

Eastern Upper Peninsula Citizen Advisory Council (EUPCAC)
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, January 23, 2014
6:30-8:30pm EST
Comfort Inn, Newberry, MI

Chair: Dick Pershinske Vice-Chair: Glenn Moll Secretary: Tom Buckingham

Council Members Present

Tom Buckingham	Jim Hoy
Phil Dennis	Bernie Hubbard
Gary Ellenwood	Michael Lawless
Jason Garvon	Glenn Moll
Ginny Giddings	Dick Pershinske
Gary Gorniak	Richard Serfass
Tim Hass	Jim Shutt

Council Members Excused/Absent

Jim Duke
Al Garavaglia
Chad Radka

Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Staff Liaisons

Kristi Dahlstrom, Executive Assistant, Marquette
Christina Hammill, Facilities & Operations, Newberry
Stacy Welling Haughey, U.P. Regional Coordinator, Marquette
Tom Paquin, Parks & Recreation Division, Newberry
Jeff Stampfly, Forest Resources Division, Marquette
Steve Scott, Fisheries Division, Newberry
Kristie Sitar, Wildlife Division, Newberry

Special Guests

Kerry Wieber, DNR Forest Land Administrator, Roscommon

Call To Order

The Eastern Upper Peninsula Citizen Advisory Council (EUPCAC) meeting was called to order at 6:30pm EST by **Chair Pershinske**. Introductions of Council members were made.

Adoption of Agenda

Chair Pershinske noted a couple of changes to the agenda. The Graymont Update will be moved to the first item under Old Business to accommodate the speaker, and subsequently, public comment will be held after the speaker's report for those that want to comment about that particular agenda item. He asked if there were any other revisions needed; none were brought forth. **Mr. Buckingham motioned to adopt the agenda as amended; Mr. Lawless seconded the motion. Ayes: All. Nays: None. Absent: Mr. Duke, Mr. Garavaglia, and Mr. Radka. Motion carried.**

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Chair Pershinske asked the Council if there were any corrections to the October 17th, 2013 EUPCAC minutes. **Mr. Lawless motioned to approve the minutes as submitted; Mr. Buckingham seconded the motion. Ayes: All. Nays: None. Absent: Mr. Duke, Mr. Garavaglia, and Mr. Radka. Motion carried.**

Chair Comments

Chair Pershinske stated it continues to be a busy time for those involved in natural resources and the Council. He spent time with the Governor, DNR Director and DNR Deputy Director in December and they all confirmed the value of the Council. The Council members are what make it work. He also received words of wisdom from the DNR Director which he will take under consideration. He touched on the following items of interest:

- The Graymont proposal has been gathering a lot of attention and an update will be provided later in the meeting.
- Dredging at the Naubinway marina (a harbor of refuge) wasn't fully completed before ceasing due to the weather. Updates will continue to be provided to the Council.
- The Hiawathaland Club lost one of their dams due to a washout. It's an ongoing concern as it has a large impact on the fishery there, and will be addressed in the spring.
- **Chair Pershinske** has been hearing some concerns about the DNR's role in political activity. He asked for clarification. **Mrs. Haughey** stated she spoke with the DNR's legislative liaison this morning to confirm the DNR's role. In past years, when the public seen legislative information from the DNR, it may have indicated whether the DNR supported, opposed, or took a neutral position on the issue. This no longer happens. For the last two years, the position stated on legislative reports from the DNR is from the Governor's Office, not the DNR (i.e. the Administration supports or opposes). Administration means the Governor's Office.
- **Chair Pershinske** briefly mentioned the petition being circulated out in the public that was developed by stakeholders who support using sound science to manage natural resources. **Mr. Gorniak** and **Ms. Giddings** both made short comments. **Mrs. Haughey** stated the DNR cannot speak to or take a position on this topic and suggested it be discussed outside of the meeting.

Public Comments

As noted and revised under Adoption of Agenda by **Chair Pershinske**, this section will follow the first item that was moved to Old Business.

Officer Elections

Chair Pershinske noted the Bylaws require the Council to have an officer election at the first meeting of each year. He opened the floor for nominations for 2014.

