquatic Plant Management Plan is available for review.

Contents of the Notification: This proposal states that the "copy of the application may be sent in its entirety". Although it excludes riparian landowner lists, the proposal adds large-scale treatment worksheets, and the amount of pesticides to be used. The worksheets should be excluded and banished for the reasons stated above. Adding the amount of pesticides to the application form will result in general, vague ranges of amounts and will go nowhere in improving the quality of information provided to the public.

No "standardization" by DNR staff: DNR staff's interpretation of the rules vary from region to region and this proposal goes nowhere to provide for fixing that. The goal of the programthat should always be considered by staff – that is to give communities a tool to control invasives and to protect public recreation access. Some staff seem to think that all chemical treatment is bad. If that is the DNR position, then 1) why did the Legislature label milfoil as one of the invasive species; and 2) why are there any treatments permitted? If SE Wisconsin communities cannot treat milfoil or other invasives, then we should just close the door, give up, and watch property values go down the drain.

One staff member signs Form 3200-004 and considers it to be the permit; then another puts together a 2 to 3 page, Chpt 30 type permit letter along with the form, doubling the amount of paper. The Form is sufficient and takes up much less of valuable DNR staff time.

Most staff members accept newspaper tear-sheets as proof of public notification; another requires an Affidavit from the newspaper, which adds to the cost, and often leads to delays in issuance of

permits. A photocopy of a tear-sheet, or a tear-sheet is sufficient. What is to be gained by an Affidavit? Nothing. Staff should be advised to accept tear-sheets.

Milfoil and other Invasives: The public's interest is served by the organizations who conduct invasive species chemical treatments. Harvesting cannot and will not ever control milfoil. It just makes it worse. Chemical treatments have dramatically improved conditions in lakes with invasive species. The DNR and public should be THANKING these organizations and making the process easier and less expensive, not more difficult and costly.

This Guidance is a waste of time and resources. Threats from Invasive Species will not go away. I am sure that this proposal took a lot of time and resources by DNR staff that could have been more appropriately used.

Brown, Kelsey M - DNR

From: Suffern Brian - Lonza Mequon <brian.suffern@lonza.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2014 5:06 PM
To: Provost, Scott M - DNR
Subject: Guidance Manual Comments
Attachments: DNR Guidance Manual Commments B. Suffern.pdf

Hi Scott:

I apologize for my confusion over the Deadline (I thought it was today).

Thank You.

Brian J. Suffern
Marine Biochemists services at LONZA
6302 W. Eastwood Ct.
Mequon, WI 53092

Work: (262) 238-0406
Toll-Free: (888) 558-5106
Fax: (262) 238-0408
Cell: (414) 406-0050

This communication and its attachments, if any, may contain confidential and privileged information the use of which by other persons or entities than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this transmission in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete the material from your system.

Aquatic Plant Management Handbook
CHAPTER xx
Notification of Proposed Pesticide Treatment Application

Guidance Purpose and Disclaimer

This document is intended solely as guidance, and does not contain any mandatory requirements except where requirements found in statute or administrative rule apply. This guidance does not establish or affect legal rights or obligations, and is not finally determinative of any of the issues addressed. This guidance cannot be relied upon and does not create any rights enforceable by any party in litigation with the State of Wisconsin or the Department of Natural Resources. Any regulatory decision made by the Department of Natural Resources in any matter addressed by this guidance will be made by applying the governing statutes, common law and administrative rules to the relevant facts.

Applicable Administrative Code Language

NR107.04(3) In addition to the information required under sub. (2), when the proposed treatment is a large-scale treatment exceeding 10.0 acres in size or 10% of the area of the water body that is 10 feet or less in depth, the application shall be accompanied by…

(f) Evidence that a public notice of the proposed application has been made, and that a public informational meeting, if required, has been conducted."

1. Notice shall be given in 2 inch x 4 inch advertising format in the newspaper which has the largest circulation in the area affected by the application. Can this be changed to same size as most legal Notices by Unit of Gov't?
2. The notice shall state the size of the proposed treatment, the approximate treatment dates, and that the public may request within 5 days of the notice that the applicant hold a public informational meeting on the proposed application.

