

NATURAL RESOURCES BOARD

MINUTES

A special meeting of the Natural Resources Board was held on Tuesday, December 5, 2006 in Room G09, State Natural Resources Building (GEF 2), Madison, Wisconsin. The Land Committee of the Natural Resources Board had an informational briefing for the Sex-Age-Kill (SAK) Audit Report. This was followed by the full Natural Resources Board reconvening for an informational briefing on the 2006 Deer Season Report.

Tuesday, December 5, 2006

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Information Items

1.A. Air, Waste, and Water/Enforcement

None

1.B. Land Management, Recreation, and Fisheries/Wildlife

1.B.1. Sex-Age-Kill (SAK) Audit Report

Keith Warnke, Wildlife Biologist, Wildlife Management Bureau stated that the Natural Resources Board directed Department staff to facilitate an outside auditor's review of the Department's "Sex-Age-Kill" formula. A SAK Audit Steering Committee made up of interested stakeholders selected a panel of six nationally recognized population modeling experts to evaluate the Wisconsin deer population model and recommend improvements. Dr. Boyce will present a draft report of the results and conclusions of this project.

Dr. Mark Boyce, University of Alberta, SAK Committee Member stated the committee set out to answer the following questions.

1. Are we doing the best job we can considering the available data? Wisconsin is doing the best job in the country.
2. How do we improve the data we use?
3. Are the techniques we are using suitable to manage deer in Wisconsin?
4. Is there a better model, considering our system?
5. What will improvements cost?

He discussed the modeling approaches and results and the deterministic models. Then he explained the stochastic model that was used. The Panel created a two-stage Leslie matrix model which evaluated stochastic nature of population by simulating, survival, and, recruitment changes. They also modeled covariance between survival and productivity, and examined effects of changes on the SAK model. While a statistically rigorous analysis of precision is not possible, assuming CVs of 5%, DMU level estimates are within 30-40% of actual population size. No one input variable contributes the greatest amount of variability to population estimates. In all but two DMUs, the predicted harvest is more strongly correlated with actual harvest (meaning the way the department is using SAK is appropriate). Simple use of the SAK model can account for only up to an average of 62% of the variability in annual deer harvests. The 64-94% suggested by the department's deer management workbook is a result of professional judgment being applied by department staff. It is more appropriate to compare SAK estimates within a DMU over time instead of across DMUs in one year.

Mr. Welter asked about the selected DMUs and if they were selected randomly.

Dr. Boyce stated that he thinks they are selected randomly. He then went on to discuss monitoring techniques used by other states. They surveyed other states to determine white-tailed deer monitoring techniques, including: AL, AR, GA, IN, IL, IA, KS, MA, ME, MN, MS, MO, NY, OH, PA, SC, TN, TX, VA, WV. The data collection varies considerably from state to state, two-thirds have mandatory registration, most other states use mail surveys, one-fourth did not estimate population size, and measures of precision are lacking from nearly all estimates. Wisconsin has one of the most thorough deer management programs. Most states do not collect information on deer status or data used in decision-making. There is a formalized process by which regional field and central office staff review decisions. Data collection and analysis is objective and open to public review. Wisconsin exceeds all states in transparency and amount of information made available to public.

The conclusions of the audit are that the SAK model is sensitive to changes in male harvest rate due to violations of the age stable and stationary assumptions, sudden changes in male harvest rate alter

proportion of 1.5-year-old bucks and 1.5-year-old does, biasing estimates. The model results are opposite population trend. Changes in regulations that alter male harvest rates (e.g., earn-a-buck) can bias population estimates. The Scale of estimation is important when considering SAK performance. For large populations, there is less variability. Precision is poor at the DMU level; aggregating DMUs for SAK improves estimates. The methods used to evaluate the ability of the model to predict future harvests (*DNR Workbook*) are inappropriate because of scale. For 16 DMUs examined, SAK model predicted an average of 62% of the variability of actual harvests. For some DMUs, SAK does a poor job. Future evaluations should consider individual DMUs over time rather than across DMUs. Occasionally DNR pools data spatially and temporally for input into the SAK model. Pooling is only valid if demographic processes are homogenous. Need to consider differences in harvest regulation that could influence demographics. Pooling is advantageous because precision is improved. Pooling data at large spatial scales might explain precision reported at large scales. The costs of collecting sufficient data to obtain a statistical measure of precision for all DMUs using the SAK model are prohibitively expensive or logistically impossible.

Dr. Thomas stated that this is the first time everyone (NRB, staff, public, and press) has seen this report. There will be an opportunity at a future meeting for the public to comment.

Mr. Warnke stated that the public will have an opportunity to comment after their groups have had an opportunity to review the report. Tim Van Deelen will compile the questions and categorize them and distribute the Steering Committee's questions to the panel. The comments are due on December 22. On January 3rd, there will be a conference call to address the questions. The steering committee will be writing a final report for the NRB at the January NRB meeting for final approval.

Dr. Thomas stated that there will be some recommendations at that meeting and the Department will be bringing forth any policy changes that they plan on making for NRB consideration.

Mr. Warnke stated that is correct.

Mr. Welter asked about areas that need further evaluation specifically density structure.

Dr. Boyce stated that the population mechanism that allows for sustainable harvest is density dependent. As the population size gets larger, survival and reproduction is affected along with carrying capacity. That could affect the optimum harvest rate.

Mr. Welter asked about the evaluative techniques. Are they breaking new ground or have they been used in other states.

Dr. Boyce stated that the developer of SAK is from Michigan and it was developed in the 1960s. There have since been studies regarding the accuracy of the method.

Mr. Welter asked about wounded buck loss estimates.

Dr. Boyce stated there have been wounding loss studies in other states, but not in Wisconsin.

Mr. Ela asked what degree of aggregation of DMUs would be necessary in order to statistically improve the population estimate.

Dr. Boyce stated that there are probably twice, maybe three times as many units as are desirable.

Mr. O'Brien asked about discrepancies in the division of units and unit boundaries.

Dr. Boyce stated that yes the units should be larger and aggregated. Predictions would be more precise.

Dr. Thomas asked if we lumped units together we would get a better estimate of deer populations, but to estimate the number of deer for a particular hunting stand there would need to be far more units.

Dr. Boyce stated that there comes a point where there aren't enough deer out there to estimate the deer population.

