

Wisconsin Conservation Congress Legislative Committee Meeting Minutes



ORDER OF BUSINESS	8/25/2012	9:00a.m.	Schmeeckle Reserve Visitors Center Stevens Point, WI
--------------------------	------------------	-----------------	---

I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

A. CALL TO ORDER

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER BY	Chairman Al Shook at 9:00 a.m.
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------

B. ROLL CALL

ATTENDEES	Roger Wilson , Ron Waller, Lowell Suring, Claude Bohn, Kathleen Tober, Al Shook, Harold Drake, John Jones, Chuck Boley , Dave Breunig, James Wrolstad , Scott Loomans, Mike Bruhn
EXCUSED	Michael Reese
UNEXCUSED	
GUESTS	Gerald Clark, Mike Fuge, Ben Loma, Roger Vanderlogt, Guy McFarren, Scott McAuley

C. AGENDA APPROVAL/REPAIR

DISCUSSION	The meeting was opened with a request by chairman Shook to amend the agenda to allow the resolutions to be taken out of order. The request was made to accommodate the resolution writers who were present and also to allow the writer of resolution 680212 to present her resolution via a conference call scheduled for 12:45.
ACTION	A motion was made by Wilson and seconded by Wrolstad to approve the chairman's request for amending the agenda. Motion carried on a voice vote.

D. REVIEW COMMITTEE MISSION STATEMENT

DISCUSSION	The committee mission statement was read by Chairman Shook. There was no discussion or request for change.
ACTION	

E. PUBLIC COMMENTS

DISCUSSION	N/A
-------------------	-----

II. INFORMATION ITEMS & UPDATES

A. CHAIRMAN'S ROLE

AL SHOOK

DISCUSSION	Chairman Shook explained his role in conducting today's meeting. He stated that the resolution writers who were present would be allowed 3 minutes to speak on behalf of their resolutions. They would then be allowed to stay to answer committee member's questions about their resolutions if they chose to do so. He further reported that he had not received any citizen requests to speak about at today's meeting.
-------------------	--

B. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

MIKE BRUHN

DISCUSSION	The Legislative update was given by Mike Bruhn. He reported on the recently passed sporting heritage bill. Some of the provisions mentioned included a provision allowing hunting license discounts for persons recruiting first time hunters. Persons recruiting up to 3 people will be allowed discounted license fees if license purchasers provide that individuals D.N.R. customer number at the time of purchase. He went on to explain how the A.L.I.C.E. system will handle this new provision. He also mentioned another provision which opens state parks to hunting, fishing and trapping. The natural resources board can exempt certain parks or areas of individual parks as deemed necessary. He stated that some user groups are already pushing back against this legislation. He expects a lot of requests for exemptions as time goes on. There is currently discussion going on about handling issues associated
-------------------	--

<p>with this part of the bill. The D.N.R. would like to see a policy in place by December of this year because this part of the bill goes before the natural resources board in January of 2013 for implementation. Without specific implementation plans there could be a rash of bills in the next legislative session asking for exemptions for specific locations. They would like to avoid this as much as possible. He further stated that there will be less of open parks or specific areas of parks on the D.N.R. website. The wolf hunting bill has passed and the season will move forward if a recently filed lawsuit doesn't hold it up. His feeling is that the judge will rule in favor of the suit but the state will win on appeal. There should be a decision by the end of the month. Currently 14,000 applications have been received. The deadline is August 31st. Licenses would be issued in early September. There are also issues with the Native American tribe's acceptance of the hunt. They will receive 84 permits which at this point it appears they will not use. Future hunts and quotas will be looked at after this year's hunt is evaluated for success rates and any legal issues that may come about. This year's quota is 350 animals. Future wolf damage claims will be paid for out of wolf license monies. A bill was introduced last year for establishing a sand hill crane season. Due to a lack of support it didn't go anywhere. It will be reintroduced in the upcoming legislative session. The D.N.R. is working with the authors of the bill. Mike also commented on the lesser weapons bill and its intent. This bill would allow individuals to use any lesser weapon during the deer gun season as long as they have a deer gun license. There were a wide range of opinions on this issue. Discussion/comments by committee members included an extended rifle gun season as well as other concerns. It was also mentioned that the state now has agricultural damage payments available for cougar damage or injury to livestock. In response to Dr. Kroll's report the governor has suspended the October antlerless deer hunt.</p>		
ACTION		
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE		DEADLINE

