What do you value about the inland trout fishery in WI?

**South District**
- Sustainability, long term health in uncertain future
- Recreational opportunities for all anglers
- Abundant wild trout and easy access to health streams (stream easement program)
- Statewide quantity of trout streams, diversity in stream types and fishing opportunities
- Land ethic, watershed management, good water quality
- Positive change in trout fishery over past 30-40 years, TU/DNR work on both habitat and general management
- Science-based management
- Nutrient management plans, buffers to improve water quality
- Partnerships w/ public, working w/ landowners
- New generation of fish biologists, enthusiasm, new ideas
- Progress made w/ point source pollution management
- Opportunities for different fishing styles (bait, fly, artificial, catch and release, harvest)

**West District**
- Exists
- Cold/clean water – water quality programs
- Adequate habitat
- Public access – accessible fishing sites ex. Handicapped
- Quality trout fisheries
- Economics, $$
- Solitude
- Native trout
- Pride
- Large distribution
- Rod/gun clubs/coops/partnerships/volunteers
- Habitat restorations
- DNR personnel/resources/$

**East District**
- Stream access
- Active habitat restoration program
- Increase in trout populations in driftless area and other streams
- Species management, brook, brown and rainbow
- Variety of opportunities
- General public positively impact partnerships to impact trout streams
- Clean water
• No barriers to trout fishing us multiple methods
• Extended season to use resource
• Citizen based monitoring
• Can find peace and quiet, more room for people
• Good water rights compared to western states
• Culture, fishing traditions in Wisconsin, unique
• More emphasis on habitat rather than stocking
• Affordable, easy to get into compared to other states

North District
• Diversity of landscapes, driftless, sand streams, northland streams
• Trout bigger = better
• Available – easy access (no boat)
• Solitude
• Size and coverage of streams
• Trout indicator of good land management
• Heritage of conservation
• Wild-native fish in an intact ecosystem
• Enjoy rivers, multiple habitat – changes around bend
• Catching fish a challenge
• Economic value to region
• Trout as a food value
• A way to connect people to land and ecosystem
• Anglers passionate and dedicated (willing to spend money on conservation)
• Relationship building (families)
• Mental health
• Physical health
• Trout habitat = habitat for other species (otter/beaver)

What concerns you about trout management in the future?

South District
• Environmental changes, adapting to changing climate
• Land use changes, particularly the influence of agricultural development on trout streams (e.g. manure)
• Water use depletion, high-cap wells
• Water quality, manure management, lax enforcement of regulations, lax penalties, non-point sources
• Recruiting next generation, continuing the positive progress we’ve made
• Non-point sources: sediments, nutrient runoff, manure, phosphorus, nitrogen, stormwater
• Continued funding for trout, trout stamp, trout propagation, as well as maintaining current funding in the face of inflation, etc.
• Missed opportunities due to inadequate funding
• Loss of fishing access, loss of easements, habitat loss, predation, beaver control
• Predation, invasive species, beaver control, New Zealand mudsnails
• Politics: non-science based management of resources

West District
• Youth exposure – education – getting outdoors
• Climate change
• Water rights
• Land use practices, row cropping, tillage, buffers, high cap wells
• Fisheries relationship w/other programs that regulate land/water use, monitoring legislation – high cap wells
• Commitment with coops rearing trout
• Managing native brook trout in the face of climate change – habitat restoration for brook trout
• Long term management of riparian areas
• Habitat maintenance
• Cost sharing for farm/ag
• Lack of $
• State budget process and prioritization

East District
• Increase in kayaking and tubing
• Groundwater depletion
• Awareness of where stream easements start and stop
• Funding – need enough for good management
• Political influence on trout/nat. resource management
• Invasive species
• Lack of adequate research funds to do needed research
• Lack of angler diversity
• Water pollution
• Preserve brook trout in the face of climate change
• Trout classification reassessments
• Maintain native trout genetics
• Genetic modifications and impacts to native trout
• Use biology and science and not so much politics and social drivers
• Use watershed approach to fish management
• Rule simplification vs. specific streams and circumstances
• New anglers and young anglers
• Better communications as it relates to engaging the non-angling public
• Spots for new and old anglers
• Communicate with legislators on real issues
North District

