

## **What do you value about the inland trout fishery in WI?**

### **South District**

- Sustainability, long term health in uncertain future
- Recreational opportunities for all anglers
- Abundant wild trout and easy access to health streams (stream easement program)
- Statewide quantity of trout streams, diversity in stream types and fishing opportunities
- Land ethic, watershed management, good water quality
- Positive change in trout fishery over past 30-40 years, TU/DNR work on both habitat and general management
- Science-based management
- Nutrient management plans, buffers to improve water quality
- Partnerships w/ public, working w/ landowners
- New generation of fish biologists, enthusiasm, new ideas
- Progress made w/ point source pollution management
- Opportunities for different fishing styles (bait, fly, artificial, catch and release, harvest)

### **West District**

- Exists
- Cold/clean water – water quality programs
- Adequate habitat
- Public access – accessible fishing sites ex. Handicapped
- Quality trout fisheries
- Economics, \$\$
- Solitude
- Native trout
- Pride
- Large distribution
- Rod/gun clubs/coops/partnerships/volunteers
- Habitat restorations
- DNR personnel/resources/\$

### **East District**

- Stream access
- Active habitat restoration program
- Increase in trout populations in driftless area and other streams
- Species management, brook, brown and rainbow
- Variety of opportunities
- General public positively impact partnerships to impact trout streams
- Clean water

- No barriers to trout fishing us multiple methods
- Extended season to use resource
- Citizen based monitoring
- Can find peace and quiet, more room for people
- Good water rights compared to western states
- Culture, fishing traditions in Wisconsin, unique
- More emphasis on habitat rather than stocking
- Affordable, easy to get into compared to other states

### **North District**

- Diversity of landscapes, driftless, sand streams, northland streams
- Trout bigger = better
- Available – easy access (no boat)
- Solitude
- Size and coverage of streams
- Trout indicator of good land management
- Heritage of conservation
- Wild-native fish in an intact ecosystem
- Enjoy rivers, multiple habitat – changes around bend
- Catching fish a challenge
- Economic value to region
- Trout as a food value
- A way to connect people to land and ecosystem
- Anglers passionate and dedicated (willing to spend money on conservation)
- Relationship building (families)
- Mental health
- Physical health
- Trout habitat = habitat for other species (otter/beaver)

### **What concerns you about trout management in the future?**

### **South District**

- Environmental changes, adapting to changing climate
- Land use changes, particularly the influence of agricultural development on trout streams (e.g. manure)
- Water use depletion, high-cap wells
- Water quality, manure management, lax enforcement of regulations, lax penalties, non-point sources
- Recruiting next generation, continuing the positive progress we've made
- Non-point sources: sediments, nutrient runoff, manure, phosphorus, nitrogen, stormwater
- Continued funding for trout, trout stamp, trout propagation, as well as maintaining current funding in the face of inflation, etc.

- Missed opportunities due to inadequate funding
- Loss of fishing access, loss of easements, habitat loss, predation, beaver control
- Predation, invasive species, beaver control, New Zealand mudsnails
- Politics: non-science based management of resources

### **West District**

- Youth exposure – education – getting outdoors
- Climate change
- Water rights
- Land use practices, row cropping, tillage, buffers, high cap wells
- Fisheries relationship w/other programs that regulate land/water use, monitoring legislation – high cap wells
- Commitment with coops rearing trout
- Managing native brook trout in the face of climate change – habitat restoration for brook trout
- Long term management of riparian areas
- Habitat maintenance
- Cost sharing for farm/ag
- Lack of \$
- State budget process and prioritization

### **East District**

- Increase in kayaking and tubing
- Groundwater depletion
- Awareness of where stream easements start and stop
- Funding – need enough for good management
- Political influence on trout/nat. resource management
- Invasive species
- Lack of adequate research funds to do needed research
- Lack of angler diversity
- Water pollution
- Preserve brook trout in the face of climate change
- Trout classification reassessments
- Maintain native trout genetics
- Genetic modifications and impacts to native trout
- Use biology and science and not so much politics and social drivers
- Use watershed approach to fish management
- Rule simplification vs. specific streams and circumstances
- New anglers and young anglers
- Better communications as it relates to engaging the non-angling public
- Spots for new and old anglers
- Communicate with legislators on real issues

