

Eastern Upper Peninsula Citizen Advisory Council
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, August 18, 2011
6:30-8:30pm EST
LMAS District Health Department, Newberry, MI

Council Members Present

Bob DeVillez	Michael Lawless
Dale DuFour	Glenn Moll
Ginny Giddings	Dick Pershinske
Gary Gorniak	Chad Radka
Jim Hoy	Doug Scheuneman

Council Members Absent

Bill Becks	Ron Ford
Tom Buckingham	Mike Patrick
Pat Carr	Ed Radecki
Jim Duke	

Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Staff Liaisons

Stacy Welling, Upper Peninsula Regional Coordinator, Marquette
Kristi Dahlstrom, Executive Division, Marquette
Lt. Skip Hagy, Law Enforcement Division, Newberry
Christina Hammill, Facilities Management, Newberry
Rich Hill, Parks & Recreation Division, Newberry
Terry Minzey, Wildlife Division, Marquette
Debbie Munson Badini, UP Communications Representative, Marquette
Steve Scott, Fisheries Division, Newberry
Kristie Sitar, Wildlife Division, Newberry
Richard Stevenson, Forest Management Division, Newberry

DNR Guests

Bill Boik, Parks & Recreation Division, Lansing
Paul Petersen, Parks & Recreation Division, Lansing

Call To Order

The Eastern Upper Peninsula Citizen Advisory Council (EUPCAC) meeting was called to order at 6:35 pm EST by **Chair Pershinske**.

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. DuFour motioned to adopt the agenda as submitted; **Mr. Scheuneman** supported the motion. Ayes: All. Nays: None. Absent: Mr. Becks, Mr. Buckingham, Mr. Carr, Mr. Duke, Mr. Ford, Mr. Patrick & Mr. Radecki. Motion carried.

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Chair Pershinske asked the Council if there were any corrections to the minutes as presented. There being none, **Ms. Giddings** motioned to approve the June 30, 2011 EUPCAC Meeting

minutes as submitted; **Mr. DeVillez** seconded the motion. Ayes: All. Nays: None. Absent: Mr. Becks, Mr. Buckingham, Mr. Carr, Mr. Duke, Mr. Ford, Mr. Patrick & Mr. Radecki. Motion carried.

Chair Comments

Chair Pershinske stated that public comments will be heard shortly. Any input from the public is appreciated, however, comments should be brief to allow others time to address the Council.

Chair Pershinske stated he talked with Director Stokes at a Farm Bureau function in Cornell the previous evening and he expressed his appreciation several times to the Council for their input, suggestions and recommendations. In addition, **Chair Pershinske** stated he continues to receive additional comments from UP legislators insisting that the Council continue with the good work it's doing as they utilize the dialogue from the Council meetings. He reminded the legislators to come to the Council with any issues as well. He is also hearing from the Michigan Farm Bureau staff and other legislators on why there is a Council in the U.P. and not downstate. It's important to know that the U.P. Councils are doing good things.

Chair Pershinske provided a brief follow-up on the wolf depredation program that was mentioned at the last meeting. He stated he received a phone call from Mr. Bob Allen of Interlochen Public Radio downstate who wanted to do an article on wolves. Mr. Allen visited the area and talked to a few folks, including Mr. Brian Roell of the Wildlife Division, who did a great job representing the DNR. **Chair Pershinske** stated he wasn't impressed with the article and it didn't do justice to the program. He read his written response to the reporter.

Chair Pershinske questioned the status of Council membership. **Ms. Welling** stated that a selection committee meeting with stakeholders will be held mid-September. She mentioned that anyone interested in serving on the Council should send in an application.

Chair Pershinske asked if there was an update on an equine trails subcommittee. **Ms. Welling** stated that information was handed out when Ms. Mindy Koch presented several meetings ago and she doesn't think there is anything additional to report. **Mr. Moll** stated that Mr. Skip Schultz is putting together an alliance of trail users in the U.P. that includes equestrian, ATVs, mountain bikes, etc. and it may possibly be linked to the subcommittee.

Public Comments

Mr. Al Garavaglia, Hudson Township supervisor, stated that he will provide comment when the Garnet Lake State Forest Campground update is discussed later on the agenda. No other comments were presented.

