Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

August 31, 2017, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
The meeting can be viewed live at https://youtu.be/gguENO7PPpI

Thursday, August 31, 2017 – 9:00 am

1. Approval of Agenda **ACTION**
   – Kirk Woodward, Chairman

2. Approval of Minutes **ACTION**
   – Kirk Woodward, Chairman

3. Old Business/Action Log **CONTINGENT**
   – Byron Bateman, Vice-Chair

4. DWR Update **INFORMATION**
   – Mike Fowlks, DWR Director

5. R657-23 – Hunter Education Rule Amendments **ACTION**
   – Gary Cook, Hunter Education Coordinator

6. R657-11 - Furbearer Rule Amendments **ACTION**
   – Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator

7. Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2017-2018 **ACTION**
   – Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator

8. Cougar Recommendations and Rule Amendments for 2017-2018 **ACTION**
   – Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator

9. Beaver Management Plan **ACTION**
   – Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator

10. Expo Permit Audit **ACTION**
    – Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief

11. Expo Permit Allocation **ACTION**
    – Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief

12. Other Business **CONTINGENT**
    – Kirk Woodward, Chairman

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

Wildlife Board Motions

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

Fall 2017 - Target Date – CWMU Single Permits

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to look into the possibility of issuing 2 permits every other year for CWMUs that currently only have one public permit, so bonus points are an advantage.

Motion made by: Kirk Woodward
Assigned to: Covy Jones
Action: Under Study
Status: Will be addressed during the November RAC and Board tour
Placed on Action Log: December 9, 2016

Fall 2017 - Target Date – Shed Antler Gathering

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a Division review of the shed antler gathering and provide an informational report at the upcoming November RAC.

Motion made by: Byron Bateman
Assigned to: Justin Shannon
Action: Under Study
Status: Will be addressed during the November RAC and Board tour
Placed on Action Log: April 27, 2017

Fall 2017 - Target Date – 2nd General Season Rifle Hunt

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a request to have the Division look at the possibility of a second General Season Rifle deer hunt on select units that runs 5 days during the Spike elk hunt (no weekends) and that the Zion and Pine Valley units be considered.

Motion made by: John Bair
Assigned to: Justin Shannon
Action: Under Study
Status: Will be addressed during the November RAC and Board tour
Placed on Action Log: April 27, 2017

Fall 2017 - Target Date – LE Late Season Muzzleloader hunts on GS Units

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a request to have the Division look at the possibility of Limited Entry late season muzzleloader hunts on General Season units with buck to doe ratios at or above the objectives.

Motion made by: John Bair
Assigned to: Justin Shannon
Action: Under Study
Status: Will be addressed during the November RAC and Board tour
Placed on Action Log: April 27, 2017

Fall 2017 - Target Date – Velvet- Only Buck Hunts on the Paunsaugunt

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a request to have the Division look at adding a Velvet-only buck hunt in November on the Paunsaugunt unit to address "Cactus" bucks.

Motion made by: John Bair
Assigned to: Justin Shannon
Action: Under Study
Status: Will be addressed during the November RAC and Board tour
Placed on Action Log: April 27, 2017

Fall 2017 - Target Date – Mountain Goats on the Deep Creeks

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a request for the Division to review placing Mountain Goats on the Deep Creeks and to have a recommendation ready by this fall.

Motion made by: John Bair
Assigned to: Rusty Robinson
Action: Under Study
Status: Update at the November Board Meeting
Placed on Action Log: April 27, 2017

Fall 2017 - Target Date – Mountain Goat Transplants

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a request to have the Division investigate potential transplant sites for Mountain Goat including the possibility of Manti, Pahvant, Logan, and North Farmington Peak and to bring a recommendation back to the board including a map of historical ranges and a timeline for transplants.

Motion made by: John Bair
Assigned to: Rusty Robinson
Action: Under Study
Status: Update at the November Board Meeting
Placed on Action Log: April 27, 2017

Fall 2017 - Target Date – Antlerless Public Hunt Ending Dates

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a request to have the Division look at ending all Antlerless public hunts by December 31.

Motion made by: Byron Bateman
Assigned to: Justin Shannon
Action: Under Study
Status: Scheduled for the April/May 2018 RAC and Board Tour
Placed on Action Log: April 27, 2017

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

June 1, 2017, DNR Auditorium

1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

The Board Meeting will stream live at https://youtu.be/PAAwFymLR0U

AGENDA

Tuesday, June 1, 2017, Board Meeting 9:00 am

1. Approval of Agenda **ACTION**
   – John Bair, Chairman

2. Approval of Minutes **ACTION**
   – John Bair, Chairman

3. Old Business/Action Log **CONTINGENT**
   – Kirk Woodward, Vice-Chair

4. DWR Update **INFORMATION**
   – Mike Fowlks, DWR Director

5. Utah Prairie Dog Update **INFORMATION**
   - Martin Bushman, Assistant Attorney General

6. Upland Game and Turkey Hunt Table Recommendations **ACTION**
   - Jason Robinson, Upland Game Coordinator

7. Falconry Rule Amendments for 2017 **ACTION**
   - Russ Norvell, Avian Conservation Program Coordinator

8. Other Business **CONTINGENT**
   – John Bair, Chairman

9. Wildlife Board Appeal – 1:00 p.m. TIME CERTAIN – Room 2000 **ACTION**
   Mr. Damien Davis
   - Martin Bushman, Assistant Attorney General

Details of the specific recommendations can be found at www.wildlife.utah.gov

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

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
June 1, 2017, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Summary of Motions

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

The following motion was made by Kirk Woodward, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimously.

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

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

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the April 27, 2017 meeting as presented.

3) Upland Game and Turkey Hunt Table Recommendations **(Action)**

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

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

4) Falconry Rule Amendments **(Action)**

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed 4 to 1. Mike King opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Falconry Rule Amendments with exclusion of the 54 species list and inclusion of the Division's alternative five point proposal.

5) Other Business **(Contingent)**

The Board voted Kirk Woodward as chair and Byron Bateman as vice-chair.

6) Wildlife Board Appeal **(Action)**

The Board approved the appeal for Damien Davis to reduce the suspension from three years to two years and six months.

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
June 1, 2017, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Attendance

Wildlife Board

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

RAC Chairs

Central – Richard Hansen
Southern – Dave Black
Southeastern – Chris Wood
Northeastern – Randy Dearth
Northern – John Cavitt

Division Personnel

Rory Reynolds
Mike Canning
Boyde Blackwell
Kevin Bunnell
Justin Dolling
Jason Vernon
Staci Coons
Mike Styler
Martin Bushman
Greg Hansen
Thu Vo-Wood
Mike Christensen
Jason Robinson
Russ Norvell
Paul Gedge
Sean Davis
Jake Greenwood
Lindy Varney
Justin Shannon
Anita Candelaria
Avery Cook
Randy Wood
Eric Anderson
Blair Stringham
Bill Bates
Kim Hersey
Jesse Chase
Rick Olson
Steve Newren
Sarah Scott
Linda Braithwaite
Heather Shilton
Phil Gray
Spencer Dushane

Public

McCall Iorg
Duane Reading
Todd Ballanttyne
Blaine Stewart
Ken Strong
Mark Housekeeper
Zach Fossum UT Falconers Assoc
Patrick Shane
Jamie Nogel – NWTF
Justin Searle
Caleb Stroh
Troy Justensen
Heather Dove – GSL Audubon
Lynn Carroll – Wasatch Audubon
Carter Wilford
Damien Davis
Ron Camp
Tara Edgler
Vinessa Dudley
Bryce Pilling
Jaren Hutchinson
Joshua Black
Lorelei Black
Monica Bair
Emma Bair
Rebecca Searle
Chris Carling

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
June 1, 2017, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
https://youtu.be/PAAwFymLR0U (part I)
https://youtu.be/RXcCWjJmDw4 (part II)

(part I)

00:00:01 Chairman Bair welcomed the audience and introduced the Wildlife board and RAC Chairs. Mike King was stuck in traffic and would arrive later. Calvin Crandall and Kevin Albrecht were excused.

00:02:44 **1) Approval of Agenda** (Action)

The following motion was made by Kirk Woodward, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimously.

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

00:03:07 **2) Approval of Minutes** (Action)

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the April 27, 2017 meeting as presented.

00:03:39 **3) Old Business/Action Log** (Contingent)

Two items will be addressed during the meeting. Kirk Woodward will address the other action log items with Chairman Bair at a later time, mainly grammatical and sentence structure issues.

00:05:28 **4) DWR Update** (Informational)

Greg Sheehan acknowledged the outgoing Board members, John Bair and Mike King, as this was their last board meeting. He named the two potential board members under consideration. The Board will need to select a new chair and vice-chair today. He also announced the formation of a new council: Private Aquaculture Advisory Council.

Chairman Bair expressed appreciation for outgoing RAC chairs, John Cavitt, Richard Hansen, and Kevin Albrecht, for their dedication and hard work.

Lindy Varney updated the Board on the draw results with the new hunt structure.

00:20:26 **5) Prairie Dog Update** (Informational)

Martin Bushman gave an update on the prairie dog court ruling.

Mike King arrived during the presentation.

00:28:40 Board Questions/Discussions

The Board pondered options or avenues to address the ruling – emergency meetings, board appeals, executive orders. They asked if the ruling was affected by recovery goals that were met or not met under ESA.

00:33:11 6) Upland Game and Turkey Hunt Table Recommendation (Action)

Jason Robinson presented the recommendations and addressed action log items: youth hunts on WMAs for upland game and order of turkey hunts.

00:46:40 Board Questions

The Board asked about youth hunt opportunities and its effectiveness on recruitment and retention, impact of crane population due to permit and falconry hunts, and documentation of predators on sage-grouse.

00:56:12 RAC Recommendations

All RACs unanimously passed the Division's recommendations. Central and Northeast RAC proposed action log items addressing predator control program and seasons.

00:59:00 Public Comments

The Board accepted public comments.

01:01:04 Board Discussion

The Board discussed the crane hunt season, upland game predator program, tracking/monitoring youth recruitment and retention.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Upland Game and Turkey Hunt Table Recommendation as presented by the Division.

The Board further discussed youth recruitment and retention. They pursued the idea of an annual report that could be part of the agenda item, perhaps as part of the director's DWR Update or from the R3 coordinator.

01:14:57 7) Falconry Rule Amendments (Action)

Chairman Bair explained the meeting process and requested that everyone display respect and restraint.

Russ Norvell presented the falconry rule amendments.

01:34:18 Board Questions

Wildlife Board asked about adding species outside the list, ownership of birds not on the list, grandfathering in species, permissible birds for meets.

01:38:37 RAC Recommendations

All RACs passed the Falconry Rule Amendments with varying dissent. They had intense discussions about the 54 raptor list, adding an exclusion of the list to their motions and referencing the Federal list instead.

Russ Norvell addressed public feedback after the RAC process, which resulted in five alternative provisions that addressed concerns of parties involved. The Board asked for clarification on the intent of the stipulations proposed by the Division.

01:52:49 Public Questions

The Board accepted public questions.

01:55:39 Public Comments

The Board accepted public comments at this time.

Chairman Bair accepted one last question from the public.

02:18:30 Board Discussion

The Board asked for clarification on the Division's decision to exclude the federal list. They discussed the 15 native species as proposed in the Division's stipulations.

00:00:00 (part II) Russ Norvell and Greg Hansen expounded on the five alternative provisions. Mike King asked about pressure on raptor species if the list is expanded.

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed 4 to 1. Mike King opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Falconry Rule Amendments with exclusion of the 54 species list and inclusion of the Division's alternative five point proposal.

00:14:38-00:30:35 **8) Other Business** (Contingent)

The Board discussed who would become the next chair and vice-chair. The Board voted Kirk Woodward as chair and Byron Bateman as vice-chair.

9) Wildlife Board Appeals (Action)

Martin Bushman presented the appeal for Damien Davis.

Board Discussion

The Board asked for clarification on Mr. Davis's history, asked a few other questions, then deliberated in a separate room.

The Board approved the appeal for Damien Davis to reduce the suspension from three years to two years and six months.

Meeting adjourned.

Summary of Motions
July/August 2017
Regional Advisory Councils

R657-23 – Hunter Education Rule Amendments

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

R657-11 – Furbearer Rule Amendments

CRO, NRO, SERO
-MOTION: To accept the Division's proposal as presented with the exception of changing trap location distance from 100 feet to 600 feet.
Passed unanimously

NERO – MOTION: To accept as presented from the Division
AMENDMENT: that private landowners and family members are not required to have a trap number license on their private property for non-protected species.
Passed with six in favor and three against

SERO – MOTION: TO exempt persons with proof of livestock ownership from the $10 trap registration fee when trapping on their own property, and to accept the remaining Furbearer Rule Amendments as presented.
Passed unanimously

SRO - MOTION: To accept the Furbearer Rule Amendments R657-11 as presented with the exception to increasing the distance to 600 feet and make all trap times to 96 hours.
Passed unanimously

Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2017-2018

CRO - MOTION: To accept the Division's proposal as presented with the exception of changing all furbearer hunts closure to one week later from the current close date of March 1.
Passed unanimously

NERO -MOTION: To accept as presented from the Division
Passed with seven in favor and one against

NRO, SERO, SRO
-MOTION: To accept the Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2017-2018 as presented.
Passed unanimously

Cougar Recommendations and Rule Amendments for 2017-2018

CRO, NRO, NERO, SRO

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

SERO – MOTION: To recommend the Northwest and Southwest Manti units be changed to split-season units
Passed unanimously

MOTION: To increase the number of allocated cougar permits by four on the Southwest Manti for a total of 12 permits, and by two on the Southeast Manti for a total of 18 permits.
Passed with 9 in favor and 3 opposed

MOTION: To accept the remaining Cougar Recommendation and Rule Amendments for 2017-2018 as presented
Passed with 10 in favor and 2 opposed

Beaver Management Plan

ALL REGIONS

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

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Civic Center
110 South Main Street, Springville
July 25, 2017 @ 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

R657-23 – Hunter Education Rule Amendments
MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously

R657-11 – Furbearer Rule Amendments
MOTION: To accept the Division's proposal as presented with the exception of changing trap location distance from 100 feet to 600 feet.
Passed unanimously

Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2017-2018
MOTION: To accept the Division's proposal as presented with the exception of changing all furbearer hunts closure to one week later from the current close date of March 1.
Passed unanimously

Cougar Recommendations and Rule Amendments for 2017-2018
MOTION: To accept the Division's proposal as presented
Passed unanimously

Beaver Management Plan
MOTION: To accept the Division's proposal as presented
Passed unanimously

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Civic Center
110 South Main Street, Springville
July 25, 2017 @ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present	Members Absent	DWR Present
Ron Camp, Chair	Ben Lowder, At Large, Excused	Tom Becker
George Garcia, Forest Service	Greg McPhie, Elected	Riley Peck
Michael Gates, BLM	Jacob Steele, Native American	Matt Briggs
Kristofer Marble, Vice Chair	Joshua Lenart, Sportsmen, Excused	Scott Root
Danny Potts, Non-consumptive		Gary Cook
Christine Schmitz, Non-consumptive		Darren DeBloois
Kenneth Strong, Sportsmen		Justin Hart
Alan White, Agriculture		
AJ Mower, Agriculture		
Mike Christensen, At-Large		

Others Present
Karl Hirst, Wildlife Board Member
Jason Vernon, CRO Regional Supervisor

---

1) Approval of the Agenda and Minutes (Action)
   - Ron Camp, RAC Chair

VOTING
Motion was made **by** Kris Marble to accept the agenda and minutes as written
Seconded by Ken Strong
Motion passed unanimously

2) Wildlife Board Meeting Update (Information)
   - Ron Camp, RAC Chair

3) Regional Update (Information)
   - Jason Vernon, Central Regional Supervisor

Wildlife

· Currently doing elk and pronghorn classification. RAC members are invited to attend and ride along with the biologists.

· There have been several nuisance bear calls this summer.

Aquatics

· The lower portions of Mill Creek were recently stocked with 6 inch Bonneville Cutthroat trout (this is the portion that was chemically treated last year).

· Transferred about 2,200 adult bluegill from Steinaker Reservoir to our community ponds over the last few weeks.

Outreach

· Fly fishing festival in Heber City on Aug 11.

· Help out at Cast for Kids event at Strawberry Reservoir on Aug 12.

· Dedicated hunters are encouraged to get their hours in (hunts begin within the month).

· Community fishing ponds are still being stocked primarily with warm water species e.g. catfish and wipers

Habitat

· Continue to installing upland game guzzlers this summer on the desert.

Law Enforcement

· Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) interdiction efforts. Over the July 24th the CR did a AIS saturation patrol primarily focused around Utah Lake but also included Jordanelle and Deer Creek. Main focus is to interdict watercraft coming into Utah County from Lake Powell which has Quagga Mussel.

* Approx.107 Officer Hours worked towards AIS efforts.

* 246 people contacted

* 98 vehicles/boat trailers checked for AIS compliance

* 56 Boats contacted/inspected

* 72 fishing licenses checked

* 21 orange card/non-comp notices left on vehicles

* 7 Failure to Self-certify warnings issued

* 2 fishing w/out valid license warnings issued

* 3 fishing w/out valid license citations issued

* 1 fishing w/ 4 poles citation issued.

* Strawberry checkpoint was held on July 19

* 214 vehicles check for compliance

* 2 or more people in most every vehicle

* had about 50 vehicles per hour.

* Probably contacted 600-800 people.

* 36 violations on 34 reports.

* Over 20 fish were seized.

RAC

· RAC and Board Member training will be held Wednesday, August 30, at Scheels in Sandy beginning at 10:00 am and wrapping up by 4:00 pm. Lunch and a ton of fudge and nuts will be provided, as well as some great information.

4) R657-23 - Hunter Education Rule Amendments 2017 (Action)
- Gary Cook, Hunter Education Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Ron Camp – Is there a penalty that goes to the sworn affidavit on your own? Do they get the permit right away and how long does it take the division to find out if they actually have that hunter education? Gary - Typically, if they do the self certification process that is happening in our big permit drawings as soon as our licensing section has that information of who self certified, my program staff gets a list of those and we go through it and we make corrections and updates to our database and then we'll send out a letter. So it takes some time to go through that process. Any permit that is obtained and that is part of the administrative changes with the proposed amendments; if it is obtained without being able to verify that the license is an invalid license we do have recourses to be able to go after an individual that has obtained this license fraudulently. Ron - So because of the time they enter into that policy and by the time it actually rewarded, you have 3 or 4 months or so to look into that. Gary - Yes, right.

Kris - My question is pertaining to the out of state hunter safety hunters, do you have access to other state databases to be able to verify that quickly or is that going to be a process where they're going to have to wait for that a bit? Gary - Again, as that list is generated with those individuals being a resident or non-resident, the non-residents there is a couple of different

options. They either can provide that to us, they have sometime there to be able to self certify then provide us with their out of state education completion. Kris - If someone is out of state do they have to self certify every time, is that the process? Gary - No, a lot of those individuals are in the database with a valid number. Kris - Okay. Gary - But only if it's the first two options. Kris - Is that only if they have hunted in Utah before? Gary - Yes, they would have had to create that customer profile within our customer database. Typically to do that they have presented that proof of completion to a division representative to get that card in there. Again, that's really where we are focused on those first two options, either already have been in the system or provide us with that certification. If you go with that self certify option then we have a little bit of time there to be able to go through and try to verify that. Kris – So that proof of certification, can that be provided to a license agent or only to a division office. Gary - They can provide that same blue card like we have in Utah from another state they can provide that to a license vendor. If we have to research that their education records then that would have to happen at one of our division offices by a division employee. Kris - So even if you have proof of hunter education certification from another state and you have never hunted in Utah, you have to go to a division office to get a permit or tag? Gary - No, not for a non-resident buying a non-resident tag in Utah, they can provide that proof of certification to a license vendor at Wal-mart, Sportsman's or wherever licenses are sold and they can issue that license to them. Kris - Do they have to enter the number into their portal, a license agent does, right, their hunter certification number? Gary - Right, their non-resident number would be entered into that in their customer profile. Kris - But it would return no result because they have never hunted in Utah before, right? That's what I am getting at; I'm trying to figure out the process and to make sure you have thought of those types of things. Gary - Yes, if it puts them into that option and that's their only option the self certification then they would have to go a division employee to be able to verify and update that in the system. Kris - Do we know how people that might impact? Gary - I can tell you the first couple of years we went through this with the big game draw we saw lists of several thousand individuals that went through that self certification process. It's getting better with each of those drawings that we go through and as we update and fix the database but we're still seeing pretty high numbers when we have 400,000 + applications coming into a big game draw. This is quite a big work load. Kris- Okay, thank you. Ron - I would assume once they present that valid from a different state to that you would have to go to the DWR obviously. The only thing we are dealing with is the ones that we're really dealing with is the ones that self certify that need to go through the office. Gary - Right.

Mike Christensen - What constitutes proof? Gary - An approved course is a course either offered by the DWR. Mike - Sorry, so we have a blue card and our numbers are also listed on the license. Gary - In Utah it's actually not anymore. Mike - Not anymore? So if a hunter from another state came in and showed you their state's "blue card" that would be appropriate or if they showed you license that had their hunter education number on it what constitutes that proof, what do they have to show you? Gary - The language in the rule states a document that has that proof of completion from another states that maybe a hunting license with that number on it. A lot of states are in the same boat as we are. They don't put that hunter education number on the license so they would have to show us a completion card. If they are not able to produce that, that is where we get into following up with that state and try to verify that they're in that state's database. Ken Strong - Is there any states at all that we don't accept? Gary - No, currently we have reciprocity with all 50 states, most Canadian providences. The international hunter education association, they set the minimum standards for hunter education and that is kind of

that minimum bar that all the different programs jurisdictions aim to meet and that is basically what the rule says any course that meets those minimum qualifications or allows the completion of that course allows the individual to obtain hunting license or permit in their home jurisdiction. Ron - Say I am living in Kansas and I want to put in for the big game hunt and you don't have record of my hunting certificate but I have proof that I did that, I am assuming you will still have to be self certified if I am applying from Kansas how do I know that unless … Gary - Right there at the time of application, that would be your option is that self certification and then you are put into that loop where we have to verify it. Ron- Have we thought about having the opportunity to be able to scan a document up and upload it right to your department at that point to prove that was the case so they could turn around and fill out the application and upload a document saying that there's hunter safety? Wouldn't this kind of help you at the same time? Gary - We have thought about that. Not really an option with our system right now. We are looking at a third party vendor that can handle a lot of our administrative work with the hunter education program and those databases. Once that is online I am hoping that the states that would have a document that they could do that with, we could look at that option but currently it's just not an option with the system we have got. Ron - So basically if you're a first time hunter in Utah it might take little while before your hunter safety is verified? After that, you're in the system and good to go. Gary - Right.

Questions from the Public
None

Comments from the Public
None

RAC Discussion
None

VOTING
Motion was made by Kris Marble to approve the Division's recommendations as presented. Seconded by AJ Mower

Motion passed unanimously

5) R657-11 - Furbearer Rule Amendments (Action)
- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator

Questions from the RAC
Mike Christensen - Where did that 100 feet come from? Darren - You know that was our best step, it's open to negotiation. The intent is just what I said, we don't want to regulate people trapping mice, raccoons around their houses and barns and things like that. But other than that, 100 feet is what we came up with so if you want to discuss that then we are certainly open to do that. Mike Christensen - Does that also include live catch/have a heart trap? Darren - Yes, it would include any kind of trapping. Mike - To obtain the trapping license that you carry in the field you also have to go through the trapping course or the furbearer's course education course?

Darren - My understanding is that is not mandatory. I know we have trapper here is that ring true with you guys? Sorry, yes it is like hunter education, so you would. Mike - Are there any provisions within the rule that deal with depredation? Darren - So things like beavers and all the stuff that was there before, you can handle things that are depredating through the rule. Now if you're a private landowner and you're trapping coyotes specifically, this would affect you, you wouldn't need to have your traps registered if you're not within that curtain or boundary. Mike - So if you're more than a 100 feet away from the building you would have to have that. Darren - Right. Mike - I have a lot of questions on this cause it seems like there are a lot of gray areas to me. What constitutes a building that is used for livestock? For example, we have at our ranch a large hay barn, it's not used for livestock, it's used to store hay but it also attracts nuisance animals that cause problems. Darren - Again, the intent is that you would be able to handle things in your barns. It's similar language to what we have to the shooting rule of 600 feet from occupied or someplace where human habitation is going on. So again the intent would be able to do that without worrying about complying with the trapping regulations. Mike - Again, I understand the intent, I worry about the nets being made pretty wide to catch people that are … Darren - Right. AJ - What is the reason for the 100 feet cause I know on some of our out building and things and neighbors, 100 feet is not very far to try and catch nuisance when they are coming from a source where you know they are. Darren - Again, it's an attempt to try and preclude that kind of activity from having to comply but yet it will draw lines somewhere. I think the distance isn't quite as important as long as we get the…we wouldn't want 2 miles or something like that.

Questions from the Public
None

Comments from the Public
None

RAC Discussion
Kris- Mike, AJ, you guys that have experience with this is there a better number than 100 feet? Mike - Well square acres are 208 feet so my personal opinion is I can see what they are trying to do I just think that, real quick anything that is red lined was in the rule before and stricken from the rule and anything that is red is added to the rule, so this rule had a lot of red added to it and we saw very little of that up there and so I think I would use the words well over 100 feet. 100 feet is 33 yards and you can throw a football way farther than that. For me I look at it like just coming from my situation I want the trap away from my animals and my house and my kids and my dog and my cats. Darren - Remember it's a onetime $10 fee. Mike - But you have to go through the course and be educated on that and I look at it also like I have a heart live catch trap we're putting that in the net with a leg hole trap as far as regulations go. I don't think those two things coincide. I personally can't support this the way it's written for the distance. For the regulation of someone that is trying to not injure or harvest that furbearer. We have had a lot of problems with foxes that come in when your cows are calving out in the field and they come in and eat the calves being birthed. I want to put a trap out there to catch that fox but I don't want end up…that's why there should be a depredation type of issue there and I didn't see it written

into the rule when I read through it. Darren - There are other rules that address depredation situations and this one specifically talks about beavers and things like that but we kind of have a separate track to deal with through the local biologists and deal with depredation issues as they arise. But again, put out a trap out under the way the rule is proposed, if it's outside a 100 feet you would have to get trapper education, trap number and all those things so that's what we're saying. Mike - Yeah exactly that's why for me personally I can't support that. Darren - What you would have to do if it's a protected species anyway is now just for coyotes and raccoons specifically. Kris – Do you have a proposed amendment that would get you there or do you feel like the rules just too far off? Mike - Personally I feel like the rule catches too many…I'm not a lawyer and I don't want to try to write the rule I just see the intent and I don't want to see some kind of mis-catch out there and have a trap that isn't being checked in time. There should be another section on the cage traps because you can go buy a cage trap at Wal-Mart and put it behind your house and put it 110 feet away … I don't know, you would be breaking the law. Darren - What we don't want to do is put our enforcement folks into a position where they have to make a decision. We need something that is enforceable so that is why we drew it at 100 feet but that doesn't necessarily mean that's magic number that can't be violated. George - Do you think you'll ever get to a magic number? You have been talking the distance thing forever. Mike - I agree. Alan - Well I suggest that even though we aren't going to get to a magic number but if we use the 600 feet like we use in the shooting thing it would make it a little easier and more understandable because it at least correspondence with that. AJ - When you're talking 600 feet or 100 feet whatever it is if you have cattle on the range, maybe word it so many feet from a problem not a building but maybe your livestock. Something like that needs to be clarified cause how many people have problems out away from the buildings and area occupied. Kris - I'm hearing the heartache over that and I just have to ask what is the big deal if you're a rancher going to go get certified or taking the course ? I am sincerely asking what the big deal is. Mike - I think we are forcing people, I am not looking at it at a harvesting point of view at all, and I'm looking at the public's point of view. Trappers are a rare breed. I have been to trapping rendezvous and I know. There are not a lot of people that do that. When we look at the public at large, I have a little bit of heartburn forcing, cause in 10 years where this could be the law . I have a hard time forcing somebody to go take that course when they bought a trap down at Wal-Mart to take care of some raccoons that is within 100 feet of their house or 600 feet. Darren - I think again for that purpose and within that boundary I think we can figure out how we want to do that, whether it is 600 feet or 100 feet or whatever. I think for us it is for our officers run across a trap in the field and it's not marked they have no idea who set it there, why it's there. They have ways to investigate that yet this rule tries to address that. It will have a number on it and they can figure out whom it is and if it's a landowner trying to catch coyotes they can figure that out. Ron - My understanding on the rule to the best of my knowledge since I don't trap would be the fact that you just want clarification so you know if the trap is going to be further away than 100 feet than I would need to take the course. Darren - Right. Ron - And if I don't take the course I am in violation? Darren - Right. Ron - And if I want to put one out at 99 feet, I'm good. Darren - Right. Ron - So I guess the point is and I understand exactly where you guys are coming from but I guess I am going to read between the lines a little bit here. I'm not sure that they are really after you; they might be after people who are out trapping illegally and now have some clarifications that enforce that a little bit more is my guess what we're looking at on this law is a little bit of aid to help our law enforcement to enforce the current laws we have. Typically the people that are in the trapping industry that do it all the time are law abiding. We

are trying to maybe not blur the lines and make it a little bit clearer. Darren - That was both our law enforcement folks concern and the trappers association concern that they want clarification and again if there is someone out there that is a bad actor it really helps our officers to make a case if they're not following the trapping rules. Public person sitting in the audience - How do you enforce that? How do you catch a guy trapping bobcats after the season how can you tell where he is already registered and taken the course to be out there during legal seasons? I see it all the time. Darren - I'm not law enforcement officer and there are ways to make cases but one thing that you can make a case and have it thrown out if it there aren't clear guidelines about what are right and what's wrong and you have to prove that the person knew. Ron - That is kind of my understanding that we are trying to make more clear guidelines so in these situations where people do take advantage of that there might be a better way of being able to enforce that now. Where we are right now it's pretty loose. So it makes it really difficult to enforce. Kris - Was there any thought about the definition of live traps, like what Mike is talking about. Darren - We talked about different trapping devices and we just came down on including everything. There is no reason we couldn't take a look at that.

VOTING

Motion was made by Alan White to accept the Division's proposal as presented with the exception of changing trap location distance from 100 feet to 600 feet.
Seconded by Kris Marble

In Favor: 8
Opposed: 1 (George Garcia)
Motion passed

6) Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2017-2018 (Action)
- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Kris - You talked about the metrics and if we go to certain end of the metric we want to make an adjustment. I understand that we are within the metrics but just barley and we're trending down pretty hard on a couple of them, so educate me on bobcats. If we were to see that with big game we would be a bit concerned and start to react now other than waiting for them to fall below the targets. Darren - Yes, that buffer that zone is kind of the safety zone so if you start seeing it dip below that you need to start making adjustments. So what the plan says is if two of those metrics are outside in a negative direction then we'll do a couple of things. One is shorten seasons, so again if it continues on the trend next year you would see a recommendation for shorten seasons and capping permits. Kris- Do you see that trend continuing? Darren - It's hard to say. You can see that it kind of cycles and bounces around. It probably has more to do with prey availability than almost anything else. As you mentioned, you know the numbers of bobcats available in the state, the number of people taking bobcats is probably not enough to make any huge at least take by people is probably not the biggest driver in the system. So again, we want to keep an eye on things and make adjustments but I don't think we need to panic if we see a downward trend. As long as it's within the buffers and then we'll adjust if we need to.

Questions from the Public
None

Comments from the Public
Ron Holt/Secretary for the Utah Trappers Association - We would like to see the price of the bobcat tags go back down to $5.00. As it is $15.00 right now the money doesn't fund anything other than the print of the tags, I think. Other states around us such as Wyoming don't have a tag system like ours for the fur harvesters. They just catch as many as they want and that's what we would like to see. We would also like to see another week put on the back end of the trapping season. That's when the big males are out roaming around looking for females and that's when you have the best opportunity on them.

Dan Cockayne/President of the Utah Houndsmen Association - We would support both those things that the trappers are suggesting that the week on at the end does help with the trend on the older adults and the price.

Ron Camp - With this in mind I have a couple of comments, I am assuming the reason that we raised the price from $5.00 to $15.00 is to get a little more revenue to help out with the management of this or do we know that? Darren - I don't know the whole history behind that price increase but I think in general we saw a deficit there; a cost to manage compared to the cost of the tag. I did actually ask about that and the general feeling to the Director's office. We just asked the legislature to increase that tag and I don't think that there is a lot of desire to go back but again this is a public process. Kris - That's one thing that those fees are set by the legislature and there is a few thing that we can't accomplish here and that is one of them. That really has to be a change with the legislature. Darren - One thing I can do is maybe get a little more history on this and get with the trappers and kind of explain what our thinking was when we raised the tags and that might help and it might not but we can keep talking about it. Ron - My experience has been once they have the taste of that extra money it's hard to get it back. Darren - It's the government, we're here to help. Ron - Let's go on the other comment to lengthen the season. I don't trap so I have no knowledge of that. Darren - I think the right biologically they are going to manage the plan so if it causes those targets to drop we'll cut the season back again so that is something you guys can discuss if you want. Ken - Isn't lengthening the season something we have talked about in the last two RAC's on cats and we've lengthened them on those so is this adding another length or is this just going back to the original? Darren - Probably the reason the season was set where it is now is we went through this bobcat planning again and we really opened the availability of permits up and we weren't sure what was going to happen. I think when I showed you the graph, we got a big spike in purchasers and then it's coming back down. We just didn't know what was going to happen so we were being conservative and kind of shortened things up to make sure that the wheels won't come off the very next year, but it looks like things are doing okay. Ron - Is there still a concern of over harvest if there is another week added on the hunt? Darren - I don't think so and again if it's mainly male harvest from a population standpoint that is not as a concerning but we will look at it again and if it's outside of our preminators we'll be back next year to recommend a change one way or another regardless. Ron - Is that something that if we actually put forth here tonight would it effect this year or would that be a 2018 deal either way? Darren - You're voting on it now… Ron - So we could make it effective this year? Darren - Yes. Ron - Just wanted a

clarification on it and make sure everyone is on the same page. Darren - The only thing again I am not 100% sure one thing I will need to check is if that is set in the plan it may be difficult to change it because the Board approved the plan and I am not sure if it is but we may need to double check and I don't have the plan in front of me at the moment. Ron - My biggest concern is only because I am ignorant on it and I hate to vote on something I know nothing about. To put my name on something and I don't know the impact on it one way or another if I were more educated on the value and how it would help you, I would be more willing personally to jump on that but I don't know whether this is the right move or the wrong move and so it is hard for me to make a move. This is just me personally but I will open it up for anymore comments on the RAC for that. Mike - Is the start date a set date in the rule or in your plan? Darren - It changes from year to year. Mike - Does it? Darren - It calls it out as the first Saturday. I wish I had the rules right in front of me. Again, if it is in the plan hard and stone we'd have to make changes to the plan to allow that to happen. I have it here but I don't know how quick I can be to find it. Mike - If it varies that's fine, I just didn't know if it was a fast day. Darren - It will adjust from year to year. We need to check on the plan cause the board approved the plan, go ahead. Ron - I hate to vote on something I know nothing about. If I was more educated it's hard for me to make a move. George - Clarification they're asking for a week addition to the end of the season not an adjustment? Kris - Yes, they want to add a week. I want to ask about one more question on the metrics/targets. If we look at our percent juvenile for 2017 we are actually over our target, right? Darren - Right. Kris - If we look at percent adult survival right at the bottom end of it and we look at our percent female harvest were right at the bottom of that so my concern with extending the season another week is you're right at the bottom of every single metric, which it can impact your over on. Darren - Right. It could affect adult survival and that does derive from the ages of animals in the harvest. Again, we can do that but if we look at the numbers and next year and we fall below those, the plan will have us adjust things. Kris - Like I said I am not super familiar with bobcat biology. I know big game we would be panicking right now. So based on that I would like to make a motion that we approve the recommendations as presented. Ken - I would like to amend that and being the extra week added on would mostly affect the males which wouldn't affect the reproduction. Kris - My only concern with that is the present of adult survival. Ken - I realize that but we're talking about males. If we lose a bunch of those we are still okay. Kris- That's understandable. It's just management plan targets and that's my concern. I'll withdraw my motion.

Jerry Carlson - We made this change/extended a week couple of seasons ago and in the process of that they did not extend the other furbearer animals along with this week and this caused a problem. They fixed that last year so if we extend this, we need to also extend the "normal" furbearers as well.

Mike - As a matter of discussion can you tell us if extending it a week has a biological effect on the furbearers. Will they catch more toms? Darren - It's hard to say until it happens. I think the thinking is sound and that intends to be when they're out moving more vulnerable to harvest. Again, males sad to say guys, aren't that important when it comes to population biology. Everybody should know that. We got those targets and triggers so we can adjust. I know if it were big game we'd be in a panic but things are crashing but this is relatively abundant resource with a relatively small number of people harvesting it. Fluctuations probably have more to do with it the number of prey species than anything else. It can adjust it's not going to be the end of

the world. Mike - Along the lines of what he just stated will it affect other species? Darren - Same thing, I think we're fine. Ken - I know we have extended it the last two years and last year we did extend it and I believe even two years ago we extended for all the trapping for 1 week. I think it was proposed for 2 weeks. Kris - I'm not sure the Board accepted that.

Ken Fouden - Three years ago we did propose a time extension on bobcat season with the agreement that if we could prove that we would harvest more toms they would give us the time, which we did. Biologically it has been proven. Darren had a graph with a date on it and the last 2 weeks of the season you will historically harvest more toms and it will show up in your adult survival availability in your females and your kitten survival availability will go up too. Historically trappers do not harvest more than around 2,400 cats annually. The 30 year average is 1.67 cats per trapper. Honestly you cannot harm these cats. Biologically their prey base will harm them by far more than human harvest. Kris - The catch in those last two weeks isn't all toms; there are still juveniles and females, right? Ken - The greater the majority is significant increase in adult toms. Danny - I don't question any of the discussion, however, because it is not in the management plan, I'm not going to support anything that isn't incorporated into the management plan. So it seems to me what we ought to do is attack the management plan and get that changed first. Ron - How long ago was the management plan amended? Darren - I think two years ago. Ron - So, not that long ago? Darren - It is worth pointing out that these plans have a lot of people on the committees that consider all these things and probably something we should take seriously when we make decisions. Mike - When does the plan expire? Darren - It calls for review I think every 10 years or as needed but it doesn't have an expiration date so it can be addressed if there is changes that need to be made it can be opened up.