- *Chairperson:* **Mr. Moll**, current Vice-Chairperson, asked for nominations. **Mr. Gorniak** nominated Mr. Pershinske to continue as Chairperson; **Mr. Pershinske** accepted the nomination. **Mr. Moll** asked twice again for nominations. There being no additional nominations received, **Mr. Pershinske** will continue as Chairperson.
- *Vice-Chairperson:* **Chair Pershinske** asked for nominations. **Mr. Gorniak** nominated Mr. Moll to continue as Vice-Chairperson; **Mr. Moll** accepted the nomination. **Chair Pershinske** asked twice again for nominations. There being no additional nominations received, **Mr. Moll** will continue as Vice-Chairperson.

- *Secretary:* **Chair Pershinske** asked for nominations. **Mr. Hoy** nominated Mr. Buckingham to continue as Secretary; **Mr. Buckingham** accepted the nomination. **Chair Pershinske** asked twice again for nominations. There being no additional nominations received, **Mr. Buckingham** will continue as Secretary.
- *Final Results:* **Mr. Pershinske** remains Chairperson for 2014, **Mr. Moll** remains Vice-Chairperson for 2014, and **Mr. Buckingham** remains Secretary for 2014.

Reports

1. *Stacy Welling Haughey, UP Regional Coordinator:* **Mrs. Haughey** welcomed first-time visitors to the meeting and provided an overview of Council history. She also explained the public comment process. She provided an update on the following items:
 - Graymont has submitted a proposal for a land transaction. Ms. Kerry Wieber, DNR Forest Land Administrator, is here to provide an update. There was a meeting held with public members in Lansing today, and some of those people are here this evening. Every effort will be made to get questions answered and to connect with those individuals who have questions.
 - The state land transaction process involves 8 steps. These steps are available on the website. The process includes a thorough review and input from inside and outside stakeholders as well as NRC involvement. The land transaction process for the Graymont proposal includes 14 steps to provide more public involvement and detail since it is a large proposal. This proposal is currently between steps 1 and 2 (described on a handout included in the meeting packets).
 - Senate Bill 78 on biodiversity died in the last legislative session (2013). There was one legislative meeting held but it has not moved. Any new information will be brought to the Council's attention.
 - At the January 13 WUPCAC meeting, two topics were suggested for the Joint UPCAC meeting for the EUCPAC to consider: State of the Forest (including a financial component) and Disease Issues (including a CWD update).
 - **Chair Pershinske** asked how far away CWD has been confirmed from the U.P. border (possibly 70 miles). **Ms. Sitar** stated she wasn't sure; it was close, but it has not met the target distance yet. **Chair Pershinske** agreed this was a good topic for the Joint agenda.
 - **Vice-Chair Moll** stated after discussing with Mr. Stampfly the topic on this evening's agenda regarding financial aspects of the state's forest, it was noted a State of the Forest topic may be included as a Joint agenda item. It was agreed to include combine the two items at the Joint meeting.
2. *DNR Division Reports:* Written staff reports were provided via email to Council members on January 16, 2014. The following were current updates or comments provided.
 - *Kristie Sitar, Wildlife Division:* **Ms. Sitar** is attending for Mr. Minzey. She had no additions to the report.
 - *Tom Paquin, Parks & Recreation Division:* **Mr. Paquin** added the management plan for the Father Marquette Memorial site will begin in February and carried out by Straights State Park. It is a 14-month process. Also, he and Mr. Stampfly are working on a few equestrian

campgrounds in the eastern U.P. More will be forthcoming; some will be in front of the NRC soon.

- **Vice-Chair Moll** asked about the legislation for the free ORV riding day. **Mr. Paquin** stated it will be held the same weekend as free fishing weekend in June and there may be another weekend set aside in September; there are no formalized plans yet. **Mr. Gorniak** questioned why it was designated during free fishing weekend; **Mr. Paquin** stated it was written into legislation.
- **Jeff Stampfly, Forest Resources Division:** **Mr. Stampfly** stated there were no updates to his report.
- **Vice-Chair Moll** asked about the major Correction Action Request (CAR) resulting from the latest audit. **Mr. Stampfly** explained it related to biodiversity and the BSA program. CAR's from audits are not uncommon and the Forest Resources Division will be working to address this specific CAR.
- **Steve Scott, Fisheries Division:** **Mr. Scott** stated he did not have any additions to the Fisheries written report.
- **Chair Pershinske** reminded the Council that Lt. Hagy sent an email to council members asking for their opinions on a number of items related to the Law Division's strategic plan. He encouraged all members to respond. **Mr. Shutt** stated he has an upcoming quarterly board meeting with the Michigan Charter Boat Association and he will circulate the survey with them at that meeting.

