2nd Wild Turkey Stakeholder Group Meeting 11/3/2015

Attendance

- John Cooper, Commission Chair
- Neil Bien, Northeast Regional Advisory Board Member
- Mike McKernan, National Wild Turkey Federation
- Chris Hesla, SD Wildlife Federation
- Mark DeVries, South Dakota Stock Growers Association
- Leonard Spomer, Central Regional Advisory Board Member
- Dean Schueler, National Wild Turkey Federation
- Terry Mayes, Western Regional Advisory Board Member
- Chad Switzer, SD Game, Fish and Parks
- Keith Fisk, SD Game, Fish and Parks
- Nathan Baker, SD Game, Fish and Parks
- John Kanta, SD Game, Fish and Parks
- Travis Runia, SD Game, Fish and Parks
- Alex Solem, SD Game, Fish and Parks
- Josh Delger, SD Game, Fish and Parks
- Chad Lehman, SD Game, Fish and Parks
- Paul Coughlin, SD Game, Fish and Parks
- Tim Olson, SD Game, Fish and Parks
- Cindy Longmire, SD Game, Fish and Parks
- Jacquie Ermer, SD Game, Fish and Parks

Opening Remarks

- Switzer thanked everyone for taking the time to attend meeting. Hoped that stakeholders had time to discuss and solicit input from those they represent. Quick overview on the key topics from last meeting which included: 1) harvest management matrix tables; 2) unit boundaries; 3) depredation tools; 4) hunter access programs; 5) habitat programs; 6) outreach/education; 7) use of rifles during spring hunting seasons; and 8) biological data needs.

Chad Lehman: Black Hills Turkey Units (draft matrix table and unit boundaries)

- Surrogate abundance – replacement metric for population abundance
    - Cooper – does there need to be an additional survey or additional data collected?
- Switzer – do we need to add unit boundary changes to the strategy table? (i.e. Black Hills unit is partially closed now and we will want to open it as we get more liberal).
- Cut out second tag and female tag from increase population category
    - Sending a mixed message because you are letting hunters harvest 2 tags in an area with an increased population management objective while also decreasing tag numbers in other areas to recoup bird loss

    - Recommend to eliminate second tag in spring season when population management objective is to increase
    - Harvest of second tag is very low so it's not really impacting the population but it does provide negative public perception
- Hunting public and general public are very different
    - Hunters will understand management strategies a lot better than the general public
- Commission understands management objectives during meeting discussions
    - We need to come up with a standardized method to create an administrative rule to make allowances for management strategies
    - Come up with a strategic plan matrix of actions to be taken based on management plan
        - Matrix provides the backbone of how Department makes recommendations and the Commission sets regulations
- Wildlife managers like that the matrix is tied to abundance estimates and that they have the option set a certain number of licenses depending on bird numbers
- Strategy matrix accounts for past years of tracking turkeys over the years when abundance was high and low
    - This input went into determining tag numbers
    - Learned that we have over-done high tag numbers in the past
- You do not want to kill 10% of hen population, this will start to drop the population
    - Can be impacted by unlimited licenses
- Spring management is different than fall management
- Currently unlimited licenses for spring season in the Black Hills
    - Do we ever reach a situation when we need to limit spring turkey licenses?
        - at some point, limit could be put in place for spring turkey if catastrophic events occur
    - Killing gobblers does not impact the population
        - Gobblers are polygynous (1 male can mate with many females) and young males can breed if big gobblers are taken
    - Biologists are not concerned that we will ever have low enough turkey populations to trigger a limit of spring turkey licenses in the Black Hills for gobblers
- Because biological data is limited on turkeys, GFP is using hunters and hunter harvest to estimate turkey abundance
    - If you were to limit the number of turkeys that are harvested in the Black Hills → abundance estimates would be off
- Write strategic plan as an educational document as well as explain that we have had stakeholder meetings, biological input and a clear understanding of how populations are being managed
    - Explain in narrative form what the plan takes into consideration for management strategies
- Waterfowl allows for bonus tags that is positively received
    - In times of need, issue a bonus tag when you need to drop bird populations