Dr. Thomas stated that is what every deer hunter wants to know, the population under his stand. But that would be too expensive and extremely labor intensive. She asked whether any NRB members have had any contact with members of the audit team or influenced them in any way.

Mr. Boyce stated that none have contacted the members or influenced them in any way.

Dr. Thomas asked about the staff.

Mr. Boyce stated that they provided data, but have not influenced the team in any way.

Mr. Welter asked about the term ridiculous deer estimates used in his presentation.

Dr. Boyce stated that an example might be a finding that gives a negative population estimate. Sometimes we know that there are violations of SAK due to assumptions.

Mr. Welter asked if the panel analyzed the tweaking by the Department.

Dr. Boyce stated that studies would justify tweaking, but it's done independently of scientific data.

Mr. O'Brien asked about concluding that SAK is working in Wisconsin.

Dr. Boyce stated that the panel did conclude that overall, SAK is working in Wisconsin and is the best model to use in all of North America. However, there are specific recommendations to improve the use of the model. For example, SAK cannot be used in Earn a Buck units because it doesn't work there.

Mr. Warnke stated that SAK is not used in EAB or CWD units. For CWD zones, the Department uses flight surveys and for EAB units we use population 2 model.

Questions from the SAK committee members

Ed Harvey, Chairman, Conservation Congress asked about the unreported kills. He is assuming it's a little buck heavy. Now that there are prequalifications for buck harvest, how will that affect those unreported kills.

Dr. Boyce stated it is not an easy thing to estimate. Therefore a telemetry study could be done for estimates.

Mr. Willett stated that brings up another issue of fine schedules and how the population has been affected by increase poaching fines.

Greg Kazmierski, Deer Hunters Coalition asked about aging samples and impact on overall estimate.

Dr. Boyce stated it's an important input parameter, but all are important, none are more important than others.

Mr. Kazmierski asked if sportsmen could help collect data. For example, identifying the sex of fawns.

Dr. Boyce stated that would be helpful, but we didn't address that in our report.

Mark Noel, Big Game Committee, Conservation Congress asked about over winter goals estimates.

Dr. Boyce stated that the problem with tying it in with habitat is depending on how much habitat there is in a particular area and changes in habitat across the unit.

Dr. Thomas thanked the Dr. Boyce and the committee for their hard work.

2.B.2. 2006 Deer Season Report

Diane Brookbank, Director, Bureau of Customer Service and Licensing gave the customer service and licensing statistics for the 2006 Deer Season. More than 283,000 (45%) of deer gun licenses were purchased in the eight days preceding the deer gun opener. More and more licenses are being purchased from ALIS retail contractors and the internet. Less than 7% of licenses are purchased at DNR locations. A new ALIS contract was signed and it is costing \$200,000 less than the previous contract.

Tom Hauge, Director, Bureau of Wildlife presented the wildlife statistics for the 2006 Deer Season. This is the fifth year there was a statewide youth hunt. There were approximately 4,000 deer taken by youth hunters. The warm weather affected the hunt. Some hunters like warm weather while others prefer cold weather. The 2006 9-day season will be in the top 10 in terms of harvest. Preliminary statewide harvest figures indicate hunters are harvesting 1.6 antlerless deer per antlered buck. A contractor is entering the deer registration stubs into a database. As of today, the contractor has returned over 80,000 records after being entered into the database. There is CWD testing being done in the West Central Region of the state.

Mr. O'Brien asked if the millions of dollars spent on CWD includes testing around the state.

Mr. Hauge stated yes.

Randy Stark, Director, Bureau of Law Enforcement gave the law enforcement statistics for the 2006 Deer Season. Overall, hunter attitude was positive because of the warm weather. Hunters were able to stay in the woods longer. The parcelization of land has increased hunter conflict along with baiting and feeding disputes. Increased rural development has resulted in conflicts between residents and hunters. Another issue is the privatization of hunting. The cost to use private land to hunt deer continues to rise making it difficult for hunters with modest incomes to participate. The top arrests are baiting and feeding violations and shooting from a vehicle. He distributed a 16-page report about significant concerns from the warden service regarding baiting and feeding. Baiting and feeding results in the privatization of public resources because it concentrates deer on private property of those who can put out the most bait, most often. It removes opportunity from hunters of ordinary means who cannot afford to own land and bait. The resulting condition confronts the premise of the conservation ethic, that wildlife is owned by everyone, and everyone should have equal opportunity

to enjoy it. He went on to explain other issues with baiting and feeding including scientific research on CWD transmission, changing natural movement patterns of deer, hunter conflict, poaching deer at night, and over-reliance on baiting as hunting method.

Mr. Clausen asked what the Department's plan is regarding baiting and feeding.

Secretary Hassett stated that he wants to wait until the new legislature is in place and to share this information with them.

Mr. Ela stated it may be strategic to separate baiting and feeding.

Mr. Willett stated he doesn't totally agree. He suggests a systematic approach to reduce baiting and feeding rather than a "knee jerk reaction" There are other factors to consider such as parcelization of paper land and public opinions on baiting and feeding.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

NATURAL RESOURCES BOARD

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the Natural Resources Board was held on Wednesday, December 6, 2006 in Room G09, State Natural Resources Building (GEF 2), Madison Wisconsin.. The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. for action on items 1-7. The meeting adjourned at 4:06 p.m.

Wednesday, December 6, 2006

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Organizational Matters

1.A. Calling the roll

Gerald O'Brien – present	Dan Poulson – present
Jonathan Ela – present	Dave Clausen – present
John Welter – present	Christine Thomas – present
Steve Willett – present	

1.B. Approval of minutes from October 25, 2006

Mr. Poulson MOVED, seconded by Mr. Clausen approval of the October 25, 2006 minutes. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

1.C. Approval of agenda for December 6, 2006

Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of the agenda for December 6, 2006. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

2. Ratification of Acts of the Department Secretary

2.A. Real Estate Transactions

Mr. Poulson MOVED, seconded by Mr. Clausen approval of the real estate transactions.

Mr. Ela asked for a typo correction on page 8.

The motion as amended carried unanimously by all members.

3. Action Items

3.A. Department Wide

3.A.1. Approval of the Departments 2007-2009 Biennial Budget recommendations.

