

Colorado Division of Wildlife

Law Enforcement Report

**Compiled by John Bredehoft
Chief of Law Enforcement**

Major contributions made by Public Services Administrator, Steve Norris; Assistant Chief of Law Enforcement, Dave Croonquist; Human Dimensions, Linda Sikorowski; Human Resource Manager, Gary Berlin; Personnel Administrator, Judy Holmes; Senior Budget Analyst, Steve Cassin

**Colorado Division of Wildlife
April 1, 2000**

COLO DIV WILDLIFE RESEARCH CTR LIBRARY



BD0W014627

Index

Page	Topic
2	Index
3	Preface
4	Wildlife Law Enforcement is an Essential Public Service
5	Wildlife Law Enforcement Planning
10	Wildlife Law Enforcement Budget
11	1990–1999 Wildlife Law Enforcement Violation Summary
13	Wildlife Law Enforcement Challenges
14	Wildlife Law Enforcement Unit
17	Operation Game Thief
18	Wildlife Violator Compact
19	Selection and Training Wildlife Law Enforcement Officers
21	The Job of a Wildlife Law Enforcement Officer
22	History of Wildlife Law Enforcement in Colorado

Preface

When I became Chief of Law Enforcement in October 1998, the law enforcement staff of the Colorado Division of Wildlife was already wrestling with a provocative question posed by the Public Services Administrator, Steve Norris. “Why do we do law enforcement?” was his question, and once we understood that he was asking for more of an answer than “it is the right thing to do”, the discussion became quite animated. The reason most wildlife officers do law enforcement is that for them, it is the “right thing to do” intuitively and seldom is the question asked about why we do it. Questioning why we do it seemed to many at the time to be an attack on a very basic value.

Since becoming Chief, I have come to understand the need to clearly articulate the reason why we (as government) do anything to anybody who asks. The question Steve posed was important, and I have worked on that question since he asked it, so that I could provide a legitimate answer.

As Chief, I was also starting to get questions from a variety of interests such as Wildlife Commissioners and legislators that seemed to have some central themes. I would be asked, “Why not have other law enforcement agencies do wildlife law enforcement; is there a law enforcement plan; how do we budget for law enforcement; what is the budget for law enforcement?” I continue to get questions about how to become a wildlife officer, and there is still confusion about our “multipurpose” orientation toward the job of being a wildlife officer in our agency. Citizens and employees want to know how Operation Game Thief and the Wildlife Violator Compact work.

What I decided to do was to take these questions that seem to be central to what various interests have about our agency and pose them to our own employees, special interests, and others. What I was looking for was a shared sense of what wildlife law enforcement is about. The result is included in this report.

This document reflects the input and contributions of many others. As you will soon see, I am not a journalist, nor a very good writer. This document is not designed for mass distribution. What is attached is a work in progress, a framework for continued discussion. It is meant to answer questions posed by special interests, Wildlife Commissioners, legislators, DNR and CDOW staff. It is also meant as a communication tool, a shared basis, and a foundation for Colorado Wildlife Officers to use when asked about Colorado wildlife law enforcement.

John Bredehoft
Chief of Law Enforcement

Wildlife Law Enforcement is an Essential Public Service

The Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW) is charged by statute to protect, preserve, enhance, and manage wildlife for the use, benefit and enjoyment of the people of this state and its visitors. Wildlife management objectives such as determining the numbers and types of wildlife taken, and providing opportunities to hunt, fish, or engage in other wildlife-related recreation are realized through the creation of regulations by the Wildlife Commission and enforcement of season dates, bag limits, and license requirements. If everyone would follow the rules, enforcement efforts would be unnecessary, however laws for some people are only effective to the extent they are enforced. Without law enforcement effective wildlife management would not be possible. Without wildlife management Colorado's abundant and diverse wildlife populations would not exist.

A 1990 Stadage-Accureach survey clearly indicated that the public expects the CDOW to enforce wildlife laws and to protect wildlife. In a 1999 survey, Ciruli Associates found that 78% of Colorado residents believe that enforcing existing wildlife laws is the top priority for the agency.

The CDOW is the best agency to provide this essential public service. Management through regulation by an appointed wildlife commission is enhanced by having the enforcement of these regulations provided by employees of the same agency. Officers who work for other agencies would have enforcement demands for their time other than wildlife law enforcement. The CDOW is very responsive to its customers in relation to regulation and enforcement as we control and direct our own enforcement efforts.

The CDOW has the best employees to provide wildlife law enforcement services. The public consistently rates CDOW officers high in regards to their job performance. Surveys conducted during check station activities in 1994 and 1996 found that respondents felt that the wildlife officers who contacted them were courteous, fair, and professional. A survey completed this year by Responsive Management found that more than 90% of Colorado residents, hunters, and anglers rated CDOW officers who they had come into contact with as professional, courteous, knowledgeable and fair. According to the report, "Wildlife Officers were given spectacular ratings among the individuals who they have had contact with, truly amazing considering the nature of the contact – law enforcement." These ratings are higher than other states surveyed by Responsive Management in the past.

Wildlife Law Enforcement Planning

The structure of the Colorado Division of Wildlife's (CDOW) planning efforts is driven by statute, mission, long range planning, five and one year operational planning, goals and objectives and performance indicators. The format for wildlife law enforcement planning efforts should follow that same framework. The following incorporates this structure, and includes the priorities as determined through an understanding of the long-range plan goal for wildlife recreation.

Statute. The legislative basis for the existence of the CDOW is found in Colorado Revised Statute 33-1-101 (1). It states, *"It is the policy of the state of Colorado that the wildlife and their environment are to be protected, preserved, enhanced and managed for the use, benefit, and enjoyment of the people of this state and its visitors."*

Mission. Understanding this statute and through internal and external planning efforts the CDOW developed an agency mission statement. The mission of the CDOW is, *"To perpetuate the wildlife resources of the state and provide people the opportunity to enjoy them"*

Long-Range Plan. The statute and mission statement drives planning efforts of the CDOW. The current long-range plan finalized in 1994 provides direction for the agency. One of the major components falls under the heading *"Wildlife-Related Recreation"*. This part of the long-range plan states, *"The Division will encourage the broadest, deepest participation in wildlife-related activities that is feasible. The Division will provide quality opportunities for hunting, fishing, wildlife viewing, and other forms of wildlife recreation and enjoyment, consistent with the goal of protecting the wildlife resource. By far the majority of the Division's resources will continue to be used to provide hunting and fishing opportunities. Key goals will be to maintain or increase participation in hunting, fishing and wildlife viewing, and at the same time maintain or improve the quality of these experiences."*

Goals and Objectives. Through planning efforts based on the long-range plan, goals and objectives are determined. The following are CDOW law enforcement goals and objectives.

Goal: Protect Wildlife. Through presence, patrol, investigation, and other law enforcement activities, the CDOW will pursue, apprehend, and prosecute those who would damage our wildlife resource.

Objective: Provide Law Enforcement Presence. Wildlife officers provide a law enforcement presence in local communities. One of the roles of the wildlife officer is to detect wildlife violations. Their presence can also deter would-be violators. Officers also contact persons who are actively engaged in hunting or fishing or other wildlife related recreation to provide service, to check for licenses, and to provide opportunities for interactions between the agency and its

customers. Contacts provide opportunities to talk to lawful participants in wildlife recreation, and also allow for the detection of wildlife violations.

Objective: Investigate Reported Violations. Citizens have a variety of ways in which to report wildlife violations. In many communities the CDOW provides a service center that can be visited or called. In many localities the citizen may know the officer personally or can find their listing in the phone book. The CDOW also operates the Operation Game Thief program, which provides an avenue for people to report crimes to a toll free number (1-800-332-4155).

Objective: Conduct Special Investigations. In some circumstances special investigations are required for some types of violations. Illegal trophy and commercial poaching activities may require special efforts to detect, deter, and prosecute. Decoy and aerial special operations are used to apprehend the poacher who may be out of sight of the law-abiding citizen. Wildlife forensics services such as DNA analysis and bullet examination are state of the art. These services are provided by agencies such as the Colorado Bureau of Investigation and through contract with universities that can meet the strict legal parameters required by our court systems.

Goal: Provide Excellent Customer Service. In relation to law enforcement services customer service is critical to the CDOW. The CDOW will continue to strive to be the best at customer orientation in relation to providing wildlife law enforcement service. Professional management of resources and systems designed to meet high public demand are critical in an environment of increasing demand with limited resources.

Objective: Provide Responsive Law Enforcement. The citizens of Colorado expect their wildlife agency to be responsive to their needs in relation to law enforcement. The agency has a variety of avenues for citizens to request assistance. Local phone calls directly to the agency during normal business hours and on-call systems that can be accessed through local sheriff or state patrol dispatches are normal operations for the CDOW throughout the state. Law enforcement calls normally take high precedence for immediate response depending on the nature of the call and if an officer is available. Another avenue for the citizen is the toll free Operation Game Thief program in which the caller can remain anonymous if they wish.

Goal: Protect Public Safety. Wildlife recreation or poaching activities that endanger the public will be of the highest concern to our officers. As State of Colorado certified peace officers, our officers will respond to requests for assistance or take the initiative in circumstances where the safety of individuals may be at risk.

Objective: Meet Public Expectations for Peace Officers. When a citizen needs help, they expect wildlife officers to be able to function in any circumstance that involves enforcement or emergency action. Although there is no requirement for the Peace Officers Standard Training (POST) certification for wildlife officers by

statute, all officers have attained that certification. It is a CDOW policy that all employees who wish to be commissioned by the agency will be POST certified.

Goal: Ensure Funding of Wildlife Programs. Wildlife protection and management requires public funding. The CDOW receives the vast majority of its funding from hunters and anglers in the form of license purchases or through federal excise tax programs that base state disbursements on the number of licensed hunters or anglers. We will continue to enforce licensing laws to provide penalties for violators who do not support the protection and management of the wildlife through license purchases.

Objective: Contact Hunters and Anglers. Field patrol by wildlife officers provides an opportunity for direct contact with our licensed customers. Field contacts also provide penalties for violators who don't buy licenses. This enforcement effort helps to ensure the continued revenue flow from license purchases to allow the CDOW to continue to manage wildlife.

Objective: Investigate Fraudulent License Purchase Violations. The Colorado Outdoor Recreation Information System (CORIS), the database that contains customer license information, has improved the agency's service to our customers. The database can also be used to detect fraudulent purchases of licenses. Nonresidents who purchase resident licenses can cost the agency and thus the citizens of Colorado, millions of dollars annually. Residents and nonresidents that purchase more than the allowed number of licenses may be taking extra animals that will not be available for a lawful hunter. The detection and prosecution of fraudulent license purchases will be a high priority for the CDOW.

Goal: Meet High Professional Standards. The CDOW is committed to meeting and exceeding the community standards for professional law enforcement, (training, equipment, response, investigations, community/customer relations, etc.). Our law enforcement will be focused, consistent, fair and will be professional. The public we contact is diverse in ethnicity, age, gender, race, and culture. Every person contacted by a CDOW officer can expect fair and professional treatment. We will professionally administer criminal records, investigative efforts, law enforcement planning, and policies. Supervisors will be accountable for employees meeting these high standards.

Objective: Train and Guide Employees. CDOW officers are certified as Colorado peace officers. All new hires are required to complete and pass the Peace Officer Standard Training (POST) course. Intensive training continues after hiring, with approximately 40 hours of annual in-service training that includes handgun, shotgun, rifle, arrest control, baton, and legal updates. Additionally, law enforcement bulletins are sent to each officer quarterly to enhance an officer's knowledge of current law enforcement issues and subjects.

Objective: Manage Information Systems Professionally. As a law enforcement agency, the Division has information systems that relate to detecting,

detering, and prosecuting of wildlife violators. There are four systems in differing stages of development that require specialized training, security, and handling. The Wildlife Violator Compact is an interstate compact between 12 states in which a wildlife violator can be held accountable across state lines for violations of state wildlife laws. The Violation Management System is the database in which violations are recorded and court processes in relation to violations are managed. The Criminal Intelligence File System allows for the legitimate collection and management of information in relation to wildlife law violators. The Criminal Evidence System provides a consistent and accountable method to process evidence seized as a result of the prosecution of criminal violations.

