



Wisconsin Conservation Congress  
 Rules and Resolutions  
 Meeting Minutes

**WCC Meeting Minutes**  
 Form 8300-026 (R 11/17) Page 1 of 4

<b>ORDER OF BUSINESS</b>	12/08/2022	6:30PM	ZOOM
--------------------------	------------	--------	------

**I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

<b>Meeting called to order by</b>	Kevin Smaby at 6:30 PM
-----------------------------------	------------------------

**B. ROLL CALL**

<b>ATTENDEES</b>	Tony Blattler, Kathy Presnell, Brad Wagner, Mary Susan Diedrich, Joel Taylor, Brad Hopp, Ken Anderson, Mike Gullickson, Kevin Smaby, Butch Roberts, LaVonne Liebrecht, Fred Wollenburg, Reed Kabelowsky, Jim Burmeister, Gary Dieck
<b>EXCUSED</b>	Matt McHugh and Larry Bonde
<b>UNEXCUSED</b>	
<b>GUESTS</b>	

**C. AGENDA APPROVAL/REPAIR**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Chair looked for approval with discretion on the order of the citizen resolutions being altered
<b>ACTION</b>	Motion to approve-Tony Blattler Second-Reed Kabelowsky Unanimous approval

**D. REVIEW COMMITTEE MISSION STATEMENT**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Mission statement was read by Chair Smaby
<b>ACTION</b>	Motion to approve-Kathy Presnell Second-Mike Gullickson

**E. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Diane Cain-gave her support for Advisory Committee term limits. Frustrated with the biased attitudes of certain committees. Delegates represent the citizens and not their own interests. Need change.</p> <p>Valarie Gibbons-Extending the virtual option of meetings to better serve the disabled and home bound. Statute of the State supports this along with the Disabilities Act.</p> <p>Josh Mueller - Expressed concern of resolutions he had submitted that had passed advisory committee and never made it to the Spring Hearing for state input. Why or how can they just be thrown out? Had many comments on the process and the attitude of the WCC.</p> <p>Francisco Santiago- The WCC represents the citizens, With the on-line input the WCC has gained more perspective of the feeling of the general population of the State. Committees are rejecting resolutions with no discussion. The resolution process should give the WCC the accountability of what they represent. All the people of the State.</p> <p>Cynthia Samels - Enjoyed listening in on the Ad Hoc Resolution Committee that was formed by the Rules and Resolutions Committee. Enjoyed the positive progress and discussion that can come from that meeting. She had listened in on a Bear Committee meeting and had to say it was a disaster, There was no discussion on any of the resolutions and there was many shared opinions from the committee members that these resolutions do not meet their interests in the sport. Thus the rejections. They need to be held accountable for their actions by the Code of Procedure that the Rules and Resolutions Committee represents</p> <p>Amy Mueller - Fur, Wolf, and Bear committees do not support anything that would change the way the laws are now unless it satisfies their own interests or enhances their harvest capabilities. They do not represent the Citizens of Wisconsin. Term limits would ensure open minded decisions and at least discussion on resolutions submitted by the citizens.</p>
<b>ACTION</b>	

**II. INFORMATION & ACTION ITEMS**

- A. A7 - Term limits for WCC advisory committee members. (020722, 133622, 581222, 641622, 682322) [PRESENTER]

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Authors testimony;</p> <p>Jean Voss - There needs to be more discussion between the authors and citizens. The Bear committee does not listen to or absorb information that they do not want to hear. Citizens were rejected to speak. Many opinions of bias were given by the members of the committee. Asked if the chair sets up his or her own select committee to protect the interests of the committee.</p>
-------------------	--

