

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

December 9, 2016, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

The Board Meeting will stream live at <https://youtu.be/WP--dIvvfb4>

Friday, December 9, 2016 – 9:00 am

- | | |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda
– John Bair, Chairman | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
– John Bair, Chairman | ACTION |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log
– Kirk Woodard, Vice-Chair | CONTINGENT |
| 4. DWR Update
– Greg Sheehan, DWR Director | INFORMATION |
| 5. Elk Unit Management Plan Revisions
– Justin Shannon, Big Game Coordinator | ACTION |
| 6. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2017 Season Dates, Application Timeline
– Justin Shannon, Big Game Coordinator | ACTION |
| 7. Preference Point System Amendments
– Lindy Varney, Licensing Specialist | ACTION |
| 8. NER Deer Management Plans
– Randall Thacker, Northeastern Region Asst. Wildlife Manager | ACTION |
| 9. CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2017
– Covy Jones, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator | ACTION |
| 10. Landowner Association Permit Number for 2017
– Covy Jones, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator | ACTION |
| 11. Other Business
– John Bair, Chairman | CONTINGENT |

Wildlife Board Motions

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

Fall 2016 - Target Date – Impacts of lead poisoning

MOTION: To add a provision into R657-19, Taking of Non-Game Mammals, for proper disposal of non-game mammals shot with lead ammunition as proposed by Derris Jones in the Southeast RAC and report back to the Board at a later time.

Motion made by: Mike King
Assigned to: Kim Hershey
Action: Under Study
Status: To be addressed with the
Placed on Action Log: March 5, 2015

Spring 2017 - Target Date – Youth hunts on WMA's

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a listing of state youth hunts, their restrictions and preclusions on WMA's and the feasibility of closing these areas during youth hunts. The findings will be presented at the next upland game meeting.

Motion made by: Byron Bateman
Assigned to: Jason Robinson
Action: Under Study
Status:
Placed on Action Log: August 27, 2015

Spring 2017 - Target Date – Order of the Turkey Hunts

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to look into the possibility of changing the order in which turkey hunts are held so that they have a greater benefit for youth hunters. Also to review the possibility of eliminating the Limited Entry Turkey draw and replacing it with over-the-counter permit sales. The findings will be presented at the next upland game meeting.

Motion made by: Byron Bateman
Assigned to: Jason Robinson
Action: Under Study
Status:
Placed on Action Log: September 1, 2016

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

September 29, 2016, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City,
Utah

Thursday, September 29, 2016 9:00 a.m.

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Motion to Dismiss – Duane Ward – Time Certain 1:00 pm
– Martin Bushman, Asst. Attorney General | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Agenda
– John Bair, Chairman | ACTION |
| 3. Approval of Minutes
– John Bair, Chairman | ACTION |
| 4. Old Business/Action Log
– Kirk Woodward, Vice-Chair | CONTINGENT |
| 5. DWR Update
– Gregory Sheehan, DWR Director | INFORMATION |
| 6. Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13
– Randy Oplinger, Coldwater Sport Fisheries Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 7. OIAL Archery Hunt Strategies
– Utah Bowman’s Association | INFORMATION |
| 8. Lake Powell Management Plan
– Richard Hepworth, Aquatics Manager | ACTION |
| 9. Conservation Permit Annual Report
– Dax Mangus, Wildlife Manager | ACTION |
| 10. Conservation Permit Audit
– Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief | ACTION |
| 11. CRC Recommendations – Sunset Shrimp Farm and Mere Shrimp Farms
– Staci Coons, Certification Review Committee Chairman | ACTION |
| 12. 2017 RAC/Board Dates
– Staci Coons, Wildlife Board Coordinator | ACTION |
| 13. Wildlife Board Stipulation – Aram W. Barsch Von-Benedikt
– Greg Hansen, Asst. Attorney General | ACTION |
| 14. Other Business
– John Bair, Chairman <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Winter WAFWA | CONTINGENT |

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
September 29, 2016, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Summary of Motions

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

The following motion was made by Mike King, seconded by Donnie Hunter, and approved unanimously.

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

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

The following motion was made by Kirk Woodward, seconded by Byron Bateman, and approved unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the minutes from the September 1, 2016 Wildlife Board Meeting as presented.

3) Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Kirk Woodward, seconded by Byron Bateman, and approved unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the catch and kill regulation on walleye in Echo Reservoir effective immediately.

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Steve Dalton. The motion failed with two in favor (Byron Bateman and Steve Dalton) and three opposed (Kirk Woodward, Donnie Hunter, and Mike King).

MOTION: I move that we accept the 2-day possession limit on Strawberry Reservoir.

The following motion was made by Kirk Woodward, seconded by Byron Bateman, and passed 4:1 (Mike King opposed).

MOTION: I move that we allow fishing in Utah Lake tributaries but keep it closed to the take of walleye.

The following motion was made by Steve Dalton, seconded by Mike King, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Division's proposals

as presented.

- 4) Lake Powell Management Plan (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Mike King, seconded by Kirk Woodward, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's proposal as presented.

- 5) Conservation Permit Annual Report (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Byron Bateman, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's proposal as presented.

- 6) CRC Recommendations – Sunset Shrimp Farm and Mere Shrimp Farms (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Donnie Hunter, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept all four variance requests as presented.

- 7) Motion to Dismiss – Duane Ward – Time Certain 1:00 pm (**Action**)

Adjudicative Proceeding. Written order will follow.

- 8) Conservation Permit Audit (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Steve Dalton, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's proposal as presented, with emphasis on sending a letter to the Conservation groups reminding them of deadlines.

- 9) 2017 RAC/Board Dates (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Mike King, seconded by Steve Dalton, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the dates for the 2017 RAC and Board meetings.

- 10) Wildlife Board Stipulation – Aram W. Barsch Von-Benedikt (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Steve Dalton, seconded by Donnie Hunter, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's proposal as presented.

DRAFT

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
September 29, 2016, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
http://wildlife.utah.gov/public_meetings/board_minutes/audio/29-09-16.mp3

Wildlife Board Members Present

John Bair – Chair
Kirk Woodward – Vice Chair
Greg Sheehan - Exec Sec
Calvin Crandall - Excused
Byron Bateman
Donnie Hunter
Steve Dalton
Mike King

Division Personnel Present

Staci Coons	Anita Candelaria	Jason Vernon
Jamie Martell	Heather Sheldon	Ben Nadolski
Randy Oplinger	Justin Shannon	Dax Mangus
Drew Cushing	Judi Tutorow	Tom Smart
Paul Gedge	Lindy Varney	Martin Bushman
Amy Canning	Scott White	Mike Styler
Justin Dolling	Monson Shaver	
Karen Caldwell	Greg Hansen	
Kenny Johnson	Justin Hartley	

RAC Chairs Present

Bryce Thurgood
Richard Hansen
Dan Abeyta
Chris Wood
Richard Hepworth

Public Present

Doug Cloward – Scofield
Homeowners Association
Ron Dunn – Strawberry Anglers
Association
John Schultz – Utah Anglers
Coalition
Steven Smoot – Mere Shrimp Farms
Mikhail Afendikov – Mere Shrimp
Farms
Ken Strong – SFW
Ben Lowder – UBA
Troy Justensen – SFW
Duane Ward

Chairman Bair called the meeting to order and welcomed the audience.

- 1) Approval of Agenda (**Action**) **00:00:0—00:05:13 of 03:12:14**

The following motion was made by Mike King, seconded by Donnie Hunter, and passed

unanimously.

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

- 2) Approval of Minutes (**Action**) 00:05:20—00:05:34 of 03:12:14

The following motion was made by Kirk Woodward, seconded by Byron Bateman, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the minutes from the September 1, 2016 meeting as presented.

- 3) Old Business/Action Log (**Contingent**) 00:05:44—00:08:56 of 03:12:14

Kirk Woodward asked when the Board was going to review the action log item regarding lead ammo. The Division will look into research being done in other states and prepare a presentation for an upcoming meeting.

- 4) DWR Update (**Information**) 00:09:12—00:11:19 of 03:12:14

Greg informed the Board that the Division just hit their 100th completion of the cutthroat slam. Over \$14,000 was raised and over 700 people participated. He gave a shout out to Trout Unlimited for their help.

- 5) Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 (**Action**) 00:11:40—01:56:27 of 03:12:14

Randy Oplinger, the Coldwater Sport Fisheries Program Coordinator, presented the Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 to the Board.

Board/RAC Questions: 00:29:37—00:38:32 of 03:12:14

John Bair asked Randy what he meant by “fix Scofield reservoir.” He also asked why DWR is only going to study using corn as bait, since Utah is the only state in the West who does not currently allow using corn as bait.

Donnie Hunter commented that we have good, clean waters and we need to make sure that we don't hurt our world class fishing. He said that he remembers when using corn as bait was legal, and it was very dirty.

Kirk Woodward asked about the seasonal limit change on the Monroe lakes, and wanted to know what the increase was in the number of anglers this year compared to last year.

Mike King wanted to know if there were other waters in the state that would fit into the same situation. He was also curious about the proposal about the perch eyes and parts, and wondered why eyes were separated from parts.

Public Questions: 00:38:46—00:38:51 of 03:12:14

Public questions were taken at this time.

RAC Recommendations: 00:38:58—00:47:47 of 03:12:14

NRO—They recommend the Wildlife Board accept the 2017-2018 Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 as presented, with the exception of allowing a 2-day possession on Strawberry passed with 5 in favor and 4 against.

NERO—The motion to approve the 2017-2018 Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 as presented passed unanimously.

CRO—The motion to treat Scofield Reservoir passed 5:2.

SRO—The motion to accept the proposal as presented, but to open Utah Lake Tributaries to year round fishing and add the 2-day possession limit at Strawberry passed 7:1.

SERO—The motion to approve the 2017-2018 Fishing Guidebook and Rule 657-13 as presented passed unanimously.

The motion to make Scofield Reservoir an action log item for the Wildlife Board to request that action be taken passed unanimously.

The motion to do away with the seasonal closure on the Utah Lake Tributaries passed 7:1.

The motion to pass the rest of the Fishing Regulations as presented by the DWR passed 7-0 with one abstention.

Public Comments: 00:47:53—1:03:35 of 03:12:14

Public comments were taken at this time.

Board Discussion: 01:03:38—01:56:27 of 03:12:14

The Board discussed adding Scofield Reservoir to the action log, and then requested that the Division provide an update in Spring 2017.

Chairman Bair reviewed the comments and recommendations.

The following motion was made by Kirk Woodward, seconded by Byron Bateman, and approved unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the catch and kill regulation on walleye

in Echo Reservoir, effective immediately.

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, and seconded by Steve Dalton. The motion failed with two in favor (Byron Bateman and Steve Dalton) and three opposed (Kirk Woodward, Donnie Hunter, and Mike King).

MOTION: I move that we accept the 2-day possession limit on Strawberry Reservoir.

The following motion was made by Kirk Woodward, seconded by Byron Bateman, and passed 4:1 (Mike King opposed).

MOTION: I move that we allow fishing in Utah Lake tributaries but keep it closed to the take of walleye.

The following motion was made by Steve Dalton, seconded by Mike King, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Division's proposals as presented.

6) OIAL Archery Hunt Strategies (**Information**) 01:57:10—02:32:18 of 03:12:14

Ben Lowder, from the Utah Bowman's Association, presented an archery only once in a lifetime proposal to the Board.

Board/RAC Questions: 02:08:17—02:16:35 of 03:12:14

The Board asked if Justin Shannon could create a proposal, specifically the second bullet point in Ben's PowerPoint Presentation "Why exchange the permit, just purchase an extended permit and extend the seasons," and add it to the recommendations this fall.

Public Comments: 02:16:38—02:19:11 of 03:12:14

Public comments were taken at this time.

7) Lake Powell Management Plan (**Action**) 02:32:37—02:44:45 of 03:12:14

Richard Hepworth, the Aquatics Manager for the Southern Region, presented the Lake Powell Management Plan to the Board

Board/RAC Questions: 02:39:45-02:42:33 of 03:12:14

Mike King asked about the evaluation with the Redear Sunfish and Bluegill.

Public Questions: 02:42:34—02:42:35 of 03:12:14

Public questions were taken at this time.

RAC Recommendations: 02:42:47—02:43:17 of 03:12:14

SRO, SERO—The motion to accept the Lake Powell Fishery Management Plan as presented passed unanimously.

Public Comments: 02:43:27—02:44:07 of 03:12:14

Public comments were taken at this time.

Board Discussion: 02:44:12—02:44:45 of 03:12:14

Chairman Bair reviewed the comments and recommendations.

The following motion was made by Mike King, seconded by Kirk Woodward, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's proposal as presented.

8) Conservation Permit Annual Report (**Action**) 02:45:02—03:00:37 of 03:12:14

Dax Mangus, the Wildlife Program Manager in the Northeastern Region, presented the conservation permit annual report to the Board.

Board/RAC Questions: 02:53:28—02:58:38 of 03:12:14

John asked why he thinks that Utah permits sell so well.

Public Comments: 02:58:58—03:00:07

Public comments were taken at this time.

Board Discussion: 03:00:12—03:00:37 of 03:12:14

Chairman Bair reviewed the comments and recommendations.

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Byron Bateman, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's proposal as presented.

9) CRC Recommendations – Sunset Shrimp Farm and Mere Shrimp Farms (**Action**)

03:01:07—03:10:37 of 03:12:14

Staci Coons, the Certification Review Committee Chairman, presented the CRC recommendations to the Board.

Board/RAC Questions: 03:05:54—03:10:10 of 03:12:14

John commended Mere Shrimp Farms on their work.

Board Discussion: 03:10:11—03:10:37 of 03:12:14

Chairman Bair reviewed the comments and recommendations.

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Donnie Hunter, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept all four variance requests as presented.

10) Motion to Dismiss – Duane Ward (Action) **00:00:00—00:15:51 of 00:15:51**

Martin Bushman, Assistant Attorney General, presented information on Duane Ward's hunting privileges to the Board. Because the appeal was filed untimely, the Wildlife Board does not have jurisdiction. Mr. Ward's written notice of appeal was received five days after the deadline.

Board Questions: 00:13:34—00:14:54 of 00:15:51

Kirk asked about the date on the actual letter.

Board Discussion: 00:14:55—00:15:46 of 00:15:51

Adjudicative proceeding. Written order will follow.

11) Conservation Permit Audit (Action) **00:00:00—00:21:42 of 37:34**

Kenny Johnson, the Administrative Services Section Chief, presented the proposed fees to the Board.

Board/RAC Questions: 00:05:52—00:19:29 of 37:34

Byron Bateman had a comment about checks that had not cleared the bank, and wanted to make sure that these groups are following the guidelines. He suggested that the interest be standardized among all the groups. Kirk Woodward commented that it might be a good idea to change the rule regarding interest accrued on those accounts.

Public Questions: 00:19:30-00:19:40 of 37:34

Public questions were taken at this time.

Public Comments: 00:19:54—00:20:38 of 37:34

Public comments were taken at this time.

Board Discussion: 00:20:42—00:21:42 of 37:34

Chairman Bair reviewed the comments and recommendations.

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Steve Dalton, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's proposal as presented, with emphasis on sending a letter to the Conservation groups reminding them of deadlines.

12) 2017 RAC/Board Dates (Action) 00:22:22—00:28:42 of 37:34

Staci Coons, the Wildlife Board Coordinator, proposed the 2017 RAC/Board dates to the Board.

The following motion was made by Mike King, seconded by Steve Dalton, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the dates for the 2017 RAC and Board meetings.

13) Wildlife Board Stipulation – Aram W. Barsch Von-Benedikt (Action) 00:29:00—00:34:02 of 37:34

Greg Hansen, the Assistant Attorney General, presented the proposed stipulation for Aram W. Barsch Von-Benedikt.

Board Questions: 00:31:35—00:33:41 of 37:34

John Bair asked how much of the suspension was being reduced. He also asked how many non-residents are caught hunting on resident permits.

Board Discussion: 00:33:42—00:34:02 of 37:34

Chairman Bair reviewed the comments and recommendations.

The following motion was made by Steve Dalton, seconded by Donnie Hunter, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's proposal as presented.

14) Other Business (**Information**) 00:35:45—00:37:34 of 37:34

Winter WAFWA – Jan 5-8th, 2016 in Litchfield Park in Arizona.

Meeting adjourned.

DRAFT

Regional Advisory Council Meetings
November 2016

Summary of Motions

Elk Unit Management Plan Revisions

CRO: Motion: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented
Motion Passes: 8 to 2

NRO, SERO:

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Elk Unit Plan Revisions as presented.
Motion Passes- Unanimous

SRO: Motion: To accept the Elk Unit Management Plans Revision as presented.
Amendment To Motion: To add stronger language in the Southern Region plans to address elk depredation on private lands upon the private landowner's request.
Amendment Passes: 8:5
Motion Passes: Unanimous

NERO: Motion: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented
Motion Passes: 6 in favor with 1 abstention

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2017 Season Dates, Application Timeline

CRO: Motion: To accept the recommendation proposed by the SFW, Utah Bowman's Association, Mule Deer Foundation and Rocky Mountain Elk Foundations to add OIAL archery hunts and extend the Division's proposal of a seven day archery only opportunity for OIAL hunts.
Motion Passes: unanimously

Motion: To keep the late season muzzleloader hunt on the Plateau Boulder/Kaiparowits
Motion Passes: 7 to 3

Motion: To remove the points and eliminate the 50% bonus hunt on management buck deer units for youth.

Motion Fails: 4 to 6 (Kristofer, Ron, Larry, George) (Christine, Danny, Ken, Ben, Matt, Karl)

Motion: Put the youth management point problem on an action item for the board to review.
Motion Passes: unanimously

Motion: To accept the remainder of the Division's proposals as presented.
Motion Passes: unanimously

NRO: Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Division's recommendations with the addition of UBA's 2017, OIAL archery hunt recommendation season dates.

Motion Fails- For: 5 Against: 6

Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept UBA, OIAL archery only Sheep hunt recommendations and season dates.

Motion Passes- For: 9 Against :1

Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Division's recommendation as presented with the exception of the 7 day archery extension for OIAL Sheep and eliminate the extra Limited Entry Bull Elk hunts during the spike season

Motion Fails- For :3 Against: 7

Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Division's recommendation as presented with the exception of the 7 day archery extension for OIAL Sheep.

Motion Passes- For: 8 Against: 2

Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board allow unsuccessful youth elk hunters to hunt during the general season elk hunt.

Motion Passes: Unanimous

SRO: Motion: To accept the Bucks, Bulls, & OIAL 2017 Season Dates, Application Timeline as presented with the exception of adding the UBA proposal (see attachment 3).

Amendment To Motion: To keep the muzzle loader limited entry buck deer hunt on the Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits.

Amendment Passes: Unanimous

Motion Passes: Unanimous

SERO: Motion: To ask the Wildlife Board, as an action log item, to direct the Division to devise a solution for Dedicated Hunters whose children draw hunting permits for a different unit

Motion Passes: unanimously

Motion: To accept the Division's proposal for the Henry Mountain management buck hunt

Motion Passes: 8-1

Motion: To leave the limited-entry Boulder/Kaiparowits muzzleloader hunt unchanged from 2016, with dates conforming to 2017

Motion Passes: **unanimously**

Motion: To reject the Division's proposed seven-day archery extension for OIAL hunts

Failed for lack of a second

Motion: To accept the Division's proposed seven-day archery extension for OIAL hunts

Motion Passes: 5-3

Motion: To accept the remaining proposed bucks, bulls and OIAL 2017 season dates and application timeline as presented

Motion Passes: unanimously

NERO: Motion to accept as presented with the exception of 6 new hunts, OIAL archery 7 day extension, Diamond Mountain boundary change and extended archery boundary change

Motion Passes: unanimously

Motion: to accept 6 new additional hunts from UBA

Motion Passes: Unanimously

Motion: to accept 7 day OIAL archery extension

Motion Passes: 5 to 1

Motion: to accept Diamond Mountain boundary change meeting

Motion Passes: unanimously

Motion: to accept a change on Extend archery boundary

Motion Passes: unanimously

Preference Point System Amendments

CRO: Motion: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented.

Motion Passes: 7 to 3

NRO, SERO, NERO:

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Preference Point System Amendments as presented.

Motion Passes: Unanimous

SRO: Motion: To accept the Preference Point System Amendment as presented.

Motion Passes: 11:2

NER Deer Management Plans

CRO, NRO, SRO, SERO:

Motion: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented.

Motion Passes: unanimously

NERO:

Motion: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented.

Motion Passes: 5-1

CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2017

CRO, NRO, SERO, NERO:

Motion: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented

Motion Passes: unanimously

SRO:

Motion: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented

Motion Passes: unanimously with one abstention

Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017

CRO, NRO, SERO, NERO:

Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017 as presented.

Motion Passes- Unanimous

SRO:

Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017 as presented.

Motion Passes- Unanimous with one abstention

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Junior High School
189 S 1470 E, Springville
November 10, 2016 @ 6:30 p.m.

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda

MOTION: To accept the agenda as written
Passed unanimously

Approval of Minutes

MOTION: To accept the minutes as written
Passed unanimously

Elk Unit Management Plan Revisions

MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented
Passed 8 to 2

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2017 Season Dates, Application Timeline

MOTION: To accept the recommendation proposed by the SFW, Utah Bowman's Association, Mule Deer Foundation and Rocky Mountain Elk Foundations to add OIAL archery hunts and extend the Division's proposal of a seven day archery only opportunity for OIAL hunts.
Passed unanimously

MOTION: To keep the late season muzzleloader hunt on the Plateau Boulder/Kaiparowits
Passed 7 to 3

MOTION: To remove the points and eliminate the 50% bonus hunt on management buck deer units for youth.
Failed 4 to 6 (Kristofer, Ron, Larry, George) (Christine, Danny, Ken, Ben, Matt, Karl)

MOTION: Put the youth management point problem on an action item for the board to review.
Passed unanimously

MOTION: To accept the remainder of the Division's proposals as presented.
Passed unanimously

Preference Point System Amendments

MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented.
Passed 7 to 3

NER Deer Management Plans

MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented.
Passed unanimously

CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2017

MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously

Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017

MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Junior High School
189 S 1470 E, Springville
November 10, 2016 @ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Ron Camp, Sportsmen
Matt Clark, Sportsmen
Larry Fitzgerald, Agriculture
George Garcia, Forest Service
Karl Hirst, Sportsmen, Vice Chair
Richard Hansen, At large, Chair
Ben Lowder, At Large
Kristofer Marble, At large
Danny Potts, Non-consumptive
Christine Schmitz, Non-consumptive
Kenneth Strong, Sportsmen

Members Absent

Michael Gates, BLM - excused
Greg McPhie, Elected - excused
Jacob Steele, Native American
Alan White, Agriculture

Others Present

Jason Vernon, CRO Reg Supervisor

-
- 1) **Approval of the Agenda and Minutes (Action)**
- **Richard Hansen, RAC Chair**

VOTING

Motion was made by Ken Strong to approve the agenda as written
Seconded by Karl Hirst
Passed unanimously

Motion was made by Kris Marble to approve the minutes as written
Seconded by Ron Camp
Passed unanimously

- 2) **Regional Update (Information)**
- **Jason Vernon, Central Regional Supervisor**

Wildlife

* With the hunt over our biologists are now focusing on deer classifications which will occur now through mid - December. We would invite the RAC members to ride along with the biologists as they do the classifications.

* The pheasant hunt began last Saturday and runs through Sunday November 20. The Division will be releasing pheasants every week throughout the region. We would invite the RAC members to call our biologists to participate on the releases. The Division does have a pheasant release area map on its webpage that indicates the locations the pheasants are released.

* The deer hunt ended last week and we are starting to compile some of the data collected from the deer check stations. Overall it was a good deer hunt and the information from check stations indicates that more mature bucks were taken this year as compared to past years. Additionally – more mature bucks were coming through the check stations and it appears the herds are largely going into the winter very healthy.

Habitat

- * This is the time of the year they are spending all of their time implementing the habitat improvement projects. Beyond the projects they have identified they continue to work on wildfire restoration projects to restore wildlife habitat on this year's wildfires.
- * Also spending time completing work on planned restoration projects including placing guzzlers across the region.

Aquatics

- * Yuba working group has been formulated and will be meeting on Nov 30. The primary topics of discussion will be the management plan update, reservoir operation information and what future work could be accomplished.
- * Final rotenone treatment for Mill Creek Rotenone Treatment was completed in early September. Bonneville Cutthroat Trout will be stock in the lower portion of Mill Creek on Nov 15. There will be about 9,000 2-3 inch fish stocked.
- * Close to 1.7 million fish have been stocked in Strawberry this year
 - * 340,000 rainbows (8-inch avg) this fall
 - * 400,000 Kokanee salmon (3-inch avg) this fall
 - * 970,000 cutthroats were stocked last spring
 - * 650,000 8-inch cutthroats were stocked last spring
 - * 320,000 4-inch cutthroats were stocked this fall

Outreach

- * Hired Chante Lundskog as our new wildlife recreation specialist (replacing Tonya Kieffer. Chante will be focusing her time on community fish ponds, walk in access and some of the watchable wildlife opportunities in the central region.

3) Elk Unit Management Plan Revisions (Action) - Justin Shannon, Big Game Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Larry – Is there an actual set number of elk we are talking about in the State of Utah? And how are you setting your numbers? Justin – Are you asking the population objective? Larry – Yes, are you doing away with the population objective number? Justin – No, for every unit we have, we put that objective on there? Is your question what would be the new statewide objective?

Larry – I'm leading up to another question. You set these numbers years ago and tried to hold the elk to a certain population number but how are you going to set these population numbers? I know you said you have tools to control the elk but in the past you haven't controlled the elk. You have let the numbers grow, grow, grow. So if we accept this, how do we know you're going to hold to these numbers and instead of just saying it is 84,000? How you going to prove that you're going to stop at that number?

Justin – That's a fair criticism because I think our last objective, our current objective now before accepting any of this, is 70,965. I think this is the most complicated number we hit and don't know why we can't, but that is where it was with all these increases.

The increases were about 7,250 so we'd be around 78,000 elk and some change with the new objective. Your criticism is a fair one. We have had some units where it has been really difficult to stand off on our elk and this hasn't been our intent. Our goal is manage those population objectives even when it's not popular. When you look at the northeastern region, current creek unit, where we're issuing permits and we're getting aggressive sportsmen but the objective is 1,200, that is what we are striving towards. We've had challenges with public land being met up with tribal lands where we don't have management authority then it becomes challenging. Again we are not blaming, we are taking full responsibility. We were over our objective, there is no doubt. We have some private landowners that want to manage more elk and the property rights are a big deal. They are important in Utah so, again we strive to get that harvest where we can. I'm excited for these new tools, private lands only permits and increasing the number of elk hunter harvest. The drought conditions have been set up where we are having problems. We can get more aggressive and have the month of August to do so.

Larry – My next big question is regarding the drought conditions. Some habitats have oodles of habitat. You have grass that is going to waste but you don't have the water to go along with it. Nowhere have I really seen where you are addressing these water situations in these areas. I spend a lot of time on the Wasatch and it's a dry area and we and you can't put a guzzler out there if you don't have any rain. This needs to be addressed. You could have more elk in the summer but you don't have the water and it's going to come and haunt you in the winter habitat if we ever have a normal winter. It's an issue that is going to be devastating if we have a normal winter and those elk have to come down into those areas. How are we going to get depredation on the winter grounds when the elk come down? How are you going to address that when you have hundreds or thousands of elk invading these low lying areas? It's not just farms but subdivisions? I know you have trouble with the public when you go in there and everyone gets mad at you but what are you going to do when you have hundreds or thousands of them?

Justin – There is no doubt that this has been a dry year and especially in pockets of the Wasatch unit specifically. One of the things we have done with our depredation concerning your question of what to do with elk if they came down and in some pockets of the state when we need a good year success rate and the numbers jump through the roof. It can be different. There are other units where it's not a good thing, just exactly what you're talking about where you really didn't get your harvest until October opposed to later months because of subdivisions and different things. So it really depends on the unit when those snows help us and when they don't. The other thing is with the last state-wide plan we were being transparent. We said depredation is going to be a priority and if we need to do division removal, we know it's not popular, but in some cases that is the best avenue to take and we are going to do it because our perspective is if you have a big unit, say the Wasatch, and you have problems in agricultural fields, to areas that you just simply don't want. For every elk that you can harvest there, that is an elk you can grow on better parts of the mountains. This isn't something we know that's not going to work. If we have problem elk, we're willing to harvest them and I think the tone of sportsman would change. Last night I was told we have too many elk to raise. We as sportsman need to support the division in the certain areas as it's a balance of proper management. I think there was a time in history where it thought to grow these elk. I think the challenge of today's biologists and our RAC and Board process is how do we

properly manage these elk when it might be some high numbers of harvests in areas that we haven't had before?

Larry – I was on the Wasatch elk committee when there is one individual that voted for the elk increase and then in the next statement he talked about how he and group of guys kept a herd of elk away from a landowner's haystack for over 30 days. So we wanted more help but they had to spend 30 nights keeping these elk away from this haystack. So are you going to have enough people to keep all these elk away from everyone's haystack in the dark?

Justin- We do have some staff but probably not enough. I think that is where our willingness to harvest depredating young elk comes into play. If we have problem elk, I don't know why we tolerate it. We have said for several years now that we want healthy but less populations of elk and deer.

Ben - I have a quick question on the elk issues in Heber. I hear what you're saying Larry but I have a little bit different take on that and the fact that the particular individuals who were supposed to gather the numbers are willing to put in the effort to help address issues that the landowners are having. That shows me a lot of commitment from sportsman to help address the issues. The other thing I want to touch on, specific to the Wasatch, is will the objective we are going off of as the recommendation not put more elk on the ground? The elk are already there. So the sportsmen are not asking for more elk on the Wasatch they are just asking to be able to keep what is there. I just wanted to point that out that we're not recommending to grow more elk but just to maintain the ones that are currently there.

Larry – But are they going to maintain the elk?

Ben- It is a concern but we have proven that we can manage the current objective we have. The elk on the Wasatch right now have been around 8,000-8,500 for a number of years and to me that proves we can manage to that particular objective but that's my opinion.

Larry – I have one more question on the transplant of elk on the Stansbury's. Are the elk transplanted there giving you problems from other areas that you were not hoping for?

Justin – This is probably a better question for the regions to address.

Larry – You are going to have additional issues with elk depredation in other areas as well.

Riley – The answer is no but I guess that depends on your opinion. We give the option to bring elk, we are not having issues with, but we're just moving population issues away from Heber City. Not necessarily for depredation reasons but in an effort to help control population on the Wasatch Mountains. So we are leaving that option open to bring or translocate elk in some of those areas but I think one of the issues is the majority of that population increase would go to the Stansbury side and not the Oquirrh side. Currently the population is so low I don't even know if they have even hit their growth curve. So I think in years to come, there won't be a need for any translocation but maybe for the first couple of years it could solve two problems. It's not necessarily problem elk, but instead population control and maybe trying to reach an objective.

Larry – Have you been on that range you're talking about transplanting these elk to?

Riley – Yes

Larry – What's the water like?

Riley - Tom is the biologist so let's have him address that.

Larry – Do you have summer water for the elk up high in that drainage?

Tom – Yes, actually there is a lot of those drainages that have clear water. You're looking at problems with water that is piped mostly from the mouth of the canyon down on the winter range. It's not typically a problem for elk or deer. The snow they both use but up in the upper elevations there is pretty good water.

Larry – It's my understanding a lot of the livestock producers cut numbers in livestock up there because of the water situation There wasn't enough water to water their livestock.

Tom – I was not aware of that. If anything, the fires that we have had has created more vegetation, more grass, more elk. I wasn't aware of any cutbacks on the forest. I just got a call from Todd, Grantsville's grazing association manager, and he didn't see any issues with elk as long as we stuck with a plan and used the tools that we have to deal with some of the issues that might come up. He was all in favor of it.

Larry – But this is standard, this is the entire unit plan we are looking at. It's not a concern about the ranchers in that part of the area, but the water is low and the elk there aren't going to be able to water and they are going to private ground to water and I think it's going to create a bigger issue and from the people I have talked to it's going to hit them the hardest and I don't know if that was a good way to go.

Tom – I haven't heard of any water issues from anybody in the committee. We got Castlerock Land and Livestock in favor of it. The bulk of the private lands especially on the west side, are in favor of having elk. Matter of fact the release site for any elk is on that side just north of their property. There is a little group of elk already wintering there. We are hoping that if we gave them a few more elk they'd stay and winter on that side. I am not aware of any water issues of any sort.

