

Trout Stakeholder Team Meeting January 27th, 2018 – Stevens Point, WI

- I. Welcome, Introductions
 - a. Joanna Griffin – Statewide Trout Coordinator
 - b. Bob Holsman – Meeting Facilitator
 - c. Stakeholders in attendance: Mark Andre, John Armstrong, Dale Ebert, Tim Fraley, Art Hansen, Kent Johnson, Robert Korth, Tom Lager, Tim Landwehr, Laura McFarland, Jan Penn, Joshua Pyatskowitz, Sue Reinecke, Roger Roehl, Jack Saltes, Ken Schreiber, Rodney Sempf, Roger Springman, Bob Jozwowski, Dean Cummings, Topf Wells, Jim Wierzba, Gary Zimmer, John Endrizzi, Kelly Thiel
 - d. DNR staff/Trout team members in attendance: Bradley Peterson, Mike Aquino, Heath Benike, Bob Haase, Justin Haglund, Matt Mitro, Jonathan Pyatskowitz, Craig Roberts, Dave Seibel, Shawn Sullivan, Joanna Griffin, Dave Boyarski, Bob Holsman, Rachel DePalma

- II. Planning Process & Meeting Goals
 - a. Purpose of the trout team stakeholder meetings is to gather input from the public for the development of the upcoming trout management plan
 - b. Today is the first of a series of meetings that will be held for this purpose
 - c. Goals of trout plan will be formulated based on the feedback provided by stakeholders
 - i. Anglers, Trout Unlimited, landowners, WCC, business/tourism reps, Members-at-Large, tribal reps, and non-consumptive reps
 - d. The Department does not currently have a trout management plan; the development of this plan will be the first ever of its kind
 - e. Today's goals:
 - i. Stakeholders will provide framework to begin drafting the plan
 - ii. WDNR will provide stakeholders with process guidance and background information
 - iii. Develop preliminary, broad goals for the management plan
 - f. Finished plan should complement and integrate with existing program management plans (ten-year strategic plan)
 - g. Stakeholder Questions, Feedback
 - i. What is the timeframe of this planning process?
 1. Hoping for 10 years, open for discussion
 - ii. Is this a dynamic plan, open to change during implementation years, or is it intended to be more general guidance?
 1. Plan will be broad enough that actions taken during implementation can be general and flexible, but will not be edited and changed once it is finalized and implemented
 - iii. Will there be intermittent public review of plan during implementation years?
 1. Worth considering, will incorporate this as much as possible

- iv. How will this plan compare with existing management plans?
 - 1. Trout plan will follow guidelines and processes set by existing management plan, but will be specific to trout
- III. Program Scope & DNR Authority
 - a. Inland fisheries only (Great Lakes excluded)
 - b. Brook, brown, rainbow, lake trout
 - c. **Stakeholder Questions, Feedback**
 - i. What happened with the 2004 survey funding?
 - 1. Since 2004, trout stamp money has not been used for surveys
 - ii. Does licensing money include vehicle licensing?
 - 1. No, it is fishing and hunting licenses primarily, although the TU license plate sales is included
 - iii. What ability does the fisheries program as currently constituted have to deal with manure issues?
 - 1. Water Quality's non-point pollution section works with us on this issue; we don't directly handle this through fisheries
 - iv. How much of the funds used by Fisheries is GPR based?
 - 1. We don't draw from that funding account as much; this is a misconception by the taxpayers that should be better communicated in the future
 - v. What Division is Fisheries currently in?
 - 1. We are in the Fish, Wildlife, and Parks Division; this is a different division that the Water Quality staff, although it has not affected communication between our two programs nor our geographical proximity
 - vi. When was the last increase on fishing or hunting licenses?
 - 1. 12 years ago; Wisconsin has one of the lowest fishing license fees in the US
 - vii. **How does Wisconsin compare to other states regarding trout management staffing, goals, work hours?**
 - 1. **Michigan is in the process of writing a trout plan as well as Minnesota, Joanna will share these plans with stakeholders**
 - viii. How does Wisconsin compare to other states in terms of per capita fishing?
 - 1. Unsure on an exact number, but it is high; we have statewide trout streams which results in a statewide trout angling base and a larger stakeholder base compared to other states
 - 2. Wisconsin has more miles of trout stream than Montana
 - ix. What are the methods used by trout anglers in Wisconsin (fly fishing, bait, etc.)?
 - 1. **Angler surveys from 2011 break down trout angler preferred methods; Joanna will share this with stakeholders as well**
- IV. Breakout Session
 - a. What do stakeholders value about our existing inland trout fishery?

