

View the February 2013 Agenda, information briefs (green sheets) on each item, and other meeting materials at: <http://dnr.wi.gov/about/nrb/2013/February/feb-2013-NRB-agenda.html>

NATURAL RESOURCES BOARD

MINUTES

A special meeting of the Natural Resources Board was held on Tuesday, February 26, 2013 in Room G09, State Natural Resources Building (GEF 2), Madison, Wisconsin. The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. for action on items 1 and 2. The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Organizational Matters

Chair Cole thanked Dr. Clausen for the time he spent as chair and certainly guiding him through the process these past couple of weeks as well as Dr. Thomas. Thank you, your insights have been absolutely wonderful.

Chair Cole then thanked Board Liaison Laurie Ross who over the last two weeks had responded to and dealt with approximately 3,000 citizen comments and requests for the Board.

Dr. Thomas stated she needs a big hand. (Applause)

Chair Cole stated we ended up doing was moving the agenda around since Wednesday was going to be busy. He thanked his fellow Board Members for their patience. The Board looks forward to hearing from the public for the next couple of days; approximately 77 people we will be listening to. We look forward to the opportunity to hear what they have to say which will add value to the Board's conversation.

1.A. Calling the roll

William Bruins – present via conference call

Christine Thomas – present Jane Wiley – present

Terry Hilgenberg – present David Clausen – present

Greg Kazmierski – present Preston Cole – present

1.B. Approval of agenda for February 26-27, 2013

Dr. Clausen MOVED approval, seconded by Mr. Bruins. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Action Items

2.A. Air, Waste, Water, and Enforcement – None

2.B. Land Management, Recreation, Fisheries, and Wildlife

2.B.1 Remand of Dane County Circuit Court Case No. 12-CV-3188 for Natural Resources Board decision whether to undertake further rulemaking regarding using dogs to hunt wolves

Chair Cole requested that Attorney Andryk take his place at the podium. He had asked Attorney Andryk to frame the issue for the Board. There are some recommendations in that if folks are so inclined to move an item to do so after we hear from Attorney Andryk and the public. He reassured the public that today is about mutual respect. You talk, we listen. We want to be able to give you three minutes to say what you have to say. His fellow Board Members will be all ears. If they have questions for you, they will ask those questions. This is not a pep rally. What will not be tolerated are outbursts from the public, clapping, and those things because what it does is intimidate others in the public who may want to speak differently than the way you feel. Let us be respectful of our fellow citizens. We look forward to hearing what you have to say. He

deferred to Attorney Andryk.

Tim Andryk, Legal Services Bureau Director, stated we are here to talk again about a controversial topic of hunting wolves with dogs. The Board has had decisions on this topic and we are here because of the recent court decision. On January 16, 2013, Judge Peter Anderson from Dane County Circuit Court issued his final ruling on the case regarding hunting wolves with dogs. He lifted his injunction on the use of dogs for hunting wolves but remanded it back to the Board for the Board to decide and make a determination on whether to pursue further rulemaking on hunting wolves with dogs. The Judge also issued a decision on training dogs to hunt wolves. He basically kept in place his injunction on the use of dogs for training dogs to hunt wolves until the department has follow-up rules with restrictions in place. This agenda item is about hunting wolves with dogs. In July of 2012 the Board, after extensive testimony, adopted emergency rules establishing the current wolf hunting season which the department implemented for 2012. Those rules are currently in place. In September 2012 the Board, after extensive deliberations, discussion, testimony, and written comments on the topic of using dogs to track and trail wolves, decided to proceed with permanent rulemaking on tracking and trailing of wolves with dogs. But the Board decided not to proceed with emergency rules at that time. At the December Board meeting, the Board approved going to hearing with the proposed permanent rule package on the wolf season that includes restrictions on hunting wolves with dogs and also includes training dogs to hunt wolves with restrictions on that. That permanent rule, the process for that, is what the department will be holding hearings on this summer and fall. It will be 2014 before the Board has an opportunity to adopt the follow-up permanent rules on wolf hunting with dogs and training with dogs. For the 2013 season, basically the department will be using the emergency rules that the Board adopted last July 2012 which are currently in effect for the 2013 season. The department's recommendation in this case is basically simply reaffirming your earlier decisions. We are asking the Board to proceed with further permanent rulemaking on hunting wolves with dogs but not emergency rules as not necessary to implement Act 169, which was the wolf hunting legislation for all the reasons that are stated in the record before you and in the green sheet package before you. He then asked Kurt Thiede to the podium.

Kurt Thiede, Land Administrator, stated that Attorney Andryk did an outstanding job he believes of summarizing why we are here discussing wolves again today. He wanted to go into further detail on what the department has planned over the next few months. Over the next few months the department will begin collecting data and engaging the public and tribal partners on the development of a permanent rule and the review of the current Wolf Management Plan. In April (WCC spring hearings) there will be multiple questions advanced regarding dog training and a Board Advisory question on overall dog use. In addition to the permanent rule and plan, we will have all hands on deck collecting carcass data and tracking data from our hunters and trappers as we begin the process of assessing our first wolf season and taking a look ahead to the 2013-2014 wolf season. It is definitely a full plate. As Mr. Andryk mentioned, at two previous Board meetings first in July and then in September 2012, we discussed wolf hunting dog use and virtually every aspect as it came to wolf hunting and management possibilities. In September we heard from on-the-ground practical experts such as wardens and hunters who have real world experience with these hounds. There has been constant speculation and challenges to the use of dogs for wolf hunting, that provision is allowed in state statute. As he stated previously, we do believe that we have put forth reasonable and enforceable rules in place, and still due to legal challenges even after our first season, we unfortunately do not have any further data or information to base a future decision. Therefore it is his recommendation as well that based on past testimony and the information provided numerous times over the past year that the Board allow the department to proceed with their previously approved permanent rule process. That permanent rule will allow the department to continue these discussions on the use of dogs to pursue wolves for hunting and training. It is their recommendation that you reaffirm your previous decision on this topic and allow the department to proceed with the previously approved permanent rule process rather than initiating an additional process at this time which would basically create a parallel rule process on the use of dogs.

Chair Cole asked the Board whether they had any questions.

Dr. Clausen asked Tim Andryk to clarify for him that you said the Judge's injunction stays in effect. He thought the Judge remanded that back to the Board and that the Board was supposed to take another look at that. If we do not do anything about it today, then the training rules go forward too?

Attorney Andryk stated that the Judge's Order is in the green sheet packet. Basically, the Judge remanded to the Board to determine whether to proceed with additional rules on hunting wolves with dogs. He did not remand back to the Board the training issue because he enjoined training. So training dogs on wolves is enjoined or prohibited until there is a new rule that authorizes it with some restrictions. That would be right now as you know we have a permanent rule that is going through the process that does include dog restrictions on it. We are asking a number of questions at the spring hearings that Mr. Thiede had referred to. The remand was not about training since the Judge enjoined the use of training. The remand is about hunting wolves with dogs.

Dr. Clausen clarified that the injunction will apply to the 2013-2014 season.

Attorney Andryk stated yes, until there is a follow-up rule that goes into effect that would replace the rule he enjoined. He enjoined an existing rule to the extent that it authorizes the use of dogs to train on wolves. Once a new rule goes into effect, then his injunction would apply to the old rule but we would have a new rule that authorizes it.

Dr. Thomas asked for clarification that for the 2013 season, hunting wolves with dogs is allowed but training dogs is not allowed.

Attorney Andryk stated that is correct.

Chair Cole then began the public input portion of this item. He gave each speaker 2 minutes and 45 seconds after which the speaker will have 15 seconds to wrap-up. He asked for succinctness.

Public Appearances:

1. **Luann O'Dell**, Juneau, representing self. She congratulated the department on the successful wolf hunt. She emphasized the "successful" part. You had a quota of 117 wolves. In addition to the 117 wolves, 75 were killed for predation, 22 were killed by motor vehicles, 5 were found dead of unknown or natural causes, 19 were killed illegally that the DNR knew of. She would call that a successful hunt and now you find it necessary to use dogs for hunting. Is this really necessary to use dogs for hunting? Is this necessary to use 1800's tactics on wild animals? Is this necessary? Really? She quoted the DNR "We have strived to base our season on science, social desire, and regulations that are reasonable, practical, and acceptable." First, she wanted to know what part of hunting wolves with dogs is based on science. Did you get your information from the people who study wolves or the hound hunters who have no clue? So what expert research can you show that hunting with dogs will not be fatal? She called all other wolf hunting states and none of them use dogs to hunt wolves. She was told this because wolves will kill the dogs. Wolves see the dogs as a threat or a dog invading the wolves' territory and they will fight to the death. Hunters also trap the wolves. Who is to say that a dog will not step into those traps or are these trap experts as well and can tell the difference between a wolf and a dog, coyote, or whatever? Your hound hunters let their GPS radio tracker dogs go while they sit in their trucks and wait. Even if their dogs can run faster than the people, so when a dog encounters a wolf, a dog-wolf fight begins. How are they going to stop it? Tell her, are they going to control the situation? Do you really think they are going to say a command and these dogs are going to stop fighting? Or is the hunter going to stop the fight or just watch it for his own pleasure? Remember, they use live bait to train these dogs. This is really sick. She has watched a video on the Internet of a hunter doing just that, laughing at the pain and torture of a wolf. What makes the hounder any different than Michael Vick?

She does not feel we should be using dogs for hunting wolves at all. The taxpayer should not be giving these hunters a \$2,500 check for each time they lose a dog in hunting any animal. You can go out there and say that you are tracking coyotes and the wolf kills the dog and you get a \$2,500 check out of my taxpayer money.

2. **Alice Miller**, Maple, representing self. She tried to cut this down to 5 minutes now she is told she has only 2 minutes.

Chair Cole stated she has 2 minutes and 45 seconds and will have 15 seconds to wrap-up.

Ms. Miller stated she is a registered nurse up in northern Douglas County. She was totally oblivious to what has been going on with our wildlife and our wilderness until one year ago when the talk of the wolf hunt started. Then she woke up and she is going to tell you what. Thousands of people are waking up. She has a petition being sent around the state for modifying Act 169 written by hunters to take their dogs on the hunt. She would say right now that as a nurse in the emergency room, every doctor and every nurse, she can go into every college, coffee shops. Everybody is signing the petition. This is northern Wisconsin where we have the problem wolves. This is not acceptable. We do not want dogs fighting wolves in northern Wisconsin. She lives there, She has been living there. She has been a resident of Wisconsin for 60 years now. She moved north 20 years ago because she loves the wilderness. She respects wildlife. The people that live up there, and she is speaking for them because they are signing her petition, they feel the same way. They respect the wilderness. They do not want dogs chasing wolves. They do not like dogs chasing anything. She told them right now that she lives where all your little orange dots are on a map showing the big depredation area in Wisconsin. These people are signing her petition. Not only are they signing her petition, but they are taking her petition and are circulating it. You guys are wrong down here. She took two days off from work to drive down here. She is a registered nurse. She had to take two days off work, drive six hours down here, for these little 2 ½ minutes to tell you that people up north do not want dogs running crazy into the woods killing wolves. They do not like it. They do not have a problem with shooting wolves. They do not think anything of it. No problem. They will shoot a wolf no problem. They will do it legally now, they do not care. They used to do it illegally. But, they will shoot a dog, too. They will shoot their own dog if it is attacking their animal. You know what, they do not want hounders bringing their dogs on their property. They do not want hounders chasing any animals through the woods. That is not respectful of hunting and it is not what people want up north. Michael Vick went to jail for six months for dog fighting. Six months. Wisconsin wants to be the first state to legalize dog fighting. Are you kidding her? Anyone who watches a dog attack another animal and finds it anything but horrific is mentally unstable. If you came into her emergency room, She would put you on a 72 hour hold. Any politician who writes a law permitting such an activity should be thrown out of office for the same reason. This is not going to stop with her. This is going viral.

3. **David Hochtritt**, Picket, representing self. He stated he owns land in the Fox River Valley and also up north near Tomahawk. He does not hunt. He does not trap. He is an outdoorsman. He asked the Board the following questions: 1) Last year there was a statement that we could not have a good hunt unless we have dogs. There were no dogs and we had a very successful hunt. Why do we need them this year? 2) The kill quota is based on the size of a pack. Now, the mindset that exists in here, you probably are going to double or triple it. You do not know how many wolves there are. Unless you know how many wolves moved into the state, moved out of the state, were born, or died. It is a guess. That is what you are basing it on. 3) Are not dogs and wolves both canines? Is this not dog fighting? He has seen dog fighting up close. He has worked with the law and he has seen what it is. He has seen people watching it. Same thing. If your dog is killed, you used to get \$2,300 or \$2,400 to replace a dog. For crying out loud, his family – you are giving his kids for going to school \$48.00. Where is the justice in that? The Wisconsin population is about 6.5 million people. 90% or more do not hunt or trap. What you are doing by doing this is disenfranchising those people. He is one of them. He has more than one million people standing behind him. He believes our tourism slogan should say “for \$50.00, kill anything, everything, anytime, with any conceivable method.” That is what we should put down. He lived in Canada for a while and came back because he loves Wisconsin’s heritage and wildlife. He always thought the DNR was the guardian of that. But that is not true.

The DNR is nothing more than a hunt club. Do the right thing. Do not let dogs chase wolves. That would be the decent thing. Thank you.

4. **James Lister**, Washington D.C., Birch Horton Bittner & Cherot Law Offices representing the United Sportsmen of Wisconsin, U.S. Sportsmen's Alliance Foundation, and the Wisconsin Bear Hunters Association. Thank you for considering their written comments submitted to you about two weeks ago. As you know, their organizations participated in the litigation on the side of the Board and the department. Their recommendations are that you proceed on the remand from Judge Anderson on the use of dogs in hunting wolves by proceeding with the permanent rulemaking and not proceeding with emergency rulemaking. The result of this is that the restrictions that are already in place that were adopted by the legislature and supplemented by this Board in its rules will remain in effect in 2013 to adopt this recommendation. We will see what happens with the 2013 season. We know from the evidence that there have been very few depredations on dogs in the winter season when the hunting takes place. That is in the Stepp memorandum. We are confident that the results will be favorable. But if they are not, then you have the chance in the 2014 season to act with further rules based on the Judge's ruling. They also recommend that you work with your wardens on enforcement. The core statutory restriction is that dogs be used only to track and trail wolves and not to physically engage them. This is an enforcement issue and your wardens need to be working on it and using their tools and powers; give a ticket to a hunter that goes too far. That will enforce what the legislature intended when it allowed the use of dogs in wolf hunting. Finally, it is important to be careful with the petition for rulemaking statute which is what the Judge ordered you all to deal with in his remand. He wants you to respond to the plaintiffs with a statement of reasons in writing and to notify them of the decision. Be very careful if you adopt the recommendation that you walk through each of those steps. That is all he has. Thank you. **(Handout)**

Dr. Clausen stated that when he first got on the Board, probably the most common citizen complaint that he got had to do with trespass by bear hunters and their hounds. The complaints dropped off but then picked up in the last year or two. He believes that the Supreme Court, and he is not an attorney, had ruled that people have a constitutional right to enjoy their property in a quiet and peaceful manner and that one of the basic property rights is the ability to exclude people from your property if you so choose. As the Board considers rulemaking on this, this is certainly an issue that has been raised and is an issue as a landowner that has been on his radar for quite a long time. He asked Attorney Lister how he would advise the Board to deal with this particular problem.

