



**Comments and Background
Information on the
2019 Proposed Resolutions**

Prepared by MUCC Staff

Proposed Resolution #01

Submitted by: Mark Hergenreder, Chelsea Rod and Gun Club
MUCC Region: 8
Passed: March 23, 2019 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **YOUTH CLAY TARGET RESOLUTION**

Background/Problem:

While recreational shooting is one of the fastest growing outdoor hobbies, the number of participants is still relatively small overall. As a way to continue to grow the sport, clay target shooting is gaining popularity and it is gaining momentum in the ranks of youth. There are currently more than 300 colleges nationwide that have trap shooting teams. Clay target shooting is also beginning to become more popular at the high school level.

In 2017, Michigan had 23 teams with 469 students participating. During the 2018 season, there were 45 registered teams and 975 students who participated. In Minnesota, during the 2018 season, there were 328 recognized teams and more than 13,600 students who participated.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution would request that MUCC will endorse and promote the participation of students in the Michigan High School Clay Target League and that MUCC will encourage all high schools in Michigan to commit to permitting a high school club be formed in their district.
- That MUCC will encourage all affiliates to offer a learn to shoot clay target opportunities for youth in their local communities and that MUCC encourages the MHSAA to recognize the Michigan High School Clay Target League as a recognized club sport.
- That MUCC encourages the Michigan DNR to recognize the Michigan High School Clay Target league as an educational program that embraces the recruitment, retainment and reactivation of hunting and shooting sports participants.

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- In 2018, MUCC members approved a resolution to work with the State Department of Education, Intermediate School Districts (ISD's), and local school districts to provide access to promoting, advertising and providing information about firearm safety classes and hunter education classes at local, regional and state facilities and other range facilities open to the public.
- In 1996, MUCC members voted to extend themselves to widen the opportunities for memberships to youth, under the age of eighteen (18) in schools, 4-H groups, Boy Scout and Girl Scout troops, or other youth groups in their area.
- In 1974, MUCC members voted to Support efforts to make conservation education mandatory in Michigan schools, the sporting clays league could be used as a gateway to help students connect the dots to conservation.
- In 1978, MUCC urged all clubs to help promote conservation education in their local schools.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- Engaging youth in clay target shooting provides the opportunity for them to experience safe and responsible firearm handling and helps create a body of knowledge in regards to shooting sports and safety.
- By creating an opportunity for an inclusive sport, clay shooting allows youth who may not fit the traditional sports mold an opportunity to join a team and build friendships and leadership skills.
- By creating a larger demand for clay target shooting by including youth, funds for conservation are being raised through the purchase of firearms, equipment and ammo through excise taxes.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- None

DNR RESPONSE #01:

The Michigan Department of Natural Resources supports educational programs that increase interest in the shooting and hunting sports. Programs such as the Michigan High School Clay Target League increase interest and participation in shooting and can help facilitate interest in participating in shooting and hunting activities by school aged youth outside of the school settings.

Position:

SUPPORT: The Department of Natural Resources

OPPOSITION:

NEUTRAL:

Proposed Resolution #02

Requires 2/3rd Majority

Submitted by: Michael Riepen, Et al., Michigan Deer Track'n Hounds Tracking Club
MUCC Region: 8
Passed: March 23, 2019 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **RESOLUTION TO AMEND LAWS CONTROLLING THE USE OF DOGS TO TRACK WOUNDED BIG GAME ANIMAL**

Background/Problem:

Across the United States regulations on tracking big game vary. Currently 40 out of the 50 states allow tracking of big game. Of those, some southern states such as Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, Georgia and others allow the tracking of big game off lead.

Some states also allow a tracker to dispatch big game with certain stipulations. These are Alabama, Alaska, Georgia, Maine, New York (only at night) and Texas.

In Michigan, according to section 2.1a of the Michigan Wildlife Conservation Order, “a dog may be used to locate a wounded deer and elk if the dog is kept on a leash... none of the persons in attendance possess a firearm, crossbow, or bow and arrow.”

Also according to section 2.1a of the Michigan Wildlife Conservation Order, “Only a licensed hunter may dispatch and tag the wounded deer, elk, or bear.”

Resolution Content:

- This resolution would request that MUCC support an initiative to amend the Michigan Wildlife Conservation Order to provide added definition to the current regulations governing the use of dogs to track wounded big game animals.
- That MUCC support an initiative to amend the Michigan Wildlife Conservation Order to provide or remove language to permit registered trackers to dispatch a wounded, legally hunted big game animal for the specific goal of recovering or ending the suffering of already wounded, legally hunted big game animals; and
- That MUCC support an initiative to amend the Michigan Wildlife Conservation Order to provide language to permit registered trackers to operate one dog at a time off lead, provided that dog has affixed a GPS tracking collar, and the registered tracker has on their person a tracking unit where they can monitor their dogs position, their position, property boundaries, and has the ability control/recall their dog prior to crossing boundaries where permission has not been obtained for the specific goal of recovering or ending the suffering of already wounded, legally hunted big game animals
- That MUCC support and work with State Legislature to amend any laws contradictory to the purposes of the above suggested changes regarding the use of dogs to track wounded big game animals to provide exceptions for the specific goal of recovering or ending the suffering of already wounded, legally hunted big game animals.

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- MUCC has passed resolutions related to hunting dogs and what defines their use. However, the organization does not have any passed resolutions related to tracking wounded game with a dog off-leash or allowing a licensed tracker to dispatch wounded game.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- Currently, licensed trackers in Michigan are hindered by state regulation that does not allow them to track wounded big game off-leash with dogs. This creates two problems: a lessened chance for retrieval of the game if the animal is able to move and a delayed time in tracking game which could allow the wounded animal to cross a property boundary, spoil, suffer or go to waste.
- Furthermore, in some cases, it isn't always feasible for the licensed hunter to be directly at the tracker's side or in close proximity while tracking. And, if given the ability, the tracker, in some cases, would be able to dispatch the wounded animal in a quicker, safer and more effective

manner than the hunter which would help to facilitate a quicker recovery of the wounded animal. This could become especially important during archery season when tracking and trying to recover wounded deer.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- Allowing a certified dog tracker to dispatch a wounded animal would allow a non-licensed hunter to harvest an animal. In Michigan, PA 451 of 1994 requires all hunters in Michigan to obtain a license for a harvestable animal so there would be a need to change both state law and state regulation.
- There is concern from hunters about the ethics of having someone other than the licensed hunter dispatch the animal because there may be some subjectivity involved in assessing if the animal is mortally wounded.

DNR RESPONSE #02:

The Department does not support amending the Wildlife Conservation Order to allow certified dog trackers to dispatch a wounded animal. The Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, Act 451 of 1994, prohibits the take or possession of a wild animal without a valid license authorized by the Act. If 1994 PA 451 were amended, changes would also need to be made to the Wildlife Conservation Order and would be subject to consideration by the Natural Resources Commission. Allowing a dog to track off leash would require changes to the Michigan Administrative Code, specifically the State Land Use Rules. The Department supports the intent of this change if the dog and dog tracker adhere to current regulations that apply to hunting dogs and recreational trespass.

MUCC Wildlife Committee:

Wildlife Committee supports breaking this resolution into two separate resolutions to separate the two different items being addressed as the WC believes each has grounds to stand on its own. One should not impact the decision of the other.

Wildlife Committee supports amending the resolution by substitution of the following two separate resolutions:

2-A – Tracking off Leash

Wildlife Committee is supportive of the substitute resolution. Not unanimous decision. Discussion on consideration of the requirement of electronic tracking/stopping equipment to be on the dog such as GPS or E-Collar. The following amendment was discussed, but ultimately not adopted by the WC: insert within the second Be it Further Resolved after the word “lead” (LINE 13) “fitted with a collar or electronic device to aid the tracker in recovery of the dog.”

2-B – Trackers ability to dispatch

The wildlife committee came to the conclusion of two specific cases where the dispatch of big game by the tracker is acceptable.

Proposed Substitute Resolution 2-A
Requires 2/3rd Majority

Submitted by: Michael Riepen, Et al., Michigan Deer Track'n Hounds Tracking Club
MUCC Region: 8
Proposed: March 23, 2019 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **RESOLUTION TO ALLOW TRACKING DOGS TO BE OFF LEASH
WHILE TRACKING BIG GAME ANIMALS**

1 **WHEREAS**, Section 2.1a of the Michigan Wildlife Conservation order governs the use of dogs to track
2 wounded big game animal; and

3 **WHEREAS**, Data collected by Michigan Deer Track'n Hounds Tracking Club indicates substantially
4 improved success rates for the ethical recovery of wounded big game animals for trackers who operate off
5 lead; and

6 **WHEREAS**, Initial research shows no major violations of tracking laws in states currently allowing off
7 lead tracking; now

8 **THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that Michigan United Conservation Clubs support an initiative to
9 amend the Michigan Wildlife Conservation Order to provide added definition to the current regulations
10 governing the use of dogs to track wounded big game animals; and

11 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that Michigan United Conservation Clubs support an initiative to
12 amend the Michigan Wildlife Conservation Order to provide language to permit registered trackers to
13 operate one dog at a time off lead, for the specific goal of recovering legally hunted big game animals;
14 and

15 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that Michigan United Conservation Clubs support and work with the
16 State Legislature to amend any laws contradictory to the purposes of the above suggested changes
17 regarding the use of dogs to track wounded big game animals.

