

# Wisconsin Conservation Congress

## Rule Simplification Committee

### Meeting Minutes



ORDER OF BUSINESS	9/26/2015	9:30 AM	Stevens Point Public Library
-------------------	-----------	---------	------------------------------

#### I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

##### A. CALL TO ORDER

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER BY	Eugene Altwies at 9:31 AM
----------------------------	---------------------------

##### B. ROLL CALL

ATTENDEES	Frank Pratt, Roger Roehl, Jim Heffner, Tom Johnston, Von Liebrecht, Steven Ninneman, Andy Geiger, Paul Reith, Eugene Altwies Matt O'Brien
EXCUSED	Curtis Youngbauer, Pearl Holmstadt, David Ninneman, Dan Cichantek
UNEXCUSED	Walter Roberts, Doug Williams
GUESTS	None

##### C. AGENDA APPROVAL/REPAIR

DISCUSSION	Roehl submitted a second resolution to be added regarding food plots.
ACTION	Motion to append as C. 8. in agenda by Geiger second by Pratt. Motion carried.

##### D. REVIEW COMMITTEE MISSION STATEMENT

DISCUSSION	Altwies presented the goal of the committee. S. Ninneman raised concerns with the process stated in the mission/goal. Part of the challenge is the frustration with resolutions being sent to other committees as which were rejected.
ACTION	S. Ninneman moved to remove "that will be sent to other Advisory Committees for their consideration" and append "and resource management" to the end of the statement. Second by Johnston. Motion Carried  The goal of this committee is to develop rule simplification ideas. The ideas should reduce complexity, increase opportunity, and eliminate regulations and policies that are obstacles for hunters, trappers, anglers, and resource management.

##### E. PUBLIC COMMENTS

DISCUSSION	None
ACTION	

#### II. INFORMATION & ACTION ITEMS

##### A. UPDATE FOR 2014 RSI STATUS

ALTWIES

DISCUSSION	Altwies presented the 15 items from last year. One has advanced from committee.
------------	--

One partially advanced but was referred back to this committee.  
13 have failed to progress or have been rejected.

Several members expressed frustration with the lack of progress for resolutions.

S. Ninneman pointed out that the Shooting Sports committee actions went directly to the executive council for the spring questionnaire.

Johnston positioned that the committee has been made subordinate to standing committees, rather than operating in parallel.

Reith stated that the process as defined currently is the slowest process in the WCC by adding a year to the process, and this is not in the spirit of the directive from the governor.

O'Brien covered the challenge in the intersection of topic committees and process committees (e.g. Rule Simplification and Legislative.) This is a structural issue for the congress.

Several comments were made around the challenge of getting appropriate visibility and discussion within the topic committees, notably around situations where the committee claimed to not have any information related to their agenda item.

Reith suggested that it is the responsibility of the respective chair to properly prepare their agenda for the meeting and ensure they have the information necessary.

Johnston reiterated the desire to improve the resolution process flow to be more like a parallel process to the topic committees, instead of submitted to the topic committees.

S Ninneman moves that the Rule Simplification Committee recommends to the Executive Council that all Rule Simplification Ideas are directly voted on by the Executive Council for advancement as a Resolution on the Spring Hearing Questionnaire.  
Second by Heffner

Discussion on the motion covered prior precedent of potential actions, what authority this committee has over the process proposal, value of the output of this committee,

Motion Carries

Motion by S Ninneman to re-forward the following resolutions from 2014 to the Executive Council.

1. Archery License Simplification
2. Change DMU Boundaries
3. Deer Hunting License Simplification
4. Eliminate Fish Zones
5. One Fish Refuge Date, Statewide
6. Act 21 Rule Changes
7. Trapping Changes, Consolidate Dates Statewide
8. Cottontail Rabbit and Ruffed Grouse Seasons
9. Eliminate "Artificials Only" restriction from Trout Regs
10. Reduce the number of rejected resolutions

Second by Heffner

Discussion focused consistently on the opinion many of these did not get sufficient review, or that topic committees did not review the RSI in the spirit of this committee.

