



Wisconsin Conservation Congress
 Resolution Review Post Mortem
 Meeting Minutes

WCC Meeting Minutes
 Form 8300-026 (R 11/17) Page 1 of 3

ORDER OF BUSINESS	04/25/2023	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, Tony Blattler, Reed Kabelowski, Fred Wollenburg, Mary Ellen O'Brien, Steve Klock, Jerome Donohue, Claude Bovi, Brad Hopp, Brian Haydin
EXCUSED	Arby Humphrey, Tony Grabski, MarySusan Diedrich, Gary Dieck, Scott Pitta
UNEXCUSED	Paul Reith, Joe Weiss, Tom Johnson,
GUESTS	Kari Lee Zimmerman DNR, Kathy Preznell, Amy Mueller, Cynthia Samuels

C. AGENDA APPROVAL/REPAIR

DISCUSSION	None
ACTION	None

D. REVIEW COMMITTEE MISSION STATEMENT

DISCUSSION	N/A
ACTION	N/A

E. PUBLIC COMMENTS

DISCUSSION	N/A
ACTION	N/A

II. INFORMATION & ACTION ITEMS

A. Post Mortem on Resolution Review Process

[PRESENTER]

DISCUSSION	<p>What went right?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed on time and not as stressful! • Using Box.com – so much more streamlines and visibility to all resolutions! • Search function in Box.com • I liked the timeline and we shouldn't change it. Public had no problem getting their Resolutions in on time. • Quality of resolutions was much better and the parameters were good, along with the structure • Helped each other along to get through Box. Created good communication that was shared and helping each other through the resolutions. Pretty awesome. Got some different thoughts on what to do. • Training was helpful. 1st year doing it. Felt confident when reaching out to the authors. • Appreciated the new policy on the shotgun resolutions and not having to coordinate with all authors. • Greater understanding of the resolution process by the authors. Speaking to them and appreciating what is involved in the resolution process. • Good to have the rules and resolutions to go through the resolutions before this meeting and they appreciated our efforts and they appreciated the clarity. • Batched Shotgun resolutions were much easier to go through at Rules and Regulations. • Authors very appreciative of the help with their resolutions from the committee members. • The new software, box.com, worked great and I hope we use it going forward. • Having time to sift through the resolutions sent my way was ideal. <p>What did you learn?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still lots of work to do with authors in writing resolutions. • Video walkthrough of process • Box-In was OK when figured out with help. • I did not hear any complaints from the public. In fact, there were compliments on rewording some of the Resolutions • Authors liked their Resolution shortened and thought they made more sense when rewritten. • I will try to harder to learn Box with help next year and reach out for help.
------------	---

- Shotgun resolutions – belief that authors would get others from other counties to submit to get approval. Then learned about the 3/2 rule. The shotgun resolutions promoted the 3/2 rule.
- Continues to be a 50/50 split about the authors that put in time to research their resolution before they write up their resolutions.
- Encourage authors to learn more about what is being done related to their resolution.
- Better instructions for next year.
- Need to learn Box better for year. Appreciated the help.
- More of the resolutions were multi-faceted than what we have had in the past. I need to pay more attention to that with the authors and try to sort out the important data points and ensure it is clear.
- 3/2 rule – disappointed but appreciated learning about our position on certain topics and having to learn about it through the process. If we have a position, agree we shouldn't have another resolution come through. Very informative.
- Confusion in Box into Word and back to Box and gave you an old draft. A little issue with moving back and forth.
- Many more positives this year than challenges and some things we need to look at next year. Obvious things that got through and should have had further adjustments. Assumptions made, leading statements, derogatory. Wasn't in WCC or DNR mission. Continue with the education at the beginning of process.
- Fuddle through Box.
- Learning experience about Box and figured out and by time I was comfortable with it we were done. Will need to relearn it for next year.

Based on what you know now, what should have been done differently?

- Batching of similar/like(shotgun) resolutions. Can't do it in batches.
- Need to do real time edits on Box.com (web) not app, not email.
- Need to document if no changes required.
- Need a solid communication plan and someone in WCC to execute it
- With so many people doing edits, the nomenclature being used was confusing for department staff on what needed to be submitted for the resolution.
- 2nd set of reviews for all resolutions by a small group of people.
- Have a 1, 2, 3 count of resolutions vs what is on the computer.
- When reviewing the resolution, it is difficult to determine which committee it should go to. Maybe have author direct towards the committee. Have the author focus on the area the resolution should be written to.
- Need to include more instructions to resolution authors to keep the language the same for shotgun resolutions and adding "other author" info is not encouraged.

What obstacles or unanticipated circumstances made it difficult to complete the resolution review?

- More box.com training and better instructions
- Moving of resolutions to the right folders
- Lack of phone numbers
- Not seeing all author information (contact) in similar/like(shotgun) resolutions. Only seeing the original author.
- Authors can be difficult to contact if they do not provide a phone number. It became clear to me because two of my authors did not give phone numbers and only email so I could not call them. Also the emails they provided were secondary emails that they did not check frequently. Finally, I entered one email address incorrectly so my message did not go through and the other emails were spammed through their email filter. Authors should be required to provide a phone number where they can be reached.
- Requires Legislative Action – Didn't know if it was required or not – need more instruction.
- Email sometimes wasn't correct and had phone number to reach them.
- Two instances where resolutions were submitted by people outside the county – Lake association. Had conversations prior to the resolution writing process to help them understand the process. Need to address for next year.

What didn't go as planned or anticipated?

- Similar/Like (shotgun) resolution review and batching the resolutions. – Do we change the timeline to allow for a longer review time.

What suggestions do you have for 2024?

- Better clarity around WCC positions.
- Group walk through of a handful of resolutions.
- More box.com training and better instructions
- All contact information is required – phone and email
- Need a solid communication plan and someone in WCC to execute it
- Worth my time as a WCC Delegate to assist them in writing their resolutions and they were appreciative of my efforts. I will assist again next year if help is needed.
- Keep up the good work. Solicited reviewers, great experience and we all learned from it.
- Adding a disclaimer – where we list contact information that if we cannot reach you, resolution will automatically be rejected.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity on legislative and what isn't and explain to the authors that once it goes through WCC process they will need to follow up with legislators to push through the legislative process • Last NRB meeting – They will not pursue legislation review. Should WCC include? We do have legislators contacting Kari for input and statewide statistics. • Ensure Statewide impact is included in the instructions. May need to look into this a bit more. Is there anything in WI that is not of statewide importance? • Gauging public input and value in the resolution process that is what is critical for the WCC process. • This process of online submission ahead of time and processing them in a timely basis is far superior than glancing at a paper copy of a resolution that is penned in pencil. 	
ACTION	Terri to create report for Convention	
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE		DEADLINE
	Terri	5/11/23

B. [DESCRIPTION OF TOPIC] [PRESENTER]

DISCUSSION		
ACTION		
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE		DEADLINE

III. MEMBERS MATTERS

DISCUSSION	None
ACTION	None

IV. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING ADJOURNED	7:58 pm
SUBMITTED BY	Terri Roehrig
DATE	04/30/2023