



Recreation/Hunting Workgroup Meeting 6
July 21, 2015
5:30 – 7:30 PM
Chambers Recovery Team

MEETING SUMMARY

Stakeholders: Tom Douglas, Becky Fancher, Matt Singer

Project Team: Linda Shead

1. Introductions

Linda reviewed the development of the management measures on the first flip chart, with most being outreach and education items. The two on-the-ground recommendations are for a boater waste pump-out station at Job Beason Park, and looking into additional restrooms for people coming for recreation in the watershed. A second flip chart will address topics shared with the Ag workgroup – feral hogs, wildlife, removal of invasives.

2. Recreation On-the-Ground Management Measures

Boater waste pump-out stations was the first on-the-ground measure that was discussed. GBF can provide some information on costs, because they've been specifically working on getting enough pump-out stations to get a no-discharge zones established around the bay. For location, the marina at Job Beason Park had been the site previously discussed by the workgroup, which would then have to be operated and maintained by the County. However, the group today noted that there could alternatively be one at a private facility there in Oak Island, adding a business opportunity and taking the burden off the County, although having to pay for the discharge might discourage some folks from using it. For maintaining and pumping out the facility, some private businesses have been involved in that, which could also be explored. Given the investigation aspects, the 4-6 year timeframe was judged to be most realistic.

The second on-the-ground item was to investigate the need and opportunities for *additional restroom facilities* in the watershed. Currently, the two public restrooms are in the lower part of the watershed, at Job Beason (at the confluence) and Double Bayou (lower East Fork) parks. Needs further upstream on the West Fork and in the upper part of the watershed for the East Fork were discussed. Additional public restrooms would likely require more public land. Businesses along I-10 may provide enough facilities for birders and hunters in the upper watershed. Identifying locations that are promoted for birding

4800 Research Forest Drive The Woodlands, Texas 77381 Tel: 281-367-1348 www.doublebayou.org

Double Bayou Watershed Partnership is a project of the following entities:



HARC

Shead Conservation Solutions

USGS
science for a changing world

and hunting would also help determine the need. Because of the amount of investigation required, both for need and methods, the group felt the 7-10 timeframe would be most realistic.

3. Recreation Outreach & Education Management Measures

Locations for providing information about *proper carcass disposal* – most specifically, not dumping in the water – was discussed, with signage at parks and bridge crossings being the primary locations, but also County waste facilities, with the number to be provided determined by the number of these locations. The signs might be linked to any government effort/signs about illegal dumping. Costs for maintenance and replacement of signs would also need to be considered, in addition to installation. The same factors and locations (except waste facilities) would also apply to the *boater waste awareness campaign*. Both of these could be doable by the watershed coordinator, and easy to show progress in the first three years of implementation.

Similarly, *adding restroom icons to area maps* would be doable by the watershed coordinator, and easy to show progress in the first three years of implementation. These are intended both for paper maps when they are reprinted (e.g., those of ChambersWild and the chambers of commerce), and for online versions.

Reinforcing hunter education at point of sale was discussed as a more complicated effort, because many hunters in the watershed come from outside the area. And many local hunters buy their supplies and licenses outside the watershed. Thus, the effort may need to be coordinated with TPWD, and take longer to implement.

On *informing and encouraging newer boat motors*, this, too, will require activity over a longer term to see about getting credits established, such as those for tractor motors for reducing air pollution.

4. Summary of Recreation Recommendations

Recreation Measures – On-the-Ground					
Management Measure	Lead Entities	Unit Cost	1-3 years	4-6 years	7-10 years
Boater Waste Pump-Out Stations	County / GBF Private business	(GBF)		1	
Potential Additional Restrooms	ChambersWild investigations	(County)			1

Recreation Measures – Outreach & Education					
Management Measure	Lead Entities	Unit Cost	1-3 years	4-6 years	7-10 years
Illegal Boater Waste Dumping Awareness Campaign	GBF	(GBF for signs cost)	Yes	1	
Add Restroom Icons to Existing Maps	Watershed Coordinator		Yes		1
Proper Carcass Disposal – Event &	Watershed Coordinator	(GBF for signs cost)	Yes		

Recreation Measures – Outreach & Education					
<i>Management Measure</i>	<i>Lead Entities</i>	<i>Unit Cost</i>	<i>1-3 years</i>	<i>4-6 years</i>	<i>7-10 years</i>
<i>Signage Program</i>					
<i>Reinforce Hunter Education – Point of Sale</i>	Watershed Coordinator				Yes
<i>Inform and Encourage Newer Boat Motors</i>	Watershed Coordinator				Yes

5. Wildlife and Non-Domestic Plants and Animals

For *vegetation physical removal*, the group agreed that this would need to be at least assessed annually, even if not performed by volunteers annually.

For the *feral hog specialist*, it would need to be continuous. For the new *county feral hog management* position, the group was unclear whether this was intended to be a full-time position, or combined with a part-time position for the two-county item, but it would also need to be ongoing. The group felt the cost for the position was very generous.

For *feral hog control equipment*, the group wondered how this would be applied – give away, loan, rent? They thought the county position could figure out that program.

For the *feral hog bounties*, the Plum Creek example was cited for number and costs, with implementation scheduled for the second 3-year period, to allow time for the other measures to get implemented first.

For the *campaign on not treating/feeding wildlife as pets*, the group felt this was a fairly low priority for water quality, as feral hogs don't generally fall into that category, deer are not much problem here, and folks do not object to feeding birds. The one exception might be alligators, but not from a water quality perspective.

6. Summary of Wildlife and Non-Domestic Plants and Animals

Wildlife and Non-Domestic Plants and Animals					
<i>Management Measure</i>	<i>Lead Entities</i>	<i>Unit Cost</i>	<i>1-3 years</i>	<i>4-6 years</i>	<i>7-10 years</i>
<i>Vegetation Physical Removal Days</i>	Watershed Coordinator		3	3	4
<i>Feral Hog Specialist (existing)</i>	AgriLife Extension		3	3	4
<i>Feral Hog Management (new)</i>	County position	≥\$50K part-time?	3	3	4
<i>Feral Hog County Position (new)</i>	Chambers & Liberty counties	\$90K	3	3	4
<i>Feral Hog Control (equipment)</i>	County	\$500/trap	Based on population and needed reduction		
<i>Feral Hog Bounties</i>	Chambers & Liberty counties	(see Plum Creek example)		Yes	Yes

**Wildlife and Non-Domestic Plants and Animals:
Outreach & Education**

<i>Management Measure</i>	<i>Lead Entities</i>	<i>Unit Cost</i>	<i>1-3 years</i>	<i>4-6 years</i>	<i>7-10 years</i>
<i>Feral Hog Management Workshop</i>	AgriLife Extension	\$8,000 ea	2	1	1
<i>Campaign: Don't Treat or Feed Wildlife as Pets</i>	Watershed Coordinator				Low priority