

Public Action Team Implementation Proposal

Action Team: Team Name	Section Name –Letter.#
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Draft <input type="checkbox"/> Submitted	Deer Trustee Report Page #

This document shows the original Deer Trustee Report recommendation that the Public Action Team considered when developing proposals for implementing the recommendation in Wisconsin. The Public Action Team's implementation proposal is then presented followed by a brief summary by the WDNR.

I. ORIGINAL DEER TRUSTEE REPORT RECOMMENDATION

Text from DTR

II. PUBLIC ACTION TEAM PROPOSAL FOR IMPLEMENTING THE ABOVE RECOMMENDATION

Below is the Public Action Team implementation proposal along with their rationale and supporting evidence, potential implementation obstacles and consideration of the proposal's potential impact on the overall deer management in Wisconsin.

1. Action Team Implementation Proposal:

- The committee endorses aggregation of DMUs which have similar habitat, overwinter goals, etc..., where 1 to 7 DMUs are aggregated (with less aggregation in the north), to be reviewed every 3 years. (8/9 support, 1 prefers current system).
- The team endorses the recommendation in principle. (8/9, 1 says no change)
- Counties as DMUs (8/9, do not support, 1 abstain, based on insufficient discussion)
- Reduce DMUs by aggregating current DMUs to maintain continuity with historical data
- Team disagrees with DTR Rules and Regulations Team's recommendation for A.5. as of 7/20/2013, given concern about the flexibility to manage at appropriate scales (e.g., address CWD) (9/9 support)
- Implementation recommendations:
 - Consider reducing the number of DMUs where appropriate and in consultation with scientists and citizen deer research advisory committee (team recommended the deer research advisory committee in a previous recommendation), incorporating public input and similar deer habitat and populations (9/9 support).
 - If considering reducing the number of DMUs, clearly define goals, functional relationship (sensitivity to change in deer population), and cost-benefit of proposed reduction (see alignment with metrics discussed in A.4.). (9/9 support)
 - Maintain DMU boundaries that are recognizable in the field, avoiding county lines (9/9 support).

2. Supporting data, references, rationale and other information behind it.

- Aggregating DMUs, using historic boundaries, preserves historical wildlife data.
- Aggregating DMUs can improve precision of estimates.
- Too much aggregation will impinge on management of CWD, or other management issues that may arise.

3. Consider and describe potential implementation obstacles or drawbacks.

- May be counterintuitive to many hunters' perspectives and expectations, and thus not supported.



2013 Deer Trustee Report
Public Action Team Implementation Proposal

4. Overall, how will this proposal simplify or complicate deer hunting, management, or research in Wisconsin.

- Boundary confusions, but may be short-term.

DRAFT