

NATURAL RESOURCES BOARD

Minutes

The regular meeting of the Natural Resources Board was held on Wednesday, May 25, 2005 at Holiday Inn Express W10170 Highway 54 E, Black River Falls, Wisconsin. The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. for action on items 1-7. The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Wednesday, May 25, 2005

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Organizational Matters

1.A. Calling the roll

| | | |
|---------------|------------------|--------------|
| Jerry O'Brien | Dan Poulson | Jonathan Ela |
| Herb Behnke | Christine Thomas | John Welter |
| Steve Willett | | |

1.B. Approval of minutes from April 27, 2005

Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of the minutes from April 27, 2005. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

1.C. Approval of agenda for May 25, 2005

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela approval of the agenda for May 25, 2005. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

2. Ratification of Acts of the Department Secretary

2.A. Real Estate Transactions

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of the Real Estate Transactions. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3. Action Items

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

3.A.1. Request authorization for public hearing of Board Order AM-18-05, revisions to NR 400 and NR 424, relating to Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) emissions from yeast manufacturing.

Larry Brass, Section Chief, Regional Pollutants and Mobile Sources Section stated The Department is proposing to revise the definition of "Volatile Organic Compound" in ch. NR 400 and related changes to ch. NR 438 to be consistent with the federal regulations at 40 CFR 51.100(s). In addition, the revision to s. NR 424.05 is proposed to address inconsistencies with the national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for yeast manufacturers. The proposed revisions include: Exclusion of four (4) compounds from the definition of VOC (Volatile Organic Compound) in s. NR 400.02(162). 2. A nomenclature clarification to two (2) previously excluded compounds from the VOC definition in s. NR 400.02(162).3. Exclusion of one compound from the definition of VOC for purposes of VOC emission limitation or VOC content requirements, but not for purposes of all recordkeeping, emission reporting and inventory requirements. This revision requires related changes to s. NR 438.03(1).4. Incorporating the USEPA VOC emission control requirement for yeast manufacturing into s. NR 424.05. Since these proposed changes are based on final federal rules, no controversy is expected. The last action of the Board related to the definition of VOC in s. NR 400.02(162) was to approve the exclusion of perchloroethylene, which became effective on July 1, 2004. The Board has not taken any significant action on the VOC emission requirement for yeast manufacturing in s. NR 424.05 since it was adopted and became effective on July 1, 1994.

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval for request authorization for public hearing of Board Order AM-18-05, revisions to NR 400 and NR 424, relating to Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) emissions from yeast manufacturing. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.A.2. Request authorization for public hearing of Board Order WT-28-04, revisions to NR 115 relating to Wisconsin's Shoreland Management Program.

Russ Rasmussen, Director, Watershed Management Bureau stated that the Department with assistance from the NR 115 Advisory Committee, drafted revisions to the NR 115 to meet the statutory objectives of the program, while providing certainty and flexibility to counties and property owners. Changes include adding definitions to the rule for clarity; establishing standards for multi-unit residential development, mobile home parks, and campgrounds; providing exemptions for certain activities from shoreland setback shoreland vegetation standards; establishing impervious surface standards; and replacing the "50% rule" for nonconforming structures with a standard based on the size and location of structures. These changes will significantly decrease the number of variances granted by counties, allowing certain activities to be allowed with a simple administrative permit by the county. The proposed revisions to NR 115 are consistent with past Department policy and guidance, and Wisconsin case law. In many instances, the proposed changes codify past guidance to counties. One major shift is present in Department policy in regards to the regulation of nonconforming structures. This shift in policy is based on input from the NR 115 Advisory Committee, past concerns raised by counties, comments received by the public at listening sessions in the Winter of 2003, and direction received from the NRB when NR 118 was approved.

Past Department policy, based on Wisconsin common law, was the goal of regulating nonconforming structures in order to bring about ultimate compliance with the shoreland zoning ordinance. In most instances, this would require the removal of existing structures within 75 feet of the ordinary high-water mark. This proposal recognizes that these nonconforming structures usually were built in compliance with the standards in place at the time of construction, and property owners may have substantial investments in the improvements on their property. This proposal still has the goal of ultimate compliance, but recognizes that the timeline for compliance has been considerable extended. Property owners are given the ability to decide whether they wish to maintain the existing structure or build a new structure in compliance.

