Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

August 22, 2013, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

Thursday, August 22, 2013 – 9:00 am

1. Approval of Agenda **ACTION**
   – Jake Albrecht, Chairman

2. Approval of Minutes **ACTION**
   – Jake Albrecht, Chairman

3. Old Business/Action Log **CONTINGENT**
   – Bill Fenimore, Vice-Chair

4. DWR Update **INFORMATION**
   – Gregory Sheehan, DWR Director

5. Goat Management Plans **ACTION**
   - Dustin Schiable, Guy Wallace, Justin Shannon, Wildlife Biologist

6. Cougar Recommendations **ACTION**
   - John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator

7. Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations **ACTION**
   - John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator

8. Turkey Depredation **INFORMATIONAL**
   - Jason Robinson, Upland Game Coordinator

9. Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 **ACTION**
   - Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Coordinator

10. R657-66 Military Installations New Rule **ACTION**
    - Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief

11. Proposed Fee Schedule FY 2015 **ACTION**
    - Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief

12. R657-52 Brine Shrimp Rule Amendments **ACTION**
    - John Luft, Brine Shrimp Coordinator

13. R657-60 AIS Rule Amendments **ACTION**
    - Jordan Nielson, AIS Coordinator

14. Convention Permit Audit **ACTION**
    - Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief

15. Convention Permit Allocation **ACTION**
    - Mike Fowlks, Deputy Director

16. CRC – Recommendation **ACTION**
    - Staci Coons, CRC Chair

17. Wildlife Board Stipulation Agreement **ACTION**
    - Greg Hansen, Legal Counsel

18. Other Business **CONTINGENT**
    – Jake Albrecht, Chairman

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act - Persons needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) for this meeting, should contact Staci Coons at 801-538-4718, giving her at least five working days notice.

Wildlife Board Motions

Following is a summary of Wildlife Board motions directing the Division to take action and the response to date:

Spring 2013 – Target Date – Preference Point Presentation

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to give a presentation on the preference point system relative to the new 30 unit deer plan.

Assigned to: Judi Tutorow / Lindy Varney
Action: Under Study
Status: Additional information to be presented December 4, 2013
Placed on Action Log: June 6, 2012

Spring 2013 – Target Date – Scopes on Muzzleloader Rifles and Use of Crossbows

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to report to the Board on the issues and concerns with using a magnifying scope on a muzzleloader as well as the use of a crossbow during the "any legal weapon" general season deer hunt by all sportsmen. This is to be placed on the action log and the report shall be discussed at the May 2013 work session.

Assigned to: Tony Wood
Action: Under Study
Status: Proposal to be taken to RAC's and Board beginning in November with Big Game
Placed on Action Log: December 6, 2012

Summer 2013 – Target Date – Additional Take of Sandhill Cranes and Swans

MOTION: I move that we put the issue of swans and sandhill cranes on the action log to see if there could be additional take in other parts of the state.

Assigned to: Blair Stringham
Action: Under Study
Status: Sandhill Crane addressed June 4, 2013, Swan is scheduled for presentation at the July RAC/August Board Mtg.
Placed on Action Log: August 16, 2012

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Nine Mile Range Creek

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to report back on the Nine Mile Range Creek change to any bull relative to all issues of hunting, including trespass, harvest, and hunter satisfaction.

Assigned to: Justin Shannon
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: December 1, 2011

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Premium Limited-entry deer tags

MOTION: I move that we have placed on the action log that the Division look into a premium limited entry deer tag similar to the premium limited entry elk tag.

Assigned to: Anis Aoude/Judi Tutorow
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: May 3, 2012

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Duck Creek

MOTION: I move that we ask the Southern Region to address the Duck Creek issues and report back to the board within a year from now. This is to be placed on the action log.

Assigned to: Kevin Bunnell
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: November 1, 2012

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Mineral Mountain Range

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to study the issues and concerns of making the Mineral Mountain Range (west side of Beaver unit) a limited entry buck deer unit and that it be discussed during the revision of the deer plan with the Deer Management Committee. This is to be placed on the action log.

Assigned to: Anis Aoude
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: December 6, 2012

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Additional muzzleloader Pronghorn hunting opportunity

MOTION I move that we ask the division to study additional muzzleloader pronghorn hunting opportunity as presented in the November RAC meetings by Mr. Zundel. This is to be placed on the action log.

Assigned to: Anis Aoude
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: December 6, 2012

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Fish Possession Limit

MOTION: I move that the division look into the issue of bag and possession limits being identical.

Assigned to: Drew Cushing
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: November 1, 2012

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Exemptions for Companion Hunters of Disabled Sportsmen

MOTION: I move that we place on the action log the motion from the Southeastern Region to look at allowing a specified companion hunter to finish off a wounded animal for a disabled hunter, who is paraplegic, quadriplegic, blind or has lost use of his upper extremities. This is to be completed by the Bucks and Bulls Board Meeting in Dec. 2013.

Assigned to: Kenny Johnson/Marty Bushman
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: January 10, 2013

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Additional Use of Crossbows for taking carp

MOTION: I move that we place on the action log that the division look at the use of crossbows to take carp by all fisherman and not just Disabled Anglers.

Assigned to: Tony Wood
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: January 10, 2013

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Transfer of Permits to Veterans

MOTION: I move that we place on the action log the recommendation made by Mr. David Gurr and that we ask the division to consider his proposal as they are considering other statue changes relating to the transfer of tags. (See Board Packet – 01/10/2013 for proposal)

Assigned to: Robin Cahoon
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: January 10, 2013

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Monroe Mountain

MOTION: I move that we ask the Southern Region Manager to meet with his staff to look at the Monroe Mountain unit to see if it requires a different hunting structure. This is to be brought back to the Wildlife Board prior to the November RAC meetings.

Assigned to: Kevin Bunnell
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: May 2, 2013

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Non-Resident Sheep Permit Quota

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to prepare a sheet for the Board and the NRO RAC that shows the sheep unit grouping and permit percentage rules that were passed (by the board) last year – and subsequent total permits and breakout between OIAL, conservation and convention permits, for each sheep species and each unit group.

Assigned to: Anis Aoude
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: May 2, 2013

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Rule/Guideline to define Species and Unit Management Plans

MOTION: I move that we establish an action log for DWR to develop a rule to define plan creations, notifications, participation, composition, and processes of species management plans and unit management plans that cover big game, bear, cougar, and turkey.

Assigned to: Bill Bates/Anis Aoude
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: June 4, 2013

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Dedicated Hunter Hours

MOTION: for DWR to reconsider allowing Dedicated Hunter program applicants to accrue volunteer hours in the first year after they apply in the program rather than waiting until the final selections and approval. Also, have the DWR bring the list of approved efforts for hours to the Board for review and consideration.

Assigned to: Bryan Christensen
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: June 4, 2013

Summer 2014 – Target Date – Hunting Turkeys with Falcons

MOTION: I move that we put the hunting turkeys with falcons proposal on the action log for consideration when the Upland Game Guidebook comes up for review.

Assigned to: Jason Robinson
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: June 9, 2011

Summer 2014 – Target Date – Additional Benefits for Limited-Entry turkey tag holders

MOTION: I move that we have placed on the action log that the Division look into the possibility and feasibility of a limited entry turkey permit holder who is unsuccessful to turn in their limited entry tag and purchase a general season tag.

Assigned to: Jason Robinson
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: May 3, 2012

Summer 2014 – Target Date – Group Applications for Limited-Entry turkey permits, sage-grouse and sharp-tail grouse permits.

MOTION: I move for the DWR to present a proposal to the RACs that group applications be allowed for the limited entry turkey, sage-grouse, and sharp-tailed grouse hunts.

Assigned to: Jason Robinson
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: June 4, 2013

Summer 2014 – Target Date – Use of 28 gauge shotgun for taking Wild Turkeys

MOTION: I move that we place on the action log the request for use of a 28 gauge shotgun for turkeys.

Assigned to: Jason Robinson
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: June 4, 2013

Fall 2014 – Target Date – Management Buck Tags on the Book Cliffs

MOTION: I move that the Division be asked to review the buck management tags on the Book Cliffs. People are always reporting the presence of big two and three point bucks in that area. Perhaps these permits could be given to youth. This is to be addressed during the revision of the Deer Management Plan in 2014.

Assigned to: Anis Aoude
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: December 1, 2011

Fall 2014 – Target Date – Cougar Data – Female Harvest

MOTION: I move that the Division do an expeditious review of the data and to provide the board members their analysis, conclusions and recommendations concerning the possible over harvest of female cougars.

Assigned to: John Shivik
Action: Under Study
Status: Letter to be presented to the Wildlife Board November 1, 2012
Placed on Action Log: August 16, 2012

Fall 2014 – Target Date – Definition of "Youth"

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to study the definition of "youth" and see if it can be adjusted and made universal across the division with the different species. This is to be placed on the action log.

Assigned to: Kevin Bunnell/Judi Tutorow
Action: Under Study
Status: the proposal is to be taken out to the RAC's and Board as the applicable guidebooks come up for review
Placed on Action Log: December 6, 2012

On going – Target Date - Multi-year guidebooks and rules

MOTION: We ask that the Division look toward multi-year guidebooks and rules and that they present a plan on how that multi-year guidebook and rule will work as each is presented.

Assigned to: Staci Coons
Action: Under Study
Status: Wildlife Board to be updated at the May 29, 2013 work session
Placed on Action Log: August 20, 2009

Utah Wildlife Board Work Session
May 29, 2013, Lee Kay Center
6000 W. 2100 S., Salt Lake City, Utah
http://wildlife.utah.gov/public_meetings/board_minutes/audio/13-05-29_work-session.mp3

Board Members Present
Del Brady – Chair
Ernie Perkins – Vice Chair
Greg Sheehan – Exec Sec
Bill Fenimore
Jake Albrecht
Mike King
John Bair (excused)
Calvin Crandall (excused)

Division Personnel Present

Rory Reynolds	Judi Tutorow
Mike Caning	Justin Dolling
Mike Fowlks	John Shivik
Marty Bushman	Jason Robinson
Staci Coons	Karen Caldwell
Thu Vo-Wood	Lindy Varney
Blair Stringham	Scott McFarlane
Kenny Johnson	Boyde Blackwell

Public Present
Fred Oswald
Robert Byrnes
Mike Christensen

1) Approval of Agenda **(Action) 0:00:00 to 0:01:22 of 1:19:40**

Chairman Brady welcomed the audience and went over the agenda. The items for discussion are informational only. The meeting is open to the public but no public comment will be accepted.

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Ernie Perkins and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda as presented.

2) Update – Mike Fowlks **(Informational) 0:01:23 to 0:03:10 of 1:19:40**

Deputy Director Mike Fowlks mentioned that at 4:00 p.m. today the Board will have a chance to test fire some nonconventional weapons.

The Division will be hosting the first Stewardship Awards banquet at the Radisson Hotel tonight at 6:00 p.m.

Mike announced Bill Bates is the new wildlife section chief.

3) Update on Coyote Control Results and Plans for Next Year – John Shivik **(Informational) 0:03:14 to 0:17:33 of 1:19:40**

John Shivik led a discussion on coyote control results and plans for next year.

4) Update on Preference Point Discussion – Lindy Varney **(Informational) 0:17:42 to 0:30:44 of 1:19:40**

Lindy Varney updated the Wildlife Board on the previous preference point discussion on May 2.

5) Update on Multiple Year Guidebooks – Staci Coons **(Informational) 0:30:46 to 0:35:29 of 1:19:40**

Staci Coons updated the Board on multiple year guidebooks.

6) Update on Turkey Summit – Jason Robinson **(Informational) 0:35:36 to 0:52:28 of 1:19:40**

Jason Robinson led a discussion on the Turkey Summit.

7) Update on Waterfowl Summit – Blair Stringham **(Informational) 0:52:30 to 1:05:17 of 1:19:40**

Blair Stringham led a discussion on the Waterfowl Summit that was held yesterday at the Department of Natural Resources.

8) Update on Actions Taken by the CWMU Committee – Scott McFarlane **(Informational) 1:05:20 to 1:17:49 of 1:19:40**

Scott McFarlane updated the Board on the CWMU Committee actions, which met in February and addressed several complaints.

9) Crossbow and Muzzleloader Demonstration (4:00 pm) – Lee Kay Center Staff **(Informational)**

Board members participated in a demonstration on the use of crossbows and muzzleloaders in order to better understand their challenges.

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

June 4, 2013, DNR, Boardroom
1594 W. North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Amended **AGENDA**

Thursday, June 4, 2013 – 9:00 am

1. Approval of Agenda **ACTION**
   – Del Brady, Chairman

2. Approval of Minutes **ACTION**
   – Del Brady, Chairman

3. Old Business/Action Log **CONTINGENT**
   – Ernie Perkins, Vice-Chair

4. DWR Update **INFORMATION**
   – Greg Sheehan, DWR Director

5. Upland Game Recommendations **ACTION**
   – Blair Stringham, Upland Game Biologist

6. Goat Management Plan **ACTION**
   – Kent Hersey, Big Game Project Leader

7. Bighorn Sheep Management Plan **ACTION**
   – Kent Hersey, Big Game Project Leader

8. Urban Deer – New Rule R657-65 **ACTION**
   – Martin Bushman, Attorney

9. NRO Deer Management Plans **ACTION**
   – Darren Debloois, Asst. Wildlife Manager

10. Other Business **CONTINGENT**
    – Del Brady, Chairman

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
June 4, 2013, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Summary of Motions

1) Approval of Agenda **(Action)**

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda as amended.

2) Approval of Minutes **(Action)**

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the May 1, 2013 Work Session meeting and the May 2, 2013 Wildlife Board Meeting as corrected.

3) Old Business/Action Log (Contingent)

Action Item: for DWR to present a proposal to the RACs that group applications be allowed for the limited entry turkey, sage-grouse, and sharp-tailed grouse hunts.

Action Item: for DWR to reconsider allowing Dedicated Hunter program applicants to accrue volunteer hours in the first year after they apply in the program rather than waiting until the final selections and approval. Also, have the DWR bring the list of approved efforts for hours to the Board for review and consideration.

4) Upland Game Recommendations **(Action)**

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we place on the action log the request for use of a 28 gauge shotgun for turkeys.

The following motion was made by Mike King, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Upland Game Recommendations as presented by the Division.

5) Goat Management Plan **(Action)**

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by John Bair and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we establish an action log for DWR to develop a rule to define plan creations, notifications, participation, composition, and processes for species management plans and unit management plans that cover big game, bear, cougar, and turkey.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Goat Management Plan as presented, with the requirement that unit plans be produced for the "Reintroduction Sites" listed in the plan and be taken through the appropriate RACs and Board.

6) Bighorn Sheep Management Plan **(Action)**

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by John Bair and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Bighorn Sheep Management Plan as presented with the inclusion of inviting all affected cooperative agencies and permit holders in the decision process when formulating a unit management plan.

7) Urban Deer – New Rule R657-65 **(Action)**

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the new Urban Deer Rule R657-65 as presented by the Division and revise the $50 fee to be used toward selection of certified hunters and meat processing by the city.

8) NRO Deer Management Plans **(Action)**

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the NRO Deer Management Plans as presented.

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
June 4, 2013, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
http://wildlife.utah.gov/public_meetings/board_minutes/audio/13-6-4.mp3

Wildlife Board Members Present
Del Brady – Chair
Ernie Perkins – Vice-Chair
Greg Sheehan – Exec Sec
Mike King
Calvin Crandall
John Bair
Bill Fenimore
Jake Albrecht

RAC Chairs Present
Central – Fred Oswald
Southern – Steve Flinders
Southeastern – Derris Jones
Northeastern - Boyde Blackwell
Northern – Robert Byrnes

Division Personnel Present

Mike Fowlks	Anis Aoude
Rory Reynolds	Chris Wood
Mike Canning	Kenny Johnson
Staci Coons	Mark Hadley
Thu Vo-Wood	Scott White
Blair Stringham	John Shivik
Kent Hersey	John Fairchild
Marty Bushman	Bill Bates
Darren Debloois	Scott McFarlane
Bryan Christensen	Kevin Bunnell
Justin Shannon	Lindy Varney
Dax Mangus	Tory Mathis
Judi Tutorow	Randall Thacker
Jason Robinson	Justin Dolling
Troy Davis	Robyn Pearson
Covy Jones	Darin Bird

Public Present
Kevin Albrecht

Byron Bateman, SFW	Keven Jensen	Troy Justenson, SFW	Lynn Ritchie, Highland Mayor
Dave Black	Jesse Jensen	Gary Nielsen	Tye Boulder, UWC
Fox 13 News	Richard Dunn	Mary O'Brien, Grand Canyon Trust	

Chairman Brady welcomed the audience and introduced the Wildlife board and RAC Chairs.

1) Approval of Agenda **(Action) 00:00:11 – 00:01:32 of 04:25:45**

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda as amended.

2) Approval of Minutes **(Action) 00:01:33 – 00:01:57 of 04:25:45**

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the May 1, 2013 work session meeting and the March 2, 2103 Wildlife Board Meeting as corrected.

3) Old Business/Action Log **(Contingent) 00:01:58 – 00:07:29 of 04:25:45**

Action Item: for DWR to present a proposal to the RACs that group applications be allowed for the limited entry turkey, sage-grouse, and sharp-tailed grouse hunts.

Action Item: for DWR to reconsider allowing Dedicated Hunter program applicants to accrue volunteer hours in the first year after they apply in the program rather than waiting until the final selections and approval. Also, have the DWR bring the list of approved efforts for hours to the Board for review and consideration.

4) DWR Update **(Informational) 00:07:30 – 00:13:46 of 04:25:45**

Greg Sheehan recognized and acknowledged Del Brady and Ernie Perkins for their years of service on the Wildlife Board.

DWR hosted the first Stewardship Awards recognizing citizens who have contributed to the promotion and conservation of wildlife recreation and resources in the state.

The day-old-chick program was re-established. Nearly 3,400 chicks were distributed this past week.

Bill Bates is the new wildlife section chief.

The big game draw was successful this year. Remaining permits will be posted online soon.

5) Upland Game Recommendations **(Action) 00:17:20 – 00:36:23 of 04:25:45**

Blair Stringham presented the recommendations for upland game.

Board Questions 00:24:43 – 00:32:04

The Board focused their questions on sandhill cranes – permit allocation history, survey history, depredation issues and how they are addressed. DWR has been working with Wildlife Services to address some of the depredation issues. Permit allocation may be modified, but harvest data needs to be collected in order to make the necessary adjustments.

RAC Recommendations 00:32:26 – 00:33:46

All RACs unanimously passed the Upland Game Recommendations as presented.

NRO requested the Board create an action log item to address Mike Christensen's petition for use of a 28 gauge shotgun for turkeys. Motion passed 8 to 1 with one abstention.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we place on the action log the request for use of a 28 gauge shotgun for turkeys.

The following motion was made by Mike King, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Upland Game Recommendations as presented by the Division.

6) Goat Management Plan **(Action) 00:36:24 – 01:37:56 of 04:25:45**

Kent Hersey presented the goat management plan.

Board Questions 00:44:40 – 00:049:23

The Board wondered about disease potential with domestic sheep and procedures to address them. Although disease has occurred in other states, it is not a concern or issue in Utah; thus, no plans have been developed to address it.

RAC Recommendation 00:50:18 – 00:54:00

The Goat Management Plan passed unanimously at all RACs except for the Southeast RAC. They added several stipulations and passed the plan with two opposing votes.

Public Comments 00:54:01 – 01:00:13

Mary O'Brien, Grand Canyon Trust, stated her objections to the plan. She said there would be irreparable habitat damage if goats were introduced to the La Sal area. The plan does not address limits, declines or monitoring of native plants.

In contrast, Byron Bateman stated his support of the plan. He said the Division has the wherewithal to monitor the plan and make the necessary adjustments.

Board Discussion 01:00:14 – 01:33:54

Bill Fenimore asked the Division to address O'Brien's remarks. Kent Hersey and Dax Mangus both stated there have not been any negative impacts to habitat where goats have been introduced. Twenty years of data collected by the Forest Service, namely on Ashley Forest, found no impact to vegetation or habitat. Extensive monitoring on the Tuscher Mountain and Willard Peak resulted in the same conclusion.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by John Bair and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we establish an action log for DWR to develop a rule to define plan creations, notifications, participation, composition, and processes for species management plans and unit management plans that cover big game, bear, cougar, and turkey.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Goat Management Plan as presented, with the requirement that unit plans be produced for the "Reintroduction Sites" listed in the plan and be taken through the appropriate RACs and Board.

7) Bighorn Sheep Management Plan **(Action) 01:38:31 – 02:47:15 of 04:25:45**

Kent Hersey presented the bighorn sheep management plan.

Public Questions 01:52:55 – 02:01:12

Keven Jensen had questions pertaining to a litigious litigation issue that DWR, BLM, and his family sheep ranch are in the midst of resolving.

RAC Recommendations 02:01:16 – 02:03:49

Southern and Northern RACs unanimously passed the Bighorn Sheep Management Plan as presented. Southeast and Central RACs passed with one opposing vote each.

Northeast RAC approved the plan 7 to 2. They also unanimously accepted a motion to include all cooperative agencies and permit holders in the decision-making process prior to drafting future plans for the next revision.

Public Comments 02:03:50 – 02:08:18

Keven Jensen continued his discussion on the sheep ranch issue. His brother, Jesse Jensen, expressed appreciation for the Board and Division's concerns for ranchers on the sandhill crane depredation matter and asked that they keep the ranchers in mind when making decisions.

Board Discussion 02:08:58 – 02:47:15

Board comments and discussions were directed at the Jensen ranch issue and the public process in affecting policy. Similar to the goat plan, the discussion was muddled in unit plans versus statewide species plans.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by John Bair and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Bighorn Sheep Management Plan as presented with the inclusion of inviting all affected cooperative agencies and permit holders in the decision

process when formulating a unit management plan.

8) Urban Deer Control – New Rule R657-65 **(Action) 02:48:11 – 03:27:09 of 04:25:45**

Martin Bushman presented a pilot program for urban deer control. The plan will have flexibility to allow cities to address their unique situations.

Board Questions 02:54:30 – 02:57:00

The Board wanted clarifications on some of the restrictions and reasoning behind some requirements.

RAC Recommendations 02:57:04 – 02:58:03

Central RAC approved the new Urban Deer Rule R657-65 as presented with one dissenting vote.

Northern RAC unanimously passed the rule with a side note for DWR to make recommendations to cities on methods to mitigate wildlife damage.

Public Comments 02:28:44 – 03:26:03

Mayor Lynn Ritchie of Highland thanked the Division for helping develop the plan. He requested the Board amend the rule to include not turning in all the antlers and increasing the fee to cover expenses.

Marty Bushman explained that in order to keep the activities of the program consistent with the purpose of the rule (urban deer control) lower fees were adopted and antlers were taken out of the equation to prevent trophy hunting within city limits.

More discussion, comments, and questions ensued.

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the new Urban Deer Rule R657-65 as presented by the Division and revise the $50 fee to be used toward selection of certified hunters and meat processing by the city.

9) NRO Deer Management Plans **(Action) 03:27:45 – 03:41:24 of 04:25:45**

Darren Debloois presented the northern region deer management plans, which include enhanced habitat needs for each unit.

Northern RAC unanimously recommended the Board approve the plan as presented.

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the NRO Deer Management Plans as presented.

10) Other Business **(Contingent) 03:41:31 – 04:25:45 of 04:25:45**

Greg Sheehan announced two new wildlife board members: Kirk Woodward and Steve Dalton.

The Board voted for chair and vice-chair positions. Jake Albrecht was elected chair and Bill Fenimore was elected vice-chair.

Marty Bushman updated the Board on the Jensen/BLM sheep issue in the Northeast region.

The Mogle appeal date was set for August 6 at 1:00 p.m. Four board members will be present for the appeal.

Meeting adjourned.

Regional Advisory Council Meeting
July/August

WATERFOWL GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-09

SRO **MOTION:** To accept the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 as presented with the exception to change the youth hunt date to September 21st, 2013.
VOTE: Unanimous

SERO, NERO, CRO
MOTION: To accept the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule as presented.
VOTE: Passed unanimous

NRO **MOTION:** Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Waterfowl Guidebook and rule R657-09 as presented with the youth hunt starting 9-21-13.
VOTE: Motion PassesUnanimous

MILITARY INSTALLATIONS PERMIT PROGRAM R657-66

SRO, NERO, CRO
MOTION: To accept Military Installations Permit Program R657-66 as presented.
VOTE: Unanimous

SERO **MOTION:** To accept the Military Installation Permit as presented.
VOTE: Passed 9 to 1 with one opposing vote cast by Charlie Tracy

NRO **MOTION:** Recommend the Wildlife Board approved R657-66 Military Installations Permit Program as presented with the suggestion to explore additional hunting opportunities on Military Installations.
VOTE: Motion Passes: For: 10 Abstain: 1, Lawrence

PROPOSED FEE SCHEDULE FY 2015

SRO, CRO, NRO
MOTION: To accept the Proposed Fee Schedule FY2015 as presented.
VOTE: Unanimous

SERO **MOTION:** To accept the Proposed Fee Schedule FY 2015 as presented.
VOTE: Passed 9 to 1 with one opposing vote cast by Charlie Tracy

NERO **MOTION:** To accept fee schedule change as presented.
VOTE: Passed 5-4

AIS RULE AMENDMENTS R657-60

ALL RAC'S

MOTION: To accept the AIS Rule Amendments R657-60 as presented.
VOTE: Unanimous

COUGAR RECOMMENDATIONS

SRO **MOTION:** To accept the Cougar Recommendations as presented with the exception of managing the Premium deer units [Henry Mountains and Paunsaugunt] the same as the big horn sheep units and ask the Wildlife Board to request the cougar management plan be reviewed [to simplify] by July 2014 and to have an update of the Monroe Cougar Study be given to the Southern Region RAC.
VOTE: Passed 9:3

SERO **MOTION:** To accept the Division's cougar recommendations as presented, except that the Book Cliffs be separated from Nine Mile and be made a split unit and raise the number of permits to 20.
VOTE: Passed 8 to 1 with one opposing vote cast by Wayne Hoskisson

NERO **MOTION:** To accept the Division's proposal as presented, adding the Utah Houndsmen's Association Book Cliffs recommendation and a mandatory orientation course for all cougar hunters
VOTE: Passed 7-2

CRO **MOTION:** To change the Manti units back to limited entry (Northeast Manti, Northwest Manti, Southeast Manti)
VOTE: Passed 7 to 1

MOTION: To require GPS coordinates for harvested cougars and make the cougar orientation course mandatory
VOTE: Passed unanimously

MOTION: To support the balance of the recommendations as presented
VOTE: Passed unanimously

NRO **MOTION:** Recommend the Wildlife Board adopt the Cougar recommendations as presented with the DWR working to alleviate depredation on livestock
VOTE: Motion Passes: For: 10 Against: 1, Hicks

GOAT MANAGEMENT PLANS- MT. DUTTON AND LA SAL

SRO

MOTION: To accept the Goat Management plan on the Mt. Dutton as presented.
AMENDMENT TO MOTION: To create a stakeholders group.
VOTE ON AMENDMENT: Passed 7:5
VOTE: Passed 10:2

MOTION: To accept the Goat Management plan on the La Sal as presented.
VOTE: Passed 11:0 (1 abstained)

SERO

MOTION: That the LaSal Mountains be removed from the list of potential introduction sites.
VOTE: Voting was tied 5 to 5. In favor of the motion were Chris Micoz, Sue Bellagamba, Wayne Hoskisson, Charlie Tracy and Trisha Hedin. Opposed to the motion were Jeff Horrocks, Darrel Mecham, Blair Eastman, Karl Ivory, and Derris Jones. The chairman, Kevin Albrecht, who represents the U.S. Forest Service, abstained from voting to break the tie, due to a conflict of interest.

MOTION: To accept the LaSal Mountains Goat Management Plans as presented, except that the density of goats at the 9,000 foot elevation model not exceed 1.8 goats per square mile during the five year period.
VOTE: Voting was tied 5 to 5. In favor of the motion were Derris Jones, Karl Ivory, Blair Eastman, Trisha Hedin, and Jeff Horrocks. Opposed to the motion were Chris Micoz, Sue Bellagamba, Wayne Hoskisson, Charlie Tracy, and Darrel Mecham. The chairman, Kevin Albrecht, who represents the U.S. Forest Service abstained from voting to break the tie, due to a conflict of interest.

MOTION: To accept the Mount Dutton Goat Management Plan as presented.
VOTE: Passed with opposing votes cast by Sue Bellagamba and Wayne Hoskisson

NERO

MOTION: To approve as two separate units on LaSal and Mt Dutton
SUBSTITUTE MOTION: I would like also to incorporate the Farm Bureau's recommendation to incorporate on Mt Dutton Joe Batty
VOTE: Passed 7-11 Abstention
The Forest Service supports the plan for Mt Dutton, but is against putting goats into the La Sals at this point based on information from paperwork from the Forest Service.

CRO

MOTION: To support the goat management plan for the La Sal
VOTE: Passed 6 to 2, 1 abstention

MOTION: To support the goat management plan for Mt. Dutton
VOTE: Passed 7 in favor, 1 abstention

NRO

MOTION: Recommend the Wildlife Board approve the Mt Dutton Mountain Goat Management as presented
VOTE: Motion Passes: Unanimous

MOTION: Recommend the Wildlife Board approve the La Sal Mountain Goat Management Plan as presented.
VOTE: Motion Passes: For: 9 Against: 2, Cowley and Purdy

FURBEARER AND BOBCAT HARVEST RECOMMENDATIONS

SRO, NERO, CRO, NRO

MOTION: To accept the Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations as presented.
VOTE: Unanimous

SERO **MOTION:** To accept the Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations as presented.
VOTE: Passed 8 to 2 with two opposing votes cast by Blair Eastman and Wayne Hoskisson

R657-52 BRINE SHRIMP RULE AMENDMENTS

CRO, NRO

MOTION: To support the recommendations as presented
VOTE: Passed unanimously

Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Belknap Elementary School
Beaver, UT
July 30, 2013
7:00 p.m.

1. REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

MOTION: To accept minutes and agenda as written.

VOTE: Unanimous.

2. WATERFOWL GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-09

MOTION: To accept the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 as presented with the exception to change the youth hunt date to September 21st, 2013.

VOTE: Unanimous

3. MILITARY INSTALLATIONS PERMIT PROGRAM R657-66

MOTION: To accept Military Installations Permit Program R657-66 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

4. PROPOSED FEE SCHEDULE FY 2015

MOTION: To accept the Proposed Fee Schedule FY2015 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

5. AIS RULE AMENDMENTS R657-60

MOTION: To accept the AIS Rule Amendments R657-60 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

6. COUGAR RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION: To accept the Cougar Recommendations as presented with the exception of managing the Premium deer units [Henry Mountains and Paunsaugunt] the same as the big horn sheep units and ask the Wildlife Board to request the cougar management plan be reviewed [to simplify] by July 2014 and to have an update of the Monroe Cougar Study be given to the Southern Region RAC.

VOTE: Motion passed 9:3

7. GOAT MANAGEMENT PLANS- MT. DUTTON AND LA SAL

MOTION: To accept the Goat Management plan on the Mt. Dutton as presented.

AMENDMENT TO MOTION: To create a stakeholders group.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT: Passed 7:5

VOTE: Motion passed 10:2

MOTION: To accept the Goat Management plan on the La Sal as presented.

VOTE: Motion Passed 11:1 (1 abstained)

8. FURBEARER AND BOBCAT HARVEST RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION: To accept the Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Beaver High School
Beaver, UT
July 30, 2013
7:00 p.m.

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Harry Barber	Kevin Bunnell	Jake Albrecht	
Dale Bagley	Stephanie Rainey	Steve Dalton	
Mike Staheli	Lynn Chamberlain		
Layne Torgerson	Teresa Griffin		
Sam Carpenter	Riley Peck		
Cordell Pearson	Heather Talley		
Dave Black	Dustin Schaible		
Mike Worthen	Blair Stringham		
Clair Woodbury	John Shivik		
Mack Morrell	Vance Mumford		
Rusty Aiken	Jim Lamb		
Sean Kelly	Brent Farnsworth		
Brian Johnson	Josh Pollock		
	Jason Robinson		
	Jordan Nielson		
	Guy Wallace		
	Greg Sheehan		
	Kenny Johnson		
	Richard Hepworth		
	Chris Wood		
	Justin Shannon		

Dave Black called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. There were approximately 23 interested parties in attendance in addition to RAC members, members of the Wildlife Board, and Division employees. Dave Black introduced himself and asked RAC members to introduce themselves. Dave Black explained RAC meeting procedures.

David Black: We would like to call this meeting to order. Welcome you out to the RAC meeting this evening. My name is Dave Black; I'm the new chairman for the southern RAC. I'm looking forward to this opportunity. Before we get started I'd like to recognize some people in the audience. We have with us tonight, very fortunate to have the new director with us, Director Sheehan. No wave. Good to see you. We also have the new chairman of the Wildlife Board, Jake Albrecht. And we also have one of the newest members of the Wildlife Board with us, Steve Dalton. So welcome. At this time we'd like to introduce the RAC, and if we could we'd start down here on my right. Sean.

Sean Kelly: Sean Kelly with the US Forest Service.

Rusty Aiken: Rusty Aiken of Cedar City.

Mack Morrell: Mack Morrell, Bicknell; representing agriculture.

Clair Woodbury: Clair Woodbury, Hurricane. I represent the public at-large.

Brian Johnson: Brian Johnson, non-consumptive.

Mike Worthen: Mike Worthen, Cedar City. I represent the public-at-large.

Kevin Bunnell: Kevin Bunnell; I'm the regional supervisor for the southern region.

Cordell Pearson: Cordell Pearson, member at-large.

Sam Carpenter: Sam Carpenter from Kanab. I represent the sportsman.

Layne Torgerson: Layne Torgerson from Richfield. I'm a sportsman representative.

Mike Staheli: Mike Staheli, Delta area, at-large.

Dale Bagley: Dale Bagley from Marysvale; elected official.

Harry Barber: Harry Barber, I'm from Kanab. I represent the BLM.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)

Dave Black: Thank you, um, to get started; first of all, we'd like to accept a motion for the approval of the agenda and the minutes. Have you had a chance to look over the agenda?

Rusty Aiken: Dave, I'll make a motion to approve those minutes.

Dave Black: A motion by Rusty. And a second by Sam. And we need a vote. All in favor? Any opposed? It's unanimous.

Rusty Aiken made the motion to accept the agenda and minutes as presented. Sam Carpenter seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Wildlife Board Update:
-David Black, Chairman

David Black: I had the opportunity to go to my first Wildlife Board meeting. I have to admit I'm going to have to repent and beg your forgiveness. When I went there I expected one thing and I was greatly surprised and saw another. When I first started on the RAC sometimes I was a little bit disillusioned that we would spend hours and talk about items and come up with what we thought was a recommendation and then it would go to the Wildlife Board and they'd decide something other than what we recommended. But when I went to the Board meeting I was very impressed. I was very impressed with

the personnel that were there, the time and effort they spend on each of the topics. I'm very impressed with the new director. And I walked out of there feeling real excited about the opportunity that I'll have as chairman to attend the Board meetings and it was a good experience for me. I'm really excited about an opportunity to work with the new Chair of the Wildlife Board and also the new members on the Wildlife Board. And I look forward to this coming year. And so I just wanted to let you know as other members of the RAC that it was a very positive experience and I look forward to working further with them. Some of the updates up there; there were five action items. The upland game recommendation, the goat management plan, the big horn sheep management plan, the urban deer new rule, and the northern region deer management plans. And each of those were passed as presented by the Division by the Wildlife Board. Another thing that I thought was interesting is they talked about some action items. And one that I was particularly interested in was they have an action item to look at a proposal from the RACs where allowing dedicated hunters to accrue hours. And so like for instance this year I was new in the dedicated hunter program and we did a lot of work early in the year in April and May and they're looking at a proposal where we could accrue those hours in our first year. And so I was excited to see that; and I look forward to see how that's going to turn out. They also, um, they also looked at a proposal, they have an action item to look at allowing limited entry group applications for turkeys, sage grouse, sharp tail grouse. And there was a new motion to put on the action item list and that was the use of 28 gauge shotguns for turkeys. So these were things that I didn't know were going on behind the scenes that I wanted to share with the RAC members tonight. But these are some things that they are actively looking at up there. So we'll move to the next item on the agenda, item number 4,the regional update from Kevin.

Regional Update:
-Kevin Bunnell, Southern Regional Supervisor

Kevin Bunnell: Thanks Dave, with the length of our agenda tonight I will be brief and just hit an couple of things out of each of the sections.

- In our wildlife section, of course everybody is aware that the archery hunt will be opening here in a couple of weeks. In addition to that towards the end of August we'll be doing a goat capture on the Beaver. The majority of those will probably going to South Dakota. Some may be going to other parts of the state depending on what happens through this process that we're beginning tonight.
- In our aquatics section, many of you that are from this area may be aware that we've, there was a possibility that we may be, we may have to drain Minersville reservoir to do some repairs on that that dam. Luckily, which would have been devastating because that's a, you know, a trophy fishery that we would have lost. The habitat council and the blue ribbon fisheries council both stepped up and put the money forward to where that repair can be done with divers instead of having to drain the reservoir to do the repairs. It's a price tag of about $30,000.00 dollars to do so, but probably well worth it considering it would be four or five years to get that fishery back to where it is if we had to drain the reservoir this year. So that will be taking place probably towards the end of August. I do need to mention it's not 100 percent that we can get it done with divers. There's still a slight chance that we would have to drain the reservoir but we're probably 90, 95 percent sure that we'll be able to, or the work will be able to be done and to repair the dam using, using divers.

A couple of other things in the aquatics program, we've had some regulation changes on Piute reservoir and Anderson Meadows reservoir. Piute because we're draining it to treat it this fall to get rid of the chubs so that we can get a trout fishery established back in there. And then Anderson Meadow here on the Beaver; uh, it doesn't have a conservation pool and it will probably be drained all the way down because the water is needed for irrigation. So we've increased the limit, the trout limit on both of those waters up to eight, and hoping that the public will take advantage of that and take as many fish home as they can between now and when those reservoirs are drained.

- From our habitat section, luckily it's been a slow fire season and we hope that continues that way.
- From law enforcement, some of you may have seen the article that came out asking for, or requesting help from the public to try to identify a couple of people, well we don't know how many people, but the um, people that shot a couple of trophy deer just outside of Alton on the Paunsagaunt. Our law enforcement folks are really hoping to get a tip on that so that they can pursue that and make a case out of that and bring those, and make those people accountable for what they've done.
- And then lastly in our outreach section, this Saturday here in, on the Beaver is our annual goat watch. Anybody that's interested in that, the group will be meeting at the south Beaver exit and leaving that location at 7:30 to go up on the mountain. Typically several hundred people come into that, Lynn? Between 100 and 300 people usually take advantage of that each year so it's a good event. So if you have the time I would recommend you take advantage of that. And that's all I have.

Dave Black: Thank you Kevin. Before we get started with the action items, if you notice on the agenda we have eight separate action items. So we want to try to keep this process moving. Let me just explain the process as we go through. First we'll have the presentation for each of these items. Then we'll entertain questions from the RAC. And then we'll entertain questions from the public. And keep in mind at this time they would just be questions. And then we'll move into comments from the public. And in order to make a comment we'd ask that you turn in a comment card; and we have some of these up here already. When you get up before the mic, please state your name. Ideally if you're here representing a group you'll have five minutes for your comment. And we'd like to limit the five minutes to one person per group. And then other individuals from that group or if you're representing yourself you'll have three minutes for your comment. And then we'll take comments from the RAC and then we'll move to make a motion on the items. So we'll turn the time over to Jason for the first presentation.

Turkey Depredation (informational)
-Jason Robinson, Upland Coordinator 13:05 to 18:01 of 4:11:36
(See attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

David Black: Thank you Jason. Just for a point of clarification, depending on the agenda that you're looking at, this in an informational item, it's not an action item. So are there any questions from the

RAC? Sam.

Sam Carpenter: So are we receiving a lot of complaints with turkeys, is that why we've had to move to do this?

Jason Robinson: Um, depending on the part of the state. The Southern region has some complaints but the vast majority of our complaints currently are coming out of the northern region, northern part of the state. We are getting a fair number but we've been able to capture and transplant those turkeys for the most part. What the Northern region is seeing is even after they've moved a whole bunch of turkeys there are still some causing some nuisance. And so they would like, basically another tool to be able to try and get these turkeys back up on the mountain.

Sam Carpenter: Well these turkeys seem to have done a lot better in Kane County than I think anybody anticipated and they're all over in town. I was just wondering, you know, if that was part of the problem, if they've done that in other areas.

Jason Robinson: They have done very well. You know, turkeys are a great success story for the Division. And you know, depending on the situation, basically what this does is if they become a nuisance we have more tools available to us to deal with them. But our primary tool is still to capture and move them to places where they won't cause nuisance and be available for harvest and viewing.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, I take it the problem is with gardens and things of that nature? Is that what they're complaining about?

Jason Robinson: Um, that's one of them. You know it seems like when they get to a threshold there's a lot of poop on the ground and scratching vehicles, that kind of thing. But really it's just, um, people just kind of get fed up with them eventually it seems like.

Dave Black: Mack.

Mack Morrell: If there is a problem with damage on private property, who do the landowners call?

Jason Robinson: They can call the local Division office. So whatever region they're in they can call that office and then we will get it to the appropriate people.

Mack Morrell: Okay.

Dave Black: Are there any Questions from the public?

Questions from the public:

Lee Tracy: Is the noise they call considered a reason to call the Division?

Jason Robinson: The rule states they have to be causing material damage. So it actually has to be causing damage to your private property.

Dave Black: Rusty, I'm sorry.

Rusty Aiken: I was just curious Jason. Are there landowner permits available for the landowners that are having property damage?

Jason Robinson: What we're hoping to do this fall is just keep it to depredation hunt to see how this goes, if we can address it through that avenue. But we will be evaluating the opportunity, maybe in the future to have landowner permits or even a more general fall season.

Dave Black: Go ahead.

Harry Barber: Just as a thought, if it does have to go to a depredation hunt, is there a chance that the youth, that kids could be looked at first in some fashion? And you don't have to answer that now necessarily, but I'm just wondering that if it came to that if there was a chance to get these tags into the hands of some of the kids first.

Jason Robinson: We can look at that. We can evaluate that.

Dave Black: We do have one comment card. John.

Comments from the public:

John Keeler: John Keeler, Utah Farm Bureau. We appreciate the RAC and the Division undertaking this issue. There's a lot of concern out there in farmsteads and operations that are dealing with this. But we'd like to support the Division in their recommendations.

Dave Black: Are there any other comments or questions on this item? Again, this is just informational to night so we don't need to take any action. We appreciate your time. Thank you. Now let's move on to item number 6, the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule. And that will be by Blair.

Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 (action) 23:40 to 35:14 of 4:11:36
-Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Coordinator
(See attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

David Black: Thank you Blair. We will start with questions from the RAC. Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Uh, in your presentation here I see where you have a youth day for the, is it the goose? Framework September 28th, but on the season frameworks for the ducks I don't see, is there a youth date on that one too? Do they, is it just for the geese or ducks also?

Blair Stringham: Nope, the youth day would be for everything. So it would be dark geese, ducks, coots, mergansers, all that.

Sam Carpenter: And this is one week prior to the opener, right?

Blair Stringham: Yep.

Sam Carpenter: For the others?

Blair Stringham: Yep.

Sam Carpenter: Does the Division have any reservation with making that two weeks like it used to be, due to complaints from your hunters saying the ducks are pretty stirred up just a week after the youth hunt, would that be a problem?

Blair Stringham: No, I mean like I say, we had data from before we started doing this, I believe it was about 2008 or so and we stated moving it, we moved it back to two weeks prior. We haven't, looking at the bag check data the average ducks per hunter was about the same as it's been since we've moved it to two weeks back. So there really shouldn't be much of a change.

Sam Carpenter: Well the complaint was opening weekend. It didn't really affect the rest of the hunt, just that opener that they were complaining about.

Blair Stringham: Yeah, and that's the data I was referencing. Whether the youth hunt is a week before or two weeks before general opener, we haven't seen any difference in the number of ducks that are harvested by hunters.

Sam Carpenter: And you've had no complaints about it, at all?

Blair Stringham: I'm heard several people mention it but this is our first RAC meeting so I haven't heard any official complaints through the RAC process.

Dave Black: Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: Yeah, I've had several people call me on the same thing, you know, in our area, in the Sevier and Piute County area, about the, when the kids got out just one week before the hunt and blast everything up and it takes them two or three weeks to calm back down again. So opening day is not like it used to be. And the people that have called me would like to see that moved back a week.

Dave Black: Thank you. Will there be any other questions from the RAC?

Questions from the public:

Dave Black: Do we have any questions from the public?

None

Comments from the public:

Dave Black: Okay. Do we have any comments from the public? I don't believe we have any cards up here for this item.

None

RAC Discussion and Vote:

David Black: Comments from the RAC? Okay, I think we're ready to . . . Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, I'd like to make a motion that we accept the Division's proposal as presented except for the youth hunt, and I'd like to see it moved back to September 21st instead of the 28th.

Sam Carpenter: I'll second that.

Dave Black: Okay, we have a second from Sam. Do we have any discussion on the motion? Okay, we have a motion before the Board that we accept the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule as presented by the DWR with the exception that we move the date back to the 21st of September for the youth hunt instead of the 28th for the youth hunt. All in favor show by the raise of hands. Keep them up until we get a count. Any opposed? Is that unanimous? Okay, unanimous.

Cordell Pearson made the motion to accept Waterfowl Guidebook and rule R657-09 as presented with the exception that the youth hunt date be moved back to September 21st, 2013. Sam Carpenter seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Dave Black: Thank you. Let's move on to item number 7, the Military Installations Permit Program. And Kenny Johnson will present that too.

Military Installations Permit Program R657-66 (action) 39:58 to 43:52 of 4:11:36
-Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief
(See attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

David Black: Thank you. Questions from the RAC? Layne.

Layne Torgerson: So, if the commander requests these permits on September 1st and those permit numbers are approved by the Board, those would go into the draw for the next year for the public hunters, correct?

Kenny Johnson: The following year. Right.

Layne Torgerson: So they would . . .

Kenny Johnson: It would be for the following year for both.

Layne Torgerson: For all of them, for the military permits also?