Old Business

1. **(Moved from New Business #1) Graymont Project Update/Land Transaction Process:** **Ms. Kerry Wieber** introduced herself, indicating she is a DNR forest land administrator from the Roscommon office. She has been involved with the Graymont proposal from the initial contact. She provided the following update, which will answer questions and dispel some myths:
 - Graymont first approached the DNR in April 2012. At that time, Graymont was unsure what land they were interested in, so in the summer and winter of 2012, they did exploration on state land.
 - Following the exploration, Graymont approached the DNR to finalize the proposal they wanted to submit. This is a very normal process when someone is interested in state land. Typically there is a conversation with them to make sure it's something the DNR can review before an application is submitted. Because this transaction involves so much state-owned land, there was concern the DNR wasn't running it through the normal process. Contact before the application is submitted is normal.
 - Graymont submitted a formal application/proposal in early November 2013. The DNR is in the process of reviewing this application now. All of the information, including the actual proposal, details, maps, and fact sheet are available on the website: http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,4570,7-153-10368_11797_66953---,00.html. Being the proposal involves a large amount of land, the DNR wants the public to be able to see all of the information regarding this transaction.
 - Graymont's current proposal includes acquisition of approximately 10,000 acres of state-owned land, of which 7,800 acres would be an underground limestone mine, 1,600 acres

for a surface mine, an additional 1,000 acres to be utilized in the future. Of the 7,800 acres for the underground mine, 1,500 acres would be needed to support the mine, with the remainder open to public use, including timber management, recreational activities, etc. In addition, for the underground portion of land, Graymont is offering the state the right of first offer to purchase back the land for one dollar at the end of operation.

- The current review process for this transaction has been given 14 steps and currently it is in step 2. A three-prong review takes place, which includes an environmental review (not DEQ) by local staff, a legal review with the Attorney General's office, and a social review which is obtaining public input in the process. The proposal went to local staff for their review in November and they have 30 days to submit their review to the lead reviewer, which is Ms. Karen Rodock at the Newberry office. Ms. Rodock is in the process of compiling local staff reviews and once finished, she will compile it and submit it to Mr. Stampfly at the Marquette Office. He will review it and submit it to Ms. Wieber. It will then be given to a committee who will make a recommendation to the Director.
- Typically, every land transaction goes to the NRC for approval by the Director; **Ms. Wieber** explained the public process at that meeting. Specific to this transaction, a DNR-hosted meeting will be held in the Rexton area before the Director makes a decision. The review is not at this point yet. The meeting will be possibly held in March, April or later. The meeting will be heavily advertised, so the public will know when it will be held. At this meeting, the staff's recommendation to the Director will be presented and comments received at this meeting will be given to the Director. Comments can also be submitted at any time at proposal.comments@michigan.gov.
- **Ms. Wieber** opened the floor to Council comments and questions.
 - **Mr. Gorniak** asked how much recreation land will be lost. **Ms. Wieber** stated, based on what is currently proposed, 1,500 acres would not be open for recreation due to the underground mine as well as the 1,600 acres for the surface mine, totaling a little over 3,000 acres. However, land will be open and closed during mining.
 - Mr. Robison from Graymont stated up to 800 acres will be private as they move the mining process forward. They recognized early on the need to not lock up that land. He further explained the mining process they are planning. **Mr. Gorniak** asked if all roads will remain open; Mr. Robison stated yes.
 - **Mr. Serfass** asked if this mine will be similar to limestone operations in Cedarville. Mr. Robison stated it's similar in that it's a surface mine. He cannot speak for that mine, but Graymont does a reclamation program which is similar to drilling and blasting. **Mr. Serfass** asked if the limestone will be shipped; Mr. Robison stated they are still investigating options.
 - **Mr. Ellenwood** asked how they plan to get the limestone to Sand Products in Brevort, MI and if they plan to build a truck trail on additional state land; Mr. Robison stated they will most likely truck it, a million tons a year, and a truck trail is an option they are looking at. The concept of having a private road away from existing public roads is what others prefer. **Ms. Wieber** clarified that a truck trail or utilizing state land for this purpose is not part of this proposal and a proposal has not been submitted for it. **Mr. Ellenwood** stated when the DNR reviews the proposal, it should review how the product is going to be removed and/or provide others the opportunity to bid on this