Larry – I hope I find individuals to speak up about the water because he personally knows how it is. These are two areas of concern of mine and I wanted to bring them up. I think there are some laws in both areas. I can't say about the rest of the plan but these two areas have some flaws.

Tom – We can work with our habitat section and develop some water issues to develop some of the springs if we need to or protect the springs if we need to. We have some habitat projects that we can put towards it.

Larry – Should they be in place before the elk arrive?

Tom- Well we're not talking about moving a 1,000 elk overnight. We're talking about moving maybe a hundred or so in the first couple of years, if that. If we have problems before we get to a 1,000, we'll deal with those. I mean we can let the elk tell us where we need to address the problems and we'll deal with that according to the plan.

Larry – Will this Stansbury unit going to affect the whole desert?

Tom – I don't see them moving off the Stansbury's.

Larry – Are you going to put collars on them? Tom – We could put collars on them.

Larry – I suggest the collars to see where the elk go. Tom – Sure, we can do that.

Larry – If they get transplanted? Tom- We certainly can do that. I don't see a problem with that. We have done it in some of the other units and the elk have moved out. We could put collars on some of the elk.

Justin – Larry, I appreciate the hard comments and questions. The reason I like it is because if we can't answer that, if we didn't have strategies in place and if we didn't struggle through some of these issues with the committees internally, I think I wouldn't pass these plans. A lot of these challenges are really thought out. We have some of the issues and it boils down to thinking it's a different time in our agency to deal with these kinds of issues.

Riley - If I could have a half second or two, Justin got up and said, you know it's not the intent of the state to grow elk on the backs of the landowners, and I just want to echo that statement from the regions standpoint as well. Mine and Tom's philosophy, with elk herds in trouble, they should be replaced that they shouldn't have been. We used the available tools to eliminate them. That is our philosophy moving forward as well so the fears that we have are most certainly going to be depredation issues and elk moving into locations that are not ideal. When you grow a population that is just the natural effect of things and we fully anticipate that the Stansbury in years to come will not be any different. It is our intent, from the region and as the unit management as a whole, to take care of those issues and handle them aggressively so when there are hard issues that arise, we take care of them and we don't sit on our hands and just expect the landowners to shoulder that blame. It is something that we are cooperating with landowners to address.

Larry – These elk are actually migrating and moving very well by themselves and there is one problem the I-15 corridor from stopping them from coming west but there are other elk moving onto ranges that are not supposed to be there. In some areas they don't even want them there but the elk are moving into those areas. I know the DWR has been trying to solve this problem but I disagree with the transplants. I think they will become nuisance elk in other areas. This will only be a quick fix. I don't think we should be transporting elk. They're moving and increasing by themselves in my opinion.

George Garcia- When you talk about drought, we have been in a drought and we continue to be in drought conditions presently and this fall is not looking good at all. Typically, on the forest we shut roads down because we have a lot of snow. We haven't shut any roads down on the forest because it's dry right now and the conditions are just fine. To go with that we are seeing as a continuous trend of a lot of our springs drying up but some of our license permittees taking voluntary reductions on their ranges due to the lack of water. That needs to be addressed somewhere in the elk management plan just to see an increase in antlerless elk permits. If not, we need to have better drought management plan. There are multiple use land managers which puts me in a tough spot. It's hard for me to continue to encourage the livestock industry to take voluntarily reductions and at the same time vote for high volume numbers on public land. It's a difficult position to be in. Until we get out of the drought or until we figure out how to deal with the drought it's going to be a tough management issue for us.

Questions from the Public

Mike O'Brien – I am curious about the route that has been taken this year with the cow tags that were issued to private landowners and how the objectives were met. How that's going to be

planned for not just for this next year but moving forward. It was here on the Wasatch. It was a pretty big deal to me and a lot of other hunters and I'm wondering why the private land access is not something that comes easy for a lot of sportsmen. I am just wondering how that plays into the management of these herds and numbers that we are looking at.

Justin – Let me answer the first part of your question, how are the private landowner permits impacting?

Mike – Yes, like with the issuing of all those tags, I think it's like 2,000 on the Wasatch. How many were filled roughly?

Justin – We haven't even sold them completely out. We won't know until the end of January when the season ends and we do the harvest reports on what the total harvest impact was, so it's still a little premature. Some of the calls that I have gotten seem like people have obtained these permits has been a high success rate. I think that it's still too premature to speculate on this yet. Because these elk are on private land, we know that the collar doesn't show that but they are getting these permits and being successful and that's a good thing. You're getting the harvest where you need to and pushing them back on public land. I think it's too early to give you a good assessment.

Mike – Is this tool something you will continue to use and excluding the public land harvest of cow tags?

Justin- I think if it's successful, we will certainly keep using it. This is the first year we have ever tried it. It's been four months into a six month season and we have had great success and it has reached where we need it to. We would certainly do it again but in long term the thought is to make sure there is a balance between private land and the public have the opportunity. We have had success rates coming in the single digit, not something that we are excited about, but it is certainly something to think about and it's going to take retraining elk. The way you do that is to back off pressure on the public land and allow those elk to feel uncomfortable on private land and then you strike that balance down the road?

Mike – I have had a lot of experience in trying to contact private landowners in the area and was shot down 100% of the time. I am just wondering how that is going for others hunters?

Justin – It is tough because it is a strategy that incorrectly helps public hunters. That permit may not be for every public hunter and may not be a good fit especially if you can't get the access. But down the road, if it pushes those elk onto public and distributes them more evenly you would have a better hunt.

Richard- Can you still purchase a private tag? Justin – yes

Comments from the Public

Chris Carling/SFW – I am here to voice SFW support for the elk management plan presented by Justin Shannon from the DWR. We want to let everyone know on the RAC, that SFW really values not only the science but the thoroughness and professionalism of the Division, biologists and other staffers, and employees who support the whole process of managing elk and other big game as well. We appreciate our opportunity to participate in that process. Speaking first hand we know the process Justin just mentioned involves multiple interested parties, fair and thorough discussions and exploration of possible avenues for the existing current elk plan as well as the proposals. We hope to continue our involvement and we're here to support them in the continuation of this high quality process.

Randy Quayle/Timpanogos Archery Club – We agree with the present elk management plan that has been presented tonight.

Ken Octker/Utah Bowman's Association –We would also like to show our support for the Division's proposal to raise the elk objective. We also had a say on committees for the Wasatch elk herd and received good input there. The Division values our input by just inviting us to participate so we just want to show our support for the Division and those committees involved to raise the elk objective.

Bill Christensen/RMEF – I wish to thank you for all the time spent for our wildlife resources and its management. I would also like to thank Justin, his staff of the Division of Wildlife and the sportsmen in attendance as we appreciate the time that goes into these meetings. I have had a chance in the past to serve on the Panguitch Lake Elk Committee and we have been picked for pushing these elk committees. I have had a chance to serve on the Elk Advisory Committee as well to help with the elk management plan and been able to participate on the Wasatch committee. We are very, very supportive of these new elk population objectives. All the local interest, what is nice about these committees is that they are local and they are locally based. We believe strongly that wildlife management starts at the local level and is more effective. We whole heartily support the Division's objectives and ask that you support them as well. Thank you.

RAC comments

Ron – I know that there are a lot of sportsman groups willing to help with labor as well as funds to do water projects, especially here in the central region. If this opportunity was available, I am pretty sure this could be facilitated. We all know we need rain to fill a guzzler but it usually rains at least a couple times a year. I think they would be willing to help on other projects, not only guzzlers, which need to be done. My experience has been that we get some other water projects that could work hand in hand and actually develop and overflow pond. That would help with the agriculture as well that becomes a win- win for everybody. I just wanted to make the comment that I know there is a lot of people who are willing to put that effort out there to try and keep the elk up on the mountain as well.

Larry – We appreciate that hunters help out on the water projects. The water projects have to be on federal range and public lands. We're talking about dispersing the elk off of private lands but if the water is on private lands it doesn't matter how much you harass them, they are still going to go back for a drink. They need projects on federal lands as well as private lands. That also needs to be addressed. We appreciate the help and we know there is help from the sportsman groups. We just need to look at the whole picture.

Ben – I would like to recognize the work that the Division has put into these plans namely Justin, local biologists, and DWR employees from these committees. I had the opportunity to sit on a statewide committee where we designed a number of these strategies and opinions and go with these management plans as well. I also had the chance to sit on the Wasatch elk plan and I appreciate the opportunity to do both. I am in support of these recommendations and I think we owe it to the Division to support them. They have put a lot of work into it and I don't believe they are trying to put more elk than necessary. I don't think it's the intent to put elk on the range for more work than they can

handle. I do believe we have the tools in place in an event of a hard winter or summer. A few years ago, I remember exactly which year it was 2012, we had some heavy populated cows in the summer and the wildlife board issued at the last minute additional cow tags that went for sale over the counter in September to the public to address this issue. I would like to thank the Division for addressing these issues and I applaud them for it. I think these plans are appropriate and would like to see them supported.

VOTING

Motion was made by Matt Clark to approve the Division's recommendation as presented
Seconded by Ben Lowder

In favor: Matt Clark, Ben Lowder, Danny Potts, Christine Schmitz, Ron Camp,
Karl Hirst, Kristofer Marble, Kenneth Strong

Opposed: George Garcia, Larry Fitzgerald

Motion passed 8 to 2

4) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2017 Season Dates, Application Timeline (Action) - Justin Shannon, Big Game Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Richard - When do they have to clarify that it is archery only or how does that work?

Justin – For the archery only extension it would be for everybody. You can hunt your normal hunt that is allocated on your season dates with any weapon you want, archery, muzzleloader or rifle, and then if you're unsuccessful, you have a seven day extension where you would use archery.

Richard- So when some of them haven't been successful, they can decide if they want to go and hunt the archery again on the seven day extension?

Justin – Yes and you don't have to come and swap a tag or anything. We want it to be as painless as possible. It's kind of a management for just archery hunters but you need hunters that weren't successful to have seven more days to try and fill their tag.

Ron – I agree with the extra seven days at the end of the OIAL hunts. This is exciting for those who have been hunting and haven't been successful to have this opportunity to go back out in the field and maybe have success. That is a great idea. If anything it still gives archers a little bit of a chance to have some one on one time if they choose to do so.

Richard- So this will make it a less complicated to do it this way?

Justin - This is one of the things we looked at on the bighorn sheep and mountain goat hunts. If you wanted to hunt archery only, we have units that only have one or two permits, you could choose those.

Ben – On the late muzzleloader hunt on the Boulders you are recommending to eliminate, do you know what the last three years buck to doe ratios are of each individual year?

Justin – Not on the top of my head, I think it is around 16, 19, and 20.6. The reason we took it off is because as you look at the plan, it says the three year average has to be above 20. So we're happy with this and we think it's trending right. Do you need exact numbers on those or is this okay?

Ben – what's the three year average? Justin – The ratios are 16.4 for 2013, 19.9 for 2014 and 20.6 for 2015 so the three years average is 19.

Ben –The muzzleloader hunt on the Nine Mile unit, I think they increased tags out there this year, how is that doing? I guess that is probably going on right now, isn't it?

Justin – Did it end or is today the last day? We can find out.

Richard – When is the last date of the season for OIAL hunts? Is it in November?

Justin – Most of our Desert Bighorn units end November 10, some go beyond that, I think Pine Valley does and the Rocky Mountain Bighorn units end generally around the first of December.

Richard - So some hunters choose to go archery after the season, will the Bighorn sheep will be in the rut?

Justin – Yes but it depends on the unit. We tend to hunt Rocky Mountain Bighorns in the rut and it seems to be okay. We tend to hunt Desert Bighorns end these hunts November 10, depending on the unit since the sheep are really starting to rut pretty heavy in November. We get some of those units like Zion that are pretty far south that have protractive breeding seasons.

Questions from the Public

Chris Carling/SFW – Concerning the Three Corners elk season. I just noticed on the bullet points on the Daggett elk season, they have it back a week? Just curious is there something going on there? Is there a conflict with another hunt or too many dead elk or what? What was the reasoning there?

Justin –This is a unit that the elk goes between us, Wyoming and Colorado so we have in the past what we call tristate agreements where we say okay what's best for these elk and we alter hunting dates where states are putting pressure on these elk at the same time otherwise we just ping pong them. We hunt them and then they run across state lines and they hunt them and they come back and at the end of the day. Amy, the biologist up in that region, coordinates with the neighboring states.

Chris – So it's just a consistent date state by state so the pressure isn't on all at once in all the places? Randall Thacker – It is just a match up so hunting pressure is all at the same time in all three states. Chris – okay, that makes sense. I just have friends that hunt there and I was curious. Good answer and thank you.

Jeremy Anderson/ Mule Deer Foundation – With the limitation taken off the muzzleloader optics last year, are we having any new late muzzleloader hunts? Do we know what the three year average is and how did it go this year? Did we thin the herd before the muzzleloader hunt? Do we have that data yet?

Justin – We don't have that data yet. We'll get our classification done here in the next little bit but Tom has already classified on some of his units in the West Desert but we'll be classifying November-December and get that buck to doe ratio and see what that looks like. From everything I can see, the muzzleloader hunts and rifle hunts had exceptional success. We look to our buck to doe ratio and it has been climbing over the last five years to where we have had a lot of success hunts on these units.

Jeremy – That is what we have heard. Great success rates and increased hunter opportunity. Thank you.

Comments from the Public

Chris Carling/SFW – We supports the bucks, bulls, OIAL season dates and application time line proposals that has been presented by the Division with two exceptions.

- 1) SFW would like to recommend keeping the late muzzleloader deer hunt on the Boulder/Kaiparowits unit because as mentioned the trend on the buck/doe ration is going in the right direction and is getting very close to applying an objective. We'd like to see that too. We recognize that the Division is mandated to manage the plan. We'd hate to see that opportunity go away to and, with that trend going in the right direction, we hope that maybe there is some consideration there not to eliminate that hunt.
- 2) Instead of what has been outlined by the Division of the seven day archery only extended season for hunters who draw, we would like to see a OIAL tag. We have provided each of you with a print out that stands from Utah Bowman's Association's original thought. Since the Wildlife Board meeting there has been a lot of excitement about the idea of an archery-only OIAL hunt among the four groups that you see listed here (SFW, Utah Bowman's Association, MDF and RMEF).

We have had a lot of discussion planning sessions exploring this idea. We recognize we are not the biologists but we are excited about the idea of what you see here and without going through rut season and the premium dates of the rifle dates, hunters who draw those OIAL hunts would be hunting with that tag so there aren't a lot of conflicts.

However these hunts are archery only hunts and not an archery extension for those who hunt with rifle. This would be a totally different proposal. There are several points that benefits to this first of all listed here at the bottom, this proposal would address Point Creek because there is an opportunity yet it is difficult. It is a difficult hunt marginal by some standards and it would allow new hunting opportunities and help address Point Creek. That is a major benefit and a new opportunity there. Point #2 they have good intentional for the success rate and that may be a benefit to the population numbers that were against providing opportunity and archers, as you may know archery hunters will often take an animal that a rifle hunter may never consider, even though that animal may be in his or hers crosshairs. We see that as a benefit because for example, sheep is a great example for this. There is a lot of older rams and the gross score a lot of trophy hunters are really looking for and rifle hunters will pass on every time in hopes for a better scoring animal. Whereas, a true archery hunters often won't pass up an animal like that and we may have the opportunity for a take on some animals that are living their lives and dying of old age and really don't achieve that classification so there is again an opportunity that goes to mist that we collectively feel should you consider as new opportunities to issue a few more tags to these archery only hunters and not just the extended rifle hunters opportunity with archery here on the same unit and with the same tag. This is a different proposal. So again the additional tags for #5 and again the season dates that we are looking at would generally void the core rut. We again are NOT biologists we recognize that there needs to be much discussion planning and certainly the biologists input above all. But we hope that this RAC might consider this proposal and vote to bring the idea to the Wildlife Board. Thank you very much.

Ken Octker/Utah Bowman's Association – I agree with all that the DWR has proposed minus the seven day extension for the archers.

Randy Quayle/Timpanogos Archery Club – We are also in agreement with the bucks/bulls and OIAL hunts as presented by the DWR with the exception of the seven day extended archery hunt at the end. We also agree with the proposal that Chris presented to have the archery only hunts for the Desert Bighorn, Rocky Mountain Bighorn, Rocky Mountain Goats and Buffalo. Thank you.

Bill Christensen/RMEF – We support the buck, bulls and OIAL recommendations with the exception of the seven day archery hunt extension. We do support the OIAL archery only hunts that were presented. We welcome the opportunity to harbor this Utah Bowman’s Association, SFW, and MDF has asked for you to consider your support of this recommendation and we will work with the Division to iron out the specifics as we work towards presenting at the Wildlife Board Meeting. Thank you very much.

Mike Christensen – With youth having an opportunity the state defines youth in one aspect but the application period and the way that the hunts lay out dictate a different avenue to distribute those permits. This goes for most of all youth permit that run into management buck tags on the Paunsaugant and the Henry Mountains. Each of you think of your birthdays and think of your kid’s birthdays, if you were born between January 1 and July 31, you or your children are disqualified from 50% of the youth tags for those hunts. The reason why is because 50% of those permits are given as bonus tags to the youth with the highest number of points. The way it lays out a person/child/youth born between January 1 and July 31, can never reach that highest level of point totals because of the date they were born. So the easiest way to make it so those 100% of those tags are visible to all youth would be simply not distribute those permits as bonus points. They would still be able to earn points and they could still use their points in that system but 50% of those tags wouldn’t go to the youth born between August 1 and December 31. Does this make sense? It’s a pretty straight forward and I don’t think there were any ill intentions, but it is just one of those housekeeping things that played out over time. We have to address certain avenues of distribution when things come up that we didn’t anticipate. We did this from the start and now it has happened so are we going to address it or not? I would just ask of you to ask the board to take a look at this hopefully address it. Youth put in and if they draw they draw and if they don’t, they don’t. On the OIAL archery elk opportunity maybe ask Utah hunters what they think about the surveys and get some feedback from them.

Richard – So are you saying that if a youth puts in for Henry Mountains they wouldn’t use bonus points?

Mike- No, they would use the bonus points but half of the permits wouldn’t go to the youth with the most bonus points. Refer to chart.

Mike – I think there is going to be some technical difficulties. I know we have the women here that run that part of the Division and I’m glad they are here tonight, but I think if you just do the bonus points don’t give 50% of the permits to the ones with the most bonus points because then 100% of the youth will have the chance to draw 100% of the permits. Under the current scenario, 40% of the youth have a chance of drawing 50% of the tags and 60% of the youth have 0% chance of drawing 50% of the tags.

Lindy Varney/SLO – This conversation has been brought up for over a year. Right now when you apply for a management buck deer hunt they were just talking about 30% that did go to youth who applied, 30% to 65 and older and 40% to everyone else who applies for that hunt. Mike is stating that about 50% do go to the youth with the most points. I don't have the data in front of me but I reviewed this last year. What would you like to see done? I can get you more data if you would like.

Kris – Based on what part of the year you were born and as a youth, you would never reach max points, whereas other kids born during a different part of the year would reach max points.

Lindy – That is just like a school year, some kids are born August 31st and some are born September 1st. Mike – Yes, but everybody goes to go to school eventually.

Lindy – The dates we choose are always going to affect someone.

Richard – When youth don't draw out on the bonus point pool do they go into the general pool? Lindy - Yes they do, youth have two chances to draw a deer tag with a bonus point. They can still use their same bonus points as an adult once they hit the 17 years and older age. Mike – But 40% of the youth have three chances to draw that permit.

Lindy – You guys can talk about it and do what you want as the RAC and I can gather all the data for you for the Board meeting.

Kris - So based on when you were born during the year, a certain number of youth have a better chance of drawing those tags? Lindy – Yes, but like I said any date we put out there is going to affect someone.

Mike – No you could still have points and it would be fine but the issue is when you give out 50% of the tags only to a certain segment that have enough points.

Kris – Lindy's point is it doesn't matter what date you choose, it will still affect someone.

Lindy – We have actually gotten the feds to agree with our youth definition of the July 31 as being considered youth for the youth waterfowl hunts. So to change that definition would be hard and take more management so just keep that in mind. Mike –This just doesn't affect management hunts it affects all the big game hunts. I'm not asking them to change the youth definition, just simply get rid of the 50% and then everybody is on the same playing field.

Karl – We have had a presentation on the archery OIAL with a Division recommendation, now we've got another recommendation. I have a couple of questions with the recommendation that has been put forward by SFW. How many tags would you get? Justin - These will be set in the spring and I really don't know what that would look like. It wasn't our proposal so we didn't put thought into how we would populate them. Regardless of what that number is, one of the reasons we didn't propose this ourselves is the “why intended” and again it's a social issue. It's not a bad thing or a good thing it's just a change. Right now every OIAL hunt is on an equal plan to go in for the draw.

Karl – With the possibility of less success would there be any additional tags?

Justin – Yes, we would try.

Kris – You couldn't do that from day one, you would have to do some sort of period where those tags would have to be taken from the general rifle pool.

Justin- We would have to do our survey harvest first because we can't just add tags.

Kris –Some of the permit numbers are so low on some of these units you'd have to have pretty low archery success to really get those tags, right?

Justin –Yes, look at the units they pick, the proposal is a smart one because they're picking units like Zion that have 9 to 12 permits.

Ron – Why are we getting rid of the seven day extension if we they both go hand in hand? If we are going to go with the seven day extension why would that affect the other tags when it's archery only?

Kenneth Ocker – You could do that. We didn't want to have it overlap instead we wanted to add a few more tags for more opportunity.

Ben - You could easily eliminate the seven day extension off of these units and keep it on the rest of the units which don't have archery now. I think that would make sense.

Ron – From a stand point on the archery only and having that opportunity, I agree with where you are coming from, but I think with the other limited entry units there is nothing wrong with the seven day extension to get out in the field.

John Bair/Wildlife Board – I know we have talked about Point Creek affecting each other's draws and we don't want to rock the boat and cause waves between the rifle and archery hunters. If we had a unit that has a bunch of permits, say a goat unit, where there is a bunch of guys who put in for that and we take a couple of those or even one of those permits and make it an archery tag. It's possible enough guys could go after that one tag. But in reality that is going to be the worse draw.

Justin – You're right, that potential is always there. So what John is saying is if you have 10 permits and you have one of them on an archery hunt, depending on the number of applicants that put in for that one hunt, that one permit actually might make draws better for the other nine. John – It could be a wash either way. Justin – When it comes to Point Creek is this going to help Point Creek? The answer is it's not going to hurt.

John – This has been kicked around for 20 years that I have been coming to these meetings all this time. We speculate and speculate about why and what might happen. I just wonder if there might be some wisdom in trying this on a small scale and see.

Justin- In reality we are already doing this. We have units that only have one permit. We have units that have only two permits. So in those areas, hunter are really only having thee and a half days in a 50-day season.

John- That is what I am saying, they may harvest a lesser ram and they may know many guys that just might go with an archery only tag, let's see.

Ben - I mentioned and presented this back in September to the Wildlife Board, some of the feedback was informational and some was why don't we create some new additional hunts. See if we can address Point Creek as John referred to. As I look at this proposal, if you start at the minimal number of permits, one or two in each hunt, I like the idea of two personally because that gives you a bonus point which makes it a little more

desirable for people with points. It can shift the applicants around, as John mentioned, and it will definitely affect draws. The original intent of the proposal was to provide archery opportunity without affecting draws or creating hunts. The feedback received was to create some hunts and see if we affect some of the draws and see if we can give some additional opportunities. I see new additional opportunities the Division has recommended and a number of new additional opportunities tonight and that shows the help from our wildlife in the state is really good and that's awesome. I applaud the Division for all the additional opportunities that are being recommended and I see new and additional opportunity. It hasn't been tried in Utah but it has been tried in other states. I have had a lot of feedback and we have all heard of the OIAL hunts. If you don't have max points it's a guess whether you're going to draw. I think we all have been asked why we can't address this or why can't we make a change and try to get more people through the system. I see this proposal with a very small step towards that but it has been a step that hasn't been taken in the state of Utah before, and like John says, if it doesn't work we can scrap with it. Maybe we need to address those issues.

Richard - My question is if we do it for archery are we going to have to do it for muzzleloader too?

Justin - I think that's the door that opens. I think those will be the questions that will be coming back to the RAC. Muzzleloader hunters are not nearly as organized as the archery hunters in Utah but could be one day. As of right now it's not in the plan.

Karl - Do you know what the success rates are on mountain goats?

Jason - It depends on the unit. Some of the units are harder to hunt. Units 9 and 12 don't have high success while some other units are a little higher. It's really based on the unit.

Karl - What is the success rate for archery? 80-90%

Jason - I think it's around 35%, having gone empty for about eight years until the last two years with about 20%.

Ken - If we kept the Boulder/Kaiparowits muzzleloader hunt, would that hurt anything?

Justin - No, if we kept it we wouldn't classify it this year. No recommendation

Kris - John has a point and I think we should try some of these things.

RAC Discussion

Kris - I feel the youth hunt situation needs to be addressed. They will never accrue max points because of when they were born in the year. I would like to make a motion as of this point. Is it limited to the Henry Mountains management hunts or are there more that are affected by this issue? Mike - The Paunsaugant and there are probably others.

Lindy - It's just the management property units. There is an option where they give 30% to the youth, 30% to 65+ age group, and 40% to others. It's another expense we don't want to take. It's just for those two units.

Ben - Would this issue affect the youth elk hunts as well?

Lindy - No points accrue from this. We can bring this up to management and go from there.

Kris - The motion is to continue the point allocation as is but youth who do not draw will no longer accrue bonus points. All youth would be in the same draw for all those tags.

Ron – I would like to see it fixed because this process will discourage kids from putting in for the hunts.

Ben – is this something we can do this year? Not sure if this is the proper fix.

Lindy – It would have to be next year as there is not enough time.

Ken – I applaud Justin and his crew on what they have accomplished on a difficult subject.

VOTING

Motion was made by Kris Marble to accept the recommendation to add the OIAL archery hunts as proposed by SFW, Utah Bowman's Association, Mule Deer Foundations and Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation and also to extend the Division's proposal of OIAL seven days extension for archery only.

Seconded by Danny Potts

Motion passed unanimously

Motion was made by Kenneth Strong to keep the late season muzzle loader hunt on the Plateau Boulder/Kairpowits

Seconded by Ben Lowder

In favor: Kenneth Strong, Ben Lowder, Ron Camp, Kristofer Marble,
Danny Potts, Kris Marble, Matt Clark

Opposed: Christine Schmitz, Karl Hirst and George Garcia

Motion passed 7 to 3

Motion was made by Kris Marble to remove the points and eliminate the 50% bonus hunt for the management buck deer units for youth

Seconded by Ron camp

In favor: Kristofer Marble, Ron Camp, Larry Fitzgerald, George Garcia

Opposed: Christine Schmitz, Danny Potts, Kenneth Strong, Ben Lowder, Matt Clark,
Karl Hirst

Motion failed 4 to 6

Motion was made by Kris Marble to put the youth management point problem on an action item for the board to review

Seconded by Ron Camp

Motion passed unanimously

Motion was made by Kris Marble to accept the remainder of the buck, bull OIAL proposals as presented by the Division

Seconded by Ron Camp

Motion passed unanimously

5) Preference Point System Amendments (Action)

- **Lindy Varney, Licensing Specialist**

Questions from the RAC

Karl- I believe the request of this change is to fill a loop hole where if you have max points and, put no hunt choice as your first choice, you automatically go to your second choice and you don't lose your point. When in fact you gain a point and get the tag you want. Is this right?

Lindy- Yes, this is one of the reasons why this has been put out to the RACs because the Division was asked to review it. Hunters are wondering how they are still drawing out and getting points. This has become a big concern.

Richard- So basically this is to close a loop hole?

Lindy – Yes, and to make sure everyone’s first choice gets chosen first. Another concern the hunters have is they want the same chance as everyone else.

Questions from the Public

Temprice Penrod/Muzzleloader hunter from Utah Co – My understanding is when you put in for hunts on the website and you picked a limited entry hunt that counted as your first hunt choice it doesn’t allow you to put one in for a first hunt.

Lindy- No, they are two different, separate applications. There is the limited entry buck deer hunt that accrues bonus points and then there is the general season buck deer hunt where you can select up to five choices. Limited entry has only two choices you can select.

Temprice –I understand when I tried to apply in the past it won’t let me put in a first hunt choice if I picked a limited entry hunt and tried to apply for the general season at the same time. So looking at this seems really bad. My father-in-law, husband and I have been putting in for 10 years for a limited entry and never drawn out. Now if they draw a general season tag, if this goes through, they lose all their points.

Lindy – No, these are two different systems. Give me a call this February and I’ll definitely help you out.

Comments from the Public

None

RAC Discussion

Danny – Because of the way that it was being drawn in the past we are tied more to the location than we are in harvesting the animals. That is why I have never put in for second and third choices because of the way it has been done in the past.

Karl – I have received a lot of emails indicating not to their preference points on the second, third, fourth or fifth choices. I support the emails that I received.

Richard – I’ve received emails as well.

Ben – I’ve received emails too requesting discussion for the agreement that the loop hole to be fixed but not to take points off for their second, third, fourth or fifth choices.

Ken - Could they change the program where if you don’t put in for a first choice, you cannot put in for your second, third, fourth or fifth choices?

Lindy- You can’t right now. Now you have to select a first choice.

Ken – I represent the sportsmen and I’m telling you that they don’t want to lose their points.

Ben – Could you put in your first choice for a preference point and then your second choice for the hunt? Lindy – You cannot do that currently.

Karl - A gentleman that emailed me went to the northern RAC last night and has a change of heart based on the Division’s proposal.

Ken Oetker – Colorado and Wyoming have one system for their points where Utah only has bonus points and preference points

Ron Camp – People are manipulating the system and it needs to be fixed. I know a lot of people that have done it and will continue to do it if we allow the system to stay the same. We need true ethics.

VOTING

Motion was made by Matt Clark to accept as the Division’s recommendation as presented
Seconded by Danny Potts

In favor: Matt Clark, Danny Potts, Kristofer Marble, Christine Schmitz, George Garcia,
Larry Fitzgerald, Ron Camp

Opposed: Karl Hirst, Kenneth Strong and Ben Lowder

Motion passed 7 to 3

6) NER Deer Management Plans (Action)

- **Randall Thacker, Northeastern Region Assistant Wildlife Manager**

Questions from the RAC

Danny Potts – Regarding the deer on the South Slope unit, are we seeing an increase to numbers?

Randall- We assume having great winters, so we are seeing great survival rates.

Larry – Will this effect permit numbers and are you going to keep the number of permits about the same?

Randall -Permit numbers are completely based on buck to doe ratio that we see out there and this is just population. This is a total number of deer so this won’t change permit numbers at all. Whether we increase or decrease our numbers are based on our deer classification conducted from this fall.

George Garcia- It looks like a trend decreasing, on one of your slides, but at the same time you increased the objective. I don’t quite understand that, can you explain that a little bit? Randall- He pulled up the slide and they discussed it.

George Garcia- I don’t know if this is just a DWR thing but where ever your current estimates are, your objectives seem to increase.

Randall- Increasing a herd in town, like Manilla, isn’t benefiting the mountain herds.

Garcia- The deer are not in the right place. Randall – That is correct.

Questions from the Public

None

Comments from the Public

None

RAC Discussion

None

VOTING

Motion was made by Kris Marble to accept the Division's recommendation as presented
Seconded by Kenneth Strong
Motion passed unanimously

7) **CWMU Management Plan and Permits Number for 2017 (Action)**
- **Covy Jones, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Ben - On the Deer Creek unit, with all those issues that you have mentioned, why are you recommending approval?

Covy - We have gone back and forth on this one. Honestly, in fact, we were recommending denial for the unit, and we wanted to come back and see if we could help if they are willing to try. We also felt like we needed to spend some time in the field with the operator, have some long discussions and just stress the importance of this. We are gaining access to a place that is marked and posted. (There is some public land) so we felt like it's worth one more try. If it doesn't happen then all this does is reinforce the fact that they probably are not a good CWMU.

Ben - So do you feel that this operator is willing to make the necessary changes and give the public a good experience? Covy - I hope so. If he's not it just strengthens our case.

Ben - How many permits were we talking about?

Covy - Before, they had two public hunters and now they've requested one public hunter.

