I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

A. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order by Larry Bonde at 9:30 AM

B. ROLL CALL


EXCUSED: Eugene Altivies and Brett Wei

UNEXCUSED: Laurie Seale, Carol Kubly and Greg Fleece, Mike Arrowood and Tony Grabski.

C. Agenda Approval or Repair

DISCUSSION: Larry asked for some flexibility in the agenda as we are in the DNR building and some staff will come down as available.

ACTION: Motion by Blattner 2nd by Rogers to allow. Motion carried.

D. Public Comment

DISCUSSION: Laurie Seale, gave a short presentation voicing her opposition to Gov. Walker's CWD Plan as it pertains to deer farmers and the proposed fencing plan.

Carol Kubley, also voiced her opposition to the governor's plan. Ever since they established their deer farm they have had double fencing. She then went on to explain the complicated record-keeping that is already in existence as they report to DATCAP. She feels that any further regulation will be a cost that will drive them out of business.

Greg Fleece, who is also a deer farmer and has been for many years talked about a research project that he is directly involved with. DBF research along with others has been a proponent of modifying deer genetically to make them resistant to CWD. Their goal is to within 5 years have this accomplished.

ACTION: Information only. No action taken.

E. Chair's Update

DISCUSSION: (This item was addressed later in the afternoon per agenda flexibility.)

Larry stated that he had heard very good positive feedback on how the convention went. He had comments during the convention after the convention and subsequent emails saying that the presentations that were at this year's convention were some of the best that we ever had and the time constraints helped to move the program along. Going forward in the future he wants to incorporate more of this interaction with the departments. Developing especially a better understanding on the roll Applied Science has in all facets of the DNR.

Larry said before the governor spoke at the convention he had 20 minutes to have a discussion with him about 3 topics of concern.

One is a Crane season, he has collected a lot of good information on different aspects of crane hunting and if you want at some point he can distribute this information out to the Council. He feels that we are probably very close to finding legislative support for this. As an interesting note in Wisconsin 8807 Cranes were harvested in crop damage permits. These animals need to be buried on site and is a tremendous waste of resources. That's more Cranes than Kentucky and Tennessee combined shot in their last season. We have a lot of interest in this season. I've been working with a number of sporting interests behind the scenes, getting our information lined up and hopefully getting legislative support on the rule.

The 2nd item is a fee package increase, last year we had a coalition of sporting groups which the Congress put together and we proposed a mutually agreeable fee structure. We thought we had somebody that would champion that legislation but that didn't materialize. Larry asked the Governor that if he was reelected, would he put that into his budget and support it. Larry stated that he has a meeting tomorrow afternoon with the governor's office to see how they feel about that process.

The 3rd that he talked about was "Cherish Wisconsin Hunt". The concept behind this is like some other states. People enter into a lottery and the winner receives a free license for all species harvested. If done in Wisconsin it would be all species other than Elk.
In Michigan they run this raffle and they have been for 7 years, the lowest year they made $175,000, the highest year they made $250,000. The vision behind this legislation if approved and passed is proceeds would solely go to R-3 and the Youth Conservation Congress Advisor. If Michigan can average $200,000 a year he feels that Wisconsin (which has a lot more hunters) can do exponentially more. We will be discussing this opportunity with his office tomorrow also. Larry knows it is an election year but the governor's response to these 3 were favorable and he wanted him to be aware prior to the meeting tomorrow.

Larry also said that there are some opportunities for congress people to sit on interview panels. One is for senior wildlife managers and another is for a fisheries position. If anyone is interested in serving the Congress on these interview panels please email me, message me or call me and I will pass on the information.

With the acceptance of online polling, (he was very pleased with the results) this committee will have an increasing roll going forward.

Since the Technology Committee has dealt with some of the social media issues, he feels it would be a good fit to merge this committee with the Outreach and Public Relations Committee.

These are some of the things he is contemplating and if there are additional opportunities within your district for committee assignments, District Leadership will be notified.

**ACTION**
Information only. No action taken.

## II. INFORMATION & ACTION ITEMS

### A. Friends of the Wisconsin Conservation Congress Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>Rob Bohmann</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larry read a report from Rob Bohmann on the financial s for the Friends of the WCC. Checkbook balance prior to the convention was $24,920. Total receipts from convention $21,659. Total in the checkbook after convention prior to bills paid $46,579. Raffle highlights: Gun Raffle $2457 profit Walk Around Raffle $1749 profit Bucket Raffle $5785 profit Free will bear bait donation was $875 Larry thanked everyone involved for the tremendous support in our effort to raise funding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>Information only. No action taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</td>
<td>DEADLINE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Recovering America's Wildlife Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>George Meyer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George presented a handout on the program, the House Bill is (HR 4647). With as much as one third of the species in the United States being at increased risk of extinction. The state fish and wildlife agencies have identified 12,000 species in need of proactive conservation efforts species include Monarch butterflies, songbirds turtles and many others. Unless we make a change in the way we fund conservation, the numbers of species on the brink of extinction will grow significantly. Current levels of funding are less than 5% of what is necessary. The magnitude of this proposed solution matches the magnitude of the problem. This bill is good for wildlife, taxpayers, and the economy. Outdoor recreation industry supports more than 6 million jobs. This legislation will create opportunities for these and other businesses. Proactive efforts would also create more regulatory certainty for businesses-reducing risk and avoiding delays associated with land uses. Healthy habitats help clean our water and air, prevent floods, and support a healthy population of pollinators. The states will use the funding on needs identified in the congressionally-mandated state wildlife action plans. The state wildlife agencies incorporate the latest science and public input into these plans, which are approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Wisconsin's share would equal $22 million. Funding for this ($1.3) billion will come from existing revenue from energy and mineral fees on federal lands and waters. This is a small portion of the overall revenues from these sources. Currently 80% of the funding for our state wildlife agencies comes from sportsman's fees such as hunting and fishing licenses and taxes on outdoor gear. Wildlife that are not hunted or fished do not currently have a similar dedicated funding stream. This bill will allocate funds via the wildlife conservation and restoration a sub-account of the Pittman-Robertson act, which was originally passed in 1937. America needs a 21st century model of conservation funding that will pro-actively and cost-effectively-address these widespread drops in our wildlife populations. We need to fund state-led actions to conserve the species of wildlife and their habitats so we can pass on America's natural heritage to future generations. George said the bill has bipartisan support having 31 Democrats and 26 Republicans as signatures to the proposed bill. Larry stated that the Wisconsin Conservation Congress is already on record in support of this. George asked that the Congress through its network contact its support organizations and asked that they take a position. Those interested in further information can contact him at the Wisconsin Wildlife Federation. He would also appreciate any clubs or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>Information only. No action taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</td>
<td>DEADLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>Position already taken. Information only. No further action taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</td>
<td>DEADLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Furbearer Assistant Position Update</td>
<td>Eric Lohner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>Eric stated this is something that we have been working on for some time, Bob back is section chief for that area. The situation is if we are going to add a full-time position for the assistant we need to come up with funding for it, or eliminate a position somewhere else. Within our division we have lost 16 positions over the last 5 years so we are going to have to move things around a little bit to try and accomplish this goal. Another option would be to go back to DOA and request an additional position. When the department goes into ask for an additional position it is important that we identify funding sources, in this case we believe we can use (Pittman Robertson money, license fee money and incidental for fees) dollars. So that's where we're at and getting ready to propose an additional position. If that doesn't work the only other option would be to eliminate a position someplace else and utilize that funding source. Dale commented that he knows that the trappers are 120% into this thing and questions whether the department was also committed? Eric stated that yes they realize the inefficiencies of training and losing LTE positions. From a business standpoint alone this made a lot of sense, say nothing about the lost knowledge involved. Our turnover rate in FTE positions is high and in LTE positions even higher. We get the value of having a full-time position but you still have to balance the process. Dale said everything comes with a cost, and from a pure business standpoint making this a FTE position just makes sense. Dale also questioned the 3rd leg funding opportunity and that taking money out of Trapper Ed funds. Is there an excess? Eric said no you're basically just juggling some money around but we're looking at all options to see if there are some things that would make better utilization of those funds. Larry explained the reason Eric is here is because of the position the Congress took in support of a resolution coming out of the Fur Harvest Committee. Joel commented that the financial impact was lessened by the fact that the position is currently in LTE. He asked what the variation would be between LTE position and a FTE position? Eric reviewed some of the wage and fringe benefit numbers. Joel said so approximately 30% more in this case to cover the difference between an LTE and FTE position. Eric agreed that that was a good analogy. Al questioned whether or not they were seeing any increase in the trapper numbers? Eric replied that ironically this is one of the few programs that are actually seeing an increase in number every year. Al asked if there were any areas where they were seeing a decrease? Eric replied that if you look at individual licensing revenue streams it's obvious that there is an approximate 2% decrease in deer hunting licenses, but based on discussion with the Congress it is felt that at least in that area our effort of participation will remain the same at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>Information only. No action taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</td>
<td>DEADLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. NRB Agenda item 2. B. 5-Forest Legacy Easement Purchase</td>
<td>Jim Lemke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>Jim explained that the proposal going before the NRB tomorrow is to purchase a conservation easement on 20,900 acres located in Sawyer County. Easement cost is $7.2 million, with a little more than 20 miles of public access that would be open from July 1 until the end of the year. The reason that it is a shortened time is to avoid conflicts with logging operations. If approved this would be open in perpetuity to public access. The proposal if approved would authorize use of stewardship monies in 2018. He has personally walked the land, it's a beautiful piece of property and has a number of lakes on it. It has many class I trout streams and a number of class 2 trout streams. It is also it is a working forest. There are a number of high quality forest roads on the property and the land owner is making an endowment for road maintenance also in perpetuity. It is estimated that it takes about $1000 a mile to maintain a Forest Road per year, so a little over 20 miles of roads and were talking at least $20,000 a year. The intent is to put about $500,000 in an escrow endowment fund and even if it is only getting 4% interest (you will receive more than that) it will be adequate as a contingency fund for road maintenance. Kari had reached out to Sawyer County delegates to ask if they had any issues and one thing that came up was access by property owners that currently have easement rights on existing roads. Jim reported that most of those properties are on the southern portion of the property and they have title easements already that would stay with their land purchases deeds. Joel commented he was pretty familiar with the area because it's not that far away from his house and one of the concerns is the current owner makes them by a key to gain access which is a pretty hefty price ($250 a year). If they choose not to purchase a key then it's only a walk-in easement. Jim said the owner of this property at time of closing will sign an easement document. This document by law is tied into the master agreement guaranteeing that the existing roads (as identified) will remain open to the public per the terms of the agreement. Larry stated that we are on the NRB agenda to speak on this tomorrow no matter what position the Congress takes. The district</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Requested Changes to Grouse Season-Bag Limits Due To Effects of West Nile Virus

