**WCC Secretary Meeting Minutes**

**Wisconsin Conservation Congress**  
**Meeting Minutes**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDER OF BUSINESS</th>
<th>01/14/2020</th>
<th>3:30 PM</th>
<th>Conference Call</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

### A. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order by Larry Bonde at 3:35 PM

### B. ROLL CALL

**ATTENDEES**  
Bonde, Blattler, Maas (3:45 PM), Weiss. 
Zimmermann and Brad Ray DNR fisheries.

**EXCUSED**  
Rohrig Motion by Weiss second by Blattler to approve. Motion carried.

**UNEXCUSED**  
Guests Jerome Donahoe and Brad Heath

### C. Agenda approval and repair

**Bonde**

**DISCUSSION**  
Larry asked to vary the order of business in order to accommodate staff.

**ACTION**  
Motion by Weiss second by Blattler to adjust agenda as needed. Motion carried.  
Secretaries note: the minutes reflect the order of the public agenda, but not necessarily the order in which taken.

### D. Public comment

**DISCUSSION**  
None.

**ACTION**

## II. INFORMATION & ACTION ITEMS

The Executive Committee will review the Natural Resources Boards January 21-22, 2020.

### A. agenda.

**DISCUSSION**  
Larry reviewed the NRB agenda and the following items were addressed by the Executive Committee:

- On the request for approval of department recommendations for the 2020 bear harvest quotas. It was stated that the WCC bear committee had reviewed this and approved the propose recommendations. Motion by Blattler second by Weiss to share the WCC position with the NRB. Motion carried.
- The department requests approval of the 2020-2030 Wisconsin Waterfowl Management Plan. Larry stated that this plan was worked on for some time and there were WCC delegates representing other organizations but that an official position for some reason wasn't taken by our migratory committee. Larry did contact Paul Gentzleman who is the vice chairman of the migratory committee, he stated that from time to time discussion would happen at committee meetings but there was no formal recommendation by the migratory committee and he thought it would be appropriate to support the 10 year plan. Paul stated that by the end of the review, that all stakeholders seem to be reasonably satisfied with the outcome of the management plan. Dale asked if from this conversation with Paul if he thought it was prudent for the executive committee to act on behalf of the migratory or should we step back from this? Larry stated that Paul thought it was important that the WCC have a position. Motion by Maas second by Weiss to approve the 2020-2030 Wisconsin Waterfowl Management Plan. Motion carried. Dale questioned some of the eight items that the NRB was proposing to put on the spring hearing. Many times we have been told that some of our questions were not relevant or poorly conceived. His concern had to do with a series of questions having to do with use of non-toxic shot or bullets on state owned or manage properties. While on the surface this seems to be a continuation in a logical manner they are now including wild turkeys slugs and ammunition including four small game in the question. He feels that the NRB would be better served on the input that they get if they define exactly where they're trying to go with this. He feels that for waterfall it's a good issue and we currently have adopted that. The concern is we don't shoot deer over water and if we shoot with a shotgun slug or a rifle bullet the general public might not get all the information prior to stating their position. The other issue was, he has done some additional investigation on the cost of non-toxic shot and ammunition and although he is not trying to read more into the question than it stated they're talking about for example small game which could be squirrels on state manage properties a box of 50 22 long rifle bullets if you can find them are going for over $19.00 a box, non-toxic turkey loads in boxes of five in a 12 gauge three-inch shell are going for any where between $1.80 to $3 apiece if you can find them. Another example is a 270 rifle bullet 20 to a box is somewhere between $33 and $45 which equals to be approximately $1.80 a piece. Now the cost is certainly a consideration to some people if it's good for the environment and needs to be discussed further that's fine, but he feels that more background information should be available to the general public before the NRB asked them to give their opinion on these questions.
**Executive Committee**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.</strong> Finalize WCC Spring Hearing questions</td>
<td>Zimmermann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

Kari stated that there was additional information from the department pertaining to the Great Lakes committee approved question. It is listed as question 13 on the handout dealing with Bayfield County's resolution (160119). Fisheries department representative Brad Ray gave a brief explanation of what was going on in that area and that this was a long-standing discussion based on the needs of the local area fisherman. He also cautioned not one of the reasons for this coming back to be discussed was that in further review of this, there was a concern that the Federal Fish hatchery which is located upstream from the proposed dam removal could cause a hazard since VHS has been identified in Lake Superior. He explained that working with the partners who share this resource he was getting some push back and concern.

Dale questioned why this information wasn't brought forward at the committee meeting nor the DLC meeting when the question was approved for questionnaire. In the question that outlined the proposed goals for this fish passage it states work with stakeholders to identify and implement strategies that protect, support and enhance the diversity, sustainability and viability of Lake Superior fishery for state and tribal support, commercial and subsistence fishing. It also talks about doing this through controls, management and mitigation of future threats and identifying strategies to coordinate with stakeholders to improve Lake Superior fisheries.

Further discussion identified that though this was a non-binding request of the WCC that additional information pertaining to the department's issues with the timeframe for testing for VHS in the Iron River should be included in the informational part of the question.

Kari stated she would draft some additional language to be included in the question and circulated for approval.

Motion by Maas second by Blatter to add additional information to the Great Lakes question. Weiss questioned what the other state feel about VHS in Lake Superior. Joe stated that there are many rivers in Minnesota, Michigan and Canada along with Wisconsin and what are they doing and how they feel about it. They already have fish runs in the existing rivers. He does not understand why this is now an issue. This has been noted to be in the lake for many many years and to his knowledge had not been a voiced issue for quite some time. Wisconsin's position was that this is the largest tributary to the superior in Wisconsin. Brad stated that they are working to finalize a master plan in the next year or two to address some of those concerns.

After additional discussion the motion was approved.

Kari stated that there was concern on question number five (720519) under the resolution, regulations would be changing the size limit to take effect the first Monday in March. She believes that per statute it has to start on a Saturday on inland waters. She had a discussion with Joe and he was going to back to the author of the resolution to see if he had any flexibility by changing it wording it differently so that it actually took place according to legislative rule.

WCC question 32. (450119) there was a question about the intent for better understanding. Kari stated she would call Scott Gunderson and get clarification on the question.

Tony mentioned a small typo in question 29 for housekeeping purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.</strong> Conservation Congress administrative housekeeping (no action will be taken)</td>
<td>Zimmermann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

Kari stated that the discussion at the DLC meeting having to do with changing two of the titles (public relations and historian) needed to be something other than delegate four and five. It was decided to use the terminology executive committee member which is consistent to what the NRB uses for non-named officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. MEMBERS MATTERS</strong></td>
<td>Battler—none Weiss—none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

Dale commented that once again we can be better by having additional information available to our standing committees. Based on the discussion previously about information given to the Great Lakes committee and the additional action taken today he is requesting that when questions come in from Lake Superior that we have somebody in attendance that is fully versed on the topic to give our committees the needed information. This is not just for one committee and we all know that some of our committees only meet once a year. He feels that we are doing a disservice to the members of the public that present questions, take the time to attend meetings to present their resolutions, attend committee meetings and if successful
attend and follow DLC meetings. This year he contacted his department liaison in an effort to get additional information on the Lake Superior question and other issues pertaining to the lake. This does not set well with the general public, does not sit well with the standing committees and needs to be addressed. Chair Bonde agreed.

There was a motion by Weiss second by Blattler to adjourn.

Bonde-none
Zimmermann-none

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Information only. No action taken. Motion by Weiss second by Blattler to adjourn. Motion carried.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### IV. ADJOURNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING ADJOURNED</th>
<th>4:30 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitted By</td>
<td>Dale C Maas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01/20/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>