

# Wisconsin Conservation Congress

## LEGISLATIVE

### Meeting Minutes



ORDER OF BUSINESS			
-------------------	--	--	--

## I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

### A. CALL TO ORDER

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER BY	Chairman: MarySusan Diedrich	[Time] 6:30 P.M. Via Zoom
----------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------

### B. ROLL CALL

ATTENDEES	Mike Ellsworth-Harold Drake-Kevin Schanning-Michael Hamm-George Meyer- Brad Wagner-Danielle Johnson-Duke Tucker-Tim Grunewald-Chuck Boley-Steve Bechtka-Butch Roberts-Peter Hellios-Todd Cook-Tashina Peplinski-Michael Murphy- Gary Roehrig-Matt Wehn W.D.N.R.- Maggie Hutter W.D.N.R.
EXCUSED	Lowell Suring-Robert Benson
UNEXCUSED	
GUESTS	Merri Ann Gonzalas-Linda Hendrix-Amy Mueller-Deb Martin -Barb Voightman-Jack Voight- Steve Benning

### C. AGENDA APPROVAL/REPAIR

DISCUSSION	The committee chair asked if members had reviewed the agenda and if there were any request for amending it.
ACTION	Motion by Mike Murphey to approve the agenda as presented. Motion 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Tashina Peplinski. Motion carried on a voice vote.

### D. REVIEW COMMITTEE MISSION STATEMENT

DISCUSSION	Mission statement was read by the committee chair. There were no requests from the committee members for review or suggested changes.
ACTION	None

### E. PUBLIC COMMENTS

DISCUSSION	Individuals registered to speak on behalf of specific resolutions were allowed to speak at the time those resolutions came up for discussion. Public E-mails addressed to the committee were also read by the chair at that time.
ACTION	none

## II. INFORMATION & ACTION ITEMS

### A. RESOLUTION 070123 AIS FUNDING

### COMMITTEE CHAIR

DISCUSSION	The committee chair read the complete resolution to the committee. Comments: Chuck Boley: In favor of advancing the resolution as a means of getting the funding process started. The fee's suggested in the resolution should not be considered at this time. Dollar amounts would be established by the legislature. Mike Murphey suggested that the two funding options in the resolution be split. They should be presented as two separate questions allowing the public to express an opinion on both.
ACTION	A motion to advance was made by Teshina Peplinski. 2 <sup>nd</sup> By Kevin Schanning. After the original motion was made Michael Hamm suggested a friendly amendment to the motion to advance the resolution by splitting the funding options into two separate questions. The friendly amendment was agreed to. The motion was amended to advance the resolution as a two-part question. Motion passed on a voice vote

	with all in favor.
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Committee chair will notify resolution writer.	

### B. RESOLUTION 130123 VOLUNTARY ASSET TAGS

COMMITTEE CHAIR

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>The committee chair read the resolution prior to discussion. Discussion: Brad Wagner commented that this resolution was being driven as a result of lost paddle board and kayak incidents. Mike Murphy suggested that in 2022 a similar question was voted on and passed the Congress. The current Go-Wild system should be able to handle the transaction process. Tashina Peplinski agreed that the question has been debated before and was supported by the Congress. She felt that the intent of the resolution was not completely understood by the general public and was therefore not supported. Michael Hamm commented that the proposal would be like a vehicle identification number. Questioned how far could this proposal be taken. How many items would or could be included and how would it be managed? There would be cost associated with setting up and managing it. It should be left up the individual to determine how far they to go with registration. Mike Ellsworth suggest that the idea may not be worth the effort needed by the D.N.R. Steve Bechtka suggested that the resolution suggests voluntary participation only and should be advanced. Todd Cook commented that the original resolution was based on request from Fire Department and First Responders as a result of watercraft incidents. Some sort of identification number would help identify the owner more quickly in these types of situations. It would not present an enforcement issue for warden staff. Danielle Johnson expressed concern that voluntary participation only, may not generate enough interest to justify putting a system in place because additional fees may keep people away.</p>
<b>ACTION</b>	<p>Motion to advance the resolution was made by Mike Murphy. Motion 2<sup>nd</sup> by Brad Wagner. A roll call vote was requested. The result was 8 in favor and 8 opposed. Because of the tie vote the Committee chair cast the deciding vote in favor of advancing the resolution. Motion Carried.</p>
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Committee chair will notify resolution writer.	