Attorney Lister stated that landowners have a right to exclude people they do not want from their property. If you go on the landowner's property without permission, and you were warned off but do not get off, that is trespassing. It is a law enforcement issue like any other. Sometimes it is helpful when you see reports of increased violations to put out enforcement advisories or bulletins. Educate the wardens. Direct the wardens, perhaps in this case the regular police, to do more to make sure the message is out there.

Dr. Clausen stated that is not exactly what he is seeing in the area where he lives. He has a couple hundred acres. When he sees coyote hunters coming, they are faced with two choices. He is saying this could be the same type of thing as with wolves. They are standing out on the road, they are faced with either violating the law against shooting off the roadway or trespassing onto somebody's property to fire their gun. He has talked with wardens about this. They said, you know, this is about impossible to enforce because all of these guys have radio control. As soon as a warden truck shows up anywhere in the neighborhood the word gets out. So you can talk about enforcement but it is not going to happen. He stated this was just a comment. Thank you.

5. **Cathy Miller**, Brule, representing self. She stated she is not used to public speaking. She is a registered nurse in medical intensive care in Duluth. She is used to taking care of patients that are dying and in comforting their families that are distraught. But today she is distraught. She drove 350 miles down here to come face to face to ask this DNR Board:

When did the DNR become a hunting club? She is against the wolf hunt but she is completely appalled by the thought of putting dogs on wolves. This is disgusting. It is legalized dog fighting. It is killing for thrill. She was raised to believe that people that kill animals or hurt animals for fun are mentally ill. She still believes that. This is disgusting. She then said she has the DNR mission statement. You might as well rip it up because you are not following it. It is "To protect and enhance our natural resources." The wolves are part of our natural resources. "To work with the people to understand each other's views and to carry out the will of the people." Please! That is a joke. You are not trying to carry out the will of the people. The people of Wisconsin do not have a clue as to what is going on. She did not know anybody up north that knows that you are trying to plot dogs against wolves. When she tells people, they have the same reaction. Their jaw opens and they gasp. They are horrified. Even her neighbors that shoot wolves are horrified. If this was a referendum it would be dead in the water. She read all of your biographies and she knows who was hand-picked by Walker. Greg, yes, Greg – the Humane (Hunters) Rights Coalition...

Chair Cole cautioned the speakers to not take on this Board individually. He stated that he understands your enthusiasm on this topic. Please go ahead.

Cathy Miller continued her testimony. The Hunters Rights Coalition and Safari International hired Walker for Governor. This is a payback position. The DNR is nothing but power and greed. When she takes care of many people and they are dying, she sees them on their death beds, daily. At the end of the day, they are at the end of their hours and minutes. They are not thinking about power and greed. They are thinking about the love they put into this world. There is more to life than power and greed. More. She is almost 60 and would leave this state out of disgust but she is not going to leave. She is not going to give the state away and just walk away. You are. War on. She will fight you. Believe me, we are. Our number is coming. This is going viral. You will not get away with this.

6. **Patricia Randolph**, Portage, representing Wisconsin Wildlife Ethic. She writes the Madraven Speaks – Living Wildlife column for the Capital Times. She speaks on behalf of the membership of Wisconsin Wildlife Ethic. First she acknowledged David Clausen for adding the wolf question to the Conservation Congress questions giving citizens, if they ever learn that have this election, a chance to vote against the use of dogs on wolves. This is about basic human dignity and decency. Up until the 1960's in this country, racism prevailed. Dogs were let loose on black people by the Ku Klux Klan who chased them down and lynched them. Imagine the terror of facing packs of armed men with packs of vicious dogs. The same mentality of cruelty, these same people, now take to the vulnerable, the same tradition that shifted to innocent black bears, bobcats, raccoons, rabbits, foxes, and all wildlife...since running packs of dogs do not discriminate and neither do mobs of men. Recently, she was approached by a man who grew up in a hounding community. He could not stomach the hounding. This man told her that easily 30% of the bears, mostly babies – the kind that you (Secretary Stepp) were cradling in your picture, do not make it to the trees in training or in killing. They are torn apart and killed on the ground in training. He said the trappers catch as many spring baby raccoons as they can, routinely over 100 each and take them to the middle of a farm field where they cannot reach a tree and loose their dogs on them to kill them, to train dogs to hate bears, coyotes, wolves, and wildlife. Or they are trained in fenced enclosures where coyotes are killed by dogs for entertainment. You shame this state. Visiting the Facebook wolf page, listening to hunter lobbyist Robert Welch, is an education in sadism. If you have a tag, to pull the trigger now. If you do not have a tag, lower your aim, gut shoot that b_t_h and let it crawl off and die and decompose.

Chair Cole cautioned Ms. Randolph.

Ms. Randolph continued. She stated that was a quote. Wolf hunters talk openly of using dogs and cats as living bait for wolves and coyotes. They boast of trapping wolf pups, skinning them, and leaving them as bait, knowing the wolves who love their pups will not leave them. Standard equipment (she retrieved a prop on hound hunting is this: 8' heavy

wooden pole with a barbed wire twisted roll attached to the top. When a coyote or wolf seeks refuge in a culvert or den, the barbed wire pull is thrust into the culvert and shoved against the canine and twisted, rolling the animal onto the barbed wire. He is extracted, wrapped onto the barbed wire, and tossed into the dogs to be killed by the dogs. "Maybe I should use this on some of you to get you out of the hole that you dug yourself." (**Handout**)

Chair Cole called a time-out. He asked the warden to escort Ms. Randolph from the room. He then stated that as he started this meeting, the key word he used was respect. We shall have it. We will not be intimidated nor shall we have individuals making disparaging comments about other members of the public with differing opinions. We are going to continue this. If he hears those disparaging comments, you will be removed from this room. So, ground zero. No tolerance. He is done.

7. **Ron Fitzpatrick**, LaCrosse, representing self. He stated he is not a hunter. He does own dogs. He is an attorney from LaCrosse. He is against the wolf hunt. The use of dogs is really frightening. He does not understand the race that the state is in to use dogs to hunt wolves. We had a wolf hunt. It was completely successful without the use of dogs. The other side has been on record as saying that you would be lucky to get one wolf without the use of dogs. Well, that was completely off the mark. It just does not make any sense to use dogs to go hunting wolves. They are going to fight each other. You know that dog fighting is illegal. While hunting may have some immunity from the criminal statute, the principal and the ethics is still the same. We as people have to be humane. We have to keep the animals from attacking each other. This is not Rome. This is barbaric. How are you going to ask a warden to enforce a hunter from letting loose his dogs and then these dogs are getting into it with the wolves? How is a warden supposed to enforce that? There is going to be hunters all over the place. We have limited wardens and the hunters are going to let loose their dogs? You know that the wolves cannot climb trees. They will turn around and will fight for their lives. It is going to be ugly. They are going to maul these dogs. He is a dog lover. He has had dogs all of his life. He cannot image what it would look like. He has a German Shepherd, a Yellow Lab, they are big dogs. He would not put them up against a wolf for one second. This is just cruel. It is inhumane. We are giving the state of Wisconsin a terrible name if we are going to be the first state to allow dogs to be used in the wolf hunt. That is going to be our legacy to the rest of the country. The next question is, if you proceed with this, how many dogs have to be killed before you say "oops, we made a mistake"? Okay? If 10 dogs are killed, is that too many? If there are 50 dogs, is that too many? At what point do you say this was really a bad idea? Let us put an end to it. You need to consider that if you are going to use dogs. Consider the lives of the dogs and how many you are going to lose.

Dr. Thomas thanked Mr. Fitzpatrick for his presentation. She then commented that there is some level of misunderstanding about who has what role here. It is great to hear what everyone has to say. And good for you for saying what you have to say. But it is a state law that there will be a wolf hunt and that dogs will be used. It is the job of the department to put together rules for the consideration by the Board that include dogs in wolf hunting. It is the job of the Board to promulgate rules. It would be breaking the law for the department or the Board to move very far in any direction outside of those parameters. That is the situation the Board is in here.

8. **Al Lobner**, Milladore, representing self. He thanked Chairman Cole, Members of the Natural Resources Board and Secretary Stepp. He asked the Board to implement the same rules for the wolf/hound hunting season as were proposed by the DNR for this past 2012 wolf/hound hunting season. More restrictions than those currently in statute and other administrative rules are not needed and would only complicate a system that is working. There are those that will say "this is different," however, prior testimony from several individuals with significant experience with trailing hounds would indicate that is not the case. To apply more restrictive regulations on speculation that there will be problems is

discriminatory to those of us that prefer to hunt with hounds. There are statutes and administrative rules currently on the books that can deal with abuses on an individual basis and are being enforced by DNR wardens. To try and make more rules and regulations on pure speculation simply does not make sense. At this time he would also recommend that rules be set in place for the wolf/hound hunting season in an effort to comply with Judge Anderson's ruling and all other rules regarding training be done at a later date so that there is no confusion on what is being done here today. He also wanted to clear up some issues regarding his past comments on using other breeds of dogs to hunt wolves. Some breeds of dogs, although they may work well in specific areas, may need to have other attributes bred into them to work well in Wisconsin. For example, site hounds. Although some of them may be large enough they would lack the scenting ability to track a wolf in a heavily wooded areas of Wisconsin unless they had some scent trailing ability bred into them. As President of the Wisconsin Bear Hunters Association with a membership of almost 2,500 people, he has talked to many of their members who have hybrid dogs to hunt bears. Not everyone chooses to do this but he believes that certain amount of people will be using hybridization of dogs to come up with a strain that satisfactorily tracks and trails wolves. Thank you for your consideration. **(Handout)**

Dr. Clausen stated that he has been a veterinarian for two-thirds of his of life. Something has always puzzled him just a little bit. In his years when he was taking his own emergencies, he certainly had worked on his share of dogs that had been injured, killed, mauled, whatever by bear hunters. The Board has affidavits and a hundred and some pages of DNR records dealing with dogs that have been killed by wolves. What he has never been able to get his head around as he certainly tries to make a decision in this and it would be helpful for him to know, when you know there is a pretty fair chance of injury or death to this animal, how do you turn something loose to go out and do that?

Mr. Lobner stated that he never had a dog killed while he was treeing a bear. He had not been able to hunt with wolves. He had never had a dog killed while it was treeing a bear although he did have a dog killed while it was treeing a bear and the wolves came up behind it and killed it. They ambushed it. He had dogs trail wolves. The only time a wolf has ever killed a dog of his was when it was at the tree and it was ambushed.

Dr. Clausen stated he is only going from his 40 years of experience. If you need visual evidence of what a bear can do to a dog...

Mr. Lobner stated he has pictures if you would like to see them.

Dr. Clausen stated he does not understand this mindset. He is done and does not need to ask you anything further.

Mr. Kazmierski said to Mr. Lobner that it was stated earlier that during bear hunting with dogs, dogs are actually killing bears. He asked whether he had ever witnessed that or seen it happen.

Mr. Lobner stated he had not, no.

Mr. Kazmierski stated that is not the point of...

Mr. Lobner stated that generally if we and the people he knows that the sow is on one of their baits is with her cubs they would not turn them loose on them. That is what we do.

Chair Cole then also cautioned Board Members. The public is here to testify. We also have to be respectful of this highly socialized society and different opinions. With that said, he called up the next appearance.

9. **Elizabeth Huntley-Roberts**, Kenosha, representing self. She thanked the DNR and Board for giving her the opportunity to express her thoughts today regarding the use and training of dogs to hunt wolves. She does not approve of the rules as they currently stand. It is clearly obvious that the WI Bear Hunters Association is in the back pocket of the DNR by the mere fact that the legislation allowing the use of dogs to hunt wolves was included in its "management" plan. A wolf is not a bear. L. David Mech, noted wolf biologist, stated in a paper that "...wolves kill and eat dogs". Further, the WI DNR documented that "Wolves killing dogs during attacks in hunting and training situations is proportionately higher – 85%

- than during attacks on pet dogs at 38%. Perhaps that is why Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, and Minnesota prohibit the use of dogs to hunt wolves? She endorses the National Wolfwatcher Coalition's stand on the following rules: 1) There must be a breed restriction on hunting dogs. The DNR supported legislation that placed restrictions on the ownership of wolf/dog hybrids so why no breed restrictions on hunting dogs? Breeds used historically to chase down and kill wolves must be banned to reduce the likelihood of a wolf being mauled to death by dogs. A wolf cannot climb a tree to escape savage dogs. 2) Leash requirement. The DNR requires pet dogs to be leashed at all times in state parks. There have been several reports of hounds having treed a bear with no handler in sight as well as reports of hounds being rescued from traffic and returned to their owners. Hunting dogs must be kept leashed in order to reduce the possibility of fatal wolf/dog encounters. Houndsmen are often up to three miles away from their hounds! 3) Certification. Potential dog trainers or hunters should be required to take a course that includes basic wolf biology. 4) Prohibit the use of dogs in prime habitat. Protecting wolves from being pursued by dogs in Zones 1, 2, and 5 clearly would not impact hunter success rates as indicated by the 2012 wolf hunting season that ended early with the kill quota exceeded and without the use of dogs! 5) Training of dogs. A separate training season is unnecessary and will result in the harassment of wolves, particularly if allowed during the month of March when wolves are selecting den sites. 6) Six Pack Rule. For wolves or any animal, to be subjected to relentless chasing by hounds is extremely cruel and inhumane; "changing out" fresh dogs should NOT be allowed for this reason. 7) Prohibit trapping and snaring. It is cruel and unacceptable and a violation of "fair chase" to allow the running of dogs while a wolf is incapacitated in a trap or snare. In case you do not know who L. David Mech is, he is a noted wolf biologist and has been for about 40 years now. It is the obligation of this Board to invoke reasonable rules and restrictions since the DNR has failed to do so.

