

October 29, 2008 Stewardship CAC Meeting

Sticky Note Exercise

1. Review Process

- ◆ Has the DNR received any local objections to grant projects under the interim protocol?
- ◆ Does the public input process in developing NRB approved plans (e.g. Land Legacy Report, Wildlife Action Plans, etc.) suffice for the public input process required for grant projects, if the purchase is within the plan? If not, why not?
- ◆ Meaningful alternative – How do you envision that? Other DNR processes require alternative by applicant.
- ◆ Can prohibitions be approved on a project basis as opposed to parcel by parcel?
- ◆ Will there be a timeline to the process of dealing with a “bona fide” objection? How does the timeline coincide with a land purchase closing date?
- ◆ Generally good 1st try – include checklist.
- ◆ Clarify public input process utilized
- ◆ What is the WEPA process?
- ◆ “Public Input Process” should be changed. The applicant should describe how their acquisition is consistent with adopted plans (Land Legacy Report, etc.) and describe how public input was sought (i.e. WEPA). An additional public hearing should not be required. It could severely hamper non-profit acquisition.
- ◆ What does “description” of public input process mean? Is anything more than a narrative intended? Is it correct to say: Review process appears – where prohibition – is so much longer, it will serve to kill projects where hunting is not permitted.

2. Public Safety

- ◆ What definition of hunting are you using now?
- ◆ The additional review steps concerning prohibitions for hunting, will have a disproportionate adverse impact on urbanized areas where hunting is not safe. How is this not true?
- ◆ Shouldn't SCORP Land legacy and Master Plans be updated to reflect 23.0916 if we are using them as foundation?
- ◆ Primary purpose that predates 23.0916 must be updated.
- ◆ 1. Has the department ever voided a hunting/fishing/trapping local ordinance? 2. Could you give any examples?
- ◆ Does the requirement to explain legislative intent behind ordinance apply just to local government? Or to other grantees and the DNR as well?
- ◆ 1. Can the board relegate authority for reviewing objections (standing stewardship committee or other appointed groups)? To address perception of incompatible uses: How will prohibitions that only apply to certain time periods be treated? Will this be considered a full prohibition or a limitation?
- ◆ How many local ordinances to date have been challenged under 29.0387?

3. Usership

- ◆ Our goal should be to maximize the number of users on a property. If allowing all 5 uses results in fewer numbers of users, than a prohibition is warranted.
- ◆ Grant application should not be downgraded because one activity has been prohibited. As long as it meets requirements of law, should not be downgraded.
- ◆ Usership pattern is not the same thing as user conflict. Accommodating users implies making sure we're meeting the recreational demands and needs of the boarder public. Use SCORP as a guide.
- ◆ Need to look regionally at recreational demands and what needs are not being met in an area. This will determine primary purpose of project.
- ◆ Stewardship needs to meet the needs of entire population, not just specific user groups. That's what "usership patterns" implies.
- ◆ Usership Pattern: In usership pattern – our conversation didn't speak of a regionalist approach for analysis, (i.e. if cross-country skiing was recommended to be prohibited – an analysis of where cross-country skiing is available for the population. Same with all NBOA's.