Objective: Research, Plan, and Evaluate Law Enforcement Programs. Law enforcement efforts need to have a basis of measurement, which should result from an understanding of agency priorities. Application of research and planning provides for effective and efficient efforts in enforcement activities. Performance indicators and measurement are developed and used as guidance in allocation of resources to deter, detect, and prosecute wildlife violators.

Goal: Enhance Public Confidence in Law Enforcement Programs. We train our officers to think of every contact as being the most important contact they will ever make. Formal complaints against employees is extremely low in relation to other agencies performing law enforcement activities (only 5 in 1999, 3 of which were not sustained). According to a recent survey by Responsive Management (2000), among Colorado hunters, anglers, and residents, more than 90% of those who had contact with a wildlife officer in the past five years felt the officer they came in contact with was professional, courteous, knowledgeable and fair.

Objective: CDOW will take complaints seriously and use the existing formal complaint policy that ensures fairness for both the citizen and the employee. The CDOW will learn through its mistakes and apply lessons learned to training, policies, and procedures. The CDOW fully understands that its existence and the ability to manage wildlife depends on the public confidence in what it does, including law enforcement.

Goal: Enhance Relationships with Other Enforcement Agencies. Partnership in the law enforcement community is critical in this time of limited resources and increased demand. We will work with other agencies encouraging cooperation in the enforcement of wildlife laws, as well as assisting other agencies upon request.

Objective: Cooperate, Communicate, and Share Information with Other Law Enforcement Agencies. Law enforcement requires agencies to cooperate with each other. Wildlife law violators may also be involved in other criminal activities. Communication between law enforcement agencies both formally, in planned meetings and official associations, as well as informally, in the form of day-to-day contacts is critical. Utilization of various enforcement databases

including but not limited to National Crime Information Center, Colorado Crime Information Center, Violation Management System, Operation Game Thief, Wildlife Violator Compact allow agencies to share information in a secure manner that protects the citizen as well as the agencies and resources they protect. Since no POST academy offers any classes on wildlife law, the CDOW will continue to provide wildlife enforcement training to agencies as requested.

Wildlife Law Enforcement Budget

Each year, the Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW) performs a budgeting process that results in determining priorities, and each year the budget is built from zero. This process results in a budget that will and does change from year-to-year. Currently the law enforcement budget is about 3.2 million dollars. This represents about 3.5% of a total agency budget of about 95 million dollars. The CDOW's Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation Section can provide year-to-date budget and expenditure data for law enforcement programs.

There are seven programs directly related to law enforcement. These include law enforcement administration; field law enforcement; special investigations; forensic services; annual training of officers; basic training of new officers; and planning, research and evaluation.

The CDOW commissions 216 employees who work in a variety of types of jobs. Currently, there are 122 District Wildlife Managers (DWM) and 38 Wildlife Technicians who work for 18 Area Wildlife Manager (AWM) supervisors. The Law Enforcement Unit has 8 Criminal Investigators (including the Chief and Assistant Chief) that focus on law enforcement administration and special investigations. Additionally, 9 Administrators, 19 Wildlife and Habitat Biologists, and 2 Hatchery Technicians maintain law enforcement commissions and provide assistance to the agency's law enforcement effort. The majority of these "multipurpose" employees do a wide variety of jobs, including law enforcement.

The following table represents the actual expenditures (FY 1998-99) and current (FY 1999-20 and FY 2000-01) budgeted FTE and operating dollars allocated to law enforcement programs.

CDOW Law Enforcement Estimated Budgets*:

Law Enforcement Programs	FTE**			Operating		
	FY*** 98-99	FY 99-00	FY 00-01	FY 98-99***	FY 99-00	FY 00-01
Law Enforcement Administration	5.5	2.6	2.6	\$407,042	\$198,608	\$198,681
Field Law Enforcement	31.0	34.4	34.4	\$2,056,874	\$2,267,885	\$2,265,920
Special Investigations	3.6	2.0	2.0	\$299,940	\$218,749	\$218,156
Planning Research, Evaluation	.3	.4	.4	\$20,245	\$32,676	\$32,532
Forensics Services	.1	.2	.2	\$22,478	\$36,360	\$36,276
Annual Training of Officers	3.7	1.1	1.1	\$339,424	\$263,130	\$279,511
Basic Academy Training of New Officers	2.8	2.8	2.8	\$232,384	\$196,091	\$196,858
Total	47.0	43.5	43.5	\$3,378,387	\$3,213,499	\$3,227,934

Note: This table does not reflect an additional criminal investigator with associated operating budget allocated to the Law Enforcement Unit in January of 2000.

*Re-allocations and adjustments may occur after the printing of this paper and are meant to show budget at the time this was written. State budgets are developed on a fiscal year basis and run from July 1 to June 30th. The budgeting cycle for the next FY does not end until the end of June in most years. **FTE – Full Time Employee. These figures represent FTE equivalents of time spent by 216 multipurpose employees on law enforcement. ***Actual expenditures.

Budget figures provided by Steve Cassin, Senior Budget Analyst for the CDOW.

1990–1999 Wildlife Law Enforcement Violation Summary

The following tables show the number of wildlife law enforcement violations that were written over the last ten years. These tables reflect the total number of violations written by Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW) officers from 1990 through 1999.

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	TOTAL
Commercial Use –Table 1.3	4	5	2	1	17	1	2	1	1	0	34
Carcass Care-Table 1.4	101	93	93	85	119	76	92	83	70	120	932
Fair Chase-Table 1.5	133	171	151	123	116	79	72	77	30	35	987
Big Game-Table 1.6	775	678	562	525	589	389	479	389	382	269	5037
Small Game-Table 1.7	483	844	580	609	498	527	396	411	455	344	5177
Fishing-Table 1.8	668	547	650	476	561	431	441	412	508	347	5041
Licensing-Table 1.9	2972	2661	3027	2617	2635	2049	2444	1889	2268	2051	24433
Safety-Table 1.10	737	817	796	771	715	584	718	718	676	508	7040
Pvt. Prop. Trespass-Table 1.11	355	294	364	389	344	308	345	305	318	261	3283
Other Wildlife-Table 1.12	408	527	597	673	694	536	591	517	387	479	5409
TOTAL	6456	6637	6822	6269	6288	4980	5580	4832	5095	4414	57373

This table shows the actual number of written citations written in 10 major categories of violations. The table shown to the right of the each category indicates the table in “Colorado Division of Wildlife Statistical Report on Wildlife Violations, April 2000”. This report breaks out the actual wildlife charges that are summarized in this table. The “Colorado Division of Wildlife Statistical Report on Wildlife Violations, April 2000” is available from the Law Enforcement Unit at the Colorado Division of Wildlife.

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	AVG
Commercial Use	0.1	0.1			0.3						0.1
Carcass Care	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.9	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.4	2.7	1.6
Fair Chase	2.1	2.6	2.2	2.0	1.8	1.6	1.3	1.6	0.6	0.8	1.7
Big Game	12.0	10.2	8.2	8.4	9.4	7.8	8.6	8.0	7.5	6.1	8.8
Small Game	7.5	12.7	8.5	9.7	7.9	10.6	7.1	9.1	8.9	7.8	9.0
Fishing	10.3	8.2	9.5	7.6	8.9	8.6	7.9	8.5	10.0	7.9	8.8
Licensing	43.2	40.2	44.5	41.7	41.9	41.2	43.8	39.2	44.5	46.5	42.6
Safety	11.4	12.3	11.7	12.3	11.4	11.7	12.9	14.9	13.3	11.5	12.3
Pvt. Prop. Trespass	5.5	4.4	5.3	6.2	5.5	6.2	6.2	6.3	6.2	5.9	5.7
Other Wildlife	6.3	7.9	8.7	10.7	11.0	10.8	10.6	10.7	7.6	10.8	9.4
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

This table shows the percentage each category represents of all tickets written for a calendar year over the last ten years.

Major 1999 Investigations

Complete and thorough investigations send a strong message to those who would violate wildlife laws for their personal gain. The people of Colorado will not tolerate such activity and these types of crime are high priorities for the CDOW.

During 1999, CDOW officers closed a number of major investigations involving the willful destruction of wildlife, illegal outfitter activities, illegal take of multiple animals, and theft of licenses. A summary of some of the major investigations worked by our officers is provided to give you an idea of the types of wildlife crime that are investigated and prosecuted by the CDOW.

Illegal outfitting involves taking the best of Colorado’s wildlife and selling it illegally. One such illegal outfitter investigation involved officers from the CDOW, the Colorado Office of Outfitter Registration, the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, and the Pennsylvania Game Commission. The Colorado Outfitters Association provided \$1,000

from their funds to help fund the cost of investigation. The illegal outfitter was convicted of a Class 5 felony charge of illegal sale of wildlife and misdemeanor counts of illegal possession of a bear, hunting bear without a license, and the illegal transfer of a hunting license. He received three years supervised probation and paid \$10,000 in restitution for the cost of the investigation. This year five other illegal outfitter investigations were successfully completed with felony wildlife charges filed. Charges were filed or are pending against some of the suspects in Utah and New Mexico.

Another case, started in 1998, involved the wanton killing of our state's wildlife. Three men from the Craig area drove rural roads in Moffat and Routt counties shooting deer and antelope after dark. CDOW officers felt that perhaps hundreds of animals were wounded or killed by these poachers. All of the animals were shot and left. DWMs Mike Bauman, Chuck Woodward, Bill deVergie, Brad Petch, Mark Caddy and AWM Dan Prenzlöw spent over 300 hours working the investigation. With information received through Operation Game Thief and contacts through the CDOW's Law Enforcement Unit, DWM Bauman put together the case against the suspects. All three were charged with 34 Class 5 felony counts of willful destruction of big game. The 14th Judicial District Attorney's office in Craig prosecuted the case. The three suspects were convicted and received a combined total of two and one-half years in jail; 1,960 hours of community service; 22 years of supervised probation; \$43,226 in fines, costs, and \$4,000 restitution to the Colorado Operation Game Thief Reward Fund; and a court request that the Wildlife Commission assess a lifetime hunting suspension for each person.

An Operation Game Thief call was received that implicated some Colorado residents in the illegal take of antelope in Wyoming. The information was passed on to the Wyoming Game and Fish Department. Game Warden Rob Lebert of Douglas, WY worked with DWM Obe Lowry – (Brighton) on the case. Two people were charged and through a plea negotiation, the father plead guilty to the charges, was fined \$2,000, and received a five year hunting suspension as well as criminal probation. Charges against his son were dropped. The Wyoming Operation Game Thief program paid a reward for the information.

A case that began in 1996 involved allegations of hunting out of season, illegal possession of wildlife, sale of wildlife, arson, felony menacing, and a felon in possession of a firearm. Working with local field officers, a CDOW investigator, with assistance from the Colorado Bureau of Investigation and Pueblo County District Attorney's office obtained convictions for illegal possession of five bighorn sheep and Class 5 felony arson. The suspect was fined \$50,000 and placed in the county jail for one year. While out on parole the suspect was arrested for a new firearm possession violation.

Paul Jones, DWM – (Gunnison) completed a lengthy investigation that started in 1997 in cooperation with Operation Game Thief. Eight suspects were charged with the out of season killing of six elk, six antelope, three mule deer, and one bighorn sheep. The eight suspects pled guilty through plea bargaining with the Gunnison County District Attorney's office. Total fines were \$22,469, of which \$2,132 was donated to the Colorado Operation Game Thief Reward Fund. One suspect received a 90-day jail sentence.

Wildlife Law Enforcement Challenges

Illegal activities targeted against Colorado wildlife are crimes that usually have few witnesses. As a consequence, many wildlife violations go undetected and unreported, and are not prosecuted in Colorado. Detecting and deterring wildlife poaching requires public participation, and specialized training and efforts of wildlife officers. Our wildlife resources are rich and diverse and it is through the efforts of an interested and involved public in cooperation with wildlife officers that it remains so. The Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW) needs to make every effort to inform the public on these problems so that public can make informed decisions in relation to our efforts and become a part of protecting the state's wildlife resources.