- Legislature doing management -DNR secretary
- Denial of climate change
- Removing science from management (wetland rule roll backs, non federal)
- De-regulation (water protections – CAFOs, mining, high cap wells)
- One size doesn’t fit all
- Take geology into account
- Pressure to go catch and relase – to much emphasis?
- Under utilization of resource
- Personal use and consumption
- User groups aging out – lack of recruitment
- Trout fishing too solitary?
- Maintaining beaver control – made an investment
- Accessible trout fishing (stocking)
- Infrastructure at local level – decrease of funding
- Is there a need for increased trout funding (stamp and license)
- Native vs naturalized populations
- Better information – regs and access
- Easements- county, township, federal, state – generally only fed and state show up on maps
- Tribal rights - educate

Goals for the plan

South District

- Increase from 25 miles of stream restoration/year to 100 miles/year; 2 habitat teams in SD
- Explore possibility of year-round season using research and social considerations/easements; explore possibility of using live bait during C/R season considering research and social concerns
- Explore alternative funding source beyond just Trout Stamp
- Focused area for family/youth fishing; natural setting vs. urban
- Improve accessibility and habitat restoration near urban areas
- Trophy angling opportunities/stream designation
- Continue use of science-based management
- Establish funding to stay ahead of inflation rate
- Increase trout research, trout management specifically
- Improve collaboration w/ agriculture industry
- More responsive and flexible regulations to address management issues such as stunting, etc.
- More public access
• Raise awareness of economic benefit of fishing

West District
• Integration of coops
• Increase public access
• Promotion of trout fishing and the program
• Science and research – stay ahead
• Implement management recommendations that stem from climate change
• Monitoring (long term) temps and abiotic comp.
• Watershed approach to management – drainage district issues
• Implementing genetic component
• Priority management for priority streams – brook trout, where work is needed
• Working with landowners to improve streams without public access
• Generating revenue – priority needs
• More coops
• Evaluation of habitat projects
• Increase outreach, communication with public

1. Increase and maintain partnerships, general public, agriculture, coops, angling groups
2. Research and science – evaluation of what we do, genetics, land-use and watershed management
3. Monitoring and evaluation, streams, classification
4. Funding and priority setting – long term
5. Education, outreach, promotion

East District
• Science trumps social – do appropriate science
• Communication strategy/plan
• Angler recruitment strategy/plan
• Increase access and maintenance of access
• Increase restoration and therefore better NR and less stocking
• Population assessments
• More kids fishing
• More NR
• More national awareness of our fishery
• Better stream access, brushing
• More variety of fishing experiences, e.g., Flat/raft
• Improved stewardship
• Trout management plan built on sound science
• Different types of anglers working together
• Increase restoration and decrease stocking
• Alternative funding and group coops doing work
• More easements and access
• Improved stream connectivity at road crossings
• Better signage – landowners, boundaries and easements
• Grant funding – education and research
• Legislation out of fish rule making
• DNR keep equip to do the restorations
• More DNR staff/field staff
• License fee increase
• Allow DNR to talk/lobby
• Continue using stakeholders in process

North District

• Trout numbers as high – increase trout anglers
• More trout/bigger trout – native brookies
• Increased access – easements
• Less stocking – more natural reproduction
• Tag alder succeeding to forest
• Fishability brushing
• More habitat crews in north
• More urban/youth fishing opportunities – put/grow/take stocking
• Determine impact of high caps
• Increase beaver control
• Adequate funding
• Interagency cooperation – universities, agencies
• Maintain water quality
• Proper funding for program needs
• Maintain and enhance inland lake trout
• Address liability issues
• Stream connectivity – culverts, road crossings
• Utilize tech to inform and clarify
• Reestablish dnr role in policy and legislation
• Facilitate and improve collaboration
• Continue to develop and use science (climate, genetics)
• Enhance young people/citizens in planning and monitoring.