Kenny Johnson: Yeah, yeah.

Dave Black: Clair.

Clair Woodbury: I was curious about how you came up with the formula of 20 percent 80 percent; 20 percent for the general public and 80 percent for the military.

Kenny Johnson: That's a fair question. I honestly wasn't involved in the negotiations there but I think it's similar to what we do in some of the other programs. That's really all I have information in front of me tonight. But I don't know that we're talking about a ton of permits. And so we had to start with the base of one, in the instance where they may only ask for a hand full of permits, and I think that was kind of, probably the basis of that math.

Dave Black: Sam.

Sam Carpenter: So what about if a Governor tag wants to hunt over there, are they going to let them do that?

Kenny Johnson: I don't see the Governor's tag being part of the military installation rule. They are separate quotas. Similar to what you see with Antelope Island.

Dave Black: Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: Are these going to be guided hunts or are they going to just give you a tag and then you just basically hunt the area on your own?

Kenny Johnson: That's a fair question. And again stuff we're probably still ironing out. The rule kind of gives us the, opens the door, the ground work for it. I don't know that the military would be guiding per say in the traditional sense, other than maybe just pointing people toward the particular places on that property that they could actually hunt.

Dave Black: Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: Just this is just a simple question; on the 80 percent of the tags that are going to stay with the military, are they just going to be handed out to individuals by the commanding officer or are they going to have a draw for all the military personnel in the state, or is it going to be in the country? How are they going to do that?

Kenny Johnson: That's a fair question. From what I understand it's designed for personnel on that property or in association to that property. And so what they'll do is present a fair way to distribute those vouchers and then we'll kind of help them approve how that works out. I guess, I guess it could become kind of a draw process for them. And we'll kind of help them determine how, whether that's a fair way to distribute those vouchers.

Dave Black: Any more questions from the RAC?

Questions from the public:

Dave Black: How about questions from the public? Please state your name; please come up.

Lee Tracy: Lee Tracy, Enoch. I hope you will indulge quite a few questions here because this is something that's really new and there's a lot of questions of the United Wildlife Cooperative has regarding this. Do we already have some of these units on board?

Kenny Johnson: Right now I think we have been approached by a couple but we don't have any signed MOUs right now today.

Lee Tracy: Is there an individual or a plan to pursue other areas? Because there's an awful lot of military bases here in Utah.

Kenny Johnson: That's a good question. And we've been working with the military personnel on those three specifically that we talked about. And even if each of those have more property, um, but you know this would just kind of open the door for us to consider any of those additional properties. So I don't know that we have, you know, a lot of resources to pursue it per say but we would entertain any of those opportunities that presented themselves to us.

Lee Tracy: Okay, uh, I haven't seen any kind of an agreement so I am not sure how this question pertains, but are the commanders obligated to manage the habitat and or the hunts to maintain populations similar to CWMUs?

Kenny Johnson: I think that's a fair question. And to the extent that they are able to, you know, I think a lot of these have, you know there's biology in place and maybe Kevin can help me with some of that more specifically, but um, there is some biology in place on most of those properties already that are kind of doing those things. This is just a way to use hunting as a tool to help manage those populations.

Lee Tracy: Okay, as a follow up to that question, are the commanders allowed to for instance have doe hunts out there, or depredation hunts, or those kinds of things that sometimes take place in other parts of the state?

Kenny Johnson: Right now, today, I think we're probably just talking about antlered species. But again, it's one of those things that, um, I think we could pursue in the future as part of it.

Lee Tracy: One last question, and this is kind of on a personal basis, are there any assurances regarding hunting length, hours or days? The reason I ask that, I was once on a CWMU and was dropped off and told be ready with the deer on the road in two hours.

Kenny Johnson: That's a good question. And um, so what we would do is review what the base commander wanted to do as far as season lengths and those kinds of things. They'd be fairly set in stone, certainly for where the public is concerned because we'd have to publish that in some format where they could read it and then let them apply for it in the draw. So we'd want them to be as aware of all of those details as we could possibly get them.

Lee Tracy: (Off Mic). By the way we had it on the road in two hours, but it wasn't fun.

Dave Black: Please state your name.

Jason Aiken: Jason Aiken, Cedar City. I was wondering, I just wanted to check and see if these 20 percent of the tags will be going into the general draw, is that correct, the general season?

Kenny Johnson: Yeah that's correct. We'll just make those available through our bucks, what we call the bucks and bulls draw.

Jason Aiken: Right, but the general, not the limited entry or . . .

Kenny Johnson: Yeah, that's a good question. I'll have to look at the rule to see if we identified it one way or the other in rule. I assumed it was general but I'll double check that before the meeting's over.

Dave Black: Do we have any other questions from the public?

Comments from the public:

Dave Black: So now we'll move to the comments from the public. We have two cards; Lee Tracy is one.

Lee Tracy: I just want to say that the United Wildlife Cooperative applauds the DWR. and the military installations for designing or at least coming up with these kinds of hunts. The United Wildlife Cooperative always looks for opportunity for the public to hunt and this is just another one. We applaud you, thanks.

Dave Black: Thank you Lee. Kirt.

Kirt Connelly: Kirt Connelly, and I'm representing myself on this. I just want to make a general comment. I worked at Hill Air Force Base for ten years in their natural resources division, and if you look there's actually already a hunt on Hill Air Force Base. It's the general late season archery hunt they allow people to hunt on base. And they have a very well thought out, very good system. They have a drawing, it goes to military people first, civilian military, or enlisted military first, civilian second, contractors third, and then the general public forth. The contractors and general public never draw because it goes in that order, but the system works really well. And one thing to comment about, to remind that, deer on Hill Air Force Base and even Dugway are a nuisance. One of those deer runs out on the runway and hits an F-16, I mean that's 20 million dollars down the drain and you're on the news. So I think not only is this a good thing to get more opportunity but it's also a way for these installations to protect our resources and allow people to hunt them. Because right now there's a lot of cases where they have to kill them by other means because they're a nuisance so, especially on places like Dugway and Camp Williams where they haven't been hunting them in the past. So I applaud the Division for looking into this as well.

Dave Black: Thank you Kirt. That's all the cards we have.

RAC discussion and vote:

Dave Black: Do we have comments from the RAC? Okay, it looks like we're ready to entertain a motion. Clair.

Clair Woodbury: I would also like to applaud the Division and the military for creating more opportunity, especially where it specifies that the general public we would draw for that 20 percent of the tags. As such I would like to recommend that we approve the program R-657-66.

Dave Black: Okay, we have a motion, do we have a second? We have a second by Mike. Do we have any discussion on the motion? Okay, the motion on the table by Clair then is that we accept the Military Installations Permit program as presented by the DWR, and we have a second by Mike. All in favor raise your hand. That looks unanimous.

Clair Woodbury made the motion to accept Military Installations Permit Program R657-66 as presented. Mike Worthen seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Dave Black: Thank you**.** We'll move on to item number 9, and that's by Jordan Nielson. Or excuse me, 8. I'm sorry I jumped ahead. Sorry Jordan. Kenny Johnson, number 8, which is the Fee Schedule.

Proposed Fee Schedule FY 2015 (action) 56:20 to 1:25:59 of 4:11:36
-Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief
(See attachment 1)

Dave Black: Um, excuse me, thank you Kenny.

Questions from the RAC:

David Black: Lets move right in to questions from the RAC. Dale, do you have a question?

Dale Bagley: I am confused, are the 12 and 13 year olds, are they not required to get a license any more or was there just no change to that price?

Kenny Johnson: Oh sorry, that's a great question. Um, I should have added that to the slide. There is still the $5.00, 12 and 13- year-old fishing license.

Dale Bagley: Okay, thanks.

Dave Black: Layne do you have a question? Oh, Mike.

Mike Staheli: We talked about these other states around us, and excluding Colorado, we're treating our residents worse than any of the other state, and the non-residents better than any other state, excluding Colorado. And why didn't we raise the non-resident as high or percentage wise as we did the resident? What was the logic is what I'm asking?

Kenny Johnson: That's a good question. And on that specifically the last real significant fee increase we had was about in 2004 or '05 if memory serves, we bumped up the non-resident fishing license, we almost doubled it. It went from 40 to 70. So they took a huge hit then. And we just want to kind of find that balance that keeps them interested in Utah and doesn't price them out of the participation here.

Dave Black: Layne.

Layne Torgerson: I just have a question on the multi year option that you're proposing on the combination license, well on any of the licenses. When a person agrees to this multi year program do they pay all five years up front or is it set up to where they're just dinged once each year?

Kenny Johnson: That's a good question. Right now it would be they'd pay for it right up front. So if they've got extra money today and they don't want a hassle with buying a fishing license next year and next year, they can just pick, pay for it right then and then uh, then we just send them the new one every time. Or we can still work out some of the details there. It may just be that depending on how it works out in the new code, we might just fulfill that as one time license and show all of those years on there.

Dave Black: Mike.

Mike Worthen: I applaud the Division for using the Hunter Ed, redoing the hunter ed. fees and making them part of their hunting, their combo licenses. I think that's a good move that will go a long ways towards those youth that want to get into hunting. One question I had that is kind of off the beaten path on this is on the real estate fees, on the assignment assessment, easements, grazing permits, right of entry and special use a $250.00 dollar fee, what is currently being done on grazing permits? Are they, does the Division assess those on AUMs like the Forest, and the BLM, and SITLA or do you charge any fees at all? Is grazing free out there?

Kenny Johnson: You know that's a fair question. I honestly don't have an answer off the top of my head on that one. I would have to do some digging. Kevin looks like he might know some more about that.

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah, right now Mike those usually go out to bid and it's a competitive bid process when we're putting grazing on our wildlife management areas. And it goes everywhere from sometimes there's a fee, sometimes it's in-kind stuff where they're maintaining fences. We have all sorts of deals. And I think that would still be in place, you know, where we're doing, most of them are done under bid. This would be, I believe, you know special circumstances where we don't have an MOU with an individual in place and we need to graze a particular spot for a short period of time or something of that nature.

Mike Worthen: So this $250 wouldn't go to existing permittees out there?

Kevin Bunnell: I don't, I don't, I think with the bid process would still stay in place. Is that correct Greg? Yeah.

Dave Black: Any other questions from the RAC?

Questions from the Public:

Dave Black: Do we have questions from the public?

None

Comments from the Public:

Dave Black: Okay, I do have two comment cards. Brayden, do you want to go first?

Brayden Richmond: Brayden Richmond, representing the SFW state fulfillment board. I'm be quick. We want to support this proposal change. The statewide committee supports this.

Dave Black: Thanks Brayden. We also have a comment card from Jason Aiken.

Jason Aiken: Um, I am Jason Aiken, from Cedar City. I'd like to comment on the 365-day license. All the other states are set dates, you know, January 1st to December 31st. Um, that's one thing that Utah's different with. Every now and then I get confused on whether or not I need a license, until I go to put in and then it tells me whether I have a license or not. And then another thing I wanted to comment on was uh, the multi year. I don't understand where that is going to be much of a benefit. If the Division thinks it's going to work, that's great but I personally think it would be even more confusing to me on the end of buying the license . . . Okay where am I at, do I need to buy another license this year, am I still current or not?

Dave Black: Thank you for your comments.

RAC discussion and vote:

Dave Black: Do we have any comments from the RAC? Do you want to share any of those with us Cordell and Layne? Okay can't hear it. Okay. If there are no further comments it looks like we're ready for a motion.

Rusty Aiken: I'll make a motion.

Dave Black: Rusty.

Rusty Aiken: Chairman I'll make the motion to accept the recommendations of the Division on the fee changes.

Dave Black: Okay, we have a motion from Rusty. Do we have a second? Second from Layne. Have any discussion on the motion? Okay. Moving forward then it looks like we have a motion for the table in that we accept the proposed fee schedule FY 2015 as proposed by the DWR. That was made by Rusty and seconded by Layne. All in favor? It looks like unanimous.

Rusty Aiken made the motion to accept the Proposed Fee Schedule FY2015 as presented. Layne Torgerson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Dave Black: Okay, let's move on to number 9, and that is Jordan, it's your turn.

AIS Rule Amendments R657-60 (action) 1:33:57 to 1:37:23 of 4:11:36
-Jordan Nielson, AIS Coordinator

(See attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

David Black: Mike, go ahead.

Mike Worthen: On there, the situation in Lake Powell and Sand Hollow, I would imagine probably the most use of those two lakes is recreation. Does the Division get any recreation dollars to support the new biologist or the part-time aquatics biologist that you're looking at to monitor this situation?

Jordan Nielson: In a round a bout way we do. The bulk of the money that we use to fund our aquatic invasive species programs comes from a legislative appropriation rather than license dollars and federal aide. So each year the legislature apportions 1.35 million for that. We bolster that with about another $550,000.00 dollars in partner contracts. In a round about way through state taxes we receive some money from recreation.

Mike Worthen: I think the RAC and the Wildlife Board should support maybe an increase in revenue on that part of the recreation because it's so vital to the waters in Utah that we contain that and not let it get up into the other waters or we're in big trouble.

Jordan Nielson: Okay.

Dave Black: Rusty.

Rusty Aiken: Uh, Lake Powell, your two marinas there, Antelope and Wahweep are in Arizona? Do you guys have control there or is there cooperation? How is that handled?

Jordan Nielson: The National Parks Service maintains control over those. They contract the Antelope Point marina out to the tribe. I'm sorry it slipped my mind the name of the tribe there, the Navajo tribe. And then they monitor and regulate their activities. We cooperate with the National Park Service as much as we can. They still have to help boaters comply with state law but we maintain no direct control. No.

Dave Black: Is there any other questions from the RAC?

Questions from the public:

Dave Black: Do we have any questions from the public?

None

Comments from the Public:

Dave Black: It doesn't look like we have any comment cards from the public.

None

RAC discussion and vote:

Dave Black: Do we have any comments from the RAC? It looks like we are ready to entertain a motion. Rusty.

Rusty Aiken: Yeah, I'll make a motion to accept the recommendations of the Division.

Dave Black: Okay, we have a motion from Rusty. Do we have a second? It looks like Sam. Okay the motion before the table is that we approve the AIS Rule Amendments R657-60 as presented by the DWR. That was made by Rusty and a second by Sam. All in favor? It looks like unanimous.

Rusty Aiken made the motion to accept AIS Rule Amendments R657-60 as presented. Sam Carpenter seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Dave Black: Yeah, I think we'll take a brief break; it's getting pretty hot up here. Let's meet back here in ten minutes. So at five minutes until we'll start again.

Dave Black: It looks like we're getting down to the important part of the agenda. Everybody is here, I don't want to take anything away from the other items but I'm sure as we move forward we will probably have more comments and more questions. So I just want to remind you again on the process that we want to limit our comments to five minutes for organization, that's one person from that organization, the rest of the comments we'd like to keep to three minutes. We do appreciate you all being here tonight. We look forward to your comments and your opinions and questions that you have. So let's move to item number 10, the Cougar Recommendations, and that's from John.

Cougar Recommendations (action) 1:44:54 to 2:01:57 of 4:11:36
-John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator
(See attachment 1)

Kevin Bunnell: John, I think there is one error on your season dates, back in the beginning.

John Shivik: Do I have a 14 where there should have been a 13? Or a 13 where it should have been . . .

Kevin Bunnell: Uh no. On the straight limited entry units, shouldn't that be a closing date of May 30th when they're straight limited entry? It's only the limited entry portion of the split that ends on the 26th of February.

John Shivik: Oh, I think you're right.

Kevin Bunnell: In the past the straight limited entry units go through the end of May.

John Shivik: Yeah, thanks.

Questions from the RAC:

David Black: Thank you John, do we have any questions from the RAC? Sam.

Sam Carpenter: In the past when we've had any discussion with cougar management we've always had information sent to us that had previous years, if the unit was getting cut or added. And uh, from the stuff that we've got in this particular packet it's very hard to tell if we're cutting tags, adding tags, and

where we're going with the management plan. I did get with our biologist and he was good enough to bring a list with him and show me where we were going. You know my interest of course is on the premium deer units. And what kind of headache would it be for these premium units to fall in that harvest objective? I mean they are the premium deer units and we look out for the bighorn sheep with an awful lot of vigor, why can't we do that with your premium hunting units for deer?

John Shivik: So are we talking about altering cougar units or deer units? I misunderstood you.

Sam Carpenter: No, I am talking about the Paunsaugunt and the Henry Mountains. They're premium deer units, why shouldn't we manage them with harvest objective strategy like we do for the bighorn sheep and put a number out there instead of running back and forth on this all the time? And from what I understand we're cutting tags on the Paunsagaunt.

John Shivik: Well we're not. We can go clear on it because one of the things . . . we can go . . .where are these guys? Um, what I've done is followed the dictates of the plan which says to take the cougar from the previous years, roll it into the area, go through the flow chart, and then I come up with the standard, the harvest quota of 24. And then how these are split into split units, harvest objective units, and then where the permits go is where that gets made at the regional scale. Can we move these things around into split harvest objectives? Um, if it's a standard management and not on a predator management plan then you're not generally put that into a harvest objective unit. So for instance the Paunsagaunt didn't have, and the Henrys, they didn't fall, the deer data weren't, according to the predator management policy they weren't put into predator management plan based on the deer data. We didn't have problems with adult survival for instance. If we wanted to move it to harvest objective or be more aggressive that's not by on a unit basis, that's not the way the plan's set up. The plan says do an area if you have problems you need predator management, then you consider predator management. So I just followed the way the plan dictates to calculate permits.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, I understand that. But our premium units, I don't know, I just think we should manage the cougars different on them than we do on the other units. They represent an awful lot of money for the department, and not only that they're set aside as a once in a lifetime hunt and we should . . . I wouldn't care if they went to the predator management plan and managed them as such. You know, but the criteria that you have in there for that, of course the deer and the ratios and stuff wouldn't allow that. But by the same token I see we're cutting tags on the Paunsagaunt this year and that's because they didn't kill the number of cougars that they already have licenses for, combined with the deer survival rates, is that what you were saying the way you come up with the number for that?

John Shivik: Right, exactly. So if I look, now . . . And I understand what you're saying but that's just not, that's out of the scope of my ability . . .

Sam Carpenter: Of the plan.

John Shivik: Yeah, exactly. So what, if you guys want to treat units differently or whatever that's out of, that's out of my power to do that. I've got to follow what the plan says to do. And it's just a, it's just a putting it through the numbers, putting it through the flow chart and then coming up with these numbers. It's pretty objective from my perspective. Um, short of opening the plan, doing something different, um, this is kind of where we are at.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, let me put it this way, would it be a major problem to manage them, you know they're premium hunting units, there are two in the state, as a predator management unit I guess that meet that criteria, manage them that way because they're premium units instead of basing it on how many cougars were killed or?

John Shivik: Right, if you treat them like a bighorn sheep units for instance.

Sam Carpenter: Yeah.

John Shivik: So I've already got three where I've got unlimited quotas. Um, in the current plan the way everything's labeled, no. But that, I mean obviously we're doing that on a few units that are dictated by the plan.

Sam Carpenter: Right, where we've got the quotas. I just wondered how big of a headache it would be where we can keep this consistent and keep these premium units premium and manage the cougars accordingly.

John Shivik: Headache is . . .

Sam Carpenter: It's okay. It's okay. I'd call Dustin up but he's already explained it to me.

John Shivik: Yeah, it's out of my power. I understand where you're coming from and I understand what you're saying. It's just that this is sort of kind of up to the RACs and Boards and things at this point.

Sam Carpenter: But would it be a valid recommendation to start doing that? Maybe that's a better way of putting it.

John Shivik: Yeah it would require a change in the plan. But would it be valid? That's again up to you know, (unintelligible).

Sam Carpenter: So if they wanted to do that they could, it wouldn't be a major headache if they included premium units be managed under the predator control plan.

John Shivik: It wouldn't be under the predator management plan. You could treat it as a bighorn sheep unit.

Sam Carpenter: Or the bighorn sheep. As a bighorn sheep plan. Yeah.

John Shivik: Right that would probably the approach you'd take.

Sam Carpenter: That would be the way to go, right?

John Shivik: That would be the approach you'd probably take. But it might take a little thought to.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, okay thanks.

Dave Black: Any other questions from the RAC? Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: Yeah, I would just like to ask you how long has the cougar study been going on on the Monroe mountain? And what has happened with that and how do we find out what's happened with that?

John Shivik: The Oquirrh Monroe has been going on 14 plus years. And the Monroe study is bigger than just cougars right now, as you know where they've implanted deer and looking at fawn survival. This is only the second year into it so there are still deer that haven't given birth yet still. They're still monitoring coyote take, cougar take. There's a graduate student that's working on the Monroe right now. So I put some more resources into the Monroe study than we had had in previous years. So we've bumped up how intensely we're looking at it in terms of data. Um, we're still going to be a couple of years before we have a definitive conclusion on that but we can probably try to figure out better ways to get you guys more updates and things. That would help.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, I just have one more question. Are all the cougars on the Monroe, supposedly, I mean they're not all, but supposedly are they all collared on the Monroe?

John Shivik: Um, I would doubt if they're all collared on the Monroe.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, because you know we hear the rumors that they're all collared and we're spending a whole lot of money for this but nobody can answer a question of what are we doing with that cougar study on the Monroe?

John Shivik: Yeah.

Cordell Pearson: I mean 14 years now and we don't get an answer. And I'm not getting on you, okay?

John Shivik: That's a valid point.

Cordell Pearson: But it's a blind spot to me and why do we spend all that money when we have no data to nobody coming back about what we're doing. And then I see that the amount of cougars taken off of the Monroe is, well other than the Thousand Lake, is the lowest of that whole area and we have less deer on the Monroe than any one of those mountains involved in that. So what is that?

John Shivik: Because, again the numbers we came with the Monroe for this year had to do with the adult female was .3 which automatically bumps us into knocking it down by 20 percent.

Cordell Pearson: Okay thank you

John Shivik: Yeah, and just to clarify too, it's interesting if you look I . . . What's happening here, just, and I think the way, this is the way the plan's developed, one of the objectives of the plan is to prevent wild oscillations and completely hitting one unit really heavily one year and then zero next year. So what's happening is that things are shifting around the state so some people's units are getting added considerable numbers of quota, other areas are being reduced. So we're just seeing kind of the shifting around in the state. And if you happen to pay attention to the Monroe you're going to be raising your eyes and wondering exactly what you're saying, what's going, what's happening?

Cordell Pearson: I've got one more question to clarify this for me. Okay, the reason that there's only seven permits on the Monroe is because we've killed too many females on the Monroe, is that why?

John Shivik: The proportion of the adult females in the harvest is, it's over the trigger so we had to reduce the permits.

Cordell Pearson: Okay. Is there any in our little study that we've done for the last 14 years, okay, is there any way that we know, I mean I know we don't know for sure, but how many males and how many females are on the Monroe?

John Shivik: I don't have that off hand. I have to look those kinds of numbers up.

Cordell Pearson: Okay just an example; what if there are 300 females on the Monroe and only 100 males? Then our little thing that we use to create the number of tags is a total fallacy. And I think that's something that we really need to look at. Because I know what the deer herd is on the Monroe, I live there. And I know that there are a ton of cougars on the Monroe that are not tagged. I've seen two in the last two weeks that have no collars that are on the Monroe.

John Shivik: What we need to do, its an imprecise science, they're hard things to find, they're hard things to track, so what we're reduced to doing, we can't, we don't have a good population estimate but we can say if you're hitting this many females you're impacting or, we have to use an index to adjust our management. And I agree, it's not perfect but it's kind of the best scenario we have. And we had a group of really smart people put the plan together and try to come up with the best approach they could take and this is the one they've taken and put through the process. But it's not perfect; I acknowledge that.

Kevin Bunnell: John and members of the RAC … is seems apparent to me that maybe what we need is to have an update from the researchers like we had on the two coyote research projects at our, I think that was our last RAC meeting in Richfield. If that's something that you're interested in I would be more than happy to work with John and arrange at one of our one of the upcoming RAC meetings to have a research update on that whole cougar project. It's pretty fascinating. There is, the shame is you're not getting it, but there is a whole bunch of really fascinating data that's come out of that. And John and I could work together to find the right person. There's been a lot of people involved in the research over the years, but find the right person to maybe come down to an upcoming RAC meeting and give a real thorough update of all that information. So we can easily do that.

John Shivik: We'll definitely get that. I've been, I've worked with the University. We had a, we did have a situation where we had people who were intimately involved retired, moved on, other jobs, and so I've got this big data set and I put some pressure on, I found a few people so during the next couple of months we're going to see a lot. There's going to be a lot happening, summarizing all of that. There's I think three or four papers now out of it. But we do have to do a better job, and I'll work with Kevin to (unintelligible) to try to update it.

Dave Black: Dale did you have a question?

Dale Bagley: On your collard cats, the non-take of them, is that just female only? It used to be female only but now is it any species, male, female or what?

John Shivik: It's going to be collard. And I do admit we struggled with this. I struggled with this because, and I've been arguing against this prohibition against collared cats up to this point, mostly because if we want to study a harvested population you have to study a harvested population. But right now we're seeing interesting interactions with cougars eating coyotes for instance. And where the cougars are relative to the deer and some of these other species that it put it over a threshold that if they've got a radio collar on it then we want to know where these things are relative to these other species, relative to the deer, relative to the coyotes, and see how they're all working, working it out. So if it has a collar then it is not harvested, that's the way we're proposing it.

Dale Bagley: Whether it's a tom or a female then?

John Shivik: Yes.

Dale Bagley: Then what about the ear tags? The ear tagged ones are okay?

John Shivik: Yeah, the collars, we've got GPS collars on these, it's really priceless information, they're difficult to get on and it just changes the dynamics of, you know once one tom comes out then the shuffle goes on. So the longer we can kind of watch these things and get this high value information the better. So we're hoping at least for a few years to focus on the Monroe, focus on where these different predators are and get some really good information out of them. So that's the reason for it.

Dale Bagley: Okay, the next question, a lot of those, I mean, we've treed them on Beaver and Boulder, so as long as they are on those units collared you can take them on those, right?

John Shivik: Yeah.

Dale Bagley: Okay, and then next question, on your management area are these getting pretty much hot spotted? I mean, Beaver used to close quick, Panguitch used to close quick. Is that still the trend where most of these cats are coming off of those certain few units or are they kind of getting spread out and taken off of all the units out of that area?

John Shivik: I am not sure, please, can you repeat your question? I'm not sure exactly what you are asking.

Dale Bagley: Where is the major portion out of this management area . . . You got several units on it, but I mean, Dutton's hardly, I know for a fact that it hardly gets hunted as hard as these other units, so . . .It used to be you had to hunt the units and now you can hunt the whole are until it closes. So are these hunters, are they distributing themselves and taking the cats pretty evenly portioned off of all these units or are they all coming off of a certain two or three units out of that whole area?

John Shivik: It really, okay that really depends on the area and that's something . . .uhhh. . . that we did try to make some adjustments with. I could dig through and get numbers for you but I think it might be simpler to answer that on some of the units yes they do hit some of the areas. They hit certain units really much harder than other ones. What we try to do is where that was a problem with too many from one area another not enough, we would make that unit limited entry or split or something in order to try to force people . . . What was happening, for instance the Wasatch Manti, what was happening is people were going to the units where it was easy to hunt cougars and not where we wanted to get them where

we are worried about sheep and deer and those kinds of things. So it's not just simply a factor of when we put these together of, you know it's not limited entry just to protect cougars in this one area it's to force people to go to some of these other spots that we want them to go to because we were having these big gaps. It was a more rugged or a harder to get to place. People weren't going to those units. And you might know some of the ones in, you know, in your area. And so what we try to do is to keep that in our calculations as far as where to, you know, try to get people diverse across the whole area a little bit better.

Dale Bagley: Yeah, that's kind of what I am alluding to on the Dutton. It's one of those rugged units. So I mean, I was just wondering if you have to up those limited entry tags more to get more people on that unit earlier or something.

John Shivik: I see what you mean.

Dale Bagley: And force people there or what, you know. Or if it's been evenly distributed as far as the kill, I guess, off all the units.

John Shivik: Right, yeah, again it comes to the regions. I really defer to them as far as any specific unit and how they're going to push people around. But they're limited by what the, you know, the overall harvest quota is. They do the numbers the best that they can.

Dave Black: Any other questions from the RAC? Rusty.

Rusty Aiken: I would like to see more comparisons with which units were reached their objectives and things. Maybe next time some comparisons of how the plan is working.

John Shivik: I can say overall, for instance, I mean how the plan's working. Things are getting, hopefully they're getting a little more in alignment. There isn't a whole huge reduction of permits or anything or quotas. There isn't a huge increase of them or anything. Um, it is a little apples and oranges since things have changed around so I wasn't able to put together a table. I couldn't put together a clear table of, um, you know, before after, before after, other than . . . uh, I mean I can tell you, I mean, our typical harvest of cougars in the state averages, you know, 370 um, or so, um, I'm sorry, and our quotas are . . . Oh I'm sorry. Our typical quota's around 370 but our take is more around 300, sub 300's. So what's happening relative to cougar harvest throughout the whole state, we're still harvesting far fewer quotas than, oh or far fewer cougars than our overall quota gets to. So what's really happening is there's not only a comparison it's more of just we're shifting where we're moving cougars from but there's no kind of, you know, overall up down. We're still not, our quotas for the state is still higher than our harvest potential probably is.

Dave Black: Let's move to the public for questions and then we'll have a chance one more time for the RAC to make comments.

Questions from the public:

Dave Black: Do we have any questions from the public?

Taylor Albrecht: My name is Taylor Albrecht and I'm representing myself and SFW. Why doesn't the

Henry Mountains, why isn't it considered part of the cougar management area for sheep? The Henrys. Why isn't it considered part of the sheep cougar management area?

John Shivik: Um for all of the reasons I explained. It's something that according to the plan it's not assigned that particular status.

Dave Black: Remember state your name please.

Brayden Richmond: Brayden Richmond. I apologize if I ask some questions, these, it's hard to hear with these mics. So if there's some things you may have covered. I have several questions on this so this is a frustrating issue for me. First question I've got is in all of the states surrounding us with the exclusion of Colorado, so New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, Idaho and Wyoming all have over the counter cougar tags that you can harvest year round. Idaho even lets you harvest them with a deer tag. Why are out cougars more delicate than the cougars in the state surrounding us?

John Shivik: I don't know if that is a question or a comment. I can't address the robustness or toughness of our cougars in the state. They seem um . . . But I can say we do have a fair number of harvest objective units that run pretty much all year, that's our . . .We almost have more harvest objective units that almost run all year than we have limited entry. So it's a mix the same way.

Brayden Richmond: And that leads perfectly into my next question. I would be curious if there's anyone in the room that understood this plan. And my opinion the cougar plan is one of the most difficult plans we have in the state to comprehend and understand. If I want to go buy a harvest objective tag I need a masters degree. Uh, so is there way we can simplify this plan, such as all the states surrounding us which do them over the counter unlimited?

John Shivik: That's an excellent point too. Like I said, a large group of houndsman, people from all walks of life, pro-cougar, anti-cougar, everybody got to sit down in the same room, a lot of smart people. And what they did is they did their best to please everybody and try to make this plan as flexible as possible but also put some safeguards, there's worries about deer in it and there's worries about cougar populations in it. So what ended up coming out is, I admit this is a really complicated plan. Putting these things together is difficult. But what's interesting is after the sausage making process I think we actually have pretty decent recommendations in terms of we've got some areas where cougars are doing what the plan says and we're trying to keep the population okay, and other areas where we're hitting them really really hard and trying to essentially have no cougars. So it's balancing having cougars and not having cougars at the same time. So I agree, it's complicated.

Brayden Richmond: Okay, so still along the same lines, once again recognizing our plan's complicated, recognizing that the states around us are managing cougars successfully over the counter unlimited. In fact Idaho and Wyoming both submit far more trophy book cougars than Utah. So understanding that, also understanding that the legislature gave us one million dollar, more than one million dollars this year as a deer, mule deer recovery act to kill coyotes but yet we're complicating the killing of cougars. Why can't we go to a statewide over the counter cougar tag?

John Shivik: In short that's not what the plan dictates. Like I said, we have a certain amount of putting things together, weighing the biology, knowing that Utah is not Idaho, Utah is not Nevada, Utah is not Texas or wherever, so we did our best to put together this plan and I'm pretty much sworn to follow this

thing. I don't want to go and arbitrarily throw one thing out or whatever. You know, can there be improvements? Yeah. Can there be other ways to do things? Perhaps. But for right now this plan is what went through the RAC process, the Board process and it's law that I'm following.

Brayden Richmond: Okay shifting gears a little bit, I may be trying to make a little bit of point there. Shifting gears a little bit, we discussed last year the idea of in our sheep units, particularly the Escalante, that the cougars are just hammering the sheep. You don't have houndsman in that unit. You can't trap cougars legally. We discussed encouraging our sheep hunters to get cougar tags. Is that still a program we're doing? And what are we doing to address cougars in those areas more aggressively?

John Shivik: Um, I, we have looked into believe it or not, in some of these areas I did look into allowing trapping for instance by the general public, um, on these areas. I didn't think we had the political support or the ability to do those kinds of things right now and we backed off of it. I've still done some things in terms of the harvest objective, trying to get the three-day instead of a seven-day wait. I also put some language in to make it easier to get authorized by the Division to work in these areas. So I tried to do some things to make it easier, especially in depredation situations for people to get in and harvest and take out those cougars but again we're still following with what the limitations of the rule and the law are at this point.

Scott Christensen: I just found it interesting this year I had a spring bear tag on the Boulder. I had a terrific hunt even though I didn't harvest a bear. I got to see a lot of mountain lions coming in which really surprised me. Every one of the baits I had set I'd have a cougar visit it. They wouldn't eat it but they were passing through. It kind of surprised me. My question is, from a guy that doesn't have the funds or the means or maybe doesn't put it as a priority, how come we don't allow trapping or snaring in these areas that fall under harvest objective? Um, you know if you have areas that are hitting it, but like you said you're not even harvesting 75 percent of what your quota of what you want to kill, what keeps us from opening that up to trapping and snaring to allow sportsman to maybe get in that don't have the ability to run hounds?

John Shivik: Again, relative to trapping and snaring it's not something that is allowed right now. It's in and has historically been set up the way it is in the rule and guidebook. I think you've got difficulties with expanding traps and snares. And I think if we were going to do it we want to be really careful, there's more potentials with dogs and hounds and conflicts. I think some of those things could be worked with and worked around but at this point we don't have it in a recommendation yet. We're not quite, we weren't quite ready to go full speed with that. And there is, oh I'm sorry, excuse me, can I just have one more thing? It's a little easier on harvest objective or the sheep units if the goal really is to reduce the cougar populations. But the nice thing about treeing and using hounds is you can see males, females, you can selectively harvest, and you can do different things with the population. With something like a snare, um, whatever it is it is dead, kitten whatever. So it's a little more complicated than just a yes or no kind of thing. There are those little details that we'd really have to pay attention to. And if you were a proponent of say setting snares for cougar and people started catching kittens it could be something would be really frowned upon and met with a bit of a backlash too. So we've got to be careful before you run headlong into something like that.

Scott Christensen: Scott Christensen. So I guess my question now is when's the next, you know I understand you fall subjective to when the management plan is and how far it is, when is that management plan come up to renew and redo?

Dave Black: Can we have you restate your name so we can get that in the minutes.

Scott Christensen: Scott Christensen.

Dave Black: Thank you.

John Shivik: The current cougar management plan runs from 2009 to 2021.

Scott Christensen: So it's a 12-year plan, we don't have the option to, at this point to re-recognize a plan for another eight years?

John Shivik: Me personally, no.

Kevin Bunnell: Can I comment on that John? The plan was set up as a 12-year plan but it does call for a 6-year review. So after this management cycle in the plan it calls to look at if it's working the way it was meant to work. And that was written into the plan just as a safeguard to not lock us into something 12-years if it wasn't working the way it was designed to be worked, designed to work. So that's in there to have a review after the first two recommendation cycles so it would be at the end of these recommendations.

John Shivik: And I think, and I said I didn't mean to be too flippant with the not me, um, I thought that was kind of leading towards if RACs and Board are worried about these kinds of things, those are the people that are going to want to open up the plan and get us to change things and get us to fix things. So again, I still take is seriously that um; it's my marching orders. But there's definitely flexibility for the RACs and Board to alter or change things or ask us to revise it.

Dave Black: Do I have any more questions from the public?

Comments from the Public:

Dave Black: Can we move to the comment section now. Okay, we do have some cards. The first one that comes up is Dan with the Utah Houndsman Association**.**

Dan Cockayne: My name is Dan Cockayne; I represent the Utah Houndsman Association (attachment 2). We appreciate this opportunity. We realize that you have a task, a difficult task to balance all of these species and cougars are no good to eat so they're just hunted for trophy. And so it's difficult to manage that. But that being said we'd like to compliment John and those who work with him. We had two representatives on that committee that put together the cougar management plan. This is the first year it's implemented the way it's supposed to be and we applaud them for that. Separating those predator units from the standard units is a huge deal, I believe. The thing that we find is that these cougars are hunted where we have access and we can get to them. So no matter how we, if we, if it's a harvest objective unit or a split unit and it's combined with this great big management area, no matter how many tags there are there the cougars are going to be hunted and harvested in the places where there is access and it is easy to get to. And so really the way to target certain areas are with the limited entry and the split units because that directs harvest to that, right to that area. And so harvest objective, although it seems like

you get more time to hunt and it's, and it allows more opportunity, it historically hasn't increased the take on those certain areas. That being said, and another thing specifically on the Monroe, I've been statewide with houndsman in meetings with three or four, in meetings with fifty in the room, trying to find out how can we help manage this species, because that's our mission, that's our purpose, and the biggest complaint on the Monroe is all the Forest Service roads get shut down and yet you don't have any access. If you have plenty of snow you can access with a snowmobile, if not you have a horse or your feet and that has a lot to do with why these cougars aren't being harvested. Because if there's no access to hunt it's just too difficult so they'll go to an area where it is easier to hunt. That's just the way it happens. We also agree with the GPS. And we, that actually recommendation came from the Southeast RAC and we think it's a great tool for law enforcement and for biology. Most houndsman have GPS collars on their dogs, it doesn't create any burden. One thing that we would ask you when you make your recommendation tonight to the Wildlife Board is that you include the, there is a voluntary cougar orientation program that is really good but we would ask that it was mandatory. If you have a tag you have one. A lot of guys that kill a cougar will only see one in their whole life and that's that one in that tree. And you know if you read through the (alarm sounds).

Dave Black: Dan, can we get you to summarize please. Sorry, we're just running short on time so we're going to start holding everybody to their time.

Dan Cockayne: Yeah, to summarize we would like that mandatory so that that hunter that's going to pull the trigger on that animal knows what they're taking. We also would like to say that snares and traps just about make that a no hound area. It would just drive the houndsman away. You know bobcat trap you might have a chance getting a dog's foot out of; a cougar trap or snare they're done. And so I think it would push it the other way. That's all I have, if somebody has questions.

Dave Black: Thank you, we appreciate your comments. Um, Dan we have one question for you really quick.

Sam Carpenter: With you being a houndsman you're of course very familiar with catching these cats and treeing them. So that said and with your comments tonight wouldn't you agree that hunting cougars is something that is going to require a special kind of person that either has dogs or hires someone, true? I mean what are my chances to go out and shoot a cougar? So how would the houndsman feel about over the counter tags? I mean what do you guys think about something like that?

Dan Cockayne: We have over the counter tags.

Sam Carpenter: I am talking about statewide over the counter. Eliminate this complicated program and just have over the counter tags like Arizona and other states. And I agree, we're not Arizona, we're not Nevada. But what kind of problems would the houndsman have with a proposal like that?

Dan Cockayne: If the female quota, which is our future, if the female quota was set at a level that we didn't just wipe out the whole species. And if the sub adult females were counted as females, because right now they're not, so you can kill one of these little baby girls and it's counted as a tom, those two things I think there would be some support for that.

Sam Carpenter: Yeah, but don't you agree it would be pretty much impossible to wipe the cougars out? Because that average hunter does not even have a chance to hunt; and you've got to have the dogs, and

the money, and the time, the weather, all the different things that go with cougar hunting are very complicated, and require an awful lot of attention; and a good set of dogs or whatever to even find em.

Dan Cockayne: Yeah, but I can say that in my experience there are more and more people involved in the sport. And the cougars are getting harder and harder to find. And we travel more miles. It's tougher and tougher. In my estimation the cougar population is much less than it was ten years ago.

Dave Black: Thank you Dan. Our next card is Lee Tracy.

Lee Tracy: Lee Tracy and I'm speaking for myself. I've been very involved in the study of the deer transplant on the Parowan Front. And we get weekly updates, or biweekly updates. And it's interesting to know how many identified deer have been killed by cougars. At this point, or as far as I know, 38 deer on that unit have been killed and probably a third of them by cougars. Which tells me that you know those cougars are not just eating the collared deer, they're eating a whole bunch of deer. And with the decline that we've seen in the deer herds as of the last few years I don't know what the solution is but is seems like we should be more aggressive in taking out the predators. We have done something to take out the coyotes but there hasn't been anything particularly done to remove some of the cougars. And I'm particularly with Sam on the premium deer units; I would go so far as to say the limited entry deer units as well. Thanks.

Dave Black: Thank you Lee. Brayden.

Brayden Richmond: Brayden Richmond representing myself. Let me try to bring . . . I have several comments written down. It's going to be a little difficult to bring them together. This microphone is real poor. Let me try to talk real loud so you guys can hear it back there. What we've heard tonight I've already tried to address. The states around us are not that different from us. Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, Idaho and Wyoming do statewide year round cougars. They still have good cougar populations. They're still healthy. They haven't wiped them out. And it works for them. Why would it not work for us? A couple of points I want to make, one I already brought up. The legislature gave us over one million dollars to mule deer recovery act. Lee Tracy mentioned on Parowan Front, the deer that we pulled off of there, over one third of those we know are killed by cougars. We suspect closer to half. That's 15 percent of our deer population being killed by cougars in a small area. I think it's fairly safe to say that number goes statewide. I don't think that's hard to imagine. I think there are areas that are worse, some areas less. So the legislature wants mule deer recovery act, the sportsman want the mule deer, that's our primary animal. As mule deer increase cougars will increase, that's their food source. On our mountains, in fact we're going to talk about mountain goats in just a minute, one of the things we're going to talk about is habitat. Do we allow more animals on the range than the habitat allows? As the habitat for cougars, mule deer decreases, we need to kill more cougars. We have antlerless tags to pull mouths off habitat. We need to have cougar depredation to pull mouths off of our mule deer; very logical very simple. We do it for all of our other species. Cattleman know that principle. Here's another thing, we also talked tonight about increasing funds for the DWR. This one is real simple too, Nevada, I don't know how many of you guys in here have bought a tag in Nevada, as you go to check out in Nevada it says please buy a cougar tag an additional fifty bucks. We're talking about increasing fishing licenses a couple of bucks. What if we had every deer hunter in the state with a cougar tag in their pocket for fifty bucks? There's revenue. We've got a revenue spring that we aren't even tapping into. Um, last point, I think I've made enough points or I've got some other things written down but I'm going to skip over them. Last point, I just want to make it clear, the members of the RAC, my voice cannot be heard if you

guys don't make a proposal here tonight. I see many of you nodding your heads yes. I've heard some good comments from you. I haven't talked to very many people that don't agree with this plan that we need to decrease cougars in the state. We need you to make a proposal to make that happen. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you Brayden. DeLoss. After DeLoss we have John.

DeLoss Christensen: DeLoss Christensen, SFW Sevier chapter. Two comments, and I want to take a minute and thank the chairman and board members for their time and the commitment that you have to hear from the public; and we really appreciate that. And I want to thank Mr. Shivik, is that how you pronounce your name Sir? And I want to say how much I appreciate the difficulty that he has here tonight. We've set up a set of rules for him and he's tried to follow those rules. Now he may have been helpful in creating the rules but he didn't do it by himself. A committee that created those rules established those rules and he has to follow that and we want him to. And we get really upset when the Division jumps outside of the rules. So he's following the rules. Now the last gentleman that got up here told you how you fix that. Mr. Carpenter you made a, you had a question tonight about how could you change the cougar management so that limited entry deer hunts could be managed cougar hunt wise the same way as sheep. You Sir have the power to do that. You make a motion tonight to do that. And you send that to the Board. That's how you can get what we want and what you want done. Mr. Pearson, you asked a question, how do we get information about a 14-year study? You make a motion tonight, I believe, asking for a specific meeting whereby they bring the data to you and the public to review that very thing. Not a general meeting like this but a specific meeting to discuss those points that you have concern for. You have the power as a RAC to call for that information. You have the power as a RAC to change management plans. If that wasn't true we wouldn't need RACs, nor would we need a Board. That's what you are for. So my comment to you tonight is please make your recommendations. Ask for a motion, get a vote and see if there's support. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you DeLoss. Uh, John Keeler, sorry.

John Keeler: John Keeler, Utah Farm Bureau.. There are still many livestock kills by cougar going on and so we would like to see as many cougar permits issued as is possible. Thank you.

Dave Black: Scott Christensen followed by Jason Aiken

Scott Christensen: Scott Christensen from Loa, Utah, representing myself. Um, I just want to echo what's been said. I'd love to see an over the counter permit issued. I'd also would like to just expand on that a little bit, maybe in some of these areas where we're not hitting objective even with the harvest objective that we do open that up to discussion as part of, you know, of trapping and snaring until we can get these cats under control. Certainly we wouldn't want to do anything statewide, it would be a test, a couple test areas primarily maybe our premium units like Sam's mentioned. Um, with that I'd also like to recommend if we could to re-look at the cougar management plan. I understand the constraints that are at, it was written in 2009. Well we've really changed a lot of things in the state with our 30-herd, 30-unit management plan for mule deer. As it's been mentioned we're spending over a million dollars on coyotes. I'd like to see a recommendation that we review that plan sooner than later and be able to discuss some of the things that we've talked about tonight.

Dave Black: Thank you Scott. Jason.

Jason Aiken: Jason Aiken, Cedar City. I would like to support what DeLoss and Brayden Richmond have said, and the same with Scott. I agree with them. This is in your guy's hands. We'd like to see some changes made and you guys are the ones that can do it. Thank you.

Dave Black: We have one more card and that's from Peter Mahoney.