land at a competitive level. **Ms. Wieber** stated the DNR is only reviewing the proposed land transaction, not a mine. She further explained legislation that governs the process.

- **Mr. Hoy** asked if more acres are being considered in the future. Mr. Robison stated they are looking at some private land, but not public land. **Mr. Hoy** asked what the timeframe is for mining the 7,800 acres as it pertains to access for recreation. Mr. Robison replied the sequence of mining will be determined by market conditions with surface mining taking place first. **Mr. Hoy** asked if the public has any input on when it's mined; Mr. Robison stated they are certainly open to input. Discussion ensued regarding royalties, safety restrictions and easements. **Mr. Hoy** asked if the roads would be gated. **Ms. Wieber** stated although no proposal has been received pertaining to roads, the DNR typically doesn't allow gates.
- **Mr. Gorniak** asked about the life expectancy of this project. Mr. Robison stated 50-100 years, long term.
- **Mr. Serfass** asked about employment numbers. Mr. Robison stated a half dozen local folks will be hired up front, and if a plant can be put in and it's market driven, it may be up to 30 local jobs. Taxes to the local county/townships will still be paid. Mr. Robison stated he has been in contact with Mr. Garavaglia, Township Supervisor.
- **Ms. Wieber** stated this project would not qualify for the CFA Program.
- **Mr. Ellenwood** asked if a 10,000 acre tract of state land has been sold before. **Ms. Wieber** stated she is not aware of any transactions this large in the last 11 years.

Public Comments

*As noted under Adoption of Agenda by **Chair Pershinske**, this section of the agenda was moved to follow the first item under Old Business (Graymont Update). **Chair Pershinske** opened the floor for public comments pertaining to the Graymont Update just provided.*

- **Mr. Art Mills** asked if this project could be voted on by the public. **Ms. Wieber** stated the authority lies with the DNR Director through the state's constitution. **Mrs. Haughey** added legislature has given the DNR the authority over this type of land transaction. The Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) would play a role as would local officials through ordinances. The public plays a role as well through their local community. This is the public's land, not the DNR's land. The DNR is entrusted to manage it on the public's behalf, which is why input from the public will be important in this process.
- **Mr. Larry Rubick** of Newberry asked if precedent is set with the permit they have currently. **Ms. Wieber** stated the DEQ handles permits required for mining, not the DNR. The DNR is reviewing the land transaction only and has no authority over the mining process.
- **Mr. Bob Simpson** of Trout Lake stated he went to a meeting in Trout Lake and listed the downsides to this project, such as the acreage, unanswered questions on the plant, noise, impact on roads, air quality, property values, water quality, and damage to wells. He does not see a tremendous economic impact. Mr. Robison of Graymont responded and asked to meet with Mr. Simpson personally. Discussion ensued. **Chair Pershinske** gaveled further discussion stating this was an information update only and not a debate.
- **Mr. Sandy Shaw** of Trout Lake asked for clarification on the review process and whether land use after it's sold is being reviewed. **Ms. Wieber** stated typically, if the DNR sells land, it

doesn't have a say on what happens on that land after it's sold. However, in this case, because the intent is clear, it is being considered. It's important to know if the DNR chooses to sell the land, there are still DEQ permits to go through. **Mrs. Haughey** added DEQ plays a role in the future of this, but there is the local ordinance factor that plays a role as well. Mr. Shaw asked what is being done to protect his air and water quality issues; **Mrs. Haughey** stated the DNR does not have the authority or expertise to evaluate them; it is the DEQ's role.

