

Michigan Deer Management Initiative

Lower Peninsula: 2024 Final Report

"It is not the critic who counts; not the man who points out how the strong man stumbles, or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who errs, who comes short again and again, because there is no effort without error and shortcoming; but who does actually strive to do the deeds; who knows great enthusiasms, the great devotions; who spends himself in a worthy cause; who at the best knows in the end the triumph of high achievement, and who at the worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who neither know victory nor defeat."

-Theodore Roosevelt

Rationale of the Deer Management Initiative (DMI):

The Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), in collaboration with the Michigan Natural Resources Commission (NRC), initiated a comprehensive Deer Management Initiative (DMI) aimed at evaluating and responding to present-day deer management challenges. The initiative seeks to develop recommendations to address these challenges and ensure the sustainable and healthy management of deer populations and their habitats across the state.

Goals of the DMI:

To develop an output of recommendations designed to change/improve deer management, both in the short and long term, that are:

- Defensible using data
- Minimize complexity
- Cost effective
- Limit conflicts and ecosystem impacts
- Maintain a healthy, sustainable deer herd

DMI Selection Process:

Committed to a comprehensive and inclusive approach, the MDNR engaged with stakeholders from various natural resource organizations, tribal partners, and unaffiliated individuals to develop recommendations to work toward improved deer management in the state. Through an application process, Lower Peninsula Deer Management Initiative (LP DMI) participants were selected from stakeholder natural resource organizations, tribal partners, and unaffiliated individuals. In addition, the MDNR sought public comment via email pertaining to their respective deer and deer management concerns for the LP DMI to focus on prior to the formal process. The MDNR commissioned LP DMI participants to read and reflect upon this public commentary to gain holistic and inclusive insight from the onset.

Lower Peninsula DMI Participants		
Boge, Eva	Hubbard, Rashel	Reynolds, Chris
Campbell, Emma	Johnson, Steve	Sheehan, Derek
Craven, Doug	Jones, Bob	Sikkenga, Paul
DeDecker, James	Ketelaar, Mike	Steenbergh, Robert
De Young, Ed	Krzyzanowski, Zachery	Sweeney, Jim
Farmer, Bryan	LaCross, David	Techel, Dale
Greenlee, Samantha	Laffrey, Brad	Trotter, Amy
Histed, Craig	Pagels, Alleigh	Vermeesch, Andrew

LP DMI Process:

Step 1: LP DMI participants were commissioned to read and review public commentary on their deer and deer management concerns in Michigan.

Step 2: LP and UP DMI participants attended and participated in sixteen, two hour virtual sessions hosted by the MDNR, in which experts in their respective fields gave formal presentations, along with Q and A, on multifaceted issues related to deer and deer management.

LP and UP DMI Virtual Meeting Topics and Presenters:

Topics	Presenters
Deer Population Dynamics	Dwayne Etter
Harvest Estimation & Reporting	Brian Frawley
Northern Hardwoods	Gray Roloff & Mike Walters
Wisconsin Deer Management	Jeff Pritzl & Dan Storm
Recruitment, Retention, Reactivation	Todd Grischke
Privately Owned Cervidae	Ryan Souldard
<i>Self-Organized Meetings (Voluntary)</i>	<i>LP DMI Participants</i>
Climate & Weather	Chris Hoving
Sportsmen Against Hunger	Joe Presgrove
Impacts on Natural Communities	Jesse Lincoln
Impacts on Agriculture	James DeDecker
Deer Winter Complex	Kristie Sitar & Tom Seablom
UP Predator/Prey & Deer Migration	Tyler Petroelje
Wolf Management	Brian Roell
CWD & TB	Melinda Cosgrove & Mitch Marcus
Bear, Coyote, & Bobcat Management	Cody Norton
Deer Regulations	Chad Stewart

Step 3: LP DMI participants, along with several staff from the MDNR, attended a two-day, in-person conference in Bay City, MI on Monday, April 22nd, and Tuesday, April 23rd. LP DMI participants, facilitated by Alexa Warwick, PhD, from Michigan State University, and MDNR staff, engaged in numerous small group and whole group discussions/activities, which culminated in LP DMI participants voting upon and prioritizing their non-regulatory and regulatory recommendations.