**Discussion**

Mike Riggle reported his observations, he stated he felt the department was doing a really good job, but like in his business your only as good as your last case. In this case as it pertains to the West Nile Virus issue on grouse his feeling is that you really fell flat. Last year he was getting reports from dog trancers that were legally training their dogs after July 1. They were reporting that their dogs brought in 3 grous that were caught in the course of the training exercise. This is highly unusual and an indicator of a less than healthy flock.

If he takes his own personal observations in this particular area his belief is that from last year until this year the size of his flock has reduced approximately 75%. Many of the people that he has talked to throughout the North report similar conditions. Unfortunately he did not have a wildlife manager in his area to report it to. He may have dropped the ball thinking that the department was taking follow-up action. He had hear hunters telling them that there were crows sitting on their bait piles and not moving. They also commented on the lack of grous observations in the course of moving through the woods scouting and tending bait. Michigan had 5 positives in all 5 counties in the UP. Unfortunately, there were some Wisconsin wildlife biologists that ignored that observation and discredited the comment saying "that's just grouse hunters complaining you have to show me the facts". Well I can tell you the facts the DNR dropped the ball on this big time. Now that being said there isn't a darn thing that they could've done.

But there is something that we can do and I'm going to go to Larry and request that the Congress go to the NRB Board meeting requesting for an emergency rule. And if approved today request the following changes:

1. cut the daily bag limit from 5 to 3.
2. eliminate the late grouse season.

I know there's going to be some blow back about the elimination of the late-season but I also know for a fact that there is a tremendous number of birds that are harvested during that season. Another thing we see in northern Wisconsin is a tremendous influx of hunters from other states like Pennsylvania, Virginia and Kentucky. They come here because of the opportunity to work with their dogs. They are good hunters and have some fantastic dogs and it certainly not uncommon to see many out-of-staters fish during that time.

As I read the information that I received from the department the other day it left me feeling flat. To tell me that you're going to monitor it is a less than acceptable action. We need to get in there and do something that is proactive, the drumming counts are not tallied yet so populations are hard to analyze. Tony and I were out with the U.S. Forest Service the other day and they were planting trees in the national forest. They ran across one of the people performing drumming counts and the comment from the individual was "I thought we picked a really crummy day because I didn't hear any". Then she went back a couple days later and didn't hear any either, she asked what's going on? She is not a grouse hunter, but I explained to her what the situation was. There is not a lot of communicating between the department and the U.S. Forest Service and that's something else that may need a little tweaking.

Mike wanted to clarify that he is going to ask this body to endorse a proposal from the Congress to ask for an emergency rule from the NRB reducing the bag limit from 5 to 3 and eliminate the 2nd season starting 2018. If you don't think it's a good idea I can live with that but I truly believe we need to be proactive until we can get a better handle on population estimates. Another consideration is the fact that Wisconsin does not have a Grouse Management Plan.

Eric was given an opportunity to comment on what happened and how we may move forward. He agreed that the department dropped the ball on what happened last year. He stated that he really wasn't aware of the issue until about October, but this is not an excuse. West Nile Virus has been in Wisconsin for approximately 20 years and you're correct there's not a lot that we can do once an outbreak occurs. But follow-up investigations would have been helpful. Did Wisconsin have a perfect storm on this outbreak, it's possible given the cyclic nature of the population. We believe we were only at 70%. Meaning the population cycles still had 30% left to peak out. I can tell you now that we are doing surveys to better assess the impact. I will say that your situation is not consistent, there are other areas that do show a strong population.

This is purely anecdotal but in one place it's declining over here it's stable and over here it's improving. What we really need to look at is where we are on a state wide scale, and that's what's really important. We are also stepping up our inter-agency discussions with neighboring states, those being Michigan and Minnesota and also facilitating a plan to more rapidly move suspected test results through the system.

Mike commented that we were 2 years away from our normal peak cycle.

When studies were done in Minnesota many years ago resulting in a published document saying you can't over hunt a grous population. That may have been an accurate assessment at the time but we're seeing different methods and different pressures being put on this population.

Mike lives near a trapper who told him it's not unusual to see 4 different hunting groups go into the woods on any given day and these are groups that aren't just walking the trails they are out there beating the brush. They are good at it, and they have some fantastic dogs.
Eric said he doesn't dispute what you're saying but we really need to look at the larger numbers. While the grouse hunters that are out there are very passionate about their sport. The reality is the number of grouse hunters has declined. It may have been that many of them are like you and me self-proclaimed and renowned for not hitting them. Or have aged to the point that they only follow the general trail. With that said I know a lot of our northern tier counties are promoting grouse hunting through their tourism because it does put a boost into their counties. 

