

Eastern (EUPCAC) & Western (WUPCAC) Upper Peninsula Citizen Advisory Councils
Annual Joint Meeting Minutes – APPROVED 12/15/22
Wednesday, October 12, 2022
3:00-5:00 pm EST
Presque Isle Pavilion, 3 Peter White Drive, Marquette

Western Council Members Present

Erik Bessonon	Dave Johnson
Floyd Dropps	George Lindquist
Barb Gajewski	Chauncey Moran
Dave Hall	Kirk Schott
Mike Holmes	Tom Solka

Eastern Council Members Present

Jarrold Biebel	Robert Liebermann
Tom Buckingham, Chair	Mark Spencer
Jeff Cox	Julie Weist
Gary Gorniak, Vice Chair	Tony Wright
Bernard Hubbard	

Western Council Members Absent

Jim Lorensen, Chair	Skip Schulz
Carol Mason Sherrill	Travis Smith
Horst Schmidt	Warren Suchovsky, Vice Chair

Eastern Council Members Absent

Ken Collier	Travis Kangas
Grant Dewitt	David Lieble
Al Garavaglia	Tom Paquin
Tim Hass	Jack Thomas, Secretary

Guests

Dave Anthony, NRC Commissioner
Tom Baird, NRC Commissioner, Chair
David Cozad, NRC Commissioner
Keith Creagh, NRC Commissioner
Leslie Love, NRC Commissioner
Dave Nyberg, NRC Commissioner
Carol Rose, NRC Commissioner
JR Richardson, Former NRC Commissioner
Doug Lindblom, Senator Peters' Office

Al Ettenhoffer-UP Whitetails Association
Brett Matuszak, Lyme Great Lakes Timberlands
Tammy McDuffie, MTPCA
Brian Reynolds, UP Whitetails-Marquette County
Rick Schwenke-UP Whitetails-Marquette County
Joe Sommers-UP Whitetails-Marquette County
Justin Tomei, MUCC
Heather Vivian, Travel Marquette

Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Staff

Lt. Ryan Aho, Law Enforcement Division-D1, Marquette
PJ Costa, UP Trails-Parks & Recreation Division, Newberry
Eric Cowing, Parks & Recreation Division, Newberry
Kristi Dahlstrom, Executive Division, Marquette
Dan Eichinger, Director, Lansing
Patrick Hanchin, Fisheries Division, Marquette
Stacy Haughey, UP Field Deputy, Executive Division, Marquette
Seth Herbst, Fisheries Division, Lansing
Rob Katona, UP Trails-Parks & Recreation Division, Marquette
Dave Lemmien, UP District-Wildlife Division, Sault Ste. Marie
Victoria Lischalk, NRC Commission, Lansing
Shannon Lott, Deputy Director, Lansing
George Madison, Fisheries Division, Baraga

Tim Novack, State Trails-Park & Recreation Division, Lansing
Brooke Parmalee, Legislative Division, Lansing
Doug Rich, Parks & Recreation Division, Baraga
Bill Scullon, Wildlife Division, Norway
Tom Seablom, Forest Resources Division, Marquette
Jon Spieles, Marketing & Outreach Division, Newberry
Jeff Stampfly, Chief of Forest Resources Division, Lansing
Chad Stewart, Wildlife Division, Lansing
Matt Torreano, UP Trails-Parks & Recreation Div., Marquette
Trevor VanDyke, Legislative Division, Lansing
Tom Weston, Licensing-Marketing & Outreach Div., Lansing
Scott Whitcomb, Office of Public Lands Division, Lansing
Ron Yesney, UP Trails-Parks & Recreation Division, Marquette

Call to Order

EUPCAC Chair Tom Buckingham called the Annual Joint Meeting between the Western (EUPCAC) & Eastern (EUPCAC) Upper Peninsula Citizen Advisory Councils to order at 3:00 pm Eastern.

Welcome & Introductions

Ms. Stacy Haughey, DNR UP Field Deputy and liaison to the UPCACs, welcomed everyone in attendance on behalf of the DNR and the East and West UP Council members. She welcomed both current and former NRC Commissioners in attendance, DNR Director Eichinger, Deputy Director Lott, DNR staff from Lansing, as well as Mr. Doug Lindblom, representative for Senator Peters. Council members and members of the audience were asked to introduce themselves at the midway point of the meeting.

Approval of Agenda

Chair Buckingham asked if there were any additions or revisions to the agenda. **Mr. Johnson** motioned to adopt the agenda as presented; **Mr. Cox** seconded the motion. **Ayes: All. Nays: None. Absent: See page 1. Motion carried.**

Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Division Updates

Written reports from each division were provided to Council members on October 5, 2022. Additional updates since that time were provided verbally below.

1. **Stacy Haughey, UP Field Deputy:** Ms. Haughey noted the Natural Resources Commission meeting will be held tomorrow beginning at 9:00am at Northern Michigan University and the public is invited to attend.
2. **George Madison, Fisheries Division:** Mr. Madison introduced Mr. Patrick Hanchin, Lake Superior Basin Coordinator, Fisheries Division; both will be available later on for any questions.
3. **Tom Seablom, Forest Resources Division:** Mr. Seablom indicated there were no new items to report.
4. **Lt. Ryan Aho, Law Enforcement Division:** Lt. Aho indicated Lt. Hagy of UP District 2 asked him to report the record number of spoiled bears officers encountered during the recent harvest season. The season was held earlier than usual this year during warmer temperatures and officers would like to see the season start later. They would also like see an online mandatory class for all bear permit holders similar to what is done for elk permits. More education is needed on how to properly care for harvested animals.
5. **Jon Spieles, Marketing & Outreach Division:** Mr. Spieles indicated there were no new items to report.
6. **Eric Cowing & Doug Rich, Parks and Recreation Division:** Mr. Cowing and Mr. Rich indicated there were no new updates. Mr. Lindquist stated he realizes the amount of work that goes into the division reports and noted he appreciates all the information provided; it is a great resource to everyone. Mr. Moran thanked Mr. Rich for assisting him in the placement of pay pipes on the Yellow Dog preserve.
7. **Ron Yesney & PJ Costa, UP Trails Program, Parks and Recreation Division:** Mr. Yesney introduced Mr. Tim Novaks, State Trails Coordinator, in attendance.
8. **Dave Lemmien, Wildlife Division:** Mr. Lemmien stated he and Mr. Bill Scullon will be available later on for any wildlife questions. Mr. Lindquist noted the wolf management plan update indicated a white paper would be published soon and questioned why a document of science would come out after the final draft of the plan instead of before or during the Wolf Management Advisory Council meetings. Ms. Haughey stated a full report and timeline will be provided at the NRC meeting tomorrow.

Mr. Solka, directing his comments to all division chiefs and assistant chiefs, stated there was a planning session for both Councils held earlier today and speaking on behalf of all Council members, he said it was mentioned multiple times the written division reports each UP division representative submits are thorough and are considered to be invaluable to them as citizen advisors. The Councils appreciate all the time and effort given to put them together.

Road/Trail Easements to Public & Private Lands

Mr. Seablom stated the topic of how the DNR handles easements came at the request of the EUPCAC. He indicated he will speak about road easements and Mr. Yesney will address trail easements.

- *History/Law/Background:* Through law and policy, the DNR is authorized to grant easements across state-owned land under jurisdiction (Private Access Easement Statute PA 323 of 2011 and DNR Policy 4605.5).

- *DNR Process for Easements:* It is about a 120-day process (30 days when application is received to completion, 90 days to review, and either grant or deny from when application is considered complete). The 120 days does not include landowners' homework (survey, title search, tax records) and deed recording.
- *Examples:* Several examples with maps were given. Everyone has a right to drive on open forest roads. However, many times, title companies will not ensure a mortgage without an easement.
- *Questions:*
 - **Mr. Johnson** asked about those that don't have access to their land. **Mr. Seablom** indicated open forest roads provide public access, but title companies may request an easement.
 - **Mr. Holmes** asked about a railroad going through private land. **Mr. Seablom** noted the DNR does not deal with railroads on private property.
- *Trail Easements:* **Mr. Yesney** stated the state manages 3,400 miles of rail trail in the state which bisects through hundreds of properties. Many were existing easements and others were at the request of a private landowner. The DNR works with a lot of driveway easements and power companies. He noted another area involving trail easements is septic systems. When landowners come to the DNR before acting on their own, the process works much more efficiently and causes less difficulties.

Potential Trail Closures Across the UP

Mr. Yesney spoke about two significant trail closures in the UP that could impact users.

- *Gogebic County-Trail 2:* A change of ownership at Snow River Mountain Resort (formerly Big Snow Resorts) has resulted in the probable closure of an important stretch of snowmobile/ATV trail managed by the DNR and the Gogebic Range Trail Authority in Gogebic County. The owners of the resort are requiring liability insurance outside of normal parameters as well as other demands such as indemnification. The closure would eliminate trail access between Wakefield and Ironwood, affecting the communities of Bessemer and Ironwood. The City of Wakefield hosted a meeting to discuss the issue. Staff met with the ski hill owners, municipalities, and clubs without much progress. A factual press release will be issued soon to clarify misconceptions from social media. Significant hurdles exist to finding a reroute (large concentrations of private land, high-traffic paved roadways, etc.), though DNR, community officials and the Gogebic Range Trail Authority are working hard to find a solution. The DNR will continue to explore options for possible alternate routes.
- *Alger County-H-58:* Alger County has requested no snowmobile traffic on this section of roadway by 2024. Several DNR staff are looking at possible reroutes, however, this also is a difficult area to work with.
- *Questions:*
 - **Mr. Solka** asked how long the DNR has had permission to utilize the trail on the ski hill property. **Mr. Yesney** stated it has been a year-to-year renewable permit at the will of the landowner since 2014. He added much of the snowmobile program is built on these types of permits as most are on private land; 25% are on state land and a small percentage is on federal land.
 - **Mr. Lindquist** asked about a conservation easement with the Canadian trust in Alger County; **Mr. Yesney** stated they are working through that easement which prohibits structures, but a bridge would be needed.
 - **Mr. Bessonon** asked how much in trail dollars comes to the UP. **Mr. Yesney** explained trail permit funding comes from permit sales—approximately \$6 million statewide with \$3 million coming to the UP, and about \$2.0 million of gas tax coming annually statewide, with about half of that (\$1.0 million) coming to the UP.
 - **Mr. Biebel** stated he heard of an ORV accident along the M-28 rail trail in Deerton and asked if there was any further information. **Mr. Yesney** and **Lt. Aho** indicated they were not aware of accident details.
 - **Mr. Biebel** also asked about ORV damage at the Deer Lake roadside park. **Mr. Yesney** stated he will reach out to his MDOT contact to find out more information and to make them aware of ORV restoration grant funding.
 - **Ms. Gajewski** stated that she has seen a series of larger red signs up on trails and asked if there has been any feedback as to the success of those signs. **Mr. Katona** explained the signs were specifically designed through an off-trail riding subgroup to discourage off-trail riding. It is an enforcement sign, red and

yellow, that says stay on trail or be prosecuted. They have seen great success so far with the new signage; it gets the riders' attention, makes offences more enforceable, and creates goodwill with private landowners.

- **Mr. Gorniak** asked where the ORV restoration grant funding comes from. **Mr. Yesney** indicated it comes from ORV permit sales.

Special Recognition: Lyme Great Lakes Timberland

Mr. Torreano introduced Mr. Brett Matuszak of Lyme Great Lakes Timberlands, noting the DNR is recognizing Lyme Great Lakes for their partnership with the DNR to secure permanent easements in perpetuity.

- *Permanent Snowmobile Easement History:*
 - Early 2000's: DNR identifies need to permanently protect trail resources.
 - 2009: A law creating the Snowmobile Trail Improvement Fund was enacted.
 - 2017: DNR amends easement acquisition policy and contracts with real estate service providers to assist with transactions.
 - Today: Permanent easement acquired across approximately 200 miles of snowmobile trail in the UP.
- *Lyme Great Lakes Timberlands (LGLT) and DNR Partnership and Process:* Creates efficiency between both parties to secure one agreement. Replaces annual permits for each club with perpetual easement. Collaborated on a mutually beneficial easement. Defines a process to complete trail maintenance, provides for continuing sustainable forest management and protections for resources, defines closures and reroutes collaboration for user safety, reduces administrative time and effort, permanently secures location, and is applicable to future opportunities.
- *Program Accomplishments and Benefits:* LGLT ownership includes 168 miles of snowmobile trail across ~600,000-acres (121 miles acquired in Ontonagon, Baraga, Marquette, and Schoolcraft Counties, and 27 miles to be acquired in November 2022 in Iron, Menominee, Alger and Dickinson Counties). Secures trail access forever, minimizes resource damage, supports local tourism economy, and is a template for future acquisitions.
- *Questions:*
 - **Mr. Lindquist** stated he appreciates the collaboration and effort and can see how this partnership would tie in with Lyme's forest certification. However, the state is buying these easements even though the property has reduced taxes CFA. He feels there could be more collaboration without the state having to pay so much for it. **Mr. Torreano** explained the devaluation of property and how landowners should be compensated appropriately. Mr. Matuszak explained the appraisal process and the damage trail use can cause. Discussion ensued.
 - **Mr. Solka** said he is very supportive of this program and agrees there should be some willingness on the landowner to do this at a reduced or no cost rate; perhaps a formula that both parties agree on. Mr. Matuszak stated working with Ron & Matt has been fantastic and the DNR should be proud of the work they are doing.
 - **Mr. Wright** asked what happens if a private individual buys a parcel that has one of these easements. Mr. Matuszak stated they are encumbered with that easement and further explained.
 - **Mr. Moran** spoke about extreme damage on trails and the forest during mudding season and asked if the partnership includes protection of trails in the springtime. **Mr. Torreano** stated the agreement does permit season closures to allow trails/roads to dry out. **Mr. Moran** asked if this information is carried out throughout the state, and stated he'd like to know how much money the state is paying from snowmobile registrations for an easement in perpetuity. **Mr. Yesney** stated seasonal restrictions have been a frequent topic of conversation. A land use order was started in the UP from April 1-May 15 to allow the closure of trails during thaw periods. However, he said, it was very difficult to implement and has limited success. For state land, there is nothing at this time.
- *Partnership Recognition:* **Mr. Torreano** presented a DNR Appreciation Award to Mr. Matuszak and Lyme Great Lakes Timberlands, that read, "Thank you for your commitment and support to local economies and snowmobilers by partnering with the Michigan DNR and the Snow Country Trails Conservancy on the sale of permanent year-round trail easements throughout Michigan's Upper Peninsula." A round of applause was given.

UP Shooting Range Updates

Ms. Haughey provided an overview of shooting range progress in the UP on behalf of Ms. Lori Burford, DNR Shooting Range Specialist, who could not be present.

- *Marquette County Shooting Range:* The Councils have been hearing about this project for many years and several local staff present at this meeting have been involved in the progression of the first DNR public outdoor shooting range in the UP. It has been 29 years in the making, since 1993. Although this range could've been built on state land, the closest location would've been 20-30 miles away from the population base. Instead, the team has secured a safe and accessible location in Richmond Township, leased through Cleveland Cliffs, near an existing, unsuitable, and illegal target shooting area near the crossroads of M-553 & County Road 480 (slides were shown of shooting debris in this area). This existing area will be cleaned and bermed, and signage to the new location nearby will be posted. DNR law enforcement will be able to take action at this new location if necessary. Over \$800,000 in funding will be used to build this range. Extensive public engagement has taken place and support has been received from Richmond Township, Cleveland Cliffs, UP Whitetails-Marquette County, Marquette County officials and the law enforcement community. The local National Guard may be able to utilize this range instead of traveling to Grayling for certifications and they may be able to help with the build. A timeline was shown, with completion expected in the summer of 2023. The new range will be named and dedicated in honor of Conservation Officers Erickson & Skoglund who were killed in the line of duty in 1926 near this new site. Ms. Burford's work in seeing this project through is greatly appreciated.
- *Porcupine Mountains Shooting Complex:* This indoor shooting range has been operated by the Lake Superior Sportsman's Club since the 1970's but was in great disrepair (it was formerly a WW2 prison camp). The new indoor range, meeting space/clubhouse has been rebuilt and is now operated through a partnership/lease with LSSC. Pictures were shown.
- *Questions:*
 - **Mr. Moran** asked how the Marquette outdoor range will be monitored. **Ms. Haughey** stated it will be operated the same as 17 other similar DNR ranges throughout the state. It will be open in summer months only with open and closed times posted. Security cameras will provide monitoring and several partner groups have offered to check-in. DNR Law Enforcement will also be making regular visits.

Mandatory Harvest Reporting / Mobile App

Mr. Stewart, DNR Deer, Elk & Moose Management Specialist, spoke about the DNR Mandatory Harvest Reporting program and provided the following information, courtesy of the Wildlife Division's survey coordinator.

- *Survey Challenges:* This is the first year hunters will be required to report their harvest. Why?
 - Response rates to mailed surveys have declined from about 75% in the mid-2000s to 33% in 2021.
 - By 2030, the response rate is expected to be about 25%.
- *Internet Usage:* Increase in the use of the internet.
 - In 2021, about 93% of US adults use the internet, either irregularly or frequently.
 - Nearly 100% of US adults less than 65 years old use the internet in 2021.
 - 83% of hunters are less than 65 years old.
- *Hunters Are Not Alone:*
 - 88% of Michigan deer hunters indicated that spending time with friends and family was an important reason why they enjoyed hunting deer.
 - Most hunters that do not have direct access to the internet can obtain assistance from their friends and family that have access to and are familiar with the internet.
 - An average of 4 or more deer hunters usually hunted together at a deer camp in the UP.
- *Benefits of Mandatory Harvest Reporting:*
 - The DNR can collect data about harvest more efficiently than in the past and produce summaries sooner than currently provided. Mailed surveys take a long time to develop, involve multiple mailings, and takes

time to input and analyze data from 25,000 incoming surveys. The harvest report from mailed surveys are usually generated in June/July, which is too late for deer regulation consideration by the NRC.

- Allows the DNR to collect new types of information, such as matching harvest to license type, type and composition of antlerless harvest, and fine scale geographic data.
- Potential to improve communications to hunters during the season, such as in the event of a disease detection in a new location that could alter a hunter's decision to have their deer tested or not.
- *Harvest Reporting Questions:*
 - Examples of questions for all successful hunters: Harvest season, date, location (county & unit), latitude and longitude coordinates of a marker placed on a map, sex (male or female) and age of deer (fawn or adult), number of antler points, presence of feral hogs.
 - Examples of questions for a subset of successful hunters: Number of days hunted (effort) during the season until the animal was taken (30%), hunting device used (20%), describe the mast (acorn) crop (15%), type of land (public or private) where deer taken (10%), was bait used (<10%).
- *Consequences for Not Reporting Harvest:*
 - The current penalty is part of existing state law. The DNR and NRC did not define this penalty and do not have authority to change it. The same penalty applies to all species that currently have mandatory harvest reporting (e.g., bear and bobcats).
 - By definition, a person who fails to report their harvest is guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment for not more than 90 days, or a fine of not less than \$25 or more than \$250 and the costs of prosecution, or both.
 - The DNR originally supported HB 6354 which reduced the penalty from a misdemeanor to a civil infraction.
 - In 2022, the DNR plans to focus on educating hunters about the new rules, rather than issuing citations (education over enforcement approach).
- *Why Collect Exact Harvest Location:*
 - Integration with disease surveillance, which provides an understanding of harvest around positive locations and allows for rapid communication to hunters if a detection occurs in a new location.
 - Finer scale management.
- *Why No Call-In Option:*
 - Not all states with mandatory harvest reporting have a call-in option (e.g., Oklahoma and Massachusetts).
 - Most states initiated their reporting system when internet use and connectivity was less common. Those states that do have a call-in option preceded an online option. Some want to shift to all online, but in some cases the phone option was grandfathered in.
 - The call-in options generally use older technology making it cumbersome to report a harvest location finer than a county.
- *Why Were Hunters Given 72 Hours to Report:*
 - Among the 15 states that had high harvest reporting compliance (>90%), 12 states required harvest reporting within 24 hours; 2 states required a report within 2 days and 1 state allowed compliance within 24 hours of the end of season.
 - Among the states with poor compliance (<40%), Alabama required a harvest report within 2 days, New York required a report within 7 days, and Pennsylvania required a report within 10 days.
- *Questions:*
 - **Mr. Bessonon** noted he seen a mention on Facebook of a high-volume deer processor in Delta County who will not process deer without a code. **Mr. Stewart** stated they do not need to reject customers who do not have a confirmation number; it is the processor's choice. They would not be penalized. **Ms. Haughey** added this instance was also discussed at a recent UPSA meeting and she was able to provide a copy of the letter that was sent to the processors indicating a confirmation number is not required.

- **Mr. Spieles** indicated the DNR operates a call center receiving 120 calls a day. Only 10% of the total call volume are for harvest reporting. There have been only a handful of issues which have all been resolved easily.
- **Mr. Solka** asked for clarification on the DNR support for HB 6354 which changes the penalty from a criminal offense to a civil infraction. **Director Eichinger** stated the DNR and the Administration did take a position to decriminalization. However, after many changes, the substitute bill that came out attempted to take away the NRC’s ability to require mandatory harvest reporting. He added the DNR is taking an educational approach this year and will again pursue decriminalization for failure to report. He stated he is disappointed in the outcome but is committed to a positive one.
- **Commissioner Anthony** stated he received a notice on the harvest reporting indicating a hunter can call or stop at any DNR office during posted hours and staff can help. **Director Eichinger** stated if there are issues reporting online, call any DNR office and they will enter the report for you. There have been very few calls coming in, so it is going well so far.
- **Deputy Lott** stated hunters may be asking why the DNR is asking for this data all of a sudden. This is the same information that is asked when hunters bring their deer to a check station. It’s the same information that has been asked over the last 25 years. She encouraged Council members to help send this message to folks when asked about it.
- **Mr. Cox** stated his job takes him throughout the UP and northern lower Michigan and 100% of the comments he is hearing is about the harvest reporting and not wolves. Although everyone in this room knows the importance of gathering this information, those outside this room do not. The 72-hour requirement is throwing up a red flag for folks and many don’t want to drive out of camp to get a cell signal. Check stations aren’t as available anymore as well as many of them closed during COVID and won’t be open. He also asked if the report can still be completed if the harvest location isn’t indicated. **Mr. Stewart** stated the 72-hour timeframe is one of the more lenient timeframes in the Midwest. He noted this year will be an education over enforcement approach. Harvest reports can be completed without the location pinned.
- **Mr. Lindquist** mentioned the exact location pinned is protected information from FOIA. If a more broad location was asked, that information would be release for a FOIA request. He stated he completed the voluntary registration last year and found it to be easy to do. He said hunters wanted harvest data forever and now they say they don’t want it. He feels there needs to be check stations, however, as it’s nice to know the age of the deer and general condition.
- **Mr. Wright** stated the sentiments from the public in his area are that the location data is a hang-up for them. He did not encounter anyone opposed to the harvest reporting in general.

Mr. Weston, DNR Technology & Licensing Officer, shared current data on recent harvest reporting.

- *Liberty Hunt, Early Antlerless and Archery Season to Date:* 33,000 deer have been reported. Of those, 82% of hunters completed the harvest reporting in under 5 minutes. 87.6% of hunters moved the pin on the map within the county in which they harvested their deer.
- *QR Code:* A QR code is printed on the back of every license. When scanned, it provides access to all digests.
- *Last Year’s Harvest Reporting:* Volunteer harvest reporting was offered last year. 6,000 hunters took advantage. 11% reported their harvest through the new Michigan DNR Hunt Fish app. It’s even easier with 2 less questions. 95% of reported harvests were submitted within 72 hours of harvest and several did it within 24 hours. 79 hunters reported seeing a feral hog in the county of harvest. Additional stats were provided. 3,892 hunters provided a comment. Every comment is read and if there is a tech issue, staff will call the customer right away to help problem solve. Most comments are positive, some are negative. There have been 55,000 downloads for the app so far.
- *Questions:*
 - **Mr. Johnson** stated he had a hard time dropping the pin; it doesn’t want to drop. He also said there are a lot of hunting camps in the UP without cell service and many hunters go to camp for a week or more. Now they will have to drive into town to report. There are also several hunters still upset about the CWD

issue and baiting ban in Dickinson County. There used to be a trusted working group with the DNR, but that trust is gone. Many people say they won't buy a license. He understands what the DNR is getting out of it, but he isn't sure the UP was considered when establishing harvest reporting guidelines.

Mr. Weston next displayed the DNR Fish & Hunt mobile app on screen and provided a brief tutorial. The app can be used to buy licenses in the same fashion as online purchases. He spoke about the number of users online, sales online, etc.

Public Comments

Chair Buckingham explained this portion of the meeting and opened the floor for public comments.

1. *Mr. Joe Summers, UP Whitetails of Marquette County*, thanked DNR staff and NRC commissioners for coming to the meeting. He asked what additional information is available regarding wolf control. **Ms. Haughey** stated the Council determines the agenda and despite it not being on the agenda for this meeting, wolves have been on Council agendas at 37 meetings over the last few years. She noted an update is included on the NRC meeting agenda for tomorrow.

Adjourn

Chair Buckingham thanked the Council for their commitment and contributions and thanked those in the audience for attending. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:20pm Eastern.