RAC Discussion
None

VOTING
Motion was made by Ken Strong to accept the Division's proposal as presented with the exception of changing all furbearer hunts closure to one week later from the current close date of March 1.
Seconded by Alan White
In Favor: 6
Opposed: 3 (Danny, Christine, George)
Motion passed

7) Cougar Recommendations and Rule Amendments for 2017-2018
- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator

Questions from the RAC
Danny - One statistic that I keep failing to see is I keep thinking on the scientific literature and behavioral aspects and ratio between younger males vs. older males. It seems like that is just a no brainer statistic that should determine basically everything. Darren - Right. There are some things that I look at in the background that aren't in the management plan but things that I

definitely want to be considered and that's one thing we'll look at. You saw a glimpse of that in the average age of harvest and you can see again we harvest heavily on the male side. You could see that increase in the males and so a lot of that is tied up in that statistic and so we are seeing increasing average age of males in the harvest. So if you're trying to maintain a cougar population that's probably a good thing. Danny - People are losing pets and they're all kinds of other social un-oriented issues that come into play. I think my point is a good one though. What is the relative harvest of younger males to older males? Many of us believe that older males kind of help stabilize the behavioral aspects of that group. Darren - Some of the stuff coming out of Colorado and Washington is showing that so I think what we have tried to do here is by adding that average age and try to make sure that component is in our consideration in terms of a management strategy so the thinking there is that older age class males set up larger territories. They don't tend to overlap so you could actually have fewer cougars on the landscape with older age classes than you might if you have a bunch of juveniles that have overlapping territories. Danny - One other consideration is when you manage a large proportion of whether they are elk or cougar you're really managing for a trophy capacity in that sense. What we have tried to do make sure the component is in strategy. Alan - What is your actual harvest, do you have that? Darren - Yes. The first slide wasn't labeled but let's goes back to it real quick. The green line is total harvest. You can see it's right on the 400 line so it's been increasing. Alan - Across each unit, were we pretty well on target? Darren - Yes. This is a state-wide prospective and it varies by unit and some units lend themselves to opportunity and access is the biggest thing and others don't. So what happens is you get into a finer scale and you start seeing these source and sink kind of dynamics go in where people will go in and hit them hard in one area because it is easy to get to and you have an adjacent unit that is private land or rocky, rough terrain and they actually feed into that and so when you start delving into these metrics you start seeing some variance in age classes and things like that. The chart that was in your packet actually has for each unit what the percent females and over age 5 for each unit on there. One overall take home probably is with only a few exceptions all of these units are within the management perimeters, even those that we are dealing with deer and bighorn sheep issues. Overall, things look pretty good for a cougar stand point. Mike - Just looking at the limited entry units, so we don't have a harvest objective there we just give out that many tags and that's how many people get to hunt. Do we have a success rate on those units? Darren - Yes, it runs again if you kind of mash everything together it's about 75% statewide. Mike - The reason why I am looking at the limited entry units because in my mind I can grasp how things are working there. I served on the cougar management committee that helped write the last plan. If I look at East Canyon, that's a limited entry unit, the target is to have less than 40% of the take as females and we're at half that so we're at 18%. The target on the 5 years or older is 15-20% of the cats that need to over it and we're at 50%. We have only increased by two permits. Darren - That's a private land unit. Mike - But I know that if the tags are given those ranchers and the CWMU's and those people up there would allow that access. Maybe some will and some won't but the point of it is it extends when you look down at a lot of the limited entry units. We're way under on our female targets and way over on our 5 year or older targets, which should mean that there should be an increase in permits on those units. I'm not seeing that. Darren - That specific unit is an access issue. They just can't … Mike - Do you have the success rate on that unit? Darren - Yes, let me look it up real quick. I'll pull up the harvest up here and we can look at it specifically. Darren - What's the harvest success on that? Riley - My recollection is that they don't fill the tags. Isn't this one that we increased on? Mike - You increased by two. That goes to my point that people can gain

access on those properties just like we do private land only on elk tags. They sold out this year fast! People can gain the access that the animals are there to harvest so why aren't we issuing enough tags to harvest those? Darren - A lot of these units the plan calls for an increase and the biologists makes a call and again I was in the northern region before. This East Canyon is tough. It's mostly CWMU's; they don't really allow a lot of…. Mike - But you had a 100% harvest so they do allow so we can't say that they don't allow. Darren - They are taking the animals. Mike - Yes, and so it's the same if we look down on Current Creek North. 5% of the harvest is females and we're target is less than 40% so we're 8 times lower than we want to be and we're at 47% on our 5 year old and over. We're 150% over there and we're giving out two extra tags. Darren - Right. Mike - Why aren't we giving out more tags to bring those into line with the management objectives that we have? Darren – I don't know every single unit. I did ask them about that one. This one is one where the hunt able ground is pretty much our WMA on Tabby Mountain and they are worried about crowding. They are worried about putting a whole bunch of guys all on top of each other on public land island surrounded by private land so I think though your point is well taken. There probably is room on some of these units to increase further. These are the recommendations we're making. Mike - Yeah. Danny - On the flip side of that comment Mike, which I do appreciate, it might be at the expense of the social structure of some of these areas. If you look at that graph and you look at the blue on the males and the females going across, it's really hard not to notice that dramatic leap from 2015 to 2017 in the harvest of males. They are primarily older males. Again, I just say Darren is doing a balancing act between managing things as if they were deer and elk vs. these kitties that have their own social structure. Mike - I appreciate that aspect but I spent 4 months of my life on that committee and I understand that we made targets and there are a lot of blood, sweat and tears that went into those targets. There needs to be more thought put into those on how we can manage to the structure. Darren - We did revisit some units, but again you expect to see some increase on a unit whether that's enough of an increase I guess is open to discussion.

Questions from the Public

Chad Coburn - You have two units that we didn't even fill last year and we're adding permits to the Southeast Manti and the other is the Tintic-Vernon. So it's the opposite of yours Mike. We're selling permits to something … can you respond to why we do that other than it's in the plan? Darren - I don't know how to answer that specifically other than to say that we saw some opportunities. Yeah, if you're not filling the tags adding another tag maybe doesn't really make a difference.

Jason Walker - If the lion unit is not considered for predator management then why are we putting in on the harvest objective? Darren - They did actually make changes to the plan last year to allow for all the strategies to apply for all units. They still have to meet the criteria. It's just a strategy thing so how you hunt them is really a social question. This is what this meeting is for.

Brian Bitner/Wool grower - Also East Canyon we have our 6,000 acres there and I have never seen so many lions. I totally agree with what he is saying that I know a lot of the ranchers around there would allow access. If someone has a permit we'll get you access. So I think that is a great objective. I also am up in Strawberry with our sheep and Strawberry has increased quite a bit. Just today in the middle of the day when it was raining we had two lambs killed by

cougars and obviously the bears are a problem too. Cougars have increased a lot and we have noticed with on our property and we have been there 100 years, I wish we could increase the deer populations. I mean that is my big thing, I love big bucks and the minute we have a lot of cougars are deer go way down. Especially for what he is talking about East Canyon and Summit right there, we can get you access. If you can get us some tags we'll get it. That's the frustration for a lot of guys.

Seth Rockwell - My question is pertaining to the Vernon Unit. Three years ago it was limited entry, two years ago it went to harvest objective and increased tag numbers, last year you increased tag numbers and you're increasing tag numbers this year proposed but the amount of lions you're killing on every unit hasn't ever raised. It averages 3 per year and now we're going to jump to 8. It just doesn't make any sense to me to kill. Yet you give more tags to units where we never fill that unit ever and the female was 33% which is within your range of what you're looking for but I hunt that unit religiously every year. That's my unit that I love to hunt and the lions just aren't there. We hunt that day in and day out and you don't count tracks out there like you used to even 10 years ago but yet you're still giving more tag numbers for a unit that doesn't support that many lions. I do understand that a lot of it is a desert terrain but I hike there and I hunt there with snowmobiles, trucks for the whole season. When I had a tag 3 years ago and I treed 2 lions all season because I never could find a track. So to see you guys give more tags for a unit you're not filling just doesn't make sense. Darren - Tags are opportunity and so you know you may not take more lions but another guy can go hunt the unit that, well it's harvest objective so… Seth - Well its split now, so I don't understand the reason to split it over to a harvest objective also because you're not filling tags. Darren - Specifically on the unit I don't know if Tom you want to speak to that or not.
Tom Becker - There is so few deer on the Tintic we have a hard time getting a sample size big enough to even get an idea what the population is doing. So it's way below objective. The Vernon has always been a sensitive one for the deer population also so we I guess decided to keep the pressure on the cougars the best we could to kind of give them a break. You're right it doesn't seem to equate. Ron - We are going to move on that because I think the whole idea behind having cougar management plans and other plans is to try to follow a trend that's going to go for anywhere from 5-10 years and it's going to have ups and downs. I do agree to a certain degree that it's hard to harvest something that's not there but also agree that different people hunt different ways and other opportunities might produce something different you never know.

Comments from the Public

Dan Cockayne/President Utah Houndsmen Association - Just to digress a little bit but I want it on the record, after the further discussion with the bobcat, we are totally in favor of opportunity but we're NOT in favor with fiddling with those management plans. Like Mike said there is a lot of time and effort and thought and 5 minutes in time here. We would be opposed to fiddling with that management plan. Same thing with the cougars there is a few tags here and there that could be argued, I suppose, but overall we support the Division's recommendation and we feel that it fits within the management plan and we think it's a good plan and it deserves a chance to work and see what happens.

Chad Coburn - I sat on the cougar management plan committee and it's a good plan as you can see looking right there. We really got aggressive after cougars through the 1990's. No deer

response. We had two good winters prior to this year. We got some coyote work and got a pretty good response with deer. So from that what we have learned is in that cougar management plans there were so many diverse opinions on what we should do with cougars. Some people wanted them all dead, some wanted them all alive. We put a plan together and maybe that plan doesn't quite make sense of why we don't add permits or why we do add permits, but from that I believe the plan should stand and we aren't smarter than those that were in that room that sat on the cougar management plan committee, I assure you this. I support the plan as presented. Let's follow the plan. We're here to manage cougars and increase deer populations. It addressed that through the whole plan and when we tear that apart like we just did in the bobcat plan saying we are smarter than the people that sat there. Please if you're intrigued next time go sit in that 4 month prime and you'll see how humble you are. There are some people, Clint Mecham, Darren, Dr.Wolfe that are smarter than what I was. Please follow the plan and stay on the plan. Cougars can be managed along side of deer and elk and it works. Darren - Dr. Wolfe, Clint Mecham must smarter than I am!

RAC Discussion

Kris- I would echo those sentiments that were just mentioned by Chad and that is the reason why I didn't vote to approve the bobcat amendment. I believe that we should stick to the plan. Having sat on a committee myself, I know the blood, sweat and tears that go into it. So with that being said, for your prospective I have a question for you. Do you feel like there are any other proposals that are in direct conflict with the plan? Mike -To me and I am just going to talk about limited entry units because I am not going to get into this splits and the harvest objectives. You guys know all of that. I think that any limited entry unit that is half again below what the female target is and is half again above what the age target is we could add probably 40% of permits to that. When I say 40 you say whoa that sounds like a lot. But we're talking 10 permits. So we add 4 instead of adding 1 or 0. Kris - That makes sense, my question is, is there a mechanism specifically in the plan that says if your achieving this number you should raise or lower by this number or are we in conflict anywhere is my question? Mike - I don't remember every trigger that we put in. In most plans we don't tie the hands of the biologists with this. Kris – So we have some leeway to… Mike - Exactly. So we could do things to… Darren - All the recommendations are within the plan it's more question of degree. Should we increase 2 or should we have increased 8? Tom- If there is a decrease you couldn't go beyond… Darren - Yes, there is a limit 20%. Kris - The 2 permits would fit within that perimeter. Mike -Yes, it would. Mike - So the way to go through that plan and probably can't do it here today would be to instead of having a limited entry unit in those units you could have a harvest objective or a split unit, correct? You could do that on all three units now because the plan was just amended. Darren - It's up to the biologist discretion and it really does help to know if you have a particular problem you're trying to address it's nice to have that whole tool box and not have your hands tied. Mike - Just so you know, I don't hold any a willow about this but I do think it is good to talk about it because if we don't talk about it then it just passes through. When we have units that have population trend and maybe that 20% cap can't keep up with that population trend to hold that cougar population within the bounds it needs to be.

VOTING

Motion was made by Kris Marble to accept the Division's recommendations as presented
Seconded by Michael Gates

In Favor: 8
Opposed: 1 (Mike)
Motion passed

8) Beaver Management Plan
- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Danny - This only pertains to beaver that built dams? Darren - No. Danny - I look through the plan and I couldn't find anything related to the problems that we are seeing on the lower Jordan River parkway of over story so now we have higher water temperature and more alga blooms. It's just problematic and so we need to deal with those beaver too. What does the plan say or did I just miss it and how do we deal with that? Darren - The plan allows flexibility to deal with problems and so there are other rules that address things like nuisance beaver, beaver that are doing damage to habitat. What this change does is it allows the flexibility in the plan then to deal with and if we want to live capture and move those beaver somewhere else it allows us to do that. Danny - And of course those beaver we don't want to move them if they are far enough down in the system as we can find so we don't want to move them anywhere. Darren - Rules address lethal take of animals that are causing nuisance and the plan really does recognize that there are areas where we don't want beavers and we'll deal with beavers in those situations. Danny - So maybe a pellet gun at night? Darren - Yeah, right. Danny - You laugh but… Darren - We'll put trapper in there at night and we will authorize in the furbearer plan you can be authorized to take beaver that are causing problems by following the rule. We can authorize that. Danny - So Salt Lake doesn't have a discharge of firearm restriction then a pellet a gun might actually work. I'm just trying to solve a problem. It's a dramatic problem for restoration projects and other parkway projects through Salt Lake City especially. Darren - This is a collaborative effort. If our habitat folks or aquatic folks have problems or concerns or want to try and establish these reintroduction areas then the ideas the plan allows everybody kind of play together. Danny - Unfortunately, that hasn't happened in Salt Lake City proper. Has there been any talk about doing specific beaver management plans for the likes of Riverton or Salt Lake City? Darren - There is a president. Joe Weedan at Utah State University has written plans for Hardware Ranch, Logan City and for Park City. The plan would allow us to do that. We'd want to sit down obviously in Salt Lake and write a plan.

George - Your slide when you said reintroduction proposal would have to score well in the "BRAT" going through that assessment tool, what do you mean by score well? Darren - What the plan says it needs to fall within a preference will be given to areas that fall within the low hanging fruit category or the living with beaver category. George - Categories in general? Darren - Yes, right, I guess that was a poor choice of words, but basically what it does is we used to have a list and what we have found first of all the statute doesn't require a list for beavers only for big game and sensitive species. So we didn't have to have that and what we have found

out over the years is that the list either winds up being so general like Bear River range, it will be on the list and we ask but where. I use that example up there. There are specific. What this does allows we to drill down and determine if an area is suitable and then we need to do some on ground work, assess it, and it may already have beavers in the system. It's a starting point and a way to identify areas and then all the leg work has to happen with the land management agencies, the county, the local landowners, stuff like that.

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 recommendations as presented
Seconded by Ken Strong
In Favor: 9
Opposed: 0
Motion passed unanimously

9) Other Business
- Ron Camp, RAC Chair

Dustin Brinkerhoff /UVHBA - I just want to say thanks, it has been educational. I was in town so I was able to stop in. I am not officially here from the homebuilders association, but I am a member and on the committee and if there is any need…we have government affairs, service projects and things in the homebuilders association so I just want to say thank you and I appreciate all you guys do.

Meeting adjourned at 9:14 pm
In attendance 34 (10 RAC Members, 8 DWR employees, 16 public)
Next Board meeting: Thursday, August 31, 2017, @ 9 am, DNR Boardroom, Salt Lake
Next RAC meeting: Tuesday, September 5, 2017 @ 6:30 pm, Springville Civic Center
110 South Main Street, Springville

Northern Regional Advisory Council
July 26, 2017
Brigham City Community Center
Brigham City, Utah

Draft Meeting Minutes

Meeting Begins: 6:05 p.m.

RAC Present	DWR Present	Wildlife Board
John Blazzard- Agriculture	Jodie Anderson	
Paul Chase- Forest Service	Nicaela Haig	
David Earl- Agriculture	Rachael Tuckett	
Christopher Hoagstrom-Noncon.	Justin Dolling	
Aaron Johnson- Sportsmen	Randy Wood	
Matt Klar- At Large	Darren Debloois	
Mike Laughter- Sportsmen	Jim Christensen	
Kevin McLeod- At Large	Gary Cook	
Justin Oliver- At Large	Phil Douglass	
Darren Parry- Shoshone Nation	Nathan Long	
Kristin Purdy-Noncon.	Devin Christensen	
Bryce Thurgood- Chair.	Jordan Hastings	
Melissa Wood for Matt Preston-BLM	Eric Anderson	

RAC Excused
Randy Hutchison- At Large

RAC Unexcused
Chad Jensen- Elected

Agenda:
Approval of Agenda
Approval of May 3, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Wildlife Board Meeting Update
Regional Update
R657-23 Hunter Education Rule Amendments
R657-11- Furbearer Rule Amendments
Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2017-2018
Cougar Recommendations & Rule Amendments for 2017-2018
Beaver Management Plan

Item 1. Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure
-Bryce Thurgood, Chair

Item 2. Approval of Agenda and May 3, 2017 Minutes
-Bryce Thurgood, Chair

Agenda approved.
Minutes approved as circulated.

Item 3. Wildlife Board Meeting Update
- Bryce Thurgood, Chair

Regional Supervisor Justin Dolling reported on the Wildlife Board meeting. Upland game turkey hunt guidebook recommendations. Motion by the board to accept the upland game and turkey hunt table recommendations as presented which was unanimous. Falconry rule last minute changes to the divisions proposal. Motion was to accept the falconry rule amendments with exclusion of the 54 species list and an inclusion of the divisions alternative 5 point proposal. That proposal consisted of 5 points by the division of wildlife. The division of wildlife will still retain the ability to regulate wild capture of native birds. Next point is to retain the 14 point species list and restrictions for all apprentice. The third point is to retain the proposed general class endorsement process for large raptors and that is primarily eagles. Still need eagle endorsement if you want to possess an eagle as a falconer. The fourth point is to improve DWR capabilities for inspecting and monitoring raptor facilities. The fifth point is some changes requested by the US Fish and Wildlife service. Essentially, the 54 list goes away. Everything that falconers want to possess will be evaluated on a case by case basis. The apprentice will have the 14 species list.

Item 4. Regional Update
- Justin Dolling Regional Supervisor

Loren Popert-US Forest Service- Sawtooth presentation award of excellence to Nathan Long.
Nathan Long- Thank the Forest Service. Appreciate working with them.
Aquatics- Muskies Inc. Tiger Muskie management on Pineview Reservoir. Community fishery enhancement projects.
Habitat Project-
Outreach- Cut Hay at Hardware Ranch. Hunter Ed Instructor training Aug 14th and 15th.
Wildlife- Updating deer unit management plans.
GSEP- Banding Pelicans on Gunnison Island, Phragmites treatment project on WMA's Aug 7th through early September.
Law Enforcement- Dakota Pray new Rich County Officer. AIS Check stations at Bear Lake.
Habitat- Wildlife Management Areas- working with MDF on a aggressive shrub planting.
General- RAC and Board Member Training Aug 30th at Scheels. September RAC meeting may be cancelled. Aquatics wants to stick to the 2 years guide book. Next RAC would be in November.

Kevin McLeod- On the invasive species at Bear Lake, Idaho had an extensive system going last year but have abandoned that. Do you know what is going on up there?
Justin Dolling- Utah and Idaho have joined forces. Check station in Idaho was moved to Garden City and all the funding and personnel associated with that were also moved to Garden City which allowed us to have extended hours.

Item 5. R657-23 Hunter Education Rule Amendments
- Gary Cook, Hunter Education Coordinator

See RAC Packet

Motion

Motion- Kristin Purdy- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R657-23 Hunter Education Rule Amendments as presented.
Second-Justin Oliver
Motion Passes- Unanimous

Item 6. R657-11- Furbearer Rule Amendments
- Darren Debloois, Mammals Coordinator

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Kevin McCloud- If an individual traps a species that they are not permitted, do they have to surrender that animal?
Darren Debloois- There is a 48 hour reporting requirement. If it is alive, you have to release it. If it is dead, you have to report it.
John Blazzard- Where did you come up with the 100 foot?
Darren Debloois- It is not a magic number. If you folks have some better ideas or feel like that is not appropriate, we are open to suggestions.
John Blazzard- My problem is the raccoon issue. I think 500 feet would be better.
Darren Debloois- I think that could work. We did not want to regulate trap that takes place on peoples properties. That would include mouse traps and anything you might be using around their buildings. Once you get out beyond that distance, you need to comply.
Kristin Purdy- Do you have any data, from the association that you mentioned, on the percentage of time that non-target species are trapped and what those species are?
Darren Debloois- The data they provided me was preliminary and it is because they are publishing. Right now, they are looking at about 25% of the time. It depends on the set and the animal you are targeting. It can be as high as that which is why we are concerned.

RAC Comment

Aaron Johnson- The 100 foot rule was a concern of mine. My concern is specifically with the raccoons. There are no farmers out there that does not have a trap more than 100 feet from his house trying to catch a raccoon.
Darren Debloois- We want to protect homeowners and ranchers and folks that need to do that around their buildings. We also need to make it clear for law enforcement. That is not a magic number if you feel like there is a better number.
Aaron Johnson- 100 feet is 30 yards and I can throw and punt that far. I think maybe some discussion about that. Commend you on the release of liability for trappers. That was a huge concern of them accidentally catching something and getting in trouble.
Justin Oliver- I think 100 or even 500 feet. If there could be some other form rather than a number that would make it easier. If it is in their cultivated area or agriculture or even in their yard. I think not doing a number would be better.

Darren Debloois- We need to have some kind of boundary so it is clear. Agriculture wouldn't work because people will be trapping fence lines and claim to be trapping raccoons and they are really trying to catch something else. Whatever that number is, I think we need to have something in there. We are not interested in prosecuting people trying to get rid of raccoons in and around their property. We don't want to leave a gray area so that our officers know what is in and what is out.
Bryce Thurgood- Isn't it 600 feet that you cannot shoot? Why not keep that even number of 600?
Darren Debloois- That is what the central region suggested last night.

Public Comment

Sierra Nelson- Homeowner in Nibley. I live on one acre. 100 feet does not get me anywhere. There has to be some way to adjust with homeowners and the agriculture community.
Darren Debloois- It is not our intent to prosecute that kind of thing. We don't want to put someone in a situation where they are outside of the rule.
Sierra Nelson- There has to be a way to work out that verbiage.

RAC Comment

Justin Oliver- What concerns me is if it is in the rule and you have a neighbor that does not like you and calls because you have done that. Wouldn't law enforcement be bound to enforce that law if you have witnessed that, whether you wanted to prosecute that or not, wouldn't that put enforcement in a bad situation?
Darren Debloois- I suppose it could.
Aaron Johnson- They would have some discretion. If your neighbor pressed the issue, maybe it would go to court on something that silly. I like the 600 feet rule. There does need to be a number and the reason is because some people will use the rule to their advantage. I think it is a good rule, I would just like the number to be increased. Maybe box traps? If it is legal to use box traps without this tag number. That is what a lot of the farmers are using.
Darren Debloois- If you are trapping a non-protected species, you do not have to do trapper education. You just need a license.
John Blazzard- I am trying to figure out how to do this. I have a lumber yard that encompasses 15 acres or so. The raccoons really make a mess. We constantly have a trap line in there. They are all box traps. A lot of my grandkids trap there as well as my sons.
Darren Debloois- The way the rule is written, it is fairly general as to what qualifies to what the starting point is. It is basically anything a person might go and use. In a lumber yard situation, people are there and moving around. Once you draw 600 feet around, I think it would be fine.
John Blazzard- I definitely like 600 feet more than 500 feet. 600 yards would be better for me.
Darren Debloois- Unfortunately, this came up because some people are taking advantage of the law and slipping under the law so it needs to be addressed. I think you are trying to do the best you can and it is going to inconvenience agriculture but 600 feet is 200 yards. If you have property bigger than that, you need to get that one $10 license.

Motion

Motion-Mike Laughter - Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R657-11 Furbearer Rule Amendments as presented with the addition of changing the distance from owner's house or structure from 100 feet to 600 feet.
Second- John Blazzard
Motion Passes- Unanimous

Item 7. Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2017-2018
- Darren Debloois, Mammals Coordinator

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Matt Klar- Could you tell me the significance of the April 4th end date?
Darren Debloois- I wish I knew the answer. It is probably in rule and that is how we do it. Other than that, I would have to go back through the history.
Matt Klar- April 1st is a Sunday and April 4th is a Wednesday. Seems like an odd time.
Darren Debloois- We do end seasons on Wednesdays sometimes. It gives people a few extra days. Biologically, it is probably not a huge concern.
Paul Chase- How do you determine bobcat adult survival?
Darren Debloois- It is based on a Chapman Robson estimator. We look at the age of animals and collect jaws from every bobcat that is taken in the state. We can section the tooth and determine the age. You can create a life table of the ages, year after year. There is a way to figure out what the odds are that you would see an age cohort in your sample based on the overall chance of survival, year to year.

Motion

Motion- John Blazzard- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2017-2018 as presented.
Second- Kevin McLeod
Motion Passes- Unanimous

Item 8. Cougar Recommendations & Rule Amendments for 2017-2018
- Darren Debloois, Mammals Coordinator

See RAC Packet

Public Question

Sierra Nelson-Why the 5 day gap? It seems arbitrary.
Darren Debloois- It kind of is. There is no real reason other than that's kind of how we have been doing it. It takes place when the conditions are not great for hunting and people are not really harvesting lions that time of year.
Aaron Johnson- They have to collect the data before that goes into harvest objective. They need a few days to collect data and give an accurate account of what has been harvested.
Darren Debloois- I assume you are talking about that harvest objective. Between the limited entry and harvest objective on those split units, that is why we need to figure out what we've got left.
Sierra Nelson- You said that there is an upward trend in the amount of predators. I am wondering what you are going to do to manage that? You look at populations of mule deer and they are going down. Also, wondering what you are doing for the producers. As a consumer, I love grass fed beef and lamb but if the predator numbers are going up, obviously they are going to kill more. We had one in River Heights.
Darren Debloois- There are a lot of things that go on. The biggest thing that causes us concern is that graph that shows increasing numbers for incidents for livestock owners and animal take. In the plan, we have allowed producers to help themselves. If there is a chronic problem, landowners can get a special permit.

Sierra Nelson- Depredation tag?
Darren Debloois- Exactly. We try to work as closely with producers to make sure they can get those tags if they need them. It use to be that you had to have a problem that was ongoing and sheep on the ground with a cougar among them. Now, you can handle some of that proactively. Wildlife Service's work closely with producers to handle problem lions. There are a lot of different layers of things going on but we want to make sure producers are getting help with problem lions. Lion populations are limited by the prey base and the other is the social territory. Older animals set up territories and defend them. If you have older animals, you may have less lions in an area than you would with younger animals.
Sierra Nelson- 20 guys statewide that help with that kind of stuff. You have to get a hold of someone that is who knows where and get him out within that 72 hour window to verify the kill. Is there anything else they can do about that?
Darren Debloois- The governor's office is interested in making sure they have the resources they need. We committed to do what we can on our side to make sure that producers have got some help. They are going to try and make sure they have the resources they need. It is a relatively small number of people dealing with a big land area.
Sierra Nelson- That is a problem of our state right? To me, it feels like that if you were a shop keeper, it would be different.

RAC Questions

John Blazzard- It looked like East Canyon had an increase of 2 also.
Darren Debloois- I missed it, my error.
John Blazzard- That's ok. How accurate do you think the incident reporting is on livestock depredation?
Darren Debloois- You mean in terms of numbers that are actually killed? Or that people just don't report it because it is not worth the hassle?
John Blazzard- Is that number coming from Wildlife Services?
Darren Debloois- Yes, they will go out and verify. We are working with USU on trying to get a look at the difference between what they find and what actually are being killed. Doesn't Wyoming do 5 to 1?
Bret Selman- 3 and 1.
Darren Debloois- Every state does it differently. We will compensate within the budget and if we top out, the money is gone and we have to prorate which is another reason we are concerned.
John Blazzard- I'm pretty sure no one shoots one in their sheep without reporting it.
Darren Debloois- Right, which you can do.
Bryce Thurgood- When they have a problem, do they call the division or Wildlife Services?
Darren Debloois- They call the trapper.
Bryce Thurgood- They coordinate with you?
Darren Debloois- Yes, they will call the trapper. He will call us and say he has a lion that took some sheep. They will talk to the regional manager and they coordinate with us. If they take the animals, there are certain procedures they have to follow.
Bryce Thurgood- Will you go back to that graph that shows the conflict.

Public Comment

Bret Selman- Utah Wool Growers Association- I applaud your increases and language about a multiplier. I wish there was more. Got compensation from last year and got paid for 41 lambs. After everything was subtracted, we were short 180. That lion is killing on us currently and has killed 10 so far that has been confirmed. The lion has been there for at least 3 years and will not tree. It is a chronic real problem. We have tried depredation tags in the fall. We are using Wildlife Services and trying everything we can. Where we may have had one lion causing problems 10 years ago, now there are 4 or 5. Since we came off the west desert, we don't have any lion problems. On lambing grounds and spring ranges, everywhere we have been, there have been lion kill.

Sierra Nelson- Multiplier info?
Darren Debloois- I don't know that there is any hard research. Maybe Bret knows more than I do.
Bret Selman- I can get that info.
Darren Debloois- Right now, the way that Utah works is we pay on verified kills and the budget is $180,000 and when that is spent, it is gone.
Sierra Nelson- That is really tough. If you are a shop keeper, you are only getting paid for 89% of the stuff they steal from you. That is kind of what I feel like we are doing to them. That is a concern for me because that will drive up the price of food because producers have to figure out a way to stay in business. I would really like to see more in this. Colorado has to have a problem as well as Wyoming. Why are we going around in circles?
Darren Debloois- We just got together and talked lions and other things. We share ideas and examine data. We want to help those producers and we will do what we can.
Sierra Nelson- I would also like them to not be in my backyard eating my dog.
Kirk Robinson- Western Wildlife Conservancy-(Email)
1. The Western Wildlife Conservancy asks that the Utah Cougar Management Plan be improved with a more precise cougar population estimate- one that is more strongly supported by empirical data.
2. Western Wildlife Conservancy asks that "harvest" records be examined to determine the age and gender demographics of cougars killed for depredation and nuisance problems.
3. Western Wildlife Conservancy asks that the Cougar Management Plan be re-examined and that recommendation based on recent cougar research in Washington and Colorado be incorporated.

RAC Comments

Aaron Johnson- The Utah Houndsmen Association supports Darren's plan as written and acknowledge that he is following the plan. There are things we don't like about it but realize it fits within the parameters of the plan and would like to see the plan run its course to see if it is working. We are not opposed to anything. There were some units in the plan, specifically the Ogden unit. It calls for a reduction in tags and they didn't, they increased it. We are not making a big stink about that. Livestock owners have a right to defend their flocks. We will help in any way to take depredating animals for the division, landowners or ranchers if it is legal. Landowner property issue. I am a lion hunter and I have zero permission to hunt on private property. I have asked over 100 people. If the landowners want lions off their property, give us permission and we will go in and take one. If you are keeping them behind locked gates and then cry about it, that is not right. I am not pointing anyone out but there are several landowners that earn money off lions. There are $180,000 that the state pays for depredation losses. If you are a shop keeper and someone breaks down your door and steals property, you have to pay for private insurance company to cover that. The state does not give you any money. Sometimes there are losses in business. There are risks of having cow and sheep on the mountain. They will get killed by predators. They have a right to defend their flocks. New research out of Colorado. I have spoken to the Biologist.
Darren Debloois- Logan.
Aaron Johnson- It is going to throw our management plan upside down. If you are killing 13% of females, you are hurting population. That is the latest research out there. They collared over 200 lions over a 10 year period. I like our plan and our association was part of drafting this plan. It is on its 3rd year now. I think we let this plan roll and Darren has followed the plan. It is not 100% of what most people want but it is a really good compromise all around. We are managing it good. You are going to get complaints from specific hunters in different areas but the Division is doing a really good job of taking out depredating animals the best they can.
Bryce Thurgood- Usually this audience is full of houndsmen and for them to not be here, it says a lot about the direction we are going.
Darren Debloois- As long as everyone is only angry at me a little bit, I am doing a pretty good job.

Aaron Johnson- You will always have a few squeaky wheels. As a whole, we put a huge effort to not be the cry babies and come to the table beforehand. We are doing good in this state. The houndsmen recognize that all the recommendations fit within the plan except they should have decreased tags in some places, especially Ogden. We trust the division.
Bret Selman- Left it the same.
Aaron Johnson- Left it the same? We support the plan and we support the wool growers. We support the landowners. We're here to help and we won't charge you a dime.
David Earl- You don't realize how much time we spend trying to identify what killed. We don't win 50% of the time. It is a timing issue and you have to be there at the right time.
Darren Debloois- Bret has given me good education over the years. That is something we recognize and see if we can look at it scientifically and come up with some kind of ratio.

Motion

Motion-Justin Oliver- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Cougar Recommendation & Rule Amendments for 2017-2018 as presented.
Second- Aaron Johnson
Motion Passes- Unanimous

Item 9. Beaver Management Plan
- Darren Debloois, Mammals Coordinator

See RAC Packet

Public Question

Sierra Nelson- Can they transmit the disease?
Paul Chase- Yes.
Sierra Nelson- So, I like the quarantine. That is something I did not know or think of.

RAC Comment

Melissa Wood- The plan and changes made are great. Beaver are important in the west for restoring streams and habitat. Really like the use of this new assessment tool. Gives us good information to manage beaver in Utah.

Motion

Motion-Melissa Wood- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Beaver Management Plan as presented.
Second- Kristin Purdy
Motion Passes-Unanimous

Justin Dolling**-** Failed to mention new employee, Eric Anderson. He is our new wildlife biologist in East Canyon and in Morgan South Rich. Greg Sheehan went on to new challenges in his career and is working as deputy director for the US Fish and Wildlife Service. They announced Mike Foutz as the new interim director. He has met with the governor and is now our new director.

Motion to adjourn

Meeting Ends- 7:54p.m.

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY OF MOTIONS
Utah Wildlife Resources Office, 318 N Vernal Avenue, Vernal
August 3, 2017

NER RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:
Dan Abeyta, Forest Service
David Gordon, BLM
Randy Dearth, NER RAC Chair
Andrea Merrell, Non-consumptive
Joe Batty, Agriculture
Joe Arnold, Public At-Large
Brad Horrocks, Elected Official
Ritchie Anderson, Agriculture
Daniel Davis, Sportsman
Brett Prevedel, Public At-Large
Boyde Blackwell, NER Regional Supervisor

UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:
Gary Cook, Hunter Ed Coordinator
Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator
Rori Shafer, NER Office Manager
Tonya Kieffer, NER Outreach Manager
Valarie Fiorelli, NER Wildlife Rec Spec.
Derrick Ewell, NER Wildlife Biologist
Randall Thacker, NER Wildlife Biologist
Kody Jones, NER Law Enforcement
Dax Mangus, NER Wildlife Manager
Clint Sampson, NER Wildlife Biologist
Amy VandeVoort, NER Wildlife Biologist

NER RAC MEMBERS EXCUSED:
Melissa Wardle, Non-consumptive
Tim Ignacio, Ute Tribe

WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS:
Kirk Woodward

- **WELCOME, RAC INTRODUCTIONS AND RAC PROCEDURES –** Randy Dearth

- **APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES**

  MOTION to approve agenda
  Brett Prevedel
  David Gordon, second
  Passed unanimously

  MOTION to approve minutes
  David Gordon
  Dan Abeyta, second
  Passed unanimously

- **WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING UPDATE – Randy Dearth**

  From the Wildlife Board Meeting back in June. There was some Sandhill crane discussion I think it would be a good topic this RAC would like to know about. That was discussed in good detail, Blair Stringham committed to addressing the season issue the federal migratory fly away committee. I appreciate his efforts to help us.

Falconry rule amendments minus the list of 54 species plus the five items the division proposed passed four to one. Thanked John Bair, the chairman and Dr. Mike King from Southeast Region, they both served their six years on the board and they thanked them for their time and effort there. The new board members from the southeast region were Kevin Albrecht and Carl Hurst, not sure what region Carl came from, but a member was required from each region and Kevin will be the one from the southeast region. HE was a member of the RAC of the southeast region. That's the update there and the time will be turned over to Boyde Blackwell, the Regional Supervisor.

- **REGIONAL UPDATE – Boyde Blackwell**

Good evening, I've got some information our new Director who was our Interim Director is Mike Fowlkes. Mike came up through the Division, I believe he was a C.O. in the southern region and then came up to Salt Lake and has been in the Salt Lake Office in several different capacities. He was our deputy director and moved into interim director and just recently last week he became the permanent director. So there is some movement going on in that Salt Lake Office. Other information, we have RAC training this month on August 30th, it is a Wednesday and that's a really good thing to attend and it is at Scheele's. We have this every year at about this time and it is a good training and I highly recommend you coming down if you have the time and learn about some of these things. You should have received a personal invitation from Stacy. WE announced already that we have a new RAC member in Ritchie Anderson and he is replacing Mitch and he is representing agriculture in the area. You guys wearing brown, make sure you come up to welcome him to working with the division and invite him out on some of your projects so he gets to know what you are doing. Wildlife section; our folks have been out surveying bison and taking biopsies from these bison and they're trying to find out movements, and see where they are going and where they are not going and trying to get some ideas of our bison herds in the Book Cliffs. Another thing of great interest, and we're really putting some emphasis on right now is migration and we'll be staring a new migration study and our region will be a big participant in that and we are mostly looking out on the Book Cliffs. I think it will give us a lot of good information and we're gonna have a lot of different species with collars on them and be able to present what they are doing out there and where they are going. Our Habitat section of course is working hard on habitat improvement projects. Our Law Enforcement always working hard. They are gearing up for coming hunts and for the most part, have closed out the past year's infractions, but there are always some of those that are lingering. We have an opening, actually two openings. We have an officer, Shane, that left us and we've got Larry who is a member of the Armed Forces and he's getting called up to Active Duty and so he is going to be away for quite some time, and so we right now are looking at replacing those. Our Aquatics section, they are treating Horseshoe Lake and the Reader and Lynne Creek area and for the remainder of this month, they will be really busy doing that. They have also been collecting data out on Red Fleet. Our Outreach section has had several events since we've been together and are planning for more viewing events for the coming months and Tonya is getting ready to have a little one, so we'll be missing her while she is gone. I think that that's all of the changes that we have that we can present right now. This is Valarie Fiorelli, she's our new Wildlife Recreation program Specialist

and she works with Tonya. I was really excited when we went through the process to get her here. She's been a school teacher, she's worked with a lot of different people and she's worked with a lot of different wildlife species throughout her career and so I'm really excited to have her on staff and we'll do well with her. Thank you.