### C. RESOLUTION 220223 RETRIEVING A HUNTING DOG

COMMITTEE CHAIR

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>The committee chair read the complete resolution prior to discussion. The resolution writer was not present to support the resolution. E mails received from the public in non-support of the resolution were read by the committee chair. Committee comments: Steve Bechtka commented that this is a property rights issue. Asking permission to trespass is reasonable. Resolution is somewhat vague and legislation could present enforcement issues. Duke Tucker expressed the same concern about this being a property rights issue. Teshina Peplinski stated that this issue has come up frequently in the past and is very controversial. Hunters are frustrated at times with land owners over this issue. Most hunters intentionally try to do the right thing while some do not. Based on the results of previous resolutions, this is probably not going anywhere. MarySusan reported that as part of the rules and resolutions committee, the resolution writer was consulted about writing the resolution. He was having difficulty getting permission from land owners. This is mostly a hound hunter issue and she understands his concern but, the resolution probably needs more work before moving thru. Danielle Johnson suggested that the circumstances regarding other states laws may be different from what we experience in Wisconsin. It may not be appropriate to compare other states laws. The resolution needs to be considered from a land owner perspective. Butch Roberts commented that current state statutes need to be considered and the resolution did not meet the burden.</p>
<b>ACTION</b>	<p>Motion was made by Duke Tucker not to advance the resolution. Motion 2<sup>nd</sup> by Michael Murphy. Motion to reject passed on a voice vote.</p>
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Committee Chair will notify Resolution author.	

### D. RESOLUTION 450123 MONARCH BUTTERFLY

COMMITTEE CHAIR

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>The resolution was read by the committee chair. The author was present and spoke on behalf of the resolution. He related that he wrote a resolution 9 years ago which passed state wide with 90% support. Unfortunately, the legislature never acted on it. Currently he is working with the legislature and a bill has been drafted. (LRB3814) Comments: MarySusan stated the currently 7 states have the Monarch as their state butterfly. Wisconsin is one of nine states without. Steve Bechtka recommended moving the Resolution forward as a means of protecting the Monarch.</p>
-------------------	--

<b>ACTION</b>	Motion was made by George Meyer to forward the resolution. Motion 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Danielle Johnson. Motion Passed on a voice vote	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
	Committee chair will notify resolution author.	

**E. RESOLUTION 570223 POINT TRANSFERR**

**COMMITTEE CHAIR**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	. The resolution was read by the Committee Chair. Discussion: Steve Bechtka asked if the point transfer system was a legislative action. The committee D.N.R. liaison stated that she was not aware of any legislative history and investigate it. Michael Hamm- This is a fairness issue. Individuals can buy points who have no intention of hunting or using them for themselves. They can transfer them to family or others give them advantage by shortening their wait time for tags. The point transfer system is ruining hunting by people taking advantage of the system. People already wait 5 to 10 years or more for kill tags. George Meyer. Can see both sides of the issue. There would be costs associated with administering and tracking these transactions. It would be helpful to know what that might be. Mike Ellsworth – Agrees with Mike's comments with this being a fairness issue. People could and will buy points giving unfair advantage to others. MarySusan-Up to now It takes too long to get enough points in some zones. This is not the correct way to go. Michael Murphy- Agrees that this is a fairness issue. Doesn't like the possibility of going this way.	
<b>ACTION</b>	Motion to Reject the resolution was made by Michael Murphy. Motion 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Michael Hamm. Motion to reject passed on a voice vote with no objection.	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
	Committee chair will contact resolution writer	