The CDOW needs to ensure that wildlife law enforcement efforts reflect the priorities and needs of the agency and the public it serves. The CDOW needs to ensure that opportunities exist for interactions with the citizens of this state that allow for their participation in determining priorities for our enforcement efforts. Liaison with individuals, special interests, community leaders, and legislators will be a priority for those serving in a law enforcement capacity for this agency. Close working relationships with other local, state, and federal government agencies that have an interest in or impact wildlife enforcement needs will be maintained and developed.

Changing demographics creates conflicts between hunters and anglers recreating in places that have become urbanized and the residents now living in those areas. There is a high demand on law enforcement officers to resolve these conflicts when they do occur. The CDOW needs to educate the public about the need for lawful hunting and angling activities, as well as educate hunters and anglers concerning the sensitivity of some people toward these activities.

The CDOW finds itself having to do more with less. The demand for services is greater than the employee time available to meet that demand. Funding for CDOW and expansion in the near future does not appear to be feasible. Our wildlife agency has taken on a large number of tasks that include law enforcement, but law enforcement is just one of the important things that employees do for wildlife. Competition for resources and funding decisions is difficult when there is simply not enough resources to fund all the good things the CDOW could do. Law enforcement efforts must be oriented around planning, determining priorities, and once priorities are determined, there must be an agency commitment to meet those priorities through resource allocation.

Wildlife officers are some of the best-trained peace officers in this state. They often work in remote locations, contacting violators without immediate backup. Most of these contacts involve armed suspects who do not wish to be apprehended. The agency also serves in an assisting role whenever local law enforcement agencies call for backup. We need the public to understand and support our officers in the often-hazardous endeavor of protecting this state's wildlife resources.

The CDOW continues to face the realities of change, and needs to have the ability to recognize changing trends in the public's expectations for wildlife law enforcement. The public supports our efforts in law enforcement and views it as one of the most important things the agency does. This support comes from a public perception that we are out there protecting their wildlife, even as they go about their daily lives. It is critical that we always maintain this public trust and support.

Wildlife Law Enforcement Unit

Vision and Mission

The Legislative Declaration that provides direction for the Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW) as an agency states, *"It is the policy of the state of Colorado that the wildlife and their environment are to be protected, preserved, enhanced and managed for the use, benefit, and enjoyment of the people of this state and its visitors."* From this state statute, the CDOW developed the mission statement, *"To perpetuate the wildlife resources of the state and provide people the opportunity to enjoy them."*

The Law Enforcement Unit (LEU) as an organizational unit within the CDOW has developed a vision and mission statement in support of the Legislative Declaration and the CDOW's mission statement. The LEU vision is, *"The Colorado Division of Wildlife is the best wildlife enforcement agency in the nation"*. The mission of the LEU is, *"The Law Enforcement Unit will provide proactive leadership to ensure that the Colorado Division of Wildlife enforcement effort serves the public interest by protecting the wildlife resource in a professional and responsible manner"*.

Roles and Responsibilities

As determined by our vision and mission, the LEU's role within the CDOW is to:

- 1) Act as proponents for outstanding wildlife law enforcement efforts.
- 2) Investigate complex and commercial wildlife violations.
- 3) Support field law enforcement by uniformed officers.
- 4) Plan and evaluate wildlife law enforcement efforts.
- 5) Provide liaison and contact with the Department of Natural Resources; legislators; other CDOW staff; and other federal, state, and local agencies concerning issues relating to wildlife law enforcement.
- 6) Administer law enforcement records, files, etc.
- 7) Provide law enforcement information systems.
- 8) Provide educational programs on wildlife protection to youth, community groups, and other law enforcement agencies.

Description

As the oldest continuing section in the CDOW, the LEU provides the leadership and guidance that directs the agency's law enforcement efforts. CDOW law enforcement efforts are an essential public service as mandated by statute and public demand.

While small in size, the LEU is often the focal point for calls requesting information on statutes and regulations by not only our license buyers and employees, but also students, concerned citizens and other local, county, state, provincial, and federal governmental agencies. The Denver LEU office handles approximately 15,000 phone calls per year.

Currently staffed with ten employees, the LEU provides assistance on wildlife enforcement issues on a statewide, national and international basis. The Denver office is staffed with the Chief, Assistant Chief, one Field investigator and two Administrative

Assistants. Four Investigators are assigned to service centers in Ft. Collins, Montrose, Steamboat Springs and Monte Vista. Each of these investigators is responsible for special investigations for about 20% of the state and serves as the primary contact for four or more CDOW Areas in addition to their primary responsibilities for special investigations, officer training support and firearms maintenance. One other investigator has special emphasis on investigative systems and processes and is located in Montrose

The LEU provides staff support for legislative issues relating to law enforcement and development and testimony on new statutory law. The unit makes recommendations to staff and field personnel on law enforcement issues. Unit members also serve on various local, state and international wildlife enforcement boards. The LEU presents educational and informational programs on the agency's enforcement effort.

The LEU is responsible for coordinating all special investigations within Colorado with the emphasis on wildlife violations of a commercial nature, where wildlife is taken for profit or other gain. Recent investigations have concentrated on unregistered outfitters involved with the illegal take of big game, license fraud and other wildlife and criminal violations. The LEU reciprocates by providing officers for investigations in other states and provinces. Over the past few years, CDOW has worked cooperative investigations and provided technical assistance to wildlife enforcement with the states of Alaska, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Kansas, Montana, New Mexico, Texas, Utah, Wyoming, and Canadian wildlife agencies in the provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario, and the Northwest Territories, and the countries of Italy and Australia.

The LEU works with the county sheriffs and local police departments. The unit also works closely with the Colorado Office of Outfitter Registration, Colorado Department of Revenue and other state agencies as needed. The LEU has also worked with the Canadian Wildlife Service and the following federal agencies: Fish & Wildlife Service; Forest Service; Bureau of Land Management; Drug Enforcement Administration, Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms; Internal Revenue Service; Post Office; National Park Service; and the National Marine Fisheries.

The LEU is responsible for developing and maintaining data base files on all citations issued during the year and adding the information to the historical database going back to 1986. Over 60,000 records are currently available. The number of citations averages 5,000 per year. The LEU also tracks and disburses various documents needed by field officers such as citations, violation warning notices and duplicate carcass tag/licenses.

The LEU also serves as the coordination point between the Division and the Operation Game Thief (OGT) program, a not-for-profit corporation that has been in place since September, 1981 and which pays rewards for information leading to the issuance of a citation for wildlife violations. Currently about 20% of calls coming into our offices result in citations being issued. Rewards can range from \$100 to \$1000 depending on the severity of the violation and average about \$250. The reward fund is based on OGT fund raising efforts and sale of OGT related items.

The LEU also serves as a contact and liaison with various private outdoor and commercial wildlife industries including the Colorado Bowhunters Association, Colorado Outfitters Association, Colorado Wildlife Federation, Trout Unlimited, United Sportsmen

Council, Colorado Sportsman Wildlife Fund and other groups on law enforcement related questions.

Critical administrative functions of the unit include the collection of law enforcement data, criminal records accounting, and maintenance of Colorado Crime Information Center (CCIC) and National Crime Information Center (NCIC) contacts and terminals. Other administrative activities include administration of the Wildlife Violator Compact agreements.

The LEU writes law enforcement plans, establishes goals and desired outcomes in reference to enforcement efforts, and establishes performance indicators to measure enforcement efforts. The LEU provides law enforcement staff input into management of agency programs, and provides support for the administration of the law enforcement effort within the agency. The unit also develops proactive approaches to wildlife law enforcement and evaluates and implements innovative new methods in relation to wildlife law enforcement.

The unit provides law enforcement training to wildlife officers as well as to other agencies such as sheriff's office deputies and district attorney's office in relation to wildlife law enforcement. The LEU also acts as a liaison with these offices as well as other local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies, such as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The unit produces bulletins, guidance and interpretation of law, and reports concerning wildlife law enforcement. The unit also responds to legislative actions and requests, and provides answers and contacts for the public in relation to statewide programs and questions.

Current priorities of the LEU include outreach and liaison with various groups, special interests, legislators, and other decision-makers. As a part of this effort the LEU conducts periodic surveys, one of which was recently completed by Responsive Management (2000) that was designed to assess customer satisfactions, expectations, and needs concerning CDOW law enforcement efforts.

Several processes require that the LEU provide guidance to the agency in relation to law enforcement. For example, evaluation and revision of the agency's law enforcement procedures to reflect organizational change in structure and function from a recent management review process will be accomplished to reflect current structure and function. Also, changing interpretations of law by state and federal courts, as well as review by the Colorado Attorney's General Office, require an on-going review of policies to ensure appropriate law enforcement guidance and direction is provided to our wildlife law enforcement officers.

Coordination, cooperation, and integration of law enforcement perspectives in the development of regulations and other agency functions by various units within the agency is high priority for the LEU. Currently, efforts are underway to develop statewide law enforcement performance indicators and measures so that we can more accurately assess and report our law enforcement efforts to the public we serve. An orientation toward openness to change and continued improvement in performance is a primary goal of the LEU.

Operation Game Thief

The Colorado Operation Game Thief (OGT) program began in September 1981. It has been in continuous operation since that date. OGT is a registered not-for-profit corporation in the state of Colorado. All donations to the reward account are tax deductible by the contributor. The reward fund is used to pay rewards and any other OGT related expenses that will benefit the program. The current reward fund balance sits at just under \$85,000. OGT pays \$250 for the issuance of citations for illegal possession of big game and endangered species, and \$100 for all other wildlife violations. The OGT Board can boost the reward to \$1000 for violations that might merit a special reward.

The OGT program is run by a five-person civilian board. The board meets at least once a year to review the OGT operations. The day-to-day operations are handled through the Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW) Law Enforcement Unit. All calls are logged and categorized as either probable violations or as intelligence. Probable violations require the District Wildlife Manager (DWM) to respond with a case status within 30 days; intelligence reports do not require the 30-day response unless a case is made.

Any officer can take an OGT call, although most come through our OGT lines. One line (303) 295-0164 is for the Denver metro area and the second number (1-800-332-4155) is a statewide toll free line. The caller can remain anonymous and is assigned a unique identifier comprised of the officer badge number, a sequential case number and the year. The caller is also asked to supply a favorite number, color and date of birth that can be remembered. This additional information is used to determine that we are talking to the correct person. If the caller can not provide the appropriate answers, the call is terminated and OGT will not make a reward payment. Callers are asked if they want to remain anonymous. A small percentage will give their name at the initial call.

In Colorado, rewards are paid on the issuance of the citation. We do not require a conviction. As a general rule, we do not pay the reward unless the caller requests it. In limited cases, we have paid the reward after the fact when requested to do so by the District Wildlife Manager (DWM) who handled the case.

Glenn Smith is currently the OGT program administrator. He can be contacted by mail (2300 S. Townsend, Montrose, CO 81401), phone (970-252-6014) or e-mail (game.thief@state.co.us).

NOTE: This contribution is from Dave Croonquist, Assistant Chief of Law Enforcement who was instrumental in the development of the OGT program in Colorado, and until recently, has been the OGT program administrator since its inception in this state.

Wildlife Violator Compact

In the early 1980s, the law enforcement units of the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies discussed the concept of a Wildlife Violator Compact (WVC). The WVC is based on the format in use by a number of states for handling motor vehicle violations by visitors to other states. Wildlife and resource protection needed some additional teeth when dealing with individuals who move among the various states and are apprehended in violation of wildlife laws.

Public Law No. 293, H.R. 7353 was passed June 6, 1934 and re-codified May 24, 1949 as Title 4 USC Section 112. This law allows the states to enter into compacts for cooperation in prevention of crime. The section reads: *"The consent of Congress is hereby given to any two or more States to enter into agreements or compacts for cooperative efforts and mutual assistance in the prevention of crime and in the enforcement of their respective criminal laws and policies, and to establish such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements and compacts."* In 1989 Colorado, Nevada and Oregon were the first states to pass legislation setting up the WVC. Nine other states have joined the compact since that time.

In Colorado, the non-resident violator from a compact state can be handled in the same manner as a resident through a mail-in fine in most cases. The non-resident may still be arrested for violations that have jail time as a mandatory penalty, any felony violations, or any crimes that the arresting officer would deem serious enough to arrest a resident for. When a person has been suspended through the legal process in the state where the violation(s) occurred, the suspension is recognized by all of the member states of the WVC.