Peter Mahoney: I am Peter Mahoney representing, basically myself. Maybe I'm jumping into the fire, but I'm actually the graduate student on the cougar project in Monroe, also cutting up the coyote proportion of that as well. So if you guys have any questions feel free to direct them to me either later this evening or at some point in the near future and hopefully I will have the opportunity to present some of the work, in recent years anyways, I haven't been on the project for as long as some other folks have. But any rate to the point, I've heard a lot of discussion of what should and should not be done using nearby state as examples of how to appropriately manage cougars. But by stating such doesn't necessarily mean that they are appropriately handling cougars. In fact there's some research that many of you guys neglected to mention out of Washington that demonstrated that over harvesting cats can present great complications for not only livestock but our deer herds. In fact in many cases we actually doubled the density of tom lions on mountains due to over harvesting of the adult resident males creating greater complications for not only our deer but also our livestock in those areas. Secondly, a lot of reference to what we have in terms of numbers, numbers in those mountains. All I generally hear is that we have too many, with no references to how many we actually have. I spend near seven days a week year round on that mountain, on Monroe. And granted I've only been there two years but I have over 15, well about 15 years of data to support this, that we are at about half our density of cats on that mountain. And it's not just from my own conclusions but from our houndsman, he's been on this project for the entire duration. With that said, cougars can percent complications for deer management. But I have a few questions though for you John if you don't mind, and actually it might be more appropriate for Dustin. But we manage cougars in our sheep ranges because they have a noticeable decline, a noticeable impact on our sheep populations, is that correct? Dustin, do you want to answer that? Or anybody? Do cougars kill sheep? Yes. And they kill them in large numbers and they have a pretty big impact on their population. I've heard reference to removing cats in our prime game units, and I do have a question, has it been limited entry in those units for a while now? And have they maintained their status as prime prized game units? So basically what I want to mention here is that cougars aren't necessarily always the problem and that we need to carefully look at these questions in a scientific objective manner as possible because there are other parties including houndsman who have an interest in seeing cats being maintained in areas where they can be accessed via hunters. Because one of the concerns is that if we open up over the counter tags that we'll end up hitting harvest units overly much and we will no longer have cats accessible to those that do want to hunt those animals and it would still maintain lions in areas that are inaccessible to houndsman. Thank you. Oh, just a final, I appreciate the committee and you guys being here as well as John for taking the time to really put forth those quotas. Thank you.

Dave Black: That was the buzzer by the way, thank you. Please state your name.

Gregg McGregor: Greg McGregor, St George area. I didn't come tonight intending on speaking as to the pros and cons of the cougar management plan. The plan is essential. The plan is the foundation. You need a plan to start someplace. Years ago, I believe maybe Steve Dalton could help me, when we were first members of the RAC we went to a meeting in Salt Lake City. It was a multistate management meeting. In fact I think the last time I saw you you still had the little briefcase toting around that had the insignia and the label on it. I came away from there, and I remember one thing, that they always or they

seem to impress upon us is do the right thing. And I've always remembered that, do the right thing. Sometimes it becomes necessarily, and whether it applies here or not I'll let you be the judge of that because I echo the sentiments of DeLoss here, you guys have that capability. I've been there. There are others in this room that have been where you sit. Sometimes the spirit of the law trumps the letter of the law and that needs to happen. That's why we have this. We have people that put things together but things change and we need to be able to adapt and use common sense. Thank you very much.

Dave Black: Thank you Greg. That's all the cards I have.

RAC discussion and vote:

Dave Black: Do we have comments from the RAC? Sam.

Sam Carpenter: I think I have another question other than a comment and that would be, on your bighorn sheep units, cougar management plan, is that essentially over the counter tags? It's unlimited right? Thank you.

Dave Black: Any other comments? Mike, do you have a comment?

Mike Staheli: Yeah, I do. You know we manage these cougars as a resource. And anybody that's had experience with them knows the resource is going down. Now the deer herd is also going down. But I can show you where we've taken hundreds of cougars in the last ten years off of a certain unit and the deer continue to go down. I want deer in the worst way but I don't think you can get them by eliminating the cougar. We cannot eliminate one species and expect it to bring the other one back. And that's all I have to say.

Dave Black: Any other comments? Before we make a motion let me summarize some of the comments that we have heard that you may want to consider in your motion. We've heard that there may be a need to have research updates for the Monroe cougar study presented here at the RAC. Concerns about not allowing harvest of collared cougars on the Monroe. Over the counter tags statewide. Treat premium deer units the same as sheep units. Consider trapping and snaring in areas where harvest isn't happening. And to review the cougar plan sooner than 2021. Do you need me to go over those again?

Sam Carpenter: One thing, the review on that Kevin, didn't you say 6-years which would be 2015?

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah, currently there is a mid plan review that it's mentioned in that plan, but that the plan wouldn't be scheduled for an overhaul until 2021. So I guess I wasn't, as I wrote that down I wasn't sure what the comment was pointing to. I guess I made an assumption that it was towards the rewrite of the plan in 2012 but I may have misinterpreted.

Dave Black: Let me add one more item there that I don't see that I saw on one of the cards, and that was to have the mandatory orientation course with the tags; instead of voluntary to have it mandatory. So if you want consider that in your motions or not. Do we have? Oh, Harry.

Harry Barber: Just clarification again, I didn't quite hear the answer to Sam's question. I think it was Sam. Is there opportunity to revisit that plan or not before 2021? What was that 6-year piece?

Kevin Bunnell: So Harry the way that plan is written right now, knowing that it was a 12-year plan which was a new thing for the Division, the plan has written into it that there will be a review after 6 years to determine, to look at whether it's accomplishing the objectives that are laid out in the plan. I would assume that based on the results of that review the Division may recommend at that time; yeah we need to rewrite the plan. Um, but it's not, it doesn't mandate that 6 years to look at it.

Harry Barber: So short of the 6 years, is there an opportunity to even override that or do you have to wait until at least that period?

Kevin Bunnell: No, certainly the, you know the way this process is set up, um, you know if the Board asked us to rewrite the plan next year that's what we would do.

Dave Black: Director Sheehan.

Greg Sheehan: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I've been trying not to comment here and get too far into your meeting tonight but you know certainly that plan, we've opened up other plans before that haven't expired yet and that could be done here. But when we do that, you know you're going to again need to bring together that group of stakeholders that came up with the last one. And certainly things have changed. They always are changing. And you know if you had a motion and they had some other support of maybe some other RACs around the state I'm sure that the Wildlife Board would ask us to go back and look at that plan and we could certainly do that. But as we bring those stakeholders together we gotta, you know, make sure we don't end up just right back where we're at now. If you look at the long history of our cougar management in the state and go way back it used to be, you know, buy a tag or shoot one if you saw one kind of a deal fifty years ago. And then it eventually gravitated into limited entry and then that wasn't working so good, and then they went to harvest objective and that wasn't working so good, and then we had split units which is kind of what you're seeing now, and then there's kind of zones that have split and harvest and this complicated thing. And so we've kind of backed ourselves into this corner. But there's a lot of people that have helped get us there. This wasn't really drawn, or the Division, there's a lot of houndsman that get pretty passionate about this. And we don't have a lot of those folks here tonight. But I can give you a real work example of just four months ago here, on one of these combined units that we've got in the Manti area, this winter the houndsman became very concerned that we were significantly over harvesting the cougars on that. And these are, you know, the guys that are out here hunting these things all week long and all weekend long. And uh, they came to the Board and made a compassionate plea that we were pounding these cougars too hard and then they really kind of protested. And we had an emergency Wildlife Board meeting and, help me out Jake, when was that in probably April or May, John whenever we had that. And they closed down one of these units outside of the regular process here and that was just, you know, March or April, here of this year, a few months ago when these houndsman all rounded up. So, you know, we could fill this room tonight with houndsman that say we're pounding the cats too hard out there. I don't know if we are or not. And we'd certainly be willing to revisit that plan and that would be an appropriate motion if you wanted to make that and have us take a look at again. But uh, and I'd hope we maybe could come up with something more simple. But again, when you bring all the stakeholders to the table you end up with what we got now. And this wasn't just written by an employee in the Division somewhere. And you bet, it's complicated, you know. I think I need a master's degree to figure that out too, and all those boxes and everything. But uh, these guys are trying hard to make this work the way our public wants and to make it the best we can. And I do think the people are out there with those, the houndsman and those

who really are hunting those cats, they understand how it works and they understand we're pressure on those lions out there. And I don't know. We could probably do it better and we could probably do some things some more, but you know like I say, if you make a motion to revisit that plan and there's some other RAC support out there we'd probably be willing to do that. And I think John might be excited to revisit the plan with all those stakeholders. Well anyway, those are my thoughts on it. But again, it wouldn't be simple. And you know we've got a lot of different thoughts here in the room but I'd say if we get to a point where we're relooking at that plan I'd hope that some of the people here could come be part of that and hear all the different sides because there would be a lot of different dialog when you invited everyone back to the table on that. So, thank you Mr. Chairman.

Dave Black: Thank you for your comments. Do we have any additional comments from the RAC before we make a motion? Is anybody prepared to make a motion?

Sam Carpenter: I'll try it. Okay, let me say let's accept the Division's proposal as presented with the exception of the premium deer units being managed under the bighorn sheep cougar plan and that we get something on the action log with the Board to initiate a review of the cougar plan by let's say July 2014. Do we need a time on that to make the recommendation? No, yes? Let's say by July 2014 to review this and look at the possibility to bring the people together and look at this over the tag proposal. I really like that idea. And that the Monroe Mountain cougar study that has been ongoing that we as a RAC will have an opportunity to review the data and be informed of how that study went and is currently going.

Dave Black: Okay, we have a motion on the table by Sam, second by Cordell. Do we have any discussion?

Rusty Aiken: I've got a question. Sam, is that limited entry or limited entry, or premium and or premium and limited?

Sam Carpenter: Premium deer units. There are two of them, the Paunsagaunt and the Henry Mountains.

Dave Black: Sam are there any other items that you may want to add on there as far as the mandatory orientation course or anything like that or? I'm not trying to lead you I'm just trying to remind you of some items that were?

Sam Carpenter: I think the orientation course be mandatory

Brian Johnson: We can just handle those by amendments.

Sam Carpenter: I think the orientation course would be a valid recommendation. I'll add it to that, that that be mandatory.

Dave Black: Is that okay with the second?

Brian Johnson: Let's, can we have some discussion on that before we second it? The one thing that I, if you're out in these sheep areas and you buy one of those tags are you really going to take the ten minutes to do the orientation or should we just let these guys, we should just let these guys that buy these harvest objective tags, just let them shoot a cougar if they see it, it's a harvest objective tag. They still got to report it. If they hit the female sub quota they're still there. Let's not make it harder for them to. . . If

you make it, I mean 99 percent of these tags that are going to get shot they're going to have a houndsman holding their hand saying that's a two-year-old female don't shoot it.

Sam Carpenter: Okay let me back up here.

Brian Johnson: So I'm just . . .yeah go ahead.

Sam Carpenter: Well we're talking about the premium units being over the counter, not the whole.

Brian Johnson: No, no, no, you mentioned, you mentioned . . .

Dave Black: Let me see if I can simplify this real quick. Let's pull the orientation course out for a minute. Let's make that, first we need a, we have a motion on the table and we have a second. The way to discuss orientation course in would probably be by amendment or by second motion. And we can discuss that before we vote on the main motion. So somebody would need to either make that a separate motion or make that an amendment to the motion.

Sam Carpenter: Read the motion back please.

Kevin Bunnell: Let me tell you what I have written down. Do you want me to give it to you Stephanie? Let me tell you what I have written down and we'll see if they match. A motion to accept the DWR proposal, except to treat the premium deer units like the sheep units and ask the Board to have the cougar plan reviewed by July 2014. And have an update. Yep.

Dave Black: And we have a second on that motion by Cordell. Do we have any discussion on this motion by the Board?

Brian Johnson: I just, I have some discussion, I don't know if I need to make, I get a little confused on my Roberts Rule because we get to do this only like six times a year. And I've kept my mouth shut all night guys. Seriously that's a big deal. For everybody who doesn't know me that's a big deal. But I'd like to make an amendment to that; and I'd like to make it okay to shoot the collared deer, or the collared cougars. Shoot collared deer too, I don't care. I mean let's just if it's got a collar let's make it like a Cabalas' tag, like you get a prize. No, but I think, I think that if we're going to, I mean it was just this year they took that out and I think that, I mean we've been shooting them before, let's, I mean I don't think the sheep herder cares so much which lion eats him lamb; I just think he knows his lamb's dead. I

Dave Black: Okay. We have an amended motion to include allowing the shooting of collared cougars. Do we have a second on that?

Kevin Bunnell: Now I would ask, is that just on the Monroe? Because it's been in place to not allow collared cougars to be harvested on the Oquirrh Stansbury for years; the only new part is the Monroe.

Brian Johnson: I'd say shoot them on both units but that's just me.

Dave Black: Okay, do we have a second on the amended motion? On just the amendment.

Mike Worthen: I'll second it.

Dave Black: Okay, we have a second on the amendment by Mike. Do we have any discussion on the amendment? Clair.

Clair Woodbury: I just had a question on this amendment proposed by Brian to John. What impact would that have on your studies on the Monroe or the Oquirrh, either one.

John Shivik: Well it's kind of counter productive to go and spend a lot of time and effort to collar animals, to get GPS collars on them to see where they're going and see what their impact are on other animals if you put them on line and then shoot them immediately. Basically it's kind of like, it would impact the study.

Dave Black: Brian.

Brian Johnson: We are shooting collared coyotes.

John Shivik: That's by, yeah exactly, and that's by design, but only on one side of the study area. So on one side we're not actively hunting the collared coyotes.

Brian Johnson: They're getting shot.

John Shivik: Clearly, clearly but not by design of the study where they're being targeted. So the study is set up so some aren't being targeted by Wildlife Services, some are.

Brian Johnson: So when you collar, this is my thing, is another thing too, when they collar a tom and it turns into a big tom and you draw a tag and all of a sudden you can't kill it because it's got a collar and it knows that it is safe so it just runs up and tree as it wags its tail at ya, because they learn pretty quick. I just think it is, I just think that if they're, I mean a lion is a lion. You drew the tag you've got every bit of right to that lion and you just turn the collar in. I mean hell, we got a million dollars to study deer let's just go put the tag, go put the collar on another lion.

John Shivik: Yeah, I studied that reasoning. And this isn't, this wouldn't be forever, this would be for a few years of the study to get the data.

Brian Johnson: You've been studying them for 14 years.

John Shivik: Not in the Oquirrhs and not in this way. Not with these collars.

Brian Johnson: I am not yelling at you and I apologize. I just, sorry.

John Shivik: Yeah, I mean, it would be really helpful, I think, I think just for now it would be really helpful to get the update on the Oquirrhs, Monroe, there's a lot of really relevant information that you guys should really hear before going to far down that road. But the simple answer to the question is yeah, if we killed those cougars it's going to impact the research and we'd (unintelligible).

Dave Black: We have one more question for you from Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: I just have a quick question and maybe you can clear this whole thing up real quick. What percentage of toms do you collar on the Monroe?

John Shivik: Pretty much every one they can get. I'd have to ask Beaver . . .

Cordell Pearson: How many toms?

John Shivik: Of how many of the toms that are on the mountain do you think? So the guess is about 50 percent of the toms are collared.

Cordell Pearson: 50 percent? No I am talking about just toms. What percent . . . So fifty percent of the catch you got collared are toms. Okay, thanks.

John Shivik: So under the current recommendation there is one cougar that someone can't shoot. One tom that someone can't shoot.

Dave Black: Okay, let's uh. Okay, we need to vote on the amendment only. And the amendment is that we allow shooting, taking of collared cougars. And so this is only for the amendment. All in favor show by the raise of hands. 1. All opposed? 1 abstention. Okay. So the amendment dies. (1 in favor, 1 abstained, 11 opposed. Amendment died)

Dave Black: Now we're back to the original motion. And do we need to restate the motion which is that we accept the DWR proposal except treat premium deer units like the sheep units and ask the Board to have the cougar plan reviewed by July 2014 and have an update of the Monroe study given to the Southern Region RAC. That's it. Okay, Rusty.

Rusty Aiken: I would like to amend Sam's motion to include limited entries as well as premium entries in that motion. Limited entry deer.

Dave Black: Okay, we have a . . . wait just a second. Do we have a second on that amendment? Okay we have a second from Brian. Now is there any discussion on the amendment? Sam, did you have a question?

Sam Carpenter: Yeah, in all honesty aren't all the units, all 30 units are limited entry now, basically. I mean we have a set number of tags for every unit. Now I understand there's a general and I understand limited entry and the management plans are different but we're limited on the amount of tags on all 30 units now. We could really say that it's a limited entry state because we don't sell any excess or anything, everything's limited.

Kevin Bunnell: Sam, in the deer management plan there are, there's units that are labeled premium, there's units that are labeled limited entry, and there's units that are labeled general. I think what Rusty's asking for is the units that are labeled limited entry to also treat them as sheep units.

Dave Black: Do we have any further discussion on the amendment? Clair.

Clair Woodbury: It will be a thorn in your side again. Again, for John, what is the realistic impact of changing or going on with Sam's motion and Rusty's motion as far as what's going to happen with our

cougars on those particular units if we manage them as those sheep units are managed? Realistic consequences.

John Shivik: I'd have to, I mean it's speculative. So I've got to be kind of careful.

Clair Woodbury: Take your best guess.

John Shivik: You know something like the Henrys is interesting because you've got a harvest objective unit. I gave the numbers wrong, our actual quota is up in the 400's and we're only getting to the 300's. The Henry's is also interesting because don't we have a um, oh what's the adult, we have to remove bucks, non trophy bucks from this area already. So there's, management bucks, sorry. And you know . . .I, I, the way a lot of these units there already are being managed towards harvest objective and they are managed towards being more intense on cougars. Um, so from that perspective changing it this way might not do a whole lot of difference. Um, the differences is more of in the spirit of what the consensus came together with this plan which is that we want to control cougar populations for the benefit of deer but we also don't want to wipe out, we also want to have cougars around. So it kind of goes at that balance and pushes the balance into we don't want to have cougars, essentially. So I don't think biologically you would change a whole bunch. It might make us have to take more management bucks out which seem kind of counter. But we'd have to wait and see. You know I'm just kind of clearly speculating at this point.

Dave Black: Do you have more discussion or are you ready to vote on the amendment?

Sam Carpenter: I would like some more discussion. I know we're going way over on our time. But, and this is more in the form of a question, and maybe I can be asking this to Jake as he is on the Board, but the more we add to this recommendation or proposal the harder it's going to be without support from all the other RACs to get this thing to go through. So if we keep adding these recommendations do the Board take each amendment and vote on them separate or would this have to go through the Board as one proposal? Maybe Greg would know. I don't know.

Jake Albrecht: I recognize all the concern here tonight but in answer to your question Sam, the simpler you can make the motion without getting too much stuff into it the better chance you'll have of getting some of it through the Wildlife Board I think. So without saying whether it would pass or not I think you'd have a better chance of doing the two units than you would the limited entry units. Do you follow me?

Sam Carpenter: That said Rusty do you still want that amendment?

Dave Black: Well we have a chance to vote on it. So let's vote on the amendment. And the amendment is to add limited entry deer units like sheep units . . .

Kevin Bunnell: To treat all limited entry deer units like sheep units.

Dave Black: Okay, excuse me. To treat all limited entry deer units like sheep units. All in favor? All opposed? Okay so that amendment failed. (2 in favor, 11 opposed. Amendment fails) (3:21:39 of 4:11:36)

Dave Black: Now we're back to the main motion. Is there any further discussion on the main motion? Okay, lets vote on the main motion. Again, the main motion is to accept the DWR proposal except treat premium deer units like sheep units and ask the Board to have the cougar plan be reviewed by July 2014 and have an update of the Monroe study given to the Southern Region RAC. All in favor? All opposed? Motion passes. 9 in favor, 3 opposed, (Clair Woodbury, Mike Staheli, Brian Johnson) Motion passes.

Sam Carpenter made the motion to accept the Cougar Recommendations as presented with the exception of managing the Premium deer units [Henry Mountains and Paunsaugunt] the same as the big horn sheep units and ask the Wildlife Board to request the cougar management plan be reviewed [to simplify] by July 2014 and to have an update of the Monroe Cougar Study be given to the Southern Region RAC. Cordell Pearson seconded. Motion passed 9:3 (Clair Woodbury, Mike Staheli and Brian Johnson opposed).

Dave Black: Okay, let's move on. I'm okay with that. I'm sure that's why most of you re here. Let's go to item number 12, the Goat Management Plan. How far do you have to drive? Is that okay Guy? Are you ready too? Hello Dustin.

Goat Management Plans – Mt. Dutton and La Sal (action) 3:23:46 to 3:36:49 of 4:11:36
-Guy Wallace, Dustin Schaible, Wildlife Biologists

(See attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

David Black: Any questions from the RAC?

Mack Morrell: How many goats do you have on Mt. Dutton now that's transferred over?

Dustin: We haven't done a comprehensive survey and so we just have sightings. And the biggest group that's been seen is seven in one group. But we haven't done any aerial surveys to determine the total population on the unit.

Mack Morrell: So you have sighted some, but you don't know how many are there?

Dustin Schaible: What's that?

Mack Morrell: So people have seen them but you don't know how many are there.

Dustin Schaible: We don't know the total population there. It's probably pretty minimal given how much uh, you can see a lot of the goat habitat from a lot of those high points. And you usually pick up one or two but we haven't done, like I said, we haven't done an intensive survey on them yet. But that would be part of the plan.

Mack Morrell: It looks like to me, it looks like to me that you would do that before you would recommend how many goats to transplant and your population and everything else. You should have some monitoring done.

Dustin Schaible: Well, yeah, and you know, at this point we have just done ground monitoring.

Dave Black: Any other questions?

Questions from the public:

Dave Black: Do I have questions from the public?

John Keeler: John Keeler, Utah Farm Bureau. You're proposing the 9,000 elevations not the 8,000?

Dustin Schaible: Correct, to be in order to be consistent.

John Keeler: Okay, because I pulled this off the website and it had both of them and so, but your proposing just the 9,000 elevation.

Dustin Schaible: Yeah, that was just to determine how much habitat was available above that elevation. But um . . .

John Keeler: And you're proposing to augment those that are there on the Mt. Dutton with 20 to 40 collared?

Dustin Schaible: Yes.

John Keeler: That's answered a few of my concerns. We would like to propose, the Farm Bureau would like to propose that a committee be set up on the Mt. Dutton goat unit similar to what we have on the Henry Mountain buffalo, a group of interested parties get together and we see what is happening with those collars and the habitat and meet yearly and make recommendations. I think it's worked fairly well over on the Henry Mountain. Uh, it mentions in the information that I got off of the website that movements between the Mt. Dutton and Beaver goat populations are highly likely and should be considered advantageous but in that movement they will be eating along the way. Do goats eat aspen? Aspen sprouts?

Dustin Schaible: I would imagine

John Keeler: I would imagine they do too. There's an effort going on on the Monroe Mountain with aspen regeneration and recruitment back into the population. I think this would be of a concern, probably should have been mentioned in the plan under perhaps sensitive species. The more mouths you put out there of grazers the more concern it is for those populations that are sprouting as a result of fire and or clear cuts or other projects of vegetative manipulation. So that might be a concern there. But we would recommend this committee be put together on the Mt. Dutton. Thank you.

Dave Black: John, let me ask you a question real quick. We're in the question section. Are these your comments or do you want to come back up?

John Keeler: Well I will leave it all as one.

Dave Black: Okay, that's fine. Thank you. Do we have any other questions from the public? Yes, you don't need a card for a question.

DeLoss Christensen: DeLoss Christensen, just representing myself. I'm on the Monroe Aspen Work Study Group as well. But my observation is that aspens have an elevation band that they grow in. And I don't know that aspens grow above 9,000 feet, do they? Does anybody in here know? It seems to me that's kind of the top of the survival for aspens but we could check on that some more but it would be nice to know where that is, not that the Monroe study has any effect on the Dutton, but just wondering.

Dave Black: Thank you, any more questions? Any more questions from the RAC?

Comments from the Public:

Dave Black: Let's move to the comment stage now. The first card that I have is Jake Schoppe.

Jake Schoppe: (Attachment 3) Hi, my name's Jake Schoppe. Glad to address you guys tonight. I appreciate your time. I sat in those hard seats many times so I appreciate your time and attention. I got asked to come and read a letter from the Dixie National Forest. For you that don't know me I'm the district biologist out of Panguitch there for the Powell District. So we've been looking to see a goat plan on this range for a long time. So I'll just read my letter and I think you have a copy don't you Kevin? It says, this letter provides a response to the proposed Rocky Mountain Goat Management Plan for the Mt. Dutton unit on the Dixie National Forest. The Forest Service appreciates the high level of early coordination on this site-specific unit plan and the positive response to those comments. After reviewing the proposed plan we have found that it will not contradict management area direction or desired conditions that are described in the Dixie National Forest resource management plan. The Dixie National Forest appreciates this opportunity and recognizes that several parts of the plan were changed based on our prior comments. We understand this is a state decision and look forward to continuing our working relationship. So, thank you.

Dave Black: The next comment is Gregg McGregor.

Gregg McGregor: Gregg McGregor, Santa Clara, Utah. Thanks for your patience and being there for us this evening to hear us out. As a member of SFW and more particularly here tonight as a voice for some 450 members of Safari Club International in Southern Utah, we whole-heartedly support the plan to put more goats on those mountains. It will, based on reaction from the Forest Service, what Jake just read, there should be no conflict, minimal conflict I should say. And uh, we think that it will do nothing but be a good thing for the sportsman and habit and on those mountains. Uh, just a note, after 20 years I finally drew my Desert Bighorn sheep tag this year, hurray. And if it takes that long to draw my next goat tag which is next on the bucket list. . . .see you later.

Dave Black: Kirk Connelly, followed by DeLoss

Kurt Connelly: Kurt Connelly, I represent SFW, specifically the executive council for SFW tonight. We are in full support as well of the Division's proposal to put goats on the Dutton and also on the La Sals. We'd also like to point out that all the mountain goats in this state have been transplanted, originally. I mean that was, you know, that was how we got them originally. So we're in full support of it both as sportsman also for viewing opportunities. We all, I mean it's what August 3rd right over here on the

Tusher Mountains, people are going to go up and view them. It's a very popular viewing animal; it's very easy to see and they're lots of fun. So I just, you know, here again representing the executive counsel for SFW, we're in full support of the Division and just moving forward. And so thanks.

DeLoss Christensen: Deloss Christensen representing SFW, Sevier chapter. I'd just like to go on record supporting the transplant of additional mountain goats on the Mt. Dutton and the LaSal units. I have no concerns over some of the concerns that have been expressed in that each of these game herds has a management plan developed by all the parties that are involved. And we have our little disagreements on the numbers and the conditions but in the end it's a good thing we have transplanted animals all over the state and this is just a continuation of that practice. And I am fully confident that the Division and the system with which we are all a part of will take care and not harm the habitat there that these animals will be participating in. Thanks.

Dave Black: Brayden followed by Scott.

Brayden Richmond: Brayden Richmond representing myself and also the Beaver County SFW chapter; also in full support of this. Very exciting for me. I had a chance to hunt mountain goats about 7 years ago; harvested one with my bow up on Timp Mountain. Incredible experience. Everybody should have that opportunity. I also love to take my 6-year-old kids up on the Beaver Mountain and look at the goats. I'll never hunt another goat in Utah in my life, I've had that opportunity and I'll spend hours and hours in viewing and recreation. So, very excited to see them being moved to other mountains including the LaSal, which is where I'm from that country. So, can't wait to go see them there.

Dave Black: Thank you Brayden. After Scott we have Travis.

Scott Christensen: Scott Christensen representing myself, Loa, Utah. I too in 2010 had an opportunity with, for a nanny tag on Willard Peak. I had a terrific hunt. It was a lot of fun. At first when I started scouting the unit it was kind of concerning how much traffic was up there but as I got to know, every time we'd go up there was just different people hiking that trail and we'd share our binoculars and spotting scopes and it was just a great viewing opportunity for a lot of non-sportsman. I was just amazed how many people just went up to see the goats. I'm in full support of this. I think it's amazing how many people are interested in. To kind of echo a previous comment, it was also disconcerting when I started to look at another once-in-a-lifetime to realize, man with the odd system the way it is and just understanding the lack of resource I'm on 100 percent luck of the draw at this point. So I'd really recommend that anytime we can graze more of these one-in-a-lifetime opportunities for the youth and everyone else involved we need to take full advantage if we can. Thank you.

Travis Seifers: Travis Seifers representing the Utah's Trappers Association. We support the Division's plan on this.

Dave Black: Thank you. Taylor Albrecht followed by Jason Aiken, followed by Craig Laub.

Taylor Albrecht: Taylor Albrecht, Kanab, Utah. I also support the Division's putting the goats on the LaSal and the Dutton. I've had the opportunity to take part in two hunts now with family. And it's a great opportunity for viewing and a blast of a hunt. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you.

Craig Laub: Craig Laub, I'm uh, represent Southwestern Utah and the Utah Farm Bureau Board. A couple of things, if those goats move from the Tushers over to the Dutton what's going to keep them from moving to Monroe and the Boulders? And uh, is that telling us that there's, we had too high of a manage, too many, too big a number on the Tushers is the reason they had to move? And the other thing was, uh, I support what John Keeler said about we need to get the stakeholders in a group to manage, to set up, to work on a management plan for them.

Dave Black: Thank you. Jason.

Jason Aiken: Jason Aiken, Cedar City Utah. I represent the Iron County SFW and the Utah Bowman's Association. We are in support of the Division and the transplant of the goats to the Mt. Dutton and the LaSal mountain ranges. And then just on a personal note, I'm in full support of this. I had a Beaver goat tag a couple years ago. I was able to harvest one with my bow. Probably one of the most exciting hunts I'll ever have in my life. And I've spent lots and lots of times up on the Tushers. I remember back in the early '90's when everything had a red tag in its ear, from the transplant back then. I was up there this weekend as well and talked to 20 to 30 different people, that's all they were there for was just to go up and see the goats. And so, and they were traveling from all over, from all the way up in Salt Lake down to Las Vegas and Mesquite; so it's a great opportunity for not only hunters but also the viewing and things like that.

Dave Black: Okay. That's all the comment cards.

RAC discussion and vote:

Dave Black: Do we have any comments from the RAC?

Kevin Bunnell: Just an administrative point for the RAC. We made a decision to put, this is one presentation, and just because of the length of this agenda, but it's really two management plans. So for just to keep things straight we would be looking for two motions, one on the Dutton plan and one on the LaSal plan; so separate that into two items if you would as you move forward.

Dave Black: Also to review since there are no comments, before you make a motion there were some comments that came out of the audience about setting up a group of shareholders for the goats on the Dutton similar to those on the Henry Mountain bison, to set up a committee. And so consider that as you're making your motion. Brian.

Brian Johnson: I'd like to make a motion that we accept the DWR's proposal on the Mt. Dutton unit as proposed.

Dave Black: Okay, do we have a second on the motion? Okay. Clair. We have a motion and a second. Do we have any discussion on the motion?

Mack Morrell: I would like to make an amendment to the motion that the stakeholders get together with the DWR on the Mt Dutton to make recommendations for the management plan.

Dave Black: Do we have a second on the amendment? Okay, we have a second from Rusty.

Brian Johnson: I have a question about that just because I'm not smart. Do we have, I'm good with it, do we have one of those special little meetings for every goat unit in the state or is this just something special that we're talking about? Because I know we got it for buffalo but do we have it for every goat unit?

Kevin Bunnell: Currently no. The only committee that's like that that's established is the bison committee on the Henry Mountains.

Brian Johnson: So it sounds like more meetings. Awesome.

Dave Black: Sure, please state your name when you come up.

John Keeler: John Keeler, Utah Farm Bureau. There are some sheep allotments in this unit and they have some concerns about this. And I think it will, can be managed a lot better with this committee. We've had several committees formed in the past on various units with elk, and the deer, with others that have been very worthwhile. One thing that you can do with this committee is as things move forward you can take some actions in between the length of the plan and it works very well. If there's a drought situation, if there are some other transplants that come up, I think it would help address the concerns that are existing on that Mt. Dutton and so that's why we're proposing it.

Dave Black: Thank you John. DeLoss. Please come to the mic and state your name.

DeLoss Christensen: DeLoss Christensen representing myself. I appreciate, I appreciate the comments that the folks have made this evening regard what I would consider to be a special committee. It seems as though we could handle that through the management plan committee. I've sat on those committees. They're made up of sportsman, landowners, agents from the federal government, DWR representative and non-consumptive people. Now I don't know why we would need to have a group outside of that other than an independent group that may want to get together like the Friends of the Paunsagaunt do; it's independent of the RAC or the Board. So why do we want to try and complicate the process by creating new committees outside of this process?

Dave Black: Thank you DeLoss.

Kevin Bunnell: DeLoss, just a point of clarification, with a lot of our unit plans we do set up committees. With this one there was not, there was not, there is not a committee that has ever been established.

DeLoss Christensen: (inaudible off the mic).

Kevin Bunnell: Nope. No, we don't do that with all of our unit plans and so there was no intention to ever have a unit committee for this plan.

Dave Black: Do we have any further discussion from the RAC?

Sam Carpenter: Quick question, your committee that you were talking about setting up, this doesn't put any uh, how do I say it, restrictions on the current plan that you're proposing. You're just saying after the sheep are on the mountain, after the goats are on the mountain you'd like to have input in the way

they're managed, according to the data and the different stuff that you get from the collars and the surveys, is that correct?

Mack Morrell: Yeah that's correct.

Dave Black: Thank you. Are we ready to vote on the amendment? So the amendment is that we will create a stakeholders group for the Dutton sheep unit, goat unit, excuse me.

Clair Woodbury: I believe we are all stakeholders and represent everybody right here on this RAC don't we for the Southern Region? Why would we duplicate what we're doing?

Dave Black: Okay, we have a, we're ready to vote on the amendment. And all in favor of the amendment please show by the raise of a hand. Okay, all those opposed. So the amendment passes.

Dave Black: So the motion then which includes the amendment would be that we approve the Goat Management Plan for Mt. Dutton as presented by the DWR to include the creation of a stakeholders group for the Dutton Goat Management unit. All in favor? All opposed? Okay, the motion passes.

Brian Johnson made the motion to accept the Goat Management Plan for the Mt. Dutton as presented with the exception to include the creation of a stakeholders group. Clair Woodbury seconded. Motion passed 10:2 (Clair Woodbury and Brian Johnson opposed)

Dave Black: Let's move to the last item on the agenda, which is item number 11, the Furbearer.

Brian Johnson: When do you want to have a motion on the LaSal? Just throwing it out there.

Dave Black: Oh excuse me. Yeah we need to. Thank you.

Brian Johnson: I make a motion that we accept the DWR's proposal on the LaSal for big fluffy goats as proposed.

Dave Black: Okay, we have a motion and a second by Cordell. Is there any discussion on the motion? As a comment, do we want to include the same amendment on this one or not? All right, any further discussion? Are we ready to vote? So the motion is then for the LaSal unit that we accept the Goat Management Plan as presented. All in favor? Any opposed? Thank you.

Brian Johnson made the motion to accept the Goat Management Plan for LaSal Mountains as presented. Seconded by Cordell Pearson. Motion passed 11:1 (Sean Kelly abstained).

Dave Black: Thank you. Okay, now we can move to the last item, Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendation by John. Do you have a condensed version John? Do you have a condensed version of the presentation?

John Shivik: We should be able to wrap this up in another hour or so.

Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations (action) 4:01:24 to 4:07:01 to 4:11:36
-John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator

(See attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

David Black: Any questions from the RAC? Sam.

Sam Carpenter: What is the set day?

John Shivik: U, I'm sorry, so that, we're looking at the number of set days, how many traps are out before you catch a bobcat. So it's set days, so it's like trap nights, set day. How many types, how many people and how many traps are out. For instance, there's, it takes 392 traps being out in 2013 before somebody catches a bobcat, overall. Sorry, no. I really rushed through this.

Dave Black: John, I have a question, in our packet there was a letter from Norm McKee. I don't know if you saw that letter from Norm or not. Do you know Norm? He's retired with the Division.

John Shivik: Oh yes, okay.

Dave Black: It is in quite details as far as some concerns, Garfield County and other areas. And if you're not familiar with it then the question's not, I was just wondering how close this is in line with some of suggestions that he had.

John Shivik: Is this relative to, is this Beaver?

Dustin Schaible: You're just talking in reference to Norm's, Norm's letter?

Dave Black: Right.

Dustin Schaible: What was the question?

Dave Black: Well I was just wondering, are we on track, or are we addressing those things? Or are we way different than some of the idea that he had in there and his concerns?

Dustin Schaible: No we, quite honestly we had a conversation very similar to what Norm wrote in his letter prior to him even writing that letter. He wasn't even aware that we were talking about the very same thing. But we felt with how few people actually get into those drainages that he was asking to be closed, we didn't think the harvest would be significant. There are a few colonies in there and we do support, you know trying to get them to build back up and repair some of that area from the fire on Dutton, particularly the areas that he was concerned about. We've had those discussions and we decided at this point we'll just kind of, based on the fact we don't feel there's a lot of trapping pressure in there we didn't want to highlight it.

Dave Black: Okay, thank you. Any other questions?

Questions from the public:

Dave Black: Any questions from the public?

None

Comments from the Public:

Dave Black: We have one comment card from Travis.

Travis Seifers: Travis Seifers with the Utah's Trappers Association. And we agree with the recommendation of the Division.

Dave Black: Thank you.

RAC discussion and vote:

Dave Black: Any comments from the Board? Are we ready to make a motion? Okay, Layne.

Layne Torgerson: I make a motion that we accept the Furbearers Recommendation as proposed by the Division.

Dave Black: Okay, I have a second by Mike. The motion by Layne is that we accept the Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations as presented by the Division. All those in favor? Any opposed? It's unanimous.

Layne Torgerson made the motion to accept Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations as presented. Mike Staheli seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Other Business

David Black: Is there any other business that the Board might have to bring forward? Brian you are dying to say something. We call this meeting adjourned.

Mack Morrell: Hey, I think that we ought to break this up. We had a meeting that lasted one hour in May in Richfield and here we got one four and a half hours. We can break this up and put something on that May agenda.

Dave Black: That's a good idea. I think Steve had a similar comment when we had a short meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

#2

[redacted]

Utah Houndsmen Association

To: All RAC members

RE: 2013 Cougar Recommendations

The Utah Houndsmen Association is the largest Houndsmen group in the State of Utah, we represent houndsmen statewide. Our mission is to assist in sound conservation and management of Cougars, Bears and Bobcats in the State of Utah to assure a stable, healthy population now and into the future. The following points represent the opinion of the majority of our members and we would request that you consider them as you contemplate the cougar regulations currently under review.

1. We feel that the DWR recommendations for quota allotments follow the guidelines set forth in the Cougar Management Plan and we would complement those involved for following the plan as it was adopted. Going forward we would like to see a review of all of the units and the harvest history to determine if the baseline quota's were set too high or too low when the current management plan was adopted.

2. We agree with the recommendation requiring GPS coordinates to be reported on all cougar harvest locations. As nearly all cougars harvested are done so with the aid of hounds, and the vast majority of houndsmen use GPS tracking collars on their dogs this requirement does not pose an extra burden on sportsmen and we feel it will aid law enforcement in their duties and will provide valuable biological information as well.

3. We would request the Voluntary Cougar Orientation Program be made mandatory for anyone purchasing a cougar harvest permit. A healthy adult female population is critical for the future of Cougars. The information contained in the Orientation Course can help a hunter better identify the sex and age of the animal before harvest and help with the decision making process of whether to harvest or not.

4. We feel that in the interest of managing for quality trophy animals and for ensuring a stable population for future generations Limited Entry tag allocation is the best management practice, the Split Limited Entry / Harvest Objective season being the next best, and a straight Harvest Objective being the most aggressive. We agree with the recommendation to move the Southwest Manti unit to Limited entry and would request the remainder of units statewide to remain as they were.

[redacted]

Email: houndsmen@dishmail.net

Utah Houndsmen Association
PO Box 64
Wallsburg, UT 84082

Website: www.utahhound.com

Utah Houndsmen Association

We appreciate your service in helping to preserve these precious resources and recognize the difficulty in balancing the interests of all sportsmen.

Respectfully

Dan Cockayne
Lion Coordinator
Utah Houndsmen Association
Lions@utahhound.com
801-420-1547

USDA United States Department of Agriculture | Forest Service | Dixie National Forest | 1789 N. Wedgewood Ln
Cedar City, UT 84721-7769
435-865-3700

File Code: 2610/2640
Date: July 30, 2013

Dave Black
Southern Region RAC Chair
2074 Princeton Circle
St. George, UT 84790

Dear Mr. Black:

This letter provides response to the proposed Rocky Mountain Goat Management Plan for the Mt. Dutton unit on the Dixie National Forest. The Forest Service appreciates the high level of early coordination on this site specific unit plan and the positive response to those comments. After reviewing the proposed plan, we have found that it will not contradict management area direction or desired conditions that are described in the Dixie National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.

The Dixie National Forest appreciates this opportunity and recognizes that several parts of the plan were changed based on our prior comments. We understand that this is a State decision and look forward to continuing our working relationships.

Sincerely,

/s/ Kevin R. Schulkoski
ANGELITA S. BULLETTS
Forest Supervisor

cc: Ron Rodriguez
Karen Schroyer
Jake Schoppe
Sean Kelly
Kevin Albrecht
Gary Nielson
Robert Byrnes
Jake Albrecht
John Bair

Southeast Region Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main
Green River, Utah
July 31, 2013

Motion Summary

Approval of Revised Agenda
MOTION: To accept the proposed changes in the agenda.
Passed unanimously

Approval of Minutes
MOTION: To accept the minutes of the previous meeting as written.
Passed unanimously

Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-
MOTION: To accept the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule as presented.
Passed unanimously 10-0

Military Installations Permit Program
MOTION: To accept the Military Installation Permit as presented.
Passed 9 to 1 with one opposing vote cast by Charlie Tracy

Goat Management Plans-Mt. Dutton and LaSal Mountains
MOTION: That the LaSal Mountains be removed from the list of potential introduction sites.
Voting was tied 5 to 5.
In favor of the motion were Chris Micoz, Sue Bellagamba, Wayne Hoskisson, Charlie Tracy and Trisha Hedin. Opposed to the motion were Jeff Horrocks, Darrel Mecham, Blair Eastman, Karl Ivory, and Derris Jones
The chairman, Kevin Albrecht, who represents the U.S. Forest Service, abstained from voting to break the tie, due to a conflict of interest.

Goat Management Plans-Mt. Dutton and LaSal Mountains
MOTION: To accept the LaSal Mountains Goat Management Plan as presented, except that the density of goats at the 9,000 foot elevation model not exceed 1.8 goats per square mile during the five year period, and that the DWR and USFS work together to ensure no vegetative damage is done.
Voting was tied 5 to 5. In favor of the motion were Derris Jones, Karl Ivory,

Blair Eastman, Trisha Hedin, and Jeff Horrocks. Opposed to the motion were Chris Micoz, Sue Bellagamba, Wayne Hoskisson, Charlie Tracy, and Darrel Mecham.
The chairman, Kevin Albrecht, who represents the U.S. Forest Service abstained from voting to break the tie, due to a conflict of interest.

Goat Management Plans-Mt. Dutton and LaSal Mountains

MOTION: To accept the Mount Dutton Goat Management Plan as presented.
Passed with opposing votes cast by Sue Bellagamba and Wayne Hoskisson

Proposed Fee Schedule FY 2015

MOTION: To accept the Proposed Fee Schedule FY 2015 as presented.
Passed 9 to 1 with one opposing vote cast by Charlie Tracy

R657-60 AIS Rule Amendments

MOTION: To accept AIS Rule Amendments as presented.
Passed unanimously, 9 to 0

Cougar Recommendations

MOTION: To accept the Division's cougar recommendations as presented, except that the Book Cliffs be separated from Nine Mile and be made a split unit and raise the number of permits to 20.
Passed 8 to 1 with one opposing vote cast by Wayne Hoskisson

Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations

MOTION: To accept the Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations as presented.
Passed 8 to 2 with two opposing votes cast by Blair Eastman and Wayne Hoskisson

Southeast Region Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main
Green River, Utah

July 31, 2013 ~ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present	*Members Absent*
Kevin Albrecht, USFS and Chairman	
	Seth Allred, At Large
Sue Bellagamba, Environmental	
Blair Eastman, Agriculture	
Trisha Hedin, Sportsperson	
Jeff Horrocks, Elected Official	
Wayne Hoskisson, Environmental	
	Todd Huntington, At Large
Karl Ivory, BLM representative	
Darrel Mecham, Sportsmen	
Christine Micoz, At Large	
Charlie Tracy, Agriculture	
Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor	

Others Present
Mike King
Greg Sheehan

---

1) Welcome, RAC introductions and RAC Procedure
-Kevin Albrecht, Chairman

Kevin Albrecht-I would like to welcome everybody out tonight.
My name is Kevin Albrecht and I will be your chair. We have a couple of new RAC members that I would like to introduce them self's real quick. We have Karl and Trisha and I will give them real quick minutes to introduce themselves.

Karl Ivory- Ok, I am Karl Ivory I am from Price and I have been in Price for about 25 years. I work with the Bureau of Land Management there for 25 years. I am a supervisor for range management specialist dealing with all programs under range right there in Price.
Trisha Hedin- My Name Trish Hedin and I am from Moab and I have been in Moab for about 13 years. I am the Chairman of our local Rocky Mountain Elk

Foundation. And I guess that is about it.
Kevin Albrecht- Thank you and I appreciate that.
I also appreciate the attendance tonight. Looks like we have a lot of public input and really appreciate that and also appreciate the time that has already been spent by the RAC members to go through e-mails and time on the phone. I know there has already been a lot of time put into tonight's meeting.
First I would like to have an approval of the agenda.

2) <u>Approval of the Revised Agenda</u> (Action)
-Kevin Albrecht, Chairman

Kevin Albrecht - Motion by Jeff Horrocks to approve the revised agenda. Second by Wayne. Also the minutes. Let's do the agenda separate ok so we have a motion and a second by Wayne. All in favor? Any oppose?
Kevin Albrecht- So we have a new RAC agenda which is different than what was on the Internet, which has moved the Goat Management plan to #8. Any thoughts on that?
Chris Wood- I will just say that the new agenda is over here on the table, so everyone in attendance tonight should have the new agenda. It was changed on Monday morning. We are required to give at least 24 hour notice and we met that requirement.
Kevin Albrecht- Do we have an approval of the agenda? Or, sorry of the Minutes? seconded by Derris. All in favor? Any opposed?