Ninneman spoke to the research he had done to verify that there would be minimal scientific impact for consolidation of grouse and rabbit season dates.

Specifically, the "Artificials Only" restriction was noted in the discussion to be primarily a social issue, with little biological impact. Pratt, Ninneman, and Johnston noted the low level of enforcement actions, ambiguity of certain products on the market, and application to only 6% of the resource. Johnston stated those factors make compliance and enforcement difficult for anglers and DNR Law Enforcement.

Pratt noted that as a social issue, these are the items most eligible for simplification, and not a valuable tool for science-based resource management.

Altwies stated that idea 10, Reduce the number of rejected resolutions, wasn't properly received because of the title, and should be moved to Member's Matters for adjustment.

Ninneman accepted moving this item to members matters for rewording as a friendly amendment

Motion Carries

**ACTION**

1. Recommend to the Executive Council that all Rule Simplification Ideas are directly voted on by

	the Executive Council for advancement as a Resolution on the Spring Hearing Questionnaire. 2. Resubmit 9 2014 Rule Simplification Ideas
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
Altwies	10/26/2015

**A. BAIT MINNOW SEINING**

**PRATT**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Motion to advance by Ninneman Second by Heffner</p> <p>Pratt noted that he would like to know what and why as results from this idea are captured moving forward.</p> <p>O'Brien noted that the current minnow regulations are difficult to enforce. From an enforcement standpoint, there is a challenge in anglers understanding what defines a watershed, and while usage would be simplified, there would not be a simplification in enforcement.</p> <p>General comments followed that overall the regulations are very restrictive in Wisconsin. Pratt pointed out that increased cost of certified minnows from out of state decreased opportunity for anglers.</p> <p>Motion carried</p>
<b>ACTION</b>	Forward to Executive Council
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
Altwies	10/26/2015

**B. BASE LICENSE**

**NINNEMAN**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Motion to advance by Heffner Second by Johnston</p> <p>Ninneman shared that his goal is to increase overall revenue for habitat in natural resources. Roehl discussed the allocation of patron funds for different resource needs, and that the survey of usage directs where the available funds go. Pratt positioned that making a more general funding source could cause funding to shift to different resources, and not in a way preferred by the author. Johnston shares concern for redirection of funds.</p> <p>Motion failed</p>
<b>ACTION</b>	None
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

**C. BEAR TAG LOTTERY**

**TUPA**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Motion to advance by Geiger Second by Roehl.</p> <p>Reith noted that while there was no specific reason to oppose this change in method, it didn't increase opportunity.</p> <p>Motion carried</p>
<b>ACTION</b>	Forward to Executive Council
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
Altwies	10/16/2015

**D. BAN BAITING AND FEEDING**

**ROEHL**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Motion to postpone indefinitely by Roehl Second by Johnston</p> <p>Roehl and Geiger pointed out the other actions (including 2014 RSI) that are in progress through the WCC. O'Brien noted differentiation of the various actions, and that each requires legislation, no matter the timeframe or extent of the proposed ban.</p>
-------------------	--

	Motion carried
<b>ACTION</b>	Idea postponed until further notice
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

**A. UNLIMITED DEER ANTLERLESS PERMITS**

**OGDEN**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Motion to reject by Ninneman Second by Geiger</p> <p>Ninneman noted that the price was very low, at \$2, not valuing the resource Geiger stated that separating public and private has added more control that is needed Altwhies, Ninneman, and O'Brien noted that this doesn't increase opportunity as many of these zones have several hundred tags left to purchase.</p> <p>Motion carried</p>
<b>ACTION</b>	None
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