Karl- I thought last year that Jacob's Creek decided not to hunt deer.

Covy - They pulled out deer either last year or the year before. They decided to draw out deer and then this year they pulled out and will only be a moose CWMU.

Karl - So they aren't going to hunt deer? Covy - No

Matt Clark -I don't know how many of you saw the kid on the Adam Eckle show. He had a great show about a fallen officer's son where they were invited on a CWMU along with his mom and sister. That showed me how wonderful this program is and hopefully that operator is commended for that.

Covy - That is a really good point. They can do things we can't. They can provide special opportunities for the wounded warriors, kids that are having a tough time or lost a parent, or parents that have fallen ill. This is one of the things these guys sacrifice with a lot of their vouchers. There are a lot of good things about this program.

Questions from the Public

None

Comments from the Public

None

RAC Discussion

None

VOTING

Motion was made by Kris Marble to accept the Division's recommendation as presented
Seconded by Ron Camp
Motion passed unanimously

- 8) **Landowner Association Permits Number for 2017 (Action)**
- Covy Jones, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

Questions from the RAC
None

Questions from the Public
None

Comments from the Public
None

RAC Discussion
None

VOTING

Motion was made by Kris Marble to accept the Division's recommendation as presented
Seconded by Kenneth Strong
Motion passed unanimously

- 9) **Other Business**
- Gary Nielson, RAC Chair

Meeting adjourned at 9:52 pm

In attendance: 50 (11 RAC Members, 19 DWR employees, 20 public)

Next Board meeting: Friday, December 9, 2016, DNR boardroom, Salt Lake
Next RAC meeting: Tuesday, December 6, 2016 @ 6:30 pm, Springville Civic Center,
110 South Main Street, Springville

Northern Regional Advisory Council

November 9, 2016

Weber State University

Ogden, Utah

Draft Meeting Minutes

Meeting Begins: 6:00 p.m.

RAC Present

John Blazzard- Agric
John Cavitt- Chair
Matt Klar- At Large
Mike Laughter- Sportsman
Russ Lawrence- At Large
Kevin McLeod- At Large
Justin Oliver- At Large
Kristin Purdy- Noncon
Bryce Thurgood- At Large
Craig VanTassell- Sportsman
John Wall- At Large

DWR Present

Jodie Anderson
Riley Peck
Tom Becker
Justin Shannon
Covey Jones
Jim Christensen
Darren Debloois
Dave Rich
Randy Wood
Chad Wilson
Nathan Long
Lindy Varney
Phil Douglass
Justin Dolling
Karen Caldwell
Krystal Tucker
Randall Thacker
Trevor Doman

Wildlife Board

Byron Bateman

RAC Excused

Chad Jensen- Elected
Matt Preston- BLM

RAC Unexcused

Joel Ferry- Agric

Agenda:

Approval of Agenda
Approval of Sept 7, 2016 Meeting Minutes
Old Business
Regional Update
Elk Unit Management Plan Revisions
Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2017 Season Dates, Application Timeline
Preference Point System Amendments
NER Deer Management Plans
CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2017
Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017

Item 1. Approval of Agenda

-John Cavitt, Chair

Agenda is approved.

Item 2. Approval of Sept 7, 2016 Minutes

-John Cavitt, Chair

Minutes approved as circulated.

Item 3. Wildlife Board Meeting Update

-Bryce Thurgood, Vice Chair

(most not audible)

Letter to conservation groups about deadlines
2017 RAC board dates

Item 4. Regional Update

- Justin Dolling, Regional Supervisor

Law enforcement-busy pheasant opener. Waterfowl management areas require steel shot. Good deer hunt. Several trespass violations on private lands.

Ecosystem program- Interviewing for Assistant manager at Farmington Bay. Ogden Bay Waterfowl management area. Brine shrimp harvest over 19 million pounds. Swans arriving in good numbers.

Bobcat tags, cougar harvest objective permits on sale now.

Habitat- Treatment projects on Cache Unit and on some Forest Service lands.

Outreach- Pheasant release, Hardware Ranch elk festival opening will be December 10th.

Wildlife- Deer classifications. December 5th, deer survival. 10,000 pheasants to be released and will continue to make releases through the season. Fall turkey hunt underway.

Aquatics- Otter creek treatment project. Netting at Willard Bay. Weber, Ogden and Blacksmiths Fork fishing well.

Item 5. Elk Unit Management Plan Revisions

- Justin Shannon, Big Game Coordinator

See RAC Packet

Public Questions

Troy Justensen- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Increases are in accordance with the overall objective right?

Justin Shannon- Yes, more than half are that way.

RAC Questions

Justin Oliver- What units have tested positive for that?

Justin Shannon- For elk, it is the San Juan unit.

Public Comment

Troy Justensen- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Put management back into the units and allow those that know the unit best, to tell us what needs to be done. Support division's recommendations on increasing objectives on these units.

Jennifer Chavez- Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation- Support increases.

Ben Lowder- Utah Bowman's Association- Thank division for work put into this. Support recommendations as presented.

Kelvin Judd- Managing hunters vs. elk. For general units, has there been discussion about dedicated hunter elk program. If so, why or why not? Introduced a limited entry hunt for deer on the North Slope Uintahs a couple of years ago. Wondering about a similar setup?

Justin Shannon- Plans for dedicated hunter strategy for elk, was that the question?

Kelvin Judd-Yes.

Justin Shannon- Yes, the statewide elk committee talked about that at length. We are likely to go to a multi-season as opposed as a dedicated hunter opportunity. Dedicated hunters are maxed out on opportunities for projects but we like the idea where you can hunt archery, muzzleloader or any weapon. We would like to entertain that and move forward.

Kelvin Judd- Possibility of limited entry rifle elk hunt in mid-September on our general unit. Increase your odds by changing the hunt dates on a general unit.

Justin Shannon- The short answer is no, we did not discuss that at all. We have not entertained that idea at all.

Bryce Thurgood- It would conflict with the youth elk hunt.

Justin Shannon- That is what you are asking essentially if you could have limited entry hunters hunt limited entry units but it would conflict with youth hunters in that same timeframe. This is the first time I have heard of that idea. I really don't have a lot of comment on that.

Kurt Wood- Effort into management and range. Recommend that the board accept the proposal.

Mike Schultz- Had the opportunity to sit on the statewide elk committee. Morgan south rich unit, small increase in that unit. It is not anywhere close to where the highs have been. Support and appreciate the division listening to our concerns and accepting the small increase in that unit.

Bret Selman- Support the changes made. Ogden herd harassed in later seasons is what puts them into the haystacks. Would like to see those elk seasons end about Thanksgiving time.

Steve Sorensen- Millions of dollars put into habitat in the state of Utah. Increases are great to support habitat work.

RAC Comment

John Blazzard- Anticipation that agriculture would be opposed to this plan. There are definitely conflicts when you get too many elk in an area. Lots of summer range. Winter range is hurting. Don't have a problem with increasing number of animals on the objective. If we are going to set an objective, we ought to go to the effort to make sure we get the herd to that objective. We can do that with various tools. I agree with Mr. Selman about hunting them too long in the fall. That pushes them into sanctuary areas where the livestock and haystacks are. I think it is a good plan and well thought out. Needs to be tools for agriculture to be able to protect their livelihood. They are the only ones providing open space for these animals to roam. Wildlife are suffering in Summit County. It will work if we pay attention and are flexible to deal with problems when they arrive.

Motion

Motion- John Wall- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Elk Unit Plan Revisions as presented.

Second- Craig VanTassell

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Item 6. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2017 Season Dates, Application Timeline

- Justin Shannon, Big Game Coordinator

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Mike Laughter- On the late season muzzleloader, we had a discussion last fall with the lack of restrictions on optics. Indications that muzzleloader hunt was a huge success. How will we determine permit numbers?

Justin Shannon- It is a 3 year average. It won't take into account the classification we do this November and December. It is really the buck to doe ratio from 2015, 2014 and 2013.

Mike Laughter- If we harvested more than we think we did and then add a hunt to that unit, 18-20 bucks per hundred doe, is that something we need to worry about?

Justin Shannon- The way we structure that is that we will have our classification and harvest data prior to setting permits.

Mike Laughter- That is what I was after.

Justin Shannon- You don't have to throw lots of permits at it.

Mike Laughter- Thanks, that clarifies that for me.

Bryce Thurgood- Stansbury sheep, disease.

Justin Shannon- That population is declined.

Bryce Thurgood- What is the long term forecast?

Justin Shannon- I think we are going to have to augment it to get things back at some point. The strain they had was a really nasty strain and we lost a lot of bighorns. We have to do something there and we will.

Bryce Thurgood- It is frustrating because a lot of us did a lot of transplants.

Justin Shannon- It is such great habitat there. It is very unfortunate.

Bryce Thurgood- Worried about more archery and muzzleloader on Henry's being management tags. Do you really have that many management deer? What is the true problem.

Justin Shannon- Yes, we have a lot of management bucks down there. We manage 40-55 bucks per hundred doe's. The mule deer committee locked in the permits we had that were public draw. We decided to manage buck to doe ratios with management tags. The higher your buck to doe ratio gets, is not always a good thing. It is not linear, more is not better. When bucks compete for resources, the things that suffer are secondary growth characteristics. We are trying to manage for trophy quality there. Keeping buck to doe ratio where it needs to be will help with that.

Bryce Thurgood- Possibility of taking kids out to shoot bulls that are not desirable. Seems like that would be a perfect area.

Justin Shannon- We have talked with sportsman about this topic and it is tough because how do you define and rule what an undesirable deer looks like?

Bryce Thurgood- Older.

Justin Shannon- Has to be criteria as to what that looks like. I don't know how to tackle that.

John Blazzard- Additional limited entry bull elk hunt during the spike elk hunt in Central Mountains, Manti and Wasatch. Would there be an increase in number of tags available total overall? Or would you plan on harvesting the same number? What kind of effect would that have on other limited entry hunts in that area as they progress through the season?

Justin Shannon- With permits on Manti and Wasatch, we are managing to that age objective. If we need to increase permits, that mid season hunt is one we could put those in. If not, on the Manti, we are really close. We are managing 5 1/2-6 year old bull. If that comes in below and we are middle of the pack and we don't want to increase permits, we would shift permits around. We would recommend adding permits on the Wasatch. Not sure about the Manti.

John Blazzard- You will be pulling some from the early in the rut?

Justin Shannon- Yes

John Blazzard- You will be limiting opportunity there to draw out. Looks to me like it would still be affecting the muzzleloader hunt and the late hunt which starts Saturday. It will affect the quality of those hunts if we do that.

Justin Shannon- It may. It is just shifting the pie around. How many permits you put in that mid hunt, in conjunction with how many people apply? If you add permits, it is going to help everyone.

Matt Klar- Extended archery on the OIAL hunts. Is that supported by the group that brought up the proposal.

Justin Shannon- No, this is something we looked at to decide season dates. It was a way for us to give and compromise a little bit and provide opportunity.

Ben Lowder- Utah Bowman's Association- Plan to address in public comment. We have an alternate proposal.

Craig VanTassell- If you put in for OIAL, can you hunt with any weapon during the regular part and switch it to extended archery?

Justin Shannon- You would get to hunt with any weapon you wanted during season dates presented. If you are not successful, you have a 7 day window to hunt with archery. Or, hold out and just hunt with archery during that time frame. It is not turning in permits, it is just a true extension.

Craig VanTassell- It is probably not going to change your changes or odds at all?

Justin Shannon- No

Craig VanTassell- You have the option of having 7 days to archery hunt if you don't fill your tag.

Justin Shannon- Correct.

Public Comment

Troy Justensen- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Support the divisions recommendations with two exceptions. Late muzzleloader hunt. Original proposal from UBA. Provide more opportunity. Any weapon hunters additional tags.

Jennifer Chavez- Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation- Support proposal for additional tags.

Kurt Wood- Archery hunter. Would love to hunt sheep. Proposal addresses point creep. Would like to see this pass.

Ben Lowder- Utah Bowman's Association- Joint proposal with SFW, mule deer foundation and rocky mountain elk foundation. Create opportunity to hunt OIAL with a bow, lots of feedback. New hunts and more opportunity requested. Addresses point creep and OIAL system. Provides new and additional opportunities. Excited to see the October limited entry hunt. Accept remainder of the divisions recommendations.

Ross Worthington- Change with youth any bull. Get one week to hunt. Only 450 tags last year. Allow youth to continue to hunt general season.

RAC Comments

John Cavitt- Could you provide commentary as provided by UBA?

Justin Shannon- On which comment?

John Cavitt- Did you get the proposed changes?

Justin Shannon- Ok, at the end of the day, this is a social issue. When it comes to draw odds on OIAL hunts, everyone is on an even playing field. Based on what we heard from the RAC's and initial proposal by YUBA, our proposal still provided that time in the field with a bow. It gave the unsuccessful hunters more time to be successful.

John Cavitt- What about adding the additional tags on some of these?

Justin Shannon- On all of our units, we manage for 30-40% of class 3 and 4 rams observed from the helicopter. On some of those units, we are close to 30% and others closer to 40%. We can't just add

permits. Some units have flexibility, but others you can't just add them. You have to stick with the plan. You would be doing it at the expense of the any weapon hunter.

Justin Oliver- If you were to add those permits, what would the process be? How long would it take?

Justin Shannon- Right now, if the RAC were to set up hunts that were archery only, this spring I would come forward with permit recommendations to populate those different hunts. Then it would be discussed and decided on how many we did. It would not be done tonight.

Craig VanTassell- In the bison hunt, to add a hunt, you cannot by law add another hunt. You would have to take one from the any weapon hunt.

Justin Shannon- It is by public process like we are doing tonight. There are valid points. If success rates are really that low and adjust for that in the future, you might be able to squeeze one more permit out of it. The success rates are really high on the any weapon. For archery, it would be speculation at best on what it would be. It would certainly be lower. In some cases, they might be the same. We would have to look at the data. We probably do have a little bit more flexibility on the big horn sheep. I would have to look at those units a little closer.

Kevin McLeod- Most of the comments I have from the public for this meeting is really to do with point creep and the draw. Do you really think that there would be any real effect on point creep by these few changes?

Justin Shannon- I think it would be minimal. Unless we threw 15 tags at it and you had the chance to throw 3 or 4 more permits based on the success rates. I don't think it would hurt but I'm not convinced it would help all that much.

Bryce Thurgood- Applaud Ben and his crew for coming up with the idea. I like thinking outside of the box. Everybody is complaining about point creep but at the end of the day, this is going to help. I hope everybody considers giving it a chance. It is so few permits.

Kristin Purdy- Earlier this spring, we voted in opposition to a certain means of harvesting or increasing the hunts on trophy bucks. A very interested group gave us a great deal of feedback on managing, across the state, for trophy bucks to give trophy buck hunters a great deal more opportunity. Our five year plan is not oriented toward only trophy buck hunting. It is oriented to the health of the herd. It is scientifically data driven, biological driven and we chose a different path than that and stuck with the plan. I believe the proposals tonight do give more opportunity. There is a lot more that the division does than focusing and managing for hunter opportunity. I believe that the proposal diverts from the plan. The scientifically oriented, biologically driven plan. If we are consistent and stick with the plans developed with a great deal of deliberation this spring, why not stick with that same philosophy on this issue this fall.

Bryce Thurgood- You are referring to deer right?

Kristin Purdy- I am referring to sticking to the plans.

Justin Oliver- The only way this does anything with point creep is by adding another tag. If we don't add additional tags, just by swapping it over to archery only, it does nothing for point creep. It would require to add tags. There is no way today we are going to be able to add tags. The proposal is to look to the future and doing this asking the division to look at it from a biological side to make sure there is enough resource that we can do this. It appears that there will be some years the resources will be there. Does it have to wait every 5 years on a plan or is there a way to watch what is going on and adjust tags per year?

Justin Shannon- I think structurally, if we wanted to have archery only hunts, we could certainly do it. I don't think there is anything in the OIAL plans that prohibit a OIAL archery hunt opportunity from occurring. If you were to go that route, we would build the hunt structure today and then populate it with permits in the spring. That would be the process.

Justin Oliver- You would be using different parameters because when you are adding a OIAL hunt, you are using that success rate and you are looking at the resource when determining adding another hunt. If you consider, in the archery, now your success rates are different. You could look at it different and not use the same parameters and equations. Can it handle having another tag added to it? That is what they are looking at doing.

Justin Shannon- From my chair, that is exactly what we would have to do. If we had an archery hunt, the first year I have no idea what that success rate would be. It would have to be looked at over time. It is hard for me to say to what extent this would have. We may have great success but I don't know.

Matt Klar- Support Kristin's stance on the biology of that but I don't think we are addressing that tonight. We are addressing the social situation whether we are going to split out an archery only hunt. Then, in the spring once they have their population data, we will need to decide how to distribute those tags. I disagree that this is a matter of adding tags without the biology. I think today we are just trying to decide if we are going to recommend splitting out a separate archery hunt. And later on, the Division will recommend the number of tags appropriate for each hunt.

Kristin Purdy- Thank you for clarifying that. My concern is the plans. There is so much work from so many people. I would just like to be clear that we are not dispensing with them for the sake of hunter opportunity without looking at health of the herd and other issues that are biologically driven which should be the number one basis for each of our plans we have created.

Bryce Thurgood- The groups that proposed this are more interested in the health of the herd than anybody in state. They are not going to do anything to jeopardize this herd.

John Blazzard- If we are going to pull from the numbers someone has been putting in for with the chance to draw out, then I am opposed to this plan. If we are going to come up with another goat tag or another cow bison tag or another sheep tag, then that is fine. If we are going to pull from the existing number of tags then we are definitely hurting and injuring those who have been putting in for OIAL. We are creating a change that it is once in six lifetimes.

Bryce Thurgood- I see your point but I think there is room to come up with one or two extra tags.

Motion

Motion- Bryce Thurgood- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Division's recommendations with the addition of UBA's 2017 OIAL archery hunt recommendation season dates.

Second- Matt Klar

Discussion on the Motion

John Blazzard- With the addition of another limited entry elk hunt that would overlap the other general seasons, if they pull numbers from the original Wasatch elk draw, they are reducing the odds for those who have been putting in for years. I think that would harm those who put in every year. If we pull numbers from the hunts we have now in order to create another hunt, we will be harming those who have put in and bought points for years in order to hopefully draw out. I would be opposed to that part of the changes.

Kevin McLeod- Do we simply accept the plan as presented by the bowhunters? We don't even have the numbers. There is no number attached to those hunts as far as permits. I like the motion but I would prefer that we go back to the biology to determine whether there are enough animals to increase the number of tags. If so, do this in a future meeting when we know what the numbers are.

Justin Oliver- In accepting this proposal, that is what we are asking to do.

John Cavitt- Right, that is my understanding. We will not know numbers until this happens. We can then allocate the numbers to the different hunts at that point.

Justin Shannon- Just to clarify, if we say yes to this plan, then we have to put numbers to it. There is no going back in the spring because people have already put in for the hunt. If it gets approved, we would have to populate with some number of permits in the spring.

John Cavitt- We would be taking opportunity away from others.

Justin Shannon- I think the big horn sheep is probably the one where we have more flexibility on the number of permits. The bison, you have to harvest a certain amount and issue a certain amount of permits. If you start to issue a hunt, that would be carving out permits for that. Same with mountain

goats. Where we have a window on our big horn sheep, 30-40%, that is where we could look at it and see where we are at with that. Are we comfortable populating with those permits?

Bryce Thurgood- We increased bison tags on the Henry's last year correct?

Justin Shannon- I think so. I would have to go look. That is always going to fluctuate.

Bryce Thurgood- There is a chance we could increase the permits by a couple this year?

Justin Shannon- Certainly. Without doing anything, there is an equal chance we would decrease permits.

Matt Klar- Given that information, would it make sense to split these into two groups today. Authorize the building of the sheep hunt right now and authorize the Divisions recommendation for the other two as a trial run?

John Cavitt- The motion on the table is to approve this as presented but if the person that made the motion would like to amend it then we will vote on that. If it fails, we will come back and do another motion.

Kristin Purdy- The issue with amending the proposal. If we accept this proposal, you must populate the table. So, we are looking for numbers from you Justin. If you take the data based on surveys, you are going to plug those numbers into the table. Sometimes on other hunts, we may not always have the numbers. If you could comment on needing to populate the table and that it does not always mean that it is going to offer opportunity.

Justin Shannon- Outside of this proposal, every recommendation in the packet tonight, if those are approved, we would have a minimum of one permit in every one of them. We would have to. At a minimum, if we approve these 6 hunts, we would have to have a minimum of one permit.

Kristin Purdy- Language contingent on numbers and surveys, that is irrelevant. It is always contingent on that. You are going to populate this table based on the results of post season surveys.

Justin Shannon- Yes, but if we take a big horn sheep survey and see 9 more class 3 or class 4 rams, then that is 3-4 more permits we would issue whether this proposal was on the table or not. Those permits that are in the OIAL pool now, there is no getting around it. You would have to take a portion of those and put them into the archery. Even looking at big horn, if we were closer to 30% as opposed to the 40%, we would add independent of this. We have a set number of permits to issue to meet the plan. You are taking a portion of those out and putting them into archery. That is why it is a social issue.

Mike Laughter- Clarification on the motion.

Motion Fails- For: 5 Against: 6

Matt Klar- I don't think anything was approved.

Motion- Matt Klar- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Division's proposal on the sheep. Accept the Division's proposal on the other two hunts for one year to see how that works out.

Second- Justin Oliver

Discussion on the Motion

John Blazzard- What is the motion?

John Cavitt- The motion is to approve everything as presented by the Division and in addition to include the 2017 OIAL archery only hunts for the big horn sheep.

Justin Oliver- What does that do with the current proposal with adding the 7 days that the Division already proposed that they wanted to add?

John Cavitt- It would include it. This is just an addendum.

John Blazzard- Entertain that you would think about changing your motion to eliminate the other limited entry elk during the spike.

John Cavitt- That was proposed by the Division right?

Craig VanTassell- If they take animals out of the regular one? If they have extra numbers, would you be o.k. putting them into that one?

John Cavitt- Motion is being made and asking Matt to include that change. Whether or not that will be in the motion or not. That is to take out that elk?

John Blazzard- Correct.

John Cavitt-We can take that as a separate motion. We accepted everything as presented by the Division. We are adding these two sheep opportunities. There are four hunts.

Bryce Thurgood- We need to take a vote on what he is amending first.

John Cavitt- The elk would be included in this. There is an opportunity, if Matt would entertain this, would be to vote on these amended hunts first and then come back and address the remainder of the Divisions plan as presented.

Amending the motion

Motion- Matt Klar- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept UBA, OIAL archery only Sheep hunt recommendations and season dates.

Second- Russ Lawrence

Motion Passes- For: 9 Against :1

John Blazzard-Do we need to eliminate the original proposal for an extra 7 days on every OIAL hunt? Or is that off the table now?

John Cavitt- It is off the table.

Motion- John Blazzard- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Division's recommendation as presented with the exception of the 7 day archery extension for OIAL sheep and eliminate the extra limited entry bull elk hunts during the spike season.

Second- Kristin Purdy

Discussion on the Motion

Bryce Thurgood- What extra hunt are you talking about?

John Blazzard- Limited entry bull elk hunt which will be a new hunt that will go on at the same time as the spike only hunt. My understanding was that they were going to pull numbers for that hunt out of the existing limited entry elk hunts for those units which I am opposed to.

Bryce Thurgood- Clarify.

Justin Shannon- This is one where we would look at the average age of the unit. If the Manti and Wasatch are exceeding the three year average age, we would recommended a permit increase at the next meeting in the spring. If they were within the correct ages, we would probably leave it status quo. From there, we would come back in the spring and have to populate the various hunts we set up tonight with those permits.

John Cavitt- Does that answer your concern?

John Blazzard- That is what I thought they would do.

Craig VanTassell- If we had extra tags, it would be good to move those to limited entry during the spike hunt to help with point creep. If there are no extra tags, that is going to hurt some people who have a lot of points and are trying to hunt that during the rut.

Bryce Thurgood- If you want to take away the 7 days for bison and goat, what is that hurting?

John Blazzard- I was just thinking that the proposal was going to replace that. If we are going to leave the goats and bison on there, I guess that is ok. We won't change the application pool right?

Bryce Thurgood- That is what I was hoping we are going after.

John Blazzard- Is that ok?

John Cavitt- I thought you were making a motion about the Division's limited entry elk.

John Blazzard- That, plus the extended archery for big horn sheep. Because we changed and made a whole new hunt.

John Cavitt- We just added these sheep hunts right now. We have not done anything else. We need to go back to what the Division presented.

John Blazzard- I will amend my motion to say we take the sheep hunts that the Division proposed, off the table. The 7 day extended sheep hunts. That is going to be a whole new hunt now right?

John Cavitt- Is that right Justin?

Justin Shannon- I was going to address something else, so I don't know.

John Blazzard-We just created 4 archery hunts for big horn sheep so we need to take those extended times off of the Divisions plan. We can leave the goat and bison on as far as I am concerned. Those were already tabled hunts. I would like to eliminate that limited entry hunt until they can show us extra numbers in order to fill that hunt.

Motion Fails- For :3 Against: 7

Motion

Motion- Matt Klar- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Division's recommendation as presented with the exception of eliminating the 7 day archery extension for OIAL sheep.

Second- John Wall

Motion Passes: For: 8 Against: 2

Craig VanTassell- Extending the youth elk hunt.

Motion

Motion- Craig VanTassell- Recommend the Wildlife Board allow unsuccessful youth elk hunters to hunt during the general season elk hunt.

Second- Bryce Thurgood

Discussion on the Motion

Kevin McLeod- What is the success rate on the youth elk? How many youth permits do we issue a year?

Justin Shannon- I think we issued 500. I think the success rates are around 40%.

Randall Thacker- Yes, right around 40% success.

Kevin McLeod- What effect do you think, allowing the youth to hunt in the general season, would have on the herd unit populations?

Justin Shannon- It is a hard question. I have not looked at or pulled the data. That youth any bull hunt that we are going to clarify this year is that they can harvest a bull or a cow. If it is really about being successful, that would certainly help. Without having studied it, I do not have a good answer for you.

Kristin Purdy- If a youth hunter can take a bull or cow. The hunter take is not keeping up with the supply of cow elk. We can absorb a lot more take of cow elk in the state.

Justin Shannon- Especially on those any bull units. If we were to harvest more cow, especially when we are talking about 500 permits, 300 of which would not be filled. It is minimal.

Kristin Purdy- If we do some public math, 300 youth hunters are going to have the opportunity to take a cow elk where we have lots of cow elk. This may benefit the herd.

Justin Shannon- Sure, if you are over objective. None of our bull units are but those that are, it would help.

Kristin Purdy- Thank You.

Mike Laughter- How many days to youth hunters get on their hunt?

Justin Shannon- It is 9 days, if I remember right. It is at the same time as limited entry bull elk hunters.

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Justin Oliver- One thing was missed with passing the motion in regards to the boulder late season muzzleloader tag that was going to be eliminated this year. When we accepted that motion, we agreed they would eliminate that hunt?

John Cavitt- Yes, we accepted everything as proposed.

Item 7. Preference Point System Amendments

- Lindy Varney, Licensing Specialist

See RAC Packet

Public Questions

Ben Lowder- If an applicant were to put in for one choice and not draw, then go buy a tag over the counter, would they retain their points or lose their points?

Lindy Varney- They retain their points.

Ben Lowder- Is that true with limited entry as well?

Lindy Varney- No, it is completely different.

Ben Lowder- In the case that somebody buys a limited entry that is left over, they would lose their bonus points but for general deer, they would not lose their preference points.

Lindy Varney- Right, because like you said, it does not happen very often. In general season, we do have remaining permits. Not just for general season deer but for antlerless elk as well.

Brandon Zundel- Antlerless, swan and grouse permits. Right now, if you draw an antlerless tag, you lose your points.

Lindy Varney- Correct, any hunt choice you lose your points. It is only general season buck deer that is different.

Brandon Zundel- Under the antlerless permits or these other ones, is the draw order the same as it is right now with buck deer preference points.

Lindy Varney- Yes.

Brandon Zundel- It would make an impact on antlerless if that draw order was changed?

Lindy Varney- Yes, it would.

Public Comment

Brandon Zundel- I agree with what is being proposed. Especially, changing the draw order. 65% of hunting public only want to hunt one or two areas. The rest just want to hunt.

Troy Justensen- Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife- Support the Division's recommendations.

RAC Comment

Russ Lawrence- Think about this in relation to my kids. I never put in for a second choice if I was going to lose my points.

John Cavitt- Do you want to address some of Brandon's comments and concerns.

Lindy Varney- If you vote for something like that, it takes away the meaning of the preference point drawing. The definition of a preference point is to allow you to get your preferred unit every few years and give you the certainty that you will get that permit. If it goes in a random drawing, you never know what you are going to get. Data has shown that a lot of hunters did apply for just one unit but then if you look at their second unit, those who do apply, it is the same unit but a different weapon. They are willing to hunt rifle, muzzleloader or archery. They don't care what weapon type it is, they want that unit. If you go to a random drawing, it will take away that issue. It does not solve the social issue that is out there. I

do get a lot of calls from hunters explaining that it is not fair that someone drew their 3rd choice over their 1st choice. You can discuss what works best and how you feel. The Division is open to other options. We are not set in stone on this. But, to us, this one worked well.

Bryce Thurgood- His proposal would be more the preference point system staying in tact and everyone would go to the draw right? After all those tags are issued in that first part, then he is saying to go to a random draw after that. So, the preference point system is still intact.

Lindy Varney- Kind of.

Bryce Thurgood- For 80% of the draw, it is still intact.

Lindy Varney- Yes.

Bryce Thurgood- You are just going to the random for the remaining. It is a small number.

Lindy Varney- It is a small number. Hunters want to hunt and are still willing to put in a second choice for the same unit. Preference point system for the first choice, other than that it is not.

Motion

Motion-Kevin McLeod- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Preference Point System Amendments as presented.

Second- John Blizzard

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Item 8. NER Deer Management Plans

- Randall Thacker, Northeastern Region Asst. Wildlife Manager

See RAC Packet

Motion

Motion-Bryce Thurgood- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept NER Deer Management Plans as presented.

Second- John Wall

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Item 9. CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2017

- Covey Jones, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Kristin Purdy- Concern at Deer Creek CWMU?

Covy Jones- Harvest is one of the issues. Priority was another issue. There were several times where they were told they would be met at the gate and they were not met at the gate. They were not put first or harvesting. It almost felt like a private hunting club.

Motion

Motion- Justin Oliver- Recommend the Wild Board accept CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2017.

Second- Matt Klar

Motion Passes- Unanimous

**SOUTHERN REGION RAC MEETING
Cedar Middle School, Cedar City, UT
November 15, 2016 5:00 p.m.**

1. REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

MOTION: To accept the minutes and agenda as written.

VOTE: Unanimous.

2. ELK UNIT MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISIONS

MOTION: To accept the Elk Unit Management Plans Revision as presented.

AMENDMENT TO MOTION: To add stronger language in the Southern Region plans to address elk depredation on private lands upon the private landowner's request.

VOTE ON AMENDED MOTION: Passed 8:5

VOTE: Unanimous

3. BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL 2017 SEASON DATES, APPLICATION TIMELINE

MOTION: To accept the Bucks, Bulls, & OIAL 2017 Season Dates, Application Timeline as presented with the exception of adding the UBA proposal (see attachment 3).

AMENDMENT TO MOTION: To keep the muzzle loader limited entry buck deer hunt on the Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits.

VOTE ON AMENDED MOTION: Unanimous

VOTE: Unanimous

4. PREFERENCE POINT SYSTEM AMENDMENTS

MOTION: To accept the Preference Point System Amendment as presented.

VOTE: Passed 11:2

5. NER DEER MANAGEMENT PLANS

MOTION: To accept the NER Deer Management Plans as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

6. CWMU MANAGEMENT PLANS & PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2017

MOTION: To accept the CWMU Management Plans & Permit Numbers for 2017 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous (1 abstained)

MOTION: To ask the Board to consider adding an action item of issuing 2 permits every other year for CWMU's that only have 1 public permit so Bonus points are an advantage.