Randy Dearth: Thank you, Boyde. I do want to recognize in the audience that we do have our wildlife board chair Dr. Kirk Woodward, we appreciate you joining us here tonight. I think everybody understands the way we do things but I'll just go over it anyway. We have the comment cards for anyone who would like to give a comment please fill out one of these cards and give it to one of these ladies up here and they will make sure they get it to us. We do need you to fill out a comment card if you have a comment. We will have a presentation by the division and after that we will have some questions by the RAC members and then we will have questions by the public. And at that time if you would step up to the mic and state your name and then go ahead and ask your questions. And then we will have comments by the RAC and then we will have another opportunity for comments by the public. Same thing, if you come up, step up to the mic and state your name and provide your comment and then we'll do a discussion by the RAC and then we'll call for a vote on each of the action items for tonight. First thing up is the hunter's education rule amendments, so we'll turn the time over to Gary Cook.

- **R657-23 – HUNTER EDUCATION RULE AMENDMENT – Gary Cook**
  See Slideshow

Questions from the RAC:

Dan Abeyta: I have a question. So what are the options for hunter education classes?

Gary Cook: Here in Utah we have basically two different delivery options. We still have the traditional classroom, instructor-led course. Typically those courses are a couple times a week for two to three weeks, depending on the instructor. We give them basic minimum criteria that they need to cover. Some instructors just hit that. Some will add some additional information and will have a little bit longer class. The other option is an online delivery for much of the instruction and that is paired with a field day where the students still meet with an instructor for some additional instruction some hands on learning exercises and both options have a final written test, as well as a live-fire exercise.

Dan Abeyta: Thank you.

Questions from the Public:

Kirk Woodward: I'll ask a quick question. I just have a question about the procedure with the trial hunter for people who are not from here. For instance, I have a buddy that

comes up from Africa who comes up and hunts every couple of years. Does he have to get a hunter education number after he's tried that for three years?

Gary Cook: The trial hunting program is up to three years of participation in hunting, but yeah, at that point if he doesn't meet the hunter education requirements, he'd either have to take a course here or provide us with verification that he's completed one somewhere else.

Kirk Woodward: No exceptions?

Gary Cook: Not that I am aware of, no.

Randy Dearth: Thank you. Other questions?

Brett Prevedel: Are people utilizing the trial?

Gary Cook: Yeah, I will try to remember off the top of my head, if you have specific questions of me I will have to grab my paper. The program has been in place for about three years and I believe our numbers are right around 8,600 individuals that have taken advantage of that program. We're just coming up on that 3-year maximum time frame. We've had about 10% of the participants that have gone ahead and gone through a hunter education course. This next year is really gonna tell us a lot when that 3 year is up, how many of those that have gone through that trial program, how many of those are now going to go on and take hunter education.

Randy Dearth: Other questions?

Dan Abeyta: I guess I do have one more question, and maybe you mentioned this and I just missed it. The fur-harvester or fur-bearer it that its own course?

Gary Cook: It is.

Dan Abeyta: It is.

Gary Cook: Yeah, there is a separate statute that the rule for hunter ed is that anybody born after December 31st, 1965 is required to take a hunter education course. The fur harvester requirement by statute is that a resident born after 1984 has got to take that fur harvester education before they can get that fur bearer license.

Dan Abeyta: Okay. Is that an online course?

Gary Cook: It is set up very similar to hunter education. We have both the classroom as well as the online with a field day options with the fur harvester education program as well.

Dan Abeyta: Alright, thanks.

Comments by the Public:

Comments by the RAC:

Randy Dearth: Any additional questions? We'll jump to comments. Comments by the RAC? I don't have any comment cards, so we'll jump that. Discussions by the RAC? Anybody have any problems with it? Issues with it? Concerns with it? If not, I'll entertain a motion.

MOTION by Dan Abeyta to accept the Divisions recommendations as presented.
David Gordon, second
Passed unanimously

- **R657-11 – FURBEARER RULE AMENDMENTS – Darren DeBloois**
  See slideshow

QUESTIONS FROM THE RAC:

Randy Dearth: So Darren if I accidentally trap a wolf, I'm not criminally liable for it.

Darren DeBloois: That's right, as long as you're not targeting wolves and you've got all the necessary permits and everything else.

Ritchie Anderson: How long does it take to get a trapping license number?

Darren DeBloois: It works online or over the counter, it will be in the system.

Ritchie Anderson: No education requirements?

Darren DeBloois: No. So, if you are trapping protected species there is a trapping education requirement. If you are trapping non-protected species, so for example, coyotes around your lambing areas or something like that, you wouldn't have to have the trapper education to trap non-protected species, but you would have to have the license and we're asking you to comply with our trapping rules if you are outside of that envelope around buildings. Does that make sense?

Ritchie Anderson: It does, yeah. Thank you.

Brad Horrocks: On the part there where it says 'because it has been shown that as many as 25% of animals caught in traps can be non-targeted species". Where is our stats on that that actually happen here?

Darren DeBloois: That's a west-wide estimate from AFWA? There are a couple different statistics, there is kind of an eastern average and a western average, and that's what they've found throughout the western states is it could be as high as a quarter, so 1 in 4.

Brad Horrocks: We don't have any actual numbers though that we can ….?

Darren DeBloois: They do have. I got that from their report. That report isn't out yet. They provided me with those stats.

Brad Horrocks: And okay. A person must possess a valid trap registration license when trapping furbearers, coyotes, or raccoons except within 100 feet of buildings or structures.

Darren DeBloois: Right.

Brad Horrocks: That doesn't work for private property owners.

Darren DeBloois: Right, now 100 feet isn't necessarily a magic number and in fact, the other RACs have all changed that number to within 600 feet. But you are right, if you are trapping on private property outside of that area, then you need to have a permit and you need to have numbers on your traps and all the rest.

Brad Horrocks: Why not include private property on there instead of just 100 feet?

Darren DeBloois: We have talked about that, it's so hard, it would be almost impossible to enforce. That was what we determined. When you start saying private, well, who's private is it? And can I tell my grandson he can do it? And who keeps the records on that and that kind of thing.

Brad Horrocks: Well, with raising sheep and livestock, that just doesn't work, you know that? We have to have private property included in that.

Darren DeBloois: What this would require you to do is get the license if you didn't already have a registration, so ten dollars to get that license, and then make sure your traps are marked. That would be the change. Now having said that, three years ago that was the requirement. It only changed last year and that's what created the confusion and that's why we are trying to clarify things so as recently as 2 years ago, you would have had to do this anyway. You should have had numbers on your traps because the trapping rule covered everything.

Randy Dearth: Other Questions? Joe?

Joe Batty: So previous to that 3 year period, when did that begin that you had to have the trapping permit?

Darren DeBloois: Um, I'm not sure.

Joe Batty: I want to know how long I was breaking the law here.

Darren DeBloois: Yeah, you know were not interested in going after guys that are trying to catch coyotes around their livestock and our officers do have some discretion in that.

Joe Batty: But the rule is obvious.

Darren DeBloois: That's the point I was gonna make. We don't want to write a rule that puts someone in violation when they are trying to go out there, and in good faith, do those things. So we tried to walk that line and do something that we felt was relatively easy to comply with.

Ritchie Anderson: Can I make another comment, or do we wanna wait until the comment period? I don't really have another question, but I do have a comment.

Randy Dearth: Make your comment Ritchie.

Ritchie Anderson: Okay. My concern is the same as Brad and Joe's. I think there could be a carve out for private landowners, livestock owners. I mean, it's not hard to determine if an individual that's trapping is the owner of that property. And it's not difficult to know if they own livestock or don't own livestock on that property. I'd have a little heartburn if a producer was losing their commodity and they wanted to set traps on a Sunday but its outside and they're not gonna get a license. I mean, I wouldn't, I'd start setting up traps and saving my stuff. And so, I don't know that it would be difficult to carve out an exemption for private landowners because it's pretty easy to verify. It's also pretty easy to verify if they have stock there that they're indeed trying to protect.

Kody Jones: Would it be alright if I make a quick comment?

Randy Dearth: Please do. If you'll state your name.

Kody Jones: I'm Cody Jones and I'm one of the local Conservation Officers. One thing that I wanted to make sure was clear with this discussion is, and especially speaking to the point that your talking about, the main reason, as officers, that we want the number on the trap is that if I go out in the field and I find a trap along a fence line, it takes me sometimes weeks to figure out who that trap belongs to if there is no kind of number on it. Who that belongs to determine whether it is the landowner legally doing it or if it's somebody illegally doing it. So the trap number is a way for us to know who the trap belongs to. That trap number license is different than your trapping license. You buy it once time. You just buy a number that is assigned to you for the rest of your life so that we know, as officers, who that trap belongs to without having to spend hours and days trying to nail that down. I just wanted to make sure that was clarified.

Darren DeBloois: That was kind of the gist.

Brad Horrocks: Do the landowners have to have them checked every 48 hours?

Darren DeBloois: Yeah, so if it's a non-lethal set, so leg-hold type of set then yeah, you need to do it every 48. Now, for the snares, their intent, they're lethal sets, then 96. And they would just need to make sure that …

Brad Horrocks: I would be a little concerned for Scott Chew. And just making comments because this is something that landowners can't abide by. I would encourage that we especially talk to representative Chew about this because of his livelihood up there and you guys adding another layer of rules and regulations to their livelihoods and I would really us adding excluding private property.

Joe Batty: I have a question.
Randy Dearth: Joe?

Joe Batty: So the tags, the traps that need to be tagged, how small of a trap is requiring a tag?

Darren DeBloois: Every trap in the field requires a tag.

Joe Batty: A gopher trap?

Darren DeBloois: Yeah, everything.

Joe Batty: Yeah, I'm not gonna vote for this.

Randy Dearth: Other questions?

Ritchie Anderson: Could I ask a question of the law enforcement? I think the landowners are relatively easy to access or visit with, would it be feasible to, I guess, to go talk to that landowner and say 'Hey are these your traps out there on your property?'

Kody Jones: And in some situations, that's pretty easy around and agricultural field, that's pretty easy. It can get cumbersome because so many of our properties are in trusts, you know, when I look it up on my phone all it tells me is Abbott Trust or whatever, so sometimes it takes a little more leg work. I have to go down to the county recorder's office and start pulling phone numbers and tax records. The longer you're in an area, it tends to get a little easier because you tend to get to know some of those landowners. What we're trying to do is, the rule used to be that they had to mark them, and in the last year it's become vague whether they had to mark them or not. And so that's why the law enforcement section teamed up with the trappers association and was trying to address this because we do get people in the field who are trying to beat the system. Our biggest concern isn't people around their homes or around their livestock, our biggest problem is guys in the field who are saying well I'm just trapping coyotes, but that set looks an awful lot like a bobcat set, you know.

Ritchie Anderson: Could you require the landowner to tag those traps with something that says this is the property of such and such landowner?

Kody Jones: And that would be I guess a question for you guys. Like I said, we're not trying to make things more difficult, we're trying to simplify things as much as we can.

Brad Horrocks: What is the problem with that, if we just put it in the rule books that the landowners need to engrave them or some identification is on it there. I would like to see some kind of compromise because I can't support that the way that is, including all private land.

Kody Jones: And that's a discussion I think you guys and the wildlife board, that's on you, you have to decide how you think you want to handle that.

Brett Prevedel: Isn't that what they're asking though by putting your number on it?

Brad Horrocks: Well they're wanting us to come down here and buy a license.

Brett Prevedel: Well, you could suggest that it's free. That would achieve the same thing, right?

Kody Jones: The biggest reason we've gone to the number is just so that somebody doesn't have to put their name on it, because if somebody's dog gets caught in it. The most upset person I've had to deal with once was a guy that had his dog caught in a trapper's trap. And they get quite emotional and worked up. Some people aren't comfortable putting their name on the trap. And that's been the advantage to the number is that the only people that know who that trap belongs to is one of our officers or our office, we don't give that information out to the public.

Ritchie Anderson: I don't know that livestock owners care if they catch somebody's dog on their private property or around their livestock that shouldn't be there.

Kody Jones: Well, like I said, we've had problems with thefts and different things from trapping as well, so it's just been kind of a way that people don't have to put their name right on the trap.

Randy Dearth: Is the ten dollar tag, a number thing, or is the issue having to check them periodically?

Brad Horrocks: Both, in my opinion, you know I'd hate to see us add another layer to the livestock operator in trying to save his livelihood because it is private ground and I have a little problem with us trying to enforce rules like that on private land and I think it just needs to be excluding private land in there.

Daniel Davis: I think a lot of the focus though, from what I understand, is protecting the protected wildlife. Protected species that belong to the public and the state, the residents of the state, not so much the predators. I've been around where trappers will just go dump a trap on private property and trespass to try to beat the system and it ends up on an antelope's foot. They drag it off and get seen and then they are trying to figure out who it was.

Darren DeBloois: That is our primary concern. We'll pay fifty dollars for the coyotes, if you catch the coyotes. Obviously, the division is trying to encourage that kind of activity. But we are concerned about deer getting caught, antelope getting caught, bobcats, things like that. We want to know if we walk up on a set and there's a bobcat in it, whose trap that is and that's one way to do it, is to require that number. That's why we are asking this, but obviously, this is a discussion.

Randy Dearth: I guess I've got a question. The other RACs that you've been to, how have they voted on this? You've talked about that they kind of wanted to move it to instead of 100 foot to 600 foot.

Darren DeBloois: They've all increased the distance to 600 feet. The first 3 RACs there wasn't a whole lot of discussion, we had a lot of wool growers there and it was kind of a non-issue. The Southeastern RAC did ask that we waive the fee, the 10 dollar fee, but it would still be required to get the license and mark your traps.

Randy Dearth: For everybody?

Darren: For private landowners on their private land. That's kind of the nuance in what we've seen so far.

Brett Prevedel: Currently, if a private landowner is trying to catch coyotes and catches protected wildlife, what is the situation there now?

Darren DeBloois: One of the reasons that I mentioned that we tried to put some protection from prosecution in that because we want people that are not out doing those things to have some type of assurance that we are not gonna come after them. Right now, it's a little bit of a gray area. If you catch something that you didn't intend, and your trap's not marked and you're not checking it, you could be prosecuted for that. So this, the intent here was to make it crystal clear for everybody what's required so that if you're putting a trap out in the field and you know what's expected, and if you comply, then we're not going to prosecute you.

Dan Abeyta: I have a question. I would imagine that there were similar concerns across the state in other regions that we're discussing here right now. Is that correct?

Darren DeBloois: This particular issue, the only region that brought it up was the southeastern region.

Dan Abeyta: Okay, was the extension from 100 feet to 600 was sort of compromise for these private landowners?

Darren DeBloois: Yeah, the gist, in a nutshell, was that the 100 feet are not far enough, and we need to have a bigger buffer, so for trapping around our barns or haystacks or things like that. Again, if you are trapping protected wildlife you'd still need all of these things within that, but if your targeting coyotes or raccoons in those areas or anything else that is not protected, then you'd be exempt.

Ritchie Anderson: Can I make one more comment? I guess I can see the point of the deal and I can see what you're trying to do with the 100 feet around the barns and all that. You're trying to give some leeway for some protection, but livestock is not always within 100 feet of a barn, and so I couldn't support it as it stands right now I think there need to be some changes.

Darren DeBloois: The main thing for that boundary, that buffer was, again in the rule we define a trap as anything that can hold an animal, and we didn't want people to literally have to mark a mousetrap that they're sitting in their house and that would have been the case if we didn't at least try to preclude areas where people would be doing their havahearts for raccoons or whatever they're doing. So that's the intent. That's kind of the starting point.
But we felt like the risk beyond that buffer to non-protected wildlife was significant enough and we have concerns about people that are already trying to drive through the loophole that we wanted to tighten that up and see if we couldn't come up with a reasonable way to ensure…

Brad Horrocks: Do you have any numbers or statistics from Uintah County of how many times that has happened or how many instances?

Darren DeBloois I have some statewide stats that we got from law enforcement, I think over the last several years it's been about 600 different incidents of trapping violations statewide. I don't have it for Uintah County, no.

Brad Horrocks: So were those private landowner violations or just general?

Darren DeBloois: General ones. And again, we are not interested in handcuffing someone who is trying to trap coyotes around their lambing grounds or something like that. We want to make sure that the bad-actors out there don't have some loopholes that make it difficult for us to put a case together. And right now, it's tough. It's really tough to make a case. In spite of the numbers, there is a lot in there too that just didn't have any evidence, so.

Randy Dearth: I would invite the audience to ask questions. Any questions by the public? Please step up to the mic and state your name.

Mike Cook: As far as checking the traps, does everyone that checks that trap have to have a license?

Darren DeBloois: Yes. I am trying to remember the specific language. I think you can authorize someone to check your traps, you have to have written authorization so you could authorize someone to check your traps, but they need to have some evidence. And that's just to prevent people from going out and messing with people's sets and sometimes people who don't like trapping will go out and try to do that so. Our officers need to know that it's okay for you to be out there doing that.

Brad Horrocks: How do we get our Peruvians approved to check our traps?

Darren DeBloois: I think they just need a letter saying that this is my employee and he'll be checking my traps. Is that right Cody?

Kody Jones: Yeah, This is designed to protect wildlife, we're not trying to make it hard for you…

Darren DeBloois: We absolutely recognize the need for people to efficiently, quickly deal with problems and so we certainly don't want to make it harder.

Boyde Blackwell: That's where the trap number comes in handy too is that you are identifying my Peruvian Jose is authorized to check my traps for me and my trap number is yadda-yadda and then he's off on his way. And that keeps our C.O.s in line as to what's going on and who's doing what.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Randy Dearth: J.C. did you have a question? J.C. did you have a question?

J.C. Brewer: I have more of a comment than a question. (Can't hear part of this)

Randy Dearth: You know, I think we're kinda into questions and comments. Step right up there.

J.C. Brewer: I'm a private landowner and I'm also concerned. I have the same concerns that Brad and Ritchie do. I don't think that the Division should be dictating to us what we can catch or do to protect our private property. Now my private property runs out, in one instance, from my home about nearly 1,000 feet. I could live with that 600 feet if that's the compromise that everybody wants to live with, but 100 feet doesn't even get to my corral. When I've got prairie dogs digging holes in my hayfield and my pasture, raccoons are tearing up my sheds, when I need to catch something, I'd like to be able to catch it a little further away…

Darren DeBloois: The language is anything; corrals, anything that you've got livestock in, anything that you're regularly going and using, so it's a little bigger than just your house. But the concern about 100 feet has been a universal concern.

COMMENTS FROM THE RAC:

Brad Horrocks: So livestock in a pasture that's regularly there, that is 2 miles from the house is covered then.

Darren DeBloois: Yeah. Let me read the actual way it reads and let's see if everybody agrees that that is how it is.

Joe Batty: It says building or structure. Is a fence a structure?

Darren DeBloois: I would define a fence as a structure.

Brad Horrocks: How are you going to enforce that?

Kody Jones: Typically a structure usually includes buildings, it doesn't generally include fencing, but I'd have to look at the rules.

Ritchie Anderson: I would consider a corral a structure, but I wouldn't consider a drift fence a structure. In my mind.

Kody Jones: Right, it typically, when considering shooting next to a home it usually defines sheds as a structure.

Darren DeBloois: Is everybody looking at that? I can read it. The way it reads is: 'trap restrictions do not apply to trapping devices set within 100 feet is what the recommended number is but it sounds like maybe we want to change that, of a building or structure occupied or utilized by humans or domestic livestock, provided the trapping device is set to capture coyotes or raccoons and with the landowner and lessee's or lessees' permission'.

Ritchie Anderson: But you can't, I mean, a fence I guess could be considered a structure in that definition because it's containing livestock, but you're not gonna set every trap 100 feet to a fence to avoid that. I'll make one more comment, then I'll shut up, but I think I can definitely see room to tighten this up. I think the way it's written it's about impossible for law enforcement, but I think we can do two things at the same time. I think we can tighten it up, but still not give any more burden to a landowner/livestock owner.

Randy Dearth: I think we are kind of in the comment period now. Any more comments from the RAC.

Joe Batty: I am really struggling with this. I had coyotes take a heifer down while she was calving, kill her, kill the calf. Of course, we trapped. It was about a mile and a half

except for a fence or irrigation equipment from a real structure. We are constantly trapping prairie dogs and that's just another hurdle for us to try and jump over and we're struggling as it is to maintain our property. I would really like to see some kind of an exemption for agricultural lands.

Brad Horrocks: Agricultural land being grazing property or just farm property?

Joe Batty: It's gotta be both. The grazing takes place especially during springtime when animals are lambing or calving and they're at risk.

Ritchie Anderson: Do you want suggestions?

Darren DeBloois: Yeah, that's what we're here for is for you folks to make suggestions.

Joe Batty: I think it's gotta be on grazing land, but it would have to be by the allotment owner, the permit owner. I think they need to put their names on their traps. I don't have a problem putting my name on a trap. I mean, if someone's got a problem with me trapping, they're welcome to contact me, if I'm protecting my livestock. I don't know any ranchers that are gonna have a problem with putting their name on a trap. I think they need to put their name on the trap and they need to be the owner of the livestock or the permit or owner of the property. Or an agent of them, a direct agent of them that they have given written permission to take care of that. And then I think that would still help you guys tighten things up, you could pretty much keep your language you just carve that out because you gotta tighten that up to the way it is. It's not enforceable, no use having the law if it's not enforceable. You're not enforceable right now, so let's tighten it up and let's take the burden off the others.

Boyde Blackwell: So Ritchie, you asking that they have their names on their traps and are not required the distance requirement?

Ritchie Anderson: No, no distance requirement, but it's gotta be within their allotment or permit, or within their private property. But no distance requirement, no license requirement. The ten dollar fee, I don't care, I don't think anybody is going to fall apart about a ten dollar fee. So the fee is not my issue so much as the no license requirement. Because, if it happens on a day they can't get it, and they want to set out traps today, they're not going to go get that license anyway. I wouldn't. If I'm going to protect my livestock, I'm gonna go set out my traps and I'll worry about a license later. If I get caught, I'm gonna fight it.

Darren DeBloois: Would you preemptively, if you knew you were going to set traps, get a license just tomorrow and then if you need it you got it, you got the number and then you don't have to write your name on the trap, you just put a number on there.

Ritchie Anderson: Yeah, but I'm not interested in killing coyotes and other protected species for the sake of killing them, I'm only going to set traps if I run into a problem.

Boyde Blackwell: This is private property, not public lands.

Ritchie Anderson: And a lot of guys are that way, we don't have a lot of time to just, I mean, the sheep guys are maybe going to preemptively set them more than cattle guys are, but I'm not going to trap for the sake of trapping. I'm going to specifically trap for protection. Or when there is an issue. So no, I'm not going to think ahead. If I run into an issue, I'm going to start taking care of it immediately.

Dan Abeyta: So Ritchie, I have a question for Ritchie and possibly maybe Brad and Joe down there. Do you guys have issues with following the rules for checking your traps or checking traps? The 48 hours or 96 hours whatever it is? Is that a concern?

Ritchie Anderson: I don't. I don't have because if I have a problem with them taking my livestock I want to know if I'm getting a handle on that problem. No, I don't have a problem with the checking rules, and that's the ethical thing to do, really. So no, I don't have a problem with the time checking that.

Brad Horrocks: I would disagree with the thought that trying to regulate your time to get back there in 48 hours, with what the livestock owners are doing. I think you're going to nail every one of them on that 48-hour deal because their schedules are not going to work around that.

Darren DeBloois: When you are, and I'm asking because I don't know, do you typically use a snare, do you use a leg-hold trap when you're doing that stuff?

Brad Horrocks: Both.

Darren DeBloois: Okay. Because it is 96 for snares. It is 48 if you're using something that is non-lethal because our concern is that if you catch an animal that you are not intending to, that you are able possibly to let it go.

Joe Batty: Dan, my biggest struggle is the encroachment on private property owners. It's just more that we have to continually battle.

Dan Abeyta: So Joe, is that a yes to my question?

Joe Batty: It's not necessarily the 48-hour check. It's just more regulations.

Dan Abeyta: It is, and I understand.

Joe Batty: Yeah, that's my struggle.

Daniel Davis: And my comment to that is that it's been in the rule, its something that we've had to follow for quite some time now.

Joe Batty: But they won't tell us how long previous…

Boyde Blackwell: Oh, it's been, I can tell you that it's been more than 25 years that there's been a trap check law, in days. You may not have read it before, but it's been in there.

Daniel Davis: But again, they are not harassing you, because you're intent.

Darren DeBloois: Yeah, we're not interested in that kind of activity.

Joe Batty: I understand that you're not harassing me, but when you guys are gone, somebody else will be in my place and they might get more harassment.

Darren DeBloois: Well, I agree with you philosophically, the less we can regulate, the better I think, overall, but this is a way to try to address a problem. And how do you split the baby? Where do you draw the line?

Joe Batty: So let's go back to the question. We've had 600 violations. How many of them were on private property, by private property owners?

Darren DeBloois: I don't know that. He didn't break it down that way. We could possibly find out. Maybe, Kody, you know something more local? Maybe you've got some examples more locally?

Kody Jones: You know, I apologize, I've only been in here in Uintah County for the last year. When I was in Millard County for the eight years prior, I dealt with a lot of trapping in Millard County and I can speak to you probably more from my experience there than I can here. The majority and this was a huge issue for me down there, but I can't think of one that dealt with private lands. It was all guys out on the west desert from Utah County coming down and trapping primarily bobcats and coyotes. They were weekend guys coming down and this was a real problem for us. They wouldn't mark their traps because they knew if I knew who they were, that I'd come write them a ticket for the 48-hour violation because they were only coming, at most, once a week. And so that's where a lot of this is stemming from is that we've got these guys that really are bad guys and we've really had our hands tied because this rule changed 2 years ago and became this gray area. Some county attorneys would charge it and some wouldn't base on how the wording was in the rule. So that's kind of what's driving this for the law enforcement section.

Randy Dearth: Kody, were the bad guys actually putting them on private property?

Kody Jones: None of them that I dealt with were on private property, they were all on BLM and public lands like I said clear out on the west desert. But, the hard thing is the way the rule is written it didn't divide between public and private lands. It was just making it difficult for us to catch the guys that really are bad guys. And that's what we're looking for. Our law enforcement officers, we're so busy, we're not looking to trip up a good guy. We really aren't. We are trying to catch the guys that are out there

hurting the resource. And that's why we are all here tonight is to try to iron that out and to figure out the best way.

Brad Horrocks: So you wouldn't have a problem with us excluding private land then?

Kody Jones: As long as the rules are clear and everyone knows what the rules are, that is my biggest concern. It is really hard for us as officers when even we get together and we all have different understandings of the rule. So, we wanted clarification so that we all can enforce it, universally.

Ritchie Anderson: Can I ask Brad and Joe, maybe J.C., would you all have a problem putting your names on your traps? Or maybe your ranch name on your traps?

Joe Batty: I have 50 prairie dog traps out.

Ritchie Anderson: And then these guys could immediately identify that trap and move on to something else.

Joe Batty: I am not in favor of it, Ritchie.

Ritchie Anderson: What's that?

Joe Batty: I am not in favor of it, no.

Ritchie Anderson: Putting your name on them?

Brad Horrocks: I just think it's an infringement on private property rights, Ritchie. For landowners, it is just more red tape.

Ritchie Anderson: I guess technically they should have your permission to be on your private property anyway unless they're seeing a current violation if they spot it outside of your property. If they identified a violation that they could clearly see within your property, which allowed them to access your property, other than that they should be asking your permission anyway to go in there. But outside of private property on permits or allotments… You know, I can understand your point on the private property, it's my private property, it's my trap, it's my deal. But when we're starting to trap outside for protection of livestock on public property…

Brad Horrocks: I would agree with that and I think on public property, they have to abide by all rules and regulations of whatever the public property is 100%. And I agree with that, they need to abide by all the rules and regulations out there if you're on public property. But on private property, I just don't think we need this.

Boyde Blackwell: And would that include private property out in the middle of the Book Cliffs that somebody just says 'can I hunt on your property?' yeah, okay you can hunt. So that person doesn't require a trap number and doesn't have to check his traps

and so on and so forth on private property that's out in the sticks. Yeah, that's going to be a problem. There's a lot of private property that is out in the outlying areas that we've got to watch and protect the resource on. We need to be careful. So far we've been able to stay ahead of the anti-trapping community. And we've been able to be that place, that okay well, we're not gonna bother Utah. But you can't run traps in Colorado like you can in Utah. You can't run traps in Idaho like you can in Utah, so.

Darren DeBloois: Nevada too, Boyde, just passed that 24 hours, well, it didn't pass, just went through the legislature in Nevada, 24-hour checks mandatory on everything

Boyde Blackwell: We need to be careful where we're going, that's all I'm saying.

Darren DeBloois: That's one of the reasons the trappers' association was concerned is that we don't wanna get more taken away.

Boyde Blackwell: And I'll be quiet now.

Brad Horrocks: That's a good point Boyde. You know, you've got a good point. It makes you think of consideration. It's a good point, you know. If it's the landowner and his direct family, how is that worded in the depredation tags, is there something in there that we could use here? If the landowner and the direct family is exempt from this. Is there something in there that we could talk about there that would work to compromise there because when you said that, I understand. I see your point. Is there something there that we could compromise on like they do the depredation tags or some wording there that we could use?

Boyde Blackwell: There may be some wording, yeah. We haven't had a chance to really think about that, but I think they were trying to get to that by providing 600 feet but I understand where you are coming from as well.

Brad Horrocks: That just doesn't work.

Darren DeBloois: We had a lot of these same discussions in our group. We want a landowner to have all the tools necessary and all the flexibility necessary to be able to deal with problems but, again this is our attempt at drawing a line and this is part of the process.

Boyde Blackwell: You know, I think they possibly could come up with something with a landowner, immediate family, or employee. But then everybody starts hiring all kinds of employees. But immediate family members could be in there.

Darren DeBloois: There is a language like that in the depredation rule.

Daniel Davis: I have a scenario I'd like to give you, I know this is the wrong subject and crew to talk to but, the unintentional trap of protected wildlife. It was a cougar. The trap wasn't checked, or they said they did, however, half a foot was still in the trap, and so

what kind of a timeframe that is, led to a chain of events where a family lost their pets because that animal now could not sustain life without taking easy prey. And that whole series of events could have been avoided had they been just ethically checking their traps within the time frame, knowing whose trap it was once it was found, either to educate because it probably wasn't intentional or it is a repetitive violator that needs to have something happen. That's my input on it.

Joe Batty: I'm still opening my mouth, but Brad so when you said that on public range, are you in favor of the ranch or livestock owner having to have that trapping permit and stuff when they are trapping on public land.

Brad Horrocks: Yeah, I feel like that's public property and they need to abide by the rules there and that's my opinion, Ritchie, yes, I think they are going up there on our permits and I feel like that is public ground, I have to abide by the public rules and regulations. But on my private property, I have a problem with more regulations. And that's just my opinion, Ritchie not to disagree, but.

Ritchie Anderson: And I see what you're saying, but I would more say that a livestock owner there that I would like it to be carved out on public too, if they are having a depredation problem, where they can start taking care of that problem immediately, you know if it's within their permit on their deal. But I guess with Boyde's point on the time frame of checking traps, I don't think, as agriculturalists and livestock people myself, I'm not gonna say that I oppose checking that trap in those time frames because it looks bad. It looks unethical for us. It just paints a bad picture of livestock people to say hey I don't want any restrictions on. Because the whole purpose of that time frame in checking traps is an ethical purpose. That's the whole purpose of that time frame. And so, when we talk about that time frame, if we just say that we don't want to abide by that time frame, I just think it gives us a black eye.

Brad Horrocks: I would go along with that, but just to come in and start telling me that I've got to buy a license and trapper number on my private property is no different than me walking into your home and saying okay, now you have to buy an air pollution permit to run your lawn mower. You know, and I just have a problem with the private property end of that. There's lot owners here in town that would be in violation of trying to get the raccoons in their yards here in town.

Daniel Davis: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question to Darren?

Randy Dearth: Please do.

Daniel Davis: Darren, these rules can be discussed, changed, voted on annually, right?

Darren DeBloois: Right.

Daniel Davis: So as these concerns surface, would it be better to table these for discussion at a more in depth, reign it in and focus more on the landowners, get through

the year with it the way it is, and see how it works for everybody before, because paper is one thing, actuality is another.

Darren DeBloois: Just so I understand Daniel, so you are saying vote it as is and see how things pan out, or are you saying let's not do this now, let's wait and readdress it later.

Daniel Davis: Across the rest of the state, they've not seen an issue, however, I understand where everybody is coming from and I support everybody's concerns, but you know, to educate ourselves on it and to bring in the private landowners and the agriculture representatives, you know make that a focus for next year's change or update. That would be my recommendation.

Ritchie Anderson: I can't support it as it stands now, but with some little modifications I sure could.

Darren DeBloois: I think I'd recommend that you recommend any changes to the board that you feel like need to be made because four of the RACs have already done that and it's going to go to the board, it's an action item. The board is going to have to make a decision one way or the other. So, I don't know that you need to necessarily wordsmith the language, but if we can get clear intent on what we'd like to see to the assistant attorney general.

Brad Horrocks: It looks to me that there are a couple different issues, I'm sorry.

Andrea Merrell: I was just going to remind them that we can make our motion, we can build and amendment to what they have proposed and that can be what we send up to the wildlife board.

Darren DeBloois: What the southeastern region did, and I don't know if this helps or not, if you are a private landowner trapping on your private property you did not have to pay the fee for the license. So you could obtain the license for free. That's what they did.

Randy Dearth: Which licenses, the annual license? The annual trapping license?

Darren DeBloois: The lifetime license.

Rand Dearth: Oh, you're talking the number, not the trapping license.

Darren DeBloois: This is just what they did, for private lands, you're the landowner, and you can get that number license for free. And I know that's a little different than what you guys are discussing, but you'd still have to have the number. That's their recommendation. The other 3 RACs passed it, the 600 foot. That's kind of where we're standing right now.

Randy Dearth: Looks to me like through our discussion, maybe distance is an issue, having the number on the trap is an issue, and even trapping on private property or not is

an issue. So I don't know if we want to make just one motion or make a motion on each one of those. And see where we end up. So give that some thought and if somebody wants to make a motion, I think now is the time to get it done.

David Gordon: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a motion that we go ahead and accept the rule amendments as proposed except for the distance and we increase that to 600 feet from a structure.

Randy Dearth: Okay, We've had a motion. Dan Abeyta has a second on that.

Brett Prevedel: So if we make other amendments, you can add to that?

Randy Dearth: You can actually make another motion afterward, that's his motion. We have to vote on this one before we can make another one, but we can make another one after this. As long as it doesn't counter that one. If it doesn't pass

Brett Prevedel: If it does pass, then we can make the exceptions for the ten dollars or whatever?

Randy Dearth: You can still make exceptions for that later. Can we not?

Dan Abeyta: So if we vote on that motion and it passes, isn't it a done deal?

Darren DeBloois: Yes.

Rand Dearth: Okay, alright then it is a done deal.

Darren DeBloois: But you can amend the motion.

Randy Dearth: We can amend the motion now, the ten dollar thing, the private property thing, we can do all that.

Dan Abeyta: Yeah, if there is an amendment to that motion, it needs to happen before the vote.

Randy Dearth: Yes.

Ritchie Anderson: I would like to make the motion that we amend that. I would like to make a motion that we amend it that private landowners are not required to have a trapping license. A trap number.

Brett Prevedel: We already have the 600.

Boyde Blackwell: So that wipes out the 600 feet.

Randy Dearth: Now wait, I guess I got confused now, private property owners are not required to have a trapper's license.

Ritchie Anderson: Correct.

Andrea Merrell: Okay.

Randy Dearth: Okay, so that didn't wipe out the 600 foot. That just said that wiped out the having to pay the annual license fee.

Brad Horrocks: That doesn't do anything with the 600 foot.

Ritchie Anderson: Okay, and no distance requirement. So do we need to make that a different motion?

Darren DeBloois: Just so I'm clear, I just want to make sure that I'm interpreting what you're saying. So private landowners on their private property would not be required to have a trap registration license, which is the number.

Ritchie Anderson: Correct.

Darren DeBloois: It's that one-time thing.

Ritchie Anderson: Correct.

Darren DeBloois: As long as you're on your private property and you're the owner, and we could say like we do in depredation, the landowner, and his next immediate family.

Ritchie Anderson: Correct

Darren DeBloois: I just wanted to make sure I got it right.

Ritchie Anderson: And there would be no distance requirement, no structure distance requirement for private property owners. Does that, Joe and Brad, does that cover kind of what you want?

Brad Horrocks: Yeah, I would second that amendment, I guess. I would do that.

Joe Arnold: Let me ask a question to that point on this private property. So, I think to Boyde's point on the black eyes and the rules that are the ethical rules that are associated with that. Because we are saying that private property really doesn't have any rules on their own private property, so I think that we have to be careful about private property is excluded completely without any somewhat rules, so I think we have to be careful. If every state around us is outlawing trapping or making it very difficult, your main focus is to allow trapping, let's make sure that we don't put ourselves on a pedestal as livestock owners that we're away from all the rules. So I like where you're going with it, but I'm

wanting to make sure we don't exclude ourselves so much that we can't accomplish that you don't have to abide by the 48 hours because I think you said that you agree with that. And I agree with that, I think that that's the ethically accountable, responsible thing that we should do. Because if you have Peruvians and you have people to check your traps, then you should be able to. If you have that size of an operation, then you should be able to do that within the confines of the rule and that way maybe it keeps some heat off your back.

Daniel Davis: Can I make some comments to that amendment?

Randy Dearth: Please.

Daniel Davis: So my concern is, you're rounding up a fistful of traps to go lay on your private property, not putting a number on it, but yet you've got a forest lease where you're gonna try to go target some coyotes up on the forest, you grab a fistful of non-tagged traps, you're now on public land. It, to me, is a consistency issue. That it's easier just to be consistent from the word 'go' with everything you do. Now, I get it if you're just a private landowner and fence is your confinement and that's as far as you go, understandable. But then, on that trap 4 miles away from the river, whose trap is it? How did that happen? How often does that happen? And how can we mitigate that? So, those are my concerns.

Ritchie Anderson: And I think that I could agree with Brad, I think that I could go with Brad and with your comments. If they are trapping on public land, even if it is to protect their livestock, I could go with that, get the license, get a number.