III. DISCUSSION & ACTION ITEMS

A. CITIZEN RESOLUTIONS

1. RESOLUTION 360112 - CHANGE IN SPORTSMAN'S LICENSE

ROGER VANDERLOGT

<p>DISCUSSION</p> <p>CHANGE IN SPORTSMEN LICENSE: The resolution was read by chairman Shook. The author of the resolution, Roger Vanderlogt, was present. He was given 3 minutes to explain the intent of his resolution. He stated that due to physical issues he no longer deer hunts with a rifle. He would like to continue to purchase a sportsman's license. The purpose of his resolution would be to allow the purchaser to specify gun or bow. This would also help persons who have previous legal issues and have firearms restrictions. A bow is a legal weapon for hunting all small game. There was a question by Waller on how lesser weapons rules would apply to this license. There was also a question by Wilson on what he hunts with the license he currently buys.</p> <p>DISCUSSION: Question by Shook on costs associated with license change and modifications needed to the A.L.I.C.E. system to handle it. It was suggested by Scott that the costs may be in the twenty to thirty thousand dollar range. This would mean that the state would lose \$2.00 per license the first year.</p> <p>SEERING: Questioned if the license issuing agents may request additional fees to issue this license. It was commented that these fees have not been adjusted in several years even though issuing agents have been required to do more.</p> <p>BOHN: Commented that there are already too many licenses. Need to simplify things, not make the process more complicated.</p> <p>SHOOK: Questioned need for this change with possible changes involving cross bow use.</p> <p>WALLER: Commented that we shouldn't decide on this resolution based on budget or A.L.I.C.E. system upgrade costs.</p> <p>WILSON: Expressed concerns about the potential costs and revenue loss. Also felt that there may be other ways to resolve this issue.</p>		
<p>ACTION</p> <p>The question wall called by Chairman Shook. A show of hands was asked. The vote was 5 to advance with 4 opposing. The resolution advances. The results of the vote were questioned by Tober. A revote was taken. A show of hands showed 5 in favor to advance, 5 opposed. The chairman cast the tie breaker advancing the resolution forward by a 6 to 5 vote.</p>		
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE		DEADLINE

2. RESOLUTION 130512 – CREATE WILDLIFE WATCHER TASK FORCE

AL SHOOK

<p>DISCUSSION</p> <p>The resolution was read by chairman Shook. He reported that he had a lengthy discussion with the author regarding the resolutions intent.</p> <p>DISCUSSION: BOLEY: Questioned the accuracy of the resolution in stating the revenue generation by non hunters. The</p>		
---	--	--

	committee was advised that the numbers being used in the referred to 2006 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service survey are fairly accurate but they include a lot of estimates and include things not taken into account when determining hunter generated revenue.	
ACTION	There was a motion by Bohn and seconded by Wilson not to advance the resolution. A show of hands showed 9 yes and 1 no. The resolution fails	
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	

3. RESOLUTION 500312 – CREATE SEPARATE LICENSE FOR CROSSBOW

MICHAEL FUGE

DISCUSSION	<p>The resolution was read by chairman Shook. Michael Fuge, the author, was present and was given 3 minutes to speak on behalf of his resolution. Before he began he presented a hand out to the committee members with statistics on harvest numbers and license sales from 2002 to 2011. The large increase in archery licenses of 44% since 2002 was pointed out. Concerns about full use cross bows for the archery season, which are currently being considered and their impact on harvest numbers in future years. Currently there is no system in place to track deer harvested with a bow or cross bow separately. The author feels that there is a need to collect data concerning method of kill to avoid future harvest issues. This would give the D.N.R. and general public accurate information on what's happening during the archery season. It will answer the question of crossbows effect on youth harvest numbers. Currently 25% of the deer harvested are taken on an archery license. The author's presentation was followed by questions from committee members. Questions were asked concerning the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Accuracy of statistics. 2) Authors thoughts on impact of harvest with increased cross bow use. 3) How other states handle the bow/ cross bow license issues. 4) How many bow users will switch to cross bows if changes are made? 5) Data available from other states with unlimited cross bow use. 6) Increased cost to D.N.R. to issue/change license. <p>The question was called by Chairman Shook. A motion to advance was made by Woller and seconded by Wolstad. Discussion by the following was had: BREUNIG: Probably will see bow harvest increase with elimination of October hunt. WALLER: Change in license will not increase revenue. Not sure we should create a separate license. BOLEY: Looking for data collection to validate statistics on what was used is a good idea. SEERING: Supports resolution as submitted. BOHN: Not in favor – questioning authors intent. WILSON: Expressed concerns about creating a license with restricted use.</p>	
ACTION	<p>Following discussion there was a motion to amend the resolution with the author's agreement. Motion to amend by Waller and seconded by Wilson. The amendment changes the problem to "no way of tracking harvest rates". It also changes the last paragraph starting after "take action to" by eliminating all the verbiage after these words and replacing it as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Be it resolved that at this meeting held in Portage County on April 9, 2012, that the Conservation Congress with the department and the N.R.B. to take action to put check boxes on deer registration stubs to allow determination of weapon type used to harvest deer.</p> <p>Chairman Shook called for a vote on the motion to amend. Show of hands showed 9 in favor of the amendment with 1 opposing. A motion to advance the amended resolution was made by Waller and seconded by Wilson. A show of hands showed 9 in favor with 1 opposing. The resolution advances.</p>	
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	