VOTE : Unanimous

7. LANDOWNER ASSOCIATION PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2017

MOTION: To accept the Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous (1 abstained)

8. 2017 SOUTHERN REGION RAC LOCATIONS & START TIMES SCHEDULE

MOTION: To keep the RAC Schedule the same as 2016 (schedule attached)

VOTE: Unanimous

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Brian Johnson Sean Kelly Layne Torgerson Wade Heaton Rusty Aiken Dale Bagley Dave Black (Chairman) Nick Jorgensen Brayden Richmond Gene Boardman Craig Laub Mack Morrell Harry Barber Mike Worthen	Mindi Cox Stephanie Rainey Zed Broadhead Kevin Bunnell Teresa Griffin Riley Peck Justin Shannon Lindy Varney Phil Tuttle Josh Pollock Blaine Cox Darren Diblois Randall Thacker Brian Shearer Dave Smedley Vance Mumford Jason Nicholes Mike Wardle Dustin Schaible Jim Lamb Gary Bezzant Covy Jones	Donnie Hunter Steve Dalton	

Dave Black called the meeting to order at 5:01 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.

Dave Black: Thank you, our first action item tonight is to accept the meeting minutes and agenda.

Dale Bagley: accept

Brayden Richmond: second it.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)

Dale Bagley made the motion to accept the agenda and minutes as presented. Brayden Richmond seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Dave Black: Next agenda item is an informational item that will be from Kevin Bunnell, will be a Wildlife Board update.

**Wildlife Board Update and Regional Update:
-Kevin Bunnell, Southern Regional Supervisor**

Kevin Bunnell: I wasn't at the board meeting, I was attending another meeting but and Donnie and, Donnie and Steve help me if we get anything wrong here but I don't think there was anything, it was mostly to do with fishing regulations and it went rather smoothly if I understand right, so nothing significant to report from the board meeting.

Dave Black: Okay, we will also follow up with Kevin with the regional update.

Kevin Bunnell: Thank you and I'll try to be brief because we've got a large agenda. In our wildlife section, the deer hunt went very well this year. We had good weather. We've seen a lot of, talked to a lot of people that are seeing more deer than they have in the past and if you are connected to anybody that, or groups of people that hunt you've all had a lot of pictures of big animals that are being texted back and forth and it seems to have been a good year. You know my opinion is that we are in the good old days of deer hunting in Utah right now. And we are going to do what we can to maintain that as long as Mother Nature cooperates with us but obviously, weather has had a big part of that. We are in the middle right now of doing our pheasant releases and having our youth hunts. We released pheasants at several places around the region. Usually on Thursday or Friday prior to the weekend hunt. There is a list of those places where they are being released on the website. We've had several youth pheasant hunts around the region. That have been very successful. I took my own boys out. Last Saturday out to the Pavont.

Brian Johnson: Can I just say something?

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah, go ahead.

Brian Johnson: It was so much fun. I took my kids to the Beaver one two weeks ago and I took my kids and some nephews and some other people to the Pavont one. And the habitat there, the work that the Division has done is incredible. They had great cover, those birds weren't running it was, I mean they were running a little bit but it was great coverage. It was just so much fun to see every kid there just grinning from ear to ear cause they all shot their shotguns. They all got the crap scared out of them stepping on pheasants. It was just so much fun. I watched a 9-year-old little girl ground pound two roosters and she was just ecstatic about it. It was awesome. So, I want to just thank the Division and SFW because it was so much fun to watch those kids pull the trigger and get to see wild birds. You'd hear bang bang bang bang bang and then you'd just see that bird keep on going and you are like sweet, let's go chase him. And you'd just go chase and it would fly and it was awesome so thank you guys, it was good.

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah, they were a lot of fun. On a personal note, my own son, my older boy you know hasn't been, really caught the bug on hunting and after Saturday I think I've got him closer than I ever have. So, if you have, you know a young person that you want to get excited about hunting, you know those youth hunts, there is not a better opportunity to do that than on a youth pheasant hunt so take advantage of that. There is lots of captures coming up in our wildlife section. They will be doing deer, elk, prong horn and big horn sheep. All, over the next four or five months that will be going on at various places across the region. The Biologists are in the middle, or just starting their deer

classifications right now. That's probably the most important data that we collect relative to big game in the year because that's where we get our buck to doe ratios and then that obviously helps determine permit numbers and everything so they put a lot of time and effort into that. Within our Wildlife Section, they are taking advantage of the good weather right now and trying to sprint to the finish on all the habitat projects. We've got close to thirty thousand acres of habitat projects that are about twenty-five thousand acres of pro-active work and about five thousand acres of fire rehab that is going on, but as soon as we get all that seed in the ground I think all of us need to pray for rain and snow cause as enjoyable as this fall has been, we gotta have some water for next year. The other thing that is noteworthy, the number of deer that has been getting hit on the road and we track that closely is up this year. That's good and bad. It's up because our deer numbers are up. It's bad obviously because its causing damage to people's vehicles and, and deer are dying in the process. Gary's crew is out you know trying to find if we have holes in fences and things like that and trying to get that stuff repaired and fix the problems where we can. But those numbers are up and we'll have seasonal road closures will be beginning on our wildlife management areas on January 1st. From our law enforcement section, obviously, this is the biggest time, or busiest time for them. Just to give you a few numbers. From, so within this calendar year, starting last January, within the Southern Region, our law enforcement have investigated, so there's lots of others out there they probably don't know about but they've investigated 313 illegal kills. Of those 53 are deer, 24 are elk, and the bulk of them are fishing violations, 142 fishing violations, but still, those are pretty large numbers and the vast majority of those come from, from tips from the public. From other hunters being the eyes and ears and reporting when they see something that doesn't look right and that's where, where a lot of the success comes in the law enforcement world. Brian or Zed, either one of you want to add anything to that? Okay, you know on that note there is currently we are offering a reward, it's a joint, we put a reward out there and SFW matched it to try to get information on a trophy buck that was killed on the Monroe Unit. You can find information on that online and we really would like to figure out what happened with that one. Within the aquatic section the Fish Lake perch tournament that has been going on for the last couple of years and growing every year, is scheduled again for this year. I don't remember the date. We are looking for some dedicated hunters to help with that if you know of anybody who needs dedicated hunter hours. We've got a big walleye tournament going on at Lake Powell. That will be going on for the next several months. We've had some really good prizes donated for that so if you enjoy Lake Powell, now is the time to be fishing at Lake Powell. We have stocked some big brown trout here on the pond just here on Leigh hill that the locals here in Cedar City have been taking advantage of and there will be some other, some more large brood fish going into the community ponds down in St. George over the next couple of weeks. That always creates quite a buzz when people are catching five and six-pound trout out of these little community ponds. And again, Richard, Richard is asking everyone to do rain dances or do whatever you can to make sure that there is water for fish next Spring. In our Admin Section, we're finally back to full staff. If you remember our last update we were kind of running on a skeleton crew but we've got Stephanie back from surgery and doing well and we've hired and now my mind just went blank, Mindi, I hate it when I do that. And everybody is doing very well. And just if you haven't put your permit application for the Sportsman permit, those close tomorrow. And the drawing, the results will be posted November 23rd, so that is one that is a pretty quick turnaround. You know, best tag in the state if you can get it. From our Outreach Section, they put a big effort in every year into the Hunters Helping Condor Program with our non-lead program on the Zion Unit and that continues to grow and we continue to get a higher percentage of people participating in that every year. They've been getting a lot of photos submitted to our Facebook page of all the animals that have been killed this year and if you want to do that you can share those directly via direct message on the Southern Region Facebook Page. Phil and his crew are currently going out and capturing a lot of video of rutting mule deer and will be

putting together some videos that they'll share over social media. Probably starting next week and then continuing for a couple weeks so, so watch for those. That's all I've got Dave but I'm happy to answer any questions.

Dale Bagley: Have you got any preliminary data on harvest success rates on the muzzleloader hunts since we've allowed magnified scopes?

Kevin Bunnell: No, it will be a while. Justin when will we start having data come in on that?

Justin Shannon: That will be closer to January, February. January, February is when we'd have that summarized.

Kevin Bunnell: (Inaudible) are you hearing anything?

Justin Shannon: Success rates are really high on archery, muzzle loader and any weapon. But I think last year we had some of the highest success rates we've seen on these general season units. We harvested as many deer last year as we did since 2000 and we did it with a lot few permits and so those success rates were quite a bit higher. It's hard to know but my guess is we're pretty similar to last year.

Kevin Bunnell: Any other questions? It's nice to have a full house. I don't think we're missing anybody tonight. Mike, and he is the guy that lives the closest. Mike lives right here in Cedar.

Dave Black: K, thank you Kevin. Before we move on to our next action item I just wanted to echo both Kevin and Brian on the youth pheasant hunt. My daughter participated this year in New Harmony with Jason Nichol's kids. Maybe next year we'll do a better job getting the word out. We only had 4 youth at that session that we went to but it was awesome. That was the first time my daughter killed a bird with a shotgun and the first bird that came up she was able to get it with one shot and we just had a great time and I appreciate the work that and the effort that was put in there and I hope that they continue to do that in the future. Item #5 is the Elk Unit Management Plan Revision. Before we get started I think most of you guys are familiar with the process. Just to go over it briefly, if you have a comment tonight you need to fill out a comment card. The yellow cards, there is some in the back. Make sure those are delivered up front, as we go through we'll have the presentation first, we'll have an opportunity after that for the RAC members to ask questions and then if there is any questions from the public, they can be asked at that time. We'll probably have the public come to the microphone on your left. And then if you ask a question we'd probably ask that you just limit any follow up questions to one after your main question. With the comments tonight we will give organizations five minutes to present their comment. Any follow up speakers from that same organization or individuals we'd allow three minutes for their comment. Since we do have a large agenda item we will follow the time tonight. And then we'll have comments from the RAC and then we'll have motions and voting after that. So, with that we'll start with Agenda Item #5 with Justin Shannon.

Elk Unit Management Plan Revisions (action)

-Justin Shannon, Big Game Coordinator

(see attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: K, great, do we have any questions from the RAC? Layne.

Layne Torgerson: Justin so with these proposed increases on some, especially some of the units in the North, what does that do to the overall to the statewide objective? I know we were talking about if I remember right the number was 80,000. When we were, when we were working on the management plan?

Justin Shannon: Yeah, so the last plan had an objective of 80,000 and if you remember we took that out of the statewide elk plan so we don't have a specific number or an arbitrary number that regions are simply trying to get to. With the increases, if the RACS and the Wildlife Board were to approve all of this tonight, it would be an increase of about 7,250 elk statewide. Which puts our objective just over 78,000. Is that kind of what you were getting at? Okay.

Dave Black: K Brayden.

Brayden Richmond: Just a question and you commented and it's in there that there is a diverse group at these plans and I participated in two, well I participated in the Beaver plan and then also a meeting over in Richfield, I don't know what we called that meeting. But in both of those, I guess I'm just curious what diverse means and who is invited because in both of those by far, the majority there were cattlemen and although cattlemen are a part of it, it didn't seem very diverse.

Justin Shannon: You know what we try to do is make sure that sportsman are represented, cattlemen, federal agencies, all that type of thing, if you have a, I don't know the specific management plan or the committee, it might be more of a local question.

Brayden: And there were, there were groups from everybody there but you know in each of those there were 2 sportsmen and gol, I want to say between 10 and 15 cattlemen.

Justin Shannon: Did they all have a, who can speak to that, is Teresa here? Vance, do you want to come up? This is why I'm glad I brought back-up. I didn't attend all these unit plans. Thanks Vance.

Vance Mumford: Yeah so at the meeting in Richfield there, so we had our official committee members that were invited to represent their different groups and then we just had some people that just came that were not part of the, the official representative, they just came and that was probably where the, where the cattlemen had a good representative, group of people. So, that's why there was those extra people there. They weren't technically voting members but they were just there.

Brayden Richmond: They were awfully vocal.

Vance Mumford: Yeah. Yeah.

Dave Black: Mack.

Mack Morrell: When we met last March, on the elk numbers, we had Bill Christensen here from the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation. And he kind of gave a mandate to DWR regarding the predation we were having on agriculture, I want to know what is your strategy there?

Justin Shannon: So, your question is what do we do with depredating elk?

Mack Morrell: No, do you remember what Bill Christensen said?

Justin Shannon: Vaguely, he said something to the effect that we need to work together, sportsmen and.

Mack Morrell: Well what he said is, if the elk are in your fields, then kill them. That's his exact words. And my question is to DWR, where do we stand on that. How do we take care of that? Because agriculture is continually, especially in the Southern Region, shouldering a big load in the winter time.

Justin Shannon: Sure, at the 30,000-foot view, we have said this many times, we, we don't want to grow elk and deer on the backs of landowners that don't want them. So, if that involves killing them, we are certainly open to that. For every, I mean these elk, if you look at the units and the objectives, if you can kill elk in the bad areas, the areas that are causing problems, the areas that we're losing public support for elk and deer and we can harvest those animals, that means we can grow them on other parts of the unit where they are more socially acceptable. So, that's the answer.

Mack Morrell: So, you are willing to take them off, is that it?

Justin Shannon: No, we are willing to issue depredation permits,

Mack Morrell: Well that's, you know all that really does is I think we are just treading water at best. Because the cow elk are training their calves to do the same thing they're doing.

Justin Shannon: If we need to get more aggressive in some of these areas let's have a conversation.

Mack Morrell: Well if you go by what Bill Christensen said you ought to be more aggressive. I mean he gave a mandate you know. He said the elk is not gonna leave but if they are in your fields let's get rid of them.

Justin Shannon: And Mack we are, I mean we have some areas that we've been aggressive with elk this summer, that we've been aggressive with elk this fall. I mean I've got Colby Jones here he is the coordinator that oversees the depredation program and he, he can probably cite a lot of examples of where we we've approved a lot of cow elk permits and really given these things out to help landowners.

Mack Morrell: I think that ought to be part of the elk plan. What he said. You know rather than what you got in the elk plan is that we're gonna give you a few tags just to keep you satisfied with what's happening in your fields. You know that isn't working much, so.

Justin Shannon: Well if we need to do better let's do better. But it is in the plan, that third bullet down, we, and that's why we have these depredation permits is to make progress and harvest some elk and reduce elk in these areas that, that landowners don't want them. I mean we don't, I'm not sure what we gain by ignoring depredation requests and not taking action. We lose public support for these elk, we frustrate land owners. We pay damage claims and so it's in our best interest, your best interest, sportsmen best interests to remove animals in these areas that,

Mack Morrell: Well I agree, you're right.

Dave Black: Any other questions from the RAC?

Nick Jorgenson: Justin under your little display for habitat management you talk about supporting federal agencies, managing horse populations objectives, is the trend to reduce the numbers, is that what it is with, that we are supporting?

Justin Shannon: Yeah, I just think that any support that we can give them whether it's politically, socially, biologically, whatever we need to do to be in their camp when they are proposing decreases in horse populations, that's what we're after.

Nick Jorgenson: And then what are you doing in terms of assessing the feeding practices at the Hardware Ranch? Is it reduce the amount that, or what is it that you are doing there?

Justin Shannon: Yeah, let's have Darren speak to that. Darren is the assistant Wildlife Manager on the Cache and he can talk about, talk of why that was such an issue on the Cache Plan.

Darren Deblois: Thanks, Darren Deblois, Northern Region. We've actually been, had a couple committees on Hardware. Our concern at Hardware is brucellosis. Those elk are right across the border from Wyoming and Idaho where, where we have pretty big migration routes. Wyoming has done a lot of GPS work with migration and so we're a little bit concerned so it's gonna be, what we're gonna do is GPS collar some elk at Hardware, get a better feel for where they are going. We do have bulls that show up in Soda Springs, Idaho out into (inaudible) out, you know they go a long ways so we're concerned about bringing brucellosis back in the state. So, the strategy is to maintain what we're doing at Hardware now, the status quo for a couple years, and then start playing around with the feeding regime and see if we can maybe get those elk to winter there without having to be fed every year. And in heavy winters where we have concerns about elk in the valley or, or possible starvation, we'd look at feeding in those years. So, that is it in a nutshell.

Nick Jorgensen: K. Thank you.

Dave Black: We would like to welcome Harry and Mike also, coming in late. We appreciate you here. Any other questions from the,

Craig Laub: I just was wondering and it doesn't involve the Southern region that much, but some of those units in the North took a pretty substantial raise, was in the elk committees were they on board with the increases in some of those areas that much?

Darren Deblois: Yeah, they were. A lot of those units up north are, are dominated by private lands and we had many private landowners come and ask for additional elk in those, those areas.

Dave Black: Okay. Gene.

Gene Boardman: On these private land people that are asking for additional elk and the ones that are wanting more elk killed and don't want em on their land, I am always wondering are their lands opened to hunting?

Justin Shannon: It probably depends the landowner. You certainly have landowners that the answer is no. It, when you say is their land open to hunting, it's not just that anyone in the public can come in and access it, there is a lot of landowners that are pretty particular about that. But there is others that are more open to it. A lot of these landowners let friends and families and others come on and get that access. And I know that can be frustrating to, to sportsmen at times cause they say this doesn't directly benefit me as a sportsmen, I don't have access to these properties. But the purpose of these private land permits and we've got some good feedback on it already, is if you can apply that hunting pressure there and you can get the harvest on those private lands, then it distributes the elk off of those private lands and then you get that harvest so you can grow them elsewhere on the unit. Like we've talked about and then that indirectly helps public hunters because there is more elk on these public land units where they are trying to apply and put in for. So, hope that helps but no, not every landowner opens their land up to hunting.

Dave Black: Anybody else on the RAC?

Questions from the Public:

None

Comments from the Public:

Dave Black: Okay we have 2 comment cards. The first is John Keeler, followed by Bryce Pillings.

John Keeler: John Keeler (attachment 2) with the Utah Farm Bureau. The Farm Bureau was represented at these unit management plan c committee meetings. There were 4 in my region. I went to 3 of them but had some other individuals that represented me at the one in Panguitch, well actually it was in Cedar but it was for Panguitch Lake. These are some of the items that we brought up at these meetings and are presenting them for your consideration. We feel that these points, if implemented, will help the success of these elk unit plans. Number 1, any proposed increase in elk unit objection numbers should only be considered if there is a significant increase in the acres of land with any unit that has been treated for elk habitat and those acres are producing enough forage to sustain the increase in elk. The forage component is critical, it has gotta be there in order to sustain these animals. That's true for livestock as well as wildlife but that production needs to be there. If the elk unit population numbers are over objective currently then they must be brought back to objective before any increases are allowed based on the previous point. In some of these areas that are over, chronically over objective numbers, those numbers have got to be brought back into objective in order for it to be successful. I know particularly in the Southwest Desert, that meeting there, with the horse numbers the way they are and the problem that exists there and I know that the plan calls for working with federal agencies on this, but there is no hardly any workability that is going on there. Those numbers are continuing to increase and Congress doesn't seem to be willing to take action on it. I know they do gather some in some areas but they are increasing so we really do need to watch those numbers there, elk numbers and they've got to be brought back into objective. All land treatments must be monitored to demonstrate the vegetative production will support the proposed increase and I think that's called for in the plan so we need to be vigilant on that. Land treatments must be made to the critical range that is needed for the elk winter or summer range. Be sure that its done and what is needed for the elk. Special hunts need to be conducted to control problem elk or elk that are over objective or in areas that have special resource issues, agriculture depredation, aspen treatments, etc., and that is called for in the plan. DWR needs to put collars on more

elk to monitor where the problem areas are and where problem elk are and most of the plans are calling for those. More water developments need to be installed to disperse animals for both wildlife and livestock. And if increases in elk numbers can be justified, based on the health and availability of the forage resources, then increases in livestock should be considered and implemented as well. This is one of the items that this (inaudible) group is working on that we if, if the range can sustain increases in elk then they can sustain more AUM's with livestock then we want to be sure that that happens. Thank you very much.

Dave Black: Thank you.

Bryce Pillings: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Bryce Pillings with Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife and we support the plan the division has put out as presented. We'd also like to thank the Division for all their hard work they've done over the years and continue to do so. Thank you.

Dave Black: Okay we also have some additional comment cards for item #5. We have Ben Lowder followed by Mike Twitchell.

Ben Lowder: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Ben Lowder representing the Utah Bowmans Association. Had the opportunity to sit on the Statewide Elk Committee as well as the Wasatch Unit Elk Committee. Very excited about some of the new tools that we have coming from those, those plans and as we've seen em start to get implemented this year. Excited to see the new plans that have been presented here tonight and the increases in the objectives on those various units and we support those 100%. I've also had the opportunity every year to attend the Habitat and Conservation Allocation Meeting held at the Division Office up in Salt Lake in Spring, usually in April, that's where all the organizations come together to spend money on habitat projects and we'd just like to point out that I witness every year the conservation organizations are putting millions of dollars on the ground to go towards habitat projects and we're doing these every year to help, and I believe that that helps support the cause for these increases. So, thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you.

Mike Twitchell: My name is Mike Twitchell, I am just representing myself. I'd just like to support the Division's plan as presented. I think its sound and it seems to make sense so I just want to be on the record for saying that. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you. Next we have Gilbert Yardley followed by Rodney, followed by Rodney (inaudible).

Gilbert Yardley: Well I wandered right out in these halls for 15 or 20 minutes and couldn't find this place, you guys are well hid. We summer on the Panguitch Lake Unit up on top of this Cedar Mountain. We've got the largest cattle permits up there. My family got those permits in 1908, my granddad did and he was running 400 head. Now, we're running 140 on those same permits. We didn't have any elk on this Cedar Mountain 25 years ago. And I don't mind seeing some, and I'm, I like to see em and I know all you guys like to hunt but these elk numbers has gotten completely out of hand up on that mountain. We didn't go in some of our upper pastures until the 20th of July, this year and when we got up there, them pastures were just grubbed right completely in the ground. Them elk had been there when the first blade of green grass showed up. They'd taken all of that pasture, We was way short of feed for

our cattle. We've got five families that have to make a living from the (inaudible) that we've got. I love these mountains and I love the desert out there where we winter. And I want my kids to have the right to keep doing what I'm doing and what I love and what I've taught them to love. To me, my permits, this mountain where we run, my ranches, my desert out there, to me that's sacred ground and we don't want to abuse it. We try to take the best care of it that there is. We don't want to abuse the range but if we didn't sell a bunch of heifer calves every year and just kept all the increase we couldn't support those cattle. No way. And then, when we have a drought year we voluntarily keep the cows off of those permits. So, that grass doesn't get killed out. I'll tell ya, we've got to take more cows elk off of that Panguitch Lake Unit. And, they tell me that you only get a 50% chance of killing em so if you let out 250 tags, you only get 125, that's not cutting the numbers down. We can't just keep raising these numbers forever. If you don't control these elk numbers, they're gonna kill these ranges right out. Now they say in the Panguitch Lake Unit, well we've done a lot of conservation work and a lot of reseeded and everything down there on Sage Hen and down there out South of Panguitch, that's all winter range, what about the summer range. That's where the critical issues are with those elk. They get up there before the first blade of green grass starts they just took that whole country this summer, this spring. So, we've got to take more of em off. For the good of the range, you've got to consider those things gentlemen. These ranges, they can't take constant beating and survive and we, we try to protect em, we want to have grass land. We want to be able to go back year after year. And we've been doing that. And we've got along fine. This is getting worse, this is the worst year we ever had. I never saw it when they came and they had it all eaten off before we got there. Now, we winter on the Southwest Desert, 25 miles West of Minersville, best winter range in the world. My cows stay just as fat out there as they did if we fed em all the hay they can eat. But those winter ranges are extremely delicate and if they once get killed out you will never get em back. Those plants are too fragile. We've not only got the wild horses but we've got this elk problem out there too. And we got we got em to take off 600, what have they got listed for this year. I couldn't get here, I'm awful sorry I couldn't get here on time, and my boys was wanting to talk and they couldn't be here yet. But I want to talk on that Southwest Desert, we've got about 1000 acres of private land up in the Shawnee Hills of that Southwest Desert, we spent over 30,000 dollars of our own money plus a lot of time, railed all those trees, burned em all up and re-seeded it all, those elk just come in there and we've got a drought out there that's been terrible. And they're grubbing that right into the ground along with the wild horses but actually right up in that particular area the elk is worse than the darn horses.

Dave Black: Gib, excuse me, we love to hear from you. You are 2 minutes over if we could get you to wrap up your comments we'd appreciate that.

Gilbert Yardley: Well I am talking about 2 different allotments.

Dave Black: Well we've allowed five minutes per group. And you've have had 7 so far so we need to get you to wrap things up please.

Gilbert Yardley: Well I'm just telling you the way it is from our situation. And we hope that you will cut these numbers down cause we've got to do it to live with and I will tell you, that Southwest Desert, between the horses and the elk they're gonna destroy that beautiful wonderful country out there so please give those things your very very serious consideration gentlemen because we've got to take more of those cows off, seriously. And, if they're only getting a 50% kill then we need to give em twice as many tags to get the numbers down so please do that.

Dave Black: Thank you.

Kevin Bunnell: Gib, Are Rodney or Steven here yet?

Gilbert Yardley: No, they couldn't make it.

Kevin Bunnell: Okay.

Dave Black: Okay, that's all the comment cards, is that right? Okay, comments from the RAC? Go ahead Brayden.

RAC discussion and vote:

Brayden Richmond: I got a comment. I'm gonna ramble a little bit here but I'll get to the point. I won't take more than 7 minutes. First, I want to say, elk is an interesting one, it's a great problem to have, an animal that you gotta figure out how to kill it. Wish we could do that with mule deer. Cause that's really what the problem comes down to is how do we kill enough of em. They love to grow and the only way you kill em is bullets. But I have some concerns. Like I said a minute ago I participated in 2 different, I participated in the Beaver Committee and then in a meeting over in Richfield. And over the past couple of years we've really had a lot of kumbaya moments in this meeting where we've talked about sportsmen and ranchers getting along. And frankly that is the answer. We've got enough enemies, we don't need to fight amongst ourselves. At the same time I feel like we're getting abused a little bit and I just want to bring up a couple little things here. Both those meetings, sportsmen were outnumbered by far by ranchers. Ranchers should have a voice but it shouldn't be a much bigger voice than sportsmen. This is public lands we're talking about. For the majority of the Beaver Unit. Beaver Unit is very little private land. I would echo what we said here earlier. If elk are in fields, let's kill em. You know, elk are smart, they learned quick. After the Richfield meeting there was an idea to go in and kill some elk on private lands and the private landowner didn't let us. Didn't let the Division. So you get up and complain and complain and complain about elk being on your land and then when the Division tries to do something about it, you tell em no. That's frustrating. Sportsmen, I don't believe, I could be wrong, I've never heard of a sportsmen going to a Forest Service Meeting or a BLM meeting and opposing cattle increases. Never heard of it. I've never heard a sportsmen talk about opposing cattle increases, but we sure get a lot of that from the cattlemen. I also agree that if we can increase elk, we should be able to increase cattle. We're doing a lot of habitat work, millions of dollars of habitat work. Unfortunately, the Division doesn't have the power to increase cattle but they do have the power to increase elk. And a decision should be based more on biological issues than on social issues which they currently are. You go to the Beaver Management Plan it shows a list of projects completed, I believe there is 17 that it shows and then a bullet it says, many additional projects were completed by the Forest Service, there is also additional projects completed by the BLM, yet the primary limiting factor was the cattlemen at the meeting said if you continue to do projects we may allow you to increase. First of all I don't know why the cattlemen get to tell us we may allow you. That was a sore point for me, but history doesn't prove that that promise holds any weight. I would like to see the limiting factors based on habitat as the primary limiting factor and not on opinion. And, it just seems like we're kind of beating the same drum here and we have been for years so that's my comment.

Dave Black: Mack.

Mack Morrell: Here we go, to my knowledge, there hasn't been any increases on cattle, in fact we've been last four years we've been decreased about sixty, seventy percent from what we had. Okay. And the other thing, we, work on AUM's. We pay money to buy those AUM's and also we pay an annual fee to take that grass. Okay, okay so that's what I'm saying, that's where we stand on that. Okay. And, Gib's right, the elk at least on my allotment, same thing, we go up there and there was nothing. Elk takes the feed all, starting when the snow recedes and goes and takes it. Usually there is some left for us but this summer there wasn't any. I look at Gib's unit, Southwest Desert, over population of approximately 600. Panguitch Lake overpopulation approximately 600. So he has a legitimate complaint. And I think that we, we want to get along. You look what John Keeler presented for the Farm Bureau, you know, I think a lot of thought went into that John, I appreciate that. On, between wildlife and livestock because it's, you know, and on private land, you know I talked about that earlier, you know we have no complaints we just want to maintain our share that we've got. And if there is an increase we'd like to get it. Cause we've been decreased sixty, seventy percent than we was 40 years ago and the range looks a lot better and there wasn't any elk then.

Dave Black: I would like to make a comment first. It will be interesting to see the elk numbers but I don't know if they're gonna count elk on Panguitch Lake this year but I know that since August of this year they have been pounding the elk. Hard. Killing cows and spikes and I hope they bring the numbers down. If the numbers are still up, Gib, I think they should pound em again next year. Cause I agree, if we have an objective, we have an obligation to stay there but I think the effort is being made and they've been trying really hard this year to bring those numbers down and there are still more cow elk hunts coming up and I hope to kill 2 of em myself. But I think that the efforts are being made and so I hope that we are supporting you now and that we continue to do so in the future. And I think we're moving in the right direction. You know sometimes I feel like we get here and we're opposing each other but you know the other times I think you know in reality we are trying to meet everybody's goals and we are trying to work together and we are trying to address Panguitch Lake and Southwest Desert. Nobody will argue with you those are critical issues and I think it's being done and I'm pretty sure it's being done and I hope we're successful this year. Brian.

Brian Johnson: Like Brayden said, it's an interesting problem to have, to try to figure out how to kill, like what the best way to kill an elk, and I think like you mentioned, we, we put a bunch of cow tags out, we put a bunch of hunters in the field, I just wonder if it would be beneficial or even if it would make a difference, but I would like to see with that general season muzzleloader tag on these units that are chronically over objective, why can't these guys with a muzzleloader, go ahead and take a cow, if they're there. If we are chronically over objective lets create another opportunity to kill another cow. Because, so I'm just wondering if this, if this board would be open to something like that.

Justin Shannon: Yeah, so the strategy that you are talking about is if you had a muzzleloader elk hunter that's already in the field, could they harvest a cow elk similar to what archery hunters do where you can hunt a bull or a cow? Yeah, so that is a strategy that was outlined in our statewide elk plan, that said to explore it. We didn't make that recommendation this last spring because we had so many changes that we were making and we wanted to chew on that idea a little bit more. That's likely a recommendation that you are going to see from the Division this spring as we do antlerless. It really falls in the antlerless much more than the bucks, bulls or once in a lifetime because it's not a permit that you are applying for, of those species but it's probably something you'll likely see this spring.

Brian Johnson: Okay that's, sometimes I want to make sure I bring it up so I don't miss my opportunity

to bring it up but I think it's a good idea and we'll deal with it this spring then.

Dave Black: Thanks Brian. Go ahead Wade.

Wade Heaton: So, as I look through these elk numbers a few things stick out to me. We, we have this same conversation every year. It's a good conversation to have, we need to keep having it. To me our biggest issue is getting the elk killed. We talk about throwing more permits at em,. And in all honesty we've done that a lot and it doesn't help. We're just not getting anything killed. And, a variety of reasons why. And I just want to take my hat off to the Division, they've gotten pretty creative this last 8, 10, 12 months trying to figure out ways, strategies, hunts, that will be more successful and this private lands only option is one of those. An example is the Paunsegaunt has that strategy on it this year, we're right in the middle of it and we've already killed twice as many cows as we ever have. I just think if we can get the permits in the hands of the people that know the area, that its accessible to them, they're motivated to go hunt, we're gonna kill more. And that's what we have to get more serious about is using these creative strategies and methods to get in there and just have elk die. I mean that's our goal. We don't care you know how many permits are issued, we just care about dead elk. So, I do think we need to get, we need to get behind the Division when they have some of these creative ideas cause I do think it will work.

Dave Black: Mike.