Proposed Substitute Resolution 2-B
Requires 2/3rd Majority

Submitted by: Michael Riepen, Et al., Michigan Deer Track'n Hounds Tracking Club
MUCC Region: 8
Proposed: March 23, 2019 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **RESOLUTION TO ALLOW REGISTERED TRACKERS TO DISPATCH WOUNDED BIG GAME ANIMALS**

1 **WHEREAS**, Section 2.1a of the Michigan Wildlife Conservation order governs the use of dogs to track
2 wounded big game animal; and

3 **WHEREAS**, the moral duty to ethically end the suffering of wounded animals and the safety of trackers,
4 hunters, and dogs participating in tracking will be improved by allowing trackers to dispatch an already
5 wounded, legally hunted big game animal; and

6 **WHEREAS**, Initial research shows no major violations of tracking laws in states currently allowing
7 tracker dispatch; now

8 **THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that Michigan United Conservation Clubs support an initiative to
9 amend the Michigan Wildlife Conservation Order to provide or remove language to permit registered
10 trackers to dispatch a wounded, legally hunted big game animal for the specific goal of recovering or
11 ending the suffering of already wounded, legally hunted big game animals in two specific cases in two
12 specific cases: (1) the licensed hunter is unable to walk through a dense wooded area or is unable to walk
13 200 feet in field conditions due to a temporary or permanent disability or medical condition (2) the life or
14 safety of the tracking dog is in jeopardy; and

15 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that Michigan United Conservation Clubs support and work with the
16 State Legislature to amend any laws contradictory to the purposes of the above suggested changes; and to
17 provide exceptions for the specific goal of recovering or ending the suffering of already wounded, legally
18 hunted big game animal.

Positions:

SUPPORT: Wildlife Committee is support of substitute resolution A and substitute resolution B as amended.

OPPOSITION: The Department of Natural Resources, as introduced

NEUTRAL:

Proposed Resolution #03
Requires 2/3 Majority

Submitted by: Paul Rose, MUCC Past President
MUCC Region: 4
Passed: December 8, 2018 Conservation Policy Meeting
Title: **MICHIGAN NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION APPOINTMENT CRITERIA**

Background/Problem:

The Michigan NRC is a public body consisting of seven citizens of the state. All seven members of the NRC are appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the state Senate. The first Michigan NRC was established in 1922 to oversee the state Department of Conservation, a precursor to the current MDNR.

As Commissioners are appointed, they are not required to have backgrounds in wildlife or fisheries biology, ecology, agriculture or natural resource management. However, some of them do take a strong interest in these areas through their professional or volunteer experiences. Each commissioner serves for a term of four years and the NRC is required to have no more than four members of the same political party.

Having the governor follow a certain set of criteria for appointees of the commission would require a change in statute.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution would requests that MUCC work with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and State of Michigan Legislature to develop qualification and eligibility criteria which seeks to populate the NRC with members who have a demonstrated interest in both game and non-game fisheries and wildlife, natural resource management, a history of personal participation in these activities, and suitable educational and professional background.
- That MUCC support consideration for appointment be given to geographic distribution and the diversity of relevant recreational participation of its membership, as well as a balance among those who have a declared political affiliation.
- That this emphasis on citizen participation should preclude the appointment of former employees of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Michigan Department of Environmental

Quality (MDEQ), Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development and members of the Michigan State legislature for a period of ten years subsequent to their most recent date of service or employment.

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- MUCC currently has no policy regarding criteria for Natural Resources Commission appointments. These are governor-appointed positions and carry terms of four years. MUCC has two past resolutions that seek to keep the NRC free from politics and use sound science to manage our natural resources.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- Ensuring that those charged with managing our natural resources have a vested interest in game and nongame species alike, while establishing criteria that proves that interest, would help to create clear and transparent motives of the commissioners.
- Requiring a 10-year time period between employment with the DNR, EGLE, MDARD and Michigan Legislature and serving on the commission creates a buffer from former employees imposing the will of the organization they were employed with or holding privy knowledge on subjects related to Michigan’s natural resources.
- Current appointments may be granted to those in political favor of the sitting Governor, without regard to their interests or background.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- This resolution would limit the appointment power of the Michigan governor.
- Past employees of state organizations might add constructive, immediate value to the natural resources commission because of their expertise and involvement in a previous state governmental agency if allowed to serve before a 10-year period has passed.
- Just as a “jury of our peers” are not required to have any specialized knowledge of the subject matter they are asked to review in a court case, the NRC may operate through asking questions and weighing facts independently rather than relying on their own expert knowledge.

DNR RESPONSE #03:

The Department appreciates the attempt to improve the current Natural Resource Commission selection process. As you are aware, the Natural Resource Commission is appointed by the Governor. Since this appointment authority is not vested with the Department, the Department would not feel comfortable weighing in on any proposed changes that could would seek to limit the Governor’s appointment authority.

Position:

SUPPORT:

OPPOSITION:

NEUTRAL: The Department of Natural Resources

Proposed Resolution #04

Submitted by: Greg Peter, MUCC Vice President
MUCC Region: 8
Proposed: December 8, 2018 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN CWD AREAS**

Background/Problem:

Chronic wasting disease (CWD) is a fatal disease with a high rate of infection. Without proper management, white-tailed deer herd health will be affected greatly. CWD will drastically impact Michigan's \$8.9 billion dollar hunting industry. Managing our deer population to prevent CWD has presented itself to be a complex issue.

The resolution sponsor believes continuing efforts of the NRC and DNR in the CWD management zone before creating further efforts of management is the best route with the available data. They argue that management efforts require years to produce results, and changing efforts could leave a drastic impact.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution would request that MUCC encourage the continuance of the present strategy in the CWD Management Zone and any additional areas where the CWD threat is identified with surveillance, until sufficient data have been generated as to its effectiveness.
- That MUCC should stress the importance of population control and the role of the hunter/conservationist in this effort and encourage the issuance of additional doe permits and extended antlerless seasons, where advisable, to decrease the density of susceptible deer.
- That MUCC remain involved in the design of any field studies in consultation with the biologists of the DNR and other wildlife disease authorities.

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- In 2004, MUCC approved a resolution requesting MUCC continues its efforts to protect Michigan's deer and elk from CWD by encouraging the state and federal government to accept and fund the recommendations of the task force, and MUCC develops and promotes an educational program to inform all MUCC members about CWD and the recommendations of the Governor's Task Force.
- In 2007, MUCC approved opposing the continued use of bait as a means of harvesting whitetail in Michigan.

- In 2012, MUCC approved a resolution requesting that MUCC work with and urge the MDNR to actively and aggressively investigate these die-offs and pursue a solution to EHD and other emerging diseases.
- In 2017, MUCC approved a resolution to urge the Michigan legislature to simplify the current regulation and increase fine and penalties for violations of the whole carcass prohibition, to help further reduce the chance of CWD or other diseases being brought into Michigan. The resolution encourages Michigan to adopt a stance similar to Montana or Minnesota whom have adopted regulations that require any cervid carcass brought into Michigan (whether taken from a wild or captive population) be in the form of deboned meat, clean skullcaps, finished taxidermy, and/or other parts not anticipated to carry CWD prions. The resolution also urges the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and other federal agencies as necessary, with support from the Michigan delegation of U.S. Senators and U.S. Representatives, work to make this federal regulation.
- In 2018, a resolution was passed that MUCC will bring the issue of CWD and TB to the forefront and work with the DNR to enforce existing laws, find alternative funding other than what is provided by existing fish and wildlife funds and continue education efforts and promote hunter involvement in combating these diseases. MUCC also supports additional harvesting of does in DMUs through methods of later seasons and reduced doe tag prices and other means to help promote the take of does to maintain a balanced herd. MUCC continues to support baiting bans. MUCC should work with QDMA and other stakeholders to help DNR and NRC with this disease.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- Chronic wasting disease management can take years to produce results. Following through with implemented management strategies is crucial in order to get accurate data and results before adapting management strategies.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- When new available science presents itself, our management efforts should rapidly adapt as well in order to properly manage CWD. By committing to current management efforts with little flexibility, we could be managing without the best practices available.

DNR RESPONSE #04:

The Wildlife Division (WLD) agrees that the known consequences of unmitigated CWD are a threat to Michigan’s natural resources and hunting traditions. The persistent environmental contamination with prions is one of many complicating factors of CWD. For these reasons, management practices and proposing regulations for the CWD Management Zone the best available science is considered when developing.

The WLD also agrees that it is important to maintain consistency in regulations in order to properly evaluate their impacts to the population. However, adaptive management may be required in the face of increased understanding of disease epidemiology. The WLD will continue to share knowledge and

maintain transparency in all proposals for the decision. Working together is the best chance we have at success.

MUCC Wildlife Committee:

Wildlife Committee along with both writers will support dropping both resolutions or replacing them with a substitute resolution that states we support the collection and use of sound scientific management of our wildlife. The writers have an opportunity to draft a substitute resolution and have ready for Wildlife Committee to review prior to convention. If this does not happen or a consensus cannot be found between the writers, the Wildlife Committee will ask for no action or a return to the writers for rewrite at convention.

