

# Western Upper Peninsula Citizen Advisory Council (UPCAC)

## Meeting Minutes

Monday, July 18, 2011

5:30-6:00pm EST DNR Division Reports \* 6:00-8:00pm EST Official Council Meeting  
Porcupine Mountain Wilderness State Park Visitor's Center, Ontonagon, MI

---

### Council Members Present

Don Britton	George Lindquist
Jerry Divine	Rory Mattson
Floyd Dropps	G. Dale McNamee
Larry Heathman	Chauncy Moran
Mick Jarvi	Robert "Skip" Schulz
Michelle Jarvie	Warren Suchovsky
Dave Johnson	Phil Wirtanen
Marty Johnson	

### Council Members Absent

David Anderson	Jim Lorensen
David Anthony	Jim Schmierer

### Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Staff Liaisons

Stacy Welling, Upper Peninsula Regional Coordinator, Marquette  
George Madison, Fisheries Division, Baraga  
Tim Melko, Field Operations & Facility Management, Marquette  
Debbie Munson Badini, UP Communications Representative, Marquette  
Dennis Nezich, Forest Management Division, Marquette  
Tom Paquin, Recreation Division, Marquette  
Lt. Tim Robson, Law Enforcement Division, Marquette  
Bill Scullion, Wildlife Division, Baraga  
Kristi Dahlstrom, Executive Division, Marquette

### DNR Division Reports

**Stacy Welling** provided an introduction and history of the Citizen's Advisory Councils to those who haven't attended previously. She acknowledged and thanked the staff from the Porcupine Mountain Wilderness State Park for their hospitality and preparation for the Western UPCAC meeting. She stated if anyone would like to speak publicly or ask questions to please fill out a comment card at the entrance of the room.

DNR written staff reports were provided to Council members on July 11, 2011. The following are updates to those reports.

- **Stacy Welling, U.P. Regional Coordinator:** Ms. Welling stated there was a USF&W wolf delisting meeting held on June 16 in Marquette in which the UPCAC resolutions were submitted. Public comments were taken online through July 5. In the meeting packets, there is a letter from Russ Mason that was sent to the media and legislators stating that the DNR would not be handling any wolf depredation cases due to the lack of federal funding; the funding is being eliminated by the federal government on July 15. As a result of this letter,

today the federal government has decided to extend funding through October 1. Also in the meeting packet is a handout on biodiversity stewardship areas-living legacies (BSA). One of the bills initiating this project was authored by Senator Casperson, and it is also part of the requirements for forest recertification. A letter from Director Stokes that mentions changes in the BSA process is also included. Ms. Welling stated she can answer any questions related to that process.

- **Debbie Munson Badini, U.P. Communications**: Ms. Munson Badini stated that because treaty rights were a topic of interest at the last meeting, she prepared an informational handout that is included in the packets and at the entrance table.
- **George Madison, Fisheries Division**: Mr. Madison added that a summary of the spring walleye stocking is attached to the division reports. As of this morning, however, an update is available: of the fry plants, 400,000 were planted in the western U.P. He noted as a reminder that there is a meeting on July 20 in Iron Mountain on the walleye management plan; it is a good venue for those interested in providing comments on the plan.
- **Tom Paquin, Parks & Recreation**: Mr. Paquin stated that the DNR received a five-year extension from the Army Corps of Engineers to dredge Ohman's Creek. He's not aware of any issues and they will continue to move forward on that project.
- **Bill Scullion, Wildlife Division**: Mr. Scullion stated that he is attending on behalf of Mr. Craig Albright. Mr. Scullion added that Director Stokes has extended the feral swine order until October 8 pending legislation.
- **Tim Melko, Operations & Facilities Management**: Mr. Melko provided a brief update on staffing additions for the U.P. operation service centers and field offices. He stated that the application period is now open for antlerless deer permits. The staff continues to help people as questions come about.
- **Dennis Nezich, Forest Management Division**: Mr. Nezich stated that he is filling in for Ms. Debbie Begalle, who is on temporary assignment in Lansing through November. Mr. Nezich added that the state forest campgrounds will remain open through October.
- **Lt. Tim Robson, Law Enforcement Division**: Lt. Robson stated he had no additional information to add to his report.

### **Pure Michigan Audio Presentation**

**Ms. Welling** played a 60-second audio piece on the Pure Michigan's, "The Wilds of Michigan" promotion featuring Gogebic & Ontonagon Counties. The website link is:  
<http://www.michigan.org/Partners/Wilds-of-Michigan/Default.aspx>.

### *Comments for DNR Staff:*

- **Mr. Floyd Dropps** asked Mr. Madison if the number of walleye fingerlings were down significantly. **Mr. Madison** stated that everyone experienced down numbers, including the tribal areas, due to the cold spring and weather through the month of June.
- **Mr. George Lindquist** questioned the Teal Lake fry. Mr. Madison indicated that the survival of fingerlings in that lake is low. He stated that they are working on shoreline habitat improvement and would like to talk to Mr. Lindquist further about the project.
- **Facilitator Phil Wirtanen** asked if there were only two management units, Lake Superior and Northern Michigan and if sportman's groups can co-manage as volunteers. **Mr. Madison**

agreed that there are only two units. He stated typically sportman's groups adopt a pond, similar to the adopt-a-highway program. Volunteers help the DNR do more ponds. For Houghton County, they are hoping to use volunteers at Portage Lake. If a unit is doing real well, volunteers will help out a less productive unit, including those raised by collaborative efforts. **Mr. Dropps** asked if the DNR uses volunteers for surveys that have a big impact and what percentage does it help. **Mr. Madison** indicated that they use volunteers frequently on lake to stream surveys, and the percentage is about the same. He stated there is limited space on the boat and its harsh work, as Council member Ms. Michelle Jarvi can attribute to when she helped with the Deer Lake survey.