**B. LICENSE SALES**

**WURZ**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Motion to advance by Ninneman Second by Johnston</p> <p>O'Brien reviewed some numbers of actual sales vs available in each region from the DNR website. Johnston asked if current situation is still a necessary method. No one in the room could predict that the turkey population would continue to grow well in the future, and consistently outstrip demand. Reith stated that although the system as-is made it difficult to match to his schedule, there is still sufficient demand to sell out certain weeks with the initial sale. Demand may yet exceed supply if the structure significantly changed.</p> <p>Motion failed</p>
<b>ACTION</b>	None
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

**A. SPRING HUNTING SEASON STRUCTURE -**

**WURZ**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Motion to advance by Ninneman Second by Johnston</p> <p>Roehl stated that the concern with a weekly structure spreads out the pressure on the resource. Ninneman noted that with the trend of increasing tag numbers available, multiple zones are currently available for purchase. Roehl noted that hunters could purchase leftover permits to hunt additional weeks. Heffner relayed personal experience that the turkeys overwintered well in the north Liebzeit noted the safety concerns of a single season and the increase of hunters in the field Roehl and Geiger noted high overall satisfaction with the current season structure, which has been confirmed in hunter surveys.</p> <p>Motion failed</p>
<b>ACTION</b>	None

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

**A. FOOD PLOTS - ROEHL**

DISCUSSION	<p>Motion to advance by Reith Second by Pratt</p> <p>Ninneman shared that it's frustrating that doing anything in a feed plot, even driving a truck through it to knock it down, is prohibited. Mowing, discing, etc. is prohibited. O'Brien stated that the current regulation of standing, or in the 4 stages of normal ag operation are generally direct to enforce, and food plots in the larger context of baiting and feeding continues to be a growing issue. Reith clarified the question of enforcement; shredding of a corn field, then supplementing with shelled corn or cobs would be possible and very difficult to enforce without witnessing the act of supplementing. O'Brien confirmed this would be one example of a difficult situation for Law Enforcement staff.</p> <p>Motion failed</p>	
	ACTION	None
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE		DEADLINE

**III. MEMBERS MATTERS**

DISCUSSION	<p><b>Altwies: Reduce the number of rejected resolutions idea:</b> Motion to advance by Johnston as: Improve the quality of resolutions submitted by offering a review process. Second by Heffner</p> <p>Altwies: discussed the annual desire to provide better quality resolutions and better review of the resolutions for the spring hearings. Reduce the number of duplicate or improperly formatted resolutions is the intent, not to stifle creativity or diversity of well-prepared resolutions.</p> <p>Proposed change to recommended action: "Draft resolutions to be presented at the WCC Spring Hearings should be submitted to a county's WCC delegation prior to the hearing date of the county.</p> <p>WCC delegates will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure all delegates within the county are aware of submissions received.</li> <li>• Assist authors to develop a high-quality final resolution, following the spirit of the mission and vision of the WCC.</li> <li>• Ensure each resolution is unique, and work with authors to eliminate duplication." <p>Liebzeit noted that there might be challenges at the county level with impartiality that may impact review, and discourage resolutions. Consensus was found overall that the desire is to improve the quality of the resolutions for higher success and better action directives</p> <p>Motion Carried</p> <p>Altwies: Concerned about the lower quantity of RSI submissions and the hope that more quality ideas are out there. Calls on the committee to deliver more ideas. Ninneman shared that it seems the Department staff are less willing to propose changes from their experience in 2015. Johnston stated that 2014 results do not make a good story for encouraging individuals to go through the efforts of simplification efforts.</p> </li></ul>

	<p>Heffner: Good assembly of people with good skills. We all need to focus on results and improve the results of this committee's efforts.</p> <p>Pratt: Very saddened about the death of his old agency unit, but encouraged that local level input could improve and replace the losses in leadership.</p> <p>Ninneman: Good discussion, good group on this committee.</p>
<b>ACTION</b>	Resubmit the resolution process suggestion.

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

<b>MEETING ADJOURNED</b>	<b>2:18 PM</b>
<b>SUBMITTED BY</b>	<b>Paul Reith</b>
<b>DATE</b>	<b>9/26/2015</b>