Position:

SUPPORT:

OPPOSITION:

NEUTRAL: The Department of Natural Resources

Proposed Resolution #05

Submitted by: Erik Schnelle, Michigan QDMA State Chapter President
MUCC Region: 5
Proposed: December 8, 2018 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH INTO CWD MANAGEMENT BEST PRACTICES**

Background/Problem:

Chronic wasting disease (CWD) is a fatal disease with a high rate of infection. Without proper management, white-tailed deer herd health will be affected greatly. CWD will drastically impact Michigan's \$8.9 billion dollar hunting industry. Managing our deer population to prevent CWD has presented itself to be a complex issue.

The resolution sponsor believes that MUCC should support efforts of the DNR and NRC to research further in determining the best methods for disease management.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution would request that MUCC encourage and support the efforts of the NRC and DNR to perform research into determining the best CWD management approaches for Michigan's CWD Management Zones, and any additional areas where the CWD threat is identified with surveillance, until sufficient data have been generated as to its effectiveness.
- That MUCC should stress the importance of population control and the role of the hunter/conservationist in this effort and encourage the issuance of additional doe permits and the establishment of doe harvest goals, where advisable, to decrease the density of susceptible deer.

- That MUCC remain involved in the design of any field studies in consultation with the biologists of the DNR and other wildlife disease authorities.

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- See resolution #4 current and past policy standing subheading.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- Response to wildlife disease in a manner that is aggressive and with the best available science is necessary. Being able to adapt practices to increase antlerless harvest is crucial to halting the spread of CWD.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- Changing management strategies for disease could exacerbate the prevalence of disease. Adapting management strategies for CWD without following through on current strategies will prevent accurate data collection.

DNR RESPONSE #05:

Overall, the Wildlife Division is supportive of Resolution G. However, we caution that several of the whereas clauses are at least partly inaccurate, and that CWD and the management of this disease remains poorly understood. Nevertheless, the resolution is consistent with our direction and approach for CWD research. The Division agrees that CWD management should be directed by research and that the effectiveness of management strategies needs to be monitored and assessed to ensure desired outcomes are being attained. We also welcome engagement with MUCC and other interested stakeholders on setting CWD research goals.

MUCC Wildlife Committee

Wildlife Committee along with both writers will support dropping both resolutions or replacing them with a substitute resolution that states we support the collection and use of sound scientific management of our wildlife. The writers have an opportunity to draft a replacement resolution and have ready for Wildlife Committee to review prior to convention in consideration of a replacement. If this does not happen or a consensus cannot be found between the writers the Wildlife Committee will ask for no action or a return to the writers at convention.

Position:

SUPPORT:

OPPOSITION:

NEUTRAL: The Department of Natural Resources

Proposed Resolution #06
Requires 2/3 Majority

Submitted by: MUCC Fisheries Committee
Passed: March 23, 2019 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **COMMERCIAL FISHING STATUTE MODERNIZATION**

Background/Problem:

The statute around commercial fishers in the state of Michigan has been the same since the late 1960s. The number of licenses commercial fishers in the state has decreased, and the overall money coming from license fees has as well. The amount of revenue to the state for license fees of commercial fishers is not enough to even pay a full-time employee with the Department of Natural Resources.

Currently commercial fishers are making the argument that they should be allowed to harvest and sell lake trout due the amount of bycatch they are having. They are forced by law to throw the fish back into the water, many of which are dead at the time. It appears that the commercial fishers may be targeting lake trout in order to make this argument, and some of them are likely to be violating law. Updating the statute to specify gear used, locations of harvest, and an increased fine of sold bycatch will aid in prevention of bycatch caught by the commercial fishers.

Preventing commercial fishers from encroaching on sportfishing species such as lake trout is important going into the 2020 tribal Great Lakes Consent Decree. If we were to allow the commercial fishers to harvest and sell lake trout or other game species commercially (previously only caught and sold commercially by tribes), then our other sportfish are at risk during negotiations at the 2020 consent decree. It is also important to bring state-licensed commercial fishers to the same regulatory standards we might ask the tribes to adhere to through these negotiations.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution requests that MUCC should make improvements to regulation of commercial fisheries to be protective of the fisheries and sportfishing. Such as:
 - Including protection of game species (except whitefish) from commercial harvest.
 - Governing how often commercial entities check their nets and regulates allowable gear in a manner that also takes into account the time of the year and specificity of the net.
 - Creates or increases penalties for the disturbance of commercial fishing nets as well as the illegal operations of commercial anglers.
 - Requires appropriate markers for the location of nets and that these locations be available to the public.

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- Several resolutions have been passed regarding the regulation of commercial fishing. None of them are newer than 1986, hence the need for modernization.

- In 1970, a resolution required that MUCC request the DNR enforce present laws regulating commercial fishing on Saginaw Bay and request the DNR to re-evaluate the present regulations regarding size and numbers of yellow perch taken by commercial fisherman. And, that the DNR cease granting permission to federal agencies allowing them to use overflow dredging methods which puts toxic laden sediments back into suspension in the water column of the Saginaw Bay.
- In 1983, a resolution passed requesting MUCC to urge the DNR to increase the price of a commercial fishing license and that each commercial fisherman pay \$5/pound for illegal fish taken in their net.
- In 1986, a resolution passed requesting MUCC to seek legislation requiring a commercial fishing license fee schedule be established which is based on the amount of fish harvested by the commercial fisherman.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- Updating the commercial fishing statute is important for a variety of reasons. One reason being increasing license fees in order to have the commercial fishers pay for the cost to operate the license process and enforcement of violations.
- Another is creating stricter regulations on bycatch, preventing commercial fishers from encroaching on game species; in this instance, lake trout.
- Having updated regulations for how the state-licensed commercial fishers operate will be an advantage going into the 2020 consent decree.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- None

DNR RESPONSE #06:

The Department supports modernizing Michigan’s commercial fishing statute. The existing current statute was last amended in the late-1960s. Regulatory requirements are obsolete and don’t align with current day enforcement needs, fisher accountability or implementation of commercial fisheries management in the Great Lakes. Therefore, the Department has also identified modernizing the commercial fisheries statute as a top legislative priority.

Commercial fisheries are of economic and cultural significance in Michigan. Commercial fisheries provide public trust resources throughout the state to citizens that might not otherwise have ability to enjoy them. The Department also recognizes the significance of sportfishing in Michigan and therefore, the Department’s goal is to implement and enforce commercial fisheries in a sustainable manner to maintain fish populations to support both sport and commercial fisheries in the Great Lakes, and to reduce conflict.

The Department has identified critical updates that are imperative to be modernized within the existing statute. These updates include addressing issues such as license fees, fines for violations, restitution for poaching, penalties, catch reporting processes, and gear deployment notification to enhance public safety. These updates align with those identified in this resolution and would greatly assist with modernizing the commercial fishing statute that has mostly been intact for nearly 100 years. Addressing the issues listed above through statutory modifications would provide the Department an improved ability to implement and enforce commercial fisheries in the Great Lakes.

MUCC Fisheries Committee:

Fisheries Committee comments will be provided at Annual Convention.

Position:

SUPPORT: The Department of Natural Resources

OPPOSITION:

NEUTRAL:

Proposed Resolution #07

Submitted by: Thomas L. Heriter, MUCC Immediate Past President, Saginaw Field and Stream Club
MUCC Region: 6
Passed: March 23, 2019 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **TRIBAL TREATY NEGOTIATIONS**

Background/Problem:

The State Of Michigan, the United States and the Tribes entered into litigation over 40 years ago to define the rights of the Tribes in regards to fishing on the Great Lakes under the 1836 treaty. MUCC has participated in the litigation as an amicus curiae and participated in the negotiations leading to two Consent Decrees which implemented the 1979 court decision. Since then, the State of Michigan, the United States and the Tribes entered into litigation in September of 2003 regarding the rights of the Tribes to hunt, fish on inland waters and gather from the land and MUCC participated in the litigation again as an amicus curiae and in the negotiations that led to the 2007 settlement of the court case.

In the end, MUCC supported the terms of the settlement agreement and the Consent Decrees. However, aside from our involvement in some advisory councils and participation in the Great Lakes Fishery Trust Board, we do not collaborate much with Tribal governments. MUCC has joined a collaborative of sportfishing groups to serve as an amicus curiae in the upcoming 2020 Consent Decree negotiations.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution requests that MUCC continue to promote and protect hunting, fishing and trapping opportunities in the State of Michigan while also seeking to improve relations with Michigan’s Native American Tribal members and leaders.

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- In 2000, MUCC passed a resolution that MUCC support the State of Michigan's involvement in negotiating fair and equitable harvest and use of the fisheries resources in the 1842 Treaty area.
- In 2008, MUCC passed a resolution that MUCC work cooperatively with the Tribes and the State of Michigan to implement the terms of the Consent Decrees; seek partnerships with the Tribes to fulfill our shared missions of conserving Michigan’s natural resources; allow certain previous resolutions regarding Native American treaties to expire.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- This would direct our staff and members to look for potential partnership opportunities with the tribes and generally improve relationships. They may be a key ally in habitat and Great Lakes protection and in preventing and combating invasive species.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- As noted in the DNR response, a clarifying amendment should be considered to replace “Treaty” and “Treaty agreements” with “Consent Decree”.
- There is concern about using the word “Tribes” as a proper noun. It is unclear whether this term has been used as such historically. Staff would offer that the word “Tribes” is replaced with the term “1836 Treaty Tribes.”