- **Mr. Marty Johnson** asked Mr. Scullion how many signed up for the habitat improvement program and whether it was successful. **Mr. Scullion** stated that 3 clubs registered and participants were pleased with it. He explained the current projects. The whole idea is to do habitat work on the ground and they are very satisfied. The number of acres was not known.
- **Mr. Mick Jarvi** asked Mr. Scullion about the bat issue. **Mr. Scullion** stated the White Nose Syndrome affecting the bat population is a fungus. It has spread to 18 states and 4 Canadian provinces. He explained the symptoms and how it is spread (bat to bat and by people), and indicated that the little brown bat could become extinct in 12 years due to the fungus. He noted that the DNR does not have a dedicated bat biologist. He indicated that they are very concerned as the economic impact in Michigan is \$5.28 million to \$1.2 billion per year offsetting chemical applications in an agricultural aspect. The syndrome has been found 70 miles from Sault Ste. Marie and in a spot in Minnesota, and it is predicted to show up in the U.P. soon. **Mr. Jarvi** asked where more information would be available; **Mr. Scullion** stated that the US Fish & Wildlife has a dedicated website with maps, disease information, etc.; the DNR website also has a link and information as well.
- **Mr. Dropps** asked for information regarding the Menominee River Headwater project. **Ms. Welling** indicated that there is an informational handout in the meeting packet and it was also emailed to Council members. **Mr. Dropps** will email his questions (regarding public access to the waterways and loss of water frontage) to Ms. Welling at her request. **Mr. McNamee** questioned what the costs are and who the DNR is buying it from. Upon Council agreement, **Ms. Welling** stated she will arrange for a presentation at the next meeting.

### Call To Order

The Western UPCAC meeting was called to order at 6:05 pm EST (5:05pm CST) by **Facilitator Phil Wirtanen**. He thanked everyone for their attendance, and explained the public comment period and time allotment.

### Adoption of Agenda

**Facilitator Wirtanen** asked for a motion to approve the agenda as presented. **Mr. M. Johnson** motioned to adopt the agenda as submitted; **Mr. Dropps** supported the motion. **Mr. Dropps** stated he would like to take from the table the motion of November 2009 to send a letter of support for the Walleye Subcommittee report regarding the walleye management plan to the DNR Director and NRC and place it on the agenda under Old Business. **Facilitator Wirtanen** asked if there was any further discussion. **Mr. Jerry Divine** stated that he has read a lot of literature and talked to a lot of people regarding the plan. His view is that really good experienced and professional people developed the plan and he'd like to support that. There is

a lot of talk here about Iron & Dickinson Counties, but generally in the U.P. for about the last 7-8 years there hasn't been much done on walleye fishing, and tourism for Iron & Dickinson Counties is extremely important. He suggested identifying the prime walleye lakes in these counties, study them with good monitoring for the next 10 years, and see what happens. He would support the resolution being brought again before the Council. **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated the Council needs to determine whether to include it under Old Business. **Mr. Dale McNamee** stated he would like to make an addition to the agenda and suggest that all the Council meetings be held in Marquette, since the Eastern UPCAC always holds theirs in one town (Newberry). He stated there would be better attendance if held in Marquette. **Mr. Rory Mattson** supported the suggestion. **Mr. Warren Suchovsky** stated he is against holding the meetings in Marquette. The Eastern UPCAC doesn't have as many community centers available to them as does the Western UPCAC. **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that the Council needs to determine whether the agenda should be adjusted; comments will be taken when the item is brought up later in the agenda. He asked if there was general agreement to include on the agenda the request to take the tabled motion from November 2009 regarding the walleye management plan and bring it to the point of resolution under Old Business, and to hold meetings in Marquette under New Business. **Mr. Dave Johnson motioned to add the two items to the agenda; Mr. Divine supported the motion. Ayes: All. Nays: None. Absent: Mr. David Anderson, Mr. David Anthony, Mr. Jim Lorensen, Mr. Jim Schmierer. Motion carried.**

#### **Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes**

**Mr. Dropps** stated he objects to approving the May 23, 2011 WUPCAC Meeting Minutes as submitted. **Mr. Jarvi** supported the objection. **Mr. Dropps** stated a presentation made by a former DNR employee that was lengthy and critical to the discussion did not appear in the minutes. He indicated that he forwarded that information and leaving it out does not support the Open Meetings Act. **Ms. Welling** stated that items can be added in to the minutes at this time.

**Mr. Dropps motioned to include the information in the May 23, 2011 WUPCAC Meeting minutes, which would then be included on the website; Mr. Dave Johnson supported the motion. Mr. Mattson** read allowed an email (on file) that Mr. Dropps sent and asked him if it was what he was referring to; **Mr. Dropps** agreed. **Facilitator Wirtanen** noted that he feels that the minutes are an adequate reflection of the meeting; it's not the intent to report verbatim. **Mr. D. Johnson** stated he feels the points were missed. **Ayes: 14. Nays: 1. Absent: Mr. David Anderson, Mr. David Anthony, Mr. Jim Lorensen, Mr. Jim Schmierer. Motion carried.**

**Mr. Moran** stated that he has testified at many meetings and every single word is not put in the minutes, and to not state specificity is not to declare that the minutes are not an adequate reflection of discussion. **Facilitator Wirtanen** agreed. **Ms. Welling** stated that Mrs. Dahlstrom was not copied on Mr. Dropps' email which is why it wasn't included in the draft minutes, and asked him to email her any changes he has in the future. Discussion ensued regarding reporting of discussion in minutes.