- **Mr. Hongisto** of Deerton asked where the public hearings will be held on this issue. **Ms. Wieber** stated one will be held in the Rexton area, and whether or not they are held elsewhere is yet to be determined. There is also the public comment option at the NRC meeting. These meetings will provide opportunities to comment on the proposal for the land transaction only. Mr. Hongisto asked what the limestone will be used for. Mr. Robison of Graymont replied it will be used at existing operations in Green Bay and Superior, Wisconsin to make calcium oxide. He stated they own the lime plant in Gulliver but not the quarry.
- **Mr. Scott** (DNR Fisheries) clarified, based on legislation for a water use act passed five years ago, aquifers are monitored in Michigan to prevent them from draining dry. He further explained. There can be use of aquifers without affecting surface waters. It is monitored, regulated, and permitted in Michigan. The Fisheries Division is a part of this review process.
- **Mrs. Wilda Frederick** of Naubinway asked what happens if her well dries up. **Mr. Scott** stated he doesn't know the answer. It was asked if Graymont is leasing or buying the land; **Ms. Wieber** stated the proposal is to buy the land.
- **Mr. Don Frederick** of Naubinway stated he spoke to two different area well-drillers and they are concerned with contamination of well water. His property is in the middle of the proposed 7,800 acres. He is concerned about road traffic and dust, up to 50 loads per day if they work 8 hour shifts, if 24 hour shifts, then much more. He is also concerned about his property value. He asked if the Council has seen the maps on the website or brochures; the Council replied no.
- **Mr. Al English** of Trout Lake stated he is a Clerk in Trout Lake and the private landowners are not being considered in these ventures. A Canadian outfit bought 40 acres in our township and they are asking the land seller what he was told the land will be used for. Mr. English encouraged people to attend a meeting in Sault Ste. Marie next week where this project will also be discussed. **Mrs. Haughey** stated she is speaking at the Sault meeting, which is a meeting of the U.P. League of Women Voters, and the same information will be presented as this evening.
- **Mr. Kip Cameron** of Newberry stated no wells have gone dry before in his area. With Mackinac County the highest unemployment in the U.P., he was disappointed in the number of people that would be hired. More jobs would help that area.
- **Mr. Joe Caswell** of Newberry stated he is not enthused about the proposal because it's giving up so much land and the buyers will do what they want; no contract, it will be a permanent deal and the taxpayers will have no say.
- **Mr. Bob Simpson** of Trout Lake stated he hopes Graymont has a ton of money to fix wells.
- **Mr. Sandy Shaw** of Trout Lake stated it's a very clumsy step to not look at what is going to be done on this land after it's sold, especially as it pertains to noise and air quality. **Mrs. Haughey** stated the DNR is not debating the mine; the DNR only has the legal authority to review the land transaction. **Ms. Wieber** stated not only is there a review through the DNR, but there is a process with DEQ as well.

- Mrs. Kathy English of Trout Lake stated any revenues generated by this mine will go to Canada. The primary source of income to their area is through tourism and if the public cannot access these lands, it will be detrimental to their tourism. There is an out in every single point to close the land due to safety. The tax base may be eroded if people move. It will be a loss of revenue for the towns and the state of Michigan.

Chair Pershinske closed further public comment as all who have indicated they wanted to speak was given ample opportunity.

Old Business (Continued)