	<p>Josh Mueller - This resolution should be advanced. It was altered at the request of the Rules and Resolutions committee and was resubmitted in 2022 from 2021. Code of Procedure states that if 2 same or like resolutions are submitted and passed in the same three counties for two years that it should be forwarded.</p> <p>Steve Beining - Was going to let this go but after watching the Bear committee meeting, changed his mind and now has the drive to persue term limits. They seem to support lobbying groups for the sport more so than the citizens of the State.</p> <p>Committee discussion;</p> <p>Jim - There good dedicated people in the WCC. Would like to see a 6 yr term</p> <p>Reed - This should not pertain to all committees. Expressed his passion for the YCC</p> <p>Tony - Committee chairs do not appoint their membership. This is done at the district level.</p> <p>Kevin - Stated that last yrs resolution and this years resolution are not exactly the same so therefore cannot be automatically forwarded as Josh stated</p> <p>Kathy - 4 yrs is enough time to adjust to the workings of a committee</p> <p>Joel - Cannot support this as it is written. Not enough detail on how it can be done</p> <p>Brad Wagner - The intent is good but needs to be tweaked</p> <p>Mary Susan - Express how hard it is to get comfortable in a committee before you want to contribute to the discussion. 6 yr terms would have to be the minimum because of the adjustments needed</p> <p>Brad Hopp - Apologized to the authors. We went through this last year, you made the changes requested and now more change is needed. Respected their efforts. This was brought up at his district meeting and was met with much push back from the established delegates. District Leadership was supposed to promote this but nothing changed.</p> <p>Kathy - Can we make the proper adjustments if the author would be willing to do that?</p> <p>Jim B - Read in the COP that the resolution do not have to be exact but need to be like to be automatically forwarded</p>
<b>ACTION</b>	Motion to advance - Brad Hopp Second - Kathy Presnill Roll call vote - 5 yea and 10 nay Resolution rejected.
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

**B. A5 Remote voting for WCC Delegates (041822, 133222, 200822, 641322, 681722, 711022} [PRESENTER]**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Author testimony;</p> <p>Jason Maloney - Mission states that delegates are to be elected by their county constituents. Last year there were 100 seats filled by appointment.</p> <p>Committee discussion;</p> <p>Jim - Can we include an election with the Spring Hearing county input?</p> <p>Kari - We don't have access to the State election process</p> <p>Joel - No way we can come up with the technology</p> <p>Reed - We need to encourage people to fill seats. Our intent is not to avoid democracy</p> <p>Tony - We've been working hard on this subject. Covid threw us into this situation</p> <p>Ken - The counties need to elect their delegates. Thats the rule</p>
<b>ACTION</b>	Motion to accept Reed Kabelowsky Second Tony Blattner Becuase of a point of order Tonys second was not for acceptance . Joel Taylor had a motion to reject that Tony was supporting with his second. Motion to reject - Joel Taylor Second Tony Blattner Unanimous support
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

**C. A1 Continue the option for all WCC meetings to have virtual access. {040622} [PRESENTER]**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Author testimony;</p> <p>Kathy - The virtual access has given me interest and perspective and thus gave me the willingness and opportunity to serve on the WCC. This give more opportunity for citizens to speak. We need our democracy.</p> <p>Committee discussion;</p> <p>Reed - There are difficulties with mass involvement</p> <p>Joel - Not against the concept. There is a lot of opportunity for failure with technology</p> <p>Mike - How would we facilitate this</p> <p>Tony - we can't require this like the statement says in the resolution. There is the opportunity to participate through ZOOM.</p> <p>Kathy - We are in a Zoom Meeting now. Can we change the statement to opportunity instead of require?</p> <p>Tony - Is Kathy putting forth an amendment to her resolution?</p>
-------------------	---

	Brad Wagner - What is the cost of Zoom? Kari - Program pays for the Zoom license. The cost is time. Agendas all have a virtual component. A licensed person has to host the Zoom meeting.
<b>ACTION</b>	Motion to reject - Joel Taylor Second - Tony Blattler Motion to reject passed unanimously
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