VOTING
Motion was made by Jeff Horrocks to accept the changes in the line-up of agenda items as printed
Seconded by Wayne Hoskisson
Motion passed unanimously

VOTING
Motion was made by Jeff Horrocks to accept the minutes of the previous meeting as written.
Seconded by Derris Jones
Motion passed unanimously

3) <u>Wildlife Board Meeting Update</u>
-by Derris Jones, former RAC chairman

Derris Jones- I am going to try and keep this real brief because I think we are going to be here for awhile tonight.
Derris Jones- A couple of things that were put on the action log by the wildlife board were to look at Dedicated Hunter hours that were worked before accepted into the Dedicated Hunter Program. I guess there is a timing issue where you don't get to sign up until just right before and a lot of people start to whittle away at some of the hours they need to work before then. In the past they haven't been able to count those hours so they are looking at modifying the rules so that those hours can be counted in the future. The other thing that was put on the action log is they asked for some information on 28 gauge shotguns being used on the Turkey hunt. Law enforcement and the wildlife section will look into that and report back to the Wildlife Board. Dale Brady and Ernie Perkins terms are both up on the wildlife board, so there is going to be two new board members and I assume or I don't know if I have heard the names yet officially. Kurt Woodward from the NERO is the NERO rep. and then Steve Dalton at large is out of the SRO. He lives in Hanksville or Sandy Ranch anyways. I guess its Hanksville area. The statewide goat plan passed as presented. The Big Horn Sheep statewide plan passed as presented. The urban deer rule passed with a little tweak in the fee structure. So unless there is any specific question I will just leave it at that. So we can get moving on to tonight's agenda.

Questions from the RAC

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

Kevin Albrecht- Ok, we are going to have a regional update, but before we do that we have very good attendance by the public and I just want to remind you a little bit about how the RAC meeting is set up. As you entered there is a agenda and there is also a paper that spells out the RAC process and procedures that will help us go through tonight. So on each of the agenda items we'll here a presentation from the division of wildlife. At the end of each presentation the RAC will have an opportunity to ask the division if they have any questions. And then the public will have an opportunity to ask the division if they have any questions. And then the public will have an opportunity for comment and then the RAC will have the opportunity for comment. And then we will have a vote. And so we will also be using these yellow comment cards so you can pick those up in the back and if you will please fill those out and if you will put which item number, which agenda item number you are going to talk on and then if you would bring those up and hand them to Chris we will on each item number we will get you in. I appreciate it.
Chris Wood – You don't need to fill a yellow comment card if you have a question.

It is just for comments. And you can bring those to me at anytime. It's not too late I guess at this point.
Kevin Albrecht- I would also like to take a minute to talk about with the attendance that we have tonight I think that there is a lot of good comments and a lot of emotions and I just ask that as you come up if we can keep this very civil and that we give three minutes for an individual and five minutes for somebody representing a group. But again I ask that you express your comments in a very civil manor and we as a RAC we'll take all of your input and try to make the best decisions that we can and I appreciate that. So with that we will turn the time over to Chris Wood for the division comments

4) <u>Regional Update</u>

-Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor

Chris Wood- Regional overview. My name is Chris Wood and I am new in my position. I was the Habitat manager in Price and in this region for the last seven years and I am now the Regional Supervisor. It is great to work in this region. We have great people and great resources and I am excited for this new opportunity. I am going to go through this fairly quickly because we have a full agenda. We have been really busy all summer long. Our aquatics section has been doing Gill Netting at Scofield, Joe's Valley, and Huntington. Were also working at our Duck Fork Reservoir we are replacing the spawning trap. You can see the old spawning trap there the new one should be built in the next month or two. There in the next few weeks we will be doing some night time electro-fishing at Huntington North State Park. This year we have also have very successful in collecting eggs from the Colorado cutthroat. And our Conservation section also has been very busy. We have a few things scheduled for August. Aquatics and Outreach will work together to host a family fishing event at the Carbon County Fairgrounds on August 10th and this will follow two events we have had at Gigliotti Pond. Brent also has been working different summer camps, conservation camps, and working with various shooting and archery programs throughout our region and hosting events. He had a big horn sheep watch in June and then coming up next weekend or this weekend on the 2nd on Friday night we have a meet the Bats Night. We will be meeting at the Crescent Junction at 6:30pm? Or sorry that is the Cisco exit at 7:30pm and heading to our Nash Wash wildlife management area where we will be fish netting some Bats and the public will have the opportunity to see those bats up close. We did it last year and we a really good turn out and is was a really big success. Our Habitat section is busy we have been managing our properties this time of year. We have several properties Gordon Creek, Nash Wash, Desert Lake and our Huntington Game Farm that require active farming. We try to improve on our water rights and plant some crops for upland game and for deer and elk in the fall and in the spring, also for some pheasants that are on some of those properties. We are starting a

project on the Cold Springs on top of the Tavaputs with a private land owner to try to rejuvenate some aspen, removing conifer and stimulating some aspen there. It is a continuation of a project that we did last year. And then on the La Sal's we just got back last week while working with SITLA there's some logging activity that is happening on the La Sal's and we are building a enclosure with to see some of the vegetation response. Our law enforcement section also has been really busy. Checking fisherman and patrolling for poaching there are also really active in our Aquatic Invasive species program. Their working several check station's both in our area and down south at the border of Utah and Nevada. Or I guess Arizona and checking for boats that are coming from Lake Meade. Then our wildlife section has been doing Elk surveys this month, pronghorn surveys and Mule deer fawn survival studies. And, if there is any questions? I can answer any questions or we will just move on. Thank You.
Kevin Albrecht- Ok with that we will move on to agenda number 5 Jason Robinson.

Questions from the RAC

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

5) Turkey Depredation (Informational)
-Jason Robinson, Upland Game Coordinator

Kevin Albrecht- Any questions from the RAC?

Questions from the RAC
Derris Jones- Assume it's not going to be a Tom only hunt? It's going to be any bird on the depredation hunt?
Jason Robinson- Correct, yes.

Questions from the Public
Kevin Albrecht- Real quick one item that I failed to mention is, with as much attendance that we have tonight, when we have public comment of the item that you are going to speak about has already been addressed I asked that there's a couple of options. One that you can approach the mic and if there was something that you wanted to address that there wasn't please address that. But just state what you would like to see maybe without readdressing everything, just so we can be able to do this in a very timely manner tonight. I appreciate that.

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING
No motion. This was an informational item only.

6) Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 (Action)
-Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Coordinator

Kevin Albrecht- Any questions from the RAC?

Questions from the RAC
Wayne Hoskisson- I have one small question. Why is it that the idea is to split the hunting seasons into zones, instead of just making them longer?
Blair Stringham- That is a great question. With the migratory bird treaty act we can only have a 107 day season for all migratory birds. And so if we want to add season dates at the end the season we would have to make a split so that the total season hunt isn't more than 107 days. The split occurs then because that is typically the a time when people are harvesting fewer number of geese.
Kevin Albrecht - Thank you. Is there any other questions?

Questions from the Public
Kevin Albrecht- Any questions or comments from the audience?
Ok, I see no comment cards from the audience, again if you do have any comments if you came in late, please fill out one of these yellow cards and hand it in here to Chris on any of the agenda items we will take your comments that way. Ok if there any comments from the RAC?

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion
Kevin Albrecht- I will entertain a motion.
Derris Jones – I move that we accept the divisions recommendations for the 2013-2014 waterfowl season guide book as presented?
Blair Eastman- I seconded that.
Kevin Albrecht-So we a motion by Derris Jones and a second by Blair Eastman. The motion is to accept the divisions water fowl Rule R-657-09.
Kevin Albrecht-All in favor?

Kevin Albrecht- Any opposed?
Kevin Albrecht- Motion passed unanimously.
Kevin Albrecht- Ok then we will move onto action number 7

VOTING
Motion was made by Derris Jones to accept the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule as presented.
Seconded by Blair Eastman
Motion passed unanimously, 10-0

7) <u>Military Installations Permit Rule (Action)</u>
-Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief

Kevin Albrecht- Thanks, Is there any questions from the RAC?

<u>Questions from the RAC</u>
Derris Jones- You say that the vouchers that the base commander can distribute them as he wants too? And is that restricted to military personnel? Or can he use those vouchers to give to anybody that he wants?
Kenny Johnson- The rule is for military personnel. We wanted to have the military personnel that is associated to that base to have the opportunity to hunt those.
Derris Jones- Assume there was some discussion of military on this proposal. Was there talk about making those vouchers available for wounded or warrior type of programs?
Kenny Johnson- I think that did come up in the conversation and again what we would do up front is look at his approach and some of that could include that. And then both parties could just agree that would be the approved method of distributing those vouchers.
Derris Jones- He won't be restricted to give to just active military personnel?
Kenny Johnson- They have to be military personnel but I will have to research the rule and look at it a little closer. But I don't think that we specified that it as to be active on that location but just associated with that location.
Derris Jones- Then you have mentioned the big species but then you said potentially other big game species. If you include any other big game species, does the rule have to be re-opened and discussed or can you just add species?
Kenny Johnson-That's a good point. Actually the power point went out before we finalized that language in the rule so it is pretty wide open to big game species at this point, so it wouldn't have to be opened again.
Blair Eastman-So you don't have a process to distribute those tags internally yet? Within the military tags.

Kenny Johnson-They would approach us with what they want to do. It could be a drawing or something that we could agree on.
Blair Eastman-So what I want to know is if one person who gets to give those tags out, is going to be giving those to all of his buddies?
Kenny Johnson-If that is what his plan said.
Blair Eastman-I think there should be even distribution of those tags.
Kenny Johnson- I think if they were bold enough to put that in their approach we wouldn't approve something like that. We would want to see something fair.
Blair Eastman-So you are going to make sure that doesn't happen then?
Kenny Johnson-that's what that agreement does. The MOU, That is where that would happen .
Blair Eastman- It looks to me that this is model after the CWMU?
Kenny Johnson- It is really similar.
Blair Eastman-On the split the 80% to the public. How I see the CWMU is that it is a 90:10 split or a 80:20 split. Which would give two tags to the public instead of one. Or am I misunderstanding?
Kenny Johnson-I think your correct in the CWMU. But I think this one is a little bit different in the volume of tags. We don't expect them asking for a tone of permits.
Blair Eastman- Well this just pick one, Like Dugway. What do you expect in the way of tag distribution or allotment?
Kevin Johnson-In the discussions that I was involved in there was like 10-12. There was a really low number of tags.
Blair Eastman- So under 10-12, the 80:20 split would be two to the public not one?
Kevin Albrecht- Yes that would be right. It would guarantee one. So if they do two permits then it would be 50:50.
Blair Eastman- Perfect. Thanks
Chris Micoz- Are the rules going to be different from base to base?
Kenny Johnson- Each one will present a proposal and each one could be a little different. And we are ok with that as long as it's fair and equitable and something that we can agree too.
Karl Ivory-Reason for the hunt? Is that based on there is a hunt able population or is because of safety reasons or depredations that will be going on?
Kenny Johnson-It's all of the above in a lot of those locations.
Charlie Tracy-So you're having a lot of trouble with wildlife on military bases?
Kenny Johnson-I don't know if it is a lot of trouble. It is just a tool that they haven't had available to them.
Charlie Tracy- Will they allow a high powered rifle on that base?
Kenny Johnson-They may not this might just give some frame work for them to start with and there may not be a feasible way to hunt with a rifle. So those are something that we work out in the initial MOU stage for sure.
Jeff Horrocks- They may just shoot a hole in one of those multi-million dollar jets. And they will be really mad.
Chris Micoz- I know in Nevada they have to go through an orientation of some sort and background checks. Have you heard of anything indicating that is what they would require?

Kenny Johnson- I think all of those things will be addressed in that preliminary stage. I know that the bases would have some concerns with just turning people loose. So there will be plenty of over sight when that does occur out there.
Kevin Albrecht- Any last questions from the RAC? We will go the questions from the public then.

Questions from the Public

Kevin Albrecht- One thing that I failed to mention before we start is that I ask if someone approaches the mic that we allow them to speak and that we hold the jeers and the cheers to our selves and if that we have something to say that you please come to the microphone. But please be silent when someone approaches the microphone. Thank you.
Kevin Albrecht- Any questions from the RAC? Sorry I mean from the audience?
Kevin Albrecht-Any comments from the RAC?

Comments from the Public

Jeff Horrocks- The only comment that I have is I don't how the military works but I am not really following why this is being pursued because if they have an issue on a military installation with wildlife, they are going to take care of it whether we are there or not.
Jeff Horrocks- They might say they won't, but they will.
Wayne Hoskisson- I guess my question to that then is, have they done that before? Have they taken care of wildlife issues before without asking through the division?
Kenny Johnson- There is some limited hunting that they do over see now. And just recently that wanted to provided more of a partnership and offer it to the public and not just keep it as a private hunt.
Kevin Albrecht-Any other comments?
Blair Eastman- It is public lands and if the military is coming to us and asking us for tags. They should be distributed fairly somehow. So I would like to see that somehow.
Wayne Hoskisson- So you would like to see line two strengthened under RS-657-699-4
That is where the wildlife board retains control. It is kind of vague.
Blair Eastman- yes. Because if I was the commander I would then invite all of my buddies.
Kevin Albrecht- Anyone want ot make a motion?

RAC Discussion

Blair Eastman-I will move to accept that proposal as it is written with a little bit stronger language on the distribution of the tags.
Wayne Hoskisson- it does give the board authority to approve. I think we would like to see something spelled out the way that the tags are distributed within the military. I don't know what that would be but because this has approve, deny or reduce the number of permits, but it really doesn't give the board the authority to

make a judgment whether or not it's a reasonable and just distribution.
Kenny Johnson-and that step does clarify in the initial MOU agreement so they bring us a proposal ,we read it over and part of that proposal is how we are going to distribute the tags to the military people and if we don't agree we say sorry, send it back to them. And if we think it is fair and equitable we will approve it. That is where we are getting how this works with the rule.
Derris Jones- I think we might be going down a slippery slope. If we get that specific with how the base commander issues his permits then we might be looking closer to how the CWMU operators and how they distribute their vouchers.
Kevin Albrecht-True, So right now we have a motion on the table by Blair Eastman to accept the tag allocation or the military insulation permit program R-657-66 do we have a second?
Chris Micoz- I second that.
Kevin Albrecht- We have a second by Chris Micoz all in favor?
Sue Bellagamba-So the motion was to distribute the language? Is that still on the table? Or did Blair move that?
Blair Eastman-He clarified that for me and I am good with that now.
Sue Bellagamba- So that is off the table now. So it is as is or as written then?
Blair Eastman- Yes as it is written.
Kevin Albrecht- All in favor? Any Opposed?
Kevin Albrecht- 1 opposes. Charlie Tracy

VOTING
Motion was made by Blair Eastman to accept the Military Installations Permit Program as presented.
Seconded by Chris Micoz
Motion passed 9 to 1 with one opposing vote cast by Charlie Tracy

8) <u>Goat Management Plans-Mt. Dutton and LaSal (Action)</u>
-Justin Shannon, Regional Wildlife Program Manager

Kevin Albrecht- any questions from the RAC?

<u>Questions from the RAC</u>
Derris Jones-You talked about Habitat enhancement projects. What kind of habitat projects do you do in Alpine?
Justin Shannon- It is pretty limited in going and doing a veg. thing but if there was a fire that went up in some of those slopes on the conifers and things like that we would support let burn and different things.
Charlie Tracy- How many tags would you actually have. You have a full population of 200 head. How many tags per year would be able to put out?

Justin Shannon- So generally it is 5-15% of the general populations so we are looking at 10-30 tags. Mountain goats are slower at reproducing than some of our other big game species. They don't start giving birth until they are 3. So their population's take longer to establish.
Sue Bellagamba-What would be the hunting season?
Justin Shannon- Randall what are the hunting seasons on your units.
Randall Thacker-They start on the 9th of October and go until the mid of October so about a month.
Wayne Hoskisson-I would like to go back to the slide title "Why Mountain Goats on the LaSals. The characteristics' are similar to the other goats in the state. That may or may not be true, I don't know about that. But goat transplants in Utah haven't resulted in the documented changes to plant species compositions. I noticed that we have a simple letter from the forest service but no studies that they have never written them up. Where are those?
Randall Thacker- The Ashley National Forest puts out their annual vegetation monitoring reports you are welcome to go look at. They don't put anything out specifically looking at just goats they have over 1,400 vegetation monitoring sights across the Ashley National Forest. A number of those are put in specifically to target areas we have identified with them and work with them over the years to make sure they do monitor habitat types right where the goats would be. We actually are part of a memorandum with the Ashley National Forest that specifies that we will identify poor use areas of Goats anywhere we get a use of goats that concentrates up that is more than just a few. We get more than 25 goats into one area we identify new core use areas and they go in and issue additional monitoring sights there too. They have those reports available that is there annual vegetation monitoring reports that are available and they numerous power points looking at vegetative trend and all of those kinds of things. If anybody would like to contact the Ashley National Forest that is available to them.
Sue Bellagamba- I am glad that you brought up trend and I am curious if the Ashley National Forest actually did any studies before the introduction to look at trends which would be at least two, three or maybe five years prior to the introduction?
Randall Thacker- The work was began with the first release of the goats in 1987 in the Uintah Mountains. On Bald Mountain there was a whole process that was put into place before that these monitoring sights that we are talking about the majority of those sites have been in longer than that. There have been additional sites that have been added when we have identified areas that we would both want to be focused on. They have added more of those along the way as we have gone throughout the course. But quite of few of the vegetation monitoring sights in the Alpine are long term trend sights. Those have been there for a number of years. I don't have the exact years for each one of them. Like I said there are 1,400 of them. There is too many to keep track off but they have been in place for a while. And additional ones added after.
Wayne Hoskisson-So the population trend in the eastern Uintah and ? peak have dropped to about 50% of what they were about a decade or so,

Randall Thacker-From when they peaked out in 2006 was kind of their high count.
Wayne Hoskisson-Is there anything in the studies from the forest service that indicate why that may be happening?
Randall Thacker-No. Again there is no indication on that. Why that may be happening there. They have seen no real habitat impact to dictate that. Some of that is when there is typically some kind of boom that comes off when there is a initial burst of use in a typical area of dispersal. And then those goats do settle in to more of a long term population level which it has maintained since the 2006 peak that it did bump up there and go back down.
Wayne Hoskisson- That is kind of interesting but doesn't explain it that well. Because of other places including Bald Mountain. The population has continued to remain pretty stable everywhere else.
Randall Thacker- the Bald Mountain area has actually increased quite a bit. It has been pretty stable but it did go up and then it stayed stable for awhile. And then it has increased in the last four or five years or the last three surveys.
Wayne Hoskisson- So there is something about that range.
Randall Thacker-The east portion of the Uintah does have a much more limited low elevation area to move too for winter. On that part of Uintah you don't have the long fingers of goat habitat that string down to lower elevation and most likely on harder winters, which we did have an occur in 2008, which was right after the peak we did have a very hard winter that year and they would have definitely suffered a higher winter mortality that year than other parts of the Uintah that year. The western part of the Uintahs they can move down to as low as 7,000 to 8,000 feet on a hard winter. On the eastern half that really doesn't exist. The lower elevation habitat doesn't exist. It doesn't go down to anything that is open for goat habitat. It would be moving into solid conifer and large expansions of it that doesn't have good south facing cliffs. Which would be good wintering habitat for goats. So, a limited wintering area on the eastern half in probably the major contributing factor to that population change.
Derris Jones- Randall has there been any other forest service vegetation studies other than the Ashley, like Cache, Wasatch. I noticed the Uintah is also the lowest density of goats. The higher density is more on the Wasatch. Have there been any studies to show what is going on in those units?
Randall Thacker- Each forest does have its own protocol or how they want to do things. Timpanogus, for example there has been two different master thesis studies done there. Monitoring the goats and looking at the vegetation impacts and concerns about rare and sensitive plants that is there. I am not aware of all of the forests because I don't work with them, but for those I do I know there is monitoring that does occur there. I assume they all have additional monitoring too going on but I am not aware of what kind.
Jason Vernon- I am the habitat restoration coordinator for the division. I can't speak specifically to forest service monitoring sites but the division does have monitoring sites on the Tushar Mountains and on Willard Peak. They were established in the early 2000's, Tushars in the late 1990's and the Willard's in early 2000's. So we do follow those. We have read the Willard peak's this year. I don't

have the Data to share with you tonight. The data that we have on the Tushars is showing a stable population. We are primarily monitoring on the Tushars that the Indian paintbrush which is a sensitive species and that seems to be stable through all of the years that we have been monitoring them. For about 15 years or so.
Wayne Hoskisson-How long have you been monitoring them?
Jason Vernon-How many years were we on the site?
Wayne Hoskisson-Yes
Jason Vernon-On the Tuchars there is three or four monitoring dates so we have been there three or four years. So a trend is what we are looking at.
Wayne Hoskisson- You do good work. I actually use your range trend studies a lot.
Jason Vernon-Thank you, I appreciate it.
Wayne Hoskisson-But now in this case you did a study in 1997 and I think one in 2000 and one 2003 then terminated the project.
Jason Vernon- We read the Tushar site in two or three years ago.
Wayne Hoskisson- That is not on the site. That would be interesting to look at. One of the things about it is it must be difficult to pick monitoring sites. Because one of them didn't show any use on them at all. Or, very minimal goat use. It was down slope from one that was used. So monitoring goats you need to get someone out there that really knows goats.
Jason Vernon- Our sites that we have established are our DWR sites who work closely with the forest service. They provide us with the locations of where they think would be the best to put these monitoring trends at. We are working currently with Barb Smith with the forest service out of Moab to identify where we think the best sites for our vegetation monitoring would be for this situation.
Wayne Hoskisson- She use to work your crews a few years ago.
Jason Vernon- Yes she did
Trisha Hedin- Can you discuss the interaction between goats and other large ungulates' for Mule Deer or mature bucks that are in their summer range. I am a little concerned about that interaction.
Randall Thacker-For the most part we have seen very or no little impact in any way. They really do segregate the goats prefer the steep rocky stuff. The mule deer can also often move into the edges of those. They usually do select areas that have more of a vegetation component to them. So we have seen very or no impact at all towards deer, elk or anything else at all. And that is even in the literature that there is nothing.
Trisha Hedin- Can you discuss management tools if you see a dramatic impact in the first few years. What the management tools will be to deal with the goats?
Randall Thacker-The impact of what? Sorry.
Trisha Hedin- If you have a massive impact in the first number of years what the management tools would be to deal with them?
Randall Thacker- I will let Justin answer that. It depends what is in the plan.
Justin Shannon- There is not much in the plan that says exactly what we will do if Mountain Goats started to compete with elk or deer. One thing to remember is for deer we don't hunt does on that unit and it is a general season unit so it is opportunity driven. So we don't feel like it would be competing for a trophy buck

type unit. And for elk it is a similar thing. It is a lower age class objective, it's not the same objective as the San Juan's or things like that. Even if there is a decrease in quality in antler size we are managing on the opportunity side for deer and elk anyway in that regard. But you're right, individual bucks and elk and things like that, they may be sharing some of those same areas. Population-wise we don't think it will have the effect.

Chris Micoz- Back to the discussion about the range for the goats in an exceptionally hard winter on the LaSals. It doesn't seem to me that from 7,000 feet because you are going to have the habitat that the goats particularly like.

Randall Thacker-On the Uintah it is not their ideal habitat either. But you do occasionally have a harder winter than others. The LaSals, I think the scale of your harder winters is much less than the level it has on the Uintahs. Just because of the latitude that you have down here. You aren't going to see the snow depths you're going to see on the Uintahs. But even you do, the goats will switch over to using pine needles, fir, all kinds of things like that if they have to during the winter. And they can usually make their way there. Again I can't speak exactly to the elevation level of to what they will move down to on the LaSals, we won't know until the goats are there and have been there for awhile to see on a hard winter to see if they would need to move that low. The Uintahs are a unique situation to where they run east and west. On the Wasatch front there are goats that move down into American Fork canyon in the winter to move down into lower elevations and most people would think that's not great goat habitat but it does seem to very successful for those that do move down on hard winters.

Chris Micoz-The elevation for those in American Fork canyon at 6,000 feet is very different that that at 6,000 feet around the LaSal Mountain.

Randall Thacker- Yes that is very much so.

Wayne Hoskisson- The fact that you think that they could go down. There is an R &A in the LaSal Mountains in the Millcreek Gorge and I think I mentioned this when we talked about this before and I noticed that it didn't appear into the minutes. I really didn't think about it until a couple of days ago when I went back a looked. But, this doesn't introduce a second R&A that probably needs to be considered in any kind of management plan?

Justin Shannon-That is a good question. In that R&A I know what one you're talking about and it has probably been overlooked. Do you know the elevation that that R&A is at? I know it much lower but I don't know.

Wayne Hoskisson- It is low. It is very cliffy and rocky and it is sort of thing that they would hang out in if they were to go low.

Justin Shannon-Part of our plan is on this monitoring thing, when were developing this vegetative monitoring thing we are going to talk about the Mount Peal R&A. But we can definitely include that in there and what responses it would have if they were there.

Sue Bellagamba- The goat density per mile per sq. mile in the Dutton is 1.7 and in the LaSals you are proposing 4 something. Why? That is a pretty drastic difference. can you explain that to me?

Justin Shannon-I didn't do the Dutton justice. The Dutton is a much lower elevation

range and it's really craggy and rocky and that type of stuff and so how much of that are the goats going to use is going to questionable. That's why we are going to radio collar these things and see. We have sites that goats are there and they are doing well already. We just felt like without that elevation and without that consistency of steep slopes and higher elevations that we would be just more conservative on it.

<u>Questions from the Public</u>

Kevin Albrecht- With that we will go to questions from the RAC and just come up to the microphone and state your name, state where you're from and one thing I will reiterate is right now we have got very good input from the audience. Looks like we are sitting at about an hour and half in projected time to listen or to go through the comments. So one thing that I will ask is if somebody has already stated what you were going to say and you have nothing additional to say then maybe you can come to the microphone and state opposed or if you were for the goat plan. But if it has already been stated we will even take one individual comment just in due to time. So with that we will go to questions from the Audience.

Lynn Jackson, Grand County Commissioner-I want to apologize for a tardy entrance into this whole issue of the Mountain Goats. It's been discussed that some of us have been aware of it and I will get to a couple of questions here in a minute but it has certainly raised a profile in the Grand County in the last few weeks. From our voters and our citizens so a couple of questions that I would have is you have mapped your area above 7-9,000 feet and you came up with 62 miles of habitat. Over a course my time in Moab and I have hiked all over those peaks there aren't 62 sq. miles of anything to eat up there. I assume they can't eat the talus on the slopes. They live in tundra so what would be interesting and the question that I have is how many sq. miles of tundra are up there because there isn't much? That needs to be addressed. To me you have your habitat of the steep slopes that they do live in but they do need something to eat. That is a question that I haven't heard addressed.

Justin Shannon- Specifically what is your question?

Lynn Jackson –How many sq. miles of actual forage are there with in this habitat?

Justin Shannon- We didn't model that. We didn't model it based on here is the vegetation type. Here is this conifer community, here is this forbs community, and here is this shrub community. Because that is not what the method is called for in the paper. So if you look at it and you talk about what is there going to be to eat. If you look at the forest plan the 1986, they came up with says that 17% of their forest is sub-alpine habitat as well. And they have anywhere from 2-3,000 lbs. per acre of available forage in there sub-alpine habitat. So on the alpine you do get a lot of rock with lichen on it and you don't have these big patches of forage and certain things like that but goats are smart and will come down and eat if their hungry in the sub-alpine habitats and so there is not a scientific paper that says model Mountain goat populations based on this. We wanted to stay as close to science as we could.

Lyn Jackson-Well I would suggest that we would need a little bit more information on what will they eat. So with that, that answers the question that I had but I would

like to come back up.
Kevin Albrecht- Ok, Have you done a comment card?
Lyn Jackson- Yes I have.
Kevin Albrecht- Ok then we call your name at that time. Thank you.
Lyn Jackson- Ok.
Kalen Jones of Moab- You have stated that the population of healthy animals will provide a broad range of recreational opportunities including hunting and viewing. My question is what other recreational opportunities will they provide? Besides those two.
Justin Shannon- There is photography, there is certain things like that. Clearly hunting and viewing are the ones that drive it, but if there is somebody else that just knows there is a presence there. A good example of on the Uintah when people want to go hiking and things like that. They want to pick drainages with mountain goats so they can go and see them and be part of that environment. Hunting and viewing is the main drivers but if the public has others they certainly can enjoy them.
Lloyd Nielson- How do you determine whether they are native or not? There is a lot of petroglyphs that could be interpreted as goats. And is the forest service supporting this?
Justin Shannon- Are they native? There is no evidence that they are native to the LaSal Mountain range. And as far as the forest service supporting it, they have written a letter which I am sure you get to read.
Kevin Albrecht- I will read that letter in just awhile.
Paul Frank of Moab- In the literature for the plan, there is five headings and you don't have the forest service study from 1981? There is this comment recommendation. I believe the person that wrote this study but I am not positive his name is Walt Loop and I think he was the range con at the time for the forest. And his recommendation was when considering the LaSal Mountains will only provide marginal topographic features and available forage as well as a potential ecosystem damage that could accompany Mountain Goat introduction. It is recommended that Mountain goats not be introduced to the Moab range or district at this time or the for seeable future. And there is a lot of information of how much tundra and rock there is, and I am just curious of why that is not in your literature?
Justin Shannon- The reason that is not cited is because it wasn't peer reviewed and there isn't even a signed date. We don't even know what processes that went through. The copy that we received was simply just a draft. So we don't know how valid it really is. Another thing is there was a lot of studies afterwards in the mid 90's that looked at Mountain Goats vs. Big Horn Sheep habitat uses and in that document they separated those out. The most current stuff 14 years later simply says that Mountain Goats and Big Horn Sheep are going to eat the same things; they are going to use the same habitats so to us we felt that there was updated literature.
Paul Frank- I haven't seen any where that you have addressed rain fall? Comparing it to the Tushars, the LaSals and the Uintahs, that seems like a pretty major issue.
Justin Shannon- Is that a question?
Paul Frank- That is a question.
Justin Shannon-The reason we didn't address rain fall on this is because it really is

what you get. What rain fall eventually equates to is vegetation and we did go up with the forest service and division and we took mountain goat biologist and we did an occular assessment on these units and there was one drainage that we went up where Randall made the comment that there was more vegetation on these slopes than any of my slopes on the Uintah. So rain fall to us really equates to vegetation and if the vegetation is there or not. And we feel like based on the sub-alpine areas and some of the alpine areas that there is vegetation to support the goats.
Dave McLean- If we keep hearing that the Mountain Goat and the big horn sheep are eating the same things, the same diet then there is plenty of opportunity for sheep to be back up there. Why are they not there now?
Justin Shannon- Honestly as an agency I think if all things are consider equal and there was any lingering potential consequences we would recommend putting the Big Horn Sheep back there. The reason we are not is because we want to be very sensitive the agricultural interests. And when Big Horn sheep and domestic sheep co-mingle Big Horn sheep die. And so there is domestic sheep grazing on there so we felt that by putting Mountain goats there it would be friendlier to the agricultural community and we lesson that disease risk.
Dave McLean- Let me clarify my question. I was asking naturally why the sheep haven't gone back there?
Justin Shannon- On that unit specifically I don't know. I haven't seen much in the literature to the exact die off. But across the state many of our sheep populations were lost from the 1930's to 1960's which corresponded with the domestic sheep grazing and there were disease outbreaks and those populations didn't recover and if you're talking about why desert's don't go back up there is Big Horn sheep select steep slopes they don't like cover they are selecting for visibility so to go from these desert canyons and go through all the oak and the aspen and conifer to get to the high elevation stuff that is the risk they are not willing to make.
Mary O'Brien of the Grand Canyon Trust- Have you mapped the area you say that has forage for goats? Have you mapped what proportion of that is already grazed by cattle or domestic sheep?
Justin Shannon- We didn't look that up, Mary. But I think you gave us this information that there are no cattle allotments above 10,000 feet.
Mary O'Brien of the Grand Canyon Trust- Yes there are!
Justin Shannon-I haven't looked into it.
Mary O'Brien- Part of the allotments go above 10,000 feet. I have sent you that map. So have you looked at the proportion of which your saying is suitable habitat for goats. That is already grazed and I must say in the LaSals pretty heavily grazed by cattle or domestic sheep. No?
Dave McLean- I have heard some fairly scary stories about mountain goat aggression to hikers and to back packers. And years ago in Glacier I was driven off of a trail by a Mountain Goat. I also have heard that they have killed a person. I just as a hiker don't want the Mountain Goats in the LaSals. Can you address that issue?
Justin Shannon- There is always a potential for wildlife and human interactions regardless of the species. I know a few months ago we heard or got a report of a

beaver that bit a guy on an artery and it killed him. A beaver. But we are not going to raise war on a beavers because someone had a bad experience with that specific animal. On the Wasatch front, where we have a lot of hiking on Mt. Timp. And recreations like that. We just simply don't get those reports. So, does it happen? Yes it potentially does. Is it and everyday occurrence? I wouldn't think so.
Kevin Albrecht- One clarification to that can we or could you talk to areas that were they do have aggression the numbers of goats that are seen a lot of times population per acre?
Justin Shannon- A lot of the areas that we see human and mountain goat conflicts tend to be on National Parks. And I probably should have focused on this as I was given the portion throughout the state but the average is about five in Utah. On Mt. Olympic the National Park and some of those areas, they are up to 38 mountain goats per square mile. And they are not hunted. So you have these animals that just congregate and they have the potential for range damage and we should not admit that if you don't keep your potential populations in check they can do that. And there also tends to be more aggression with hikers and in those dense populations that tend to be unhunted.
Eric Luke of Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife (SFW)- Going back to your map that you have modeled, the area above 9,000 feet . You give some percentages of public and private land. Are those numbers based on the area above that 9,000 feet or just based on the unit as a whole?
Justin Shannon- That is above 9,000 feet.
Mary O'Brien of the Grand Canyon Trust- Do you know of any goat introductions in as far south and in as arid and warm areas as Southeastern Utah? I mean really they weren't native to Utah? They are a far arboreal north animal. Is this the lowest in the entire United States in terms in aridity and temperature?
Justin Shannon- I haven't checked with Colorado. I know they have some populations that are low. But one thing that there is about the LaSals is you do have populations all throughout the Colorado and the Uintahs also along the Wasatch front. So we are horseshoed but I will agree with you, this is a low altitude.
Mary O'Brien- This is pretty far away from where they were a native and have adapted and evolved.
Justin Shannon- How much further is the Tushars, Dustin? Do you know? How much lower in latitude is the LaSals than the Tushars? Do you know?
Both of them are south of I-70 so. It would be similar to the Tushars I would imagine.
Mary O'Brien- Aridity and for heat for the Tushars vs. the LaSals?
Justin Shannon- It is probably a little dryer over here.
Mary O'Brien- Yes.
Travis Pehrson- As you can see. I would like to see what the forest service says. Can we see that now? That would be addressing my question. As far as what is the support of the forest service?
Kevin Albrecht- I will give that at the very start of the comments.
Justin Shannon- I will say that we wrote this plan and we sent drafts to the forest supervisor and he gave comments back and Guy and I have even sat down with the

forest service and we went page by page line by line and there were many aspects to the plan that they have changed. That they said we would be more comfortable if we stated this or that. We did get there input on a lot of these issues and we did work closely with them.
Travis Pehrson- How about the 7% of the private land owners are there any comments from them? For or against?
Guy Wallace- I have spoke with Dave Redd with Redd Ranches about the issues with goats he was interested in what that meant for them in hunting opportunities and as far as other issues. He didn't have issues with that. Basically he was interested in that would affect them in the terms of their hunting whether it was opportunities for them to hunt the goats.
Derris Jones- Is that the same landowner that has 7% of the private ownership on the LaSals ?
Guy Wallace- Some of it. Some of it is up there around Dark Canyon Lake and that goes into that elevation. One of those was Doctor Sorenson from Moab. He was at the open house and was opposed to the goat transplant.
Derris Jones-Is he the biggest land owner in the Dark Canyon Lake area.
Guy Wallace- Hollyoaks is but they mainly have cabins in that area.
Dave Erley, Castle Valley Mayor- I talked with the public information affairs officer at the Olympic National Park yesterday and she indicated that the herd in the Olympic National Park was co-mingled with the herd in the National Forest and so that herd was actually being hunted and that the reason that those animals were hunted some. But what she also told me which is where my question is going. Is that they tried to do a management plan back in the mid-90's to address the impacts that they were having with the goats and because of the political pressures in the plan evidently that they recommended that the goats be removed and the plan was never able to get anywhere and they are about to address or try to do another management plan to reopen that next year. What guarantees can the RAC and the DWR give us that we won't end up in similar situations where it's documented that the goats are doing damage but we can't get them out of there? Thank you.
Justin Shannon- I think the biggest tool that wildlife agencies have that parks don't is the ability to hunt. So if we see too many goats in a given drainage we can certainly issue more permits in that particular drainage.
Anne Clair of Moab- My question is about the density and you addressed Mt. Dutton vs. the LaSals. But I am wondering why in a place that doesn't have goats yet, we would be aiming for a density of almost 5 per sq. mile? It seems really, really high?
Justin Shannon- When we look at our Mountain Goat densities across the state, the density's are doing well and the average is about 5 and they are modeled at about 9,000 feet. Are these goats going to be at 9,000 feet? I don't know but we are going to put them there and monitor them and see if this gets through. So really 4-9 is the higher end of it. So it's really between 3.2 and 3.9 goats per sq. mile. And if that becomes an issue then we can reduce populations. A good example is in 2006 we looked at our deer and elk population and our range unit ran out on the unit 13A, the Delores Triangle. Our range conditions were not looking well so we lowered the

population based on habitat monitoring. We feel comfortable at 200 but we can certainly look at it on the way.
Carl Kimmerle- What is this going to cost? What is it going to cost and what are we going to have to give up? Are we going to have to trade a whole herd of elk and fifty million dollars and hire personnel to monitor or is this relatively cheap? What's the cost of this?
Justin Shannon- Kenny was looking in to the cost of the goat transplants. Kenny, can you come up here for a sec.? One of the questions had to deal with what this is going to cost? What are we spending on Mountain Goats and Mountain goat management and transplants and things?
Kenny Johnson- Sorry, I had to step out and take a phone call really quick. We're actually in the process of some of this data that has been asked for and we have some accountants back in Salt Lake trying to dig up the specific costs of it. From what I have seen initially everything we bill to the activity code in the big game section that has to do with the mountain goat probably averaged somewhere around $20,000 dollars a year. I don't have any data on what a transplant costs. What former transplants cost. We are actually looking at gathering that right now. So I don't know that right now off the top of my head until I get that report.
Kent Hersey- In terms of the transplant we are looking at a helicopter capture and generally we are going to spend about $700 dollars an animal for the helicopter to catch it. We will be collaring all of these animals. Each collar costs about $300 dollars per, so we assume about a $1,000 per animal. For this particular, we will be more concerned about the monitoring so we will be doing flights probably every month to monitor their movements and that is about $200 per hour. Assume about a 6 hour flight. So that is $1,200 per flight. So about ten of them a year. And then we will do helicopter surveys every two years and a cost of about $1,000 per hour and about 8-10 hours of survey time. And this is all conservation permit money so it is not additional funds for sportsman at all. It is all paid for by FNAWS and SFW. This is all through conservation permit funds is how we would fund the surveys and the monitoring and the transplant. So it would funded by FNAWS and SFW.

<u>Comments from the Public</u>
Kevin Albrecht-reads letter to RAC, composed by Allen Rowley, U.S. Forest Service acting supervisor, Manti-LaSal National Forest: This letter is to provide comment to the proposed Rocky Mountain goat Introduction on the LaSal Mountains. Manti LaSal National Forest. I appreciate the open constructive and positive dialogue my staff has had with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources personnel on this proposed plan and in introduction. Through the discussions we have identified two remaining issues pertaining to Rocky Mountain Goats be introduced. First we were concerned with the introduction of goats may be inconsistent with the National Forest service policy on the Mount Peal Natural area. Our National policy is to maintain natural conditions and processes and minimize equal logical disturbance in R&As. Secondly we are concerned about the possible impact to forest service regionally sensitive plants. The LaSal Daisy is a g2 globally impaired species and the

LaSal groundsel is a different grounsel. Both, critically imperiled t1 taxa. Several elements of the management plan have been changed based on our discussions of these issues with the division. We understand that this is a state decision and action and look forward to continuing positive working relationship. Sincerely Allen Rowley, U.S. Forest Service Supervisor
Chris Wood- Organizations get five minutes and individuals get three minutes for comments. I will raise my hands when you have 30 sec. left.
Randy Quayle of Utah Bowmen's Association- The Utah bowmen's Association supports the DWR in their Mount Dutton and the LaSal Mountain wildlife management proposal for the Rocky Mountain goat. Mountain Goats have been very successful in Utah to this point in both North and Southern units. And they have created a lot of opportunities for both consumptive and non-consumptive users and the wildlife viewing areas are always enjoyable to go to and there is a lot of people that go to those and we recommend that this RAC supports the wildlife DWR proposal for this Mountain Goat management plan. Thank You.
Joel Tuhy of the Nature Conservancy- The Utah chapter of Conservancy appreciates this opportunity to address the RAC on this issue. Strictly with regard to Mountain goats on the LaSal Mountains not the Mount Dutton. With regard to the draft plan which is really what the issue is tonight. I believe you all received a letter by our state director Dave Livermore that stated our position so I won't go through that. I would like to address a couple of things that are actually in the management plan. If the decision by the wildlife board does stand and remains in force then we believe that this the introduction must be delayed and this herd unit management plan sent back to be remanded back to the division and should not be approved tonight to be revised in several significant ways mainly having to do with the monitoring aspects of the plan. There has been a lot of talk about the need for scientifically creditable monitoring program. We believe this is the case. Methods need to be established and plots be put into place, which has already been said that will be done. But the plots need to be read for several years before the Mountain goats are introduced, so that there is a valid pre goat base line established. I believe there is a reference made to the Tushar Mountains where plots were put in 1997 but the goats were there prior I believe. But I could be wrong on that. But, if that was the case, then the opposite needs to happen here. That needs to be in writing in the plan before a goat is introduced. Second, the monitoring needs to be accompanied by thresholds or trigger points on unacceptable impacts mainly to the Mount Peal research natural area, the sensitive plan of unmodified conditions. The thresholds need to be under the direction of the forest service, the managers of the habitat and if such pre determined thresholds are approached or crossed, there must be written commitment in the plan from the division to remove goats accordingly. In other words x amount of impact means x number of goats removed, not mitigated but removed. Page 7 of the plan about range conflicts is much too vague. It talks about we will coordinate or we will design management to avoid affecting those range usages when possible. Well it has to be possible or it shouldn't be done. And then third, I don't know if this has been written but I think it should be written in the plan: the cost of establishing and reading the monitoring has to be done entirely by

the state of Utah. They are your animals and they are your management responsibility, they are under your authority solely, the forest a service should have no obligation in this regard. No federal money or otherwise a burden on the forest service to deal with this issue. And not at any opportunity costs to other things that they are doing. There has been a statement that the Mountain goats have not had adverse impacts to other research. Natural areas--maybe that is the case in the Ashley Forest where there is thousands of square miles. A statement on page three of the plan says, " Forage use by Mountain Goats in R&As have not been thoroughly examined" so I don't think that is the case universally. So why is this big deal to the Nature Conservancy? Why am I here? Well in the 1980'S the nature conservancy under several formal cooperative agreements with the forest service inventories hand wrote designations of materials for natural areas and I myself in July of 1983 thirty years ago last week was in the LaSal mountains doing the inventory for the Mount Peale Research natural area. Which led to the preparation of this established record 1987 with my signature as the preparer with all of the line officers at the time of the forest service approving it. The designation was over signed by the chief of the forest service in 1988. So we don't look at these as throw away designations. They are an essential part of our early more than three decades history of our conservation in Utah. They are a big deal to the Nature Conservancy. And they were established with the intent to maintain unmodified conditions in Mountain goats by their very nature as a non native animal are a modified condition. There are other scientific studies in this R&A. I will just show you a couple done by Barb Smith on the Mount Peale Research natural alpine vegetation impacts. One Minute?
Chris Wood- No, 30 sec.
Joel Tuhy- The DWR and the Conservancy work collaboratively and congenially and have done so for three decades on many projects. Matheson Wetlands, the state wildlife action plans, Grey ranch, Cunningham ranch. But with regards to Mountain goats in the La Sal Mountains we're are at polar opposites and will always be. Everybody likes a compromise. Nobody likes a win-lose situation. To us the compromise is at the state level. Non native Mountain goats are a lot of places we hold the line in the LaSal Mountains. Thank you.
Sue Bellagamba- Do you have a hand out for us Joel? Can he pass them out to us? Or can he hand them to me? Thank you.

Mary O'Brien of the Grand Canyon Trust- I serve as the director of the Utah Forest program on the Dixie fish lake and Manti La Sal National Forest and Grand Canyon Trust urges you to reverse your vote on placing Rocky Mountain Goats on the LaSal Mountains. I contacted Allen Hubert of the Ashley National Forest regarding studies of Rocky Mountain Goats in the high Uintahs with Mountain goats at 1.8 goats per sq. mile. Deeper snow depths and colder and asked him if he knew of studies on the other peaks. Willow Peak, Lone Peak, Box Elder peak, Provo Peak, Timpanogus Peak, the Tushar Mountains. He indicated that he knew of no studies on any of those. In terms of Rocky Goat impacts, I contacted the regional

office of the forest service. Theresa Pindouce, the regional Bionomist indicated she knew of no studies other than one on Mt. Timp. And Trish, you were asking what would happen if there were massive effects. I think the problem is there won't be massive affects. You will have a gradual loss of plant diversity over time and inseparable from the loss occurring due to climate change which alpine areas around the world are slowly decreasing in plant diversity. And pica are a sub-species here on the LaSals, the American pika has been petitioned repeatedly for listing under the endangered act and primarily because studies have showed the lower populations are being depleted so you have a slow bleeding of alpine areas. Then there is a study of James Fowler, Forest service research person who has been investing years in studying Erigeron sp. on the LaSal Mountains as a sign of climate change. It is a plant that grows at several of the elevations that you can track what climate change is having impacts on that species, which has implications for management of land. And those studies will have to cease if the Goats are introduced because there will no way to separate the impacts of the climate change from the grazing or digging up of plants by the goats. The Mount Peale research natural area does represent a very similar problem of loss because the forest service has committed in the establishment of the Mount Peale R&A to maintain it in an unmodified condition. And we would maintain that the forest service is a decision maker in this process because while you DWR manages the game animals and hunting, the forest service manages wildlife habitat. And this is a two party system. And they are committed to maintaining the R&A in an unmodified condition which will be impossible to maintain if Rocky Mountain Goats are released on the Mountain. Thank You.