Mike brought up how that late season grouse hunting opportunity came up. It was brought up by a high ranking DNR official who said he was too busy in the fall and wanted an opportunity to hunt December and January. And whether you like it or not that's where that came from. It has been questioned in the past. There is some question if that person may still be here.

The late season birds are breeders for the next year and there's no way somebody's going to convince me that that's good for the population.

Eric said he thinks looking at the late season is a great idea.

Mike stated that this is not a detrimental comment but in my business I have to take care of things as they come up. The way the department does business is they spend an exorbitant amount of time studying something. That's not the way my mind works and I think we need to address this for now until we have some more factual information. I talk to people all across Northern Wisconsin and yes there are some areas where there remains some pockets of grouse. A lot of those populations came in sand country where they don't have a large mosquito population versus wet swampy terrain where that nasty little mosquito abounds.

Tony commented that about 5 years ago he was a member of the local Chamber of Commerce and he can attest to the fact that a group from Tennessee, Kentucky and Virginia exhibited great interest in coming here. Working their dogs and spending a lot of money and a lot of time enjoying our resources. There are a large number of these groups that occupy campgrounds in the Phillips area starting in October. Staying until they have to get out of the campgrounds because the wells freeze. The only reason that they would leave otherwise is during the nine-day deer season, because the deer hunters were putting pressure on their hunt, but then they come back.

Tony also mentioned another item that may need to be looked at; it's not uncommon to hear that an out-of-state hunter has gone to a shipper and sent 20 carcasses back to their home state. Now they can start over again on their possession limit (and this is totally legal).

Part of my job working for the Chamber of Commerce was to ask hunters what brought them to our county? The reply was I'm spending thousands and thousands of dollars on my dogs and this is the best opportunity to continue my training for a full 4 months of the year.

Joe asked what the impact of West Nile was on humans?

Mike stated you can't get West Nile from consuming infected game.

What will happen if you're bit by a mosquito carrying West Nile Virus?

Mike stated that 80% of the people that do get it don't even know they have it. ~20% of the people will get mild headaches and flu-like symptoms and things like that. Then there is that small percentage that die. There is no vaccination, it's a viral disease and they treat you with antibiotics.

Jane asked if we can expect a continued die off or will these birds develop an anti-body?

Mike said that the problem in this species they do not develop an immunity as survivors and that's what makes this very difficult to predict the impact on the population.

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

| 1. Continuation of discussion from above | [PRESENTER] |

**DISCUSSION**

- Joel commented that it seems that some of this discussion is similar to our CDACs. When we reduce our harvest to increase a population, when maybe what we have is an over harvest from local and out-of-state hunters.
- Larry questioned if this proposal is accepted how would he react to Eric's statement that he believes the late-season hunt is not connected to the West Nile outbreak?
- Mike's reply was the late-season is impacting on the brood flock. He is not suggesting that we take it away forever, just under emergency rule until we can get a better understanding of the existing populations.
- He also suggested that since Wisconsin has no grouse management plan, a planning process should be initiated. We at least should be proactive that along with not having the latest drumming counts we don't really know how this is going to affect the cycle peak.
- Is it going to pushed back the cycle a couple years? Or will it be a normal cycle (2 years to go) that would normally happen and are we going to be really short of population? Those are some of the questions we need to put forward and protect ourselves with this emergency rule. If we go down from here in some areas there's nowhere to go, down is a relative term we might have to dig a hole.
- The late-season birds are the brood stock that you want to carry you through the winter to the next birthing cycle so if you want to bring it back in a couple years after study and things look acceptable I've got no problem with that, but again this is a proactive position.
- But I personally disagree, I think this is something we should eliminate but until we find out, we need to take measures.
rather overreact and face some blow back then not react and find out that we should have done something 3 years in the past when that opportunity is gone forever. There really is no harm in overreacting. We have taken a late-season away for one year and reduce the bag limit from 5 to 3.

Eric thought that we should at least wait until we get the survey results back.

Mike said that might be something that the NRB will ask us to do, all we're asking is that they take some action.

Eric agreed that this is an opportunity for a Grouse Management Plan to be established. Eric stated that another area that he's going to have push back from is the economics as far as the impact financially, lessening the season and changing the opportunity will have an effect on the tourist industry during that time of year.

Mike said he would hope that they would do what's best for the resource in the long term and he doesn't think that a one year emergency rule would put an end to it.

Dave Larson commented that in his observations St. Croix County did not seem to have the die off that you're talking about and that he believes population numbers are up.

Mike responded that maybe we need to see north of Highway 64. The issue as he understands it is that we need to get something going on this to be proactive and the department can come back with whatever they feel is appropriate if the Natural Resources Board asked for further information.

Dale commented that he appreciates Mike's position on this, but that we need to be careful that we are not doing a nuclear strike. If a surgical strike would be more appropriate. I think we need additional information to better target the areas of concern so as not to reduce opportunity statewide if it's not necessary.

Joel commented that he understands the economic driver in many of the counties he also says in his neck of the woods it is not the same impact that Mike is describing. Not that he doesn't believe him but he agrees that we need to limit the focus so as not to appear heavy-handed yet do what's right for the resource.

ACTION

Motion by Meyer 2nd by Blattnier to support an emergency rule asking for the lowering of the bag limit from 5 to 3 and the elimination of the late-season hunt. A friendly amendment to the motion was brought forward to look at this on a regional basis. Tony commented on this that he felt very uneasy about the amendment. Jane commented that the NRB could take this action under advisement and modify it if they so choose so we might as well just go with the original motion and monitor how this plays out. Mike Rogare commented that at the start of last year's bear season he was seeing lots of grouse by the end he was lucky if he would see 3 on a weekend so something is going on. Motion carried.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE: Larry to deliver request to the NRB

DEADLINE: NRB Board Meeting

F. Propose COP Changes

Tony Blattnier

DISCUSSION: Tony asked everyone to go to tab 5 which is a code of procedure section page 6 item E. (3) The proposal that we have been assigned is whether or not we want to make the Motorized Recreational Vehicle Committee a standing committee. Motion by Gunderson 2nd by Larson to make this a standing committee. Motion carried.

Page 17 (XI) (A) This section has to do with the election of the District 1 leadership Council. This paragraph if approved will read as follows: each district shall elect its District Counselors by separate written ballot, on the first morning of the Annual Conservation Congress meeting. The proposed change continues the read to say (an agreed upon, uninterested party shall facilitate the elections for each district. Nominees may have (3) minutes to give a statement regarding their qualifications and interest in becoming a WCC district counselor).

Motion by Koetner 2nd by Weiss to advance. Motion carried.

Page 19 (D) (2) The proposed modification to step 2 is as follows. (An independent) investigation shall be performed by a subcommittee of three members of the executive committee, in conjunction with the District counselors for the District that the individual subject to the alleged misconduct is from. (Subcommittee members shall independently investigate the complaint).

Motion by Larson 2nd by Smaby to advance. Motion carried.

ACTION: As stated above.

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE: Yes

DEADLINE: Yes

1. Sturgeon Regulations

Justine Hasz

DISCUSSION: Larry has been talking to a lot of people within the department and on the outside, he knows that they are working on a management plan and is not sure the regulation change should be a part of it but it should be a consideration. Some things that he feels needs a rule change or at least review are:

1. Camera use
2. Spear size (currently there are no restrictions)
3. Exposed Sturgeon transporting (many feel this is not realistic)
4. Carp harvest (Larry's favorite)

In talking with Justine a discussion on cameras and spear size, they will be working on a question on the department side for 2019. Larry stated he has spent more time talking about Sturgeon spearing this year than ever before. A lot of people feel that there needs to be some changes made in the regulations some are not tight enough, some are obsolete and he feels that the Congress should get out in front of this and start the process.
With all the discussion on camera use during spearfishing we decided to shoot a resolution around to 10 counties surrounding the Winnebago system to try to get input on the question. 8 of the 10 counties submitted the shoot resolution and all of the 8 counties favored elimination of the cameras. This is a very contentious subject much like baiting and feeding of deer. It is a topic that is not going away. In his opinion we are better off addressing this thing sooner rather than later.