Mr. Willett asked if there are sufficient guidelines in the rule to allow for variances.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that this rule tries to cut down on the number of variances, instead, the Department tried to use mitigation.

Mr. O'Brien asked what if the counties don't conform.

Mr. Rasmussen stated the Department can promulgate an overriding ordinance, but instead we try to work with the counties.

Mr. Welter asked if dry boathouses are considered a primary structure.

Toni Herkert, Shoreland Zoning Program Manager, Watershed Management Bureau stated that the rule still allow for lifts, just not the boathouses within 75 feet of the shore.

Mr. Ela asked if track systems are allowed.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that is not in the rule and never been brought up before. Many people at the listening sessions have admitted that their boathouses are used as storage sheds rather than boathouses.

Mr. O'Brien asked if mitigation was a Department or county enforcement issue.

Mr. Rasmussen stated it is a county enforcement issue that must meet the Department's minimum standards.

Mr. Willett asked if the impervious surfaces provision does not apply within municipalities, but they are the ones with the largest amount of impervious surfaces, what is being done to address that.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that is being addressed in NR 151, the nonpoint rules.

Mr. Welter asked for further information on the sliding scales found in the appendix. He also stated that there should be flow charts that provide explanations to public of sliding scales found in the appendix because they are complicated and confusing.

Mr. Ela asked about non-conforming structures and how the rule extends the timeline rather than addresses the issue of pressuring towards lakeshore conformity.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that it provides less pressure. If someone wants to build a larger structure, it can be brought into conformity if you have a building location. There are limitations for rebuilding.

Mr. Willett stated that we know more now than in 1966, the research in Burnett County that looked at what was critical for the protection of the waterways and they found that 35 feet is necessary, but 75 feet is not. The best suggestion was the mitigation process. It can improve the water quality.

Ms. Herkert stated that there is a huge shift in our paradigm as a Department in the way we regulate non-conforming structures. The reason is because of market forces and property owners' decisions come into play when bringing non-conforming structures into compliance. The Department wants to get out of the business of hammering property owners and into the business of protecting the resource. She gave further clarifications about replacing non-conforming structures.

Mr. Rasmussen added that there is language that was left out of the green sheet that they would like to take to public hearing. Including a provision to add language dealing with department/county disagreements on ordinary high water mark determinations and the impact on waters that have a wetland fringe.

Mr. Willett asked how NR 220 changes impact the review of county determinations.

Mr. Rasmussen stated the issue with NR 227 is that it requires that each rule have a description of the statutory authority that allows us to promulgate the rule.

Mr. Ela asked about the county approach and that they can take a different approach as long as they meet the goals. Does this create a new set of issues and what is meeting legislative intent and what is not?

Mr. Rasmussen stated that one of the pluses is that it encourages innovation and new ideas and allows the county to customize the rules to their needs.

Mr. Ela stated that the additional issues not being in the draft rule before going to public hearing is a problem. He suggested that language addressing the resolution of disputes of the location of the Ordinary High Water Mark be added to the proposed rule so that it could be discussed at the public hearings.

Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of request authorization for public hearing of Board Order WT-28-04, revisions to NR 115 relating to Wisconsin's Shoreland Management Program with amendment to include the Ordinary High Water Mark language. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.A.3. Request authorization for public hearing of Board Order LE-24-05, revisions to NR 64.07 relating to ATV Noise Measuring Procedure.

Karl Brooks, Deputy Chief Warden, Bureau of Law Enforcement stated that 2003 Act 251 created a new law regarding ATV noise emissions. The new law, 23.33 (6m) prohibits a person or manufacturer from selling, renting or operating an ATV if the noise level from the ATV exceeds 96 decibels on the A scale in a manner prescribed under rules promulgated by the department. The "A" scale is a measuring technique that uses a sound meter to measure noise in the same manner that a human ear interprets noise. The department proposes to use an existing noise-measuring standard (SAE 1287) that is approved by the Society of Automotive Engineers. This standard is consistently used by governing agencies that regulate noise laws. Summary of standard; The ATV rests on a flat surface, which is typically gravel and is free from large reflective objects. The ATV is straddled by the rider and is placed in neutral; the brake is held. After a warm-up period, the sound meter is placed to the rear of the machine, twenty inches behind the exhaust at a 45-degree angle and at the same height of the exhaust outlet. The machine is revved to 1/2 the ATV's maximum RPM speed. The officer would record the noise level during a steady state of operation at that speed. The standard requires meter calibration and checks to be performed prior to and after the noise is measured. The test is a pass/fail test, such that if the measured level is at or below 96 decibels, the machine passes.