Mike Worthen: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would be remised if I didn't say something about wild horses even though I do agree with the presentation and the, the comments that have been made regarding increasing elk hunting opportunities and I think the Division has done a good job the last couple years of giving spike hunt the opportunity to take a cow elk and, and I think it's been a good program. Back on the wild horse issue, of course we all know that basically the BLM has their hands tied. They can't do anything unless Congress decides to act. And that is a reality that I think hits a lot of the ranchers in the face that, that struggle with wild horses. If you go out in the Southwest Desert there is probably quadruple the number of horses that is allowed in the appropriate management level that the BLM has established out there. And they know it, the ranchers know it because they have to graze those lands. If you go around a spring out there, it is totally deluded within a mile of that spring, and the elk ran off, the deer ran off and the horses are just living right there cause there is no other water. One thing that I think the BLM could and should and I think it would be very appropriate for this body and the state wildlife board to push a little bit, is to maintain the, the vegetation projects that have been done that have been just left to grow back with sage brush and juniper and pinion and move on to new projects. But the other projects are just left. There's, 40-year-old projects out in that desert that are in the West hills that have never been touched since they were railed fifty years ago and the brush is so choking out the grass there is no feed for the horses, there is no feed for the cows, there is no feed for the elk. And about 5 years ago, 4 or 5 years ago the BLM started a evaluation on maintaining those but it got dropped out for some reason. To me that would be very appropriate to increase the forage out there so we can get through these tough times until Congress finally decides to do something with the horses. I think the horse problem would alleviate a lot of problems that we see out there and I think that the Division stands behind that. And, appreciate their support on what we can do with those, those critters out there. Anyway, that's my 2 cents worth on the horse issue, I have to deal with it in the county in my job quite often so I would be remiss if I didn't bring it up. Thank you.

Harry Barber: I appreciate you bringing that up. I represent the BLM here. I can't speak specifically for

the offices in Cedar or other areas besides Kanab. I manage the Kanab Field Office, I'm the Kanab Manager. If you are familiar with the Kanab area we are doing thousands of acres of restoration projects, in fact we started some more this week in the area we call Yellow Jacket out in the Coral Pink Sand Dunes. They've been really successful for us. We've also been trying to work with the livestock men to try to establish or at least get back some of those AUM's that have been reduced in the past. It's a delicate balance in there. But going back to what was just said, we do try to go back to some of our previous projects, we don't just try to jump ahead to new projects, we do try to go to those previous projects and maintain those. And if you thought it would help because I represent the BLM, I don't mind going to these other offices where there have been some treatments and maybe those treatments have been ignored and I can make a push there to do that if you would like me to do that.

Kevin Bunnell: There's kind of 2 different time frames as most of you are aware when a lot of habitat work was done and I think everybody does a pretty good job of maintaining the more recent projects, the stuff that's done over the last 15 years but the projects that were done back in the 60's and 70's, when it was another time when they were doing a lot of chaining, those are more of the projects that Mike is talking about and its, it's some of them are essentially just become new treatments rather than maintenance projects on, on some of those that are 40, 50 years old.

Dave Black: Gene.

Gene Boardman: I am sitting here between the sportsman and the agriculture representing the public at large, and I've, I grew up on the agricultural land and I have a lot of, lot of understanding for them, but, for the public at large, when we see, keep seeing more orange paint on the trees and rocks and so forth on, in places where you couldn't do anybody any harm, that isn't even fenced and its questionable whether they have, whether its deeded or not, we get really uptight about this and when we have people that want to want to have more wildlife killed but not on their land, it bothers us a little bit and that's about all I got.

Dave Black: How about on my right, any comments? Go ahead Sean.

Sean Kelly: Yeah, I'm gonna need to give a shout out to the Division's Habitat Program. We, about 5 years ago we had a slight increase in our population objective and we had some, a little bit of heartburn over that, it was only 150 head, but over the years they made the commitment to certain focus areas and they have put in literally hundreds of thousands of dollars and treated tens of thousands of acres, matter of fact we had the first increase since I've been here in cattle numbers on the Oak Creek allotment after the Clay Springs fire, we couldn't afford to seed that, the only thing we could do is put in winter wheat which is gone in a year, just to stabilize the soil. The Division stepped in and they paid for the seed, they paid for flying it on, this year, matter of fact next week they're gonna pay for us to chain and re-seed a fire scar up above Holden, and they are pretty much footing the bill for it. Over the years they've put water developments in, they've done a great job. And sometimes we look at these management plans and we think they're just paper. They really put their money where their mouth is for us on the Pahvant Unit when it comes to habitat improvements and I just really appreciate Kendall Bagley, Gary Bezzant, a lot of those guys for doing that. And I also appreciate the opportunity to look at these plans. Like I say we've got, you know a lot of (inaudible) are important to us and we value them. Nothing is ever perfect, there is gonna be problems, bumps in the road, but I've been pretty happy with how overall with how things have been addressed in the past.

Dave Black: Thank you. Okay, I think we are ready to get the motion. Do we need to review any of the comments? Come on Wade. Okay, make a motion.

Layne Torgerson: Mr. Chairman I would like to make a motion that we accept the Elk Management Unit Plan as presented.

Wade Heaton: I'll second that.

Dave Black: Okay, we have a first and a second, any discussion on the motion? Okay Mack.

Mack Morrell: I would like to amend the motion to make a mandate about what Bill Christensen said about killing the elk on, on private land, you know subject to the private landowner's permission. Year round, yeah. So,

Dave Black: Is that in the plan?

Mack Morrell: I don't see it's in the plan.

Justin Shannon: Which plan specifically? We have a lot of plans tonight.

Mack Morrell: Well Southern Region then. I don't know about the Northern Region but I think we represent the Southern Region where we have a bunch of problems. In every county I think, Garfield, Wayne, Paiute, Kane, everybody has problems. Beaver.

Kevin Bunnell: Mack I think all of the plans address depredation and talk to you know removing elk from private land. I mean what, that language is already in every one of those plans. What, what specifically are you asking?

Mack Morrell: Well I don't think we are making any progress with it though.

Kevin Bunnell: I disagree but, you know.

Mack Morrell: I am speaking from the area where I can see it personally. Like this, the, the, its growing rather than cutting back.

Dave Black: Okay so we have an amendment to the plan. That we, help me with the amendment, do we put stronger language, do we put more effort, what do we?

Mack Morrell: I would like to see stronger language in the plan, for the Southern Region specifically then on what Bill Christensen said. I think that the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation has something to do with the elk in the area and I think that we ought to honor what he said. He is one of the board of directors.

Covy Jones: Hey, Kevin, Mr. Chair, I think a lot of this though, I'm Covy Jones, Private Lands Coordinator for the State. I think, so a lot of depredation and how we do that is in state code. So, we address depredation in these plans and we address problem issues. We've been very good this year about how I mean every request for depredation removal that has been sent in has been approved. We've gone

out and removed animals and worked with private landowners. We have a depredation hunt in elk going on right now in San Pete, so wherever we've had problems, we keep saying that we've taken this approach and we have. I mean I see the request come in, we process the request, we go out we remove the animals, we help the landowners remove the animals, they remove the animals, we use (inaudible) hunters to remove the animals, so it's happening Mack. But just to, to enter in a request to remove animals at any time and any place on private land, these are protected under state code and so, I don't know what a request, and that's what I hear you saying is that stronger language that, you know and there are, there is protection for private landowners in state code as well. So,

Mack Morrell: Let's get that down to upon the private landowners request.

Dave Black: Okay. I'm not trying to ignore your motion, Mack I'm just trying to get it spelled out.

Mack Morrell: Okay, we've got it narrowed down then.

Dave Black: In writing so its concise and we know what we're voting on.

Kevin Bunnell: Okay Mack tell me if I captured this. So, your motion to amend is that we add, add stronger language to the Southern Region plan to address elk depredation on private lands, upon the private landowners request, is that?

Mack: That will do.

Dave Black: Okay, thank you. Do we have a second? We have a second from Gene. Any discussion on the amendment or not Gene from Craig. Sorry. Any discussion? Okay we'll vote on the amendment first. Which let me read it one more time. That we add stronger language in the Southern Region Plans to address elk depredation upon private lands upon the private landowners request. All in favor? Okay hold your hands up high. All opposed. Hold your hands up.

Second from Craig Laub 8 : 5 Sean, Layne, Wade, Rusty, Nick opposed. Motion passes

Original motion passes unanimously

Layne Torgerson made the motion to accept the Elk Unit Management Plan Revisions as presented. Wade Heaton seconded. Mack Morrell made an amendment to the motion to add stronger language to the Southern Region plans to address elk depredation on private lands at the request of the landowner. Craig Laub seconded the amendment. Amended motion passes 8:5 (Sean Kelly, Layne Torgerson, Wade Heaton, Rusty Aiken and Nick Jorgenson opposed). Original motion passes unanimously.

Dave Black: Now we'll move onto item #6. This will be Justin Shannon as well.

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2017 Season Dates, Application Timeline (action)
-Justin Shannon, Big Game Coordinator
(see attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Okay, do we have any questions from the RAC? Go ahead Dale.

Dale Bagley: What's your numbers on Mt. Dutton as far as goats now and how many permits, I know you are not doing permit numbers yet but what are you looking at roughly as an estimate as what you would give out on that unit?

Justin Shannon: Let's have Josh answer that, he would probably do a better job than I would.

Josh Pollock: Let me raise the mic to man level from little midget Ginger. We did a survey on August 9th this year and we flew and we did we counted 47 total goats. We had 30 adults and 17 kids, we didn't really differentiate between the billies and nannies but we had 30 adults. We saw at least 6 that were significantly larger, you know appeared to be billies, but off of that as of now, from that data we're just going to be conservative. We want to give an opportunity but we're gonna be conservative and probably end up issuing like 1 permit, but the Governors Tag and Sportsmen Tag have the potential as well to potentially harvest there so we'll probably start with one and go from there. As that population increases. That's the first time we've ever flown it and surveyed it so we're just gonna start (inaudible).

Justin Shannon: Josh hurt my feelings.

Dave Black: Any other questions? Okay, go ahead.

Craig Laub: If I understand you right you are dropping that Boulder muzzleloader deer hunt? Just on that unit?

Justin Shannon: Yeah.

Craig Laub: I don't know if this is the place to comment but I hunt over there and I am always there for that muzzleloader elk deer hunt and then of course the muzzleloader big bull hunt is going on at the same time and it has been a mess over there the last 2 years, with muzzleloader deer hunters having cow tags, chasing the same elk herd that the big bull muzzleloader hunters are trying to hunt and I applaud you there. I don't know if any other units have that problem but if I waited 15 years to get a big bull tag there and had it messed up by a bunch of guys chasing cows, I'd be one mad feller.

Justin Shannon: Yeah, just to clarify maybe I presented that wrong, and if I did I apologize. What, what this is, this isn't the general season muzzleloader hunt. This is the late one that essentially goes to October to the first week in November. I apologize if I presented it wrong.

Craig Laub: Then if I ever draw that tag I might be one mad hunter then, huh?

Dave Black: Gene.

Gene Boardman: On these late hunts, they are done because they are over objective. Why not just give out more permits on the regular hunt?

Justin Shannon: Yeah, so this is a strategy that was put together in the Statewide Mule Deer Plan. And what we were struggling with was trying to provide more limited entry hunting opportunity on, for

hunters throughout the state. The number of people that are applying for limited entry mule deer hunts is far outpacing the number of permits that we issue and this was, this was one of the, this is a really good recommendation that I felt because instead of taking a unit and saying it has to all be general season or all limited entry, we kind of took a page out of Colorado's book where they hunt their, their deer based on timing. And so this is a way to say okay it's a little after the season, not a lot of hunters out there, but you would use your limited entry bonus points on a general season unit. And so, I mean certainly if we had issues where we wanted to increase or decrease the buck to doe ratio, we would make those recommendations like we did this last spring, where over 4000 general season hunters had that opportunity but this is just a way to provide that for the limited entry hunters. Does that help?

Gene Boardman: Yeah, thank you, also, I understand that there's at least some interest in a true primitive weapons hunt. Could, (inaudible) and long bow. Could, could some of these late season hunts be tried on that basis?

Justin Shannon: You could certainly use your long bow or your (inaudible) not your long bow, this is a muzzleloader hunt but your more primitive muzzle loader gun. I mean you could use that in your muzzle loader hunt, this hunt or your any weapon hunt. We haven't gone to the lengths of carving out its own season for a very primitive weapon hunt because you can use them in the muzzleloader or the any weapon already.

Gene Boardman: This is muzzleloader only?

Justin Shannon: Sure, sure.

Gene Boardman: The way it is now.

Justin Shannon: Yeah, you can use that primitive weapon on this muzzleloader hunt.

Gene Boardman: Primitive muzzleloader? But archery isn't included?

Justin Shannon: Archery, no you would either have to use your primitive, your long bow and your archery hunt or your any weapon hunt.

Dave Black : Brian.

Brian Johnson: On this October limited entry elk hunt, on the Wasatch Mountains, where were you guys planning on pulling the tags cause right now you've got an archery, you've got a September rifle hunt and then a October or November slash delayed rifle hunt, Where were you planning on pulling those out?

Justin Shannon: We haven't had those conversations yet. The way that the statewide plan says is that if you have 100 permits, for an elk unit, 25 of them have to go to archery, 15% of them have to go to muzzleloader, so that 40 permits is already set in stone. And then there's quite a bit of flexibility with what you can do with the other 60 permits. You can, the only limitation that you could do is if you had an early rifle hunt you can't have more than 60% of your rifle permits in that one and so we certainly don't want to exceed that but whether we pull them from the late or the early, not sure yet. That will be the spring meeting.

Dave Black: Go ahead.

Wade Heaton: Justin, back to that Boulder Kaparowitz, late muzzleloader hunt, you said we dropped below the 20 objective for the buck to doe ratio, what is it?

Justin Shannon: Right now its 19.

Wade Heaton: How did we end up with that late hunt if our 3-year average was already under, you said we were on an upper trend?

Justin Shannon: It wasn't, so last year when we looked at it, so 2013 your buck to doe ratio was about 16.4, if I remember right and then it went to 19.9, I'm sorry if I'm off a little bit on these numbers a little bit and then 20.6. And so the last 3 years even though our trend is doing this, our buck to doe ratio is falling because in 2012 our buck to doe ratio was really high, it was like mid-twenties, which pulled that average way up. So if you look at the Boulder Unit, really that outlier on there is that 2013, classification where we were at 16 bucks per 100 does. Everything else has been at or above that 20 and so that's why the discussion in some of the other RAC's. I know its counterintuitive because the trends going up over the last 3 years, but you know it still fell this year because we were so high in 2012.

Wade Heaton; No that makes sense, and I guess my question or point is that I kind of hate to lose that opportunity, I'm a pretty big fan of those late hunts just cause it kind of dilutes things and gets it solves some problems so I kind of hate to lose it and I'm sure it will probably be right back next year if those trends continue. Would it hurt anyone's feelings if we maybe made a recommendation to keep it in anticipation we'd have it back?

Justin Shannon: Not from my chair I mean the region might have other thoughts. Who is over the Boulder on this? Jim what are your thoughts on that, I'd hate to speak for ya.

Jim Lamb: (off mic).

Justin Shannon: Wade this is one where we were trying to manage to the letter of the law and, I didn't want to come through with recommendations that we knew were below that. And really this is, this is also is one, if you look at the strategies, it says explore doing this so it didn't have a lot of additional language, if you look at our other recommendations in the Mule Deer Plan a lot of it says manage that 3 year buck to doe ratio and take trend into consideration. We didn't even know if we were gonna do this and so that's why we didn't get into the other detail of taking trend but to be consistent if we were managing this like our other hunts, there is a high likelihood we would have brought trend, but you know this being the first one that fell below, I'm glad we're having the discussion because I think it will help us with future recommendations and kind of follow suit.

Dave Black; K, good, any more questions?

Dale Bagley: On that boulder hunt, how many permits was there like 4 or 5 is all last year?

Justin Shannon: Let me look. Does anyone have that off the top of their head? How many permits did we have last year? I think 5, I can double check really quick.

Dale Bagley: Is there an option you could just cut, cut tags in half where you are border line on that buck to doe ratio rather than do away with the hunt?

Justin Shannon: Certainly, in the spring I mean that will be an option, that we can bring forward. The one thing that we wanted to do as an agency is kind of standardize these and so any of these late season hunts 5 has been the minimum and so I think if we were to go below 5, we just wouldn't have the hunt I mean at that point. Cause then you can have a non-resident and some other things. And, I will double check that and make sure it's 5.

Dave Black: K, Gene.

Gene Boardman: These hunts are late season hunts or when you are over 20 buck for 100 doe is that right?

Justin Shannon: Correct, yeah.

Gene Boardman: But you haven't counted yet so are you a year behind on this data?

Justin Shannon: Yeah, we always will be because this is 2013, 14 and 15 numbers. And so, I mean if that were the case we would have shut it off early last year. So, we are always going to have to be a year behind Gene.

Dave Black: Do we have any questions from the audience? Hold on, one more.

Rusty Aiken: Last spring at the, when we were picking numbers we had some complaints for overcrowding on the Pine Valley, Zion and Panguitch Unit. It was brought up to maybe do a split hunt, has there been any talk about that for season dates on some of these units?

Justin Shannon: You know we have to have more of these conversations and that is one that I'm excited to meet with the managers about this Spring, when we have our big group meeting and the reason I think we need to have that conversation is the, we have some units that have just extremely high buck to doe ratios. And to say we can throw more permits in our current hunt structures, I don't know if that is realistic, and really it might solve 2 problems. We have 2 challenges, one is adding an additional hunt, is that kind of what you are getting after, if we added an additional rifle hunt?

Rusty Aiken: Yeah, do it early, yeah.

Justin Shannon: Yeah if you could do that you could lower buck to doe ratios without affecting the crowding. The way that we went about it last year is we increased permits. We put more of them archery and muzzleloader which I think is fine. The more I've looked at that I think that it's gonna be difficult to track over time because as I come with recommendations, they are already confusing enough and if I'm having to say this one has 56% of the permits in rifle and this one has 24, and I mean that gets convoluted and so there is some real positives to what you are talking about and I think statewide the managers and biologists and myself are gonna have to talk about some of these and we have some ideas, we're probably a year out on them. Can I ask a question back?

Rusty Aiken: Sure.

Justin Shannon: How would you, how would you feel about having an additional hunt like that?

Rusty Aiken: I'm on the mule deer committee meeting and it was brought up a lot of discussion, 2 five day hunts but I think we ended up with two 9 day hunts but where to put em. You know you overlap the general season elk hunt if you moved it early and you don't want to move it too late so, putting it on the calendar I guess is the big problem.

Justin Shannon: It's certainly something we are going to have to look at and the other thing is the reason we couldn't move forward with that recommendation immediately, because I remember working through some of that and it's actually a strategy in the deer plan to provide some hunts that have deer and elk overlap and for some good reasons too, in the Northern part of the state they used to have a buck bull combo where you could go out and you would have a buck tag and a bull tag and the feedback we had on that was great so if we could have some hunts where your buck hunt and your spike elk hunt or whatever would be overlapped, its fewer days that hunters have to take off of work and there are some real benefits. The reason we didn't move forward with it though is we hadn't completed the statewide elk plan and we wanted to get some feedback on how comfortable hunters would be with that. Both plans there was high acceptance of having the overlap so, we have that data now.

Dave Black; K, questions from the audience?

Questions from the Public:

None

Dave Black: Okay we do have some comment cards. We'll move to those. First, we have Ben Lowder followed by Bryce.

Comments from the Public:

Ben Lowder: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Ben Lowder representing the Utah Bowman's Association. First, I'd like to say we support the recommendations from the Division as presented with 1 exception. That exception is concerning this proposal which I handed out, put copies on your tables before the meeting started. Before I get into that proposal I'd like to point out, if you look across the top of that sheet you will see 4 different organizations on here, this is a joint proposal from SFW, from (inaudible) from the Mule Deer Foundation and the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation. As a little bit of background and Justin eluded to this as well. Back in September I'm sure you all remember I brought an informational proposal to the RAC's and the Wildlife Board, concerning once, Archery Only Once in a Lifetime Hunt Opportunities. That proposal, the intent of that proposal was to offer a archery only opportunity for Once in a Lifetime species, with a couple criteria and those criteria were to not create new hunts and to not affect current draw odds. As we took that proposal through the RAC's and the Wildlife Board Meeting, we got a lot of feedback which is exactly what we were looking for. And a lot of that feedback, a good portion of that feedback was contrary to what we initially anticipated public reaction. A lot of that feedback was why don't we go ahead and ask for some new hunts and create some new and additional opportunities and see if we can't maybe address a point (inaudible) with Once in a Lifetime Species. We are all aware that it takes 20 plus points to draw a lot of these Once in a

Lifetime Species tags and if you are not up in that upper tier you may never draw a tag. And so I found through this process there is a lot of opinion out there that we'd like to do, from the public, that we'd like to do something to address that. We went back to the drawing table and we met with these other organizations and this proposal that I handed out is what we came up with. So I'll go through the proposal and then mention a couple of talking points. (Attachment 3)

Dave Black: Thank you. Bryce.

Bryce Pillings: Bryce Pillings, Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife. We support the Divisions recommendations with 2 exceptions. We'd like to see the late muzzleloader hunt on the Boulder Unit kept and we don't like the extended season on the archery but we do support the Bowman's Association on this new proposal. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you. Boyd Harris.

Boyd Harris: This is a little bit off topic and changing the subject a little bit but are you gentlemen aware that in the State of Utah is the only intermountain state that allows baiting of deer for any purpose, for hunting especially. There is, a number of reasons I think that it would be beneficial to do away with baiting one of which is the question of fair chase. I believe in baiting that eliminates at least to a certain degree the fair chase. Possible increase in disease by having them eat out of the same troughs and what not. There is a number of ways to deal with, with somebody who may want to feed the deer for horn growth or growing the bigger bucks or what not. I checked into this and a lucky buck feeding deer supplements has a website out there that tells you all of the regulations for all of the states about baiting deer. A number of states do allow baiting and they are more Southern and more Eastern but the Rocky Mountain area does not allow it except for in Utah. But they described baiting as anything you put out that a deer might ingest as to draw them or to keep them in an area. There is ways to, there are states who have a 10 day rule that says 10 days prior to any hunt on, in your area, baits must be pulled and that's not just stop putting the stuff out but all the bait has to be pulled. And, that's, that's what I've got to say is I believe the baiting goes a long ways to eliminate the large bucks from the population that the general public sportsmen who are not professional hunters don't have a chance to get into the big bucks. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you. I believe that's all the comment cards that we have on this item. Comments from the RAC?

RAC discussion and vote:

Dale Bagley: I just need some clarification, so SFW and UBA you don't support the 7 days on the end of those hunts? You just want these particular hunts, is that what you are saying?

Ben Lowder: So initially that was our stance but honestly there isn't, I don't know that we couldn't have both. The Northern Region recommended supporting some of these hunts and then on the rest, the Once in a Lifetimes, doing the 7-day extension. I don't see a problem with that.

Dave Black: Okay, go ahead Rusty.

Rusty Aiken: So on the, the number of permits would we have to increase permits on these, the Once in

a Lifetimes? To compensate for these?

Justin Shannon: Sorry, about that I couldn't tell who you were looking at. I mean the way it stands now is when we go out and do our flights and we see a certain number of class 3 or class 4 rams we say okay this unit can have 5 permits and as of now what we'd have to do is take a portion of those permits, it sounds like with this proposal too, and shift them into archery so you would have 2 in archery and 3 in regular Once in a Lifetime hunt. Now, if over time, to Ben's point, what he is saying is if these success rates were lower, and they were significantly lower you could increase permits over time and you could actually add a few but initially you would have to remove them from the other hunts where Once in a Lifetime hunters had been applying for so long. We wouldn't, sorry, I'm rambling, we wouldn't just add permits, we would have to issue permits according to the plans. So if the plan says you can issue 5, we can't just come with 7 to accommodate this type of request. So,

Rusty Aiken: So you are really not aiding the point creep other than if you kill fewer animals with the archery? But he's saying, he's saying he is going to be 20% less, if you are at 95% success, you are going to be at 75% on the other?

Justin Shannon: Yeah, it depends on the hunt and how many permits we have that are allocated to that. And it may be up front, that you, you are just cutting the pie a different way. Now if over time we can show okay we are actually lowering success rates and you are issuing more permits as a result of that, yeah certainly then I think there is a case to be made that you could increase permits but still harvest the same amount of rams. Initially though we are not sure what that is going to look like.

Dave Black: Brayden.

Brayden Richmond: Yeah stay there Justin, I got a question, kind of a question/comment. Kind of a split comment here but for a long time I've been asking why we can't increase dates you know particularly on mountain goats. I've never understood why we quit killing mountain goats about the time they turn pretty. But with all these hunts if we are willing to extend the dates by 7 days on each of them why aren't we just extending dates. On Once in a Lifetime the goal is to provide people an experience, if we can lengthen the seasons, is there any reason we wouldn't lengthen them on Once in a Lifetime?

Justin Shannon: Yeah to answer that question we already did. I mean with mountain goats there was a proposal from the Utah Bowmans Association, I think it was 2 years ago, I think it was 2 years ago that talked about lengthening these dates and so we did we worked with our Forest Services and said ok, what are the dates that you are shutting gates and closing gates and doing some of that stuff and in some cases it was hard fast, others it was you know if there is access, and then some of these you have access points independent of those roads and so that's why if you look at the,

Brayden Richmond: I appreciate that you already lengthened them but now we are saying we can technically lengthen them another 7 days because you, that's the proposal, well why don't we just do it for all weapons, if we can do it why aren't we doing it?

Justin Shannon: Mountain goats it probably makes the least sense because I'm not sure we can do it.

Brayden Richmond: Okay.

Justin Shannon: Like with this we are talking about access points that wouldn't require access through the forest because what we didn't want to do is extend these dates and have hunters say well I've got another 3 weeks and then they get up there and they realize they have no access. And we didn't want to set these guys up to fail. So I get what you are saying, but this is one where we already gave as, as much as we are comfortable with.

Brayden Richmond: So now I am ready for my comment, I get what you are saying, and I disagree, if you draw a tag for Jack Creek Sheep, the Division is in no way obligated to provide a helicopter to fly you in there. So, if you draw a tag for a mountain goat in January I don't understand why its any of the Divisions business if you have motorized travel. But aside from that, the Divisions proposal is showing that we can extend the date 7 days so let's do it for all weapons and let's let people hunt,. My other comment is I'm not sure I'm completely on board with this proposal from UBA but I think that this is something to explore. I really do support the idea of adding some sort of opportunity for hunters where it wouldn't take as many points to draw and this may be going that direction so I like the idea.

Dave Black: Additional comments? K, let us summarize. So, from the public comments we had the proposal from the UBA, Utah Bowmans Association supported by Mule Deer Foundation, RMEF, Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife and you have that in front of you so I don't think we need to go over that. SFW supports this proposal and in addition to that they would like to keep the muzzleloader deer hunt on the Boulder instead of eliminating that and then we also had a public comment about eliminating the ability to bait mule deer in Utah. And the RAC comments we had Rusty, he just had a question if these permits would be taken from the currently issued permits and that is yes and then of course Brayden's recent comments on why not just lengthen the hunts. So with that I am ready to entertain a motion.

Brian Johnson: I'll make a motion.

Dave Black: Brian.

Brian Johnson: Let me take a stab at it and see how we do. I'd like to make a motion we accept the Divisions proposal with the exception of the SFW Utah Bowman's Association, Mule Deer Foundation , Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Once in a Lifetime Archery permits.

Dave Black: Do we have a second?

Wade Heaton: (off mic).

Dave Black: You can after you second.

Wade Heaton: So I, just a quick comment I should have made earlier. I came here with the expectation to amend this proposal by the Division to recommend a split rifle split any weapon hunt on the Zion. I think the Zion is a good unit that we could experiment with that we've got an (inaudible) hunt going on that we're not going to interfere with a lot of things. Its hunter crowding is a big issue, I have a lot of people talk to me about this idea and I was going to fully propose it tonight but after what Justin's told us I'm willing to wait a year as long as we have some pretty good discussions and maybe have some kind of proposal next year. I'll sit on that so I'll just make it as a comment tonight.

Dave Black: Okay, any further discussion? We can amend.

Rusty Aiken: I'd like to amend Brian's motion to with the not to exclude the Boulder Kaiparowits on the muzzleloader. To keep that the same.

Dave Black: Okay do we have a second?

Brian Johnson made the motion to accept the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2017 Season Dates, Application Timeline as presented with the exception of adding the UBA proposal (see attachment 3). Wade Heaton seconded. Rusty Aiken made an amendment To keep the muzzle loader limited entry buck deer hunt on the Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits. Wade Heaton seconded the amendment. Motion on amendment passed unanimously. Motion carried unanimously.

Preference Point System Amendments (action)

-Lindy Varney, Licensing Specialist

(see attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: K, I have a question, how would this affect the youth process? Did you go through a mock drawing with the youth or does it effect it that much?

Lindy Varney: I didn't get those numbers but probably about 3% more of the youth drew in the youth round because everything else, like dedicated hunter, was about the 3%, non-residents was about 3%, so like I said I don't have those numbers with me,

Dave Black: But it's a similar type trend?

Lindy Varney: But it's a similar trend yeah that I could see happening that the youth yeah definitely would draw out more in the youth round.

Dave Black: Brayden.

Brayden Richmond: This is the only thing that I really had comments on coming into this RAC. And, and you already know the question I can tell. But, the, its unanimous, everybody wants something done about that loophole that I've talked to. I should clarify just some people have talked to me. But the other option they've talked about is can't we still have it as part of the regular draw but we take away the points so everybody is in a random draw for their second, third, fourth, fifth. What, did you look at that at all as an option and what is the downside to that versus the plan presented? Do you understand what I'm asking on that?

Lindy Varney: Yes, I have been addressed with it by several people as well. You know that is definitely another option. This is the one that you know I'm bringing out tonight. It addresses both of the main issues from our hunters is the loophole and also people feel like if you get a deer tag you should lose your points. Now if you go to the random, it kind of devalues the whole preference point system. You know it is designed to give you that certainty that you are going to draw your deer permit either every year depending on the unit or some units are every other year so it definitely does devalue it. Another

thing is you know there is that concern is someone drew my first choice when it was their third choice, I can see if you do it random its gonna just change it to,

Brian Johnson: (off mic)

Lindy Varney: Well yeah let me finish. You are good. But yeah no, so whats gonna happen is I can see people saying, well now its random I've been applying for you know a couple years and now someone is drawing my second choice when it was their third choice. Because my data shows that a lot of people apply for the same unit as their first and second choice, about 90% of our hunters do, they just use a different weapon type. And so, they are saying I want to hunt this unit and I'm good with hunting with a rifle or a muzzleloader or a bow. So I can just kind of see that instead of my first choice its gonna swap to a second choice. So, but it's definitely a different option, that's you know.

Brayden Richmond: So, we could just rename it to be alternate choices? And then nobody's feelings would get hurt. I'm just teasing. I'm sorry.

Lindy Varney; That's a different option.

Dave Black: Rusty.

Rusty Aiken: So how, how are the 7000 tags over the counter, how are those, explain how those are sold, is that over the counter?

Lindy Varney: Yeah, they are just over the counter, first come first serve basis.

Rusty Aiken: So, we're getting into lines again like back in the old (inaudible)? Is that really where you want to go?

Lindy Varney: No, the Division doesn't want to see it that way but our system has improved from when we had that issue you know 10 years ago. Our applications are increasing by 7% each year just for general season.

Rusty Aiken: But it's still sleeping bags out on your front lawn.

Lindy Varney: Maybe but we have over 300 agents in the State of Utah, now, compared to back then when we had those numbers so there is definitely a lot more options and we also have online that is a great resource to those, you know to the hunters. But like I said that is worst case scenario, I honestly don't see it getting that bad but that's worst case.

Rusty Aiken: How many youth don't draw? 20%, 50%?

Lindy Varney: So this is current, I knew I had a slide for this, I was like hold on. So, this just kind of shows you how many youth that apply and how many that draw out so if you look at 2016, successful, I don't have my glasses. So, successful just in the youth round were 10,239. And then overall and then we had 19,386 total applicants and then just in the normal round you know 3100 drew so about what, over a little over 13,000 out of 19,000 drew for youth.

Rusty Aiken: How many?

Lindy Varney: A little over 13,000 youth drew and there was a total of 19,000 that applied. 60% yeah.

Brian Johnson: So, I must have, you did a mock draw and you said if everything stays the same, you'd have 7800 tags left over? I'm just,

Lindy Varney: That is worst case scenario.

Brian Johnson: Same, with the new scenario and I'm just sitting here thinking, I'm looking at the crowd and by the show of hands how many of you guys out there is going to put in for a second choice if you know if you draw 2nd, 3rd or 4th or 5th choice, you are going to lose your point? So, a couple of you but everybody else is shaking their heads no. So, I think that you are going to see a lot of 1st points get drawn, a lot of people put in their first choice, and then people are just not going to fill out their 2nd choice or alternate choice.