Step 4: Several LP DMI participants volunteered to organize and compose the Michigan Lower Peninsula Deer Management Initiative 2024 Report.

Step 5: This Michigan Lower Peninsula Deer Management Initiative 2024 “Draft” Report was shared with all LP DMI participants for feedback, comments, and suggestions of amendment.

Step 6: The MDNR will finalize the report and share/present the LP DMI’s non-regulatory and regulatory short-term and long-term recommendations to the Michigan Natural Resource Commission.

LP DMI In-Person Meeting Activities and Results

Day 1:

Activity 1: LP DMI participants were separated into five groups to collaborate, brainstorm, and document/scribe vital deer and deer management challenges they see in Michigan, as well challenges voiced through public commentary (all challenges were accepted and recorded in this process). Once this task was complete, the five lists of challenges were compiled into one, with seventeen challenges ([refer to Extra Board Report for the entire list](#)). Then, with the assistance of the facilitator, LP DMI participants prioritized the seventeen challenges down to five challenges to drive their upcoming non-regulatory and regulatory discussions.

The Finalized List of Challenges (in no particular order)
Limited access to quality private and public hunting land (Quality refers to habitat and deer populations)
Presence/spread of deer disease (CWD and TB)
Decline of hunters
Extreme deer densities (either too high or too low) relative to habitat
Miscellaneous*

LP DMI participants were in strong agreement that an “umbrella and all-encompassing” challenge category was crucial

Activity 2: LP DMI participants re-joined their groups and were asked to come up with objectives for each challenge on the latter finalized list. The facilitator defined objectives as “what change is needed to overcome the challenge,” not how to go about meeting the objective or specific solutions. Again, each of the groups came up with a list of objectives, which were compiled to one list with twelve objectives. Then, with the assistance of the facilitator, and based on if multiple tables had the same item, the list was reduced down to eight objectives. These eight objectives were intended to be “filters/checks and balances” on the effectiveness of non-regulatory and regulatory suggestions and in turn, remedy the five challenges ([refer to Extra Board Report for the entire list](#)).

The Finalized List of Objectives (ranked in order)
1. Balanced and healthy deer herd
2. Contain/eradicate disease (as applicable to CWD and TB)
3. Increase hunter satisfaction
4. Increase hunter access
5. Reduce deer conflicts
6. Increase hunter numbers
7. Increased hunter education on deer and deer management
8. Improved habitat

Activity 3: LP DMI participants were allocated into five new groups. Around the room, large poster boards were hung with the five challenges, along with “non-regulatory” and “regulatory” written next to each challenge. For example, one area of the room had a poster with the challenge “decline of hunters: non-regulatory” with another poster “decline of hunters: regulatory” next to it. Another area of the room had the challenge “presence/spread of disease: non-regulatory” with another poster “presence/spread of disease: regulatory” next to it. Each group was given approximately 10 minutes at each of the five stations to write down any and all non-regulatory and regulatory solutions group members suggested (in each group, *all* non-regulatory and regulatory solutions offered were written down). When this activity concluded, 72 non-regulatory and 120 regulatory solutions were recorded.

Activity 4: The facilitator provided each LP DMI participant with five sticker-stars. Participants were asked to go around the room, to each of the non-regulatory challenge posters, and place a star next to five non-regulatory solutions they believed had the most merit, effectiveness, and relevance. [\(refer to Extra Board Report for all starred non-regulatory suggestions\).](#)

Day 2:

Activity 1: The facilitator tallied the sticker-stars LP DMI participants placed on the non-regulatory solutions from Day 1. LP DMI participants viewed the final tally, and the seven non-regulatory solutions which ranked highest were used as headers for more in-depth discussion. Then, as a whole group, the facilitator prompted LP DMI participants to share specific ideas of how these non-regulatory solutions could be accomplished, and the actionable items were written down. The facilitator then asked participants to publicly vote, with a show of hands, whether they support each of these non-regulatory solutions, do not support it, or abstain

from voting, to gauge participants' finalized level of support of these seven non-regulatory solutions.