DNR Division Reports

DNR written staff reports were provided to Council members on August 9, 2011. The following are current updates to those reports.

- Stacy Welling, UP Regional Coordinator: **Ms. Welling** provided a short overview of the Council, which has been in existence for two years. She stated that the DNR appreciates the volunteer Council members for all that they do.

- A feral swine update is included on the first page of the Division Reports which provides an overview of the most recent press release. The invasive species order has been extended to October 8; this is the second extension. The extension is to allow for potential bills to go through the legislative process.
- The Moose Advisory Council met this week. The Council was established through legislation to give recommendations on a potential moose hunt to the NRC in September. At this point, the Council is recommending a very limited hunt, however, the recommendation still has to go through the process. In the last 2-3 weeks, 3 moose were hit by vehicles. **Mr. Minzey** added that over the course of year, 10 moose have been struck by vehicles U.P.-wide with 9 being killed; 3 were females lactating, 1 was a calf. Two of these moose were in the eastern U.P. He stated they are always looking for partnerships and collaboration; for example, in one moose incident in Iron County, the animal was over 1200 lbs. An MDOT vehicle happened to drive by with a crane and offered to help. The animal was so heavy, it bent the tailgate.
- As promised, the Wildlife Division Annual Report and the new strategic plan are included in the meeting packet. The report shows where dollars are being spent. The report is also online.
- A fully accessible recreation event, *A Day at the Lake*, will be held on September 28. A brochure is included in the packets. The event is sponsored by many partners, including the DNR. Anyone is welcome to attend.
- *Debbie Munson Badini, UP Communications Representative:* **Ms. Munson Badini** stated that for those who read the Marquette Mining Journal, there was an interview with Secretary of State Johnson printed with incorrect information about the recreation passport. It stated that the annual fee will increase next year to \$15. Legislatively, the DNR can increase the cost, but there are no decisions made to increase it. **Mr. Hill** added that the DNR has the ability to charge up to \$20 for those individuals who don't buy the passport at the Secretary of State offices, but it was determined that more time was needed to educate the public before implementing a fee increase.
- *Christina Hammill, Facility Management:* **Mrs. Hammill** stated that an addition to her report is the NRC approved the regular goose season as Sep 17-Oct 31 and duck season from Sep 24-Nov 18, then reopening from Nov 24-Nov 27. Also, as part of the Director's four priorities for the DNR, a renewed emphasis has been placed on customer service. A customer service team has been implemented and will be meeting for the first time next week to go over ways in which the DNR can better serve the public. The Council may be able to provide input in the future.
- *Rich Hill, Parks & Recreation Division:* **Mr. Hill** added that the Detour State Harbor upgrade may be delayed for one year due to permitting issues that they are working through. **Mr. Moll** asked about the percent of participation for the recreation passport, wondering if the percent stated for Ottawa in the report is correct and what the assessment is for dollar amounts received statewide for the program. **Mr. Hill** replied that 45% of Ottawa residents purchased a passport when renewing their licenses through the Secretary of State. Statewide, he noted that the program is doing quite well with 24.5% participation to date. For the first year, the DNR is very pleased. The new program is providing more revenue than the old system; exact dollar amounts are not yet known.
- *Richard Stevenson, Forest Management Unit:* **Mr. Stevenson** stated is he reporting on behalf of Mr. Steve Milford. He added that this spring was a fairly mild fire season and there have

been only a few fires this summer. As a result, firefighters have been sent out west to help with fires there; three from the eastern U.P. are in Texas. **Mr. Radka** questioned the Governor's request to increase timber sales 20-30%. **Mr. Stevenson** stated that in Newberry, they look at next fiscal year timber targets at this time of year. There are 5,000 acres to cover and with the current manpower, only 3,000 can be done; they are looking at which sales can be contracted out and what can be done with internal staff.