2. Council Membership Status: **Mrs. Haughey** explained the Council structure. There are two positions currently open on the EUPCAC and those interested were encouraged to apply by January 10, 2014. A total of 7 applications have been received and will be reviewed in February by the selection committee, which is made up of stakeholder and staff representatives. They review applications based on an equal number of county and stakeholder groups represented amongst other qualifications. New members will be chosen prior to the March Joint UPCAC Meeting.
3. Limited UP Wolf Hunting Season Update: **Ms. Sitar** stated the first wolf hunt was deemed a successful hunt with 23 wolves harvested out of the target of 43. In Unit A in the far west U.P., 5 wolves were harvested out of a target 13; in Unit B near central U.P., 14 were harvested out of a target 19, and in Unit C in the eastern U.P., 4 were harvested out of a target 8. Of the 23 wolves harvested, 50% were males and 50% were females and 50% of each out of each unit as well. 3 radio-collared wolves were legally harvested. 13 of the 23 (56%) wolves were harvested by U.P. residents, 9 (40%) were harvested by lower peninsula residents, and 1 was harvested by a non-resident.
 - **Chair Pershinske** asked if the hunt resulted in erratic movement of wolves. **Ms. Sitar** stated now that its winter, wolves do move in this season. She does not believe that any wolves left the hunt units.
 - **Mr. Serfass** asked if the harvested wolves were aged. **Ms. Sitar** stated they did collect teeth from the animals for this purpose; results are not yet known. Carcasses of female wolves were also collected and sent for study.
 - Mr. Rubick from the audience asked if there will be a hunt in 2014 and if the quota will be doubled since only half of the quota was harvested. **Ms. Sitar** stated if another hunt is allowed, the whole season structure will be reviewed. Mr. Rubick stated there were three articles in the Daily Press on why deer season was poor, and none of the reasons given involved wolves, which is his belief.
 - Mr. Cameron from the audience asked if there were any wolves harvested in southern Luce County. **Ms. Sitar** stated in Unit C, there was a target of 8 wolves and 4 wolves were harvested. One of those four may have been in southern Luce County.
4. U.P. Deer Advisory Team Open House Dates: **Ms. Sitar** stated there are 8 open houses planned, 3 of which have already occurred and 1 is being held in Marquette this evening. The remaining four will be held in Munising, Baraga, Newberry, and Escanaba. All meetings are

held from 6-8 pm local time and open to the public. The 2013 license package will be discussed and input will be solicited for U.P. buck management options.

5. Forestry Subcommittee Presentation-Financial Aspects: **Vice-Chair Moll** indicated because a state of the forest agenda topic was suggested for the Joint UPCAC meeting, this agenda item will be deferred to that meeting.

New Business

1. Graymont Project Update/Land Transaction Process: As noted under Adoption of Agenda by **Chair Pershinske**, this item was moved to Old Business #1 to accommodate the speaker.
2. Dear Season Recap: **Ms. Sitar** reported in the eastern U.P., the deer harvest was down approximately 30% from 2012 and down about 15% from the 3-year average. Supplemental feeding was implemented for the southern U.P. counties due to the heavy accumulated snowfall. The northern counties are not required to meet a threshold level of snow in order to feed deer in a given winter; permits can be applied for in those counties anytime during the winter. It is believed the heavy amount of snow still on the ground late in last year's winter season had a large impact on the deer. If this year is difficult as well, it will have a larger impact. Body weights of deer were good this season, but antler development was poor. More 2.5 year old deer were seen than previously. Fewer year and a half old deer. Fawns had a hard time making through last winter.
 - It was asked if the DNR was opening up cutting lands through swamps for deer as they did in the 60's. **Ms. Sitar** replied no, as state land is not managed in the same way. It is managed by several divisions for different reasons. Also if cedar is cut in the winter, deer will only feed once that winter, as the cedar will not grow back. In response to audience questions, she further explained deer yards, cover, and how stands are managed in the winter.
 - Mr. Cameron from the audience asked if deer can be fed if one receives a permit. **Ms. Sitar** stated the permit is applicable to private land only, not state land, in the southern U.P. counties.
 - **Ms. Giddings** stated it would be nice to see more predators for deer other than humans, especially for sick deer. 60,000 deer starve per year in the U.P. Humans will see wolves when hunting for deer because wolves are hunting for deer too. **Ms. Sitar** stated in severe winters, about that many deer starve to death. In a mild winter, about half that much.
 - **Mr. Gorniak** asked why deer cannot be fed on state land. **Ms. Sitar** stated it is not permitted on state land due to potential disease issues in feeding deer.
3. Cougar Update: **Ms. Sitar** reported a press release was issued before the holidays indicating a cougar had been illegally poached in Schoolcraft County. This same cougar was verified in a sighting photo previously. To date, including the poached cougar, there have been 24 verifications of cougars in the U.P. since 2008. There have been no verified cougar sightings in the lower peninsula. There are 4 DNR staff considered as cougar experts and they have looked at numerous photos of alleged cougar sightings. The DNR suspects the animals are coming from the Dakotas. A sample from the poached cougar will confirm his origin.