The WVC has proven to be a valuable tool for the field officer. Colorado officers have been issuing citations to non-residents from other member states. The WVC process is explained and, in most cases, the tickets have been paid. Those that haven't paid are contacted and advised that, unless the citation is taken care of, their home state privileges will be suspended. As an example, in 1999, Colorado received information that a person who was under a lifetime suspension in Montana had purchased a Colorado non-resident elk license. He was contacted, the WVC was explained, the license was seized, and a Colorado citation for hunting while under suspension was issued. The WVC members (CO, AZ, ID, MT, NV, OR, UT, WA, WY, MO, MD, and MN) encourage all of the other states to pass enabling legislation to join the WVC.

Details about the WVC can be obtained from Rob Buonamici, WVC Chair, Nevada Division of Wildlife, P.O. Box 10678, Reno, NV 89520. Electronic copies of the WVC are available.

Adapted from materials provided by the Assistant Chief of Law Enforcement, Dave Croonquist.

Selection and Training of Wildlife Law Enforcement Officers

Although there are a number of similarities and activities in common with other types of law enforcement, natural resource law enforcement has significant differences and requirements. In response to these differences and requirements a natural resource officer is selected and trained differently than what is expected of other law enforcement officers.

The goal of most law enforcement agencies is to hire an officer who has an interest in providing public safety through protecting people from people. A police department serves as a force in society to ensure compliance with laws. In contrast, natural resource officers are hired with an interest in serving as a liaison between the public and the resource. The natural resource officer's goal is to protect community, public property, such as wildlife, from abuses by individuals within the community.

In order to apply for a District Wildlife Manager (DWM) position with the Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW), an applicant must have a baccalaureate degree or higher in wildlife biology, fishery biology, natural resource management, or some closely related field. An applicant may also qualify for the examination process by substituting years of experience for the degree. The science based degree requirement eliminates many individuals who are predisposed to becoming single purpose law enforcement officers.

To assist in selecting candidates who possess strong biological, communication, and interpersonal skills, the CDOW uses a multiphase assessment center to screen potential applicants for the DWM position. This testing process assesses an applicant's skills in these areas, rather than testing for an applicant's knowledge in law enforcement. During the first phase of the hiring process, with the exception of a law enforcement job suitability assessment and psychological evaluations, the assessment center does not evaluate an applicant's knowledge of law enforcement techniques. It is the desire of the CDOW to hire applicants with a strong biological background, outstanding communication abilities, excellent interpersonal skills, and a willingness to learn and perform a customer service approach to effecting law enforcement.

Once hired, the DWM attends a basic Colorado Peace Officer Standard Training (POST) certified police-training academy that is required of other Colorado law enforcement officers. The 650-hour curriculum includes courses in administration of justice, basic law, community interaction, patrol procedures, traffic enforcement, investigative procedures, communications, and all subjects mandated by the POST Board for all police officers in Colorado.

Upon successful completion of the basic POST academy and certification as a Colorado Peace Officer, DWMs receive a significant amount of additional training in the CDOW Academy prior to being assigned to a CDOW district. Those courses include an additional 150 hours in customer service, community relations, officer and violator relationships, ethics, conflict management, etc. New wildlife officers also receive a considerable number of hours in law enforcement training specific to resource enforcement. Upon completion of these courses, new DWMs must complete approximately 400 hours of on-the-job training with veteran wildlife managers. DWMs who successfully complete the Field Training Officer (FTO) program then return to the classroom for a myriad of biological course work. During their training in the CDOW

Academy new officers are trained in the manner in which they are to perform the law enforcement part of their job in relation to customer service.

Officers are reminded of the federal statistics that show a natural resource officer has nine times the chance of getting killed or injured in the line of duty than other law enforcement officers. With the inherent risk of being a natural resource officer, DWMs are encouraged to resolve conflicts using their interpersonal skills rather than resorting to using force. This emphasis in conflict resolution has been beneficial to the agency. To date, no CDOW officer has ever been accused of using excessive force or resorting to the use of deadly force to effect an arrest for a wildlife-related crime.

From the time a new DWM starts employment until the date of district assignment, the officer has received ten months of intensive training. However, this intensive training does not come to an end once an officer is assigned to a CDOW district.

Every CDOW commissioned officer is required to attend about 40 hours of in-service training annually. This training includes firearms, arrest control and baton practices and proficiency qualifications, first aid and/or CPR, physical fitness certification as required and legal updates. In addition to the law enforcement courses required for every CDOW commissioned officer, all CDOW employees receive on-going training as required in customer service, supervisory training, policies and procedures, performance management and any other course deemed necessary by the CDOW Leadership Team or section and region managers.

NOTE: Adapted from materials provided by Gary Berlin, Human Resource Manager for the Colorado Division of Wildlife.

The Job of a Wildlife Law Enforcement Officer

Perhaps the most frequent and best known activity of a wildlife officer is that of contacting our customers. Hunters, anglers, and other wildlife recreationists traditionally enjoy being contacted by the local wildlife officer. Who better to talk to about hunting, fishing, and other forms of wildlife recreation than the local expert on wildlife in the area? Law abiding citizens also expect and deserve enforcement of laws concerning licensing, manner of take, and bag limits. After all, it is the law, which allows for the fair and equitable distribution of opportunity and it is the wildlife officer who ensures that these laws are followed.

Wildlife officers respond to violations and other complaints concerning wildlife. Wildlife officers receive calls at all hours of the day and night from citizens who wish to report wildlife violations. People can call the local Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW) office during normal working hours. After hours, calls can be dispatched through the Colorado State Patrol dispatch centers, sheriff's offices, or made to Operation Game Thief phone system.

Wildlife officers also perform planned law enforcement activities. They are active day and night protecting wildlife through patrols, aerial operations, decoys, and check stations. Investigations into wildlife violations (known or suspected) are also performed in response to information provided by the public, computer research, and information received from other law enforcement agencies.

Certain violations require specialized investigations. These include investigating complaints against illegal outfitters, environmental violations, and poisoning cases. Wildlife officers are also responsible for inspecting commercial and private parks and lakes, as well as falconry facilities when application is made for these types of specialized licenses.

Wildlife officers meet and exceed the Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) certification requirements for peace officer certification in the state of Colorado. These officers have the authority to write affidavits and serve search and arrest warrants. They are fully trained in protecting the rights of citizens, processing evidence, investigating criminal cases, and testifying in court. Assisting other officers as the need arises and providing backup for local police and sheriff's officers is a critical need in the law enforcement community. Each wildlife officer is also commissioned as a Deputy Game Warden for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and works closely with federal officers on violations concerning joint jurisdictions.

In Colorado our wildlife officers are known as "multipurpose" employees and serve their communities in many ways other than as an enforcement officer. Wildlife officers manage state wildlife areas, provide wildlife education programs to schools, comment as biologists on land use in local county planning arenas, provide guidance on land and water reclamation efforts, respond to calls concerning wildlife-people conflicts, and manage wildlife populations. The list goes on. In Colorado, wildlife officers are involved in almost every aspect of wildlife management and have provided an essential public service to their communities and the wildlife resource for over 100 years.

History of Wildlife Law Enforcement in Colorado

Colorado citizens have a history of caring about their wildlife. The Colorado Territorial Assembly provided for the protection of the wildlife resource prior to Colorado becoming a state in 1876. The first law concerning wildlife was passed in 1861 and stated, *“it is unlawful to take trout by seine, net, basket or trap”*.

This continued interest and concern resulted in the passage of several laws such as the Preserve Game Act, The Fish Law of 1870, The Game Law of 1870, and The Fish Propagation Act. These laws provided for protection of fish, small game, waterfowl, big game and other wildlife, such as woodpeckers, orioles, swallows and larks. Activities associated with illegal buying, selling, trapping, snaring, killing and possession of wildlife were addressed prior to Colorado becoming a state. Fines ranged from \$5 to \$300, and in some cases, included jail time until the fine was paid. Fines were split in various ways between the citizens who reported violations, schools, and counties.

In 1876 the First State Legislature convened and in its “General Laws” provided for the protection of trout through fines and imprisonment for violations. The state’s first attempt at providing for wildlife protection was in the form of a “Fish Commissioner” who was hired to protect that resource through scientific management and production, as well as protection.

In 1881 the Fish Commissioner was granted the power to appoint deputy commissioners to enforce fish laws, but could not pay them. Although fourteen such deputy commissioners were appointed in 1882, and they did collect \$123 in fines, it was evident that the wildlife resource continued to be at risk from lack of enforcement of the laws. In 1891, the Fish Commissioner became the State Game and Fish Warden and was given the authority to appoint four district game and fish wardens with two deputies each. These were paid positions and wildlife enforcement as a profession in Colorado had begun. By 1894 there were three salaried deputy wardens and the results were evident as reported in the 1893-95 biennial report to the Colorado Governor; *“Investigation of 285 reported violations; arrest of 104 persons, 78 convictions. Fines of from \$250 to \$300 and in some cases imprisonment with one term of 90 days.”* By 1900, there were five district game and fish wardens.

Colorado’s citizens continued their interest in protecting their resource into the 1900s through licensing and fine structures. The following tables compare what license fees and fines were passed by the Colorado Legislature 1903 and what they are today:

Licenses*:	1903	2000
Nonresident general hunting	\$25	\$40
Nonresident, 1 day bird hunting	\$2	\$5
Resident hunting	\$1	\$10
Guide license**	\$5	\$1000
Taxidermy	\$25	None
Importer’s license	\$50	\$50

*License types from 1903 legislation matched as closely as possible with wider variety of license types today. **Office of Outfitter Registration is the licensing agency for this type of license.

Fines*:	1903	2000
Elk	\$200	\$700
Deer	\$50	\$500
Antelope	\$100	\$500
Mountain sheep	\$200	\$1000
Buffalo	\$1000	Private
Beaver	\$25	\$50
Birds	\$10	\$50
Fish	\$1	\$35

*Fines as established in 1903 as compared to illegal possession fines in 2000, which also does not include 37% charge assessed against all penalty assessments today.

By 1903, the proud tradition of what it takes to be a wildlife law enforcement officer had begun. The state was large, poachers were tough, and the cadre of officers too small. To be a warden, then as today, took someone that had a strong commitment to the resource, had the courage to pursue poachers through all kinds of weather and terrain, and could work alone through all of it. In a 1913-1914 biennial report to the Governor, a warden was described as someone who, *"must have tact, know trial and court procedure, how to handle men, ride and drive horses, and have a strong physical constitution; men who take no cognizance of the time of day or night or weather conditions."*

The tenacity, strength of character, and willingness to go beyond what is required describes the men and women of today's wildlife agency just as accurately. The type of person who pursues a career in wildlife law enforcement probably has not changed, however the challenges certainly have. The game warden at the turn of the century would probably have difficulty recognizing the Colorado we live in today with its four million residents, four-wheel drive trucks, all terrain vehicles, global positioning systems, and all the other advancements and challenges a wildlife officer faces today.

(NOTE: The background source for this introduction to the history of wildlife law enforcement comes from "Colorado's Wildlife Story", written by Pete Barrows and Judith Holmes published in 1990. It is available from the Colorado Division of Wildlife and is critical to understanding the development of wildlife management in Colorado.)

Colorado Division of Wildlife
Statistical Report on Wildlife Violations
April 2000

Report by John Bredehoft, Chief of Law Enforcement and Glenn Smith, Criminal Investigator
Tables prepared by Janet Green, Programmer, Montrose Colorado.