**Facilitator Wirtanen stated that the Council is still acting on the motion to accept the minutes with the inclusion previously mentioned and asked for a vote. Ayes: All. Nays: None.**

**Absent: Mr. David Anderson, Mr. David Anthony, Mr. Jim Lorenson, Mr. Jim Schmierer.**  
**Motion carried.**

#### **Public Comments on Agenda Items Only**

**Mr. Jack Herrick** from the audience spoke in reference to the DNR Wildlife Division Accountability of Revenues & Expenditures agenda topic. He stated that Wildlife Unlimited has given the DNR a lot of funding over the years and yet he still can't get a boat in (location unknown) and has contacted the DNR several times to dredge it. He would like to know why it hasn't been done and wants to see a better breakdown of revenues and expenditures. **Mr. Moran** questioned if the Army Corps of Engineers were involved with the dredging. **Mr. Tom Paquin** stated that he and a site planner were at the site today; the Corp of Engineers will probably not dredge it and the DNR is looking at it now. It is a definite issue until the water level comes back. **Mr. Herrick** asked when a decision will be made. **Mr. Paquin** said they are reviewing it; there's not much that can be done with the low water levels. If a ramp is put in, it will back into the other end of the river. **Mr. Herrick** stated that stumps could be taken out. **Ms. Welling** asked if Wildlife Unlimited is funding any part of the project; **Mr. Paquin** replied no.

**Mr. Dave Nelson** from the audience also spoke in reference to the DNR Wildlife Division Accountability of Revenues & Expenditures agenda topic. He questioned the allocation of monies for wolf depredation. He would like to see numbers broken down. He stated he doesn't think Fisheries or Wildlife Division funds should be spent on wolf depredation. He mentioned Agenda 21. He stated he read about living legacies, and he wants to know how many people are involved, how long the project will continue, the number of hours and money spent on the project, and thinks it should be listed on the website. **Ms. Welling** stated this program, which is not on the agenda, is not related to Agenda 21. The handout about BSAs and living legacies indicates that it was passed in legislation through a bill sponsored by Senator Casperson in 2004. The handout includes a letter that was sent out by the DNR Director on the current status. The DNR was asked to look at this under the forest certification and legislative revisions. She would like the opportunity to have a more lengthy discussion on the topic and feels it is important. She mentioned that the Wildlife Division's annual report discusses all revenues and expenditures, including the Pittman-Robertson funding on pages 65-67. The Russ Mason letter in the meeting packets discusses the ending of wolf depredation funding on July 15, and she mentioned at the beginning of the meeting that as of today, the federal government is now extending pass-through funding through October 15. **Mr. Mattson** asked if she was saying that according to Russ Mason, the agency is no longer responding. **Ms. Welling** clarified that if the funding had not been extended, the DNR would've not responded to any depredation issues; fortunately the funds were extended.

#### **Old Business/Reports of Council Committees**

**Facilitator Wirtanen** presented information and a review for Council members and the public on how and why the CAC's began. He personally reviewed the CAC Charter and Bylaws. In his interpretation, the Council's role is in an advisory capacity, not as an advocate group. He stated that as a group executing the responsibility as stated in the Charter and Bylaws, the Council needs to work diligently to find a way to work with the DNR in a positive fashion. It is not to

suggest that the Council becomes a primary forum of criticism. It is a two-way exchange by bringing to the DNR's attention issues that pertain to policies, procedures, and protocols. The Council, representing an interest for the citizens, should reflect on what they have learned about the DNR when discussing issues with them. His interpretation is that Council members should show a high level of confidence in the DNR. Members need not show constant support, but rather seek to understand and then provide direction as best as possible to the DNR in order to meet the general needs of citizens, outside of the specific group that each represents, being as neutral as possible.

1. Subcommittee Status (Deer, Walleye, Wildlife): **Facilitator Wirtanen** indicated that there are currently two existing subcommittees: deer and walleye, and Mr. M. Johnson has set a date and time for a new wildlife subcommittee. There have been no resolutions or activity from the deer subcommittee and the regional deer advisory team (RDAT) ended. He asked if there was any interest on the Council's behalf to continue with the deer subcommittee. Discussion ensued. **Ms. Welling** stated when RDAT was created, they were aware of the existing deer subcommittees at CAC's, since RDAT was the main advisory group on U.P. deer issues. She stated the Council is welcome to make recommendations to the DNR and to RDAT at any time if the deer subcommittee wishes to continue to meet. **Mr. Mattson** suggested merging the deer subcommittee into the new wildlife subcommittee; **Mr. Johnson** and **Mr. Moran** indicated their support of the suggestion based on their involvement in the two subcommittees. **Mr. Lindquist motioned to merge the deer subcommittee into the wildlife subcommittee; Mr. Divine seconded the motion. Ayes: All. Nays: None. Absent: Mr. David Anderson, Mr. David Anthony, Mr. Jim Lorensen, Mr. Jim Schmierer. Motion carried.**

In regards to the walleye subcommittee and the walleye management plan, **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that the Council has spent a lot of time on this subject and he would like it to come to closure at this meeting. If it can't be brought to closure, then he would like the walleye subcommittee to take it back for further discussion in that venue. Currently, the Lake Michigan Walleye Management Plan is in the public comment process through the DNR. At this time, Mr. Dropps is suggesting that the Council take from the table the November 2009 motion *"to table sending a letter of resolution (supporting the report from the walleye subcommittee to the NRC & legislators) until the report and walleye management plan is reviewed by the Council members"*. Back in November 2009, the Council approved a motion to support the walleye subcommittee report; however, since the report, which included disagreements against and a new outline for the proposed walleye management plan, was submitted to the DNR without Council review and a vote, a motion was made to table submission of a resolution letter. **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that the Council will revisit the motion, ask for support and then follow with discussion. **Mr. Dropps** stated he would hope the Council would let him state why he feels it is a bad plan and what items in the plan have not been developed in good faith. **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated this is not a time for another presentation, but rather to have a healthy exchange on whether the Council wants to support what was presented in 2009 and make any resolutions or recommendations.

**Mr. Mattson** motioned for the Council to support the original motion made in November 2009: "...a motion was made for the Council to send a resolution letter supporting the report from the walleye subcommittee to the NRC & legislators". **Mr. D. Johnson** seconded the motion. The motion was open for discussion.