Randy Dearth: Okay, is there any other discussion on that amendment?

David Gordon: I just want a clarification of what is the motion? Are there really two motions or is it one motion?

Randy Dearth: There is one motion with an amendment, the motion was yours, which is to accept the Divisions recommendation with the exclusion of the 100 foot and changing that to 600 foot, and then, Ritchie correct me if I'm wrong, but your amendment was to exclude private land on it and that the private landowners did not have to purchase a trapping registration license.

Ritchie Anderson: And no distance requirement.

Randy Dearth: And you did away with the 600 foot, well actually its private property, so that would automatically do away with the 600 foot on private property.

Ritchie Anderson: Correct. If that's what Brad and Joe want. Well, Brad already seconded it. We've got to third it now.

Brad Horrocks: Well, I backed Boyde's statement and Boyde you need to help us here, that it needs to have some wording in there that landowner relatives, so it's not just opening up. Boyde, help us on that. You know, I think we need to have some regulations there that I just can't turn anybody loose there. I understand Boyde's comment there with sending them out there. Family members, work employees, something like that. Boyde?

Boyde Blackwell: Okay so, it could possibly say that that was amended. And I've typed in that private landowners are not required. It could be private landowners and their immediate family members are not required to have a registration number and are not held to the 600-foot distance.

Joe Batty: On their private lands.

Boyde Blackwell: On their private lands.

Andrea Merrell: And this is for coyotes, raccoons…

Boyde Blackwell: It would be for unprotected species.

Andrea Merrell: Unprotected species, okay. Okay.

Would this include lessees?

Darren DeBloois: There is language in the lion depredation rule that specifies who's eligible to handle problems, we could probably mirror that language.

Joe Batty: Include lessees.

Darren DeBloois: It doesn't include lessees.

Joe Batty: Yeah, I would appreciate that.

Darren DeBloois: The current rule identifies lessees as well, as eligible.

Randall Thacker: Part of the issue is a trap number or identifying tags on these little small mammal type of traps? Is that the bigger issue? The problem that we would be concerned about is the leg-holds or snares taking larger bobcats or coyotes. People that are going to try to catch coyotes, that's where we get our real problem. That's also where you're gonna end up with deer stepping into the trap, getting a leg-hold on the trap. Snares, you could have other animals, bigger large animals that maybe a lot of us here would care about being trapped and injured being a problem that you would need to have some way to address those. What if you simply made on private property that the small mammal traps, the rodent type traps that are set for rodents or small mammals trapping don't require a number at all or identification. That would solve your problem, Joe, I don't think that does all of them, but it would solve a lot of them. The bigger traps,

being numbered have a real value because you argue that if you remove all the restrictions on private property, there's a lot of folks who are gonna start trapping deer and elk and anything else that comes into their property. Not the good guys. There's a lot of folks that we deal with that aren't the nice guys. They are going to be trapping stuff on purpose with these traps and the way it reads right now, they will have no recourse for a penalty, no way to identify who's doing it.

Darren DeBloois: I agree with that. Except I think, my understanding of the motion right now is that, if you snare a deer, you are liable even if you are trapping coyotes to protect your sheep.

Ritchie Anderson: Well, because it's on private property and you can go ask hey is that your trap. Where if it's out on public land and you don't have that trap identified, you have nowhere to go to try to identify that trap owner, but on private property, you can go to someone to identify who owns that trap and say 'hey, that happened on your private property, is that your trap?'

Randall Thacker: And if he says no?

Ritchie Anderson: Then somebody's trapping without his permission and that's not legal under this law.

Darren DeBloois: But it happens though, and we can't identify who it is because there is no number.

Ritchie Anderson: They'll have to help you identify who that is because they're trapping illegally on their ground under this law.

Randy Dearth: Okay we've got a motion with an amendment, we've got to vote on that motion with that amendment and if the amendment does not pass, we go back to the original motion. I think that's the rules, so let's all call for a vote. The amendment was, and correct me if I'm wrong, the amendment was… Actually, I'm going to have Boyde state it, he's got it right here I believe.

Boyde Blackwell: Received the first motion, then this motion was amended before a vote for private landowners and their immediate family members are not required to have a trap number and also without a distance requirement. And I think that was everything.

Randy Dearth: Any questions on that amendment? Okay, I'll call for a vote. All in favor?

David Gordon: Of the amendment, right?

Rand Dearth: Well, of the motion and the amendment.

MOTION to accept as presented from the Division

AMENDMENT that private land owners and family members are not required to have a trap number license on their private property for non-protected species.

Passed with six in favor and three against

- **FURBEARER AND BOBCAT HARVEST RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2017-2018 – Darren DeBloois**
  See slideshow

Randy Dearth: Thank you, Darren.

QUESTIONS FROM THE RAC:

Brett Prevedel: I just have one quick question. Are mink native or are they ferrel? Why do we have a season on mink?

Darren: Boyde are they native? I don't know.

Boyde Blackwell: They are native.

Darren DeBloois: I figured they were.

Brett Prevedel: They are native. The ones who escaped are just a different issue.

Boyde Blackwell: Usually they don't make it.

Darren DeBloois: Yeah, usually they don't survive.

Randy Dearth: Other questions?

Daniel Davis: I've got a question for you Darren. On the total harvest, what did that do when we went to unlimited tags?

Darren DeBloois: It kind of slowly climbed. I can look at numbers if you want, but we did see it kind of come up and then it kind of goes down. But again, I think it had more to do with those higher prices than almost anything else. We had a combination of allowing people more tags and a relatively high fur price, prices just added to it. So again you see take. Take kind of goes up and down over time. Does that help? I can look the number up.

Daniel Davis: So with unlimited permit sales, say those trends continue to go on with our juvenile take and population trend in the wrong direction. With these unlimited permit sales, what kind of management strategy can we come up with?

Darren DeBloois: There are three things identifying the plan. First of all, two of those have to be out and then heading in the wrong direction. The first thing we would do is cap the number of permits that an individual can get. So maybe go from 6 to 4. We'd also shorten the season. We tend to get a little bit more take as the season goes on, when the breeding starts, you start getting males moving around and those are really the desirable pelts, those male animals. So by cutting back on the season you'd see some reduction. You'd probably see some benefit to your adult component, you'd have more adult survival. The other thing we can do is if we have them out and they're staying out and they're still in the wrong direction is to put a cap. And what we would do is look at what the permit sales were the previous year and cut that by 20 percent. So that would be a state cap and it'd be first come, first serve. Once they were gone, they were gone.

Daniel Davis: Thank you.

Darren DeBloois: Yeah.

Randy Dearth: Other questions by the RAC?

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Randy Dearth: Well then I would move to the comment period by the RAC. Comments on this one?

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

COMMENTS FROM THE RAC:

Daniel Davis: Are we going to go public comments first or just the RAC?

Randy Dearth: There were no public comments on this one, so these are just RAC ones.

Daniel Davis: I've got some Mr. Chair. Last year we went for the season increase and went to March 1st to keep some consistency, but yet our trends for our adult survival and our juvenile are headed in the wrong direction. I just don't like when we go beyond those and try to come back.

Darren DeBloois: So just real quick, so the one that's concerning is the adult survival, the other ones are actually heading in a positive direction. But that's one we need to look at.

Daniel Davis: Will you go to the juvenile slide for me? And we want to be down to the red line, right? Above the red line.

Darren DeBloois: We want to be above the red line. So that one is trending in a positive direction.

Daniel Davis: But is there a cap on the trend up?

Darren DeBloois: There is a cap because there is a baseline and what we did when we wrote the plan was that we set the baseline and didn't allow for us to go over it. So right now, it keeps trending up and keeps staying where it is. So but when it trends down, that's when we'd change it.

Randy Dearth: Other comments by the RAC?

Ritchie Anderson: I guess I have more of a question on that graph. You want your juvenile harvest, percent of juvenile harvest, to be pretty low, correct?

Darren DeBloois: You want it to be high because when you're setting traps, you tend to kind of catch what's out there. And so if you're consistently catching a lot of juveniles that means that there are a lot of juveniles in the population. So it's a little bit different than a hunt where you're selecting for a specific age group. This is almost more like running a net through the ocean.

Ritchie Anderson: So this is telling us that the population trend is good, it's not saying you're killing too many juveniles.

Darren DeBloois: Exactly, yeah.

Boyde Blackwell: The juveniles eventually, that's when you're adult harvest it shows up in the data.

Ritchie Anderson: And it's kind of trending down.

Daniel Davis: Which it's headed that way, right?

Darren DeBloois: The adult survival is the one that's in the negative direction.

Ritchie Anderson: Okay, I understand.

Darren DeBloois: But again, the plan says that if it's within the window, we'll make changes until it gets out. And the feeling is that the window was set based on historic data and it was set high enough that if we dip below it, we have time to come back up. Does that make sense?

Ritchie Anderson: Okay. It does.

Daniel: No, not really. I'll be as honest as can be.

Darren: No, that's good.

Daniel Davis: Because the more juveniles you take, obviously you're not gonna have adults. I mean, you're gonna completely annihilate a population essentially before you meet both of those limits, right? Am I mistaken there?

Darren DeBloois: This might help. So this is how the harvest breaks down. You'd expect to have more juveniles in the harvest than older age classes. So this is from last year, but we do this every year. You can actually start to see those cohorts kind of move through. You can track what's going on in your population. So we do look at this additionally to try to get a feel for where things are going. But again, the plan is based on this kind of data. We looked at this data and then we wrote the management criteria to try to catch those variations and adjust soon enough that we could take action. But again, this is a relatively new change so we want to be conservative and careful.

Randy Dearth: Other comments?

Randy Dearth: Well, I'll entertain a motion on this one.

MOTION by Brett Prevedel to accept the Divisions recommendations
David Gordon, Second
Passed seven in favor and one opposed

- **COUGAR RECOMMENDATIONS AND RULE AMENDMENTS FOR 2017-2018- Darren DeBloois**
  See slideshow

Questions from the RAC:

Randy Dearth: Thank you. I guess I've got a question right off the bat. Here in the Book Cliffs our harvest objective I think was 29 last year. What actually was the take last year?

Darren DeBloois: I think you filled them all didn't you Dax?

Dax Mangus: Twenty nine.

Randy Dearth: We got twenty-nine last year?

Darren DeBloois: Yep.

Randy Dearth: Is that pretty true of the last couple years? Have we got them all?

Clint Sampson: I think the year before that we finished with 4 less, we killed 25.

Randy Dearth: Okay.

Clint Sampson: And then before that, we killed the quota, the quota was then twenty. And so the last three-year average harvest is about twenty-five.

Randy Dearth: Okay, thank you.

Daniel Davis: What's our deer herd done since then?

Randy Dearth: Clint, state your name please.

Clint Sampson: Clint Sampson. I'm a wildlife biologist. So the deer herd hasn't done as well as we'd hoped out in the Book Cliffs, despite all of our best efforts. It hovered right around 50 % of the overall objective for the unit. The overall objective of the unit is 15,000 and we hover right around a little above 7,000 to a little above 8,000. And like I say we hover right around that 7,500 mark. Last year our post-season population estimate was about 47% of our objective for the deer.

Brad Horrocks: What's the problem with the deer herd?

Clint Sampson: You know, that's a great question. We tend to classify deer in November, we tend to count around 30 to 40 fawns per 100 does, whereas a lot of other regions, their deer herds throughout the state will be considerably higher than that. And what's interesting is through the winter we don't seem to lose as many fawns through the winter. We'll still have around 30 or so fawns in March and April and so it's not so much a lot of winter loss. We did have several radio collars on adult does out in the Book Cliffs when we were doing this study about the Seep Ridge road getting paved and we did find that mortalities for the adult does that happened during the summer months, which makes us kind of lean a little bit towards predation. But like Boyde mentioned at the first of the meeting the DWR is really invested in learning and establishing better data and better science behind our recommendations. So we currently have quite a few new GPS collars scheduled to go out on a lot of deer and we plan on collaring a lot of fawns along with adult does and bucks to kind of help us answer what's wrong with our deer herd.

Darren DeBloois: We are also working with USU on a lion and bear component. We're curious about what are the lions doing out there. There's been some literature lately that shows in some areas that bears will steal lion kills and lions may increase the amount of animals that they take. We don't know if that's what's going on so, it's going to be kind of a big thing. Book Cliffs is part of it, we're going to look at the probably the Manti and the Cache as well so we can kind of compare. But we're excited about trying to get something going.

Daniel Davis: I've got a question.

Randy Dearth: Daniel.

Daniel Davis: On your depredation take, do you have the data to indicate whether those were juveniles or adults that were taken in that increase?

Darren DeBloois: We do collect ages on that. Off the top of my head, my general impression is that it tends to be younger animals. But you'd expect younger age classes in the population in general as well. I could get that for you, Daniel. And tell you what age classes those were in.

Daniel Davis: One more, Mr. Chair?

Randy Dearth: Yep.

Daniel Davis: So original recommendation had a decrease on the northwest. What was the take in change on that?

Darren DeBloois: They were a little bit confused about the management parameters. The biologist thought if it was below 20 that you needed to reduce. He was within the window, I think he was 19. So he was above 15 which is, you need to kind of be in there. And I called and asked him about that and he wouldn't have reduced if he had realized that. So that's why.

Randy Dearth: Other questions by the RAC?

Questions from the public:

Comments from the public:

Randy Dearth: Questions by the public? Okay, comments and I've got one comment card. J.C if you will come up and give us your comment, please.

J.C. Brewer: My name is J.C. Brewer. Actually, I came here tonight prepared for an argument because I thought there'd be some hounds men here madder than hell at me, but there's not so I'll leave some of these with you anyway. I run cameras on the Book Cliffs year-round and I take lots of pictures. And this year is the year that my pictures are different. I've seen an increase in pictures of cougars. Can you go back to the Book Cliff piece, please? Clint and I have some interesting discussions over cougars anyway. His recommendation is 29 Cougars again this year. Our deer herd is not increasing, we are way below objective out there. I'm going to recommend that we increase that at least a few cats. Cat numbers are going up at least as far as I can see, and deer numbers aren't going up. We need to do something. Some people will blame it on drought or a lot of other things, but when I'm getting pictures of families of cats, adult cats, on half a dozen cameras, we've got a lot of cats out there. Thank you.

Randy Dearth: Thank you J.C.

Randy Dearth: Oh, alright Mike.

Mike Cook: My comment isn't necessarily on the numbers and stuff. We hunt cow elk up on diamond and between our family, there is always somebody with a tag. And we usually hunt in December when it's snowing and that's the time to hunt cougars. What we've run into the last few years is we've pulled up, stayed out of the draw in the morning and waited until shooting light, hunting hours, and headed up into the draw only to have a lion hunter coming out of it before shooting hours. And they may or may not have turned their dogs loose, but they were up in that draw 15 minutes before shooting hours. So where are all the elk now? They are all clear booted out of the draw now. And it's becoming common practice now with guiding and stuff to actually hire people to look for tracks, sit on the tracks. So all night there's people up and down those draws, especially if it snowed. And from an elk hunting standpoint, it just ruins opening weekend of the hunts. Now, I'm not recommending that they close the mountain or cougar season during those opening weekends, but I do think that there needs to some education for the lion hunters to kind of respect that people are up there trying to get some elk. And they aren't being paid to be up there, they're paying to be up there unlike a lot of the guides. And it does increase the difficulty to kill an elk. Last year we went up and we happened to catch the lion hunter before he went up into the draw. He was ahead of us, but we caught him and the only thing that saved us was that he had cut a track at the bottom of the draw. We went up and went around him and we killed elk. And this isn't just a one-year thing, this is an every year thing. So I just think that I'd like to see some kind of education, kind of a voluntary thing for the lion hunters to respect those opening weekends of the cow elk hunt in those areas. And try to keep them out of the draw. Try to keep people out of the draws, just as common courtesy, because it does ruin a person's hunt. So that's my comment. I'd just like to see, and I don't know how it could be done, but it is a serious problem and we're not the only people that run into it. I know if I keep running into it, I'm going to start coming and asking that the lion hunting season in those areas be closed on opening weekends of the cow hunts so that people can have a chance. People do expend a lot of time and money for those hunts and want a quality hunt also. Thank you.

Randy Dearth: Thank you, Michael. We're on to discussion now of the RAC. Those are both really good comments. J.C. is seeing a lot more cats, possibly than the harvest objective this year in the Book Cliffs East and Michael is on the hunter education and possibilities there. So let's take the first one. So what do we think about more cats in the Book Cliffs?

Comments from the RAC:

Brett Prevedel: Can I put Clint on the spot for a second? I'd like to ask Clint or Dax on that as well. Are you seeing symptoms like more females in the cougar harvest or anything that we're having an impact by trying to harvest more?

Clint Sampson: Clint Sampson, wildlife biologist. What we've seen for the female harvest as far as percent of the take, last year there was 38% of the cats harvested were females.

Brett Prevedel: And where we start seeing the concern if we were managing for Cougars would be 45? Or where is that?

Clint Sampson: Forty.

Brett Prevedel: So we're really not

Boyde Blackwell: It's forty, and probably growing.

Clint Sampson: The age to is something we track like Darren mentioned and last year, of the cats killed, forty percent of the cats were 5 years and older. The 3 year average for that, five years and older, is a little over 30 percent. So I don't know if that helps.

Brett Prevedel: So your perception is that we're not hitting the cougars really hard then? Is that accurate?

Clint Sampson: That's what the numbers show us.

Joe Arnold: Clint, last year I believe we were at 38 recommended and we cut that by 10. Did we miss the boat there a little bit. We can't probably put everything of the deer not growing, there's all these other factors, but I think it was recommended 30 brought that down. There was definitely a lot of hounds men influence in here at that time. As far as telling us they're not seeing what they used to see out there as far as lions, and wanting a good experience for them as well, but also trying to maintain the deer herd. So are we gun shy a little bit because you went to 38 last year that you're like 'well, maybe we don't want to recommend 35', is that more your recommendation to Darren about the deer herd?

Clint Sampson: Well, there's a lot of social science that goes into our recommendations. So, yes, a lot of that is reflected. And like I say, we have all this stuff on the horizon, all of these great new technologies and new things, new ways to get information and so just too kind of keep an even keel for a little bit to help with these future studies we decided not to shatter too many dreams out there.

Joe Arnold: At least from the lion end, the deer hunters are still disappointed.

Clint Sampson: The deer hunters, they will probably always be.

Daniel Davis: Before you leave Clint, so clearly, the lions have an impact on the deer herd or we'd see hundreds a year increase?

Clint Sampson: Well, there's way more lions out there than hounds men.

Daniel Davis: Okay, okay. So let's go that route. Okay. So on a trend, our female harvest has increased every year, right?

Clint Sampson: No.

Daniel Davis: So what was it last year?

Clint Sampson: Forty.

Daniel Davis: And it was 38 this year? So we're right on the brink, right? So what's happening as a trend right now is, we've went and harvested, they went and harvested these lions and they've harvested the aged males, because it's a trophy hunt, that's what everybody wants out there. Now we're still harvesting age, but it's in the female age, because of the males ages… what's the male age trend?

Clint Sampson: I think it was over twenty? Maybe Darren can tell you.

Darren DeBloois: I can look at it. For greater than 5 years old we're actually up to 40% for last year, is that right? That's what I've got.

Daniel Davis: Overall, but for the males?

Darren DeBloois: Yeah, I think that one pulls all the females out of that. Let me see what I've got. Compared to the previous years, it was 26% and 28% over five years old, but there is still some good, mature component to that population. Twenty percent was over six.

Clint Sampson: There hasn't been anything really drastic to make us think that we're really putting a hurt on them too bad.

Daniel Davis: So back to my questions that I asked Darren. Thank you Clint. The reason that I bring that up is, with Mr. Brewer's pictures, if there was a mature tom, is it not science that a mature tom's going to help reign in his area and kill off young and things of that nature. There is a hefty balance here. I mean, we can sit here and point out them as the blame them for the deer herd, and is there more of an issue. We had a meeting last year, last fall about the deer herd. It's a summer range habitat issue. Now we're going with technology to identify and try and pinpoint, is it summer range or is it predator? We're using this harvest data to dictate a population that we don't know what actually exists. Oh, they're coming from Colorado, or they're coming from the tribe, that was the justification for the increase, and that's why that houndsman settled. I believe the numbers, where they're at is where they should be. Weather is going to dictate

certain things, but those older age-class males that you are harvesting, taking them out and you're also harvesting older age-class females that are raising young, juveniles. Juveniles are the main culprit in your depredation issues. Because they have to go find a resource on their own now because mama just kicked them off the milk-maker and they've gotta go fend for themselves. So, there's a lot to it to me other than just statistics and male harvest versus female harvest. There is a whole round about it. I think the Division's on with their recommendation and if there are triggers that say an increase or triggers that show a decrease, that's what's in the plan and that's what it should go by. I don't think they're off at all on their recommendation this year, statewide.

Randy Dearth: Okay, thanks Daniel. I guess Clint, Daniel just said something, is there any triggers in there that say 29 is kind of a good number? Or is it more like 27, or is it more like 32?

Clint Sampson: According to the rule, we could have increased from this last year and we could have increased the permits this year as well.

Randy Dearth: By how many?

Daniel Davis: Now again, that's based on a population issue, I mean, we're facing a bigger deal in the Book Cliffs than anywhere else in the state. It's deer population. It's managed as a predator management unit because of our deer population.

Dax Mangus: If I could maybe I'll just say, you know the forty percent females in the harvest, that's for sustaining a cougar population. Our intent was to reduce the cougar population in the Book Cliffs. We made what we thought was a fairly aggressive recommendation based on the parameters in the plan to try to reduce the cougar population. And we've had pretty substantial harvests if you look at what the harvest was before back when the Book Cliffs was a split unit before when we made it a harvest objective unit, we were harvesting two or three times as many cougars per year out there as we used to. And surprisingly the data hasn't shown, we haven't started to harvest a whole lot of females or a whole lot of juvenile animals. But it's still a fairly aggressive recommendation you know to kill almost 30 cougars a year in the Book Cliffs. You know, according to the parameters of the plan, we could increase that more and harvest more lions sooner and try to do that in conjunction with a lot of other efforts to try to help that deer population that's struggling out there. Like Clint said, there has been some social pressure, some folks who weren't happy with us killing that many lions, and there's a lot of other factors in play too and a lot of other things we're doing. We're pretty excited about what we can maybe learn from some of these studies that we are gonna take on in the Book Cliffs, so we just decided to take it easy, keep with the 29 that we had last year, which is still a fairly aggressive recommendation based on the criteria there is room to go further with it, but we decided to keep it where it is for now. But it doesn't show that we're making a big dent in reducing that cougar population based on the parameters that we look at in our plan and the numbers that we've got from the harvests of animals. Just wanted to clarify that, if it helps.

Boyde Blackwell: I have a question. You reached your quota of 29, how soon did you reach that quota? How soon was it reached? Was it reached at the beginning of the season, towards the middle, or the end?

Dax Mangus: It was towards the end of the winter, you know, it's a long season, but it was towards the end of the winter. It was almost into this spring. It wasn't hit real quick, but…

Daniel Davis: It was well into the bear season, wasn't it?

Clint Sampson: I think it was around March.

Dax Mangus: Yeah, it was in the spring.

Boyde Blackwell: Okay so the season runs from November?

Dax Mangus: It runs almost year-round, there is like a week that it's not open. The first week in November it's not open. It started the second week in November and we hit the number 29 I think it was in March, but you can correct me if I'm wrong.

Boyde Blackwell: And that's good, just a roundabout date is good for me.

Daniel Davis: Along that line, how many of these quotas get filled after the seasonal change? So after the snow stops, we go to dry conditions, how many of these quotas are filled after that time frame?

Dax Mangus: Usually our best harvests are going to be the first few snows of the year. Those first few snows of the year are when folks seem to have the most success, correct me if I'm wrong Darren.

Darren Davis: The date is actually April 2nd.

Dax Mangus: Okay.

Daniel Davis: Yeah, it was well into the bear season.

Brad Horrocks: How long have we been under objective on the deer herd out there?

Dax Mangus: A long time.

Daniel Davis: Since they made one.

Brad Horrocks: So could it be an overly aggressive objective or…

Dax Mangus: One of the things that we want to look at with the deer study that we are proposing right now as part of our migration initiative is body condition with ultrasound in mule deer and through looking at body condition, the deer's body is going to tell you about the habitat. And we'll look at them in the fall and again in the spring. Early winter and then again in spring to see how many conditions they've lost over the winter. We're working with some really good professors at BYU who have been doing on all of our mule deer monitoring studies throughout the state. And through body condition, I think we're getting to the point where we're going to be able to determine on some of these units, based on body condition, that our carrying capacity might be different that what our objective is. And I think that may be the case. We're not harvesting does out there, we're at an effective carrying capacity. There are things we can do to increase the carrying capacity of water development, habitat work, you know, we've done a lot of that out there in the Book Cliffs if you go out there and look around. Predator control has been part of that equation as well. But there also is a point where maybe 15,000 deer in the Book Cliffs isn't a realistic objective. And we're open to that and we're hoping that with some of these new things we're doing, we can get a better understanding of that. If it's too high, we might need to make some adjustments.

Joe Arnold: Dax, back in the day, the 80s, what was the population in the Book Cliffs, do you know if there is data available? I was out there a lot in the 80s and I'm trying to decide…

Dax Mangus: Clint, do you know? Do you remember?

Dax Mangus: Boyde's pretty old, he was here back then!

Darren????- In the last 15 years, it has been within that 7,000 to 9,000 range is where that population has been for the most part. I don't know about the 80s, we can look at some of the old annual reports, but I don't know. The numbers were set based on what they were killed back in 93, that big winter we had prior to that big die off we had. Most of them were set to what we had prior to that big winter.

Boyde Blackwell: We did take a huge dip and it was closed for three years, 96, 97 and 98, and then it was opened back up again.

Joe Arnold: They tried a three-point or better out there in about 84 through 89 and that was the start of the demise in my opinion.

Randy Dearth: Alright, any other comments on the RAC?

Daniel Davis: I've got one question.

Randy Dearth: Please do.

Daniel Davis: So in the plan it doesn't outline season dates or portions of that nature, right? So we can vote not realistically, but every year to move a season date one way or another.

Randy Dearth: Okay, we haven't talked about the hunter's education portion of it.

Darren DeBloois: That would be something that we could easily add to the lion education online thing that people have to take. Right now we're focusing on telling the difference between males and females, but we could easily add a blurb about you're sharing the mountain with other people, please be courteous of other users, something like that would be easy to add.

Randy Dearth: Especially during the opening weekend of cow season.

Daniel Davis: Let's go to that reverse perspective

Randy Dearth: I mean, I know they want to go in there when it snows, that's pretty important

Daniel Davis: Let's talk about spike elk hunters and Book Cliffs bear hunters. Fifteen years versus and over-the-counter tag. Go try to hunt that bear with all them spike elk hunters being courteous to you and that bear tag that took you 15 years to get. I mean, it's a two-way street inevitably. It just boils right down to that individual. Education or not, a course, they're there and it goes both ways.

Randy Dearth: Good point, Daniel. Okay, I'm not sure where we are, but any other discussion before we call for a motion on this one? J.C.?

J.C. Brewer: I know I've spoken up before. I've got a question for Dax.

Randy Dearth: Yep. Step up to the mic please, as I can catch it on record.

J.C. Brewer: Question for Dax when he was talking about this study that they're going to do on body condition on the deer herd. He said that they were going to do it fall and spring. I have maintained for some time that our problem in the Book Cliffs is not winter range. It's not winter kill. Our fawns that we're losing out there are summer kill. I would like to see if you are going to do this study year-round, look at the body condition in spring and the fall? On the summer range, which is a very narrow band of mountain out there, and we've got a large winter range. So I've been trying to get the thinking of everyone involved with deer management out there, to start thinking about how we are impacting our deer herd in the summer. We've got 3,000 head of cattle on the mountain out there, we've got 7,000 at least head of deer out there and now we're introducing Buffalo and our deer herd comes off that mountain with 40% of their fawns in the fall? Something is wrong with our summer range management folks, not our winter range. Can we get that same study that you're thinking about doing out there on the deer conditions in the summer? What is the matter with our deer condition in the fall when

they come off that mountain? We're putting too many animals on the top of that mountain, that's what I'm maintaining.

Dax Mangus: I'll talk to that in just a little bit. So when we get those body conditions in the fall, we're capturing what they had to eat that summer. When they're gaining that weight, so we know what they've gained in the summer and we look at them again in the spring and see what they've lost over the winter. And so I think we're trying to get at some of the same things you're getting at. With looking at body condition in the fall after they've been eating all summer, we're looking at body condition early in December. And so they've had pretty darn good nutrition right up until then is when stuff starts freezing and you start losing availability of nutrition due to snow depth and stuff. So I think we're looking at that and then we put vaginal implant transmitters in the does, so when they fawn, we'll go catch the fawns and put a radio transmitter on the fawn and we'll monitor fawn survival during the summer. Then that'll also be a big indicator of nutritional shortage in the summer and if that's playing a big factor. You know, if these fawns are starving to death because the moms aren't getting enough to eat and aren't able to produce enough milk to keep the fawns alive or if the fawns are being eaten by predators. It'll answer a lot of questions once we have collared fawns or collared elk calves to see why are we losing these deer. Is it a habitat issue? And that's probably part of it. We have some ideas, but it will help us confirm some of those things and we'll probably learn some stuff we didn't know. But those are some of the questions that we want to get at with this study that's in the works right now, that we're developing. Good questions.

Randy Dearth: Thanks Dax

Daniel Davis: Mr. Chair? I've got one more question. And it goes to a biologist standpoint on the cougars. So we tend to get away from the split harvest because of filling the quota. We lose those optimal times to harvest those lions because snowfall conditions make it easier to obtain. If that season date was to be February 1st rather than March 1st, that still leaves suitable conditions, storms to move through. Would there be possibly a bigger consideration to hold more split-harvest hunts in that aspect? To allow those quotas to be filled. Because, a lot of them, if they do open, it's one or two left. Or say it is larger than that, you put a bigger quota on it. Management-wise seasonally, would that be a bigger consideration?

Darren DeBloois: I think it's more social than anything. But I do have landowners that are running animals on split units and they've been concerned about by the time it opens up, the snow's gone and the conditions aren't that good. So I've heard that argument for shortening the split season. I thing the other side of the coin is that they do look at those people who are hunting on that and it is a limited-entry opportunity. So you'd be shortening the opportunity that whatever that small number of people who drew a tag could be afield. But again, these are from a biological standpoint, it depends on what's going on.

Daniel Davis: As long as the quota was filled they're happy.

Darren DeBloois: Yeah, exactly. If the quota is getting filled, it's probably distinction without a difference. If it's not, yeah, you might get some additional harvests when you open the door and let everybody who's got dogs hit the ground.

Daniel Davis: So where I'm going with that as a comment is, those folks would still like to have that limited entry opportunity, but still be able to allow biologically to harvest the quota. Short season or not, they're gonna get to hunt the whole season because until they harvest that cougar, that permit's valid. So even once it goes to split-objective, they can continue hunting once it opens up to the public. As a hounds man and a cougar hunter, the opportunity of an enjoyable opportunity, just like the 10 to 12 years you put in for a big game species that everybody else goes hunting, those opportunities are dwindling. And Darren's graph, those opportunities are just on their way out the window. Those quality times, where it's just general season versus limited-entry, it's no different from a harvest objective to a split. We still see the biological sense in it, but at the same time having an opportunity.

Randy Dearth: Thank you, Daniel. Any other comments on this topic? I'll call for a motion.

Daniel Davis: I'll make a motion. To accept the permits as presented, the permit numbers as recommended by the state. The season dates for the split harvest moved to February 1st, rather than March 1st and to leave that split-harvest to the harvest-objective unit as a split-harvest.

Randy Dearth: Which unit are you talking about?

Daniel Davis: There is only one unit being recommended for a change. It's the Plateau Thousand Lakes. To maintain split-harvest.

Darren DeBloois: Instead of harvest objective. Would you have any heartburn if we opened it that Saturday?

Daniel Davis: No. Just using the same verbiage as we would March 1st but allowing more seasonal opportunity to fill the objective.

Darren DeBloois: And that's for all split units throughout the state?

Daniel Davis: Yes sir.

Boyde Blackwell: Leave the split harvest unit objective…

Daniel Davis: Leave the Plateau Thousand Lakes as a split harvest.

Joe Arnold: Rather than harvest-only?

Daniel Davis: Correct.

Joe Arnold: Allow for limited-entry?

Daniel Davis: Opportunity with the seasonal advantage of being able to fill the harvest of what's not met.

Randy Dearth: Okay, you had three different ones. One being the permit numbers stay as recommended, the Plateau Thousand Lakes stay as a split instead of a harvest objective, and what was your third part of it?

Daniel Davis: Moving the harvest-objective date on the split-season unit to open as close to February 1st as allowed by code.

Darren DeBloois: It would be February 3rd, I think.

Randy Dearth: So basically the first of March to the first part of February. Okay. Alright, we have a motion on the floor, we need a second.

Joe Arnold: I have a question of any as far as recommendations of the other RACs according to this.

Darren DeBloois: I think all of them have passed as recommended, so they haven't made any changes.

Randy Dearth: I'm not hearing a second. Okay, that motion dies. Mr. Horrocks?

MOTION by Brad Horrocks to accept recommendations from the Division
Daniel Davis, second
Passed unanimously

Randy Dearth: Well, I'm going to keep you in the hot seat one more time for the beaver management plan.

- **BEAVER MANAGEMENT PLAN – Darren DeBloois**

Questions from the RAC:

David Gordon: I've got one. So is there anything changed in the management plan really, or is it just…?

Darren DeBloois: Yeah, some of the key things we're using. So we used to have a transplant list. We're not required for beavers to have a list, but we wanted some criteria. So what we're doing is we're using that BRAT model to assess whether it's suitable or not. The problem with the list is that some of the areas were really vague and

others were really specific. This way, we can look at the habitat and decide what's appropriate. The other thing we changed is, the old plan had some restrictions on sub-species and moving sub-species around the state. Everything that I can find indicates that North American Beavers are North American Beavers. There isn't any strong evidence that those sub-species are real. Some people are lumpers and others are splitters. So we removed the restrictions so if you've got animals in Box Elder County it's okay to move them somewhere else. But essentially those are the main changes. What it's done is allow us a little more flexibility to do that.

Randy Dearth: Other Questions by the RAC?

Dan Abeyta: So Darren, do you know, is there good evidence that beavers can spread whirling disease or quagga mussels? Or is that just hypothetical?

Darren DeBloois: Our aquatics folks want to be especially cautious.

Dan Abeyta: I get that.

Darren DeBloois: I'm not familiar with any kind of data or studies, but we just wanted to err on the side of being cautious.

Dan Abeyta: Okay.

Randy Dearth: Other questions? Dr. Woodward, you're the only public, do you have any questions?

Dr. Kirk Woodward: I have none.

Comments by the RAC:

Dan Abeyta: I just wanted to comment that there is strong support from the forest service to incorporate this BRAT assessment into the beaver management plan.

Randy Dearth: Thank you.

Brad Horrocks: And just a comment with that too, it's just amazing on the forest up there the remnants of old, existing beaver ponds and we must have had a lot more water years ago, maybe? I don't know, but their habitat and where they were, it is amazing that there was ever enough water there to create numerous beaver dams.

Randy Dearth: They call that the Central Utah Water Project!

Brad Horrocks: Never mind!

Randy Dearth: Other comments? Well, we'll entertain a motion on this one.

MOTION by David Gordon to accept the Divisions recommendations

Brad Horrocks, second
Passed unanimously

Darren DeBloois: I appreciate everyone's time. That was a marathon.

Randy Dearth: Thank you. Yeah, we tend to go long, we're kind of windy here.

Boyde Blackwell: They asked a lot of good questions and made a lot of good recommendations, I'm very impressed.

Randy Dearth: Alright, I'll entertain a motion that we adjourn.

MOTION to adjourn by Joe Batty
David Gordon, second

Adjourn at 9:41

SOUTHERN REGION RAC MEETING
Beaver High School, Beaver, UT
August 01, 2017 7:00 p.m.

1. REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

MOTION: To accept the minutes and agenda as written.

VOTE: Unanimously.

2. R657-23 – HUNTER EDUCATION RULE AMENDMENTS

MOTION: To accept the Hunter Education Rule Amendment as presented.

VOTE: Unanimously

3. R657-11 – FURBEARER RULE AMENDMENTS

MOTION: No to the changes to the trapping regulations.

VOTE: Failed: 4 to 6

MOTION: motion to accept the Furbearer Rule Amendments R657-11 as presented with the exception to increasing the distance from 600 ft. and make all trap times to 96 hrs

VOTE: Passed unanimously

4. FURBEARER AND BOBCAT HARVEST RECOMMENDATIONS 2017-2018

MOTION: To accept the Furbearer Rule Amendments R657-11 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimously

5. COUGAR RECOMMENDATIONS AND RULE AMENDMENTS FOR 2017-2018

MOTION: To accept the Cougar Recommendations and Rule Amendments for 2017-2018 as presented

VOTE: Unanimously

6. BEAVER MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION: To accept the Beaver Management Plan

VOTE: Unanimously

SOUTHERN REGION RAC MEETING
Beaver City Center, Beaver, UT
August 2, 2016 7:00 p.m.

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Dave Black	Mindi Cox	Donny Hunter	Sean Kelly
William Boardman	Cody Evans	Steve Dalton	Harry Barber
Brayden Richmond	Kevin Bunnell		Nick Jorgensen
Michael Worthen	Teresa Griffin		
Brian Johnson	Blaine Cox		
Wade Heaton	Johnny Neil		
Rusty Aiken	Selena Yardley		
Craig Laub	Vance Mumford		
Verland King	Jim Lamb		
Tammy Pearson	Gary Cook		
Riley Robert	Darren DeBloois		
	Micah Evans		
	David Smedley		
	Jason Nicholes		
	Mike Wardle		
	Josh Pollock		
	Clint Mecham		

Dave Black called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. There were approximately 10 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.

