

**ADVISORY COUNCIL**

The Garrison  
Fort Harrison State Park  
6002 North Post Road  
Indianapolis, Indiana

**Minutes of July 14, 2009**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Patrick Early, Chair  
AmyMarie Travis Lucas, Vice Chair  
John Bassemier  
Richard Cockrum  
Bill Freeman  
James Snyder  
James Trachtman

**NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:**

Sandra Jensen  
Jennifer Kane

**DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES STAFF PRESENT:**

John Davis	Executive Office
Chris Smith	Executive Office
Linnea Petercheff	Fish and Wildlife
Gregg McCollam	Fish and Wildlife
Mitch Marcus	Fish and Wildlife
Chad Stewart	Fish and Wildlife
Steve Hunter	Law Enforcement

**GUESTS PRESENT:**

Tim Nussbaum	Chad Zartman	Jeremy Stackhouse
Bryan Poynter	Phil French	Dwayne Burke
Dan DeWitt	John Haendiges	James Campbell
Bill Herring	Jim Huxford	Mark Fink
Josh Beck	Logan Beck	Larry Owen
Stephen Spencer	Eric Williams	Bill Reiman
Tim Labbé	John Wahl	Andy Willis
John Christopher	Charles Snyder	Linda Snyder
Jack Corpuz	Clarence Williams	Herb Altiggen
Dustin Nichols	Jude Senour	Dough Allim
Richard Landon	Danny East	Tyler Welles

Charles Walters  
Kevin Smith

John Evans  
Doug Allman

Kevin Ailes

### **Call to Order by Chairman, Patrick J. Early**

Patrick Early, Chair of the Advisory Council, called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m., EDT, at The Garrison, Fort Harrison State Park, 6001 North Post Road, Indianapolis, Indiana. With the presence of seven members, the Chair observed a quorum.

Jim Trachtman moved to approve the meeting minutes of June 10, 2009. Rick Cockrum seconded the motion. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried.

The Chair gave a brief explanation of the process regarding the consideration of the suggestions received through the Comprehensive Fish and Wildlife Review Project (“Project”). He also announced that after a person addressed the Advisory Council for the first time, that person would not need to provide his or her name in order to use time efficiently.<sup>1</sup> He then asked Sandra Jensen to provide an update regarding adoption of proposed rules being considered separately from the Project review process.

Sandra Jensen, Administrative Law Judge with the Natural Resources Commission (“Commission”), Division of Hearings, explained that several suggestions were received proposing to allow youth to take a buck. She said that a proposed rule amendment was preliminarily adopted by the Commission prior to the initiation of the Project, and noted that the proposed rule amendment is in the public hearing phase of rule adoption. Jensen explained that the date and time for the public hearing would be announced soon and that any comments relating to this topic should be made either at the public hearing or in writing through the Commission’s comment form link associated with that rule proposal.

Linnea Petercheff, with the Department’s Division of Fish and Wildlife noted that the Commission also gave preliminary adoption to proposed rules to allow both archery equipment and firearms to be loaded outside lawful shooting hours and a provision to allow archery hunters to carry firearms during the archery season, and allow during firearms season to carry archery equipment as long as the person possesses the appropriate licenses. She stated that the public hearing associated with this rule package will also be announced soon and that comments should be made at the public hearing or in writing.

John Davis, Deputy Director of the Bureau of Lands and Cultural Resources, noted that the definition of “youth” was amended legislatively and made consistent throughout statute. “‘Youth’ is now anyone under 18 years of age.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Anonymous comments have not been included in the minutes in order to insure transparency and to comply with the Natural Resources Commission’s nonrule policy document, Information Bulletin #55 (First Amendment).