This is in cases, is not followed by Dept - sometimes greater time is allowed?

NR 107.04(4) The applicant shall certify to the department that a copy of the application has been provided to any affected property owners' association, inland lake district, and, in the case of chemical applications for rooted aquatic plants, to any riparian property owners adjacent to and within the treatment area.

NR 107.04(5) A notice of the proposed treatment shall be provided by the department to any person or organization indicating annually in writing a desire to receive such notification.

treatments can have whole-lake impacts in small lakes. If the proposed treatment will result in lakewide impacts, then the whole-lake treatment guidance in section V below must be followed. Public Water Shoreline Treatments would include all treatments within 150 feet from shore. The 150 foot limit as a definition of shoreline treatments is due to the Department's ability to deny treatments greater than 150 feet from shore according to NR 107.05(3)(f). Also, this section makes no differentiation between invasive and native species treatment, or whether there is an approved plan; notification is required regardless of the situation. NR 107.04(4) clearly states that any riparian owner adjacent to and within a treatment area must be provided a copy of the APM application.

Steps for proper notification:

1. A copy of the permit application must be given as a notification to riparian owners adjacent to or within the area to be treated.
   a. The notification must include the treatment map and if applicable the large-scale treatment worksheet. The notification does not need to include a list of riparian landowners contacted. However, the list of riparian owners contacted must be included as part of the permit application to DNR.
   b. The copy of the application may be sent in its entirety or,
   c. Sent as a hyperlink or website address containing an electronic copy of the permit application. The application or website address may be sent via US mail or email and a return receipt is preferred for either method.

Question as to why Large Scale Worksheet is considered so important. Aquatic Plant Management Plans are being "Phased In" - can't this old requirement be eliminated

No! Too great of expense Not required in NR107

2. Notice of treatment shall be provided by the Department to any person or organization indicating annually in writing a desire to receive such notification. This notice will be provided for treatments of rooted plants or algae.

III. **Small-scale Public Water Offshore Treatments:** For the purpose of this guidance, any water not meeting the definition of Private Pond per NR 107.11(3)(a) ***and*** greater than 150 feet from shore will be considered Public Water Off-Shore Treatment. Small-scale treatments are those not considered large-scale under NR 107.04(3). These types of treatments are occasionally conducted for navigational lanes or for control of invasive aquatic plants. Notification of "adjacent riparian owner" is currently undefined for off-shore treatments. However, if the proposed treatment will result in whole-lake impacts, then the whole-lake treatment guidance in section V below must be followed.

Steps for proper notification:

1. A notification summarizing the permit application must be sent to all riparian landowners, affected property owners association, or inland lake district, or
2. Posted in two of the following ways:
   a. at all public access points,
   b. at all adjacent town halls,
   c. in the lake district or association newsletter or website,
   d. in the local newspaper following NR 107.04(3)(f)
3. The notification must include:
   a. Pesticide product(s) to be applied,
   b. Size of proposed treatment,
   c. Approximate treatment date(s),
   d. Map of proposed treatment areas,
   e. Proposed pesticide concentration for the treatment area and whole-lake, and
   f. Instructions detailing how to obtain a complete copy of the application.

Again, this exceeds original requirements of NR107

→ Eliminate a-e Keep "f" as it will explain everything to these interested parties

4. Any off-shore pesticide applications are not exempt from NR 107.04(5), thus notice of treatment shall continue to be provided by the Department to any person or organization indicating annually in writing a desire to receive such notification. This notice will be provided for treatments of rooted plants or algae.

IV. **Large-scale Treatments:** Large-scale treatments are defined in NR 107.04(3) as exceeding 10 acres in size or 10% of the area of the water body that is 10 feet or less in depth. The appropriate guidance for notification will be determined by location of the treatments (e.g. five acres of treatment along the shore and 5 acres of treatment >150 feet from shore follows guidance for near shore and off shore treatments). However, if the proposed treatment will result in whole-lake impacts, then the whole-lake treatment guidance must be followed.