Wildlife Board Update and Regional Update:

Kevin Bunnell: Thanks Dave. Two things, I am going to spend most of my time kind of giving an update on the Brian Head Fire and what the impacts there to the wildlife have been and what the plans are for rehabilitating the burned area but before that, I think most of you are probably aware we do have a new director for the Division of Wildlife Resources, Greg Sheehan was recruited back to Washington and is a Deputy Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service and is the Acting Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service in Washington. Mike Fowlks who was our Deputy Director was an interim director for about, for 2 months but then just earlier this week or late last week sometime in the last few days Mike

was named as Director of the Division of Wildlife Resources by Mike Styler who is our DNR Director. So we look forward to Mike's leadership. He has indicated to us that he doesn't plan on changing course, the Agency is headed in a good direction, following Greg's leadership and will probably continue in a similar vein to that. With the Brian Head Fire, I'll run down some information here and then if there is any questions I'll do what I can to answer them. The total burned area was 72,000 acres so it was quite a large fire. Of that 72,000 acres, 60% of it was classified as either moderate or high severity meaning that it burned hot and burned rather completely in some of those areas. A lot of that 60% will require rehabilitation or some efforts to go back in to recover the habitat there. Immediately after a fire like this there is a group that is called the Burned Area Emergency Response or BEAR that gets together and puts together an initial request for funding to start rehab, that has already been funded at 3.8 million dollars. With that 3.8 million dollars the Forest Service will treat some of the worst areas, just over 3,000 acres will be, and a lot of it are places they are concerned with human health and safety or there is infrastructure that is at risk and a lot of it is soil stabilization as well. The only lasting impact of the fire that may impact the hunting public and recreationists for the summer is that the Yankee Reservoir area, the roads up there remain closed so the, let me get this right, the, so First and Second Left Hand Forks, its a loop that goes up around the Yankee Meadows area, that road is currently closed and will probably remain closed at least through the archery season. We are anticipating it may be open for the muzzleloader and rifle seasons but Second Left-Hand Fork is probably going to remain, well will remain closed just because its impassable, the road in Second Left-hand Fork has been washed out with debris flows and I don't know how long it will take them to go in and rehab that. In addition to the funding that came through the Forest Service, the Division of Wildlife and Forestry Fire, and State Lands have gone back to the State Legislature and asked for some emergency funding for fire rehab, the request is for 5 million dollars for all the fires throughout the State, about half of that will probably come to the Brian Head Fire. With that, in addition to the 3,000 acres that the Forest Service will be treating, and that will begin in the next couple of weeks, we will work to rehabilitate an additional 15 to 20,000 acres with around 2.2 million dollars. And that will be in the form of seeding and mulching and maybe some chaining in some of the lower areas where we had pinion and juniper that was burned. We've prioritized the areas to treat based on deer habitat, sage grouse habitat, areas that are less than 40% in slope, and then we've placed, prioritized any place that isn't dominated by aspen. Aspen communities will come back on their own and really don't need much in the way of rehabilitation to come back and to make good wildlife habitat. In addition to that we will probably doing work in that fire area for the next 3 to 5 years as it, as that mountain responds after the fire. Probably our biggest concern from a wildlife standpoint from the fire, is what it has done and what it will continue to do to our aquatic resources. So far Panguitch Lake and Red Creek Reservoirs are holding fish but we have had some minor fish kills in both of those reservoirs. Impacts from ash flows in the nutrient loads that come as a result of those ash flows could severely impact both of those reservoirs but so far they are holding up and we are hopeful that they will be able to, we won't have widespread fish kills. We do expect, we fully expect to lose the fish in Yankee Meadows Reservoir that the basin around Yankee Meadows was burned very completely and very hot and and we will have to go in after the fact and, and bring those resources back and it is pretty likely that we will lose the fish in Red Creek Reservoir or Paragonah Reservoir. With the, we are concerned about nutrient loads in Panguitch Lake and part of that is due to the fact that Panguitch Lake is a natural lake so there is a natural lake basin that is below the dam structure that we are unable to pull water out of the lower levels of that lake and so those nutrients accumulate in the lower portions of that lake and right now we don't have any way to flush them out and as that continues to build up we are worried specifically about phosphorus levels and algae blooms that could result from that. We are, with the money that we requested from the legislature we are hoping to get some engineering work done to try to design a way that we can pull some of the water out of the lower levels of that lake and flush that nutrient load out and make that a healthier lake going forward but we are not quite sure how that will

work or what we are going to have to do to make it work but its something we are working on and we will find a solution to. Probably the biggest impact has come in our streams, we've already lost the fish populations in about 100 miles of stream, including Mammoth Creek, Castle Creek, Blue Springs, Clear Creek, Ipson Creek, Three Mile, Little Creek, Red Creek and Parowan Creek. The good news is that those aquatic resources, both the fish and the habitat can be restored, we are fortunate here in the Southern Region to have experience with that, our crew, our aquatics crew here in the Southern Region restored 65 plus miles of fish and fish habitat following the Twitchell Fire here on the Beaver Mountain and so we've got people and resources that are experienced and know how to do that. But the sad part is with some of the streams, they will wash out, they will channelize, they will down cut, that is just gonna happen, there is not much we can do about it but we do know how to go in after the fact and bring those streams back. And we will be working on that. It is probably going to be a couple of years before we start on the streams because we kind of have to let nature take its course first and then we will go back in and put effort back into them. In an effort to support the local businesses up around Panguitch Lake, that were impacted by just the closures up there during the season where they make the, where the majority of their business comes, we have started a tagged fish contest up at Panguitch Lake, it began over the 24th of July weekend and will continue through Labor Day. We've put 100 tagged fish in the lake, all of the local businesses have donated prizes, so that if anybody catches a tagged fish they can just take it into the, one of the local businesses and they are giving out fishing equipment, sometimes boat rentals and things of that nature. And in addition to that on Labor Day weekend we will have a drawing for everybody that has captured a tagged fish, and Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife was generous enough to donate a rifle that we will hold a drawing for on Labor Day to kind of close out that tagged fish contest so we appreciate the partnership we have there. And that is all I have unless there is questions about, additional questions about the fire or about other things going on in the region.

Gene Boardman: First question, the report was, was public that what tagged game you had in that area, it all survived?

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah we have a few radio collared animals in the area of the fire, we didn't lose any of our radio collared animals. The timing of the fire was probably unfortunate but and in some ways fortunate. The 17th of July is when the fire started, that's right within a week of when our peak of when our fawning and calving takes place and so we assume we probably lost at least some of the fawns and calves that were newly born. We don't think we lost many adults. That is a sad thing to have happen but the reality of it is, we probably need fewer mouths on that mountain for the next year or so anyway and so to have a somewhat reduced reproductive effort this year may not be a bad thing as that mountain recovers from the impacts of the fire.

Gene Boardman: The other question, have you noticed that any game has been moving off from that unit into other units?

Kevin Bunnell: I am not aware of any of our collared animals, where is Josh at, I saw him come any, you can just give me a yes or a no, none that we are aware of that have moved off the unit? The number of collared animals that we have is relatively low but we haven't seen any of them leave the unit Gene. Any other questions. Alright thank you.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)

Wade Heaton made the motion to accept the agenda and minutes as presented. Braydon Richmond seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

R657-23 Hunter Education Rule Amendments (action)
-Gary Cook, Hunter Education Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Questions from the RAC? Gene.

Gene Boardman: On this certification, what I'm wondering about is, I put in all the applications for all my family or they don't get in and all I do is check the box that says they have hunter education. Is that gonna just, is that's all that's gonna have to happen?

Gary Cook: Well at some point if you are in that self-certification loop, then we will ask you to you know provide that proof that they have completed a hunter education course and get into the Division database with a number. And if that can't be provided, if at that time you can't provide that proof, they would have to take a course. But, and the last couple of years that we've been in this situation, you've been able to go back and continue to do that self-certification, with these changes to the administrative rule that will give us the option to be able to turn that off at some point. If you have received notification that you've got to provide that proof to the Division that they have in fact completed a course then you wouldn't be able to select that self-certification option.

Gene Boardman: Okay and if I do as I often do and don't submit the applications until 48 hours before the deadline?

Gary Cook: Again at the time that you are submitting that application, the self-certification option will be there unless you have, after an application period, we have some time and that's where we get that list from our licensing department of who is self-certified, we go through and try to clean that up, and then make those contacts if needed to let people know we do need to see that proof of certification.

Gene Boardman: Thank you.

Dave Black: Tammy.
Tammy Pearson: I have a similar question, so my kids, I was very proud to carry my blue card and I used to know my number but that was a hundred years ago, and now when I apply for it, because I'm too old, I don't even have to put that in because I'm born before the date, so I've done the same thing like Gene has with my kids, where we all fill it out and your automatic information just pops up on the website and you use your COR number or whatever pops up, is there no record in the state bank of when we originally put in those blue card numbers? I don't even know if they still call them blue cards, we used to call them blue cards.

Gary Cook: We do still call them blue cards. The process has changed a little bit over the years. Now when a new student takes the hunter education course, its automatically linked to their customer profile so that information is just, as soon as they get that blue card, that's in the database so they fall in under that first option there of already being in the database. We do have and you know for years have constantly tried to update and improve our historical records, it gets better all the time but we still do have some problems with that database from years past and from the procedures that were followed before we had everything automated. And that's where it comes into there, where if we can't find it, either in our hard copy records or in that Division database, if a customer can't provide a blue card, a

wall certificate, some sort of proof that they have completed that course, then that's again why we have the language there that if you can't provide the proof, that we don't have in our database they'd have to take the course again.

Tammy Pearson: K.

Kevin Bunnell: Riley it sounds like you're going to have to give a hunter safety course to the children of the RAC members.

Dave Black: Anybody else? Do we have questions from the audience? It looks like we only have one microphone. If you do come up for questions or comments we will have to share this microphone and please state your name when you come up as well so we can have that on the record. Okay I don't see any questions or, do we have any comments from the audience? Cards? Okay any comments from the RAC? Gene?

Gene Boardman: It's not a comment I just thought of another question and that is how much of a problem is this, how often does it come up?

Gary Cook: We see a pretty good-sized list. It's getting better each time we go through and clean up this database, this list of self-certification a bit more but with the big game draw when you have 400,000 plus applicants, my staff is probably getting a list of 3 or 4,000 names after a big game draw that we have got to go through and take the time to clean up or request proof of certification from people. Again, as we do this and go through this process each time it gets a lot better and those numbers go down.

Dave Black: Okay, alright, I'm ready to entertain a motion.

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public:

RAC discussion and vote:

Brian Johnson made the motion to accept the hunters education rule amendments as presented. Rusty Aiken seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

R657-11 Furbearer Rule Amendments (action)
-Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Questions from the RAC?

Mike Worthen: K I have a question regarding trapping coyotes. You mentioned that the authority does not rest with DWR on managing coyotes or racoons, but yet you are asserting authority by establishing trapping regulations on them. Do I understand that?

Darren DeBloois: Right and the reason we are is because there is a risk that you could catch something

that you didn't intend to catch.

Mike Worthen: Right and I understand the risk but how is this going to impact those that are hired by the livestock industry to keep coyotes out of sheep.

Darren DeBloois: They, we've got a memorandum of understanding with Wildlife Services and they won't change anything for those guys, they will still be able to,

Mike Worthen: How about if a rancher wants to hire a pretty good trapper in the area to come and trap while he is having trouble?

Darren: Then you would need to have that trap number on his traps.

Mike Worthen: But then. then they are I guess subject to the 48 trap, and that's another concern over a coyote trapping because any trapper knows you can't catch a coyote if you are checking your, can't catch a lot of coyotes if you are checking your equipment every 48 hours.

Darren DeBloois: Right it is 48 hours for a live set, the leg hold and its 96 hours for a lethal, like snare, that is intended to kill the animal

Mike Worthen: Right and I guess that is where my concern is, is narrowing that down to where you are taking the efficiency away from the trapper of stopping depredation on livestock.

Dave Black: We'll go to Braydon and then we'll come back to Craig.

Braydon Richmond: My question probably builds on what he is saying, I'm not a trapper but I am good friends with one of the, I think he is the vice-president of the trappers association. And they were, my understanding is they were quite excited about this idea that now we can finally trap coyotes efficiently. That's not what I heard you say, I heard you say,

Darren DeBloois: I sat down with the president, vice-president and secretary and they brought this up. They didn't like it being a gray area like this, they wanted us to make some changes and they support this.

Braydon Richmond: K they do support this?

Darren: Debloois: Yes.

Braydon Richmond: Okay and I was hoping that someone would be here to speak for them and maybe they will be in a second. Um, but I guess the question, not only livestock but it also affects you know we, we invest a lot of money into the mule deer protection act and different things, I'm just wondering, what options were explored to allow a longer check time, when you sat down and reviewed this, what options did you explore and was there really no, no way we could do that?

Darren DeBloois: Uh we didn't talk about check times, the concern that the trappers brought up to me was that they were concerned about longer check times, they are getting a lot of pressure from outside groups about trapping ethics and the best practice is 96 for lethal and 48 for leg hold so there was no discussion with them and therefore we didn't discuss as a group trying to extend check, check times.

Dave Black: Craig.

Craig Laub: Mine kind of ties in with what, he kind of partially answered it, I was concerned about the snares and what the situation was with them because actually on our farm we actually, my son killed a coyote the other day that had been caught in a snare and still had, it had broke the snare loose and it wouldn't have lived too long but he found it that way anyway.

Dave Black: Anybody else? Riley.

Riley Robert: This might sound a little bit minute, considering some of the other stuff that has been questioned but I know a lot of old time trappers that are probably going to struggle a little bit carrying something around with them that they have never been asked to carry. The question is, is how lenient is law enforcement going to be and what are the repercussions if, if you've got a 70-year-old trapper such as my old man that's out there who has never been asked other than he is gonna have, I'm gonna have to explain this to him and so there is a lot of these folks that are like that. What's the process and what's the enforcement when that happens.

Darren DeBloois: I think currently if you are trapping protected wildlife you have to have your fur bearer license on you.

Riley: Correct.

Darren DeBloois: So, this is just a, it is an additional thing that you would have to have on your person. Now if you are trapping unprotected this would be something new you would have to have with you. Law enforcement, you know they have a little bit of discretion and I think they will deal with things on a case by case basis. But, but yeah, this change would require that license to be carried just like a fishing license or a hunting license or anything like that.

Riley Robert: I understand the process behind it and I would certainly hope that law enforcement would take that into consideration especially the first little while this is ongoing with these gentlemen especially with some of our older generation that taught us how to do some of these things because it's gonna be an adjustment and I know it sounds like a little thing but some of those little things are what they hold onto. Thank you.

Dave Black: Gene.

Gene Boardman: I go a long ways back, I know I look young but I'm not. But, everybody had a few traps at one time, nobody had a license, nobody had to tag their traps or anything now maybe we've outgrown that and got completely past it but this 100-foot rule, and on private property, it sounds to me like somebody that might revert back to the old days that I once lived and may have some free, free roaming animals that wonder more than 100 feet away from his building.

Darren DeBloois: There is nothing magic about that 100-ft. line, that is just a number that we chose that seemed reasonable so you know if the RAC wants to discuss different distances I'm sure that we could work with that. The intent though is that we don't want to regulate stuff going on and around people's properties. A trap would include a mouse trap, it would include just anything and we don't want to be in the business of regulating that so the intent is if people are trapping in the field where they are likely to

catch a protected species we want to make sure that people are following the trapping rule.

Gene Boardman: Well that is the intent but if you make a regulation of 100 feet then people could be in non-compliance.

Darren DeBloois: Well we don't want to put people in that situation, so.

Riley Robert: Now on that just to be clear, the 100 foot was it looked like it was in a, like a family dwelling, that's not necessarily a property line.

Darren DeBloois: Any, any, its structures,

Riley Robert: But it is structures so I mean if you've got two or three hundred acres that of private property, you are going to have to follow those same rules on your own private property.

Darren DeBloois: Yeah similar to you need a deer license to shoot deer in your,

Riley Robert: No but I am saying now with the 100 feet, it's going to apply to all of that to where before it didn't necessarily have to with the coyotes and racoons.

Darren DeBloois: That is right.

Riley Robert: No, what I'm asking, so the whole property now, that you are talking,

Kevin Bunnell: In the past, if you are trapping protected wildlife on your private property you have always had to comply by the rules.

Riley Robert: No, I'm not talking protected, I'm talking non-protected.

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah and that has always been a bit of a gray area. This is, so 3 years ago, before we made this change, you would have had to then, its only been about a 2-year window that they specifically exempted non-protected wildlife from the rules, that's a new change and now we're going back to that's too, it's too much gray so really going back to where we had been in the past.

Darren DeBloois: And that's why the trappers association were concerned, that we used to be this way, we changed it, people are trying to feel their way in the dark and figure out what exactly, they didn't want to get in trouble and so they want to make sure that it was clear, and so we tried to clarify that.

Kevin Bunnell: And to Gene's point and correct me if I'm wrong Darren, I think that the 2 RAC's that have already seen this, they did discuss that 100 feet and made a recommendation to make it a larger buffer, I think 600 feet?

Darren DeBloois: 600.

Kevin Bunnell: 600 feet came out of both the previous RAC's.

Darren DeBloois: And again, you know this is people in a room trying to figure out a distance so, it's not magic, it,

Dave Black: K, Tammy.

Tammy Pearson: K my question is the same thing because we are kind of like the sheep guys, we've got a lot of property that is continuous but there is no corrals or outbuildings or anything else and we're kind of out there in the lone, alone in the boonies and so there is not a whole lot of protected wildlife but, so its, I guess it just goes back to what the original,

Darren DeBloois: Yeah this goes back to what it was 3 years ago except that we add some language to not try to regulate around, yeah.

Dave Bunnell: Wade.

Wade Heaton: So, Darren just a question, this is gonna require some speculation,

Darren DeBloois: I'm great at speculating.

Wade Heaton: But, my concern is a little bit like Mike's, yeah we changed the rule a couple of years ago, it's been wonderful it really did open up some leeway, some new avenues for the agricultural community, I appreciate the trappers association of which I am a member, I appreciate their opinion and their stance, but I think if we were to talk to the Farm Bureau or the Wool Growers Association we would have probably got a little different idea as to let's leave it the way it is right now because we're kind of loving it. I understand the balancing act, where we're at between everybody likes dead coyotes, we all want to kill coyotes, but we also want to protect protected wildlife and so I understand the balancing act, I guess my question is, this is the speculation part, how many fewer coyotes are we going to kill because of this change back?

Darren DeBloois: I can speculate. I, I suspect that since this is kind of going back to where we were before it would be similar, I don't think we've seen a decrease or an increase over the last couple of years when things have changed and to be frank, according to the presidency of the trappers association, guys have just kind of been continuing on the old way things were because they weren't sure and really the biggest problem we've had is a law enforcement problem where guys saw this huge loop hole to drive through and you know we've got guys on revocation out trapping coyotes and so again that's a relatively small number of people, but it does allow our enforcement guys to make a case if there is something in black and white about what is legal and what is not, so.

Wade Heaton: Thanks.

Kevin Bunnell: Can I respond to that for a minute Darren? You know Mike made a point that it's hard to, to trap coyotes if you are checking, if you are going right up to your trap every 48 hours and that is absolutely right but a good coyote trapper also knows how to check his traps without going right to em and using and putting flags on them, there is lots of states that are much more stringent than we are and people have figured out ways to make this work and it will in Utah as well.

Dave Black: Braydon.

Bradyon Richmond: Again, I am not a trapper so I'm speaking in ignorance here but I guess then I would have a question on what is the definition of checking the trap? I didn't realize you could check it from a thousand yards away in a spotting scope, is there a definition on checking the trap? You make a

good point.

Darren DeBloois: I don't think so, what you need to do is verify whether the trap is empty or not so whether you can do that from a distance or

Braydon Richmond: That makes me feel a little better.

Dave Black: Okay, any more questions? Verland.

Verland King: Well before I came today, yesterday I met with a trapper there in Wayne County and he was pretty excited the way it has been you know, where they don't have to check so often, and it looks to me like the association is just scared of law enforcement, they, I mean its, you guys have, you are kind of in the drivers seat and you can that's why they want it in black and white because there is that gray area and they know which way its gonna go, so I, I would be, I would rather leave it the way it is and work on it some other way because the only good coyote is a dead coyote and that's my thoughts.

Dave Black: Lets open it up to any questions from the audience. Do we have any questions out there? Please come up to the mic and state your name.

Questions from the Public:

Mill Waub: My name is Mill Waub, I would just like to know are we trying to fix a broken problem, is there, can you give us numbers on how many cases there were perhaps people without a license trapping protected wildlife? Is it really an issue or if we just let it ride the way it is, I mean it's been in place for what 3 years now? So is that a big enough time to actually take an accurate analysis of how the new program is working, is my other question.

Dave Black: K thank you and we will get a response to that.

Darren DeBloois: I don't have an exact number I know that law enforcement has worked several cases over the last 2 years of people claiming to be trapping coyotes and actually targeting other things, it's difficult to prove that and since the law currently has no, no specific prohibition on that it makes it difficult for them to prosecute. I mentioned that you know we do have people on revocation that are, that are participating, which was another law enforcement concern and so yeah, I guess I don't know if that is an effective, I don't know if that helps, I can't give you a number and again when they are working cases they are not real forthcoming about numbers so they are real careful about, about that kind of thing.

Dave Black: Okay, if we don't have any further questions, we don't have any comment cards, so is there any further comments from the RAC? Wade?

Comments from the Public:

RAC discussion and vote:

Wade Heaton: So, I guess my comment is just a follow up to my question. I can appreciate the law enforcement dilemma and gray areas even though I'm not law enforcement but I can appreciate where they are at and that struggle. I can also appreciate that you know there is some untargeted take that

nobody likes. But, if we look at the tradeoff, if we can kill more coyotes staying the way we are, and by doing so, save some more fawns, save some more calves, you know save some more lambs, it's just a balancing act (inaudible) and so I can appreciate both sides of it, but if we've got a few criminals out there and a few more law enforcement guys with a little uneasy feeling versus a lot of dead lambs and fawns, I, I could justify keeping it the way it was. I don't, I just don't want to change for the sake of a few if its really affecting many, I guess that's my biggest concern even though I can understand the concerns of a few so I, I could leave it the way it was if I was king for a day probably.

Dave Black: K. Braydon.

Braydon Richmond: K I have a couple comments. It was interesting cause like I said I talked with and I guess he is the past vice president of the Utah Trappers Association so I sent him a text because I thought this does not jive with the conversation you and I had not too long ago, let me, let me quote him and he didn't say any swear words so I think I can, he says, no, the new officers do but the rest of the members are pissed. So, it, it doesn't sound like it went over real well. Then as Wade indicated you know, it didn't, as far as we know or you haven't indicated that it didn't go out to the cattlemen and the sheep herders, so there is one comment. The next comment I would have is, in general, I really like to error on the side of less regulation unless there is a real reason to have more regulation, and my additional comment to that is criminals will always be criminals, poachers will always be poachers, trapping is probably one of the easier ones to cheat at, so what you are, I like to help honest people stay honest and if that can mean killing more coyotes potentially, that would be the side I would lean on.

Darren DeBloois: You know let me just comment. There is some protection here for someone who accidentally catches something they are not intending to. That is not currently in the rule so I don't know if you want to consider that or not.

Brian Johnson: So I, sorry Mike if you want to go first you, so the way I understand it now, if you make a decision, a conscious decision to target coyotes and you go set your stuff out there for a week and a half, you are a big boy, we are all adults here, and you catch a bobcat, that is on you, you can get ticketed, that's on you because you didn't check your traps every 48 or 96 or whatever it is. I, I'm all about accountability. I mean if you make the big boy decision, and you are an adult and you say you know what I'm trapping coyotes, and I accidentally catch a, catch a bobcat, I can get in trouble for that, I think, I'm all about personal accountability and I think that sometimes we baby stuff along and we take it away. That's just thoughts I'm having, if that is the way I understand that rule.

Kevin Bunnell: Go ahead Mike.

Mike Worthen: I appreciate all the input we have got but I don't feel it's all the input we need. I was kind of disappointed that none of the wool growers nor the cattlemen nor the Farm Bureau had been discussed when this impacts their operations and the impact that it will have on the number of livestock and whatever else and I could not go along with this the way it is without their input and therefore I would, I would like to see us have a motion that it continues as is until we get that input and make it have a broader input.

Dave Black: I'm not quite ready to accept a motion, there is still a few more comments out there. Riley did you have a comment?

Riley Robert: Yeah, it makes me just a little bit uneasy, I would have to go along with what some of the

other comments from the other RAC members as it definitely appears to be more of an issue of regulating and the law enforcement on, on a check time that is currently, I mean that's law and I understand that and that's fine, and it doesn't appear to have a lot of data one way or the other that says it is gonna help or its gonna hurt, really it is only clearing up an issue and that concerns me and that is similar to I believe it was Braydon that said that it is more of a, it is definitely more of a regulation step rather than allowing these guys to do what they can do and help out the wildlife. And I am kind of the same way I think I would lean on the side of leaving it the way it is and let's gather some data and some other info from some of these other groups and parties and I would love to hear some of that other info and that data before I could go on with it.

Dave Black: Okay Brian.

Brian Johnson: So, one thing that I have noticed as I have sat up here for a number of years is, we get these law enforcement and I can accept and I agree that there are challenges with law enforcement, absolutely, we get these rules to help with law enforcement and I've asked well how many problems are there and we never know. We never know, maybe we just have one law enforcement officer that is really squealing, but,

Kevin Bunnell: The proposal came from the trappers association.

Brian Johnson: Did it?

Kevin Bunnell: Yes.

Brian Johnson: Okay and I get that to and so I apologize but this has happened in the past where we say how many incidents have we actually had and no one ever knows because we don't track that type of stuff and I'm talking particularly with bear hunting over baits, over dogs, chasing them off, there is problems and there is not problems, there are make believe problems, so, I guess the real question that I'm bringing up is when there is a problem, like this that is a new rule change, is there any way to document how many problems that there are so we can actually make an informed decision? I mean we document everything else I am just wondering how, I don't know, I don't know the challenges, I don't, and I'm sure that there are challenges with it so, it's just a suggestion of coming to us with actual numbers instead of somebody said, so.

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah Brian and I don't want to, I don't want to embarrass Darren here but I suspect that data exists, our law enforcement guys track everything.

Brian Johnson: And I believe they do, we just never see it. And I apologize and maybe this isn't the place to bring it up.

Kevin Bunnell: Where is Micah at? Come give us your 2 cents. I still don't see you. There you are. So specifically, Micah, talk about how the data is tracked and have you personally in your area seen where this has made enforcement more difficult?

Micah Evans: It hasn't just made law enforcement difficult, its made it almost impossible. I know of 5 cases where we had suspects killing protected wildlife, using trapping methods illegally, when we went and talked to him, his excuse was, I'm just trapping coyotes. The way the rule is right now, there is nothing we could do it him. Okay, it happens all the time.

Brian Johnson: Didn't we just ask that question that if right now if you put your big boy pants on and you say I'm trapping coyotes and you take something else illegally, then you are accountable for that take?

Kevin Bunnell: No and I was gonna comment on that Brian, that's the loophole that this has created. If you do that, and you claim no I was just trapping coyotes, it's very difficult to prosecute.

Brian Johnson: Even if they catch something?

Kevin Bunnell: Even if they catch something and they hadn't checked their traps in a week and a half.

Micah Evans: And the issue with the trap numbers. I'm hearing a lot of discussion oh this is gonna stop guys from killing coyotes, this isn't stopping anybody from killing coyotes, what this is doing is requiring they say who they are when they are using that device. Cause we've had snares put out by guys trying to catch coyotes that have killed deer, they killed dogs, they've killed bobcats, they've killed things other than the item they are trying to catch, and when we get called as law enforcement and we show up and we investigate that, we have no idea whose trap it is, which is what the trap would tell us, hey this is so and so's trap, we can now go talk to him and find out if he is participating in the activity legally, we can then track down whose trap it is, does he have all the required pieces on it, this change is not going to affect what our trappers are doing, other than require that they say who they are when they are doing it in the field. We have heard people, and check. I have seen snares, I have seen traps take eagles, I have seen them take all kinds of non-target protected wildlife and they don't have a trap number on them and they say oh, I'm trapping coyotes. If they had the trap numbers at least I would know who was participating in the activity.

Kevin Bunnell: K thank you Micah.

Dave Black: Wade.

Wade Heaton: I actually appreciate what Micah brought up because a lot of my comments and I think a lot of other board members strictly revolved around the check, I think the other stuff makes a lot of sense and I appreciate Darren and all the work they've done. To me this is a good measured common-sense solution to the problem. My hold up is if we even tie one hand behind somebody's back that allows them to not catch as many coyotes, I don't care, I would vote against tying one finger back, if they are going to catch more coyotes, that's my only concern. I think the points that Micah brought up make a whole lot of sense and I think this is a good measured approach, I just like dead coyotes.

Dave Black: K let's try to wrap it up, let's go down to Mike.

Mike Worthen: Yeah, I can appreciate what Micah said, and I'm not, I'm not hung up on the changing of the requirement to tag traps and snares or whatever, I think that's a good idea. It holds people accountable for their own equipment and if they are there. Where I am is, is I kind of have a problem is the 48 trap check, it is either going to impact how many animals you are going to take to protect livestock or its going to make thieves out of, or non-compliant people out of everybody cause I can guarantee you, you go to 48 hour, there is not going to be very many trappers that are going to adhere to that. And there is not enough law enforcement out there to verify that yes they are checking their traps every 48 hours or whatever else. So,

Micah Evans: With the 48 checks, it depends on what they are using, I am a trapper, k, I trap. I don't go anywhere near my traps for weeks, because I can look at them from 200, 300 yards away through a spotting scope, or a set of binoculars and I know what is there. 48 hours, all that, the people, in my experience as a law enforcement officer, the people who the 48-hour law puts in a jam are the people who are not doing it legally in the first place.

Mike Worthen: K if you see or you go out and find a trap, and you, you monitor that trap for say 2 weeks and you don't see any tracks there, and then he catches something and goes and gets it are you gonna write him up? Cause what you are saying is you are not coming close, you are just up on a hill and anybody could say I've been up on a hill.

Micah Evans: Sir I would have to prove that he was not checking that trap within that 48-hour time period. And there are ways for us to do that, but in my experience most people are walking in their traps every 96 hours, even if they are looking at them or what they are doing is, but they are checking it every 48 hours, the only people we see who don't check every 48 or don't check on a kill trap, the 96, are the guys who are trying to get away with breaking the law.

Mike Worthen: Exactly.

Micah Evans: So, the 48 hours and the 96 hours rules, they really don't harm honest trappers, who they harm are the guys they put in a jam are the guys willingly going out to try to break the law.

Mike Worthen: And I question that because I've been trapping all my life and even ran programs of trapping and I know the issues and what is out there and there is not all of the time if you are trapping out on the flat dessert there is no way you can check that trap without driving by it or walking by it or whatever else so you can't check it. We've even gone to the extreme of putting radio collar, or radio devices on the trap where if they close they set off a signal, to keep the employees in sync with what the requirements were and so it's a tough situation and that's, my biggest problem is that, is doing something that really, I really don't think it needs to be done as far as, as a 48 trap check, that is every 2 days, and anybody that has got a job can't get away every 2 days and go and check their traps. That's impossible.

Micah Evans: That does make it difficult, yes.

Mike Worthen: And I bet 90% of the trappers association people have jobs. And so, I'm saying, let's not box people into a corner, let's give them a little flexibility and also get the people, this is a, the coyote is a UDA, Utah Division of Agriculture animal, managed animal yet the DWR sees fit to go in and make management out of it by the trap checks and I totally disagree with that. It should be a Utah DWR, or UDA requirement and input from the livestock industry and the trappers and the hunters and whoever else. That's all.

Dave Black: Thank you I think we've flushed out some pretty good conversation. Does anybody else have anything that they are dying to say, if not, let me just summarize a little bit. It looks like we've seen some options, one is to accept the changes as presented, another one that Kevin mentioned was some of the other RAC's have increased the distance from 100, was it 100 feet to 600 feet. Or we've also talked in length about leaving the rule the way it is now. So, there is something to consider and I'll entertain a motion.

Dave Black: Hold on just a second Wade's got one more option.

Wade Heaton: I am just going to throw it out there, I love a lot of this stuff and would really support it all if we maybe entertained, if we are lengthening the distance from a structure could we maybe not lengthen trap check? I know that is a big old can of worms but I'm throwing it out there. I'd say change it all to 96.

Dave Black: K, let's start with a motion, Mike did you have a motion?

Mike: not to accept the motion and keep it the way it is. Tammy seconded.
Vote is not to accept the plan: 3-6 failed

Kevin, Dave, Brian, Braydon all in discussion.

Wade Heaton made the motion to accept the Furbearer Rule Amendments R657-11 as presented with the acceptation to increasing the distance from 600 ft. and make all trap times to 96 hrs Rusty Aiken seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2017-2018 (action)
- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Thank you. Do we have questions from the RAC? Wade.

Wade Heaton: Darren why did the adult survival rate drop these last 2 years?

Darren DeBloois: You saw the big kick-up. I think a lot of people (inaudible) and they were successful to some degree so we did see an increase in harvest and you would expect to see more adults taken in those years, trend wise we'll just have to keep an eye on that.

Dave Black: Gene.

Gene Boardman: Do you make these recommendations on a single year or a 3-year average or?

Darren DeBloois: We look at trends but each year we look at where we are in relation to the targets and make recommendations for permits that year so we can adjust yearly if we need to.

Gene Boardman: Well looking at the chart and looking at the trend, the trend is down.

Darren DeBloois: Right for that parameter it is, yeah. You have 2 that are trending in the right direction, and one that is going in a concerning direction. The way the plan is written, we would make adjustment depending on how many of those are out of whack and we would either adjust season dates by shortening the season or adjust the number of tags a person can get.

Dave Black: Any questions from the audience? I don't see any comment cards.

Unknown: One.

Dave Black: Oh, excuse me.

Unknown: SFW didn't want to comment but said that they support the recommendations.

Questions from the Public:

Comments from the Public:

RAC discussion and vote:

Braydon Richmond made the motion to accept the Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2017-2018 as presented Riley Roberts seconded. Motion carried unanimously

Cougar Recommendations and Rule Amendments for 2017-2018 (action)
- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Dave Black: Okay, thank you. Questions from the RAC? Go ahead Gene, or Craig.

Craig Laub: A couple of questions, I see that your depredation has gone way up on livestock and I was just wondering does these increases have anything to do with that or are they?

Darren DeBloois: Some of them are increased because of that, others are increased because they are within management parameters and we can increase tags, there is opportunity left and you know if you have specific question about units I'm sure that the regional folks could tell you.

Craig Laub: Well I guess that was my other question is on how many of these units are reaching objective, you know are they harvesting all the cats that are able to be harvested?

Darren DeBloois: It varies, if you look at your table there it will show how many are taken over 3 years compared to, actually you know if you would like I could provide you a year by year rundown if you've got a question on a specific one. Some are and others aren't. I know that there are couple units down here where we don't ever hit, where we don't fill all the tags, it seems to be an access issue, people just can't get in there.

Craig Laub: Just take the Southern Region particularly, what units are they killing all the cats and what aren't they?

Kevin Bunnell: Teresa did we close any units this year? I don't think we did, did we? Pavant? Say that again, Justin, or Jason come up and tell him what units met the harvest objectives in the Southern Region.

Jason Nicholes: If I remember right we closed both the Pine Valley North and South and I believe also the Southwest Desert.

Kevin Bunnell: And then somebody said Pavant?

Jason Nicholes: And Pavant, yes.

Kevin Bunnell: So, we met the harvest objective on those 4 units. Beaver and Monroe if you want to check that Darren?

Darren DeBloois: Yeah, I think they, I think the ones I heard are the ones I see here.

Teresa Griffin: K so we've got the Beaver, for just the Southern Region we've got the Pavant, the Monroe, Panguitch Lake, Pine Valley North, that's, all that my table shows for this year closures.

Dave Black: Craig.

Craig Laub: One follow up question, where is most of the depredation happening? Do you have any idea?

Darren DeBloois: Yeah that's probably another question for the region.

Teresa Griffin: The 2 units that we see the most depredation is the Zion unit and Mt Dutton. Anything else significant? Occasionally a few on the Monroe, but the 2 major ones are Zion and Dutton.

Craig Laub: And those ones they are not able to get all the cats off from?

Teresa Griffin: I believe on Mt. Dutton last year, I don't have the annual data in front of me, but we had 14 tags available on Dutton, I believe we killed 8 last year.

Dave Black: K, any other questions? Wade and then Verland.

Verland King: When you make these recommendations do you take into account the depredation to livestock and adjust numbers on those? On these columns you talk about deer and big horn sheep but,

Darren DeBloois: We do. Particularly you know we don't like to see that number increase. We like to provide opportunities for sportsmen to take those animals and on the ground that, you know for example with the Dutton where you are not filling your tags, that you can throw some more tags out there and you may get an additional harvest or you may not but in addition to that we work closely with Wildlife Services to make sure that they are able to address problems that they have the tools that they need from us to take care of those problems.

Verland King: So the take that they'll get on one that is depredating will not be on your count really on this?

Darren DeBloois: It is included on your table,

Kevin Bunnell: But not a sports harvest.

Daren DeBloois: Right but not a sports harvest. So we account for it but it's in a separate column.

Kevin Bunnell: Its not counted against a quota on a unit.

Daren Debloois: Right.

Kevin Bunnell: That's just sports harvest. So, if we have a harvest objective of 14, and hunters take 6 and Wildlife Services takes 3, we don't report 9, we only report the 6 against the quota.

Wade Heaton: So, Darren one question, you mentioned that you were highlighting the changes from last year to this year with the arrows and I noticed that did that on the permit numbers but I didn't notice that you had highlighted changes on strategies, other than just one or two.

Darren DeBloois: So that one changed on the Plateau was the only strategy change

Wade Heaton: So, I am hoping very much that there was one other change or I was hunting illegally, we worked really hard, the Friends of the Paunsaugunt worked really hard to change the Paunsaugunt from split to harvest objective, was it last year or the year before and got it changed to harvest objective. I had a year-round permit last year for the Paunsaugunt and you show it as split this year so I am thinking that would be a change, is that?

Darren DeBloois: I can check on that.

Teresa Griffin: On this one it shows as a harvest objective.

Kevin Bunnell: (Inaudible) type it is a harvest objective and will remain harvest objective.

Darren DeBloois: I'll make a note of that, thanks.

Dave Black: Any other questions? Do we have any questions from the audience? Okay, as you come forward please come to the mic and state your name. Remember this is the question time and for comments we'll entertain those in just a minute.

Questions from the Public:

Dustin Clark: My name is Dustin Clark and I have a question as far as the harvest objective quotas go. The Division has a parameter that you want to keep the female quota around 40%, is that right? So, my question is on those harvest objective units, why can't we set a female sub quota at 40%? To shut those units down when 40% of the females are killed.

Darren DeBloois: We used to have female sub quotas, if you recall we made changes to the plan I believe 2 years ago, to what we were doing is a 3-year recommendation cycle with female sub quotas. Now what we do is look at it annually, so based on a 3 year, 3 years of previous data, we look at that annually and if we drop below that we make changes the following year. So, it gives our biologists a little bit of flexibility and we can also react a little bit quicker.