**Mr. Lindquist** questioned if the subcommittee report is still valid as it was a review of the 2009 management plan and it has since been updated. **Ms. Welling** added that the Council received (in a May email) 18 pages of every comment and suggestion that was made on the plan and, as a result, the plan is now different than the one presented in 2009. All prescribed inland lakes in Dickinson and Iron Counties were stocked, so a lot has happened since then. There is a public meeting on July 20 and one was previously held on July 13. **Mr. Dropps** stated he wants to address and point out the deficiencies in the management plan that the DNR has denied.

**Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that the discussion needs to be pertinent to the motion on the floor. It may be difficult without everyone having a copy of the plan and comments at this meeting. **Mr. Dropps** pointed out that he would like to see the DNR be held accountable for the actions in the plan; also the new growth rate listed is not a weighted average and shouldn't be included in the plan. **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that the Council has no experience with growth rates and there should be confidence in the DNR in this area. **Mr. Dropps** questioned if the DNR is insincere and dishonest about walleye stocking plans, then what about wildlife, etc. **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that if the Council is generally considered critics, then it lessens the Council's influence. The Council doesn't need to endorse the plan. Having looked at all the work that has been done since the original plan was produced, there is a decent consideration of the concerns of the public, stocking has been done in Dickinson and Iron Counties, and in the general sense, an inclusion of your point of view was done. He is aware that Mr. Dropps has a higher level of understanding with the plan. He is not challenging the basis, but questioning Mr. Dropps' overall approach, understanding that the Council's charter is to advise. **Mr. D. Johnson** stated that they are not looking to barter back and forth, but from Mr. Dropps standpoint, they are looking at it through a scientific approach by talking with a fish biologist and using what he is telling them. **Mr. Dropps** continued discussing his disagreement in the walleye planting per acre.

**Mr. Divine** thanked Facilitator Wirtanen for his earlier description of the Council's function. He stated that in consideration of the advisory function and viewing this issue from a scientific perspective, he would advise the DNR to take this information and utilize a 10-year approach to meet the five walleyes per acre, monitor the anglers' satisfaction and the lakes, and talk to those in the tourism business. The fisheries were cheated for 7-8 years and a lot of people can be kept happy by following that method. **Mr. Mattson** stated he agreed with only a part of what was said. He stated that the Council is the conduit between the people who use the resources and the people who manage the resources. The fisheries have been forgotten due to political agendas. He stated he went to former fishery biologists and asked them if stocking is at a level that is good; he was told why even do it. What Mr. Dropps is trying to bring across is why even

bother fishing. For two years, this issue it hasn't moved forward, and this is why he made the recommendation to support the motion.

**Ms. Welling** stated that there are 18 pages of comments/items that were included in the plan and to say that the DNR hasn't done anything for two years is false. The DNR could have done things better, however, the DNR has made efforts to meet with the walleye subcommittee and the lakes were stocked at 100% as prescribed. She stated the staff has done a lot of work and a second meeting is being held next week for public comment. The Council needs to decide how much more time they wish to spend on this topic as there are other items to discuss as well. **Mr. Mattson** asked if the Council can support the original motion.

**Mr. Lindquist** stated that it's difficult to spell out what the original motion was. He can see that there is an idea on what should be done on specific lakes and it would be great to focus all energies to do just that. However, the Council's territory is the western U.P. from Highway 13. This discussion's focus has mainly been on Iron & Dickinson Counties. He prefers the focus to be more inclusive of the entire western U.P. Discussion ensued regarding the Bays de Noc tribal issue.

**Mr. Suchovsky** stated that the Council may want to identify what the real issue is, the number of fish or communication. **Ms. Jarvi** stated that she has served a limited time on the Council and she has seen this subject take a lot of the Council's time. The Council needs to focus on their role, which is to offer advice. She understands its frustrating when that advice isn't taken, however, the state government hires trained professionals in DNR positions and there are also budgetary restrictions that the state is dealing with. The DNR is responding to the public on this issue which is the public process; it's how the public works with the state government.

**Mr. Dropps** stated there are issues that apply to the entire U.P. The growth rate will be used for the entire U.P. If the average isn't met, there will be no planting. He feels it is not a realistic average and wants to call the DNR on the inaccurate response. VHS was also mentioned, but no one is willing to mention that walleyes were taken from Dickinson & Iron Counties to stock the Bays de Noc. **Mr. D. Johnson** stated that was before VHS. **Mr. Dropps** stated the DNR is putting out false presentations on what the whole thing is about. **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that the perspective is very often the rub. There needs to be a sound argument. One of Mr. Dropps' memos suggests that the DNR is not willing to hold themselves accountable for every point of the plan. He says that they will say one thing and do something opposite behind closed doors. If one believes the DNR is going to take advantage at all costs, then common ground will never be found. There needs to be a good exchange of communication and trust in the intentions. Mr. Dropps doesn't trust their intentions at all. However, it would appear that the DNR has a general willingness to meet him at least more than half way. **Mr. Dropps** stated that the DNR states they haven't done anything wrong and he doesn't agree with them. It was mentioned that the upcoming meeting is inviting the public to comment on what they would like to see happen. **Ms. Jarvi** stated it is what the DNR is

supposed to be doing. **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated there are obvious totally different points of view. **Mr. McNamee** provided an example related to science in which a slot limit was recommended, but it wasn't carried through because it was good for local business. **Mr. M. Johnson** stated that at the conclusion of the May Council meeting, Director Stokes encouraged the Council to get this walleye issue concluded. He has heard Mr. Dropps state that he's contacted Ms. Mistak to get this done and yet the Council has been talking about this issue for two years. **Mr. D. Johnson** stated that this isn't to stay what is or isn't wrong; he would like to make sure there is a planting that doesn't collapse on itself.