**Consideration of public suggestions received through the Fish and Wildlife Comprehensive Rules Enhancement Project regarding rules governing hunting, trapping, and taking deer; Administrative Cause No. 09-088D**

Seasons: Muzzleloader; Extend Archery; Move Firearms Out of the Rut; Extend Firearms; Doe Only Season; and Seasons/Reduce Firearms Season

Tim Nussbaum, from Kosciusko County, provided to Counsel members a hardcopy of several rule proposals. He said the rule proposal would move the firearms season out of the “rut” and reducing firearms season. He said he suggested moving the start date for antlered bucks back seven days from the beginning of firearms season and the first seven days of firearms season would be for antlerless deer only. “Basically it would be frontloading the season to shoot does or antlerless at the front of our firearms season. That way you are not reducing hunter opportunity. You are becoming more efficient and effective with your opportunity.” He said these proposals would put hunters on the “same page” statewide. “I really believe this will help recruit hunters.”

Bill Herring, from Morgan County, suggested that days not be eliminated from the hunting seasons, but actually recommended adding a couple days. Herring said he “strongly supports” establishing an early antlerless deer reduction season for antlerless deer only and open to any firearm, modern or muzzle loader, bow or crossbow for one weekend following the youth season for DNR selected counties. He also proposed that no antlered deer be taken under depredation permits in order to minimize the temptations for illegal taking of antlered deer. “These proposals would effectively address some serious concerns in parts of Indiana regarding overpopulation numbers, crop depredation losses, and motor vehicle accidents.”

Kevin Smith indicated he was presenting “pretty much a core group of the most active participants with the Indiana Deer Hunters Association”. He said the group agreed that the existing firearms season is “long enough and none of them need to be extended or changed; the archery season should be extended to the second Sunday in January; and doe only seasons should start the Saturday after Christmas and extend to second Sunday in January filling all unused tags.

The Chair noted that many suggestions received proposed either shortening the firearms season or to move the firearms season back so that the season did not start at the peak of the rut. He said the Advisory Council is “interested in knowing what deer hunters think about these proposals.”

Clarence Williams, from Newburgh Indiana and owner of Hunt-Indiana.com, an online forum, suggested that the existing muzzleloader season remain as it exists or the season could be extended to the end of December. He said the muzzle loader “does a yeoman’s job in taking care of the antlerless population; their kill is 80% antlerless, with a good portion of those are does.” He supported extending all hunting seasons. He said archery season should begin September 15 and extended to end of January. He also supported an antlerless deer season. Williams said the firearms season is at the “tail end of the rut

now.” He said the Indiana needs to be creating hunting opportunities rather than taking them away. Williams noted that a “good portion” of antlerless deer are killed after the first weekend of firearms season; therefore, shortening the season would “seriously limiting the DNR’s method of managing deer.” He concluded by voicing his support for extending firearms season.

Richard Landon noted that he owns timberland in Fountain County and deer herd management is necessary for timber management. He agreed that shortening the firearms season would be a “bad idea, because it will rush people and already the two week period of time around my property becomes a war zone on opening day...I feel if we were to extend the season it is possible that we would have less crowding of hunters on the lands.” He said the season extension would provide additional opportunities for hunters. Landon also noted that even though he did not understand the biology of moving firearms season out of rut, “making it more difficult to take a deer might not help new hunters coming into the sport. By keeping firearms season within rut, I think, would help.”

Chad Zartman said he supported moving the firearms season out of the rut, which would increase age structure of the deer. He said “frontloading” the season would help control the doe population, because “people haven’t been out for a year; they are very anxious to get out”. He said the earlier season would create a “more even distribution of per hunter doe kills.”

Danny East said that moving firearm season out of rut was an “act of prejudice. I have yet to see a definitive bracket of when the rut is. How can you move it out of something that you do not know what it is?” East said he was not an antler “worshiper. I go deer hunting.”

Eric Williams noted that he has hunted southern Indiana for the past 15 years. He said the start of firearm season around November 16<sup>th</sup> is generally when the older aged deer ... or two year old bucks are “running out of does. They’ve had does earlier in the season before 16 days of firearms season begins. A little bit of the rationale in Illinois and Ohio is an awesome technique to provide a proper age structure of antlered deer.”