Dustin Clark: Then my next question is on units that we don't fill all the tags, why are they going up?

Darren DeBloois: Some of those are trying to address problems, the Dutton is one for example we haven't been filling it, we added an additional tag that may result in an additional lion and it may not.

But at least it puts someone else out there with an opportunity I guess and that's probably the best way to describe it.

Dave Black: I do have 2 comment cards, if we have any other comments please fill out a card and get those up. The first one is Bryce from SFW. SFW supports the recommendations as present and then we would like to hear from Sharron St. John if you would like to come up.

Comments from the Public:

Sharron St John: Hello, thank you for the opportunity to comment. I would like to ask you to not make any increases in the hunting quotas for cougars. There are many reasons but I'll restrict myself to 4. One is cougar populations, I know none of you are gonna agree with me but that's okay, I'm gonna carry on. And I do appreciate the opportunity to speak. Cougar populations regulate themselves. They are not expanding to be out of control. They don't require human intervention. This was established by a study in 2009 conducted by Oregon State University and the assumption that cougars have to be hunted in order to be kept under control is just not true because they limit their own populations and this study states apex predators are distinguishable by a capacity to limit their own population densities, self-regulation. Concerning that's, so that's the first point, Second point, it is concerning the depredation on cows and sheep, it is possible and it has been shown by studies that hunting cougars may actually cause greater levels of calf and sheep depredation and I would draw your attention to the fact that these the sheep depredation, the calf I think it is, depredation levels, they've gone up, and this has followed the hunting quotas going up. So, I, it's not just me who thinks there is a correlation. It is possible there is. Concerning the mortality of young calves, only 1 to 2% of these deaths are caused by depredation, from all predators, including dogs. All the other calf deaths are caused either by illness or are weather related, ranchers are compensated for the loss of their livestock and non-lethal forms of predator control have been shown to be the most effective response. So, there is no reason to kill cougars in order to protect calves. In fact just the opposite may be true. It has been shown that increased hunting may cause fewer, may cause more, not fewer, calf deaths. And so it may be a mistake to do that, to increase the hunting in the hope of lessening livestock population. Because what happens is when the cougars are hunted, that disrupts their natural social order. It means young cougars are separated from their mothers while they are still learning to hunt and learn what their natural prey is supposed to be, it's not supposed to be calves. With fewer adults in the population, hungry adolescent cougars are far more likely to engage in erratic behavior and we can see that with instances of cougars going near cities and near human structures, that is not their natural behavior, their natural behavior is to be out in the wilderness as far away as possible. The higher instance of livestock deaths noted in certain areas could be actually being increased it could be due to the increase in the hunting of predators in recent years. If the hunting quotas are increased again as is planned then the greater numbers of cougars hunted may lead to even higher livestock deaths in those areas next year and the year after. Okay point three, this is a study on the cougars in Zion. It was done by Oregon State University published in 2006 and they looked at Zion National Park, most of that park, obviously there are a great number of visitors, and there are very few cougars, its only in the North Creek area of Zion where you find the same number of cougars there always were. And the study looks at the effect of the decline of the cougars in the rest of Zion National Park. As the number of cougars took a downward dip, herds of mule deer no longer kept moving along as they would naturally do in the presence of cougars, instead they spent a lot of time hanging about, congregating in stream beds, browsing on cottonwood and other saplings and leading a kind of sedentary kind of life style and the forest was diminished and the abundance of all wild species, mammals, birds, fish, amphibians and other plants and animal life went into decline, the stream beds were trampled and muddy and all life near them dwindled and this is with the absence of cougars. By contrast, in the North

Creek area of Zion National Park where there was far less human intrusion, both the cougars and the deer remained lively and active much as they always had. With far less trampling of stream bed erosion and loss of soil, the loss of soil was less than half of what it was in the rest of Zion. There was an abundance of young cottonwoods, squirrels, butterflies, lizards and (inaudible plants, there was 3 times as many fish in the streams. And the wild land stayed healthy and thriving and all this was because actually cougars are very necessary to nature. We don't actually need to have fewer. Okay.

Dave Black: Ms. St John? We have a 5-minute limit.

Sharron St. John: Okay.

Dave Black: So, if we could get you to wrap things up we would appreciate it.

Sharron St. John: I will just do one more sentence. I feel it is very unethical, the killing of female cougars at all because inevitably I know there is some protection for their kittens but in the law but actually many kittens die of starvation. And that makes the killing of cougars altogether unethical. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you. I want to say we appreciate you coming from Kanab and sharing that view point. Quite often we don't hear that view point in the Southern Region but when we go to the Wildlife Board meeting the audience will be full with many people sharing those same opinions. And so I just wanted to point that out and again thank you for traveling here today. That's all the comment cards, did you have a comment for that? Comments from the RAC?

RAC discussion and vote:

Dave Black: Gene

Gene Boardman: I want to make one comment and that's that we need to hear more from the public, the trappers, the houndsmen, appreciate the lady being here, making a comment, other than that we wouldn't have any public comments today and we sure do need to have those comments.

Dave Black: Thank you.

Wade Heaton made the motion to accept the Cougar Recommendations and Rule Amendments for 2017-2018 as presented seconded. Motion carried unanimous.

Beaver Management Plan (action)
- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Okay, any questions from the RAC?

Riley Robert: Just one, with the proposal would there be any way to limit take once you do, you move them or I mean is there going to be a way to regulate that as well because that would be pretty awful to get em established after a year and then having someone like me come in and get rid of them for you.

Darren DeBloois: Yeah and that exists under our current rule so that would remain in place and typically yeah you would want to do that to give them a chance to establish and then so close those areas for a certain amount of time.

Riley Robert: Is it a time limit right now, I'm not familiar with that, I'm sorry, I should be.

Darren DeBloois: 3 years

Riley Robert: Okay. Thank you

Dave Black: Anybody else? Okay, Verland.

Verland King: So, when you look at this plan and you get response from like the land owner or the owner of the irrigation rights to that stream, how much do you take that into account, is that high on your list or?

Darren DeBloois: Yeah that human conflict model is pretty conservative so it looks at proximity to private land and agriculture and things like that so it errors on the side of kicking stuff out even if it maybe is okay, so. And then also you know we rely on our local folks, they know who is in that drainage, they know who that is likely to effect and they need to be talking to all those folks if they are going to try and put a project together. And the plan says that is the part of the planning process you've got to go through to make before you start moving animals around, you need to make sure everybody is in the loop everybody understands what you plan on doing. And if you know, if it's not gonna work and people have concerns we just won't do it.

Verland King: Yeah cause on an irrigation system, the beavers don't work, they are just trashy and it's not good.

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah Verland in general what we are doing is we're taking the beavers from those sorts of situations where they are down in irrigation ditches and they are causing problems, we are moving them up high into the drainage so they are doing some good and they are making it so that when the snow melts it's not just like flushing the toilet, we get a release throughout the summer and an increase in those water tables and that benefits everybody.

Dave Black: Okay any other questions, comments? I don't have any comment cards? Did I ask for questions from the audience? I think we are ready for a motion.

Questions from the Public:

Comments from the Public:

RAC discussion and vote:

Craig Laub made the motion to accept the Beaver Management Plan as presented Rusty Aiken seconded. Motion carried unanimous.

Other Business
-Dave Black, Chairman

Dave Black: I just want to make sure that everybody is aware of the August 30th training meeting, you should have all received an email on that. It is open to all the RAC members and especially those that are just new with the RAC but if you are already a member and you would like to go you are invited as well. Did you want to add to that Kevin?

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah as much as we can make something required for volunteer advisor council members, it is required for the new ones and optional for everybody else if you want a refresher.

Unknown off mic: (inaudible).

Dave Black: That is tentative, watch your emails on the next RAC meeting.

Braydon Richmond: Can I ask you a question before we get to that? Just a question on the board meeting they are going to go over the expo permits and that, how come that is not in front of the RAC's?

Kevin Bunnell: Because according to that rule it is just something that the board does. That's the way it's always been. In regards to the September RAC meeting. September is normally our fishing rules and regulations, if you remember last year we passed a two-year fishing proclamation so right now there are no action items for the September RAC meeting. There are a couple of potentials but as of right now that RAC meeting will likely be cancelled. We will let you know.

Dave Black: That's all I have so we will call this meeting adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 9:14 p.m.

Southeast Regional Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell River History Museum
1765 E. Main
Green River, Utah
Aug. 2, 2017

Motion Summary

Nomination of Southeast Regional Advisory Council Chairperson
MOTION: To elect by acclamation Trisha Hedin as Chairwoman
Passed unanimously

Nomination of Southeast Regional Advisory Council Vice Chairperson
MOTION: To elect by acclamation Kent Johnson as Vice Chairman
Passed unanimously

Approval of Agenda and Minutes
MOTION: To accept the agenda and minutes as written
Passed unanimously

Hunter Education Rule Amendments
MOTION: To accept the Hunter Education Rule Amendments as presented
Passed unanimously

Furbearer Rule Amendments
MOTION: To extend the trap registration license exemption from being within 100 feet of a building or structure occupied by humans or livestock to 600 feet
Passed unanimously

MOTION: To exempt persons with proof of livestock ownership from the $10 trap registration fee when trapping on their own property, and to accept the remaining Furbearer Rule Amendments as presented
Passed unanimously

Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2017-2018
MOTION: To accept the Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2017-2018 as presented
Passed unanimously

Cougar Recommendations and Rule Amendments for 2017-2018

MOTION: To recommend the Northwest and Southwest Manti units be changed to split-season units

Passed unanimously

MOTION: To increase the number of allocated cougar permits by four on the Southwest Manti for a total of 12 permits, and by two on the Southeast Manti for a total of 18 permits

Passed 9-3

MOTION: To accept the remaining Cougar Recommendations and Rule Amendments for 2017-2018 as presented

Passed 10-2

Beaver Management Plan

MOTION: To accept the Beaver Management Plan as presented

Passed unanimously

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

Aug. 2, 2017 ↜ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present	*Members Absent*
Trisha Hedin, Chairwoman · Sportsmen	
Kent Johnson, Vice Chairman · Public at large	
Sue Bellagamba · Non-consumptive	
Keith Brady · Elected official	
Jeff Christensen · Agriculture	
Jace Guymon · Public at large	
Eric Luke · Sportsmen	
Darrel Mecham · Sportsmen	
Darren Olsen · USFS	
Kirk Player · Public at large	
Helene Taylor · Agriculture	
Todd Thorne · Public at large	
Dana Truman · BLM	
	Gerrish Willis · Non-consumptive
Chris Wood, DWR Regional Supervisor	

Total public attendance
3

Others Present
Kevin Albrecht, Wildlife Board member

---

1) Welcome, RAC introductions and RAC Procedure
- Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor

Ok. We're going to go ahead and get started. I'm Chris Wood, the regional supervisor for the Division of Wildlife for the southeastern part of the state. Usually our RAC chairman starts the meeting but we don't have a chairman yet. Part of the matters of the business that we will do before we dive too far into the agenda. There are 8 new RAC members. I thought we could go around the room and introduce ourselves. State you name, where you live, who you represent and what your interest in wildlife is. We'll start with commissioner Brady.

Keith Brady - Commissioner Keith Brady with Emery County. My interest in wildlife is good management and making sure that everyone has access.
Todd Thorne – My name's Todd Thorne. I'm public-at-large. I live in Price, interested in hunting and other outdoor activities.
Darren Olsen - Darren Olsen, I live in Ferron; I'm with the Forest Service, so federal rep. Enjoy the outdoors; fishing, hunting, and camping, getting outside.
Eric Luke – Eric Luke; I live in Ferron. Sportsmen rep. Hunting and outdoors is my passion, done it my entire life.
Jeff Christensen - Agriculture Rep from Price. We have a little hunting business in the fall.
Sue Bellagamba - From Moab. My interest is mostly in rare species.
Trish Hedin - From Moab. I represent sportsmen.
Helene Taylor - From Moab. I represent agriculture. Passionate about hunting and wildlife management.
Dana Truman – I work for BLM. I live in Price. I've always loved wildlife from the ecosystem perspective as well as hunting and the rare species
Jace Guymon – I live in Cleveland. I really enjoy hunting, do guiding and spend a lot of time in the woods every year.
Kirk Player – I'm Kirk Player; I represent public-at-large. I like most all wildlife and a lot of them.
Darrel Mecham – Sportsmen rep from Green River.

Chris Wood – Welcome everybody. Our wildlife board rep for the Southeastern Region was Mike King for six years. Our new wildlife board member that will represent the SER is Kevin Albrecht. Congratulations to him. He will begin his first meeting later this month and serve for six years. He knows the process well and will represent us well. He works for the Forest Service. He will represent us independently from them and will be a regular board member.

Please fill out the form for reimbursement for miles and a meal. Fill out all the areas in red. Sign and date on front. Fill in date/time you left and from where. Can claim $18 in dinner. If you drove your own vehicle, put the round-trip mileage and we'll reimburse you. Please give the form to me or Morgan and we'll have it processed in a few days and check will be mailed to the address provided within a week or two. That's how we do our mileage and meal reimbursements. If some reason you forget, you can always mail or email this to me.

RAC and Wildlife Board training will be at the end of the month and you will use the same form for reimbursement. If you'd like to stay in a hotel, the state per diem rate is $100 for the Salt Lake area. Bring the receipt and attach it to this form for reimbursement. As far as gas or dinner receipts, we don't need them. We'll give you the rate that we reimburse for miles and meals.

2) Wildlife Board Meeting Update
- Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor

Chris Wood - I will give the RAC and Board update. The last board meeting was on June 1. If you remember, we had what I thought was going to be a pretty short RAC meeting back in May; only a few agenda items. We said goodbye to our outgoing RAC members. But it was a longer meeting than I thought. Our RAC accepted the Division's recommendations that were purposed for Upland Game hunt and the Turkey Hunt. The board did as well.

The big discussion at our last meeting was the falconry rule. We had some falconers here and they asked the RACs and the Board to accept the Division's recommendation with the exception of the 54 species list. They wanted that to be excluded. There was a lot of discussion at all five RACS of the 54 species. Our RAC was mixed. Some felt that more restriction above and beyond the federal restriction was not necessary. Other RAC members felt that the Division had thoroughly researched this and supported the Division's proposal. We had a 3-3 tie and our chairman ended up breaking the tie, and our RAC ended up voting to accept the Division's proposal. Three other RACs voted to exclude the 54 species list. The other two, us and the Southern Region accepted the Division's proposal as presented. There were a lot of falconers that showed up at the Wildlife Board meeting, it was discussed at length, and in the end, the Division said, if you are going to accept this list of 54 species and deviate from our recommendation a little bit, please include these five points. The five points were to: To retain the DWR's ability to regulate wild captive native birds; Two, to retain the proposed list of 14 species for apprentices; Three, retain the proposed general class endorsement process for large raptors; Four, improve DWR's abilities for inspecting and monitoring raptor facilities; and five, some non-substantial changes requested by the Fish and Wildlife Service. The Wildlife Board ended up accepting the Division's proposal with the exception of 54 species list, they excluded that list, and they adapted these five points that we recommended if they were going to exclude that. That passed 4-1. Mike King voted against, the others voted for. That's the update from the last Wildlife Board meeting.

Welcome, Kent. We all introduced ourselves. Maybe introduce yourself, where you're from, who you represent and your interest in wildlife.
Kent Johnson – Kent Johnson, I'm the at-large seat. I'm from right here in Green River, which is why I'm so late.
Chris Wood – I'm glad you're here. Welcome. Now I'm going to jump into our regional update.

3) Regional Update 11:15
- Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor

Chris Wood - The purpose of the next few minutes is to update you on what the DWR is doing in our region since the last RAC or board meeting and what we'll be doing in the upcoming weeks or months, just to keep you up to speed. If you have any questions, you

can ask them. If I don't have any answers, I have a bunch of biologists and law enforcement officers here tonight that can help answer them.

It's our big field season, especially for our Aquatics Section. They have been really busy doing several rotenone treatments to restore native cutthroat trout. Tomorrow they will be at the Ferron drainage for a treatment. They've been up there prepping all week long. We have been up there the last few years and will continue this year treating some stretches of the creeks that come into Millsite and part of the Ferron drainage and also restocking with native cutthroat trout in the stretches of stream treated last year. We usually do treatments two years in a row before we restock them with fish. Next week, we'll be in Range Creek. We've worked with Butch and Jeanie Jensen and their ranch and the Preston Nutter, SITLA, BLM as a big partnership, we're treating Range Creek. The process will also restore native cutthroat trout to the creek. We will take part in a family fishing event at the Carbon County Fair at the end of the month.

Our Habitat guys are gearing up for a big season. We have several WMAs, including our Gordon Creek Wildlife Management Area, near Price, that's our biggest one with 15,000 acres of land in Carbon County. We have some water rights associated with that property and we grow crops for deer and elk and turkeys. We exercise these water rights every year and grow some fields, we've been doing that this summer. We just heard that we got funding for a bunch of projects so we have $1.9 million worth of project money coming to the SER this year. That is a combination of BLM money, Forest Service money, WRI (Watershed Restoration Initiative) money, that is state money, along with sportsman groups. They raise a lot of money and almost all of it goes back to on-the-ground projects. So that $1.9 million is a mixture of those funds. Specifically, in our region, there are about 15 projects. To name a few, there's Grimes Wash, it's a bull hog pinion and juniper removal near Orangeville; the South Book Cliffs bull hog project will also remove pinion and juniper both by bull hogging and lop and scatter; there's the Elk Ridge prescribed fire the will happen; there's a Blanding East phase II project, that is also a bull hog project; there's some aspen regeneration going on up by Cold Springs; then there is a Trail Mountain prescribed aspen regeneration project. At some point in a future meeting, we'll have to have our Habitat folks come by and give you a presentation during a meeting that has a smaller agenda and show you all the good work that they're doing, the amount of partnerships that are coming together and the amount of money that gets pooled together to restore habitats throughout the state.

The UPCD (Utah Partners for Conservation and Development) team approves these projects. They have several field tours every year. They went to Miller Creek in Carbon County just a few weeks ago and looked at some of the projects there. They have been putting in BDAs (beaver dam analog). They are essentially creating fake beaver dams with vegetation and posts and debris to back up the water and slow flow to create pools and reshape the channels. It's been really effective in areas that we haven't been able to restore beavers for many reasons. The Habitat Section has been doing some really good things.

Law Enforcement has been busy as well. They did a saturation patrol which means that

all of the officers got together over July 24th weekend and teamed up and hit the Manti. They made a lot of contacts and a lot of education and outreach. They contacted over 560 individuals. There were a few violations that they cited for but it was great to have their presence out there talking to our sportsman and anglers and relaying our message to the public. There was a jury trial in Monticello a few weeks ago and the defendant was found guilty for poaching a deer. It's always good to see our hard work, our investigative work come together and have a successful trial and see restitution made and a verdict we were hoping for. The archery deer hunt starts on August 19th so from then on, our guys will be really busy.

Our Outreach section has been working hard, too. They had a "Meet the Bats" night in Moab by Ken's Lake on July 18th. It was well attended. A lot of our non-consumptive constituents attended. People from all over the state came. They caught numerous bat species and had a really good night. They stayed out until 1 or 2 a.m. This fall there will be a fly fishing clinic and a waterfowl hunting clinic. Then of course we'll be out there meeting with youth groups and community fisheries and holding fishing events.

Our Wildlife Section has been doing elk classifications and pronghorn classifications throughout the region. Bison surveys will begin next week. They're also doing mountain goat surveys and then we've been doing bat and pika surveys. We'll be doing pika surveys from now until the end of the month and a little bit into September as well. They will be on all the high-elevation ranges in our region. They are working on CWMU renewals.

And again, we'd like to invite the RAC. If there are any of these things that caught your interest, talk to me or any of the biologists and we'd love to invite you out and give you specific dates and times of when you can assist us. We'd like you to have some hands-on experience with wildlife and we hope you feel comfortable enough to invite yourself if we forget to invite you. Whatever sparks your interest, let us know. With that, I'll take any questions that you might have.

Eric Luke - How did the aerial survey go on the La Sal mountain goat?
Chris Wood - It's next week. We'll let you know at the next RAC meeting, remind us.

Election of RAC Chairman and Vice Chairman

Chris Wood - We need to elect a new Chairman and we also need to elect a Vice Chairman. Our Chairman last time was Kevin Albrecht whose term ended. His Vice Chair was Dr. Todd Huntington. His term is also over. At this time, we can accept nominations or you can nominate yourself. Depending on how many nominees we have, we'll either do a ballot vote or I guess we'll go from there. I should say that the role of the Chairman is to run the meeting following Roberts Rules of Order. I assist the Chairman a little bit with meeting management and making sure we follow the right process but really, it's the Chairman that runs the meeting. The Chairman does vote if there is a tie. Certainly, the Chairman can provide insight and ask questions. We saw

Kevin do that a lot the last few years. He didn't make motions, himself. I don't think the Chairman can make motions but he definitely provided his insight and input and led a discussion as motions were being developed. It's an important role that also requires the person to attend most of the board meetings. Most of the board meetings are on Thursdays. It's an all-day thing that starts at 9:00 a.m. and goes until 2:00 or 3:00 p.m. Please consider that. If there are one or two meetings that you can't make, the Vice Chair can step in and if the Vice Chair can't step in I have stepped in, in the past for the Chairman. Any questions? With that, we'll open it up to any nominations.
Sue Belagamba – Chris, I would like to nominate Trisha Hedin as Chair.
Chris – Trish, do you accept the nomination? OK. Any other nominations?
Kent Johnson – I would make a motion that we accept Trisha Hedin by acclamation.
Chris Wood – All in favor, raise your hand. Any opposed. Anybody want to be a vice chair?
Eric Luke – I nominate Kent Johnson. No offense.
Chris Wood – Kent, do you accept the nomination?
Kent Johnson – I'll accept it.
Keith Brady – Motion to accept by acclamation.
Chris Wood – OK, we have a motion to accept Kent Johnson as our vice chair. All in favor. Any opposed?

For those of the public who are here and for those who don't know, there's a process that we have on this paper that you might have picked up as you walked into the door. So for each agenda item, you'll hear a presentation. Usually the presentations are from our Salt Lake Office coordinators, sometimes they're from our regional personnel. At the end of the presentation, the chairman will ask the RAC if they have any questions or need clarification on the presentation. The Chairman will then ask the audience if they have any questions, and if the audience doesn't have any questions, the Chairman will call them up and ask them to state their name and ask them to state their question. We need to make sure it's only a question time. And then at the end of the period for questions and clarification, after the audience is able to ask questions, the Chairman will then allow the audience to make comments. If the audience would like to make any comments, they need to fill out a comment card and give it to me. The comment cards are at the front of the room here. So I'll collect comment cards. Usually throughout the meeting, I'll get some handed to me; sometimes at the beginning of the meeting I get these handed to me. We'll call up those people who have filled out a comment card. If you represent yourself, you get three minutes for the comments, and I will keep the time. If you represent an organization, you get five minutes for your comment. Once all the public comments have been received, the Chairman will close the comment period for the audience and at that point the RAC will discuss and deliberate these issues and make motions for each topic.

VOTING
Motion made by Kent Johnson to elect by acclamation Trisha Hedin as Chairman of the Southeast Regional Advisory Council
Motion passed unanimously

Motion was made by Eric Luke to elect by acclamation Kent Johnson as Vice

Chairman of the Southeast Regional Advisory Council
Motion passed unanimously

4) <u>Approval of the Agenda and minutes</u>
- Trisha Hedin, RAC Chairwoman

Trisha Hedin – Do we have a motion to approve the agenda and the minutes from the last meeting?
Kent Johnson – So moved.
Keith Brady – Seconded.
Trisha Hedin – All in favor. Passed unanimously.

VOTING
Motion was made by Kent Johnson to accept the agenda and minutes as written
Seconded by Keith Brady
Passed unanimously

5) <u>Hunter Education Rule Amendments</u>
- Gary Cook, Hunter Education Coordinator

<u>Questions from the RAC</u>

Eric Luke – Looking at the wording in there, it crossed out "having passed" and added "successfully completing a course". What constitutes successfully completing? Does it require a passing grade? Is there a test? Something that says that they learned something and are qualified or is it a participation trophy?
Gary Cook – We actually still have, there's three testing components to our hunter education course. Whether it's an in-person, instructor-led classroom course or an online instruction accompanied with a field day, there's a written test that the students have to complete and score 75 percent on that written test. Additionally, there is a live fire component to the Hunter Education course. They are tested on safe gun handling, their attitude and ability to follow instructions and being safe with a firearm. There's also a component in there, we call attitude. Based on the student's behavior in class, they can be failed on that merit alone. Those are the three components that we have in the course right now. The language in the rule says, it will either meet or exceed the International Hunter Education Association's minimum standards for a course or in the case of other states it will either meet that minimum standard or by successfully completing their course it allows them to obtain a hunting license in their home state of residence.
Kent Johnson – Is the Division going to recognize every other state's hunter education program or is there criteria where that wouldn't be the case?
Gary Cook - Currently we have reciprocity with every other state, most Canadian provinces. There's some recommendations from that International Hunter Education

Association on foreign countries but that's a decision made at our Director's Office level for the reciprocity. It's one of the reasons we put the language in there. Another state may or may not meet that international hunter education minimum standard requirement but if in that state, completion of that course allows them to hunt in their state, that is what we will consider an approved course. Yes, right now we accept all other states' courses.
Trisha Hedin - I apply in Nevada, which their system is identical. When I move through that system at one junction, it stopped me and I had to mail in a copy of my blue card. Then I got an email that allowed me to continue with my application process. I put in for example, my brother and nephew in this state and it just pops up, "do you have Hunter Ed?" And all I have to do is push yes, and off we go. So, what you're telling me is at the junction, someone is investigating whether they have finished hunter ed?
Gary Cook - Yeah, we receive a list from our Licensing Section of all of the individuals that have self-certified. We then go through, we start off with just trying to fix those records. Researching those individuals, a lot times our education database and our customer database just aren't synched up. We need to correct some of the errors that may be there. If we can't do that, then we send a letter to those individuals that they have to provide that proof to us.
Kirk Player – If they self-certify and you investigate it, can you investigate, say they are from Nevada and you have the ability to search that database?
Gary Cook - If we've requested the information and they can't provide it to us, we regularly contact other states and verify hunter education.

Questions from the Public

No questions

Comments from the Public

No comments

RAC Discussion

Kent Johnson – I make a motion to accept the Hunter Education requirements as presented from the Division.
Trisha Hedin – We have a motion to accept the recommendations by Kent. Do we have a second?
Helene Taylor – Seconded.
Trisha Hedin – We have a second by Helene. Everybody in favor. It's unanimous.

VOTING
Motion was made by Kent Johnson to accept the Hunter Education Rule Amendments as presented
Seconded by Helene Taylor

Passed unanimously

6) <u>Furbearer Rule Amendments</u>
- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator

<u>Questions from the RAC</u>
Eric Luke - With the trapping license, they're still required to have the number on their trap, correct?
Darren DeBloois - Yes, the idea is that people setting traps will comply with that. Our officers then can identify whose devices those are. It helps them to figure out who is doing what out there.
Jeff Christensen – Any trap? Live trap, foot trap?
Darren DeBloois - Yes. Any trap.
Darrel Mecham – I have a question as it pertains to dead deer and elk. I had three dogs snared last year. They were snared up by dead deer. That's the ultimate bating in the world. There are all these rules on bating. Is that something you guys did for coyotes or what?
Darren DeBloois - I don't have a detailed recollection to the history. I know they changed it to allow you to set within 30 feet of a carcass as long as you didn't dump it there, if it was already in the field. That was something that changed when they redid things last year. There was a committee that discussed that. I wasn't there. They would still need to comply with all of the checking times and the rest on that. Obviously, this is an opportunity to discuss other things in the rule as well.
Kent Johnson - I did have one question, it's actually just changes you made under license/permit tag requirements. You made everything singular pertaining to bobcat. I'm curious as to why you did that.
Darren DeBloois - It's probably just housekeeping. Our Attorney General representative goes through the rule and sometimes there's legal reasons why they change things that really are pertinent in the legal world. And sometimes it's just wordsmithing it.
Kent Johnson – I was just curious.
Darren DeBloois – It's just housekeeping
Jeff Christensen – Where did the 100 feet come from?
Darren DeBloois - That's just a number that we came up with in the review committee. Just for your information, the first three RACs have all changed that to 600 feet. I don't know if that's something that you folks want to consider as well. It's not a magic number. The intent there was, we don't want to regulate mouse traps and people trying to catch raccoons in their barns and things like that. We want to regulate trapping in the field.
Kirk Player – To clarify, if someone is out setting a normal spring trap, they catch a cougar in the middle of the summer and they leave the cougar in there for eight days and it dies. They are criminally liable, right? Even if they were going after non-targeted, because according to this new rule they will be subject to the trap check.
Darren DeBloois – All the trapping rules are still in place, so if they aren't checking their traps they'd be liable. If they don't report it, they have 48 hours to report something

like that to us, they would be criminally liable.

Questions from the Public

Jerry Swasey from Moab - I do a lot of trapping. The 48-hour check, is that still on that coyote tag or is that a longer duration than 48 hours?
Darren DeBloois – It depends on type of trap. So, it's 48 hours for a leg hold, a non-lethal trap. The intent there is that if you catch something that you are not intending to catch, there's a greater chance you can release it if you found it in that time period. Lethal sets, snares things like that, it's 96.

Comments from the Public

Jerry Swasey – I didn't really know licensing was taking place tonight for this whole RAC meeting. The question I have to follow along with this is you get a handful of licenses, the combination license to me is kind of misleading. Combination gives you the option to hunt and fish, small game. We have to carry for band-tailed pigeon, trapping, fur harvester. Seems to me there should be a way to do your licensing to put individual species to what that license is good for so you have the option to carry one license, rather than a whole handful. Six cat tags that you get, that's a wad of tags that you got to keep in your pocket through the course of the season just so you have them in possession. My thing is looking at some way to combine that or give you the option to add different license that you can foresee. Because I'm going to buy a furbearers license from here on out. That might be an option to select in buying my combination license and that would be included in that. So for people chasing cougars or bears, it's one less license to carry.
Darren DeBloois - I'll make a note of that and bring it up. I think what we've tried to do up to this point is provide that app so that you can download everything. You've got your phone, you've got all your licenses there but I'll mention it.
Jerry Swasey – But I don't carry my phone in the field because I'll lose it too.

RAC Discussion

Jeff Christensen - I had a little concern on the distance, number one. Explain what the others have done.
Darren DeBloois - What they did was increase that 100 feet to 600 feet, similar to our shooting requirements so that's 200 yards. The language in the rule, it's fairly inclusive so if you've got livestock that are visiting the structure, it should qualify for haystacks, barns and houses and buildings. Then you would have this 600-foot buffer around that kind of stuff. That's what the other RACs have tumbled to on a number. Again, that 100 foot is something that we came up with. It seemed like it might work.
Jeff Christensen – Another concern I would have is around our livestock. I think it's a little different if you're trapping coyotes for bounty or if you're trapping coyotes to protect livestock, I think there's a difference there. I don't know if we can manipulate

that.
Darren DeBloois - What this would do is, if you're trapping on your property away from this sort of envelope around your buildings, you'd have to have this trapping license and you'd have to have numbers on your sets. You wouldn't have to have a furbearer education class. That's only for protected species. So that's what this would do. Again, if you've currently got a trap registration number, you'll just get the license. If you need it you pay $10 once and then you've got it.
Jeff Christensen – I do have concerns with that. I don't know how you can draw that line but I think you're putting a burden again on someone that now needs to go out and get a tappers license, registration license just for protecting our livestock or their garden.
Darren DeBloois – I think gardens would fall within that buffer.
Jeff – Some would and some wouldn't.
Darren DeBloois - If you're trapping fence lines out in your pastures or on rangeland or something like that, it would change.
Jeff Christensen – Also, what are you going to do for education to educate some of these old dogs that have been used to trapping stuff around their livestock their entire life. Now you're going to tell them that they are going to have to go out and buy a tag. Those are my concerns. I'd like to make a motion that we change the 100 feet to 600 feet like the other ones, I guess. I think that would help.
Kirk Player – I'll second it.
Trisha Hedin – We have a motion to extend the distance from a home from 100 feet to 600 feet. Everybody in favor. Opposed? That was unanimous (in favor).
Jeff Christensen – Is there a way to put a provision in there on livestock protection?
Darren DeBloois - We went around and around on that and it's tough to do that. The problem is that the officer doesn't know who set that. If there's a number on it that goes back to you then he knows who that's set it. You're right, it changes things a little.
Jeff Christensen – Is there a way the rancher can just go into the office and get a tag without having to pay the money?
Darren DeBloois – We didn't discuss that but it is something you could recommend.
Jeff Christensen - I understand it but I also understand the ranchers in this part of the world that are just trying to protect their livestock. That $10, as little as it sounds is going to be heartburn for people.
Darren DeBloois - I'm sympathetic to that. This is one of those things where how do you split the baby.
Jeff Christensen – I understand. Just bringing up a point.
Trisha Hedin – So do we have a motion on the remainder of the proposal?
Todd Thorne – I'll make a motion to approve the remaining furbearer amendments as presented.
Keith Brady – Second.
Kent Johnson – Point of discussion; with regard to livestock owners protecting their animals, would we be able to amend your motion, Todd, to change the wording to where livestock owners that can prove ownership of their livestock, can be exempt from the $10 rule on their own property?
Todd Thorne – I'll amend my motion to change that language to where, if you can prove ownership of livestock, you can waive that $10 fee.
Darrell Mecham – This is in private property, not permitee property?

Todd Thorne – Yeah.
Kent Johnson – Just trapping on your own place, because a lot of livestock owners will bring their livestock for calving and lambing onto their own place.
Jeff Christensen – That's going to go over a lot better, I believe.
Kent – It's just kind of an idea to work to find the middle ground where it doesn't put as much hardship on an old rancher that doesn't even know this discussion's taking place. He could end up in violation of the law on his own place around his pens and stuff where he's setting traps for coyotes because he's bringing in his calves and everything. That's going to attract coyotes. I don't know how we would want to word that, exactly.
Trisha Hedin – To clarify from your position, we could waive the fee but they still would be given a number that they'd have to put on their traps
Darren DeBloois – Right, they'd still have to comply. If that's what the RAC decides to do, our assistant AG can figure out the wording that would work there.
Todd Thorne – I will make a motion to approve the furbearer rule amendments with exempting livestock owners from the $10 registration fee on their private property.
Jeff Christensen – I'll second that.
Trisha Hedin – So Todd made the motion and that is seconded by Jeff. All in favor. Opposed? It was unanimous (in favor).

VOTING
Jeff Christensen made a motion to extend the trap registration license exemption from being within 100 feet of a building or structure occupied by humans or livestock to 600 feet.
Seconded by Kirk Player
Passed unanimously

Todd thorne made a motion to exempt persons with proof of livestock ownership from the $10 trap registration fee when trapping on their own property, and to accept the remaining Furbearer Rule Amendments as presented.
Seconded by Jeff Christensen
Passed unanimously

7) <u>Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2017-2018</u>
- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator

<u>Questions from the RAC</u>

No questions

<u>Questions from the Public</u>

Derris Jones – Is there any data that indicates that Bobcats are plentiful, that trappers are releasing females and juveniles, thus skewing the data?

Darren DeBloois - It looks like we're probably skewed towards males. We usually run about 1.7 males per female. Which you would expect to be 50/50 so that is something we definitely want to look at. Actually, with that female parameter we'd like to see trappers do that. The other thing to bear in mind is that we've advanced that season later and later into February and we'd expect to see more males as that breeding season starts the males start ranging. Those are all things that we need to keep in mind while looking at it.
Derris Jones – Plus the price differential for males.
Darren DeBloois – Yeah, they're more valuable.
Kent Johnson – I've got friends who trap and I know what they do and the people they trap with and talk to in terms of trappers. They release every female they catch because they understand that they like trapping bobcats and if you trap all the females you're not going to have bobcats to trap. It's anecdotal, but that is the attitude of some people.
Trisha – Any comment cards?
Chris – No comment cards

Comments from the Public

No comments

RAC Discussion

Eric Luke – I'd make a motion to accept the bobcat recommendations as presented.
Trisha Hedin – So we have a motion by Eric Luke, seconded by Darrell Mecham. All in favor. Unanimous.