DNR RESPONSE #07:

The Department is conceptually supportive of this proposed resolution. It is important to note that treaties are recognized in the U.S. Constitution (Indian Commerce Clause Treaty Clause, Supremacy Clause) as the “supreme” law of the land. It was through Article 13 of the 1836 Treaty between the United States, the Ottawa and Chippewa Tribes of the northern Lower Peninsula and eastern Upper Peninsula that stipulated certain rights for the tribes such as hunting and fishing.

The 2000 Great Lakes Consent Decree represents an agreement between the 1836 Treaty Tribes, the State of Michigan and the U.S. Government regarding the allocation, management, and regulations of State and Tribal fisheries in the 1836 Treaty waters. The 2000 Great Lakes Consent Decree is set to expire in August of 2020. During the negotiations of the new 2020 Great Lakes Consent Decree the DNR will continue to seek to promote and protect fishing opportunities in the State of Michigan while also seeking to improve relations with Michigan’s Federally Recognized 1836 Treaty Tribes.

In addition to the 2000 Great Lakes Consent Decree, there is also a 2007 Inland Consent Decree that represents an agreement between the 1836 Treaty Tribes, the State of Michigan, and the U.S. Government. This inland consent decree is a negotiated settlement that defines the extent of the Inland Article 13 rights while also defining the extent of right to hunt, and the other usual privileges of occupancy, secured by the 1836 Treaty. This establishes parameters that define where, when, and how the Tribes may exercise those rights. The 2007 Inland Consent Decree has no expiration, but all the parties confine every August to discuss any proposed amendments to the Inland Consent Decree. Any proposed change must be approved by all five 1836 Treaty Tribes, State of Michigan, and the U.S. Government.

Position:

SUPPORT: The Department of Natural Resources supports this resolution in its conception.

OPPOSITION:

NEUTRAL:

Proposed Resolution #08
Requires 2/3rd Majority

Submitted by: Craig Larson, Dowagiac Conservation Club
MUCC Region: 7
Proposed: December 8, 2018 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **USE OF ARTIFICIAL LIGHT TO TRAVEL TO DEER HUNTING SITE**

Background/Problem:

Hunters traveling to and from their deer hunting stands early in the morning or after dark are currently only allowed one hour of artificial light to find their way into or out of the field. The current regulations limit hunters in their ability to travel long distances into the field to pursue game at peak hours of activity, without risk of an infraction. If more time was granted for hunters to find their way to or from their stand, it may increase the ability of these hunters to pursue game, without breaking the law.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution requests that MUCC work with the Natural Resources Commission or the Michigan Legislature as necessary to change the regulation to allow deer hunters to use an artificial light two hours before and two hours after shooting hours while carrying an unloaded firearm or bow and arrow when traveling on foot to or from their hunting location.

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- In 1971, MUCC passed a resolution that outlaws “shining” deer from 11pm until dawn.
- In 1987, MUCC passed a resolution that would seek an end to all shining during the months of October, November, and December.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- Allowing artificial lights earlier in the morning and later after dark will improve hunter safety during this time under legal means.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- Artificial light may have unintended effects on early-morning or late-evening behavior of game or non-game animals.

DNR RESPONSE #08:

The DNR supports the intent of this resolution with the clarification that an uncocked crossbow would also be applicable. This would require changes to the Wildlife Conservation Order and consideration by the Natural Resources Commission.

MUCC Wildlife Committee:

MUCC Wildlife Committee supports with two amendments.

Amendment 1 offered on line 13-14 after the word light and before the word two add **“TO AID WITH THE INGRESS AND EGRESS TO THE HUNTING LOCATION AND NOT TO BE USED FOR SPOTLIGHTING.”**

Amendment 2 offered on line 15 after the word arrow and before the word when add **“UNLOADED CROSSBOW”**

Position:

SUPPORT: MUCC Wildlife Committee supports with the above amendment. Michigan Department of Natural Resources supports with version of amendment 2.

OPPOSITION:

NEUTRAL:

Proposed Resolution #09

Submitted by: Ted LePresto, Hillsdale County Conservation Club
MUCC Region: 7
Passed: March 23, 2019 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **WATER WITHDRAWAL FROM THE MICHINDOH AQUIFER**

Background/Problem:

The Michindoh Aquifer is an underground water reserve that exists under seven counties in Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio (thus, Mich-Ind-Oh). This aquifer serves as a water source for more than 20 communities in this region and is estimated to service as many as 400,000 people. Due to recent issues

with water quality in Lake Erie, the Artesian of Ohio has presented a proposal to sell water from this aquifer to the greater Toledo, OH area at a rate of up to 28,000 gallons per day. This could violate the agreements outlined in the Great Lakes Water Compact and have an influence on the other Great Lakes States.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution requests that MUCC work with the Great Lakes Water Compact and the states of Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio (who are members of the Great Lakes Water Compact) to ensure that the rules and processes of the Great Lakes Water Compact be employed in this large scale use or diversion of water of the Great Lakes.
- That MUCC work with the Environmental Protection Agencies of the States and Provinces of the Great Lakes Water Compact and with the Federal Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that the waters of the Great Lakes are protected as dictated by the rules and processes of the Great Lakes Water Compact.

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- In 2001, MUCC passed two resolutions stating that MUCC opposes water diversion outside of natural watershed boundaries and asks for clear conservation standards to regulate and restrict inter-basin water diversions.
- That MUCC also opposes drainage of aquifers at a rate greater than natural replenishment.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- The Great Lakes Compact is an important agreement for all of the Great Lakes States and should be maintained.
- Water withdrawals from the aquifer could outpace recharge and deplete the aquifer for others living in the region.
- Wells in the Michindoh area could lose water and need to be expanded to remain effective.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- Consumptive use of water under this proposal might not trigger the notice process outlined within the GLWC (see MDNR Response #09).
- No formal permit application has been submitted for MUCC to act on.

DNR RESPONSE #09:

The State of Michigan takes all requests for Great Lakes water use seriously, and appreciates the interest expressed in MUCC's Proposed Resolution in protecting Great Lakes waters, ensuring new withdrawals respect all water users, and preventing negative impacts to aquatic habitats. The 2008 The Great Lakes–

St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Compact (Compact) adopted by the eight Great Lakes States governs water use within the Great Lakes basin. Each state regulates large water withdrawals within its borders and has the authority to prohibit diversions, with limited exceptions. However, the provisions of the Compact do not apply to all circumstances. Under Section 4.6, states are required to notify the other states if they receive proposals for new or increased consumptive uses of water in excess of 5 million gallons per day.

Consumptive use is the portion of a withdrawal that is lost or not otherwise returned to the basin; public water supplies generally have a 10-15% consumptive use. Therefore, the proposed withdrawal to supply water to the City of Toledo would need to exceed 33 million gallons a day before the triggering the formal notice process under the Compact. However, Michigan can take steps to protect water users under Ohio law and common law principles. Ohio law for the facility proposed by Artesian of Ohio is governed by Sections 1501.33 and 1501.34 of the Ohio Revised Code (<http://codes.ohio.gov/orc/1501.33>, and <http://codes.ohio.gov/orc/1501.34>). Those provisions condition any permit on several findings, including that the facility:

- Will not have a significant detrimental effect on the quantity or quality of water resources and related land resources in this state; and
- There is sufficient water available for the withdrawal, and other existing legal uses of water resources are protected.

The State of Michigan has been in contact with Ohio’s Department of Natural Resources and will continue to monitor the proposed facility as the process moves forward.

Position:

SUPPORT:
OPPOSITION:
NEUTRAL:

Proposed Resolution #10
Requires 2/3rd Majority

Submitted by: Mike Avery, Individual Member
MUCC Region: 6
Passed: December 8, 2018 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **EXPAND NUMBER OF RODS FOR TROLLING ANGLER**

Background/Problem:

Prior to 2008, two rods were allowed to be used by anglers. In 2008, the number of rods increased from two to three per angler. A desire to expand the rods even further is seen among trolling anglers due to existing bag limits that would prevent exceeding such limits.

Conflicts and opposition in the past were related to a conflict of user groups. As the DNR has mentioned, certain areas such as below dams and harbor piers are susceptible to conflicts when using multiple rods, and can create issues for creel clerks. The enforcement of this regulation on inland waters becomes increasingly difficult with each increased rod. However, these concerns are not directed to increasing the number of rods for trolling.

Resolution Content:

- That MUCC work with the Michigan Legislature and Michigan Department of Natural Resources to enact legislation to allow the DNR to expand the number of lines for trolling anglers.