- **Terry Minzey, Wildlife Division:** **Mr. Minzey** stated he had several updates to his report:
 - He received word yesterday that the US Fish & Wildlife Service (USF&WS) is opening the comment period for an additional 30 days on wolf delisting. He stated he does not know what date the comment period opens. He explained that the delisting is currently for the timber wolf (gray wolf). However, there was a genetic study done that focused on two different species of wolves in the U.P., the timber wolf and the eastern wolf, which comes from farther east in Canada. These species also cross-breed. One cannot tell the visual difference between the two. The eastern wolf isn't currently listed and wasn't recognized. The DNR is concerned about that and provided comments during the last comment period. Despite the additional comment period, the USF&WS will issue a final rule in December 2011. **Chair Pershinske** questioned what the USF&WS is looking for. **Mr. Minzey** stated they are looking for more comments on whether the genetic system is the right way to go and should they be going forward in the manner that they are. His concern is how to manage the delisted population if one cannot visually tell the difference between the two species. **Mr. Gorniak** questioned the difference between a timber wolf, gray wolf, and eastern wolf. **Mr. Minzey** stated that the timber wolf is actually a gray wolf; it is often called by both names. Discussion continued on the evidence of genetic differences between the eastern wolf and the gray wolf (timber wolf) and the debate of that evidence. **Ms. Sitar** stated that DNA studies are showing that both species were present more than 100 years ago. However, DNR analysis has only been available the last couple of years, which has allowed the differences in species to be newly identified/recognized. All wolves handled by the DNR are DNA-tested, but it is not known how many of either species are present in the U.P. The animals are hybridizing and their parents have hybridized. **Mr. Minzey** stated that there is a sustainable population in the U.P., there is a need to get the animals delisted, and they need to be controlled. **Mr. DeVillez** questioned if the DNR will be making a new statement; **Mr. Minzey** replied that he does not know.
 - **Mr. Minzey** stated that the Wildlife Division is collaborating with all sportsmens groups through coalition meetings. The effort was expanded to the U.P., starting in the east first and now in the west, with a meeting held last evening in Shingleton. The Division is in constant communication with 40-50 sportmens organizations through these meetings and they are highly praised and well received. Discussions focus on habitat management, regulation processes such fisher martin regulations, etc.
 - **Mr. Minzey** reported that although he now lives and works out of Ishpeming, he will continue to be the representative on the EUPCAC.
 - **Mr. Minzey** commented on the moose at Presque Isle in Marquette that received a lot of press. A 2-3 year old bull moose in poor nutrition condition resided in Presque Isle for two weeks. The City of Marquette contacted the DNR as they were very concerned with crowd control. They didn't want the animal removed at first, and instead posted signs asking the public to stay away. However, the public refused to heed the warning and the

city had to post an officer at the site to maintain control. With an imminent public safety issue, the city then asked the DNR to remove the animal. Working closely together on a plan, the moose was tranquilized and relocated, being released in good moose habitat on state land without injury one hour later. The moose was not collared. It was found to be fairly emaciated with the hind quarters very thin (estimated 500 lbs). The tips of the ears were burnt off (frost-bite) and antler development was very poor. The cause of his condition is not known. Mr. Gorniak questioned the population of moose in the U.P. Mr. Minzey stated there are two moose populations in the U.P., the east and west populations. About 15-16 years ago, when the east population was tracked, it was estimated to be about 100 animals; it is unknown if the number has changed much. In the west, there is about 450 moose; population estimates are surveyed every other year. **Mr. Caswell** from the audience asked if a moose hunt will be approved for that size population. Mr. Minzey stated that the recommendation may be for a very limited hunt, maybe 10-12 bulls. Mr. Radka asked a question [*could not hear question asked*]. Mr. Minzey stated that deer prefer dogwood over cedar and it provides more usable crude protein for a better spring. He noted that 25,000-26,000 seedlings are being planted in gaps and openings in hybrid soils.

- **Steve Scott, Fisheries Division**: **Mr. Scott** stated that he had no additions to his report.
- **Lt. Skip Hagy, Law Enforcement**: **Lt. Hagy** stated that it was a busy summer with several days of warm weather and good boating activity. Fishing reports have been great and ORV activity increased.