VOTING
Eric Luke made a motion to accept the Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2017-2018 as presented.
Seconded by Darrell Mecham
Passed unanimously

8) Cougar Recommendations and Rule Amendments for 2017-2018
- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Kent Johnson – On that new unit in Salt Lake County, I know within incorporated areas of the county they prohibit the discharge of firearms. That's a redundancy because state law already covers how it works. Does the state allow the counties to set their own hunting regulations now?
Darren DeBloois – Counties can set the discharge of firearms but they cannot regulate

hunting.
Kent Johnson - You're telling me that they don't allow hunting with dogs in Salt Lake County.
Darren DeBloois – That was my understanding is that counties don't have the authority to regulate hunting. There's a restriction on dogs and I know if it's something the county set or it's because of the nature of the cabin associations and things like that. I can find out. As a matter of law only the Division can regulate hunting. Counties can't close an area to hunting but they can close it to the discharge of a firearm or bow. But they can't close it to hunting. They could have a leash law, something like that, you just can't have dogs running off leash. They would be able to do something like that.
Todd Thorne – In my day job, I'm a Carbon county planner. My understanding is, if it's Forest Service property the county can't create ordinances. The county can't say that you can't run dogs on Forest Service land. If it's private property the county can create ordinances or things through their development code and zoning regulations. But I think most of that is national forest.
Darren DeBloois – And it may be a forest regulation.
Todd Thorne – Counties really don't have jurisdiction to say, "You can't do this on the Forest Service land." Forest Service can set their own regulations, but to be able to have a county to say, "On National Forest Land, you can't run dogs," I've never come across that. And we as a county, there's some things we disagree with that the Forest Service does, but ultimately, when the Forest Service makes a decision, whether we like it as a county or not, we have to abide by it because it's a federal land agency. So that is interesting if they can do that, I've never heard of that.
Darren DeBloois - The region just told me that you weren't allowed to hunt with dogs. I should have dug a little bit and figured out why. I will.
Darren Olsen – I know many of those watersheds are closed to dogs so maybe that is what the limit is. They don't let you just run dogs around because of watershed/drinking water.
Darren DeBloois – Now that you mention that, Darren, I'm pretty sure that is why. You've got to pick up after your dogs.
Eric Luke – That's interesting because I hunted up there last year, and every one of those trails that I went up, there was people walking and trails were covered in dog tracks. Most were probably on a leash but there are dogs.
Darren DeBloois - Carry a plastic bag and you're OK.
Jeff Christensen – Is any other form of management in that area?
Darren DeBloois - It makes it tough if we want to address things. If the Division has a particular concern we've got authority to do things but we like to afford opportunities to sportsmen whenever we can. We'll see how this goes. If we had a lion that we're concerned about that stalked someone or took off after someone then we'd deal with that ourselves.
Kent Johnson – So, even on the Forest Service that's unincorporated they don't allow firearms in Salt Lake County? Is that the Forest Service doing that or Salt Lake County?
Darren DeBloois - I can find out for you. They said it was county.
Kent Johnson – If it's Salt Lake County, we need to put a stop to it.
Darren Olsen – Yeah, I don't think that's Forest Service. I think that's the county.
Darren DeBloois – And it may be because of the volume of use on those trails, they

don’t want people up there shooting. The county can regulate shooting; they can’t regulate hunting. But I’ll look into that, too. I think we’re on the right track, but I’ll double-check.
Eric Luke – I have a question on the southwest Manti. Since the Manti falls under a predator management for deer, that changes the management plan as I understand it. Rather than a less than 40, they want a harvest of over 40 percent.
Darren DeBloois - It can be more. The way the plan is worded is, the qualifications are it needs to be below 80 percent of the mule deer objective if we’re talking about deer. Adult survival needs to regularly fall below 85 percent survival. So, there are these triggers. Then the plan says, you *may* harvest more and get outside of these targets so it does leave it up to the region and biologist to make a call. In other words, it’s not mandatory and if they don’t feel like, for example, if you have a low cougar harvest you’re only taking three to four animals per year and you’re outside of your parameters or you’re inside, it doesn’t really mean much. It’s too low of a sample size or they may feel like they’ve got habitat issues or something like that. There’s flexibility in the plan. That’s how I interpret it.
Eric Luke – I look at it a little differently because to me it says, a portion of female harvest…
Darren DeBloois – It’s kind of confusing. If you look at the remedies, if you look at deer, there will be some strategies. I could be wrong but I think it says you may increase harvest on those units. On this one specifically, this is one that is shared between regions, the Central Region is managing it at a much lower harvest rate than the Southeastern Region. I talked to the Central Region manager about that. The history on that is that over the years they have tried to increase permits on that unit and it’s died through the process. So, they’re willing to take a look at it again and get with the region here and maybe look at more of a combined strategy for those units. Right now, the recommendations are how they came in.
Eric Luke – I guess my question was, with me having an understanding that the objective, because it was predator management, was to have a harvest of over 40 percent of females. My question would be, is an increase of two permits enough to do that? Because they’re well below that.
Darren DeBloois – Depends on what kind of animal they take. Right now, they’re managing under a limited entry. Again, in large part is part of the public process. I can commit that we, as biologists can sit down and take a look at that and see what makes sense and what the concerns are. Obviously, the RAC can recommend a change right now if you’d like.
Darren Olsen – Can you explain to me on the Central Mountains, what’s north-south versus east-west? Is there an easy split there?
Darren DeBloois - Can one of you guys explain that?
Brad Crompton - The short version is Huntington Canyon and Skyline Drive.
Trisha Hedin – You’re stating that you’re taking older males, more males. Is that because we believe that’s the population or is that trophy hunting, meaning are we letting lions go that aren’t big and males?
Darren DeBloois – Lion hunting by its nature is selective. Normally, if you’re using dogs, you get to look at the animal in the tree. Harvest is skewed. What we’re trying to get out with that age of harvest is, there’s a lot of recent research that’s been going on and

sort of social structure among lions. If you can have older animals in your population, and there are no other concerns that you're trying to address you may actually have lower densities. You'll get a big male that'll set up a big territory and he kicks everything out. Especially young males that come in. A lot of times those teenagers are the ones that cause problems. When they readdressed the plan, they wanted to allow for that. To keep older age classes, as long as there aren't livestock or other problems. But it is skewed.
Kirk Player – When there is a problem with livestock, is there some sort of depredation pool where sportsmen can put their name in a hat so if something comes up a houndsman or general sportsmen could help out?
Darren DeBloois – We do have a lot of tools in place. That would be an option. The normal process is the livestock owner will call the wildlife service, government trapper/agent and they'll try to address the problem. But the plan does say you can try. It's a timing thing, if he's having sheep killed, he doesn't want to wait a couple days to come up with a hunter but if we can we'll do that. We do have the option to do that. Another tool that we have is if a livestock producer is having chronic problems, we'll give them tags to handle the problem proactively. If they know that they're taking lambs up and they have a Lion that's hitting them every year, they can go ahead of time with the tags and try to take that Lion. They can't keep the lion with those tags. So, it's not something they can sell but we are pretty flexible, if they know a houndsman that they want to take care of the problem they can give the tag to them.
Eric Luke – If I understand it right, if a livestock producer or one of their headers actually encounter a lion in their herd, they can shoot it on site. Is that correct?
Darren DeBloois – If it's chasing, harassing, looking sideways at, yes they can take it.

Questions from the Public

Derris Jones - When your management objectives or whatever determine whether you increase/decrease tags, was that just sport harvest or did that include depredation animals in that?
Darren DeBloois - It's mainly targeted toward sport harvest. You're talking the numbers? They're sport numbers. Some of those charts are all take and others are sport harvest.
Derris Jones – I just noticed it we're right on the line on a couple of those. If you added depredation harvest in, does that do anything to your triggers?
Darren DeBloois – It could. The tables include everything so when we look at targets, we'd be looking at that. With everything lumped together but one of the goals was to try to decrease depredation take and increase hunter take on those units where we've got issues so we've been trying to manage in that direction.

Comments from the Public

Brett Guymon – I'm representing Ferron houndsmen guys. I've got a handout. What I've just passed out is… the data that you saw earlier in the presentation was statewide data. This is data specific to the Manti Deer Management Unit, which encompasses four

units: Northeast Manti, Southeast Manti, Northwest Manti and Southwest Manti. What I did, the blue line is the deer estimates since 2004. You'll notice I scribbled out 2002-03, I made an error. In 2002-03 there was no Northeast, Northwest it was North Manti, South Manti. If you look at 2004 that is the correct data to look at. I think a lot of times we manage lions based on deer. I don't think we're supposed to but that's what we end up doing when we adjust tag numbers. If you look at this and look at the trend line, my intent in bringing this up is to try to maybe open a few eyes and let people see that deer population certainly doesn't independently depend on the number of Lion tags and Lion harvests that you have in any given year. In fact, if you were to read this graph independent of any other factor you'd say that decreasing a lion harvest actually increases the deer herd. If you follow the trends line there. I'm not advocating that we not manage lions based on the deer population.

I've got two items for consideration. First, is the number of permits on the Southeast Manti. Three years ago, the number of permits was at 10. The recommendation this year is 20. That's a 100 percent increase. On the Southwest Manti it has maintained it used to be upwards of 16 tags. It's now down to 8. They're recommending a two tag increase this year. They're meeting the same indicators on the management plan as is the Southeast Manti. Because it's in the same deer management unit. So what I'd like to see is a reduction in the number of tags on the Southeast Manti by two. That still gives you a two-tag increase and it takes it around 80 percent on the percentage increase over three years. So you're still getting an 80 percent increase on the total number of tags over three years. The second piece of that, FYI there's 20 tags on the Southeast Manti and 8 tags on Southwest Manti. If you're familiar with those areas, I'm not 100 percent sure where that discrepancy comes from. I have my own ideas on why that happened but I think we need to increase them maybe on the Southwest Manti and decrease them on the Southeast Manti. The Southeast Manti is in a slip strategy. We haven't in the last two years met that quota and we're still increasing tags by four. Southwest Manti is a limited entry and yet we're in predator management for the entire Manti. So that, brings me to my second point and that is any deer management unit that is under predator management doesn't make sense to me why you would have a limited-entry unit on the deer unit. I would ask you turning the Southwest Manti into a split harvest strategy from its current strategy of limited entry. That's all I have.
Jeff Christensen – Bret, I got your second one. What was your first recommendation?
Brett Guymon - The first recommendation was to decrease the number of proposed permits on the Southeast Manti by two. So, you're just shifting the two from the Southeast Manti to the Southwest Manti.
Eric Luke – So you're asking for four total on the southwest?
Brett Guymon - Four total on southwest.

RAC discussion

Eric Luke - I like the thought of what Brett has proposed. As I look at the numbers here, the Southwest Manti being limited entry for the three-year time frame has only killed about 66 percent of the total permits. I agree with the Manti being in a predator

management system, I'm not sure that I would agree with that strategy. I like the idea of a split season. It allows for the extra tags to be filled.
Darrel Mecham – Your units like the La Sals and the Henries that have an artificially high number even though it's a predatory unit is I believe something for your statistical numbers. The La Sals get hunted as hard as hell. You have four lions taken but it's got 15 on it so that makes your charts and stuff look real pretty. It makes your numbers look good. You're right biologically if you have a stable population where you have a large lion in the area you have fewer lions. When you have this game of killing as many as you can, you have teenagers and a population trying to spread and go so it's a wreck. When does the plan change next time?
Darren DeBloois – Probably another 10 years but it can be reviewed anytime. They just did it last year.
Darrel Mecham – I see no reason why you play the game of having the La Sals and Henries in any kind of unit other than unlimited, open it up because that's basically what you have. Other than to make your numbers look good.
Darren DeBloois – These numbers are just putting everything together statewide.
Eric Luke – I would make a motion that on the Southwest Manti, we would ask for that shift of tags so there's an increase of four tags on the Southwest Manti, and also that unit be changed to a split-season unit, and that the Southeast Manti only have an increase of two tags rather than four tags, and the rest of the recommendation would be accepted.
Jace Guymon – I'll second that.
Trisha Hedin – We have a motion that on the Southwest Manti, we're going to recommend a split harvest strategy, increasing the Southwest by four, and increasing the Southeast by two. We have that by Eric and seconded by Jace.
Darren Olsen – Question. I'm not opposing. You'd still have a limited entry on the Northwest, right?
Trisha Hedin – It's just manipulating the Southwest Manti.
Eric Luke – Northwest Manti also limited entry? Can I change my motion? Let me look at the harvest data on that one. Basically the same results there, so I would change my motion to include the Northwest Manti to be also recommended as a split-season unit.
Trisha Hedin – Would that just make all the Central Mountains, the entire Manti split? Is that correct?
Jeff Christensen – Do you want to do two motions? Do the split in one and the adjustment on the second one.
Trisha Hedin – That sounds great. Let's start with just hunt strategies.
Eric – I would make a motion that because of the predator management situation that the Manti is in, I would recommend that the Northwest and Southwest Manti units be changed to a split-season unit.
Jace Guymon – Seconded.
Sue Bellagamba – Do we have to actually vote on the motion on the table before we can make another motion?
Chris Wood – He withdrew the original motion, so it's not on the table anymore.
Eric Luke – Say that again.
Chris Wood – Withdraw the original motion, and we'll split that into two separate motions.
Trisha Hedin – Eric has made a motion to turn the Southwest and Northwest hunt

strategies into a split. It was seconded by Jace. All in favor. That's unanimously approved. Second motion.
Eric Luke– Now I would make a motion that the number of tags on the Southwest be increased by a total of four, and the number of tags on Southeast only be raised by two.
Trisha Hedin – So we have a motion by Eric to increase the Southeast Manti by two and increase the Southwest by four. Do I have a second on that motion?
Jace Guymon – Seconded.
Trisha Hedin – All in favor. Opposed. So opposed, we have Darrel Mecham, Sue Bellagamba and Kent Johnson.
Darren DeBloois – So just so I'm clear, that should make the permit recommendations for the Southwest 12, correct? It was 10, but you want to go four from last year, so it would be four 12, and 18 on the Southeast.
Eric Luke - Correct.
Trisha Hedin – And that passed. And then lastly, do we have a motion on the remainder of the recommendations by the Division?
Eric Luke – I'll make a motion that we accept the remainder of the recommendations as presented.
Trisha Hedin – Eric wants to accept the remainder of the motion as presented. Is there a second? Jace seconds it. All in favor. All opposed. So we have Darrel and Sue opposing, and it does pass.

VOTING
Motion was made by Eric Luke to recommend the Northwest and Southwest Manti units be changed to split-season units.
Seconded by Jace Guymon
Passed unanimously

Motion was made by Eric Luke to increase the number of allocated cougar permits by four on the Southwest Manti for a total of 12 permits, and by two on the Southeast Manti for a total of 18 permits.
Seconded by Jace Guymon
Passed 9-3 (opposed: Darrel Mecham, Sue Bellagamba, Kent Johnson)

Motion was made by Eric Luke to accept the remaining Cougar Recommendations and Rule Amendments for 2017-2018 as presented
Seconded by Jace Guymon
Passed 10-2 (opposed: Darrel Mecham, Sue Bellagamba)

9) <u>Beaver Management Plan</u>
- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator

<u>Questions from the RAC</u>

Kirk Player – What are the human conflicts?

Darren DeBloois – Damming, irrigation ditches, damming culverts along highways, flooding highways, those kinds of things. They can be a headache if they're not in the right place. They don't usually attack people.

Questions from the Public

No questions

Comments from the Public

No comments

RAC discussion

Kent Johnson – Motion to accept the Beaver Management Plan as presented by the Division.
Keith Brady – Seconded.
Trisha Hedin – It's unanimous. Passed.

VOTING
Motion was made by Kent Johnson to accept the Beaver Management Plan as presented
Seconded by Keith Brady
Passed unanimously

10) Scofield Reservoir Management Plan (informational)
- Justin Hart, Southeastern Region Aquatics Manager

I'm Justin Hart, I'm the Aquatics Manager. I've been a biologist and manager in the Southeast Region for about 15 years now. I am going to present our newly adopted management plan for Scofield Reservoir. This plan was generated by a public involvement process that I'll briefly describe. We've used this same process for plans on Lake Powell, Fish Lake, Boulder Mountains, Starvation and several others. It involves the public to the best of our abilities and we generally get good buy-in with the product these generate.

So, just briefly I want to talk about the history of Scofield. It was originally built in 1926. Twenty years later it was enlarged to its current size. By 1958 they did their first rotenone treatment. For those of you that don't know, rotenone is a chemical that effects aquatic animals and kills them. It targets fish. The 1958 treatment was essentially for Utah chub which are a very large minnow, long lived, lay a lot of eggs and are direct competitors

with trout, juvenile trout in particular. We weren't able to estimate the cost of that original treatment but they treated and went back in with rainbow trout and some various strains of cutthroat. Twenty years later, they did it again for the same reason. That treatment for unadjusted dollars for inflation was about $100,000. Fourteen years later, they did it again this time it was for Utah chub, there were some common carp and also some illegally stocked walleye. That treatment costed around $300,000. After that treatment, they again went back in with rainbow trout and some various strains of cutthroat. So that kind of gives you a history of the challenges Scofield has had.

I want to briefly talk about the history of the use at Scofield. Over the years we do creel surveys which are year-long surveys that allow us to estimate total angling hours. Which is total effort up there. The number of fish caught, the number of fish harvested; we can generate catch rates, harvest rates, things of that nature. What I want you to see here is, on the bottom, 1986 there was an estimated 300,046 angling hours, which is a lot for a 2,200-acre reservoir. In 1997-98, we estimated use at about 278,000. In 2004-05 it was down to 114,000 hrs. And in 2007 we did a truncated creel survey and estimated use at 55,000. In all of those years, fishing was good. Some of these were post-treatment. Fishing wasn't terrible. Yet, we saw a decrease in use. We see this at a lot of Utah reservoirs over the years. The exact reason we don't know. It's social to some extent. I think a lot of it has to do with the amount of opportunities and diversity we have now compared to then. There's just more places for people to go fish, other things competing for their time. There was decreasing use out there and it wasn't related to poor fishing. However, the survey we did in 2015 the hours were down to about 34,000 which was significantly down. So, it became pretty clear, we needed to do something out there. We needed to make some changes, to reassess how we're managing it and figure out how to move into the future.

So, last fall, early winter, October-November, we initiated an online survey. It had 21 questions. And it also identified individuals that were willing to volunteer to be a part of this management team. From that group, I think we had 600 people volunteer, which impressed me. We got some names, we put together a team, we tried to represent as many user groups and different interests as possible. We met right after the first of the year in our Price office and had a marathon meeting. We had a couple other conference calls and review periods and things of that nature. Sharing emails and conference call phones. By about mid-March we had a draft management plan ready for review. Initially that was reviewed by our internal staff. Some of our fisheries chief, of course and some of our coordinators in Salt Lake, some other regional staff. After that it was sent to the US Fish and Wildlife Service. The UCRP is the Upper Colorado River Recovery Program. Then the states of Colorado and Wyoming all reviewed this plan and had some comments and we made some modifications based on their feedback. At that point, we considered it kind of finalized. We were really trying to hit the May RAC and Wildlife Board cycle but didn't get all the comments back quite in time for that. So, we had to take a little time off during the summer and here we are tonight.

The committee members real quickly, we had representation from our Blue Ribbon Fisheries council, Southeastern RAC: Derris Jones, Mike King from the Wildlife Board

participated. Ken Strong from SFW, the state park manager, Doug Cloward is a Scofield cabin owner and resident up there. And these anglers are primarily from the Wasatch Front, historically a little over 70 percent of the use at Scofield came from Utah and Salt Lake counties. So, we tried to do that with our angling members. We tried to have a local guy and then heavily weighted towards that Wasatch, which is most of the use up there.

So, what was the purpose? Well, we wanted them to provide input and help us develop a management plan for Scofield. We determined a mission statement, they helped us set goals and objectives for the fishery, they made recommendations on how we were going to achieve those goals and we tried to consider all interests and find common ground. Our mission statement: To develop a sport fish management plan that will provide the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources with recommendations and direction to create a sustainable and high quality fishery at Scofield Reservoir.

And we generated six goals. The first goal was to re-establish the family fishery and maintain a harvestable component. Over the last seven or eight years we've pretty much lost the family fishery at Scofield. We are no longer socking rainbow trout today, simply because they won't perform and return. We're focused mostly on predatory species. Primarily the Bonneville Bear Lake cutthroat and the tiger trout. So, there's really nothing out there for the worm dunkers to catch right now.

Goal No. 2: Maintain and enhance trophy angling opportunities. Our management the last seven or eight years has created some incredible trophy opportunities. We created a period of several years where we were breaking the tiger trout state record. Now we have a lot of quality cutthroat trout in the population. There's a group of people that don't want that to go anywhere. They want to keep that and even enhance it.

The third thing that was clear from the survey and the group was that people wanted more diversity up there. We're going to do that with alternative fish species. The crux of the plan, the Utah chub, we need to reduce their numbers. We need to do that with some sort of sustainable management model, a one-time fix and them come back 14 years later.

Goal No. 5: Increase angling and recreational use. The table I showed you, we're losing anglers out there and a lot of it recently is due to the quality of the fishery. Also, our state park partners have noticed decreased visitation. We need to try to improve that.

Lastly, certainly not least, we need to manage Scofield for compatibility with native species management. Scofield, of course, eventually connects to the Green and Colorado Rivers where we have native state conservation species and threatened and endangered species. With those T&E species we have agreements on what we can and can't stock in this drainage. So, we have to be really careful with how we manage our fisheries in this part of the state in particular.

So, real briefly let's talk about these six goals. The first one to re-establish a family fishery: We're going to reinstate the stocking of rainbow trout using a larger size fish and that will be a catchable size fish. Typically, on a reservoir the size of Scofield we don't

use catchable fish because catchable fish are expensive. We can't put enough in there to maintain a catch rate that's acceptable. So, what we usually do is use what we call a sub-catchable size fish that's between five and seven inches. That fish is expected to go in the water, grow for a year and become harvestable the next year. But we're going to be start using these catchable fish next year so anglers have a rainbow trout that they can harvest immediately. After chub biomass is reduced through this plan, we'll go back to stocking that traditional sized fish we usually have the put grow and take type model. We're also going to use triploid which are sterile walleye and wipers, which are striped bass hybrids. They're a cross between white bass and striped bass as part of the harvestable component. What we mean by that is, we're not going to put any special regulations on those fish they'll be just your regular statewide creel limits with no size limits. So, we're not going to overregulate those and get super restrictive with those new species.

Enhance trophy angling opportunities. We're going to continue using the cutthroat and tiger trout like we are now and the regulations we have a slot limit on those fish that will remain. As I mentioned, we're going to add those sterile walleye and wipers and with the prey base out there it's going to create some trophy opportunities because there's a lot of food out there and they're going to utilize it. We're also going to use the tiger muskie as a predator and also as a trophy fish. We've used those at Joes Valley and they've been increasingly popular. They're an impressive fish when they get big.

Enhance the diversity: Some of this is getting redundant because we are only adding three species. We're of course going to again stock the sterile walleye and the wipers and tiger muskies. That's the added diversity that hasn't been there in the past. Then we'll continue with the rainbow trout, the tigers and the cutthroat. So, we'll have a few more species in there that have never been there before. We hope that will attract a lot interest and help us meet our goals.

This is the big one, we need to reduce the chubs. We don't want to eliminate them completely, of course. We plan to use them to grow some big fish but we do need to get their biomass down. Our management right now is working. What we've done is shifted the size structure of these chubs. They're all 10-12 inches. They look like the chubs in that bucket. Those are big and there's no little ones left because all our trout are eating them. However, these chubs can live for 20 years, 25 years, even 30. So, we need to get more mouths out there that will eat those bigger fish and whittle that number down for us. That's where the walleye, wipers and tiger muskies will hopefully help us. And of course, we're going to monitor the chub numbers very carefully. We've got a lot of measurable numbers associated with all of these goal and objectives. I didn't add those, it gets into a lot of detail but it's in the plan if you read it. We're going to monitor those several times a year and more if necessary.

The increase angling and recreational use: Both us as far as license sales and anglers, angling hours and state parks think it's reasonable to increase our use angling and at the state park by 50 percent over the next five years. Scofield Reservoir was on the Blue Ribbon Fisheries list primarily because it's always been an attractive family fishery. The Blue Ribbon council removed that two years ago, I think, because we've lost that family

component. It's still a great trophy fishery but that's not the original reason it was on the list. I hope we can re-establish Blue Ribbon Fishery designation.

Then, our native species concerns: We have signed a non-native stocking agreement that basically there's a big list of fish we can use and can't use. Even though the fish that we're proposing being used are sterile, if they escape they're not going to create a population, we're still worried about their escapement. So, we need to put some sort of screen below the reservoir to minimize fish escapement. We actually met today and discussed some options for doing that. This lower left picture is kind of just a rigid fence. That's what we have at Starvation. When it spills, it stops walleye from moving down stream. The structure on the right's a half million-dollar structure in Colorado. I hope we don't have to go there. We do need to try to reduce fish escaping out of Scofield Reservoir and moving down stream. That's a big part of this plan, too.

Let's talk about rotenone really quick. Obviously, with these chubs there were two ways to go. We could have gone biological like we did with the plan or we could have just rotenoned it again like we've done every other decade for the last 50 years. The group decided, let's not do that. However, we're leaving rotenone as a plan B option. We currently have a private consulting firm doing a NEPA analysis for us for rotenone treatment of Scofield, all its tributaries and the tail water clear down to highway 6. Anytime we do some sort of action on federal property which in this case is BOR we have to do a NEPA. Even though the lake was low last year and it would have been a perfect time to treat it, we can't just do that. We have to go through these processes. So, we're doing that right now and we'll have that in our pocket in case we need it. We've talked about, it could cost a million dollars to do a rotenone treatment in today's dollars depending on lake levels. We hope we don't have to go there, but we're planning it in the background just in case we do. That's it.

Questions from the RAC

Jeff Christensen – How long is NEPA good for once it's completed?
Justin Hart - It depends on the agency but, Darren, five to seven years is that right?
Darren Olsen – Yeah, five to seven years, maybe even a little longer.
Justin - I failed to mention that. I should have, I meant to. This plan has a roughly a life span of five years. If we're not meeting some of these chub reduction goals within five years, we're going to go to that option. It could be earlier than that, though. You know, we're adding some species up there that have never been there before and if they don't perform and survive we might go to rotenone earlier.
Trisha Hedin – In that treatment, when you were giving the earlier numbers, $100,000, $300,000, that doesn't incorporate reintroduction or restocking?
Justin Hart - No that would be primarily the purchase of the chemical and then just manpower. At this point, it's just kind of a rough estimate.

Questions from the Public

No questions.

Comments from the Public

Derris Jones – Just wanted to report. I represented you guys on this management committee. Being a game guy, not a fish guy, you kind of relate the room full of anglers was kind of like bringing in Henries Mountain buck hunter, a Cache general season buck hunter, maybe a couple Vernon guys and a Book Cliff guy, trying to come to some kind of consensus on how big of a buck to manage for. So Justin had his work cut out for him. The only consensus we had to begin with was, get rid of the chubs. There was a big push to not waste time and just poison and get on with it. There was a lot of trophy fisherman there that caught some of those fish in the last few years and they did not want to see that component go down to rotenone. So, I think the Division and Justin did a fantastic job of bringing that kind of polarized group together with the management implications he's got with new species. Let's bring back the old rainbow fishery and on top of that he's got a contingency plan. If this doesn't work, we're still going to get rid of chubs. Just kudos to the Division. They did a great job.
Chris Wood – Just to clarify, Derris Jones was a RAC member for the last eight years.

RAC discussion

Eric Luke – With the predator species, will you continue to maintain those at the same time you're trying to introduce the rainbow fishery?
Justin Hart – Yeah. We may have to reduce stocking rate, for example. Once some of the food's gone obviously they're going to eat something else so we may have to reduce wiper, walleye, tiger muskie stocking a little bit. But we think we can maintain that diversity. This has kind of been replicated on some waters in the Southern part of the state with wipers in particular and rainbow trout. It's worked, it's a balancing act so in the plan there's some language and hard numbers that kind of answer that question you asked me.
Helene Taylor – If you do go to the treatment, do you offer a free fishing weekend?
Justin Hart - We'd liberalize the fishing limits for probably a year. They're draining Millsite Reservoir up in Ferron and we quadrupled the limits in January. Yes, we would.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

The next Wildlife Board meeting will take place on Aug. 31, 2017, at 9 a.m. in the DNR Board Room, 1594 W. North Temple, in Salt Lake City.

The next Southeast RAC meeting will take place on Sept. 13, 2017, at 6:30 p.m. at the John Wesley Powell River History Museum, 1765 E. Main St., in Green River.

2018 Expo Permits by Species and Residency

	TOTAL PERMITS		
	Res	NonRes	Total
Grand Total	**145**	**55**	**200**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Bison	Henry Mtns	Hunters Choice Early	1	0	1
Bison	Henry Mtns	Hunters Choice Late (non resident only)	0	1	1
Bison	Henry Mtns	Cow Only Early	1	0	1
Bison	Henry Mtns	Cow Only Late	1	0	1
		TOTAL	**3**	**1**	**4**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Black Bear	Wasatch Mtns, West-Central	**Summer, Any Legal Weapon, No Dogs**	1	1	2
Black Bear	La Sal	**Spring, Any Legal Weapon, No Bait**	1	1	2
Black Bear	Nine Mile	**Fall, Any Legal Weapon**	1	0	1
Black Bear	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowitz	**Fall, Any Legal Weapon**	1	0	1
Black Bear	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South	**Spring, Any Legal Weapon, No Bait**	1	0	1
Black Bear	S. Slope, Bonanza/Diamond Mtn/Vernal	**Spring, Any Legal Weapon, No Bait**	1	0	1
Black Bear	Central Mtns, Manti-North	**Spring, Any Legal Weapon, No Bait**	1	0	1
Black Bear	San Juan	**Spring, Any Legal Weapon, No Bait**	1	1	2
		TOTAL	**8**	**3**	**11**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs, North	Any Weapon	6	3	9
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs, South	Any Weapon	3	1	4
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	Archery	3	1	4
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	Muzzleloader	3	1	4
Buck Deer	Fillmore, Oak Creek LE	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Deer	Henry Mtns	Premium Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Deer	Henry Mtns	Management Buck	1	1	2
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Any Weapon	2	1	3
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Archery	1	1	2
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Management Buck	1	0	1
Buck Deer	San Juan, Elk Ridge	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Deer	South Slope, Diamond Mtn	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Any Weapon	4	1	5
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Archery	1	1	2
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Muzzleloader	1	1	2
Buck Deer	North Slope, Summit	Any Weapon	1	1	2
		TOTAL	**32**	**13**	**45**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South	Any Weapon (early)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Little Creek Roadless	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, Meadowville	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Central Mtns, Manti	Any Weapon (early)	5	3	8
Bull Elk	Central Mtns, Manti	Any Weapon (late)	3	1	4
Bull Elk	Central Mtns, Manti	Archery	4	2	6
Bull Elk	Central Mtns, Manti	Muzzleloader	2	1	3
Bull Elk	Central Mtns, Nebo	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Central Mtns, Nebo	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Fillmore, Pahvant	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	La Sal, La Sal Mtns	Any Weapon (early)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	La Sal, La Sal Mtns	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	La Sal, La Sal Mtns	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Mt Dutton	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Mt Dutton	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Mt Dutton	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Panguitch Lake	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Panguitch Lake	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Panguitch Lake	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Paunsaugunt	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake/Thousand Lakes	Any Weapon (early)	2	1	3
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake/Thousand Lakes	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake/Thousand Lakes	Archery	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake/Thousand Lakes	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Southwest Desert	Any Weapon (early)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Southwest Desert	Any Weapon (late)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Southwest Desert	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Southwest Desert	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Bull Elk	San Juan Bull Elk	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	San Juan Bull Elk	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	South Slope, Diamond Mtn	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mtns	Any Weapon (early)	5	3	8
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mtns	Any Weapon (late)	3	1	4
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mtns	Archery	6	3	9
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mtns	Muzzleloader	3	2	5
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mtns	Multi-Season	1	0	1
		TOTAL	**69**	**22**	**91**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Bull Moose	Wasatch Mtns/Central Mtns		**1**	**0**	**1**
Bull Moose	Wasatch Mtns/Central Mtns	Non Resident Only	0	1	1
		TOTAL	**1**	**1**	**2**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Cougar	Plateau-Boulder	Split, Limited Entry/Harvest Objective	1	0	1
Cougar	Plateau-Fishlake	Split, Limited Entry/Harvest Objective	1	0	1
Cougar	Central Mtns, Nebo	Split, Limited Entry/Harvest Objective	1	0	1
Cougar	Central Mtns, Northeast Manti	Split, Limited Entry/Harvest Objective	1	0	1
Cougar	Chalk Creek/Kamas	Limited Entry	1	0	1
Cougar	Panguitch Lake	Split, Limited Entry/Harvest Objective	1	0	1
Cougar	Fillmore, Pahvant	Split, Limited Entry/Harvest Objective	1	0	1
		TOTAL	**7**	**0**	**7**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Desert Bighorn Sheep	Zion	Non Resident Only (Early Season)	0	1	1
Desert Bighorn Sheep	Kaiparowits, West		1	0	1
		TOTAL	**1**	**1**	**2**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Pronghorn	Book Cliffs, South	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Pronghorn	Cache/Morgan-South Rich/Ogden	Any Weapon	3	0	3
Pronghorn	Cache/Morgan-South Rich/Ogden	Archery	1	0	1
Pronghorn	Mt Dutton/Paunsaugunt, Johns Valley	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Pronghorn	Plateau, Parker Mtn	Archery	1	1	2
Pronghorn	Plateau, Parker Mtn	Muzzleloader	1	1	2
Pronghorn	Plateau, Parker Mtn	Any Weapon	3	2	5
Pronghorn	Pine Valley	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Pronghorn	San Rafael, North	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Pronghorn	West Desert, Riverbed	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Pronghorn	Southwest Desert	Any Weapon	2	2	4
		TOTAL	**16**	**6**	**22**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Rocky Mtn. Bighorn Sheep	Box Elder, Newfoundland Mtn	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Rocky Mtn. Bighorn Sheep	Nine Mile, Gray Canyon	Non Resident Only (early season)	0	1	1
		TOTAL	**1**	**1**	**2**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Mountain Goat	No. Slope/So. Slope, High Uintas West		1	1	2
Mountain Goat	Ogden, Willard Peak (early)	Non Resident Only	1	1	2
Mountain Goat	Ogden, Willard Peak (late)		0	0	0
		TOTAL	**2**	**2**	**4**

			PERMITS		
Species	**Area**	**Condition**	**Res**	**NonRes**	**Total**
Turkey	Northern Region		1	1	2
Turkey	Northeast Region		1	1	2
Turkey	Central Region		1	1	2
Turkey	Southern Region		1	1	2
Turkey	Southeast Region		1	1	2
		TOTAL	**5**	**5**	**10**

GARY R. HERBERT
Governor

SPENCER J. COX
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Wildlife Resources

GREGORY J. SHEEHAN
Division Director

August 17, 2017

Mike Fowlks, Director, Division of Wildlife Resources
Kirk Woodward, Chairman, Utah Wildlife Board
Byron Bateman, Vice Chairman, Utah Wildlife Board
Utah Wildlife Board Members

RE: 2017 Expo Permit Internal Audit – Rule R657-55

Dear Director Fowlks and Wildlife Board Members,

In accordance with Rule R657-55, an audit of the Expo Permit program has been conducted. This audit is attached for your review and the results will be presented at the Utah Wildlife Board Meeting on August 31, 2017.

If you have any questions please contact me at 801-538-7437.

Sincerely,

Kenny Johnson
Administrative Services Chief
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources

1594 West North Temple, Suite 2110, PO Box 146301, Salt Lake City, UT 84114-6301
telephone (801) 538-4700 • facsimile (801) 538-4709 • TTY (801) 538-7458 • *www.wildlife.utah.gov*

Internal Audit of the 2017 Expo Permit Program

Dated August 17, 2017

Background

Since the expo permit program began in 2007, three separate expo permit contracts have been awarded to conservation organizations. The first contract went to the Foundation for North American Wild Sheep in 2007, and the second one went to the Mule Deer Foundation (MDF) in 2011. The most recent expo permit contract — which runs from 2017–2021 — was awarded to Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife (SFW) in December 2015. During the entire length of the expo permit program, the fee assessed by the conservation organization to process expo permit applications has always been $5 per application submitted. Since 2013, a portion of the $5 fee has been dedicated for use on wildlife projects approved by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (Division).

Under the new 5-year contract beginning in 2017, expo permits are distributed at the Western Hunting and Conservation Expo by Sportsmen for Fish & Wildlife (SFW) in partnership with the Mule Deer Foundation (MDF) and Utah Foundation for North American Wild Sheep (FNAWS). (SFW and MDF are the major partners in this effort, and will sometimes collectively be referred to as the "contractor" in this audit report.) Under this new contract, the entire $5 fee will be utilized to support wildlife conservation in Utah. Of the $5 fee, $1.50 will be utilized on Division-approved projects that benefit protected wildlife. The remaining $3.50 will be used by the contractor on policies, programs, projects, and personnel that support conservation initiatives in Utah.

The Western Hunting and Conservation Expo was held in Salt Lake City from February 16-19, 2017. In accordance with Administrative Rule R657-55, an annual audit of the Expo permit program has been conducted. This audit was not performed using generally accepted auditing standards, but is an internal audit designed by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Administrative Services Section to ensure compliance with applicable rules and contractual obligations.

This audit report covers the 2017 Expo performance specifically, and uses historical data from the outset of the Expo permit program in 2007 through 2016 for some comparative items, as well as to ensure compliance with applicable rules and contractual terms.

Overview

The focus of this audit is to assist the Division and the Wildlife Board to ensure contract compliance. Our report focuses on verifying that data is protected and secure, and that the drawing procedure used is random for the permits being issued. Additionally, we reviewed data regarding the number of applicants, success rates, and programming code related to drawing procedures and issuance of permits. We also reviewed revenue amounts retained by the contractor for use on Division-approved projects, as well as the remainder of the revenue, which is to be used to benefit Utah conservation initiatives. In addition to verifying revenue totals, we look to verify that the funds designated for Division-approved projects, as well as the funds

designated for other conservation initiatives, are kept separate from other funds in separate insured bank accounts. Finally, we seek to verify that funds are appropriately spent on or committed to Division-approved projects, or are used to benefit Utah conservation initiatives, as required.

Review of handling personal and sensitive data

The Division monitored the processes of data collection and input, securing of personal and confidential data received, and performance of the actual draw process. Third party system scans were completed, and Payment Card Industry (PCI) assessment questionnaire was provided to the Division prior to the Expo.

The Division considers the handling of personal data and information a top priority. Because the contractor conducting the draw is allowed limited access to DWR data for populating the hunt applications, we require adherence to protocols that will safeguard this data.

The contractor has two process components regarding sensitive and confidential data from the applicants. For these purposes, sensitive and confidential data is defined as social security number, driver's license information, height, weight, gender, and hair/eye color.

The first process component is the handling of sensitive information given by applicants at the Expo to apply in the drawing manually. This is done on a paper form completed by the applicant. Once completed and submitted, these forms are cross-shredded on site. No paper applications are retained by the contractor.

The second process component is the handling of electronic data that is used in the electronic application process. Sensitive data is used during the application process for customer lookups into the Division database. This data transmission is through a secure socket layer using 128 bit encryption. Once the customer information is retrieved, no sensitive information is stored in the contractor database.

No compliance issues were identified by the Division in 2017.

Review of the drawing process

Division of Wildlife/Department of Technology Services personnel go through an extensive review of the draw processes used by GraySky Technologies, the subcontractor selected by SFW to conduct the Expo permit drawing. The Division is represented by technical experts from the Utah Department of Technology Services, who reviewed the following:

1) The process of the draw is reviewed for its soundness.
2) The database structure is reviewed to make sure that a customer can't flood a certain hunt by making multiple entries for that hunt.
3) A review of the code is conducted to make sure that there is no chance that a seeded record could exist in the database prior to the assignment of random numbers. This is done to ensure that the result table is empty and no records can be inserted independently of the

drawing code. This ensures that a record with an abnormally low random number isn't placed in the table thereby guaranteeing a permit to that record.
4) The code is reviewed to ensure that all records are treated equally in the process that assigns random numbers to the entries. Care is given to make sure that when the random numbers are being assigned, no records are identified to get a number other than a random number which is generated by the system.
5) The code is then reviewed for inserts that may occur after the drawing to make sure that a secured opportunity record is not placed in the result table after the assignment of random numbers takes place.

This was an exhaustive and thorough review; no compliance issues were identified by the Division in 2017.