## **North District**

- Legislature doing management -DNR secretary
- Denial of climate change
- Removing science from management (wetland rule roll backs, non federal)
- De-regulation (water protections – CAFOs, mining, high cap wells)
- One size doesn't fit all
- Take geology into account
- Pressure to go catch and release – to much emphasis?
- Under utilization of resource
- Personal use and consumption
- User groups aging out – lack of recruitment
- Trout fishing too solitary?
- Maintaining beaver control – made an investment
- Accessible trout fishing (stocking)
- Infrastructure at local level – decrease of funding
- Is there a need for increased trout funding (stamp and license)
- Native vs naturalized populations
- Better information – regs and access
- Easements- county, township, federal, state – generally only fed and state show up on maps
- Tribal rights - educate

## **Goals for the plan**

### **South District**

- Increase from 25 miles of stream restoration/year to 100 miles/year; 2 habitat teams in SD
- Explore possibility of year-round season using research and social considerations/easements; explore possibility of using live bait during C/R season considering research and social concerns
- Explore alternative funding source beyond just Trout Stamp
- Focused area for family/youth fishing; natural setting vs. urban
- Improve accessibility and habitat restoration near urban areas
- Trophy angling opportunities/stream designation
- Continue use of science-based management
- Establish funding to stay ahead of inflation rate
- Increase trout research, trout management specifically
- Improve collaboration w/ agriculture industry
- More responsive and flexible regulations to address management issues such as stunting, etc.
- More public access

- Raise awareness of economic benefit of fishing

### **West District**

- Integration of coops
  - Increase public access
  - Promotion of trout fishing and the program
  - Science and research – stay ahead
  - Implement management recommendations that stem from climate change
  - Monitoring (long term) temps and abiotic comp.
  - Watershed approach to management – drainage district issues
  - Implementing genetic component
  - Priority management for priority streams – brook trout, where work is needed
  - Working with landowners to improve streams without public access
  - Generating revenue – priority needs
  - More coops
  - Evaluation of habitat projects
  - Increase outreach, communication with public
1. Increase and maintain partnerships, general public, agriculture, coops, angling groups
  2. Research and science – evaluation of what we do, genetics, land-use and watershed management
  3. Monitoring and evaluation, streams, classification
  4. Funding and priority setting – long term
  5. Education, outreach, promotion

### **East District**

- Science trumps social – do appropriate science
- Communication strategy/plan
- Angler recruitment strategy/plan
- Increase access and maintenance of access
- Increase restoration and therefore better NR and less stocking
- Population assessments
- More kids fishing
- More NR
- More national awareness of our fishery
- Better stream access, brushing
- More variety of fishing experiences, e.g.. Flat/raft
- Improved stewardship
- Trout management plan built on sound science
- Different types of anglers working together
- Increase restoration and decrease stocking
- Alternative funding and group coops doing work

- More easements and access
- Improved stream connectivity at road crossings
- Better signage – landowners, boundaries and easements
- Grant funding – education and research
- Legislation out of fish rule making
- DNR keep equip to do the restorations
- More DNR staff/field staff
- License fee increase
- Allow DNR to talk/lobby
- Continue using stakeholders in process

### **North District**

- Trout numbers as high – increase trout anglers
- More trout/bigger trout – native brookies
- Increased access – easements
- Less stocking – more natural reproduction
- Tag alder succeeding to forest
- Fishability brushing
- More habitat crews in north
- More urban/youth fishing opportunities – put/grow/take stocking
- Determine impact of high caps
- Increase beaver control
- Adequate funding
- Interagency cooperation – universities, agencies
- Maintain water quality
- Proper funding for program needs
- Maintain and enhance inland lake trout
- Address liability issues
- Stream connectivity – culverts, road crossings
- Utilize tech to inform and clarify
- Reestablish dnr role in policy and legislation
- Facilitate and improve collaboration
- Continue to develop and use science (climate, genetics)
- Enhance young people/citizens in planning and monitoring.