**F. RESOLUTION 040523 ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS**

**COMMITTEE CHAIR**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	The resolution was read by the committee chair. The resolution writer was not signed in for comment. Committee discussion: Michael Hamm- The money being spent is all borrowed and is tax payer money. The Joint Finance committee should retain control. George Meyer- When land is removed from the tax role local government is reimbursed. Projects have oversight by the legislature. The Joint Finance Committee or any one of its members can hold up a project and remain anonymous. Land owners must agree and most of these projects take years to negotiate and develop. All these efforts can be wasted because one individual can stop it. The system is not perfect. Lands of value are protected first and paid for over time. Duke Tucker- Payment in lieu of taxes is paid to the municipality involved. Often these projects start with outside organizations, like Friends Groups. They take down structures which reduces the value and sell the property to the state. Many of these properties are not being properly maintained. Not in favor of the resolution. Tashina Peplinski- There have been similar resolutions. Is concerned about the excessive amount of being spent yearly for payments and interest. The debt is huge and we continue to buy more. Question on current debt and interest payments. Maggie Hutter reported current stewardship payments of 44 million dollars per year with interest payment of 19.8 million dollars on current debt. Michael Hamm- Shared revenue payments have not increased in 20 years. Affected townships/ counties are not voting on these projects. The current process is not fair to the municipalities affected. There may be some rule changes need to the process. Duke Tucker- The state owns 69% of the township. Since 1992 the payments stay with the Township. Payment in Lieu of taxes is not enough to cover major uptick in expenses. Steve Bechtka- There are a lot of talking points to the process. Legislative requests have a lot of support. George Meyer- Explained the Payment in Lieu of taxes history and process of administering. Kevin Schanning- The resolution is well written and had wide support. The committee is trying to read too much into it. Gary Roehrig- Agrees. The resolution had wide support and should be advanced. It should be up to the legislature to address the problem and develop legislation to correct any problems.	
<b>ACTION</b>	A motion to advance was made By George Meyer. Motion 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Steve Bechtka. A roll call vote was taken. Results were 13 in favor and 3 opposed. Motion Carried	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
	Committee chair will advise resolution writer	

**G. RESOLUTION 040623 NON- LETHAL PREDATOR CONTROL**

**[PRESENTER]**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	The resolution was read by the committee chair. Public comments in support of the resolution were given by Amy Mueller- Barb Voightman-Debra Martin. The committee chair also read e-mails sent in support of the resolution. Committee discussion: Tashina Peplinski- Her understanding is that some non-lethal is already in place for 2023. She gave some statistics from 2012 thru 2014 on payments for losses due to wolves. Is in favor of continuing to look at non-lethal options but believes it is not the "be all end all" to the situation. Not in favor of taking hunting completely out of the equation as a means of control. Predation went down after 2021 hunting season. Michael Hamm- Questioned whether affected farmers will have the option of using lethal or non-lethal methods. The resolution is focused more on funding for such a program. Steve Bechtal- Farmers union is in favor of trying non-lethal options. Sounds like a win-win for both sides if successful. Stated that predation went way up after 2021 hunt. Danielle Johnson- Agreed with Steve Bechtal comments. Chuck Boley- In favor of giving farmers options and helping them out with cost. Concerned about non-lethal only limiting farmer control options. MarySusan- Resolution does not take away farmer options. Resolution is a funding request. Tashina Peplinski-Resolution author states that non-lethal is more effective than lethal. Is not sure if that is in fact the case. Danielle Mueller- Nothing in the resolution says that farmers will not have a lethal option.	
<b>ACTION</b>	Motion to Advance the resolution was made by Kevin Schanning. Motion 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Michael Murphy. Motion carried on a voice vote.	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	