Steps for proper notification:

1. A copy of the permit application must be given as a notification to all affected riparian owners if the treatment will be within 150 feet of the riparian shoreline.
2. If treatment includes off-shore treatment area(s) the off-shore guidelines for notification in section III above must also be followed.
3. If it is known that pesticide concentrations will be great enough to prompt the label's water use restrictions across an entire bay of a lake, notification must be given to all riparian property within this area.
4. The notification must include…
   a. Large-scale treatment worksheet,
   b. Map outlining treatment areas, and
   c. Proposed pesticide concentration for the actual treatment area.

Again - why can't all interested parties be directed to a website where they may review permit application, or be notified of how they may obtain a copy This is efficient & simple

Again, Registered Mail is not necessary & too expensive. Is there a Precedent? Is there a Real Need?

d. The notification does not need to include a list of riparian landowners contacted. However, the list of riparian owners contacted must be included as part of the permit application to DNR.
e. The copy of the application may be sent in its entirety or sent as a hyperlink or website address containing an electronic copy of the permit application. The application, hyperlink or website address may be sent via US mail or email and a return receipt is preferred for either method.

5. Public notification requirements of NR 107.04(3)(f) must be followed. Proof of the public notice must be included as part of the permit application to DNR.
   a. In addition, the applicant must hold a public informational meeting if properly requested to do so under NR 107.04(3)(f)2. If a public informational hearing is to be held, the applicant is required to provide notice of the hearing as specified in NR 107.04(3)(f)2.b.
6. Notice of treatment shall be provided by the Department to any person or organization indicating annually in writing a desire to receive such notification. This notice will be provided for treatments of rooted plants or algae.

V. **Whole Lake Treatments or Impacts:** Whole-lake treatments are considered treatments in which the concentration of pesticide after complete dissipation will impact aquatic plants lakewide, based on the most recent pesticide residual/plant data. They may or may not be intentional. These treatments may be shoreline, off-shore or a combination of both. Small scale treatments may have whole lake impacts. Generally, treatments exceeding 5% of the lake area may have whole-lake impacts. Consult with the Department Aquatic Plant Management Coordinator if you aren't sure if the treatment will have whole lake impacts.

Since the revision of NR 107, aquatic plant management has shifted priorities to concentrate on managing invasive species throughout a lake utilizing a holistic lake management approach. Although nuisance control for navigational lanes and small-scale treatments still occur, they have become less frequent as the focus of lake groups, partners and the Department have shifted to the more holistic management where Aquatic Plant Management Plans and citizen awareness of management within the lake tends to be higher. "Adjacent riparian owner" is currently undefined for whole-lake treatments, but it is reasonable to conclude that under these treatment circumstances "adjacent riparian owners" include everyone with riparian property on the lake.

Steps for proper notification:

1. A copy of the permit application must be given as a notification to all riparian owners.
2. The notification must include:

a. Large-scale treatment worksheet,
b. Map outlining treatment areas, and
c. Proposed target pesticide concentration for the actual treatment area and whole-lake
d. The notification does not need to include a list of riparian landowners contacted.However, the list of riparian owners contacted must be included as part of the permit application to DNR.
e. The copy of the application may be sent in its entirety or sent as a hyperlink or website address containing an electronic copy of the permit application. The application or hyperlink may be sent via US mail or email and a return receipt is preferred for either method.

3. Public notification requirements of NR 107.04(3)(f) must be followed. Proof of the public notice must be included as part of the permit application to DNR.
   a. In addition, the applicant must hold a public informational meeting if properly requested to do so under NR 107.04(3)(f)2. If a public informational hearing is to be held, the applicant is required to provide notice of the hearing as specified in NR 107.04(3)(f)2.b.
4. Notice of treatment shall be provided by the Department to any person or organization indicating annually in writing a desire to receive such notification. This notice will be provided for treatments of rooted plants or algae.