    - You can have a set baseline population of birds and issue bonus tags when needed, public likes perception of a bonus tag
    - Strive for a baseline and implement bonus tags when the population is abundant
- Can we manage turkey population if we focus on the fall management season → this is when we are having the most impact on the population; is this the best way to manage the turkey resource?
    - We could still do unlimited spring turkey and if we reach a certain point of population, we can start to limit spring tags
        - This is already a guideline but we may need to set a hard trigger and spell out if/when you limit spring season in the Black Hills
    - Fall season is an opportunistic hunt in December and January
    - Need to set a clear time for fall season
    - Fall season has always been a bonus season and very opportunistic → there is no guarantee a season or birds will be present
    - Fall season is to provide recreational opportunity and act as a population management tool
- Need a step system or progression for the number of hens being harvested, not jumping in high numbers from year to year
- Should have the flexibility to close a fall season whenever necessary
- Spell it out that we can close spring and fall season; need to give Commission lots of wiggle room to make decisions into the future
- Strategy plans should answer 90% of public and staff questions about why license allocations are set the way they are
- Matrix keeps us from going overboard on selling too many licenses when the state doesn't have the population needed to support those license numbers
- Public comment about teeter-totter management decisions
    - GFP should have seen things coming and shouldn't react so severely to big events
    - Turkeys are a boom or bust species because they are so weather dependent compared to mammalian species – this is why a management decision matrix is so important
    - Strategic matrix is a better plan than a "Turkey Reaction Plan"
- Matrix is the best that we have and will hopefully keep GFP from teetering so severely
    - Two year plan smooths out the "reaction" as well
    - Matrix plan will need lots of education and explanation
- Can leftover tags be taken after the second draw up to the allotted number of tags?
    - Didn't sell all of the tags via drawing so as long as the number of tags are kept under the matrix guideline, number of individual hunters doesn't matter
    - Hunters should be able to pick up the leftovers, loss of revenue is important to GFP and hunters due to match dollars
    - If matrix says the population can handle 600 tags, then leftovers should be allowed to meet the 600 tags

        - if this causes a drop in the population, GFP will get the blame for poor management
- Keep regulations as simple as possible

Travis Runia – Prairie Turkey Units (draft matrix table and unit boundaries)

General

- Management strategies are contingent on aligned spring and fall units
- Need to set a minimum threshold to meet objective – data comes from staff and public input
- If spring hunter success is 40% for 2 consecutive years at specified minimum threshold, then management goal is being met
    - If it's not, then GFP needs to increase bird population
    - Unit objective is increase if threshold is not met, 40% hunter success is bare minimum GFP wants to meet
- Prairie units have limited number of licenses, so that's why a higher success rate
    - Other states have a 27-32% success rate similar to that in the Black Hills

Population Objective Increase

- Not meeting the minimum hunter success threshold but management staff is being cautious
- Hard triggers (change happens without need for discussion) to close fall season
    - no discussion, fall season is going to close if minimum threshold has not been met in 2 consecutive seasons
- For fall season – limit number of ANY turkey tags or close fall season
- For spring season – bearded turkey only or close spring season if necessary
    - 19% of hens have beards in the Black Hills
    - 10% of hens are bearded East River
    - General public may not be able to pick out males from females
        - Average hunter is going to be looking for a large gobbler and not likely to harvest a hen
- If a disease outbreak occurs, GFP can make recommendation to Commission to alter the tag allocation for spring/fall seasons
    - This needs to be spelled out in management plan in addition to statute and regulations
- Any drastic event can be separate from hunter harvest goals that can cause emergency rules for limiting the tag allocation

Population Objective – Maintain

- Minimum hunter success is 40% for 2 consecutive years
- Management staff reserve the option to close fall season and restrict unit boundary
- Potential to do a bearded only in the fall season which would be more acceptable to the public because it gives people the opportunity to still hunt without impacting breeding numbers

- Spring – only bearded turkeys, split seasons as needed
    - Split seasons are not positively received by some because hunter has to choose if they want to hunt in early season or late season
        - Hunters can't predict weather so split season can reduce hunting opportunity
        - Also impacts landowner tolerance

<u>Population Objective – Decrease</u>

- Too many turkeys on the ground; should offer a good spring season
- Allow liberal number of fall turkey tags
- Allow for any turkey tags in spring
    - Allow for split spring season