10. **Scott Meyer**, Gleason, representing self. He thanked Chairman Cole and Board Members for allowing him to speak today. This past year they had a very successful wolf hunting season. The season ended early with the quota of wolves being met in all zones. However, there may come a time when the use of dogs is needed to reach these quotas in the future. Currently, we have rules in place with regards to using dogs to hunt other game species. These rules are enforced by DNR wardens. Dogs cannot harass, kill, or injure any game animal by law. The last time this rule was before the Board the wardens testifying did not foresee problems with dogs pursuing wolves from an enforcement standpoint. In the past they have inadvertently ran wolves by accident and there were no dogs killed or injured. Past testimony to this Board by experts in the use of trailing hounds indicated that wolves run ahead of the dogs and problems did not exist. There have been cases of wolves, mistaken for coyotes pursued by dogs and again no dogs were injured. To his knowledge no dogs were killed or injured this winter. We are in the process of a permanent rule which will address the hunting and training of dogs on wolves. There will be ample time for the public to weigh in on these provisions in the permanent rule. Further restrictions at this time are not necessary and for the Board to rule at this time would be a top down approach rather than a bottom up approach to rule making which allows public input. On another note there has been discussion on which breeds of dogs should be allowed to pursue wolves. There is no state, country, or providence that has any such restriction on breeds of dogs to hunt any type of game from rabbits to leopards. Let the dog experts, which we have many in this state, decide and develop breeds of dogs to hunt wolves. A rule of this nature would be impossible to enforce and would be a slippery slope argument in the future. On another note, he would like to clear up the trespass issue as well from earlier. There are three ways. First, you cannot site from the road, you cannot shoot from the road, but anybody with a gun can be cited for dogs running at large through private property which is a \$241 fine. Thank you for your time.
11. **Patricia McConnell**, Black Earth, representing self. She could not attend due to her work schedule. She submitted her testimony which is as follows: Speaking as a zoologist and

certified applied animal behaviorist, she will argue that the rules currently proposed to regulate the use of dogs in public wolf hunts are inadequate, for the following reasons:

ENCOUNTERS BETWEEN SPECIES

1. The Department argues that it is already illegal to kill a wolf with a dog. But hound hunters use GPS collars to follow their dogs, and are often many miles away from the location in which dogs encounter wolves. How then will a pack of dogs be restrained from attacking and or killing a single wolf? Exactly what training would be used?

Currently, it is legal and common in Wisconsin to train hounds to vigorously pursue an animal through the use of roll-cages, or barrels with holes in them, in which a bear, coyote or bobcat is trapped inside while the dogs attack it. As a professional dog trainer who has over 25 years of experience and her own working dogs, she cannot imagine a training paradigm that would both encourage dogs to enthusiastically pursue wolves and at the same time, train them to avoid any contact with them after an extensive and stimulating chase in the absence of a handler. It is a given that many initial encounters between dogs and wolves will be in the absence of their handlers and it is clear, once one does any research whatsoever, that violent encounters between hounds and other species like bear and coyote are relatively common. Just because hound hunters like to keep it quiet doesn't mean it does not happen.

2. The DNR also argues that wolf carcasses are required to be registered and inspected by DNR staff, and that complaints will be made if there is evidence that a wolf has been killed by dogs. Might it perhaps be possible that, if coming upon a wolf killed by their dogs, a hunter might choose to not register the carcass with a local warden?

3. Even if a single wolf is not killed by a pack of hounds, the "tracking and trailing" of other species, coyotes for example, often involve chases involving many hours, up to as many as six or seven. In these cases, the individual animal is run until it collapses in a state of complete physical and emotional exhaustion. Does that not violate the animal cruelty laws of the State of Wisconsin?

4. In addition, she is unclear how wolves themselves will be trained to not turn and attack the dogs. We are all well aware of the number of dogs killed and injured by wolves in previous years. The hound hunters who want to use dogs to hunt wolves argue that they will only set their dogs on the trails of a single wolf, or at maximum, a pair, and that single wolves will not turn and attack dogs. However, individual pack members often disperse for brief periods of time and then rejoin the rest of the pack, so there is no way of knowing if starting dogs on a single track will ensure that the dogs only encounter a single wolf. She herself watched two wolves move well over a mile beside a stream bed in Yellowstone National Park, and continued to watch as the pair joined 12 other wolves 30 minutes after our first sighting. The argument that hunters can protect their dogs by only allowing them to track a single wolf is simply not based in reality.

The DNR argues that it is impractical to restrict dogs to leashes or long lines, yet this is exactly the method used by people tracking and trailing lost humans in all environments, including dense brush, and by wolf hunters using dogs in some other countries. This is the only method that would both protect dogs and wolves from unnecessary pain and suffering, as mandated by law.

TRAINING DOGS TO HUNT WOLVES

1. Will the same methods be used to train dogs to hunt wolves as are used now to hunt bear? Dogs do not need to be trained to follow a scent trail, but they need extensive training to focus on one particular species and to follow that scent trail while ignoring all others. How exactly will dogs be trained to hunt wolves? Will wolves be put into roll cages while a pack of dogs is encouraged to attack them? Extremely specific guidelines must be written and enforced regarding exactly how dogs would be trained to focus on wolves and wolves alone, to avoid violations of animal cruelty laws.

2. She is concerned by the suggestion of the DNR that "outside experts" will be brought in to train "best practices" of the use of dogs to hunt wolves. Who exactly would these experts be, given that no other state in the union allows dogs to participate in wolf hunts?

EFFECTS ON THE POPULARITY OF HUNTING

1. The poorly regulated use of dogs to hunt wolves is the last thing that should occur if the DNR and the state of Wisconsin want to encourage more hunting. Some argue, inaccurately, that those against the use of dogs are “anti-hunters in disguise.” This may actually be a *good short-term* strategy, but will have the opposite effect in the *long term*. Using fear as a way to bond groups together (uniting the vast array of different types of Wisconsin hunters into just “hunters”) may be effective in the short run. But the fact is, as the state of Wisconsin has noted, the number of people hunting in the state is on the decline, and it is certainly in the minority, but because of changes in behavior and beliefs. Culture, by definition, includes the change of societal beliefs about many things, including how best to use one’s free time, whether or not to spend time out of doors, and what is moral and ethical regarding our interactions with animals. The more that non-hunters associate the use of man’s best friend, the domestic dog, in unnecessary and inevitably violent encounters with “hunting,” the more hunting itself will be threatened.

IN SUMMARY

It is obvious to all that the use of dogs itself is unnecessary, as evidenced by last season’s wolf hunt. The only reason to allow it is to satisfy a small group of hunters who, unlike the vast majority of hunters, hunt with free-ranging hounds who work out of sight of the hunters themselves. Allowing inevitable wolf-dog encounters violates Wisconsin’s Anti-Cruelty laws which ban animal cruelty, clearly defined as “causing *unnecessary* and excessive pain or suffering or unjustifiable injury or death.” There is simply no credible argument that using dogs to hunt wolves will not result in exactly that. That said, she is aware that the DNR and NRB is charged with establishing rules and regulations regarding the use of dogs as established by law. Regrettably, the proposed rules are sorely inadequate for the reasons stated above.

12. **Ralph Fritsch**, Townsend, representing Wisconsin Wildlife Federation (WWF). Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify today on behalf of WWF and their 182 hunting, fishing, trapping, and forestry-related groups. WWF supports hunting of wolves with the aid of dogs and based on the experience and expertise of their members that hunt various species of wild animals with hounds believe that the hunting of wolves with dogs can and will be done safely with full consideration of the need of animal safety and humane treatment. They also support the training of dogs by the pursuit of wolves to be an important component of assuring that expertise and experience is further developed and assured for all future hunting of wolves with the aid of dogs. He shared briefly some critical points of information. 1) Hunting wolves with the aid of dogs is a legitimate furthering of Wisconsin’s long-time cultural heritage of using dogs for hunting various species of game birds, to predators such as coyotes and bears. It is highly appropriate to continue that heritage by allowing the training and hunting of wolves with the aid of dogs. 2) Wolf hunters using dogs have a great interest in assuring that the training and hunting of wolves will be done in a manner that is humane for both the wolf and the dogs. This will be done because of a strong belief of these hunters in the humane treatment of animals in general and because of their strong financial and personal attachments to the hounds that they have. 3) The reality is that there have been large populations of wolves in Northern Wisconsin for years while there has been hunting of bear and coyotes in the same location during the same period of time. There have been incidental and inadvertent pursuit of individual wolves during that time that have been safe and humane.

In conclusion, the WWF supports the NRB and DNR continuing its current planned course of regulation strategy for the hunting and training of the use of dogs in the pursuit of wolves. The current regulations are reasonable and effective and may well be enhanced by the future rule making efforts of the Board and DNR. Thank you.

13. **Bob Welch**, Redgranite, representing Hunters Rights Coalition and Safari Club International. He spoke in support of the action he believes will be taken considering the Board’s policy. The wolf hunt was designed with the best science in mind when it was

before the legislature in the rule making process. In all the testimony that has come before this Board that is based on science goes to the fact there is not a problem with allowing dogs to hunt wolves. There have been a lot of people up here making assumptions and accusations that as far as people actually out in the field that have real evidence as to how this works will tell you that wolves pursued by a pack of dogs will run away. They run a lot faster than dogs so they will get away and will be harvested by a hunter meeting up with them by finding out there they will exit from the woods. That is how it works. This year, they had a successful wolf hunt without dogs but almost everyone believes that wolves are sharp critters and they will figure out how the harvest works and people will need to be a little more cagey as hunters in order to find them in the future and meet the quotas. The dog hunts allow them to be able to do that. He also reiterated what some other people said today is that hunters love their dogs. They are not putting them in harm's way on purpose. It is ridiculous. They love their dogs. Just because they are hounds and not a lap dog does not mean they are not loved by their owners just as much. They get very sad and angry when their dogs somehow get taken by a wolf inadvertently when they are in the process of a different kind of hunt. That is not going to happen in the wolf hunt. Also, you had all received a letter from Anna Seidman, Director of Litigation with Safari Club International. We are intervening to defend the Board's action and we would just like to say on a legal basis, they agree with what James Lister said, that you have plenty of evidence in the record that you have before this Board to directly address what the Judge wants you to do. We very much encourage you to issue a clearly stated decision that you choose not to engage in further rulemaking on the use of dogs to hunt wolves and to document its reasoning as based on the evidence received from the public at the prior meetings when you had these public testimonies. **(Handout-Seidman letter)**

14. **Patricia Lowry**, Madison, representing self. She stated that she feels like it is her responsibility as a citizen in the state of Wisconsin to air her views. Once again she finds herself in a position to oppose yet another politically motivated policy enacted by our Wisconsin legislature without input from the WI DNR wildlife experts or the state's Wolf Science Advisory Committee. She is not a wildlife expert or even a hunter but she believes that our newly sanctioned law to use dogs in wolf hunts is immoral and should be illegal. She is here to testify against this most egregious method of using dogs for hunting wolves, a species just recently stripped of its endangered species status? Why would legislators want Wisconsin to have this distinction of being the only state in the U.S. to use dogs for wolf hunting? This heinous hunting method will lead to vicious battles between wolves and dogs. She does not care what anyone says, they have seen it in pictures already leading to immeasurable suffering for both animals. Is this considered hunting by anyone's definition? Or is this simply state sanctioned dog fighting? Is this the kind of reputation we want for our state: a no holds barred, dog versus wolf bloodbath used for the amusement and sport of a small group of unprincipled hunters?

In addition to conservationists like herself, many hunters are opposed to this law and one group filed a lawsuit last fall to oppose the unrestricted use of dogs to hunt wolves. WI Mainstream Hunters (WMH) is a group of WI hunters, landowners, and sport business owners. I have known some of these people for many years, and they are dyed-in-the-wool hunters, but they are conscientious hunters who use responsible ethics when pursuing game. WMH opposed the use of dogs for wolf hunting because it will "negatively impact other established, traditional WI hunts and will infringe upon private landowners' rights." It is their concern that the unregulated use of dogs for wolf hunting will result in "packs of unrestrained and unsupervised dogs allowed to run at large across public lands (which) will have a significant deterrent effect upon non-wolf hunters. One of their primary concerns is that wolves that are chased by dogs during training and hunting will begin to view all dogs as immediate threats. Wolves are intelligent. They will remember. In the past, wolves have ignored bird-hunting dogs, but will now perceive dogs as a threat and will attack all dogs, including those not involved in the wolf hunting. The possibility that wolves will attack bird-hunting dogs will deter bird hunters who are not willing to risk the lives of their highly trained and beloved hunting dogs.

These people are from Northern Wisconsin. They own hundreds if not thousands of acres of land. They know what bear dogs are about. She has seen these bear dogs. They look like they have not eaten in weeks. They are lost, they have their collars, nobody knows where they are. Other Mainstream Hunters are concerned that these dogs running through hunting grounds and privately owned forested lands in the community will interfere with the deer hunt because unrestrained dogs harass and disburse game and disturb hunters. She asked the NRB to consider, in spite of what is currently expected to be the law, that there is a lawsuit to ban the use of dogs for wolf hunting. The use of dogs is unnecessary as we have seen from the inaugural wolf hunt and it will have a negative impact on wildlife, domestic dogs, and mainstream hunters. WI has always, always, for as long as she can remember, had a reputation as a progressive state, a state where ethics dictated our politics and not the other way around. Please use ethics and not politics to ban dogs for wolf hunting.

15. **Carolyn Schueppel**, Madison, representing self. She was in attendance at the December Board meeting on Act 168. She was impressed with the fact that the Board did decide to make some changes even though the law was in effect. That leads her to believe that this is possible and she would encourage the Board to do so. After the testimony of the public today, she was impressed by the mention of regulation and enforcement with using game wardens and police and that sort of thing. Her ears perked up. In her case when her pet was killed in October of 2011, she had a real hard time with law enforcement and game wardens. Actually, what a game warden said to her when she asked him to put up some signs locating traps, he said that “trappers have rights. We do not have to put up signs. Someone could steal their traps.” Nothing was done in her case. She received no compensation. She had a friend help her dig through the police and Sheriff reports. They were not done correctly. The private landowner did not file trespassing charges. The DNR said they could not file trespassing charges but that she would have to go to the District Attorney. It was a huge mess. This is what will happen. We have so many areas of enforcement, we cannot do it. She hears over and over again that this is highly regulated and it is not true. If it was highly regulated, the people would be here today because they would know what is going on. They do not know there is trapping. They do not know there is hounding. And they will not know because it is not highly regulated otherwise people would see the signage. Using dogs to hunt wolves in her mind is animal cruelty. She is here today because she witnessed animal cruelty. She witnessed what happens when there are no good rules. She had a personal experience and it is really hard to come here. She feels like she is going to be sick. She is sure a lot of people do not come here because this is very sickening. They cannot come, they cannot talk, and they cannot deal with this. She has been out leafleting for one year and one half. People do not want to see the pictures. In closing, she wanted to say again that she feels the NRB has the ability to option to make some changes. You made some big changes in December 2012. Expert dog behaviorist Patricia McConnell stated that tracking one wolf is not really that possible because she has witnessed wolves joining packs. The trapper put his trap down because he knew he could. The trap that killed my dog was on a very highly marked, used trail; which was very obvious, and even the warden agreed. He did it because he could. She encouraged the Board to not do this because you can. Thank you.
16. **Rob Bohmann**, Racine, representing WI Conservation Congress (WCC). Good Afternoon Chairman Cole, Secretary Stepp, and Board Members. You have to admit that “Chairman” Cole has a nice ring to it. He is chairman of the WCC. WCC supports the use of dogs to hunt wolves. They also support the training of dogs to hunt wolves. They have delegates who are hound hunters and delegates who have friends that are hound hunters. He himself has a Labrador Retriever who is his number one hunting buddy. He knows that he is not a hound and he would not use him for hunting bear or wolves but he is just like any other hunter who appreciates hunting over a great dog. It is not about the harvest of an animal or bird, it is all about the dog performing the way he or she has been trained. When we leave home with our dogs for a day’s hunt, we understand that there is always a risk involved. The vast majority of hunters who use dogs are ethical and would not put their dogs in harm’s way intentionally. We understand that there is always a possibility that something may

happen to our dog and when it does, they take full measure to ensure that our dogs are taken care of. He has had his dog run into barbed wire while out bird hunting, he has had his dog step on a piece of glass in a parking lot, he has had his dog sucked under the current while out hunting. He has been hit by pellets by other hunters and he has always paid the bill. He goes to work with him and when he is not and his family is home sick, he is at the bedside. When he does not take him out in the field with him he is at the door pouting. He is his best friend. And just like hound hunters, they are their best friends. If something happens to these dogs, they are paying the bill. For years, hound hunters have had their dogs run wolves incidentally while hunting or training bear, bobcat, or coyotes. Especially when training during the winter months. They have seen little to no incidence during the winter months. The wolves are running from the dogs now and not fighting them at this time of year. They also do not believe that there is a need for breed restrictions. The use of site hounds will not be as effective in WI as the use of scent hounds due to the wooded terrain. This past year's quotas were met relatively quickly but in time wolves will adapt and be acclimated to the hunting and trapping methods and they will likely become more difficult to harvest. The ability to use dogs is another means to ensure we will be able to meet our harvest quota and effectively manage the wolf population in the future. WCC recommends that the DNR proceed with further rulemaking on hunting wolves with dogs through the permanent rule process. Any further restriction on the use of dogs is not necessary for emergency rules at this time. Thank you.