Mr. Willett asked if there are ATVs that are being manufactured that don't meet these standards and where are the hearings

Officer Brooks stated there are none being manufactured that do not meet the standards that he knows of and the hearings will be in Madison and Wausau.

Mr. Ela asked what is the relationship between this standard and the Iowa's standard of 86 decibels at 50 feet.

Officer Brooks stated he is not familiar with Iowa's standard and doesn't know if it is measurable.

Dr. Thomas asked why is 96 decibels acceptable on ATVs, but it had to be 82 decibels on snowmobiles.

Officer Brooks stated because the measuring distance on the snowmobiles is 157 1/2 inches away from the noise source and on ATVs the measuring distance is 20 inches.

Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of request authorization for public hearing of Board Order LE-24-05, revisions to NR 64.07 relating to ATV Noise Measuring Procedure. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.A.4. Request authorization for public hearing of Board Order LE-25-05, revisions to NR 64.03 relating to ATV Trail Pass and Registration Policy.

Karl Brooks, Deputy Chief Warden, Bureau of Law Enforcement stated that 2003 Act 251 created a new law that requires all out of state ATVs (not registered in Wisconsin) to display a nonresident trail pass. The new law is listed under s. 23.33 (2j) Wis. Stats. Prior to operating an ATV in Wisconsin, current law requires all ATVs to be registered in Wisconsin unless exempted. The exemptions provided are for municipalities, governmental agencies, machines registered in another state/country or ATVs registered under a federally recognized American Indian tribe or band. A problem arose when Wisconsin became popular as a vacation destination by nonresident ATVer's. Since some states did not register ATVs (specifically Illinois and Michigan) this placed a burden on those nonresidents. Unaware, those riders typically arrived in Wisconsin on a weekend, were faced with the registration requirement, and were unable to immediately rectify the problem. Some riders knowingly took a chance and rode in violation of the law; some riders went home disappointed. This rule for a registration exception is necessary because the 2003 Wisconsin Act 251 - mandating the display of a nonresident trail pass, did not address nonresident concerns whose home state did not have an ATV registration program. The ATV community intended the legislation to simplify the nonresident's requirements

by only requiring a nonresident trail pass; unfortunately, it did not. As well, the legislation did not specify which part of the ATV the trail pass should be prominently displayed. This rule would also correct that omission by requiring the nonresident trail pass to be permanently affixed to the forward half of the machine in a manner that was visible at all times.

Dr. Thomas asked if Wisconsin residents have to register their ATVs and what does it cost.

Officer Brooks stated that yes they do and it is \$30 every two years. The non-resident trail pass is \$18 per year. There is no resident pass because their registration suffices.

Mr. Willett asked about the tribes and whether they have their own system.

Officer Brooks stated the tribes can implement their own registration program, but he doesn't believe there is one.

Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of Request authorization for public hearing of Board Order LE-25-05, revisions to NR 64.03 relating to ATV Trail Pass and Registration Policy. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

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

3.B.1. Adoption of Board Order FH-09-05, proposed fishing regulation changes after the 2005 Spring Fish and Wildlife Hearings

Steve Hewett, Section Chief, Fisheries Policy and Operations, Fisheries Management and Habitat Protection Bureau stated that the Department recommends that the Natural Resources Board adopt Order FH-09-05, proposed rule revisions from the 2005 Spring Fish and Wildlife Hearings, held April 11, 2005. The following statewide and regional changes were supported: 1) prohibiting the placement of setlines, set or bank poles and associated equipment prior to the opening day of the season and requiring removal of the gear after the season is closed; 2) changing the beginning of the night fishing closure on tributaries to Lake Michigan and Green Bay from October 1 to September 15 and clarify that from September 15 - December 31 fishing by all methods is prohibited, while hook and line fishing is prohibited from September 15 - the first Saturday in May; 3) authorizing anglers to keep and kill one specimen of any non-indigenous fish species for the purpose of transporting it to a DNR office for positive identification; 4) changing the open season for northern pike on small Lake Michigan tributaries north of US Highway 10 from a continuous open season to the general fishing season of the first Saturday in May to the first Sunday in March. Also included are 22 fishing regulation changes primarily of local interest.