Finalized List of the 7 Non-Regulatory Solutions	Support	Do Not Support	Abstain
Educate about Doe Harvest	24	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <u>Why</u> is this ecologically important on a population and landscape level? ➤ <u>How</u> does antlerless harvest alter a population? (birth rates, population growth, carrying capacity, density dependence, buck quality, etc.) ➤ Accomplished through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Social media campaigns and in-person meetings ○ A letter to hunters printed in the Hunting Regulations Summary with specification to targeted areas and outlining the consequences of overpopulation ○ Included education within the hunter safety training ○ Collaboration between organizations to promote outreach and inclusive education for non-hunters 			
Increase Funding/Support for MSAH (Michigan Sportsmen Against Hunger)	22	2	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Emphasize the donation option at point of sale (online and at licensing retailers) ➤ Educate and promote to hunters, non-hunters, and farmers on <u>how</u> this program operates and <u>who</u> is benefitting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use of storytelling to articulate this and engage audience ○ Social media campaigns and in-person meetings ○ Incorporate this information into the Hunting Regulations Summary ➤ Include metrics, such as cost/lb of venison and testing required (including costs) for donations in Hunting Regulations Summary, on kill tags, at point of license sale, and other educational avenues. 			
Public Land Habitat Improvement	16	7	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Support Young Forest Initiatives/GEMS/similar programs ➤ Expand permission and access for NGO's to do habitat work on public lands ➤ Expand educational programs beyond CISMA's <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Why are native species beneficial? Habitat improvement demonstrations. ○ Facilitate wildlife access/interactions to non-hunters and non-traditional users ➤ Provide better access to grant programs for NGO's ➤ Consider overhauling programs like "Adopt a Forest," where funding can be collected and then allocated for habitat improvements 			

MDNR Continuity (on management actions across regions) and Transparency with DNR/NRC	24	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Manage programs similarly within regions ➤ PR training for DNR staff ➤ Overhaul the website to a more user friendly format ➤ Host “Town Hall” meetings around the state and consider reopening check stations to facilitate intentional connections between DNR staff and hunters ➤ Educate the public and share relevant research in easy to understand ways 			
Increase Access to Agricultural/Urban Hunting Opportunities	23	0	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ordinances need to be changed with in some municipalities to allow access to hunting ➤ Improve the HAP program and increase incentives by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Finding new funding sources ○ Remove liability from the landowner ○ Reformat/rebrand the structure of the program ○ Educate both the farmer and the public on the benefits of collaboration ○ Provide structured/facilitated hunts on private lands 			
Support/Endorse Michigan Hunt Collaborative (Umbrella entity to pool together R3 efforts of multiple conservation groups/organizations to increase hunter participation statewide)	22	0	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Clearinghouse of R3 programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Facilitating connectivity between different programs and organizations ○ Utilizing QR codes posted at locations such as: archery and shooting ranges, state parks, outdoor recreation stores, etc. for a quick, one stop link to current and upcoming hunting/fishing opportunities, trainings, and programs ➤ Mentored database: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Access to mentored/guided hunts targeted for beginners, but also available to seasoned hunters ➤ Funding and leadership need to be identified ➤ Help from the DNR to advertise the program. Promoted in the Hunting Regulations Summary 			
Incentives for Antlerless Harvest in Disease Areas	24	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Incentivize landowners to provide access or harvest of deer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Free or reduced cost disease tags ➤ Refrigerated drop off locations expanded ➤ Expand processor network for disease sampling partnerships 			

- Increase availability of testing through drop boxes, check stations, and processors
- A Pure Michigan Hunt point given away for disease sample submissions
- Consider special antlerless tag bundles for density reduction

Activity 2: LP DMI participants were put into five new groups. They were given printed pages of the 120 regulatory solutions offered from Day 1, categorized by the five challenges. Participants were asked to collaborate with their group, filter through the 120 regulatory solutions, and as a group, come up with two different regulatory scenarios, and given direction to note if it was a short term or a long term solution ([refer to Extra Board Report for the narrowed down regulatory lists generated by each table](#)). Then the DMI members were split into 2 groups, where they discussed and assessed the five regulatory scenarios, and synthesized them down to four scenarios - A,B,C and D.

