# WCC Secretary Meeting Minutes

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

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**  
12/04/2017  
1:30 PM  
Conference Call

## I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

### A. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order by Larry Bonde at 1:30 PM

### B. ROLL CALL

- **ATTENDEES**: Larry Bonde, Al Shook, Dale Maas, Joe Weiss, Joel Taylor, Kari Lee Zimmermann and Mike Schmit.
- **EXCUSED**: None
- **UNEXCUSED**: None
- **GUESTS**: Bob Nack

### C. Agenda approval and repair.

**DISCUSSION**: Larry Bonde asked for some flexibility on the order of presentation.

**ACTION**: Motion by Shook second by Weiss to allow the chairman that flexibility. Motion carried.

### D. Public comments

**DISCUSSION**: There being no members of the public on the call we moved onto the next agenda item.

**ACTION**: N/A

## II. INFORMATION & ACTION ITEMS

### A. Hunting Of white deer

**DISCUSSION**: Larry Bonde stated that this will be an informational item for the Natural Resources Board at their upcoming meeting. He has had discussions with department staff and due to the many concerns of the public he will be explaining those concerns to the board at their December meeting. It is his hope that the board will reconsider their position.

**ACTION**: Informational only. No action taken.

**PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE**: Larry Bonde  
**DEADLINE**: None

### B. Hunting of raccoon during the gun deer season.

**DISCUSSION**: Larry Bonde stated that the night hunting of raccoon during the deer gun season has been going on in the southern part of the state for many years. Current regulations for prohibiting this in the North appear to be flawed. Larry will be going before the Natural Resources Board this month and presenting this as an informational item. It is his hope that they will also change their position on this issue. Larry wanted to thank Mike Schmit for his help in gathering information on the history of this issue.

**ACTION**: Informational only. No action taken.

**PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE**: Larry Bonde  
**DEADLINE**: None

### C. 2018-2020 deer population objectives

**DISCUSSION**: Bob was standing in for Kevin Wallenfang who was on vacation. Bob will be going before the NRB board at their upcoming meeting offering the departments position on the next three year cycle of CDAC proposals. He stated that all proposed population objectives would be recommended to the board. The second step of the process is DMU boundary recommendations, and to simplify this they are broken into the following three categories:

- **A. County DMU’s**.
- **Six counties had recommended a split they were**: Douglas County, Florence County, Langlade County, Oneida County and Vilas County. These six counties will not have their recommendation supported by the department, the reasons are as follows:
  1. This is the second three-year emulation to a new program, improvements can be made but we want to be true to the deer trustee report and following those recommendations.
  2. The department sees splitting counties at this point as kind of going back to the way things used to be. These recommendations are not necessarily bad and he thinks that managing deer by habitat is not necessarily bad but using the County as standard for the management unit and not micromanaging in under hundred square mile blinds will help.
  3. Another issue is changing the rules on an annual basis just confuses the hunters and goes against our effort in rule
simplification.
4. It also decreases the workloads for the CDAC committees and also the department staff that is required to gather information to support the proposed changes.
5. Dividing the units in the smaller parts also affects the deer metrics and has a tendency to skew the numbers and certainly affects the accuracy of the overall unit.
6. There is a cost involved in redoing the regulations and would also require different naming convention if we go down the road to splitting additional counties.

Larry mentioned that the department reached out to all of the counties that were denied their requests and the feedback was that there wasn't a major disagreement on the department's decision. There were also conference calls made to any counties in an effort to create a better understanding of what common goals were and how to achieve them. Bob stated that if any of the Congress delegates are hearing any negative feedback on any of these decisions he would be happy to make a personal contact with the local CDAC to resolve any issues they may have.

Questions were asked on whether department staff had suggested to the local CDAC's and question that their proposals may not be within given guidelines. Bob stated that the department requested good justification for any rules changes but did not want to be perceived as leaving any CDAC in a particular direction, this should be an open discussion and have a transparent give-and-take on possible solutions for any problem area.

B. Modified deer management zones
The department received five recommendations for modification, the counties were: Chippewa County, Clark County, Eau Claire County, Marinette County, and Wood County. The department accepted the recommendation from the first four counties but is recommending rejection from Wood County. The rationale behind the rejection is that this recommendation was made at the second meeting and had no public input.