Mr. Ela asked when these changes will take affect.

Mr. Hewett stated April 1, 2006.

Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela adoption of Board Order FH-09-05, proposed fishing regulation changes after the 2005 Spring Fish and Wildlife Hearings. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.B.2. Adoption of Board Order WM-01-05 related to NR 10, 12, 15 and 45 proposed wildlife regulation changes after the 2005 Spring Fish and Wildlife Hearings

Kurt Thiede, Wildlife Biologist, Wildlife Management Bureau stated that based on the support at the 2005 Spring Hearings the department recommends board adoption of the following wildlife rule proposals: allowing landowners on private land to shoot and kill any gray wolf in the act of attacking domestic animals; prohibiting the tagging, collaring or marking and release of wild animals without the Department's authorization or as authorized under a Federal migratory bird banding permit; eliminating the bear hunting "no dog zone" in bear management zone A; modifying the bear hunting license application deadline and updating application submission information; prohibiting the use of electronic turkey decoys for turkey hunting; establishing a deer hunting season at Kohler-Andrae State Park; allowing certain Class B disabled permittees to participate in disabled hunts; allowing the hunting of other game species on lands open to disabled hunts; eliminating the requirement for bear hunters to declare their willingness to participate in agricultural damage and nuisance situations and modification of the application deadline; establishing a "no entry wildlife refuge" at the Turtle Valley Wildlife Area; requiring the owner to identify tree stands used on state owned lands and lands under the management of the department. Proposals that were not supported at the Spring Hearing, which the department will not be forwarding for adoption include: creating a subzone in bear management zone C where the use of dogs would be allowed; creating consistent standards for body-gripping type traps; authorizing the use of dogs for fall turkey hunting.

Mr. Willett asked about the status of the court case and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) delisting process.

Ms. Osterndorf stated that there was a joint letter sent from Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin to the USFWS. The Department has a special permit to kill 33 depredating wolves.

Mr. Willett asked what the Department is doing to change the wolf classification.

Ms. Osterdorf stated that the Department is appealing to the federal government for a change in the Midwestern population.

Mr. Behnke added that the Department is requesting a different management zone from the western states to include Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

Mr. Willett stated that our recourse is that the Department could sue them or join the other lawsuit. It's the Board's decision to sue, not the Department's decision.

Mr. Welter stated he along with other groups have concerns about shooting turkeys off the roost with this change in the turkey hunting hours.

Mr. Thiede stated that the majority of people think that it's reasonable.

Public Appearances

Mark Toso, Roberts, Wisconsin Deerhunters' Association stated that his organization is concerned about the Conservation Congress' insistence of the need for another SAK audit. Although Earn-a-Buck and Zone T are not popular, but they work to manage the deer herd. He stated that the Congress complains about the SAK research, but have no solutions to the deer population problem. He also is concerned that the Congress claims to represent all the deer hunters of the state. Only 7,000 people attend the spring hearings. That is less than 1% of the state's hunters and anglers. He distributed research results regarding Hunters' Responses to CWD done by an independent party. He doesn't want to get rid of the congress, however he wants them to change the way they gather data.

Mr. Behnke stated that the administrative rules adopted by this Board require public hearings. It is published for those who want to attend and express their opinions. The Board listens to the people who take the time to attend these hearings.

Steve Oestreicher, Harshaw, Conservation Congress gave a report of the annual Conservation Congress Convention. He reviewed the Conservation Congress advisory question results. Question 62, regarding listing feral cats as an unprotected species he noted that the Executive Committee decided not to pursue the issue. The Congress is recommending that pet owners be responsible for their pets through the following measures: report feral cats to local animal control officers, keep cats indoors, spay or neuter kittens, provide routine veterinary care, place identification tag on cat's collar, license cats, support local cat control protection plans, support legislation requiring pet owners to register their cats and prevent them from roaming, do not feed free-ranging cats, take unwanted cats to an animal shelter. Many cat organizations that we heard from had a very well kept secret: trap, neuter, re-release. The re-release must stop. It is against state law unless permission is granted by the landowner. He requested that the Board to direct Department staff to contact Mr. Mark Smith regarding the feral cat issue.