Index

Page	Table
2	Index
3	Table 1.1, 1990-1999 VIOLATIONS GROUPED BY MAJOR CATEGORY
3	Table 1.2, 1990-1999 PERCENT BY MAJOR CATEGORY/CALENDAR YEAR
3	Table 1.3, 1990-1999 - COMMERCIAL USE
3	Table 1.4, 1990-1999 - CARCASS CARE
3	Table 1.5, 1990-1999 - FAIR CHASE
4	Table 1.6, 1990-1999 - BIG GAME - (Does not include License Violations)
4	Table 1.7, 1990-1999 - SMALL GAME - (Does not include License Violations)
4	Table 1.8, 1990-1999 - FISHING - (Does not include License Violations)
5	Table 1.9, 1990-1999 - LICENSING
5	TABLE 1.10, 1990-1999 - SAFETY
6	TABLE 1.11, 1990-1999 - PRIVATE PROPERTY TRESPASS
7	TABLE 1.12, 1990-1999 - OTHER WILDLIFE VIOLATIONS
7	Table 1.13, 1990-1999 - COMPLETE LISTING OF ALL VIOLATIONS BY FREQUENCY
9	Table 2.1, 1990-1999 – VIOLATIONS BY COUNTY
10	Table 3.1- 1990-1999 NON-RESIDENT (NR) AND RESIDENT (R) VIOLATION COMPARISONS
10	Table 3.2- 1990-1999 PERCENTAGE COMPARISONS BETWEEN NON-RESIDENT (NR) & RESIDENT (R) VIOLATIONS
10	Table 3.3- 1999 RESIDENT-SPECIFIC LICENSES BY CATEGORY, SALES & PERCENT
10	Table 3.4- 1999 TOP 20 VIOLATIONS (BIG GAME AND FISHING).
11	Table 4.1, 1990-1999 – CASE DISPOSITION SUMMARY
11	Table 4.2, 1990-1999 – CASE DISPOSITION SUMMARY BY PERCENT
11	Table 4.3, 1999 CASE DISPOSITION BY COUNTY
13	Table 4.4 1999 CASE DISPOSITION BY COUNTY BY PERCENT (%)
14	Table 5.0 1998/1999 CHECKSTATION AND DECOY EFFORTS
14	Table 6.0 1999 OPERATION GAME THIEF

Table 1.1, 1990-1999 VIOLATIONS GROUPED BY MAJOR CATEGORY*

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	TOTAL
Commercial Use -Table 1.3	4	5	2	1	17	1	2	1	1	0	34
Carcass Care-Table 1.4	101	93	93	85	119	76	92	83	70	120	932
Fair Chase-Table 1.5	133	171	151	123	116	79	72	77	30	35	987
Big Game-Table 1.6	775	678	562	525	589	389	479	389	382	269	5037
Small Game-Table 1.7	483	844	580	609	498	527	396	411	455	344	5177
Fishing-Table 1.8	668	547	650	476	561	431	441	412	508	347	5041
Licensing-Table 1.9	2972	2661	3027	2617	2635	2049	2444	1889	2268	2051	24433
Safety-Table 1.10	737	817	796	771	715	584	718	718	676	508	7040
Pvt. Prop. Trespass-Table 1.11	355	294	364	389	344	308	345	305	318	261	3283
Other Wildlife-Table 1.12	408	527	597	673	694	536	591	517	387	479	5409
Total	6456	6637	6822	6269	6288	4980	5580	4832	5095	4414	57373

*These codes have been arranged into major categories of violations. Violations that are a part of each major category can be found in the tables listed next to the category name.

Table 1.2, 1990-1999 PERCENT BY MAJOR CATEGORY/CALENDAR YEAR

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	AVG
Commercial Use	0.1	0.1			0.3						0.1
Carcass Care	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.9	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.4	2.7	1.6
Fair Chase	2.1	2.6	2.2	2.0	1.8	1.6	1.3	1.6	0.6	0.8	1.7
Big Game	12.0	10.2	8.2	8.4	9.4	7.8	8.6	8.0	7.5	6.1	8.8
Small Game	7.5	12.7	8.5	9.7	7.9	10.6	7.1	9.1	8.9	7.8	9.0
Fishing	10.3	8.2	9.5	7.6	8.9	8.6	7.9	8.5	10.0	7.9	8.8
Licensing	43.2	40.2	44.5	41.7	41.9	41.2	43.8	39.2	44.5	46.5	42.6
Safety	11.4	12.3	11.7	12.3	11.4	11.7	12.9	14.9	13.3	11.5	12.3
Pvt. Prop. Trespass	5.5	4.4	5.3	6.2	5.5	6.2	6.2	6.3	6.2	5.9	5.7
Other Wildlife	6.3	7.9	8.7	10.7	11.0	10.8	10.6	10.7	7.6	10.8	9.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 1.3, 1990-1999 - COMMERCIAL USE

VIOLATION	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
SALE OF WILDLIFE - FELONY	0	2	0	0	10	1	1	1	1	0	16
SALE OF WILDLIFE - MISDEMEANOR	4	3	2	1	7	0	1	0	0	0	18
Total	4	5	2	1	17	1	2	1	1	0	34

Table 1.4, 1990-1999 - CARCASS CARE

VIOLATION	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
WASTE OF FISH	1	5	0	4	1	2	0	1	4	0	18
WASTE OF GAME MEAT	99	83	84	78	107	67	74	75	58	111	836
WILLFUL DESTRUCTION OF WILDLIFE	1	5	9	3	11	7	18	7	8	9	78
Total	101	93	93	85	119	76	92	83	70	120	932

Table 1.5, 1990-1999 - FAIR CHASE

VIOLATION	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
UNLAWFUL USE OF AIRCRAFT AS HUNT/FISH AID	1	1	3	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	13
UNLAWFUL USE OF ARTIFICIAL LIGHT	88	117	89	88	66	46	33	41	21	12	601
UNLAWFUL USE OF MOTOR VEH TO HUNT/HARASS	44	53	59	34	47	29	39	36	9	23	373
Total	133	171	151	123	116	79	72	77	30	35	987

Table 1.6, 1990-1999 - BIG GAME - (Does not include License Violations)

VIOLATION	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
ANTELOPE - ACCIDENTAL KILL	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	2	0	2	10
ANTELOPE-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	19	17	34	34	26	24	18	20	20	15	227
ANTLER POINT VIOLATION - DEER	75	114	15	8	11	10	38	9	11	5	29
ANTLER POINT VIOLATION - ELK	57	62	55	34	52	18	41	43	46	28	436
BEAR - ACCIDENTAL KILL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	6
BEAR-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	19	9	13	25	7	7	13	14	11	11	129
DEER - ACCIDENTAL KILL	0	0	0	0	13	22	0	5	3	1	44
DEER-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	318	257	199	179	198	124	151	104	87	60	1677
ELK - ACCIDENTAL KILL	0	0	0	0	32	34	4	18	9	4	101
ELK-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	275	201	228	226	234	133	204	162	175	133	1971
MOOSE-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	4	2	5	3	4	3	2	3	13	3	42
MOUNTAIN GOAT-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	5
MOUNTAIN LION-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	5	14	1	14	6	6	5	4	3	2	60
SHEEP-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	3	2	11	2	4	2	3	3	2	1	33
Total	775	678	562	525	589	389	479	389	382	269	5037

Table 1.7, 1990-1999 - SMALL GAME - (Does not include License Violations)

VIOLATION	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
FAILURE TO LEAVE EVIDENCE OF SEX	124	448	143	199	124	89	88	95	113	95	1518
FAILURE TO LEAVE EVIDENCE OF SPECIES	2	7	8	5	6	1	2	0	9	1	41
FURBEARER-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	3	3	0	3	1	2	7	4	5	4	32
HUNTING BEFORE/AFTER LEGAL HOURS	52	75	64	56	64	67	57	56	91	50	632
HUNTING DURING A CLOSED SEASON	98	84	88	91	61	89	82	90	65	73	821
HUNTING IN A CLOSED AREA	63	51	97	83	86	85	46	77	50	24	662
LEAD SHOT IN STEEL SHOT ZONE	52	78	38	58	74	95	32	50	51	21	549
SMALLGAME-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	49	59	61	50	38	34	25	33	32	58	439
TRAPPING DURING A CLOSED SEASON	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
TRAPPING WITHOUT A PROPER/VALID LICENSE	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	1	6
TURKEY-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	10	4	7	16	2	9	5	8	3	5	69
WATERFOWL-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	30	35	73	47	42	55	49	28	36	12	407
Total	483	844	580	609	498	527	396	441	455	344	5177

Table 1.8, 1990-1999 - FISHING - (Does not include License Violations)

VIOLATION	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
FISH-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	395	326	406	309	316	248	273	223	267	205	2968
FISHING BEFORE/AFTER LEGAL HOURS	6	1	6	1	2	1	4	0	4	1	26
FISHING DURING A CLOSED SEASON	4	2	7	2	1	2	1	7	5	3	34
FISHING IN A CLOSED AREA	10	11	11	15	19	13	15	11	30	10	145
FISHING W/MORE THAN LEGAL NUMBER OF HOOKS	4	0	2	0	1	1	5	0	1	0	14
FISHING W/MORE THAN LEGAL NUMBER OF LINES	10	29	24	25	34	32	14	25	38	43	274
FISHING WITH BAIT IN FLY/LURE ONLY WATER	182	131	137	96	143	78	102	112	120	64	1165
UNATTENDED POLE/LINES	29	17	27	18	35	33	17	21	32	11	240
UNLAWFUL BAIT OF FISH (CHUMMING)	15	21	22	5	6	20	9	7	8	10	123
UNLAWFUL DEVICE-FISHING	13	9	8	5	4	3	1	6	3	0	52
Total	668	547	650	476	561	431	441	412	508	347	5041

Table 1.9, 1990-1999 - LICENSING

VIOLATION	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
ALTERATION OF A LICENSE	4	10	5	3	12	9	14	5	9	3	74
APPLYING FOR LICENSE WHILE UNDER SUSPENSION	0	1	1	2	3	0	4	4	3	0	18
APPLYING FOR MULTIPLE LICENSES	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	13
CONSERVATION-LICENSE-STAMP	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	3
FAILURE TO CARRY LICENSE AS REQUIRED	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	0	9
FAILURE TO DISPLAY LICENSE AS REQUIRED	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
FAILURE TO OBTAIN ROADKILL PERMIT	3	0	1	1	1	5	2	1	0	2	16
FAILURE TO TAG	189	188	196	206	168	112	131	150	168	136	1644
FALSE STATEMENT MADE IN PURCHASE OF LICENSE	204	236	171	159	151	93	129	90	62	43	1338
FALSE STATEMENT MADE-ACQUIRING A PERMIT	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	8	1	17
FISH WITHOUT A PROPER/VALID LICENSE	1782	1522	1934	1600	1658	1347	1434	1097	1309	1228	14911
FISHING WHILE UNDER SUSPENSION	1	2	0	1	2	2	0	4	1	0	13
HUNTING WHILE UNDER SUSPENSION	2	0	4	2	0	0	2	3	0	1	14
HUNTING WITHOUT A PROPER/VALID LICENSE	324	358	411	364	353	269	325	287	313	245	3249
LICENSE VIOLATION - MISCELLANEOUS	0	1	2	0	2	3	145	25	140	167	485
NO MIGRATORY WATERFOWL STAMP	53	79	38	52	57	50	28	32	32	21	442
NO PARKS PASS	2	4	3	4	0	2	19	22	17	31	104
OUTFITTING WITHOUT REQUIRED REGISTRATION	0	0	1	1	14	1	1	2	4	1	25
PURCHASING MULTIPLE LICENSES	12	13	24	21	26	18	13	17	11	6	161
SECOND ROD STAMP VIOLATION	107	129	130	99	118	83	136	84	86	92	1064
UNLAWFUL TRANSFER OF A LICENSE/PERMIT	98	113	93	98	60	48	45	50	52	59	716
UNREGISTERED/UNNUMBERED	11	2	11	4	9	4	7	8	47	12	115
Total	2792	2661	3027	2617	2635	2049	2444	1889	2268	2051	24433

TABLE 1.10, 1990-1999 - SAFETY

VIOLATION	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
CARELESS OPERATION OF A MOTORBOAT	7	8	8	2	0	5	29	9	19	13	100
CARELESS OPERATION OF A SNOWMOBILE	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3
CARELESS OPERATION OF MOTORVEHICLE	3	0	0	1	5	1	4	5	24	4	47
FAILURE TO WEAR DAYLIGHT FLUORESCENT ORANGE	105	128	120	128	119	98	114	110	91	77	1090
HUNTING IN CARELESS/RECKLESS/NEGLIG MANNER	19	22	15	16	15	10	18	9	6	7	137
HUNTING UNDER THE INFLUENCE DRUGS/ALCOHOL	0	1	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	10
HUNTING WITHOUT AN ADULT	10	9	10	4	7	6		3	6	3	58
LOADED FIREARM	365	379	387	378	380	302	305	350	304	271	3421
NO HUNTER SAFETY CARD	6	16	23	9	7	8	4	11	2	10	96
OPERATING A VESSEL W/O PROPER SAFETY EQUIP	13	14	20	12	19	16	30	29	37	29	219
SAFETY-MISCELLANEOUS	9	14	8	7	1	5	2	4	1	1	52
SHOOTING FROM A MOTOR VEHICLE	1	0	0	1	1	2	19	7	25	19	75
SHOOTING FROM A PUBLIC ROAD	198	216	196	205	159	127	180	177	154	67	1679
SWIMMING IN UNDESIGNATED AREA	1	10	6	8	2	4	10	3	5	4	53
Total	737	817	796	771	715	584	718	718	676	508	7040