C. Metro boundaries
Five counties recommended a modification of their Metro units they were: Dane County, Manitowoc County, Ozaukee County, Sheboygan County, and Vernon County. The department is recommending to support these counties.
Three counties made recommendations to establish new Metro units these were: Chippewa County, Eau Claire County, and Rock County. These three counties were reviewed and approved it will be recommended to the board for their establishment. These six counties will not have their recommendation supported by the department, the reasons are as follows:
1. This is the second three-year emulation to a new program, improvements can be made but we want to be true to the deer trustee report and following those recommendations.
2. The department sees splitting counties at this point as kind of going back to the way things used to be. These recommendations are not necessarily bad. Using the County as the standard for the management unit and not micromanaging in under two hundred square mile blocks will help.
3. Another issue is changing the rules on an annual basis just confuses the hunters and goes against our efforts in rule simplification.
4. Additional DMU's also increase the workloads for the CDAC committees and the department staff that is required to gather information to support the proposed changes.
5. Dividing the units in the smaller parts also affects the deer metrics and has a tendency to skew the numbers and certainly affects the accuracy in the overall unit.
6. There is a cost involved in redoing the regulations and would also require a different naming convention if we go down the road to splitting additional counties.

Larry mentioned that the department reached out to all of the counties that were denied their requests and the feedback was that there wasn't a major disagreement on the department's decision. There were also conference calls made to many counties in an effort to create a better understanding of what the common goals were and how to achieve them. Bob stated that if any of the Congress delegates are hearing any negative feedback on any of these decisions he would be happy to make a personal contact with the local CDAC to resolve any issues they may have.

Questions were asked on whether department staff had suggested to the local CDAC's and question that their proposals may not be within given guidelines. Bob stated that the department requested good justification for any rules changes but did not want to be perceived as forcing any CDAC in a particular direction, this should be an open discussion and have a transparent give-and-take on possible solutions for any problem area.

There was further discussion about how new this process was to everyone and the need to continue with accountability and better understanding of the issues.
Larry pointed out an issue between two adjoining counties where better communications on what individual neighboring counties were doing before recommendations were made. Better communication would have avoided the need for one of the two counties to modify their proposal.

**ACTION**
Motion by Maas second by Weiss to accept the department's proposal. Motion carried.
Larry will work with the board and the department on ways to improve communications as discussed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Conservation Congress administrative housekeeping
### E. Update on commercial whitefish netting study

**DISCUSSION**

Dale gave a brief overview on a proposed memorandum of understanding between two Commercial Fishing operators, the Department and Sea Grant. The study if approved would be for one possibly two years investigating the use of large mesh gill nets in area three of Lake Michigan. Currently this area is excluded from this practice. Dale stated that the draft proposal did not contain, in his opinion, enough detail to be supported at this time. He did feel that with the proper controls and a better description of the process that there may be some merit in conducting the study. There will be a meeting on Thursday, December 7 at Lakeshore Technical College of the Great Lakes Forum that he is planning to attend. At that time he will share his questions in hopes of getting additional answers and more details on the proposal. There was agreement by the committee no position for be taken until more details were explained.

**ACTION**

Informational only. No action taken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### F. Discussion of ideas for changes to wetland regulations

**DISCUSSION**

Larry stated that proposed legislation (AB 547) drops all protections for non-federal wetlands. Larry shared a proposal from Ducks Unlimited they will be submitting to the legislators involved with this bill. They brought the proposal to the Congress and asked if we would support these proposed changes. Larry thought it was important that we consider supporting this proposal.

**ACTION**

Motion by Shook second by Weiss to support the proposal by Ducks Unlimited. Motion carried.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### III. MEMBERS MATTERS

**DISCUSSION**

- **Joe:** none
  - Joel: he stated that he is being receiving feedback from some of the counties that they do not have confidence in the CDAC process. He feels somehow we need to find a way for the counties to find value in assure a voice in the process.
  - Dale: a recent meeting he attended there was discussion about the possibility of shipping crude oil from the Dukotas via rail to the Port of Milwaukee then be put on tanker ships for delivery via the Great Lakes. He asked if anyone had heard about this and will try to follow it further. He also heard some discussion about the recent change between wardens and Park Rangers and the issue was wardens be assigned to some of the busier state parks in a manner that was not consistent to what we were told. He will attempt to talk to the chief warden for clarification.
  - Al: he wants to clarify a comment from the last DLC meeting in reference to waterfall bag limit, there was a misunderstanding about bag limits and was postponed until the January meeting. Al will contact the individual that was in attendance at the last meeting in attempt to clarify since he will not be invited to the January meeting.
  - Larry: he will get the information to the executive committee prior to his appearance at the NRB meeting, this is reference to hunting of white deer and hunting of raccoon during the gun deer season

**ACTION**

Motion by Weiss second by Shook to adjourn. Motion carried.

---

### IV. ADJOURNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING ADJURED</th>
<th>2:36 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED BY</td>
<td>Dale C. Maas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>12/08/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>