

AIS Meeting Notes
4/30/2019 via Conference Call

Present: Tracy Beckman – Lumberjack RC&D, Stephanie Boismenu – Oneida Co LWCD, Michele Sadauskas – Oneida Co LWCD, Cathy Higley – Vilas Co LWCD, Carolyn Scholl – Vilas Co LWCD, Mitchell McCarthy – Lincoln Co LWCD, Scott Goodwin – Florence Co LWCD, Alix Bjorklund – TIP & Menominee Co LCD, Emily Heald – Discovery Center, Molly McKay – Lincoln Co LWCD, Scott Frank – Shawano Co LWCD, Chad Trudell – Oconto Co LWCD.

- I. Call to Order – The meeting was called to order at 9:02am by Beckman.
- II. Introductions: Beckman announced those in attendance
- III. DNR AIS Funding Background – Beckman briefly explained the reason for the meeting is that the DNR Natural Resources Board (NRB) is gathering information and accepting comments regarding their new surface water funding plan.
- IV. DNR’s proposed new Rule NR193 – Beckman explained this is the new rule that combines several old rules, so everything is streamlined and includes current management practices.
- V. AIS Programs in each area:
 - a. Oneida Co has AIS coordinator
 - b. Vilas County’s coordinator role has changed to a Lakes Specialist
 - c. Discovery Center has staff doing AIS work
 - d. Florence Co has an AIS Coordinator, but the roles have become limited over the years and currently only doing CBCW work
 - e. Langlade Co does not have an AIS coordinator but completed some work last year with a Lumberjack Grant. They are one of the three counties (Forest & Lincoln) that were turned down for a tri-county AIS grant to fund a coordinator.
 - f. Lincoln – Same as Langlade
 - g. Forest – Same and Lincoln & Langlade
 - h. Shawano Co has a partnership with the Fox/Wolf Watershed Alliance who, under a DNR grant, employs a coordinator house Kimberly who does work in Shawano & Menominee counties. It is the 2nd year of a 3-year grant and they are not sure of plans after the grant is complete.
 - i. Oconto County does not have an AIS coordinator.
- VI. Develop questions for the May 2nd meeting with Bob Wakeman: Beckman opened it up for the group to share their concerns, questions, ideas, etc. The outcome of the discussion appears as a table on Page 2.
- VII. How willing is each group to Partner with others in region? It was learned this topic is not easily answered without having more information from NRB. For those who felt they could answer at this time, we learned that Oneida & Vilas Counties would accept \$ and pay staff or program costs; Langlade, Lincoln & Forest would be flexible to work across county lines like the Tri Co AIS grant and the Discovery Center feels they don’t have enough information to answer at this time. This prompted more discussion about fairness between counties and other stakeholders such as tribes, lake groups, nature centers...how will funds be assured to provide full county-coverage?
- VIII. Other Topics
 - a. OF NOTE:
 - i. As the group understands it, the list of core services is the Network Activity list on page 59 of the draft NR 193.
 - ii. Page 60 of Draft NR 193 talks about who can participate and what groups should do.
 - b. Entity Tasks prior to meeting with Bob Wakeman:
 - Develop a list of current programs & how much time/resources they take
 - Bullet list of needs
 - Decide if partnerships will work for your area. If so, consider with whom you’d like to partner.
 - Read Draft NR 193 here: <https://dnr.wi.gov/news/input/documents/rules/WY1815DraftRule.pdf>
- IX. Adjourn – The meeting adjourned at 9:50am

For Meeting with Bob Wakeman on 5/2/2019

Guidance Issues	Important Considerations	Other Questions
How will DNR ensure continuation of current projects?	Our area is unique because of the amount of lakes we have – ‘lake rich’.	Will funds to straight to counties? Different answers being given to this question.
Which grants do current projects fall under?	Our area has a bigger need than what the current AEPP system allows.	Will there be a base level given to each applicant and if so, will the balance of funds be disbursed competitively?
Concise list of Core Services	It is felt that the Natural Resources Board doesn’t fully understand and are underestimating the amount of time and resources needed to do AIS work in ‘lake rich’ counties.	If counties are already receiving a base amount, under the model, are they more or less likely to get additional funding?
Where will the matrix/model appear? In NR 193 or somewhere else? This must be shared because it determines our questions so while it’s great the board is asking for input, without the matrix/model, it is hard to know which questions to ask.	If the outcome is to give a finite amount of \$ to each applicant, this will put partners in the position to compete against one-another, especially in ‘lake rich’ counties that have multiple groups.	If core services in counties are funded, can a county designate unused funds to areas they feel are high-priority?
Need communication of funding scenarios. How do the competitive properties work?	Population is not a fair way to assess need.	How do the core services/network activity from page 59 Draft NR 193 fit into Table 1 Cost Share on page 18 of Draft NR 193?
What is already firm in the process and can we see it? Core Services? Matrix/Model the NRB is leaning toward? Knowing this helps us know where to focus.	There is an overall feeling by the northern groups that have met, that we are not being heard regarding the sheer # of lakes	What are the proposed funding terms? One year, two years?
	Lakes in southern counties are already infested and some are beyond control. Northern, ‘lake rich’ counties must be protected.	How will the NRB assure funds will provide fair coverage if used by different groups that don’t answer to one-another?
	Water Rich areas of the state should be given high priority.	