Lindy Varney: It's a possibility.

Brian Johnson: I'm just wondering if the point of this is to, okay that was my question is that's how you did the mock draw, then my second question is how long did it take you to do the mock draw? Like was it you just put the numbers in the computer and it just spit them out?

Lindy Varney: No, we had our, our programmer, our contractor in Fallon, Nevada actually run it and it took about a month.

Brian Johnson: It took a month? I'm just wondering why we don't know about our bucks and bulls until May?

Lindy Varney: You want to know why? Them back there, Justin, I don't get your guys' permit numbers until about May. So, if you give me permit numbers earlier, I can get you the results earlier.

Dave Black: Time to move along, any more questions?

Gene Boardman: Now you start out with life time hunters they probably all get their first choice right?

Lindy Varney: They do because yeah, in the contract that we,

Gene Boardman: And then you go to the dedicated hunters, do they all get their first choice?

Lindy Varney: No.

Gene Boardman: Okay now. Every dedicated hunter doesn't get his first choice? Does it go down to the youth and to the great unwashed where I am at before they, before they before the dedicated hunter gets his second choice or?

Lindy Varney: No, we run the exact same, so we run this whole structure between all the dedicated hunter applicants.

Gene Boardman: So the dedicated hunter is going to get a tag, right?

Lindy Varney: If we have, cause we have a set quota. We only can go up to 15% of quota for that, for that unit. Once we've hit that 15% we can't issue any more quota. Does that make sense?

Gene Boardman: Well, it might make, it might make sense.

Lindy Varney: Yeah we have a set, we have a cap of 15% for dedicated hunters so we can't go above that cap. And so once we've hit that and if there is a dedicated hunter that still has that as his first choice they would be unsuccessful because we've ran out of quota.

Gene Boardman: But it is by each group, then? That you are running this through and so, so, the, the higher groups are going to get filled first and then we are going through the great unwashed and then we are going to run this program for them?

Lindy Varney: Yeah, that's, definitely, I get what you are saying, dedicated hunters applications are evaluated first before everyone else.

Gene Boardman: Thank you.

Kevin Bunnell: I think we use all remaining applicants rather than the great unwashed Gene, but.

Dave Black: Craig.

Craig Laub: Yeah my question is dealing with running this beyond one year which you probably didn't do, is it gonna on some of these units that are hard to draw I mean like there are units here in Southern Utah that you got to wait 3 years, will that increase their opportunity where you know where everybody, if they draw a deer tag they lose their points?

Lindy Varney: I can see it changing it from you know making it easier, not going as long. If everyone loses their points, its gonna get people through the system faster instead of someone applying for that hard to reach unit that takes 3 or 4 years to draw out for. They are going to lose their points and go back to the bottom.

Craig Laub: K.

Dave Black: Any more questions. Any questions from the audience?

Questions from the Public:

Lee Tracy: Lee Tracy representing myself. I have several questions. Number 1, while we were on the Mule Deer Committee we talked about some methods or some opportunities to combine the bonus point system with the preference point system with deer. Is that, is this the answer to that or are you still working on those kinds of things?

Lindy Varney: Um it is definitely something that we are still looking at. There are so many different

webs that it created and so we are still kind of looking at the options but like I said in April the Wildlife Board wanted us to look at this method because as you can see 2014, it got, we took this out and it was voted to stay status quo and again it brought it up again but yeah we are still looking at that option of merging the 2 but its definitely something that we're. Its huger than this because it affects not only deer but its gonna affect elk its gonna affect prong horn so its a lot bigger than what people think it might be.

Lee Tracy: Another question you saw me raise my hand when they asked, when he asked for a second option, that doesn't necessarily mean that I would go to a different unit, maybe just a different weapon. If I wanted to hunt the Panguitch Lake Unit, I'd have 3 different hunts there that I could apply for and still be in the same unit. Is there any way you are tracking those kinds of 2nd or 3rd or 4th choices? Weapon wise as opposed to unit wise?

Kevin Bunnell: Lee she stated earlier that 90% of the second choices are within the same unit for a different weapon type.

Lee Tracy: No I am asking if that is being tracked as opposed to you know the 2nd choice being a different unit rather than a different weapon.

Kevin Bunnell: Right that's what I just said, 90% of them, peoples second choices 90% of the time are on the same unit but for a different weapon type.

Lee Tracy: Oh ok. Third question there are an additional 20% youth archery tags as, additional to the numbers that we see, will that change or will that be the same?

Lindy Varney: That is staying the same. That's not being touched because its 20% above the quota. Those are, we're not gonna touch them, they will still be available.

Lee Tracy: Thank you.

Dave Black: Okay, state your name.

Jason Aiken: I'm Jason Aiken representing myself, I've got a question, can you go to the slide, you were going through them pretty quick, it looked like you had some slides that showed how many people put in for 1st through 5th choices, things like that.

Lindy Varney: This one? What I sent you?

Jason Aiken: Yeah that one, that one will work for now. And so, 58% put in for more than one choice. Correct?

Linda Varney: Correct.

Jason Aiken: And then it looked like there was another slide that had some other columns and data and stuff like that, like I said you went through them pretty quick and I missed em. So, is that just part of your mock drawing, do you have any of that data that shows where, where those drawings took place for okay, 2nd choice, 3rd choice, 4th choice and how many points those guys had? Does that make sense?

Lindy Varney: Is this what you're talking about? So, this kind of shows how many applicants applied with how many points. And how many drew their first choice and how many drew their 2nd through 5th.

Jason Aiken: Ok ok.

Lindy Varney: So, this is like I showed a big graph of it and this is it broken down and this is our current drawing versus our mock drawing. This is what I showed, yeah I showed the board this.

Jason Aiken: Okay so is this on the mock drawing, okay the current drawing and the mock drawing. Ok I was thinking the green and the blue were different colors.

Lindy Varney: No the green is the current the blue is the mock.

Jason Aiken: For the different,

Lindy Varney: And this definitely just shows how many points people had when they applied and how many were successful on their first and how many were successful on their 2nd through 5th. This just gives you the actual number instead of the graph.

Jason Aiken: Ok that makes sense. So at the end, on the unsuccessful, is there just an unsuccessful?

Lindy Varney: No there isn't, that's around what did I say, 44,000 were unsuccessful? And that didn't change.

Jason Aiken: Right, now I have lost train of thought of where I was going with my question. Okay, thanks.

Dave Black: Okay, we do have some comment cards. Jason, did you want to comment. You are on top of the list and then followed by Lee.

Comments from the Public:

Jason Aiken: I'm Jason Aiken again representing myself, so, I'm kind of with Brian here, let's use the draw system to, to distribute those tags as, I guess fairly and I guess efficiently as possible. Rusty had mentioned that we don't want to go back to selling tags over the counter, first come first served basis sort of thing. You know we could possibly have to deal with crashing the system, and things like that and one way to eliminate that possibility, I'm not saying its gonna happen, its one way to eliminate that possibility is to when they go to those 2nd through 5th choice, remove that preference point part of it and just make it a random draw for the 2nd choices and then if there is any tags left over they move onto the 3rd choice and then if there is any tags left over, and, and that will, and then don't take that preference point away from somebody that draws their 2nd through 5th and kind of the reason I think that you do it that way is if you've got people putting in for like the Thousand Lakes that's gonna take like 5 or 6 years to draw and they are putting against someone who is drawing like Pine Valley rifle where it is taking 2 years, they've got a lot better chance of drawing that 2nd, 3rd choice, because of the fact that they're putting in for a unit that is harder to draw for their 1st choice and so you are giving them that precedence over somebody else. I can appreciate that, that you give them the opportunity to put in, but when you are only talking about 8000 tags compared to 80,000 tags, don't you want to kind of make it fair as just a

random draw, everybody has the same number of names in the hat and then that way you can't say these guys are drawing more often because they are putting in for those, those harder to draw hunts for their first choice. And then, the one thing that I really do like about it is look at everybody's first choice, that is to me the most important part of the way the preference point system works, give everybody their first choice, that should be the ultimate goal, second would be to distribute those tags as evenly as possible to the remaining draw, the 2nd through 5th choice so you don't have the 8,000 tags left over to sell em on the first come first serve basis. I mean this year she said they only had 8 or 900 left over so, why would we want to go back to selling them on a first come first serve basis when we already have a good avenue to distribute those tags so, thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you, so Lee Tracy followed by Mike Twitchell.

Lee Tracy: I think this is an answer to a question, a long time question and its, I think it's a great answer. My only disclaimer would be that we review this this process maybe in a 3-year period because its gonna cost us hunters you know a lot of grief trying to outsmart the rest of the hunters and outsmart the system and try to figure out the best way to work this thing so, you know, some of us will probably find loop holes in this one too, thanks.

Mike Twitchell: Mr. Chairman, thank you my name is Mike Twitchell, I'm just representing myself tonight. I, I do want to thank the Division, they do put a lot of hours a lot of time, the mock draw they go, they showed that they have a precedence for at least getting their data and understanding. I propose what they are doing with the exception of one item on this and that's the loss of the point. I think that this is a perfect example of when we take something we have a great idea and down the road it needs to be tweaked just a little bit but it may not need to be tweaked clear back to what it was almost initially. You know a dozen years ago we lost our point if we didn't, if we drew our 2nd choice, And so let's, let's do not to go too redundant but follow what Jason said maybe what Brian has recommended and that is to allow that point to accrue if you do not draw your first point. The 2nd through the 5th can be a random drawing. I think that that seems fair. 8,000 permits is not that many. I've seen, I've seen a few hundred cow tags shut the system down. Has there been improvements, yes I think there probably have, but when you start talking 8,000, starting at a certain time on a certain day, I really think that we will run into issues. So I don't think that this is something that we need to make a major tweak to, but maybe just, just a very simple adjustment with the way that its handled through their proposal sounds great, Let's just not lose that point. Thank you.

Dave Black: K, our last comment card is from Bryce, Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife and they support the preference point system amendments as presented. Do we have comments from the RAC? Brian.

RAC discussion and vote:

Brian Johnson: I just think that we might be trying to fix this too much. I think we set this up two years ago with basically draw your first, everybody's first choice first, and then choices 2-5, you can even draw them in order 2-5, but just have them be points don't count and you don't lose a point if you draw. I just, I just think that we might be over fixing it.

Dave Black: K, thank you Brayden.

Brayden Richmond: Let me be the devil's advocate here, mostly because I just don't like Brian. Frankly,

just to be honest up front I'm probably going to vote for whichever is proposed first but I do want to clarify one thing I see in this. Is this does have as presented it does have the potential to get rid of some of the points and so a unit that now may take 3 points to draw could potentially only take 2 points to draw. And to me that's a positive that we may be overlooking. I don't think it will be hugely impactful but if there is a potential to get people moved through the system faster and only miss 2 years of hunting instead of 3 years of hunting, that is a good consideration.

Dave Black: Okay, Wade.

Wade Heaton: I probably should have asked this during questions Lindy but, what has our point creep looked like? I know we don't talk a lot about that but how many preference points have been added in the last 5 years?

Lindy Varney: Off top of my head I don't know I would have to look at my notes and pull it up. Yeah the total number is 11. But that percent drew out because they buy them over the years. So, yeah there was an applicant that had 11 points, I know crazy, right, but you know, that person did lose their points this year from drawing out, you know the unit that takes the hardest is of course Thousand Lakes and you have to have at least 5 points to draw out for that unit currently. So that kind of shows you like I said you know how many people, what their points look like. But I don't have the number of how many actually buy off the top of my head I'd have to look it up and see if I could get it tonight.

Justin Shannon: I'm remembering this off the top of my head but this question came up in during some of the mule deer stuff and five years ago we had about a hundred thousand applicants that were applying for general season deer, this last year we were about 127,000 or something like that, so just in that time span it has increased close to 30,000. And our general season permits really have fluctuated between 85000 and 90000 so if that helps you.

Dave Black: Ok, any comments?

Wade Heaton: Okay this is a real comment not a question. So I think one thing Lindy brought up is 7800 potential leftover permits, we just accepted that as that's the number its going to be, she mentioned about six times, that is worst case scenario. And she said I don't see it being that many. I, Lindy kind of is the resident expert on this and I would probably agree with her. I kind of think she knows what she is talking about. I don't know that that aspect of it, leftover permits, I don't know that that is a big enough issue to really factor in.

Dave Black: K.

Brian Johnson: So, so what is the big, the biggest complaint I heard about this point loophole was they weren't looking at everybody's first choice first. That's, that is my biggest, everybody said that's the biggest complaint. I don't think anybody even cares I mean the big complaint I got was so and so put in for it as his third and I put in for it my first and I didn't draw and he draws on his third. If we take care of that I think the social issue goes away. You know I mean that's what we're talking about, that's what we talked about 2 years ago when we sent it up is let's just, if you just draw everybody's first choice first, the loophole just got closed because the second, and then choices 2-5, the points just don't apply, its all random after that. I'm a gambler so I'm all about evening the odds. I just think that we can close the loophole, fix the problem and not overfix the problem.

Dave Black: K.

Brian Johnson: Can I make a proposal?

Dave Black: Let me just summarize first and see if there are any other comments. I guess in summary I think the way I see is it that everybody is in favor of closing the loophole and there is 2 options on the second, either, the Divisions proposal or a random draw for choices 2-5. So I think we're probably ready for a motion and possible amendment and lets see where we go.

Brian Johnson: I make a motion that we

Dave Black: Okay do I have a second to the motion. Okay we have a second from Harry. Any discussion on the motion? Wade?

Wade Heaton: I seriously have changed my mind on this issue about 5 times today. And about 90 second ago I finally decided where we are going or where I want to go. I've been accused of having an over developed sense of fairness and I just feel like I just like the Divisions proposal the way it is. I feel like if we draw a deer permit, we lose our point. Its clean, its simple. Its fair. One permit, you lose your points.

Craig Laub: Alright I'll second Wade's,

Dave Black: Wait, that's a discussion point so we are going to have the opportunity to vote, Okay, so the motion as presented is to accept the DWR proposal to consider all first choices first and then have a random draw for everyone's second choices, 2nd through 5th choices that doesn't consider points. So I interpret that that you do not lose your points, is that correct? If you choose. So, all those in favor.

Wade Heaton: Hold on Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an amendment to that motion. Lets hack off the last 2/3 of that. The first part of that motion just says I accept the Divisions proposal as presented on, or preference points, that's what I would like to amend the motion to say.

Unknown talking off mic:

Dave Black: Basically, I would say you can vote against the motion and we would entertain a new motion to accept the Divisions proposal as presented. So, okay. What do we do. Okay, Wade I think the way to address that is we have an opportunity to vote on the motion as presented. If that's not the motion that you want to see we'll have, you can vote against it, if that fails we'll have an opportunity to entertain a new motion. So all those in favor of the motion as presented with a second show by the raise of hands.

Motion failed :6-7

Dave Black: So the motion fails. There are no motions on the table.

Craig Laub: I'll make a motion that we accept the DWR's recommendations as they were presented, do we have a second.

Dave Black: Second from Brian. Any discussion? Okay, all those in favor.

11-2 Nick Jorgensen and Mike Worthen opposed

Craig Laub made the motion to accept the Preference Point System Amendments as presented Brian Johnson seconded. Motion carried 11:2 (Nick Jorgensen, Mike Worthen opposed)

NER Deer Management Plans (action)

-Randall Thacker, Northeastern Region Asst. Wildlife Manager

(see attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Any questions from the RAC? Okay, Rusty?

Rusty Aiken: Good to see good news. What single thing do you think has caused all your population increases?

Randall Thacker: We've had 5 really nice winters in a row out in the basin last few years and it really is, our population gets driven by our hard winters. Our last one was 6 years ago and that's when we see and the radio collars have confirmed that, those hard winters we drop significantly in survival on our fawns and even adults take a pretty substantial hit when we have really bad winters out there. And it's a cyclic thing you never know when its coming, it will come some day we will have another one of those brutal winters hit us out there. But the last 5 have been excellent. This one is looking good so far so we'll wait and see.

Rusty Aiken: Are you getting your fair share of habitat improvements over there?

Randall Thacker: We have on a number of the units its, there is one or two units that are affected, where the winter range areas are limited for access for us because of the Ute tribal lands that are there, the South slope for example, the (inaudible) and some of the (inaudible) are hard to, there are certain portion of those units that are really difficult to get projects accomplished, because its Ute tribal land they are a sovereign land and they have you know different priorities sometimes than what we've got and so, but we've done, we've been able to do quite a bit on the Wasatch Mountains West has had over 7000 acres, it's a fairly small unit, just (inaudible) there where you saw the one big increase we had over 7000 acres of habitat improved out there, that's chainings and brush hogs and the various projects types that have happened. We've also been able to, through different partners over the years and through mitigation for some of the Central Utah Project actually have them pick up and they've acquired additional acres over there, thousands of acres, of winter range that have been picked up and protected through perpetuity on those units too which is really a benefit to (inaudible) for sure.

Dave Black: K, additional questions? Any questions from the audience?

Questions from the Public:

Lee Tracy: Lee Tracy, with those increases in the population, can we anticipate an increase in tags?

Randall Thacker: As you know buck doe ratios is what determines that and we have been increasing actually out there in our region, the Wasatch Mountains, Current Creek for example increased 10% last year and 10% the year before because we were seeing an increase in buck to doe ratio and so when we have the good survival rates we've been seeing good buck doe ratio increases and if it will continue, if the weather holds out for us it and it continues to save deer, they'll be there and we are seeing, we had the best hunt out there really in 40 or 50 years probably in the quality of deer that came off on the general season hunts. It was neat to see.

Dave Black: Thank you, any additional questions? We have one comment card from SFW and they support the plan as presented. Do we have any comments from the RAC?

Comments from the Public:

Dave Black: "Reads comment card from SFW."

RAC discussion and vote:

Brayden Richmond: I make the motion to accept as presented.

Dave Black: We have a motion and a second, any discussion? All those in favor. Motion carries unanivious.

Brayden Richmond made the motion to accept the NER Deer Management Plans as presented Nick Jorgensen seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

CWMU Management Plans & Permit Numbers for 2017 (action)

-Covy Jones, Public Wildlife/ Private Lands Coordinator

(see attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: K, thank you. Any questions from the RAC. I have one question. Same question I had last year Wade. See if you made any progress on this or if you remember it. There is a number of CWMU's there is one in particular that we put in for every year for an elk, and it only has one public tag and so the preference points don't ever kick in, is there any thought or has there been any discussion on having a minimum of being 2 public tags so you can have one be preference and one be random?

Covy Jones: You know that's a good question we really haven't ever toyed with the splits. The splits have been in place for a long time. I can understand how that would be beneficial to the public, it's a really good question. Its something that we can entertain and look at with our partners there but I haven't ever looked at that before honestly.

Dave Black: I guess another question would be what do we need to do to move it forward to entertain it? We had discussed it last time, Wade is on the committee.

Covy Jones: So, some of that would be with elk. A lot of these are in limited entry units. And so it really would have to be a change in the split. Cause allocating more permits, it changes the percentage of

public draw permits that go to private land. And so that could be seen as unfair. So, yeah its tough, that one is not easy. Wade?

Wade Heaton: Mr .Chairman, can I throw out an idea? This is the only one that I've heard that made sense to me. What if we just have 2 public permits, every other year? Same amount of permits, same split, same ratios but what you are talking about wouldn't come into effect, it would just be every other year. That's about the only way I can even think to make it feasible.

Covy Jones: Without changing a split, that's the only thing that would work Wade, you are right.

Dave Black: Well I think that would be worth considering maybe taking to the RAC's or whatever that process is to see what the public comment is. I don't know how much interest there is out there but you know there is an advantage both ways, somebody who is just starting over again with zero points has just as much chance as drawing that tag as somebody who has been putting in for the last 15 years. But yet if you've been hoping to hunt on that particular CWMU and you keep putting in year after year after year, it would be nice if your preference point kicked in. So I think there is pros and cons that I'd like to see move forward if we could. Any other comments, questions from the RAC?

Questions from the Public:

None

Comments from the Public:

None

RAC discussion and vote:

Dave Black: Ready for a motion.

Wade Heaton: abstained

Brian Johnson made the motion to accept the CWMU Management Plans & Permit Numbers for 2017 as presented (didn't catch who seconded). Motion carried unanimously (Wade Heaton abstained).

Rusty Aiken made an additional motion to ask the Board to consider adding an action item of issuing 2 permits every other year for CWMU's that only have 1 public permit so Bonus points are an advantage (didn't catch who seconded). Motion carried unanimously.

Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017 (action)

-Covy Jones, Public Wildlife / Private Lands Coordinator

(see attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

Dave: Any questions

Questions from the Public:

None

Comments from the Public:

Comment card was read by Dave Black from SFW to accept as presented

RAC discussion and vote:

Rusty Aiken: make a motion to accept as presented.

Wade Heaton: excused himself from voting

Rusty Aiken made the motion to accept the Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017 as presented Dale Bagley seconded. Motion carried unanimously (Wade Heaton abstained)

2017 Southern Region RAC Locations & Start Times Schedule (action)

-Dave Black, Chairman

(see attachment 1)

RAC discussion and vote:

Dave Black: The one thing that I noted and its noted here that in September we were supposed to go to Richfield but we ended up going to Beaver and I personally liked that change and other than that I didn't have any issues with the other locations. Do we have any comments on the schedule or anything you'd like to change or?

Dale Bagley: I'll make a motion that we approve the meeting schedule for 2017 as presented.

Dave Black: Okay so the main motion is to have the September meeting in Beaver, do we have a second?

Rusty Aiken: I second it.

Dale Bagley made the motion to accept the 2017 Southern Region RAC Locations & Start Times as the draft schedule shows with the exception to hold the September meeting in Beaver. Rusty Aiken seconded. Motion carried unanimously. (This means all locations and start times will be the same as 2016 schedule).

Other Business

-Dave Black, Chairman

None

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.



Utah Farm Bureau Federation

9865 South State, Sandy, Utah 84070-3205 • Fax: (801) 233-3030

Executive (801) 233-3040
Accounting (801) 233-3008

Public Policy (801) 233-3004
Farm Safety (801) 233-3006
Water Quality (801) 233-3014

Communications (801) 233-3005
Member Services (801) 233-3010

TO: The Southern RAC
FROM: The Utah Farm Bureau Federation

As a member of the Elk Unit Committees in the Southern Region we present the following points to the Southern RAC that are elements we feel are necessary for the success of the Elk Unit Plans. Most of these items were presented by the Farm Bureau at the Elk Unit committee meetings.

- Any proposed increase in Elk unit objective numbers should only be considered if there is a significant increase in acres of land within the unit that has been treated for Elk habitat and those acres are producing enough forage to sustain the increase in Elk.
- If the Elk unit population numbers are over objective currently, then they must be brought back to objective before any increases are allowed based on the previous point.
- All land treatments must be monitored to demonstrate that vegetative production will support proposed increase.
- Land treatments must be made to critical range that is needed for the Elk. (winter or summer range)
- Special hunts need to be conducted to control problem Elk or Elk that are over objective or in areas that have special resource issues (agriculture depredation, Aspen treatments, etc.)
- DWR needs to put collars on more Elk to monitor where the problems areas are and where problem Elk are.
- More water developments need to be installed to disperse animals (for both wildlife and livestock).
- If increases in Elk numbers can justified based on the health and availability of the forage resources, then increases in livestock should be considered and implemented as well.

We submit these comments at the Southern RAC meeting held on November 15, 2016 in Cedar City, Utah.

Sincerely,

John B. Keeler, Southern Regional Manager
Utah Farm Bureau Federation



MEMORANDUM

Date: November 9, 2016

To: Wildlife Board and Regional Advisory Council Members

From: Sportsmen for Fish & Wildlife, Utah Bowmen’s Association, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Mule Deer Foundation.

Subject: 2017 OIAL Archery Only Hunt Recommendation and Season Dates

Recommendation:

We recommend adding (6) new Archery-Only Once-in-a-Lifetime hunts.

Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep		2017	
Hunt #	Hunt Name	Season Dates	Notes
	Nile Mile, Jack Creek	Sept 9 – Sept 30	New Hunt, Archery Only, Difficult Access,
	Box Elder, Newfoundland Mtn	Dec 11 – Dec 31	New Hunt, Archery Only

Desert Bighorn Sheep		2017	
Hunt #	Hunt Name	Season Dates	Notes
	Zion	Nov 11 – Dec 1	New Hunt, Archery Only
	Kaiparowits, West	Nov 11 – Dec 1	New Hunt, Archery Only

Bison		2017	
Hunt #	Hunt Name	Season Dates	Notes
	Henry Mountains	Sept 30 – Oct 20	New Hunt, Archery Only

Mountain Goat		2017	
Hunt #	Hunt Name	Season Dates	Notes
	North Slope/South Slope Uintas	Aug 19 – Sept 10	New Hunt, Archery Only, Entire Unit

Benefits:

- 1- Address point creep.
- 2- Provides new and additional opportunities.
- 3- The hunts have a high potential for a lower success rate.
- 4- Targets animals that are often passed over by rifle hunters.
- 5- We are seeking additional tags, thus tags are not taken from the current hunts.
- 6- Not the most opportune time to hunt some of these unit. Best time still slated for the any weapon hunts.

**Southeast Regional Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main
Green River, Utah
November 16, 2016**

Motion Summary

Approval of today's Agenda and Minutes

**MOTION: To accept the agenda and minutes as written
Passed unanimously**

Elk Unit Management Plan Revisions

**MOTION: To accept revisions to the elk unit management plan as presented
Passed unanimously**

Bucks, Bulls and OIAL 2017 Season Dates, Application Timeline

MOTION: To ask the Wildlife Board, as an action log item, to direct the Division to devise a solution for Dedicated Hunters whose children draw hunting permits for a different unit

Passed unanimously

MOTION: To accept the Division's proposal for the Henry Mountain management buck hunt

Passed 8-1

MOTION: To leave the limited-entry Boulder/Kaiparowits muzzleloader hunt unchanged from 2016, with dates conforming to 2017

Passed unanimously

MOTION: To reject the Division's proposed seven-day archery extension for OIAL hunts

Failed for lack of a second

MOTION: To accept the Division's proposed seven-day archery extension for OIAL hunts

Passed 5-3

MOTION: To accept the remaining proposed bucks, bulls and OIAL 2017 season dates and application timeline as presented

Passed unanimously

Preference Point System Amendments

**MOTION: To accept the preference point system amendments as presented
Passed unanimously**

NER Deer Management Plans

**MOTION: To accept the NER deer management plans as presented
Passed unanimously**

CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2017

**MOTION: To accept the CWMU management plans and permit numbers for
2017 as presented
Passed unanimously**

Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017

**MOTION: To accept the Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2016 as
presented
Passed unanimously**

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

November 16, 2016 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

**Kevin Albrecht, Chairman, USFS
Sue Bellagamba, Non-consumptive**

**Trisha Hedin, Sportsperson
Todd Huntington, At-large & Vice Chair**

**Kent Johnson, At-large
Derris Jones, Sportsmen
Darrel Mecham, Sportsmen**

**Charlie Tracy, Agriculture
Gerrish Willis, Non-consumptive**

Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor

Members Absent

**Keith Brady, Elected Official
Blair Eastman, Agriculture**

Karl Ivory, BLM representative

Christine Micoz, At-large

Others Present

Dr. Mike King, Wildlife Board member

Audience Present: 7

1) Welcome, RAC introductions and RAC Procedure

- Kevin Albrecht, Chairman

Kevin Albrecht: We would like to welcome everyone out to the RAC tonight; if you could find your seats, we will get started. I appreciate everyone taking the time to come down. I appreciate good public attendance. My name is Kevin Albrecht. First off, we will have approval of the agenda. If not we will ask for a motion

(Before questions on agenda item 5) First we will go to question from the RAC and they'll ask the Division for any questions or clarifications and then we will go to the

public. If you have a question please come up to the microphone in the front and state your name and your question or clarification. When that's done if you would like to make a comment there in the front when you came in there was one of these comment cards if you'll fill out your name, bring it to Chris or give it to a Division employee and I will call you up. We will give three minutes for individuals and five minutes for groups. Then we will come back to the RAC for questions and for a motion.

**2) Approval of the Agenda and minutes (Action)
- Kevin Albrecht, Chairman**

Kent Johnson: Motion to approve the agenda.

Todd Huntington: I'll second.

Kevin Albrecht: Motion to approve the agenda by Kent Johnson. Second by Todd Huntington. How about approval of the minutes. Any discussion on the minutes?

Todd Huntington: Motion to approve.

Kevin Albrecht: Okay. Motion to approve the minutes by Todd Huntington.

Kent Johnson: I'll second.

Kevin Albrecht: Seconded by Kent Johnson. All in favor? Okay, we will go to old business.

(After agenda item No. 3) I had to see if everyone was on their toes, and Derris and Todd were. We do need to have a vote on the minutes and the agenda. So all in favor of the agenda. Unanimous. All in favor of the Minutes. Unanimous. Thank You. We will have a regional update.

VOTING (After agenda item No. 3)

Motion was made by Kent Johnson to approve this meeting's agenda as printed.

Seconded by Todd Huntington

Motion passed unanimously

Motion was made by Todd Huntington to approve the minutes of the Sept. 14, 2016, meeting as printed.

Seconded by Kent Johnson

Motion passed unanimously

3) **Wildlife Board Meeting Update**
- Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor

Chris Wood: So I attended the Wildlife Board and spoke for our RAC because Kevin was not able to attend that meeting. So I will give you an update on what was discussed and what motions were made and what was approved. If you remember our last RAC was about fisheries and aquatics, and so the hot topic was corn, remember that? So they made motions on that there were several different items that were brought up so the aquatics recommendations were broken up into several different motions. There was a motion to approve a catch-and-kill regulation on walleye in Echo Reservoir, and that passed unanimously. Walleye were illegally introduced into Echo, so that came to the Board and that was approved. There was also some discussion among the RACs and proposal for Strawberry for a two-day possession limit to be allowed at Strawberry Reservoir that would match the two-day possession limit the Board approved, I think, last year state wide. So there was a lot of discussion on that proposal, and in the end, that motion to accept the two-day possession limit on Strawberry failed 3-2. There was also discussion about Utah Lake and its tributaries. If you remember, our RAC voted to approve fishing in the tributaries, so we voted to do away with seasonal closures in the Utah Lake tributaries. The Wildlife Board agreed. They voted 4-1 to allow fishing in the Utah Lake tributaries, but to keep it closed for walleye, which are spawning during that time. And then the remaining proposal including the use of corn at eight different bodies of water throughout the state on a trial basis was approved. That passed unanimously. Corn is, I believe starting January 1, you can use corn at eight different bodies of water. There are two per region, and two of the regions share two of the reservoirs, that's why there are eight. And I believe that was it.

4) **Regional Update**
- Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor

Chris Wood: We concluded our fall gill netting surveys in October. We gill netted Scofield, and I forgot to mention this in the update from the Board meeting. But Scofield was discussed quite a bit at the Board meeting, and the Board agreed with what the RAC felt as well that the Division of Wildlife needed to take additional action at Scofield that the current biological strategy, which we believe is working, was going to take to long to reach its results, and so we presented to the board our strategy, and they gave use the thumbs up and said, yes please proceed in that direction. And that is that we put out a survey to the anglers and sportsmen of Utah. We got a lot of people that took that survey.

In the survey we asked, here are some options, what should we do at Scofield? How happy are you with Scofield currently? And as you can imagine, most people said they weren't happy with Scofield and they wanted action to occur sooner rather than later, so we gave them different options of what actions could be. It would be a rotenone treatment, it could be introducing a different type of predator fish or a few different types of predator fish that would reduce the amount of chubs and then we also asked in the survey whether they would be willing to sit on a committee to help develop a plan for Scofield Reservoir. And so we have been reviewing those results the last two weeks. We are putting together a team in the next week or two and will have our first meeting we hope before Christmas and we hope to meet three or four times, develop a plan together as a group and on the group will be angler groups and citizens of Carbon County and local communities, people who own cabins near Scofield, people who want family fisheries, multiple interests groups will be on this committee and together they will write a plan. And that plan will come to the RAC and the Board next Spring.