Chair Cole stated this concludes the public input as it relates to item 2.B.1. now before the Board.

Ms. Wiley asked for clarification for the record. Right now in this whole rule process, the Board's job is to move the rule along, right?

Attorney Andryk stated yes.

Ms. Wiley continued that the rule will come back to the Board after the public hearings. The next step that the Board will be to authorize public hearings. Is that correct?

Attorney Andryk stated that is generally correct. However, the Board is here today to respond to the Judges remand which is to determine whether to do further rulemaking on hunting wolves with dogs. That is what he remanded to the Board to make that decision. The Board has already made that decision at a number of other Board meetings so this is a reaffirmation to its earlier decisions.

Ms. Wiley stated that basically, the Board is moving to reaffirm what has already been done to keep the process going. Is that correct?

Attorney Andryk stated that in his opinion, yes.

Mr. Thiede clarified that you had stated previously that the next step for the department would be to come back to the Board for hearing authorization. That has already been done. It was done in December 2012. The Board has already authorized the department to go forward with rules for public hearing.

Ms. Wiley stated that the department will then have public hearings as part of the process. After the public hearings, then it goes back to the staff to evaluate the hearing results and after that it goes back to the Board at which time the Board will once again have public input and will then vote on it. This is the same thing with this rule, whether everyone agrees with it or not, that we do with every single other rulemaking process.

Mr. Thiede stated yes.

Mr. Kazmierski MOVED approval, seconded by Mr. Bruins, to accept the recommendation for further rulemaking on permanent rules and to not proceed with an emergency rule.

Chair Cole asked for Board discussion.

Dr. Clausen commented that he sat in on the trial. He heard Judge Anderson say that he did not think there was any way this could be accomplished without violent confrontations between the dogs and the wolves. He is a veterinarian, a hunter, and knows something about animal behavior. He tends to agree with that. There is going to be interactions. Experts have testified to that. His personal opinion is that this is dog fighting. The problem that he has is the statute says there is

going to be dog hunting. The Board received a memo from Secretary Stepp telling us why all these things will not work. The Board has heard from people here saying the restrictions will not work and so on. He tends to agree with that. He believes a lot of the rules the department has in place for this from a practical standpoint, they may be in the books, but these rules are not enforceable. He sits in a position of not being able to find a rule that this Board could adopt and people could accept that would prevent these confrontations. He is between a rock and a hard place. He does not like being in that position. He does not know what kind of further rulemaking that the Board could go ahead and do that would solve this issue.

Dr. Thomas stated the comment that she would make about this is that in our previous decisions, we asked staff to collect as much evidence about every aspect of the wolf hunt that they possibly could so that after we had a complete season, then we would have evidence to tell us what things did and did not happen. There was not a dog hunt so there is no evidence on that at this time. She felt the Board is in the same exact place we were on this issue when we started; which is, we have sent this out for public hearing, we do not have any evidence to come back at the moment for the permanent rule making, there is going to be a dog hunt this fall whether there is dog training or whether there is not, then we will have one years' worth of evidence when we get done and we can change our mind at that point in time if we need to change our mind. The Board does not have a whole lot of wiggle room here regardless. We know how many dogs get to be used, when they are going out, there is not a lot of wiggle room. She does not think anything has happened between the last time we made a decision and this time in making the decision that brings evidence to the table.

Mr. Hilgenberg asked whether staff could explain what the Board's alternatives are. He does not see any alternatives.

Ms. Wiley stated the Board needs to let the process continue. We will still have a chance for public input and we know from past recent experience, that if the public is really concerned they will, in fact, let the Board know how they feel. We keep hearing from the science services people that there is a three-prong stool that we listen to; one of those prongs being social acceptance. She thought the Board should let the process continue. We will have another opportunity to visit this when the rules are sent back to the Board after the public hearings. We will have a public hearing at that time too. That is when we make a decision. We have no option at this point.

Mr. Bruins stated that one of the things we have not talked about today is how valuable the hunting community is in enabling us to manage our wildlife populations. As a landowner, he absolutely appreciates what the hunters offer in that regard. He views this as a tool that hunters have got a right for - hunting wolves with dogs. He believes we should allow hunters to be fully equipped so that they can continue to provide the valuable service that they do.

Mr. Kazmierski stated that one of the concerns that we have here is that the dogs are either going to rip the wolves apart and have site dogs that actually kill wolves. There are currently laws against that but how are we going to be able to tell? Does the department do necropsies on the wolves that were harvested? Are you going to follow up on that if that is what is occurring out there? Do we have data on that?

Mr. Thiede stated that Board Member Thomas had indicated this as well the last time we came to you he believed in September, the charge to the department was to collect as much data as possible. That is their intent. Every wolf that was harvested this past season, the carcass was collected, and whether it be a warden or staff, had the opportunity to while they are collecting tissues to inspect the carcass. It is their understanding as well when talking with some of their folks from law enforcement that they can tell in regards to looking at the carcass whether dogs are the ones that caused the damage or not.

Mr. Hilgenberg stated for the sake of information and clarity that as we go through the process as Ms. Wiley described and we receive public input, staff comes up with a recommendation. At that point in time, is he correct that the Board makes a determination as to what happens?

Chair Cole stated yes.

Attorney Andryk clarified to make sure that the Board understood what the recommendations before them are. If you approve the department recommendations laid out at the bottom of green sheet, the department is required as one of the prior people testifying, and as Attorney Lister said, to get back to the plaintiffs with the reason for the decision. The reason is at the bottom of the memo. It is basically that the reasons for additional emergency rule restrictions are not necessary at this time to implement Act 169 for the reasons before the Board. That includes reasons in the record, the green sheet, the testimony received, the written comments received, all of that information. That is what the department would report back to the plaintiffs in the lawsuit if the Board adopts the department recommendations.

Dr. Clausen asked whether his minority opinion will be in there and the permanent record that he does not believe the Board could adopt anything that would be effective.

Attorney Andryk stated yes, that his comments would be part of the record that they get.

Jane Wiley called the question.

The motion carried unanimously.

8. Information Items

8.A. Air, Waste, Water, and Enforcement

8.A.1. Update on implementation of Wisconsin's electronics recycling law and E-Cycle Wisconsin results

Sarah Murray, E-Cycle Wisconsin Coordinator, reviewed why electronics recycling is important, landfill and incinerator bans, E-Cycle Wisconsin Program, pounds collected by registered E-Cycle WI collectors since January 2010, participation by county, how TV's were disposed of this past year, growth of the e-cycling industry, PY3 pounds received by registered recyclers by state, the challenges, possible changes, and 2012 recommendations. She stated that a strong electronics recycling industry continues to develop, it is more convenient and less expensive for most residents, and that WI is a leader among states with similar laws. **(PowerPoint)**

Discussion followed on the net cost and future potential cost of this program to the department; and how the program works at stores such as Best Buy.

INFORMATIONAL ITEM – NO ACTION WAS TAKEN

8.B. Land Management, Recreation, Fisheries, and Wildlife

8.B.1. Report on the Wisconsin CWD Response Plan and discussion of revisions that may be needed

Kurt Thiede gave an overview of the presentation and then introduced staff.

Tom Hauge, Wildlife Management Bureau Director, and **Tami Ryan**, Wildlife Health Section Chief gave a joint presentation. They discussed the successes, new initiatives, the challenges, WI CWD positive locations in 2012 outside of CWD zone, additional challenges, CWD response plan goal, status of CWD response plan objectives, overview of Deer Trustee Report (DTR) recommendations, DTR recommendations implemented, DTR CWD recommendations, herd health/CWD action team, other key discussion areas, DTR and CWD Response Plan (RP) comparison, DTR and RP alignment and where they do not align, future outlook, CWD prevalence, and SW core area – males from 2002 – 2012. **(PowerPoint)**

Discussion followed on what has happened to the deer population in the last 10 years in the area where it was first discovered and where it has become more prevalent, whether the department has

found anything politically acceptable, assurances to the deer hunting community that deer meat is safe or not safe to eat, whether the department has done an economic analysis on potential impacts of this in the next 5 – 10 years as it relates to the state and coffers of the department, the geographic spread of the disease, whether there is any information on the behavior of the disease that would estimate what areas may be engulfed in 10 years, whether the department has lost its battle, and the length of time a deer infected with CWD will survive.

Dr. Clausen stated that one of the things he had asked in a “rant” he sent to the department about three weeks ago were the ranges in prevalence on the landscape that may be present in correlation to deer density. This analysis was done in 2012 in conjunction with determining the surveillance goal. He then requested an after-the-fact analysis for the NW WI CWD surveillance area. He knew that the department has collected over 1,000 CWD samples and he would like the department to share data with the Citizen Advisory Team that includes the outcome of analysis as to what the department’s conclusions are, next steps, etc.

Secretary Stepp stated that she sat in the Board’s seat when CWD first came out. This was new to Wisconsin and she appreciates the men and women who have worked on this. The last several years have shown strong sales in licenses. The department is educating the public as is the Health Department with statements on CWD and its impacts on human health. How we relay our comments, we have to be careful. We do not want to over-react or under-react.

Discussion continued on what the average age of the buck population is and prohibitions on baiting and feeding.

INFORMATIONAL ITEM – NO ACTION WAS TAKEN

8.B.2. Update on FY 11-13 Capital Development Funding to Enhance Public Access and Use of DNR Lands

Mr. Thiede thanked Scott Gunderson, Executive Assistant, for securing Stewardship funding to improve access to state lands in the past budget. He then gave an overview of the herculean effort by staff over a two year period in coming up with projects and completing them in a tight timeframe.

Dan Olson, Facilities Management Section Chief and **Glen Clickner**, Engineering Section Chief gave a joint presentation. They presented the background, geographic distribution of over 200 properties statewide, projects that are underway or have been completed, projects identified for allocation, recently completed conservation infrastructure projects, campsite electrification, expanded property access, road access improvements, information signage, and the Terrell Island Breakwall. **(PowerPoint)**

Discussion followed on what it costs to build a parking lot and the length of the Terrell Island breakwall.

INFORMATIONAL ITEM – NO ACTION WAS TAKEN

8.B.3. Developing a 10 year Fisheries and Wildlife Management Plan

Kurt Thiede, Land Division Administrator, **Ken Johnson**, Water Division Administrator, and **Tim Lawhern**, Enforcement and Science Division Administrator gave a combined presentation. They gave a brief background and then discussed outreach and public involvement and described the need for the plan, the proposed process to be used, the proposed process for significant public involvement in developing the plan, and the planning timeline. **(PowerPoint and Handout)**

Discussion followed on whether WI Conservation Congress was one of the stakeholders.

INFORMATIONAL ITEM – NO ACTION WAS TAKEN

8.C. Budget

8.C.1. Update on Governor's FY 13-15 Biennial Budget

Joe Polasek, Management and Budget Bureau Director, presented highlights and additional initiatives in the Governor's Budget, debt service re-estimate for department bonding, and PECFA transfer. He reviewed funding for deer management, outdoor recreation, environmental protection, business growth and job development, streamlining and efficiencies, and operations increases. He then reviewed the final element of the package which is the 2013 – 15 bonding authorization for dam repair and removal, TRM, urban NP and flood control, and contaminated sediment removal. **(PowerPoint)**

Discussion followed on whether there was anything in the budget for testing for CWD faster, the total budget for Stewardship, and the probability that the legislature will approve the department's request.

INFORMATIONAL ITEM – NO ACTION WAS TAKEN

Chair Cole stated that he will try to run an orderly meeting and hoped he did not offend anyone today. He appreciates the patience shown by Board Member's.

Dr. Clausen MOVED, seconded by Dr. Thomas to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

The regular meeting of the Natural Resources Board was held on Wednesday, February 27, 2013 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 2:15 p.m.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Organizational Matters

1.A. Calling the roll

William Bruins – absent	David Clausen – present
Christine Thomas – present	Jane Wiley – present
Terry Hilgenberg – present	Preston Cole – present
Greg Kazmierski – present	

1.B. Approval of minutes from January 23, 2013

Dr. Thomas MOVED approval, seconded by Mr. Hilgenberg. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Ratification of Acts of the Department Secretary

2.A. Real Estate Transactions

Dr. Clausen MOVED approval, seconded by Ms. Wiley. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Action Items

3.A. Air, Waste, Water, and Enforcement

3.A.1 Request adoption of Board Order RR-04-11, proposed revisions to chs. NR 700 to 754 regarding the investigation and cleanup of Brownfield's and other contaminated properties

Mark Gordon, Policy and Technical Resources Section Chief, presented a brief background, discussed the five public hearings that were held in May 2012 and follow-up from the hearings. He requested the Board adoption Board Order RR-04-11. **(PowerPoint)**

Public Appearances:

1. **Laura Olah**, Merrimac, representing Citizens for Safe Water Around Badger. She spoke with concerns. She asked that the department 1) Consider an independent statewide analysis of site closures to assess the state's progress in restoring soils and land that are without limitation on future use. 2) For the DNR to issue guidelines that will encourage responsible parties to comply with the cumulative risk assessment framework issued by EPA in 2003 and corresponding EPA guidelines expected later this year which will also address chemical mixtures. **(Handout)**
2. **Mark Thimke**, Milwaukee, representing self. He stated that the rule package represents a careful refinement and fine tuning of one of the department's exemplary programs. It was thoroughly reviewed by the department's Technical Advisory Committee in an open and transparent matter with revisions being made where appropriate. He requested that the Board approve the rule package. **(Handout)**

Chair Cole asked how easy or difficult the requests would be to act on from Ms. Olah, Citizens for Safe Water Around Badger.

Mr. Gordon stated the information is readily available in their tracking system.

Ms. Wiley asked whether this will be done.