Old Business

1. **Wildlife Division Realignment Plan Update**: **Mr. Minzey** stated that he now serves the entire U.P. and as part of the realignment plan, will be conducting interviews for a regional deer specialist position (biologist-type position) which will handle deer issues for the northern two-thirds of the state (northern lower peninsula and all of the U.P.) Once a candidate is selected, it will be determined where the position will be located. A communications tech has been hired and will be located in Marquette or Escanaba. This position will assist the Wildlife Division with presentations, interface with Ms. Munson-Badini for press interviews, etc., and will help to remove some of the administrative work for the biologists in order to allow them more time in the field. A regional operational manager will be in place within a month; this is a higher level experienced biologist who works directly with field biologists and provides administration (time and expense) and mentoring, and works with population management issues. Another position that is planned for, but not yet advertised, is an administrative tech. This person will work on projects and the procurement process freeing several hours of a biologist's time, allowing them more time in the field. This person will also be an assistant to Mr. Minzey. **Ms. Welling** asked if these positions are new or are they due to restructuring. **Mr. Minzey** stated it is restructuring; the goal is to get paid biologists in the field and away from the administrative work that is diluting their abilities to get out in the land. The division looks at 200,000 acres a year (10% of 2 million), and there are only 8 biologists to do this. **Mr. King** from the audience questioned how much this is going to cost the budget. **Mr. Minzey** replied that the costs are built into the whole restructuring process; he does not have the exact figures. He noted they will be paying less for an administrative position than a biologist.

2. Regional Deer Advisory Team Update: **Mr. Minzey** stated that there are no updates from the Regional Deer Advisory Team. The new person mentioned in the Wildlife Division realignment update will be involved in this effort. **Chair Pershinske** questioned the permits needed for crop damage. **Mr. Minzey** stated that the process has been standardized. For summer crop damage problems, submit a permit and the local biologist will review. Once a new supervisor biologist is in place, that person will take over the process. For deer management assistance permits on CFA lands, they were being handled differently in the west than the east, and when those areas were merged into one region, a person was assigned to be the regional DMAP person for CFA lands.

3. Garnet Lake State Forest Campground Update: **Mr. Stevenson** stated that he is providing an update on this topic in Mr. Milford's absence. He stated the campground has been leased for a long time, and although he hasn't been involved in the most recent lease agreement changes, his understanding is the price per night was negotiated successfully, with approval from the DNR Director, lowering the fee from \$15 to \$10. The DNR is currently waiting for the signed lease from the township. **Mr. Garavaglia** from the audience (Hudson Township supervisor) stated that he received the revised lease and with it were requirements pertaining to the protection of endangered species (plant or animal) that was not included previously. He suggests that the DNR send a biologist to the campground to see if there are any endangered species as he is not aware of any. This is why he hasn't yet signed the lease agreement. He thanked the Council and Ms. Welling for their help with the fee changes. He stated he thought he went through the proper channels initially, but felt he wasn't getting anywhere and it became frustrating. He discussed his frustration with a letter he received from the DNR about the yellow painted posts in the park. **Ms. Welling** stated that he can contact the Council or her at anytime if there are future questions. **Mr. Stevenson** read out loud Exhibit B of the lease, which includes an agreement to protect endangered species, plant or animal, and historical sites. **Mr. Minzey** stated that basically the form is asking the township to have the same diligence as the DNR as if they owned the park. **Mr. Garavaglia** stated that the Township is proud of the park and would like to keep it. He wasn't aware the topic was on the Council's agenda as he wasn't invited. **Ms. Welling** apologized and stated that it was on the agenda only to give the Council an update of the successful fee change. **Mr. Stevenson** agreed to visit the park and review it for endangered species.

4. Menominee River Headwaters Forest Project Update: **Mr. Stevenson** reviewed the project fact sheet with the Council. **Mr. Caswell** of the audience asked if this project was all state land; Mr. Stevenson replied that it includes both state and private land. He stated that if the Council wishes, Mr. Milford indicated he can have an expert from Forest Management Division provide a presentation at a future meeting if more information is desired. **Chair Pershinske** stated he is not aware of any contentious issues on this that warrants a presentation. **Ms. Welling** stated that this item was brought forward from a WUPCAC member at the last EUPCAC meeting; she further explained the Q&A handout that was included in the meeting packets. **Mr. Garavaglia** asked if any of this land is being impacted by the mine; it was stated this project is located in a different county.