TABLE 1.11, 1990-1999 - PRIVATE PROPERTY TRESPASS

VIOLATION	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
CRIMINAL TRESPASS	17	25	37	45	18	45	12	22	27	39	287
FISHING W/O PERMISSION ON PRIVATE PROPERTY	19	16	44	21	16	14	47	26	18	19	240
HUNTING W/O PERMISSION ON PRIVATE PROPERTY	319	253	283	322	308	249	286	256	273	203	2752
TRAPPING W/O PERMISSION ON PRIVATE PROPERTY	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	4
Total	355	294	364	389	344	308	345	305	318	261	3283

TABLE 1.12, 1990-1999 - OTHER WILDLIFE VIOLATIONS

VIOLATION	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
ALLOWING DOG TO CHASE/HARASS WILDLIFE	28	37	46	59	43	53	60	56	58	37	477
CAMPING IN AN UNDESIGNATED AREA	1	5	9	5	13	1	7	9	14	2	66
CDOW PROPERTY REGULATION VIOLATION	0	0	0	0	0	4	26	45	24	46	145
CONSERVATION-BIRDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
CONSERVATION-ENVIRONMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
CONSERVATION-FISH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
DRUGS, POSSESSION	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	6	19
EXCEEDING ESTABLISHED BAG LIMIT	0	0	0	0	9	0	1	2	0	0	12
EXOTIC WILDLIFE-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5
FAILURE TO APPEAR	5	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	11
FIRE BUILT IN RESTRICTED/PROHIBITED AREA	1	4	0	0	2	4	20	2	10	3	46
LITTERING	45	22	51	31	40	26	22	19	28	15	299
MISCELLANEOUS-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	0	0	0	0	7	0	8	12	10	2	39
MOTOR VEH/VESSEL OUTSIDE DESIGNATED AREA	61	84	35	71	85	41	64	53	35	64	593
NONGAME-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	16	10	17	12	11	23	9	5	4	4	111
PARKS-MISCELLANEOUS	1	3	3	0	1	0	10	21	0	17	56
RAPTOR-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	4	14	13	17	15	7	7	3	7	6	93
UNATTENDED CAMPFIRE	0	1	2	5	0	3	0	0	0	1	12
UNLAWFUL BAITING OF WILDLIFE	7	14	10	6	8	9	4	4	6	6	74
UNLAWFUL DEVICE-WILDLIFE	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	4	2	5	14
UNLAWFUL METHODS OR PROCEDURES-MISC	118	228	297	403	361	267	311	196	114	166	2461
UNLAWFUL WEAPON	121	101	109	63	95	96	41	81	60	97	864
WEAPONS OFFENSE - ALTERED SERIAL NUMBER	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
Total	408	527	597	673	694	536	591	517	387	479	5409

Table 1.13, 1990-1999 - COMPLETE LISTING OF ALL VIOLATIONS BY FREQUENCY

VIOLATION	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
FISH WITHOUT A PROPER/VALID LICENSE	1782	1522	1934	1600	1658	1347	1434	1097	1309	1228	14911
LOADED FIREARM	365	379	387	378	380	302	305	350	304	271	3421
HUNTING WITHOUT A PROPER/VALID LICENSE	324	358	411	364	353	269	325	287	313	245	3249
FISH-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	395	326	406	309	316	248	273	223	267	205	2968
HUNTING W/O PERMISSION ON PRIVATE PROPERTY	319	253	283	322	308	249	286	256	273	203	2752
UNLAWFUL METHODS OR PROCEDURES-MISC	118	228	297	403	361	267	311	196	114	166	2461
ELK-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	275	201	228	226	234	133	204	162	175	133	1971
SHOOTING FROM A PUBLIC ROAD	198	216	196	205	159	127	180	177	154	67	1679
DEER-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	318	257	199	179	198	124	151	104	87	60	1677
FAILURE TO TAG	189	188	196	206	168	112	131	150	168	136	1644
FAILURE TO LEAVE EVIDENCE OF SEX	124	448	143	199	124	89	88	95	113	95	1518
FALSE STATEMENT MADE IN PURCHASE OF LICENSE	204	236	171	159	151	93	129	90	62	43	1338
FISHING WITH BAIT IN FLY/LURE ONLY WATER	182	131	137	96	143	78	102	112	120	64	1165

VIOLATION	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
FAILURE TO WEAR DAYLIGHT FLUORESCENT ORANGE	105	128	120	128	119	98	114	110	91	77	1090
SECOND ROD STAMP VIOLATION	107	129	130	99	118	83	136	84	86	92	1064
UNLAWFUL WEAPON	121	101	109	63	95	96	41	81	60	97	864
WASTE OF GAME MEAT	99	83	84	78	107	67	74	75	58	111	836
HUNTING DURING A CLOSED SEASON	98	84	88	91	61	89	82	90	65	73	821
UNLAWFUL TRANSFER OF A LICENSE/PERMIT	98	113	93	98	60	48	45	50	52	59	716
HUNTING IN A CLOSED AREA	63	51	97	83	86	85	46	77	50	24	662
HUNTING BEFORE/AFTER LEGAL HOURS	52	75	64	56	64	67	57	56	91	50	632
UNLAWFUL USE OF ARTIFICIAL LIGHT	88	117	89	88	66	46	33	41	21	12	601
MOTOR VEH/VESSEL OUTSIDE DESIGNATED AREA	61	84	35	71	85	41	64	53	35	64	593
LEAD SHOT IN STEEL SHOT ZONE	52	78	38	58	74	95	32	50	51	21	549
LICENSE VIOLATION - MISCELLANEOUS	0	1	2	0	2	3	145	25	140	167	485
ALLOWING DOG TO CHASE/HARASS WILDLIFE	28	37	46	59	43	53	60	56	58	37	477
NO MIGRATORY WATERFOWL STAMP	53	79	38	52	57	50	28	32	32	21	442
SMALLGAME-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	49	59	61	50	38	34	25	33	32	58	439
ANTLER POINT VIOLATION - ELK	57	62	55	34	52	18	41	43	46	28	436
WATERFOWL-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	30	35	73	47	42	55	49	28	36	12	407
UNLAWFUL USE OF MOTOR VEH TO HUNT/HARASS	44	53	59	34	47	29	39	36	9	23	373
LITTERING	45	22	51	31	40	26	22	19	28	15	299
ANTLER POINT VIOLATION - DEER	75	114	15	8	11	10	38	9	11	5	296
CRIMINAL TRESPASS	17	25	37	45	18	45	12	22	27	39	287
FISHING W/MORE THAN LEGAL NUMBER OF LINES	10	29	24	25	34	32	14	25	38	43	274
UNATTENDED POLE/LINES	29	17	27	18	35	33	17	21	32	11	240
FISHING W/O PERMISSION ON PRIVATE PROPERTY	19	16	44	21	16	14	47	26	18	19	240
ANTELOPE-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	19	17	34	34	26	24	18	20	20	15	227
OPERATING A VESSEL W/O PROPER SAFETY EQUIP	13	14	20	12	19	16	30	29	37	29	219
PURCHASING MULTIPLE LICENSES	12	13	24	21	26	18	13	17	11	6	161
CDOW PROPERTY REGULATION VIOLATION	0	0	0	0	0	4	26	45	24	46	145
FISHING IN A CLOSED AREA	10	11	11	15	19	13	15	11	30	10	145
HUNTING IN CARELESS/RECKLESS/NEGLIG MANNER	19	22	15	16	15	10	18	9	6	7	137
BEAR-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	19	9	13	25	7	7	13	14	11	11	129
UNLAWFUL BAIT OF FISH (CHUMMING)	15	21	22	5	6	20	9	7	8	10	123
UNREGISTERED/UNNUMBERED	11	2	11	4	9	4	7	8	47	12	115
NONGAME-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	16	10	17	12	11	23	9	5	4	4	111
NO PARKS PASS	2	4	3	4	0	2	19	22	17	31	104
ELK - ACCIDENTAL KILL	0	0	0	0	32	34	4	18	9	4	101
CARELESS OPERATION OF A MOTORBOAT	7	8	8	2	0	5	29	9	19	13	100
NO HUNTER SAFETY CARD	6	16	23	9	7	8	4	11	2	10	96
RAPTOR-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	4	14	13	17	15	7	7	3	7	6	93
WILLFUL DESTRUCTION OF WILDLIFE	1	5	9	3	11	7	18	7	8	9	78
SHOOTING FROM A MOTOR VEHICLE	1	0	0	1	1	2	19	7	25	19	75
ALTERATION OF A LICENSE	4	10	5	3	12	9	14	5	9	3	74
UNLAWFUL BAITING OF WILDLIFE	7	14	10	6	8	9	4	4	6	6	74
TURKEY-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	10	4	7	16	2	9	5	8	3	5	69
CAMPING IN AN UNDESIGNATED AREA	1	5	9	5	13	1	7	9	14	2	66
MOUNTAIN LION-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	5	14	1	14	6	6	5	4	3	2	60
HUNTING WITHOUT AN ADULT	10	9	10	4	7	6	0	3	6	3	58
PARKS-MISCELLANEOUS	1	3	3	0	1	0	10	21	0	17	56
SWIMMING IN UNDESIGNATED AREA	1	10	6	8	2	4	10	3	5	4	53
SAFETY-MISCELLANEOUS	9	14	8	7	1	5	2	4	1	1	52
UNLAWFUL DEVICE-FISHING	13	9	8	5	4	3	1	6	3	0	52
CARELESS OPERATION OF MOTORVEHICLE	3	0	0	1	5	1	4	5	24	4	47
FIRE BUILT IN RESTRICTED/PROHIBITED AREA	1	4	0	0	2	4	20	2	10	3	46
DEER - ACCIDENTAL KILL	0	0	0	0	13	22	0	5	3	1	44

VIOLATION	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
MOOSE-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	4	2	5	3	4	3	2	3	13	3	42
FAILURE TO LEAVE EVIDENCE OF SPECIES	2	7	8	5	6	1	2	0	9	1	41
MISCELLANEOUS-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	0	0	0	0	7	0	8	12	10	2	39
FISHING DURING A CLOSED SEASON	4	2	7	2	1	2	1	7	5	3	34
SHEEP-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	3	2	11	2	4	2	3	3	2	1	33
FURBEARER-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	3	3	0	3	1	2	7	4	5	4	32
FISHING BEFORE/AFTER LEGAL HOURS	6	1	6	1	2	1	4	0	4	1	26
OUTFITTING WITHOUT REQUIRED REGISTRATION	0	0	1	1	14	1	1	2	4	1	25
DRUGS, POSSESSION	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	6	19
SALE OF WILDLIFE - MISDEMEANOR	4	3	2	1	7	0	1	0	0	0	18
APPLYING FOR LICENSE WHILE UNDER SUSPENSION	0	1	1	2	3	0	4	4	3	0	18
WASTE OF FISH	1	5	0	4	1	2	0	1	4	0	18
FALSE STATEMENT MADE-ACQUIRING A PERMIT	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	8	1	17
SALE OF WILDLIFE - FELONY	0	2	0	0	10	1	1	1	1	0	16
FAILURE TO OBTAIN ROADKILL PERMIT	3	0	1	1	1	5	2	1	0	2	16
FISHING W/MORE THAN LEGAL NUMBER OF HOOKS	4	0	2	0	1	1	5	0	1	0	14
UNLAWFUL DEVICE-WILDLIFE	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	4	2	5	14
HUNTING WHILE UNDER SUSPENSION	2	0	4	2	0	0	2	3	0	1	14
APPLYING FOR MULTIPLE LICENSES	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	13
UNLAWFUL USE OF AIRCRAFT AS HUNT/FISH AID	1	1	3	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	13
FISHING WHILE UNDER SUSPENSION	1	2	0	1	2	2	0	4	1	0	13
EXCEEDING ESTABLISHED BAG LIMIT	0	0	0	0	9	0	1	2	0	0	12
UNATTENDED CAMPFIRE	0	1	2	5	0	3	0	0	0	1	12
FAILURE TO APPEAR	5	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	11
HUNTING UNDER THE INFLUENCE DRUGS/ALCOHOL	0	1	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	10
ANTELOPE - ACCIDENTAL KILL	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	2	0	2	10
FAILURE TO CARRY LICENSE AS REQUIRED	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	0	9
TRAPPING WITHOUT A PROPER/VALID LICENSE	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	1	6
BEAR - ACCIDENTAL KILL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	6
MOUNTAIN GOAT-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	5
EXOTIC WILDLIFE-UNLAWFUL POSSESSION	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5
TRAPPING W/O PERMISSION ON PRIVATE PROPERTY	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	4
WEAPONS OFFENSE - ALTERED SERIAL NUMBER	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
CARELESS OPERATION OF A SNOWMOBILE	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3
CONSERVATION-BIRDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
CONSERVATION-ENVIRONMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
CONSERVATION-LICENSE-STAMP	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	3
FAILURE TO DISPLAY LICENSE AS REQUIRED	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
CONSERVATION-FISH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
TRAPPING DURING A CLOSED SEASON	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	6456	6637	6822	6269	6288	4980	5580	4832	5095	4414	57373