4. RESOLUTION 160612 – EXPAND USE OF CROSSBOWS TO ALL HUNTERS DURING REGULAR ARCHERY SEASON

AL SHOOK

DISCUSSION	<p>The resolution was read by Chairman Shook. There was a motion to advance by Waller and seconded by Wrolstad. DISCUSSION: SHOOK: Commented on the number of letters in the Wisconsin Outdoor News regarding the cross bow issue. He stated his belief that it is time to allow a statewide vote on the issue of cross bow use during the archery season by anyone with an archery license. Need to determine actual support for or against. WILSON: Is okay with 65 or older cross bow use. Doesn't see any need for change. WALLER: Doesn't see the cross bow as a superior weapon. Believes it's time to allow its use. WOLSTAD: Had a cross bow and no longer uses it. Any opportunity to hunt or harvest a deer is a plus.</p>	
ACTION	<p>Following discussion the chairman called for a vote. A show of hands indicated that there were 7 in favor of advancing the resolution with 3 opposed. The resolution advances.</p>	

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

5. RESOLUTION 580312 – FREE FISHING/SMALL GAME FOR ARMED FORCES REGARDLESS OF RESIDENCY

AL SHOOK

DISCUSSION	<p>The resolution was read by chairman Shook. Before discussion a motion was made by Waller and seconded by Boley to advance the resolution.</p> <p>DISCUSSION:</p> <p>FALK: Questioned the scope of the resolution with regard to all active armed forces members. Does or would this apply to National Guard or reservists who are always active in positions such as recruiters?</p> <p>BREUNIG: Stated that he felt it was time to take the lead on this issue.</p> <p>WROLSTAD: Suggested that there should be a minimal dollar amount attached.</p> <p>WILSON: Questioned the number of people receiving this type of license already.</p> <p>SCOTT LOOMANS: Responding to Wilson’s question stated he would guess 2,000 or so.</p> <p>WALLER: Agreed with some dollar amount or reduced fee to avoid loss of Pittman/Robertson funds from license sales.</p>
ACTION	<p>Motion by Waller and seconded by Boley to amend the resolutions last paragraph starting at “on leave or furlough” to read reduced fee licenses at a level required to maintain Pittman/Robertson funds for all fishing and hunting licenses.</p> <p>The chairman called for a vote on the amendment. Show of hands indicated that there were 9 in favor to amend and 0 opposed. The chairman then called for a vote to advance the amended resolution. A show of hands indicated that there were 9 in favor and 0 opposed. The resolution will be forwarded as amended.</p>
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