5. *Living Legacies/Biodiversity Stewardship Areas Update*: **Ms. Welling** stated that BSA's were brought up at a few past meetings. She briefly reviewed the BSA presentation given to the Council in October 2010 to explain why the DNR is involved in this project, the benefits of the initiative, what it involves, how areas were identified, management of those areas, progress to date, and public review. The only information changed on the presentation since that time is the DNR is no longer DNRE; the content has not changed. She reviewed the statute mandating BSA's; Senator Casperson initiated the legislation that called for this plan. BSA's (now known as the Living Legacy Project) is an initiative that involves the identification (inventory of species and different ecological services), restoration & management of those places in Michigan that collectively represent the diverse nature of the state's biological heritage, and is part of the forest certification plan. The progress to date indicated back in October 2010 hasn't changed much despite it being 10 months later; all regions continue to be at the DNR review stage. The fact that this topic was discussed again in June indicates how confusing it still is to the public. There have been several institutional changes since October 2010; the DNR and DEQ have unmerged and a new DNR Director was appointed. As a result of these changes and concerns raised, including the Council's comments from the June meeting which Ms. Welling brought back to the Director, the Director issued a letter on July 12, 2011 citing 8 modifications to the project; a copy is the meeting packets. **Ms. Welling** reviewed each modification; she stated that ensuring no net loss of timber production on state-owned lands (#2) was reiterated by the Director today with the Governor during their U.P. visit. **Mr. Hoy** asked what no net loss means. **Mr. Scott** stated that there is a certain amount of wood that cannot be cut in some areas, whereas in other areas, there may be more cutting. No net loss is a key point with timber stakeholders. It was never the intent to block off all those areas. **Ms. Welling** stated that the Councils will play a large part in the communication plan (#7) and input from constituent groups (#8) in going forward. **Mr. Hoy** asked if the Council can receive copies of the two plans that the Director refers to in his letter; **Ms. Welling** replied that when the plans are distributed in final form, she will share them. On September 2, a letter is being sent to the Statewide Council regarding the first step in redirection, including a proposed schedule. Once the Director approves it, it will be shared. She stated that she appreciates the Councils' input as it helped the DNR to identify something that needed to change. **Mr. DeVillez** indicated that with the increase in timber sales, determining the net loss, and providing access to these lands, it seems like an impossible task without having a long-term planning process for all state lands; not just state forest lands, but park lands and all other types of ownership. He doesn't understand how the DNR will achieve a 20-30% increase in timber sales. **Chair Pershinske** asked if that issue has been brought up. **Mr. Scott** stated that it has been discussed; the DNR is in a difficult spot trying to keep everyone happy. Discussion continued. It was stated that it is important for the DNR to determine what the Council can do to help. **Chair Pershinske** stated that this is a topic that should remain on the agenda for updates. **Ms. Welling** stated that there will be more substance once the Director approves the documents.
6. *Naubinway Marina Dredge Update*: **Mr. Stevenson** introduced Mr. Bill Boik and Mr. Paul Peterson from the Parks & Recreation Division in Lansing, who were on their way to a Waterways Commission meeting and agreed to come to the Council meeting to answer any questions about the Naubinway Marina Dredge project. **Mr. Boik** thanked Mr. Stevenson