Chris Baird of the Canyonlands Watershed Council of Moab- First I want to say thank you for this opportunity to speak. One of the big things that I wanted to relay is how crowded the LaSals are in Moab. As you are aware the recreational activities that happen in that county is what drives the economy and I have sat on several trail building crews and committees and I know the difficulties involved in trying to merge recreation with wildlife and other uses happening on the mountain. I also know the stressors associated with everything combined is impacting deer herds,' impacting cattle, impacting wildlife in a variety of ways. On top of that we also have a climate that is continually getting dryer, so for the past 15 years we have been having drought conditions and they continue on getting worse. The stressors are adding up and it doesn't make a lot of sense to me when everybody else is already having a hard time trying to figure out how to manage the uses that are already on that mountain to add another use on top of that. Anecdotally speaking, there is a lot of that involved in the proposal so I won't mind bringing up my own. I have hiked nearly every mountain range that these goats are in except for Tushar and the Duttons. And I will tell you right now that the exfoliated vegetation that exists in the LaSal range is not like anything else in any other mountain range that these goats are on. And what that means is that the vast majority of what's above 9,000 feet is just raw talus and I could tell you that this is considerably different than any other mountain range that I have been on in Utah. So it has been asked about before actually doing an evaluation of the true habitat that the goats have up there versus

how things are in the other mountain ranges. I think this needs to be done before any decision is made. The R&A or if you read the principles of these research areas, they are clearly saying no to the introduction of an exotic bovid species in those areas. You would just basically ignore the principles of the forest service designation. It makes no sense whatsoever to allow goats or an exotic species into the area. One of the biggest issues that I have is the citation of Big Horn Sheep in this range. I have done my own studies of the overlap of the two and it happens at about the 8,000 foot level and most anybody can find that out by themselves. Get on a computer right now and look up the typical ranges of both species and you will see the Mountain Goats exist in a much higher elevation than even Rocky Mountain Big Horn Sheep. They will top out at around 8500 or 9,00 feet, where a Mountain goat will go below 9,000, so in my opinion, ranges do not mix and in my research they do not mix. Maybe at the 8,000 ft. level you will see them eating the same stuff. One sighting by somebody there was a Big Horn sheep on top of one of those peaks is not substantiation that they use to be up there all of the time regularly grazing. There has also been sightings of Mountain Goats at sea level but nobody is going to be making an introduction or a proposal to introduce them at sea level . even though they have been seen there. So that line of logic in my opinion fails and so I think that when you look at the reasons for this introduction and weigh the pros and cons that the cons far outweigh the pros. There are many people who have hiked the LaSals for decades and are in love with the alpine tundra. It is a very rare thing and I think that this proposal jeopardizes it. And hundreds of local people will be trumped by a handful of hunters. Thank You.

Kevin Albrecht- We have another comment card. We are still sitting at about an hour and fifteen worth of comment and so again I want to remind you if your comment has been stated please don't restate it again we have four more actions tonight that we need to get through.

Byron Bateman, President of Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife- The question was raised earlier: "Where was the money going to come from?" and the answer was we're going to put the money up--us and the other conservation groups in the state of Utah. I am glad I sit here and listened to all of the good questions that have been asked so far tonight. We all need to be concerned anytime we transplant animals anywhere in the state of Utah. But I think the division along with the forest service has looked at all of these things. I know because these same questions came up for every transplant that has already occurred in the state of Utah, going back to 1967 through the 80's, through the 90's. Groups like these were to ask the same questions and what you can look back at is what the results we have today as we have several healthy Mountain Goat populations in the state of Utah. The Wasatch front is probably the home 80% of the state's population. There are Mountain Goats in everybody's back yard on the Wasatch front. There is more people using the Wasatch front skiing, hiking and other uses and everybody is getting along. The forest service manages for multi use. Multiple uses consider all uses. We're concerned about working with livestock operators and stuff like that because that could be a conflict in the problem that we might have on the mountain. We're willing to work with those livestock operators to mitigate any problems that might

occur with mountain goats. The Mountain goats are going have a radio collar on them. Some are going to have a GPS collar. If there are problems identified, we want to stay on top of the monitoring to make sure that the monitoring is done jointly by the DWR which has their own habitat section along with forest service and the habitat section to make sure we are not compromising any plants or any part of the Great LaSal Mountain range. That is the last thing any of us want is to do any damage to the LaSals. So I just want to let you all know that we are concerned with the habitat. We are looking forward with the opportunity to have more opportunity to view the mountain goats because the people that go in the other places throughout the state we have to mountain goat opportunities right now. One was mentioned earlier by Justin August 3rd there is going to one on the Tushar Mountains. We already had one this previous year April 10th in American Fork Canyon. Hundreds of people came out to view these goats every day. It would be an economic addition to the county and to the state of Utah. The LaSal Mountains belong to all of us. They're not just indigenous to the SER. The SER is lucky that you have some of the prettiest habitat there is in the world. And we want to make sure that everybody has the opportunity to see that habitat and everybody has the opportunity to view our wonderful wildlife. There are bears, lions, deer, elk that all inhabit and all of the other small critters that run around on the LaSal mountains. We don't want to impact anything there. So we just ask that you consider all of the information that you have been given tonight and know that all of these questions have been asked and answered repeatedly. You look at the letter from the forest service. They are willing to work and have done that on the Ashley National Forest and stuff like that. The past twenty years up there has been nothing but great results. We have the means to remove the goats if there is a problem. So we always have that protection that buffer that we can go in and take care of anything that might arise. We are in this to make it successful for everybody we don't want to compromise mountain goats or anybody, especially the habitat on that mountain. We just ask that your RAC pass the statewide management plan. This was part of the plan. Now we are just going through these two unit plans. I ask you to please approve the translocation of goats to the LaSals and also onto the Dutton range. Thank You.

Stan Baker of the Mule Deer Foundation- Mule deer foundation is in support of the division's plan to transplant Mountain Goats to Mount Dutton and the LaSal. We do not foresee there being any significant impacts to other big game species mainly deer and elk.

Lynn Jackson of the Grand County Council- I have been in your shoes quite a bit and I know what you are doing. As I look across the board I see some good familiar faces that I have know for a long time. Trish, Karl up there. Jeff, Sue and you folks. I really appreciate your job. Guy and your team over there. We have known each other 40 years or so. I know you guys have a tough job. I have worked in public land management before being elected to the grand county council so I know this is a difficult job and I expect you guys are going to wrestle with this. Tonight I would speak to Grand County and the LaSal portion of this plan. What goes on in Garfield County is not my business. I guess what I would offer after listening to a lot of the

comments is a political perspective here. Grand County has no position on this at this point. but as a representative of the people of the Grand County, it's my duty to see that all sides of this issue are looked at. We recognize the value of wildlife, recreation, and hunting. But these are some difficult questions and with all due respect I don't believe that all of the questions have been answered. I think there have been some good questions here but there is some work that is left and needs to be done by you guys. I apologized to earlier. You have some open houses and I think some of us were unaware of those. We have thought of this as to not be such a large issue, but it is apparent that in Grand County it has become a large issue. I think that some of these questions that have been answered and need a little bit more detail before the final decision is made. I have talked with Bruce Adams in San Juan County recently. He doesn't feel that he or they don't have all of the information either. The LaSal Mountains are in both counties, so I could have just one recommendation tonight to you guys is that you delay action on the LaSal portion of this plan and would appreciate if the Grand And San Juan County commission could have a little bit more information and detail presented to help with this decision as it is presented. Thank you.

David Erley, Castle Valley Mayor- I would like the thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. I would like to very much agree with both Mary and Chris Baird comments tonight. I would like to echo Joel Tuhy comments on the monitoring in the plan implementation. I agree that needs to be strengthened beforehand and believe that there should be more baseline monitoring. When I asked a question earlier, I got an answer that the way that we were going to deal with it is that we can hunt here. That brings back my question that I really think that when the animals are there, it is going to hard to get them off. I don't think they will do no damage to all users and we can take them off. I think the plants will be damaged and the pikas before we have the chance politically can get the Rocky Mountain Goats off of the LaSals. There is evidence from Wyoming that the alpine growing season under climate change is actually shortening. They are doing research and have found in places there is 12-8 weeks. So has the DWR done any length of research on the length of the season on the LaSals? Until the recent rains down there, the tundra was looking incredibly terrible and was looking like it couldn't support the pikas. So many people locally and I echo Lynn's feelings, and I feel that a lot of questions haven't been answered yet. The Uintahs is definitely not the LaSal Mountains in both size and the amount of precipitation that they get. Depending on the season we can have very variable years. I do believe that a DWR representative said that there is a lot more snow in the Uintahs and further north. I question if there is really the moisture to support the tundra and the goats. Finally as mayor my council is extremely concerned that there has been no consideration of either Moab or the Castle Valley sole source aquifer. If this was a federal project happening it would have to be considered in terms of what the impacts could do to our aquifer but because it is a state implementation it's not considered. This doesn't really seem fair and seems against the intent of these laws. Again I would echo Lynn Jackson's comments and encourage you to postpone the LaSal section of this plan until more information is gathered. Thank You.

Kevin Albrecht-Thank You. Shane Thompson? (Pause) Lloyd Nielsen?
Lloyd Nielson Sunrise Outfitting- I have called a lot of people on this issue. One person I talked to was David Redd. I have called people in Moab, people in Blanding. I haven't gotten any negative reports. A lot of them are just wishy washy they don't care which way one or the other. But a lot of them are positive for it. My biggest concern if we are putting this kind of money and this effort into having goats to make sure that we take care of the predators. Just don't throw goats up there to get rid of.
Shayne Thompson of Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife- I support Byron on everything that he said. He covered everything that I wanted to go over. On personal notes I have stumbled all over the Wasatch front and hunted hard up in that country and been kind of considered the Mountain Goats in my own little party. I do get up quite often and pursue Mule deer up in there and there is no conflict with them at all. They are fun to watch. I think it would be a good addition on the LaSals. I think it would be fun for the community and everybody down there for an opportunity to view them. Like Byron said, if there was a problem then I think we could remedy that easy enough. I am for the Fish and Game to do this transplant.
Terry Ekker of the San Juan County Commission- I would like to thank the RAC and all of the time you guys commit to all of the wildlife issues. I know you volunteer a lot of time to be here. Wish we were talking about doing the Sheep transplant but most of the communities here southeastern Utah have friends and family and neighbors who make a living in the livestock industry. I think most of us that live here in this area support those folks and the way they make a living is part of our heritage. With that being said, I believe that Rocky Mountain Goats are similar to the sheep that we historically had here and that I think it would be a great compromise to have goats and to provide a different wildlife viewing and hunting opportunity. I petition that those on the RAC would approve the Divisions plans to make that transplant happen.
Paul Frank-I think Mary, Joel and Chris and the forest service letter have pretty much said everything I have to say except maybe one thing. I am philosophically opposed to trans-locating exotics into a pristine environment habitat. I have heard over and over that wildlife viewing would be a positive thing. If you're philosophically opposed to that like I am and many other people then wildlife viewing pretty much becomes a kick in the teeth. Thank you.
Dennis Silva-I am opposed to the translocation of the goats. I think the LaSal Mountain is perfect the way that they are. I have enjoyed them for over 20 years. I support the comments made by Mary O'Brian and Joel Tuhy.
Travis Pehrson-I would like to support the DWR's proposal to transplant the Rocky Mountain Goats onto the LaSals. What a great opportunity it will be. I have spent a lot of time up there on the Redd Ranch's. I guide for them. To see the top of the mountain and not see anything up there, it would be nice to view. I probably will never hunt a goat or have the opportunity because it is a once in a lifetime tag. But just to have the viewing opportunity of this animal would be nice to see up there. Also, what a great opportunity it will be to do a study on the goats. Especially how

far south this would be. This would be a great opportunity for an article on the study of the goats. It would be something new rather than a past experience of 1960's studies. Something more accurate and more recent and new in our generation. Thanks

Anthony Bayles- A lot has already been said. I just want to say that I support putting Mountain Goats on the LaSals.

Susie Harrington of Moab- I wanted to say that I have gone to the open houses and I started out fairly neutral on this, but having been educated myself and listening to it. I am coming out pretty strongly against. And I am one of the landowners that all of my land is above 10,000 feet and there is a very small portion of the land that is above 10,000 feet that is actually lush. The rest of it is really talus and I feel like I am not interested in feeding the goats. I support all of the other comments that have been made. This feels like there is a huge amount of extrapolation from other ranges that are extremely different and weather patterns that are very different and I don't really see it being relevant to the LaSals. I would like you to delay and put more studying to this but I think those of us that spend a lot time up there it does seem very evident the difference in conditions and I would actually like to see you turn this down and stop spending money on it. Thank You.

Bob O'Brien of Castle Valley- I support many things said opposing the introduction to goats. I would ask you to recind that decision and I will just say a couple of things. I think the most terrible thing is accumulative impact of large browsers. so we have got deer, elk, and we have cattle and no one is asking for you to take those off or limit those numbers. The real question is "Are we going to take another big browser and put it up on top of those mountains?" Remember the LaSal Daisy grows nowhere else on earth than the LaSals and the LaSal pika that is a sub-species of a pika is nowhere else on earth. I don't believe there will be no impact by having that grazer up there. I was going to say "Gosh, I am going to go speak for the plants and the animals" but I won't say that and go through that long speal. I will say that I am also a little bit selfish because I hike up in those mountains several times. I am a little bit worried about the sub-alpine areas. You go up there and that is where I see lush meadows. Some say that they won't always graze up just at the top of those mountains, which is a very fragile tundra type environment. They will do damage. That's what I believe anyways. I don't want to see the very few meadows that are lush that don't have cattle on them that is certainly when I go up Mann Peak, there aren't cattle up on the areas about 10,000-10,500 feet. The same thing with Gold Knob when you're probably 9,500 feet. These animals if I understand it, they will go to the top but they will also come on down and graze at 9,000 feet. We are going to have a large herbivore destroying those lush meadows. Please don't allow for this to happen. Thank you.

Lindsay Gregor- I support all of Mary and Bob and Joel have already talked about. This summer I have been doing field work on the Manti La Sal and the Fish lake National Forest. And recently I took a hike up to Mann's Peak and I was photographing the various alpine and the sub-alpine plant species and I was just taken back at how dry and fragile the land was and I just got really emotional about how a big ungulate can go up there with as many stressors that are already up there.

So I would again like to ask that you would reconsider this issue. Thank You.
David McLean- I am a hunter, but I also am a hiker. I have hunted more years than most of these presenters have been alive even. I still enjoy hunting. I still enjoy hiking. Our LaSal is a very, very small mountain range. They are isolated. We have a lot of questions about what kind of impact these goats will have. There is one question that I am sure we have no discussion about at all--that is there will be some impact. Obviously there will be impact. That impact no matter what it is cannot be undone. I encourage you to please do not approve to putting Mountain Goats on our LaSals.
Kalen Jones of Moab- I have been visiting the alpine LaSal area for and in every season for the past 20 years. As I review this plan I started off somewhat neutral on this because I have enjoyed observing goats and other far lusher ranges. But I really don't think that they have a place in the LaSals and as I review these management plan. Frankly it makes me mad. There are so many skirting around the truth, the willful overlooking of the precipitation differences between the LaSals and other ranges where the goats have been transplanted. I feel like there are very few specifics in this. One specific is the target population number. I feel like because what has been mentioned about the composition up there, just the incredible amount of pure talus. Sure there are maybe some like to nibble on if you're a goat. But it's not like other ranges. That combined with the rain fall makes me believe that this 200 number is a gross over-estimation of the carrying capacity of the LaSals. I believe that if you approve this you're putting or if have recommended on approving it, you're putting the DWR on a collision course with the forest service and the forest itself. With the other large animals domesticated and wild that use this area, I urge to vote, No. Thank You.
Anne Clare Erickson of Moab- I would just agree with everything that Kalen and Susie and Lynn and that everyone has said. I really urge you to vote No. I have spent hundreds of days in the LaSals I can't imagine what would happen if these goats are introduced. Thank You
Kevin Albrecht-Ok with that we will close the comments with the audience and real quick one thing that I failed to mention was I would like to welcome the director of the DWR here tonight. In my seven years on the RAC I have not witnessed that and I would like to show him our appreciation and to let him know that this really representative of how many people we usually have at our meetings. Again we appreciate that and we thank you very much. With that we will go to the comments from the RAC.

<u>RAC Discussion</u>
Wayne Hoskisson-You know, I have looked through this plan and this plan is not a management plan. It is an introduction plan. It doesn't do anything that a management plan should do like create a system for creating a baseline data for introducing a species. It doesn't do anything like establish a trigger point for when management needs to change. It doesn't trigger anything like an end point if it is

unsuccessful. It is basically not a management plan. So I really can't support this plan and the forest service has given a very wishy washy statement. It doesn't say whether they support it or not. They say they want to work with the DWR. I suspect that's really the case. That's what they want is a better plan. I won't put you on the spot Kevin. I am tempted to. I have talked to other people. It does fail. We talk about trying to introduce a healthy population of mountain goats but that is not really the question when we are talking about introducing the mountain goats in a new area. That is going backwards. That's thinking backwards. That is like you know we have lots of healthy habitat for cheat grass, and tamarisks, Russian olive. even carp, quagga mussels... that is not the way we look at how we manage habitat. It's not by whether a population can survive there, it's by whether the habitat is really ready or if it should be managed that way. So this going backwards, it's wrong. And to tell you the truth I am incredibly disappointed. We just talked about these two months ago and all of the sudden there is a plan? But it is not a plan. And so I am going to actually make a motion that the Southeast RAC withdraws its approval for including the LaSals on introduction for Rocky Mountain Goats.
Kevin Albrecht-We have a motion by Wayne Hoskisson to oppose the introduction of Rocky Mountain Goat on the LaSal Mountains, and I would like to keep these separated. 1-the Mount Dutton. And 2- the LaSal Mountains.
Wayne Hoskisson- It is a little bit of a different situation, because the mountain goats were not transplanted there. I don't know if it is great that they are there. But they were not transplanted there. But they are there and so you have got to manage them. It is a different situation.
Kevin Albrecht- Any other discussion?
Sue Bellagamba-I think we need a second ? and I will second it.
Kevin Albrecht- We have a second. Any discussion on the motion of the board?
Sue Bellagamba- I will say that I am extremely concerned that we had two elective officials here tonight one from Grand County council and one from the town of Castle Valley asking that this plan be sent back to the drawing board and that they have opportunity to have more input and either write a letter of support or not for this plan. I have also talked to Bruce Adams County Commissioner for the San Juan county and he is concerned also that this has not been brought forth to San Juan County. So I think that we need to pay attention to our county council people and our county commissioners and our mayors.
Derris Jones- Can I ask the division a question on the procedure? I know all of the transplants have to go through the RDCC, which allows folks that Sue is talking about to review. Is that a process that has already occurred, or is that something that occurs after the plan is approved?
Derris Jones-I am just curious with the RDCC at least in the past all of the transplants go through a state clearing house.
Justin Shannon- The statewide plan did go through the RDCC with zero comment and that satisfied the requirements the unit plans are subject to that.
Derris Jones- The unit plans don't have to?
Justin Shannon- The statewide did and we had zero comment.
Guy Wallace-What I was going to add is that I have had conversations and worked

with Nick Sandburg, the San Juan County planner about the Mountain goat plan specifically and we have had a discussion of the items that we have discussed tonight and I have offered to come to a county commission meeting and talk to the county commission about that, and they have not asked that we do that. That information is relayed from the planner to the county commissioner to Bruce and I talked with Bruce just outside of the county commission meeting and I gave him some information and he didn't indicate one way or the other which way the county commission. They basically said that they wouldn't oppose it. But they did not know whether they could support it.
Chris Wood-I will just mention that this was brought to the county commissioners' attention through many avenues as Guy was saying, including the Canyon Country Partnership which I attended and that Bill has attended. We brought this up to the group and the commissioners were present from both (not all of them but some of them) that attended the meeting were there, and it was discussed and received nothing but positive feedback from them.
Kevin Albrecht- Ok so we have a motion on the table. Any other discussion that we really need to discuss before we vote on the motion?
Wayne Hoskisson- I have further comment. Basically the DWR held a double standard tonight when they were talking about the research. The fact that the forest service did indeed conduct a valid sort of research that has been done (inaudible) that has not been published and it is not even on the way. There have been peer reviews and they were not done before Mountain Goats were introduced. And yet they won't take a piece of research that was done in the LaSal Mountains before goats are introduced and look at that. That is a double standard and it is shameful. A shameful act on the part of the agency.
Kevin Albrecht- We have a motion on the table. Let's vote on the motion.
Blair Eastman- Can you give me, on your private land ownership you talked about that just for a second. You have 2942 acres, in that is there a primary land owner? I mean is one of those landowners that owns a substantially more or a bigger piece of that property?
Guy Wallace- Probably Redd's.
Blair Eastman-What I want to know is I guess. is what were your landowner comments? What was the general consensus?
Guy Wallace- Like the ones I talked to was David Redd. And we talked to Dr. Sorensen at the open house. His comments were… I explained David Redd's before. It's basically his interests were in whether or not the CWMU would be able to have permits?
Blair Eastman- And Dr. Sorenson is he a substantial land owner? Minor owner or cabin Lot?
Guy Wallace- I am not sure how many acres he has up there. He has some high country that he does graze with cattle. His concerns were about whether the potential for fence damage from Mountain Goats because he had some issues with elk. And along those lines. That was his primary concern--whether there would be fence damage.
Blair Eastman- What about your permittees?

Guy Wallace- No we haven't really talked to the permittees.
Justin Shannon-I have had individuals with one of the permittees attend the open house and didn't give a yes or a nay. It was one of those middle discussions just a big Q & A and we talked about putting Goats instead of Big Horn Sheep and that type of conversation. There was a sub-lessee that I have talked to that has been fairly receptive to it and favorable to it.
Blair Eastman- So either one of you can answer this question. I have been trying to figure this out, approximately how many sq. miles of sun-alpine country are up there, that these goats are going to feed on?
Justin Shannon- That is tough. I have seen reports that there is only 8,000 acres of alpine habitat. So I think the other stuff would be, well it's not all sub-alpine because you have conifer and other things like that. But that breakdown wasn't part of the model. It was the slope and things.
Blair Eastman-We are looking at 200 goats and your sub-alpine forage production is somewhere between 2-3,000 pounds per acre? Is that right?
Justin Shannon- Yes that is according to the 1986 forest service plan where they looked at their sub-alpine habitat on the Manti LaSal National Forest as a whole. And they said that 17% was sub-alpine. How much of that falls onto the LaSals? I don't know because the Manti has some as well. But their publication said that on that plan they can have up to 3,000 pounds per acre in their sub-alpine habitat.
Wayne Hoskisson- That was based on a model, so you're basing a model on another model. Once you start modeling on modeling you start to destroy accuracy. That is not done for measurement. That is not the way baseline things ought to be done. It's to go up there and to actually measure the amount of forage. There is (interrupted by Blair)
Blair Eastman- Wayne, wouldn't you agree with that-- you could work off averages for this? To figure something out?
Wayne Hoskisson- It could be done. It would probably take a couple of years. 2-3 years.
Blair Eastman-Well, ok. It's not easy. But we do forage surveys all the time. And over years there has to be comparison' that will work with the LaSals I would guess. So let's be conservative and say 2,000.
Wayne Hoskisson- The ranger district has a very good range count and she may have something.
Blair Eastman-I wouldn't disagree with you there. I am sure that is the case. My point is, and I am just trying to figure this out and understand it. Using a conservative figure of 2,000 pounds of forage per acre at that sub-alpine and that's a low end of what was given tonight.
Blair Eastman- You have 200 goats and they ate somewhere in the neighborhood of 8 lbs. of dry matter a day. Do you know how much these goats eat? What do they need in the way of dry matter on a daily basis?
Randall Thacker- I don't know that but I do know the UAM is equivalent to more than 6 goats for 1 UAM.
Justin Shannon-On Montana's state website if you look at their extension website they have 200 mountain goats will equate to 30 AUMs is what they estimated at.

Blair Eastman- I used 8lbs. of dry matter a day that is 1600 lbs of dry matter a day that these goats are going to eat and that's less than an acre a day. Throughout the whole year of dry matter that they need and that is 200 goats. Is that somewhere in the neighborhood what these things are going to be consuming?
Wayne Hoskisson- But wait a minute you're mistaking dry matter for the other.
Blair Eastman- I am, Wayne, right. It still seems to me if we are comparing (Interrupted) How many AUMs did you just tell me, 30 AUMs for how many goats?
Justin Shannon-We have to be careful because the division doesn't manage wildlife on the AUMs but if you came from the ranching background, which you are, 30 AUMs would be equivalent to 200 goats.
Blair Eastman-I am trying to understand it... equate that back to dry matter for me ok?(laughing)
Wayne Hoskisson- Well you have to divide and it really varies if you are doing grasses or forbs and then you're also throwing in shrubs.
Blair Eastman- I am just trying to understand. I understand Wayne that your (interrupted by Wayne)
Blair Eastman- What I am trying to understand is that there is a lot of country there. I am not going to argue whether or not these goats should or shouldn't be there necessarily and that they are not native vs. they are native, and what should be there. I am just trying to figure out why you don't want them? Honestly...and you know multiple use resource this seems to be a good thing. I don't think the amount of forage that they are going to consume is really going to be that damaging to somewhere in the neighborhood. This is a large area for the number of goats. Goats aren't a huge eater. They are going to consume something but they're not going be like putting a bunch of cattle up there.
Kevin Albrecht- Blair brings up a really good point in that the question of the amount AUMs to be used and the amount of forage available. I appreciate that. I think if a lot of this is going to come down to what your opinions are, I think with that we'll call for a vote.
Guy Wallace- I have one more thing. I don't feel like I had enough information on the issue of the amount of permittees. We had some verbiage in the management plan that was related to that whether that was a concern or not. And in our discussions with the forest service, they indicated to us that was not a concern of the forest service for permittees because there wasn't that much cattle use at those elevations.
Karl Ivory- Just a question for Justin maybe. We have a motion on the table to recind the plan? Is that what is on the table?
Kevin Albrecht- The motion on the table is to oppose.
Wayne Hoskisson-To recommend to the wildlife board that they remove the LaSals from the list of potential introduction or translocations.
Kevin Albrecht-You got that, Brent?
Brent Stettler- Can you say that again?
Wayne Hoskisson- So my motion is that we recommend to the wildlife board that they remove the LaSals as a potential introduction location for Rocky Mountain Goats.

Karl Ivory-Ok. That was the point of clarification.
Kevin Albrecht- With that, all in favor? 5 opposed. Those in favor are Chris Micoz, Sue Bellagamba, Wayne Hoskisson, Charlie Tracy, and Trisha so those that oppose are: Jeff Horrocks, Darrel Mecham, Blair Eastman, Karl Ivory, Derris Jones, so we are setting at a tie. With that I being the chairman I will have the deciding vote and with that I have had a lot of discussions with the forest service and given a lot of direction. And with that because this is on the Manti LaSal National Forest and I am a Manti LaSal Forest service employee, this is in direct conflict so with that I am going to abstain from vote and pass this on to the wildlife board to make a decision. Did you get that Brent? With that we will go to Number 9 Proposed fee schedule.

VOTING
Motion was made by Wayne Hoskisson that the LaSal Mountains be removed from the list of potential Rocky Mountain goat introduction sites.
Seconded by Sue Bellagamba

> **Voting was tied, 5 to 5.**
> **In favor of the motion were Chris Micoz, Sue Bellagamba, Wayne Hoskisson, Charlie Tracy and Trisha Hedin.**
> **Opposed to the motion were Jeff Horrocks, Darrel Mecham, Blair Eastman, Karl Ivory, and Derris Jones**
> **The chairman, Kevin Albrecht, who represents the U.S. Forest Service, abstained from voting to break the tie, due to a conflict of interest.**

Kevin Albrecht- So as my first meeting as RAC chair nothing like Baptism by Fire. But in my first go at it I made a mistake. In that tonight's meeting we are voting on The La Sal Mountain management goat plan. And in the motion, just let me read the motion and then I will let you clarify, Wayne. The motion is to remove the LaSals as a potential relocation area for goats. So with that we already voted on that motion as the statewide plan. And that was already voted and we voted, yes. And so tonight we are voting on the individual unit goat plan. And so that language does not clarify what we are voting for.
Wayne Hoskisson-This is what I would say to that. And this will actually take a (inaudible) to resolve and I hope you got one with you because this will be something that can go to the courts. This motion that I made addresses an issue that was addressed previously by this body. This body has the authority to go back and address those issues again. This issue or motion addresses this as making a moot point. And so that addresses the issue of a goat management plan and making it moot. That's all it does.
Derris Jones- I guess I don't understand what's the problem?
Kevin Albrecht- The problem is in the recommendation we voted that we're not

accepting LaSals as a translocation area. The wildlife board voted that and that decision has already been done. So in tonight's meeting we are voting for the LaSal management goat plan. That is a new plan already written and that is what our vote should be for.
Chris Wood- You can make a motion that you request that the wildlife board remove the LaSals.
Wayne Hoskisson- That is what my motion was. It was a recommendation to the wildlife board.
Sue Bellagamba- We also have an issue on it. When we voted on it at the last RAC, Kevin didn't excuse himself and the vote would have gone in favor of no LaSals in that vote.
Darrel Mecham-I think that Wayne's motion goes to the wildlife board so I think that is a moot point.
Chris Wood- Ok then I think we need to vote on the unit plans as presented as well.
Wayne Hoskisson- I think this does need to go back to the board.
Kevin Albrecht- The way it stands it will.
Wayne Hoskisson-I think if you want to vote on whether or not to accept the plan, I am also willing to take a vote on that.
Jeff Horrocks- Are you going to vote on those independent plans? Dutton as one vote and the LaSals as another?
Greg Sheehan- So there are two things. There is the stat wide goat plan that came out the last round of RACs and board. In that plan, it identifies potential release or future release sites. The LaSals was one of those. The entire plan passed the wildlife board so we have a plan in place. Now the next follow up, and it was described at the time of the plan as that plan in itself didn't approve the release of any goats. We then said that we would come back and if we had areas of the state and there are two Mount Dutton and the LaSals that we were interested in having goats on, we would bring those out to you individually as action items, which we are doing tonight. So what we need from you is to vote yes or no on each of these two units. Those are your action items on the agenda. If this body would like to make a motion to the wildlife board to re-look at the plans, something that has already passed, you're welcome to do that. Will they or is that your motion, then make sure that everybody understands that clearly because there are two separate discussion items and because the plan itself that was approved last month isn't an action item tonight, your certainly able to make that recommendation but the board themselves may not opt to vote or do anything with that plan. And my guess is that they likely won't at this point in time without a lot of discussion from all of the other regional advisory councils and bringing that whole thing back out as an agenda item. So tonight the most important thing is to address these two action items that are a part of your agenda this evening. Does that help clarify that?
Kevin Albrecht- To me that really helps clarify as to why we need go back.
Wayne Hoskisson- As long as my objectives are clearly recorded in the minutes, this decision I am willing to move on. I believe that my motion stands that it addresses this and it makes a motion that is a perfectly legal motion to the board.
Kevin Albrecht- So that direction will be seen by the board.

Greg Sheehan- Yes, you will have the opportunity to say that there are other things voted on. Last night we presented some cougar recommendations and a recommendation that came out of that RAC in Beaver when we met last night was they had some concerns with multi-year plans that they would like the board to look at. So that will go and be presented to them regarding the cougar plan. You can do that as well with the goat plan, but it doesn't inherently mean that they are going to open it up have a discussion, and change it. And they couldn't do that at this board meeting, they would have to vote to bring the whole plan back out and start all over again. Thank You.
Kevin Albrecht- With that I will open it back up to motions solely for the LaSals dealing with the management plan.
Derris Jones-I will make a motion. I move that we accept the division management plan as written with the exception of the goat density. I would like to see (this is a five year plan is that correct?) for the duration of the five year plan I would like to see the goat density kept less than 1.8 or less. Per square mile.
Kevin Albrecht-So we have a motion on the table by Derris Jones to accept…
Justin Shannon- If I may, is that at 9,000 feet or at 10,000 feet? because there are two different portions or elevations in the plan. A number may be more fitting.
Derris Jones-That would be at the 9,000 foot elevation.
Kevin Albrecht- So let me restate the motion. We have a motion on the table to accept the LaSal goat management plan as presented by the DWR with the exception that the density of goats per square mile will not be above 1.8 or less at the 9,000 foot habitat model.
Kevin Albrecht- Do I have a second?
Jeff Horrocks- You do. And I would like to add to the motion or to amend the motion if I may. To include that the local officers that monitor this pay real close attention to this in case there is a problem that does develop that they remove the goats.
Derris Jones- Does this need a second for an amendment? I don't remember. Either way you were the second. Yes I will accept that addition.
Kevin Albrecht- Did you get that?
Sue Bellagamba- Would you accept some more additions if I add them?
Blair Eastman- We should work on this motion and then make amendments to the motion, so we don't muddle this, because it's going to get muddled.
Derris Jones- To accept the division unit management plan for the LaSal Mountains as it was written with the exception of the population objective which using the division using the map on it, the goat objective cannot exceed 1.8 goats per square mile above 9,000 feet and that the division will work closely with the forest service on setting up monitoring transects to protect the alpine habitats.
Kevin Albrecht- Motion made by Derris Jones. Seconded by Jeff Horrocks. Are you willing to entertain an amendment or to vote?
Derris Jones- I will entertain one . But don't know if I will accept one.
Kevin Albrecht- So we will listen to an amendment and then you can decide that.
Sue Bellagamba- Last meeting Derris, you spoke of having triggers clearly articulated; triggers that if we see this type of alteration in the habitat and

something happens. Would you be interested in amending your motion that the unit management plan be rewritten to have those clearly articulated-- triggers with actions associated. You brought it up last time.
Derris Jones- My problem, Sue, is you would be leaving it up to the division trusting them because what we would be doing is saying that the plan is going to come back to us.
Sue Bellagamba- You're right.
Derris Jones- If you're comfortable, I am comfortable, but I doubt you're going to be comfortable.
Wayne Hoskisson- How about the correlation with the forest service and the division to do those triggers?
Derris Jones- It is the plan that they will work together and figure out when the problem occurs and what to do about it.
Wayne Hoskisson- I will wait until we open up for discussion now that we have had the motion and the second and the amendment.
Kevin Albrecht- Motion on the table, we have a second. We are going to stick with the motion that was presented. Now is there any discussion on this motion that's the question is just on this motion?
Wayne Hoskisson-Whether to know or not the condition that will cause a trigger or cause a change in management you have to have good baseline data. So I would say that the plan needs to include an established baseline data for the habitat.
Trisha Hedin- I would agree with that.
Wayne Hoskisson- Otherwise it makes no sense in saying that there is a trigger, because you won't know when it triggers.
Derris Jones- Again like I say we passed this motion. We aren't going to see this plan again. It's going to go to the wildlife board without any further review from us. So anything that you put like that in it, you're going to get what you get.
Wayne Hoskisson- That's better than what we have got. It may be the same thing but it's an attempt to make them do it right.
Sue Bellagamba- If this motion doesn't pass then we can make a motion that we want this plan to come back to the RAC.
Kevin Albrecht- I think so with that let's call for a vote.
Chris Wood- To approve and accept the DWR management plan as written with the exception of goat density for the duration of the five year plan the goat density should not be higher than 1.8 goats per square mile at 9,000 feet elevation. Then Mr. Horrocks made a motion to amendment to closely work with the forest service and monitor the vegetation.
Kevin Albrecht- And that is the motion and that was seconded by Jeff Horrocks.
Wayne Hoskisson- Now are we going to discuss this?
Kevin Albrecht- We already did, we just restated it.
Wayne Hoskisson-Right, but that is not the formal discussion that you do after a motion is made and seconded.
Kevin Albrecht- After the first formal motion we made, we did discuss it.
Wayne Hoskisson- I don't have an objection with what that is, but do we get to have a chance at discussing this?

Kevin Albrecht- The motion? You did once.
Wayne Hoskisson- But I didn't say that I was done.
Blair Eastman- Okay. Then let's hear what you have to say.
Wayne Hoskisson- So once again that what I am going to object to is simply that this motion does not address setting up a situation where the DWR can actually accomplish this motion. It does not establish the baseline data that you will need to actually do this. And so I am going to just say that I am going to vote against it. And that's my discussion.
Kevin Albrecht- With that I am going to call for a vote on the motion. All of those in favor? So we have Derris Jones, Karl Ivory, Blair Eastman, Trisha Hedin, and Jeff Horrocks. All of those opposed? Chris Micoz, Sue Bellagamba, Wayne Hoskisson, Charlie Tracy, and Darrel Mecham.
Kevin Albrecht- Again with that a tie so I as a forest service representative having a direct conflict of interest, I recommend that this go to the wildlife board for their vote. Now, that is one part. Now we need to vote on the Mount Dutton.
Derris Jones- I make the motion that we accept the Mount Dutton plan as written by the Division.
Trisha Hedin- I second that motion
Kevin Albrecht- So we have a motion on the table by Derris Jones to accept the Mount Dutton Mountain Goat plan as presented by the division. And seconded by Trisha Hedin. With that all those in favor? In favor: Chris Micoz, Charlie Tracy, Jeff Horrocks, Darrel Mecham, Trisha Hedin, Blair Eastman, Karl Ivory, and Derris Jones. And two opposed: Sue Bellagamba and Wayne Hoskisson
Kevin Albrecht- With that we appreciate Sue spending a late night with us. She has to make some travel arrangements. So thank you.

VOTING
Motion was made by Derris Jones to accept the LaSal Mountains Goat Management Plan as presented, except that the density of goats at the 9,000 foot level elevation model not exceed 1.8 goats per square mile during the five year plan duration and that the DWR and USFS work together to closely monitor vegetation.

> **Voting was tied, 5 to 5. In favor of the motion were Derris Jones, Karl Ivory, Blair Eastman, Trisha Hedin, and Jeff Horrocks.**

Opposed to the motion were Chris Micoz, Sue Bellagamba, Wayne Hoskisson, Charlie Tracy, and Darrel Mecham.
The chairman, Kevin Albrecht, who represents the U.S. Forest Service abstained from voting to break the tie, due to a conflict of interest.

VOTING
Motion was made by Derris Jones to accept the Mt. Dutton goat management plan as presented.
Seconded by Trisha Hedin

Motion passed 8 to 2 with opposing votes cast by Wayne Hoskisson and Sue Bellagamba

9) <u>Proposed Fee Schedule FY 2015 (Action)</u>
-Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief

<u>Questions from the RAC</u>
Jeff Horrocks- I am looking at the schedule that is here, if there is something that is missing. I drew out on the elk hunt and the open buck hunt. It is costing me about $130 with my combination and special draw licenses. Why those license fees aren't those included in here?
Kenny Johnson-We are not proposing changes to those now.
Jeff Horrocks- But if you're looking for additional money. then I think that the RACs need to understand exactly how much money is coming in on permits.
Kenny Johnson- About a year ago we took out the $5 increase for the predator control for most of those big game permits. And we just don't want to touch those at this time. We think we have left this isolated long enough that it is just time to look at these specific licenses and make the adjustments we need to operate just based on those.
Jeff Horrocks- the other question that I have is at 30 to 25 % increases--these are hefty increases and money is tight for every government entity in the state of Utah. I would be inclined to go for a lesser amount of increase but I am pushed to go 30% personally.
Kenny Johnson-That is a fair point. We don't make any apologies for it. I think what we try to do is just to act from a place like a guy like me with one son who still hunts and fishes, my daughter stopped fishing a little bit. I actually come out a little bit net ahead, so it is still family-friendly in a lot of circumstances and I think that will level out the 30% hit on the lion share of those.
Chris Micoz- On the miscellaneous real estate fees. To go from 50 to 750, those are really big jumps. Do you think you are going to get a bit of resistance on that?
Kenny Johnson- They are big jumps but then again it's the going market rate right now. And we just haven't changed them forever so there are other entities that are what they get for that type of fees already. And so we are just trying to get in line with that. They are big jumps but what you're seeing is just the inflationary pressure on those. They are big jumps but small impacts in the big picture. It just one of those costs of doing business.
Kevin Albrecht- Any other questions?
Jeff Horrocks- Just another comment. I have to dig you a little bit, OK. I understand that the officers are under-paid. All state agencies are drastically under-paid. I am a county commissioner and I can't give my people a pay raise this year. And they are drastically underpaid as well. That portion of the bill bothers me a

little bit. I don't know how much the 1.5 million would bring to the table for your people. I would be willing to vote for that before I would be willing to vote for any other portion of this thing. I support you guys. I think you do a fabulous job. You're a great group but money is tight all over the state. And I think you need to keep that in mind.
Wayne Hoskisson- You will have more money for management plans.
Jeff Horrocks- We need your organization to start donating some of that money you're taking.
Kevin Albrecht- Are there any other questions from the RAC?

Questions from the Public
Kevin Albrecht- Questions from the audience? I have no comment cards from the audience. So comments from the RAC?

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion
Derris Jones- I would just like to speak back to Jeff. There is a fine line on raising the price of the license and increasing dollars. Because if you raise it too far, then you get buyer resistance and you lose money instead of increasing money. You have to balance that out. I wish we could just say that we need this much money so we're going to charge a license this much fee, but it doesn't work out that way. And as far as salary increases, unless the legislature gives us permission, none of this money can be spent on salaries.
Jeff Horrocks- I understand all of that Derris. I just had to dig him a little bit. I do appreciate what you guys do. You're an awesome group.
Derris Jones- With that I make a motion that we accept the fee schedule as presented
Blair Eastman-I will second it
Kevin Albrecht- We have a motion on the table by Derris Jones to accept the fee schedule as presented by the DWR, seconded by Blair Eastman. Any discussion on the motion?
All in favor? Motion passed with one opposing vote by Charlie Tracy. (Sue Bellagamba left the meeting by this time.)

VOTING
Motion was made by Derris Jones to accept the proposed fee schedule for FY2015 as presented.
Seconded by Blair Eastman
Motion passed 8 to 1 with one opposing vote cast by Charlie Tracy

10) R657-60 AIS Rule Amendments (Action)

-Jordan Nielson, AIS Coordinator

Kevin Albrecht- Any questions from the RAC?

Questions from the RAC
Karl Ivory- Is there a cost or do you just have to decontaminate the boat?
Jordan Nielson- It doesn't cost the boater. We offer that free of charge in the state because want to keep our water safe from any kind of species infestation.
Kevin Albrecht- Any questions from the audience?

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion
Wayne Hoskisson-It sounds like a reasonable thing if indeed it can be controlled. There is good compliance part of the boaters. I don't know how it works, but I am assuming that you know more about that works.
Kevin Albrecht- I will entertain a motion.
Karl Ivory- I move that we accept the Rule R657-60 as stated here.
Jeff Horrocks-Second it
Kevin Albrecht- We have a motion by Karl Ivory to accept R657-60 seconded by Jeff Horrocks. All in favor? Unanimous.

VOTING
Motion was made by Karl Ivory to accept the R657-60 AIS Rule Amendments as presented.
Seconded by Jeff Horrocks
Motion passed unanimously.

11) Cougar Recommendations (Action)
-John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator

Kevin Albrecht- Questions from the RAC?

Questions from the RAC
Darrel Mecham- What criteria did you use to put the Bitter Creek in the Harvest Objective Plan.
John Shivik- The Bitter Creek was put into Harvest Objective because again it is the

deer issue. So they have a 50% low on the deer population.
Darrel Mecham- Deer are? Is that adult survival? Buck to doe ratio?
John Shivik-Below objective of where the population should be. So they want the population to be a lot higher than exactly where it is. And then the fawn: doe has been low for a couple of years now. And Randall left. He is the guy that I really needed to go over that. But in discussions with Randall, the population is way lower than objective. The fawn: doe didn't meet those criteria. They wanted to change it from the split to the harvest objective because they are hoping that with the harvest objective they will be able to take out a few more cougars by opening that up.
Darrel Mecham- Why is it linking to the Nine Mile Range Creek?
John Shivik- It's not linked but is in the same area.
Darrel Mecham-Looking at your thing there. What is your highest potential number that you can kill off Bitter Creek? Does that number go over there. Can you kill off 30 if the Nine Mile unit doesn't reach there? Is that how I read that?
John Shivik- Yes
Darrel Mecham- What is the science behind that? Where is the biology behind that? That's what I am struggling with here.
Darrel Mecham-That just seems like a plan to wipe a population out.
John Shivik- Well, essentially when things…
Darrel Mecham- Really? You can't convince me that the Book Cliffs deer herd is that bad? You have a good buck: doe ratio on that. I looked at the numbers on that. And I spent a lot of time this spring work-wise and saw a lot of fawns. So you're saying that you can kill 30-34 lions off of Bitter Creek. That is irresponsible. To me that is just insane.
John Shivik- I can't. The only way that I can address a question is like these about the policies being irresponsible are by saying it is increditably difficult because these. What we are doing is following policies and we are following plans that were approved by the RAC and Board process so what I do is I got clear. We have got triggers. If you hit this trigger with deer you hit this trigger, it goes to predator management plan. Then it goes to the cougar management plan and this is a bit of a (inaudible) process but then when you look at the fawn: doe ratios and the cougar take, the female quotas and I can…
Darrell Mecham- You don't go to a harvest objective. You go to a harvest objective that you can double the take or more than the take with your plan. I do not understand that.
John Shivik-It is because the plan says if we look at the female take and for instance if it is supposed to be 2.5, and it is less than that, then you can do. The plan calls for a 50% increase in the quota on that area. So here is the difficulty and we have had a lot of discussion on this because we can talk about things scientifically, we can talk about things biologically or about the things that the way we do it, which is through following this plan that multiple people from multiple different perspectives agreed on. So I have this situation where I have to follow this plan that has been approved that has triggers, that tells me when this happens, then I do this. And that is the only way that I can answer your question is by saying we are proposing these recommendations based on what the plan is saying what to do.