**Facilitator Wirtanen** asked the Council to bring this issue to closure. **Ms. Welling** reviewed the statements regarding the motions from the November 9, 2009 meeting: *"Mr. McNamee made a motion for the WUPCAC to support the walleye subcommittee report. The motion was supported by Mr. M. Johnson. Discussion followed on the timeline and that the DNR already has the subcommittee report and they are using the report to outline the new walleye management plan. Ayes: 12. Nays: 3. Abstained: 1. Mr. Hagan left the meeting prior to the vote. Absent: Mr. D. Johnson, Mr. Schmierer, and Mr. Schulz. Mr. Stachwewicz opposed the motion as the primary focus of the subcommittee report was for Iron and Dickinson Counties and did not represent nor address the stocking of the NLMMU as a whole. Further, the subcommittee report did not address all of the points the subcommittee was asked to consider, leaving gaps in information that would have aided on a decision for Mr. Stachwewicz to support the report."*

*"Mr. Black made a motion for the Council to send a resolution letter supporting the report from the walleye subcommittee to the NRC and Legislators. Mr. M. Johnson made a motion to table the letter of resolution until the walleye management plan is reviewed by the Council members. Facilitator Suchovsky said the motion to table takes precedence over the motion to move. The motion to table was supported by several Council members. Ayes: 9. Nays: 7. Mr. Hagan left the meeting prior to the vote. Absent: Mr. D. Johnson, Mr. Schmierer, and Mr. Schulz."*

It was mentioned that the issue stemmed from the subcommittee report being submitted without Council review and a vote. **Mr. Dropps** stated it had to be submitted due to a DNR timeline which was August 2009. **Mr. Britton** questioned how the Council could support the report when it was submitted to the DNR without the Council's vote. **Mr. Mattson** indicated that is why he made the motion today. Discussion ensued regarding the non-council members of the walleye subcommittee making recommendations for support. **Mr. Schulz** stated he respects all the work Mr. Dropps has done, but stressed the need for the Council to move forward.

**Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that the Council will now vote on **Mr. Mattson's** motion for the Council to support the original motion made in November 2009: *"...a motion was made for the Council to send a resolution letter supporting the report from the walleye subcommittee to the NRC & legislators". Ayes: 6. Oppose: 8. Abstention: 1.*

**Absent: Mr. David Anderson, Mr. David Anthony, Mr. Jim Lorenson, Mr. Jim Schmierer. The motion was defeated.**

2. Update on Resolution Presented to Former DNR Director Humphries: **Ms. Welling** stated that the resolution from the May 23, 2011 meeting recognizing former Director Humphries was presented to her last month and she was very appreciative. **Ms. Welling** noted that the EUPCAC also approved the same resolution.

### **New Business**

1. DNR Wildlife Division Accountability of Revenues & Expenditures: **Mr. Mattson** distributed a handout to the Council members and made a motion for the DNR to provide a broader breakdown of the Wildlife Division's expenses to the Council; **Mr. Lindquist** seconded the motion. **Mr. D. Johnson** supports the request. Discussion on the motion took place.

**Mr. Mattson** stated that over the last 10-15 years he has requested information on how money is spent for "boots on the ground" activities. He is not singling out the Wildlife Division. However, upon review of their annual report, he still has many unanswered questions. He described how he compared figures stated in the annual report to his formula using a January report on the average age of a deer hunter and the license booklet to determine that there should be higher revenue than what's indicated in the funds. He questioned where the \$25 million came from. He is asking for the DNR to break it down tighter, as listed in his handout (*titled Western CAC Financial Request, Revenues: total income received for FY, separated by each funding source individually, then broken down within each funding source by revenues received from each individual source. Expenditures: All expenditures broken-down by expense item; for example, list all employees separately by name, division-section, job description, salary, benefits & associated costs; and for remaining funds, list all expenditures from revenue fund sources with breakdown for each expenditure by project, management objective, purpose, etc.*), so that sportman's groups can determine whether they should do anything with it and then decide whether they should lobby against it or not. If it can be done, he feels a lot of trust can be built and the groups can move on. The DNR has a responsibility to send good information when asked. **Mr. Schulz** stated he also supports the request.

**Ms. Welling** stated that **Mr. Mattson** brought up different financial information before, and she questioned him who is asking for this information. **Mr. Mattson** replied that landowners, UPSA, UP Whitetails, Wildlife Unlimited, etc. want it. **Ms. Welling** asked, as a clarification to report back to Ms. Schafer (Chief of Finance & Operations), if he found any of this information in the annual report. **Mr. Mattson** replied some information was in the report, and some was not; if comparisons are made, it doesn't add up. He reviewed a previous email sent by Ms. Welling regarding appropriations. He stated the groups want to see the gross and the net. He's hoping that the Division can take his handout, match it with the annual report and add the information he's asking for. He stated that the former Director Humphries invited him to Lansing to meet with the finance staff and they agreed that they did not have the financial information to break it

up between turkey licenses, deer licenses, etc.; it's not what he's asking for. **Ms. Jarvi** questioned why Mr. Mattson wants to know this information and for what purpose. **Mr. Mattson** explained his methodology for coming up with his figures for revenue. He said the annual report doesn't tell him anything, such as how much was used on wolves, how much turkey money went to wolves or communications or advertising. This gets back to management and "boots on the ground". He stated he wonders whether enough management is being put on the ground where the wildlife populations are. If this information is provided to the public, then every group can find their interest.

**Mr. M. Johnson** asked Mr. Mattson what he is intending to do with this information. **Mr. Mattson** stated he'd give it to the public. **Mr. M. Johnson** stated that he's heard Mr. Mattson's frequent talks on a public radio show in which there is a lot of negative talk about the DNR, and in the past, there have been negative comments on the DNR budget, where it went and how it's used. If Mr. Mattson were to receive this information, it should not be broadcast on this radio show and used in a negative fashion. He agrees that the public should know what the DNR is doing as public servants, but it's not the Council's job to tell them to start shifting money. He said he doesn't like how the radio show is used to say the DNR isn't doing their job or used to get people out of office. **Mr. Mattson** stated he's only asking for information and how it's used. **Mr. Divine** stated that one can't nickel and dime everything such as listed in the handout. Any group will look at the information differently, and it won't accomplish anything in the long run. It would create a bureaucratic nightmare by asking to pinpoint information in that sort of detail; it's too much to ask. **Mr. Suchovsky** stated he doesn't have a problem with the revenue, but the expenditures will be very difficult to determine how much and whose time is spent on what. Staff are handling a lot of different species, not just one. **Mr. Mattson** stated he's not asking for a breakdown by each employee per species, just a total by individual.

**Mr. Lindquist** stated that he has asked for similar information at the spring meeting and he did receive some information back which was not as much as he was hoping for. MUCC received a presentation on Pittman- Robertson funding, but the impression is that some of these funds are lumped together in their own general fund and a percentage is placed on different things. **Mr. Scullion** stated that staff keep track of time by project code, not species, and it's difficult to measure every 15 minutes. They tend to lump things together because there is no other way to do it. **Mr. Mattson** stated that he is not asking for that specific information. **Mr. McNamee** stated he doesn't care if a dollar is spent here or there, his concern is dollars spent on the ground. For example, there is only one fish biologist on the ground in the U.P. At a presentation at a previous meeting, Mr. Ederly brought two people with him to talk about the Wildlife Division's strategic plan. He said they were going to hire two more managers ("13's"). **Mr. McNamee** stated that he's concerned with the number of people in Lansing versus what is in the U.P. on the ground. **Ms. Welling** added that on the same token, if the DNR spends time on other things, like collecting this type of data, it is time not spent with "boots on the ground". She stated that a full annual report was provided

and she has asked Mr. Mattson several times previously for information that she can send to Ms. Schafer to no avail.

**There being no further discussion, Facilitator Wirtanen asked for a vote by show of hands on the previous motion made by Mr. Mattson to request a broader breakdown of the Wildlife Division's expenses, seconded by Mr. Lindquist. Ayes: 6. Nays: 8. Abstentions: 1. Absent: Mr. David Anderson, Mr. David Anthony, Mr. Jim Lorenson, Mr. Jim Schmierer. Motion defeated.**

Mr. Suchovsky stated he discovered that Michigan doesn't have a forest pathologist. Maybe having more detail information can help the Council make true recommendations on whether the DNR needs staffing in certain areas. Mr. Jarvi stated he voted against the motion because he thinks it went too far; some information would be good, but the request is too much. He understands the intent, but it may be uncomfortable for some and there may be union concerns with revealing exact wages, etc.

2. Follow-Up – Treaty Meeting Issues: **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that there was a separate meeting regarding treaty issues just before the May meeting. He questioned the Council on whether additional information is needed and whether to keep this topic as a future agenda item. **Mr. Moran** stated that having worked with a lot of different groups and views around the state, the feeling is that it is hard to get folks to come to the table; the information regarding treaty rights isn't represented in a positive light. He suggested a meeting with tribal representatives. **Mr. Schulz** agreed, stating that this is an important topic and hopes that a tribal representative can attend a future meeting to talk about the treaties in an informative manner. **Mr. Jarvi** stated that he serves on the Moose Advisory Council and of the seven members, one was appointed to be a tribal member; a recommendation has yet to be forwarded. He is hopeful one will be appointed before the final recommendation due date of September 15. **Mr. Moran** stated that the tribal ways are complex and he is hopeful that someone will come to the forefront. **Ms. Welling** stated that Ms. Munson Badini prepared a brief handout on treaty rights that is included in the meeting packet. **Ms. Munson Badini** stated most questions received about treaty rights refer to management by the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission (GLIFWC) so it would be helpful to have a representative from GLIFWC attend a WUPCAC meeting. The Council agreed. **Ms. Welling** indicated that she will request a presentation opportunity with them in the near future.
3. Additional Agenda Items Added by the Council
  - a. Senate Bill 248-Land Cap Bill: **Ms. Welling** stated she is presenting information on this bill as a point of clarification. It is a fluid bill that has passed the Senate and is currently in the House. It has changed quite a bit from its original form, with easements added in to the amount of land being capped. It includes trails and trust fund purchases approved this past year. This topic was on the EUPCAC agenda as well for a brief update. She stated that she can keep everyone updated and/or answer any questions. **Mr. Divine** questioned what the primary motivation was

behind the bill; **Ms. Welling** stated she can't answer for those that wrote the bill; however, she's heard that it has something to do with PILT payments (she referenced the PILT handout from the May meeting). Currently, the Treasury pays the prorated amount and the DNR matches that amount. There is also another bill that addresses PILT payments. **Mr. McNamee** stated that there are 10 different changes on the bill from the writers and the DNR. He stated that he spoke with DNR Director Stokes who said he is in favor of the bill as it now stands. There are several townships who have a lot of state-owned areas and they are being strapped with no taxes being paid on that land. There is not much affect downstate, mostly the U.P. **Ms. Welling** stated for the record that an edict from the Governor's Office indicates that the DNR will not make a statement/recommendation either for or against a bill. **Mr. McNamee** indicated that he was just stating that the Director was satisfied with the way it is currently written.

**Mr. M. Johnson** asked for clarification on what the bill means. **Ms. Welling** indicated that if the bill passes, it will limit the amount of land the DNR could purchase. Land can be sold in order to buy new land, but there is also a cap. **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that the intent of this agenda topic is to make the public aware of the bill and to provide information only; the Council is not in a position to make a recommendation. When/if it passes, it will have an impact on the DNR. **Mr. Suchovsky** stated that there are features of the bill that when enacted, will be concerning. There are some lands that may serve public interest. He is aware of the changes, but hasn't seen them in print. Some of the compromises and changes do concern him regarding the forest development fund. He advised people to take a careful look at this bill as there are many unintended consequences. **Mr. Divine** noted to watch for state response time when capping items; it's only beneficial if land can be quickly acquired or disposed of. If not, then it could be a problem. **Mr. McNamee** stated there is a 17,000 acre cushion written into the bill. **Mr. Lindquist** mentioned that at the MUCC convention, it was nearly unanimous that members were against this bill with a resolution brought forward not to support it. **Mr. Mattson** stated, from UPSA's perspective, several townships are hurting because of the percentages of state land owned. Because of this bill, they are looking at the bigger picture, such as how much does the state need to own. He said if anyone would like more information, the UPSA is putting a packet together.

- b. Meeting Location Suggestion: **Mr. McNamee** suggested that all the WUPCAC meetings be held in Marquette, rather than meeting in each of the counties it represents, just as all EUPCAC meetings are held in Newberry. He indicated that many people have to work, and coming to these meetings takes time out of their schedule. If they were held in Marquette, everyone would have equal distances to travel. **Mr. Schulz** stated that he is used to everything being in Marquette or Escanaba; he has simply asked for a meeting every two years in Ontonagon and he has no problem driving to the meetings. **Mr. Moran** indicated that Alberta is more centrally located, if the constituency was tabulated across the U.P. He also stated that by going to different locations, there may be 12-20 different people in

attendance providing good representation. If it were always held in Marquette, the same people will attend and the broad spectrum of people wouldn't be present.

**Mr. D. Johnson** stated that he likes the different areas as it provides a chance to see different things and what's happening in the U.P. **Mr. McNamee** stated he will retract the suggestion based on the comments.

### **DNR Reports on Requested Information**

1. **Event Permit Requirement Update:** **Mr. Nezich** stated that a handout was provided in the meeting packet at the May meeting regarding the status of this issue. The resolution that the WUPCAC submitted in 2009 was for trail use permits not to be required for groups consisting of less than 75 vehicles. That recommendation went to a DNR committee that is reviewing it through the Administrative Rules Process, which is a 20-step process; this issue is at step 5 where the DNR develops a set of recommendations. Currently, the DNR requires an application for an event permit for groups of 20 or more individuals; however, with the current rules, the DNR may waive the requirement for a permit for a group of 20 individuals or more if the event will not require DNR oversight, no fee is charged, and the event will have minimal impact on the resource or use of lands by others. The DNR committee has worked on the draft rules, but there are still 14 steps in the administrative process to go through, which includes additional opportunity for public review and input. At this time, the DNR committee has recommended to continue with the 20 or more limit with the opportunity to waive. The DNR did develop a draft rule packet, but a Governor's executive order was issued that established the Office of Regulatory Reinvention (ORR) and they are currently re-evaluating the Administrative Rules Process; that review has suspended further action on the event permit issue at this time.

**Mr. Schulz** stated that this was brought up two years ago and now the Council finds out two meetings ago that it is only at step 5 in an administrative rules process and that the permit can be waived. **Mr. Nezich** clarified that the group has to apply for a permit before it can be waived; if the unit manager gets the permit and makes the decision to waive the fee, the application fee can be returned. **Mr. Schulz** stated that the U.P. is losing tourism business in the meantime. Discussion ensued regarding the length of time this issue has taken and examples of tourism lost. **Mr. Nezich** stated that a group of 20 people can have a significant impact on a trail or pathway. **Mr. D. Johnson** requested the number of permits that are applied for and how many fees were refunded for the next meeting. **Mr. Nezich** stated those numbers may not be available because in some cases there may not be an application; there are times where someone has called to get it waived without an application. **Mr. D. Johnson** asked for just the number of fees refunded. **Mr. Schulz** stated that he can show how 20 people will not have an affect on a trail. **Mr. Lindquist** questioned if this includes snowmobilers and if the Governor's review team is looking at this; **Ms. Welling** clarified it does include snowmobilers, and the review team is looking at the administrative process, not this particular issue. **Mr. Mattson** asked for a list of who was involved in the workgroup; **Mr. Nezich** stated that the chair of the workgroup is listed on the handout. He stated that there is an opportunity for public input in the administrative process. **Mr. Mattson**

stated he supports Mr. Schulz's comments and agreed the process is disorganized. **Mr. Suchovsky** questioned if this information is related to only recreational uses or use of a DNR road through a special use permit process. **Facilitator Wirtanen** clarified that this discussion pertains to event permits only.

2. ORV Trail Signage Update: **Mr. Nezich** provided a historical overview of the ORV trail signage project and distributed a handout explaining the same. A resolution was submitted by the WUPCAC in June 2009 urging the development of a uniform trail marking and ID system and recommending signs placed by Mi-TRALE on state designated trails be allowed to remain until a uniform system is adopted. A response was sent in September 2009 by the DNR stating that the ORV trail ID signs placed by Mi-TRALE can remain on state-owned lands until a uniform sign system is adopted. A workgroup was created in 2010 to address the motorized trail signing program in which new markers were developed and an implementation plan was started this year. Another workgroup was to be created to establish an ID system for ORV destination routes, but it has been put on hold due to a staff vacancy. **Mr. Nezich** stated the vacancy has caused a marked delay in any further progress.

**Mr. Schulz** repeated what he stated in 2009 that OHV's have been around since 1981, and in 30 years the DNR has yet to initiate a specific trail identification and signing system. In the third and final trail signing workgroup meeting that he attended, every member but one agreed that the snowmobile program has a specific trail identification system and one is also needed for OHV trails. It was at that meeting that a separate OHV trail signing committee was to meet, of which he was appointed to that subcommittee. That subcommittee has never met. However, the DNR has implemented a new OHV trail signing program that uses icons, which were included in Mr. Nezich's handout. The icon that was agreed to at the trail committee meetings and not on the handout is an icon for what is called "side-by-side." **Lt. Robson** questioned if an ORV is larger than 50 inches; **Mr. Schulz** stated yes. **Lt. Robson** noted that if it is larger than 50 inches, then it is considered a side-by-side which is included in the icons. **Mr. Schulz** indicated that the new OHV trail signing program again does not use what he stated has been proven and successful, and that is the Mi-TRALE OHV trail signing program.

**Mr. Mattson** noted that Mr. Suchovsky previously brought up issues about the process, and when reading the seven bulleted items in the handout, maybe the Council needs to make a recommendation on the process. There is a problem in creating a new workgroup to develop a recommendation when it was already done. **Ms. Welling** offered to invite Lansing staff to attend the next meeting and answer questions if needed. **Mr. Britton** stated that he served on the sign committee and there are two more signs not included on the handout; **Mr. Nezich** apologized as he may have missed them when creating the handout. Discussion ensued regarding the jeep icon being the same as a side-by-side.

3. Fisheries Division Procedures for Regulation Changes: **Facilitator Wirtanen** asked that this agenda item be tabled until the next meeting due to time constraints; the Council agreed.
4. WUPCAC Expense Report: **Facilitator Wirtanen** asked that this item be tabled until the next meeting due to time constraints; the Council agreed.
5. Priority Items for Future Meeting Agendas: **Facilitator Wirtanen** asked that this item be tabled until the next meeting due to the absence of Mr. Jim Lorenson whose input would be valuable to the discussion; the Council agreed.

### **Special Presentation**

Copperwood Project: **Facilitator Wirtanen** indicated that Mr. Dave Anderson was not able to be present at this meeting to provide the presentation; it will be provided at a future meeting.

### **Next Meeting/Items for Next Agenda**

1. Next Meeting Date/Time: **Facilitator Wirtanen** noted that the next meeting will be held on Monday, September 12, 2011 in Houghton County, location to be determined. DNR Division Reports will be provided at 5:30pm EST and the Council Meeting will begin at 6:00pm EST.
2. Items for Next Agenda: **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that he spoke with a gentleman from the Forest Products Council who mentioned that at a meeting with Director Stokes in Ironwood, they talked about a 12-point program they will be proposing to the DNR's Forest Mineral and Fire Management (FMFM) Division. **Facilitator Wirtanen** indicated he didn't fully understand the program and thinks there hasn't been much discussion about it which may suggest that the Council could profit from a better understanding of state forest practices. He questioned the Council if an overall discussion of timber relationships with the state would be beneficial to have at a future meeting. **Mr. Dropps** stated he would like to hear discussion related to the Menominee Headwaters project. **Mr. Suchovsky** stated that the Menominee project may be beyond the stage of discussion, being that it has been identified and ranked #4 in the nation for funding this year. Discussion ensued. The Council agreed that the Menominee Headwaters project and a timber presentation would be good items for future agendas. **Mr. Moran** questioned if the Copperwood Project presentation will be rescheduled for the next meeting; **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated it will. **Mr. Divine** suggested the commercial forest act as an item for a future agenda. It was not known if there were changes or amendments to the act. **Mr. Kitzman** from the audience stated it is open for change/amendment every five years. **Mr. Suchovsky** explained the qualified forest program. **Mr. M. Johnson** suggested a report regarding the protection of the great lakes from asian carp and what legislation is pending. It was noted that a presentation on asian carp was provided six months ago. **Ms. Welling** stated that an updated can be provided through the division reports.

3. **Acknowledgement:** **Ms. Welling** stated that she'd like to acknowledge Mr. Suchovsky on behalf of the DNR and WUPCAC members, for his leadership as past Chair of the WUPCAC and for his diligence in getting the WUPCAC up and running, which was no small task. She thanked Mr. Suchovsky and presented him with a certificate of appreciation, which read, *"In recognition of Warren Suchovsky for his invaluable contributions and leadership as Facilitator of the Western Upper Peninsula Citizens Advisory Council from 2008-2011"*.

### **Public Comment**

1. **Facilitator Wirtanen** read a question on a comment card from Mr. Jeff Pitlars of the Watersmeet Lakeguards who could not be present. A presentation from the Lakeguards was provided at the last meeting. He stated that Mr. Pitlars is asking if the DNR can assist in having the DEQ waive the permit fees for their group, based on their work protecting 320 lakes in the area from invasive species. There is a very strong legitimate interest for the DNR to help this group who is providing a valuable service. **Ms. Welling** stated that the DNR cannot waive fees assessed by another department. **Mr. Dropps** asked if the DNR can help with funding and through that recommend the reduction in fees. **Ms. Welling** indicated that she will discuss the issue with the DNR Director and will respond back to Facilitator Wirtanen and Mr. Pitlars before the next meeting. **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that it may be helpful to reference the new volunteer bill in this effort.
2. **Facilitator Wirtanen** reviewed a card submitted by Mr. Henry Heperly regarding park development. Mr. Heperly was no longer present to address his question.
3. **Mr. Pat Kitzman** from the audience stated that he was going to talk about the commercial forest act, but Mr. Nezych indicated he would meet with him at a later time about that topic. **Mr. Kitzman** thanked Mr. Mattson for asking about fund information and encouraged him to continue talking on the radio. He stated the public needs to know what the priorities are to make the right choices and to know where the funding is going because these are his taxes. **Ms. Welling** added that every Michigan resident pays \$1.67 and the rest of the funding comes from user fees.
4. **Mr. Jack Herrick** from the audience discussed his dismay in the accomplishments made by the Council. He stated if he is going to buy a license then he wants to know where the money goes. He made a comment about a Commissioner; **Ms. Welling** interjected stating that the information was not factual. **Mr. Herrick** stated his disappointment in the accomplishment of the joint meeting held in Marquette in March. He suggested disbanding the Council.
5. **Mr. Dave Nelson** praised Mr. Herrick on his comments and also added his dismay in the Council's accomplishments. Discussion ensued regarding a radio show and factual

information. He stated that he has private property rights because it's his property. He stated he wants to see an NRC for the U.P. and he mentioned Agenda 21.

### **Closing Comments**

**Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that in light of the time and due to the many comments made, there will be no closing comments. **Mr. Schulz** added that he'd like to compliment and thank Mr. Bill Doan and Mr. Bob Wild from the Porcupine Mountain Wilderness State Park; they have been fantastic to work with as a volunteer for Search and Rescue.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 9:26pm EST (8:26pm CST).