- i. Diversity of streams, landscapes, and habitats; healthy ecosystems
 - ii. Easy public access throughout the state
 - iii. Solitude and feeling of being in nature, escape from reality
 - iv. Science-based management of fishery
 - v. Opportunities for all types of anglers (fly, bait, artificial, catch-and-release, harvest, etc.)
 - vi. Sustainability of fishery and progress made over the past few decades
 - vii. Very good water quality, control of point-source pollution
 - viii. Land ethic and ethical watershed management, connection to the land
 - ix. Economic value to the state and individual regions
 - x. Partnerships, work between the Department and public, stakeholders, etc.
 - xi. Trout as a food value and healthy, non-polluted food source
 - xii. Culture and tradition of trout fishing among families, passing on to future generations
 - xiii. Mental and physical health
- b. What concerns do stakeholders have about trout management in the future?
- i. Political climate; departure from science-based management, denial of climate change
 - ii. Deregulation of all sorts: mining, CAFOs, high-cap wells; lax enforcement of regulations and penalties, especially with non-point sources of pollution (manure, sediments, phosphorus, nitrates, stormwater)
 - iii. Underutilization of the resource, decrease in consumption and personal use, lack of recruitment to new generation as old angler base ages out
 - iv. Maintaining beaver control and monitoring of predation, invasive species, New Zealand mud snails; prevention of loss of fishing access and habitat for trout
 - 1. Otters, blue herons
 - v. Transportation intersection with the resource, not enough fish passage
 - vi. Better communication of information, regulations, etc, to increase access; simplification of rules
 - vii. Tribal rights and increasing education about the tribes
 - viii. Environmental changes and adapting to climate change
 - ix. Land use changes, particularly in agriculture
 - x. Maintaining current funding sources and ensuring continued flow of money for trout work, propagation, etc.; missed opportunities due to inadequate funding
 - xi. Overlap between trout fishing and other recreational uses of streams (kayaking, tubing, etc.)
 - xii. Groundwater depletion and decrease in stream easements
 - xiii. Lack of adequate research funds
 - xiv. Lack of angler diversity
 - xv. Maintaining native trout genetics
 - xvi. Collaborative approach to fisheries management

V. Trout Fisheries Overview

a. Stakeholder Feedback and Questions

- i. **Inland trout stamp sales of patron cards spiked in 1999; Joanna will research the reason for this**
- ii. **Percentage of trout stamp sales to out of state residents; Joanna will determine this answer**
- iii. Is there a strain of brook trout that is more native or unique to Wisconsin than others?
 1. Complicated answer due to the amount of diversity among genetic trout strains
- iv. If a stream has a native genetic, is it unique to that stream? Or are genetics strains mixed in certain streams?
 1. Trout stocking guidance document details that non-native genetic strains cannot be stocked in streams where an established population of a native stream is present
- v. Looking at the different genetics on brook trout, is there a problem with gill lice? Does northern Iowa have a problem with this?
 1. **Unsure on Iowa, fairly certain they are starting to look into this; our program is working with Wes Larson at UWSP to study genetic resistance to gill lice**

VI. Goals Breakout Session

- a. Explore possibility of year-round season
- b. Increase miles of stream restoration
- c. Explore alternative funding sources beyond just trout stamp
- d. Encourage family and youth fishing in a natural setting vs. urban
- e. Designate trophy only fishing areas
- f. Continue use of science-based management
- g. Improve accessibility and habitat restoration in urban areas
- h. Improve collaboration with agriculture industry
- i. More public access and maintain that access
- j. Raise awareness of economic benefit of trout fishing
- k. More responsive and flexible regulations to address management issues such as stunting
- l. Increase and maintain partnerships
- m. Increase education and outreach, promote the trout fishing industry; develop a communications plan
- n. Increase beaver control in North District
- o. Protect and enhance inland Lake Trout fisheries

VII. Next meeting on March 3rd, same time, same place