Secretary Stepp stated the department would do so, if that is what the Board is asking.

Ms. Wiley stated yes.

Discussion followed on whether there are any cumulative risks.

Ms. Wiley MOVED approval, seconded by Dr. Thomas. The motion carried unanimously.

- 3.A.2 Request authorization for public hearing for Board Order OE-46-10, proposed changes to Ch. NR 150 Wis. Adm. Code, pertaining to the Department's environmental analysis and review procedures

Dave Siebert, Office of Energy & Environmental Analysis Director, summarized WI Environmental Policy Act (WEPA) history highlights, goals for revision, the strategic analysis, and compared the EIS process vs. the EA process. He requested the Board authorize public hearings for Board Order OE-46-10.

Dr. Thomas MOVED approval, seconded by Mr. Hilgenberg. The motion carried unanimously.

- 3.A.3 ~~Request approval of the recommendations contained within the Department's report on the state's mercury air emissions rule, Chapter NR 446, Wis. Adm. Code~~ **DELETED**

- 3.B. Land Management, Recreation, Fisheries, and Wildlife

- 3.B.1 Request adoption of Emergency Board Order FH-23-12(E) relating to lake trout harvest limits as required by the State-Tribal Lake Superior Agreement

Peter Stevens, Lake Superior Fisheries Field Unit Supervisor, presented a brief background and summary of the rule. He requested the Board adopt Emergency Board Order FH-23-12(E). **(PowerPoint)**

Discussion followed on decreased reproduction, what the department is doing about controlling lamprey, US Fish & Wildlife Service funding, and the use of lampricide.

Mr. Kazmierski MOVED approval, seconded by Dr. Clausen. The motion carried unanimously.

- 3.B.2 Request authorization for public hearings for Board Order FR-24-11, revisions to Chapter NR 1, Wis. Adm. Code, related to regenerating harvested areas of state owned and managed lands

Teague Prichard, State lands Specialist, and **Tim Bever**, Forester, gave a joint presentation. They presented background information on the proposed rule. They stated this rule will create a funding mechanism for artificial and natural regeneration treatments which include site preparation, tree planting and invasive species control associated with forest regeneration. They requested the Board authorize public hearings for Board Order FR-24-11.

Ms. Wiley MOVED approval, seconded by Dr. Thomas. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Cole stated that the next four items are items that have been recommended for approval by the Secretary. He reminded the Board that it is not their role to approve the Stewardship grant but rather if there is a request for a change as it relates to the Nature Based Outdoor Activities, those items do come before the Board.

- 3.B.3 Ratification of department decision to issue a Stewardship grant that will prohibit at least two nature-based outdoor activity (NBOA) on non-department land: River Revitalization Foundation, City of Milwaukee, Milwaukee County

Lavane Hessler, Stewardship Grant Manager, presented a background of the project and reviewed the department's determination. She requested the Board ratify the department's decision that the prohibition of hunting and trapping on 6.47 acres is necessary for public safety.

Dr. Thomas asked whether comments should be directed as to whether the Board should be

approving the NBOA's or to the merits of the project.

Chair Cole stated they have yet to see what those comments are.

Public Appearances:

1. **Kimberly Gleffe**, Milwaukee, representing River Revitalization Foundation as Executive Director spoke in support of the department's determination. **(Handout)**
2. **Kevin Shafer**, Fox Point, representing the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District spoke in support of the department's determination. He stated the DNR has been a great partner on many different efforts in the region.
3. **Carolynn Leaman**, Madison, representing self, spoke in support of the department's determination. She stated that with this project, the quality of habitat will be improved, it will add to the fun factor and safety of the area, and that this is value added for the community.
4. **Ken Leinbach**, Milwaukee, representing the Urban Ecology Center spoke in support of the department's determination. He stated that this is the most densely populated area of the state. It is estimated that the Arboretum will host over 40,000 children and youth annually not including all the kids that come with their families. In total they anticipate over 300,000 visitors a year. **(Handout)**
5. **Jill Pelisek**, Milwaukee, representing self, spoke in support of the department's determination. She stated that human diversity, crime reduction, and access for many who have never experienced conservation or animal life are positive attributes. **(Handout)**
6. **Mary McCormick**, Milwaukee, representing Rotary Club of Milwaukee as Executive Director stated that Rotarians have shown incredibly powerful support for this endeavor of which they are a partner. She stated that in addition to raising money for the construction, the partners are committed to building a Preservation Fund. **(Handout)**
7. **Dan Davis**, Milwaukee, representing self, spoke in support of the department's determination. He and his four boys use the Riverside Park and Urban Ecology Center a lot. He is a hunter and a fisherman. He feels that hunters and trappers can certainly use this parcel as well for other purposes than hunting and trapping because it is appropriate.
8. **Bob Welch**, Redgranite, representing Hunters Rights Coalition stated he was not here to object to this project particularly. He stated his objection is to the continued use of Stewardship dollars, that they believe, violate the intent of the law creating Stewardship. He believes there are cases where monies are being used to augment urban redevelopment or urban development. This does not fit in Stewardship. Parcels located within a city should not be a reason for prohibition. Ordinances can be changed. They will take their position to the legislature.

Mr. Hilgenberg expressed his concerns of trying to locate this property and the need for directions and maps; that there is no local funding for this; and deficiencies of the appraisal process. He stated that this project in general is fantastic for the community and state.

Chair Cole noted that he asked Mr. Hilgenberg to review this project. He appreciated his efforts.

Discussion continued on department guidelines

Dr. Thomas stated she agreed with Mr. Hilgenberg on local funding and that this is a plus if they can get that. She feels the Board will need more information on these as to how these happen and on the guidelines staff use. We all need to get on the page with staff.

She then stated that she does disagree on the use of Stewardship. If the legislature wants

to clarify, that is clearly their prerogative but the Stewardship money got passed by a really broad coalition of people. One million were hunters and five and one-half million were not, who decided to put state money forward for a whole broad variety of reasons. The Board has visited this project now three times since she has been on the Board. Each visit shows more businesses, jobs, and green space, and less crime.

Discussion followed on exposing people to nature and getting them outdoors, the match requirement that is in statute, and the endowment attached to this project.

Dr. Clausen MOVED approval, seconded by Ms. Wiley. The motion carried unanimously.

- 3.B.4 Ratification of department decision to issue a Stewardship grant that will prohibit one nature-based outdoor activity (NBOA) on non-department land: City of Eau Claire, Eau Claire County
Lavane Hessler, Stewardship Grant Manager, presented a background of the project and reviewed the department's determination. She requested the Board ratify the department's decision that the prohibition of hunting is necessary to protect public safety.

Public Appearances:

1. **Phillip Fieber**, Eau Claire, representing Eau Claire Parks, Recreation and Forestry
Department spoke in support of the department's determination.

Discussion followed as to who the prior owner of the property were and for how many years they owned it.

Ms. Wiley MOVED approval, seconded by Dr. Clausen. The motion carried unanimously.

- 3.B.5 Ratification of department decision to issue a Stewardship grant that will prohibit two nature-based outdoor activity (NBOA) on non-department land: City of Muskego, Waukesha County
Lavane Hessler, Stewardship Grant Manager, presented a background of the project and reviewed the department's determination. She requested the Board ratify the department's decision that the prohibition of hunting and trapping is necessary to protect public safety.

Public Appearances:

1. **Craig Anderson**, New Berlin, representing City of Muskego was not in attendance.
(Handout)

Ms. Wiley MOVED approval, seconded by Dr. Clausen. The motion carried unanimously.

- 3.B.6 Ratification of department decision to issue a Stewardship grant that will prohibit at least two nature-based outdoor activity (NBOA) on non-department land: Town of Wilson, Sheboygan County
Lavane Hessler, Stewardship Grant Manager, presented a background of the project and reviewed the department's determination. She requested the Board ratify the department's decision that the prohibition of hunting and trapping is necessary to protect public safety.

Public Appearances:

1. **David Gartman**, Town of Wilson, representing Town of Wilson as Chair. He could not attend due to weather conditions.
2. **Gerald Bertsch**, Town of Wilson, representing self. He could not attend due to weather conditions.

Dr. Thomas stated that she understands the Board is supposed to be reviewing whether an NBOA should be prohibited versus other concerns. However, this one is described as a subdivision development and that there was a farm there previously. It states that it is surrounded by homes or homes under construction. That sounds like we are facilitating parcelization of farmland by helping the developer by buying the parcels that could not be sold to someone else. She asked

why the department is doing this.

Ms. Hessler stated that by statute in code, this is an acquisition and development of a local parks project and we are looking at developing the acquired land to build a park in a local area. In this case, it met all the criteria for their subprogram so it was moved forward.

Mr. Hilgenberg asked how you can look at it as being a benefit for the state of Wisconsin versus for the benefit of the local unit of government.

Julie Sauer, Customer and Employee Services Division Administrator, stated that staff have a specific criteria to use. They do not have the authority to make a judgment call.

Mr. Hilgenberg asked who approved the criteria.

Secretary Stepp stated that when they came in a few years ago, they reviewed how Stewardship was being rated and scored. We thought there was more ambiguity in those decisions than what would be transparent and a good government practice. Matt Moroney, Deputy Secretary, worked with staff to come up with what is good criteria that we can defend so it is not so much of a judgment call or judgment being passed. This one happened to score well and was forwarded.

The Board requested a briefing on Stewardship scoring criteria and the grant process at one of the next meetings of the Board

Attorney Andrvk added that the department has rating and ranking criteria to score these grants that are based on administrative rule and statute requirements and priorities set in statute and rule.

Chair Cole recalled that they did have this discussion as a Board as part of the Sub-Committee work for the second re-authorization. It is timely. He hears the Members loud and clear. The Secretary and staff are willing to put something together to get everyone back on the same page as to what those criteria are.

Discussion followed on clarification of the Board's action, the need for additional information, and whether this item should be tabled to allow for public appearances since both pre-registered speakers had to cancel due to weather conditions.

Dr. Thomas MOVED to table, seconded by Mr. Kazmierski. The motion carried unanimously

3.B.7 Land acquisition – Buena Vista Wildlife Area – Portage County

Mr. Hilgenberg stated that this property is actually south of Plover and not north of Plover like the green sheet describes.

Dr. Thomas MOVED approval, seconded by Mr. Kazmierski. The motion carried unanimously.

3.B.8 Land Donation and Project Boundary Modification – Western Prairie Habitat Restoration Area – Saint Croix County

Dr. Clausen MOVED approval and to acknowledge the donation, seconded by Ms. Wiley. The motion carried unanimously.

3.C. Scope Statements

3.C.1 Request approval of the statement of scope for Board Order FH-26-12, relating to Ch. NR 25, lake trout harvest limits and other issues as required by the State-Tribal Lake Superior Agreement

Peter Stevens, Lake Superior Fisheries Field Unit Supervisor, stated this was similar to the previous item he presented to the Board. The Board voted without further information from staff.

Dr. Clausen MOVED approval, seconded by Dr. Thomas. The motion carried unanimously.

- 3.C.2 Request approval of the statement of scope for Board Order FH-25-12, proposed rules affecting ch. NR 25 related to trap net placement locations and commercial fishing activity in the Restricted Use Area of Lake Superior
Peter Stevens, Lake Superior Fisheries Field Unit Supervisor, presented background information including user conflicts, current regulations, and proposed regulations. He requested the Board approve the statement of scope for Board Order FH-25-12.

Discussion followed on the noticeable increase in nets in this area .

Mr. Hilgenberg MOVED approval, seconded by Ms. Wiley. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Cole moved the meeting to items 6 and 7.A. – Secretary’s Matters.

6. Special Committees’ Reports
None
7. Department Secretary’s Matters
- 7.A. Retirement Resolutions
- 7.A.1 David Algrem
- 7.A.2 Mark De Baker
- 7.A.3 Charlie Kilian
- 7.A.4 Daniel J. McCutchin
- 7.A.5 Richard J. Wilcox

Dr. Clausen MOVED approval, seconded by Mr. Kazmierski of the retirement resolutions. The motion carried unanimously.

- 7.B. Donations
- 7.B.1 The Paul E. Stry Foundation will donate \$20,000 to be used to support the management of state natural areas in the La Crosse area

Mr. Hilgenberg MOVED approval and to acknowledge the donation, seconded by Mr. Kazmierski. The motion carried unanimously.

Secretary Stepp gave a presentation on the year-in-review for 2012 – reflecting on success. She reviewed department goals, use of social media, expanding interactive tools, improving the website, joining technology and traditions, volunteers, enlisting other experts, educating through experience, partnering with schools, reeling in a new generation, calling on mentors, building on recent gains, partnering to promote special places, helping during drought, happy cows and happy farmers, helping in your own back yard, delivering results where you live, adding cost-effective collaboration, combining work and play, moving from recovery to management, helping business start and succeed, and increasing accountability.

Dr. Clausen thanked Secretary Stepp for her presentation.

Chair Cole stated this is not your grandfather’s DNR. Significant changes have been made and good things are going on and that is because of Cathy Stepp, Matt Moroney, Scott Gunderson, and the leadership team. You certainly are servant leaders. He appreciates it and knows this Board appreciates it. It is not going to get any easier for you but he knows you are up to all the challenges before you. He then thanked Secretary Stepp for a wonderful presentation.

Chair Cole requested a motion to go into Executive Session under the authority of s.19.36(1) Wisconsin Statutes for purposes of discussing personnel matters.

Dr. Thomas MOVED, seconded by Mr. Kazmierski. The motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.

William Bruins – absent	Preston Cole – yes
Christine Thomas – yes	Jane Wiley – yes
Terry Hilgenberg – yes	David Clausen – yes
Greg Kazmierski – yes	

Chair Cole reconvened the meeting at 11:35 a.m. He reported that during the Executive Session no action was taken.

Chair Cole then moved the meeting to item 7.B.2

7.B.2 Green Bay Packers will donate \$16,000 to be used to partially fund the “First Downs for Trees” program

Secretary Stepp stated that “First Downs for Trees” began in 2010 as a way to help the Green Bay Packers offset their carbon production when flying to away games. By donating trees to be planted based on first downs, the team reduced its carbon footprint and municipalities in Brown County were able to meet urban forestry and community goals. The continued commitment by the Green Bay Packers to this program is a key component to its success. In 2012, the team donated \$16,000 to the effort in addition to use of their facility and staff time. In the 2011-2012 season, we planted nearly 850 trees in 22 communities thanks to the Green Bay Packers and a Great Lakes Restoration Initiative grant from the U.S. Forest.

This is a win-win program for everyone. The Green Bay Packers reduce their carbon footprint, the waters flowing into the Bay of Green Bay will be cleaner, and communities will benefit from the social, economic, and ecological well-being of urban forests. The “First Downs for Trees” program is a wonderful example of how the DNR is working together with other agencies, communities, and businesses to improve where we live. The involvement of two dozen municipalities, the Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, Brown County, the Green Bay Packers, Wisconsin Public Service, local nurseries and the Wisconsin DNR make this program possible. She then asked Ave Bie, who is representing the Packer organization, to join her at the podium. She asked all in attendance to join her in thanking the Packers for their generous contribution and donation of \$16,000 in this effort. (applause)

Public Appearances:

1. **Ave Bie**, Green Bay Packers Board of Directors. She stated she wore her Super Bowl ring today because at her last appearance everyone asked where it was. She was thrilled to be here on behalf of the Packers. She has been a member of the Green Bay Packer Board since 2004. She is from Green Bay. This is a partnership that not only has advanced so many environmental issues, but it advanced a collaborative effort of a state agency and an organization beloved in Wisconsin.