Darrell Mecham- But what you're not answering for me is if you have a unit clear over in Carbon County and they don't meet the take, then you can take the lions they don't take over there and take them off of the Book Cliffs over here in Eastern Utah, correct?
John Shivik- Things are grouped up in areas. The plan says here you have an area. It says that cougars don't just use one unit. Then it says if it is going across a whole area that is why units are grouped onto a whole area. Then it says you form the quota based on the area not on the unit by unit. And this is a difficulty in the plan but this is something different than the way it had been done before. We don't do quotas unit by unit. If two units are in the same area it can happen and this is what happened with the southwest Manti. It can happen where you can have two units in the same area and one is really accessible and one's not. And what will happen is that people will still go that accessible area and they might miss this one.
Darrell Mecham- Ok, you have people that have put in for that unit for years they have bonus points and now you're opening that unit with no redress there so these people miss out on that opportunity and this unit has been that way before. You have outfitters from surrounding states as far away as Washington that pile in there and start killing lions and you have took the opportunity away from your Utah residents to hunt that unit. Did you guys give any thought to that?
John Shivik- You still have units that are not too much further away. They still have limited entry units. The opportunity is still on limited entry units. Here is the difficulty here if we make one thing, everyone in the state has a back yard unit.
Darrel Mecham- Do you see doing this on an elk unit? Is it that easy to do there?
John Shivik- They can still hold their points, they can go to another limited entry unit. They can still hunt that as a harvest objective and keep their points. They can still buy a harvest objective and still go in there they do not lose their opportunity to hunt that unit.
Kevin Albrecht- Any more questions?
Wayne Hoskisson- I am not quite sure why this change would mean that out of state outfitters would have more opportunity in that area than they do now?
Darrel Mecham- Clients can just buy tags and they can have fifty to hundred clients they can come in with big operations and hunt the units out. Instead of just 15-20 in that unit, if Nine Mile doesn't fill, they can start killing lions that belong to that unit over there. So you can kill a huge amount of lions over there with no recourse. So next year we say doggone we messed up. Let's put it to limited entry. It just doesn't make sense.

<u>Questions from the Public</u>
Guy Webster-You want to read right here, out of your own predator management plan. Use either split or harvest objective hunt strategies on units under predator management plans. Is that not right out of your plan?
John Shivik- Yes sir.
Guy Webster- You said that the Book Cliffs has a bunch of units that are limited entry that I can put in for a tag. Will you tell me one here that is in Green River that is close for me to put in as a limited entry?

John Shivik- It's not, Wasatch West is the closest.
Guy Webster- Book Cliffs please. That is the one that we are discussing. It's one of the first ones you had.
Guy Webster- So with that, you are telling me over the next three years because this is a three year plan. That there could be the potential for a 120 lions being killed off the Book Cliffs Bitter Creek unit. Correct? 3x40
John Shivik- Over three years? Yes. 40 per year unless or you get a female sub-quota. Then that would be 60.
Guy Webster- Can you tell the RAC how many has been on the Book Cliffs for the last 3 years? Its 13, so that is potentially 44 lions off of the Book Cliffs.
John Shivik- Ok
Guy Webster- So under your own plan, do you have the ability to have the Range Creek as a quota and the Book Cliffs as a split unit?
John Shivik- The Book Cliffs Bitter Creek could be a split. Yes. The recommendation was made by the region to put it as a harvest objective. Because again they were worried about the deer issues there. So they wanted to have… it is by design that this pressure and this how they want that pressure to be there. It is all by design.
Guy Webster- Under a split unit, do you have the ability as an agency to increase the tags on that as a split unit?
John Shivik- It would. If this was in a split unit what would still happen is you could still end up with that harvest quota. Then some proportion would be identified as a limited entry. We could make the Bitter Cliffs a split and the numbers could work out a variety of different ways. It could be a split and you could have 10 in there. Or we could put 40 in there for the limited entry. So there a variety of ways that they can kind of tweak and try to balance things out and then in opt for that . What they opted for was they said, "We are worried about our deer in the Book Cliffs Bitter Creek. We want to go harvest objective in order to get more people out earlier." That is essentially what they tried to do.
Guy Webster- So if you went to a split on your own predator management plan with your own criteria based on female percentage of harvest based on deer population, you are allowed and obligated to go a certain percentage increase. Correct? You just can't just say we are going to go from 14-40 because that does not fit within your percentage. Correct?
John Shivik- No that is not correct. Because what is correct it is done on the area again. It is done on that area percentages, so that whole area you're still going to have even if the Book Cliffs was a split, they're still going to add together to get that overall harvest quota of 40 that we come up by going through the plan. So, yes that is how the numbers go together. They're all summed to put into that big overall area harvest quota. It's not on a unit. We are still stuck in this of thinking of it terms of a unit. But the plan doesn't put things into terms of unit. I can be very flustered with this plan myself. It is complicated. There are units, there's areas, there is predator management plans. We are tied in to a whole bunch of stuff with one plan and it gets frustrating and then it still comes down to the judgment of our folks in the field as far as the final numbers and the final split or harvest objective. We will probably

do a lot more discussion on this one especially on the Northeast since that falls into Randall's area. I will do my best.
Lloyd Nielsen- I don't have a copy of the plan, but if my memory serves me correct it says, " If an area goes into the predator management plan, you can raise your permits up to 75 or 50%" I couldn't remember what it is, but it is quite a jump. It does say that in the plan. My main question that I would like to ask is it was mentioned that last night RAC voted to bring this plan back to the table. Was it the whole plan or just part of it?
John Shivik- The motion had to deal with the board having to re-look at this plan by July of 2014, if I said that correctly.
Bob Peterson- What is the buck: doe ratio on the Manti? Because 8 yrs ago when they started this split, Bill told us flat out, when we get our numbers back we go back to limited. Now you're jumping to where you guys want to go. We are going to split instead your jumping to harvest.
Justin Shannon- 15.6 is our buck: doe ratio on the Manti
Bob Peterson- What do we need to go back to limited entry?
Justin Shannon- I am a little confused with the question. The cougar management isn't based on buck: doe ratio. What is your question?
Bob Peterson- When they started this split unit, Bill told us that is why they take it to a split is because the buck: doe ratio aren't hitting. They figured there is too many cats and they wanted to take the cats and when the ratio comes back then the unit goes back to limited entry.
Justin Shannon- The way we deal with buck: doe ratio now, is where we are unit by unit is adjusting tags. So I can't speak for what you're talking about. The overall objective on the Manti is 38,000 deer and our current population is at 23,600. In the past our predator management was based on where your deer population was relative to where it was on the whole objective, not on a buck: doe ratio. So I am struggling to understand to what Bill was saying.
Bob Peterson- That is why they started this. You can ask Bates about this. Why are we just running in the San Juan now as just one unit instead of like last year? In the last management we had the Blues and the Elk Ridge?
Justin Shannon- The reason on that is we split it at the time because one of those units fell out predator management. The Abajo did. Now that unit qualifies for predator management again. So we thought that if we combined Elk Ridge and the Abajos, it would simplify that whole unit. The other thing since we went out of predator management, since we did that split, our harvest decreased by about 5 cougars every year on average. The purpose of putting it back into predator management is to get that additional harvest on the San Juan unit.
Bob Peterson- Now they had a disease down there on the deer last year. I had a biologist tell me that's why we lost it. So we have lost the deer so were taking it out on the lions now?
Cody Webster- You have said that you wanted to manage your lion units more closely with your deer units. Correct? To line them up so their borders matched. So why are we lumping and throwing the Book Cliffs in with the Range Creek? Because it is not the same deer unit.

John Shivik- We are not. Again this goes back to managing at an area vs. a unit scale. The way this plan started this is our 2nd of a 3 yr. cycle under this plan. These are managed as an area not unit by unit. So we can still identify them by unit but there is a sum to one quota at an area scale.
Kevin Albrecht- Any other questions from the audience? Seeing none. We will move to comments.

<u>Comments from the Public</u>
Kirt Connelly of Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife- We are in favor of the DWR's proposal in this.
Kevin Albrecht- Bob Peterson? Dan Cockayne?
Dan Cockayne, V.P. of Utah Houndsmen Association- We appreciate that there are many interests here. It is hard to balance it. John said cougars eat coyotes so we have a common enemy so now we can talk. These cougars are hunted for trophies. We don't eat them, I have tried it and it is nasty. So we are hunting them for sport and for trophies. We agree that the way that John has structured this plan is correct. The first time in all of this 3yr. cycle this will be the 4th year. The first time it has been implemented correctly and we compliment him for that. We have really struggled with that. It is implemented correctly, we agree with the quotas those are implemented correctly. We agree with the GPS. We think that is a great thing. We would add and request that when you vote on this that a part of your motion would include moving voluntary orientation program to a mandatory orientation program. We feel that there is some great information in that. A lot of the guys that are going to kill one of these lions, that is the only one that they will see in their life and we want them to know what they are taking. We want these lions for the future. We want them so that we have decent lions and we want them to know that they are taking a trophy. The other thing that we would say is we believe that we can harvest and reach these quotas by using limited entry and using split units. And still achieve that. The harvest objective turns into a contest of quick we can get these killed and typically lead to us killing younger and more females. The females are our future. We just want to protect them. We do support the plan and would request that you would add that making the orientation mandatory. It is done in a ton of other species. We agree with the furbearer too, just to save some time. (Laughing)
Aaron Johnson, Board member of Utah Hounds men Association- I support what Dan has said. Just a couple of things to hit on. I do think that lions are trophy and I would like to see them. Our Utah residents like Darrel Mecham have talked about to have the first chance. I ask that the Bitter Creek unit be left as a split unit. That is possible in their plan. There is nothing that is if left as a split unit will be going against their plan.
Lloyd Nielson of Sunrise Outfitting- Basically I support the plan. I think it ought to go the way it is this year. I do think that we will go the other way. I do think that we need to bring up that 10yr plan. About 4 yrs ago I fought and went to every RAC meeting and was fighting that plan and it is disastrous for lions. I think we need to make a separate amendment and follow the other RAC and re-look at that plan. I think is not good for lions. As far as your predator, you're following your deer base.

A healthy lion population follows behind a healthy deer population that is the key thing for lions is deer. There is a lot of argument about they will eat other things. And they will kill an elk to survive. But a two year old female can't kill a mature elk. And if she can't feed herself until she gets up there and is savvy enough to kill an elk, she will starve to death. We have got to have a healthy deer population to have a healthy lion population.
Kevin Albrecht- Lloyd can you clarify a little bit as you talk to the plan and then you talked a little bit about the RAC last night. Will you talk a little more to that?
Lloyd Nielson- All we know about is what was brought up here. They said that the RAC last night brought up a proposal to re-look at the lion plan. I think we need to bring up another proposal to re-look at this lion plan. It is a ten yr. plan. Or a 12yr. plan actually. And this plan in my eyes I didn't think it was good then and still don't think it's good for the lion population.
Jared Wiggins of Moab- I would like to see the number of cougar tags in the Book Cliff Bitter Creek area increased. The proposal from the DWR to combine the Book Cliffs and the Nine-Mile area, into one predator management unit with the harvest of 40 cougars seems like a good number for both units combined. But if the Book Cliffs Bitter Creek unit could be left as a split unit, it would give local hunters and outfitters a better chance to utilize this area, and not to be over harvested by non-residents. I live in a harvest objective unit and we have taken a big hit and we still have no deer.
Guy Webster- On the Book Cliffs Bitter Creek /Nine-Mile, it is not the same deer unit. We do not manage deer on the Range Creek the same that we do on the Book Cliffs. Book Cliffs is a limited entry, Range Creek is not, it is a general unit. No need to try and do this as we are doing it for an area. I propose that we separate these into separate units, manage them separately. Leave the Book Cliffs as a split unit and the Nine-Mile as a quota. We can have the number of 20 on each. Like Darrel said I have been around and on this roller coaster ride and have run hounds for more that 30 yrs. Of my life. I have seen the Book Cliffs when it was straight opened to harvest objective. We had outfitters come in from all surrounding states. I am totally aware that Utah is very lenient on getting permitted. There is nothing from preventing someone from Washington, Colorado, Idaho, and New Mexico from getting an outfitter's license and going up there. You come in from out of state and history has showed us this. On the Book Cliffs they will come in set up camp, seven or eight hunters at one time, 10-12 guides run the roads and kill every lion that goes in the tree. That is not what lion hunting is about. Need to leave it as a limited entry so those people that draw a tag can go out and a valuable experience to take a trophy animal. Something that they can be proud of. And no to just wipe out the lion population. There are provisions that we can increase that. I can support somewhat of an increase on the Book Cliffs under a split season and you can still maintain your quota. It is absolutely irresponsible to take the potential which is potential to kill 120 lions off of the Book Cliffs over the next 3 yrs when the maximum would be taken. That is a percentage increase that is absolutely out of line and has no purpose in wildlife management. Bottom line we have got to realize that we have got other issues with deer and just going out and doing an all out assault on

the lions is not going to bring back the deer. We keep forgetting as for the study that was done on the Monroe Mountains keeps getting neglected. They purposely went in and took every single lion off of the Monroe Mountains that they could possibly catch. Unlimited days, miles and resources. If we go back and pull that study out, we will see that there statically no increase in the deer population. We need to start looking at the other things. Stop the assault on the lions and we need to make sure that this goes back to a split unit and the two separated and yet we can still maintain what we have got and allow for what needs to be done.

Carl Kimmerle of Moab- I just want to talk about the San Juan unit, I have never hunted on the Book Cliffs I don't want to have my opinion on that. That belongs to somebody else. The San Juan unit has been a split unit limited entry on the Abajo side . Completely unscientific but I hunt a lot and I haven't noticed that it is easier to find a track since it is limited entry. I haven't noticed if there are more lions. All I can say is that over the last 5 yrs. I haven't even noticed any kitten tracks. In my unscientific experience I think what is happening is that lions aren't raising kittens. The only thing that I can think of is that there is not enough deer to feed them. So to me I love having a lot of lions. I love it! I wish there was more of them. To me, the fact that we kill more of them doesn't mean that there is not going to be more next year. Everything that I have ever or from my limited number of years hunting when I first started there was a lot more lions. You look back in the 1980's and ask all of the hounds guys. There were a lot more lions back in the 80's and we were killing a lot more back then. I think if you have turnover you can have the lions. In my unscientific being I think we do have a shortage of lions and it has nothing to do with the fact that it is on a harvest objective or not. If there is a lot of deer there will be a lot of lions. I think it would make sense to knock the lions down as well as the coyotes as well as everything. Let the deer come back. And then there can be some more cats. And I would like to see there be more cats. I am not one of the guys that want to see the forest voided of padded tracks. I think it would make sense on the San Juan unit at least to go back to harvest objective on both of them. I didn't notice one difference one way or the other. All I can say is that we're not raising kittens and there is still no deer.

Eric Luke of Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife- As I have sat and listened to some of the comments tonight, something came to mind that I guess I have a concern about. I am a deer hunter. I am not a lion hunter. I would love to see our deer herd back, but I think Darrell brought up a good point. It concerns especially towards the Book Cliffs. You got the Book Cliffs which is kind of a unique unit and the terrain, the way you have to hunt it in my opinion. I think you have got a group of houndsmen that have hunted the area for a lot of years, they know how to hunt it and they are successful. If it is opened up and a whole bunch of outfitters from different areas come in, is it possible that we could be shooting ourselves in the foot in what we are trying to accomplish in that we push out these guys that have hunted it for a lot of years. They go somewhere else and the hunters that move in are not as successful. I don't really have a proposal it is just a concern that I can see a possibility of that happening. Just bringing it up for food for thought.

Bob Peterson- I go along with what the Houndsmen Association says.

Kevin Albrecht- That is the end my comment cards.

RAC Discussion

Darrel Mecham- I am not totally against the division's plan. But when you have a chunk in there that leaves a potential to wipe out an entire range and take opportunities away from your people that have been putting in and wanting to go there for years, it's irresponsible. And it is not biologically sound. I don't see how you justify that kind of an increase. With that being said, I don't know if more comments are going to be made. I will make a motion that we accept the division plan with the exception that you leave the Book Cliffs as a split unit and increase your tags to 20. Put the increase there and leave the opportunity to the people of the state instead of this influx that's going to be a wreck and there is really no hope there. That's where I am at.

Kevin Albrecht- Is that a motion? Can you recite that?

Darrel Mecham- I accept their plan with the exception and leave the Book Cliffs a split unit separate it from Nine-Mile and leave the division latitude to raise the number to 20 on the units.

Jeff Horrocks- I will second the motion.

Blair Eastman- And leave Nine-Mile at 20? Ok.

Kevin Albrecht- Did you get that Brent? I would like to open this up on the discussion about the motion. I guess one question that I have is, goes to Blair's question. The other parts that are in the cougar management plan. They would be open objective?

Darrell Mecham- I agree with the plan other than the issue that I have already stated.

Derris Jones-I would like Justin or John to answer. Is that a correct statement when he said what his motion does fall under the cougar management plan?

John Shivik- We could definitely make the Book Cliffs Bitter Creek a split, you could put the number at 20-30 or a variety of numbers in there. But then those still or it would be just a limited entry for 20 for instance is what I am hearing. But then it would close and there would still be a harvest quota for 40 for the whole units together. But people would have their limited entry portion.

Darrel Mecham- I was saying to split the units. I guess you don't want to do that? Is that what your telling me?

John Shivik- No, the Book cliffs.

Darrel Mecham-Separate the units.

John Shivik- They still fall under the same harvest quota. What would happen is as an example the Book Cliffs were 20 limited entry and they killed 20 cougars there, there would still be 20 more cougars to kill on either the Nine-Mile or the Book Cliffs.

Darrell Mecham- Why are you hooking them together? I say separate them. Why the Book Cliffs and Nine Mile do has together?

John Shivik- They are in the same area.

Darrell Mecham- They never have been until you started to put them together now.

Justin Shannon- What we are doing is dealing with cougar management areas. So you have the LaSals, San Juan the Henry's. They are all managed under cougar management areas. You have separate areas. You have separate units within that cougar management area. For the Book Cliffs, the Book Cliffs and the Nine-Mile consists of that cougar management area. That is how it has been the last three years. This isn't a new proposal that says let's change the cougar management areas. That is how we have been functioning the last three years. You still have your individual deer units, but it's just a cougar management area.
Jeff Horrocks- Your looking to harvest 40 cats if you harvest 30 off of the Book Cliffs and you harvest 30 off of the Nine-Mile area or 20 and 20 that still gives you your 40 animals for that area. So why would you do 20 and 20 and then come back and say that we still have to 40 under the plan? You already have done it.
Justin Shannon- Let's back up and look at last year. So on the harvest quota we had 26 last year for the same unit. 26 and then 13. And then based on the lack of adult females that we were unable to kill under that predator management system, we increased it. So if the RAC wants to do a split and say 20-30 or whatever you guys would like the Book Cliffs Bitter Creek unit to be, that doesn't change the boundaries of the cougar management areas. That just dictates how you hunt the Bitter Creek unit. It keeps it the limited entry to begin then harvest objective at the end.
Darrel Mecham- So like the LaSals and what are the other ones that are connected to it?
Justin Shannon- The LaSals, San Juan and the Henry's.
Darrel Mecham-Do you can just take the LaSals and kill your 10 and then kill 10 more there because the Henrys tag's weren't filled and then 10 more for the San Juan because they weren't filled. So you could get 30 off of the LaSals?
Justin Shannon- Correct.
Darrel Mecham- Are you serious? Serious??
Justin Shannon- That is how we have been functioning the last 3 yrs. Darrell this isn't new
Darrell Mecham- It's not good. Are you kidding me? I am starting to agree with Lloyd. This is a disaster. I don't agree with Lloyd very often.
Justin Shannon- I hope that clarifies it.
Darrell Mecham- Well you need to leave the split unit to give the opportunity. Because your taking that away from people that have put in for years. And you're all of a sudden saying this is gone. We are going to give it to somebody that buys a tag, comes in as an outfitter hired and goes hunting.
Kevin Albrecht- So I guess if we have a motion is on the table. Do we understand the discussion?
Derris Jones- Not totally. Justin, we have heard what potentially can happen all 40 permits could be killed in Nash Wash after it goes to harvest objective. In reality what happens?
Justin Shannon- In reality on the Book Cliffs we are killing just over 10 cougars a year on the three year plan. I can get you the exact numbers. They are just right there. On the Nine Mile we are probably 10-12 every year.

Derris Jones- The fact that this is news to some people that this is how it has been for the last 3yrs. The paranoia that all of a sudden they think it's new this year, makes them think the holocaust has come in their favorite area. I just don't think in reality that happens. On the southwest Manti there was a concern because one year they did kill a bunch of cougars on the split down there. Didn't they? And that was kind of a one year thing.
Justin Shannon- They overshot it by 5 or 6 that year. I don't have the data in front of me.
Darrel Mecham- Well they killed 26 one year and I think they almost 30 one year. So you know what a harvest objective will do. It will kill a lot of lions
Justin Shannon- I am not sure. Derris, this is about 3 years ago correct?
Derris Jones- Last year at the board there was some big concern over change and emergency closures and all kinds of stuff.
John Shivik- This is a roundabout. That does concern me. We have been operating this way. There is no change and there is no difference in grouping. Nothing like that has changed in the last few years. Big things have happened in terms of emergency closure of the SW Manti, this last time around. The SW Manti becoming a limited entry unit. The other thing to keep in mind here, there are biological issues here too. Just removing cougars doesn't necessarily mean you're going to get more deer. Sometimes if you move a big old tom you might get 4 new toms in there. And you might actually hurt your deer more. There is a lot of other complicating factors. Last night was a very different crowd. Last night the pitch fork and fires were out about turning the whole state harvest objective and killing all of the cougars. This is a very different tone that I am hearing tonight than what I heard last night. I can also tell you that we have reduced overall in the state the quota on cougars has come down. We have 35 fewer quota numbers in the state this year than we had during the last three years. So we have actually backed off statewide. We are just looking at one little unit in the microcosm and I am thinking we are coming in kind of right because I have got everybody really or kind of mad at me which means I am probably in the right spot, in terms of management. As turning Book Cliffs Bitter Creek into a split. Then you would be exactly like you have been for the last 3yrs. So if people haven't been upset or more than the last three years then you would make it pretty much status quo if you guys make the Book Cliffs Bitter Creek a split then we would just need to figure out how much of the Book Cliffs Bitter Creek limited entry. How many permits to assign for the limited entry portion of it. I hope that clarifies a little bit.
Guy Webster- If you was to do that though what… (Inaudible. Away from the microphone.).
John Shivik- Exactly with the 50% added to the overall. What was it last year? 26? For the area not the particularly unit.
Justin Shannon- The way I understand it is not a 50% increase. That only applies that weren't in predator management. That are now going into predator management. Both the Book Cliffs Bitter Creek and the Nine-Mile were both under the predator management last year. So the way that we got the 40 total on the quota is you take your total harvest your 3 yr average on that which was 20 animals.

That's what we were averaging over the 3yrs. on both units. Then you double it. If you're percent of adult female is not in that harvest. Sorry if your percent of adult female is below the 25% below the adult female threshold. And so that is how we got to the 40. It is based on what was harvest the last 3yrs. And then double it if your adult female isn't where it needs to be.
John Shivik- For those two units together the percent of adult females was .17 and it is suppose to be .25 so basically the quota was adjusted up from the 20 to the 40. For both of those. The whole area. Together.
Kevin Albrecht- I have one question with the motion on the table they would split out the Bitter Creek South unit and the motion on the table is to give it 20 tags? What would the number of tags be in the surrounding units under this motion that is on the table?
John Shivik- There would be none. The only limited entry tags would be for the Book Cliffs Bitter Creek. There would be 20 of those and then the quota would still be 40. So there were be if 20 were killed on the Bitter Creek limited entry. There would be 20 left to take from where ever in that area. If we follow the plan as is and you guys are a part of the sausage making process now. So if the plan told me make the overall area 40 and then we got some lee way to make the Book Cliffs a split or limited entry and we have lee way to how many we put into the harvest objective. But then if it is a split which we can do very easy. We just have to come up with that number. We could make the Book Cliffs a split and put 40 or 30 in there. But then if 20 were harvested then there is 20 left. If 10 are harvested then there is still 30 left. For those two units combined for the harvest. And that is until May 30th.
Darrel Mecham- The motion stands that's fine. Just split the unit give it 20 and give our people in the state the opportunity to go hunting who has put in for years. Then let your harvest objective kick in. So I will just let the motion stand.
Chris Wood- The motion is to accept the divisions plan as it is written except make the Book Cliffs a split unit, separate the Nine Mile and raise the number to 20.
Wayne Hoskisson- Iit sounds like part of the problem here is indeed the way that the outfitters are handled and it might be that the board needs to address that. And of course I think am going to vote against the motion because I don't think that we have enough cougars.
Derris Jones- Darrell, on your motion, you're expecting the Book Cliffs to not part of this unit that it has been for the last 3 yrs. You want that?
Darrel Mecham- You will have to leave Range Creek at quota and the Book Cliffs a split unit until your harvest objective day kicks in and then it goes.
Derris Jones- So all you're saying is instead of harvest objective you're going to go split on the Book Cliffs side and harvest objective on the other?
Darrel Mecham- Well yeah, you have people putting in for years and years and I think that we owe it our citizens.
Derris Jones- I just wanted to make sure that was all that you were changing. The harvest objective to a split and 20 tags.
Darrell Mecham- That will give everyone a chance to go hunting without having the world up there.
Kevin Albrecht- We are ready to call for a vote. All in favor?

VOTING
Motion was made by Darrel Mecham to accept cougar recommendations as presented, except that the Book Cliffs be separated from Nine Mile and be made a split unit with an increase in permits to 20.
Seconded by Jeff Horrocks
Motion passed 8 to 1 with the opposing vote cast by Wayne Hoskisson

12) <u>Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations (Action)</u>
-John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator

<u>Questions from the RAC</u>
Kevin Albrecht- Questions or comments? We have one comment card. Carl Kimmerle?
Derris Jones- He is out in the hall. Do we reach that 4,600? Do we sell out all of the Bob Cat Tags?
John Shivik- Very quickly
Derris Jones- Is it first come-first serve? Or do you do a drawing?
John Shivik- It is first come-first serve. One thing that was brought up by the trappers association and if there is a way that we can do it that they mentioned if that do like we do with cougars and check in your animals and do that way, but we just don't have the resources to check in 4,000 bobcats. We can check in our 300 cougars and do a quota. It would be nice to make bobcat into a quota. So people that are good trappers could get out and try to divide it up. Again we are trying to divide up the good trappers with the people that are coming and whatever. This is the best that we can do right now. But they go quick. There is a lot of demand for them. The pelts are quite high right now.

<u>Questions from the Public</u>

<u>Comments from the Public</u>
Carl Kimmerle- I will try and make this short. I guess I am the only trapper here. I just got reading through the Bobcat management plan there is something that I would like to pick with. Your making decisions based upon something that I really want to pick on. It the set days per bobcat. Meaning, you know I can understand at the end of the year you total up how many cats are killed. If so many of them are females, kittens it can show that they we have a problem that too many females are getting killed. That makes sense to me, I want to pick the set-days per bobcat on the

management plan because I think you're setting yourself to be lied to and have skewed data. To me it is a terrible management practice and here is why. Trappers will go out and he is going to set his traps in December and then in May some poor lady is going to call them up on the phone and say " How many traps did you have back in December?" and it's like are you kidding me ? And so you're immediately setting yourself to being lied to. Because the trappers are going to figure it out and so it is going to go either way. It is either going to hurt you or it is going to hurt you no matter what. You're never going to get reliable information. Either someone is going to say I set three traps I caught three big toms on the first day. There are tons of bobcats. There is one behind every bush. We want more bobcat tags or they will say that they were running 300 traps. Either way you're going to get lied too. To me it is a poor, poor, poor management practice. That is like setting the fishing limit based on how close you got to land the biggest fish in the boat. Terrible management plan doesn't make any sense. Again you're making your prime based upon harvest. How many are harvest and then setting the dates from December 1st to February 3rd which the worst possible time to be trapping. The ground is frozen, it's snowy, and they are stuck on the south slope away from the road. That would be like doing your deer count in June and July when there is canopy on the trees and you can't see any deer. To me the bobcat management plan needs to revise so that it is accurate. And if there is a possibility to go through something's in the furbearer thing that I would really like to see changed is snare break away devices need to be lighter with a 300 lb. break away on your snares it is too heavy. Snares need to be connected to a fence post.

<u>RAC Discussion</u>
Kevin Albrecht- Comments or entertain a motion?
Jeff Horrocks- Motion that we accept the division's recommendations on furbearer and bobcat harvest as presented.

Darrel Mecham- I second it.
Kevin Albrecht-I'll then call for a vote. Those in favor? Motion passed with opposing votes cast by Blair Eastman and Wayne Hoskisson.

VOTING
Motion was made by Jeff Horrocks to accept the furbearer and bobcat harvest recommendations as presented.
Seconded by Darrel Mecham

> **Motion passed 8 to 2 with opposing votes cast by Blair Eastman and Wayne Hoskisson**

Meeting adjourned at 11:46 p.m.

Public in attendance: Approximately 50

The next Wildlife Board meeting will take place on August 21-22 at 9 a.m. at the DNR Board Room at 1594 W. North Temple, SLC

The next southeast regional RAC meeting will take place on September 11 at 6:30 p.m. at the John Wesley Powell Museum in Green River.

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY OF MOTIONS
Utah Wildlife Resources Office, 318 N Vernal Ave, Vernal
August 1, 2013

6. WATERFOWL GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-09

MOTION to approve the Division's recommendation as presented

Passed unanimously

7. R657-66 MILITARY INSTALLATIONS PERMIT PROGRAM

MOTION to accept the Division's recommendation as proposed

Passed unanimously

8. PROPOSED FEE SCHEDULE FY 2015

MOTION to accept fee schedule change

Passed 5-4

9. R657-60 AIS RULE AMENDMENTS

MOTION to approve Division's recommendation as presented

Passed unanimously

10. COUGAR RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION to accept the Division's proposal as presented, adding the Utah Houndsmen's Association Book Cliffs recommendation and a mandatory orientation course for all cougar hunters (see attachment)

Passed 7-2

- I'm brand new and I don't see a difference if it is a split or a harvest objective. My concern is that residents have the opportunity. There are a lot of residents who don't draw out and maybe they'd like an opportunity also. Everyone who draws out is going to hire a hounds man to go.
- If you have a limited entry instead of harvest objective, if you draw a tag, there are less people in the field and it's more of a quality hunt.
- I feel we need to take a few more lion and this proposal is not going to do that.

11. FURBEARER AND BOBCAT HARVEST RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION to accept as presented by the Division

Passed unanimously

12. GOAT MANAGEMENT PLANS - MT DUTTON AND LA SAL

SUBSTITUTE MOTION to accept the Division's proposal and also to incorporate the Farm Bureau's recommendation to incorporate on Mt Dutton

Passed 7-1

1 Abstention

- The Forest Service supports the plan for Mt Dutton, but is against putting goats into the La Sals at this point based on information from paperwork from the Forest Service.

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY
Utah Wildlife Resources Office, 318 N Vernal Ave, Vernal
August 1, 2013

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:
Randy Dearth, Sportsmen
Andrea Merrell, Non consumptive
John Mathis, Public Official
Wayne McAllister, At Large
Mitch Hacking, Agriculture (Acting Chair)
Boyde Blackwell, NER Supervisor
Joe Batty, Agriculture
Dan Abeyta, Forest Service
Carrie Messerly, At Large
Rod Morrison, Sportsmen
David Gordon, BLM

RAC MEMBERS EXCUSED:
Beth Hamann, Non consumptive

UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:
Jason Robinson, Upland Coordinator
Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Coordinator
Jordan Nielson, AIS Coordinator
John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator
Guy Wallace, Wildlife Biologist
Dustin Schaible, Wildlife Biologist
Kenny Johnson, Admin Services Sect Chief
Derrick Ewell, NER Wildlife Biologist
Randall Thacker, NER Wildlife Biologist
Dax Mangus, NER Wildlife Manager
Amy VandeVoort, NER Wildlife Biologist
Gayle Allred, NER Office Manager
Ron Stewart, NER Conservation Outreach
John Owen, NER Law Enforcement

WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBER:
Kirk Woodward

1. WELCOME, RAC INTRODUCTIONS AND RAC PROCEDURE: Mitch Hacking, Acting Chair

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

3. WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING UPDATE: Boyde Blackwell

4. REGIONAL UPDATE: Boyde Blackwell

Law Enforcement:

Besides checking anglers on the local reservoirs, CO's have been chasing down rumors of poached mountain goats and dead eagles in the high country. Both were natural causes. The shuffling of hats has continued. Torrey took a one year position in Salt Lake, Sean has moved to take the open Lieutenants' position, Dan will fill in the investigators position and Randy has moved into a newly created Sergeants' position.

Habitat

They finished up on a major fencing project in Willow Creek and have been spending time monitoring pj removal projects, mostly lop and scatter, in the Book Cliffs. Along with biologists from other sections they have been planning/walking or riding over areas for more projects this fall and next year. They were also able to send a biologist or two to some advanced training on restoration ecology and habitat enhancement.

Wildlife

Pronghorn surveys have started which will be followed by bighorn sheep and black-footed ferret surveys. The sensitive species crew has been working on bats, yellow-billed cuckoos, and a prairie dog disease study.

Aquatics

Biologists have finished their early season trend netting surveys and have moved into the High Uintas working on Colorado cut and amphibian surveys. Along with outreach and law enforcement, they helped scouts catch fish at the High Uinta Scout Camp. They have also started preparations for the second Middle Fork of Sheep Creek treatment. They have surveyed most of the lakes and lower streams, with just a few upper connecting streams to go they have found no fish in the upper lakes and only a few fish in areas in the lower streams. Most of those fish were tiger trout found near Spirit Lake, so they likely came from the summer stocking effort there. Unfortunately they did find a few brook trout in some heavily braided stream areas so they will have to concentrate efforts there to get a complete removal.

Outreach

Outreach held the annual Osprey Watch, a watchable wildlife event, in the rain at Flaming Gorge and has been working with Aquatics on their lake surveys, scout camp fishing, and new signs in between news releases and fishing reports.

5. TURKEY DEPREDATION: Jason Robinson, Upland Coordinator (INFORMATIONAL)
(see handout)

Questions from RAC:

Rod Morrison: How are the populations doing?

Jason Robinson: Better

Dan Abeyta: Are some regions doing better than others?

Jason Robinson: the Northern Region had to have some removed. 370 were moved to other places where they won't cause be a nuisance. In other regions it's not so much of an issue.

Carrie Messerly: What is the transplant success rate?

Jason Robinson: Very high. Pretty much every turkey in the state was transplanted.

Carrie Messerly: So what is the actual success rate?

Jason Robinson: I don't have specific numbers but it's quite high.

Questions from Public:
None

Comments from Public
None

Comments from RAC:
None

6. WATERFOWL GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-09: Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Coordinator (ACTION)
(see handout)

Questions from RAC:

Joe Batty: I'm new. Why is the sand hill crane not addressed as a hunt?

Blair Stringham: We do that in the May meeting with upland game recommendations because we have to have the dates published in the registrar before the hunt starts.

Mitch Hacking: We did that in our last meeting, Joe.

Questions from Public:
None

Comments from Public:
None

Comments from RAC:
None

MOTION:

Joe Batty motion to approve the Division's recommendation as presented
Carrie Messerly second
Motion passed unanimously

7. R657-66 MILITARY INSTALLATIONS PERMIT PROGRAM : Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief (ACTION)
(see handout)
Allows access to areas for hunting previously closed for military personnel and members of public at Camp Williams, Hill Air Force Base and Dugway Proving Grounds (mainly for deer, elk and pronghorn).

Questions from RAC:

John Mathis: Initially there was talk about disabled veteran use. Where are we at on that?

Kenny Johnson: It's part of what they will consider in the initial MOU. They can tell us that they plan on offering some to disabled veterans.

John Mathis: We should continue to push for this.

Kenny Johnson: Yes

Joe Batty: How much interest has been shown to hunt on these lands?

Kenny Johnson: We talked to the commander at Hill Air Force Base and they're excited and looking forward to it. This is new, so the public might not know but a lot of the public who do know seem interested.

Dan Abeyta: These base commanders, do they have trained staff in biology or big game hunting management or will this be a close relationship between DWR and base commander?

Kenny Johnson: They have trained staff. It will be a joint effort but they have a trained staff.

Questions from Public:
None

Comments from Public:
None

Comments from RAC:

Boyde Blackwell: When I was recently in Salt Lake, I began to work with Dugway Proving Grounds for pronghorn and there was a whole lot of interest for military personnel and retired personnel. There's a lot of land out there that has been off limits for the public and we felt like this was an excellent opportunity to give the public additional opportunity.

MOTION:

Wayne McAllister motion to accept the Division's recommendation as proposed.

Carrie Messerly second

Motion passed unanimously

8. PROPOSED FEE SCHEDULE FY 2015: Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief (ACTION)
(see handout)

Questions from RAC:
None

Questions from Public:

Jared Workman: Why wasn't bear and cougar listed?

Kenny Johnson: We're not proposing to touch them right now. I can get statistics later.

Comments from Public:
None

Comments from RAC:

John Mathis: I think it's appropriate. I'd like to look at the details a little bit more. Several areas in DWR are supporting themselves quite well, others are falling short. We have a little reserve in the Fish and Game. I understand that we've started to eat into that and the time to start discussing

that is now because it's a slow process to get through. Some areas I can support tonight, some I can't support tonight. I would like to talk to my constituents before I can blanket support this.

Joe Batty: With the change in administration there are some old tools that have been reinstated to help with depredation wherein those depredating animals are carrying their share of costs. I'm really impressed with what's taken place this year.

John Mathis: That's part of the reason I'm holding off.

Mitch Hacking: We've taken baby steps but they've been in the right direction.

MOTION:

Dan Abeyta motion to accept fee schedule change.

David Gordon second

Favor: David Gordon, Rod Morrison, Carrie Messerly, Dan Abeyta, Joe Batty

Opposed: Wayne McAllister, John Mathis, Andrea Merrell, Randy Dearth

Motion passed 5-4.

9. R657-60 AIS RULE AMENDMENTS: Jordan Nielson, AIS Coordinator (ACTION)
(see handout)

Questions from RAC:

John Mathis: How long does a quagga mussel live on a boat once they're out of the water?

Jordan Nielson: It changes. Boaters can clean and drain it. During the summer months, dry condition for seven days should kill quagga. It takes 18 days in the fall and spring, and 13 days in winter. It is illegal in the State of Utah to transport quagga mussels on any type of conveyance whether alive or dead, so boaters should inspect and make sure they don't have any. If so, contact us and we'll decontaminate.

John Mathis: Which other waters?

Jordan Nielson: In Electric Lake, veligers were discovered five years ago but we haven't had positive sampling yet. If we continue with negative sampling, they will be declassified this year.

In Sand Hollow Reservoir, 2010 found one adult quagga, currently coming back with negative samples. It's a tribute to the boaters who care and are helping take care of the problem. Lake Powell is sampling positive though.

Carrie Messerly: There are a lot of people who don't understand why quagga is a problem. Can you explain?

Jordan Nielson: If you look at it from Economics: In the state of Utah, we move water through pipelines and canals. etc. Quagga mussels colonize rapidly on top of each other and reduce the ability to move water. They also clog dam structures, etc. 2 million dollars is spent yearly to prevent them. If we get them, it will cost 15-16 million to treat them and keep our waters open. From an Ecological standpoint: Quagga mussels are filter feeders and eat the zooplankton which will starve the fish. From an Aesthetics point of view: When the mussels die, they go on shorelines, They are sharp to walk on, and smelly when they decompose.

Mitch Hacking: How do you keep track of the days to dry boat?

Jordan Nielson: We've implemented a tagging program. As boats leave waters, they can be inspected to make sure they're cleaned and drained. Get a date that they have been inspected, so as they go to another water, the technician can look at the boat and see the information. Red Fleet, Electric Lake and Sand Hollow are participating very well in that program. Lake Powell is working on that program but currently they don't have the resources to catch everybody's boat but we're working on a program.

Questions from Public:
None

Comments from Public:
None

Comments from RAC:

Wayne McAllister: Quagga in Lake Mead is horrendous. It's so ugly you can't believe it. Monitoring and having people clean their boats is a challenge.

Jordan Nielson: Boats running down the Colorado River have to decontaminate every time. Any boats coming up north from Lake Mead are being stopped at the port of entry to make sure they're not bringing quagga into the state.

Dan Abeyta: Are the shoulder seasons defined?

Jordan Nielson: Summer: June, July, August. Shoulder season: March, April, May, September, October, and November

MOTION

Carrie Messerly motion to approve the Division's recommendation as presented

Wayne McAllister second

Motion passed unanimously

10. COUGAR RECOMMENDATIONS: John Shivik, Mammals Program Coordinator (ACTION)
(see handout)

Questions from RAC:

Randy Dearth: Looking at the predator management criteria slide. Most of us are interested in the Book Cliffs and the Nine Mile area. Are we saying that we're less than 90% of objective?

John Shivik: It's less than that. It's more like 50% of objective. If it's fawn survival that's low, we target coyotes. If it's adult survival that's low, we target cougars.

Rod Morrison: Has the Book Cliffs ever filled its quota without the harvest objective?

John Shivik: I'm thinking areas. The average is 20. The quota has been 26, so it typically doesn't.

Dax Mangus: In 2009 which is the last year before we combined, we reached the quota, but that's the only time that we have since I have data back to 1990.

Carrie Messerly: What kind of handle to you have on population numbers for cougars?

John Shivik: The plan's an educated guess of 3000 for the state. Those kinds of numbers are based on average density and areas. Those aren't really good, and so what we do with large carnivores is indices, things to indicate whether the population's going up or down. The percent of females tells you something. Based on research from Idaho, it's the same with bear. If you hit females hard, you drive the population down. If you're not hitting the females hard, your population grows better.

Carrie Messerly: And that information is completed post harvest and that data could be analyzed?

John Shivik: That's another reason we do that in a three-year cycle. What's a percent if you've harvested five animals? So we'll take a three- year block and use that so we're always looking in the rear view mirror and nudge the system.

Carrie Messerly: There's not a way to find actual numbers, I'm guessing there are some hounds men who would be willing to take an adult female vs. some people who would not. It depends on the hunter and lack of research. This is all kind of political.

John Shivik: It's not all political but not all biological.. Sociology, weighing deer, with people, with hounds men who have varying opinions. Everyone has a different opinion. We weigh these and come out with recommendations. We don't have a rigorous way to get populations. We do want people to know the difference between a tom and a female. We are encouraging that. And people choose the right thing, then they can keep more females and keep the population more robust. It's more complicated than that but those are the guidelines.

Carrie Messerly: Are we going to wipe out the population of cougars on Nine Mile and the Book Cliffs?

John Shivik: When something goes under the predator management plan, the goal is to impact that population. The goal is to have source areas and sink areas, where cougars go to die. This is the balancing of deer, cougar, people, whether or not they're going to be wiped out completely. Probably not because there are sources areas around it, but the populations are likely to be impacted in that unit.

Carrie Messerly: So in terms of quality of the cougar?

John Shivik: The way the plan was designed, that area is designed to impact the cougar populations based on what's going on with deer.

Carrie Messerly: On the list of what impacts deer herd, where is the cougar?

John Shivik: You can have situations where you can kill as many cougars or coyotes or anything, and you're not going to see any more deer. You can remove cougar and coyotes and you can help deer herds. The difficulties are, if we see deer really being hit, in terms of pressure, there's pressure to do something. And if killing a cougar saves one deer, in people's minds, that's enough. Next cycle, did that deer herd rebound? If the predator management plan didn't work we

need to rethink it. Right now we're still in the three-year cycle so I can't answer that question. It will depend on winter weather conditions as well.

Carrie Messerly: How much impact does predation have on a deer herd based on historical data?

John Shivik: It depends on who's historical data. Half the plans show predation helps, half show it doesn't help. Now that we've got 50% survival it could be a predation issue, maybe not.

Carrie Messerly: When did the deer herd really start to decline?

John Shivik: Statewide, we've been stable for 10 years now, but on any given unit, they're going up and down.

Carrie Messerly: When did we start seeing a deceleration trend?

Dax Mangus: I have deer population numbers for the last dozen years. The Book Cliffs should be 15,000. It was 6,200 last year. The highest in 2006 was 8,500, or 57% of objective. The largest drive has been weather conditions. Adult survival are what are concerning us right now. Our target is to be above 85%. Mortality has occurred in the summer, which is an indication of predation whereas mortality in winter is more weather. As far as reaching 15,000 deer in the Book Cliffs, a lot of things are going to have to line up. The predator management plan is probably a piece of that.

Carrie Messerly: Of 20% mortality you've had, do any necropsies suggest it's nutritional deficiencies:?

Dax Mangus: Our people aren't here tonight. The marrow will be red if an animal is nutritionally stressed, but they still could have been killed by a predator. Our Habitat section is taking the lead on this due to the paving.

Carrie Messerly: Can you speak on the benefits of predators to a deer herd?

John Shivik: That depends on your perspective. Some of the hard data I can think of is a study out of Colorado regarding CWD, indicates deer are much more likely to be taken by cougars than general hunters. In the Lindsay stuff in Utah, cougars tend to take the older animals, specializing in those things that are on their way out anyway. Those would be potential benefits. If you have a healthy deer herd an all else is equal,. If deer are in trouble for other reasons, it could be counterproductive.

Randy Dearth: I'm not much of a cougar hunter, but I assume since it's a limited entry area that there's a preference point system. If we go to this, will they lose out on their preference points?

John Shivik: People have assured me that they've been saving for years and years. If they were trying to save for this year, by themselves, they could be impacted, but they could be impacted if they had 40 permits, or 20 permits, or 10 permits. So the quality of the hunt and whether it's time to cash in their hunts, is up to them. If it's split but they wanted to hunt it at the same time, they could hunt it as a harvest objective. It's a real fine point as far as which way you want to choose, to make that a limited entry or a harvest objective.