<u>Management Objective Examples:</u>

- Brookings – Objective is set to Increase Population
    - 2014 – 30-40% success
    - 2015 – 20-32% success → hard trigger to close fall season, no need for discussion just close the fall season
- Custer/Pennington counties – Objective is set to Increase Population
    - 2014 & 2015 – hunter success greater than 40%
    - Manager decides to keep objective at increase population, so decide to close the fall season but not due to a hard trigger
- Gregory County – Objective is set to Increase Population
    - 2014 – 36-46%
    - 2015 – 42-51%
    - Hard trigger not set, but fall season was recommend to be left open with a limited number of licenses if spring and fall units are aligned
- Fall River County – Maintain Population Objective
    - 2014 & 2015 – hunter success 40%
    - Manager decided to close fall season but would have the option to have fall season if units aligned with Spring
- GFP is not comfortable having large fall units for analysis reasons, ideally fall seasons would match spring units. This model (large units) was acceptable when turkey populations were high across much of West River.
    - Perkins County may have a large turkey population and Fall River County is getting all the hunting pressure → problematic to set management objectives if all west river unit is open during the fall
- Recommend to go back to easier spring management units and align fall units with spring hunting units
- Feedback from Conservation Officers about expanding west river turkey units?
    - Didn't get much feedback from COs because it became so spread out
- Checkerboard pattern of fall/spring units is confusing for public and hard to manage

    - Open units are nice for hunters, but not a deal breaker for hunters
    - From hunter side, hunter knows the spring boundaries and hunters would like consistency because they know the boundaries of the unit they are hunting in
- Survey cards are able to tell us where turkeys are being harvested
- Smaller units allow for some forethought and build stronger hunter/landowner relationship
- Most of the public just wants to know if they can hunt turkeys and if not, be able to use the plan to answer why they can't hunt
- Need a narrative background and justification for management decisions

Keith Fisk – Depredation Tools

- Could have been some misperception at last meeting that wildlife managers limit spring season based on landowner input and tolerance
    - Managers take this into account but it doesn't act as the main driving force of setting season limits
- Any time you can use the fall season to address over-abundant local populations, that is preferred management tool over pool hunts
- If fall season is closed and a depredation problem arises, GFP will go to Secretary to seek out a depredation hunt for problem areas
- A hard trigger to close the fall season in the matrix table does not eliminate the potential for a depredation pool hunt if the fall season gets closed
- How do wildlife managers include landowner tolerance when setting seasons
    - Depends on extent of damage
        - Predominately turkeys are hitting stored feed and eat a lot of food in a short amount of time
    - Managers use a progressive system
        - Netting is used and is relatively good for landowner access to stored food under nets
        - Hazing of birds
            - Cracker shells at the roost site night after night does work, some flocks are stubborn – you can haze them out of the roost night after night for a week and they come back as soon as you stop hazing if feeding is really good and harsh weather conditions persist
            - Also can move the birds onto a new roost site or unintentionally onto a neighbor site and still have problems
            - If you are feeding cows in a sheltered area, going to be harder to haze turkeys off of site
        - Sometimes use trap and transfer to areas with suitable habitat with lower turkey abundance
        - Pool hunts after regular seasons to put some pressure on birds to move them out of the area
            - This is a last resort

            - Have to be careful with depredation pools and hazing when it's close to start of hunting seasons
    - Some people will have annual issues with birds and GFP will work with them to meet their needs to reduce potential for depredation and improve landowner tolerance
- Need to provide photos of how GFP staff use Depredation tools and provide some narrative about how hard it is to work with turkey removal and maintain balance with hunting recreational opportunities within the management plan
- Need some background on seasonal movement of turkey (where information is known)
    - They can congregate in large flocks in certain areas during the winter – this can act as a magnet for turkeys
- Just dispersing turkeys is not the answer – you can push birds out to areas where survival may be reduced
- Right now we have very few instances of turkey depredation
    - GFP does not want to go down the road of paying to offset damage → sets up a bad precedent moving forward and simply could not afford such a program
        - Payments doesn't solve the problem
        - It's better to prevent or eliminate what is attracting the turkeys and work directly with the landowner to solve the problem
    - Not fair to reimburse turkey depredation and not reimburse other wildlife damage complaints
    - Landowners would take the money but they still want to resolve the turkey problem
- Remind landowners of the benefits vs depredation
    - Landowners get preference for hunting vs non-landowners
    - In some counties over half of the landowners have tags and some non-landowners don't draw any tags
- Most landowners will take loss from turkeys because they know birds will disperse eventually once more natural food supplies open up
- How to combat urban turkeys?
    - Getting more and more birds coming into towns in the Black Hills where hunting opportunity is not allowed; most cost effective tool is to use hunters to remove birds
    - Licenses are valid in town but cities have ordinances against discharge of firearms
        - Able to archery hunt?
    - City promotes feeding wildlife
        - City needs to enforce their own ruling to stop feeding of wildlife
            - Enforcement is a form of education
        - GFP catches heat that should fall more on the city and its residents
    - Educate people to stop feeding wildlife and show them the damage feeding urban birds is having to urban areas and turkeys in general
    - Maybe capture birds from the city and move them into lower density areas for better hunter opportunity knowing that birds will travel 20 miles from where they are being released back to original capture sites

