

**Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Stewardship Citizen Advisory Committee**

**Small Group Findings
(In Order of Report-Out)
September 29, 2008**

Question 1: How to deal with local ordinances that are in effect and restrict one or more activities?

Group 1:

- o Local ordinances should be on a list of consideration by DNR.

Group 2:

- o How widespread are ordinances related to discharge of firearms, trapping and hunting?
- o When and how will local ordinances be reviewed in DNR process?
- o How many have been problematic?
- o An ordinance is an indicator that there is a public safety concern. There needs to be a narrative as to why there is a public safety concern.
- o Use existing process to review grants and ordinances. Don't extend the life of the application.
- o A restriction or prohibition of one of the five NBA's based on one of the three exceptions will not affect the rating, ranking or eligibility of a grant application.

Group 3:

- o Provide clarification as to the impact an ordinance can have on a non-profit's grant application., e.g., Where land trust would be able to get a grant and where they wouldn't. Provide some hypothetical examples that would explain the interpretation. An independent third party would have the most credibility.

Question 2: How to address public perception vs. reality of safety concerns and hunting?

Group 2:

- o We considered this a usership pattern/issue.

Group 3:

- o Hunting is very safe. We're not dealing with a safety issue, but a usership issue.
- o It's incumbent upon user groups and the department to create and implement a strong education program to deal with perceptions. A shared responsibility.
- o Anyone who is enjoying a NBA, is reflecting upon their entire community. One bad apple...
- o There are some perceived threats that need a reporting mechanism to document them, to determine if they actually are threats.
- o Use time and space, spatial management.
- o How does DNR define a "threat"? Is there a distinction between "incident" and "conflict"? How do we measure conflict? How do we define and measure conflict?
- o Judge by the facts.

Group 1:

- o Agree with Group 3, but also be aware that as perceptions improve, so could usage density.
- o There is self-regulation within the hunting community.
- o User groups and state can communicate facts about hunter safety.

Questions 3 and 4: How to factor in differences in urban areas vs. rural areas? How do property shape, size, location, attributes and adjacent property uses affect safety concerns?

Group 3:

- Step up notification on multiple uses.
- Separate uses by time.
- Defining methods of hunting, e.g. bow vs. rifle, and types, e.g. deer vs. small game.
- Monitor use through time.
- Lower levels of restrictions rather than eliminating.

Group 1:

- Safety considerations on case by case basis.
- Utilize toolbox to maximize opportunities, including random access permits.
- Create a one-stop-shop online for access permits for NGO's and LUG's

Group 2:

- Not really urban vs. rural, but case by case, how close to activity.
- Consider method of hunting, space, the season, time of day and geographical area.
- Signage should be an allowable cost, e.g. endowment.
- Each property should be analyzed, based on the features of the property itself. May be able to accommodate multiple uses based on the attributes.

Usership Patterns:

- How are all possible uses of the property established?
- Not all properties are suitable for the 5 NBA's and that's OK.
- Is there an intended priority use?

This topic will have a lot more discussion. Statute says we have to look at all five activities regardless of the priority. Priorities help shape the discussion.