6. RESOLUTION 720212 - HARVEST FERAL PIGS YEAR ROUND WITH ANY LICENSE

SCOTT MCAULY

DISCUSSION	<p>The resolution was read by chairman Shook. The author of the resolution, Scott McCauly, was present and allowed 3 minutes to speak. He explained that the purpose of the resolution was to make it simple to hunt feral pigs. Their numbers and range have grown steadily over the years and they are now present in Wisconsin. They have the ability to multiply at a very rapid rate and are a threat to agriculture.</p> <p>QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:</p> <p>BOLEY: Trapping year round could be a problem. Would eliminate trapping from the resolution.</p> <p>WILSON: Would the author be willing to change the wording to hunting only? Scott agreed.</p> <p>SCOTT LOOMANS: Regarding trapping feral pigs – they are an unprotected species and can be trapped year round already.</p> <p>BRUENNING: Has a problem with the any license wording - with the authors approval would like to change to wording to “any hunting license”.</p> <p>Motion to amend the resolution by Waller and was seconded by Falk. The resolution was amended to remove the wording “by hunting or trapping” and adding “hunting” between any and license. The new resolution will read: Be it resolved that the conservation congress work with the W.D.N.R., the natural resources board, and the state legislature to allow feral pigs to be killed year round with any hunting license.</p> <p>DISCUSSION:</p> <p>FALK: Supports due to crop damage issues.</p> <p>SURING: Questioned the current situation regarding hunting and trapping of feral pigs.</p> <p>SCOTT LOOMANS: Responding to Suring’s question. There is no season or bag limit on unprotected species. Individuals would need a small game license to shoot them or a landowner can kill them without a license.</p> <p>SURING: Would there be any advance to a no license requirement?</p> <p>SCOTT LOOMANS: A no license option could open up possible enforcement issues in the spring. Anyone lawfully hunting needs a small game license. This would become an exception. He feels the resolution is okay as is.</p> <p>BOHN: Believes author’s intent was for deer hunters to shoot pigs.</p>
ACTION	<p>Following discussion the chairman called for a vote on the resolution as amended. A show of hands indicated 10 in favor to advance as amended and 0 opposed</p>
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

7. RESOLUTIONS 200212 & 710312 - INCREASE FINE FOR DOGS RUNNING AT LARGE WHILE TRAINING OR HUNTING **GUY MCFARREN, GEROLD CLARK**

DISCUSSION	<p>Increase fines for dogs running at large. A copy of the current state statute was handed out to committee members by Scott Loomans. The resolution was read by chairman Shook. The authors of both resolutions were present and were both given 3 minutes to speak on their resolutions. Guy McFarren spoke first. He reminded the committee members that he appeared before us last year with an almost identical resolution. The resolution was passed but was rejected at the executive council meeting in January without discussion. As a landowner whose property has been violated numerous times, he feels that the situation will not change unless the offenders face higher fines. He would like to see the minimum and maximum fines increased as a deterrent. Gerald Clark spoke second. He has land in the Lincoln-Price-Oneida County area. He related his personal experiences with dogs at large on his property. Local law enforcement has been reluctant to issue tickets or prosecute violators. He also feels that higher fines are needed as a deterrent.</p> <p>QUESTIONS/DISCUSSIONS: FALK: How much trespassing is experienced yearly? Both gentlemen replied it occurs multiple times a year. There was then a question on how current fine limits are established. Most counties go by current state statute to establish minimum/maximum fines. BOLLY: Questions on whether fines should be leveled on an occurrence basis or by number of dogs involved. Probably would be more difficult to enforce by number of dogs. Would the resolution writers be ok with an occurrence fine as to a per dog fine – YES! FALK: Similar situation in her area with coon hunters would be ok with occurrence fine. Is okay with \$500 maximum. JONES: Expressed concern that changing state statute may not be enough of a deterrent. WILSON: Will law enforcement deal with things differently in the future if fines are higher? Will enforcement issues still exist? Currently these fines go to the counties general school funds. There was a motion by Waller to advance the resolution and this was seconded by Boley. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION: The chairman related how last year's resolution was handled at the executive council meeting. WALLER: Expressed concern about how last year's resolution was killed without discussion by the executive committee. WILSON: Will the chairman support this resolution if advanced. SHOOK: Chair will support at executive council if advanced. JONES: Agrees with increasing fines. BOLEY: Related that other states have much higher fines that seem to work for them and agrees with raising limits. BOHN: Called the question ending debate.</p>
ACTION	<p>SHOOK: Called for a hand vote. Show of hands showed 9 in favor of advancing the resolution with 1 against. The resolution advances.</p>
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