The next issue is that currently there is a need to review spear size, all it says is it needs to be a hand thrown device. He talked to some spear manufacturers and was told that they are getting requests for some pretty large guillotine type devices that when dropped through the hole would cover the entire legal dimensions of the hole. In discussions with individuals and the department it probably is agreed that this is the time to better define spear size. We do not want to the sport to be so distorted that by the time we get to defining it people are horrified by the spear process.

Currently there is an ordinance that says you have to have the Sturgeon exposed prior to registration. In reality there are people with suburban type vehicles transporting with the doors or gates open. Every year one or 2 of them fall out on the road or the lake. In discussing this issue with law enforcement and fisheries there may be some other alternatives that we can investigate.

And lastly going back 2 years for $228 which was my penalty for spearing a carp. I have yet to find a fisheries biologist or law enforcement member that can give me a rational reason why that rule is in place. I think some of these rules and regulations need to be reviewed.

Justice's stated that the last 2 on your list were down and will include that in a meeting that's going to be taking place next week, and she will make sure discussion will take place.

On the spear size issue they are going to attempt to put in a question (not stating size) to get people's opinions on what would be an appropriate spear size. The only reason it is going to be approached this way is there is not going to be enough time to meet with all the stakeholders to narrow this down beforehand. We are going to try to define it is much as possible beforehand, but the department feels that it will be a general though rather than an A or B option.

It may seem like we have a lot of time but we will be meeting in July already listing all the possibilities for next year. This has to go through an extensive internal review and then a joint meeting with law enforcement and then a combined total review. It's about a 6 month time period from start to finish and that includes all the finalization of paperwork and supporting data so it would be extremely tight if at all possible.

The electronics is more of a social issue, we feel we have enough regulatory protection with the quota system (harvest caps) in place. In all the combined opinions we have gone through is widely split 50% opposed 30% in favor and 30% had no opinion one way or the other. Proceeding forward with a rule change on an issue with that wide range of input becomes problematic.

When we talk about banning cameras we really must look at all electronic devices. With the advancements in side scan sonar and motion detectors maybe a consideration down the road is all electronic devices. But again the harvest caps protect the resource so it becomes more of a social issue.

Larry stated that there's so much division on this and this is why we really need to take it to the public and find out if there is some common ground that we can agree on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Information only. No action taken.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</td>
<td>DEADLINE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**G. Assigned Resolutions**

**DISCUSSION**

Ban the use of underwater cameras for spearfishing Lake Sturgeon on Winnebago system (080318, 140318, 200518, 240518, 360418, 450318, 600518, 710418)

Mike Arrowood Congress delegate from Fond du Lac County spoke in favor of the resolution. Mike sits on the Sturgeon advisory committee and last year they brought this to the committee and he forced it to a vote. The committee voted 17 in favor of banning cameras, 5 in favor of cameras. This committee has been in effect for over 20 years. In 1992 people were caught putting baited lines down a Sturgeon hole leaving the bait on the bottom overnight hooking a fish then the next day pulling it up so they could see its size and then spearfishing it. Fishing in a Sturgeon hole was banned almost immediately, that didn't come before the Congress, the Sturgeon advisory committee made that recommendation.

Technology.

To put a (4 lens) camera down the middle of a spearfishing hole and put four different colored balls one on each corner, now when a fish comes into view your throwing between the center of the hole and the colored ball which does not take a lot of skill.

There are a number of people out there that rent Sturgeon holes for $100 a day nobody is going to sit in a shack looking down a hole that they paid $100 a day to utilize if it's a bare hole. They want a camera down there.

It's a known fact that just like trophy bucks large surgeon are worth large dollars some have been sold for thousands of dollars.

Yes, there is a Sturgeon harvest cap but even when line fishing down a hole was banned (and there was no public input on that other than the Sturgeon advisory committee) nobody wants to admit it, but when line fishing was no longer allowed there were many times when our season would last longer. Another thing Justice didn't mention is the ongoing requests for a hook and line season Winnebago system. I sit on the warm water committee and this has been brought up many many times not only in conversation but also in resolution format. This is a difficult issue, at our Fond du Lac County Conservation Alliance, which is made up of 24 different clubs. We had a vote last year and it was about 50-50. We had a vote, not a survey. This year when the Conservation Congress sent out the resolutions in the 10 county area it was almost a 2 to 1 survey input to band cameras. There
are a whole lot of other issues not just social. Underwater drones, you’re not seeing any fish in your area you drop the drone down, it swims around in an area, you see a number of Sturgeon, you hit a button it locks in the GPS system you go over there. Cutting a hole, now your getting in an area that you’re more likely to see Sturgeon. Where do we end? There are so many issues, it is not cut and dried. Larry thanked Mike for taking the time to present the issues as he knows it. Larry asked for a position from the DLC. Joel said we need to act on the wording of the sturgeon resolution pertaining to underwater cameras only. We want to do what Justine suggested as far as elaborating on the different types of electronics that would require in his opinion additional motions to be passed. Motion by Haase 2nd by Taylor to advance. Motion Carried. Tony Grabski appeared before the DLC to speak in support of his resolution (250218) titled: Require a detailed and easily acceptable annual accounting and reporting for the spending of Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Grant and Dingell-Johnson Sport Fishing Restoration Grant Monies. Tony stated that he receives many questions from his constituents throughout the year on how this money is spent. He feels it’s important that not only the consumptive sportsmen and women out there know how this money is spent. Also the nonconsumptive users would be able to get a better understanding on how monies collected under these 2 tax authorities support the whole process. Since these fund grants supply 25% to 30% of the DNR’s annual budget his resolution is asking that expenditures in excess of $10,000 from these 2 grants be accurately tracked and reported annually. The annual report accounting for allocations and spending of these grants should be published and easily accessed on the state of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources website. There are a lot of projects supported by these grants and if the nonconsumptive users of the projects get a better understanding of who is supporting them. He feels it will help them get a better understanding that hunting and fishing taxes in some cases provide a majority of funding. He also is a member of the Sporting Heritage Council and he knows that the new target range that has been established in Columbia County, many people do not know how operations like that have been funded. Many people have not heard of or understand the impact Pittman-Robertson, Dingell-Johnson money is collected and or where it is spent. In 2017 alone Wisconsin was awarded over $34 million: 23.1 million from PR and 11.4 million from DJ funding. He's done some research at various sites and run across a couple of pie charts that he felt were lacking in explaining the process. Larry mentioned that after the Secretary of the Interior had presented the $34 million grant money he (Larry) was asked by a number of reporters on how the money was collected and where the money went after the overall grant was distributed. The questions were always "why did we get it, where did we get it from and how is it spent" there is clearly a lot of room for informing people on the process. Dale questioned what is the cost going to be for this accounting, every time we talk about programs we get push back from the department we have to justify cost. Larry stated that he remembers a while back where there was a report that had everything laid out with the reason and the amount of the expenditure, he is not sure what has become of it. Internally it has to be accounted for somewhere because there are certain criteria that has to be met in order to allocate these funds. Larry stated that Scott Loomans has a lot of knowledge on what's involved in this plan, unfortunately we haven’t been able to get him to this meeting as of yet and ask permission for this item to be postponed until we can have him address the DLC later today. Scott came in later in the meeting and was asked about the accounting process and stated that yes he is familiar with that, at least from his past experience with the fisheries expenditures and that this is something that can be done and they do it upon request from legislators quite often as an example Kari asked if Scott knows if there was a reason that it wasn't out there on the website? Is it a workload issue or is there some other reason? Scott stated that it was part of the workload issue and would take some additional effort to make happen, but it could be done. It is a pretty dry report, and not going to be an easy read on the website. When we did some remapping on the website the instructions were to offer items that were of more interest to the majority of the public and focused on engaging our core values to the citizens. They have meters on a number of items on the website and if they failed to receive a certain amount of hits in the course of the time they were removed. Decisions were made based on use. Larry stated that Tony's resolution asked for expenditures over $10,000. Do you have any idea what percentage of the expenditures would fall in that category? Scott stated that a majority of the expenditures are over $10,000. Tony stated that he realizes some of the reports are kind the dry but the people that are questioning him and the questions that he has are important. These reports will be utilized if we can get more people to understand how and where the money is raised and where it goes. Larry stated that to his understanding action on this would not necessarily generate a spring hearing question but would be a request that he would make to the department. Joel questions whether or not this is something that should be buried on the website or if there was another way of going about it. Scott Gunderson said that if he is understanding Tony's request correctly, this is something that could very easily be done. It doesn't have to be super detailed and could refer to a more detailed report via a link if necessary. You don't need a pie chart if you want expenditures listed and what for. This shouldn't be a big time consumer for staff. Joel said that this is something the department should be able to share with Congress and you would think that the department...
would want to make a little bit of a fuss over a $34 million grant and maybe do something on its website through multimedia. Motion by Maas 2nd by Gunderson to endorse the discussion. Motion carried.