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- In 2000, MUCC adopted policy that supported working with DNR, NRC and the legislature to achieve an increase in the number of fishing lines from two to three for trolling all MI Great Lakes. That resolution became law in 2008, and anglers are allowed three lines anywhere in the state.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- Because this does not change the possession limit per angler, this would not impact the resource in a negative way. It simply allows anglers to cover water more effectively.
- Trolling anglers are limited by boat space and rod positions, so it is unlikely a trolling angler would place out a high number of rods.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- This resolution would further convolute fishing regulations and goes against the department's wish to try and standardize as many regulations as possible to make regulations easier to understand for anglers.
- As noted by the DNR, conflicts among user groups could arise.
- If passed, this resolution would be hard for the department to enforce on inland waterways.

DNR RESPONSE #10:

The Department is neutral on expanding the number of rods for trolling anglers in the Great Lakes. Existing fishing regulations, such as daily bag and possession limits, size restrictions, and closed seasons provide necessary protections for fish populations that would address any potential biological concern associated with increased angling effort. Furthermore, any potential concerns of increased angling effort would be tracked through the Department's ongoing statewide angler survey program that is conducted annually at ports throughout the Great Lakes.

In 2008, sec. 48703 of NREPA Part 487 was amended to increase the number of fishing lines and rods from two to three. During that process, the Department identified concerns of conflicts among user groups at certain fishing areas, especially in locations where angling activity is concentrated (e.g., below dams and at harbor piers). Considering the proposed resolution is requesting a similar increase, the Department would expect to have similar concerns of conflicts among user groups at specific fishing locations. In addition, concerns will likely arise from inland anglers that also have an interest in increasing their number of allowable lines. It's important to note that the Department would oppose increasing the number of allowable lines on inland waters because resources for inland creel programs and fishing regulation enforcement are limited and therefore staff would be unable to evaluate the social and biological impacts of increased angling effort.

Based on the identified potential conflicts, The Department would recommend gathering input from stakeholder groups and the DNR Law Enforcement Division on how best to address potential user group conflicts before pursuing any change in the existing statutory language regarding the number of allowable fishing lines.

Position:

SUPPORT:

OPPOSITION: (**WHEN INLAND WATERS ARE INCLUDED**) The Department of Natural Resources

NEUTRAL: The Department of Natural Resources

Proposed Resolution #11
Requires 2/3rd Majority

Submitted by: Rob Miller, MUCC Wildlife Chair

MUCC Region: 9

Proposed: December 8, 2018 Conservation Policy Board Meeting

Title: **EXPANDED HUNTING OPPORTUNITY WHILE MANAGING FOR A BALANCED DEER HERD**

Background/Problem:

There is concern that something must be done to encourage hunters to harvest more does in areas that can support it and restrict buck harvest. A "one buck rule" (OBR) has been offered as a solution in many instances, but has not garnered majority support from the hunting community or within MUCC to date. This proposal would only allow hunters to buy the combination tag, which would include one buck tag and one doe tag. There would be an exception for hunters who wish to only hunt in the Upper Peninsula (UP) in areas not open to antlerless harvest, who could buy just the single buck tag or a combo buck tag (under the proposed Wildlife Committee amendment) if they wish.

It is believed that by limiting hunters to only one buck per year, they would restrict themselves into ensuring it is used for older bucks as they would be provided a doe tag as an alternative to a young buck. This could increase the age structure and alter the buck to doe ratio of the deer herd.

In looking at the data from the 2016 Deer Harvest Survey, one can find that 43 percent of respondents support limiting hunters to one buck (no APRs) and 48 percent oppose. The proposal outlined in the resolution was not tested.

According to the newer 2017 Deer Harvest Survey:

- About 40 percent of the license buyers purchased at least one antlerless license (248,125 people), while nearly 60 percent of license buyers (366,000) purchased the combination license
- Statewide, 50 percent of hunters harvested a deer in 2017. About 22 percent of hunters took an antlerless deer, and 36 percent took an antlered buck in 2017.
- About six percent of hunters harvest two bucks, and only about 15 percent of hunters harvest two deer of either sex.
- Hunters in the UP make up about 14 percent of deer hunters statewide.

In interpreting the data, it could be concluded that a move to this modified one buck rule (requiring the purchase of a combo license with buck and doe tags, except for UP hunters) would affect a significant number of hunters.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution requests that MUCC work with the DNR and NRC to change the current definition of combo tag to read valid for the take of one buck and one doe with any legal method.
 - To only allow a single buck tag option in areas that require extra herd protection and would otherwise not allow the take of a doe with any means (such as archery).
 - To make available in all other areas either the new combo (both sex) or single buck tag.
 - To maintain hunter supported additional requirements in DMUs that have supported such. (Such as APRs).
 - In areas of special management needs such as disease or high-density areas additional tags can be made available per DNR recommendations or mandates.

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- MUCC supported the elimination of the archery and firearm specific single tags into a single deer license during the license restructuring in 2013, with support from a MUCC resolution from 2011.
- In 1996, MUCC passed a resolution to create the combination license, urging MUCC to work with DNR to establish a harvest tag system for deer that will allow for the purchase of up to two antlered harvest tags and these tags may be used in bow or firearm season.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- Could potentially simplify the license structure.

- This licensing structure could eventually eliminate the need for antler point restrictions.
- This licensing structure could potentially help disperse doe harvest more evenly across the landscape and increase doe harvest as well.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- With 38 percent of hunters purchasing a single deer license in 2017 rather than the combination license, the DNR does not feel it would be an acceptable change to remove the single license from the current license structure.
- May complicate management in areas that antlerless quotas have been low, as it's uncertain what hunters would do with an antlerless tag they don't typically buy. It would make it more difficult for the DNR to determine how many hunters use antlerless tags in a given Deer Management Unit.

DNR RESPONSE #11:

The DNR appreciates the sentiment of this resolution, which focuses on improving deer hunting in Michigan. Increasing hunter satisfaction and herd management are both important objectives of the deer program. The diversity of the landscape in Michigan certainly presents difficulty in creating a license structure that works for all locations. This resolution, as presented, would have uncertain impacts regarding deer management and license buying behavior. A comprehensive human dimensions and economic impact project would need to be conducted before going to a one-buck limit across the state. With less than 15 percent of hunters taking two deer or more in a season, it would remain a real possibility for many hunters to simply switch their purchasing habits from a combo license to a single deer license. This could result in a loss of opportunity for many hunters. This resolution (outlined as point 2 in the resolution) would also limit opportunity for many UP hunters, who currently enjoy pursuing 2 bucks, especially where antlerless harvest is restricted. These hunters would be forced to only purchase a single buck license or travel long distances to take a doe on a combo license. In a recent survey (Frawley 2017), 43 percent of hunters supported a one buck limit, compared to 48 percent opposed and 9 percent not sure about the regulation. The DNR feels that increasing antlerless harvest is important throughout much of Michigan, however simply offering opportunity or restricting buck harvest may not necessarily produce the desired results.

MUCC Wildlife Committee:

MUCC Wildlife Committee supports with three resolutions.

Amendment 1 offered on line 22 after the word doe add **“OR TWO BUCKS”**

Amendment 2 offered on lines 24-25 rewrite to say **“CONTINUE TO ALLOW A COMBO BUCK TAG OPTION IN AREAS THAT WOULD OTHERWISE NOT ALLOW THE TAKE OF A DOE WITH ANY MEANS (SUCH AS ARCHERY)”**

Amendment 3 offered on line 26 strike the words **“(BOTH SEX)”**

Position:

SUPPORT: MUCC Wildlife Committee supports with the above amendments.

OPPOSITION:

NEUTRAL:

Proposed Resolution #12
Requires 2/3rd Majority

Submitted by: David Van Lopik, Individual Member
MUCC Region: 7
Passed: December 8, 2018 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **SPORT SHOOTING RANGES PROTECTION MODERNIZATION ACT**

Background/Problem:

Shooting ranges face pressure both locally and nationwide, from both neighbors, homeowners associations and local government. Currently, local municipalities can place many hurdles in the way of a new range from opening and a current range from continuing operations.

The Sport Shooting Ranges Act of 1989 691.1543 local regulation. Sec. 3. states “except as otherwise provided in this act, this act does not prohibit a local unit of government from regulating the location, use, operation, safety, and construction of a sport shooting range.” This, and other state laws give local authorities a wide berth in regulating and hindering current shooting range operations. Noise ordinances, for instance, can vary widely municipality by municipality.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution requests that MUCC shall work with the state legislature to pass a law limiting or eliminating new and existing regulatory pressure aimed at sport shooting ranges via local ordinances, prohibitive zoning changes and regulations, planning commission issues, regulations and changing tax formulas and taxes on new or expanding sport shooting ranges provided the sport shooting ranges meet or exceed nationally recognized range standards at the time of development on the property they currently lease, own or purchase in the future. Remodeled buildings shall meet building codes in existence when the original structure or structures were built.
- That the Legislature update Michigan law in regards to firearms ranges and allow new and existing sport shooting ranges to work under the prior firearms range laws and noise ordinances AND enact new laws to protect existing ranges from nuisance complaints, additional regulatory pressure, excessive local ordinances, prohibitive zoning changes and regulations, planning commission issues, regulations and taxes on new or expanding sport shooting ranges.
- That the Legislature should also enact and/or create civil penalties for private citizen nuisance complaints made to any governmental entity toward a sport shooting range in which those complaints or issues are addressed by Michigan law, or are based in common law.