for inviting them; they have heard about the Council and are glad to have been invited. **Mr. Stevenson** stated that in the past, the work done at the marina was funded 100% by the State of Michigan. Today, qualified townships can receive up to 95% funding. The DNR is happy to be working with Garnet Township on this project. It is an important public boat launch because of its location. **Mr. Stevenson** presented a 1998 photo of the marina and a 2006 photo to compare how it is filling in. The DNR's intent is to put in a breakwater to divert the sand. When this was tried in the past, permits were required from the Corps of Engineers and DEQ. A study was performed and it concluded that sand continued to come into the marina. The breakwater would be installed on the west side of the boat launch. This will hopefully prevent yearly dredging. **Mr. Stevenson** also displayed the cost of annual dredges in areas around the state. It is hopeful that the breakwater will eliminate the need to spend dollars every few years on dredging the marina. The DNR has met with the community and both parties are happy with the progress. **Chair Pershinske** asked when the project will be completed. **Mr. Peterson** stated that there is no completion date scheduled at this point. The community is working through the preliminary engineering process (updating it, ice and wave analysis, topographic and hydrographic surveys) and the DNR is working with the community to complete the joint application. When approval is received, the final engineering packages will be completed and the cost will be assessed. The grant is for the final engineering. **Mr. Radka** asked where the funding came from for all the dredging shown on the slide. **Mr. Peterson** stated it came from a mixture of local funding, federal funding, a combination of grants, and congressional budgets. The Federal Water Resources Act, which collects taxes on cargo that comes into the Great Lakes, provides funding. Several of the areas have recreational harbors; funding is available for commercial harbors but not recreational harbors. **Mr. Scott** stated that a lot is done by the Corps of Engineers. They used to finance three different harbors; however, over the years as their money sources tightened, they dropped funding for recreational harbors. There are very few ports of refuge funded. **Mr. DuFour** asked if it will take as long as the Grand Marais project. **Mr. Boik** stated that Grand Marais is a unique project; **Ms. Welling** added that it is extremely unique and rare to have a \$4 million general fund appropriation and \$1 million from the Waterways Fund. **Mr. Scott** pointed out, in reference to the photos, that according to the information, the marina was dredged in 2004, and in the 2006 photo, it had filled in significantly. **Mr. Stevenson** clarified that only the tip shown was dredged, not the entire area. In addition, the lower water levels in 2006 may be the reason it looks so different. **Chair Pershinske** asked Mr. King from the audience if he had any questions. **Mr. King** asked why the sedimentary drift was ignored in 2004. It could've been done privately at a far cheaper cost. **Mr. Boik** replied that in 2004, the DNR had to wait for the study to be conducted, and unfortunately, the mistake is now being fixed. **Mr. King** explained the incorrect development in the 60's. **Mr. Boik** stated that marine engineers made that decision; he is not aware of the reasons and cannot change what happened several decades ago. At this time, a new harbor cannot be built; they are trying to fix it now as economically as they can. **Mr. King** stated that if it was done right before, they wouldn't have to be fixing it now and spending \$1 million dollars. **Chair Pershinske** suggested that, in the interest of time, Mr. King take his information back to the township to discuss. **Mr. King** stated that if the township doesn't pay \$100,000, then it gets shut down. **Chair Pershinske** stated that there is nothing the Council can do to inject any assistance in this project. **Mr. King** stated he feels it's broken and someone should fix it. **Chair Pershinske** stated that Mr. King is

entitled to his opinion. **Mr. Moll** asked if, despite the dynamics or physics that causes the sand to be deposited, the water level has an impact. **Mr. Boik** replied it would be slower with higher water levels.

- 7. Wolf Depredation Update:** **Ms. Sitar**, a biologist in the eastern U.P., provided a presentation on Michigan's Wolf Livestock Demonstration Project Grant Program (WLDPPG). The USF&WS-funded program assists farmers who have wolf depredation events in reducing the loss of livestock in non-lethal ways. Non-lethal methods include the use of donkeys, llamas, and guard dogs used with sheep & cattle. Other options available through this grant are assistance with different types of fencing. Several farmers don't have adequate fencing to ward off wolves. Flashing lights and other equipment are also available. Every farm and operation is unique. In order for a farm to be eligible for assistance, they have to have had a verified wolf depredation (by the DNR) and be willing to try these options. In the eastern U.P., 3 farms have participated in the program. She stated that the grant will run out of funding at the end of the fiscal year (September 30). It was questioned where the donkeys come from; **Ms. Sitar** stated that she found a provider through a bid process. There have been a few glitches along the way with the donkeys, however, they have successfully worked through those problems. So far this year in the eastern U.P., there have been 3 farms with livestock kills totaling 5 animals; 1 dog depredation event, totaling 3 dogs; 4 separate farms with livestock kills from coyotes, totaling 6 animals. **Mr. Gorniak** asked if one dog will keep wolves away from sheep. **Ms. Sitar** stated that guard dogs are a suggested effective method. Dogs will usually work in pairs. **Mr. Minzey** further added that there are farms in Rudyard that are using guard dogs successfully. **Chair Pershinske** also added an explanation of the type of dogs used (Great Pyrenees for example). **Mr. Minzey** further explained how donkeys and guard dogs face down the wolf in lieu of running away. He stated most depredation is done by a single wolf or in pairs. Pack cohesion with wolves is seen more in the winter season. **Mr. Scheuneman** asked about the cost of feeding dogs. **Ms. Sitar** stated that once a farmer receives the guard animal, they are required to keep it for at least 3 years and are required to accept total care including feeding costs. **Chair Pershinske** stated these farmers/producers are going through tremendous financial situations, and they are willing to work with the government in lieu of becoming a "felon". **Mr. Gorniak** questioned how long the program is available. **Ms. Sitar** stated that this program is in its very first year and there are no indications that it will continue after this year.