Joe Polasek, Director, Management and Budget Bureau stated The Department's supplemental 2007-09 biennial budget recommendations include requests for \$455,600 in expenditure authority and 5.0 FTE in 2007-08; \$599,200 in expenditure authority and 8.00 FTE in 2008-09; and \$15.5 million in bonding authority for nonpoint source pollution abatement (\$10.5 million) and environmental repair (\$5 million). The Department's recommendations also include revenue proposals and proposed statutory language changes. These expenditure authority requests, revenue proposals, and statutory language proposals are detailed in the attached documentation. Additionally, to comply with the Governor's budget instructions, the Department is submitting a proposed budget reduction plan equal to ten percent of selected non-federal administrative appropriations (\$4,471,000 annually). These budget reduction proposals are also detailed in the attached documentation.

Mr. Willett asked about bonding for covering nonpoint and is that what the bonding is for.

Mr. Polasek stated that the Board at its September meeting in Green Bay amended the Department's budget request by adding \$10 million for the Target Run-off Management program. This is an additional amount for the urban side of the program.

Mr. Willett asked about cutting positions in UW-Extensions and then adding another position for

nature is our business program.

Ms. Osterndorf stated that the nature is our business position is not an educational position. It is a business sector support position.

Mr. Willett stated that is what the extension say that they do, plus more.

Mr. Welter asked if 10% cuts are from the GPR fund.

Mr. Polasek stated no they are not source targeted.

Mr. Welter asked about the environmental repair. Are they related to the proposed \$600,000 cuts.

Mr. Polasek stated they are related and can be used for the same purposes.

Mr. Poulson asked about the new nonpoint program. Are we satisfied to see the slowdown in nonpoint program?

Mr. Polasek stated that we are still going to be out there, but we are going to have a more direct, targeted impact.

Todd Ambs, Administrator, Water Division stated he is satisfied with this package. The turnaround on the money will be much quicker.

Mr. O'Brien asked if this money will cover the entire nonpoint program.

Mr. Ambs stated this is part of the money. This is the state bonding that we have available.

Mr. O'Brien asked what the impact will be on agricultural clean up.

Mr. Ambs stated we will be able to address the problem much quicker.

Mr. Poulson stated he is satisfied with this proposal.

Mr. Willett stated that we are not a GPR agency. Our partners and license holders are our constituents.

Mr. Ela asked where the unexpended money goes.

Mr. Polasek stated it goes back in the fish and wildlife account and is carried over.

Mr. Welter asked how many positions will be cut in the basin educators.

Mr. Polasek stated that 15 educators are funded. 8-9 positions would be cut.

Mr. Willett stated that only 7 positions are filled.

Mr. Ambs stated that this program started with watershed approach that educates a variety of publics including nonpoint related activities. It is a critically important piece of how we inform and educate the public especially about nonpoint related activities.

Mr. Ela asked who employs the basin educators

Paul DeLong, Administrator, Forestry Division stated they are UW Extension positions.

Mr. Clausen stated that his basin educator has been essential and has had a lot of impact in his area.

Mr. Willett stated he agrees that these positions are very important.

Mr. Welter asked what will be lost if we cut the fisheries surveys.

Mr. Ambs stated there have been some increases in federal funding to help, but we will lose ability to fund fishkill research.

Mr. O'Brien asked what the service center positions do.

Mr. Polasek stated that they sell licenses, provide clerical support, do reception duties, and answer questions.

Dr. Thomas stated that the NRB received a letter from Senator Hansen. He is concerned about the technical support from the staff.

Bill Smith, Deputy Secretary stated that when there is staff there, they will try to help someone, but if staff are out in the field the door will be locked.

Mr. Clausen stated he thinks it is shortsighted because these positions are the ambassadors of the DNR.

Vance Rayburn, Administrator, Customer and Employee Services Division stated that they have lost 128 positions in the last two bienniums. We cannot afford to take further cuts. It is going to prevent us to support the computer system of the wardens.

Public Appearances

1. **George Meyer**, Madison, Wisconsin Wildlife Association stated his organization is in favor of the budget proposal, although they are in opposition to some of the proposed cuts identified within the 10% cuts required by DOA. They strongly oppose the game farm cuts, the elimination of damage payments for the loss of hunting dogs lost to predation by gray wolves, reductions in warm water habitat development and fishery survey, and the closure of the Poynette Service Center.

Mr. Welter asked about the WWF's position on closing other service centers.

Mr. Meyer stated they are opposed to those closures as well, but they are more directly affected by Poynette's closure.

2. **Mike Brust**, Conservation Congress Wolf Committee stated that hunters have been patient with the Bureau of Endangered Resources. The impact on dogs is fatal if a wolf is able to catch them. The reimbursement doesn't cover the cost of the dogs. The Department agreed to make these payments and now they aren't keeping up their end of the bargain.
3. **Robert Welch**, Wisconsin Bear Hunters Association, stated his organization is in opposition to the \$40,000 dog payment cut. The DNR is breaking their end of the deal according to NR 12.54(2)(am) which states "The Department shall reimburse the claimant the fair market value based upon recent sale records for similar animals of hunting dogs or pets killed by E/T species or wolves up to a maximum of \$2500 per animal." Once the wolf is delisted, there may be other ways to deal with depredation problems such as reducing the wolf population.
Mr. Clausen asked if the Department reintroduced the wolves or if they came here on their own.
Mr. Willett stated that the wolves came here on their own and the Department has had to deal with them.
4. **Rob Stafsholt**, Wisconsin Bear Hunters Association stated he is against the reduction. He distributed pictures of his depredated dogs to the NRB.
Mr. Willett asked that the pictures not be distributed.
Mr. O'Brien stated those who would like to see the pictures could look at them.
Mr. Stafsholt stated there was a commitment by the Department that pet owners, including sportsmen would be reimbursed for depredated dogs. He would like to see the commitment upheld by the Department.
5. **Robin Shepard**, UW Extension stated he is opposed to the basin educator positions. There are 15 educators. It is a multi-agency partnership and tailored for the local residents. Removing dollars will hurt our programs immediately. Some of the programs that these educators have are woodland management programs, agriculture programs including discovery farms and the Natural Resource Conservation Service.

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of the Departments 2007-2009 Biennial Budget recommendations and 10% budget cuts.