- Any GFP harvested wildlife goes to Sportsmen Against Hunger (SAH)
    - Same applies for city killed birds
    - Option to capture all of the city birds and donate to SAH or local shelters
- Not always bad to have a natural reservoir of wildlife in town to use to offset population declines
    - For example, Canada Geese in Rochester MN when population was thought to be extinct
- Educate people that if they build in good habitat – you will likely get wildlife in your backyard

Paul Coughlin – Turkey Hunting Access

- One aspect of hunter success is access to recreational opportunities
    - Public land within the state is approximately 10% of the land base, Game Production Areas owned/managed by GFP account for <0.5%
    - 1.25 million acres enrolled in Walk-In Area (WIA) program, not all of it is turkey habitat
    - 3.5 million acres of public land (does not include National Park Service or non-hunting National Wildlife Refuges)
    - Ample opportunity for turkey hunting on public lands, lots of access to river breaks down in Gregory County
    - Public land is some of the best hunting in the state, unlimited access → this can be a problem, gets to be too crowded or wildlife pushed off
- Sometimes we forget that there are a lot of hunters out there that have access to hunting regardless of public land access
    - Hunters can have access to private land if they can build a relationship with landowners
- GFP has had the discussion to target spring turkey hunting for WIA program
    - GFP would not hesitate to enroll private land for spring turkey hunting
    - It has been tried and National Wild Turkey Federation (NWTF) staff have brought names of landowners to GFP staff and it turns out that those landowners don't have an interest in WIA program for turkey
        - We need landowners that have an interest in the program to pursue getting spring turkey access
- NWTF is moving for habitat development and management on public land
    - Common strategy in all management plans is to acquire public lands for hunting
        - Is this a strategy to include in the new plan?
    - All plans need to include getting public access to more private land (WIA Program) and land acquisition; it does not spend tax payer money, it spends sportsmen's dollars
    - Landowners have some sensitivity to GFP buying more land vs leasing access to hunters
    - Private landowners don't mind squaring off GPAs/WPAs or working with landowners who volunteer land or non-crop productive lands
    - Put in a statement about land acquisition for newly purchased land; hunters are paying the bill to acquire and manage these properties

    - Focus on getting more access to private land adjacent to public land because wildlife are drawn to the private land use operations
- How do we as an agency, stakeholder, and interest group get access to public lands that are privately land-locked?
    - For 5-6 years, GFP was not able to acquire public land, now GFP can; maybe focus on getting easements to access private land-locked public lands
- Private inholdings in the Black Hills are open to public access unless posted, GFP can target these areas if necessary
- Landowners that are not interested in WIA program may primarily decline because they want people to come knock on their door, they want control of their land and provide a quality hunt for the public
    - Controlled Hunting Access Program (CHAP) fills gap between standard WIA contract and allowing the landowner to maintain control on number of hunters
        - CHAP provides the public with a known landowner who is interested in allowing hunters
- Landowners may be more willing to allow for archery hunting instead of rifle
- People need to be willing to go around and knock on the door before the season and build that relationship with landowners
    - People are getting further and further removed from the land
        - Lives are busy so they just don't have time to make landowner connections
    - GFP can work to promote a "Knock on Doors" campaign to promote landowner/hunter relationships
- Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) allows for habitat enhancement on leased private land
    - GFP managed land focuses on habitat management that does not necessarily exist on private land
    - WIA area is not good if there isn't any habitat, better to let landowner pay for land and manage it but GFP still provides public hunting access – CREP and WIA are great programs
- Pay hunting is becoming more of a reality than easy access (WIA program) or knocking on doors to get access
    - Drop a bill that states you cannot charge to hunt
    - A lot of competition among hunting community
        - Some hunters pay landowners to restrict access for others; want to keep the areas for themselves
        - Can't blame landowner for taking the money
    - Argument that most landowners do/don't charge for hunting access
    - Tripp County no private land provides free access, everyone charges
- Fiscal decision for GFP to purchase public lands
    - These lands have upfront cost and maintenance of lands
    - The people paying the bills are the ones getting access to the land

