Wisconsin Conservation Congress Spring Hearings Subcommitee Meeting Minutes



ORDER OF BUSINESS	01/17/2022	6:30 pm	Zoom
-------------------	------------	---------	------

I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

A. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order by	Terri Roehrig at	6:33 pm

B. ROLL CALL

ATTENDEES	Terri Roehrig Tashina Peplinski Reed Kabelowsky Fred Wollenburg Arby Humphrey Paul Reith Brock Rosenkranz MarySusan Diedrich Ken Anderson Kari Lee Zimmerman Tony Blattler
EXCUSED	
UNEXCUSED	
GUESTS	

C. AGENDA APPROVAL/REPAIR

DISCUSSION	None
ACTION	Motion to approve agenda by Fred Wollenburg, 2nd by Reed Kabelowsky. Motion Carried.

D. REVIEW COMMITTEE MISSION STATEMENT

DISCUSSION	N/A
ACTION	N/A

E. PUBLIC COMMENTS

TODELE COMMITENTE		
DISCUSSION	Cynthia Samels but wasn't present during this time.	
ACTION	None	

II. INFORMATION & ACTION ITEMS

A. Overview of Resolution Process

Kari

DISCUSSION	a. Kari provided an overview of process last year which included citizens submitted resolutions electronically and a
	PDF of the resolution was uploaded into the online input tool.
	b. On the back end, resolution was received and the following challenges were encountered:
	Volume of resolutions
	Resolution deadline date was as close to Spring Hearings as possible
	• Some authors did their homework on the resolution, others did not
	Quality of resolution
	a. Each resolution needs review to ensure it is:
	b. Accurate
	c. Unbiased
	d. Has a problem and solution
	e. Is not a complaint
	• Got too overwhelming to review all of the resolutions in time and some were just passed through
	DISCUSSION
	Mary Susan asked if we have the cutoff date, can the resolutions be reviewed by the county just like the Spring
	Hearings?

Kari responded:

- 1. It is a possibility an option to spread out the burden
- 2. Trade-off you have 72 people checking the resolutions
- 3. Terri commented about the need to educate the reviewers

Ken Anderson discussed that all resolutions are biased, and the resolutions have to be in a Yes or No format. Fred Wollenburg commented that we need more time to review and correct. Not sure if each county reviewing is realistic. Need parameters for the reviewers.

Arby Humphrey asked if we had a skeleton crew review, how many resolutions? How much time was allowed to review?

Kari shared that online as similar to in person in that we gave citizens enough time to write resolutions and get them in. WCC had 1 week to review. Had over 400 resolutions. WCC reviewers was about 5-8 people.

Reed Kabelowsky explained that he didn't know what was expected of him as a reviewer last year and he needed more guidance.

Kari explained that the COP doesn't provide guidance for online review. In person, the county delegates are reviewing the resolutions. She stated that we need to clearly define the process. We need to know the delegates roles in the process and help the citizens bring better requests to the public.

Reed Kabelowsky suggested a deadline March 1 and that we teach 10 people to review really well.

Kari shared that the Rules and Resolutions committee suggested March 1 and March 15 for deadlines for resolutions. This would allow time to review. This will require a strong communication push out to WI citizens to let them know of the new deadline.

Mary Susan recommended March 20 as a deadline.

Fred Wollenburg suggested March 5 to give adequate time to review and contact author for corrections.

Ken Anderson asked if we could look to move to in person hearings after this year.

- Review/create template with guidance instructions
- a. Terri asked Kari share the Resolution template

DISCUSSION

Paul Reith suggested that we split up the submission into 3 parts

- Title submission text box (with limited # of characters) and include notes on the guidance for writing a title
- Problem Statement and include notes on the description, outline the problem
- Solution (call to action in the form of a question)

Kari suggested that we include how to reinforce that "scientific" claims will require documentation eventually if it passes and goes to committee.

Terri asked How do we ensure the resolution is objective and supportable?

Kari explained that authors don't do "due diligence" but they're still frustrated.