So in addition to the gill netting at Scofield, which we did see a lot of chubs, they were the bigger chubs but as we learned at the last RAC meeting, chubs can take 20 years before they die. There weren't a whole lot of little chubs, so it was an indication that our biological strategy was working but, as I just mentioned, that is what we discussed at the last RAC meeting, citizens and sportsmen don't want to wait that long, so there are other strategies we can implement to get that fishery in a great production and shape before 20 years from now. We also did gill netting at Joes Valley. Indications were that there aren't very many chubs there and that's because the larger predator fish, the tiger muskie, there's some splake that are really big — we got one in the nets that was 27 inches and almost 9 pounds — those larger predator fish are removing and keeping down the chub populations.

We also hired a new biologist. His name is Jordon Detlor. He has worked for us for the last four or five summers. He is our aquatic invasive species biologist, so he oversees and tries to prevent quagga mussels from coming onto our Utah waters. His specific areas are the waters on the Manti and other parts of the region. We have a separate biologist that works the Lake Powell area.

Our Habitat Section has been busy. This is the busiest time of year for them. They are implementing habitat projects, everything from pinyon-juniper removal projects — you can see there on the bottom right corner is a bull hog, and it removes pinion and juniper trees that are encroaching on sage brush communities that are vital for our mule deer and elk in the winter time. We are also putting in some guzzlers. We have worked with some Boys Scout groups the last few weeks. We have also trapped chukars near Delta and relocated them in the Price area, and some of these guzzlers you see will benefit upland game. Some guzzlers will benefit big game, and sometimes they benefit, there's multiple use, including livestock.

Our Outreach Section has been busy, too. I think it was Nov. 5 was National

Bison Day. Jason Chaffetz, our Congressman, was key in getting National Bison Day and bison are our national mammal. That legislation passed and part of his involvement was to continue to allow us to hunt the bison and so he came down with us the day before National Bison Day, and the Director came down, and Bill and Morgan, and some biologists took him down on the Henry's and we showed him some bison up close and personal. So it was a good experience for him to see that and having him support our efforts in restoring bison.

We have a Mule Deer Watch coming up on November 19, that's this Saturday. It has been an RSPV type of event, our list is full. We have a wait list, but there's been a strong interest in that. Every year we take some constituents up there and they love to see the wintering mule deer that are coming off the Book Cliffs and into our Nash Wash property.

This year, like we have done the last three or four years, we have released a lot of pen-raised pheasants. Statewide we have released 10,000 pheasants. A lot of those birds, 1,000-plus, maybe 2,000 birds, are coming to the southeastern part of the state. And we release them at our Wildlife Management Areas and our Walk-in Access areas. We actually have a map on our website that shows the properties we are releasing them at. It's been a great opportunity for people to hunt pheasants again. And we get a lot of positive feedback from our constituents they love that experience and that opportunity. We release them every single week until the hunts closed. So each week there is a new batch of birds ready to be hunted. So it's been fun.

And then we are currently reviewing a walk-in access property near Hiawatha that will be open for big game hunting and renewing other applications that we have.

We did have a youth pheasant hunt on October 15 and our Law Enforcement group our officers hosted that event. They have also been responding to U-tip calls. I'm just always amazed at how busy our officers are responding to different leads and investigating different cases and they are busy this year again as well. They will be doing some winter range patrols at the end of this month and then in general they are getting positive feedback from hunters and our officers are the ones who really are the face of our agency a lot of the times and who talk to hunters more than anybody else. And what they are hearing is that this year has been a good mule deer hunt. And that's what we have heard state wide, and they are also getting great feedback about our pheasant hunt.

We had CWD check station in Wellington and La Sal junction. Hunters who want a CWD sample taken they can stop by our station or stop by our office and we will take a sample, and three to six weeks later we can tell you if there are any CWD issues. We have very little CWD, I think last year on the La Sals we had 2 total deer, so it's very unlikely that your deer has CWD. But it's a service we provide our hunters and it's something that we want to monitor as well. The feedback we are getting from our check stations is that people are happy. There were more deer than previous years and the size of the deer were bigger than previous years as well. And these pictures are fresh from this

year; that was at our Wellington check station.

The biologists are currently as of today and the next few weeks are doing big horn sheep surveys. Then we will start our capture season where we were going to put GPS collars on deer and then we will continue our big horn sheep studies on the Rattlesnake and Nine Mile Unit in December. And that's all I got. If you got any questions I can try and answer and I have a bunch of biologists back here who can answer anything you have too.

Todd Huntington: On the Scofield, was there any benefit from the toxic algae bloom that killed a bunch of chub or was that just kind of superficial?

Chris Wood: The opinion of our local aquatics biologists was that it was just superficial. It was just, you know, it didn't really make a dent in the overall population of the chubs

Todd Huntington: Wondering what steps the Division is taking to ensure that the Mt. Nebo fiasco doesn't happen again.

Chris Wood: Justin, want to talk about that?

Justin Shannon: Good question. No. I'm just kidding. It's an interesting one because we had that information from the rule and we never put that information in the guidebook because it really impacted two people: the sportsman permit holder and the conservation permit holder. And in the past, we have sent letters and different things like that. As we update our application guidebook, we are going to include some language to clarify that.

Todd Huntington: What is the Division doing to make Captain Ecker whole?

Justin Shannon: That's a good question. I'm really not sure how to answer that. I haven't been involved in the investigation; that has been handed over to our law enforcement, so the details on that entire case, I'm not really sure. We certainly took it to the county attorney to review it and the county attorney decided there wasn't enough there for prosecution, or, I'm sorry, to make a case. Other than that certainly you can hunt other the other units in the state and those types of things, beyond that our big horn biologist has been on the phone constantly with Captain Ecker talking about rams they have seen and areas to go. So I think we have given a lot more assistance in that regard than we have with any of the other permit holders.

Todd Huntington: So we have a specialist, a big horn biologist that's, special for big horn sheep

Justin Shannon: Yeah, we do at a statewide level.

Todd Huntington: And he has the sportsman's tag holder's phone number? Did he not have access to the governor's tag phone number? I mean it sounds to me like he has been able to get a hold of sportsman's tag holder and we relied on a letter. I believe perhaps a phone call would have been in order, especially after the outfitter contacted the Division. I think there should have been perhaps some outreach there I guess is what you want to call it.

Justin Shannon: Certainly there are some things we can learn from this experience. I mean we aren't jumping up and down with excitement about what happened either. It's unfortunate and there's some things we have learned about it and talking about better

training on what the rules are and better education and those types of things. You know we can't replace what happened, certainly, but we can improve moving forward and I think that's what we are going to try to do.

Kevin Albrecht: Is that all of the questions? With that we will go to item No. 5: Elk unit management plans.

5) **Elk Unit Management Plan Revisions**
- Justin Shannon, Big Game Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Kevin Albrecht: Thanks Justin, before we start, I just want to give a quick explanation of how this works... (Refer to summary for agenda item No. 1). Questions from the RAC?

Kent Johnson: I have a question just real quick. There are several units, especially in the Northern Region where the increase in the management objective was substantial, what's the reason for going that far all at once? Because the elk are already there and you're just tired of trying to kill them off or what?

Justin Shannon: A lot of the units in the Northern Region are private land dominated, and the private landowners like the elk. They're the ones that were probably the most ardent supporters for the population increases. So they like having them where they are at currently. If you remember on those slides we were over objective in a lot of those units and, they like to see elk in those units. As we held these committees together, a lot of support from the major landowners in the units.

Gerrish Willis: I've got a question about the La Sal Unit. Just part of the report it talks about increased decadence in sage brush communities and slight downward trend in herbaceous communities but then you conclude that the forest service and BLM assessments of current vegetation trends on the unit have not indicated over utilization of herbaceous forage by elk. Do they have a rationale or an idea of why the sage brush communities seem to be going down?

Justin Shannon: Let's see if Guy can help with this question.

Chris Wood: Justin, I think it has to do with the pinyon-juniper encroachment will choke out grasses and forbs and reduce the amount of available vegetation for elk, and so there's that threat there and we work the BLM and Forest Service to improve those habitats. Guy, do you have anything else to add?

Gerrish: Chris it talks about decadence in the sage brush community. That doesn't sound like PJ encroachment it sounds like something going on with those communities themselves.

Guy Wallace: If I may answer that, this has gone on for several years with the Dolores Triangle. We had several years where the sage brush especially in the lower end of the triangle was getting utilized fairly hard because of the high numbers of deer that were being attracted to fields down along the river. And then once the snow came they would move into the sage brush, and then also they quit farming the fields watering the fields so then we had a high number of deer primarily relying on sage brush and so it was pretty well beat out. And then through that same period, you know, we went into some dry drought years and the sage brush basically just died and so as a result of that, we reduced our objectives for both our deer and elk numbers in that area.

Derris Jones: Justin does the Division track general season elk hunters by unit that they hunt?

Justin Shannon: For spike hunters?

Derris Jones: Yeah, do we know, next follow up question is are the elk hunters pretty standard or do they do a lot of moving around from one spike unit or one any bull unit to another?

Justin Shannon: We do track it, yeah. We can track the harvest and we can ask them on these surveys what units they have hunted. As far as how many individual units that they hunt on a spike hunt or any bull hunt I'd have to look, I don't know that off the top of my head.

Derris Jones: Not necessarily the number of units they hunt, but are the numbers pretty consistent from year to year?

Justin Shannon: On the harvest on these units?

Derris Jones: Not on the harvest, but the units the hunters are selecting.

Justin Shannon: I'd have to go look. I'm probably pretty ill-prepared to look at something like that. Randall, do you have your computer? I mean, yeah, that is something we can certainly look at while we are answering other questions. Just so I understand it correctly, if the Manti has 200 spike hunters for instance, is that pretty stable from year to year or do we see major fluctuations? Okay. Can you take a stab at that Randall?

Trisha Hedin: And Justin, the reason we were talking about that earlier I was spike hunting in the Book Cliffs this year and the population to me had like quadrupled in spike hunters, and so we were just wondering if the state is considering limiting where spike hunters choose to hunt and they were all, everybody I talked to was from the Wasatch Front and that Seep Ridge Road has made a fairly major change in where hunters are coming from and where they are hunting. So yeah, is it affecting one unit more than another regarding the spike hunt?

Justin Shannon: I think certainly you are going to have more pressure on one unit than another by allowing hunters to go do that. This was a question that came up in our

statewide elk committee as we went through it, and the feeling there was let's let hunters be able to go to and from, especially where decreases in general season deer permits has kind of, I don't want to say diminish, but it's not that family traditional hunt, it's not what it once was, and so with the spike hunt there is a lot of conversation about maintaining maximum flexibility for the any bull or the spike bull hunt to go to and from. A lot of it had to do with, if you're in Northern Utah and you have a lot of private land and you want to try to harvest an any bull in your back yard or in some of those areas great but if you want to go try the Uintahs for a few days, you have that flexibility as well. So I remember it came up, and there wasn't a lot of support from that committee to go force people into a specific area.

Derris Jones: It came up in the Range Creek Unit plan as one of the more discussed items, maybe Brad can give us some information on why he decided not to incorporate it. My memory is fading, maybe we voted as a committee, I can't remember, to not do it, I can't remember.

Justin Shannon: That's one that would have statewide implications. If we limited the amount of people that could go into one unit versus another, we could pull up that data. Are you interested in the data on the Nine Mile specifically, how many spike, or any bull hunters we've had there?

Derris Jones: Trish is more interested in the Book Cliffs, my unit I hunt more often is Nine Mile/Range Creek. I'm just curious whether hunters are doing a lot of shifting or if it's pretty consistent number of hunters on the unit every year.

Justin Shannon: Let us look real quick. We will put something together.

Trisha Hedin: When you mention manage horse populations, what exactly are you saying?

Justin Shannon: That's a good question. What we are talking about is providing any type of public or social or political or any type of resources or support that federal agencies would need to help manage their horse populations to objective. Most of the concern in a lot of these unit plans is that horse populations are exceeding many of these objectives. And in fairness to the BLM, a lot of times they felt like their hands were tied and that the process is associated with being able to get horses to objective, and so if we can offer support, that is what we would like to do.

Trisha Hedin: So you're just talking about education?

Justin Shannon: Yea and social and political support, you know, if they need a letter saying you know we just need to show there are constituents that want to see populations of horses decrease, that type of stuff.

Derris Jones: Follow up to that Justin, the wording you had on your slide is better than I guess this is the Book Cliffs one and one of the habitat objectives is to manage to minimize wild horse herds and their impacts and I mean that as a Division plan, there's really nothing the Division can do to manage horses, so I'd suggest you standardize the wording more.

Justin Shannon: Is that in the memo I put together or what are you reading?

Derris Jones: Right out of the management plan.

Justin Shannon: For the Book Cliffs?

Derris Jones: Yes.

Justin Shannon: Okay, Can you read it again for me one more time, Derris?

Derris Jones: It says manage to minimize wild horse herds and their impacts.

Justin Shannon: And your point is we don't manage horse populations and so to have that as a strategy...

Derris Jones: Right and your wording was support management actions there that do get wild horses into compliance with...

Justin Shannon: That is the intent. I don't want to give the impression we think we can manage horse populations because that's not our role.

Derris Jones: And I understand that, but I think you probably ought to standardize the wording in all these plans that talk about wild horses so that it doesn't make it look like you guys are going to come up with new management techniques to get rid of wild horses.

Justin Shannon: That's really good feedback. Thank you.

Trisha Hedin: Justin, will you talk about chronic wasting? Are you talking about specifically in the Southeastern Region, just the La Sal unit? I mean is that really the only spot where we have seen it?

Justin Shannon: Yeah, we've only found it in one elk, and was it the La Sals or the San Juan for elk, Guy? So yeah, it would just be that one (the La Sals).

Trisha Hedin: And then as far as the Book Cliffs, the objective is 7,500 but we are way under that, I mean why not just switch the objective if — I think at one time Brad and I talk about this — I mean why not just change the objective if you don't feel like you are ever going to get to that objective?

Justin Shannon: I think we are making strides though. You know I was talking to Randall Thacker, the biologist, and you'll hear from him tonight, he was saying their habitat section has done like 30 water projects on the Book Cliffs this year alone and there have been a lot of habitat restoration efforts and things like that. It's a goal we have and we are certainly trying to improve the habitats to get there.

Trisha Hedin: No, I think it's great, but if you are that much under objective it's at a point, you know, are you beating your head against a wall?

Justin Shannon: And that population seems to be a little different than a lot of the other ones in the state as you can see in some of these units we are trying to figure out how to get enough harvest where we don't really harvest a lot of cows except to solve some of these issues on the south side with the BLM and some depredation challenges. You know, those types of things we're trying to get the population to that desired outcome.

Kent Johnson: Might be the competition with the horses. There are a lot of horses.

Justin Shannon: Hence you can see why it was a common theme in a lot of the plans.

Trisha Hedin: It's really interesting the whole kind of west side of the unit is just stacked with, I mean that's where the bison are, that's where the horses are really heavy, and yea there's a lot of elk, so there is a lot going on over there.

Derris Jones: Another question on the Book Cliffs plan, under the habitat section there is a section that says promote sustainable livestock grazing practices that minimize negative impacts to plant health and diversity especially on summer ranges on SITLA and DWR lands. I'm assuming that's the road-less area we are talking? Well the Book Cliffs initiative lands I guess in general. Is that something we have never had a livestock grazing program in the roadless area since the Division has owned it is that something new are they considering livestock grazing in the wilderness area or is that a catch-all statement?

Justin Shannon: I'm not sure exactly. Randall?

Randall Thatcher: Yeah, Derris, it's a catch-all statement. Just to answer your others, this is just really quick, this is three years of data on the spike hunters, and it's just the any rifle any weapon and I can look up the others if you'd like but the North Book Cliffs in 2013 had 465 any bull spike hunters. In 2014 we had 455, so that's only a 10 hunter difference. But last year in 2015 we only had 380. We don't have the data yet for this year.

Trisha Hedin: This is harvest?

Randall Thatcher: No these are hunters. Is that what you asked, harvest or number of hunters?

Trisha Hedin: Meaning they are hunting in that unit.

Randall Thatcher: That is how many of them hunted that unit during the spike hunt for at least one day. They could have hunted other units too that are spike, you know spikes multiple units in the state but that's how many actually hunted at least one day on that unit. If the South Book Cliffs was more the question I didn't know for sure which you were asking. In 2013 we had 230, in 2014 we had 99 and 2015 looks like 125, so it does vary a little, not significantly, though, it's not a major, 40 percent change or anything from year to year.

Trisha Hedin: This may be the year cause there was a drastic change, I've hunted there for many years during the spike hunt and it was drastic.

Randall Thatcher: And you saw more this year than last year? And this was on the North or the South?

Trisha Hedin: What do you consider North or South? It was on the divider of it.

Randall Thatcher: That's the North, so this year we actually had less spike hunters by 70 hunters at least than previous years, so it's probably more the concentration of where they were at more so than the actual number of hunters. Sorry that was last year's data, so I don't have this year's data, if that's what you were referring to. You're right. On the grazing there is no intent on the plan on the roadless to change the grazing program than what is out there.

Derris Jones: You better check that wording cause if I was a livestock grazer I would look at that and say...

Randall Thatcher: Put in for that one? Yeah, we will double check that.

Todd Huntington: Another question Justin, if my memory serves me right we have had discussion of black bear predation on mule deer and it was pretty much said that it's not a big issue. But yet, in every one of these elk management plans, it brings up black bear predation on elk calves, at least on units with high populations of black bears. Are we changing our tune or are elk more susceptible than mule deer, what are we saying here?

Justin Shannon: I think what we are doing on these plans one of the things managers and biologists were asked to look at was the limiting factors of elk populations. And it does come up all the time on this, so we just wanted to include language to address potential limiting factors on it. Because to say that black bears don't take calves, I mean, they do in some cases. Now what effect it has on the population, those things are things we could debate and discuss but we're just trying to identify limiting factors in the plan.

Derris Jones: Where it's listed as a limiting factor, wouldn't that tag it for maybe a research project? It's hardly worth mentioning as an impact if we aren't going to find a solution to it, is kind of my point.

Justin Shannon: Candidly, it's not a bad research project, and I think in some units where we have higher black bear populations than others and areas that have limited aspen cover and limited summer range, are you talking the Book cliffs in particular?

Derris Jones: Well the Book Cliffs, or every one of the southeast units with bears, the Abajos, La Sals, you mention black bear populations a potential limiting factor.

Justin Shannon: It's not a bad research project. In fact, I think it might be on those types of units that are summer range limited that we know we have high density of black bears, it's probably something worth looking into.

Kevin Albrecht: Any other questions from the RAC?

Justin Shannon: Can I make a comment real quick? Derris and others, thank you for feedback on these plans so thoroughly. I think the feedback on some of this is good. I appreciate the time you took to thoroughly review these. Thank you.

Questions from the Public

No questions

Comments from the Public

Randy Quayle: My name is Randy Quayle. I represent the Utah Bowman's Association. First I would like to thank all the RAC members for coming out tonight and DWR, we

know it's pretty tough to make it this far sometimes, but anyway, we would concur with the recommendation from the DWR for the elk management plan they have in place.

Bryce Pilling: Thank you Mr. Chairman, RAC members and the Division for what they have done. I represent Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife (SFW), and we support the management plan as presented. Thank you.

Ed Muir: I'm Ed Muir. I'm a lifetime member of Timpanogos Archery Club. We are the oldest established archery club in the state of Utah since 1946. We have 120 members. We would like to concur with resolution No. 5 the fish and game has proposed. Thank you.

Butch Jensen: Butch Jensen, we are landowners on the Tavaputs and Desolation Canyon area in the Nine Mile/Range Creek unit. We have private land up on the Tavaputs and we are permit holders in Desolation Canyon from Flat Canyon to Range Creek, so that's a pretty good portion of Desolation Canyon. We were involved with the meeting a month or so ago with the land owners for that unit. It was a good meeting, and I think we all agreed we would like to see the elk numbers go to at least the 1,800 head mark. Up on the ranch where we are at and our ranch just is one of the places that has done a lot of work there. We have done over 3,000 acres of habitat control, brush management. We have done lots of water developments, we have done controlled burns getting aspen regeneration, so we've built miles and miles of wildlife friendly let-down fences for the game for the deer and the elk. So anyway, we agree with bumping this number to at least 1,800. Thank you.

Kevin Albrecht: I'd just make the comment that it's nice to be able to hear from a landowner that has worked with the Division and be able to hear those comments because many times decisions effect the landowners. So I appreciate to hear that. Any other comment cards? Seeing none we will go to comments from the RAC.

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion made by Kent Jonson to approve the elk management plan as proposed by the Division.

Seconded by Trisha Hedin

Motion passed unanimously

6) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2017 Season Dates, Application Timeline

- Justin Shannon, Big Game Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Todd Huntington: Do you know they (buck-to-doe ratios) are on those three (units) you are wanting to add?

Justin Shannon: Yeah, I can find out real quick. For the Mount Dutton the three-year average it's over 22. For Ogden it is almost 21. And on the Plateau/ Fish Lake it is 22. And the one we are taking out that we are recommending is Plateau Boulder/Kaiparowits and its average is 19, but the three-year average on it is went from 16.4 in 2013 up to 19.9 up to 20.6. So it is trending in a positive direction, but it has fallen off the three-year average. the previous year in 2012, the buck-to-doe ratio was really, really high, which is why it went in as a three-year average. So we like the trend of it but to stick with the letter of the law we are recommending it be discontinued.

Todd Huntington: Justin how many tags are on the Nine Mile/Range creek unit right now, I mean, the whole thing altogether?

Justin Shannon: I think there are 13 public draw permits.

Todd Huntington: I know we're not setting tag numbers tonight, but how do you think that will break out? Split in half, or most of the sheep on one side or the other?

Justin Shannon: Just to clarify, we're not setting permits tonight.

Todd Huntington: What's the plan there? If we want to split it, we've got to split it for a reason.

Brad Crompton: Typically in the past, 80 percent of the sheep live in the Gray Canyon part of it but 95 percent of the harvest occurs down there so we are trying to force a little bit of harvest that way. So we will survey it in a couple weeks and we will know what to do from there for this coming year.

Todd Huntington: So probably talking 10-3, 9-4.

Justin Shannon: To clarify, once we get the survey results back the way it works we count and see how many class-3 and class-4 rams we have on each unit and so now what we do is take that number for Gray Canyon and we issue 30-40 percent of the permits for rams that we saw, if that makes sense. So if you saw 10 rams, 10 class-3 or class-4 rams in Gray Canyon, you know, the plan says issue 3 or 4 permits or recommend that and so I think Brad plays a good point as they go survey it. They will just assess that for Jack Creek and they will assess that for Gray Canyon. I'm not sure how that will shake out compared to what we have had in the past.

Todd Huntington: That's just a one-year deal, that'll come back in next year then?

Justin Shannon: So yeah, that population, the state line straddles the mountain range and so we issue a permit and that permit holder can hunt both sides of the mountain. They can hunt into Nevada; our hunt boundary actually goes into Nevada. It's an interesting one.

They do it the same. If we ever had increased populations there is probably years both states could have a permit but the history has been turning off and on every other year.

Derris Jones: The Columbia sheep would be in the Jack Creek portion?

Brad Crompton: It goes to Bruin Point and down to Highway 123. Anything south of Sunnyside would be in the Gray Canyon portion of it.

Kent Johnson: Is that the Horse Canyon road?

Brad Crompton: That's the Bruin Point road. So its Range Creek all the way to the head waters at Bruin Point and then down to Highway 123 and over to the highway.

Todd Huntington: Justin on the management hunts, the idea behind the management hunt is to actually kill some bucks, right? To lower the buck to doe ratio, right? Did the thought come up to maybe increase the rifle tags on that management hunt, or better yet, increase or lengthen that season. As I understand it, it's only a five-day season and it's a Monday through a Friday. We don't even have a weekend in there, so could we at least throw in a weekend? If we are trying to kill the bucks, why are we adding two weapons we have beat to death that they are less successful?

Justin Shannon: Yea they are less successful, there is no doubt. But on these premium limited-entry hunts with archery and muzzleloader equipment, they are extremely high success rates. This was our stab at it. This was our approach to say, let's get some hunters in there, you know, if you look at it. I think we only have nine archery hunter's public draw archery hunters. They wouldn't start the same day

Todd Huntington: But they are competing, their season overlap. Same with the muzzleloader, and that's nuts.

Justin Shannon: It was just our approach, our stab at it, Todd, so I mean if you would like to do something different with it, give it a shot.

Todd Huntington: I may make a proposal.

Kevin Albrecht: So one of the things, as I understand, the numbers you have during the rifle right now, from the surveys you feel that there are too many rifle hunters to add more at that time?

Justin Shannon: We tried it. So we were at 30 hunters for a while and then went up to 35. And the feedback Wade got and law enforcement got, you know, you have the hardest hunt that we offer in the state, an antler point restriction hunt and you have several people in the same drainage going after the same buck. And so it was one of these things we just felt like the feedback we got was there is a lot of crowding and pressure, and we want hunters to look at these bucks and make sure they are harvesting the right animals. So that's what we are trying to do.

Kevin Albrecht: So one of the questions, talk about those 5 days. Isn't it because of those other once-in-a-lifetime hunts?

Justin Shannon: Yeah, we are trying to squeeze that in there between the end of the rifle hunt, which also has 30 hunters in it as well, but again it's not an antler point restriction, and between the bison hunts, so that five-day window is kind of that where we are trying

to get it there. And Todd, I didn't finish answering your question I apologize about that. The other thing you asked was why can't we just increase permits on the normal hunts?

Todd Huntington: No I didn't ask that. I think those are pretty nice.

Kevin Albrecht: Any other questions from the RAC?

Questions from the Public

Eric Luke: I have two questions for you, Justin. One on the Henrys, do you feel like if you were to add more rifle permits to that management hunt that because of the overcrowding success rates would actually go down? Is that a possibility?

Justin Shannon: Are you asking if we add more permits to the management?

Eric Luke: Yes, to the management hunt. You mention it was overcrowding the feedback you were getting. If you put more in that hunt, it seems like success could actually go down the success rate.

Justin Shannon: Yeah, It may. I would have to look at what the success rates were when we had 20 and then 30, 35, and then back to 30. Guy, is that something you can pull up real quick on what those success rates were? But in theory to answer questions, generally on hunts, the more hunters you put in there, the lower the success rate has the potential to be.

Erik Luke: The other question on the late muzzleloader deer hunt on the Boulder that you're looking to do away with, you mentioned that it was trending up, and according to the letter of the management plan, you had to recommend doing away with it. What are your thoughts, would you have heartburn if that recommendation was made to keep that because of the trend?

Justin Shannon: This is an interesting one for us because the strategy in the plan says explore having this type of hunt that if you were exceeding 18 to 20 bucks, you would try and have this limited entry experience hunt on a general season unit and with that, that's all it said was to explore it. If you look at all the other language in the mule deer plan, it says manage to a three-year buck-to-doe ratio while taking trend into consideration, and so that committee, this wasn't a very flushed-out idea. We like the concept, Division, you go figure out how to make it work. For us, the reason we took the recommendation out is we are trying to be transparent, so if it is not meeting that 18 to 20 bucks per 100 does, the letter of the law says to bring it down. The biologist in the Southern Region last night was asked how he would feel and he says, no, it's a great unit, that herd's doing awesome. Buck to doe ratios are fine in that region and that region approved it to stay fine as is. And so no heartburn. We just wanted to manage to the plan as best we could.

Todd Huntington: Justin, about this idea. You've got a break between the muzzleloader hunt and the Rifle hunt of about 15 to 16 days, can you do a management hunt there, in that window? Still keeping your later one. I realize that would be the more desirable one

because its later, it may pick up some rut action, but could you use that window if we are worried about stepping on the bison hunters, which, yeah, if I was a bison hunter I don't want deer hunters running around either but is that a possibility?

Justin Shannon: Yeah certainly. I mean that's a window that right now the only hunt that is going on is the any weapon elk hunt and I think they have 25 hunters a year give or take in there. So it's not very many, so that is another window that would be open. I don't know. Guy, do you have any opinion on this? I guess I'm speaking for...

Justin Shannon: Now you can appreciate how hard it is to find these season dates. It is challenging.

Todd Huntington: So if we have only a five-day hunt and we have a 16-day window, we put them right after the muzzleloader, you've still got 10 days. So the theory is that after the muzzleloader all of a sudden the deer quit running around and are docile again by the time the rifle hunt begins we can shoot them off the road or what?

Kevin Albrecht: Any other questions from the RAC?

Comments from the Public

Randy Quayle: Hello again, I'm Randy Quayle, Utah Bowman's Association. We agree with the DWR's proposal for the once-in-a-lifetime hunts, with the exception to the archery only seven-day extension on the once-in-a-lifetime hunts. We have another memorandum we would like to propose. In September ,the Utah Bowmen's Association presented an informational proposal to the RACs and wildlife board concerning archery only once-in-a-lifetime hunting opportunities. The intent of the proposal was to provide an archery-only hunting opportunity, without creating new hunts, without affecting draw odds, and without disrupting the current once-in-a-lifetime hunt structure. The majority of the feedback that we received was contrary to the original intent of the proposal. We found that there are many individuals and groups that would like to see new and additional hunt opportunities created that would ultimately address the problem of point creep. Due to the nature of bow hunting and the difficult season dates that we are proposing, we expect these hunts will have a low success rate. Ultimately over time this would allow additional opportunity, which, in turn, helps address issues of point creep. We encourage you to seriously consider these new recommendations and please take action on this recommendation here tonight. Our new recommendations are six recommended archery-only once-in-a-lifetime hunts. The first is a Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep hunt in the NineMile/Jack Creek area. Its hunt date would go from September 9 to September 30. It's a new hunt, archery-only difficult access hunt. The second is also a Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep hunt, Box Elder/Newfoundland Mountain, December 11 through Dec 31, new hunt, archery only. The next one, number three, is desert bighorn sheep in the Zion area hunt November 11 through December 1,

new hunt archery only. The Kiaparowits West desert bighorn sheep hunt, November 11 through December 1, new hunt, archery only. We are proposing a bison hunt on the Henry Mountains Sept 30 through October 20, new hunt, archery only. And a mountain goat hunt, high Uintahs West, August 19 to September 10, new hunt, archery only, entire unit.

As we all know archery is, we have a tendency as archers to take lesser animals that what rifle hunters take; they would probably walk away from some of the animals that bow hunters would be willing to take. There are sheep out there for example that are getting old, they just don't have the genes or whatever to get the big size of Boone & Crocket trophy animals, but archers are willing to probably take one of those so that's, we are getting rid of, harvesting some of those animals that wouldn't normally be taken. And our hunts are quite a bit less than the rifle any weapon hunts are, but it is giving a point creep, its helping out on that cause its spreading the points out a little bit further, and anyway I think, if it doesn't work out I think its worthy of a vote in favor of this. You know if it doesn't work out we won't do it again but it gives us more opportunities to hunt and like I said help spread the points out a little bit. You know for example I've got 20 desert bighorn sheep points, I'm 68, I probably still won't ever get him. But with an extended one out there I could pull my point system out of the any weapon pool, put it in the archery pool and that would open that up. Somebody else would move up in points and it would help that out a little bit too. Anyway that's our proposal. Thank you.

Bryce Pilling: Bryce again from SFW. We accept the plan with two exceptions. The first exception we would like to see them keep the late muzzleloader hunt on the Boulder/Kaiparowits, and then we approve UBA's plan on the once-in-a-lifetime hunts and not the Division's on the seven-day hunt. Thank you.

Ed Muir: First of all thank you for all your time and effort you put into this I represent Timpanogos Archery Club. I'm a lifetime member. I'm on the board of directors. I have been a bow hunter since 1970, I have not missed a season. I am in love with the sport. I highly recommend that the Board goes along proposal No. 6 with the fish and game with the UBA proposal. Like I said, for some of us that have hunted in the state all our life to draw tags like that would be a dream. I concur with it. Thank you.

Jesse McCourt: I'm Jesse McCourt. I represent middle-aged guys with too many kids. The youth opportunities in the state have been good but as a dedicated hunter I've run into a pretty major problem. Two years ago, I had three of my kids classified as youth 17-12 years old. Not one of them drew a general season deer tag because I put them in just for the unit I was a dedicated hunter in. I didn't want to, since they didn't draw the last two years, I've put them in for multiple choices, my dedicated hunter unit as their first choice, second choice, third choice. I haven't been able to hunt my dedicated hunter unit in two years now because my kids have drawn other units, and I've chose to spend time pursuing game with them. I would propose there be a mechanism put into the general season draw where a youth hunter — and that's the other part of it, these youth come

with us on these dedicated hunter projects, they help work on these projects. I would like to see a mechanism in the general season draw that my kids can attach to my dedicated hunter number or something so they could have the opportunity to draw the same unit I'm a dedicated hunter in. I feel like it's a waste of my time, money, everything else to do the Dedicated Hunter when I can't hunt my unit because my kids are drawing elsewhere. So if something like that could be put in place I think it would benefit a lot of youth. And also, youth in general I would like to see any youth that put in to be able to draw a tag somewhere because it's kind of disheartening for some of them to get excited for them to go and then they don't draw a tag, I've seen some of them go a couple of years without a tag. So that would be my proposal. Thank you.