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter to delete the basin educator cuts.

Mr. Ela stated that the Department is under instruction from the Department of Administration and puts the Department of Natural Resources in a bind. We need to decide where the \$600,000 will come from.

Secretary Hassett stated that we have discussed that possibility. If the NRB starts taking items out of the cuts, then the Department will fall short of the 10% cuts. He doesn't know what DOA's response will be to that.

Mr. Willett stated this is the message he would like to send the message that we don't agree with this exercise.

Mr. Polasek stated that he doesn't know how DOA will respond, but they could still consider these cuts or the other cuts we had seen as potential cuts.

Dr. Thomas will abstain from voting because one of positions is an employee of UWSP will be affected.

Mr. Willett stated that he thinks she should vote.

Mr. Ela stated that he will agree to this amendment if we agree to meet again via conference call if DOA rejects our cuts.

Dr. Thomas stated that the NRB is probably opposed to most of these cuts. Perhaps sending a note with the package that we are opposed to any 10% cut.

Mr. Ela suggested voting on the budget and the 10% cuts as two separate items.

Mr. Willett withdrew the amendment. Mr. Welter agreed.

Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett approval of the Departments 2007-2009 Biennial Budget recommendations. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Dr. Thomas not approve the proposed 10% budget cuts.

Mr. Welter stated there are some things that can be sent over with our expression that it's not appropriate for this Department to cut by 10%.

The motion failed.

Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded Mr. Welter to approve 10% budget cuts.

Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson to approve items 4-8 and 12-15 budget cuts. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

The original motion as amended carried unanimously by all members.

3.A.2. Approval of the 2007-09 Legislative Proposal Package

Paul Heinen, Policy Initiatives Advisor, introduced the 22 legislative proposal package. He distributed the new legislative leadership assignments.

Amber Meyer Smith, Legislative Liaison, presented the Legislative Proposals 2007-09. In the division of Forestry: Creation of Urban Forestry Response Grants, Expansion of the County Forest Administration, Simplification of the Managed Forest Law petition deadline; Customer Assistance and External Relations: Protection of customer email, Alignment of ATV and snowmobile laws regarding operation along a highway Vehicle Advisory Council. Air & Waste: Recycling of Electronic Waste, Recycling Efficiencies, Allow transfer of tax delinquent brownfields without competitive bids, Assign judgment of a tax deed without taking title. Land: Uniform police powers by natural resource officers on non-state park properties, Removal of waterfowl, Preference Points for bobcat, fisher, or otter tags; Resident landowner preference for turkey permit. Water: Wetland, Citizen Monitoring Program Data; Criminalizing falsification of drinking water samples; Criminal penalties would also apply to samples from Public Water Supply systems as well, County/Town Floodplain and Shoreland Permitting; Chapter 31 rewrite related to dams and bridges, Regulatory Reform - Insignificant Discharges, Streamlining procedures for processing variances to water quality standards, Beach tilling on beds of the Great Lakes. Law Enforcement: License qualification requirements for hunting, fishing and trapping guides.

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela approval of the 2007-09 Legislative Proposal Package.

Mr. Ela stated that the NRB needs to figure out a way to setting legislative proposals more systematically.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the NRB is more than a policy NRB. We also supervise the Department.

The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.B. Air, Waste, and Water/Enforcement

3.B.1. Adoption of Board Order CF-13-06, revisions to NR 166, and repeal of NR 127 and NR 160, pertaining to the safe drinking water loan program

Bob Ramharter, Environmental Loans Section, Bureau of Community Financial Assistance, stated that the Department administers the Safe Drinking Water Loan Program under NR 166. The bureau proposed to revise NR 166 to clarify or codify existing policies through revisions to the definitions, project eligibility, engineering report, procurement, financial assistance agreement conditions, records and records retention, priority scoring criteria, and procedure for determining and updating project priority scores sections of the code. In addition, the bureau proposes to add

language to limit the refinancing of local governmental units' existing, long-term debt on projects for which construction has been substantially completed for more than 3 years. Revisions to NR 166 will also eliminate some inconsistencies between NR 162, Clean Water Fund Program, and NR 166, making administration of the two State Revolving Fund programs more efficient. Chapter NR 127 and NR 160 were the rules for grant programs that have been obsolete for more than 10 years due to changes in federal regulations and state statutes. Repealing these codes should eliminate any confusion their existence may cause about available funding programs.

There is no known or probable controversy. In January 2006 the Board authorized the bureau to hold a public hearing on this code revision. The bureau held the public hearing on April 12, 2006.

Dr. Thomas MOVED, seconded by Mr. Clausen adoption of Board Order CF-13-06, revisions to NR 166, and repeal of NR 127 and NR 160, pertaining to the safe drinking water loan program. The motion carried unanimously by all members

3.B.2. Adoption of Board Order WA-30-06, revisions to NR 600 series, related to hazardous waste manifest rules.

Joan Burns, Section Chief, Hazardous Waste Prevention & Management Section Waste Management Bureau stated that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recently promulgated significant revisions to the manifest regulations that went into effect on September 5, 2006. The new EPA regulations require the use of standard manifest forms in all states, and require certification from EPA in order to print the manifest forms. The new federal requirements apply in all states, including Wisconsin but will not override or supersede Wisconsin's state-specific hazardous waste manifest requirements. To prevent legal confusion and potential conflicts with our current manifest rules, they must be revised or the advantages of a single, uniform nationwide rule will be lost.

Businesses and individuals that generate hazardous waste and those that transport, treat, store or dispose of hazardous waste will be affected by the rule. These businesses and individuals are already regulated by current hazardous waste rules and federal regulations.

An emergency order approved by the Board at their meeting in August 2006 revised Wisconsin's manifest rules in time for the September 5, 2006 effective date of the new Federal manifest regulations. WA-30-06 is the parallel permanent manifest rule.

Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Clausen adoption of Board Order WA-30-06, revisions to NR 600 series, related to hazardous waste manifest rules. The motion carried unanimously by all members

3.B.3. Adoption of Board Order LE-23-06, revisions to NR 5, related to boat noise.