Tyler Willis indicated he hunted in Crosley Fish and Wildlife Area and that he supports extending archery season earlier, the “one buck” rule and moving firearms season out of rut. He said he was an avid bow hunter and when he hunts from October to mid November it’s the first weekend of firearms season. “Everybody and their brother is out there and its gunfire everywhere.”

### Non-Resident Licenses

The Chair said that suggestions were received that indicated Indiana’s non-resident license is “too expensive” or “too inexpensive,” and requiring \$125 for buck tag and another \$125 for a doe tag was unreasonable.

John Davis explained that some licenses were modified to market Indiana deer hunting. He said that previously a nonresident youth hunter was required to buy an adult nonresident hunting license, but now the nonresident youth will purchase a special nonresident youth license at the regular resident license fee.

### Hunter Orange

The Chair noted that “quite a few” suggestions were received regarding requiring hunters to wear hunter orange only when on the ground, and that once a hunter was in a tree stand hunter orange was not really necessary. He noted that none of the suggestions questioned the validity overall of wearing hunter orange from a safety standpoint.

John Evans, representing the Indiana Deer Hunter’s Association (“IDHA”), suggested that a 12 x 12 hunter orange tag observable 360° be posted on blinds and elevated shooting houses.

Doug Allman said the IDHA submitted a suggestion noting that the idea of requiring a blaze of hunter orange be mounted on ground blinds and hunter orange has merit. “Some sort of flag for visibility to let someone know there is someone in the blind.”

Bill Herring agreed with Allman that requiring hunter orange on ground and elevated blinds has “considerable” amount of merit. He noted that it is to a “person’s advantage to advertise their presence” in wearing hunter orange during firearm season whether on the ground or in a tree stand.

Nussbaum commented that he was “definitely” opposed to not requiring wearing hunter orange when a hunter is in a tree stand. “As a landowner, it allows me to find poachers on my land. If they are not wearing hunter orange, that is an additional penalty.” Nussbaum said that he understood the safety of requiring hunter orange on blinds; however, said he has hunted his property while in a blind and has caught persons coming across his property. “I wouldn’t want to have to advertise that I am there, but part of me understands the safety issue so I don’t know how we could address that. Would there be an exemption for landowners?” He noted that non-hunters understand hunter orange and requiring any other color would require a “much greater” learning curve.

### Buck and Doe Tag

The Chair reiterated that the Advisory Council does not have an opinion on any of the suggestions received or comments presented at today’s meeting. “I don’t want to give the impression that we are in support or in opposition to any of it. We are just listening to what people are saying, and then we will report to the Commission.”

The Chair explained that most of the suggestions received proposed to reduce costs of licenses by combining the primary licenses or creating a license package with multiple doe tags.

Two individuals stated their opinion that the general firearms license should be for a deer of either sex.

#### One License for All Deer Seasons

The Chair noted that the Department receives federal funding based on license sales. He asked John Davis to provide a brief overview of the federal requirements.

Davis explained that federal reimbursement comes from the sale of hunting and fishing licenses. He said that federal funds are not dependent on the tag designation. Davis then deferred to Gregg McCollam, Assistant Director of the Division of Fish and Wildlife.

McCollam explained that the first purchase of either a hunting license or a fishing license certifies that person as a certified hunter or certified angler. Purchasing multiple licenses during the year does not impact federal funding. Federal funding is based on the number of certified hunters and anglers in a given year.

Bill Freeman said that some suggestions received noted the convenience of purchasing combined licenses and the willingness to pay an increased fee for that convenience.

#### Muzzleloader and Primitive Firearms

The Chair said that suggestions received proposed eliminating inline muzzleloaders due to the advanced technology and greater range, expanding muzzle loading season for primitive muzzleloaders, and allowing antique calibers.

Herring noted proposed allowing muzzleloaders to hunt an additional two days earlier before archery season to help control deer population by taking an antlerless deer.

#### Increase Rifle Calibers

Danny East said that “several of us started petitioning the DNR when we used to meet down at the State House...when we were first just looking at straight-walled rifles, I think due to politics, that got swept under the rug...I think we are fine just the way we are. Let’s not push our luck.”