**D. A2 Creating more democracy in the WCC [PRESENTER]**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Tony - We are an advisory group for the DNR and DLC. We represent the resources of the State in that realm Reed - e represent the statewide impact Kathy - When Leopold design this he wanted democracy Mike - Milwaukee county would would have more to say about concerns outside their district Than the people in that district Jim - Milwaukee county used to have a district, why did that change? Kevin - They didn't delegate representation Tony - The people that vacation around the state don't know what the resource concerns are of the area they are vacationing in.
<b>ACTION</b>	Motion to reject - Tony Blattler Second - Butch Roberts Motion to reject passed unanimously with 2 nays
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

**E. A3 Delegate status of graduating Youth Congress Delegates [PRESENTER]**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Ken - This could pose problems cause some counties do not have youth delegates. This would also create an even number of voters in the county Reed - What dictates a graduate? Kathy - Agreed with both but it would be good to keep these young people involved Tony - This doesn't solve the problem of youth involvement Mary Susan - This would take the vote away from the county chair with the even number of delegates Mike - Would that individual be assigned to a committee? Reed - Yes they would sit on committees Brad Hopp - They are eligible to run for a seat through the county election process
<b>ACTION</b>	Motion to advance - Ken Anderson Second - Mary Susan Diedrich Motion failed unanimously Resolution rejected
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

**F. A4 Eliminate non-resident participation in the Spring Hearing process [PRESENTER]**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Author testimony; Al Lobner - Why do we allow people who do not reside in our state the right to have input on our resources? We don't have the luxury to do that in any other state! Kari - Just wanted to add info for the record that out of the 28,000 citizens that provided input, 2% were from out of state Committee discussion; Mike - Can we handle a large input from out of state if it arises? Kari - The 2% generally have ownership or vacation in Wisconsin Reed - Is their input counted? Kari - They are only allowed to provide input on Spring Hearing questions. Not in the county level Tony - We make our decisions on all the input that is provided. That creates our decisions to accept or reject Brad Wagner - We need to explore this more as far as what characterizes a citizen. Does our mission mean just the citizens of the state or citizens that use and share our resources from around the country
<b>ACTION</b>	Motion to reject - James Burmeister Second - Mike Gullickson Motion to reject passed unanimously
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

--	--

**G. A6 Request the WCC to approve all advisory committee meeting minutes** [PRESENTER]

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Author testimony; Jerome Donahoe - He had experience exclusion from minutes in the past after testimony. All info needs to be admitted to records properly Kari - Currently the minutes are written by the secretaries and then sent to the chair for the approval needed, Then they are posted Committee discussion; Ken - Minutes in other type meeting are posted as a draft Reed - Being a secretary is challenging enough. This would create more of a burden to the task Jim - Can we send a draft to the committee for approval? Joel - The point of the minutes is a generalization of the working of the meeting Mary Susan - Agrees with Joel Kathy - How long are the recordings kept Kari - 30 days. People can request a recording Jerome - Where are the minutes shown to be approved? Kari - They have been approved when posted	
<b>ACTION</b>	Motion to reject - Tony Blattler Second - Brad Hopp Motion carried to reject unanimously	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>		<b>DEADLINE</b>

**H. Rest of the agenda** [PRESENTER]

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Doodle pool will be set up to have the meeting within the next two weeks. The remaining agenda will be addressed then. Kevin - Answer the pool immediately when getting it. We need better response time than this meeting!!!	
<b>ACTION</b>	Motion to table the rest of the agenda until the next meeting - Joel Taylor Second - Mike Gullickson Motion carried with 2 nays	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>		<b>DEADLINE</b>

**III. MEMBERS MATTERS**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	It was 10:00 and member matters will addressed at the next meeting
<b>ACTION</b>	

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

<b>MEETING ADJOURNED</b>	<b>Motion adjourn - Brad Hopp Second - Butch Roberts Unanimous approval 10:00PM</b>
<b>SUBMITTED BY</b>	<b>Brad Hopp</b>
<b>DATE</b>	<b>12/09/2022</b>