Roy Zellmer, Recreation and Safety Warden, Law Enforcement Bureau stated that Section 30.62(2)(b), Stats., limits all boat noise at 86 decibels (dB). At the January 2006 Natural Resources Board meeting, the board heard comments from the public regarding their concerns over boat noise generated by airboats. The Department requested authorization to hold public hearings on a rule to establish new noise level testing procedures due to safety concerns for the public, the boat operator and officers conducting such tests. The rule taken out to public hearing recommended using the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) J1970 testing procedure at a distance of 300 feet from an airboats or similar vessel.

Concerns raised at the public hearings related to the distance at which airboats would be tested and how the test results would correlate to the 50 feet used in the J34a pass-by test, and which test an officer would use in a river which might not be 300 feet wide. There were also concerns about the impact this rule may have on the commercial type airboats (airboat tours), and recreational, fishing and trapping airboat users. Owners of airboats or similar vessels who assist in search and rescue operations were also concerned how this rule may affect their ability to assist governmental agencies with search and rescue. Because the noise generated by airboats comes largely from the air propeller used as the method of propulsion, it is very likely many of the airboats and similar craft in the state may not be in compliance with the current statutorily established 86 dB maximum noise level.

After considered public comments received during the public hearing process and doing additional research on the modified testing procedure, the Department is recommending that when an officer requests a boat operator to conduct a boat noise test under the J1970 shoreline test or the J34a pass-by test method, it will be done at a minimum distance of 100 feet. If the J34a pass-by test is used it will be correlated back to 50 feet by adding 2 dB's to the decibel reading obtained by the test.

To address the issue regarding the use of boats, such as airboats, hovercraft or similar craft used during search and rescue operations, the department has created an exemption for such vessels.

Mr. Ela asked the circumstances of when you would use one test versus the other.

Officer Zellmer stated it is based on environmental conditions. The sound level meter that is used is the same. The J34a test requires the officer to set out buoys for 100 feet. It is not conducive for river conditions. It is more conducive for lake or still water conditions. It is officer discretion which test they use.

Mr. Clausen asked how would you know the throttle speed.

Officer Zellmer stated it is an estimate by the officer based on training and experience.

Public Appearances

1. **Lori Grant**, Madison, The River Alliance stated her organization supports the rule proposed by the Department. She thinks it should be adopted quickly. She asked for education aimed at boat users about these rules, so when someone goes to purchase an airboat they can make an informed decision.

2. **Chris Cass**, Janesville Wisconsin Bowfishers Association, stated that Bowfishers utilize a pusher fan, which is similar to air boats. It is used to troll in weedy waters. They may be inadvertently affected by this rule. The group wasn't invited to the testing session in June and hasn't been kept involved in the rule making process.

Mr. Welter asked if the pusher fan is the same as an airboat.

Mr. Cass stated that there is an outboard motor on the boats. We use the pusher fan for weedy, shallow water. We don't produce a significant amount of noise because we are not traveling at high rates of speed.

Dr. Thomas asked what the issue is, whether or not you will meet the noise requirements.

Mr. Cass stated he doesn't know if their group is adversely affected. They don't know if they can complete the test.

3. **George Meyer**, Madison, Wisconsin Wildlife Federation stated that they have not taken a position on this rule. However, this rule needs to be applied uniformly to all watercraft. Many WWF enjoy the peace and quiet of fishing and are concerned about the noise produced by the airboats. However we understand the role of airboats.

4. **Tim Morgan**, LaCrosse, Upper Mississippi Airboaters Association, stated his association is opposed to the rule. This rule will outlaw airboats in the State of Wisconsin. Airboats are valuable for search and rescue and it is private citizens who perform those search and rescues. He asked the NRB to reconsider these rules.

Mr. Welter asked about retrofitting the airboat with a muffling system.

Mr. Morgan stated there is work being done to quiet airboats. However, they still produce noise.

Dr. Thomas asked if the boat can exceed 86 dpi is it illegal.

Mr. Morgan stated he thinks so. The full throttle testing is almost impossible because you cannot control the boat at full throttle.

Officer Zellmer stated that just because it can exceed 86 dpi it isn't illegal.

Mr. O'Brien stated that this is a difficult rule to understand and it seems to be at the discretion of the officer.

Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Clausen adoption of Board Order LE-23-06, revisions to NR 5, related to boat noise.

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. O'Brien to exclude the J34 test from the rule.

Officer Zellmer stated that the test is used for other types of watercraft such as racing boats. Since this rule is applicable to all motor boats it would prevent us from using the J34 on those types of boats.

Mr. O'Brien stated he has difficulty with the subjective nature of this rule. How do the wardens know for sure if the boats are running at full throttle.

Officer Zellmer stated that it is not our objective to eliminate airboats.

Mr. Willett stated some officers will say that boats are running at full throttle and make boats illegal.

Mr. Welter stated that the range of subjective opinion about what constitutes full throttle is dangerous. The probable cause based on observation.

Officer Zellmer stated the J34 test more for lake situations.

A roll call vote was taken.

Mr. Clausen – No

Mr. Ela – No

Mr. Welter – No

Mr. Willett – Yes

Mr. Poulson - No

Dr. Thomas - No

Mr. O'Brien - Yes

The motion failed 2-5.

Mr. Poulson suggested possibly tabling the rule because of the confusion. He has concerns others will be confused as well.

Mr. Welter stated that he shares the same concerns. We are relying on a warden's perception. He would like to see a clearer rule developed.

Mr. Clausen asked about the J34 and J1970 that are in effect. We are changing the distances.

Officer Zellmer stated there is a field interview in addition to the noise test. These techniques build a case.

Mr. Ela asked for clarification on his understanding that the test and the standard are not being changed. He asked whether he was correct in stating that the only change to existing procedures was to alter the distance from which the test was made, in order to provide greater safety when the test was applied to air boats.

Officer Zellmer stated that is correct.

A roll call vote was taken.

Mr. Clausen – Yes

Mr. Ela – Yes

Mr. Welter – No

Mr. Willett – No

Mr. Poulson - No

Dr. Thomas - Yes

Mr. O'Brien - Yes

The rule passed 4-3 by a roll call vote.

3.B. 4. Request Authorization to hold public hearings on Board Order LE-04-07, related to NR 19.50, establishment of fees for Internet ATV and Snowmobile safety certification programs.