Two other individuals also stated their opposition to the addition of high powered rifles for hunting deer.

#### Crossbow During Archery Season

James Campbell noted that he is a lifetime hunter since 1970 and asked that crossbow season be expanded into all of archery season. He said crossbows are recognized as archery equipment by all the major archery organizations, the American Trade Association, and the U.S. government, and have proved to be a “good” recruitment tool to bring youths and women into the sport of hunting and it helps retain older hunters.

Clarence Williams said, “First of all, a crossbow is not a hybrid of a gun and a bow, because the crossbow was invented in 400 BC.” Williams said that he hunts with a bow for 40 years and with a crossbow for the past seven years. He noted that there is “not much difference” between a crossbow and a “high tech” compound bow, and both have advantages and disadvantages. Williams also noted that other states are allowing crossbows in archery season.

Tim Nussbaum said that the debate regarding crossbows is an “eternal” debate. He noted that he has hunted in Ohio, which allows crossbows during archery season, and he has not heard “a lot” of complaints from hunters who use either a compound bow or crossbow. “What tends to be the subject is how can I still have a best deer hunting experience?” Nussbaum suggested creating a crossbow tag.

Tim Labbé, President of the Indiana Bow Hunter Association (“IBA”), stated that the Association is “strongly” against allowing the crossbow during archery season. The IBA “does not feel” the crossbow meets the requirements to be considered a bow or archery equipment, but “more resembles” a firearm than a bow. He noted that evidence shows that crossbows are capable of a 100-yard range, which the IBA considers unsafe.

Kevin Haendiges noted that he owns both a vertical bow and a crossbow, and has experimented with a wrist-held trigger operated release, which most compound bow hunters use. He has concluded that the release is “no different than the trigger on my crossbow”. He said that “anyone who thinks they can get 1,000 feet/second or 100 yards out of a crossbow has never fired one.” He said there are misconceptions about the crossbow. He said that crossbows would not be considered archery equipment under Indiana law, but “a stick with a string that flings a feathered stick is archery.” He said the ballistics of a crossbow is “nearly identical” except that the much shorter crossbow bolt will loose energy faster and thereby limits its range. He said, “If you get 40 yards, that’s a good shot.” Haendiges concluded that he “strongly” advocated the inclusion of the crossbow in early archery or any other archery season.

The Chair noted that a few suggestions received indicated that there would not be opposition to allow the use of crossbows for seniors or those with a disability during archery season. He asked whether the IBA had an opinion as to this suggestion.

Tim Labbé said that the IBA would not be opposed to allow seniors or those with disabilities to use a crossbow during early archery season.

John Walt, a District Representative for IBA, said that he discussed the crossbow issue with the fish and wildlife director of Ohio. Walt asked the director whether offering a crossbow license added to the sales of licenses in Ohio, to which the director answered affirmatively. Ohio experienced a 43% increase in license sales for crossbows. Walt asked the director how many new hunters were recruited because of the allowance of the use of the crossbow, to which the director answered that recruitment was less than 0.5%. Walt said that the director explained that the majority of crossbow license sales were due to “cross over” of those who previously purchased firearm licenses. Walt also indicated

that the director noted that crossbows do not recruit women and youth into hunting. Walt explained that new hunters need to be “schooled” on the use of the crossbow, just like other hunting equipment. He said the crossbow is easier to use, but is not purely a recruitment tool. Walt agreed that the allowance of the use of crossbows retains older hunters.

Clarence Williams noted that the hardcopy report provided to Advisory Council members contains recruitment statistics of crossbows on page seven. Statistics show that youth hunters age nine and ten, are recruited using crossbows. At age 21, the hunters are using vertical bows, and after 40 the hunters revert back to the crossbow.

Bill Freeman asked an IBA representative how IBA recruits youth hunters with bow equipment.