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- In 1980, MUCC passed a resolution that opposed operating permits for shooting ranges for sportsmen’s clubs.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- Shooting ranges continue to be one of the best places to introduce new shooters to the sport in a safe and controlled environment. Easing regulatory burden on shooting ranges will allow new and current ranges to flourish. Marksmanship is the first skill on the road to becoming a successful and ethical hunter.
- Trap shooting is one of the fastest growing high school sports in Michigan. As more and more schools add these teams, the need for facilities to practice will continue to grow.
- Other states (such as Maine, LD 79, signed March 29th, 2019) have recently passed statutes to extend additional legal protections to existing shooting ranges.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- Township opposition would be high.
- Current township control allows some shooting ranges to operate as they do now. More state oversight may swing the pendulum in the opposite way, and open the door to more constricting regulations.

DNR RESPONSE #12:

Maximizing shooting opportunities at ranges throughout Michigan aligns with the DNR’s goal of ensuring sustainable recreation use and enjoyment of natural resources.

Positions:

SUPPORT: The Department of Natural Resources

OPPOSITION:

NEUTRAL:

Proposed Resolution #13

Submitted by: Greg Peter, MUCC Vice President
MUCC Region: 8
Passed: March 23, 2019 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **PFAS AS AN ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTANT**

Background/Problem:

Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) are a large group of man-made chemicals that include perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS). PFAS have been used globally during the past century in manufacturing, firefighting and thousands of common household and other consumer products. These chemicals are persistent in the environment and in the human body – meaning they don't break down and they can accumulate over time. In recent years, experts have become increasingly concerned by the potential effects of high concentrations of PFAS on human health.

Although there is still more to learn about PFAS and human health, the State of Michigan has taken this issue seriously and is one of the first states in the nation to establish a clean-up standard for PFAS in groundwater used for drinking water.

However, much more work needs to be done in regards to the impact to fish and wildlife populations and how they take in PFAS. In Michigan, two animals are also tested for PFAS: fish and deer. The Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) partners with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to evaluate the potential for wild game, including waterfowl such as ducks, sampling. Collection of waterfowl requires careful consideration of the species and migration patterns to ensure the sampling would result in information beneficial for hunters. Michigan will be discussing the species present in the area and their migration patterns to determine next steps.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution requests that MUCC support PFAS education for the public and our affiliates as well as supporting the state agencies to do the necessary research to better address the issue.
- That MUCC work with other organizations for which this is an issue of concern to better facilitate the objective decision making needed to find solutions to PFAS contamination.

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- There is no MUCC past policy on pollution efforts aggressively to protect water quality, fisheries and wildlife, and human health.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- This approach is consistent with MUCC's support for using data and sound science to manage critical natural resource issues. It is important that our decisions and actions are driven by high-quality data.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- PFAS is a class of persistent chemicals that have a significant impact on human health, but there are still many other chemicals (with known and unknown impacts) to be concerned about. It is

important to ensure there is continued work on other water pollution issues that may be of equal or greater risk to public health and fish and wildlife populations.

DNR RESPONSE #13:

The Department supports the proposed resolution as it will provide support towards advancing the understanding of how PFAS moves through ecosystems and encourages public education to support science-based decision making.

Position:

SUPPORT: The Department of Natural Resources

OPPOSITION:

NEUTRAL:

Proposed Resolution #14
Requires 2/3rd Majority

Submitted by: Rob Miller, MUCC Wildlife Chair
MUCC Region: 9
Proposed: December 8, 2018 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **MANDATORY DEER REGISTRATION**

Background/Problem:

Gathering accurate harvest information from hunters is critical in making deer management decisions on a statewide level. At this time, this information is gathered on a volunteer basis. The DNR uses postseason surveys and has deer check stations available for hunters throughout the season for data collection and disease testing.

A mandatory deer registration system, which is already in use in some states, would offer an influx of reliable information by increasing participation. This proposed system would include the ability to register deer over the phone, online or at check stations. To ensure compliance, there would be a penalty for those that do not register their deer within 24 hours of harvest or 24 hours upon returning home. This accommodates people that hunt in areas with little to no phone or internet service.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution requests that MUCC work with the DNR and NRC to enact a mandatory deer check system that is supported with penalties for those that ignore this requirement. This system should have a simple call in with predetermined questions such as ID, animal description, method of take, area of take. An online system that will complement the call-in system as another means of reporting. Historic drive-in check stations that will maintain the check in requirement. The deer will need to be registered within 24 hours OR 24 hours of returning home from camp. (To accommodate where phone/internet access is not viable.)

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- None

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- The resolution would increase the amount of data collected on deer harvest which would improve the accuracy of management decisions.
- The resolution would allow for real-time harvest information to be available to hunters. This offers an opportunity to set harvest goals and communicate progress.
- The resolution offers more and reliable information to be shared in real-time. This could increase the level of trust between agency and hunters.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- The DNR has confidence in the current, voluntary system and believes it is one of the best in the country.
- States that have similar policies on mandatory registration have a minimum count of deer, but do not estimate non-reported deer. This can be problematic if the ratio of non-reported deer changes annually.
- Enforcing a mandatory regulation such as registering your deer could result in negative connotations from hunters.
- Enforcement of the repercussions that follow not complying with the mandatory deer registration could be difficult from the DNR standpoint.

DNR RESPONSE #14:

The DNR has the utmost confidence in our current harvest estimation system, and believe it is one of the best methods employed by any agency in the country. Many states that use mandatory registration simply only have a minimum count of deer that have been checked, but do not estimate non-reported deer. This unknown can prove problematic if the ratio of non-reported deer changes each year. Michigan's estimation system provides a range of confidence with how many deer are being harvested, something many states cannot say. With that being said, the DNR does see the benefit to having real-time harvest information available to hunters and does believe there is a communication advantage in being able to report the progress of the season to hunters in real-time.

The DNR recently switched retail sales vendors and will soon have the capability to incorporate a harvest registration system. Though this function probably won't be available for 2019, it is likely to be incorporated in 2020 or shortly afterward. The advantages to this new system would be real-time reporting of harvest data, an opportunity to put forward "goals" for harvests and communicate progress towards those goals as the season progresses, and hopefully increased trust in the data that the DNR provides its hunters. A post-season survey would still be done to correct the data collected through

registration, so the DNR believes it will still have high quality data to make recommendations to achieve management goals.

MUCC Wildlife Committee:

MUCC Wildlife Committee supports with the following 2 amendments.

Amendment 1 on line 3 between the words accurate and information add the words “**REAL TIME**”

Amendment 2 between lines 5 and 6 add another “**WHEREAS MICHIGAN’S CURRENT HARVEST ESTIMATION SYSTEM IS BELIEVED TO BE ONE OF THE BEST METHODS EMPLOYED BY ANY AGENCY IN THE COUNTRY**”

Wildlife Committee comment: Make it mandatory that anyone who purchases a hunting license must respond to a registration/survey via internet, phone, in person or through other means to answer basic hunting questions about your hunting experience from that season. Failure to do so will make you ineligible to purchase further licenses until the survey is completed, failure to comply with the survey by a set date will add a \$5.00 fee to your next year license as you do your survey at the time of purchase.

Positions:

SUPPORT: With the above amendments, MUCC Wildlife Committee supports.

OPPOSITION:

NEUTRAL:

Proposed Resolution #15
Requires 2/3rd Majority

Submitted by: Greg Peter, MUCC Vice President
MUCC Region: 8
Passed: March 23, 2019 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **STATE PARKS ENDOWMENT FUND (SPEF) OVERSIGHT**

Background/Problem:

Currently the State Park Endowment Fund does not have a citizen board to provide input or oversight to disbursement of the funds. The Michigan Natural Resource Trust Fund has a citizen board and they have the opportunity to provide input and oversight to financial decisions.

Without the opportunity to provide input to a board, citizens may feel their priorities are not being heard and the projects that are being funded are not in the best interest of the citizens or the resource.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution requests that MUCC will work to develop a similar governing body for the SPEF to make decisions as to the disbursement of the fund for acquisition, improvement, and restoration (capital expenditures) and not for operations (recognizing that any such project will have a certain % of labor cost and staff time needed above and beyond the normal operating costs)

of the Division – a % to be considered by the suggested board as that which is appropriate to the grant proposal).

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- We currently have no resolutions on the State Park Endowment Fund.
- However, in 2013, MUCC pledged to work with decision makers and partners to ensure that the royalties from the sale of the state’s non-renewable natural resources continue to be used for the benefit of current and future generations by creating a Fisheries and Wildlife Habitat Trust Fund. Alternatively, create other solutions to prevent diversion of royalties to non-conservation uses that will receive the royalties now deposited into the State Parks Endowment Fund once the State Parks Endowment Fund reaches its cap.
- In 2009, our members urged the Michigan Legislature to adopt a long-term State Park and Recreation Area funding proposal (motor vehicle license registration).