8. RESOLUTION 110120 - INCREASE NON-RESIDENT DEER LICENSE TO \$250 & LIMIT AVAILABILITY **RYAN COOK**

DISCUSSION	<p>The resolution was read by the committee chair. The author of the resolution, Ryan Cook, was present and allowed 3 minutes to speak in support of his resolution. He stated his concern about the low cost of non-resident deer licenses in Wisconsin. He hunts out of state and pays much more elsewhere. The state would benefit from increased revenue. A \$250.00 license is still a bargain compared to all neighboring states.</p> <p>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS: BOLEY: The resolution is asking for increased rates and tag limits. Would the author consider doing a fee increase separate from tag limits? YES WILSON: Is the quantity of tags issued to out of state hunters known? How would the author establish tag limits? He responded that tag limits would be set at a level consistent with current sales at about 35,000. WALLER: Expressed concern that increased fee may decrease sales and hurt revenue instead of helping. FALK: Questioned how out of state land owners would be treated. Most out of state licenses are sold to non-resident landowners. BOHN: Not opposed to license increase. He questioned how tag limits would be determined or if needed at all. WALLER: Concerned about revenue issues. Decrease in license sales in northern areas of state due to higher cost and loss of revenue The motion was made by Wilson to advance the resolution that was seconded by Waller. DISCUSSION: FALK: When was the last out of state license increase? SCOTT: Indicated it was in 2006. FALK: How many out of state deer licenses were issued last year? SCOTT: There were 33,348 non-resident gun and 8,781 non-resident archery. BOLY: Wisconsin is a bargain for non-residents. A healthy deer herd is important to having non-residents secure a license. There is a need to look at the economics. We rely on hunters for revenue.</p>
-------------------	---

	<p>SURING: Many non-residents are from Wisconsin originally and have family here they hunt with. Would not support the changes.</p> <p>WILSON: Support resolution as written.</p> <p>FALK: Concerned about how out of state land owners would be treated as they are also property tax payers.</p> <p>BOLEY: Establish that the writer is okay with amending the resolution to remove tag limits.</p>
ACTION	<p>Motion was made by Waller and seconded by Wrolstad to amend the resolution by removing the hand written words at the bottom of the resolution "and limit those tags" and by removing from the first line all verbiage after (\$250.00) and all of the second line.</p> <p>A hand vote was taken to approve the amendment. The results indicated 9 in favor of the amended resolution and 1 opposed.</p> <p>A hand vote was taken to advance the resolution as amended. The results indicated that there were 9 in favor and 1 opposed. The resolution advances.</p>
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

9. RESOLUTIONS 080112, 220312, 340112, 670112, 690112 - REDUCED RATE FOR CERTAIN FISH & GAME LICENSES FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

AL SHOOK

DISCUSSION	<p>The resolution was read by chairman Shook. All 4 resolutions were considered as one. Scott was asked about the current payment schedule for licenses issued to those under 18 years of age. He responded that all licenses have reduced rates for the 12 to 17 year olds. The following examples were given:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Residents Deer \$24.00 reduced to \$20.00 Archery \$24.00 reduced to \$20.00 Sportsmen's \$60.00 reduced to \$35.00 Patrons \$165.00 reduced to \$100.00</p> <p>DISCUSSION: WALLER: Commented on senior license buying habits. He felt that reduced rates would encourage participation by seniors and actually result in increased revenue for the D.N.R.</p>
ACTION	<p>There was a motion to advance by Wrolstad and seconded by Falk. There being no further discussion, the chairman called for a vote. A show of hands indicated that there were 8 in favor and 1 opposed. The resolution advances.</p>
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

10. RESOLUTION 250112 – REGISTRATION OF NON-MOTORIZED BOATS

AL SHOOK

DISCUSSION	<p>The resolution was read by chairman Shook. There was a motion by Wrolstad to advance and seconded by Falk.</p> <p>DISCUSSION: FALK: Favors the resolution. Many places rent out canoes and kayaks. Would be a good revenue source. Also would be a good way to track lost or stolen items. BREUNIG: Canoe/kayak users require the same services as boats. Users demanding public money for launch sites. Feels it's time for them to pay their fair share. WILSON: Had kayaks/canoe. They get very limited use. Doesn't use any public services or launches. Disagrees with charging individual users. BOLEY: Believes there are a lot of youth with skiffs and canoes who do not use public areas. Not fair to charge them. BOHN: Questioned charging religious camps and Boy Scout camps. Not in favor of charging these types of organizations. Also not in favor of fee for the limited use his own craft gets. BREUNIG: Resolution could be amended to exclude camps and non-profits. Believes other states do register non-motorized. JONES: Cited safety issues. Would like to see some sort of owner I.D. WILSON: Questioned whether the newer S.U.P. boards or sailboards should or would be included.</p>
ACTION	<p>There being no further discussion the chairman called for a vote. A show of hands indicated that there were 5 in favor of advancing and there were 5 opposing. Chairman Shook cast the tie breaker in favor of advancing. The resolution advanced</p>
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