    - Hunting public and general public appreciate GFP buying more public lands
    - Over the last 4 years, GFP has only purchased approximately 640 acres, not a lot when our mission is to provide hunter access and habitat for wildlife
    - GFP needs to maintain their lands the same as the private landowners do – only fair
    - GFP is paying taxes for GPA property – need to educate this to the public
    - GFP should only purchase properties that they can properly manage
        - GFP needs to be a good land steward and set example for private landowners
- Owning land has an expense as well
    - Landowners want control of access to help provide quality hunts
    - Landowners are responsible for caring for their livestock and feed the world while also providing habitat for wildlife
- Want a matrix toolbox on how public land gets purchased

Habitat Programs – Tim Olson

- South Dakota has a lot more quality habitat than other states and we overlook this sometimes
    - It's always worth trying to make habitat better, but South Dakota already has a reputation for good habitat and quality hunting
- GFP is working with private landowners to improve habitat on their land using two programs: Wildlife Partners Program & Wetland and Grassland Habitat Program
- Wildlife Partners Program
    - Around for 3+ decades for cost share of putting food plots and woody habitat on the ground with cooperating landowners
    - GFP felt the need to complement CRP programs to focus on habitat for resident deer and pheasants
    - These programs benefit turkey and are occurring in areas where turkey occur but turkeys are not the primary focus of the program
- Wetland and Grassland Habitat Program
    - Four GFP staff work with private landowners on wetland and grassland management projects
    - Began in the mid-80s when Ducks Unlimited came to the Dakotas
        - Focused on grassland and wetland restoration programs
        - Waterfowl organizations recognized the need to engage with private landowners
        - Includes non-hunting wildlife organizations (Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory, etc.) to chip in money for grassland and wetland enhancement
    - This program was nationally recognized because there was a lot of opportunity for restoration projects on private land for waterfowl management
        - Realized that managing national wildlife populations (waterfowl) via management goals would require working with private landowners to improve habitat
    - Primarily working with grass-based management practices

        - Help with water development, riparian management, etc.
    - Not much interest from landowners about conservation programs
        - Need for more educational effort to inform landowners about the programs that are out there → Habitat Pays website (www.habitat.sd.gov)
    - Do some work on riparian production and opportunistic work with landowners when natural production is prolific
        - Not much success rate for tree plantings
            - Deer depredation is high on cottonwood plantings
    - Protect natural flooding areas
    - Providing more habitat can help disperse birds and limit depredation
    - This is a small program and it works opportunistically
        - Staff don't go soliciting new landowners because so many come to them
- Story: Looking at a sage grouse riparian management project, asked landowner if any land enrolled in Walk-In Area program, he said no because he can provide a refuge for wildlife, only hunters he talks to now are the hunters that are trespassing. Point here was the landowner would allow some hunting access if hunters asked for permission.
    - Likely a consequence of WIA program that he no longer has interactions with the public. The WIA program has allowed people places to go hunt without asking for permission; many hunters are no longer asking landowners for permission.
- There is a need to keep the hunting community aware that much land is open to hunting if you just get out, visit with landowners and ask for permission
    - People nowadays are almost afraid to go out and talk to landowners
- Pheasant habitat group did a lot of work on acquiring access
    - Never going to get enough land to stop using private habitat to support wildlife
    - Pheasant group topics where almost all landowner based
- Habitat Pays website is centered on landowners who can get a menu of options that are available to enhance their wildlife habitat
- Need to have a discussion in strategy plan to talk about landowners and their contributions
- Everyone who pays taxes has helped cover the costs of habitat enhancement on private land
    - Landowner has the responsibility to let hunters have access to the lands hunters are paying for habitat development and management
        - Can have limited access for hunters as long as some access exists
    - Ducks Unlimited and Natural Resource Conservation Service don't have a contract that requires public access to their private land habitat improvement projects, GFP does require reasonable public access

Outreach and Education – Chad Switzer

- Strategy plan needs to include education aspect within it
    - Strategic plans provide an opportunity for outreach
- Explain to the public where we have been with management and where we are going
- Need to write plan in a way that is easily understood by the public