On behalf of the Green Bay Packers, she thanked Cathy Stepp for her leadership and the department for the wonderful things you do. This is a way for them to leave a legacy well into the future for not only our children and grandchildren but to celebrate a collaborate effort between a state agency that has taken the leadership to do some great things in Wisconsin and offer them a tremendous quality of life and the Green Bay Packers which is certainly their hometown team heroes.

Dr. Thomas MOVED approval and to acknowledge the donation, seconded by Mr. Hilgenberg. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Cole then moved the meeting to item 4.A.

4. Citizen Participation – 1:00 p.m.
4.A. Citizen Participation
Public Appearances

Chair Cole asked Kurt Thiede to give an overview of the MacKenzie property and our relationship to it.

Kurt Thiede, Land Administrator, stated this is an issue that sparked a lot of interest over the past couple of weeks. When the department took a look at the MacKenzie Environmental Education Center (MEEC), it was clear that as it currently existed and what was offered, continues to be valued to the state. He wanted to be clear that the environmental education component of MacKenzie will continue as the MacKenzie Center moves forward. He then reviewed an outdoor skills program; mentorship and the importance of getting youngsters involved in hunting, fishing, and trapping; opening up a request for proposal (RFP) to provide for that three-legged stool of environmental education, outdoor skills, and mentorship training; in closing he discussed funding.

Chair Cole then reviewed the three minute time limit and asked those speaking to be respectful of those that have a differing opinion.

1. **Dave Tremble**, Prairie du Sac, representing The Sauk Prairie Conservation Alliance as President.
Topic: The Sauk Prairie Recreation Area and the Badger Reuse Plan. He stated the plan should be reviewed in the context of the consensus developed for the entire Badger property in 2001. He noted key questions that must be answered as the DNR brings forward its own Master Plan: How will activities proposed for one part of the property support vital ecological processes and conservation objectives at other sites of the property? How will they each contribute to the health of the land and the betterment of the community? **(Handout)**
2. **Derek Duane**, Poynette, representing self.
Topic: Ask NRB to reinstate contract between WI Wildlife Federation, Friends of the MacKenzie Center, and the DNR. He retired from the DNR in 2011 after serving 20 years director of the MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He urged the Board to direct the DNR to rescind the 180-day notice of termination recently given to the WI Wildlife Federation. In addition, he urged the Board to direct the DNR to complete the property master plan with substantial input from the public, schools that use the Center, The Friends of MacKenzie, other stakeholders, and the WI Wildlife Federation. Following Board approval, the RFP should be written and opened for bid. **(Handout)**

[Added] **Representative Brett Hulsey**, 78th Assembly District.

Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He thanked the Board for their work in protecting safety while allowing hunting at state parks. As a lifelong hunter, fisherman and a parent of two who attended the MacKenzie Center, he is here today to oppose efforts to radically change the current environmental and conservation program at the Center. He believes this measure violates DNR's own regulation and is based on many false statements that have been made. The MacKenzie Center is a national environmental model. Since the Wildlife Federation and Friends of MacKenzie Center had taken this on, he has seen steady growth in involvement of students from across the state and Illinois. It is a tourist attraction. We do not want to mess with that. He believes that the changes proposed by the Secretary would threaten the excellent environment education programming as we have heard is being applied in a very cost-effective way and would do so in a way that would not promote conservation education. Again, he wants kids to go out and learn how to hunt, fish, and trap as much as anybody but this takes us in the wrong direction.

The fiscal reality as we have heard is the programming there costs less than it used to. There was no financial reason to make these changes. It appears, perhaps, to be politically

motivated against the Wildlife Federation that does not support many of Governor Walker's political positions. He believes there is a political component here that must be acknowledged. He knows you are shaking your head but we need to be real here. The financial realities are we have a well-run system that is working. Do not "fix" it. The other thing is he believes the DNR would be breaking its own rules if they were to make these changes. You do not have a master plan for this which he believes you need but you should not throw the excellent conservation education out while you prepare that master plan. He believes the DNR should follow its own rules for public participation on this. As you are seeing here today, a room full of people are going to basically stand up and tell you the same thing. The DNR should maintain the current programming, conduct the master planning process, involve all these people, in what the future is going to look like and then let us figure out how to get more money to provide the better conservation, shooting, and other education. **(Handout)**

3. **Ashley Nissen**, Dousman, representing self.

Topic: Ask NRB to reinstate contract between WI Wildlife Federation, Friends of the MacKenzie Center, and the DNR. She believes that if the school based programs were eliminated it would deny thousands of future students the overnight-environmental field trip experience and the making of memories that many of them treasure still to this day. Many of the students and faculty that she had shared the MacKenzie experience with were outraged and disheartened to learn of the possible end to the school-based program. She asked the Board to reconsider terminating the agreement between the WWF, Friends of MacKenzie, and DNR. **(Handout)**

4. **Jackie Woodruff**, Madison, representing Spring Harbor PTSO.

Topic: MacKenzie Center education opportunities. She shared the following three points with the Board: 1) The MEEC is not a dying facility. The programs are growing to meet a diverse user group; 2) The facility is cost-effective and she doubts a private firm can serve 16,000 school children with a \$280,000 budget; 3) There are nine shooting ranges within 20 miles of Poynette. She noted that WI has one of the highest participation rates for hunting and fishing in the U.S. She then read a portion of a letter from Margaret Stumpf of the MacKenzie family. **(Handout)**

5. **Jeremy Woodruff**, Madison, representing self. He was not able to attend.

Topic: MacKenzie Center education opportunities. **(Handout)**

Dr. Thomas stated that they are hearing the message loud and clear as to the value of school-based environmental education. She asked Chair Cole if she could ask Mr. Thiede a question before we proceed.

Chair Cole asked Mr. Thiede to come forward to the podium.

Dr. Thomas asked whether it is noted in the RFP and in the DNR's plan if school-based environmental education was going to be eliminated.

Mr. Thiede stated no, that it was not going to be eliminated. He then read from the draft RFP to help clarify. "Current environmental and conservation education activities taking place at MEEC will continue. These include teaching youth and adult environmental and ecosystem outdoor related education focused on WI's natural resources, conservation, and management, along with demonstration areas showcasing the sustainable use of our natural resources." He then read from Further Clarifying Objectives: "Continue K-12 environmental education programs offered at the Center that support DNR strategic education plans and state/national academic standards.

Dr. Thomas thought this might help everyone to know that as far as she knew, they were not planning to eliminate those things.

Mr. Thiede stated they are not planning on being eliminated.

Chair Cole then moved speakers #44 and #45 to this location so they could return home due to child care issues.

[44] **Carly Gallenberg**, Genesee Depot, representing self.

Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. She stated she is 10 years old and is in the 4th grade. She spoke of her experiences and what she learned this year at MEEC, which she said was incredible. She has siblings in 3rd grade and would be sad if they could not go to MEEC next year. She offered a solution that hunting is on the weekends in the summer and have the children's education programs during the week. One of the exhibits at MEEC is a box that asks you to look inside to see the most dangerous species. It has a mirror in it. Every decision we make has an impact. Keep the programs the way they are.

[45] **Amy Gallenberg**, Genesee Depot, representing self.

Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. She is Carly's mom. Her job as a parent is to provide many opportunities for her kids to learn and to love learning. Since 2008, they have seen take-aways at their public school such as foreign language, music programs, and teachers/class merges. These programs never come back. MEEC programs make public education competitive with private. We need to keep programs like this. It is a win-win-win. She questioned how we can drive sustainable change by selling out the future. She asked for reassurances that the programming in its current format are maintained and that the DNR formally include educators in the bid selection process.

Chair Cole stated that he usually does not allow clapping since this is not a pep rally. People do get intimidated. Unless you are cute or 10 years old: no clapping. To be clear: no clapping, please.

6. **Ralph Fritsch**, Townsend, representing self.

Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He stated MEEC's purpose was to be a learning center, a meeting place for environmental groups and organizations, and a community gathering area. He stated that environmental education, skills function, and mentor education could co-exist on a daily basis of operation. A little inner working thought could have total prevented what we are faced now. The solution could be for open public hearings allowing all involved to contribute their ideas and thoughts into making all of this work together again.

(Handout)

7. **Don Hammes**, Middleton, representing The Yahara Fishing Club.

Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He stated that on Monday, February 11, Kurt Thiede and Southern District Manager Mark Aquino informed WWF's Executive Director George Meyer and himself that the 10-year contract between DNR and WWF to provide school based environmental education to WI's youth at MacKenzie was being terminated after the sixth year despite the success of the program. They were told there would not be any more school based environmental education at MEEC and that the focus would be on outdoor skills. He is happy to hear today this decision was changed. They were also told this program was too costly for the DNR to support. The DNR's own cost benefit study showed that MEEC has the lowest cost per student of any of DNR's education centers. This decision was made without any comprehensive plan to replace the current education activities at MEEC. He questioned if it is the Board's policy to exclude the public from considering different recreational options, if it is the NRB's policy to ban the 250-acre MEEC from the master planning process, and whether the DNR should be penny wise and pound foolish when it comes to outdoor environmental education for WI's youth? (Handout)

8. **Jason Dinsmore**, Rochester, representing the National Wildlife Federation.

Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He read a letter from their National President Larry Schweiger. He urged the WI Legislature, Natural Resources Board, and DNR to consider the cumulative impact of their decision regarding the continuing relationship with WWF and the MacKenzie Center. Those 16,000 kids every year will be dearly missed by the conservation community as a whole. Without the support and understanding of these kids, we risk continuing the downward slide of participation in hunting and fishing and the members of the public who support those activities. (Handout)

9. **Francis Finn**, Lowville, representing self.
Topic: MacKenzie Center. He gives WWF much of the credit for saving MEEC during the last administration. No other organization offered to come forward to help. The Friends of MEEC is a dedicated group whose purpose is to encourage, perpetuate and promote natural resource and conservation education in Wisconsin. Being a town resident, he was disturbed by the lack of community involvement with regard to the changes at the MEEC. They found out that a shooting range was in the plans for the new partnership. Neighbors complained of the one at this site in the mid-70's. He asked the Board to help the DNR reconsider this "cart before the horse" situation. He asked that the new environmental education programming be as wide ranging, robust, and beneficial to our children and grandchildren as the current programming is. **(Handout)**

10. **Kim SperryFrazier**, Milton, representing Northside Intermediate School.
Topic: MacKenzie Center. She stated that MEEC is an integral part of combining conservationism and environmentalism into our daily lives. The MEEC land is not owned by the DNR. Its use and stewardship belongs to the taxpayers of WI. It is the DNR's short sightedness that has led to half-truths in the media, to lessen their focus on their agenda: to make MacKenzie a "pay to play" center. Governor Walker and his entourage talk how important educational programming is for our state, yet the DNR is trusting the environmental education of our greatest natural resource, our children, to a private interest group. **(Handout –packet included 60 comments from students)**

- Chair Cole** warned that no disparaging comments will be allowed. If you do so, you will be escorted out of the room. It will not be tolerated.

11. **Ruth Ann Lee**, Poynette, representing self. She is the current Director of MEEC.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. She asked that the DNR restart the partnership agreement, continue the current school based environmental education programs, and plan for the Center's future – with public and stakeholder involvement before issuing an RFP. Last year at the State Fair, Secretary Stepp told her not to worry. Well she is, she worries about the kids they serve, their employees, and for her family. **(Handout)**

12. **Janice Delo**, Milton, representing self.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. She stated that only an environmentally informed public will have the knowledge and passion to preserve WI's natural resources. She believes the proposal to change the MEEC is unjustified and irresponsible. WI residents deserve the educational benefits unique to MacKenzie. **(Handout)**

13. **Leslie Delo**, Milton, representing self.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He believes that the real reason the DNR wants to change the MEEC is to satisfy special interest groups and further the attack on public education. Do not change a facility that was established for the purpose of learning about environmental education and is so successful in providing that education to students and the public. Leave MEEC as it is. Set your classes and activities up at a different facility. **(Handout)**

14. **Chuck Matyska**, Cecil, representing self. He was not in attendance.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center

15. **Neil Bishop**, Lodi, representing Friends of MacKenzie as President.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. The Friends of MacKenzie are volunteers and we exist because of environmental education for our kids. Environmental education at MEEC is a unique learning experience enjoyed by those that come here. Their rewards as volunteers come from the excitement and looks on young people's faces. The DNR's timeline shows poor judgment and lack of respect for the WWF employees and the

loyal participants in the EE program at MacKenzie. Is that serving the citizens of WI?

On behalf of the Friends of MacKenzie, he asked the Board to persuade the DNR to 1) reinstate the current contract until such time as a new program is developed and ready for implementation; 2) put together a plan for MEEC and seek public input; and 3) insure that any awarding of a contract to operate MEEC maintains the same standard of environmental education and animal care that is currently in place. (**Handout** and a flyer announcing the April 6 Maple Syrup Festival)

Chair Cole stated to Mr. Bishop, from one Chair to another, thank you for your service.

16. **Kathy Liska**, Madison, representing self.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. She stated her contact with MEEC has been through/with her children. This is a fantastic program and she would hate to see it diminished in any way. She then finished reading a letter from Margaret Stumpf that Jackie Woodruff, speaker # 4, had started.
17. **Derek Johnson**, DeForest, representing self.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He stated he was concerned that decision-makers within the DNR have chosen to disregard the value of what has been a vital part of many school curriculum activities on an annual basis for the sake of a few training sessions for hunting, fishing, and trapping skills. This to him is a tragedy. The outdoor skills that the DNR is talking about are already in place. Why take away from what is already there to start over in growing this entirely new program? Why not work in partnership with the partner that was already on site, instead of pursuing a new vendor? If this plan goes forward as stated, future generations that will appreciate the outdoor world in a diverse way will have been neglected in favor of serving a very specific target audience in an effort to increase annual license sales. (**Handout**)
18. **Virgil Schroeder**, Cottage Grove, representing the Wisconsin Trappers Association (WTA).
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. They regularly work with WWF to put on trapping skills classes for future young and novice trappers at MEEC. However, they are just as supportive of keeping the WWF's current school-based environmental education program at MEEC. They fully incorporate harvest of fish and wildlife by hunting, fishing, and trapping in their daily course work for their school-based programs. The WTA believes that the WWF's school-based program is as important to the future of trapping in WI than the teaching of trapping skills to future trappers. He asked the Board and Secretary Stepp to continue the WWF's current school-based environmental education program at MEEC. (**Handout**)
19. **Mark Tomlinson**, Poynette, representing self.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He stated he and his family live next to MEEC. He has fond memories of when his father worked at the game farm and his Grandmother helped make the maple syrup. He remembers looking at the animals with his aunt. The Maple Syrup Festival held at MEEC is extremely important to his community of Lowville and the community of Poynette. Eliminating MEEC will mean that his childhood and the community traditions will be gone for generations to come. (**Handout**)
20. **Annalynn Hammond**, Poynette, representing self.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. She stated she is the full-time animal caretaker at MEEC. Her major issue with the DNR's plan is that there is no plan. There are only two options, but both are impossible under the current timeline: 1) The animals stay at the property and continue to receive high-quality care. Under the DNR's proposal, the WWF staff is leaving August 15 and the RFP selection is not until fall. This gap means the necessary transition could not take place. 2) The animals are transferred to other appropriate, high-quality facilities. Based on her 17 years of animal experience, a timeline of one full year would be very optimistic. The plan the DNR has offered is one of no time at all

since the RFP selection is after the current employees have left. Many of the animals are elderly and have lived at the center almost their entire lives. A move to a new facility would cause extreme stress. Further, DATCP and USDA regulations prohibit some animals from being moved at all. She hoped it is apparent to the Board and DNR that the only possible way to maintain the required standards of animal care at MEEC is for the current contract to be extended and for the DNR to develop a detailed plan that addresses all of these issues.