Randy Dearth: So they could use the points elsewhere, but at harvest objective, they could get one over the counter.

John Shivik: A concern would be, where someone saved up and saved up and then there are no cougars in three years from now. The decision we make now could make a difference three years from now.

Questions from Public:

Daniel Davis: Regarding the three- year cycle. Is there a possibility of harvesting 40 lions in the next three years?

John Shivik: This is an area, so if nobody hunts Nine Mile and they all go to the Book Cliffs Bitter Creek, you would remove 40 cougars per year.

Brad Evans: (Local sportsman, outfitter, Utah Hounds man Association): If the division cougar proposal passes will there be any split units in the NE region?

John Shivik: No

Michael Merrill: (Concerned citizen): On the cougar management area slide, is the one on the right the proposed?

John Shivik: This shows Book Cliffs as split entry, which is incorrect.

Michael Merrill: Only two are limited entry to supply a source. What about the bighorn sheep area in Daggett County?

Amy VandeVoort: It's a bighorn sheep area, so it's been in a cougar predation management area.

Michael Merrill : Has it worked?

Dax Mangus: It's pretty close to objective for deer.

Amy VandeVoort: Approximately 6 to 8000 for the North Slope and combined with South Slope it's 12,000.

Michael Merrill: Is it based on deer percentage?

Dax Mangus: No. The North Slope would not qualify based on deer percentage but because of bighorn sheep it does.

Michael Merrill: How many kittens do you think you're going to be taking in the Bitter Creek unit?

Dax Mangus: Legally none.

John, do you know how many kittens you've been taken?

John Owen: No. but if they are taken, we want to know about it.

Aaron Johnson: (Utah Hounds man Association): The regional biologists give you recommendations on whether it stays limited entry or harvest objective, correct?

John Shivik: Yes

Aaron Johnson: Did they talk to hounds men?

Dax Mangus: Clint Sampson's the biologist in that area. He is not here tonight. I know that he communicates with hounds men regularly but I don't know if there was a formal meeting.

Aaron Johnson: In the future, is it possible that before these recommendations are made, that those communications can be done with hounds men, so that we could have a voice and it doesn't become an issue?

John Shivik: Yes. That's my protocol, when I do furbearer, I sit down with UTA and the hounds men as well. What I'm finding though is it's hard to communicate with everybody in the entire state. Even with the Hounds men Association, things weren't getting to my contacts. That's the reason for these RACs too, so you have ask your questions and give your input.

Aaron Johnson: According to the plan, if the Book Cliffs Bitter Creek were to stay a split unit, that falls completely within the parameters of the plan?

John Shivik: Yes.

Comments from Public:

Brad Evans (Utah Hounds men Association): As members of Utah Hounds men Association, we would like to help the Division bring deer numbers up in the Book Cliffs Bitter Creek unit. We agree with cougars proposed to harvest but left as a split unit. For the past years 15 tags have been available. We would like to see an increase of 33%, increase tags to 20, to help reach 40 between the two units. We would like to give sportsmen an opportunity to harvest. We don't like to have units combined. We would like to amend the Book Cliffs Bitter Creek back to a split unit.

Aaron Johnson: *First:* the Hounds man Association in the State of Utah support the local hounds men and their clubs and what they want to see happen here. We support the Division's proposal. It closely follows the plan. Going forward ,would like to revisit the plan in the future and make the plan easier for everyone to follow and understand.
Second: We agree with GPS coordinates.
Third: The volunteer orientation course we would like to be made mandatory . Many people will only shoot one animal in their life. Making it mandatory makes it possibility that they have a trophy animal or at least has the knowledge to tell.
Fourth: The best way to harvest a mountain lion is a limited entry to make people feel better about the deer and to provide the best hunting opportunity in the state. There has to be a balance, and here we're asking to leave the Book Cliffs a split unit, so people can draw to shoot a trophy animal. The concern is that we can overharvest the Bitter Creek unit and hurt the population. It happened on a different area in Utah. The houndsmen have followed the process by sending emails and contacting people. We strongly encourage the RAC to acknowledge that.

Mitch Hacking: Would all the hounds men who have written comment cards raise their hands? If you're okay with it, we won't have each of you get up and state the same thing over and over again. Can we say that what has been stated so far represents all of the hounds men and then we'll have anyone who has any comments that have not already been addressed come to the front?

Agreement from hounds men.

Individuals:

Dennis Ingram: In 95-96 we went to a harvest objective. The split season came the last three years. We did not wipe out the population of the Book Cliffs. I support letting people hunt and controlling the harvest by the limit you take, not by limited entry. I support opportunity of harvest objective. I don't support the lottery system. If those people want to kill a tom, they should train a dog. But to make me stay home so they can go, I don't support. I support the Division's recommendation for harvest objective if that's what they want. I'll support a split unit if that's what they recommend. I support harvest objective on South Slope. And people haven't been putting in for years and have six-points or more, because it's been harvest objective until the last three years.

Steve Mahler: (Sportsman): I support the Hounds man Association

Clay McKeachnie: (Book Cliffs Landowner Association): We support the Division and harvest objective. Even when this thing was open, we weren't getting the job done. Lion hunting is a couple decent days a year when the snow's right. The more people you have out there, the more chance you have to get them. If we had mentioned that this affected the deer herd we'd have had a lot more people here tonight, but just based on a cougar agenda item, a lot of people overlooked it.

Morgan Birchell: (NE Utah chapter of SCI): I support the Hounds men Association in keeping it a split unit.

Kent Fowden: (Utah Trappers Association): I'm here in support of the plan. Every plan has a few holes that will have to be worked out in the process, but we support plan as proposed. With the support of hounds men, these holes could be filled in.

Byron Batemen: (President of Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife-SFW). We support the Division's recommendation on the Book Cliffs because when we go to deer and elk we're losing our youth and our opportunity for our youth to have a good deer hunt. Our deer herd was shut down for a number of years and we don't want to go there again. We got past the Mule Deer Protection Act which put money toward coyote predation on mule deer and a major effort was done on the north part of the Book Cliffs to help predation on mule deer. I'm also a houndsman. If you look in the guidebook, my picture is by all the pictures in the guidebook. Also a lot of peer-related papers published on Monroe lion study with sync and source populations. Book Cliffs have 1.4 million acres of Tribal lands, national monuments, and parks, where no hunting is allowed. When you take out a lion, there's several lions waiting to take their place. There has been a long study of lions on Monroe and Kennecott Copper, so we have a lot of information on how we determine populations. If you read those papers, it'll give you a better understanding of how lions fill in populations. Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife want to see the deer populations come back. We can't even get deer populations up to 60%. I think the Division has a good plan. Only one year

have we hit the population objective. We might knock the lions back for a few years, but they rebound real fast and those females start to breed at 1 1/2 to 2 1/2 years. Let's look at the long-term benefit for hounds men and sportsmen. If we get the deer herd back, we can increase permit numbers.

Mitch Hacking: Where do you stand on the hounds man's amendment?

Byron Bateman: We didn't discuss that, but numbers can be tweaked to reach goals. You might have to increase numbers. those numbers are not to attain 100% success rate. What is the number?

Boyde Blackwell: It depends on whether it's a limited entry, harvest objective, or predator management plan. That's why I leave the big bucks to John.

Byron Bateman: That's why we do have that female quota in there, so there are triggers in there to make sure we don't overharvest, so there are safeguards.

Jared Workman: I support the hounds men proposal. Byron said there are areas where other cougars can move in but there's not. Unit 21 is a harvest objective where they're wiped out and other units don't have areas cougars can move in.

Aaron Johnson: We respect SFW's position on this, but lions are hunted by hounds men. Hounds men are in support of the proposal and numbers going up so more lions are harvested and more deer will survive. That's what the Division wants. We're merely asking for a split unit to give hounds men in Utah to have first choice. It'll go to a harvest objective in March and at that time, that quota is possible to be filled.

Boyde Blackwell: John, define a Split Unit.

John Shivik:
Split Units: Limited entry draw, closes in spring.
Harvest objective, closes in summer or quota achieved. Has resident and non-resident tags. So if there were 20 tags, there would be 2 nonresident tags. Then once that closes on February 26, then that unit would open up as a harvest objective unit and anybody can buy a harvest objective tag, which is good for any unit in the state.

Andrea Merrell: Do you have any data taken by residents vs. nonresidents? Why do you think no one's going to hunt on Nine Mile and all cougars will be taken in the Bitter Creek unit. and why do you think nonresidents will get the tags?

Daniel Davis: Nine Mile has a lot of private property and Bitter Creek has an abundance of access. The reason we feel nonresidents would step in is because it's open over the counter. for a harvest objective. That's why we express the concern because it's open to nonresidents, and outfitters from outside the state with no concern for our backyard.

Andrea Merrell: There is no private land in the Book Cliffs?

Very little

Daniel Davis: We're also afraid of people who have disregard for resources just to be the first one to harvest the trophy male.

Mitch Hacking: Colorado's so close it's going to be easier access to come over here.

John Shivik: On the Wasatch-Manti we wanted them to hit some of them, but they wanted to hit on the easily accessible units and we couldn't get people to go where we wanted them to go. This is a scenario we constantly struggle with.

Daniel Davis: We want opportunity. We're not asking anybody to stay home. It would be the only split season in our region.

Clint McKeachnie: I've heard the Henry Mountains. Is Book Cliffs a cougar Henry Mountains equivalent? If it is, why is that good?

Jared Evans: If we had the data available with the Boone and Crockett book, I could assure you there's not been any Boone and Crockett toms taken off this northern unit in the past five to six years, where I can say there are Boone and Crockets coming out of the Book Cliffs each year. I personally have taken some of those toms. On a yearly basis there's at least one Boone and Crockett tom taken out of the area.

Aaron Johnson (Hounds men): For me to drive out here in the winter is hard. I do most of my hunting in the spring and hunt and I believe the Book Cliffs is a trophy cougar unit. I don't want to kill a cougar up north because there's not very many. The Books is still a pretty good unit .

Dax Mangus: In cougar management, we don't have a designation of premium limited entry, etc. for lions. The Book Cliffs is a limited entry unit for mule deer. It wasn't that long ago in April RAC meeting we had a lot of sportsmen show up and they recommended this recommendation. The number one recommendation was the overall number of deer and then buck quality. The Division changed from split unit to harvest objective. Our recommendation is designed to reduce

numbers of lions and would reduce the quality of cougars. That is a deliberate recommendation we made in response to sportsmen concerns and the predator management plan.

Comments from RAC:

Joe Batty: Are any cougars harvested on Tribal land?

Dax Mangus: The Tribe does some hunting on Tribal lands but they're a sovereign nation and they manage their own. It's a fairly limited harvest based on Roland Cook. These recommendations don't apply to Tribal lands.

John Mathis: If you go strictly harvest objective. or split and up the number of tags aren't you going to be killing the same amount of cougars?

Dax Mangus: There could be debate on that. It 's not going to make a big difference one way or the other though.

MOTION:

Carrie move to accept as presented as hounds man recommendation, to maintain a split unit with 33% increase, and include a mandatory orientation class.

Andrea Merrell: second

Favor: David Gordon, Carrie Messerly

Joe Batty: According to Roberts Rules of Order, there must be a motion moved and seconded, then a *discussion*, then the vote. I would like to know exactly what the motion was. Come spring, if the numbers haven't been met, they open it back up and then more hunting until the numbers are met?

John Shivik:
Book Cliffs Predator Management Units
Split Unit Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek, 20 permits for limited entry portion
Nine mile would be under a Harvest Objective unit with a female sub quota of 20
with a total harvest quota of 40

MOTION:

Carrie Messerly motion to accept the Division's proposal as presented, adding the Utah Houndsmen's Association Book Cliffs recommendation and a mandatory orientation course for all cougar hunters (see attachment)

Approved: David Carrie, Dan Abeyta

Favor: David Gordon, Carrie Messerly, Dan Abeyta, Joe Batty, Wayne McAllister, Andrea Merrell, Randy Dearth

Opposed Rod Morrison, John Mathis

Comments:

John Mathis: I'm brand new and I don't see a difference if it is a split or a harvest objective. My concern is the residents have the opportunity. There are a lot of residents who don't draw out and maybe they'd like a n opportunity also. Everyone who draws out is going to hire a hounds man to go.

Mitch Hacking: If you have a limited entry instead of harvest objective, if you draw a tag, there are less people in the field and it's more of a quality hunt.

Josh Horrocks: There's Limited Entry, and Split Entry. Then the Harvest Objective is like the general season, so whoever wants a tag can go and hunt.

Rod Morrison: I feel we need to take a few more lion and this proposal is not going to do that.

UTAH HOUNDSMEN ASSOCIATION PROPOSAL
As members of the Utah Houndsmen Association we would like to help the division in achieving their goal of bringing the deer herd numbers up in the book cliffs bitter creek unit. We also would like to see the number of cougar tags in the book cliffs bitter creek area increased. We agree with the number of cougars the division wants to harvest, but we would like to see the book cliffs bitter creek unit left as a split unit. For the past 3 years this unit has had 15 tags available. We would like to see this number increased by 33 percent, allowing sportsmen 20 tags for harvesting. By increasing the amount of tags to 20 we feel this will help the division reach their goal of 40 cougars between the two units. The reason we would like this area left a split unit is to give the sportsmen residents of Utah the majority of opportunity to harvest these cougars. We would like the DWR to consider leaving this unit open until the goal of 20 has been reached. If the division was to open this area to a harvest objective unit we feel the majority of harvesting would be done by non residents and outfitters from other areas. We are also concerned with the

two units being united as one; there is the potential of over harvesting the book cliffs bitter creek unit in the first couple of years. This would directly affect the quality of hunt for houndsmen for years to come.

11. FURBEARER AND BOBCAT HARVEST RECOMMENDATIONS: John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator
(see handout)

Questions from RAC:
None

Questions from Public:
None

Comments from Public:
Byron Batemen SFW: Support Division's recommendation

Kent Fowden (Utah Trappers Assoc.): We support the program submitted by Fish and Game and ask the RAC to do the same.

Comments from RAC:

MOTION:

Randy Dearth motion to accept as presented by the Division

Wayne McAllister second

Passed unanimously

12. GOAT MANAGEMENT PLANS - MT DUTTON AND LA SAL: Guy Wallace, Dustin Schaible, Wildlife Biologists (ACTION)
see handout

Questions from RAC:
None

Questions from Public:
None

Comments from Public:
Byron Bateman (SFW): We commend the Division for taking the lead to bring forth this transplant on La Sals and on Mt Dutton. A lot of people love to hike and watch mountain goats. Minimal impacts with grazers and livestock operators. We are willing to work with them if there are any. Mountain goats are a great success story in this state and we want this to continue. Other surrounding states have had populations diminish. We've been able to maintain and grow deer elk, mountain goats, etc.

Kent Fowden (Sportsman): Any time we have the opportunity for a transplant and augmentation it should be applauded. I support this 100%.

Garrick Hall (Utah Farm Bureau): We are always concerned with mountain goats and conflict with domestic livestock. We hope there are no conflicts but history has shown this can exist. Southern RAC recommended a mountain goat committee be formed to watch the goats. I would recommend that something similar be recommended by this RAC to watch that population of mountain goats, to make sure they stay in the area they're supposed to be in so we don't have the conflicts with sheep and cattle. We're not opposed to them being in there as long as they stay in those parameters. We've had problems with a population that was supposed to be a certain size and then they got out of control.

Mitch Hacking: Who'd put this committee together?

Boyde Blackwell: If it's like the bison committee, it would be the Division and they would pull together, landowners and sportsmen. That's what they've done in the past, to go over concerns annually to try to make sure they are addressed. They recommend things that need to be done.

Garrick Hall: Yes. A group to look at this yearly and make sure we keep that population within the parameters that are adequate. Our fear is if we get too many animals, they will move down the mountain.

John Mathis: How does that committee work on the Henries? Has it been effective at all?

Garrick Hall: I don't cover that at all. It's not my area. I've heard it's effective.

Byron Bateman: I'm on that committee. I believe in multiple use. Actually the bison committee is down there right now. Today we're doing our flights to track the population and fly until we've found them to verify the counts. We work hand in hand with permittees on the mountains. It's a good working relationship between different users for the resource. We would totally welcome something like that in this situation. Some goats will be radio-collared of some sort, so if there is

a problem we can locate the animal and take care of it. Any time we can work together with different committees it's a great opportunity to learn and cooperate.

Mitch Hacking: Without these committees, as an agricultural person, you have problems. With these committees you get problems solved.

Byron Bateman: They do.

Dave Olsen (comment card sent in earlier: representing himself): He's in favor of the military installation permits (which was already voted on). He's also in favor on the mountain goat proposal because it will provide a great new resource for public recreation and is a western icon. Dave has reviewed the management plan. Supports it and hopes the Division will as well.

Joe Batty: How many dollars per animal will they spend to collar, monitor, and transplant?

Randall Thacker: About $1,000 per animal for capture and radio collar. Transplant is not too expensive. Follow-up flights are about $200 per hour and five or six hours once a month for a total of about $35,000, all of which was going to come for Conservation Permit money.

Byron Bateman: We put up the money to cover it. Sportsmen for Fish and wildlife. The money is donated back to be used for this transplant.

Comments from RAC:
None

MOTION:

Wayne McAllister to approve as two separate units on LaSal and Mt Dutton

Carrie Messerly second

SUBSTITUTE MOTION:

John Mathis: I would like also to incorporate the Farm Bureau's recommendation to incorporate on Mt Dutton Joe Batty

Favor:

Abstain David Gordon

Opposed Dan Abeyta. Forest Service supports the plan for Mt Dutton, but is against putting goats into the La Sals at this point based on information from paperwork from the Forest Service.

Del Brady (Former Wildlife Board Chairman): It should have been divided into two motions so Dan's concerns could have been addressed separately.

Meeting adjourned 10:15 pm

NER RAC Chairman nominations:

Mitch Hacking: I would like to nominate Wayne McAllister

Wayne McAllister: I would accept the nomination

Andrea Merrell second

Randy Dearth: Sounds like Joe Batty knows Roberts Rule of Order. I nominate him.

Joe Batty: I respectfully decline

Mitch Hacking: Nominations cease?

Randy Dearth: Second

Wayne McAllister elected as RAC chair

Passed unanimously

NER RAC Vice-chair nominations:

Randy Dearth: I would like to nominate Carrie Messerly as Vice-chair

Mitch Hacking second

Carrie Messerly: I would accept that

Passed unanimously

Summer BBQ:
NER RAC Social will be held:

Sept 10, 2013 Tuesday
at 6:00 or 6:30
at Randy Dearth's backyard
1999 W 2500 N
Vernal UT

RAC dismissed 10:30 pm

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Public Library
45 S Main Street, Springville
August 6, 2013 ~ 6:30 p.m.

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda and Minutes
MOTION: To accept the agenda and minutes as written
Passed unanimously

Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09
MOTION: To support the Division's proposal as presented
Passed unanimously

Military Installations Permit Program R657-66
MOTION: To support the recommendation as presented
Passed unanimously

Proposed Fee Schedule FY 2015
MOTION: To support the recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously

R657-60 AIS Rule Amendments
MOTION: To support the recommendations as proposed
Passed unanimously

Cougar Recommendations
MOTION: To change the Manti units back to limited entry (Northeast Manti, Northwest Manti, Southeast Manti)
Passed 7 to 1
MOTION: To require GPS coordinates for harvested cougars and make the cougar orientation course mandatory
Passed unanimously
MOTON: To support the balance of the recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously
MOTION: To state an interest in seeing the plan in future years be on a deer unit basis
Motion dies for lack of second

Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations
MOTION: To support the Division's recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously

Goat Management Plans – Mt. Dutton and La Sal
MOTION: To support the goat management plan for the La Sal
Passed 6 to 2, 1 abstention
MOTION: To support the goat management plan for Mt. Dutton
Passed 7 in favor, 1 abstention

R657-52 Brine Shrimp Rule Amendments
MOTION: To support the recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously

Northern Regional Advisory Council Meeting Motions
Wednesday Aug 7, 2013
Brigham City Community Center

Meeting Begins: 6 p.m.

Approval of the Agenda
Motion: Move to approve the agenda**.**
Motion Passes: Unanimous

Review and Acceptance of May 15, 2013 Minutes
Motion: Approve the minutes of the May 15, 2013 meeting.
Motion Passes: Unanimous

Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09
Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Waterfowl Guidebook and rule R657-09 as presented with the youth hunt starting 9-21-13.
Motion Passes: Unanimous

R657-66 Military Installations Permit Program
Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board approved R657-66 Military Installations Permit Program as presented with the suggestion to explore additional hunting opportunities on Military Installations.
Motion Passes: For: 10 Abstain: 1, Lawrence

Proposed Fee Schedule FY 2015
Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board approve the proposed fee schedule FY2015 as presented.
Motion Passes: Unanimous

R657-60 AIS Rule Amendments
Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board approve R657-60 AIS Rule Amendments as presented**.**
Motion Passes: Unanimous

Cougar Recommendations
Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board adopt the Cougar recommendations as presented with the DWR working to alleviate depredation on livestock
Motion Passes: For: 10 Against**:** 1, Hicks

Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations
Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board approve the Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations as presented.
Motion Passes: Unanimous

Goat Management Plan-Mt Dutton and La Sal
Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board approve the Mt Dutton Mountain Goat Management as presented
Motion Passes: Unanimous

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board approve the La Sal Mountain Goat Management Plan as presented.
Motion Passes: For: 9 Against: 2, Cowley and Purdy

R657-52 Brine Shrimp Rule Amendment
Motion: - Recommend the Wildlife Board approve R657-52 Brine Shrimp Rule Amendments as presented.
Motion Passes: Unanimous

Election of RAC Chair and Vice Chair
Motion: Suspend the rules and re-elect the current chair and vice chair for an additional term of two years.
Motion Passes: Unanimous

Meeting Adjournment
Motion- Move we adjourn**.**
Motion Passes: Acclamation by RAC Chair

Meeting Ends:11:30 p.m.

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Wildlife Resources

GREGORY SHEEHAN
Division Director

GARY R. HERBERT
Governor

GREG BELL
Lieutenant Governor

August 5, 2013

Greg Sheehan, Director, Division of Wildlife Resources
Jake Albrecht, Chairman, Utah Wildlife Board
Bill Fenimore, Vice Chairman, Utah Wildlife Board
Utah Wildlife Board Members

RE: 2013 Convention Permit Internal Audit – Rule R657-55

Dear Director Sheehan and Wildlife Board Members,

In accordance with Rule R657-55, an audit of the Convention Permit series program has been conducted. This audit is attached for your review and the results will be presented at the Utah Wildlife Board Meeting on August 22, 2013.

If you have any questions please contact me at 801-538-7437.

Sincerely,

Kenny Johnson
Administrative Services Chief
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources

1594 West North Temple, Suite 2110, PO Box 146301, Salt Lake City, UT 84114-6301
telephone (801) 538-4700 • facsimile (801) 538-4709 • TTY (801) 538-7458 • *www.wildlife.utah.gov*

Internal Audit of the 2013 Convention Permit Program

Dated August 5, 2013

Background

In accordance with R657-55, an annual audit of the convention permit program has been conducted in 2013. This audit was not performed using generally accepted auditing standards, but is an internal audit designed by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Administrative Services Section. Our report focuses on verifying that the drawing processes used were proper and fair for the permits that were issued. Additionally, we reviewed data regarding number of applicants, success rates and other efforts related to the drawing procedures issuance of the permits. New this year is the amendment accounting for the use of application funds on division approved projects, this is the first year of this requirement and is included in this audit.

Overview

The contract for the wildlife convention permits was awarded to the Mule Deer Foundation in 2010. The award was for a five year contract period that runs from 2012 through 2016. This report covers 2013, but does have some comparative data from the initial convention contract period of 2007 through 2012.

This report refers to the contract and event as the "Convention", but the Mule Deer Foundation and the co-sponsor, Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife, refer to this event as the "Hunt Expo."

Findings and Recommendations

This audit was performed by the Division of Wildlife Resources to provide information to the Utah Wildlife Board in order to help make an assessment of program compliance and other general information about the 2013 convention. The Division has closely monitored the processes of data collection and input, securing of personal and confidential data received, and performance of the actual computer drawing. Additionally, the Division has performed eligibility checks of successful applicants, and alternates that may have been assigned a permit. Applicants that do not have a valid hunting permit at the conclusion of the convention application period are removed from consideration for permits. This audit verified the amended use of application revenue, and that the Division did receive the related permit funds in full from each successful applicant before issuance of the permit.

Information gathered herein is intended to assist the Division and the Wildlife Board as they ensure contract compliance and allocate permits for the 2014 convention.

Review of handling of personal and sensitive data

The division considers the handling of personal data and information a top priority. Because the contractor conducting the draw is allowed to access DWR data for populating the hunt applications we have required adherence to protocols that will safeguard that data.

The contractor has two process components regarding sensitive and confidential data from the applicants. For these purposes sensitive and confidential data is defined as social security number, drivers license information, height, weight, gender, hair/eye color.

First, is the handling of sensitive information given by applicants at the convention to apply for the drawing. This is done on a paper form completed by the applicant. Once completed and submitted these forms are cross-shredded on site. No paper applications are retained by the contractor.

Second, is the handling of electronic data that is used in the electronic application process. Sensitive data is used by the application for customer lookups into the Division database. This data transmission is through a secure socket layer using 128 bit encryption. Once the customer information is retrieved no sensitive information is stored on the contractor database.

No compliance issues were identified by the Division.

Review of the drawing process

Division of Wildlife personnel go through an extensive review of the draw processes used by GraySky Technologies, the drawing contractor selected to conduct the convention permit drawing. The Division is represented by Greg Evans and Kirk Poulsen of the Utah Department of Technology Services, who reviewed the following:

1) The process of the draw is reviewed for its soundness.
2) The database structure is reviewed to make sure that a customer can't flood a certain hunt by making multiple entries for that hunt.
3) A review of the code is conducted to make sure that there is no chance that a seeded record could exist in the database prior to the assignment of random numbers. This is done to ensure that the result table is empty and no records can be inserted independently of the drawing code. This ensures that a record with an abnormally low random number isn't placed in the table thereby guaranteeing a permit to that record.
4) The code is reviewed to ensure that all records are treated equally in the process that assigns random numbers to the entries. Care is given to make sure that when the random numbers are being assigned no records are identified to get a number other than a random number which is generated by the system. In 2012 the Division requested a change in the handling of duplicate random numbers. Although the likelihood of two people being assigned the same random number is extremely remote it was felt that if a duplication occurred it was best to add one to the second duplicate number rather than reassign a new random number, thereby

maintaining as closely as possible that parties position in the draw. This process occurred again in 2013.

5) The code is then reviewed for inserts that may occur after the drawing to make sure that a winning record is not placed in the result table after the assignment of random numbers takes place.

This was an exhaustive and thorough review, no compliance issues were identified by the Division.

Conducting the Draw

The actual drawing is conducted at Division Offices in Salt Lake City. Attendees that are present at the drawing are required to sign a login sheet as shown on Attachment 2. The public are invited to attend the drawing and at least one individual that was unrelated to the Division or contractors did attend. The draw is then conducted by GraySky Technologies whereupon the following occurs:

1) An impromptu passphrase "Greg loves Hillside" was given to the GraySky representative and was witnessed written into the code prior to beginning the draw process. Later this same passphrase was verified to display on the result page to ensure the code reviewed by the Division was the actual code used during the draw.
2) The draw was then run assigning random numbers to applicants hunt choice entries and then sorted in descending order.
3) The results of the draw were printed and immediately given to a Division representative to ensure that there were no edits to the results table.
4) This list was then given to the Division Law Enforcement and Licensing sections to validate eligibility before any results were posted.
5) Any applicants selected through the draw that receive multiple permits for the same species are contacted by the Division and asked to select their preferred hunt choice. The unclaimed permits are issued to alternates.

The passphrase was witnessed being added to the code, and the same passphrase verified at the conclusion of the draw. Results were instantly printed and the process to validate began immediately.

No compliance issues were identified by the Division.

Note about Random Drawings

In any truly random drawing there always seems to be a few "lucky" individuals. Statistically when randomness is discussed it is always possible to view the final result and pick out certain trends, especially with few historical data sets to observe. The key to these trends is that they cannot be predicted prior to the event or drawing. This is the very essence of randomness. Random is not an assurance that an event will be spread evenly across a population, or distributed equally among participants. There were not any abnormalities observed in the 2013 drawing, whether random or otherwise.

Draw Related Information

The Division reviewed data from the convention regarding application numbers and success rates of the convention. Applicant numbers verified that at least 10,000 individual were attending the convention each year as was established as a basis for applying for the permit series. The reported number of attendees at the 2013 convention was approximately 30,000 with more than 10,000 being formally registered for activities.

No compliance issues were identified by the Division.

Applicant data for years 2007-2013 is as follows:

Year	Applicants	Applications	Gross Revenue @ $5 per App	Average Applications Per Applicant
2007	10,527	205,462	$ 1,027,310	19.52
2008	8,745	138,988	$ 694,940	16.89
2009	9,927	169,123	$ 845,970	17.04
2010	9,700	165,866	$ 847,285	17.10
2011	12,154	196,360	$ 981,800	16.16
2012	13,388	207,870	$ 1,039,350	15.53
2013	14,043	197,312	$986,560	14.05

Informational Applicant Demographics by State

State	Applicants	State	Applicants
Alabama	1	New Jersey	1
Arkansas	1	New Mexico	7
Arizona	39	New York	2
Arkansas	18	North Dakota	3
California	110	Ohio	1
Colorado	126	Oklahoma	3
Connecticut	1	Oregon	23
Florida	1	Pennsylvania	2
Georgia	5	South Carolina	3
Idaho	204	South Dakota	9
Illinois	3	Texas	13
Massachusetts	1	Utah	13,040
Maryland	1	Washington	32
Michigan	2	Washington, D.C.	2
Minnesota	4	Wisconsin	2
Missouri	3	Wyoming	205
Montana	70	Non-USA	8
Nevada	91	VA	1
Nebraska	5	**Total**	**14303**

Resident versus Nonresident Success

Data was reviewed comparing the number of resident applicants versus the nonresident applicants. The detailed data is shown on Attachment 6, but to summarize, in the 2013 application period 87.7% of the applications for the 200 permit series were residents and 88% of the permits drawn were awarded to residents, and 12% to nonresidents. The numbers are similar for the cumulative six years of the convention with 83.3% residents applying and 84.8% of successful applicants being residents.

Other data related to draw success by hunt number and numbers of permits issued by species are attached to this report. These findings are consistent and in line with previous comparisons.

Historical Comparison of Convention Permit Applications and Success Rates

	Average 2007-2012	2013
Total Resident Applications	152,571	173,192
Total Nonresident Applications	29,131	24,120
	181,702	197,312

Percent of Resident Applications	83.97%	87.78%
Percent of Nonresident Applications	16.03%	12.22%
	100%	100%

Permits Issued to Residents	171	176
Permits Issued to Nonresidents	29	24
	200	200

Percent of Permits Resident	85.64%	88.00%
Percent of Permits Nonresident	14.36%	12.00%
	100%	100%

License Sales

The Division requires that anyone applying for a permit at the Hunt Expo must have a valid hunting or combination license at the time of application. To ensure this compliance the programming will not allow applicants to apply without a valid license in the system. For the Hunt Expo in 2013 there were 1,036 combination and hunting licenses sold on site. The resulting license revenue generated was $40,120.00. The entirety of these funds are owed to the division with the same reporting stipulations as other third party license vendors; the invoice was paid in full promptly.

There were no compliance issues with license sales, reporting, or payment.

Application Revenue Amendment

In October of 2012 the Division of Wildlife, Mule Deer Foundation and their partner Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife, amended the contract to more clearly account for application revenue. It was agreed that the party awarded the Convention contract retain the same draw administration fee that is provided to the division's current big game draw contractor. The approved application fee based on the 2012 big game drawing was $3.12 per application. The amendment provides for this portion to be used for administrative costs incurred by the Convention contractor. The remaining $1.88 shall be used for division approved projects within 2 years of receipt.

In 2013 the Convention draw processed 197,312 applications, generating $986,560 in gross application revenue. The retained portion allowable under the amendment for administrative expenses was $615,613.44; the remaining $1.88 per application dedicated to division approved projects totaled $370,946.56. These fund balances were clearly identifiable, verified, and held separate from other funds in federally insured bank accounts per the amendment. No compliance issues were identified by the Division.

Of note, this being the first of 2 years to expend project revenue, the progress on beneficial projects has begun in earnest. The division has approved 3 projects, one of which was complete awaiting invoices, and 3 additional projects are in the planning stages. More detail can be found in attachment 5.

Draw Probability Statistics

The Convention offers a limited number of permits annually and attracts exponentially more applicants who compete for them through the draw process. It should be noted that this dynamic implies a statistically low probability of obtaining a permit. While the draw odds are not a controllable variable or concern of the division, we want to acknowledge the expediency with which this information is made available to the public. The convention contractor publishes these statistics annually on their website prior to the next year application period; more detail can be found in this review in attachment 6.

Conclusions

This audit was expanded slightly from last year. It retains findings related to processes involved in the handling of applications and data. We believe that with the procedures set in place by MDF, SFW, and GraySky, that the data was properly secured at the convention, and the drawing was conducted in a fair, transparent, and consistent manner.

New for 2013 is the amendment authorizing the convention contractor to retain a portion of application revenue for administrative purposes, and to expend a portion on specific division approved projects. These funds were verified and accounted for in the prescribed manner, kept separate from other account funds in federally insured bank accounts, and utilized to plan for and complete division approved projects.

The Division will perform another audit of the 2014 convention and will provide a report including any findings to the Utah Wildlife Board.

We would like to thank the Mule Deer Foundation and Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife for their time, prompt response and their willingness to provide the information requested for the preparation of the audit. Their information was clearly presented and very much appreciated. If there are questions regarding this report, please contact me at 801-538-7437.

Kenneth Johnson
Administrative Services Chief
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources

CC: Gregory Sheehan, Director
Jake Albrecht, Board Chair
Bill Fenimore, Board Vice Chair
Utah Wildlife Board Members
Miles Moretti, Mule Deer Foundation
Byron Bateman, Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife

ATCH:
1. Current Convention Rule R647-55
2. Attendance log at the computer drawing for permits
3. Convention Permit Application form – Paper
4. Approved projects list
5. Application success rates by hunt
6. Listing of specific permits issued by species

Attachment 1

UTAH ADMINISTRATIVE CODE

The Utah Administrative Code is the body of all effective administrative rules as compiled and organized by the Division of Administrative Rules (Subsection 63G-3-102(5); see also Sections 63G-3-701 and 702).

NOTE: For a list of rules that have been made effective since June 1, 2013, please see the codification segue page.

NOTE TO RULEFILING AGENCIES: Use the RTF version for submitting rule changes.

Download the RTF file

R657. Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources.

Rule R657-55. Wildlife Convention Permits.

As in effect on June 1, 2013

Table of Contents

- R657-55-1. Purpose and Authority.
- R657-55-2. Definitions.
- R657-55-3. Wildlife Convention Permit Allocation.
- R657-55-4. Obtaining Authority to Distribute Wildlife Convention Permit Series.
- R657-55-5. Hunter Application Procedures.
- R657-55-6. Drawing Procedures.
- R657-55-7. Issuance of Permits.
- R657-55-8. Surrender or Transfer of Wildlife Convention Permits.
- R657-55-9. Using a Wildlife Convention Permit.
- KEY
- Date of Enactment or Last Substantive Amendment
- Notice of Continuation
- Authorizing, Implemented, or Interpreted Law

R657-55-1. Purpose and Authority.

(1) Under the authority of Sections 23-14-18 and 23-14-19 of the Utah Code, this rule provides the standards and requirements for issuing wildlife convention permits.

(2) Wildlife convention permits are authorized by the Wildlife Board and issued by the division to a qualified conservation organization for purposes of generating revenue to fund wildlife conservation activities and attracting a regional or national wildlife convention to Utah.

(3) The selected conservation organization will conduct a random drawing at a convention held in Utah to distribute the opportunity to receive wildlife convention permits.

(4) This rule is intended as authorization to issue one series of wildlife convention permits per year beginning in 2012 through 2016 to one qualified conservation organization.

R657-55-2. Definitions.

(1) Terms used in this rule are defined in Section 23-13-2.

(2) In addition:

(a) "Conservation organization" means a nonprofit chartered institution, corporation, foundation, or association founded for the purpose of promoting wildlife conservation.

(b) "Special nonresident convention permit" means one wildlife convention permit for each once-in-a-lifetime species that is only available to a nonresident hunter legally eligible to hunt in Utah.

(c) "Wildlife Convention" means a multi-day event held within the state of Utah that is sponsored by multiple wildlife conservation organizations as their national or regional convention or event that is open to the general public and designed to draw nationwide attendance of more than 10,000 individuals. The wildlife

convention may include wildlife conservation fund raising activities, outdoor exhibits, retail marketing of outdoor products and services, public awareness programs, and other similar activities.

(d) "Wildlife Convention Audit" means an annual review by the division of the conservation organization's processes used to handle applications for convention permits and conduct the drawing, and the protocols associated with collecting and using client data.

(e) "Wildlife Convention Permit" means a permit which:

(i) is authorized by the Wildlife Board to be issued to successful applicants through a drawing or random selection process conducted at a Utah wildlife convention; and

(ii) allows the permittee to hunt for the designated species on the designated unit during the respective season for each species as authorized by the Wildlife Board.

(f) "Wildlife Convention Permit series" means a single package of permits to be determined by the Wildlife Board for:

(i) deer;

(ii) elk;

(iii) pronghorn;

(iv) moose;

(v) bison;

(vi) rocky mountain goat;

(vii) desert bighorn sheep;

(viii) rocky mountain bighorn sheep;

(ix) wild turkey;

(x) cougar; or

(xi) black bear.

(g) "Secured Opportunity" means the opportunity to participate in a specified hunt that is secured by an eligible applicant through the drawing process.

(h) "Successful Applicant" means an individual selected to receive a wildlife convention permit through the drawing process.

R657-55-3. Wildlife Convention Permit Allocation.

(1) The Wildlife Board may allocate wildlife convention permits by May 1 of the year preceding the wildlife convention.

(2) Wildlife convention permits shall be issued as a single series to one conservation organization.

(3) The number of wildlife convention permits authorized by the Wildlife Board shall be based on:

(a) the species population trend, size, and distribution to protect the long-term health of the population;

(b) the hunting and viewing opportunity for the general public, both short and long term; and

(c) a percentage of the permits available to nonresidents in the annual big game drawings matched by a proportionate number of resident permits.

(4) Wildlife convention permits, including special nonresident convention permits, shall not exceed 200 total permits.

(5) Wildlife convention permits designated for the convention each year shall be deducted from the number of public drawing permits.

R657-55-4. Obtaining Authority to Distribute Wildlife Convention Permit Series.

(1) The wildlife convention permit series is issued for a period of five years as provided in Section R657-55-1(4).

(2) The wildlife convention permit series is available to eligible conservation organizations for distribution through a drawing or other random selection process held at a wildlife convention in Utah open to the public.

(3) Conservation organizations may apply for the wildlife convention permit series by sending an application to the division between August 1 and September 1, 2010.

(4) Each application must include:

(a) the name, address and telephone number of the conservation organization;

(b) a description of the conservation organization's mission statement;

(c) the name of the president or other individual responsible for the administrative operations of the conservation organization; and

(d) a detailed business plan describing how the wildlife convention will take place and how the wildlife

convention permit drawing procedures will be carried out.

(5) An incomplete or incorrect application may be rejected.

(6) The division shall recommend to the Wildlife Board which conservation organization may receive the wildlife convention permit series based on:

(a) the business plan for the convention and drawing procedures contained in the application; and

(b) the conservation organization's, including its constituent entities, ability, including past performance in marketing conservation permits under Rule R657-41, to effectively plan and complete the wildlife convention.

(7) The Wildlife Board shall make the final assignment of the wildlife convention permit series based on the:

(a) division's recommendation;

(b) applicant conservation organization's commitment to use convention permit handling fee revenue to benefit protected wildlife in Utah;

(c) historical contribution of the applicant conservation organization, including its constituent entities, to the conservation of wildlife in Utah; and

(d) previous performance of the applicant conservation organization, including its constituent entities.

(8) The conservation organization receiving the wildlife convention permit series must:

(a) require each wildlife convention permit applicant to verify they possess a current Utah hunting or combination license before allowing them to apply for a convention permit;

(b) select successful applicants for the wildlife convention permits by drawing or other random selection process in accordance with law, provisions of this rule, proclamation, and order of the Wildlife Board;

(c) allow applicants to apply for the wildlife convention permits without purchasing admission to the wildlife convention;

(d) notify the division of the successful applicant of each wildlife convention permit within 10 days of the applicant's selection;

(e) maintain records demonstrating that the drawing was conducted fairly; and

(f) submit to an annual wildlife convention audit by a division-appointed auditor.

(9) The division shall issue the appropriate wildlife convention permit to the designated successful applicant after:

(a) completion of the random selection process;

(b) verification of the recipient being found eligible for the permit; and

(c) payment of the appropriate permit fee is received by the division.

(10) The division and the conservation organization receiving the wildlife convention permit series shall enter into a contract, including the provisions outlined in this rule.

(11) If the conservation organization awarded the wildlife convention permit series withdraws before the end of the 5 year period, any remaining co-participants with the conservation organization may be given an opportunity to assume the contract and to distribute the convention permit series consistent with the contract and this rule for the remaining years left in the 5 year period, provided:

(a) The original contracted conservation organization submits a certified letter to the division identifying that it will no longer be participating in the convention.

(b) The partner or successor conservation organization files an application with the division as provided in subsection 4 for the remaining period.

(c) The successor conservation organization submits its application request at least 60 days prior to the next scheduled convention so that the wildlife board can evaluate the request under the criteria in this section.

(d) The Wildlife Board authorizes the successor conservation organization to assume the contract and complete the balance of the 5 year convention permit period.

(12) The division may suspend or terminate the conservation organization's authority to distribute wildlife convention permits at any time during the five year award term for:

(a) violating any of the requirements set forth in this rule or the contract; or

(b) failing to bring or organize a wildlife convention in Utah, as described in the business plan under R657-55-4(4)(d), in any given year.

R657-55-5. Hunter Application Procedures.

(1) Any hunter legally eligible to hunt in Utah may apply for a wildlife convention permit except that only a nonresident of Utah may apply for a special nonresident convention permit.

(2) Any handling fee assessed by the conservation organization to process applications shall not exceed $5 per application submitted at the convention.

(3)(a) Except as provided in Subsection (3)(b), applicants must validate their application in person at the

wildlife convention to be eligible to participate in the random drawing process, for wildlife convention permits, and no person may submit an application in behalf of another.

(b) An applicant that is a member of the United States Armed Forces and unable to attend the wildlife convention as a result of being deployed or mobilized in the interest of national defense or a national emergency is not required to validate their application in person; provided convention administrators are furnished a copy of the written deployment or mobilization orders and the orders identify:

(i) the branch of the United States Armed forces from which the applicant is deployed or mobilized;

(ii) the location where the applicant is deployed or mobilized;

(iii) the date the applicant is required to report to duty; and

(iv) the nature and length of the applicant's deployment or mobilization.

(c) The conservation organization shall maintain a record, including copies of military orders, of all applicants that are not required to validate their applications in person pursuant to Subsection (3)(b), and submit to a Division audit of these records as part of its annual audit under R657-55-4(8)(f).

(4) Applicants may apply for each individual hunt for which they are eligible.

(5) Applicants may apply only once for each hunt, regardless of the number of permits for that hunt.

(6) Applicants must submit an application for each desired hunt.

(7) Applicants must possess a current Utah hunting or combination license in order to apply for a permit.

(8) The conservation organization shall advertise, accept, and process applications for wildlife convention permits and conduct the drawing in compliance with this rule and all other applicable laws.

R657-55-6. Drawing Procedures.

(1) A random drawing or selection process must be conducted for each wildlife convention permit.

(2) No preference or bonus points shall be awarded in the drawings.

(3) Waiting periods do not apply, except any person who obtains a wildlife convention permit for a once-in-a-lifetime species is subject to the once-in-a-lifetime restrictions applicable to obtaining a subsequent permit for the same species through a division application and drawing process, as provided in Rule R657-5 and the proclamation of the Wildlife Board for taking big game.

(4) No predetermined quotas or restrictions shall be imposed in the application or selection process for wildlife convention permits between resident and nonresident applicants, except that special nonresident convention permits may only be awarded to a nonresident of Utah.

(5) Drawings will be conducted within five days of the close of the convention.

(6) Applicants do not have to be present at the drawing to be awarded a wildlife convention permit.

(7) The conservation organization shall identify all eligible alternates for each wildlife convention permit and provide the division with a finalized list. This list will be maintained by the conservation organization until all permits are issued.

(8) The division shall contact successful applicants by phone or mail, and the conservation organization shall post the name of all successful applicants on a designated website.

R657-55-7. Issuance of Permits.

(1) The division shall provide a wildlife convention permit to the successful applicant as designated by the conservation organization.

(2) The division must provide a wildlife convention permit to each successful applicant, except as otherwise provided in this rule.

(3) The division shall provide each successful applicant a letter indicating the permit secured in the drawing, the appropriate fee owed the division, and the date the fee is due.

(4) Successful applicants must provide the permit fee payment in full to the division and will be issued the designated wildlife convention permit upon receipt of the appropriate permit fee and providing proof they possess a current Utah hunting or combination license.

(5) Residents will pay resident permit fees and nonresidents will pay nonresident permit fees.

(6) Applicants are eligible to obtain only one permit per species, except as provided in Rule R657-5, but no restrictions apply on obtaining permits for multiple species.

(7) In an applicant is selected for more than one convention permit for the same species, the Division will contact the applicant to determine which permit the applicant selects.

(a) The applicant must select the permit of choice within five days of receiving notification.

(b) If the Division is unable to contact the applicant within 5 days, the Division will issue to the applicant the permit with the most difficult drawings odds based on drawing results from the Division's Big Game drawing for the preceding year.

(c) Permits not issued to the applicant will go to the next person on the alternate drawing list for that permit.

(8) Any successful applicant who fails to satisfy the following requirements will be ineligible to receive the wildlife convention permit and the next drawing alternate for that permit will be selected.

(a) The applicant fails to return the appropriate permit fee in full by the date provided in Subsection (3) or

(b) The applicant did not possess a valid Utah hunting or combination license at the time the convention permit application was submitted and the permit received.

