

## NATURAL RESOURCES BOARD

### Minutes

The regular meeting of the Natural Resources Board was held on Wednesday, December 7, 2005 in Room G09, State Natural Resources Building (GEF 2), Madison, Wisconsin. The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. for action on items 1-7. The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Organizational Matters

1.A. Calling the roll

Gerald O'Brien – present	Dan Poulson - present
Jonathan Ela – present	Herb Behnke - present
Christine Thomas – present	John Welter - present
Steve Willett – present	

1.B. Approval of minutes from October 26, 2005

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of the minutes from October 26, 2005. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

1.C. Approval of agenda for December 7, 2005

**Mr. Hassett** requested that item 8.B.3 be taken up before item 8.B.1

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela approval of the agenda for December 7, 2005 as amended. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

1.D. Approval of minutes from November 15, 2005

**Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett approval of the minutes from November 15, 2005 conference call. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

2. Ratification of Acts of the Department Secretary

2.A. Real Estate Transactions

**Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela approval of Real Estate Transactions. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3. Action Items

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

3.A.1. Adoption of Board Order WA-10-05, revisions to NR 590 and 600 to 690, pertaining to Used Oil, Hazardous Waste, and Universal Waste Management.

**Susan Bangert**, Director, Waste Management Bureau stated that these rules replace and update current rules that regulate the generation, transportation, recycling, storage, treatment and disposal of hazardous waste, universal waste and used oil. The revisions eliminate outdated language, include new state rules similar to federal rules already in effect and revise current rules to more closely parallel the format and content of the federal hazardous waste regulations. The rules include provisions to facilitate legitimate recycling, reduce paperwork for businesses and provide flexibility in the design and operation of hazardous waste management facilities. The updates will allow DNR to retain authorization from US EPA under RCRA to implement the federal hazardous waste program in Wisconsin.

The rules continue the long-standing state policy of more fully regulating companies that generate small amounts of hazardous waste than EPA's rules. The Department believes this level of oversight is necessary to protect human health and the environment. The rules also include adjustments to the current fees for hazardous waste plan review and license fees that have been in effect since 1994. The proposed fees are necessary to generate sufficient revenue to allow the department to administer the hazardous waste program.

**Mr. Willett** stated that this is a national issue. He asked why the EPA couldn't take this program over.

**Ms. Bangert** stated that the businesses and industry in the state have a good relationship with the DNR. They don't want have to work with federal staff in Chicago. They would like local regulators.

**Mr. Willett** stated they may have been true in the past, but recently he hasn't heard that. He asked if there has been research to support those statements.

**Ms. Bangert** stated our businesses would like to work with the DNR who they have established a longer term relationship with.

**Mr. Willett** stated that he would like concrete evidence of that. We are facing a budget deficit with this program and this would help our budget if the federal government took the program over.

**Ms. Bangert** stated that the stakeholders understand the fee increase overall and only raised an issue with one small part of the fee increase. They recognize that the fees will help maintain an effective program.

**Pat Chabot**, Hazardous Waste Team Leader added that the Department met with three of the large storage facilities and two of them stated that they want the state to continue to do the work. 49 of the 50 states have a state-run program.

**Mr. Ela** stated that it is similar to any other waste programs that are run by the state because Wisconsin wants to run the programs in the state.

**Mr. Willett** stated that our GPR dollars are shrinking. We are the implementer of water and waste and it's expensive to do that. We need to let our citizens know that the alternative is to have the federal government take it over and what their opinion is about that.

**Mr. Ela** asked what services are we not able to provide because of the reduction in staff.

**Ms. Bangert** stated that our outreach and technical assistance has been cut.

**Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela adoption of Board Order WA-10-05, revisions to NR 590 and 600 to 690, pertaining to Used Oil, Hazardous Waste, and Universal Waste Management. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.A.2. Adoption of Board Order LE-39-05, revisions to NR 19.50, establishing a fee for hunter education students.

**Tim Lawhern** Hunter Education Director, Law Enforcement Bureau stated that the language in the Recent Budget Bill requires instructors to charge a fee for the hunter education course. Due to the requirement that the department create rules on this issue we need to create rules on this issue. The rule is needed in order to comply with legislative direction. Instructors would be allowed to charge students a fee and keep up to 50% (or up to \$5) of that fee to offset expenses. The remainder of the fee (at least \$5) is to be returned to the department. The department is now required to develop administrative code before the fee can be implemented.

The adoption of this rule will create a standard fee (\$10) which would be consistent with all of the department's safety education courses. The volunteer hunter education instructors will be affected as it would allow them to collect funds to offset their expenses when the courses start as opposed to being reimbursed after they are over.

**Dr. Thomas MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett adoption of Board Order LE-39-05, revisions to NR 19.50, establishing a fee for hunter education students. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

**Mr. Willett** asked if we have enough instructors.

**Officer Lawhern** stated that yes and no. We have the largest volunteer force in North America. People are asking for more convenient courses. We could always use more instructors, but with better education of timing of taking the course. Many people ask for courses within 30 days of the nine day gun season. The volunteers are hunters and usually want to be hunting during that time. Planning ahead is the key.

3.A.3. Adoption of Board order AM-03-05, revisions to NR 485, pertaining to motor vehicle emission limitations and catalytic converter replacement provisions.

**Larry Bruss**, Section Chief, Regional Pollutants and Mobile Sources Section, Air Management Bureau stated that stated that the emission limitations ("cutpoints") subject to this proposed revision are pass/fail standards for the state's motor vehicle inspection and maintenance (I/M) program. This program is operating in the seven southeastern Wisconsin counties of Kenosha, Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Racine, Sheboygan, Washington and Waukesha.

The Department proposes to revise certain cutpoints for specific categories of vehicles as follows:

(1) Relax the cutpoints for oxides of nitrogen (NOx) for some groups of trucks and older cars to account for some deterioration of the emission control systems for these vehicles;

(2) Establish new cutpoints for model year 2005 and newer heavy-duty trucks to account for new federal certification standards for these vehicles; and

(3) Simplify the cutpoints for some categories of model year 1994 to 1996 vehicles so that the lane inspector would not need to decode data under the vehicle's hood in order to determine the proper cutpoints.