Again - Isn't Notice of Intent to Pursue a permit sufficient - along with directions for obtaining a copy

Tens of thousands of these "Riparian Copies" have been mailed out - only to be dumped in the garbage

A more simple, logical approach is req'd.

Ø

Aquatic Plant Management Handbook
CHAPTER xx
Caution/Warning Sign Posting for Pesticide Treatment

Guidance Purpose and Disclaimer

This document is intended solely as guidance, and does not contain any mandatory requirements except where requirements found in statute or administrative rule apply. This guidance does not establish or affect legal rights or obligations, and is not finally determinative of any of the issues addressed. This guidance cannot be relied upon and does not create any rights enforceable by any party in litigation with the State of Wisconsin or the Department of Natural Resources. Any regulatory decision made by the Department of Natural Resources in any matter addressed by this guidance will be made by applying the governing statutes, common law and administrative rules to the relevant facts.

* Why do we have to Post if there are No Restrictions ???

Applicable Administrative Code Language

* This is very Poor wording — has been source of confusion & disagreement

NR107.08(7) The permit holder shall be responsible for posting those areas of use in accordance with water use restrictions stated on the chemical label, but in all cases for a minimum of one day, and with the following conditions:

(a) Posting ~~signs shall be brilliant yellow and~~ conspicuous to the nonriparian public intending to use the treated water from both the water and shore, and shall state applicable label water use restrictions of the chemical being used, the name of the chemical and date of treatment. For tank mixes, the label requirements of the most restrictive chemical will be posted;

(b) Minimum sign dimensions used for posting shall be 11 inches by 11 inches or consistent with s. ATCP 29.15. The department will provide up to 6 signs to meet posting requirements. Additional signs may be purchased from the department;

(c) Signs shall be posted at the beginning of each treatment by the permit holder or representing agent. Posting prior to treatment may be required as a permit condition when the department determines that such posting is in the best interest of the public;

(d) Posting signs shall be placed along contiguous treated shoreline and at strategic locations to adequately inform the public. Posting of untreated shoreline located adjacent to treated shoreline and noncontiguous shoreline shall be at the discretion of the department;

(e) Posting signs shall be made of durable material to remain up and legible for the time period stated on the pesticide label for water use restrictions, after which the permit holder or representing agent is responsible for sign removal. * Think this through. Typically the landowner removes the sign.

Pesticide treatment posting guidance is outlined below for the different types of pesticide treatment strategies outlined in the DNR Administrative Code for Aquatic Plant Management (NR 107). NR 107.08(7) makes the permit holder responsible for complying with posting requirements. The Department considers proper posting by contractors to meet this requirement, as posting may be accomplished by a "representing agent". In addition to DNR authority under (adm code NR 107), permittees may be required to post additional signs if pertinent under adm code ATCP 29.52 or required by the product label.

Longest Restriction is Irrigation

Caution Sign Posting (2)

I. **Private Ponds:** Private Ponds are defined according to NR 107.11(3)(a) as, *a body of water located entirely on the land of an applicant, with no surface water discharge or a discharge that can be controlled to prevent chemical loss, and without access by the public.* Those waters that meet this definition are exempt from posting according to NR 107.11(3), however permit applicants may still be required by DATCP or label directions to post warning signs.

Steps for proper posting:

1. DNR does not require posting of private pond treatments.
2. Signs will not be provided by the department free of charge for private pond treatments.
3. Applicants may request standard pesticide treatment signs from the department at code rates.

II. **Public Water Small-scale Shoreline Treatments:** For the purpose of this guidance, any water not meeting the definition of Private Pond per NR 107.11(3)(a), will be considered public water. Small-scale treatments are those not considered large-scale under NR 107.04(3). However, even small-scale treatments can have whole-lake impacts in small lakes. If the proposed treatment will result in lakewide impacts, then the whole-lake treatment guidance in section V below must be followed. Public Water Shoreline Treatments would include all treatments within 150 feet from shore, based on the language of NR 107.05(3)(f). Also, this section makes no differentiation between invasive and native species treatments.