Labbé said that National Archery in the Schools Program starts youth with a Genesis™ bow, which is about 35 pounds. Through the program, the youths become familiar with archery equipment. Labbé confirmed that a youth would be capable of taking a deer with this equipment at 20 yards.

John Walt said, “I agree that there is a certain amount of recruitment with the crossbow...the Ohio data showed that the only way that the crossbow works is through a mentor system.”

Other individuals observed that allowing crossbows would be good for recruitment purposes and for introducing youths to archery hunting.

### Antler Restrictions

Kevin Haendiges said he was opposed to antler restrictions. “My vision is not great to begin with and the idea of trying to count points at even 50 yards would be a chore for me with binoculars.” He said the enforcement of this requirement would be a “nightmare”. He also noted that antler restrictions might cause waste, and has been tried in other states producing negative results. He said Mississippi noticed after several years of antler restrictions the average size of the racks diminished.

Clarence Williams said he would not support antler restrictions. He said enforcement of the restrictions would be a major issue. He noted that studies in Mississippi show that antler point restriction basically has an adverse affect on the size of antlers. Williams noted that judging antler points and spreads in the woods, especially from the side, is difficult. He said undersized bucks taken would be “left to rot” in the woods. “We have too many restrictions now; please do not add any more.”

Other individuals offered comments in opposition to antler restrictions

### Ban on Spotlighting

Doug Allman noted that spotlighting is a “pet peeve. I hate it because I work to gain access through landowners. I work to keep that access. I constantly have a parade of vehicles before and during gun season and other hunting seasons spotlighting deer on where I hunt.” He said spotlighting disturbs the deer and their behavior. Allman said that access is “hard to gain and is very treasured.” He concluded, “I wish it was banned prior to and during seasons.”

Allman noted that any legislation proposed that would govern spotlighting always contained exemptions for landowners or those with landowner’s permission.

Conservation Officer Steve Hunter explained that public perception is that spotlighting is illegal already. “We get a lot of calls of people spotlighting.” He said that the non-hunting public is “turned off” by spotlighting. He said spotlighting is a law enforcement issue. Hunter explained that it is currently illegal to spotlight from a vehicle with possession of firearm or archery equipment capable of taking a deer.

The Chair said that any amendments to spotlighting would have to be accomplished legislatively.

Kevin Smith indicated that the IDHA membership agreed that it did not want to see any changes to the current rule. Smith commented that personally he has spotlighted deer with his sons and their friends to “make the 6-mile trip around the Hoosier National Forest section that we hunted, and seeing 50 to 100 deer go them pumped up for the next day...spotlighting really helps them to sit in the woods for ten hours the next day to know there are some big boys out there.”

Other individuals noted that imposing a time limit that allowed spotlighting until 10:00 p.m., for example, similar to what other states have done might assist conservation officers.

### Depredation

Danny East said he was “all for” depredation permits and changing the rules. He said some hunters can shoot a doe and “not worry about the fawns starving to death... I refuse to shoot a doe this time of the year, and no bucks, period. Too many guys are taking advantage of that.” He asked, “What’s wrong with a little quick survey after the regular season? Do it in January or something like that”.

Bill Herring indicated he had limited experience actually hunting with depredation permits, but did hunt under a depredation permit in early to mid September, which is after the fawns are reasonably able to take care of themselves. “By shooting those does in June, July, or even August, all of those fawns would not have much of a chance of making it with the stray dogs and coyotes.” He suggested establishing an early doe season in areas where depredation permits have been issued previously, which would reduce the need somewhat for the depredation permits. Herring said depredation permits should be for antlerless only no matter what time of year the permit is issued. He noted

that a trend is developing for some hunters to take a buck in the velvet; that “shouldn’t be allowed in Indiana.”

Doug Allman noted that he has “spent time down in front” of the Legislature testifying and hearing discussions revolving around deer. He said the depredation permit is a tool to “appease landowners who are complaining.” Allman said that hunters should be speaking to their legislators rather than the Advisory Council. Regarding depredation permits, “I don’t think DNR likes them; I don’t think the hunters like them.”