- Explain how depredation tools impact hunters during seasons
- Why do we manage turkeys the way we do and what are the implications of management practices

Rifles – Group Discussion

- Have Dick Neil (GFP Lawyer) look for statutory guidelines on removing rifles during spring season – came about from an accidental shooting incident
- Modern hunting techniques increase the likelihood of hunters being accidentally shot
    - An accident is bound to happen if rifles are allowed
    - Everyone wants a good safe spring season
    - People are using more lifelike decoys and calls and still allowing rifle shooting is setting us up for another fatal accident
    - The way turkey hunting goes now, it's probably time to get rid of rifles
- The experience of luring birds in is gone if you allow long-range rifle shots
    - Going to get 100% satisfaction if you harvest without a rifle
- Come up with letter of recommendation to restrict rifles in spring season presented to GFP Secretary Hepler and Commission for safety and enjoyment reasons
- What other states allow rifle hunting in spring season?
    - Wyoming is the only known state that still allows rifles during a spring turkey season
- Anecdotal agreement amongst stakeholder group to get rid of rifles for spring season
- It is currently recommended that blaze orange be worn but not required
    - Wearing blaze orange does not decrease success rate of harvesting an animal
- Landowners not too keen on rifle shooting for turkeys
- Keeping rifles is not an area of contention with the hunting public
    - GFP will likely get loud applause for removing rifle season
    - Likely to increase number of turkey hunters if rifle is removed
    - NWTF is in support of removing rifles
- Possible to allow rifle on private land and eliminate it on public land
    - could still be a safety issue of hunters adjacent to private hunting property shooting at people that are not rifle hunting on public land
- More people hunting turkeys on the ground with non-rifle weapons
- Do a public survey about getting rid of rifles
    - Has to be a threat of removing rifles from hunters otherwise you won't hear about any opposition

Biological Data Needs – Travis Runia/Chad Lehman

<u>Current/Historic Biological Data</u>

- Fall feather collection (discontinued) from harvested birds was used to determines age and gender
    - If GFP got enough data, GFP would be able to get population estimate

    - Feather collection is not enough due to poor number of correct feathers being sent it due to a limited fall season and small hunter participation
        - Wrong feathers were turned in
    - Discontinued because not getting enough quality data
- Winter flock counts (current process) are used to get gender, age, and number of birds
    - Survey is limited to staff and volunteers
    - Survey takes some training and time to identify age and sex
    - Some success in locations, but in other places, only able to get numbers not age and gender
- Brood Counts (current process) are used to gage the number of poults per hen
    - Hard to get an estimate of number of hens without poults
        - Survey is done in brood rearing habitat and not wooded areas where hens without poults are typically found
- Radio-collared studies in past
    - Data is still used today to assess aspects of ecology
    - Only useful for specific areas but dated

<u>Future Collection ideas</u>

- Continue to evaluate current survey efforts
    - Continue research studies – radio-collared birds by region or smaller units
- Enhance winter flock counts by using drop nets in each region to determine age and gender of 200-300 turkeys in each region each year
    - Drop nets are probably the best way to get population estimates
        - What are the costs?
            - In Region 1 this is already occurring so minimal additional costs
            - More of an issue in other regions who are not currently using drop nets
                - Region 3 will likely have no success from drop nets
    - You would want 2-3 traps sites per Data Analysis Unit
        - This much work would have high costs associated with it for staff time and equipment
        - Promote to public as a pay option to come out and help?
            - Not a guarantee that you will get birds
        - Lots of time and effort goes into a successful drop net
- Use camera traps (particularly in Region 3) near winter sites to captures photos to get age and gender estimates
- Any grant funding for turkey population estimates?
- Heat sensing operation to estimate sex and numbers?
    - Used this for sage grouse
    - Could be used at night to get numbers but would not be able to get age or sex in the winter, could get age from poults in summer
- Drones a potential way of counting populations

Other Topics (Group)

- Positive feedback on adaptive matrix, easily understood by the public
- Like idea of triggers so that you are not entirely reactive
    - Need some flexibility to react to dramatic events

Future Plans

- Still some work to be done on the plan, but timeline is to bring plan to Commission in June 2016 that will already include input from staff, stakeholders, and 30-day public comment period
- Next meeting will likely be in Jan/Feb 2016
- If you present ideas discussed today to your interest groups, please get feedback back to GFP staff within the next month so GFP can incorporate ideas into plan