Mr. Hoy questioned how guard animals work with coyotes and if federal monies pay for fencing from them too. **Ms. Sitar** stated that coyote depredations are not eligible in this program. Federal grant and DNR funds are being utilized to the program end. **Mr. Radka** asked what the total grant amount was, how much was spent, and how much has been spent on reimbursement for farmers. **Ms. Sitar** stated the grant was for \$90,000 with a \$90,000 match and the funding is used for time spent, reimbursement to farmers for losses, and the purchase of materials. She stated she did not have the actual expense figures at this time; a good portion has been spent on fencing and donkey costs (10 donkeys). For farmer reimbursement, she indicated a loose estimate would be \$60,000-\$75,000 over the last 12 or more years. The average reimbursement per farmer is \$5,000. The budget for reimbursement is a legislative act, not something the DNR has flexibility with. **Mr. Radka**

stated it seems that in one year, a program could be funded to offset the cost of livestock predation cost reimbursements.

New Business

1. **Muskie & Pike Regulations:** **Mr. Scott** stated that in an attempt to streamline regulations on muskie and pike, a committee was formed with fishing groups around the state. The goal is to develop something simple for all lakes, looking at a wide variation of climates, growth, etc. The committee met yesterday and after review of a few proposals, the group came to the same conclusion that there isn't a better way than what's being done right now. Another proposal for muskies will be reviewed and discussed when the committee meets again in December. A public comment period will be held in February and feedback can be provided online. Based on the discussion, the internal group is favoring a 24-inch minimum size limit for the 109 lakes with exceptions. They would like to get away from exceptions, but there is support to keep it the way it is. **Chair Pershinske** stated there is a request by Millecoquins Lake to change the requirements due to the population in that lake, which is the reason this topic is on the agenda. **Mr. Scott** stated the standard state size regulation is 24-inch. There is a stunted population and as a result, there are 109 lakes with no minimum size limit (each of these lakes are specifically listed in the guide).
2. **Communication: Real vs. Perceived/Solving Public Misconceptions:** **Chair Pershinske** stated that in the interest of time, this agenda item will be deferred to the next meeting. He acknowledged those Council members that spent time on this item with him. He stated that not all the statements are negative and some are very positive; all comments will be included.

Upcoming 2011 Meetings

Chair Pershinske referenced the Council meeting dates for the remainder of the year that were noted on the agenda.

Public Comment

There were no comments brought forth by the audience.

Closing Comments from the Council

Ms. Giddings stated that there is current legislation to cut the Natural Resources Trust Fund in half. She suggested contacting legislators if one doesn't want this to happen. **Mr. DeVillez** stated that the legislation is regarding paying PILT. **Ms. Welling** stated that PILT payments are a result of a legislative change in 2008 in which the Treasury pays half and the DNR pays half (pro-ration) and this new bill would change the process.

Chair Pershinske reiterated the agenda item on communication. He stated this is a significant topic based on his interaction with legislators, the DNR Director, and staff. The Council can provide a great service to the DNR in addressing the issues. It will remain on the agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. Scott stated that a new subgroup was formed for legislators who are interested in hunting and fishing to become involved in DNR-type matters. This may be something for the Council members to be engaged in. He will provide the names of those in the subgroup to the Council when he becomes aware of them.

Adjourn

There being no further business, **Chair Pershinske** adjourned the meeting at 8:50pm EST.