### Over-Population/Under-Population

The Chair asked Chad Stewart, the Department’s Deer Biologist, to provide an overview of the deer population and other statistics used to determine bonus deer tags. Chad Stewart said that the “bonus” deer numbers are a collaborative effort between the Division of Fish and Wildlife and the Division of Law Enforcement. At the conclusion of each year’s harvest, the data is summarized and distributed to the district wildlife biologist, “who know their areas better than anybody.” The district biologists along with the conservation officers make recommendations. He said the recommendations are then compiled and reviewed and the process is based on a 10-year harvest trend. Stewart said the county population goals are compared to the present trend to determine county allotment.

The Chair asked for an update on the status of Indiana’s deer herd.

Stewart said it is difficult to determine that DNR can only manage deer at a county level. “It’s impossible to go lower.” The county bonus permits are a “generalization” of the county itself. “We know perfectly well that within that county, those numbers can be higher or those numbers can be lower.” He said that Madison County has been allotted eight bonus deer, but “there are probably locations in Madison County that well-deserving of having an eight and there are areas where they are not deserving of having an eight.” He said deer populations are dynamic and are not homogenized within the county.

John Davis noted that areas, such as Carmel, Fishers, and Noblesville in Hamilton County, which have restrictions on firearm use but still with rural areas, there are pockets that are “pretty intense” as far as deer-vehicle accidents, deer sightings, or crop depredation. He said, “When you are seeing ten or twelve deer out there and you are killing as many as you can, and you trying to get them at the specific time when [soybeans] bifurcate, which is a certain time in a plant’s life, then it gets a lot more complicated than just to say, ‘Don’t ever shoot a buck.’” He also noted that deer processors are “geared” to the hunting season. “There is a lot of complexity involved” in deer management.

AmyMarie Travis Lucas said that many of the suggestions received noted a reduction in the deer population. “Do your studies show counties that are showing an extreme reduction in the population?”

Stewart explained that aside from Tipton County and Benton County, “we feel there are plenty of deer around.” He said Benton County does not have the habitat to support a high deer population. He said the northern counties and the southern counties, in particular, “we have not noticed” a decrease in population. Stewart said that five of the past six years the harvests have increased. “The harvest numbers certainly support that the deer numbers are there.” He said 2008 season harvest was approximately 129,748, and deer taken under a depredation permit were a little of 2,700.

John Davis said that the county bonus designation is a “reflection of a lot of statistics”.

### One Buck Rule

The Chair noted that the Advisory Council has reviewed the “one buck rule” previously, and the Department’s previous deer biologist indicated there was no biological reason not to harvest two bucks. The Advisory Council extended the “one buck rule” for an additional five years to gather data to determine impact of the rule on the deer population.

### “Earn-A-Buck”

Bill Herring said that those who hunt deer to take a trophy deer only will pass on does. One of the merits for an early antlerless season could “in a way” serve as an “earn a buck” by shooting a doe before the regular seasons where a buck can be taken. Herring said establishing an early antlerless season would eliminate paperwork that may be associated with an “earn a buck” program.

### Other Suggestions: Telecheck

The Chair explained that the Natural Resources Commission referred the suggestions regarding checking in of deer by telephone by to the Advisory Council.

Charles Walters said he has hunted in Kentucky, which allows telecheck. He said he would be “against” telecheck, because telecheck would “take away” the Department’s ability to gather data and monitor disease.

Doug Allman stated that he would be “strongly opposed” to going to a telecheck system “given that we have CWD in surrounding states, and given that we just had TB discovered in two deer farms.” He said currently the Department has “hands on” inspection during gun season, but the Department would lose the ability to “go back” to institute a system to monitor disease in the herd. Allman said telecheck is basically done for convenience, but noted that the existing check-in system has “flaws”.