Terri responded indeed they're frustrated; how can we get them to be more successful?

Arby Humphrey felt we needed to restate item #5 in the guidance rules as the language is confusing about the statutes.

Terri gave an example of the back tags and how that would require legislative action because that law was passed by legislative action.

Kari discussed the statute requirement

Fred Wollenburg felt that #5 is okay we need to educate writers and readers

Reed Kablowsky shared that we need toteach the public how to write the resolution and we need to add subpoints for the reviewers

Kari shared that citizen are not required to cite studies. If it passes, then they need to bring studies or facts to committees or send out up front. Need to defend the claims in the committees. She also shared that citizens need to keep the emotions out of it. Citizens need to keep emotions out of it. We need to share with them they need to come prepared with the data to defend your proposal. She shared that people come to WCC with anecdotal concerns. We need to be sure that people are identifying that there is an issue.

Tashina Peplinksi asked if we can add a 4th section to cite sources or studies to support the resolution. Terri likes this recommendation.

Kari shared that some people may not know how to add a link. Journals require subscriptions and people may not have a subscription to those journals. Will get people to think if they have real sources.

Ken – not everyone has internet access, free internet access. Most people who look at resolutions will know if they are accurate or not accurate

If the resolution is going to refer to studies and question is based on science, then it must be defendable when the citizen presents to the committee.

We also discussed the need to ensure the action fits in the toolbox of options.

Citizens need to be invested in the process.

Kari suggested for this year, have a committee that can be the reviewers and are the contacts for the authors for help and assistance.

Reed Kablowsky added that Kari asked last year for volunteers and we should do that this year. Resolutions that are coming in. Reviewers also cannot form bias on the resolution.

Terri discussed that we need to have consensus on the template for submission.

Form 8300-026 (R 11/17) Page 3 of 3

	ACTIONS:
	1. Need to get a notice out to delegates.
	a. Include:
	i. Time Commitment
	2. Review the resolutions
	a. Group the resolutions when we get them
	3. Work with the authors
	4. Create Guidance to the Reviewers
	Discussion around the number on the committee included 20-25. Ask for more than we need to ensure we get the
	number we feel we need to be successful. Reed felt that 20 may be enough. Paul commented that is 1 resolution per
	day per person. Arby asked what is the response time? When do I need to be available?
	Ken recommended that a COP change happen to only allow 1 resolution per person but that has to go through Rules
	and Resolution committee.
	Fred Wollenburg asked how do we scale, read, and review the resolutions?
	Kari said there is some work to do on the back end on number assignments and assigning to the county.
	Reed Kablowsky made motion for electronic resolution deadline of March 11, 2nd by Mary Susan. Motion Carried
	Timeline:
	3/11 Deadline submission and triage
	3/18 – Deadline to review Notify author changes are necessary and collaborate Review the resolution good move
	forward and bad get remediation
	3/25 – deadline for collaboration to complete unresolved escalated to oversight team. corrections - needs to meet the
	parameters or it doesn't move it forward
	3/30 – Escalation meeting if needed all escalated are finalized (in or out) and collated list is complete
	4/1 - Deadline
ACTION	
ACTION	

B. Next Meeting Terri

DISCUSSION	Wednesday 1/26/21 @ 6:30 pm.	
ACTION	None	
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE		DEADLINE

DEADLINE

III. MEMBERS MATTERS

PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE

	Reed - R&R meeting – "Josh" presented a resolution and committee would review. It got dropped at the DLC committee and somebody needs to follow up with Josh. Reed to follow up via email Fred -Nothing Paul -Nothing MarySusan -Nothing – Thank you Kari for all you do! Arby -Nothing Brock -appreciative to be part of the process Ken - Nothing Tashina – Don't think that next year will be in person. Keep planning that we will be in this next year.
ACTION	

IV. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING ADJOURNED	8:38 pm Motion to adjourn by Mary Susan, 2nd by Tashina. Motion carried
SUBMITTED BY	Terri Roehrig/Paul Reith
DATE	01/24/2022