**ACTION**
All action resolutions as stated above.

**PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE**

**DEADLINE**

1. **Continued discussion on assigned resolutions.**

   **DISCUSSION**

   Resolution (680118) Reduce daily bag limit on long-tailed ducks to 3. Larry read a note from AI Shock, WCC migratory chair. AI stated that his reasons for the resolution, as he explained at the state convention have not changed. This particular duck species is harvested primarily as a trophy option and for the most not table fair. The fact that the U. S. Fish and Wildlife experts and Canadian officials have no clear understanding of population estimates he feels that Wisconsin should proceed with caution.

   Taylor Finger, DNR liaison to the migratory committee listed some of the harvest data that was available. While to his knowledge there is no population data available as this species of duck migrates North of the Arctic Circle. And there was some locals concerned about the utilization and harvest of this specie as it migrates through Wisconsin. Some of the surveys taken at Wisconsin ports (since this is an open water hunt opportunity) came back saying "we just hammered them out there" and people are feeling guilty and concerned that there's no way we can sustain the harvest without hurting the population. He said that if we reduce the bag limit to 3 he has no scientific data to prove one way or the other if this will have an effect either way.

   Motion by Gunderson 2nd by Krueger to advance resolution. Motion carried.

   As we bounce around our flexible agenda today the next item will be resolution (020418) appoint a sports-person to participate in DNR/Tribal negotiations. Chandra Harvey our "Attorney of the Year" will give us some background information. Chandra stated that there are many facets to the department and the tribes discussions. Many of them resulting from the Supreme Court [Voight] case. The easiest way to explain it is the tribes were granted specific treaty rights many years ago in an agreement with the federal government. The department as a state agency must in good faith have the discussions and work out the agreements with the tribes. While she understands some of the discontent coming from the sporting community these discussions and negotiations are at a higher level.

   The interpretation of treaty rights precludes any other discussion that the sporting community has a say in. The reality of negotiations with the tribes is that if we cannot come to agreement we will wind up back in litigation before a judge. Only the formal parties that were involved on that litigation have a place at the table. That being the tribal representatives and the Department of Natural Resources. The other thing she would ask people to understand is that the department in its capacity does represent all the stakeholders in Wisconsin but they also have a responsibility to balance those stakeholders desires while keeping true to the process.

   The department meets with stakeholders, we discussed the issue with our constituents and there are a lot of different processes that they use in an attempt to develop a negotiation strategy.

   Motion by Lobner 2nd by Blattner to reject. Motion rejected.

   Resolution (60118) Titled, designate uniform hours of operation all DNR field station/service centers throughout Wisconsin.

   Scott Loomans presented information from the DNR side. During his time at the department there have been many adjustments made to the service centers hours. For a period of time we had a wide open policy, then went through a period of reduction of hours and consolidation of staffing. He said we are more available now than probably 2010. Our online and phone service centers are open from 7 AM until 10 PM so in that instance I would believe we are more available. Other things that come to mind is the realignment strategy and the fact that not very much surfaced about customer service complaints. He also pointed out that over 50% of license sales are done online and in the last quarter we only sold 3% of our licenses over-the-counter and service centers. He believes we are as a department very available by way of phone or text and computer. I know that is not the way some people want to do it but here again is another example of cost to the department. If we do not utilize the most popular and efficient options were taking funds away from other projects. We have been doing a large amount of outreach through media and our license vendors to try and make people aware of all the tools that are available for answering questions. He mentioned also that the main call in number for the DNR service center is open 7 days a week 7 AM to 10 PM. He also shared that the people naming these phones have and continue to go through a large amount of training to help them keep a high level of expertise. There is such a wide range of possible call discussions so these individuals not only need to know about the normal hunting, fishing, trapping issues, environmental permitting but also all of the safety programs that the department provides.

   Motion by Taylor 2nd by Krueger to reject. Motion rejected.

   Anecdotally Joel mentioned some of the people involved with this are the ones that refuse to embrace technology. He also mentioned that he had one of his neighbors come to his house last weekend and he assisted them in buying his licenses online, he was glad to help, but that is an example of the issues.

   Resolution (410218) titled, return WCC district status to Milwaukee County and its Executive Council Seats.

   Barbara Maniotis representing the resolution writer stated this action was a punitive measure affecting Milwaukee County
for past underrepresentation on the Executive Council. It unfairly punishes the current county delegation and the county citizens. She listed population numbers for counties currently in her district along with Dane County and stated that Milwaukee County has the largest population of any county in the state. Yet has the same voting power as the smallest county in the state. It is decidedly undemocratic, this action in 2016 minimizes the voices of millions of county residents in the WCC process.

Obviously this group in the past by having Milwaukee County as it's own separate district felt that was the correct way to go until 2016. She also noted that Milwaukee County has a number of universities within the county and a young population of activists who feel disenfranchised by this position.

Barbara asked the question if the current delegation is prepared to do the necessary work required? When Milwaukee County status was changed participation was at an all-time low.

Dale asked if the delegates were going to their district meetings in force?

Barbara stated that the last district meeting all 3 delegates showed up in the 1 prior to that 4 showed up.

Mike commented that this was an interesting way of looking at things, that Milwaukee County wants to be a district all to themselves. Delegates in less populated areas and I will use (Vilas County as an example,) has more lakes than most counties. People up there say why should high population counties be able to dictate what happens in our county? You talk about the power you think you should have to tell people in the North what they should do, but you don't live there. I don't buy into the concept that just because you have 1 million people that you should be anointed with the power over another county.

When there's 5 counties in the North and we can come together and elect people to represent our district he just doesn't see why one county should be an island of itself.

Barbara said she understands your point but Milwaukee County borders Lake Michigan and has rivers and streams running through it. They are talking about a democratic process and they feel that they are being treated inappropriately by the WCC. She feels that the representation should be based more on population.

Larry stated that in 2006 we made an attempt at redistricting by population and that failed miserably.

Kevin Smaby asked how many delegates were at the state convention?

Barbara said they had 3 delegates there on Friday and 2 on Saturday. Of those absence one had a parent pass away and another one had a final exam, the 3rd one I'm not sure of.