Eric Luke: Eric Luke. I support the proposal that UBA association and SFW has proposed as a pretty much full-time bow hunter. I very seldom hunt with a muzzleloader or a rifle. The thing I see with the Divisions proposal is those hunts are after those animals have been pushed for a whole season by other hunters. To me, that's not appealing. As a bow hunter, those animals are going to be so skittish, and probably slim, at best, chance at harvesting those animals I think those animals. So to me those hunts wouldn't be very appealing. Therefore very few people are probably going to put in for them. It's not going to help the point creep issue we have. The UBA proposal puts the season dates where the bow hunters can actually have a chance at harvesting the animals much more appealing which I think will definitely get hunters to move from the general pool to some of these hunts providing more opportunity. I support that proposal, support the rest of the division's recommendations. We do support keeping the late muzzleloader hunt on the Boulder/Kaiparowits because the trend is trending up, it seems like a waste of time to do away with it this year and turn around and put it back in place next year.

Shane Thomson: Shane Thomson with SFW and myself. I am in support of the proposal UBA has done as well along with the rest of the proposal, but I will make comments on the archery once-in-a-lifetime hunts. I think this is a good start. I think it's a good way to get some of the numbers down on the draw. We are having a lot of points issues getting up there. A few tags, I mean, it isn't like we are going to open it wide open; there will only be a handful of tags for each one of these hunts. And it's a great opportunity and I think it would be a great thing to pursue this and it's a good start for it. The Boulder Unit, I'm not one for increasing tags but that's a minimal, you know, they aren't going to open it up wide open, so I think they should keep that opportunity for a muzzleloader hunter to go down there. I don't know how many tags there have been but that would be a good number. If we don't have that many at least one or two until it gets to that number to keep that open I think that would be alright. On your uh management hunts on the Henrys going to a muzzleloader and archery, again, trying to spread that out and get some of them bucks harvested, I think it's a good opportunity to thin down some points too as well. I mean there's bucks that are living there that nobody wants to hunt or kill. I would like to see it go a little farther with some encroachment on some quality bucks down there

I don't know if that would ever be possible but we got a lot of 4 points that nobody wants to kills and management hunters can't kill and they are growing every year. I don't know how we could do that as far as maybe getting some pretty qualified guys to go target some of these bucks that are not ever going to get killed by anybody and they are taking over the gene pool. I mean literally its big crab claw fronts that nobody is going to kill on once-in-a-lifetime hunt and they can't kill them on a management hunt so I'd be interested in seeing you guys pursue it a little bit more the I don't know the isolated management hunt there. I know it's tough. I appreciate all the work everybody has done. The division works their butts off trying to fit all these hunts in. Its difficult task but for some of these exceptional units, the Henrys is an unreal unit, so I think if we want to keep improving and making it the best hunt there is I think we can go a step farther, so I would like to see you guys entertain that. But anyway I'm with SFW and UBA as far as getting some of these opportunities for archers. I think it would be a great thing. Thanks.

RAC Discussion

Kevin Albrecht: I think there will probably be a few questions the RAC will have for some of those proposals. We will go to that before we go to comments.

Derris Jones: I'd like either UBA or SFW to maybe explain how they picked the dates they picked it's interesting on that Nine Mile/Jack Creek they picked September and the rest the bighorn units they picked the rut or after the rut. I'm just curious what the reasoning for it was.

Randy Quayle: Randy Quayle, Utah Bowman's Association. The one that's September that's a new hunt and it would be an archery-only hunt they aren't crossing over on any of the other sheep hunts going on at that time and where it is a new hunt we would be the only ones out there. Is that helping you out with that or...

Derris Jones: Well for Box Elder/Newfoundland, you picked Dec 11 through Dec 31. There won't be any rifle hunters out there then on Box Elder/Newfoundland either. why didn't you pick December 11 through December 31 for Nine Mile/Jack Creek because there won't be any hunters on that unit at that point.

Randy Quayle: As far as the dates go, I'm not certain on how we decided. I know we are trying to keep them off of other dates.

Kevin Albrecht: That had a lot to do with the access that is the reason why they picked that September date was so that they would have access.

Derris Jones: A point of clarification on that, the archery hunters would have it from September 9 to the 30 but then it still going to have some rifle tags on it during the Nov. 1 through 30 season. Is that a correct assumption or is it nothing but archery hunters are ever going to hunt Jack creek?

Eric Luke: Correct me if I'm wrong but as I understand it the way it was explained to me this would be an added hunt. You would still have the rifle hunters but — I lost my train of thought. Because of the access and it was explained that very few of the, I can't remember the percentage rate, but most of the hunters and the sheep that were killed were in the Gray Canyon area, and so we felt it was an opportunity to provide a new hunt with some opportunity to pull some of the hunters out and not make a big impact on the resource.

Derris Jones: We aren't excluding rifle hunters from hunting Jack Creek during the regular rifle Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep hunt. Is that correct?

Randy Quayle: Yes and that is true. One of the reason we picked that date too is it's a hard access area and a lot of the rifle hunters don't even go back in there. There's sheep back in there that's probably never seen a human before so we are trying to get into those areas where the main bighorn sheep hunt is usually over with within the first week or so, if I am correct on that. It will give us an opportunity to go back in a little farther to the harder-to-get sheep that never does get hunted and it's a tough area to get into and I believe that's one of the reasons we picked those dates also. It's off most of the, I believe it is off the rifle hunt so, I think that's how it works, how we thought about it.

Kent Johnson: Can I play Devil's advocate for a second? I am not disagreeing per se, but if access is so difficult nobody is going there anyway why do we need a new hunt? I'm not disagrees, just so that questions get answered.

Audience member (unknown): Provide opportunity.

Kent Johnson: Those season dates are during a rifle bull elk hunt, too. And there will be a rifle elk hunt going on on that unit; you should be aware of that.

Bryce Pilling: It's like we explained before some of those archery hunters will take a 160 ram where a rifle hunter never would shoot that ram. So we can harvest those lesser rams that will never be more than that instead of letting them die of old age. Plus running people through the system because some people will never draw that once-in-a-lifetime. Does that make sense?

Kevin Albrecht: Thank you.

Derris Jones: One other point of clarification. I didn't get the name of the archery club, the Timpanogos Archery Club, my understanding you supported the DWR recommendation or did you support this recommendation by the other NGOs?

Ed Muir: Pardon me, can you say that again sir?

Derris Jones: Did you support the DWR recommendation or the UBA?

Ed Muir: And the UBA.

Derris Jones: So you support both recommendations?

Ed Muir: I do.

Derris Jones: Do you have a preference or do you want both?

Ed Muir: To be honest with you I want the UBA, what have you. But as archers, we take fewer animals we spend more hours in the field. It's just more opportunity that we can be

there for the few people that are lucky enough to draw that tag. Like he said it takes the numbers away from the others; it gives somebody else a greater opportunity to draw something.

Derris Jones: Does it not also give you guys as well a better odds of drawing if you've got a hunt?

Unknown: How many permits are you talking about?

Derris Jones: The new hunts.

Randy Quayle: What the UBA and Timp archery are doing is in lieu of the extend DWR proposal the seven-day archery-only at the end of the general any weapon hunt, in lieu of that we want to go with the once-in-a-lifetime hunt any weapon once in a lifetime hunts on that and that would add opportunity and spread the point pool out a little bit and make it easier for other people to draw out also it would benefit everybody for that part for as far as point creep goes.

Derris Jones: Does the Division have any numbers on, I suppose not, on how many people are applying for once-in-a-lifetime are archery hunters and would go out of the regular pool and into an archery pool?

Randy Quayle: We don't know that until it actually happens. It might not be any, you know. I don't think that's going to happen. I'm not the only one, there's a lot of people that archery is their passion and that is what they want to do. They'll take the challenge of it and go out and do that. My thinking is I've been, I'm not Chuck Goudy or anybody like that, but hunting has been good to me and those animals don't owe me anything and I'm willing to try to go out and get a desert bighorn sheep with my bow. If I don't get one there is a lot more to it than that. It's the opportunity I chose to take I know that the success rate is probably around 25 percent, 35 percent with a bow, where it's probably close to 100 percent in Utah. It's way up there. But it is what some of us would choose to do and I think we are going to get those pools. There is going to be people that put in for them but if it doesn't work we don't have to do it again. It is worthy of consideration for it I believe.

Erik Luke: Derris to answer your question as far as giving us better odds, you're probably right for the first year but when other people see that those odds are better more people will pool to it.

Todd Huntington: I'm going to go beat my dead horse for a minute. So I want to, I'm getting pushback on the fact that we can't have a rifle hunt in between the muzzleloader and the rifle because of pressure or because it will make it unsatisfactory for the hunts later, yet what is the proposal? The proposal is to make it overlap. That's not going to make it bad for the guys that drew the limited-entry tag?

Trisha Hedin: Are you talking about that spike hunt?

Todd Huntington: I'm talking about the management hunt on the Henrys. Am I crazy here? There's no logic there. It doesn't make any sense.

Trisha Hedin: No, well it seems like it's similar to the overlap on bull elk limited-entry and spike hunt. If I drew that limited-entry tag and there were spike hunters, I wouldn't be very happy, so I would assume that is a similar proposal that is not very appealing. Can I move on? I am an avid archer, so I want to state that. However I do not support this proposal and I did not support it at the last meeting. I just feel like I heard two people, Shane and Justin, use the word squeeze. We are trying to squeeze in hunts and yet we are talking about more squeezing. And I just don't see it. And I guess to me looking at those numbers you're talking about one of the sheep hunts was 51 days but the average hunter hunted four days, and it's like if you're telling me you don't have enough days to hunt, I just don't see it. I was on a bison hunt last year, we never saw another hunter and we easily had the opportunity to hunt with a rifle hunt with a bow whatever we wanted to use — its called any weapon — and we chose to use a rifle. We could have walked up and used a bow. It doesn't matter. I feel like a hardcore hunter will have success with whatever weapon they choose to use. We are giving ample opportunity and looking honestly at the average hunter, the average hunter isn't hunting that hard, to be honest. I see it all the time. We are giving opportunity, we just need to hunt harder, and that includes archery I chose to use a landowner tag this year and hunt with a bow. Was I successful? No, but I chose to do it because of what I experience, which is I am closer to animals, you know, there is a lot of things that come with archery. Success rate is low but that doesn't mean you didn't have a hunt that was spectacular. I don't think we need to add more days and to squeeze those calendars any more. I just don't see it. That's my opinion.

Todd Huntington: Trisha, can I ask you about what about the Division's proposal about the seven-day extension. No on that either?

Trisha Hedin: I say no on that either. And again I go back to what I said earlier meeting about this, so we give archers more, then eventually muzzleloaders more, and they already got a bunch this year, so then it's like where do we stop? Everybody is in the sandbox just pitching a fit, basically.

Kevin Albrecht: So I've got a comment on that. When the first proposal came last time, I was opposed to it for the reason why I feel like more than ever now we need to be united as sportsmen. When I talked about being at the Wildlife Board meeting with lion hunting, we need to be together. But tonight I think my views changed a little bit in the fact that some of the gentlemen talked about this proposal and they said that there are areas that receive very few hunters in fact some of those sheep that don't maybe haven't seen hunters. My thought is if they draw that tag with the same point pool as anyone else, they are going to have very good success on those sheep and they can do that now. But the difference in the proposal is they're saying that archers should have a better, they should have better point odds than other hunters and I think that separation is separating themselves from others. That is going to separate us as hunters. The Division proposal won't do that. I am not huge on either idea, I think the Division's proposal will not split

us as hunters and it does not give preference points to one or the other. So I would say that is definitely better than the other.

Kent Johnson: You stole my comment. Thank you. Now I don't have to say it. One thing that might be explored, you know, if the Division wants to add a few days and give archers extra it might be to their benefit to put it on the front end of the hunt. I know some of the archery elk hunts were that way the limited entry bull elk hunts before they went to archery hunts like in the Book Cliffs years ago were that way where you could go in and declare to the Division you wanted to hunt early and you could get a certificate of registration where you could hunt I think it was 10 days early, wasn't it Derris? Years ago with archery equipment only.

Derris Jones: I just don't think there is any room to put any days on the front end of it anymore.

Kent Johnson: There may not be room to do it, so but I you know I agree with Kevin and his comment that doing this if it were doable and did happen it would upset rifle and muzzleloader hunters. Not that I would agree with them being upset over it, but there would be a certain degree of them that would be upset over. I don't necessarily disagree with the proposal and then you know this is something where the biologists are going to have to dig into it and look at numbers on the units because you are asking to add tags and that opens a whole other can of worms that the Division's going to have to dig into as well with the biologists. I don't know what that would be has anybody, Justin, have you thought about that have you read this before? Do you know anything — what the Division thinks about adding permits on the once in a lifetime?

Justin Shannon: So that has come up before — so why don't we just add tags? As mentioned earlier we have these management plans that have sideboards as to how many permits we would issue so for bighorn sheep we do the survey see what is available class-3, class-4 rams and issue permits there. Whether this proposal passes or not we wouldn't add tags above and beyond what the management plans would allow for we wouldn't recommend that.

Derris Jones: So it would come out of the tags.

Justin Shannon: It's just cutting the pie a different way.

Derris Jones: Before you leave, Justin, the Boulder Mountain limited-entry muzzleloader the Division has recommended to delete from it, is it because of the management plans and next year you will be putting it back in, but because the management says we are going to cut it out we have to recommend that?

Justin Shannon: We struggled with this one because if you remember whether we should hunt deer in November with a muzzleloader two years ago it was pretty controversial. I mean Kevin, you were on that committee do you want to speak, I mean the room was split, right? In fact we had to hold another meeting and bring the committee members back because it was such a new idea. I know we have done it in the past but it was strong emotions and strong feelings. So with that if we have a unit that fell under 20,

I wasn't going to be the one to come through and ignore that because I know there is a lot of passion behind whether we should be doing it or not if the RAC approves for it we are fine with it. We just wanted to be transparent, let everybody know it fell below but the trend is doing well, however the RAC decides to go we will support. Does that help you Derris?

Derris Jones: There is management plans and then there is common sense, and I'm just trying to figure out where this is going to lay.

Todd Huntington: You mean sometimes those don't match?

Justin Shannon: Based on the feedback we've got from the other RACs and looking at the trend data and having the biologists speak to it last night, common sense is a good idea.

Charlie Tracy: The way I look at this sometimes I mean these guys have definitely done a lot of work in figuring this out probably with a lot of people involved but I do, as the gentleman stated before, if they do have some success it is going to get flooded and diminish their opportunities anyway. But of these six new ones, is there one or two you would be happy with instead of like six of them? Is it all or none?

Randy Quayle: No, it's not all or none. We would be happy with maybe the four sheep tags or, you know, or whatever, we will take whatever you want to give us. But we are just trying to open up opportunities and spread the point system around a little bit and make it easy for other people to get it. You know there are people that will never draw out for those once-in-a-lifetime tags the way it's going. We always talk about or hear about people tweaking it or changing it a little but we never do anything about it and this is an opportunity to do that and, you know, let's see what happens with it.

Eric Luke: You mentioned just adding tags to the regular hunts. One problem with that is the high success rate of those general hunts. Even though if I draw I may choose to hunt it with a bow, but someone else they could choose to hunt with a rifle, and that high success rate kind of defeats the purpose of what we are doing. These hunts are in difficult areas, low success rate obviously with archery. So we feel like we are providing an opportunity to those who are willing to take that risk, I mean it is a once-in-a-lifetime hunt. You got to be pretty dedicated to give up that opportunity to give up on such a high-risk hunt but it provides an opportunity with a very low impact to the resource.

Kevin Albrecht: I'm not going to be liked very well, but I feel like by doing this we are saying that one group of hunters is better than the other because you got a pool of hunters that have 20 points but we are saying one group is better because they use this weapon so they can draw it with less points.

Kent Johnson: I think that is the way a lot of people will perceive it. For good or bad or otherwise, whether you agree or not, a lot of people will have that perception. I do like the Division's proposal with splitting the Nine Mile into two units and having back to a 30-day hunt with the sheep. I mean it's kind of off topic with this, but I've talked to quite a few people and I've had a couple of friends with tags and the shorter hunt made it more

difficult, especially for those that drew the first one and I've told people that I talk to and correspond with in trying to get hunters to go there I told them to apply for the late hunt if it's going to stay that way because it's a better time to hunt so I like the Divisions proposal of that. I really do. I think it's a good idea to split in in half and it accomplishes the goal they set out with of splitting the hunt in the first place but it gives the most opportunity for those that draw. I like it.

Kevin Albrecht: As we have heard the comments, I have tried to write down some of those I feel like would be better to split out and have individual discussion. One of those is the limited-entry Boulder/Kaiparowits muzzleloader. The DWR archery proposal and also the UBA proposal and then the management buck hunts on the Henrys are all items I think we should discuss separately. Any others you feel or think the rest of the stuff could be as one proposal.

Derris: Kevin, I'd like to suggest that the youth hunter dedicated hunter dilemma that Mr. McCourt brought up be put on an action log for the Wildlife Board to direct the Division to look into a solution.

Kevin Albrecht: I appreciate you bringing that up and I did want to speak to that I appreciated you bringing that up and one thought I had was I've been in that same boat with my children and one of the things I've done is put them in for the dedicated hunter tag to be able to have them hunt the same unit as me. I'm in a position where paying those increased fees I was able to do that. But maybe one solution is, you know you mentioned your kids are going with you now and helping with those projects, maybe a simple solution to that would make that fee price for those youth less so that they could have a way to hunt where their parents are hunting but not, but maybe be an easy solution to what he is talking about. But I agree, I think an action log would be a good thing to ask the Division to do on that.

VOTING

A motion was made by Derris Jones o ask the Wildlife Board, as an action log item, to direct the Division to devise a solution for Dedicated Hunters whose children draw hunting permits for a different unit

Seconded by Todd Huntington

Motion passed unanimously

A motion was made by Kent Johnson to lengthen the existing management buck hunt on the Henry Mountains by two days to include a weekend

Motion withdrawn by Kent Johnson

A motion was made by Charlie Tracy to accept the Division's proposal for the Henry Mountain management buck hunt

Seconded by Darrel Mecham

Motion passed with 1 opposed (Todd Huntington)

A motion was made by Todd Huntington to leave the limited-entry Boulder/Kaiparowits muzzleloader hunt unchanged from 2016, with dates conforming to 2017

Seconded by Kent Johnson

Motion passed unanimously

A motion was made by Trisha Hedin to reject the Division's proposed seven-day archery extension for OIAL hunts

Motion failed lack of a second

A motion was made by Charlie Tracy to accept the Division's proposed seven-day archery extension for OIAL hunts

Seconded by Darrel Mecham

Motion passed with 3 opposed (Sue Bellagamba, Todd Huntington, and Trisha Hedin)

A motion was made by Kent Johnson to accept the remaining proposed bucks, bulls and OIAL 2017 season dates and application timeline as presented

Seconded by Derris Jones

Motion passed unanimous

- 7) **Preference Point System Amendments**
- Lindy Varney, Licensing Specialist

Questions from the RAC

Derris Jones: Is the cow moose a preference or a bonus point?

Lindy Varney: A bonus point, so that's the one that's not affected.

Kevin Albrecht: It's interesting to see you run the differences. I thought maybe it would have more of an effect than it did it was interesting to see what that change was on the first choice but it wasn't as big as I thought it would make.

Lindy Varney: Yeah, that's kind of what shocked me too. And so that's why I was kind of wondering who it was.

Questions from the Public

No Questions.

Comments from the Public

Kevin Albrecht: Comments from the audience?

Eric Luke: Eric Luke representing SFW. If it's alright with you Mr. Chairman I'd like to save us all a lot of time and just state that SFW on the remaining agenda items we support the Division's recommendations.

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion made by Kent Johnson to approve item No. 7: preference point system amendments

Seconded by Charlie Tracy

Motion passed unanimously

8) NER Deer Management Plans

- Randall Thacker, Northeast Regional Asst. Wildlife Manager

Questions from the RAC

Trisha Hedin: Have you seen any kind of major changes in the Book Cliffs herd with the paving of the Seep Ridge road, I mean any negative effects overall?

Randall Thacker: Good question, with the paving of the Seep Ridge road it is an issue and we were very concerned about it and we still are we did do. Well one good thing about it I guess we have been able to we worked quite closely with Uintah County and worked with them to get a lot of underpasses put in. If you have been out there, there were some huge coverts that were installed, we also monitored those since, put trail cameras on those and we are getting real good use on those underpasses. That is the good side of it, the positive side of it. We did go out and radio collar a number of deer and it was, I believe 50 to begin with, and we have maintained those collars on there for a few

years. We did it for the two years prior and then during the actual after the road was constructed. We did see an increase in road kill along the corridor there, it was not as dramatic as what we expected it to be, we thought it might be worse I guess. The good news has been with the oil field drop off the last two years up there, the traffic has significantly dropped off on that road, so despite the fact that it is now a 65 to 70 mph highway, it is one of the nicest ones in the state if you haven't driven it yet. As of yet we aren't seeing huge road kill impact we thought we might. We are kind of waiting until we see that traffic increase again out there and it is identified in the plan we mentioned in the plan. If needed, we will go ahead and do more studying out there. We would have liked to have seen more fencing there. Ideally in a perfect world it would have been better to do that but the costs were so high Uintah County was unwilling to work with us on paying for that. For now we are just trying to monitor those areas to see where the real bad spots will be and address that. And again the traffic has dropped off significantly. It's very little traffic out there compared to what there use to be. We will wait and see how that impact occurs.

Questions from the Public

No Questions

Comments from the Public

No comments

RAC discussion

Trisha Hedin: Just a general comment, I think looking into the future with the proposal of the Book Cliffs corridor where they were talking about running that road all the way up through Hay, well not through Hay, but up through East and then coming into the divide road, it's something the division really needs to look at as far as really fracturing a limited-entry unit. I think it's, for deer and elk, for all species, bear hunters, lion hunters, I think it's something we need to look at and hopefully come up with some kind of recommendation when that comes up. Because I do think it is going to come up, especially with the incoming administration and at our county level, at Grand County, but also higher up. It's just something the Division needs to look at. It would be quite devastating to that unit.

VOTING

Motion made by Charlie Tracy to accept item No. 8: NER deer management plan as presented

Seconded by Darrel Mecham

Motion passed unanimously

- 9) **CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2017**
- Covy Jones, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Trisha Hedin: I always have to bring this up, but if one of these CWMUs has an infraction, a citation, and they go up for renewal, does the Division take that into account? And I'll be specific about it, they are guiding hunters and trespassing onto public land for example. I mean it's difficult when I see this and I see the Division continuing to renew these CWMUs.

Covy Jones: So is this a specific example you are referring to then?

Trisha Hedin: Do you want me to tell you? The Red Ranches, specifically, and this was probably beyond a few years ago now but you know they have repeatedly had issues with trespassing onto public land with their allotment and yet we continue to renew their CWMU. And I guess I just want to know what the process is. I mean are those all taken into account all of these issues taken into account? Because you said you were just talking about hunters satisfaction. I mean do we take into account all issues when renewing those?

Covy Jones: So help me understand the question then. Do we take into account livestock trespass on public ground?

Trisha Hedin: This isn't livestock, this is they are given deer and elk depredation tags and then they are taking their hunters onto public lands to hunt those deer and elk. And they are cited for that, and yet we continue to give them deer and elk depredation tags.

Covy Jones: You know I'm not familiar with that incident I guess.

Trisha Hedin: I understand. It is a few years old. I'm just wondering if infractions like that are taken into account when you're looking at applications.

Covy Jones: Absolutely. When we review one of these, there are checks and balances from the biologists to the regional supervisor and law enforcement as well, and if there are infractions in rule it states we have the ability to pull the COR there, so yes. I mean in fact we have done that: Crab Creek is a perfect example of that.

Trisha Hedin: Good to know.

Questions from the Public

No questions.

Comments from the Public

No comments

RAC discussion

VOTING

Motion made by Charlie Tracy that we accept item No. 9, CWMU management plans, as presented

Seconded by Darrel Mecham

Motion passed unanimously

- 10) **Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017**
- Covy Jones, Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Derris Jones: On landowner associations they are required to enroll over 50 percent of the private land, is that correct?

Covy Jones: It is 51 percent is how the rule reads right now.

Derris Jones: How many total private or eligible acres are there? What percent is 6,000 acres?

Covy Jones: The way the rule is written it is of the deer habitat in the unit, so it is about 62% of the private land.

Derris Jones: How many landowners are involved in the Henry Mountains land owner association?

Covy Jones: We have got Brad here that can probably answer that better than I could.

Brad Crompton: Four or five, I think. It's not a whole lot.

Derris Jones: So more than just the Sandy Ranch.

Covy Jones: More than just the Sandy Ranch but they are the majority of the land.

Kevin Albrecht: How does this differ from what they have had in the past with the tag that was that they did have?

Covy Jones: It doesn't it is right in line with what it has been in the past. One every three years.

Questions from the Public

No questions.

Comments from the Public

No comments

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion made by Charlie Tracy to accept item No. 10, landowner permit numbers, as presented

Seconded by Darrel Mecham

Motion passed unanimously

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:36 p.m.

The next Wildlife Board meeting will take place on December 9 at 9 a.m. in the DNR Board Room, 1594 W. North Temple, Salt Lake City.

The next SER RAC meeting will take place on December 14 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 Avenue, Vernal
November 17, 2016

NER RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Joe Arnold, Public At-Large
David Gordon, BLM
Dan Abeyta, Forest Service
Randy Dearth, NER RAC Chair
Brett Prevedel, Public At-Large
Melissa Wardle, Non-consumptive
Tim Ignacio, Ute Tribe
Mitch Hacking, Agriculture

NER RAC MEMBER EXCUSED:

Andrea Merell, Non-consumptive
Joe Batty, Agriculture
Daniel Davis, Sportsmen

UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Justin Shannon, Big Game Coordinator
Clint Sampson, Wildlife Biologist
Amy Vande Voort, Wildlife Biologist
Derrick Ewell, Wildlife Biologist
Randall Thacker, Wildlife Biologist
Dax Mangus, Wildlife Manager
Covy Jones, Public Wildlife/Private Lands
Lindy Varney, Licensing Specialist
Larry Wheatcraft, NER Law Enforcement
Randy Scheetz, NER Law Enforcement
Dallon Christensen, NER Landowner Tech
Tonya Kieffer, NER Outreach Manager
Rori Shafer, Office Manager
Teri Weimer, Office Specialist
Boyde Blackwell, NER Regional Supervisor

1. WELCOME, RAC INTRODUCTION – Randy Dearth

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – Randy Dearth

MOTION to approve agenda
David Gordon
Mitch Hacking, Second
Passed Unanimously

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION to approve minutes
Brett Prevedel
David Gordon, second
Passed Unanimously

3. OLD BUSINESS – Dan Abeyta
Update on September Board Meeting, using corn in specific waters was passed. Flaming Gorge in our Region is one of them. Using led to harvest prairie dogs is still being researched. More introductions on the Cut Throat Slam.
4. Regional Update – Boyde Blackwell
Aquatics have put together an Advisory group for restoration of habitat. Outreach has been busy putting out pheasants. Wildlife is working on data classifications. Dax Mangus – Invited RAC to get with biologist to assist in ride along for classifications. LE is very busy visiting with people and there is an increase in infractions on the east side this hunting season. They will also be doing winter range patrols in December. Habitat is wrapping up all their projects for the year and getting ready to plan for next year.
5. ELK UNIT MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISIONS – Justin Shannon
See handout

Questions from the public:

Brian Snow: What are you doing for the Anthro unit?

Derrick Ewell: There is no committee this year but we reduced the cow tags for this unit.

Question from the RAC:

None

Comments from the RAC:

Brett Prevedel: Animals are moving onto tribal land and private property

Tim Ignacio: The end of January and February Rock Creek to Little Water had 5500 head of Elk.

Comments from the Public:

Kyle Young: Very concerned about spike elk in the Book Cliffs and hunters tearing up the habitat.

Randy Quail (Timpanogos Archery) concurred with the management plan presented

Ben Lauder (Utah Bowmen's Association) supports the recommendation of the Division

MOTION by Dan Abeyta to accept the Divisions Proposal as presented
David Gordon: Second

6 in favor

Tim Ignacio abstained

6. BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL 2017 SEASON DATES, APPLICATION DEADLINE –
Justin Shannon
See handout

Questions from the RAC:

Conversation concerning Spike hunts and success Rate.

Clint Sampson cleared things up with success rate of 26% and a total of 153 spikes harvested.

Questions from the public:

Jed Plum: Wondering why archery is so special on the extension for the OIAL.

Justin Shannon: We were accommodating the UBA's proposal and the public and RAC voted for it.

Brian Snow: Can the proposal be amended on the extended 7 days?

David Gordon: Hunters can get a COR for disabilities.

Comments from the public:

Ben Lauder (UBA) supports the recommendations for the archery OIAL extension.

Dale Batty: Questioning the Diamond Mtn Boundary. Proposes for a better description and management of the unit. Mitch Hacking agrees.

Dax Mangus wants to put together a meeting for approval on the boundary.

Steve Batty is wondering if there is GPS coordinates for the boundary.

Randy Scheetz explains how there is temptation between boundary's

John Mckaechnie wonders if there is any input from the phosphate mine.

Mitch Hacking would like to set up a meeting for the boundary.

Dax Mangus will set up a meeting for 2018 which will need to be done by December 4th for 5th to present to the Board. This is pure coincidence that this happened this year we have never had an issue in the past.

Kyle Young: Has concerns about wild horses tearing up habitat in the Book Cliffs

Boyde Blackwell explains that this is out of our hands.

Brian Snow: Proposes a change on the extended archery boundary

Dax Mangus explains that the extended archery is a management tool and not for recreation. It is set in place to help landowners remove resident deer.

MOTION by Dan Abeyta to accept the Divisions proposals with exceptions

Melissa Wardle: Second

Passed unanimously

Exception to accept 6 new hunts from UBA

Undivided

Exception to accept 7 day OIAL by Brett Prevedel

Mitch Hacking: Second

In favor 5 to 1

Tim Ignacio abstained

Exception for Diamond Mtn boundary meeting by Mitch Hacking

David Gordon: Second

Passed unanimously

Exception to change extended archery boundary

Undivided

7. PREFERENCE POINT SYSTEM AMENDMENTS – Lindy Varney

See handout

Questions from the RAC:

None

Questions from the public:

None

Comments from the RAC:

None

Comments from the public:

Jake Huber: Proposes that only the first choice should count with the point system.
People find a way to cheat the system.

Lindy Varney: Explains how we need to educate the hunters on the draw.

MOTION by David Gordon to accept the Divisions proposal as presented

Brett Prevedel: Second

Passed unanimously

8. NER DEER MANAGEMENT PLANS – Randall Thacker

Questions from the RAC:

None

Questions from the public:

None

Comments from the RAC:

None

Comments from the public:

Blake Bess: Believes we are 50% under objective.

MOTION by Mitch Hacking to accept the Divisions proposal as presented

David Gordon: Second

In favor 5 to 1
Tim Ignacio abstained

9. CWMU MANAGEMENT PLANS AND PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2017 - Covy Jones

Questions from the RAC:
None

Questions from the public:
None

Comments from the RAC:
None

Comments from the public:
None

MOTION by Brett Prevedel to accept the Divisions proposal as presented
Joe Arnold: Second

Passed unanimously

10. LANDOWNER ASSOCIATION PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2017 – Covy Jones

Questions from the RAC:
None

Questions from the public:
None

Comments from the RAC:

MOTION by Joe Arnold to accept the Divisions proposal as presented
David Gordon: Second

Motion by David Gordon to adjourn
Brett Prevedel: Second

Item 10. Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017

- Covey Jones, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

See RAC Packet

Motion

Motion-John Wall- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017 as presented.

Second-Matt Klar

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Motion to adjourn

Meeting Ends-9:08 p.m.

DRAFT