(Handout)

21. **George Meyer**, Madison, representing Wisconsin Wildlife Federation as Executive Director. **Topic:** MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He emphasized the point that Don Hammes and Friends of MacKenzie made earlier. Three weeks ago, there were meetings with WWF, the Friends of MacKenzie, and DNR. It was very specific, in fact, there was not going to be a mandatory requirement on the RFP to have environmental education. Things may have changed but they were not told. Clearly there has been public interest in this. He thanked Secretary Stepp and Administrator Thiede for making those changes. He stated there are roles for the Natural Resources Board and roles for the Secretary. You have supervisory and policy making responsibilities. DNR has the charge of administration. He listed four reasons for the Board to exercise their supervisory responsibilities: 1) the Board has previously recognized its supervisory responsibility in December 2005 when it directed the DNR to keep MEEC going. 2) It is the history and long-time practice of this Board to assure that there is adequate public involvement in resource management and DNR property use before decisions are made. It was for this very purpose that this Citizen Board was created in 1928. 3) Your rule NR 1.60(1) provides that the Board has final authority to determine whether a property management plan is required for any department property. Also, since this will ultimately require the Board's budgetary approval, it is appropriate for the Board to exercise its supervisory responsibility and require a property management plan. 4) Your rule NR 1.70 sets Board policy on environmental education and singularly designates the MacKenzie Center for environmental education programming. Any one of these stated reasons is sufficient for the Board to assume its supervisory responsibility in this matter.

The Federation is willing to take some cost reductions. They were told initially the DNR was going to come back and negotiate with them. They were ready for it but they got the termination notice. They also have ideas for alternative funds to keep this place going until a plan is in place. **(Handout)**

Mr. Kazmierski asked Mr. Meyer whether WWF plans on putting a bid in for the RFP.

Mr. Meyer stated they surely hope so but have not yet seen the RFP. They are not a rich organization. The DNR is talking about how they cannot afford the \$185,000 or \$285,000 depending on how it is calculated. WWF and the Friends put up \$178,000. WWF does not have a big budget. What they will be looking at is if they can afford to do it. They do it well, they do it cheap, but they cannot do it for nothing. Any of your staff will tell you this, while you can get revenue from skills programs by charging kids and clubs, environmental education loses money. It has to be heavily subsidized. That is why the state has been in this business. They will look at it and they will look for partnerships. Please keep it going until you get there. Your staff told us at that meeting that this was a major change; that it has never been done in the United States before but we are going to put out an RFP. That gives them grave concern that no studies have been done.

Chair Cole stated he is an environmental advocate in Milwaukee. He stated to Mr. Meyer that he appreciates your effort.

22. **Marv Tomlinson**, Poynette, representing self and family. **Topic:** MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. Their family farm which has been in the family for almost 200 years borders approximately 80% of the east side of the MacKenzie Center. For years they have tried to be good neighbors with the state owned property. He would appreciate the state informing the neighboring landowners of any changes before they hear it from an outside source. He gets the impression the state is trying to railroad something

through. He feels the state has a great facility for training children. Why spend more money to change the facility for a different type of training?

He does not oppose hunting, trapping, or fishing but he remembered they had a rifle range in the 60's and 70's. Because of neighbors' complaints and lack of supervision of the users it was closed down. He is definitely opposed to a rifle range being installed because their land is used daily for family recreation. He would like to see the MacKenzie Center remain the same because the children from the inner cities are benefitting greatly from their experience. It would be a tragedy for the youth to lose this facility. **(Handout)**

23. **Roxanne Burgard**, Poynette, representing self.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. She stated she was fortunate enough to work at MacKenzie once her four children were in school. She is an LTE for the DNR. When she started, there were no educators and only a part-time group facilitator in the program. In 2005, MacKenzie was slated to close once again. A partnership was formed to keep the MacKenzie open. They negotiated for some time and came up with an agreement that worked for everyone. This was to be a 10 year contract. She eventually was hired by WWF to work part-time for them while she kept her DNR position. Since that time MEEC has flourished in touching children's lives. How can you put a value on that much less than a price tag? She asked that the contract be reinstated. **(Handout)**

24. **Becky Tomlinson**, Lowville, representing Town of Lowville as Supervisor.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. She stated that MEEC has been a draw for their tourism businesses for many years. The Town of Lowville would like to see it remain open to the public year round. They are concerned about the proposed shooting ranges and hunting that may go on at the MacKenzie. Over 100 new houses were built adjacent to or across the road from MEEC since the range in the 1960's was closed due to safety concerns and trespassing. She asked that the DNR teach their hunting and shooting in more remote places such as the already established hunting areas that Lowville taxpayers support, and leave the much more heavily populated area that surrounds MEEC alone, keeping it open to the public for tourism and for education. **(Handout)**

25. **Barbara Sickenberger**, Poynette, representing self. She was not in attendance.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center

26. **Marcia MacKenzie**, Madison, representing self.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. She is the granddaughter of Harley MacKenzie. She brought along his great-great-grandkids. Harley was the first chief warden of the state, and is legendary among the wardens. He was a lifetime hunter and fisher. He taught her how to shoot as a young child. The following is what he taught her family: 1) Without educating young people about preserving the environment, there will be no hunting or fishing for future generations. 2) Young people whose parents hunt and fish teach them hunting and fishing skills (DNR website says that over 80% of young hunters come from hunting families. 3) The majority of kids parents do not hunt or fish. Those children on their own are not going to go out and seek hunting and fishing skills or even understand that hunting and fishing is good for game management. 4) Environmental education provided to the school groups, scouting, 4H, and other groups that come to MEEC introduces the 90% of children who are not being taught hunting by their folks, to the concept of game management and the importance of hunting for environmental balance. 5) Her grandfather taught her this as she taught her children and grandchildren, and the folks at the DNR over all of these years have known. They still do. That is why her grandfather purchased and created the MacKenzie Center years ago. That is why it became an environmental education center in the 1960's. That is why WWF, which is WI's largest hunting and fishing group, is running its educational programs. 6) There is no logical reason to change MacKenzie or its programs. It is the only facility of its kind. 7) They have heard reasons today for cancelling this contract and letting it out for commercial bid. It does not make much sense. 8) All of this begs the question: Why would we invite a commercial enterprise to change its wonderful programs and take over the costs and introduce

hunting training and a shooting range? What about the beautiful buildings, the lodge, and the kitchen, which were paid for by the citizens of Wisconsin over all of these years? It makes no sense.

In closing, she said the talk around the Capitol and the DNR is that privatizing MacKenzie is politically motivated. There are lots of people watching and not just the people in this room. If it is privatized and commercialized and its mission is changed, they will report to the public and the public will hold those responsible accountable. **(Handout)**

27. **Jerry Burke**, Village of Poynette, representing Village of Poynette Board as President. He was not in attendance.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center

28. **Adam Brandt**, Mauston, representing self.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He stated that he works at MEEC and that he supports the DNR every year through buying licenses. He does not support the DNR's proposal for MEEC. According to the DNR's proposal, "outdoor skills" only consist of learning things to participate in hunting, fishing, and trapping. He questioned why it is okay for the DNR to skip the planning process and public input sessions for MEEC. He asked the Board to urge the DNR to reconsider their proposal and to keep the current partnership the way it is. They also need to keep the native wildlife exhibit up and running at the center. They should allow for the WWF to keep operating the center until the planning process has been completed and a new contractor can take over in order to avoid any gaps in the programming. **(Handout)**

29. ~~**Evan Duchow**, Pardeeville, representing self~~ He asked to be removed from the list since he could no longer attend.
~~**Topic:** MacKenzie Environmental Education Center~~

30. **Amber Hahn**, Poynette, representing self.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. She is the former Republican Party of Columbia County Chair. She has had ten years in corporate finance and two years of auditing. She agrees it is absolutely correct to send out an RFP for any substantial expenditure. With that said, dollar amounts give very little information. They always need to be compared on an index basis or dollar per unit basis. The current funding of \$285,000 funds over 200,000 hours in environmental education. That is \$1.41 per hour. This funding has not increased since 2006. That is an 84 index which is something anyone in private would love to have. She challenged the Board to ensure that this type of analysis is completed with the RFP. For this to occur, the 200,000 hours of environmental education must be included. In fact, they should be the basis for the RFP, with hunting, trapping, and angling training supplementing the RFP. Poynette would welcome more visitors and users of the Center. She thanked the DNR for all the media attention generated already. MEEC is run on a day to day basis by a core group that is incredibly mindful of every expense. She knows that WWF has opposed republican policy in the past. However, it is running MEEC incredibly efficient. Go ahead, put out the RFP. Make sure 200,000 hours of environmental education is included and allow WWF to bid on it.

31. **Andrew Sheppard**, Palmyra, representing self.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He stated that he is here for his kids. He went to MEEC in 1986. He was a punky kid that was always out in the woods with a gun, bow, or fishing rod. He learned at MEEC there was more to the environment than just that. He ended up getting a degree in wildlife ecology from UW-Madison. It is the hands on learning that cannot be replaced in a classroom. He can take his kids and teach them the concepts but they need to see the physical animal in MacKenzie to learn and to have that moment of awe. He feels that if hunting, fishing, and trapping are taught at MEEC, it will not match with the current curriculum for schools. The schools will not make the three day trip. He does understand the need for the new hunter mentorship program. He took his oldest daughter hunting for the first time this year. He feels this enhanced mission he has read about

is a redundancy. A simple search on the DNR's website shows that there are trapping programs, fishing programs, and hunting programs. It can be taught at home and at the DNR. You need to concentrate on conservation and not just hunting.

32. **Brenda Allen-Johnson**, Arlington, representing self. She was not in attendance.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center.
33. **Brit Schoeneberg**, Poynette, representing Poynette Area Chamber of Commerce.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. She offered the following five points:
1) Their membership consists of 45 area businesses. They continue to support and have been closely involved with MEEC and Game Farm. 2) The DNR costs of running this facility are not explained correctly. The budget includes costs that are part of the infrastructure such as buildings and electricity. 3) They request the DNR withdraw the termination of their current contract with MEEC including the native WI wildlife exhibit and to continue the existing contract to cover the 2013 and 2014 programs. 4) They request the DNR be required to create a written and visual plan to explain their intentions for the physical and program changes including presentations to Poynette's residents. 5) Include the MEEC staff, the Friends of MacKenzie, and WWF members in the planning process.
She then suggested the following: 1) Consider the whole 500 acres: the 250 acres used for the state pheasant program, owned and run by the DNR, and the 250 acres where MEEC is located. 2) Have the DNR work with the current MEEC staff, the Friends, and the WWF to create a plan to have both children and adult education on the property. 3) Consider a shooting range in a gulley or similar area on the 500 acres. Check out the Dane County Sheriff shooting range near Waunakee.
34. **Ryan Wherley**, Madison, representing self.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He stated he is greatly disappointed that no public hearing was held before the decision was made, and that no public input was taken ahead of time while at the same time failing to develop a master plan for the Board. This shows a disregard for the democratic process and at some extent, disdain to the citizens of WI in saying how our tax dollars are spent. He fears this is another example of special interests being put before public good and need. As for funding the \$185,000 or \$285,000, whichever way you look at it, is a mere pittance. Shortly after the DNR's press release, NRA ally United Sportsmen of WI put out a press release that began by saying "commend the DNR in actively pursuing a correction in the current trend of declining sportsmen numbers." Unfortunately, that tends not to be the case. The 2011 national survey of fishing, hunting, and wildlife associated recreation, listed WI as second most to hunters in the nation and fourth most per capita which is 17% of the population. He asked why the United Sportsmen of Wisconsin putting out such factually incorrect information on this decision by the DNR. What is at stake for them in this process? He then reviewed his childhood memories of MEEC and of the animals that live there. He worries that his state's natural resources continue to be up for sale and he fears that Aldo Leopold is rolling over in his grave.
35. **Terry Kaldhusdal**, Oconomowoc, representing his 4th grade students at Kettle Moraine School District.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He is a former Kohl Fellowship Award winner, past History Teacher of the Year and past State Teacher of the Year. He is not a lobbyist. He has no financial interest in MEEC. He is here representing his students. Two things said earlier changed what he was going to say: 1) Dr. Thomas' question and 2) Mr. Thiede's answer. He then read an email sent by Mr. Thiede to his students. It was about environmentally based education. He wrote "to the question of will next year's fourth grade class have the same curriculum and overnight stays as occurred in the past? That he cannot guarantee. I am sorry. While environmental education will be part of the offerings at MacKenzie, we will not know until we receive the proposals from the prospective operators how they plan to administer the outdoor skills, environmental education, and mentorship training at MEEC." That is a very different answer than what he gave before.