Tony Blattner commented that he read a study lately where only about 3% of the population hunt and fish, do you have any idea how many in your population are truly involved in the outdoors? Is it a high population only or more than 3% of the population?

Barbara said she was not sure of the mix of the population but hunting and fishing is not the only thing that the WCC is involved with.

Bob asked how many people attended the spring hearing this year?

Dale looked it up and stated that the tally showed 294 in attendance.

She hoped with the new technology coming out that they would get more people out in the county voting.

Bob Haase commented that Fond du Lac County had~160 people attend so proportionately, participation in Milwaukee County does not fit the rational that you are talking about.

**ACTION**
All action resolutions as stated above.

**PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE**

**DEADLINE**

2. Continued discussion on assigned resolutions. [PRESENTER]

**DISCUSSION**
Barbara stated that in her opinion the new technology coming out will have a great impact on the number of people contributing to the Spring Hearings in Milwaukee County.

Bob stated that we would expect much higher participation with the new technology coming up in all the counties in the state and it would be interesting to see what happened in the higher populated areas.

Motion by Meyer 2nd by Weiss to advance the resolution.

Discussion Larry stated that if it advanced it would be something that would be done internally and not brought to next year's questionnaire.

Jane stated that the people of Milwaukee County who hunt, fish and trapped don't have the opportunity for the most part to do that within their county, so they go to other counties in the state. She also feels that they should have the same rights to comment on those as any other County.

Dale pointed out that anyone in attendance at the Spring Hearing could always weigh in on any question. Now with the online polling going in it should be even easier. He doesn't see the reason to make a district by population. From the beginning of the Congress the vision was to keep the decisions in the hands of the county delegations, unless it had statewide implication.

Joe stated he didn't have a problem with Milwaukee County being their own district, they used to be. But in recent times they were not doing the work needed and it was hard to justify. He questioned how many people outside of Milwaukee County have been involved in promoting the Congress within Milwaukee County which is one of our goals.

Ron asked how many counties are in the district and was told that it was Milwaukee County, Racine and Kenosha.

Dale stated the comment that you made in the resolution about the representation in the WCC is undemocratic. My opinion
is if you are doing the job like you say you are you are representing the citizens of your County. You do have an opportunity to run as a delegate to the District Leadership Council and since the WCC does not designate districts by population I see no reason to spin off one County has its own district.

Mike stated that if you were to get your own district, that doesn't make you more active in Milwaukee County. You can be more active right now and still be part of your district.

Joel commented that if they were removed from district status for nonparticipation and they made a marked improvement then maybe reconsideration would be in order. But it seems to him that they are participating at the current level to the other counties within there district.

Kevin Smaby stated another thing to think about is; look at the number of committees that we currently have, do you expect the 5 delegates to share meeting assignments do go to all of these committee meetings? Because on a district wide level most districts have at least 2 delegates for the major committees? In order to stay fully informed as a district you need to have representation from your district on all these committees and I don't see that as a viable option.

Scott Gunderson commented that Milwaukee County is in there district (11) and they have made some marked improvements, they finally have 5 delegates and are attending meetings for the most part. He really thinks that if we are to entertain allowing them to be their own district again that we need a little bit more time to see how well this revitalization goes.

Larry said that there being no further discussion he will call the question.

On the motion by Meyer 2nd by Weiss to advance the resolution.

Motion failed. Resolution rejected.

3. Continued discussion on assigned resolutions.

Resolution (060318, 320118) titled, adopt management policies to actively reduce the rate and spread of CWD.

Larry stated that the Congress has a long-standing position in opposing baiting and feeding, what's your pleasure?

Motion by Riggle 2nd by Maas to reject.

Discussion. Terry, CWD has been identified in Buffalo County so this discussion is pretty much mute. Larry stated that we just entered into this big partnership with DATCAP and we need to let this develop.

Motion carried. Resolution is rejected.

Resolution (150118) titled, immediate action to stop further spread of CWD.

Motion by Knaeber 2nd by Smaby to reject.

Discussion, Larry stated again that we just entered into this big partnership with DATCAP and we need to let this develop.

Rob commented that what the writer is asking for in this resolution can't be accomplished. Does he have any idea cost and the time to test and report out 600,000 deer in the time frame the people would expect? While he is frustrated as the next person with all the CWD issues he can't support this resolution.

Motion to reject carried. Resolution rejected.

4. Friends of the Wisconsin conservation Congress update

Larry read off of an email from Rob Bohmann with the following financial information:

Starting balance before convention. $24,020.

Total deposits after bills paid. $21,659.

Current checkbook balance. $46,579.

Notable receipts are as follows:

- Gun Board Raffle $2457.
- Walk Around Raffle, $1759.
- Bucket Raffle $5785.
- Free will bear bait collection $875.

Larry thanked everyone for the tremendous effort in providing prizes and digging deep into your pockets as we had an outstanding fund raiser.

Larry also stated that Rob reported that the Friends Group had applied for a $9950 request to cover the cost of writing a grant for the YCC. The grant was approved in May 2016 early in 2017 the friends entered into a contract with Mark Labarbera to write the plan for the YCC. The contract was for $9000 to be paid out in $3000 increments of which the final
payment will be coming due shortly. As we all know from the interim reports that we received from Mark that the focus needs to be on figuring out a way to fund a coordinator for the YCC. One of the things Mark brought up was the raffle idea that I talked to you about earlier, similar to other states. Our proposal is for an all-inclusive license as a raffle with everything except an Elk tag included. As I mentioned I will be talking to the governor's office tomorrow on this. Scott reminded everyone to thank Rob when they run into them for all the work that he's put in through the friends group and the raffle's again this year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Information only. No action taken.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</td>
<td>DEADLINE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. YCC Update

**DISCUSSION**

The YCC committee had recommended that an update be given at every district meeting to keep the delegates informed.

Terry stated that if we want to see the YCC grow we need to keep everybody involved in the process and up-to-date. Their vision would be to have youth delegates at district meetings making reports and being a part of the process.

Kevin commented that this doesn't have to be a very long report just a reminder to talk to a school to encourage a youth to be a part of the terrific program that we are involved in.

Joe commented on the article that he clipped out of the local paper talking about future conservation leaders that were involved with the Wisconsin wildlife Federation program. The difference with their program is there high school seniors, and college students. He thought it might be worthwhile to expand our program to encompass the older group as well.

Tony stated he hated to rain on any body's parade but District Meetings are being overburdened by agenda items. Judging from the resolutions that are coming to his committee it's obvious that we aren't getting the information or instructions to the District Leaders and County Chairs. Information is either not being brought up correctly or not at all. We graze over these topics at District Meetings because it's already 11 o'clock at night and people have to go home. I understand what is being said about the Youth Committee is correct but we're going to have to figure out a way to get the information to the delegates at the District Meetings without it taking 4 hours in the process.

Mike suggested putting together a short webinar that could be shown on a laptop (no more than 3 minutes long), to update the group on what's going on. On the District Meetings, we need to have delegates come prepared. Too many times delegates are opening their packets the night of the District Meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Motion by Roehng 2nd by Smaby to add YCC reports to each district meeting agenda. Motion carried.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</td>
<td>DEADLINE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Advisory Committee Assignments

**DISCUSSION**

Mike handed out draft committee assignment sheets, noting there were quite a few districts that had open positions.

Larry commented that if your district has some open vacancies on committees that now would be the time to reach out to your delegates and try and fill those positions.