Mr. O'Brien asked Secretary Hassett to contact Mark Smith.

Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett adoption of Board Order WM-01-05 related to NR 10, 12, 15 and 45 proposed wildlife regulation changes after the 2005 Spring Fish and Wildlife Hearings The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.B.3. Request authorization to hold public hearing for Board Order WM-19-05 and WM-20-05(E) revisions to NR 10 related to 2005 migratory game bird seasons and regulations.

Kent Van Horn, Migratory Bird Staff Specialist, Wildlife Management Bureau stated that the proposed rules establish the regulations for the 2005 migratory game bird season. The significant regulations are:
 Ducks - The state is divided into two zones each with 60-day seasons. The zones are subject to change based on public feedback and approval by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Under current USFWS rules a zone change is not allowed until 2006. The daily bag limit is expected to be 6 ducks including no more than: 4 mallards, of which only one may be a hen, one black duck, one pintail, 2 wood ducks, 2 redheads and 3 scaup. The canvasback and pintail seasons may again be shorter than the 60-day season. Canada geese - The state is apportioned into three goose hunting zones: Horicon, Collins, and Exterior. Other special goose management subzones within the Exterior Zone include Brown County, Burnett County, Rock Prairie and the Mississippi River. Season lengths are expected to be as follows: Collins Zone - 64 days, Horicon Zone - 92 days, Exterior Zone - 92 days, Mississippi River Subzone - 70 days, Youth hunt- The Canada goose bag limit is established for the youth waterfowl hunt and two days will be offered. Since this hearing request precedes receipt of the preliminary Federal framework regulations by about 3 months, please note that the actual season lengths, dates and harvest allocations will change. In addition to these annual regulatory issues we will be requesting public input on 2 additional items: 1) Elimination of the Canada goose Horicon Intensive Management Subzone directly adjacent to the Horicon National Wildlife Refuge with an effective date of fall 2006. 2) Location of the

duck zones in support of developing a Department Spring Hearing Question for 2006 regarding changes to Wisconsin's duck zones for the 2006-2010 period.

Dr. Thomas MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett approval of request authorization to hold public hearing for Board Order WM-19-05 and WM-20-05(E) revisions to NR 10 related to 2005 migratory game bird seasons and regulations.

Mr. Ela asked why there is such a high bag limits on snow geese.

Mr. Van Horn stated that they don't migrate through Wisconsin, but this is based on the national population.

The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.B.4. Land Acquisition, North Branch Milwaukee River, Sheboygan County

Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett approval of Land Acquisition, North Branch Milwaukee River, Sheboygan County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.B.5. Land Acquisition, Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area, Dodge County

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of Land Acquisition, Horicon Marsh Wildlife Area, Dodge County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.B.6. Land Acquisition, Lower Chippewa River Natural Area, Dunn County

Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela approval of Land Acquisition, Lower Chippewa River Natural Area, Dunn County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.B.7. Land Acquisition, Glacial Drumlin State Trail, Dane County

Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of Land Acquisition, Glacial Drumlin State Trail, Dane County.

Mr. Ela asked about the feasibility of collecting properties as they come on market, but is the Department actively seeking easements to reroute the trail.

Richard Steffes, Real Estate Director stated yes we are and we are finding landowners to be cooperative.

The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.B.8. Land Acquisition, Baraboo Hills, Sauk County

Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela approval of Land Acquisition, Baraboo Hills, Sauk County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.B.9. Land Donation, Statewide Natural Area, Bayfield County

Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of Land Donation, Statewide Natural Area, Bayfield County.

Mr. Welter asked about the donors and their request to put a fish management program in place. Will it always be a catch and release fishery regardless of what our fish biologists find regarding the health of the fisheries?

Mr. Steffes stated no because the deed will not be restricted. The regulations could be changed. It was a condition of the gift.