He asked his students on his way out the door this morning to give him one word to describe MacKenzie. They gave him answers such as educational, tracking, woods, perfect, one-in-a-million, and joy. Why would you want to change the focus of a program that brings joy to students? You need to start including educators who bring their students to MEEC as part of the process. **(Handout)**

36. **Joel Stone**, Madison, representing self.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He stated he is a retired DNR employee and was a wildlife manager. He is not opposed to expanding outdoor skills education at MEEC. He is opposed to the DNR abandoning the facilities and relinquishing control of the programs conducted there. In order for any long-term education program to be successful at the Center, the DNR must have a solid presence. He urged the DNR to stay involved for the following reasons: 1) Name recognition. 2) Facility upkeep. 3) Partnerships. 4) Community support. He urged the Board and DNR to not give up on MEEC. Its budget is small for what it does and can accomplish. Maintain the facilities and let the staff and partners expand their quality programs to include more emphasis on skills training. **(Handout)**
37. **Amy Skaar**, Poynette, representing self. She was not in attendance.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center
38. **Karen Etter Hale**, Madison, representing Madison Audubon Society.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. She stated that besides advocacy on behalf of nature and restoring natural habitat, a very important part of their mission is education. She seconds most of what has been said today. They were really shocked as many learned, that without seeking any input from the local community or participating schools, the DNR decided to break the 10 year no-cost increase contract even though the WWF and Friends of MacKenzie are doing an outstanding job. Why is the DNR trying to fix something that is not broken? Besides the nearly 16,000 students that gain from visiting the Center each year, MacKenzie receives significant use on the weekends when visitors come to view the wildlife exhibits and hike the trails. They urged the Board to retain WWF and Friends of MacKenzie through the end of the contract. At the very least, retain them through the 2014 school year which is fully booked. If the DNR is short on funds to run the Center, perhaps funds could come from the school voucher program and be used to cover the educational costs. In the meantime, they urge the DNR to work on developing a plan by involving all interested parties, by providing plenty of opportunities for public input, then and only then issue the RFP.
39. **Kyle Coker**, Madison, representing self.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He is the part-time animal caretaker at MEEC. He stated there are 35 animals representing 23 native WI species. They are all non-releasable and were taken in with the intent of providing them a home for life. These animals provide a vital component to the environmental education at the MacKenzie Center, giving thousands of schoolchildren every year the opportunity to see WI's wildlife up close. They also provide a unique opportunity for wildlife students from Wisconsin universities to gain professional experience. Multiple year-round interns help make the wildlife exhibit an exemplary facility, focusing on natural diets and environmental education to provide the best life possible for these animals. He then named all the animals in the exhibit. If you have not visited the wildlife exhibit, he highly suggested you do so. **(Handout)**
40. **Andy Sleger**, Madison, representing self.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He stated that he grew up within two miles of MEEC. He was a misguided child but found his way through MEEC. He is now a successful project manager with a private environmental restoration firm. He wanted to say that environmental education is necessary for the survival of the human race. It is a balance. If we are irresponsible with nature, there is no repairing it. Every human has to be a steward of nature. What better way to educate about nature than at MEEC? He offered the following points: 1) It provides hands-on education at an extremely low cost. 2) MEEC is a great

display of the history of WI; particularly the management and mismanagement of the state's natural resources. 3) There are plenty of shooting ranges in the area. This is not a necessary thing to have at MEEC. 4) MEEC is a great place to learn of ecosystems and their importance to human race. He asked that the DNR please reinstate the contract with WWF and Friends of MacKenzie until you can obtain public input and come up with a legitimate RFP. **(Handout)**

41. **Charlie Brown**, Milton, representing Wisconsin Muzzle Loaders Association (WMLA).
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. WMLA is opposed to the DNR terminating the lease contract with WWF and the Friends of MacKenzie who have been operating MEEC for the education of school age students for the last six years. In no way do they feel that environmental education should be decreased or eliminated. Until all stakeholders have had input into the new plans, they ask that the contract be reinstated to allow the facility to continue as an environmental education center. The DNR said that they want to improve their relationship with the citizens of WI. This action appears to be one giant step backwards. **(Handout)**
42. **Bob Welch**, Redgranite, representing Hunters Rights Coalition.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He spoke in favor of DNR's plans. He feels that today has been helpful to a lot of people in the room because there has been a lot of misunderstanding and rumors out there. The original idea of a private/public partnership is a good idea but it was not put out to bid. There was no RFP to see what else was out there. He was not there at the time and does not know how that happened. We may get everything that everyone is lauding today and a whole bunch more. It is never a bad idea to have openness and transparency and to test the marketplace. Why not save money if you can. Environmental education is a good idea – we support it. As our kids become more and more removed from wildlife, as they become more urban they may not have mentors in their families to do this. This is an exciting initiative. They have heard from National Groups that they might be interested in bidding on this. They applaud the DNR for opening the transparent process here and they think it is a good idea to see what is out there.
43. **Nancy Elsing**, Portage, representing Columbia County Economic Development Corporation.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center changes. She requested that DNR develop a written business plan for the changes at MEEC and hold public meetings before going forward with an RFP. They would like the school based environmental education programs to be continued until new programs are up and running. Please keep in mind it is not just for the youth but also for the adults. Remember the importance of the center for the economy of Poynette, Town of Lowville, Dekora, and the entire Columbia County. They appreciate the employment, the wages that help their businesses, and tourism. Multiply all the MEEC students by the years they have been coming to give you an idea of a good base for tourism. It brings in sales tax for their county. She noted that her mom worked with Warden MacKenzie at the game farm. She appreciates the long time she has had to enjoy the Center.
44. **Carly Gallenberg**, Genesee Depot, representing self. She spoke after speaker #5.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center
45. **Amy Gallenberg**, Genesee Depot, representing self. She spoke after Carly Gallenberg.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center
46. **John Ivens**, Poynette, representing self.
Topic: MacKenzie Environmental Education Center. He explored the DNR's story that explains why they are ending the current contract at MacKenzie. The DNR explains that their reason is based in "costs" – that it is just too darned expensive to run. This does not make sense. MEEC was not a problem during the financial crash in 2008 and 2009, or 2011 when Governor Walker faced a massive budget shortfall. Fast forward to now and the budget outlook is so improved that an income tax cut has been proposed. MEEC is now suddenly a problem? Fast forward to tomorrow and the proposed 2014-15 budget increases the DNR's

revenues. The DNR study from fall last year found that MEEC programming had the lowest “cost-per-pupil”. Why in this story of “costs” are they terminating this highly successful and cost-effective program rather than it be championed? This makes little sense. He urged the Board to restore the current contract, restore transparency to this process, and to develop a master plan that allows more input from stakeholders. **(Handout)**

Chair Cole thanked those in attendance for their respectfulness that many of them showed for this Board and this process. The Board heard a little bit about a lesson in civics. There certainly has been a lot of discussion today about our differences. He listed some items where there is agreement on MEEC: 1) Both the DNR and the WI Wildlife Foundation (WWF) want to maximize the use for MacKenzie for future generations. That goes without saying. George Meyer (WWF) represents a number of hunting and fishing groups. The DNR too wants the need for increased recruitment and retention, and certainly around skills training. There is no question that this is important for the DNR and this Board. It should be important for the folks in this room that we yearn for low cost, high impact programming for our youth; that environmental education is important and a cornerstone for DNR and certainly for WWF. One only had to be here earlier in the day to see what the DNR staff put before the Board and what the Board voted on in terms of environmental education for youth in this state. There is no question it is important for both organizations. We both agree, we are not giving up on MEEC. This Board is not going to give up on MEEC. The DNR is not going to give up on MEEC nor will WWF. That is the lesson in civics. If we focus on where we agree, maybe, solutions can come to bear. He then asked for the view point of Board Members.

Mr. Kazmierski stated he could not help but get a little bit angry here. The department was accused of all kinds of different things with this. He had asked Bill Cosh, Agency Spokesperson, send to him every press release. In no press release or statement of the department was the misinformation that the Board was hearing today put out by the department. He read through each one of them. He is not totally sure what kind of misinformation campaign went out there to waste a lot of these people’s time to come here today. He is disappointed about that. It did not need to go to that point. He is sure they will get good people coming forward on being able to continue the programs out there and add on to them. That is what the whole point of this was.

Mr. Hilgenberg stated we have all been encouraged by the commitment of people to environmental education. We all agree with that. Since his short tenure on this Board, it has been very evident to him that the department has committed to that. He sees that not changing in this program. He would certainly hope the department takes that home. The educational part of our programming will foster great benefits for the department and the citizens of WI in showing better and greater appreciation of what WI has to offer all our citizens. He has a great deal of trust in the department that they will value this facility and continue to value this facility and do what is in the best interest of all of the citizens of WI. Being up 35 miles west of Lambeau Field, he does not have any kids that go to this facility. He is sure MEEC is a wonderful one. Their kids have the opportunity to go to the Navarino Wildlife Center. This facility is totally run by volunteers. He did not believe the department spends any money on that facility but they get 2,000 kids and not 16,000 kids each year. Again, this is important. He trusts that the department will do the right thing to maximize the environmental education for all of our citizens as well as to be able to expand the use of what he hears is a fantastic facility in a population center that can be utilized by a lot of folks. The charge is there for the department.

Ms. Wiley stated that one of the things that Mr. Thiede assured the Board he would do and knows he is doing is getting ideas for the RFP (request for proposal). The speakers today have done a good job of giving the Board ideas on what should be included. She took some notes as well, which she presented to the Board as follows: 1) Educators need to be in the evaluation program for the RFP. 2) That the department should not terminate the relationship with WWF before the RFP’s have been reviewed and before the contract has been awarded. Perhaps the lease should be continued until everything is in place and to not simply drop it. 3) Within the RFP, is there a plan for the animals and whether in fact they will be continued to be cared for and how they are cared

for at MEEC or how many new facilities can in fact be found for the animals? 4) The need for a public hearing and need for a management plan that the public sees and is very transparent. 5) Define what kind of shooting range is going to be there. Her guess is there has been some miscommunication on this in terms of what size shooting range it is going to be. She did not think the plan within the department was ever to have a full-size shooting range with skeet, trap, sporting clays, and so forth. That is something again within the department needs to be refined and made more transparent. 6) The words “outdoor skills” perhaps is not necessarily what one wants now. The way outdoor skills have been identified within the discussion today is that it is hunting, fishing, and trapping skills. Obviously, outdoor skills are much wider than that. This is one of those perceptions and miscommunications. 7) Put the planning process first. 8) Add adult education. 9) Continue department management because of the DNR stamp of approval that goes on things that are in fact approved and part of DNR.

These are the things that she picked out of this as broadening the scope of what the program should be and also including citizen participation.

Dr. Thomas echoed what Mr. Hilgenberg and Ms. Wiley said. People are here today because they think something is happening that they were not involved in. Mr. Meyer gave the Board a little public administration lesson today of whose role is what. She has always even tried to police the Board in that score to try to stay out the Secretary’s business and to stay in our own business. We can argue about whether we should have a master plan on this property or not. Going back through all the Secretary’s that ever were, there has not been a master plan on this property. That is not really a change in direction historically. All of that is neither here nor there. What we are hearing from citizens is that they would like to see environmental education continue in a form like it is now, meaning overnight programs and all the excitement that comes with staying overnight. Harley MacKenzie, incidentally, she was so tickled to see the MacKenzie descendants; Harley MacKenzie was one of the people who worked early on with others to have environmental education required in the schools of Wisconsin. We were the first state to have that. He was one of the key players. She does not think that anyone here wants to change that direction. Firstly, she believes that everyone is concerned about the animals. She cannot imagine that the department would do anything to hurt them. Secondly, she does not feel the department would do anything to change that direction without some major public involvement process. Thirdly, people are worried about what is going to happen to the school program in the transition if there is an RFP and a short timeline. She sees these as the key issues. She personally does not think she wants to muck in the business of the Secretary but she believes the Secretary has heard what the people are concerned about: public involvement, the animals, what is going to happen with the schools next year, and environmental education.

Dr. Clausen stated the people have pretty much said it all.

Secretary Stepp thanked the Board for their thoughtful and insightful comments. We always take those to heart and they appreciate your guidance. That is why you are here. It is a very important role that you play. To the members of the public, it takes a lot to take time out of your day from your work and family schedules and to show up. We all know the world is run by those who show up. She appreciates that you did that. She also wanted to assure you, she is a mom with kids in the public school system. She understands how hard it is to get kids engaged in things outside of their PlayStations and their games. To get them outside and to understand that important connection between the theories of things and the reality of things and how important that environmental education piece is to all of you as it is to the department. That is unwavering. She wanted to assure them of that and their commitment to that part of the program. The exciting thing they are taking about today and a few people touched on it, is that for the first time for this facility, we are going to have an opportunity for all kinds of people to give us their plans and to say this is what we think we can bring in. Whether that is in partnership with other organizations like the Federation to whom she gives the bottom of her heart thanks for allowing them to continue this important facility in the state. She encouraged WWF to be part of the process moving forward. She wants 4th graders 40 years from now to be talking about their recent field trips to MacKenzie and what it means to them. She thanked everyone again for their commitment,

spirit, and compassion for environmental education. Know that you have been heard.

Dr. Thomas asked Secretary Stepp whether her address was a commitment to address these issues.

Secretary Stepp responded yes. They will address those issues.

5. Board Members' Matters

5.A. Appointment of five (5) members of the Sporting Heritage Council

Chair Cole stated that he had assigned Dr. Thomas and Mr. Kazmierski to a working group to review the candidates. He asked for their report.

Mr. Kazmierski reported that they had a very difficult time narrowing the list down to the final group. After going through an extensive review of some very good candidates, the working group recommended the following be appointed by the Board to the Sporting Heritage Council:

- **Deer, Ralph Fritsch** –Wisconsin Wildlife Federation
- **Bear, Andy Pantzlaff** –Wisconsin Bear Hunters Association
- **Furbearer, Scott Zimmerman** –Wisconsin Trappers Association
- **Angling, Benjamin Gruber** – Kids and Mentors Outdoors
- **Game Birds, Mark LaBarbera** –Friends of the Poynette Game Farm

Mr. Kazmierski MOVED to approve the Board appointments to the Sporting Heritage Council, seconded by Dr. Clausen. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Cole requested the Board report on any Board Members Matters.

Mr. Kazmierski revisited the discussion on CWD from yesterday's meeting. He did not feel it was appropriate to bring this up at that time. The scientists from Prevent were back. This was the group that had been working on the vaccine study. They met with Safari Club International chapter presidents. He had tagged along. There were some very promising results that they had a vaccine. They are currently working on live trials in Wyoming on elk. They will be coming to Wisconsin again and would like to have Wisconsin be the place for where they work on these live trials on white tails. He recalled the state has this perfect place for them to do that that we bought that is double fenced. They will be in contact. It was good to hear that they were making tremendous progress on the CWD vaccine.

Mr. Hilgenberg wished everyone a safe trip home.

Dr. Thomas responded to Mr. Kazmierski. She felt compelled to say that she is a scientist. She also understands the value of these CWD vaccine trials. She also has some concerns because of Murphy's Law - anything that can go wrong, will go wrong and also because all this time we have quarantined this place so we hope at some point these prions are not active. We do not know now whether there are active prions there or whether there are none. If we do this, are we introducing active prions into the environment in a place where they have become inactive? We need to be sure we have public involvement so that everyone is on board if we do this so that when the fence goes down and one more of those dots shows up on the map that we did not cause this to happen after we spent a lot of money for it not to happen. She is not opposed but putting a cautionary message out there.

Chair Cole thanked fellow Board Members for their listening skills over the last couple of days.

FEBRUARY 26-27, 2013

Ms. Wiley MOVED, seconded by Mr. Kazmierski to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

The Natural Resources Board and Department of Natural Resources are committed to serving people with disabilities. If you need Board information in an alternative format, please contact:

Natural Resources Board Liaison: Laurie Ross at 608-267-7420 or laurie.ross@wisconsin.gov

NOTE: Each Natural Resources Board meeting is recorded. Tapes of each meeting are available for purchase by contacting the Board Liaison at 608-267-7420. Recordings will be posted on-line at: <http://dnrmedia.wi.gov/main/Catalog/pages/catalog.aspx?catalogId=5449d652-227e-46a8-b511-bfc430ca79ce> The following resources are also available: Agenda Item Packets (green sheets), supporting documents, and public comment.