Kari mentioned that a number of delegates had not turned in their delegate profiles and those were also listed for each district. We had given people a pass code in order to update this ahead of time, this was unique to the individual and yet many still failed to accomplish this. We were trying to make it less work for delegates so all they had to do was go to their saved file and make whatever changes were necessary. For whatever reason we had a lot of delegates that failed to complete their profile. Many of them said they never got the communication whether or not it went to their junk box or not is yet to be discovered, or their firewalls are preventing the connection and blocking certain emails. She thinks next year were going to have an open link so that anybody can go to the website and fill it out but you're also going to have to fill out your profile from the beginning. This particular program will not let you upload previous information.

Dale stated that he was unhappy with the proposal to go back the way we used to do it. There's no reason to have to reinvent the wheel every year.

Harry said yes that was the beauty of the current process but over 50 people failed to utilize it or utilize it correctly.

Dale stated that it's wrong to penalize the other 300 that did it right just because 50 or 60 couldn't follow instructions we just need to work on a better procedure. He suggested to turn it over to the District Counselor's to make sure that their people comply. You said in some cases you sent multiple requests to the individuals and still not received the information. He thinks that after the 1st request for compliance that District Leadership should be notified and let them follow it up before the deadline date.

Tony agreed that this proposed change is a step backward and wrong.

Kari stated that she is not sure what happened this time, we did not have this lack of compliance in previous years.

Joel commented he would rather contact the 3 or 4 delegates within his district and follow up with them on why they didn't complete rather than going back to the old days.

Larry suggested that counselors work one-on-one with Mike to sort out some of the discrepancies in the committee assignment sheets.

Larry also mentioned that he would like to have at least one person from each district on the YCC oversight committee. These are just preliminary assignments please work with Kari and Mike to get any discrepancies or differences ironed out.
he would like to finalize these assignments in the next 2 weeks. Kari stated that she would send out and emailing to all
deleagtes stating that if you're interested on sitting on the YCC advisory committee and to contact your District Counselors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Information only. No action taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</td>
<td>DEADLINE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Stewardship Reauthorization (540418) Larry Bonde

**DISCUSSION** Larry believes that Congress should work with the rest of the sporting community to move the Knowles Nelson stewardship program to the highest level possible. He doesn't think we can set number limits and he feels that it's not realistic to take it back to 1989 numbers. But he thinks it would be wise for the Congress to work with the other groups to come to a consensus and work as a whole. Steve commented that the reason that this program has been scaled-back so far is because of the debt service on these loans. This is all borrowed money that needs to be repaid. That's not to say that they didn't scale it back too far, so it wouldn't be a bad idea for us to be involved in the conversation. The program is certainly not under attack in his opinion, we're at this point because were it was in the past was not physically responsible.

**ACTION** Motion by Budnick 2nd by Lobner to reject the resolution. Motion carried. Resolution rejected. Motion by Meyer 2nd by Budnick to authorize the chairman to work with other sporting organizations on stewardship upgrading. Motion carried.

| PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |

8. Sportsmen for Wetlands Larry Bonde

**DISCUSSION** Larry believes that this is another opportunity for the Congress to work together with other organizations, and use their combined strengths for the betterment of the resources.

**ACTION** Motion by Meyer 2nd by Krueger to authorize the chairman to work with this organization and enter into a memorandum of understanding with them. Larry mentioned that this organization is fully cognizant of the limitations by statute that the Congress must abide by and honors our position. Motion carried. Participation authorized.

| PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |

9. Restore public access across railroad tracks (131818, 520118, 570418, 720518) Larry Bonde

**DISCUSSION** Larry stated that the Congress already has a position in support of re-instituting public access. We have worked with other groups in contacting legislators to sponsor the change, but so far we have not been able to accomplish that. He doesn't think we need to ask this question again since we already have a position. Discussion, Scott Gunderson mentioned that we do need to keep this in the forefront and continue work on this, everyone in the room agrees we need to work on this but we do already have a position.

**ACTION** Motion by Krueger 2nd by Taylor to reject. Motion carried resolution rejected.

| PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |

10. License Fee Increase Package Larry Bonde

**DISCUSSION** Larry again reviewed with the District Leadership the issues in last year's negotiations. He is asking permission to again participate in the license fee increase discussion. He would like our approval to call a meeting of the stakeholders and again be in a leadership position on this initiative. He believes that we may be in a little better position than we were last time, this being an election year. We also started late (last year) and didn't quite find that champion we needed to spearhead the legislation on the floor. He would be willing to lead the Congress on another charge at that if this group so decides. Motion by Maas 2nd by Larson to authorize the chairman to undertake this initiative with our complete approval. Discussion, Budnick he doesn't understand why non-motorized watercraft are not charged a licensing fee, this would add much additional revenue. He mentioned the that our wildlife fee increase was approved at the state convention and wondered if we really needed that if we get this fee increase.

Jane Meyer commented that this (licensing non-motorized watercraft) is a contentious issue and that there are some legal issues based on wording (always free and wild) in the state constitution.

Larry stated the original license fee package had several earmarks on where money was supposed to go. Some of the changes taking place may not work for the group this year they may not have all the same earmarks as was proposed.
last go-round. If he can get the governor’s office to agree to accepting a (fee increase) we can potentially massage a few things around in the course of negotiations. Larry asked Scott Gunderson if he thought this was a logical approach based on his experience. Scott said the legislature wants to know that there is broad support for any fee increase being proposed. If the legislature and the governor can agree on that there’s a very good likelihood of acceptance. His sense is if you go with to large of an increase right out of the gate you may not have that “unity of the group” that we were able to achieve last time. Without that unity he is pretty sure that the governor will not support it. Quite frankly if you can’t find a good champion in the legislature that's willing to take it on and sponsor the bill, it's not going go anywhere. His feeling is we don't have a strong outdoors person in the legislature and questions whether are we going to find the right candidate? Larry said going back to Dave’s question; that his position on this is that nothing is off the table but that going back to last year’s proposal is a good starting point. Larry stated that we have a motion on the floor and there being no further discussion he would call all the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Motion carried. Authorization given.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**11. Members Matters**

**DISCUSSION** Ken Risley stated he had a lot of contact with deer farmers (in the last couple of months) concerned with the governor’s position on CWD. He agreed with everything that was passed and discussed at the convention pertaining to CWD. But had a problem with the clause in the governor’s proposal that prohibited a deer farmer from moving clean animals from a facility. By doing this it would force the deer farms to become a shooting facility or drive them out of business. He doesn’t agree with that it goes against his philosophy of “free enterprise”. If the person follows all the rules and did everything he was supposed to and still gets penalized this flies in the face of that.

Larry commented that after working on a comprehensive CWD management plan for over a year that he felt that we need to let that plan work for a while, the Congress needs to monitor the situation.

Mike talked about the program and the plan that he was a part of along with some best management practices that he is familiar with and agreed with Larry. Jumping into this now is a no-win situation for the Congress at best.

June Meyer was concerned about the NRB board chairman’s comments on how the Wisconsin Conservation Congress should “tend their knitting” she thought it was condescending. After the presentation she challenged him as to how he expected us to address our core issues that are in his words hunting, fishing and trapping if the water doesn't support fish and the air and the habitat are detrimental to wildlife.

Dave Larson said that June stole quite a bit of his thunder, but the comment concerned him also. It is called the Department of Natural Resources not the Department of Fish and Game and we are by statute to advise the Natural Resources Board. Dave thanked the DLC for making the Motorized Recreational Vehicle Committee a standing committee and feels that was a good move.

Scott Gunderson commented on the youth Expo and the need for additional funding. 2800+ students attended along with over 550 teachers, parents and chaperons. There were over 40 displays in the “See and Do Outdoor Expo”. He encouraged the District Leadership Council to talk with their local clubs and organizations about providing scholarship money for transportation.