The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.B.10. Land Donation, Cross Plains Ice Age Reserve, Dane County

Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of Land Donation, Cross Plains Ice Age Reserve, Dane County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.B.11. Land Donation, Statewide Spring Ponds, Langlade County

Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Dr. Thomas approval of Land Donation, Statewide Spring Ponds, Langlade County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

3.B.12. Land Acquisition, State Wildlife Area, Kenosha County DEFERRED FROM APRIL

Mr. Poulson stated that he visited the site. He thinks the Department should purchase it and open it to duck hunting.

Mr. Poulson MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of Land Acquisition, State Wildlife Area, Kenosha County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

4. Citizen Participation4.A. Citizen Recognition4.A.1. Don Johnson Appreciation Resolution

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Behnke approval of Don Johnson Appreciation Resolution. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

4.A.2. Pete Helland Memorial Resolution

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Dr. Thomas approval of the Pete Helland Memorial Resolution.

Mr. Willett stated that information be added about Mr. Helland's ability to convince Gov. Thompson about Knowles Stewardship

The motion carried unanimously by all members.

4.B. Citizen Participation

Clyde Winter, Waukesha representing himself stated he is concerned about the resolution introduced at the Conservation Congress meeting about farm buffer programs. Developers want his land. He has voluntary set up buffers on his land and it is not subsidized. He cannot enroll his land in subsidy programs because they are already implementing these practices voluntarily.

Mr. Poulson asked how he is not receiving under use value tax if he is farming the land.

Mr. Winter stated that he does receive under use value tax on tilled fields, but not on the other features.

Mr. Poulson encouraged him to examine the new laws just passed and to contact his County Farm Bureau.

5. Board Members' Matters5.A. Deer Population Sex-Age-Kill (SAK) Model Audit Update

Tom Hauge, Director, Bureau of Wildlife Management stated that the Department is beginning an audit of the SAK population model that is used to make annual population estimates of white-tailed deer herds in Wisconsin's deer management units. The audit will start with a meeting on June 7th with the major stakeholder groups with an interest in deer management and the accuracy of SAK model estimates. The June 7th meeting will help determine the scope of the audit and will discuss timelines for completion.

Mr. O'Brien asked the Land Committee of the Board to get involved in this process and have a Board representative during the process and at the meetings.

Dr. Thomas stated that there is one simple question: is the way we are estimating our deer herd accurate?

Mr. Hauge stated that at the highest level, he agrees. However, people get into the details of the process. Do the estimations take into account such things as wolf depredations and car kills? At the June 7th meeting, all of those factors will be identified.

Mr. Behnke stated that at this first meeting we should invite a broad representation and then narrow down the issues to what the basic elements are.

Secretary Hasset stated he thinks it's important to have participation in the front end of this process. Input will decrease likelihood of criticism of final product.

Additional Board Member Matters

Herb Behnke stated that one of the big problems with the deer population is baiting and feeding. This is a legislation matter. He thinks the Department should initiate legislative action to change baiting and feeding policy.

Secretary Hassett stated it could be put on as an advisory question at the Conservation Congress Spring Hearings. The Land Committee could also gather the same data. He would like it to be a cross-divisional effort to include forestry, law enforcement, and wildlife input.

Mr. Poulson asked about timing of this issue.

Mr. Behnke stated the timing will be self-evident once we start gathering data.

Mr. O'Brien appointed the Land Committee to work with Department to develop the strategy to deal with baiting and feeding.

Mr. Ela suggested an informational item in the fall, go through the 2006 Conservation Congress Spring Hearing process, and then implement in 2007.

Duke Welter gave an update on the subcommittee regarding endangered resources conservation plans and said that the subcommittee is planning to provide recommendations and a report at the August meeting.

Mr. O'Brien stated he has concerned about the feral pigs department plans.

Mr. Hauge stated that it's a problem in Crawford County. The Department is working hard by having informational meetings in that area of state. There are tools at our disposal to remove feral pigs. The Department is trying to organize locals to remove feral pigs. Our strategy is to educate and organize the citizens of Crawford County.

Mr. Poulson asked how a group of people organizes to clean up a stream specifically are there any permits required.

Secretary Hassett suggested he consult with the local conservation warden and he can help you organize it.

Mr. Ela thanked the other Board members for their support during his ongoing pending confirmation.

6. Special Committees' Reports
7. Department Secretary's Matters
- 7.A. Retirement Resolutions
- 7.A.1. Janet Kersten
- 7.A.2. Darrell A. Solberg
- 7.A.3. Nagalaxmi (Lakshmi) Sridharan
- 7.A.4. Duane Esselstrom
- 7.A.5. Gary W. Blinkwolt
- 7.A.6. D. John Coke
- 7.A.7. Mark H. Stokstad
- 7.A.8. Eileen E. Statz **ADDED**
- 7.A.9. P. Scott Hausmann **ADDED**
- 7.A.10. Michael A. Smith **ADDED**

Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of the retirement resolutions. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

Secretary Hassett gave an update on the Joint Committee on Finance Actions. He stated that a couple of proposals were denied including pheasant permit for hunting on state lands. However, the motion specifies that 40% of all revenues generated by the pheasant stamp be used for wild pheasant habitat; and 60% for stocking and propagation of pheasants.

Mr. Behnke asked if pheasant stamp was originally for portions of the state where there was habitat restoration, will the pheasant stamp be required for everyone throughout the state.

Mr. Hauge stated the Department isn't envisioning statewide, but we will be talking with stakeholders on how to handle that issue.

Mr. Welter stated there has already been one raid on stamp funds by joint finance, now there is a sub raid on stamp funds. We are taking habitat funds and turning them into stocking funds. He thinks that the people who buy these stamps should be outraged at that.

Secretary Hassett stated some other proposals that were denied were the grouse and woodcock hunting stamp and the Great Lake commercial fishing fee increase. He stated that state park admission and camping fees increases were approved. There were adjustments to the stewardship program and the aids in lieu of property

taxes. He stated that 34.75 FTE forestry positions have been restored. He also discussed water and air and waste issues.

Dr. Thomas asked if any additional funds have been allocated for CWD.

Secretary Hassett stated there haven't been any funds allocated yet.

7.B. Donations

- 7.B.1. FLW Outdoors will donate \$5,000 for evaluating the impacts of the pilot program on bass populations, local economies, and angler attitudes in Wisconsin.

Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of FLW Outdoors donation of \$5,000 for evaluating the impacts of the pilot program on bass populations, local economies, and angler attitudes in Wisconsin. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

- 7.B.2. ESPN/BASS Outdoors and Mercury Marine will donate \$15,000 for evaluating the impacts of bass fishing tournament pilot program on bass populations and local economies in Wisconsin.

Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela approval of ESPN/BASS Outdoors and Mercury Marine donation of \$15,000 for evaluating the impacts of bass fishing tournament pilot program on bass populations and local economies in Wisconsin. The motion carried unanimously by all members.

8. Information Items

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

- 8.A.1. New system for estimating the current and future ecological health and fisheries potential of Wisconsin Streams.

Amy Smith, Administrator, Enforcement and Science Services introduced John Lyon.

John Lyon, Research Scientist, Integrated Science Services Bureau stated that Wisconsin's great diversity of stream resources is a management challenge. Different types of streams have different fisheries and recreational potential, are influenced differently by human activities, and require different management strategies. The Fisheries and Habitat Research Section of the DNR Bureau of Integrated Science Services, in collaboration with the U.S. Geological Survey and Illinois and Michigan DNR's has developed a stream classification framework to address this challenge. Geographical Information System (GIS) and statistical analyses of data from hundreds of watersheds in the upper Great Lakes Region have produced a computer model that allows us to estimate the type and abundance of fish species expected to be present in every stream reach in Wisconsin. From these predictions the fisheries potential and ecological health of each stream can be determined and mapped. These maps allow Department staff and the public to access easily information on the current status of any stream or river in the state. Further, the framework enables prediction of how future events will affect stream ecosystems. For example, we can forecast how climate warming and urban sprawl over the next 50 years will influence Wisconsin's trout fishing resource. Overall, the framework is a powerful new tool with major applications both inside and outside the Department.

Mr. Willett asked about urban sprawl and it's affect on fish populations.

Dr. Lyon stated that the effects are dramatic and it is difficult to control.

Mr. Poulson asked about Illinois and their buffer plans.

Dr. Lyon stated that they are miles ahead in establishing buffers, but they are way behind with the condition of their streams.

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.