Gary Eddy, ATV/Snowmobile Warden, Law Enforcement Bureau stated that the Department proposes a rule be drafted within NR 19.50 to establish specialized fees for Internet based ATV and snowmobile safety certification programs. An Internet based course currently exists for Boating Education and is successfully utilized. The Department often receives complaints about the availability, location and times that these courses are offered by volunteer instructors. This type of course will provide additional opportunities and convenience for completion, especially for out-of-state residents and adults.

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Dr. Thomas approval of request authorization to hold public hearings on Board Order LE-04-07, related to NR 19.50, establishment of fees for Internet ATV and Snowmobile safety certification programs. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.B.5. Request authorization to hold public hearings on Board Order LE-05-07, related to NR 5.001, establishment of motorboat certificates for temporary filming.

Officer Zellmer stated that the Wisconsin Legislature passed 2005 Wisconsin Act 481 which took effect on June 14th, 2006. This Act exempts boats from the need to pay a fee to be registered and issued a certificate of number when the boat is used exclusively as part of an advertisement being made for the manufacturer of the boat. The department is required under s. 30.52(3g)(a), Stats., to promulgate rules for the issuance of the free certificate of number for such boats. The rule will establish the procedure for applying for issuance of a free 15-day boat registration/certificate of number. This rule will primarily affect persons or businesses that film commercials and shoot photos for advertisements to be used by the manufacturer of the boat. This rule will allow them easier access to Wisconsin's waters for creating such advertisements and commercials. In addition this rule creates three new definitions to clarify terms used in Chapter 30, Wis. Stats. Clarification of these terms will reflect how they have traditionally been interpreted and enforced by the department and will assist the public in understanding the law. This better understanding will help gain compliance with the current law. This rule will clarify the terms "carrying capacity" and "recommended number of persons" as they relate to the information provided on the capacity plate attached to a boat. Section 30.68(9), Stats., states that no person may operate a boat that is loaded with passengers or cargo beyond its safe carrying capacity. Section 30.501, Stats., requires all boats less than 20 feet in length designed to carry 2 or more people and to use a motor shall display a capacity plate which contains the maximum recommended number of persons and the maximum weight of persons, motor, gear, etc., that may be placed aboard the boat. This rule clarifies that neither of these maximums may be exceeded. The term lifeboat is also being clarified for purposes of interpretation of the statutory exemption from registration of a motorboat that is a lifeboat. This rule clarifies that the exemption from registration provided for a lifeboat only applies to a boat used exclusively for the purpose of transporting person(s) from a vessel in distress.

Dr. Thomas MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett approval of request authorization to hold public hearings on Board Order LE-05-07, related to NR 5.001, establishment of motorboat certificates for temporary filming. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.B.6. Request authorization to hold public hearings on Board Order LE-06-07, related to NR 5.18, establishment of mandatory education for boaters renting boats.

Officer Zellmer stated that 2005 Wis. Act 356 was passed into law in May 2006. Provisions of this Act require all persons born after 1-1-1989 and who are at least 16 years of age, to possess a WI DNR approved boating education course certificate before they may operate any motor boat. There was an exception created for a person who is renting/leasing a motorboat if the person providing the boat gives the renter/lesser instruction on how to operate a motorboat in the manner established by the department by rule. A non-statutory provision of Act 356 prohibits the department from enforcing the new mandatory boating education certification requirement until the department first promulgates rules that establish the minimum standards and procedures for the instruction to be given to persons who rent or lease a motorboat. This rule order has been developed to establish the minimum standards and procedures for the instruction to be given under and comply with ss. 30.625 (1) (a) and 30.74 (1) (am), Stats.

The process developed under this rule will allow boat rental businesses to provide the minimum basic training required to for a person who will be renting or leasing and operating a motorboat which they have rented or leased. This rule clarifies the minimum age to be eligible for a temporary boating education training and certification will be 16 years of age and that the certification only applies to the operation of boats that are rented or leased by the holder of the certificate. In addition, this rule establishes the process for administering an exam and issuance of a temporary certificate. Motorboat rental businesses will be required to collect a \$10 fee for the temporary boating education course of instruction and issuance of the certificate. Similar to fees collected for regular boating education certification courses, the person or business providing the training and administering the exam will be allowed to retain up to 50 % of the fee to defray expenses incurred locally to provide the training and issue the temporary certificate. All remaining funds shall be turned in to the department to defray expenses incurred to operate the boating safety program.

Dr. Thomas asked if boat rental operations rent to 16 year old.

Officer Zellmer stated probably not.

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of request authorization to hold public hearings on Board Order LE-06-07, related to NR 5.18, establishment of mandatory education for boaters renting boats. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.C. Land Management, Recreation, and Fisheries/Wildlife

3.C.1. Adoption of Board Order FR-28-06, related to NR 1.25, pertaining to generally accepted forestry management practices.

Darrell Zastrow, Director, Bureau of Forest Services stated that the purpose of the creation of NR 1.25 is to define “generally accepted forestry management practices” as required by s. 823.075(1)(d), as created by 2005 Wisconsin Act 79. The legislation allows the Department to incorporate into the definition, by reference, the most recent version of the Department’s publication “Wisconsin Forest Management Guidelines”. The proposed rule includes procedures for updating the FMG.

Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett adoption of Board Order FR-28-06, related to NR 1.25, pertaining to generally accepted forestry management practices.. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.C.2. Approval of the Ice Age Trail Corridor Master Plan for Kewaunee, Manitowoc, and Sheboygan Counties

Peter Biermeier, Trails and External Relations Section Chief, Park and Recreation Bureau, stated that this plan looks to establish and expand the Ice Age National Scenic Trail in Kewaunee, Manitowoc and Sheboygan Counties. The planning process has been a 4 year collaborative effort between the Department, the National Park Service, the Bay Lake Regional Planning Commission and the Ice Age Park and Trail Foundation. Together, these partners have worked to develop a proposed trail corridor that will pass through state wildlife areas, a natural area, fishery lands, a state forest, 8 cities, 21 villages, and 23 townships. In addition, it is proposed that the Kewaunee River section of the Ahnapee Trail be used as part of this corridor.

Jeff Prey, Program and Planning Analyst, Parks and Recreation Bureau stated that currently there are just 5.3 miles of existing Ice Age Trail in the proposed corridor. This plan recommends establishing up to an additional 125 miles of trail. Estimated costs for acquisition and development within the three counties of the trail's proposed corridor are estimated at just under \$5.4 million. In actuality, these costs may be less depending upon the amount of easements, gifts and donations that may be gathered during the trail construction process.