Scott said Mark LaBarbera is thrilled with the turnout at this years Expo and the fact that it has been growing every year. We had a little bit of a setback this year when an individual approached the Waunakee school board claiming that the youth Expo was nothing but a front for the NRA. Mark reached out to the administration and tried to explain that the NRA was one of 40 vendors and the BB gun course was sponsored by the Wisconsin Hunters Safety Instructors Association. Attendance at any of the displays is purely voluntary but his appeal fell on deaf years. Because of this action over 200 youth were prohibited from attending this year’s Expo. Gundy also ask everybody to thank Rob Bohmann the next time you see him for all the effort he puts in with the Friends Group and raising money through the Raffles to support transportation grants.

Dale Maas had a couple of items pertaining to licensing; he was at Fleet Farm getting his license and the employee behind the counter was concerned about the fact that they couldn’t issue any of the bonus deer licenses and it would require people to come back or to do it online. He introduced myself and explained the whole CDAC process and the fact that after the final recommendation from each of the counties was in. The overall plan had to be approved by the Natural Resources Board. After explaining it to her she said that would be something that would be important for her as an agent to know. She would be better informed on telling her customers. So my suggestion is that somewhere in the packet that they send out to the merchants that they add another piece of paper that explains that and maybe a small poster that could be displayed.

Another license related issue is why our external vendors could not have our State Park Stickers to distribute at the point-of-sale? It’s a little thing but it really is something that I believe could be rectified.
Gundy reported on the youth Expo and I don't want to rehash that other than to say the 4 really old guys that spend 5 hours setting up the booth, 2 days working the booth and another 4 hours tearing down the booth could use a little help. Even if it was one additional delegate it would make a big difference.
If you've never been to the youth Expo I strongly suggest that you find some time to attend at least once those of us that work and find it a very fulfilling opportunity to interact with the future of conservation in the state. One of the cool things about the Expo besides the kids is the number of fathers the take the day off of work to be chaperons. I was told that this event was one of the field trips that dad's found important and obviously made time for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. Members Matters continued

**DISCUSSION**

Joe Weiss asked if there was any progress on getting the computer program for tracking of resolutions going yet? Kari said it was still a work in progress but getting closer. He also put out a request for any pictures (old or current) that might be in local newspapers, magazines or other publications that had to do with history of Conservation Congress or outdoor events throughout the state.

Joel Taylor also wanted to talk about the issue that the NRB board chairman brought up at the state convention. He feels that all the things he does as a Forrester are just as important to warblers as much as they are to Whietail deer. He finds it difficult to separate any of the Natural Resources. Joel said he's intending to bring it up with Terry tonight because this position is about everything we do on behalf of the residents of this state. He thinks our voting process as it pertains to election of the District Leadership Council could use a little work. He knows his delegation didn't really follow the format and looks forward to addressing that. With our Code of Procedure changes that we just approved it might be prudent that anybody considering a position on the DLC announce at the Spring District Meeting their interest. The last item is a discussion that needs to take place about some of the resolutions that come up by the nonconsumptive users. An example was: "we should have every stream monitored in the state". For what? Would be the logical question and I think with a little guidance at the county level we can drill down some of these questions and avoid problems later on. His hope would be that we help them develop a resolution that solves the problem that they have identified but it also must be something that we have the authority to request a change in.

Larry commented that he still believes that the Spring Hearings are not the venue to take on environmental issues. Not because it's not part of our responsibility but we do not have the people to advise us from the department on the discussions that follow. Maybe there should be a secondary opportunity for those issues.

Larry thought that possibly with the online polling scenario that there would be an opportunity in that area. The mechanics are capable of getting a survey put together that individuals could tab through to specific facts that pertain to that environmental issue that we may not be able to handle on a face-to-face basis.

Mike Rogers commented that the environmental issues are not going away and quite often do require legislation. Stewardship is another issue that we haven't heard too much about the last 2 to 3 years but there seems to be a shift and it's starting to come back into the discussion, so we'll have to see where that goes. If the political winds change he will be very interested to see how that all plays out.

Dave Breunig commented that after 19 years of being on the Congress he finally got on the Deer and Elk Committee. Bob Ellingson commented that he is glad that there was a discussion on the West Nile outbreak as it pertains to the Rough Grouse.

Ron Krueger has been receiving a lot of comments on the deer farm issue and the governor's proposal. Also there were many people at the environmental committee supporting their resolutions and it was very helpful to have the right department personnel in attendance to help the committee better understand a lot of the issues.

Kevin Smaby asked to consider re-establishment of the CWD committee and take some of the pressure off of the Deer and Elk Committee. Kevin said he will be polling the District Leaders probably within the next couple of weeks on how they go about assigning committees within their district. Whether you have term limits, whether it is an appointment, pick and choose whatever the method. Another comment on the state convention was the youth were able to fly a fly make a spinner. A thank you to Bob Haase and Frank Pratt for putting this on. He thanked everybody that helped with the youth field trips and the friends group for providing the YCC T-shirts.

He did say that in the Dairy state he thought we should at least provide milk as an optional beverage. He noted that he took a long time at some of the meals at the convention, but overall he felt the convention it self was good.

Terry Roehling questioned if the public even knows about the WCC? She's concerned that the message isn't getting out. The Public confuse CDAC and our participation in it and were misinterpreted the information. They thought at the spring hearing they could vote on deer quotas. She thinks there is a real missed opportunity and we need to do a better job of dialing into it, maybe our social media plans will help that.

At 11:00, nothing

Stan Brownell this wanted to mention about how the deer farmers talk about what the cost was to them. But what about the cost to Wisconsin tourism, heritage and the general economy. This concerns him.
He would like to ask the executive committee to find a way to tell the public that the spring hearing is not a vote before the next go round. Please try and come up with a standard phrase that we can all start to adhere to.

Steve Budnick, nothing.

Tony Blattner, just to reiterate what Kevin had said, the Rules and Resolutions Committee would like to review how each district goes about their selection for committee assignments and term limits. The other day Mike and I had the opportunity to interact with members of the US Fish and Wildlife Service. In the course of our discussion and joking with Mike about him being voted into the Vice Chair position. They asked Vice Chair of what? When we abruptly said Wisconsin Conservation Congress, at which time they had a very glazed look on their face. We went on to explain what the Conservation Congress does and what its mission is. It just goes to show that our work is never done. These are very knowledgeable people that have done Grouse drumming surveys and many other conservation duties.

Joel Taylor questioned about a comment Tony made about handwritten resolutions. Joel said he would have no problem taking a handwritten resolution acting on it then taking it home and typing it up. Joe asked how critical was the timing on getting the resolution? Kari stated that they'll be about a week turnaround and if it was emailed the following day it would not be an issue. But if it's 4 days later that would be problematic because she needs to get copies to the Rules and Resolutions Committee so they can start the process of committee assignments.

Mike Riggle commented on the youth Expo that he attended 12 years ago as a chaperon. Incursing 3 and half hours travel time each way. The following year he worked with a bunch of volunteers in his area and this year completed the 11th year of the one day "Youth Day". This is done with all volunteers and done during the school year, during the week, through the schools so that every fifth-grader attends. If you do it on the Saturday you get the ones that want to attend. If you do it during a school day you expose many of them to what may be the only opportunity they will ever have to be exposed to some outdoor activities. Mike said he agreed with Larry on the environmental separation. Being able to separate environmental issues from consumptive user issues on a survey will allow for the public to give their opinion on the items most important to them. Another important side product when we were talking earlier about Sturgeon spearing. Wouldn't it be cool to tailor a question about the opinion of only Sturgeon Spears for the last 5 years on that issue? I believe we will be able to mine that data.

Mike Schmit, nothing.

Kan Lee Zimmerman, nothing.

Larry Bonde, nothing.

ACTION
Information only. No action taken.
A motion by Maas 2nd by Gunderson to adjourn. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM.
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