**H. RESOLUTION 131523 CITIZEN -SCIENTIST**

**[PRESENTER]**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	The resolution was read by the committee chair. Committee discussion: Michael Murphy- in his part of the state, a lot of people use down wood to heat in the winter. Would not get much support. Mike Ellsworth- for clarification "Purple Air" is a product brand name. Tashina Peplinski- Resolution is talking about monitoring wood burning stoves but, could involve more. Wood burning is a minor part of the problem. Kevin Schanning- Not in Favor of resolution. Should go back to the author for more data to support the resolution. Butch Roberts- expressed concern about definition of "Citizen Scientist" and who would get involved. George Meyer- Explained that a citizen scientist program has been in place for about 30 years and has been applied in several areas. Individuals are certified thru training. Particle size from wood burning is a problem and could be a issue in urban areas. Monitoring could be beneficial but, not focused on a single source. Steve Bechtal – Would like a clear definition on Citizen scientist. Anyone could buy a meter and monitor. Concerned that the resolution was a result of a neighbor dispute. Would like to see other actions explored. Kevin Schanning- Would like to see the resolution go back to the author for clarification to get the resolution passed.	
<b>ACTION</b>	Motion to reject was made by Michael Murphy. Motion was 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Chuck Bowley. Motion carried on a voice vote	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
Committee Chair will contact the resolution writer		

**I. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

**MAGGIE HUTTER**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	D.N.R. Legislative liaison updated the committee on 3 recent bills that recently passed. Wisconsin Act 5 related to watershed protection grants. Wisconsin Act 6 related to eliminating the land recycling program. Wisconsin Act 12 related shared revenue. Also working their way thru the system are AB312 related to PFAS funding. AB11 Related to park fee waivers for 4 <sup>th</sup> graders. AB270 related to hunter safety requirements for minors. All 3 of these bills resulted from Resolutions that came thru the congress process. She will send an e-mail to all committee members with links to the text of each bill. Matt when was introduced as the new Law enforcement liaison replacing Matt O'Brian.	
<b>ACTION</b>	Informational only.	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	

**[PRESENTER]**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>		
-------------------	--	--

<b>ACTION</b>	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

**J [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC]**

**[PRESENTER]**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	
<b>ACTION</b>	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

**K [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC]**

**[PRESENTER]**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	
<b>ACTION</b>	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

**L [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC]**

**[PRESENTER]**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	
<b>ACTION</b>	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

**M [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC]**

**[PRESENTER]**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	
<b>ACTION</b>	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

**N [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC]**

**[PRESENTER]**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	
<b>ACTION</b>	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

**J. [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC]**

**[PRESENTER]**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	814
<b>ACTION</b>	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

**K. [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC]****[PRESENTER]**

DISCUSSION		
ACTION		
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	

**L. [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC]****[PRESENTER]**

DISCUSSION		
ACTION		
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	

**M. [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC]****[PRESENTER]**

DISCUSSION		
ACTION		
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	

**N. [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC]****[PRESENTER]**

DISCUSSION		
ACTION		
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	

**O. [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC]****[PRESENTER]**

DISCUSSION		
ACTION		
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	

**P. [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC]****[PRESENTER]**

DISCUSSION		
ACTION		
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	

**Q. [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC]****[PRESENTER]**

DISCUSSION		
ACTION		
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	

--	--

**R. [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC]**

**[PRESENTER]**

DISCUSSION		
ACTION		
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	

**S. [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC]**

**[PRESENTER]**

DISCUSSION		
ACTION		
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	

**T. [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC]**

**[PRESENTER]**

DISCUSSION		
ACTION		
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	

**U. [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC]**

**[PRESENTER]**

DISCUSSION		
ACTION		
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	

**III. MEMBERS MATTERS**

DISCUSSION	Kevin Schanning suggested committee members reach out to their legislators to get the 3 pending bills passed. Michael Hamm commented that the meeting went well. George Meyer thanked the committee for forwarding the asset tag resolution. Danielle Johnson commented that this was her first legislative committee meeting and enjoyed the experience. Tim Grunewald. Also new and appreciated the opportunity to be involved. Chuck Boley. All committee members should push for legislation to move these resolutions forward. Tashina Peplinski thanked everybody for forwarding resolutions based on their merit whether they agreed or not. Mike Murphy requested that the D.N.R. liaison forward a copy of her remarks to all the committee members and thanked the committee chair for conducting a well-run meeting.
ACTION	None required

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

MEETING ADJOURNED	Motion To adjourn was made by Mike Murphy. Motion 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Gary Roehr 8.43 P.M.
SUBMITTED BY	Harold Drake
DATE	9/11/23