An extensive public participation process entailed four sets of public meetings and mailings to over 6,000 landowners within the corridor. Overall, positive support was shown for establishment of the trail corridor. Examples of this support include Resolutions of Support from the Village of Mishicot, City of Two Rivers and the City of Manitowoc.

The goal of the National Park Service, the Ice Age Park and Trail Foundation and the Department is to acquire, develop, operate, maintain, and protect, through public and private partnerships, the Ice Age National Scenic Trail.

Mr. Clausen MOVED, seconded by Dr. Thomas approval of the Ice Age Trail Corridor Master Plan for Kewaunee, Manitowoc, and Sheboygan Counties.

Mr. Ela complimented the Department on the plan.

The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.C.3. Approval of Wisconsin Whooping Crane Management Plan

Beth Goodman, Whooping Crane Coordinator, Endangered Resources Bureau stated that the Wisconsin Whooping Crane Management Plan is a guidance tool specific to released and wild-hatched cranes for use by individuals and groups charged with maintaining habitat quality, assessing state population goals, monitoring and managing crane activities, addressing landowner

needs, developing ecotourism opportunities, and educating the public. In this Plan, management strategies and protocol recommendations have been developed to maintain a high level of protection and ensure future success of whooping cranes in Wisconsin, while considering the needs and interests of state citizens and communities.

DNR and other members of the Whooping Crane Eastern Partnership (WCEP), a group of nine government and private sector organizations, are restoring a second self-sustaining migratory population. This Management Plan is intended to help achieve that mission and bring the whooping crane closer to delisting from the Federal List of Threatened and Endangered Species. The Plan is designed for Wisconsin but may be adopted or used as a template by other states. **Jim Hook**, International Crane Foundation, gave a brief history of the International Crane Foundation. He stated that their role in the process is providing genetically sound birds and provide education to the public regarding the project. He supports the Wisconsin Whooping Crane Management Plan.

John Christian, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, explained the regulatory side of the reintroduction of Whooping Cranes. The Wisconsin Whooping Crane Management Plan provides a prescription to continue the reintroduction and growth of the Whooping Crane flock. He supports the plan.

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela approval of Wisconsin Whooping Crane Management Program. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.C.4. Land Acquisition, Statewide Natural Areas, Florence, Oneida, and Vilas Counties

Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of Board of Commissioner Land Acquisition, Statewide Natural Areas, Florence, Oneida, and Vilas Counties. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.C.5. Land Sale, Willow Flowage, Oneida County

Mr. Ela asked if there were any forestry standards or requirements with the land sale. **Richard Steffes**, Real Estate Director stated that DNR legal staff is working with the Board of Commissioners on an easement. The Board of Commissioners will have the land deed, but then grant an easement to the Department for recreation and keeping the land in sustainable forestry. He will provide a copy to the NRB at a later date.

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of Board of Commissioner Land Sale, Willow Flowage, Oneida County contingent on a sustainable forestry component in the easement. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.C.6. Land Acquisition, White River Fishery Area, Bayfield County

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela approval of Land Acquisition, White River Fishery Area, Bayfield County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.C.7. Land Donation, Statewide Natural Areas, Bayfield County

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of Land Donation, Statewide Natural Areas, Bayfield County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.C.8. Easement Donation, Statewide Natural Area, Door County.

Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett approval of Easement Donation, Statewide Natural Area, Door County.

Mr. Ela stated that there was a previous donation from the Nature Conservancy to the County. His wife was involved in the transaction, but since neither she nor the Nature Conservancy will benefit, he will vote on the transaction.

The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.C.9. Easement Donation, Statewide Natural Area, Sauk County

Dr. Thomas MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett approval of Easement Donation, Statewide Natural Area, Sauk County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.C.10. Approval of 2007 Bear Quotas

Keith Warnke, Wildlife Biologist, Wildlife Management Bureau stated that the preliminary bear harvest total for 2006 was 2,930. That is above the quota established last year of 2,525. Recommended quotas for 2007 were determined by using the department's bear population model to assess the effects of various harvest levels relative to the current population estimate. When Tribal harvest declarations are received, we will incorporate that information along with harvest history to determine the final number of permits to be issued. The department recommends the 2007 bear harvest quotas as listed:

Zone	Quota	Permits
A	1,000	1,680
A1	550	550
B	500	615
C	600	1,560
Total	2,650	4,405

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Dr. Thomas approval of 2007 Bear Quotas. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

Mr. Poulson asked about a situation in Sawyer County on Mike Roberson's farm where 46 bears were removed from his land on agriculture damage permits and the people removing them were not allowed to keep any of the bears.

Mr. Warnke stated that is a decision made by the local wildlife biologist because there are so many bears being removed on agriculture damage permits in Sawyer County. He will investigate the matter and get back to Mr. Poulson with more details.

3.C.11. Request authorization to hold public hearing for Board Order WM-10-07, related to NR 10 pertaining to 2007 antlerless deer season.

Mr. Warnke, stated that the Department recommends that the Board authorize public hearing on the rule proposal to remove the 1 year sunset on the statewide 4-day antlerless only December gun hunt, amend the special youth gun deer hunt event, and implement housekeeping changes included to correct drafting errors in the original Deer Rule 2006.

The 4-day antlerless only December hunt starting the second Thursday after Thanksgiving in Deer Management Units north of Hwy 8 was limited to a 1-year trial in 2006. In order for the December gun hunt to continue after this year north of Hwy 8, the Department must modify administrative code through the rule process.

During the 1-year trial, the Department will collect data to evaluate the effectiveness of the herd control under this structure and to assess whether the December gun hunt impacts snowmobile recreational opportunity.

The Department is requesting authorization to hold public hearings on removing the 1-year sunset on this December deer hunt for fall 2007.

The rule language authorizing the special youth gun deer hunt event is modified in this package to clarify Earn-a-buck and CWD tagging requirements during the event. This rule order also includes several housekeeping changes pertaining to deer hunting in several state parks.

Mr. Ela asked when the Department will come back to the NRB with the results of the harvest and whether or not the harvest quotas were reached.