Steps for proper posting:

1. Signs shall be posted at each property along treated shoreline and at each riparian property immediately adjacent to treated properties.
2. Signs may be required at all commercial and public boat landings and beaches at the discretion of the Department.

III. **Public Water Small-scale Off-Shore Treatments:** For the purpose of this guidance, any water not meeting the definition of Private Pond per NR 107.11(3)(a) ***and*** greater than 150 feet from shore will be considered Public Water Off-Shore Treatment. Small-scale treatments are those not considered large-scale under NR 107.04(3). These types of treatments are occasionally conducted for navigational lanes or for control of invasive aquatic plants. Posting is currently undefined for off-shore treatments, but left to the discretion of the Department. If the proposed treatment will result in whole-lake impacts, then the whole-lake treatment guidance in section V below must be followed.

Brown, Kelsey M - DNR

From: Dale Dressel <ddressel@centurytel.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 10, 2014 9:54 AM
To: Provost, Scott M - DNR
Subject: Notification Guide

Scott,

Good to have talked with you yesterday. Here is a summery of the conversation in writing for your records.

1. My experience in sending folks permit applications as a "notification" of a pending treatment often times triggers a response of bewilderment from the recipient. After all it is a document intended for some entity to ask permission from the DNR to chemically treat some of the waters of the state. I feel that in all cases (not just some) it would be more informative and to the point if the notification could be done by the use of a notification letter which as you discuss contains all the pertinent information. A map is also important to include with the letter. The maps would probably have to be OK with using last fall's best guess kind of data. Time between spring survey and optimal treatment time is very limited...so the map might not be the actual treatment map.

2. Warning signs made to 11 x 11 inches means copying the signs onto 11 x 17 stock and discarding 6 inches of material. Wasteful. Warning signs of 8.5 x 11 should be allowed. Much cheaper to buy the paper in this size. Much cheaper to produce signs of this size. Plenty big to catch the public eye.

We also discussed granular vs liquid formulations and I shared some of my ideas of why I think the technique being used to generate this "science" is flawed. In a nutshell, the contention is that by sampling the water from granular herbicide treatment and comparing concentrations found to the water collected in a liquid herbicide treatment you can project lethal dose/contact time and thus "effectively". I agree this thought process works for liquid formulations but disagree that it works for granular formulations. I contend that we need to be doing plant tissue analysis to see what the plant is adsorbing (which is the real goal here) not measuring concentrations in the water (which I agree is important when thinking along the lines of whole lake treatments). A solo cup treatment using liquid 2,4-D has no chance of working, but I contend that it has a good chance of working using granular formulations under the right conditions. I believe that small scale treatments usi!
ng granular formulations are often successful because at the "micro-level" where the pellet meets the leaf, concentrations are surely higher than they are going to be where you gather a water sample from. I hate to anthropomorphize, but imagine you had to lay in the bottom of a pool, naked, while acid was added to change the ph of the pool. You are the plant, the acid is the herbicide. Would you rather the ph be changed by adding liquid acid which will quickly disperse or using pellets which would sink to the bottom and sit on your skin and dissolve. It is that intimate contact that my experience tells me matters a lot. I don't know what kind of science has been done to look at this but if you know of any please send it my way. I see the scientists and decision makers being consumed by looking at pretty graphs generated by water sampling over time and projecting that onto efficacy data generated in the lab (it takes this long at this dose to kill)... Rather I think t!
hey should be comparing the real world results, how much contr!
ol did w
e achieve; and plant tissue analysis, how much herbicide did the plant take when studying herbicide treatments.

Dale Dressel
Northern Aquatic Services
1061 240th street

Dresser WI 54009
Home/Office 715-755-3507
Cell 715 495-5252

NOTICE: This message is intended exclusively for the individual or entity to which it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged, or confidential. If you are not the named addressee, you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy, or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or fax and delete all copies of this message.