Conducting the Draw

The actual drawing was conducted at the Division Office in Salt Lake City on February 21, 2017. Attendees included Division staff, representatives from Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife and the Mule Deer Foundation, and the general public. The public is welcome to attend the drawing and at least 3 individuals unrelated to the Division or contractors were in attendance. The draw was then conducted by GraySky Technologies whereupon the following occurred:

1) An impromptu passphrase was given to the GraySky representative and was witnessed written into the code prior to beginning the draw process. Later this same passphrase was verified by all in attendance to display on the result page to ensure the code reviewed by the Division was the actual code used during the draw.
2) The draw was then run assigning random numbers to applicants hunt choice entries and then sorted in descending order.
3) The results of the draw were printed and immediately given to a Division representative to ensure that there were no edits to the results table.
4) This list was then given to the Division Law Enforcement and Licensing sections to validate eligibility before any results were posted.
5) Any applicants selected through the draw that receive multiple permits for the same species are contacted by the Division and asked to select their preferred hunt choice. The unclaimed permits are issued to alternates.

The passphrase was witnessed being added to the code, and the same passphrase was verified at the conclusion of the draw. Results were instantly printed and the process to validate began immediately.

No compliance issues were identified by the Division in 2017.

Note about Random Drawings

In any truly random drawing there always seems to be a few "lucky" individuals. Statistically when randomness is discussed it is always possible to view the final result and pick out certain trends. The key to these trends is that they cannot be predicted prior to the event or drawing.

This is the very essence of randomness. Random is not an assurance that an event will be spread evenly across a population, or distributed equally among participants.

There were no abnormalities observed in the 2017 drawing.

Draw Related Information

The Division reviewed data from the Expo regarding application numbers and success rates of the Expo. Applicant validation numbers showed that at least 10,000 individuals attended the Expo in 2017 as required by rule. 2017 was the first year that youth hunters age 12 and 13 could apply for limited entry permits. The reported number of attendees at the 2017 Expo was 46,000.

There were no attendance issues in 2017.

Applicant data for years 2007-2017 is as follows:

Year	Applicants	Applications	Resident	Nonresident	Gross Revenue@ $5 per application
2007	10,527	205,462	163,054	42,408	$ 1,027,310
2008	8,745	138,988	116,465	22,523	$ 694,940
2009	9,927	169,988	139,748	29,375	$ 845,970
2010	9,700	165,866	139,920	25,946	$ 847,285
2011	12,154	196,360	170,539	25,821	$ 981,800
2012	13,388	207,870	179,077	28,793	$ 1,039,350
2013	14,043	197,312	173,192	24,120	$ 986,560
2014	14,148	206,506	178,250	28,256	$ 1,032,530
2015	14,910	228,530	192,420	36,110	$ 1,142,650
2016	15,507	233,210	195,973	37,237	$ 1,166,050
2017	**16,127**	**247,148**	**204,016**	**43,132**	**$ 1,235,740**

Resident versus Nonresident Success

Data was reviewed comparing the number of resident applicants versus the nonresident applicants. In 2017: 83% of the applications were residents with 17% nonresidents. 173 permits drawn were awarded to residents, which is 86.5% of the total permits available, and 27 to nonresidents, or 13.5% of the total permits available.

There were no anomalies in this data in 2017.

Draw Application Statistics

The Expo offers a limited number of permits annually and attracts exponentially more applicants. It should be noted that this dynamic implies a statistically low probability of obtaining a permit.

While the draw odds are not a controllable variable or concern of the Division, we want to acknowledge the expediency with which this information is made available to the public. The Expo contractor publishes these statistics annually on their website prior to the next year application period.

License Sales

The Division requires that anyone applying for a permit at the Expo have a valid hunting or combination license at the time of application. To ensure this compliance, the computer programming will not allow applicants to apply without a valid license in the system. For the Expo in 2017, there were 1,225 combination and hunting licenses sold on site. The resulting license revenue generated for the Division was $55,509.22. The entirety of these funds are owed to the Division with the same reporting stipulations as other third party license vendors; the invoice was paid in full and on time.

There were no compliance issues with license sales, reporting, or payment.

Application Revenue

For the 2017 expo permit draw, the Expo accepted applications beginning in October 2016, and continuing through the end of the Expo, which was held from February 16–19, 2017. The draw processed 247,148 applications, generating $1,235,740.00 in gross application revenue.

Use of Application Revenue for Division-Approved Wildlife Projects

The retained portion of application revenue allowable for use on Division-approved projects is $1.50 per application, or $370,722.00 in 2017. This revenue was split 50/50 between SFW and MDF, with each organization receiving $185,361.00. This initial deposit was verified in a federally insured bank account for both MDF and SFW. These funds will need to be spent on, or committed to, Division-approved projects by September 1, 2019.

Both SFW and MDF have been obligated to spend or commit a portion of expo funds to Division-approved projects since 2013. These funds must be spent or officially committed to projects by September 1st, 2 years after the year of the expo permit drawing. To verify SFW and MDF met their spending obligations from past years for Division-approved projects as of September 1, 2017, we reviewed project revenue balances from 2013 through 2015. Division-approved project invoices paid with expo dollars were then tallied to obtain the total amount of project revenue spent. In addition, total dollars officially committed to Division-approved projects, but not yet spent, were tallied.

MDF and SFW were each required to spend or commit $585,197.25 by September 1, 2017 (see Table 1 below). Each organization easily met this obligation, with SFW having spent or committed $925,117.87, and MDF having spent or committed $944,747. A list of these projects can be found in Attachment 1.

Table 1 - Revenue Required to be Committed or Expended on Division-Approved Projects by September 1, 2017

Org.	Project Revenue **2013-2015**	Project Revenue **2016**	Project Revenue **2017**	Total Project Revenue	Obligation **Due Sept 1, 2017**	Total Currently Committed or Spent
MDF	$585,197.25	$174,907.50	$185,361.00	$945,465.75	$585,197.25	$ 944,747.00
SFW	$585,197.25	$174,907.50	$185,361.00	$945,465.75	$585,197.25	$ 925,117.87
Total	$1,170,394.50	$349,815.00	$370,722.00	$1,890,931.50	$1,170,394.50	$1,869,864.87

SFW

Total Revenue for Division-Approved Projects 2013-2017	$945,465.75
Interest (which may be removed from account)	$17.37
Actual Project Expenditures 2013-2017	($903,577.31)
Verified Bank Statement Balance	$41,905.81

MDF

Total Revenue for Division-Approved Projects 2013-2017	$945,465.75
Actual Project Expenditures 2013-2017	($768,199.50)
Verified Bank Statement Balance	$177,266.25

Issue Identified and Resolved – During the Division's initial review of bank account records, it was found that SFW and MDF had included some additional funds in their bank accounts beyond those that were required. Co-mingling of money in expo permit fund bank accounts is not allowed. SFW and MDF have removed the excess funds from the accounts and this issue is now resolved.

Use of Application Revenue for Contractor-Approved Conservation Initiatives

New in 2017, the retained portion of application revenue allowable for support of contractor-approved policies, programs, projects, and personnel that support conservation initiatives in Utah is $3.50 per application, or $865,018.00. Of these funds, $277,732.80 were spent by SFW on expenses directly related to advertising expo permits, accepting expo permit applications, and conducting the actual expo permit draw, all in concert with the Western Hunting and Conservation Expo. The remaining $587,285.20 of these funds were split 50/50 between MDF and SFW, with each organization receiving $293,642.60. Bank records and project expenditures were reviewed. To date, SFW has spent $9,750.00 of these remaining funds. MDF has not spent any of these funds, but they have committed $293,043.00 to Utah conservation initiatives. A list

of these conservation initiatives for both groups can be found in Attachment 2. The deposit and required balance were verified in a federally-insured bank account held separate from other funds for both SFW and MDF.

SFW	
Total Revenue for Contractor-Approved Initiatives	$571,375.40
Interest (which may be removed from account)	$255.61
Actual Project Expenditures	($287,482.60)
Verified Bank Statement Balance	$284,148.41

MDF	
Total Revenue for Contractor-Approved Initiatives	$293,642.60
Actual Project Expenditures	($0.00)
Verified Bank Statement Balance	$293,642.60

Issue Identified for Future Resolution – The entire $865,018.00 that is to be used on contractor-approved conservation initiatives must be held in a dedicated bank account, and all expenditures of those funds must be made from that bank account. The $277,732.80 spent on expenses related to the expo permits were paid by SFW out of different bank account, prior to opening the new, dedicated bank account. In the future, all expenditures must be made from the bank account(s) dedicated to these funds.

Issue Identified and Resolved – During the Division's initial review of bank account records, it was found that due to a math error, SFW and MDF each needed to deposit and additional $133.60 into their respective accounts. Those additional deposits have been made, and this issue is now resolved.

Conclusions

Revenue from expo permit application fees has funded numerous efforts that benefit wildlife habitat, wildlife species, and sportsmen in Utah. In fact, the funding has become an important component of the conservation work that has improved our state's wildlife populations and made Utah an outstanding place to hunt.

Project revenues were verified by bank statements, and expenses were supported with the appropriate documentation. Three minor accounting-related issues were identified during the audit; two of the issues have been resolved, and the third should be corrected in future years.

The measures in place to ensure PCI compliance and prevention of unwanted external access served this program well this year. We reiterate that with data being under constant threat, the need to create processes and systems that are up to the challenge of securing information is of utmost importance. System penetration scans and PCI assessment questionnaires greatly

relieved the fear of data becoming compromised, and served to protect this data in 2017. We believe that with the new security scans and PCI compliance procedures set in place by SFW, MDF, and GraySky, the data was properly secured, and the drawing was conducted in a random, transparent, and consistent manner.

We would like to thank Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife and the Mule Deer Foundation for their time, prompt responses, and their willingness to provide the information requested for the preparation of the audit. Their information was clearly presented and very much appreciated. If there are questions regarding this report, please contact me at 801-550-8349.

Kenneth Johnson
Administrative Services Chief
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources

cc: Michal Fowlks, Director
Kirk Woodward, Board Chair
Bryon Bateman, Board Vice Chair
Utah Wildlife Board Members
Troy Justensen, Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife
Miles Moretti, Mule Deer Foundation

Attachments:
1. List of Division-Approved Wildlife Projects
2. List of Contractor-Approved Efforts to Support Utah Conservation Initiatives
3. Draw Process Roll Sheet
4. Current Expo Rule R647-55

Attachment 1

List of Division-Approved Wildlife Projects

Mule Deer Foundation

Project#	Project Title	Year	Amount	Status	Funding Source
2076	Hamlin Valley Habitat Restoration Project - Sagebrush Restorat	2016	$ 10,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
2675	McMillan Springs Phase 2	2014	$ 21,958.02	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
2805	MDF Stewardship Position FY14	2014	$ 30,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
2808	Stockton Shrub Planting	2014	$ 1,740.77	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
2865	Wood Hollow Fire Bitterbrush Seeding	2014	$ 4,591.64	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
2918	Dugout Flat Reseeding	2015	$ 20,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
2931	Little Mountain Bullhog	2015	$ 20,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3019	Mill Fork Wildlife Habitat Improvement Project (Phase 2)	2016	$ 2,500.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3120	MDF Stewardship Position FY15	2015	$ 30,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3137	Deer Fawn/Adult Survival FY15	2015	$ 22,400.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3151	David Edwards Fencing Project	2014	$ 48,219.60	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3187	Left Fork Stewardship Project	2017	$ 43,005.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3234	Roughneck Vegetation Restoration (Phase II)	2016	$ 5,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3236	West Vernon Phase 5: Lion Hill	2016	$ 5,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3250	Transplant trailer for deer	2015	$ 13,687.96	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3263	Yellowjacket (Farm Canyon)	2016	$ 10,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3281	Coal Hollow, Kane County - Phase II	2016	$ 2,500.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3282	Sheep Creek Phase 3: Sheep Creek North	2016	$ 5,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3308	Dark Canyon Plateau Phase III	2016	$ 5,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3314	Cabin Cliff Water Tank	2016	$ 2,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3321	Crouse Canyon Brows Plots	2016	$ 1,218.40	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3350	McMillan Spring Phase III	2016	$ 30,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3370	Temple Fork Juniper Restoration	2016	$ 4,250.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3441	Park Valley Winter Range Bullhog	2016	$ 5,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3495	Youth Education	2015	$ 25,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3496	Volunteer Mileage Reimbursement for Urban Deer Transplant	2016	$ 2,136.42	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3497	MDF Stewardship Position FY16	2016	$ 30,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3498	Outdoor Adventure Days Sponsorship	2015	$ 5,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3500	Gordon Creek WMA Shrub Planting	2015	$ 12,127.50	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3505	Efficacy of Translocation as a Management Tool for Urban Mule	2016	$ 5,940.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3512	Bruce Hall Hardware Ranch	2016	$ 21,886.23	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3526	Advancing Hunting and Angling Sports	2015	$ 50,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3549	Utah Youth Hunter Education Challenge	2016	$ 2,500.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3563	Duncan Creek - Final Phase	2017	$ 10,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3568	Moon Ridge Chaining maintenance	2017	$ 5,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3599	Flaming Gorge Bighorn Sheep Habitat Lop and Scatter; Phase 1	2017	$ 5,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3605	Birdseye WMA Bullhog Project	2017	$ 13,600.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3606	Sheep Creek Phase 4	2017	$ 10,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3633	Indian Creek West Drag Chaining	2017	$ 10,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3642	Boulevard Ridge Pinyon and Juniper Removal Maintenance Pro	2017	$ 5,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3650	Warm Spring Hills Juniper removal project phase 2	2017	$ 10,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3659	Monroe Mountain Aspen Ecosystems Restoration Project Phase	2017	$ 20,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3662	Cedar Fort Chaining	2017	$ 15,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3673	South Bookcliffs Phase 4 (Sagers)	2017	$ 10,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3674	CRO Transplants	2016	$ 1,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3690	Went Ridge Guzzlers	2017	$ 5,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3701	Hardware Plateau Lop and Scatter	2017	$ 10,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3742	Fish Park Gunnison Sage-grouse Habitat Improvement	2017	$ 5,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3756	Outdoor Adventure Days Sponsorship	2016	$ 7,500.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3769	Cedar City and Summit I-15 Deer Fence and Cattle Guards	2017	$ 29,500.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3773	North Elk Ridge Aspen Restoration Phase II	2017	$ 2,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3774	Mormon Pasture Mountain Wildlife Habitat Improvement Phas	2017	$ 10,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3782	Little Davenport Slashing/Lop & Scatter	2017	$ 5,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3794	Paradise Valley Restoration Project	2017	$ 3,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3795	Spring City Fuels Reduction and Habitat Improvement	2017	$ 2,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3797	Willow Creek Habitat Improvement and Fuels Reduction	2017	$ 1,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3815	MDF Deer Transport Trailer	2016	$ 13,033.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3830	FY17 Effects of Habitat Treatments on Mule Deer	2017	$ 21,245.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3831	FY17 DeerFawn/Adult Survival	2017	$ 15,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
3913	Box Elder SGMA Aerial Infrared Lek Searches	2017	$ 4,000.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit

Mule Deer Foundation

Project#	Project Title	Year	Amount	Status	Funding Source
4156	Winter Deer Feed FY17	2017	$ 15,159.96	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
4200	Outdoor Adventure Days	2017	$ 7,500.00	Paid	MDF Expo Permit
	TOTAL PAID		**$ 768,199.50**		
3918	Little Valley North Sheeprocks PJ Removal	2018	$ 19,000.00	Committed	MDF Expo Permit
3943	Long Hollow Sheep/Parowan Gap (Upper Long Hollow Vegetati	2018	$ 15,000.00	Committed	MDF Expo Permit
3969	Cockey Hollow Vegetation Management Project	2018	$ 10,000.00	Committed	MDF Expo Permit
3979	Temple Fork Juniper Restoration 3	2018	$ 30,047.50	Committed	MDF Expo Permit
3995	Mytoge-Tidwell Sage Grouse Habitat Improvement Phase 1	2018	$ 20,000.00	Committed	MDF Expo Permit
4036	South Horn Wildlife Habitat Improvement Project	2018	$ 15,000.00	Committed	MDF Expo Permit
4078	Trail Mountain Wildlife Habitat Enhancement and Aspen Regen	2018	$ 20,000.00	Committed	MDF Expo Permit
4085	Little Creek Ridge Guzzlers	2018	$ 10,000.00	Committed	MDF Expo Permit
4089	Richfield Upland Game and Waterfowl Management Project Ph	2018	$ 5,000.00	Committed	MDF Expo Permit
4103	La Sal/Elk Ridge Prescribed Burn Projects	2018	$ 10,000.00	Committed	MDF Expo Permit
4104	Helicopter Lift of Remote Watering Facilities	2018	$ 2,500.00	Committed	MDF Expo Permit
4128	Cedar City to Parowan I-15 Deer Fence and Double Cattle Guar	2018	$ 10,000.00	Committed	MDF Expo Permit
4129	Traverse Mountain Winter Range Improvement	2018	$ 10,000.00	Committed	MDF Expo Permit
	TOTAL COMMITTED		**$ 176,547.50**		

MDF Total Committed and Paid $ 944,747.00

Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife

Project#	Project Title	Year	Amount	Status	Funding Source
2633	Sowers Canyon SFW Property Habitat Improvement	2014	$ 6,125.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
2767	South Slope Feral Horse Gather	2014	$ 34,817.20	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3078	Bighorn Sheep and Mountain Goat Transplant Trailer	2014	$ 5,000.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3092	Buckskin and 5 Mile Catchment Apron Repairs	2013	$ 14,148.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3095	Tarantula Pipeline Pump Replacement	2014	$ 7,043.78	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3146	Mule Deer Transplants FY13-14	2013	$ 166,085.80	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3147	Youth Recruitment and retention pheasant program	2014	$ 78,906.45	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3149	Black Mesa Pond Cleaning	2014	$ 9,180.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3151	David Edwards Fencing Project	2014	$ 48,219.60	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3161	Richfield Upland Game and Waterfowl Management Project Ph	2014	$ 35,369.04	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3186	Pahvant spring rehabilitation	2014	$ 13,635.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3220	Wildlife Crossing US 191 mp 66-70	2015	$ 25,000.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3236	West Vernon Phase 5: Lion Hill	2016	$ 5,000.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3246	Support for Congressional Sportsman's Foundation	2016	$ 50,000.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3397	Richfield Upland Game and Waterfowl Management Project Ph	2016	$ 35,000.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3499	South Slope Feral Horse Gather Phase II	2016	$ 34,817.20	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3508	Parowan Front deer translocation	2015	$ 74,089.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3589	Timpanogos Guzzler Project	2017	$ 5,000.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3662	Cedar Fort Chaining	2017	$ 2,500.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3746	Wide Canyon Water Enhancement Project	2017	$ 45,250.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3795	Spring City Fuels Reduction and Habitat Improvement	2017	$ 2,000.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3831	FY17 DeerFawn/Adult Survival	2017	$ 5,000.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3832	FY17 Determinants of Population Growth in Utah Moose	2017	$ 5,000.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3848	Richfield Pheasant Project	2016	$ 47,440.56	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3849	Wild Turkey Feeding SFW	2016	$ 4,503.68	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3913	Box Elder SGMA Aerial Infrared Lek Searches	2017	$ 4,000.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3929	Westside Northeastern Region WMA's Water Development Pro	2018	$ 20,000.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
3980	Book Cliffs Lower Elevation Guzzlers phase II	2018	$ 25,000.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
4089	Richfield Upland Game and Waterfowl Management Project Ph	2018	$ 29,500.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
4104	Helicopter Lift of Remote Watering Facilities	2018	$ 2,500.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
4180	FY18 DeerFawn/Adult Survival	2018	$ 10,000.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
4182	FY18 Determinants of Population Growth in Utah Moose	2018	$ 3,447.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
4188	FY18 Wildlife Migration Initiative	2018	$ 50,000.00	Paid	SFW Expo Permit
	TOTAL PAID		**$ 903,577.31**		
4156	Winter Deer Feed FY17	2017	$ 21,540.56	Committed	SFW Expo Permit
	TOTAL COMMITTED		**$ 21,540.56**		

SFW Total Committed and Paid $ 925,117.87

Attachment 2

List of Contractor-Approved Efforts to Support Utah Conservation Initiatives

Mule Deer Foundation

Project #	Project Title	Year	Amount	Status	Funding Source
3823	MDF Stewardship Position FY17	2017	$ 30,000.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
3868	Pine Canyon to Koosharem Creek Wildlife Habitat Improveme	2018	$ 5,000.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
3917	Stansbury Mountain Catastrophic Fire Juniper Removal and Se	2018	$ 5,000.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
3918	Little Valley North Sheeprocks PJ Removal	2018	$ 6,000.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
3934	IndianPeak/Spanish George (Hamlin Valley Habitat Restoratio	2018	$ 5,000.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
3947	Tavaputs Plateau Sagegrouse Habitat Restoration	2018	$ 2,500.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
3950	Swasey Wildlife Habitat Improvement and Hazardous Fuels Re	2018	$ 5,000.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
3961	South Bookcliffs Phase 5 (Bryson)	2018	$ 3,000.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
3965	Antelope-Pine Valley Hand Thinning	2018	$ 5,000.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
3966	Antimony (Forest Creek)	2018	$ 5,000.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
3980	Book Cliffs Lower Elevation Guzzlers phase II	2018	$ 13,108.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
4084	White Horse Pasture Habitat Improvement Project Phase I	2018	$ 10,000.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
4087	Stateline (Hamlin Valley) Sagebrush Habitat Restoration Proje	2018	$ 5,000.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
4096	Hardware Ranch Juniper Lop and Scatter II	2018	$ 12,000.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
4129	Traverse Mountain Winter Range Improvement	2018	$ 3,885.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
4149	Watts Mountain Wildlife Habitat Improvement Project	2018	$ 13,100.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
4180	FY18 DeerFawn/Adult Survival	2018	$ 6,950.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
4187	FY18 Parker Mtn Pronghorn Capture and Monitoring	2018	$ 1,000.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
4188	FY18 Wildlife Migration Initiative	2018	$ 25,000.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
4191	MDF Deer Transport Trailer	2018	$ 24,000.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
4195	Middle Fork WMA acquisition	2017	$ 75,000.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
4196	Utah Youth Hunter Education Challenge	2017	$ 2,500.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
4215	MDF Stewardship Position FY18	2018	$ 30,000.00	Committed	MDF Admin Expo Fund
	TOTAL COMMITTED		**$ 293,043.00**		

Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife

Project #	Project Title	Year	Amount	Status	Funding Source
-	Pheasants for UDWR Youth Day -Millard County	2017	$ 9,750.00	Paid	SFW Admin Expo Funds
-	Expo Draw Expenses in concert with WHCE	2017	$ 277,732.80	Paid	SFW Admin Expo Funds
	TOTAL PAID		**$ 287,482.80**		

On Tuesday, February 21, 2017 the electronic random drawing for the 200 Expo permits will take place at the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources located at 1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah. These permits were awarded to the Western Hunting & Conservation Expo by the Utah Wildlife Board.

The following are witnesses of the drawing and were present during the entire process. Once the successful applicants have been drawn, all names will be given to Division of Wildlife Resources Law Enforcement. The names will be checked for any compact violations and will be deemed eligible by the Division of Wildlife and the successful applicants will be notified by mail.

Start Time: 10:21 a.m.

End Time: 10:44 a.m.

PASSCODE Big Buck 4x4

Print Name	Signature	Date
Lindy Varney	Lindy Varney	2/21/17
Kenny Johnson		2 2 17
Greg Evans		2/21/17
Brian Sumner		2/2/17
Rob Gray		2/21/17
Debbie Marchese	Debbie Marchese	2/21/17.
Chris Carling		2/21/17
Troy Justensen		2/21/17
Phil Gray		2/21/17

Print Name	Signature	Date
Rick Olson		2-21-17
Cory Anderson		2-21-17
Justin Tolbert		2-21-17
Jeff Green		2-21-17
Mike Canning		2/21/17
Jeremy Withers		2/21/17
Miles Moretti		2/21/17

R657-55 – Wildlife Expo Permits

KEY: wildlife, wildlife permits

Date of Enactment or Last Substantive Amendment: November 10, 2015

Notice of Continuation: May 5, 2015

Authorizing, and Implemented or Interpreted law: 23-14-18; 23-14-19

R657-55-1. Purpose and Authority.

(1) Under the authority of Sections 23-14-18 and 23-14-19 of the Utah Code, this rule provides the standards and requirements for issuing wildlife expo permits.

(2) Wildlife expo permits are authorized by the Wildlife Board and issued by the division to a qualified conservation organization for purposes of generating revenue to fund wildlife conservation activities in Utah and attracting and supporting a regional or national wildlife exposition in Utah.

(3) The selected conservation organization will conduct a random drawing at an exposition held in Utah to distribute the opportunity to receive wildlife expo permits.

(4) This rule is intended as authorization to issue one series of wildlife expo permits per year to one qualified conservation organization.

R657-55-2. Definitions.

(1) Terms used in this rule are defined in Section 23-13-2.

(2) In addition:

(a) "Conservation organization" means a nonprofit chartered institution, corporation, foundation, or association founded for the purpose of promoting wildlife conservation.

(b) "Special nonresident expo permit" means one wildlife expo permit for each once-in-a-lifetime species that is only available to a nonresident hunter legally eligible to hunt in Utah.

(c) "Wildlife exposition" means a multi-day event held within the state of Utah that is sponsored by one or more wildlife conservation organizations as their national or regional convention or event that is open to the general public and designed to draw nationwide attendance of more than 10,000 individuals. The wildlife exposition may include wildlife conservation fund raising activities, outdoor exhibits, retail marketing of outdoor products and services, public awareness programs, and other similar activities.

(d) "Wildlife exposition audit" means an annual review by the division of the conservation organization's processes used to handle applications for expo permits and conduct the drawing, the protocols associated with collecting and using client data, the revenue generated from expo permit application fees, and the expenditure of designated expo permit application fee revenue on division-approved projects.

(e) "Wildlife expo permit" means a permit which:

(i) is authorized by the Wildlife Board to be issued to successful applicants through a drawing or random selection process conducted at a Utah wildlife exposition; and

(ii) allows the permittee to hunt the designated species on the designated unit during the respective season for each species as authorized by the Wildlife Board.

(f) "Wildlife expo permit series" means a single package of permits to be determined by the Wildlife Board for:

(i) deer;

(ii) elk;

(iii) pronghorn;

(iv) moose;

(v) bison;

(vi) rocky mountain goat;

(vii) desert bighorn sheep;

(viii) rocky mountain bighorn sheep;

(ix) wild turkey;

(x) cougar; or

(xi) black bear.

(g) "Secured opportunity" means the opportunity to receive a specified wildlife expo permit that is secured by an eligible applicant through the exposition drawing process.

(h) "Successful applicant" means an individual selected to receive a wildlife expo permit through the drawing process.

R657-55-3. Wildlife Expo Permit Allocation.

(1) The Wildlife Board may allocate wildlife expo permits by May 1 of the year preceding the wildlife exposition.

(2) Wildlife expo permits shall be issued as a single series to one conservation organization.

(3) The number of wildlife expo permits authorized by the Wildlife Board shall be based on:

(a) the species population trend, size, and distribution to protect the long-term health of the population;

(b) the hunting and viewing opportunity for the general public, both short and long term; and

(c) a percentage of the permits available to nonresidents in the annual big game drawings matched by a proportionate number of resident permits.

(4) Wildlife expo permits, including special nonresident expo permits, shall not exceed 200 total permits.

(5) Wildlife expo permits designated for the exposition each year shall be deducted from the number of public drawing permits.

R657-55-4. Obtaining Authority to Distribute Wildlife Expo Permit Series.

(1)(a) Except as provided in Subsection (b), the wildlife expo permit series is issued for a period of five years.

(b) For expo contracts governing the 2017 expo, and all expo contracts thereafter, the original five year term may be extended an additional period not to exceed five years, so long as:

(i) the division and conservation organization mutually agree in writing to an extension; and

(ii) the contract extension is approved by the Wildlife Board.

(2) The wildlife expo permit series is available to eligible conservation organizations for distribution through a drawing or other random selection process held at a wildlife exposition in Utah open to the public.

(3) Conservation organizations may apply for the wildlife expo permit series by sending an application to the division between August 1 and September 1 of the year preceding the expiration of each wildlife exposition term, as provide in R657-55-4(1).

(4) Each application must include:

(a) the name, address and telephone number of the conservation organization;

(b) a description of the conservation organization's mission statement;

(c) the name of the president or other individual responsible for the administrative operations of the conservation organization; and

(d) a detailed business plan describing how the wildlife exposition will take place and how the wildlife expo permit drawing procedures will be carried out.

(5) An incomplete or incorrect application may be rejected.

(6) The division shall recommend to the Wildlife Board which conservation organization may receive the wildlife expo permit series based on:

(a) the business plan for the wildlife exposition and drawing procedures contained in the application; and

(b) the conservation organization's, including its constituent entities, ability, including past performance in marketing conservation permits under Rule R657-41, to effectively plan and complete the wildlife exposition.

(7) The Wildlife Board shall make the final assignment of the wildlife expo permit series based on the:

(a) division's recommendation;

(b) applicant conservation organization's commitment to use expo permit handling fee revenue to benefit protected wildlife in Utah;

(c) historical contribution of the applicant conservation organization, including its constituent entities, to the conservation of wildlife in Utah; and

(d) previous performance of the applicant conservation organization, including its constituent entities.

(8) The conservation organization receiving the wildlife expo permit series must:

(a) require each wildlife expo permit applicant to possess a current Utah hunting or combination license before applying for a wildlife expo permit;

(b) select successful applicants for wildlife convention permits by drawing or other random selection process in accordance with law, provisions of this rule, proclamation, and order of the Wildlife Board;

(c) allow applicants to apply for wildlife expo permits without purchasing admission to the wildlife exposition;

(d) notify the division of the successful applicant of each wildlife expo permit within 10 days of the applicant's selection;

(e) maintain records demonstrating that the drawing was conducted fairly; and

(f) submit to an annual wildlife exposition audit by a division appointed auditor.

(9) The division shall issue the appropriate wildlife expo permit to the designated successful applicant after:

(a) completion of the random selection process;

(b) verification of the recipient being eligible for the permit; and

(c) payment of the appropriate permit fee is received by the division.

(10) The division and the conservation organization receiving the wildlife expo permit series shall enter into a contract, including the provisions outlined in this rule.

(11) If the conservation organization awarded the wildlife expo permit series withdraws before the end of the 5 year period or any extension period under R657-55-4(1)(b), any remaining co-participant with the conservation organization may be given an opportunity to assume the contract and to distribute the expo permit series consistent with the contract and this rule for the remaining years in the applicable period, provided:

(a) The original contracted conservation organization submits a certified letter to the division identifying that it will no longer be participating in the exposition.

(b) The partner or successor conservation organization files an application with the division as provided in Subsection (4) for the remaining period.

(c) The successor conservation organization submits its application request at least 60 days prior to the next scheduled exposition so that the Wildlife Board can evaluate the request under the criteria in this section.

(d) The Wildlife Board authorizes the successor conservation organization to assume the contract and complete the balance of the expo permit series period.

(12) The division may suspend or terminate the conservation organization's authority to distribute wildlife expo permits at any time during the original five year award term or any extension period for:

(a) violating any of the requirements set forth in this rule or the contract; or

(b) failing to bring or organize a wildlife exposition in Utah, as described in the business plan under R657-55-4(4)(d), in any given year.

R657-55-5. Wildlife Expo Permit Application Procedures.

(1) Any person legally eligible to hunt in Utah may apply for a wildlife expo permit, except that only a nonresident of Utah may apply for a special nonresident expo permit.

(2) The handling fee assessed by the conservation organization to process applications shall be $5 per application submitted.

(3)(a) Except as provided in Subsection (3)(b), applicants must validate their application in person at the wildlife exposition to be eligible to participate in the wildlife expo permit drawing.

(i) No person may submit an application in behalf of another.

(ii) A person may validate their wildlife expo permit application at the exposition without having to enter the exposition and pay the admission charge.

(b) An applicant that is a member of the United States Armed Forces and unable to attend the wildlife exposition as a result of being deployed or mobilized in the interest of national defense or a national emergency is not required to validate their application in person; provided exposition administrators are furnished a copy of the written deployment or mobilization orders and the orders identify:

(i) the branch of the United States Armed forces from which the applicant is deployed or mobilized;

(ii) the location where the applicant is deployed or mobilized;

(iii) the date the applicant is required to report to duty; and

(iv) the nature and length of the applicant's deployment or mobilization.

(c) The conservation organization shall maintain a record, including copies of military orders, of all applicants that are not required to validate their applications in person pursuant to Subsection (3)(b), and submit to a division audit of these records as part of its annual audit under R657-55-4(8)(f).

(4) Applicants may apply for each individual hunt for which they are eligible.

(5) Applicants may apply only once for each hunt, regardless of the number of permits for that hunt.

(6) Applicants must submit an application for each desired hunt.

(7) Applicants must possess a current Utah hunting or combination license in order to apply for a wildlife expo permit.

(8) The conservation organization shall advertise, accept, and process applications for wildlife expo permits and conduct the drawing in compliance with this rule and all other applicable laws.

R657-55-6. Drawing Procedures.

(1) A random drawing or selection process must be conducted for each wildlife expo permit.

(2) Preference and bonus points are neither awarded nor applied in the drawings.

(3) Waiting periods do not apply, except any person who obtains a wildlife expo permit for a once-in-a-lifetime species is subject to the once-in-a-lifetime restrictions applicable to obtaining a subsequent permit for the same species through a division application and drawing process, as provided in Rule R657-5 and the proclamation of the Wildlife Board for taking big game.

(4) No predetermined quotas or restrictions shall be imposed in the application or selection process for wildlife expo permits between resident and nonresident applicants, except that special nonresident expo permits may only be awarded to a nonresident of Utah.

(5) Drawings will be conducted within five days of the close of the exposition.

(6) Applicants do not have to be present at the drawing to be awarded a wildlife expo permit.

(7) The conservation organization shall identify all eligible alternates for each wildlife expo permit and provide the division with a finalized list. This list will be maintained by the conservation organization until all permits are issued.

(8) The division shall contact successful applicants by phone or mail, and the conservation organization shall post the name of all successful applicants on a designated website.

R657-55-7. Issuance of Permits.

(1) The division shall provide a wildlife expo permit to the successful applicant, as designated by the conservation organization.

(2) The division must provide a wildlife expo permit to each successful applicant, except as otherwise provided in this rule.

(3) The division shall provide each successful applicant a letter indicating the permit secured in the drawing, the appropriate fee owed the division, and the date the fee is due.

(4)(a) Successful applicants must provide the permit fee payment in full to the division.

(b) Subject to the limitation in Subsection (8), the division will issue the designated wildlife expo permit to the applicant.

(5) Residents will pay resident permit fees and nonresidents will pay nonresident permit fees.

(6) Applicants are eligible to obtain only one permit per species, except as provided in Rule R657-5, but no restrictions apply on obtaining permits for multiple species.

(7) If an applicant is selected for more than one expo permit for the same species, the division will contact the applicant to determine which permit the applicant selects.

(a) The applicant must select the permit of choice within five days of receiving notification.

(b) If the division is unable to contact the applicant within 5 days, the division will issue to the applicant the permit with the most difficult drawings odds based on drawing results from the division's big game drawing for the preceding year.

(c) Permits not issued to the applicant will go to the next person on the alternate drawing list for that permit.

(8) Any successful applicant who fails to satisfy the following requirements will be ineligible to receive the wildlife expo permit and the next drawing alternate for that permit will be selected:

(a) The applicant fails to return the appropriate permit fee in full by the date provided in Subsection (3);

(b) The applicant does not possess a valid Utah hunting or combination license at the time the expo permit application was submitted and the permit received; or

(c) The applicant is legally ineligible to possess the permit.

R657-55-8. Surrender or Transfer of Wildlife Expo Permits.

(1)(a) A person selected to receive a wildlife expo permit that is also successful in obtaining a Utah limited entry permit for the same species in the same year or successful in obtaining a general permit for a male animal of the same species in the same year, may not possess both permits and must select the permit of choice.

(b) In the event a secured opportunity is willingly surrendered before the permit is issued, the next eligible applicant on the alternate drawing list will be selected to receive the permit.

(c) In the event the wildlife expo permit is surrendered, the next eligible applicant on the alternate drawing list for that permit will be selected to receive it, and the permit fee may be refunded, as provided in Sections 23-19-38, 23-19-38.2, and R657-42-5.

(2) A person selected by a conservation organization to receive a wildlife expo permit, may not sell or transfer the permit, or any rights thereunder to another person in accordance with Section 23-19-1.

(3) If a person is successful in obtaining a wildlife expo permit but is legally ineligible to hunt in Utah, the next eligible applicant on the alternate drawing list for that permit will be selected to receive it.

R657-55-9. Using a Wildlife Expo Permit.

(1) A wildlife expo permit allows the recipient to:

(a) take only the species for which the permit is issued;

(b) take only the species and sex printed on the permit;

(c) take the species only in the area and during the season specified on the permit; and

(d) take the species only with the weapon type specified on the permit.

(2) The recipient of a wildlife expo permit is subject to all of the provisions of Title 23, Wildlife Resources Code, and the rules and proclamations of the Wildlife Board for taking and pursuing wildlife.

R657-55-10. Wildlife Expo Permit — Application Fee Revenue.

(1) All wildlife expo permit application fee revenue generated by the conservation organization under R657-55-5(2) will be deposited in a separate, federally insured account to prevent commingling with any other funds.

(a) All interest earned on application fee revenue may be retained and used by the conservation organization for administrative expenses.

(2) The conservation organization may retain up to $3.50 of each $5.00 application fee for administrative expenses.

(3) The remaining balance of each $5.00 application fee will be used by the conservation organization to fund projects advancing wildlife interests in the state, subject to the following:

(a) project funding will not be committed to or expended on any project without first obtaining the division director's written approval;

(b) cash donations to the Wildlife Habitat Account created under Section 23-19-43 or Division Species Enhancement Funds are authorized projects that do not require the division director's approval; and

(c) application fee revenue dedicated to funding projects must be completely expended on or committed to approved projects by September 1st, two years following the year in which the application fee revenue is collected, unless otherwise authorized in writing by the division director.

(4) All records and receipts for projects under Subsection (3) must be retained by the conservation organization for a period not less than five years, and shall be produced to the division for inspection upon request.

(5) The conservation organization shall submit a report to the division and Wildlife Board each year no later than September 1st that accounts for and documents the following:

(a) gross revenue generated from collecting $5 wildlife expo permit application fees;

(b) total amount of application fee revenue retained for administrative expenses;

(c) total amount of application fee revenue set aside and dedicated to funding projects, including bank statements showing account balances; and

(d) description and records of each project funded with application fee revenue, including the date of funding, the amount of funding contributed, and the completion status of the project.

(6) An organization that individually receives application fee revenue from the expo permit drawing pursuant to a co-participant contract with the conservation organization, is subject to the provisions in Subsections (1) through (5).