Mr. Warnke stated that would be at the March meeting.

Mr. Clausen MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of request authorization to hold public hearing for Board Order WM-10-07, related to NR 10 pertaining to 2007 antlerless deer season. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

4. Citizen Participation – 1:00 p.m.

4.A. Citizen Recognition
None.

4.B. Citizen Participation

4.B.1. **Jack King**, Manitowish Waters, President of Manitowish Chain Defense Fund and the Manitowish Waters Lake Association stated he is opposed to the proposed changes to Manitowish Waters Rest Lake Dam Operation. He presented a petition signed by over 12,000 citizens who also oppose the changes. He described the drying up of wetlands and creeks due to the draw downs. He is disappointed in the Department's handling of this situation.

Mr. Willett asked why the DNR is pushing the issue.

Mr. Ambs stated that the lake management level concerns and the amount of water in the river below the dam for sturgeon spawning.

Mr. Willett asked about the sturgeon population

Mr. Ambs stated that the levels are not high enough below the dam.

Mr. Willett asked if a social impact study has been done.

Mr. Ambs stated that the proposed water levels aren't going to significantly affect summer water levels.

Mr. O'Brien asked if the water levels above the dam have been consistent over the past 70 years.

Mr. Ambs stated no it has not been consistent.

4.B.2. **Michael Fitzpatrick**, Attorney Janesville, representing the township of Manitowish Waters and the Manitowish Chain Defense Fund from the firm Brennan, Steil & Basting, stated there is a letter from the company that manages the dam who expresses concerns and that the Department's proposal are not feasible. Lac du Flambeau tribal members have concerns about rice beds and walleye populations. There are some endangered fish species that the Department hasn't studied yet. The flow of the water is a bigger concern than the level of the water. The Department has not studied the economic affects.

Mr. Willett asked if an environmental impact study was requested.

Mr. Fitzpatrick stated we haven't gotten to that point yet.

Mr. Willett asked what he would like the NRB to do.

Mr. Fitzpatrick asked that the NRB stop the process.

Mr. O'Brien asked if the lakes will be separated if the levels are lowered, rather than being a chain of lakes.

Mr. Ambs stated that we disagree with the assessment. Perhaps once every eight years that will happen.

Mr. Willett asked if the clients would be willing to help pay for the cost of the environmental impact statement.

Mr. Fitzpatrick stated he didn't know.

4.B.3. **Phil Hahn**, Viroqua, Wisconsin P.L. 566 Coalition, Dams in Wisconsin, gave a brief history of dam management in Wisconsin. He asked the Department for rehabilitation and restoration of dam structures. Federal funding is uncertain at best. State assistance is required to maintain the dams. He invited the NRB to the National Watershed Coalition 10th Watershed Conference May 20-23, 2007.

4.B.4. **Greg Holt**, Manitowish Waters, Friends of Manitowish Waters, Rest Dam, stated he thinks the Department has followed the statutory authority requirements. The sturgeons need higher water levels below the dam to spawn. He supports the Department's proposal.

Mr. Willett asked if his organization would be willing to assist with the environmental impact study.

Mr. Holtz stated he would have to discuss it with his members.

5. Board Members' Matters

Mr. Ela requested an energy and global warming strategy from the Department. He would like a report about where state government and where the Department is on addressing this problem.

Mr. Willett announced that he would resign as of noon January 24th. He has been on the NRB for 15 years. He thinks the NRB inherited a great DNR. It is the best DNR in the world. In the past 16 years there have been many successes including whooping cranes, turkeys, waterfowl, elk restoration with kudos to Dr. Thomas, youth hunts, wolves, safe hunting, hunting education, wardens, fish harvests, dams, trout stream habitat, hatcheries, increase in water designations, wetland restoration, air emission reductions, oil clean-up, recycling. There are future challenges to face including sandhill cranes, deer populations, wolves, etc. He is concerned about the survival of the NRB. The NRB is an important part of the process and must maintain independence. Gov. Doyle stated he would support the appt. of the Secretary to the NRB. The Department is responsible to the Secretary. The NRB needs to have input in, if not the authority to appoint and then the approval of the Secretary. He reiterated the need for airplane use and other resources that allow the NRB to do their job.

6. Special Committees' Reports

None

7. Department Secretary's Matters

7.A. Retirement Resolutions

7.A.1. Jerilyn Dahmen

7.A.2. John R. Christian

7.A.3. Jack S. Tritt

7.A.4. Dale L. Ziege

Mr. Clausen MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of the retirement resolutions. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

7.B. Donations

7.B.1. The Natural Resources Foundation of Wisconsin, Inc. will donate \$9,000 to the Endangered Resources Program to fund a marketing effort to raise awareness of the Endangered Resources Fund.

Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Dr. Thomas approval of the \$9,000 donation from the Natural Resources Foundation. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

8. Information Items

8.A. Land Management, Recreation and Fisheries/wildlife

8.A.1. Summary of the 2005-2010 Wisconsin Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP)

Mr. Prey stated that the Wisconsin Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) assesses current trends and issues with Wisconsin outdoor recreation. The Department is the state agency authorized by the Governor to represent and act for the state in administration of the Federal Land and Water Conservation Funds (LWCF) Program, and has prepared this plan since 1965. Preparation of the SCORP has been required for Wisconsin to be eligible for LWCF funding plus this is used as a tool for allocation of state stewardship funds. Plan contents and format are shaped by the planning guidelines set by the LWCF Act. The major requirements of the plan are: comprehensiveness, an evaluation of the demand and supply of outdoor recreation resources and facilities in the state, a wetlands priority component, a program for implementation of the plan, ample public participation in the planning process, and a description of the process and methodology used to create the plan. To aid recreation providers in developing an adequate supply of recreational lands and facilities, and to promote the conservation of important natural resources, this SCORP presents several goals and actions. These include understanding and managing the growing issue of Wisconsin outdoor recreation conflicts; to continue to provide Wisconsin outdoor recreation and educational programming; to continue to provide and enhance public access to Wisconsin recreational lands and waters; to understand the threats and opportunities of Wisconsin's developing

December 5-6, 2006 Minutes

urban areas and areas of rapid population growth; and to promote Wisconsin outdoor recreation as a means to better health and wellness for state citizens.

The meeting adjourned at 4:06 p.m.