Four Regulatory Scenarios			
Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C	Scenario D
Maintain mandatory reporting	Maintain mandatory reporting	Maintain mandatory reporting	Maintain mandatory reporting
Earn a 2nd Buck	Earn a 2nd Buck	Earn a 2nd Buck	Combo split into Archery or Firearm
Combo: becomes 1 buck / 1 doe	No change to current combo	No change to current combo	Combo: becomes 1 buck / 1 doe
Improve and expand HAP program	Improve and expand HAP program	Improve and expand HAP program	Improve and expand HAP program
Early/Late antlerless for both public and private	Early/Late antlerless for both public and private	Extend late antlerless to public land	Extend late antlerless to public land
More localized deer management (DMU/Region)	Use and maintain current APR stakeholder program	Smaller management units	Smaller management units
No baiting in disease areas	Maintain baiting ban	No baiting only in disease areas	Maintain baiting ban
Expand late urban archery - antlerless	No drone harvest recovery	Expand late archery in Zone 3 w/ an urban emphasis	Expand late archery in Zone 3 w/ an urban emphasis
Expand APR's		Bring back actual muzzleloader season	Bring back actual muzzleloader season
Drone harvest recovery			

Using a QR code via phones/devices, these four regulatory scenarios (A, B, C, and D) were voted upon by participants, with the intent of using the eight objectives as “filters/checks and balances.” Voting results were shown to participants and regulatory scenarios were ranked.

The scenario rankings are below:

8 Objectives (in order of support)	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C	Scenario D		Key
Balanced and healthy deer herd	1.17	0.29	0.63	0.75		>1
Contain/eradicate disease	0.42	0.38	-0.04	0.63		0.75-1
Increased hunter satisfaction	0.96	0.04	0.79	-0.17		0.5-0.74
Increased hunter access	0.78	0.38	0.83	0.67		0.25-0.49
Reduce deer conflicts	0.75	-0.13	0.42	0.63		0-0.24
Increased hunter numbers	0.25	-0.17	0.57	0.13		<0
Increased hunter education on deer / deer management	0.38	-0.17	0.17	0.13		
Improved habitat	0.13	-0.09	0.18	-0.04		
SUM	4.83	0.54	3.54	2.71		

Noting that Scenario A and Scenario C ranked highest, participants were led in a collaborative discussion, in which it was agreed to combine Scenario A and Scenario C, which resulted in a combined total of 12 regulatory solutions.

Activity 3: Once these twelve regulatory solutions were finalized, the facilitator asked participants to take one final vote on their phones/devices using a QR code to gauge participants’ finalized level of support of these twelve regulatory solutions. Participants were asked whether they support, do not support it, or abstain.

Here is the finalized list of the twelve regulatory solutions, along with their level of voting support:

Finalized list of 12 Regulatory Solutions	Short Term	Long Term	Support	Do not Support	Abstain
Continue Mandatory Reporting	X		23	1	0
Earn a Second Buck		X	19	3	2
Make Combo License 1 Buck and 1 Doe	X		13	8	3
Improve/Support/Enhance HAP Program (Hunter Access Program)		X	22	1	1
Expand Early and Late Antlerless Harvest on Public and Private Land	X		20	4	0
Develop More Localized Deer Management Approaches (Either by DMU or Region)	X		20	1	3
No Baiting in Disease Areas	X		18	5	1
Expand Late Season Urban Archery Antlerless Hunting	X		24	0	0
Expand APR's (Antler Point Restrictions)	X		13	8	3
Allow Drone Harvest Recovery		X	11	10	3
Reinstate Formal Muzzleloader Season	X		16	7	1
Keep Combo Tag Same as 2023 Season	X		10	12	2

In summation, the LP DMI participants suggest the following non-regulatory and regulatory solutions in their Michigan Deer Management Initiative: Lower Peninsula: 2024 Final Report.

LP DMI Non-Regulatory Solutions (Not Ranked Here):

- Educate about Doe Harvest
- Increase Funding/Support for MSAH (Michigan Sportsmen Against Hunger)
- Public Land Habitat Improvement
- MDNR Continuity (on management actions across regions) and Transparency with DNR/NRC
- Increase Access to Agricultural/Urban Hunting Opportunities
- Support/Endorse Michigan Hunt Collaborative (Umbrella entity to pool together R3 efforts of multiple conservation groups/organizations to increase hunter participation statewide)
- Incentives for Antlerless Harvest in Disease Areas

LP DMI Regulatory Solutions (Not Ranked Here):