- **Mr. Gorniak** asked if there is a map on the website that shows cougar sightings in the U.P. **Ms. Sitar** stated she is not sure if there is and will look into it. She also noted there has been no sign of breeding cougars to suggest there is a growing population in Michigan.
- Mr. Caswell indicated there was a TV report of a female bobcat and two cubs in Iron Mountain years ago. **Ms. Sitar** stated there are TV stations and newspapers that run items which are not verified.
- **Chair Pershinske** stated the media is bringing attention to a trend of confirmed attacks by cougars over the years. He asked if the DNR is concerned with potential attacks. **Ms. Sitar** stated attacks are happening where there are populations of cougars and Michigan does not have that. **Chair Pershinske** stated the public thinks the DNR doesn't react the way they should and that between the Council and the media, the public needs to know the DNR is interested in any incidents or photos. **Ms. Sitar** noted the DNR cannot make verifications if the public doesn't contact them.
- **Mr. Hass** stated he read an interesting article in last month's National Geographic which talked about some reasons why attacks are happening. He knows people in the U.P. are refusing to tell the DNR if they spotted a cougar as they don't want them to meddle.
- It was asked if the DNR plans to trap wolves and move them to Traverse City. **Ms. Sitar** stated there are no plans to move wolves.

Next Meeting

1. **Approval of 2014 Meeting Dates & Locations:** **Chair Pershinske** noted the proposed 2014 meeting dates and locations listed on the back of agenda: April 17, June 19, August 21, October 16, and December 4. A change this year in the normal schedule is holding the meetings in two alternate locations to provide opportunity for more public involvement: June 19 in Manistique and October 16 in Sault Ste. Marie. **Secretary Buckingham motioned to approve the 2014 meeting dates and locations as proposed; Mr. Lawless seconded the motion. Ayes: All. Nays: None. Absent: Mr. Duke, Mr. Garavaglia, and Mr. Radka. Motion carried.**
2. **Next Meeting Date:** **Chair Pershinske** noted the next regular meeting of the EUPCAC will be held on Thursday, April 17th at the Comfort Inn Conference Room in Newberry. The Joint UPCAC meeting will be held on Monday, March 17th in Marquette at Northern Michigan University. More information on the joint meeting will be forthcoming.
3. **Topics for Joint Meeting & Next Agenda:** **Chair Pershinske** reiterated the suggested joint meeting topics include a state of the forest presentation and disease issues (including CWD). If there are any other ideas or input, please let him know in the next few weeks. **Mr. Lawless** suggested an update on the state's trail initiative would be beneficial to all Council members. **Vice-Chair Moll** stated, as a possible agenda topic, there is interest in groups putting together and publishing point-to-point trail maps for ORV's. He said uniform signing has been an initiative of Council Member Schulz of the WUPCAC. If the state is going to promote Michigan as a trail state and make it user friendly, there should be some kind of seamless system. **Mr. Hass** noted the forest service changes their rules from year to year and doesn't publish maps.

Public Comments

Chair Pershinske opened the floor for additional public comments. There were no further comments made.

Closing Comments from the Council

- **Mr. Hoy** suggested the Council take a position or make a recommendation on the limestone mine at the April meeting. **Chair Pershinske** stated there should be more information out at that time. **Mrs. Haughey** reminded the Council the DNR's review is for the land transaction only. **Mr. Hoy** stated the Council may have more of an impact than the public meetings.
- **Mr. Lawless** asked that the Council's public comment policy be reviewed as it pertains to the format in which public comments were made this evening. **Chair Pershinske** agreed he would do so.
- **Mr. Gorniak** mentioned if anyone would like information on the petition to see him after the meeting. **Ms. Giddings** stated her opposition to the petition as it will create a dictatorship. **Mrs. Haughey** again stated this discussion cannot occur during the meeting.

Adjourn

There being no further business, **Chair Pershinske** adjourned the meeting at 8:45pm EST.

Approved 4/1/14