

## **Select Examples of How the GOP Draft Amendment Differs From What Was Agreed To, and Endangers Our Environment**

- 1) Under Chapter 30, the negotiators agreed that certain specific activities, such as dredging by hand, would be exempt from the requirement to get a permit, but that individuals would still have to follow the law and environmental standards surrounding those activities. But the amendment drafted by Republicans simply provides a blanket exemption from the obligation to follow the law, which lowers our environmental standards.

The negotiators agreed to use the term “non-notification general permits” to describe these exceptions, but this term does not even appear in the draft.

- 2) Negotiators agreed with the Governor’s bedrock position that the public trust doctrine – part of our state Constitution – must be absolutely protected, to ensure that everyone can enjoy our waters, not just those who own shoreland property. But the draft Republican amendment carves out a new exception to this doctrine – never agreed to in the negotiations – that limits the public trust protection only to those waters deemed to be “Areas of Special Natural Resource Interest.” This definition means that 93% of Wisconsin’s waters will not enjoy public trust protection.
- 3) Negotiators agreed to expand the use of general permits, which require an individual to get approval to conduct a certain specific activity in accordance with environmental standards and the law. But the draft refers to “statewide general permits,” which would give blanket approval for the activity in ANY Wisconsin waterway, preventing the DNR from ensuring that the activity isn’t disruptive to smaller, pristine waterways. For example, a certain activity might be appropriate for a large, heavily developed lake, but might be devastating to a small lake in Northern Wisconsin that has not been developed.

Ironically, this language in the amendment as drafted would not only harm the environment, but it would actually be a step backward in streamlining the regulatory process, since it would limit the flexibility the DNR would be able to offer developers.