- Continue Mandatory Reporting
- Earn a Second Buck
- Make Combo License 1 Buck and 1 Doe
- Improve/Support/Enhance HAP Program (Hunter Access Program)
- Expand Early and Late Antlerless Harvest on Public and Private Land
- Develop More Localized Deer Management Approaches (Either by DMU or Region)
- Baiting Ban Lifted Outside of Disease Areas
- Expand Late Season Urban Archery Antlerless Hunting
- Expand APR's (Antlered Point Restrictions)
- Allow Drone Harvest Recovery
- Reinstate Formal Muzzleloader Season
- Keep Combo Tag Same as 2023



Michigan Deer Management Initiative

Lower Peninsula: 2024 Extra Board Report

In the following report is the gathering of items and recommendations generated by the LP DMI group during the in person meeting that was either highlighted, voted on, or otherwise indicated as important, but that was cut due to time or to narrow down the lists generated. It was desired by many members of the DMI that items from the cutting room floor be compiled into a supplemental report and accompany the final results.

LP DMI: Challenges to Deer Management:

Participants were separated into five groups to collaborate, brainstorm, and document/scribe vital deer and deer management challenges that they see in Michigan, as well challenges voiced through public commentary. The 17 challenges are as follows **(in no particular order)**:

Challenges
Unsustainable high deer density and/or low deer density (distribution/differences)
Ecosystems impacted / reduced habitat
Unbalanced sex ratios
Lack of hunter access to private property, quality public, and or urban hunts
Lack of value / devalue of hunting / Differing of values of deer quality / bucks for example; Hunting Rights
Deer disease increasing and human risk factors
Lack of robust deer data collection (impacts)
Lack of programs to recruit / educate -- R3 / healthy herd dynamics
Decline / loss of hunters because of hunter desires (example, wanting baiting or APRs)
Limited management toolbox
Lack of quality / mature bucks

Deer regulations too broad (geographic differences / need for regional)
Limited access to deer management information and hunter education
Lack of access to donation programs
High processing costs and lack of processors
Lack of DNR staff in field (Check Stations and Biologists)
Conflict between humans-deer (Deer Vehicle Collisions / garden and Crop Damage)

LP DMI: Objectives to Solve Challenges:

Participants re-joined their groups and were asked to come up with objectives for each challenge. These objectives were intended to be “filters/checks and balances” on the effectiveness of non-regulatory and regulatory suggestions and in turn, remedy the previously defined challenges. The 12 objectives are as follows (**ranked by number of tables that had the same objective listed**):

Objectives	# Tables with same Item
Balanced and healthy deer herd	5
Contain/eradicate disease	5
Increased hunter satisfaction	4.5
Increased hunter access	4
Reduce deer conflicts	4
Increased hunter numbers	4
Increased hunter education on deer / deer management	3
Improved habitat	3
DNR transparency (improved)	2
Improved data collection	2
Increased venison donation	2
Simplify deer regulations	1

LP DMI: Non-Regulatory Solutions:

Participants were allocated into five new groups. Around the room, large poster boards were hung with the five challenges, along with “non-regulatory” and “regulatory” written next to each challenge. In each group, *all* non-regulatory and regulatory solutions offered were written down. When this activity concluded, 72 non-regulatory and 120 regulatory solutions were recorded. The facilitator provided each LP DMI participant with five sticker-stars. Participants were asked to go around the room, to each of the non-regulatory challenge posters, and place a star next to five non-regulatory solutions they believed had the most merit, effectiveness, and relevance.

Listed below are the stated non-regulatory items that were deemed important by the LP DMI members (**ranked by number of stars**):

Non-Regulatory Solutions	Stars
1. Increase/educate importance of doe harvest, De-stigmatize	15
2. Increased funding / support for Michigan Sportsmen Against Hunger (MSAH)	11
3. Public land habitat improvement - help public hunter success	9
4. Reduce high density areas - Incentivize antlerless harvest - POS discount bundles	8
5. Continuity (on mgn't actions across regions) and transparency within DNR. - PR training for DNR staff (fight oppositional / defensive attitude) - user friendly website - NRC/DNR/DMI town hall meetings throughout the state	8
6. Increase hunter access in urban areas and agricultural land	7
7. Michigan Hunt Collaborative - Urban and Farm hunt (umbrella/clearing house for R3 programs)	7
Specific regulations for UP, NLP, SLP, and disease/regional DMU's	6
No market hunting for money - donation system only. Don't monetize wild game/hunting	5
Educate regarding benefits of doe harvest --> change in culture	5
Better data collection through Mandatory Harvest Report/check stations	4
Increase hunter safety opportunities - hunter safety in schools	3
DMI continues - not just a one-hit wonder. - Require for NRC members + legislators - Open access to DMI educational content for public	3
Increase young forest initiatives (increase forest management to encourage early	3