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- Creating a board would allow citizens the opportunity to have a direct say in the expenditure process of the State Park Endowment Fund.
- The Michigan Natural Resource Trust Fund currently operates under a model that is governed by a citizen board, similar to what is being proposed in this resolution.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- The Michigan Constitution in Article IX section 35a states, “Money available for expenditure from the endowment fund as provided in this section shall be expended for operations, maintenance, and capital improvements at Michigan state parks and for the acquisition of land or rights in land for Michigan state parks.”
- The Legislature provides appropriations for the state parks and the Governor signs the appropriations bills and vetoes anything not supported. Citizens have the opportunity at any time to engage with legislators to voice their desired use of the fund.

DNR RESPONSE #15:

The Department does not support this resolution. The Michigan Constitution in Article IX section 35a states, “Money available for expenditure from the endowment fund as provided in this section shall be expended for operations, maintenance, and capital improvements at Michigan state parks and for the acquisition of land or rights in land for Michigan state parks.” The Michigan State Parks Advisory Committee is a subcommittee of the Natural Resources Commission, serving as a citizens’ advisory committee to the NRC and the Department of Natural Resources on all Michigan state park-related issues. This diverse panel of individuals ensures that the public has a voice in the operations, planning and development of Michigan's premier state park system. In addition to this committee, the legislature provides the appropriations for the state parks and the Governor signs the appropriations bills and vetoes

anything not supported. Citizens have the opportunity at any time to engage with legislators to voice their desired use of the fund.

Position:

SUPPORT:

OPPOSITION: The Department of Natural Resources

NEUTRAL:

Proposed Resolution #16
Requires 2/3 Majority

Submitted by: Charles Felcyn, Paw Paw Conservation Club
MUCC Region: 7
Passed: March 23, 2019 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **ONE BUCK PER HUNTER IN EACH PENINSULA**

Background/Problem:

There is concern that something must be done to encourage hunters to harvest more does in areas that can support it and restrict buck harvest. A “one buck rule” (OBR) has been offered as a solution in many instances, but has not garnered majority support from the hunting community or within MUCC to date. This proposal would allow hunters to buy up to two buck tags, but each would be valid in only one of Michigan’s peninsulas.

It is believed that by limiting hunters to only one buck per peninsula per year, they would restrict themselves into ensuring it is used for older bucks and could encourage more harvest of does. This could increase the age structure and alter the buck to doe ratio of the deer herd.

In looking at the data from the 2016 Deer Harvest Survey, one can find that 43 percent of respondents support limiting hunters to one buck (no APRs) and 48 percent oppose. The proposal outlined in the resolution was not tested.

According to the newer 2017 Deer Harvest Survey:

- About 40 percent of the license buyers purchased at least one antlerless license (248,125 people), while nearly 60 percent of license buyers (366,000) purchased the combination license
- Statewide, 50 percent of hunters harvested a deer in 2017. About 22 percent of hunters took an antlerless deer, and 36 percent took an antlered buck in 2017.
- About six percent of hunters harvest two bucks, and only about 15 percent of hunters harvest two deer of either sex.
- Hunters in the UP make up about 10 percent of deer hunter’s effort (hunting days) statewide.
- It is unclear from the data presented in the survey as to how many hunters may already hunt in both peninsulas or would desire to.

In interpreting the data, it could be concluded that a move to this modified one buck rule (limiting it to one buck per peninsula) would affect a significant number of hunters.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution requests that MUCC work with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and the Natural Resources Commission (NRC), and the Michigan Legislature if necessary to simplify and restructure the deer license to include one LP buck tag, and one UP buck tag eliminating the need for the combo deer license.
- That the DNR and the NRC manage Michigan's deer herd for health, buck to doe ratio - and quality and not quantity.
- That the DNR and NRC provide sufficient antlerless tags available to meet the needs of managing the deer herd in that Deer Management Unit (DMU).

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- MUCC supported the elimination of the archery and firearm-specific single tags into a single deer license during the license restructuring in 2013, with support from a MUCC resolution from 2011.
- In 1996, MUCC passed a resolution to create the combination license, urging MUCC to work with DNR to establish a harvest tag system for deer that will allow for the purchase of up to two antlered harvest tags and these tags may be used in bow or firearm season.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- Could potentially simplify the license structure.
- This licensing structure could eliminate the need for antler point restrictions.
- This licensing structure could encourage intrastate travel, increasing local economic benefits of hunter spending.
- This resolution could advance the age structure of our deer herd in Michigan and place a greater emphasis on doe harvest — a goal of the DNR and many stakeholders.
- The DNR has no data on how many hunters pass a doe because they are in pursuit of a second buck, and the harvest of these passed does could align with department and stakeholder goals to increase deer harvest.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- We do not know how many hunters already hunt in both peninsulas, but it is expected to be a relatively small amount.
- It is unclear how this would impact purchases, but could drastically impact revenue to the Game and Fish Fund, which provides substantial support for the Fisheries, Wildlife, and Law Enforcement Divisions of DNR
- There is concern from the UP as to how many LP hunters may travel to get a second buck and whether this may impact the deer population in the UP.
- This resolution could limit hunter access and opportunity.

- This resolution could limit landowners and hunters ability to manage the deer herd on their property. (particularly, if there is a need to harvest more than one mature buck)
- Older bucks have a higher prevalence rate of CWD, and this resolution would increase the age structure of the herd.
- According to the DNR, only 4 percent of hunters utilize their second buck tag.

DNR RESPONSE #16:

Michigan deer hunters have been periodically asked, most recently in 2016, whether they supported buck harvest restrictions through the deer harvest survey report. Support for a statewide antler point restriction (APR) (i.e., 4 points on one side) on the second harvested buck declined since first reported in 2006, while support for regional APRs on a second harvested buck increased between 2012 and 2016. A plurality of Michigan deer hunters statewide in all years except in 2001 did not support restricting hunters to taking one buck per year.

Purchasing behavior reviewed since 2014 indicates increasing demand for the combo tag. Of all deer license tags [which doesn't include antlerless tags] sold from 2014-2018 over 70 percent were combo tags, with the highest percentage coming this past 2018 season at 76 percent. Demand for additional peninsula restricted tags and antlerless tags is unknown. Assuming no additional demand for those tags, and no change to existing pricing, the proposed structure change has a potential financial impact of over seven million dollars annually in license fees plus any additional matching federal funds.

In Michigan, only 4 percent of hunters' report harvesting two bucks per year, so the impact on buck harvest going from two bucks to one buck per peninsula is likely to be minimal. What is not quantified, however, is how many does are passed in pursuit of a second buck. The increased selectivity that accompanies a one buck limit per peninsula may also have impacts on increasing age structure of bucks. Indiana saw this over time after implementing a one buck limit, but this trend was also occurring prior to the one buck rule being implemented. In terms of chronic wasting disease, (CWD) deer demographics should be considered; older deer are more likely to be infected than younger deer, and males tend to have higher prevalence of disease than females. The Department cannot support this resolution because providing a second license to only those that hunt in both peninsulas serves few of our hunting public and there is little if any data that suggests that this opportunity would change current hunting location behavior.

MUCC Wildlife Committee:

Wildlife Committee supports with a narrow margin when the vote occurred.

Positions:

SUPPORT: MUCC Wildlife Committee

OPPOSITION:

NEUTRAL:

Proposed Resolution #17
Requires 2/3rd Majority

Submitted by: Paul Rose, MUCC Past President
MUCC Region: 4
Passed: December 8, 2018 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **UNATTENDED CAMERA USE (TRAIL CAMS) ON STATE-MANAGED LANDS**

Background/Problem:

The technology of cameras has improved drastically over the past few decades. They have become smaller and more discreet, and with this comes privacy concerns. State Land Use Rules R299.922(w) currently states a camera may not be left unattended for over 24 hours on state land. This camera must also include the owner's contact information and address.

The concern is that individuals using cameras for purposes other than monitoring game could ruin the opportunity for hunters to utilize trail cams. Having regulation surrounding unattended camera use that both non-hunters and hunters abide by would help to protect the rights of all parties involved.

According to the Department of Natural Resources, an internal policy is being developed to balance public users' needs and privacy with the department's need of wildlife research and monitoring.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution requests that MUCC work with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources to develop a policy for the use of unattended cameras (a.k.a. trail cameras) on State of Michigan-managed lands which seeks to limit their number and duration of use, and further require that each camera deployed include the name and contact information of the owner/user.
- That unattended cameras used for DNR-sponsored, or DNR-approved research shall be subject to a separate policy regarding their use.

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- There are no MUCC policies on unattended cameras or trail cameras.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- There are valid privacy concerns of public land users with the lowered cost and smaller size of cameras. Having regulation for unattended camera use can protect public land users and hunters.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- There is already regulation on storing private property on public land, which includes cameras. Having more regulations could restrict the access of hunters to monitor game.

DNR RESPONSE #17:

Privacy concerns regarding the use of trail cameras on public lands is an emerging issue, and the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (DNR) shares MUCC’s concerns vis-à-vis the use and disposal of images that may include individuals photographed without their knowledge or consent. The DNR has been aware of this issue and has been developing an internal camera use protocol that may balance peoples’ use and enjoyment of state lands with the DNR’s need to use trail cameras for wildlife research and monitoring efforts. The under-development camera use protocol provides policy and procedures for appropriate use of DNR research photos collected during wildlife research activities and is intended as practical guidance. It includes protocols to protect people’s privacy and ensure photos are collected, analyzed, and disposed of properly. The DNR is willing to explore how this protocol may be applied to private individuals’ trail camera use as well and will seek input from affected stakeholders as we finalize our camera use protocol.