The Department also proposes to revise the catalytic converter replacement provisions in s. NR 485.06(2), Wis. Adm. Code, to make them consistent with current federal emission warranty provisions.

The changes to the NOx cutpoints could result in fewer NOx emission reductions from the I/M program than those the Department originally projected in its state implementation plan (SIP) for attainment of the one-hour ozone standard. However, the emission budgets in the SIP include “safety margins” to accommodate a limited increase in emissions. Any additional NOx emissions from this proposal will be substantially less than the NOx “safety margins” in the SIP and thus will not result in NOx emission levels exceeding the NOx budgets in the SIP.

The proposed rule has not been controversial. No comments were received from the public. The main impact of the proposed rule is that slightly fewer vehicles would fail the emission inspection. This would affect some vehicle owners and vehicle repair technicians.

The last action of the Board pertaining to the I/M program was its adoption of rules during September 2000 that changed the NOx cutpoints from advisory to enforceable, effective May 2001.

**Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett adoption of Board order AM-03-05, revisions to NR 485, pertaining to motor vehicle emission limitations and catalytic converter replacement provisions.**

**Mr. Poulson** asked what he meant by not leaving enough time for deterioration and what constitutes deterioration.

**Mr. Bruss** stated that we set those cutpoints on advice of the EPA.

**Mr. Ela** asked about the method of changing the measurement tool in the late 1990s.

**Mr. Bruss** stated that it has been changed to onboard diagnostics. A computer is connected to the vehicle’s computer and identifies what is wrong with the vehicle and what needs to be repaired.

**The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.A.4. Request authorization for public hearing for Board Order SS-06-06, recreation of NR 149, pertaining to Certifying and Registering Laboratories.

**David Webb**, Section Chief, Environmental Science Services, Integrated Science Services Bureau stated that Chapter NR 149 establishes requirements for laboratories participating in the laboratory certification and registration program. The Department proposes to repeal and recreate the chapter in its entirety. In the ensuing time since the last revision of the chapter in 1998, the Department realized the need for updating the Chapter to reflect current analytical practices, give specificity to vague language, provide needed flexibility, and promote efficient means of administering the certification and registration program. The Department engaged in a structured process for arriving at this proposed rule, significantly considering input from all affected constituents, most notable, through the formation of a rule advisory committee. The proposed rule covers details on program administration, program structure, certification and registration process, proficiency testing, on-site laboratory evaluations, and laboratory quality systems. The Department plans to offer materials geared towards facilitating compliance with the proposed rule, responding to requests made by sectors of the regulation community.

**Mr. Welter** asked if the advisory council will stay in existence after the rule is adopted.

**Mr. Webb** stated yes, the majority of the advisory committee is the council.

**Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of request authorization for public hearing for Board Order SS-06-06, recreation of NR 149, pertaining to Certifying and Registering Laboratories.**

**Mr. Willett** asked if all 450 labs will receive copies.

**Mr. Webb** stated yes.

**Mr. O’Brien** stated that Board members received correspondence from some small labs who have concerns. He asked if you have taken their concerns into consideration.

**Mr. Webb** stated that this chapter is very complex and it applies to very small labs up to very big labs. We understand that it’s going to take education to help these labs comply.

**The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.A.5. Request authorization for public hearing for Board Order AM-28-05, creation of NR 462 and revisions to NR 460 and 484, pertaining to incorporation of national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants (NESHAP) for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers and process heaters into NR 462.

**Bill Baumann**, Section Chief, Compliance and Enforcement, Air Management the US EPA promulgated the NESHAP for industrial, commercial and institutional boilers and process heaters, effective on September 13, 2004 (69 FR 55,218), and amended this NESHAP on June 27, 2005 (70 FR 36,915). The proposed rule incorporates this NESHAP, as amended, into the Wisconsin Administrative Code by creating ch. NR 462 and Appendix DDDDD in ch. NR 460. Chapter NR 484 is also amended to incorporate by reference several test methods and a test method version cited in ch. NR 439 is updated to maintain consistency with a newly incorporated version.

Section 285.27(2), Stats., requires the Department to promulgate NESHAP into the administrative code. The Natural Resources Board has not acted on this NESHAP before. Since the regulations are already in effect at the national level, there are no policy issues to be resolved. The proposed rule will affect about 215 facilities statewide.

**Mr. Ela** asked if this was to bring Wisconsin in compliance with federal guidelines.

**Mr. Baumann** stated that is correct.

**Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of request authorization for public hearing for Board Order AM-28-05, creation of NR 462 and revisions to NR 460 and 484, pertaining to incorporation of national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants (NESHAP) for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers and process heaters into NR 462. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.A.6. Adoption of revised Board Order FH-42-04, revisions to NR 326 pertaining to pier, wharves, boat shelters, boat hoists, boat lifts and swimming rafts in navigable waterways.

**Todd Ambs**, Administrator, Water Division stated that on November 7, the NRB asked the Department staff to recommend revisions to the Board Order which was adopted on September 28, in light of new information from recent Department studies regarding piers. At the Board's request, Department staff has developed recommendation revisions to FH-42-04 which was adopted by the Board in September. The recommended revisions achieve the following:

- Establish one single clear exemption standard for all piers and all waters
- Allow 99% of all existing piers to remain unchanged
- Allow simple "registration" of existing non-exempt piers
- Ensure that existing large pier structures do not impede navigation or harm habitat
- Protect navigable waters for the future

The five proposed amendments revise the Board Order in the following ways:

1. modify the rule's purpose section to explain that a three-year period is allowed for pier owners to apply for a general permit for preexisting piers and that no fee is required
2. establish the maximum width for piers at 6-feet to be exempt from permitting, consistent with state statute, and eliminate provision for a wider loading platform under the exemption.
3. modify the rule's procedures for the general permit for preexisting piers to allow a three-year period for pier owners to apply, and to establish that no fee is required
4. modify the general permit for preexisting piers to allow a pier with a loading platform up to 200 square feet in size to qualify for "grandfathering"
5. modify the individual permit procedures to allow 3-years for owners of preexisting piers to apply.

**Mike Staggs**, Director, Fisheries Management and Habitat Protection Bureau further explained the study and results of the study.

**Mr. Welter** asked about large decks and platforms.

**Mr. Staggs** stated that the rule allows them to apply for an individual permit to retain the structure. It will be evaluated based on aquatic habitat impact and navigation safety impacts.

**Mr. Behnke** asked about the definition on rivers and an 8 foot structure that runs parallel to the shore.

**Mr. Staggs** stated that may be considered a wharf, but the rule still applies in the same way.

**Dr. Thomas** stated that there is a handful of letters requesting grandfathering party platforms and a large number of letters in support of excluding party platforms. Could local governments zone their lakes to not allow party platforms?

**Mr. Staggs** stated we don't want to rely on that, but they could be more restrictive.

**Mr. Willett** asked about the future of "dockminums".

**Mr. Staggs** stated it would be regulated under the same rules that apply to any other private property owner.

**Mr. Poulson** asked how to regulate the dockminums to prevent them from happening over and over.

**Mr. Staggs** stated that there is a limit to the number of boat slips for private property owners.

**Lisa Lehmann**, Statewide Waterway Policy Coordinator, Fisheries Management and Habitat Bureau stated that there are two issues when it comes to dockminums: the number of boat slips, which we can regulate. The other issue is the way the boat slip is conveyed which this rule doesn't address. There have been situations where a boat slip is only attached to a mailbox and there isn't a house or condo on the property.

**Mr. Staggs** distributed an amendment regarding the number of boat slips on a river. "NR 326.23(6)(e) Riparian property is common association ownership may have no more than one boat slip for the first 200 feet of riparian owner's shoreline footage, and no more than one additional boat slip for each additional full 200 feet of the riparian owner's shoreline."

**Public Appearances**

1. **Charles Dykman**, Monona, representing himself stated that in this current rule, over half of the piers on Madison lakes will be out of compliance. He suggested an amendment that states “The riparian property may have up to 2 boat slips for less than 50 feet of riparian owner’s shoreline footage, 3 boat slips for the first full 50 feet of shoreline footage and one additional boat slip for each additional full 50 feet of shoreline footage.
2. **Peter Murray**, Madison, Wisconsin Association of Lakes stated that all members of the stakeholder group except the realtor agreed to the prior draft of this rule. The realtor wanted all piers to continue to be allowed in public waters no matter what. His organization thinks it is the responsibility of the DNR and the NRB to provide to the legislature the best rules possible to be sure all Wisconsin’s waters are protected. He asked the Department to distribute a brochure that outlines the potential harms of large piers have on the lake to those who apply for general permits.
3. **Nancy Mistele**, Madison, Yahaha Lakes Association stated she doesn’t want the amendment for NR 326.22(2)(f), rather keep the 120 ft. exempt. There are notification issues. How is the DNR going to notify all riparian owners on all lakes? She also questioned how absentee owners will be notified. She also questions the new owners and their rights. There will be a reduction in value of property, The 3 year period is problematic and the amount of paperwork required.
4. **George Meyer**, Madison, Wisconsin Wildlife Federation stated that his organization has concerns about the protection and navigation of the waterways in Wisconsin. He supports the rule that is before the Board today. The definition of a pier is to aid in navigation of the waterway. It’s not a patio or a deck.
5. **Robert Larsen**, Monona, Lake Monona Sailing Club stated that the club owns and maintains piers at two city parks on Lake Monona. The club leases one from the City of Madison and one from the City of Monona. Under the latest provisions of the rule, our status is no longer clear. He is concerned that the club may require an individual permit rather than being grandfathered. He asked the Board to protect the club against the risk of being terminated under these rules. He asked that “or lessee of municipal riparian” be added to the language.  
**Mr. Ela** asked about the club making arrangements with the landowner.  
**Ms. Lehmann** stated the rule accommodates this situation, however the landowner must apply for the permit rather than the lessee.
6. **Bill Gillen**, Madison, Lake Monona Sailing Club stated that he believes there is a risk that the Club may lose its piers. He distributed proposed amendments to protect the Club. As the lessee we want to stand in the place of the municipality for applying for permits.  
**Mr. Ela** asked what the club’s justification was for requesting to go through the general permit process.  
**Mr. Gillen** stated that the public pier section of the rule is new. We want to be able to maintain the 32 boat slips that we already have.  
**Mr. Staggs** stated that the general permit doesn’t have a restriction of the number of boat slips. Ultimately the landowner is the stable record of deed owner and that’s where all water regulations are vested.  
**Mr. O’Brien** asked if Mr. Gillen thought that one of the landowner’s wouldn’t give them permission to have the pier.  
**Mr. Gillen** stated he didn’t know, but if his proposed changes were made to the rule, then he could act as the agent.  
**Mr. Staggs** stated that the riparian owner is the only one who has the right to place a pier including municipalities.
7. **Dan Schultz**, Madison, Yahaha Lakes Association stated he is concerned about the rule that is going forward. He asked the Board not to completely eliminate the loading platforms. He gave a suggested amendment. He stated that there are 3 main pier manufacturers and their specs don’t fit nicely into the rule.

**Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Behnke adoption of revised Board Order FH-42-04, revisions to NR 326 pertaining to pier, wharves, boat shelters, boat hoists, boat lifts and swimming rafts in navigable waterways.**

**Mr. Ela, MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter the amendment to NR 326.23(6)(e) Riparian property is common association ownership may have no more than one boat slip for the first 200 feet of riparian owner’s shoreline footage, and no more than one additional boat slip for each additional full 200 feet of the riparian owner’s shoreline The motion carried by all members.**

**Mr. Welter** stated that some lake associations would like to see a smaller platform size and that could be done through local municipalities.

**Mr. Ela** stated that the Monona Lake Sailing Association concerns are valid and he suggested for a note to be added to the rule that states that lessees can work with municipalities to complete the permitting process.

**Mr. Poulson** stated that we can’t extend ourselves. It’s between the municipality and the lessee.

**Mr. Ela** clarified that he is saying that if the municipality wants to give some authority to the lessee to work with the Department they should be able to do that.

**The original motion passed unanimously as amended.**

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

3.B.1. Adoption of Board Order WM-29-05 revisions to NR 10 pertaining to deer hunting season and regulations.

**Keith Warnke**, Wildlife Biologist, Wildlife Management Bureau stated that the rule includes a 2-year trial moratorium on the October 4-day antlerless only hunt (outside CWD zones) in 2006 and 2007; a statewide 4-day antlerless deer only gun hunt beginning on the 2nd Thursday following the Thanksgiving holiday; elimination of the Hunter's Choice program to be replaced by the sale of bonus antlerless tags valid in specific regular units; a 2-day youth either sex gun hunt in September; antlerless tags will be available for a minimal handling fee in herd control units (\$2 if purchased over the counter, a \$3 processing fee will be added to tags purchased online or by phone); the archery license would come with two tags valid statewide: one valid for one antlered deer only and the other valid for antlerless only and; the late archery season will close the Sunday nearest January 6th.

If the average antlerless:antlered harvest ratio in non-Earn-a-Buck herd control units statewide is below 1.4 antlerless deer per antlered buck in 2006, the rule will sunset immediately and there will be an October antlerless deer gun hunt. If the average antlerless:antlered harvest ratio in non-Earn-a-Buck herd control units during the two years of the trial does not meet or exceed 2.0 in a deer management region, the October gun hunt will return in that region. The Earn-A-Buck season structure will be an available tool (in 2006 and 2007) for recommendation to the Natural Resources Board based on the criteria currently used.

Ten public hearings were held across Wisconsin to gather public input on the proposed changes in this rule order. Hearings were held in Green Bay, Eau Claire, Waukesha, Fond du Lac, Onalaska, Stevens Point, Ashland, Spooner, Rhinelander, and Madison between October 11 and October 19, 2005. Support for the proposal as a whole was widespread amongst most user groups who gave representation. The majority of opposition was from various snowmobilers and snowmobile groups who were opposed to the December antlerless hunt north of highway 8.

**Mr. Poulson** asked if anything relates to crop damage.

**Mr. Warnke** stated that the only thing pertaining to crop damage is through the agricultural damage claims program and we anticipate that moving away from hunters' choice and into selling the antlerless tag as an additional tag. The crop damage fund will probably grow as a result of that.

**Mr. Poulson** stated he is concerned about the timing of the ability to shoot the deer.

**Mr. Behnke** added that if you have it going on during the regular gun season there is a conflict. The deer should be killed at the time they are doing crop damage.

**Mr. Welter** asked if crop damage tags are forbidden from being used during the gun season or just discouraged.

**Mr. Hauge** stated that the general rule is that if you have a crop damage tag you can use them during the gun season.

**Mr. Willett** asked about the 4 day December statewide hunt and how it affects the snowmobiling.

**Mr. Behnke** stated that he has heard from people who hunt in Northern Wisconsin and they stated that they are not seeing deer. He asked if the Department has considered only having the December hunt in units where they are not at goal.

**Mr. Warnke** stated that the Department considered that, but in the interest of clarity and reducing confusion, we decided to go with the statewide hunt, rather than the unit by unit hunt.

**Mr. O'Brien** asked for clarification about where the tag may be used in the December hunt.

**Mr. Warnke** stated that it must be used in the unit that it was purchased for.

**Dr. Thomas** asked about doing the T zone hunt in October North of Hwy 8 and in December South of Hwy 8.

**Mr. Warnke** stated that it was considered, but we went with consistency.

**Mr. O'Brien** asked if someone can buy as many antlerless tags in different units as long as they are available.

**Mr. Warnke** stated yes.

**Mr. Behnke** asked if all antlerless tags will be unit specific.

**Mr. Warnke** stated yes, where they are limited.

**Mr. Welter** asked if the Department will have the final kill figures for the 2005 season by the January NRB meeting.

**Mr. Warnke** stated that most of the data will be in, but there is still tallying to be done, so it will be the end of January before the final numbers are in and we can look at units and make decisions about next year.

**Dr. Thomas** stated that she had said she would not vote for this proposal unless the conservation congress came through with their promise of getting people out to hunt and harvest the deer.

**Mr. Warnke** stated that at this point it looks like they did keep their promise.

**Mr. Poulson** asked about the two day youth hunt harvest numbers.

**Mr. Warnke** stated this year we had about 300 deer harvested. He estimates 250-500 deer statewide next year. It's a hunter recruitment tool, not a harvest tool.

**Public Appearances**

1. **Scott Makowski**, Menomonee Falls, Association of Wisconsin Snowmobile Clubs stated his organization is opposed to any statewide December deer hunt. It prevents us from opening the trails into northern counties on December 1<sup>st</sup>, but could cause some private landowners to deny access to finish preparing the trails for use. Many tourism dollars could be lost due to snowmobile events that normally occur in early December. He asked the NRB to consider allowing hunting a December hunt south of Hwy. 8, leaving the area North of Hwy 8 with no hunting in December. He suggested offering extra free antlerless deer tags to hunters during the regular November deer season.
2. **Morris Nelson**, Edgerton, Association of Wisconsin Snowmobile Clubs stated he doesn't support the four day hunt in December. He reviewed the previous negotiations regarding extending the bow season to January. The agreement included that there would never be a gun season in December North of Hwy 8. He suggested there not be a four day hunt North of Hwy. 8. He doesn't think it will affect the deer harvest.
3. **Steve Oestreicher**, Harshaw, Conservation Congress gave a brief history of the Deer 2000 program. He stated that during that process, the snowmobilers chose not to participate, even though they were invited to participate. He gave a brief history of how the citizens voted at the spring hearings. He stated that from personal observation, there are not snowmobile tourists in Northern Wisconsin during early December. The busiest time, if there is snow, is the week between Christmas and New Years. Without snow, there are no tourists. He has met with the Snowmobile Club trying to work out a compromise, but they did not agree. The Congress is requesting Board approval of the season structure as presented.
4. **George Meyer**, Madison, Wisconsin Wildlife Federation stated WWF supports the September youth hunt. He asked the Board to include a letter to the legislature stating this is a package and picking it apart will decrease its effectiveness. He doesn't think there will be a great conflict in the December between snowmobilers and hunters.  
**Mr. O'Brien** asked if the reason we are abandoning the October hunt because of the conflict with the bow hunters.  
**Mr. Meyer** stated yes, that's a fair assessment. However, you have a commitment from WWF if this doesn't work, we will support going back to the October hunt.
5. **Todd Zeuske**, Middleton, Wisconsin Bowhunters Association thanked the Department and Board for making an effort to listen to Wisconsin deer hunters to help bring the deer season more in line with the format that has worked for decades. He supports the proposed deer season structure.
6. **Greg Kazmierski**, Pewaukee, Wisconsin Deerhunters Coalition stated this package still includes Earn a Buck and he opposes it. He gave statistics stated that the 5 year gun harvest is down. He asked the Board to remove the Earn a Buck provision off the rule and give the hunters a chance to show they can get it done during the 9 day season.

**Mr. Behnke** asked about EAB possibility in 2006 in some units.

**Mr. Warnke** stated that having to kill an antlerless deer first is not an impediment to herd control. It's a highly effective tour. There is a list of 75,000 hunters who have already qualified for a buck.

**Mr. Ela** asked unit dependency and December hunt to be only to herd control units.

**Mr. Warnke** stated we were trying not to make it less confusing through consistency, clarity, and simplicity. Statewide it provides more hunting opportunity.

**Mr. Behnke** complimented the Department for trying something different. It must go forward as a package in order to work rather than picking and choosing portions of it.

**Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela adoption of Board Order WM-29-05 revisions to NR 10 pertaining to deer hunting season and regulations.**

**Dr. Thomas** asked about tourism income affects in Northern Wisconsin.

**Mr. Warnke** stated that he contacted tourism. We didn't get solid numbers, but they also didn't express concern.

**Mr. O'Brien** asked if the main objective is to keep it simply.

**Mr. Warnke** stated yes and to keep it consistent statewide.

**Mr. O'Brien MOVED, seconded Dr. Thomas amend to have no December hunt North of Hwy 8.**

**Mr. Welter** stated that the tourism groups didn't express their opinion and perhaps it isn't a burden on them. The hunting pressure may not be a conflict because there won't be a high concentration of hunters. He will vote against the amendment.

**Mr. Poulson** asked if this enhances the opportunity for the package to pass at the legislature.

**Mr. O'Brien** stated he doesn't think it will affect the package that substantially. The need to reduce the herd North of Hwy 8 isn't a big concern.

**Dr. Thomas** asked if the Department can issue enough extra antlerless tags for the regular nine day season to make up for 1% of the kill you may get in the T-zone.

**Mr. Warnke** stated that many of the units are very close to EAB status.

**Mr. Behnke** stated that this amendment would take the controversy out of this rule. Keeping this December hunt could prevent it from passing at the legislature.

**Mr. Willett** stated he supports the amendment because it will pass the legislature then.

**Mr. Ela** stated that herd control is the overall goal.

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Behnke to amended the amendment to have a 4 day hunt N. of Hwy 8 in October in lieu of the December hunt.**

**Mr. Welter** suggested that we take this a step at a time and see how the legislature responses to this package.

**Mr. Willett** stated the county boards and the snowmobile clubs oppose it and the legislature will listen to them.

**Mr. Behnke** asked for a legal opinion about what will happen if it is sent back.

**Tim Andryk**, DNR Attorney stated that the legislature cannot write a change to the rule or amend it. It would have to send it back to the Board and ask for a change.

**Dr. Thomas** supports the amendment to the amendment. It addresses the issues raised by the snowmobilers, it creates tourism opportunities, and there are two T zone hunting opportunities.

**Mr. Welter** clarified that the zone T it is the Thursday closest to October 15.

**Mr. Behnke** stated he wonders if making a spur of the moment decision without having studied the science behind the Department's recommendation isn't fair.

**Mr. Welter** stated that our number one priority is to protect the natural resources in spite of the social issues.

**Mr. Hauge** asked if this amendment applies to all units North of Hwy 8 for both years.

**Mr. Willett** stated yes.

**A roll call vote was taken.**

**Mr. Behnke – No, Mr. Ela – No, Mr. Welter – No, Mr. Willett – Yes, Mr. Poulson – No,**

**Dr. Thomas – Yes, Mr. O'Brien – Yes**

**The amendment to the amendment failed.**

**Mr. O'Brien** stated he doesn't think the simplicity argument is a valid reason. Sportspeople are used to complicated rules. The snowmobilers would like to get out on the trails. This is a good compromise.

**Mr. Behnke** stated that the original amendment calls for no October hunt. This could be of concern.

**A roll call vote was taken.**

**Mr. Behnke – No, Mr. Ela – No, Mr. Welter – No, Mr. Willett – No, Mr. Poulson – No,**

**Dr. Thomas – No, Mr. O'Brien – Yes**

**The amendment failed.**

**Mr. Poulson** asked if the herd control unit change between the 9 day and the early December hunt if the kill is not reached.

**Mr. Warnke** stated no because the proposal must come to the Board in March.

**The original motion carried by all members present by a roll call vote.**

3.B.2. Adoption of Board Order WM-30-05, revisions to NR 10 pertaining to deer hunting season in Straight Lake Wilderness State Park.

**Mr. Warnke** stated This rule proposes a deer firearm season beginning on the Saturday immediately preceding the Thanksgiving holiday and continuing for 9 consecutive days followed by a muzzleloading firearm season beginning on the following Monday and continuing for 10 consecutive days.

The 2,779 acre Brunkow Hardwoods Cooperation department land acquisition in northern Polk County has allowed for the establishment of the Straight River Wildlife Area and Straight Lake state park. Together the state park and wildlife area is an undeveloped, heavily wooded property that is relatively pristine and undisturbed. It contains an extremely rich diversity of flora and fauna as well as very unusual geographic features. Without a deer hunting season to control deer populations on the state park property, deer herd control will not occur at the state park for several years (until the master plan is complete). This will result in an increasing deer population, which typically results in increased direct and indirect adverse impacts on the native plant communities. This rule proposes a standard deer season in advance of a completed master plan that may be modified if the master planning process results in an alternative hunting season structure. Initial meetings with local interest groups support hunting on the property in advance of a completed master plan.

Typically the establishment of rules does not precede master plan completion. However, in this instance potential direct adverse impacts on native plant communities has led the department to recommend deer hunting season in advance of the

final property master plan. If the master planning process results in a recommendation for an alternative deer season framework and regulations, then the department will initiate rule making to implement the preferred season structure.

**Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Behnke adoption of Board Order WM-30-05, revisions to NR 10 pertaining to deer hunting season in Straight Lake Wilderness State Park. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.3. Approval of the 2006 Bear Harvest Quotas

**Mr. Warnke** stated that In 2005, the Natural Resources Board requested final approval of bear harvest quotas beginning with the 2006 season. Recommended quotas are determined by using the department's bear population model to assess the effects of various harvest levels relative to the current population estimate. When Tribal harvest declarations are received, we will incorporate that information along with harvest history to determine the final number of permits to be issued. The department recommends that that the Board approve the recommended 2006 bear harvest quotas listed:

Zone	Quota	Permits
A	825	1475
A1	550	685
B	550	700
C	600	1510
Total	2525	4370

**Mr. Welter** asked about the unused permits.

**Mr. Warnke** stated he isn't sure of the reason why people don't claim them.

**Mr. Poulson** asked if the hunter gets to keep the bear if it's shot on a nuisance tag.

**Mr. Warnke** stated yes in most cases.

**Public Appearance**

1. **Steve Oestreicher**, Harshaw, Conservation Congress stated that the Bear committee didn't unanimously approve the Zone B bear quota. He requested the Board review the quota in Zone B and raising it to 650-700. The harvest was down in some zones due to fewer permits and 2 weeks of mid 80-90 degree weather. There was a large acorn crop that caused the bears to pull off the bait.

**Mr. Welter** asked that if the Bear committee endorsed these numbers, even if it wasn't unanimously, why are you asking us to change the quotas.

**Mr. Oestreicher** stated that the committee members who live and hunt in this zone are the ones who are opposed to this.

2. **Mike Gappas**, Eau Claire, Wisconsin Bearhunters Association stated that Wisconsin is a leader in bear management because of the models that we work with, the aggressive seasons and harvest strategies. As things change on the landscape, we need to change our model to reflect what is going on the landscape. There has been a revised model developed that is more reflective of the current bear population. The only difference in the revised model is the number of bears we started with. The model is very sensitive. He would like to ask the Board to encourage the Department to use the revised model and increase the harvest goal for zone B.

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter Approval of the 2006 Bear Harvest Quotas. The motion carried by all members.**

3.B.4. Adoption of Emergency Order FH-46-05(E) and request authorization for public hearing of FH-45-05, revisions to NR 25, pertaining to adjusting allowable harvests of lake trout from Wisconsin waters of Lake Superior as specified in the renegotiated State/Tribal Lake Superior Agreement.

**Mike Staggs**, Director, Fisheries and Habitat Bureau stated that NRB Order FH-45-05 and identical emergency order FH-46-05(E) establish new lake trout harvest limits as agreed to by negotiators for the Department and the Red Cliff and Bad River Bands of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians in a proposed new State-Tribal Lake Superior Agreement. It is expected that the agreement will be finalized and signed before these rules are presented to the Natural Resources Board in December. He distributed an amended rule.

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Dr. Thomas adoption of Emergency Order FH-46-05(E) as amended, revisions to NR 25, pertaining to adjusting allowable harvests of lake trout from Wisconsin waters of Lake Superior as specified in the renegotiated State/Tribal Lake Superior Agreement. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

**Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett approval of request authorization for public hearing of FH-45-05 as amended, revisions to NR 25, pertaining to adjusting allowable harvests of lake trout from Wisconsin waters of Lake Superior as specified in the renegotiated State/Tribal Lake Superior Agreement. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.5. Adoption of FH-27-05, revisions to NR 20 and NR 25, pertaining to commercial and recreation harvest of yellow perch from Green Bay.

**Bill Horns** stated that in 2001 the Natural Resources Board adopted NRB Order FH-12-01, reducing the recreational and commercial harvest of yellow perch from Green Bay. The sport fishing daily bag limit was lowered from 25 to 10 and the total allowable annual commercial harvest was reduced from 200,000 to 20,000 pounds. The rule provided that the changes would expire (sunset) on June 30, 2004. That expiration date was postponed until July 1, 2006, by NRB Order FH-36-03. The proposed rule increases the sport fishing daily bag limit from 10 to 15 and increases the annual total allowable commercial harvest from 20,000 pounds to 60,000 pounds. It also eliminates the sunset clause.

**Mr. Welter** asked about increasing the bag limit from 10 to 15 in the sports fishing. Will there be pressure to increase the commercial harvest rate? Are those limits sustainable?

**Mr. Horns** stated that if the population increases we will be back asking the Board to increase commercial harvest. We don't have a way right now to make the sport and commercial harvests equal. We can make adjustments over time to equalize it.

**Mr. Staggs** stated the larger, older fish are dying and the biomass of lbs is being replaced with smaller fish.

**Mr. Welter** asked if there was a quick trigger that would prompt the Department to come back to the Board to change the harvest.

**Mr. Staggs** stated that these harvest quotas are conservative.

**Public Appearances**

1. **Mark Maricque**, Green Bay, Lake Michigan Commercial Fishing Board stated that both sport and commercial fishing was good this year. He disagrees with some of the Departments graphs and troll data. He would like to see an increase in the harvest limits.

**Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter adoption of FH-27-05, revisions to NR 20 and NR 25, pertaining to commercial and recreation harvest of yellow perch from Green Bay. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.6. Approval of revisions to the Rib Mountain State Park Master Plan.

**Peter Biermeier**, Trails and External Relations Section Chief, Park and Recreation Bureau stated The Department requests approval of a Master Plan Revision for Rib Mountain State Park consistent with Wisconsin Stats. Chapter 27.01 State Parks and NR44- Master Planning for Department Properties. The Rib Mountain master plan revision proposes to provide primarily day-use activities and facilities in the Park's more developed area located along the mountain's ridge top.

**Tim Miller**, Regional Park Manager, Northern Region stated the existing rustic campground, currently located in the busy and constricted area at the top of the hill, no longer provides the type and quality of camping experience desired by today's campers. Therefore, the Plan proposes to convert this area to a family and group picnic area with 8 family picnic sites and 5 group picnic shelters built along the northern bluff top. Limited overnight camping will continue to be provided at the Park with the addition of a new group campground and several hike-in campsites proposed to be located in the more natural and secluded northwest corner of the Park.

There are a number of modifications to the existing park facilities, along with several new facilities to enhance recreational and educational opportunities. Examples of these new developments include a new public entrance visitor station, a 1.5 mile paved exercise walking path and a nature center.

The plan also proposes to designate 215 acres on the southwest and western sides of the park as the "Rib Mountain Talus Forest State Natural Area". This area of quartzite talus and artesian seeps proved micro habitats for many rare species of flora and fauna.

It is estimated that the total cost of the proposed park developments and improvements will be approximately \$6.5 million.

**Mr. Welter** asked about camping opportunities and why the current campground is being removed.

**Mr. Biermeier** state that the sites were very small and not one of the most highly occupied in the state.

**Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela approval of revisions to the Rib Mountain State Park Master Plan. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.7. Land Acquisition, Statewide Natural Areas, Dane County DELETED from Agenda

3.B.8. Land Acquisition, Governor Knowles State Forest, Polk County

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of Land Acquisition, Governor Knowles State Forest, Polk County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.9. Land Acquisition and Donation, Statewide Habitat Areas, Dane County

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela approval of Land Acquisition, Statewide Habitat Areas, Dane County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

**Mr. Poulson MOVED, seconded by Mr. Behnke approval of Donation, Statewide Habitat Areas, Dane County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.10. Land Acquisition and Project Boundary Modification, Bean Brook Fishery Area, Washburn County

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of Land Acquisition and Project Boundary Modification, Bean Brook Fishery Area, Washburn County The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.11. Land Acquisition, Turtle Valley Wildlife Area, Walworth County

**Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett approval of Land Acquisition, Turtle Valley Wildlife Area, Walworth County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.12. Land Acquisition, Statewide Natural Area, St. Croix County

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of Land Acquisition, Statewide Natural Area, St. Croix County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.13. Land Acquisition, Northern Highland/American Legion State Forest, Oneida County

**Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela approval of Land Acquisition, Northern Highland/American Legion State Forest, Oneida County The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.14. Land Acquisition and Donation, Statewide Natural Areas, Juneau County

**Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of Land Acquisition and Donation, Statewide Natural Areas, Juneau County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.15. Donation, Fishery Remnant Areas, La Crosse County3.B.16. Land Donation, Statewide Natural Area, Bayfield County

**Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett approval of Land Donation, Statewide Natural Area, Bayfield County The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

4. Citizen Participation – 1:00 p.m.4.A. Citizen Recognition4.A.1. The Natural Resources Foundation will donate \$73,500 for various projects in the Land and Water Divisions.

**Mr. Hassett** presented a plaque of appreciation to Charlie Luthin for this generous donation. He stated that the donation will include \$19,000 for a Neda Mine bat study, \$15,000 for whooping cranes, \$18,500 for public services announcements, \$5,000 for Door County State Natural Areas, \$2,000 gift to purchase fish for kids fishing clinic, and \$14,000 to produce the Land Legacy Report.

**Mr. Luthin** acknowledged Ron Johnson for his generous donation of his extensive book collection to the NRF. He stated there are two major initiatives underway by the NRF. NRF has signed an agreement with American Transmission Commission (ATC) through Green Tier. Through NRF, ATC has established an ATC environmental stewardship fund. The majority of the fund will go to the Endangered Resources Bureau for different programs. The second initiative is the development of the Wisconsin Conservation Endowment.

4.B. Citizen Participation

1. **Bruce Nilles**, Madison, Sierra Club-Midwest Office commented on Air Regulations in Wisconsin. He is concerned about the state adopting rules that are taking the state in the wrong direction – increasing, rather than decreasing air pollution. He stated that every lake, river, and stream is contaminated with mercury. DNR staff is moving forward to relax Wisconsin's mercury rule. In regards to the New Source Review, DNR is proposing to adopt provisions that the Court did not find unlawful, but are nonetheless, as the State argued in its litigation, unenforceable and will increase air pollution in Wisconsin. He requested that the DNR to postpone any further action on its NSR rules until it ensures that any changes will not increase air pollution or slow progress toward meeting clean air standards, consistent with Governor Doyle's instruction and the state's need to reduce, not increase air pollution. Secondly, instruct the DNR it is not to adopt a bad mercury rule. Thirdly, instruct the DNR to withdraw its submission to USEPA that requests removing NR 445 from SIP. Finally, instruct the DNR that it should only adopt those provisions of the Jobs Creation Act that move the state forward, not backward, in its efforts to improve air quality.

5. Board Members' Matters5.A. Landfill Owner Financial Responsibility Resolution (Tabled from October)

This item is returning after the Natural Resources Board tabled it at the October, 2005 meeting. A proposed resolution to replace a resolution passed by the Board in March, 2005 reads as:

**WHEREAS**, on March 23, 2005, the Natural Resources Board passed a resolution directing the Department of Natural Resources to develop draft rules relating to landfill owner financial responsibility and organic waste stability to be presented at the February 2006 Board meeting;

**WHEREAS**, the Governor has convened a Task Force to study and make recommendations on waste materials recovery and disposal in Wisconsin which will include the economics of land-filling and recycling including the full environmental costs and benefits and how those are reflected in the costs of waste management activities, among other issues;

**WHEREAS**, the Governor's Task Force will develop its recommendations by December 2006;

**WHEREAS**, the Department believes that developing a draft rule package on land fill owner financial responsibility before the Governor's Task Force has completed its deliberations is premature;

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, by the Natural Resources Board, that the Department of Natural Resources is directed to bring a draft rule package on landfill owner financial responsibility to the Natural Resources Board at its March 2007 meeting and to provide updates on discussions and proposed rule development to the Board in December 2005 and March, August, and December 2006.

Approved this 7th day of December 2005 by the Natural Resources Board at its meeting in Madison, Wisconsin.

NATURAL RESOURCES BOARD  
Gerald M. O'Brien, Chairman

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela approval of Landfill Owner Financial Responsibility Resolution The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

**Mr. Ela** stated that Steven Winters wrote a letter and noise issue of air boats and enforcement of noise. He asked for LE staff to report back next month.

**Mr. Poulson** added that someone from the Black River safety concerns about hovercrafts.

**Mr. Ela** asked the Department to be better prepared and more broadly briefed on the New Source Review issue. He asked that DOJ personnel, EPA, industry, and environmental groups be involved. He asked for other air matters such as mercury be presented. He suggested a Tuesday afternoon tutorial session.

**Mr. Welter** asked for an informational item on scopes with magnifiers not being allowed on muzzleloader. He commended LE and Hunter Ed and Hmong community for their efforts to educate public to enjoy the deer season and be able to get along.

**Mr. Poulson** asked about turkey overpopulation and crop damage. He asked why the animals cannot be harvested. The ethanol issue is getting some bad press. He believes there is an opportunity for ethanol use. He asked the Department to educate the public about this issue.

**Secretary Hassett** stated the Department is trying to educate the legislators who wrote a letter about ethanol.

**Dr. Thomas** asked if the staff has explored with the legislator strong enforcement of ATV damage.

**Secretary Hassett** stated that there was interest and legislative staff is deciding how to handle it.

**Mr. O'Brien** asked for an update from SAK committee.

6. Special Committees' Reports

None.

- 7. Department Secretary's Matters
- 7.A. Retirement Resolutions
- 7.A.1. Janet Beach Hanson
- 7.A.2. Gregory Mathson
- 7.A.3. Marcia M. Peeters
- 7.A.4. Marsha St. Louis
- 7.A.5. Marjorie Devereaux

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of the Retirement Resolutions. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

- 7.B. Donations

- 7.B.1. Margaret Van Alstyne will donate \$8,000 in support of the Whooping Crane Restoration Program.

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela approval of \$8,000 donation from Margaret Van Alstyne to support of the Whooping Crane Restoration Program The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

- 7.B.2. The Lake Emily Fishing Improvement Club will donate \$5,800 for conducting a comprehensive fisheries survey of Lake Emily in Dodge County.

**Mr. Willett, MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela approval of \$5,800 donation from the Lake Emily Fishing Improvement Club for conducting a comprehensive fisheries survey of Lake Emily in Dodge County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

- 8. Information Items.

- 8.A. Air, Waste, and Water/Enforcement  
None.

- 8.B. Land Management, Recreation, and Fisheries/Wildlife

- 8.B.1. 2005 Deer Season Report

**Kevin Huggins**, Section Chief, Customer Service and Licensing Bureau gave an overview of the customer service licenses sales for the 2005 season. He described the season as remarkable. With less than two weeks before the season opened, articles throughout the state were highlighting how license sales were 11% lower than in 2004 and offering possible reasons for the decline. Deer hunters came through in a big way, continuing the trend towards last minute purchasing. A total of 641,789 gun deer licenses were sold this season which is within 1% of the total sold in 2004. He gave the demographic statistics of the hunters.

**Randy Stark**, Director, Law Enforcement Bureau gave an overview of the law enforcement segment of the deer season. Nearly perfect hunting conditions, with snow and mild temperatures especially early in the season, made hunters very happy and had a positive impact on the deer harvest. He stated that pre-season preparation reduced potential for conflict during the season. These steps included public service announcements in video, audio and print formats. They emphasized the importance of ethics, landowner relations, and hunter responsibility in continuing Wisconsin's hunting tradition. The two trends that are growing are implications of land use and ownership patterns on the hunting tradition and the future access to a place to hunt and problems associated with baiting and feeding. He gave statistics for violations, shooting incidents, etc. Hunters are asking for tag simplification.

**Mr. Behnke** stated he doesn't feel we are going far enough in the baiting issue. We need to do more. The Department needs to take the lead and tell the legislators that we need to take action on how to approach the issue.

**Officer Stark** stated that we need to educate the public.

**Mr. Behnke** stated we need to find a legislator who will introduce a bill.

**Tom Hauge**, Director, Wildlife Bureau gave an overview of the Wildlife segment of deer season. He highlighted the new registration database for deer registration that enables a hunter to pre-qualify for an antlered deer should EAB be authorized. He gave preliminary numbers for early archery, Zone T, and 9-day gun season. He gave an update on the deer donation program. He gave a CWD management update. He stated that over 98% of the positives are from the Deer Eradication Zone.

8.B.2. ~~Friends of Wisconsin State Parks – Mission, Vision, and History of the Organization~~

8.B.3. Status of the Wisconsin State Natural Areas Program

**Rebecca Schroeder**, Endangered Resources Bureau stated that the State Natural Areas Program within the Bureau of Endangered Resources has been an active and successful project since its inception in 1951. More than 165,000 acres of Wisconsin's native landscapes are protected within the 416 sites that currently comprise the SNA system. State Natural Areas provide habitat for rare species, protect the last vestiges of our natural heritage and afford opportunities for nature-based recreation. The program is a true partnership involving 47 conservation organizations, universities, federal/state/local agencies and other units of government. Increased media coverage, the release of guidebook to SNAs, and the recent celebration of the program's 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary, have significantly raised the level of awareness of the program among the public. The Board has requested an overview of the program and its status. The Board presentation will include a brief history of the program, an explanation of the program's mission and objectives, and a description of how SNAs are selected and protected. The Board will be asked a subsequent meeting to consider approving an increase in the acreage goal for the program.

**Mr. Ela** asked for a description of the dedication program.

**Ms. Schroeder** stated that it is a legal process that puts an easement on the land on private land.

**Mr. Welter** asked about public accessibility on State Natural Areas.

**Ms. Schroeder** stated that most of them are for some uses such as limited hunting.

\*\*\*The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.\*\*\*