**11. RESOLUTION 680212 – REQUIRE SCIENTIFIC
INPUT/RECOMMENDATIONS FROM DNR BEFORE
LEGISLATION**

GLORIA KLEIN

DISCUSSION	<p>A conference call was set up for 12:45 p.m. with the resolution writer Gloria Klein. Due to connection problems she was unable to get through at that time. Her call was received at 1:20 p.m. She was put briefly on hold so that the committee could finish discussion on the current resolution. Following the delay she was given 3 minutes to explain the intent of her resolution. She stated her concerns that the legislature is enacting legislation without regard for proper scientific data. The D.N.R. has qualified personnel in place who can or have done the research and they are not being consulted. The author was questioned by committee members.</p> <p>FALK: Is the D.N.R. not qualified? The caller responded that she believed that they are being ignored. We need to use the knowledge of the people we have in place when making decisions before legislation is passed.</p> <p>WALLER: Does the caller have evidence to support her claim of D.N.R. personnel being censored? The caller replied that her personal contacts have been.</p> <p>BREUNIG: With the signing of Act 21 and the mandate for economic impact studies - isn't this enough? The caller didn't feel that there were enough rules in place concerning scientific data. Following the call there was a motion to advance the resolution by Wilson and seconded by Boley.</p> <p>COMMENTS/DISCUSSION</p> <p>WILSON: This resolution probably isn't going anywhere but we need to let the legislature know how we feel.</p> <p>BREUNIG: C.W.P. has been under the control of D.N.R. experts and ruined by it.</p>	
ACTION	<p>With there being no more discussion, the chairman called for a vote. A show of hands indicated that there were 6 in favor of advancing the resolution with 3 opposed. The resolution will be advanced.</p>	
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE		DEADLINE

**12. RESOLUTION 440111 (REFERRED BY EXEC
COUNCIL) - TRANSFER OF LICENSE/PERMIT TO
SENIOR OR DISABLED PERSON**

BEN LOMA

DISCUSSION	<p>The chairman explained that this resolution was sent back to the legislative committee by the executive council as a result of discussion at their May 22, 2012 meeting. The resolution was presented before the legislative committee in 2011 and was approved and forwarded with an amendment to the wording of paragraph (2) line (6) to read "allow a senior 65 years of age or disabled resident sports person to receive an approved license transferred from another sports person".</p> <p>The resolution appeared as question 63 at the 2012 spring hearings. Questioned was the way the question was written and whether it had the resolution writer's intent in mind in the way it was written and presented.</p> <p>The original resolution writer, Ben Loma, was in attendance and was granted 3 minutes to explain the issues surrounding the resolution and its intent. Before he began he handed out a copy of the resolution on which he had underlined at the end of the first paragraph the words "first time". He explained that the question as written and voted on did not include what was meant to be a "first time" or one time only event. As written the question puts no limits on the number of times this would happen. The resolution was meant to give a person a first time, one time opportunity they may not get due to age or health issues. There were also concerns about who wrote the question and whether it was correctly or incorrectly changed after being approved by the legislative committee and the intent of the resolution was lost when the question was written by the D.N.R. liaison. Ben also asked the committee to review the results of question 63 from 2012 spring hearings. The results were given as 2743 yes, 771 no. Passed in 71 counties and failed in 1.</p> <p>COMMENTS/DISCUSSION:</p> <p>BOLEY: Asked the author if he would like to see the resolution passed as currently written. He was okay with that.</p> <p>WILSON: Felt the "first time" wording should have been included in the "be it resolved" second paragraph of the resolution. This may have helped avoid the problems to begin with.</p>	
ACTION	<p>Motion was made by Wilson and seconded by Waller to advance. A show of hands indicated there were 10 in favor to advance with 0 opposed. Chairman Shook will write the question to better relay the author's intent.</p>	
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE		DEADLINE

B. PRIORITIES FOR 2013 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

DISCUSSION	none	
ACTION		
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE		DEADLINE

IV. MEMBERS MATTERS

DISCUSSION	none
ACTION	

V. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING ADJOURNED	3:10 P.M.
SUBMITTED BY	HAROLD DRAKE
DATE	8/25/2012