successional forest)	
Get local jurisdictions on board with urban hunting - educate on allowing hunting for management	3
Develop program to connect farmers/landowners/urban with hunters	3
Increase disease detection methods / capabilities	3
Update CWD / TB response plan	3
Lack of deer -- public land habitat improvements to draw deer in for hunting	2
Increase hunter education opportunities for minorities and women	2
Build archery ranges in public parks	2
Easy access to deer damage permits - educate about DMAP's	1
Non-hunter surveys to inform R3, communicate with non-hunters, public messages (representative public sample)	1
Share relevant research in easy to understand ways - Open communication about reality - Create MI deer data dashboard site	1
Public Service Announcements about deer management: educational programs on herd management / healthy ratios	1
Expand cull / sharp shooting for municipalities/CWD areas	1
Venison exchange program - non-hunters connect with hunters	1
Lapsed hunter survey to inform R3 efforts	1
Expand HAP to include other harvest permits (youth seasons / out of season / DMAPs)	1
Pay landowners for 'HAP' type access - incentives to participate	1
Allow hunting on CRP/funded federal land	1
Open all public land - no local township closed to legal hunting	1
Appropriate more funds for disease study	1

LP DMI: Regulatory Solutions:

Participants were asked to collaborate with their group, filter through the 120 regulatory solutions, and as a group, come up with two different regulatory scenarios. The five group tables created regulatory scenarios which each contained the below suggestions (**not ranked**):

Table 1	Table 2	Table 3	Table 4	Table 5
Earn a second buck	Earn a 2nd buck in SLP	Zone 2 improve habitat so deer populations redistribute	Combo split into Archery OR Firearm , and Combo is 1 buck/1 doe	Reduce deer density where needed (negative impacts)
Protect yearling bucks and protect bucks less than 3" (remove antlerless, true doe tags)	Combo buck+doe (no APRs except NW13)	Zone 3 improve hunter access to private lands where the deer are	APR options, also no APR's	Expand Urban Archery to new locations/cities, Need Urban deer point of contact for DNR
Allow baiting with compliance of MOU	Ban baiting in disease zones	Zone 3 Increase doe harvest to reduce densities	No baiting	Deer Management Plan
Smaller management units	County Based DMUs	Regulations too broad / needs to be separated by region	DMUs / Quota based management	Create harvest goals by DMU
Mandatory reporting	Keep mandatory reporting	Disease Regulations	Keep mandatory reporting	Create Dashboard to track trends, use to evaluate regs
Early and late antlerless hunt on private and public lands	Extend late antlerless to public land	Increase access/easy access to data on deer and deer impacts	Doe tag transfer ability	DNR communicate importance of DMAPs
Enhance HAP program	Increase funding for HAP	Retain hunters and increase hunter effort	Habitat improvements - public lands	Review local ordinances
Drone recovery	Discounted antlerless bundle at point of sale	Public needs to be more educated about deer / town hall meetings and public outreach	Evaluate youth and liberty hunt, season dates	DNR communicate with locals / public engagement
	Gun season split - 2 opening days		Increase out of state fees	

LP DMI Participant Reflection:

LP DMI members found educational value in this process and enjoyed collaborating with each other while learning diverse perspectives. Many LP DMI members have strong sentiments that the work this group has begun should continue, as the process was expeditive at times, and there are many regulatory and non-regulatory suggestions demanding attention and collaborative efforts to urge their possible fruition. In addition, it was felt the results of the in-person meeting created many possible solutions, but these solutions lacked clear and direct courses of action due to time constraints. Moreover, the LP DMI wants to extend gratitude to all DNR staff, the NRC, and the guest speakers for sharing their time and knowledge throughout the virtual portion of this process. Lastly, the LP DMI wants to thank Chad Stewart for his organization, facilitation, and commitment to this process.

This concludes the LP DMI 2024 Report.