Table 2.1, 1990-1999 – VIOLATIONS BY COUNTY

COUNTY	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
ADAMS	184	157	162	92	144	113	90	34	73	59	1108
ALAMOSA	1	3	6	15	4	12	14	26	17	4	102
ARAPAHOE	69	43	61	45	75	81	92	13	14	25	518
ARCHULETA	70	65	58	43	78	64	67	85	55	46	631
BACA	44	26	44	19	23	15	4	1	10	5	191
BENT	34	41	44	46	30	36	80	53	52	44	460
BOULDER	127	144	189	104	149	92	93	69	30	33	1030
CHAFFEE	196	181	186	155	130	123	178	141	120	134	1544
CHEYENNE	4	6	8	5	8	9	17	5	5	1	68
CLEAR CREEK	51	20	38	7	17	22	36	27	15	22	255
CONEJOS	9	36	53	33	93	58	76	80	83	20	541
COSTILLA	23	43	38	65	61	51	25	39	38	40	423
CUSTER	45	73	92	118	86	51	86	67	102	44	764
DELTA	98	106	119	92	129	79	107	73	91	51	945
DENVER	99	62	80	108	66	22	22	26	62	36	583
DOLORES	26	24	87	86	56	32	95	44	58	42	550
DOUGLAS	177	143	74	78	84	87	108	48	52	31	882
EAGLE	98	107	125	105	82	65	51	69	86	77	865
EL PASO	85	140	182	149	156	143	177	186	85	58	1361
ELBERT	39	28	37	22	28	15	27	16	7	22	241
FREMONT	138	175	173	159	86	39	89	61	62	62	1044
GARFIELD	166	187	156	198	157	125	135	114	158	107	1503
GILPIN	11	5	11	15	12	8	15	7	5	8	97
GRAND	343	279	224	226	211	112	132	209	205	154	2095
GUNNISON	180	223	143	171	135	92	129	116	156	123	1468
HINSDALE	16	30	27	35	20	25	35	23	22	38	271
HUERFANO	36	49	101	55	30	32	22	31	55	61	472
JACKSON	168	124	186	144	205	172	112	117	109	97	1434
JEFFERSON	387	223	232	182	230	158	210	58	86	66	1832
KIOWA	17	11	11	9	13	10	11	9	6	5	102
KIT CARSON	12	42	13	4	13	5	6	4	4	13	116
LA PLATA	123	134	96	108	93	66	136	95	92	85	1028
LAKE	95	89	68	104	67	122	154	122	161	101	1083
LARIMER	597	741	937	832	827	720	617	521	414	536	6742
LAS ANIMAS	90	563	104	282	100	59	74	53	69	41	1435
LINCOLN	12	22	17	14	33	19	7	14	9	11	158
LOGAN	40	44	50	42	39	30	24	22	59	56	406
MESA	150	88	179	165	181	153	157	124	127	222	1546
MINERAL	60	44	55	37	22	34	24	31	40	21	368
MOFFAT	243	154	147	170	247	166	151	212	142	263	1895
MONTEZUMA	78	78	101	75	79	56	63	63	77	73	743
MONTROSE	102	87	65	86	102	65	71	86	69	72	805
MORGAN	69	68	77	78	79	124	69	66	45	111	786
OTERO	48	56	44	11	9	19	50	28	26	20	311
OURAY	36	40	26	61	50	24	33	34	28	31	363
PARK	139	136	188	149	203	85	128	160	155	106	1449
PHILLIPS	8	29	11	25	11	4	6	11	6	14	125
PITKIN	33	47	35	26	17	12	26	21	13	27	257
PROWERS	10	5	3	15	15	4	16	20	11	10	109
PUEBLO	201	226	382	252	282	257	334	260	453	254	2901
RIO BLANCO	155	177	164	133	89	143	190	158	128	116	1453
RIO GRANDE	113	66	87	75	60	71	55	133	200	54	914
ROUTT	228	189	199	156	194	85	90	86	171	139	1537
SAGUACHE	61	98	103	84	63	70	62	67	61	42	711
SAN JUAN	14	0	10	0	5	1	16	3	0	5	54
SAN MIGUEL	41	28	27	43	31	28	23	18	57	39	335
SEDGWICK	1	7	18	20	12	9	11	15	11	24	128
SUMMIT	239	143	218	164	174	50	91	80	83	45	1287
TELLER	40	51	38	60	93	88	110	91	82	63	716
WASHINGTON	42	29	39	42	39	31	36	31	38	54	381
WELD	357	345	316	325	397	395	355	317	309	200	3316
YUMA	59	32	32	35	44	30	32	27	11	19	321

Table 3.1- 1990-1999 NON-RESIDENT (NR) AND RESIDENT (R) VIOLATION COMPARISONS

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	TOTAL
NR	1287	1686	1182	1136	1109	826	1080	971	1159	947	11,383
R	5169	4951	5640	5133	5179	4154	4500	3871	3936	3467	45,990
Total	6456	6637	6822	6269	6288	4980	5580	4832	5095	4414	57,373

Table 3.2- 1990-1999 PERCENTAGE COMPARISONS BETWEEN NON-RESIDENT (NR) & RESIDENT (R) VIOLATIONS

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	TOTAL
NR	19.9%	25.4%	17.3%	18.1%	17.6%	16.6%	19.3%	20.1%	22.7%	21.4%	19.8%
R	80.1%	74.6%	82.7%	81.9%	82.4%	83.4%	80.7%	79.9%	77.3%	78.6%	80.2%

Table 3.3- 1999 RESIDENT-SPECIFIC LICENSES BY CATEGORY, SALES & PERCENT

LICENSE CATEGORY	RESIDENT LICENSES	RESIDENT LICENSES BY %	NON-RES. LICENSES	NON-RES. LICENSES BY %	TOTAL SALES
1) ALL*	691,864	80%	177,256	20%	869,120
2) FISH	424,214	95%	20,863	5%	445,077
3) ELK	140,057	55%	115,514	45%	255,571
4) DEER	59,430	64%	33,477	36%	92,907
5) ANTELOPE	14,046	93%	1001	7%	15,047
6) BEAR	10,965	80%	2743	20%	13,708
7) SM. GAME	29,446	91%	2924	9%	32,370
8) TOTAL (LINES 2-7)	678,158	79%	176,522	21%	854,680
9) % OF ALL RESIDENT-SPECIFIC LICENSES (LINE 8/LINE1) *	98%		99.6%		98%

*Remaining %'s are made up of licenses that are either limited in number and/or constitute low sales, like Sheep, Goat, Moose and Mt. Lion licenses. Note: Of lines 2-7, 52.1% were fishing, 44% were big game, and 3.9% were small game. Of big game licenses, (lines 3-6) residents purchased 73%, and non-residents, 27%. Of just elk and deer (lines 3 and 4) 60% were residents, 40% were non-residents.

Table 3.4- 1999 TOP 20 VIOLATIONS (BIG GAME AND FISHING).

VIOLATION	RES.	% RES.	NON-RES.	% NON-RES.	TOTAL
1) Fish W/O License	1114	91%	114	9%	1228
2) Unlawful Possession of Fish	181	88%	24	12%	205
3) Loaded Firearm in M/V	144	53%	127	47%	271
4) Hunt W/O Permission	144	71%	59	29%	203
5) Unlawful Possession of Elk	86	65%	47	35%	133
6) Unlawful Possession of Deer	40	67%	20	33%	60
7) Shoot from Public Rd.	56	84%	11	16%	67
8) Failure to Tag	78	57%	58	43%	136
9) No Evidence of Sex	33	35%	62	65%	95
10) False Statement Purch. License	18	42%	25	58%	43
11) No Fluorescent Orange	47	61%	30	39%	77
12) Waste of Game	60	54%	51	46%	111
13) Unlawful Transfer of a License	28	47%	31	53%	59
14) Use of an Artificial Light	12	100%			12
15) Hunt Before/After Legal Hours	49	98%	1	2%	50
16) Elk- Unlawful Antler Pt.	5	18%	23	82%	28
17) Deer- Unlawful Antler Pt.	1	20%	4	80%	5
18) Unlawful Use of a M/V	17	74%	6	26%	23
19) Use of an Unlawful Firearm	91	94%	6	6%	97
20) Hunt W/O License	191	78%	54	22%	245
Total	2395	76%	753	24%	3148

The total violations for 1999, at the present time (3/1/00) = 4414. The percentage of the listed high-frequency violations, 3148, =71%.

Of fishing violations, (lines 1 and 2) 90% were residents, 10% were non-residents. Of big game, (lines 3-20) 64% were residents and 36% were non-residents.

Table 4.1, 1990-1999 – CASE DISPOSITION SUMMARY

Disposition	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
Pending	152	144	215	255	320	313	480	753	603	694	3929
Guilty											
Amended	20	23	20	22	29	37	15	8	20	7	201
Deferred Prosecution	4	8	9	12	18	8	11	2	2	74	
Deferred Sentence	41	45	64	38	53	36	38	29	11	8	363
Guilty Plea	1185	1028	1199	1118	984	737	662	478	447	237	8075
Paid	3253	3409	3321	3030	3136	2397	2942	2703	2850	2469	29510
Warning	661	915	820	686	757	741	722	384	649	668	7003
Subtotal	5164	5428	5433	4906	4977	3956	4390	3604	3979	3389	45226
Not Guilty											
Case Dismissed	633	600	593	548	510	336	325	236	172	83	4036
Found Not Guilty	22	20	34	31	11	4	16	8	2	2	150
Void	485	445	547	529	470	371	369	231	339	246	4032
Subtotal	1140	1065	1174	1108	991	711	710	475	513	331	8218
Total Violations	6456	6637	6822	6269	6288	4980	5580	4832	5095	4414	57373

Table 4.2, 1990-1999 – CASE DISPOSITION SUMMARY BY PERCENT

Disposition	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Total
Pending	2.4%	2.2%	3.2%	4.1%	5.1%	6.3%	8.6%	15.6%	11.8%	15.7%	6.8%
Guilty											
Amended	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.7%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Deferred Prosecution	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%
Deferred Sentence	0.6%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%	0.6%
Guilty Plea	18.4%	15.5%	17.6%	17.8%	15.6%	14.8%	11.9%	9.9%	8.8%	5.4%	14.1%
Paid	50.4%	51.4%	48.7%	48.3%	49.9%	48.1%	52.7%	55.9%	55.9%	55.9%	51.4%
Warning	10.2%	13.8%	12.0%	10.9%	12.0%	14.9%	12.9%	7.9%	12.7%	15.1%	12.2%
Subtotal	80.0%	81.8%	79.6%	78.3%	79.2%	79.4%	78.7%	74.6%	78.1%	76.8%	78.8%
Not Guilty											
Case Dismissed	9.8%	9.0%	8.7%	8.7%	8.1%	6.7%	5.8%	4.9%	3.4%	1.9%	7.0%
Found Not Guilty	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
Void	7.5%	6.7%	8.0%	8.4%	7.5%	7.4%	6.6%	4.8%	6.7%	5.6%	7.0%
Subtotal	17.7%	16.0%	17.2%	17.7%	15.8%	14.3%	12.7%	9.8%	10.1%	7.5%	14.3%

Table 4.3, 1999 CASE DISPOSITION BY COUNTY

COUNTY	Pending	Amended	Deferred Prosecution	Deferred Sentence	Guilty Plea	Paid	Warning	Guilty Total	Case Dismissed	Not Guilty	Void	Not Guilty Total	Grand Total
ADAMS	14	0	0	0	2	25	8	35	0	0	10	10	59
ALAMOSA	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	4
ARAPAHOE	8	0	0	0	13	3	0	16	0	0	1	1	25
ARCHULETA	3	0	0	0	0	30	10	40	0	0	3	3	46
BACA	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	5
BENT	10	0	0	0	4	15	5	24	2	0	8	10	44
BOULDER	9	0	0	0	1	17	5	23	0	0	1	1	33
CHAFFEE	9	1	0	0	15	70	9	95	2	0	28	30	134
CHEYENNE	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
CLEAR CREEK	6	0	0	0	0	9	6	15	0	0	1	1	22

COUNTY	Pending	Amended	Deferred Prosecution	Deferred Sentence	Guilty Plea	Paid	Warning	Guilty Total	Case Dismissed	Not Guilty	Void	Not Guilty Total	Grand Total
CONEJOS	1	0	0	0	5	8	5	18	1	0	0	1	20
COSTILLA	26	0	0	0	1	12	1	14	0	0	0	0	40
CROWLEY	7	0	0	0	0	20	2	22	0	0	3	3	
CUSTER	7	0	0	0	2	32	3	37	0	0	0	0	4
DELTA	2	0	0	0	7	33	2	42	2	0	5	7	51
DENVER	15	0	0	0	0	19		19	0	0	2	2	36
DOLORES	8	0	0	0	2	28	3	33	0	0	1	1	42
DOUGLAS	8	0	0	0	0	14	3	17	0	0	6	6	31
EAGLE	15	0	0	0	4	44	10	58	1	0	3	4	77
EL PASO	11	0	0	0	4	30	9	43	1	0	3	4	58
ELBERT	3	1	0	0	1	9	7	18	0	0	1	1	22
FREMONT	16	0	0	0	3	37	5	45	0	0	1	1	62
GARFIELD	14	0	0	0	5	79	6	90	2	0	1	3	107
GILPIN	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	7	0	0	1	1	8
GRAND	17	0	0	3	9	99	17	128	2	0	7	9	154
GUNNISON	7	0	0	0	18	80	8	106	0	0	10	10	123
HINSDALE	6	0	0	0	0	23	9	32	0	0	0	0	38
HUERFANO	3	0	0	0	0	44	12	56	1	0	1	2	61
JACKSON	12	0	0	0	5	54	22	81	1	0	3	4	97
JEFFERSON	14	0	0	0	1	33	6	40	9	0	3	12	66
KIOWA	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
KIT CARSON	2	0	0	0	3	6	1	10	0	0	1	1	13
LA PLATA	12	0	0	0	2	48	13	63	3	0	7	10	85
LAKE	12	0	0	0	14	60	3	77	3	0	9	12	10
LARIMER	109	0	0	0	19	242	113	374	5	2	46	53	53
LAS ANIMAS	6	0	0	0	0	28	5	33	0	0	2	2	41
LINCOLN	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	11	0	0	0	0	11
LOGAN	11	0	0	1	4	23	14	42	0	0	3	3	56
MESA	23	0	0	0	10	143	40	193	1	0	5	6	222
MINERAL	2	0	0	0		17	2	19	0	0	0	0	21
MOFFAT	14	0	0	0	18	154	71	243	1	0	5	6	263
MONTEZUMA	28	0	0	0	2	28	4	34	10	0	1	11	73
MONTROSE	8	1	0	0	7	40	13	61	2	0	1	3	72
MORGAN	17	0	0	0	0	61	29	90	0	0	4	4	111
OTERO	3	0	0	1	2	11	0	14	0	0	3	3	20
OURAY	1	0	0	0	0	27	3	30	0	0	0	0	31
PARK	16	0	0	0	9	65	4	78	0	0	12	12	106
PHILLIPS	0	0	0	0	2	10	1	13	0	0	1	1	14
PITKIN	1	0	0	0	0	20	5	25	1	0	0	1	27
PROWERS	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	8	0	0	1	1	10
PUEBLO	77	0	0	0	14	117	22	153	2	0	22	24	254
RIO BLANCO	7	1	0	0	6	82	16	105	3	0	1	4	116
RIO GRANDE	9	0	0	2	6	26	11	45	0	0	0	0	54
ROUTT	17	0	0	0	5	79	19	103	16	0	3	19	139
SAGUACHE	7	0	0	0	0	27	7	34	1	0	0	1	42
SAN JUAN	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	
SAN MIGUEL	4	0	0	0	1	21	12	34	0	0	1	1	3
SEDGWICK	1	0	0	0	2	13	8	23	0	0	0	0	24
SUMMIT	7	0	0	0	0	27	6	33	2	0	3	5	45

TELLER	6	0	0	0	4	37	8	49	5	0	3	8	63
WASHINGTON	1	0	0	0	4	27	19	50	0	0	3	3	54
WELD	40	3	0	1	10	113	25	152	2	0	6	8	200
YUMA	0	0	0	0	0	12	6	18	1	0	0	1	19
Total	694	7	0	8	250	2459	665	3389	83	2	246	331	4414

Table 4.4 1999 CASE DISPOSITION BY COUNTY BY PERCENT (%)

County	Pending	Amended	Deferred Prosecution	Deferred Sentence	Guilty Plea	Paid	Warning	Guilty Total	Case Dismissed	Not Guilty	Voided	Not Guilty Total
ADAMS	24	0	0	0	3	42	14	59	0	0	17	17
ALAMOSA	25	0	0	0	25	25	0	50	25	0	0	25
ARAPAHOE	32	0	0	0	52	12	0	64	0	0	4	4
ARCHULETA	7	0	0	0	0	65	22	87	0	0	7	7
BACA	0	0	0	0	0	60	40	100	0	0	0	0
BENT	23	0	0	0	9	34	11	55	5	0	18	23
BOULDER	27	0	0	0	3	52	15	70	0	0	3	3
CHAFFEE	7	1	0	0	11	52	7	71	1	0	21	22
CHEYENNE	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	100	0	0	0	0
CLEAR CREEK	27	0	0	0	0	41	27	68	0	0	5	5
CONEJOS	5	0	0	0	25	40	25	90	5	0	0	5
COSTILLA	65	0	0	0	3	30	3	35	0	0	0	0
CROWLEY	22	0	0	0	0	63	6	69	0	0	9	9
CUSTER	16	0	0	0	5	73	7	84	0	0	0	0
DELTA	4	0	0	0	14	65	4	82	4	0	10	14
DENVER	42	0	0	0	0	53	0	53	0	0	6	6
DOLORES	19	0	0	0	5	67	7	79	0	0	2	2
DOUGLAS	26	0	0	0	0	45	10	55	0	0	19	19
EAGLE	19	0	0	0	5	57	13	75	1	0	4	5
EL PASO	19	0	0	0	7	52	16	74	2	0	5	7
ELBERT	14	5	0	0	5	41	32	82	0	0	5	5
FREMONT	26	0	0	0	5	60	8	73	0	0	2	2
GARFIELD	13	0	0	0	5	74	6	84	2	0	1	3
GILPIN	0	0	0	0	0	75	13	88	0	0	13	13
GRAND	11	0	0	2	6	64	11	83	1	0	5	6
GUNNISON	6	0	0	0	15	65	7	86	0	0	8	8
HINSDALE	16	0	0	0	0	61	24	84	0	0	0	0
HUERFANO	5	0	0	0	0	72	20	92	2	0	2	3
JACKSON	12	0	0	0	5	56	23	84	1	0	3	4
JEFFERSON	21	0	0	0	2	50	9	61	14	0	5	18
KIOWA	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	100	0	0	0	0
KIT CARSON	15	0	0	0	23	46	8	77	0	0	8	8
LA PLATA	14	0	0	0	2	56	15	74	4	0	8	12
LAKE	12	0	0	0	14	59	3	76	3	0	9	12
LARIMER	20	0	0	0	4	45	21	70	1	0	9	10
LAS ANIMAS	15	0	0	0	0	68	12	80	0	0	5	5
LINCOLN	0	0	0	0	27	18	55	100	0	0	0	0
LOGAN	20	0	0	2	7	41	25	75	0	0	5	5
MESA	10	0	0	0	5	64	18	87	0	0	2	3
MINERAL	10	0	0	0	0	81	10	90	0	0	0	0
MOFFAT	5	0	0	0	7	59	27	92	0	0	2	2

COUNTY	Pending	Amended	Deferred Prosecution	Deferred Sentence	Guilty Plea	Paid	Warning	Guilty Total	Case Dismissed	Not Guilty	Void	Not Guilty Total
MONTEZUMA	38	0	0	0	3	38	5	47	14	0	1	15
MONTROSE	11	1	0	0	10	56	18	85	3	0	1	
MORGAN	15	0	0	0	0	55	26	81	0	0	4	
OTERO	15	0	0	5	10	55	0	70	0	0	15	15
OURAY	3	0	0	0	0	87	10	97	0	0	0	0
PARK	15	0	0	0	8	61	4	74	0	0	11	11
PHILLIPS	0	0	0	0	14	71	7	93	0	0	7	7
PITKIN	4	0	0	0	0	74	19	93	4	0	0	4
PROWERS	10	0	0	0	0	60	20	80	0	0	10	10
PUEBLO	30	0	0	0	6	46	9	60	1	0	9	9
RIO BLANCO	6	1	0	0	5	71	14	91	3	0	1	3
RIO GRANDE	17	0	0	4	11	48	20	83	0	0	0	0
ROUTT	12	0	0	0	4	57	14	74	12	0	2	14
SAGUACHE	17	0	0	0	0	64	17	81	2	0	0	2
SAN JUAN	0	0	0	0	0	80	20	100	0	0	0	0
SAN MIGUEL	10	0	0	0	3	54	31	87	0	0	3	3
SEDGWICK	4	0	0	0	8	54	33	96	0	0	0	0
SUMMIT	16	0	0	0	0	60	13	73	4	0	7	11
TELLER	10	0	0	0	6	59	13	78	8	0	5	13
WASHINGTON	2	0	0	0	7	50	35	93	0	0	6	6
WELD	20	2	0	1	5	57	13	76	1	0	3	4
YUMA	0	0	0	0	0	63	32	95	5	0	0	5
Total	16	0	0	0	6	56	15	77	2	0	6	7

Table 5.0 1998/1999 CHECKSTATION AND DECOY EFFORTS

TYPE OF EFFORT	CHECK STATIONS						NIGHT				
	BIG GAME	SMALL GAME	FISHING		DECOYS		FLIGHTS	TOTAL			
	1998	1999	1998	1999	1998	1999	1998	1999	1999	1998	1999
Number of Efforts	7	9	2		1	10	32	33	8	42	60
Total Vehicles	818	1814	940		606	1519	1094	649	15	3358	3997
Vehicles Stopped	359	642	900		140	421	96	70	15	1495	1148
Individual Contacts	548	1296	188		225	1463	143	108	18	1104	2885
Individual Charges	14	28	8		3	21	68	34	13	93	96
Total Fines (Dollars)	5,665	6,800	544		507	949	6,871	3,600	1,850	13587	13,199

Table 6.0 1999 OPERATION GAME THIEF

CATEGORY	TOTAL
Total OGT Calls	405
Total Cases Filed	105
Criminal Fines To Date	\$16,139
Cases W/O Reward	86
Cases W/ Reward	19
Reward In \$'s Paid	\$4,670
OGT Donations In \$'s	\$28,849