R657-55-8. Surrender or Transfer of Wildlife Convention Permits.

(1)(a) If a person selected to receive a wildlife convention permit is also successful in obtaining a Utah limited entry permit for the same species in the same year or obtaining a general permit for a male animal of the same species in the same year, that person cannot possess both permits and must select the permit of choice.

(b) In the event the secured opportunity is willingly surrendered before the permit is issued, the next eligible applicant on the alternate drawing list will be selected to receive the secured opportunity.

(c) In the event the wildlife convention permit is surrendered, the next eligible applicant on the alternate drawing list for that permit will be selected to receive the permit, and the permit fee may be refunded, as provided in Sections 23-19-38, 23-19-38.2, and R657-42-5.

(2) A person selected by a conservation organization to receive a wildlife convention permit, may not sell or transfer the permit, or any rights thereunder to another person in accordance with Section 23-19-1.

(3) If a person is successful in obtaining a wildlife convention permit but is legally ineligible to hunt in Utah the next eligible applicant on the alternate drawing list for that permit will be selected to receive the permit.

R657-55-9. Using a Wildlife Convention Permit.

(1) A wildlife convention permit allows the recipient to:

(a) take only the species for which the permit is issued;

(b) take only the species and sex printed on the permit; and

(c) take the species only in the area and during the season specified on the permit.

(2) The recipient of a wildlife convention permit is subject to all of the provisions of Title 23, Wildlife Resources Code, and the rules and proclamations of the Wildlife Board for taking and pursuing wildlife.

KEY

wildlife, wildlife permits

Date of Enactment or Last Substantive Amendment

February 7, 2011

Notice of Continuation

May 26, 2010

Authorizing, Implemented, or Interpreted Law

23-14-18; 23-14-19

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

CONTACT

For questions regarding the content or application of rules under Title R657, please contact the promulgating agency (Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources). A list of agencies with links to their homepages is available at http://www.utah.gov/government/agencylist.html or from http://www.rules.utah.gov/contact/agencycontacts.htm.

Attachment 2

On Tuesday February 26th 2013 the electronic random drawing for the 200 convention permits will take place at the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources located at 1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah. These permits were awarded to the Western Hunting & Conservation Expo by the Utah Wildlife Board.

The following are witnesses of the drawing and were present during the entire process. Once the winners have been drawn all names will be given Law Enforcement for the DWR. The names will be checked for any compact violations and will be deemed eligible by the DWR and notified by mail.

Start Time 10:29 am

End Time 10:39 am.

Print Name	Signature	Date
BYRON BATEMAN		2-26-13
Ryan Foutz		2-26-13
Mike Foulks		2-26-13
Mark Robison		2-26-13
Miles Moretti		2-26-13
Bill Phifer		2-26-13
Eric Tycksen		2-26-13
LINDY VARNEY		2-26-13
Kenny Johnson		22613
Kirk Poulsen		2-26-13

Page 2 cont.

Name	Signature	Date
Greg Evans		2-26-2013
Greg Sheehan		2/26/2013
Robert Gray		2/26/13

Attachment 3

ALL APPLICANTS must have a valid Utah Hunting License at the time of application in order for the application to be valid.

Application for 200 Permits Drawing

As the person who prepared this application, I declare under the penalty of perjury that to the best of my knowledge the information provided in this application is true and correct, and that the applicant under all prevailing laws and statutes to apply for and possess this license/permit or tag if drawn as defined in Utah Code 23-13-2.

Yes, I would like to purchase a license along with this application.

- ☐ **Utah HUNTING License**
- ☐ **Utah COMBINATION License**

Hunter Ed. # _____
(for those born after 12/31/1965)

Hunting License Fees: Resident $26, Resident Youth (13 and under) $11
Non-Resident Any Age $65
Combination Fishing/Hunting: Resident (12+) $30, Non-Resident (12+) $80

Applicant's Signature: _____

I have read the foregoing statement and agree with its terms. I have also read and understand the regulations in the rules pertaining to this application.

Customer ID: _____ *(found on your Utah hunting license)* Date of Birth: ____/____/____ (MM/DD/YEAR)

***(You do not need to write your SSN and Address if you know you Customer ID and DOB.** You can skip to the Hunt Selection portion if you have completed the Customer ID and DOB.)*

SS#: ___ ___ ___ - ___ ___ - ___ ___ ___ ___ *(Your SS# is not required but will be used to expedite the hunt application process.)*

First Name: _____ Middle Initial: _____ Last Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Email Address: _____ Daytime Phone: (_____) _____-_____

Spend $100 in application fees and receive 3 chances to win prizes valued at thousands of dollars. Spend $150 in application fees and receive 6 chances. Spend $200 in application fees and receive 10 chances. No applicant can receive more that 10 chances.

PLEASE SELECT FROM THE FOLLOWING PRE-SET PACKAGES A THROUGH K. OR, CUSTOMIZE YOUR OWN PERMIT SELECTIONS.

Hunt Packages	SPECIES	DETAILS	FEE
☐ **Package A, Residents .**	All Species	All Buck, Bulls, Moose, Bison, Goat, Desert Bighorn, Rocky Mtn Bighorn, Antelope, Cougar, Bear & Turkey	$420
☐ **Package A, Non-Utah Residents**	All Species	All Buck, Bulls, Moose, Bison, Goat, Desert Bighorn, Rocky Mtn Bighorn, Antelope, Cougar, Bear & Turkey.	$445
☐ **Package B, Residents .**	Select Species	All Bucks, All Bulls, All Moose, Al Bison, All Goat, All Desert Bighorn, All Rocky Mtn. Bighorn	$265
☐ **Package B, Non-Utah Residents**		All Bucks, All Bulls, All Moose, Al Bison, All Goat, All Desert Bighorn, All Rocky Mtn. Bighorn.	$290
☐ **Package C**	All Elk		$155
☐ **Package D**	All Archery Elk.		$40
☐ **Package E**	All Muzzleloader Elk		$15
☐ **Package F**	All Rifle Elk		$100
☐ **Package G**	All Deer		$70
☐ **Package H**	All Archery Deer		$15
☐ **Package I**	All Muzzleloader Deer		$15
☐ **Package J**	All Rifle Deer		$40
☐ **Pkg K, Residents.**	Once-in-a-Lifetime Hunts	All Moose, Bison, Desert Bighorn, and Rocky Mtn. Bighorn, and Mtn. Goat,	$40
☐ **Pkg K, Non-Utah Residents**			$65

NON-RESIDENTS! THE 5 HUNTS LISTED BELOW ARE AVAILABLE TO NON-RESIDENTS OF UTAH ONLY.

Non-Residents of Utah Only — *Put an "X" in the box on the left of any and all hunt selections you choose to apply for.*

X	SPECIES	HUNT / UNIT	FEE
☐	Once-in-a-lifetime Utah Bull Moose	Wasatch Mountains	$5
☐	Once-in-a-lifetime Utah Bison	Henry Mountains - Hunters Choice (late)	$5
☐	Once-in-a-lifetime UT Desert Bighorn Sheep	Zion	$5
☐	Once-in-a-lifetime UT Rocky Mtn. Bighorn Sheep	Nine Mile, Range Creek	$5
☐	Once-in-a-lifetime UT Rocky Mtn. Goat	Ogden, Willard Peak (late)	$5

ALL APPLICANTS Customized Selections — *Put an "X" in the box on the left of any and all hunt selections you choose to apply for.*

	X	SPECIES	WEAPON	HUNT / UNIT	FEE
1	☐	Buck Deer	Any Weapon	Book Cliffs	$5
2	☐	Buck Deer	Archery	Book Cliffs	$5
3	☐	Buck Deer	Muzzleloader	Book Cliffs	$5
4	☐	Buck Deer	Premium Any Weapon	Henry Mountains	$5
5	☐	Buck Deer	Management Buck	Henry Mountains	$5
6	☐	Buck Deer	Premium Any Weapon	Paunsaugunt	$5
7	☐	Buck Deer	Premium Archery	Paunsaugunt	$5
8	☐	Buck Deer	Premium Muzzleloader	Paunsaugunt	$5
9	☐	Buck Deer	Management Buck	Paunsaugunt	$5
10	☐	Buck Deer	Any Weapon	San Juan, Elk Ridge	$5
11	☐	Buck Deer	Any Weapon	South Slope, Diamond Mtn	$5
12	☐	Buck Deer	Any Weapon	West Desert, Vernon	$5
13	☐	Buck Deer	Archery	West Desert, Vernon	$5
14	☐	Buck Deer	Muzzleloader	West Desert, Vernon	$5
15	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek, South (late)	$5
16	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek, South (early)	$5
17	☐	Bull Elk	Archery	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek, South	$5
18	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Book Cliffs, Little Creek (roadless)	$5
19	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Cache, South (early)	$5
20	☐	Bull Elk	Archery	Cache, South	$5
21	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Cache, South (late)	$5
22	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Cache, North (early)	$5
23	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Central Mountains, Manti (early)	$5
24	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Central Mountains, Manti (late)	$5
25	☐	Bull Elk	Archery	Central Mountains, Manti	$5
26	☐	Bull Elk	Muzzleloader	Central Mountains, Manti	$5
27	☐	Bull Elk	Archery	Central Mountains, Nebo	$5
28	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Central Mountains, Nebo	$5
29	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	La Sal, La Sal Mountains (early)	$5
30	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Mt Dutton (late)	$5
31	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Mt Dutton (early)	$5
32	☐	Bull Elk	Archery	Mt Dutton	$5
33	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Panguitch Lake (early)	$5
34	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits (early)	$5
35	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lakes (early)	$5
36	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake (late)	$5
37	☐	Bull Elk	Archery	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	$5
38	☐	Bull Elk	Muzzleloader	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	$5
39	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	S.W. Desert (early)	$5
40	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	S.W. Desert (late)	$5
41	☐	Bull Elk	Archery	S.W. Desert	$5
42	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	San Juan (early)	$5
43	☐	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Wasatch Mountains (early)	$5
44	☐	Bull Elk	Archery	Wasatch Mountains	$5
45	☐	Bull Elk	Muzzleloader	Wasatch Mountains	$5
46	☐	Pronghorn	Any Weapon	Cache, North Rich	$5
47	☐	Pronghorn	Any Weapon	Mt Dutton/Paunsaugunt	$5
48	☐	Pronghorn	Any Weapon	Plateau	$5
49	☐	Pronghorn	Archery	Plateau	$5
50	☐	Pronghorn	Muzzleloader	Plateau	$5
51	☐	Pronghorn	Any Weapon	San Rafael, North	$5
52	☐	Pronghorn	Any Weapon	West Desert, Riverbed	$5
53	☐	Pronghorn	Any Weapon	SW Desert	$5
54	☐	Bull Moose		Wasatch Mountains	$5
56	☐	Bison		Henry Mountains, Hunter's Choice (early)	$5
58	☐	Bison		Henry Mountains, Cow Only	$5
59	☐	Black Bear		Wasatch Mtns West (Spring)	$5
60	☐	Black Bear		La Sal, La Sal Mountains-Dolores Triangle (Spring)	$5
61	☐	Black Bear		Nine Mine, Anthro-Range Creek (Spring)	$5
62	☐	Black Bear		Bookcliffs (Spring)	$5
63	☐	Black Bear		Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowitz (Spring)	$5
64	☐	Black Bear		Nine Mile (Fall)	$5
65	☐	Black Bear		South Slope Bonanza/Diamond Mtn (Spring)	$5
66	☐	Black Bear		Central Mountains, Manti North (Spring)	$5
67	☐	Black Bear		San Juan (Spring)	$5
68	☐	Cougar		Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek	$5
69	☐	Cougar		Ogden	$5
70	☐	Cougar		Plateau-Boulder	$5
71	☐	Cougar		Cache	$5
72	☐	Cougar		Central Mountains, Nebo	$5
73	☐	Cougar		Central Mountains, Northwest Manti	$5
74	☐	Cougar		Central Mountains, Nebo-West Face	$5
75	☐	Cougar		Pine Valley	$5
76	☐	Cougar		Mt. Dutton	$5
78	☐	Desert Bighorn Sheep		San Rafael, South	$5
79	☐	Rocky Mtn Bighorn Sheep		Box Elder, Newfoundland Mtn.	$5
81	☐	Rocky Mtn Goat		Ogden-Willard Peak (Female Only)	$5
82	☐	Rocky Mtn Goat		Beaver (early)	$5
83	☐	Rocky Mtn Goat		No. Slope/So. Slope, High Uintahs West	$5
85	☐	Turkey		Northern Region	$5
86	☐	Turkey		Northeast Region	$5
87	☐	Turkey		Central Region	$5
88	☐	Turkey		Southern Region	$5
89	☐	Turkey		Southeast Region	$5

WHCE is not responsible for incomplete, missing, or illegible information on this paper application. **TOTAL Amount Due: $** _____

NOTES:

Attachment 4

Convention Funds
Project Approval Cover Sheet

Database No.:
Habitat Project No.:
Billing Agency: DWR

Project Title: David Edwards Fence Project
Region: SRO
Type of Project: Depredation Prevention: Fencing

Organization: Sportsmen for Fish & Wildlife, Inc.
Contact: Byron Bateman
Phone: 801-725-8526 Email: brbateman@comcast.net
Amount: $48,220.00

Division Contact: Scott McFarlane
Phone: 801-538-4776 Email: scottmcfarlane@utah.gov

Project Conditions: Provide funding to construct a big game-proof fence to eliminate big game damage to agricultural fields owned and operated by David Edwards. See attached for additional information regarding the agreement with David Edwards.

SFW Signature: B/C Bateman 7-29-2013
Authorizing Agent Date

DWR Signatures:

N/A
Habitat Section Chief Date

Bill Bates 7/29/13
Wildlife Section Chief Date

ACTING DIRECTOR
Michael F. Canon 7/30/13
Director, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Date

Copy: 1-Database File (Anita) 2-Mail to organization 3-Division Contact

p.2

Convention Funds
Project Approval Cover Sheet

Database No.:
Habitat Project No.:
Billing Agency: DWR

Project Title: David Edwards Fence Project
Region: SRO
Type of Project: Depredation Prevention: Fencing

Organization: Mule Deer Foundation
Contact: Miles Moretti
Phone: 801-747-3344 Email: miles@muledeer.org

Amount: $48,220.00

Division Contact: Scott McFarlane
Phone: 801-538-4776 Email: scottmcfarlane@utah.gov

Project Conditions: Provide funding to construct a big game-proof fence to eliminate big game damage to agricultural fields owned and operated by David Edwards. See attached for additional information regarding the agreement with David Edwards.

MDF Signature:

Authorizing Agent — Date: 7-29-13

DWR Signatures:

N/A
Habitat Section Chief — Date

Wildlife Section Chief — Date: 7/29/13

ACTING DIRECTOR
Director, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources — Date: 7/30/13

Copy: 1-Database File (Anita) 2-Mail to organization 3-Division Contact

Convention Funds
Project Approval Cover Sheet

COPY

Habitat Project No.: 2814
Billing Agency: Direct pay

Project Title:	Youth Outdoor Experience
Region:	SL
Type of Project:	Education

Organization:	Mule Deer Foundation	
Contact:	Miles Moretti	
Phone:	801-747-3344	Email: miles@muledeer.org

Amount: $2,500.00

Division Contact:	Gary Cook	
Phone:	801-538-4719	Email: garycook@utah.gov

Project Conditions: See attached.

MDF Signature:

Authorizing Agent — Date: 8-7-13

DWR Signatures:

Section Chief — Date: 8/7/13

Wildlife Section Chief — Date: 8/13/13

ACTING DIRECTOR

Director, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources — Date: 8/9/13

Copy: 1-Database File (Anita) 2-Mail to organization 3-Division Contact

Convention Funds
Project Approval Cover Sheet

COPY

Habitat Project No.: 2675
Billing Agency: DWR

Project Title: McMillan Springs Phase 2
Region: SE
Type of Project: Habitat

Organization: Mule Deer Foundation
Contact: Miles Moretti
Phone: 801-747-3344 Email: miles@muledeer.org

Amount: $16,500.00 amount to change Pending

Division Contact: Tyler Thompson
Phone: 801-538-4766 Email: tylerthompson@utah.gov

Project Conditions: See attached.

MDF Signature:

Authorizing Agent — Date: 8-7-13

DWR Signatures:

Habitat Section Chief — Date

Wildlife Section Chief — Date

Director, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources — Date

Copy: 1-Database File (Anita) 2-Mail to organization 3-Division Contact

Convention Funds
Project Approval Cover Sheet

COPY

Habitat Project No.: 2808
Billing Agency: DWR

Project Title: Stockton Shrub Planting
Region: CR
Type of Project: Habitat

Organization: Mule Deer Foundation
Contact: Miles Moretti
Phone: 801-747-3344 Email: miles@muledeer.org

Amount: $1,740.77

Division Contact: Tyler Thompson
Phone: 801-538-4766 Email: tylerthompson@utah.gov

Project Conditions: See attached.

MDF Signature:

Authorizing Agent — Date: 8-7-13

DWR Signatures:

Habitat Section Chief — Date: 8/8/13

Wildlife Section Chief — Date: 8/12/13

ACTING DIRECTOR

Director, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources — Date: 8/9/13

Copy: 1-Database File (Anita) 2-Mail to organization 3-Division Contact

Attachment 5

2013 Odds Report

Applicant by Area Statistics					
Species	**Location**	**Type**	**Weapon**	**Applicants**	**Tags Avail.**
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	6871	10
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	Limited Entry	Archery	2832	4
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	Limited Entry	Muzzleloader	3302	4
Buck Deer	Henry Mountains	Premium Limited Entry	Premium Any	8722	1
Buck Deer	Henry Mountains	Premium Limited Entry	Management	4449	2
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Limited Entry	Premium Any	6660	3
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Limited Entry	Premium	2987	2
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Limited Entry	Premium	3360	1
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Limited Entry	Management	2641	1
Buck Deer	San Juan, Elk Ridge	Premium Limited Entry	Any Weapon	4091	1
Buck Deer	South Slope, Diamond Mtn.	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	3064	2
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	5134	5
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Limited Entry	Archery	2025	2
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Limited Entry	Muzzleloader	2554	2
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek - South	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	2824	1
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek - South	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	4253	2
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek - South	Limited Entry	Archery	2042	1
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Little Creek (roadless)	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	2649	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	2580	2
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Limited Entry	Archery	1477	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	1972	1
Bull Elk	Cache, North	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	2115	1
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	4870	6
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	2856	3
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Limited Entry	Archery	2301	4
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Limited Entry	Muzzleloader	2316	2
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Nebo	Limited Entry	Archery	1580	1
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Nebo	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	2515	2
Bull Elk	La Sal, La Sal Mountains	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	2647	1
Bull Elk	Mt. Dutton	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	2449	1
Bull Elk	Mt. Dutton	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	3427	1
Bull Elk	Mt. Dutton	Limited Entry	Archery	1813	1
Bull Elk	Panguitch Lake	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	2729	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	2988	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	3434	3
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	2256	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Limited Entry	Archery	1836	2
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Limited Entry	Muzzleloader	1845	1
Bull Elk	S.W. Desert	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	3149	2
Bull Elk	S.W. Desert	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	2273	2
Bull Elk	S.W. Desert	Limited Entry	Archery	1677	1
Bull Elk	San Juan	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	5067	1

Bull Elk	Wasatch Mountains	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	6482	10
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mountains	Limited Entry	Archery	3001	8
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mountains	Limited Entry	Muzzleloader	3118	5
Pronghorn	Cache, North Rich	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	1216	3
Pronghorn	Mt. Dutton/Paunsaugunt	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	671	1
Pronghorn	Plateau	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	854	2
Pronghorn	Plateau	Limited Entry	Archery	285	1
Pronghorn	Plateau	Limited Entry	Muzzleloader	298	1
Pronghorn	San Rafael, North	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	914	1
Pronghorn	West Desert, Riverbed	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	1135	1
Pronghorn	SW Desert	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	1232	3
Bull Moose	Wasatch Mountains	Once in a Lifetime		5895	1
Bull Moose Non-	Wasatch Mountains	Once in a Lifetime		752	1
Bison	Henry Mountains - Hunters Choice	Once in a Lifetime		5159	1
Bison Non-Resident	Henry Mountains - Hunters Choice	Once in a Lifetime		707	1
Bison	Henry Mountains - Cow Only	Once in a Lifetime		2155	1
Black Bear	Wasatch Mtns West (Spring)	Limited Entry		765	2
Black Bear	La Sal, La Sal Mountains-Dolores	Limited Entry		567	2
Black Bear	Nine Mine, Anthro-Range Creek	Limited Entry		286	1
Black Bear	Bookcliffs (Spring)	Limited Entry		819	1
Black Bear	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowitz (Spring)	Limited Entry		306	1
Black Bear	Nine Mile (fall)	Limited Entry		295	1
Black Bear	S. Slope Bonanza/Diamond Mtn	Limited Entry		336	1
Black Bear	Central Mountains, Manti North	Limited Entry		426	1
Black Bear	San Juan (Spring)	Limited Entry		720	2
Cougar	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek	Limited Entry		460	1
Cougar	Ogden	Limited Entry		321	1
Cougar	Plateau-Boulder	Limited Entry		232	1
Cougar	Cache	Limited Entry		298	1
Cougar	Central Mountains, Nebo	Limited Entry		305	2
Cougar	Central Mountains, Northwest Manti	Limited Entry		344	2
Cougar	Central Mountains, Nebo-West Face	Limited Entry		208	2
Cougar	Pine Valley	Limited Entry		199	1
Cougar	Mt Dutton	Limited Entry		206	1
Desert Bighorn	Zion	Once in a Lifetime		823	1
Desert Bighorn	San Rafel, South	Once in a Lifetime		5056	1
Rocky Mtn.	Box Elder, Newfoundland Mtn.	Once in a Lifetime		5038	1
Rocky Mtn.	Nine Mile, Range Creek	Once in a Lifetime		803	1
Rocky Mtn. Goat	Ogden, Willard Peak (Female Goat	Once in a Lifetime		2328	1
Rocky Mtn. Goat	Beaver (early)	Once in a Lifetime		3563	1
Rocky Mtn. Goat	No. Slope/So. Slope, High Uintahs	Once in a Lifetime		3192	1
Rocky Mtn. Goat	Ogden, Willard Peak (late)	Once in a Lifetime		707	1
Turkey	Northern Region	Public Lands		522	8
Turkey	Northeast Region	Public Lands		403	8
Turkey	Central Region	Public Lands		630	8
Turkey	Southern Region	Public Lands		391	8
Turkey	Southeast Region	Public Lands		257	8

Attachment 6

2013 Convention Permits by Species and Residency

Species	Area	Condition	Res	NonRes	Total
Bison	Henry Mountains	Hunters Choice Early	1	0	1
Bison	Henry Mountains	Hunters Choice Late	0	1	1
Bison	Henry Mountains	Cow Only	1	0	1
Black Bear	Wasatch Mtns West	Spring	1	1	2
Black Bear	La Sal, La Sal Mountains-Dolores Trian	Spring	1	1	2
Black Bear	Nine Mine, Anthro-Range Creek	Spring	1	0	1
Black Bear	Bookcliffs	Spring	1	0	1
Black Bear	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowitz	Spring	1	0	1
Black Bear	Nine Mile	Fall	1	0	1
Black Bear	S. Slope, Bonanza/Diamond Mtn.	Spring	1	0	1
Black Bear	Central Mountains, Manti North	Spring	1	0	1
Black Bear	San Juan	Spring	1	1	2
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	Any Weapon	7	3	10
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	Archery	3	1	4
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	Muzzleloader	3	1	4
Buck Deer	Henry Mountains	Premium Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Deer	Henry Mountains	Management Buck	1	1	2
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Any Weapon	2	1	3
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Archery	1	1	2
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Management Buck	1	0	1
Buck Deer	San Juan, Elk Ridge	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Deer	South Slope, Diamond Mtn.	Any Weapon	1	1	2
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Any Weapon	4	1	5
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Archery	1	1	2
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Muzzleloader	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek-South	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek, South	Any Weapon (early)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek, South	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Little Creek (roadless)	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Any Weapon (early)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, North	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Any Weapon (early)	4	2	6
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Any Weapon (late)	2	1	3
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Archery	2	2	4
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Muzzleloader	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Nebo	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Nebo	Any Weapon	1	1	2
Bull Elk	La Sal, La Sal Mountains	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Mt. Dutton	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Mt. Dutton	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Mt. Dutton	Archery	1	0	1

Bull Elk	Panguitch Lake	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Any Weapon (early)	2	1	3
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Archery	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Bull Elk	S.W. Desert	Any Weapon (early)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	S.W. Desert	Any Weapon (late)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	S.W. Desert	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	San Juan	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mountains	Any Weapon (early)	6	4	10
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mountains	Archery	5	3	8
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mountains	Muzzleloader	3	2	5
Bull Moose	Wasatch Mountains		1	1	2
Cougar	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek		1	0	1
Cougar	Ogden		1	0	1
Cougar	Plateau-Boulder		1	0	1
Cougar	Cache		1	0	1
Cougar	Central Mountain, Nebo		1	1	1
Cougar	Central Mountains, Northwest Manti		1	1	2
Cougar	Central Mountains, Nebo-West Face		1	1	2
Cougar	Pine Valley		1	0	1
Cougar	Mt. Dutton		0	1	1
Desert Bighorn Sheep	Zion		0	1	1
Desert Bighorn Sheep	San Rafael, South		1	0	1
Pronghorn	Cache, North Rich	Any Weapon	2	1	3
Pronghorn	Mt. Dutton/Paunsaugunt	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Pronghorn	Plateau	Archery	1	0	1
Pronghorn	Plateau	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Pronghorn	Plateau	Any Weapon	1	1	2
Pronghorn	San Rafael, North	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Pronghorn	West Desert, Riverbed	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Pronghorn	SW Desert	Any Weapon	2	1	3
Rocky Mtn. Bighorn Sheep	Box Elder, Newfoundland Mtn.		1	0	1
Rocky Mtn. Bighorn Sheep	Nine Mile, Range Creek		0	1	1
Rocky Mtn. Goat	Ogden, Willard Peak (Female Goat Only)		0	1	1
Rocky Mtn. Goat	Beaver (early)		1	0	1
Rocky Mtn. Goat	No. Slope/So. Slope, High Uintahs West		1	0	1
Rocky Mtn. Goat	Ogden, Willard Peak (late)		0	1	1
Turkey	Northern Region		7	1	8
Turkey	Northeast Region		7	1	8
Turkey	Central Region		7	1	8
Turkey	Southern Region		7	1	8
Turkey	Southeast Region		7	1	8
Total			145	55	200

2014 Convention Permits by Species and Residency

Board Approved:

	TOTAL PERMITS		
	Res	NonRes	Total
Grand Total	**141**	**59**	**200**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Bison	Henry Mountains	Hunters Choice Early	1	0	1
Bison	Henry Mountains	Hunters Choice Late (Non Resident Only)	0	1	1
Bison	Henry Mountains	Cow Only Early	1	0	1
Bison	Henry Mountains	Cow Only Late	0	1	1
		TOTAL	**2**	**2**	**4**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Black Bear	Wasatch Mtns West	Spring	1	1	2
Black Bear	La Sal, La Sal Mountains-Dolores Triangle	Spring	1	1	2
Black Bear	Nine Mine, Anthro-Range Creek	Spring	1	0	1
Black Bear	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowitz	Spring	1	0	1
Black Bear	Nine Mile	Fall	1	0	1
Black Bear	S. Slope, Bonanza/Diamond Mtn.	Spring	1	0	1
Black Bear	Central Mountains, Manti North	Spring	1	0	1
Black Bear	San Juan	Spring	1	1	2
		TOTAL	**8**	**3**	**11**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	Any Weapon	7	3	10
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	Archery	3	1	4
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	Muzzleloader	3	1	4
Buck Deer	Fillmore, Oakcreek	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Deer	Henry Mountains	Premium Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Deer	Henry Mountains	Management Buck	1	1	2
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Any Weapon	2	1	3
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Archery	1	1	2
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Management Buck	1	0	1
Buck Deer	San Juan, Elk Ridge	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Deer	South Slope, Diamond Mtn.	Any Weapon	1	1	2
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Any Weapon	4	1	5
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Archery	1	1	2
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Muzzleloader	1	1	2
		TOTAL	**29**	**12**	**41**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek-South	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek, South	Any Weapon (early)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek, South	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek, South	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Little Creek (roadless)	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Any Weapon (early)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, Meadowville	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1

Bull Elk	Cache, North	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Any Weapon (early)	5	2	7
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Any Weapon (late)	3	1	4
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Archery	3	2	5
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Muzzleloader	2	1	3
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Nebo	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Nebo	Any Weapon	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Fillmore, Pahvant	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	La Sal, La Sal Mountains	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	La Sal, La Sal Mountains	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Mt. Dutton	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Mt. Dutton	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Mt. Dutton	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Panguitch Lake	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Panguitch Lake	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Panguitch Lake	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Paunsaugunt	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Any Weapon (early)	2	1	3
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Archery	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Bull Elk	S.W. Desert	Any Weapon (early)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	S.W. Desert	Any Weapon (late)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	S.W. Desert	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	S.W. Desert	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Bull Elk	San Juan	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	San Juan	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	South Slope, Diamond Mountain	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mountains	Any Weapon (early)	5	3	8
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mountains	Any Weapon (late)	3	1	4
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mountains	Archery	6	3	9
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mountains	Muzzleloader	3	2	5
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mountains	Premium Limited Entry, All Weapon Hunts	1	0	1
		TOTAL	**68**	**22**	**90**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Bull Moose	Wasatch Mountains		**1**	**0**	**1**
Bull Moose	Wasatch Mountains	Non Resident Only	0	1	1
		TOTAL	**1**	**1**	**2**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Cougar	Oak Creek, Kamas		1	0	1
Cougar	Ogden		1	0	1
Cougar	Plateau-Boulder		1	1	2
Cougar	Cache		1	0	1
Cougar	Central Mountain, Nebo		1	0	1
Cougar	Central Mountains, Northwest Manti		1	0	1
Cougar	Central Mountains, Nebo-West Face		1	1	2
Cougar	Pine Valley		1	0	1
Cougar	Mt. Dutton		0	1	1
		TOTAL	**8**	**3**	**11**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Desert Bighorn Sheep	Zion	Non Resident Only	0	1	1

Desert Bighorn Sheep	San Rafael, South		1	0	1
		TOTAL	**1**	**1**	**2**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Pronghorn	Cache, North Rich	Any Weapon	3	1	4
Pronghorn	Cache, North Rich	Archery	1	0	1
Pronghorn	Mt. Dutton/Paunsaugunt	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Pronghorn	Plateau	Archery	1	1	2
Pronghorn	Plateau	Muzzleloader	1	1	2
Pronghorn	Plateau	Any Weapon	3	2	5
Pronghorn	Pine Valley	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Pronghorn	San Rafael, North	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Pronghorn	West Desert, Riverbed	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Pronghorn	SW Desert	Any Weapon	2	1	3
		TOTAL	**15**	**6**	**21**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Rocky Mtn. Bighorn Sheep	Box Elder, Newfoundland Mtn.		1	0	1
Rocky Mtn. Bighorn Sheep	Nine Mile, Range Creek	Non Resident Only	0	1	1
		TOTAL	**1**	**1**	**2**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Rocky Mtn. Goat	Ogden, Willard Peak (Female Goat Only)		0	1	1
Rocky Mtn. Goat	Beaver (early)		1	0	1
Rocky Mtn. Goat	Beaver (Female Goat Only)		0	1	1
Rocky Mtn. Goat	No. Slope/So. Slope, High Uintahs West		1	0	1
Rocky Mtn. Goat	Ogden, Willard Peak (early)	Non Resident Only	0	1	1
Rocky Mtn. Goat	Ogden, Willard Peak (late)		1	0	1
		TOTAL	**3**	**3**	**6**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Turkey	Northern Region		1	1	2
Turkey	Northeast Region		1	1	2
Turkey	Central Region		1	1	2
Turkey	Southern Region		1	1	2
Turkey	Southeast Region		1	1	2
		TOTAL	**5**	**5**	**10**

GARY R. HERBERT
Governor
GREGORY S. BELL
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director
Division of Wildlife Resources
GREGORY SHEEHAN
Division Director

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: **August 1, 2013**

TO: **Utah Wildlife Board**

FROM: **Staci Coons, Chair**
Certification Review Committee

RE: **Variance Request from Mr. David Jensen, Wasatch Snake Removal for the possession of rattlesnakes.**

The Certification Review Committee met July 29, 2013, to discuss the above-mentioned variance request to Rule R657-53, for the possession of rattlesnakes.

In attendance were: Bill Bates, Wildlife Section Chief; Roger Wilson, Aquatic Section Chief; Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Chief; Tony Wood, Law Enforcement Chief; Jodee Baker for Robert Rolfs, Department of Health; Bruce King, State Veterinarian, Suzanne McMullin, COR Licensing Specialist; and Staci Coons, Administrative Rules Coordinator.

ANALYSIS

The committee evaluated the merits of the request based on the criteria established by the Wildlife Board in R657-53-11. Based upon the criteria established by the Wildlife Board, the analyses and recommendations of the committee are as follows:

1. **The health, welfare, and safety of the public** - The committee expressed no concerns over health, welfare, and safety of the public.

2. **The health, welfare, safety and genetic integrity of wildlife, domestic livestock, poultry and other animals -** The committee had no significant concerns with impacts on wildlife or domestic animals.

3. **The ecological and environmental impacts -** The committee had no concerns with ecological or environmental impacts.

4. **The suitability of the facilities** - The committee had no significant concerns with the suitability of the facilities.

1594 West North Temple, Suite 2110, PO Box 146301, Salt Lake City, UT 84114-6301
telephone (801) 538-4700 • facsimile (801) 538-4709 • TTY (801) 538-7458 • *www.wildlife.utah.gov*

5. **Experience of the applicant for the proposed activity** - The committee had no concerns regarding the experience of the applicant for the proposed activity.

6. **The ecological and environmental impacts on other states** - The committee had no significant concerns with impacts of this request on other states.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee, after careful evaluation, recommends that the request be approved and that the following stipulations be made part of the Certificate of Registration:

1. The committee recommends approval for Mr. Jensen to remove nuisance rattlesnakes from areas along the Wasatch Front that have the potential to come in contact with the public and to relocate them to other areas.

2. The committee recommends that Mr. Jensen not allow public contact with the rattlesnakes that he relocates. It is rumored that Mr. Jensen would allow photos to be taken with the snake by the homeowners.

3. The committee recommends that the Certificate of Registration issued to Mr. Jensen is not transferable and cannot be sold with the business.

cc: Certification Review Committee Members
Jensen, David, Wasatch Snake Removal

GARY R. HERBERT
Governor
GREGORY S. BELL
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director
Division of Wildlife Resources
GREGORY SHEEHAN
Division Director

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: **August 1, 2013**

TO: **Utah Wildlife Board**

FROM: **Staci Coons, Chair**
Certification Review Committee

RE: **Variance Request from Mr. Tim Rowberry for the personal possession of a Two Toed Sloth.**

The Certification Review Committee met July 29, 2013, to discuss the above-mentioned variance request to Rule R657-53, for the possession of a toe-toed sloth.

In attendance were: Bill Bates, Wildlife Section Chief; Roger Wilson, Aquatic Section Chief; Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Chief; Tony Wood, Law Enforcement Chief; Jodee Baker for Robert Rolfs, Department of Health; Bruce King, State Veterinarian, Suzanne McMullin, COR Licensing Specialist; and Staci Coons, Administrative Rules Coordinator.

ANALYSIS

The committee evaluated the merits of the request based on the criteria established by the Wildlife Board in R657-53-11. Based upon the criteria established by the Wildlife Board, the analyses and recommendations of the committee are as follows:

1. **The health, welfare, and safety of the public** - The committee expressed no concerns over health, welfare, and safety of the public.

2. **The health, welfare, safety and genetic integrity of wildlife, domestic livestock, poultry and other animals -** The committee had no significant concerns with impacts on wildlife or domestic animals.

3. **The ecological and environmental impacts -** The committee had no concerns with ecological or environmental impacts.

4. **The suitability of the facilities** - The committee had concerns with the suitability of the facilities and whether or not Mr. Rowberry could provide the type of environment that the sloth would require to live in Utah. The committee is adding a stipulation to the recommendation that Mr. Rowberry's facilities be approved by the Division prior to purchasing the sloth.

1594 West North Temple, Suite 2110, PO Box 146301, Salt Lake City, UT 84114-6301
telephone (801) 538-4700 • facsimile (801) 538-4709 • TTY (801) 538-7458 • *www.wildlife.utah.gov*

5. **Experience of the applicant for the proposed activity** - The committee understands that Mr. Rowberry has little to no actual experience in raising a two toed sloth, however, the committee has also taken into consideration the inability to gain firsthand experience because of the prohibited status of the species. The committee did not feel that Mr. Rowberry would be in physical danger as he gained hands on experience with the sloth.

6. **The ecological and environmental impacts on other states** - The committee had no significant concerns with impacts of this request on other states.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee, after careful evaluation, recommends that the request be approved with the following stipulations:

1. The committee recommends that appropriate documentation be provided to both the Division of Wildlife Resources and the US Fish and Wildlife Service proving the sloth purchased is captive-bred and legally acquired from a reputable dealer.

2. The committee recommends that Mr. Rowberry's COR be limited to the possession of one sloth. In the event that the sloth does not acclimate to the new climate, Mr. Rowberry would be required to petition the Certification Review Committee again before a new sloth could be obtained.

3. The committee further recommends that the Certificate of Registration issued to Mr. Rowberry prohibit the breeding and selling of offspring.

4. The committee recommends that Mr. Rowberry also obtain approval from the Salt Lake County Animal Control Agency prior to the possession of the sloth.

5. The committee recommends that a Health Certificate from the Department of Agriculture be issued from the originating state of purchase and that a test for both internal and external parasites be completed.

6. The committee expressed significant concerns about the environment that would be required for a sloth to live. The Utah desert does not offer the humidity or steady temperature that a sloth would require, therefore, the committee recommends that Mr. Rowberry's facilities be approved by the Division prior to purchasing a sloth. In addition, any outside enclosure must be fully enclosed to protect the sloth from other animals.

cc: Certification Review Committee Members
Tim Rowberry

MARTIN B. BUSHMAN # 5594
Assistant Attorney General
GREGORY B. HANSEN # 13731
Assistant Attorney General
UTAH ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
1594 West North Temple, Suite 2110
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114
Telephone : (801) 538-4703

BEFORE THE UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF THE PRIVILEGES OF **Jose L. Garcia** TO HUNT IN THE STATE OF UTAH	:	**STIPULATION AND ORDER** Case No. 2011-000980

The DIVISION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES ("Division") and JOSE L. GARCIA ("Petitioner") as evidenced by their signatures to this Stipulation agree as follows:

1. Petitioner admits the jurisdiction of the Division over him and over the subject matter of this action.

2. Petitioner acknowledges that he enters into this Stipulation voluntarily and other than that which is contained in this Stipulation, no promise or threat whatsoever has been made by the Division, or any member, officer, agent or representative of the Division to induce him to enter into this Stipulation.

3. Petitioner acknowledges he has been informed of his right to be represented by legal counsel and has voluntarily chosen not to pursue legal representation in this matter.

4. Petitioner has been afforded the opportunity to read this Stipulation, to seek clarification from the Division, and to seek counsel from a legal advisor; and Petitioner

acknowledges that he knowingly executes this Stipulation fully understanding its terms, conditions and consequences.

5. Petitioner acknowledges and understands that any suspension of hunting privileges imposed in this Stipulation is given reciprocal recognition in other states participating in the Interstate Wildlife Violator Compact.

6. Petitioner understands that he is entitled to a formal hearing before the Utah Wildlife Board, at which time he may present to the Board evidence on his behalf, present his own witnesses, and confront adverse witnesses. Petitioner acknowledges that by executing this document he waives his right to: (1) a hearing before the Board; (2) present evidence on his behalf; (3) present his own witnesses; and (4) confront adverse witnesses, together with such other rights as to which he may be entitled in connection with said hearing.

7. Petitioner understands and agrees that by executing this Stipulation he waives his rights to further administrative and judicial review.

8. Petitioner admits as follows:

a. For the entirety of the year 2011, Petitioner's primary residence was in California, his family lived in that primary residence, and he intended to make the California residence his permanent home.

b. In 2011, Petitioner purchased California Resident permits for bear, two permits for deer, a California hunting license, and a California Upland Bird Stamp.

c. In 2011, Petitioner also purchased a Utah Resident Control Antlerless Elk permit (#133100038), a Utah Resident Buck Deer permit (#825142), and a Utah Resident Combination license (#497153078).

d. Petitioner knew that he qualified as a resident of California, yet he intentionally purchased resident licenses and hunting permits in Utah.

d. On October 26, 2011, Petitioner and four other individuals were hunting near Grassy Lake, Sanpete County, Utah.

e. Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Investigator Schlappi and Conservation Officer Topham located Petitioner and his hunting party at their camp and found two 2-point buck deer in their possession.

f. Petitioner intentionally took at least one of the buck deer found in his possession by Utah Division of Wildlife Resources law enforcement personnel.

g. Petitioner unlawfully obtained a Utah Resident hunting license and permit because he was actually a resident of California.

h. Petitioner unlawfully took and possessed protected wildlife because his associated permit was invalid.

i. On January 27, 2012, Petitioner pleaded guilty in the Sixth District Court of Sanpete County, State of Utah (Case No. 111600139) to Wanton Destruction of Protected Wildlife, in violation of Utah Code Section 23-20-4, a Class A Misdemeanor, and Fraudulently Obtaining a License, Permit, Tag, or Certificate of Registration, in violation of Utah Code Section 23-19-5, a Class B Misdemeanor.

j. A Notice of Agency Action was issued to Petitioner via certified mail on February 22, 2012, notifying him of the Division's intent to initiate suspension proceedings against his hunting privileges based on his wildlife violations.

k. At Petitioner's request, the Division conducted an informal administrative hearing on May 2, 2012 at Petitioner's request. Petitioner participated in the hearing via telephone, but did not have counsel present. Petitioner was afforded the opportunity to present evidence and to controvert the Division's evidence on the issue of suspension. Interpreters were used in order to translate between English and Spanish.

l. The Division issued a Decision and Order on May 22, 2012, ordering the suspension of Petitioner's big game hunting license and permit privileges for a period of five (5) years, effective from May 3, 2012 until May 2, 2017.

m. Petitioner appealed the Division's Decision and Order to the Wildlife Board on June 14, 2012.

9. Petitioner acknowledges that the acts admitted in paragraph 8 were committed knowingly, intentionally, or recklessly and they constitute violations of the Wildlife Code to

which he pleaded guilty. Accordingly, a basis exists under Utah Code § 23-19-9 for the Division to suspend Petitioner's big game hunting privileges in Utah.

10. Based on the acts admitted in paragraphs 8 and 9, Petitioner accepts and agrees to the following terms and conditions:

a. **Petitioner's big game license and permit privileges are suspended for One Thousand Three Hundred Sixty-Nine (1,369) days, beginning May 3, 2012 and ending January 31, 2016.** The remaining Four Hundred Fifty-Eight (458) days of suspension imposed in the Division's May 2, 2012 Decision and Order are set aside and vacated.

b. During the period of suspension, Petitioner may not hunt big game, apply for, obtain, or attempt to obtain any permit or license issued for taking big game. Any licenses or permits obtained by Petitioner in violation of this Stipulation and Order are invalid.

c. During the period of suspension, Petitioner may not apply for, obtain, or attempt to obtain any big game bonus points or preference points issued through the big game drawings. Any big game bonus points or preference points obtained during the period of suspension are invalid.

d. Petitioner shall immediately surrender to the Division of Wildlife Resources any license, permit or tag currently held in his possession that is suspended by virtue of this Stipulation and Order.

e. Any subsequent violation that occurs within the period of suspension may result in a doubled suspension period imposed consecutively with any existing unexpired suspension period, and may further result in the suspension of all hunting and fishing privileges.

f. The suspension imposed in this Stipulation and Order are reciprocally recognized in all states participating in the Interstate Wildlife Violator Compact, including Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, and Wyoming.

11. Petitioner acknowledges that, in the event he is unable to read English, this agreement has been interpreted and fully explained in Spanish by an individual fluent in both English and Spanish, and that he understands the Stipulation's contents.

12. This agreement, upon approval by the Wildlife Board, shall be the final compromise and settlement of this matter. Petitioner acknowledges the Wildlife Board is not required to accept the terms of this Stipulation, and if the Wildlife Board does not do so, this Stipulation and the representations contained herein shall be null and void, except that the Division and Petitioner waive any claim of bias or prejudgment they might have regarding the Wildlife Board by virtue of it having reviewed this Stipulation.

13. Petitioner acknowledges that this Stipulation, once accepted by the Wildlife Board, will be classified by the Division as a "public" record under the Utah Governmental Records Access Management Act.

14. This document constitutes the entire agreement between the parties and supersedes and cancels any and all prior negotiations, representations, understandings or agreements between the parties. There are no verbal agreements which modify, interpret, construe or affect this Stipulation and Order.

CERTIFICATION

I, Maura Garcia, can read, write, and speak English and Spanish fluently. I have read the foregoing Stipulation and fully understand its contents, restrictions, and ramifications. I understand how to translate the contents, restrictions, and ramifications into Spanish. I certify that I have accurately translated the Stipulation in its entirety from English into Spanish, provided the Spanish translation to Petitioner, and answered all language interpretation questions he may have regarding the terms and conditions of the Stipulation. Petitioner fully understands the Stipulation's contents, restrictions, and ramifications.

Sworn this 11 day of June, 2013

Maura Garcia
Name (printed)

Signature

ORDER

The above Stipulation in the matter of JOSE L. GARCIA, which is approved by the Division of Wildlife Resources, constitutes the Wildlife Board's Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in this matter. The terms and conditions of the Stipulation are incorporated herein and constitute the Wildlife Board's final Order in this case.

DATED this 11 day of June, 2013.

DEL BRADY, Chairman
Utah Wildlife Board

DIVISION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES:

TONY WOOD DWR Operations Captain	DATE	GREGORY B. HANSEN Assistant Attorney General Counsel for the Division	DATE

PETITIONER:

X José García León 6-11-13

JOSE L. GARCIA — DATE

Petitioner