Conservation Officer Steve Hunter explained that there are “a lot” of cultural differences across the State and deer check stations are available in areas where deer hunting is a “real popular” sport. However, there are areas in the State, such as in Benton, Blackford and Tipton Counties, where there are fewer deer and “we are having trouble finding those

check stations.” A hunter who harvested a deer in some locations may have to drive 45 minutes or more. Hunter said, “[Telecheck is] not necessarily convenience only, it’s getting to the point in some areas it may be a necessity.” He agreed that there may be issues of tissue collection associated with telecheck. Hunter said that the Division of Law Enforcement is not “strongly for or against” telecheck, but “there will probably be a time in the future where it is going to be a necessity to go to something else because people in more urban areas don’t like to see a bloody deer in the back of a pickup.” He explained that some cities have wanted to pass ordinances against bringing in a deer uncovered and other deer related ordinances.

Chad Stewart said that collecting biological data is “much easier” with the physical check stations. He said the Department has had mandatory check stations since 1981. Since that time the Department has gathered approximately 28 years of data, and from a biological standpoint “that’s valuable”. He said as attitudes and priorities change telecheck may be inevitable since technology “tends to win out”. Stewart said a survey was conducted last year as the deer were checked in asking the hunter whether deer would be commercially processed or self-processed. There was no statistical difference in adult deer age structure of those deer commercially processed or self-processed. There was a statistical difference in the amount of fawns that were self-processed versus commercially processed, commercially processed fawns were much fewer than self-processed fawns. Stewart said that the Department would have to “mandate” areas “highly sensitive” to Chronic Wasting Disease or Bovine Tuberculosis, as a sampling area. “Whether that’s delineated by counties, townships, or major highways, we need to maintain that ability in those areas” to collect data. He noted that Illinois has instituted this kind of check station program where it knows there is CWD or TB. He said Indiana may have to institute a program similar to Michigan where physical check in of deer is voluntary, to which Michigan provides hunter incentives.

Bill Freeman asked whether the data the Department collects can be collected by commercial processors. Stewart said that commercial processors could collect age data; however, female fawns would have to be enumerated some other way. Freeman then commented that the Department could access the commercial processor as a source for scientific data. Stewart; however, explained that some of the biologists have had resistance from processors in collecting for disease samples. “[The processors] are afraid that if the animal is positive [for disease], it could be traced back to their facility which would result in additional quarantine”. Freeman said, “Good point.”

Some individuals suggested that Indiana consider methods adopted by other states. Reportedly some states require a person to physically check one animal for every “so many” tags purchased. Illinois and Kentucky both have some form of telecheck

The Chair asked whether telecheck would “make it easier” for hunters that self-process to take more than one buck. Steve Hunter said, “That’s already happening now. I think the deer we are missing are the ones that don’t have any check stations attached” to a processing facility. He said that if it is made easier to check in deer compliance will most likely increase.

The Chair opened the floor for further comment.

A question was raised regarding the proper disposal of deer carcass.

AmyMarie Travis Lucas stated that the feline rescue station “begs for pieces and parts”.

Steve Hunter said that deer carcass should be disposed of in a responsible manner. “You can’t just be throwing them in the creek or roadside; that’s littering.” He said deer carcass “must be treated as garbage”.

Bryan Poynter thanked the Advisory Council members, the Commission staff, and the public for taking time to attend today’s meeting and participating in the rule review process. He noted that ample notice will be provided to the public regarding any rule amendment proposals that result from the review process.

John Davis also thanked all those involved in the rule review process.

Written comments were submitted by certain individuals while offering input on particular topics as follows:

- Tim Nussbaum submitted written comments regarding early doe season.
- Bill Herring submitted written comments on early antlerless deer reduction season.
- John Haendiges submitted written comments on crossbow.
- Kevin Smith provided written comments on misc topics, but the comments represent IDHA. On a separate matter where the draft minutes (that include anonymous comments saved on I: Drive), perhaps those that list “Committer: IDHA...”, we could just insert Kevin Smith’s name. Was he the only representative from IDHA?
- Tim Labbé submitted written comments (and a CD) on crossbows.
- Clarence Williams submitted comments (blue folder) on crossbow (w/ CD) and misc comments (red folder).

## **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m., EDT.