The State Land Use Rules R299.922(w) prohibit an individual from storing or leaving property, which would include a trail camera, on state-owned land for more than 24 hours. In addition, the DNR has existing regulations for property that may be placed on state land including hunting blinds and fishing shanties. Currently, the DNR requires this equipment to be labeled with the owner’s name and address, driver license number, or sportcard number. The use of this equipment is also limited to certain dates. A similar requirement may be useful for unattended cameras but an amendment to the State Land Use Rules would be necessary to allow the placement on state lands for more than 24 hours.

As protocols or regulations are developed, they would not apply to trail cameras used by law enforcement personnel for investigative purposes.

MUCC Wildlife Committee:

There was a discussion on the possibility of restricting usage within certain distances of non-game type locations such as restrooms, beaches, etc. No action was taken. Wildlife Committee supports this resolution unanimously.

Positions:

SUPPORT: MUCC Wildlife Committee, The Department of Natural Resources

OPPOSITION:

NEUTRAL:

Proposed Resolution #18
Requires 2/3rd Majority

Submitted by: Charles Felcyn, Paw Paw Conservation Club
MUCC Region: 7
Passed: March 23, 2019 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **CENTER FIRE CHANGES TO MICHIGAN’S LIMITED FIREARM ZONE**

Background/Problem:

Historic caliber and case length restrictions for the limited firearm deer zone (formerly the shotgun zone) were relaxed in 2014 and just reauthorized in 2017 to allow many straight-walled cartridges in the limited firearm deer zone for firearm deer hunting. Large caliber rifles are currently used in Zone 3 for species other than deer. Unifying the caliber and case requirements for all zones would conform with a desire to simplify regulations. With the addition of new calibers and firearms in the limited firearm deer zone, Michigan continues to have one of the nation’s leading records for safety.

Deer hunting regulations may be updated this summer in response to Chronic Wasting Disease; however, the standard deer regulations cycle would not come up again until 2020.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution requests that MUCC work with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and the Natural Resources Commission to change Michigan’s limited firearm deer zone to have the same firearm restrictions and regulations as the rest of Michigan.

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- In 2010, MUCC passed a resolution requesting that MUCC urge the NRC to change the law regulating the shotgun zone to allow use of rifles using straight-walled pistol cartridges and to allow the use of single shot rifles that are chambered for black powder cartridges loaded with cast lead, non-jacketed bullets between 38 and 46 calibers, some examples being 38-55, 40-65 and 45-70.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- Unifying the caliber and case requirements for all parts of the state would conform with a desire to simplify regulations.
- This resolution may provide greater hunter opportunity or access to those that only own a rifle and must travel north of M57 (the north-south shotgun line) in order to hunt.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- Restrictions in the limited firearm deer zone are intended to protect the public during the firearm season by preventing the use of rifles in the field as well as in areas with high population densities. There is a safety concern that inexperienced hunters may use these rifles without proper training and may take inappropriate shots at game, causing stray bullets near more populated areas.
- In the limited firearm deer zone, there are fewer blocks of public lands than throughout the rest of the state. These public lands become saturated with hunters, particularly on or around November 15, and allowing hunters to use centerfire rifles could increase fatalities or injuries.
- There is also a concern among law enforcement officials that allowing rifles in southern Michigan may cause more urban/suburban townships to seek hunting closures.

DNR RESPONSE #18:

The Department does not support this resolution. The Department has data that support current regulations in the limited firearm deer zone. Safety issues have not been sufficiently resolved in order to warrant a change.

MUCC Wildlife Committee:

Wildlife Committee supports with a narrow margin. A discussion occurred on making elevated stands a requirement for centerfire use in the limited firearm deer zone or adjusting the current zone lines. No action was taken on this in the form of an amendment.

Positions:

SUPPORT: MUCC Wildlife Committee

OPPOSITION:

NEUTRAL:

Proposed Resolution #19

Requires 2/3 Majority

Submitted by: Jack Letho, Individual Member
Passed: March 23, 2019 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: SPORTSMEN’S CLUB/SHOOTING CLUB FIREARMS OWNERSHIP

Background/Problem:

Current law requires that firearms be registered to an individual. This can create a multitude of problems for sportsmen’s clubs when it comes to liability and maintenance issues. For instance, if a firearm or several firearms are registered to an individual who is deceased, the firearms will not be accepted by the manufacturer for maintenance.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution requests that MUCC work with the Federal Government, Michigan Legislature and the Governor’s office to enact legislation that will legally allow organized, incorporated sportsmen’s clubs and or shooting clubs to register firearms owned by the club.

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- MUCC has no past policies on this issue.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- Taking the legal burden off of individuals and passing it on to another entity (i.e. the club, a trust, etc.) would be a benefit to the organization. This would allow for the proper registering of warranties, required service work, etc. that currently firearms being registered to an individual that has passed away prevents.
- With the growing interest in shooting sports, allowing clubs to purchase, own, store and maintain firearms will allow them to expand the programs they offer in the safest and most responsible way possible.
- Allowing entities to own firearms for the purposes of shooting sports could help them recruit new members into the shooting sports world and have a positive impact on R3 (recruitment, retention and reactivation) efforts.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- State law currently prohibits an incorporated sportsmen’s club from owning and registering firearms unless they are a federal firearm licensee
- Firearm storage, if the firearms are owned by the club, may become an issue. Who is responsible, where they are stored, parameters for storage, etc.

DNR RESPONSE #19:

Federal law and state law currently prohibit an incorporated sportsmen’s club from registering firearms owned by the club. If the laws were changed, the DNR would support.

Positions:

SUPPORT: The Department of Natural Resources supports if the law was changed.

OPPOSITION:

NEUTRAL:

Proposed Resolution #20
Requires 2/3rd Majority

Submitted by: Tim Kobasic on behalf of the Hiawathaland Trail Association
MUCC Region: 1
Passed: September 22, 2018 Conservation Policy Board Meeting
Title: **RESOLUTION TO ASSURE FAIR AND EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS DERIVED FROM GAS TAX**

Background/Problem:

Due to PA 451 of 1994 Part 711, a portion of the state gas tax is allocated to a fund source called the Recreation Improvement Fund. This is a fund that is a subsection within the overall legacy fund, which is protected in the constitution. This dedicated funding apportioned from the gas tax is used to maintain and develop recreational trails. Two percent of this funding is allocated annually to restoring damage to trails caused by ORV use.

Concerns have been raised about the matrix of users paying into this fund, and for the spending of this fund to appropriately represent contributions. Currently ORV gas tax revenue exceeds both watercraft and snowmobile gas tax revenue. The spending of dollars from the Recreation Fund does not reflect the contribution to the fund. 80% is allocated to the Michigan State Waterways Fund, 14% to the Snowmobile Trail Improvement fund, and the remaining 6% goes towards the DNR for trail improvements.

Resolution Content:

- This resolution requests that MUCC support an initiative to change the Michigan Recreational Improvement Account matrix of fund distribution to include only those entities that directly contribute to the account via the gas tax.
- That the Michigan Legislature resolves to also amend the Michigan Improvement Account matrix of fund distribution to establish as fair and equitable sharing of said funds proportionate to the current economic impact by unit sales, and/or permit (license) unit sales, and/or impact on tourism for the State of Michigan.
- That a percentage of all proportionate designated funds shall be put aside for all related remuneration needs and eligible for application and use by those county, state and federal and highway management agencies affect.

MUCC Current & Past Policy Standings:

- In 1994, a resolution requested that MUCC reaffirm its position to support a statewide system of designated trails, routes and scramble areas for ORVs to curb environmental damage and user conflicts. Further, all ORV funds be used strictly for ORV programs and administration and that ORV fees be set at an appropriate level to support cost of program. ORV advisory committee

continue in its present form with oversight and input on the ORV program and the ORV enforcement citation and accident data be aggregated and analyzed.

Arguments in Support of Resolution:

- ORV gas tax revenue has surpassed the revenue generated from watercrafts and snowmobiles. Adjusting the spending to reflect the current revenue will help to manage our trails and waterways accurately.
- Non-motorized trail users do not pay equally into the fund source compared to motorized trail users. Having the money spent in a fashion that accurately reflects the users that pay into the fund itself is a fair way to manage the trail system.

Arguments in Opposition of Resolution:

- Non-motorized trail users do pay on their travel to and from trail sites. Redirecting funds that do not support non-motorized trail use would be detrimental to the trail system that supports non-motorized users.

DNR RESPONSE #20:

The Recreation Improvement Fund is contained in Article IX subsection 40 of the Michigan Constitution. It is an account under the Michigan Conservation and Recreation Legacy Fund. Elimination of this funding source for non-motorized use will leave a void in the funding for these activities. Non-motorized trail users do contribute to gas taxes as they travel to their trail destinations. Non-motorized trails are an important part of the trail system in this state and redirecting these sources of funding would have a detrimental impact. With the increased access to roadsides and the ever increasing popularity of recreational vehicles, there should be sufficient revenue to repair any damage done.

Positions:

SUPPORT:

OPPOSITION: The Department of Natural Resources

NEUTRAL: