

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

January 11, 2018, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

The Board Meeting will stream live at <https://youtu.be/xFPeE79o9Ok>

AGENDA

Thursday, January 11, 2018

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda
– Kirk Woodward, Chairman | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
– Kirk Woodward, Chairman | ACTION |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log
– Byron Bateman, Vice-Chair | CONTINGENT |
| 4. DWR Update
– Mike Fowlks, DWR Director | INFORMATION |
| 5. Deer Creek Reservoir
- Nathan Owens, Aquatic Invasive Species Program Coordinator | INFORMATION |
| 6. Flaming Gorge Management Plan
- Ryan Mosley, Regional Aquatics Biologist | INFORMATION |
| 7. 2018 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments
- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator | ACTION |
| 8. CWMU Advisory Committee Appointments
- Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief | ACTION |
| 9. Other Business
– Kirk Woodward, Chairman | CONTINGENT |

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

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 – 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: Update September 28, 2017
Placed on Action Log: April 27, 2017

Spring 2018 - Target Date – Big Game Baiting Issues

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log item a report in spring 2018 from DWR's big game coordinator on the review of big game baiting issues.

Motion made by: Kirk Woodward
Assigned to: Justin Shannon
Action: Under Study
Status: Scheduled for the April/May 2018 RAC and Board Tour
Placed on Action Log: August 31, 2017

Fall 2018 - Target Date – Conservation Permit Program Audit

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log item a review of the conservation permit audit process that could include a rule change.

Motion made by: Karl Hirst
Assigned to: Greg Hansen/Kenny Johnson
Action: Under Study
Status: Scheduled for the May/June 2018 RAC and Board Tour
Placed on Action Log: September 28, 2017

Fall 2018 - Target Date – Archery Season Dates for Deer

MOTION: I move that we put on the action log a review of the season date change for archery deer hunting and add a survey concerning this issue prior to the next revision of the statewide deer management plan in 2022. The Division will report back next year to look at how season date changes would look with the requested change

Motion made by: Calvin Crandall
Assigned to: Covy Jones
Action: Under Study
Status: Scheduled for the November 2018 RAC and Board Tour
Placed on Action Log: September 28, 2017

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
November 30, 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 Calvin Crandall, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda.

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

The following motion was made by Kevin Albrecht, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the September 28, 2017 Wildlife Board Meeting.

3) Old Business/Action Log (**Contingent**)

Action Log Items addressed:

CWMU Single Permits - not recommended

4) Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2018 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Kevin Albrecht, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments 2018 as presented by the Division.

5) R657-19 Taking of Non-game Mammals Rule Amendment (**Action**)

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

MOTION: I move that we approve R657-19 Taking of Non-game Rule Amendment as presented by the Division.

6) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2018 Season Dates, Application Timeline (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Bighorn Sheep hunt on the Oak Creek unit.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Karl Hirst and failed 4 to 3. Byron Bateman, Kevin Albrecht, and Steve Dalton opposed. Chairman Woodward broke the tie in opposition of the motion.

MOTION: I move that we accept the new archery only, once-in-a-lifetime Bighorn Sheep hunts on the Newfoundland and Zion units.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst and died for lack of a second vote.

MOTION: I move that we approve the multi-season elk hunt with a 5,000 cap for spike and 5,000 cap for any bull.

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed 5 to 1. Karl Hirst opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the multi-season hunt as presented with the caveat that the Division conduct a survey gauging permit holders' success rates and weapon types, and provide the Board a report of the results next year.

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Byron Bateman and passed 4 to 2. Calvin Crandall and Karl Hirst opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the early rifle season hunt as presented excluding the Panguitch Lake unit.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's alternative recommendation provided by the Mule Deer Management Committee that allows for a late muzzleloader, limited entry hunt on units that exceed the buck-to-doe ratio objective, keep last year's units minus the Plateau/Boulder and Kaiparowitz, and add the Beaver and North Slope units.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the bison recommendation as presented by the Division with the addition of creating a working group modeled after the Henry Mountain working group.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the cactus buck hunt on the Paunsaugunt.

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

MOTION: I move that we set the Paunsaugunt rifle hunt date to begin alongside the limited entry hunt date and end on the last day of October; in addition, the Division may adjust the other management hunts accordingly.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Calvin Crandall, then withdrawn since either sex hunt was already in the elk management plan, but had not been implemented.

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a Division review of turning the muzzleloader elk hunts into an either sex hunt on units that are over objective and report back to the board next year.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed 5 to 1. Kevin Albrecht opposed

MOTION: I move that we put on the action log a review of the season date change for archery elk hunting and add a survey concerning this issue prior to the next revision of the statewide elk management plan in 2022. The Division will report back next year to look at how season date changes would look with the requested change.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the balance of the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2018 Season Dates, Application Timeline as presented by the Division.

- 7) R657-5 Taking Big Game Rule Amendments (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept R657-5 Taking Big Game Rule Amendments as presented by the Division including a definition change for cactus buck of 50% velvet coverage to antlers.

- 8) R657-71 Removal of Wild Mule Deer from Domesticated Elk Facilities (**Action**)

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

MOTION: I move that we approve R657-71 Removal of Wild Mule Deer from Domesticated Elk Facilities as presented by the Division.

- 9) Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan as presented by the Division.

- 10) Statewide Moose Management Plan (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Statewide Moose Management Plan as presented by the Division.

11) NR Deer Management Plans (**Action**)

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the NR Deer Management Plans as presented by the Division.

12) CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2018 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve Jump Creek CWMU's three-year COR with the understanding that they will apply for the variance in February 2018. Contingent upon a favorable recommendation, permits will be issued for years two and three; otherwise, an unfavorable recommendation will bring it back to the Wildlife Board.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Byron Bateman and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2018 along with the recommended permit changes for Jacob's Creek and Woodruff Creek CWMUs for 2018 and 2019.

13) Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2018 (**Action**)

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

MOTION: I move that we accept Diamond Mountain Landowner Association's variance request; grant six landowner permits to the Book Cliffs and five landowner permits to Three Corners; and approve the remainder of the 2018 permit numbers as presented by the Division.

14) R657-67 Mentor Rule Amendments (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve R657-67 Mentor Rule Amendments as presented by the Division.

15) Other Business (**Contingent**)

The following motion was made by Kevin Albrecht, seconded by Byron Bateman and passed

unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we recommend to the Division that they form a sheep working group or committee prior to the next statewide sheep management plan.

DRAFT

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
November 30, 2017, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Attendance

Wildlife Board

Kirk Woodward – Chair
Byron Bateman – Vice-Chair
Mike Fowlks – Exec Sec
Kevin Albrecht
Calvin Crandall
Donnie Hunter
Karl Hirst
Steve Dalton

RAC Chairs

Central – Ron Camp
Southern – Dave Black
Southeastern – Trisha Hedin
Northeastern – Dan Abeyta
Northern – Randy Wood

Division Personnel

Mike Canning
Bill Bates
Chris Wood
Kevin Bunnell
Boyde Blackwell
Jason Vernon
Rick Olson
Robin Cahoon
Justin Shannon
Kenny Johnson
Scott White
Mitch Lane
Mike Christensen
Paul Gedge
Staci Coons
Thu Vo-Wood
Ben Nadolski
Daniel Olson
Shelly Clement
Jack Lytle

Martin Bushman
Greg Hansen
Lindy Varney
Teresa Griffin
Guy Wallace
Riley Peck
Randy Wood
Dax Mangus
Blair Stringham
Jessica Van Woeart
Covy Jones
Randy Larsen
Kent Hersey
Jim Christensen
Mike Wardle
Phil Gray
Mark Hadley
Brad Crompton
Steve Newren

Public Present

Lee Tracy
Gerda Dickinson
David Hinkins – Senator
Troy Justensen – SFW
Ben Lowder – UBA
Kyle Whitherspoon – SCI
Bill Christensen – RMEF
Scott Chew – UT House of Representatives
Ken Clegg – Jump Creek CWMU
Jared Robinson – Muley Fanatics Foundation
Dennis Beardall – Jump Creek CWMU
Leslie McFarlane – UT Dept of Agriculture and Food
Dennis Blackburn – Wayne County Commission
Marc Dickinson – 3 Corners Landowners Association
Casey Hopes – Carbon County Commission
Sterling Brown – UT Farm Bureau
Tammy Pearson – Beaver County Commissioner

Butch Jensen
Bob Christensen
Ken Oetker
Steve Dansie
Brad Brown
Del Milewddy
Ken Strong

Jana Johansen
Brian Pedersen
Wade Garrett
Tom Barton
Jennifer Nichols
Gary Hallows
Lloyd Pehrson
Brent Anderson
Kami Marriott
Jeanie Jensen
Bryce Pilling

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
November 30, 2017, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
<https://youtu.be/Zb2YAO7ORBk>

- 00:00:10** Chairman Woodward called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, introduced Board and RAC members, and reviewed the meeting process.
- 00:04:35** 1) **Approval of Agenda** (Action)
The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.
MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda as presented.
- 00:04:58** 2) **Approval of Minutes** (Action)
The following motion was made by Kevin Albrecht, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed unanimously.
MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the September 28, 2017 Wildlife Board Meeting.
- 00:05:27** 3) **Old Business/Action Log** (Contingent)
Vice-Chair Bateman reviewed action log item CWMU Single Permits. The Division did not recommend this action, opting for more public hunting opportunities.
Other items were addressed during the RAC meetings and/or during agenda items of this board meeting:
Shed Antler Gathering
2nd General Season Rifle Hunt
Limited Entry Late Season Muzzleloader Hunts on General Season Units
Velvet Only Buck Hunts on the Paunsaugunt
Antlerless Public Hunting Ending Dates
- 00:09:13** 4) **DWR Update** (Informational)
Mike Fowlks summarized DWR's winter projects: big game captures, and trap and transfer of bighorn sheep. Fowlks thanked Executive Director Styler and Assistant Director Canning for working on finalizing the SITLA Access Agreement.
- 00:10:27** 5) **Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2018** (Action)
Blair Stringham presented the recommendations and rule amendments.
- 00:18:10** **Board Questions**
The board asked about hunter/youth retention and goose terminology.
- 00:19:40** **RAC Recommendations**
All RACs passed the rule amendments unanimously. Northern RAC had an

exception to delaying the start of the scaup season.

00:21:56 Public Comments

Public comments were accepted at this time.

00:24:30 Board Discussion

The following motion was made by Kevin Albrecht, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments 2018 as presented by the Division.

00:25:30 6) R657-19 Taking of Non-game Mammals Rule Amendment (Action)

Jessica Van Woeart presented the rule amendment.

00:29:05 Board Questions

The board asked for clarification on what this means for the division and requested for updates as developments occur.

00:30:36 RAC Recommendations

All RACs passed R657-19 unanimously except for Southern RAC, which had one abstention.

00:31:16 Public Comments

Public comments were accepted at this time.

00:37:56 Board Discussion

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

MOTION: I move that we approve R657-19 Taking of Non-game Rule Amendment as presented by the Division.

00:38:36 7) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2018 Season Dates, Application Timeline (Action)

Covy Jones presented the agenda item.

00:51:19 Brad Crompton provided background on bison unit boundary.

01:00:55 Board/Public Questions

The board asked for clarification on the boundary, fencing feasibility, and partnerships to address issue. Public questions were also accepted at this time.

01:11:33 Technical Difficulty – break

01:19:12 Board/Public Questions continued

01:21:13 Presentation continued

01:26:20 Board/RAC Questions

Questions revolved around multi-season elk hunts, additional deer permits, split deer hunts, permit numbers, late muzzleloader hunts, reasoning behind limited entry, and effects on general season hunting opportunities.

01:36:11 Public Questions

Public questions were accepted at this time.

01:51:52 RAC Recommendations

Each RAC had various stipulations for the 2018 bucks, bulls, and OIAL season dates. They all passed the balance of the recommendation with varying dissent.

02:01:39 Public Comments

Public comments were accepted at this time.

02:32:58 Board Discussion

Chairman Woodward summarized the RAC motions, outlined the order of topics to tackle, then opened it up for board discussion.

02:43:15

Bighorn sheep hunt discussion on Oak Creek, Newfoundland, and Zion units.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Bighorn Sheep hunt on the Oak Creek unit.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Karl Hirst and failed 4 to 3. Byron Bateman, Kevin Albrecht, and Steve Dalton opposed. Chairman Woodward broke the tie in opposition of the motion.

MOTION: I move that we accept the new archery only, once-in-a-lifetime Bighorn Sheep hunts on the Newfoundland and Zion units.

02:56:23

Multi-season elk hunt discussion.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst and died for lack of a second vote.

MOTION: I move that we approve the multi-season elk hunt with a 5,000 cap for spike and 5,000 cap for any bull.

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed 5 to 1. Karl Hirst opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the multi-season hunt as presented with the caveat that the Division conduct a survey gauging permit holders' success rates and weapon types, and provide the Board a report of the results next year.

03:12:34

Early rifle season deer hunt discussion.

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Byron Bateman

and passed 4 to 2. Calvin Crandall and Karl Hirst opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the early rifle season hunt as presented excluding the Panguitch Lake unit.

03:16:56

Late season muzzleloader discussion.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's alternative recommendation provided by the Mule Deer Management Committee that allows for a late muzzleloader, limited entry hunt on units that exceed the buck-to-doe ratio objective, keep last year's units minus the Plateau/Boulder and Kaiparowitz, and add the Beaver and North Slope units.

03:22:00

Bison boundary discussion.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the bison recommendation as presented by the Division with the addition of creating a working group modeled after the Henry Mountain working group.

03:30:15

Cactus buck hunt and Paunsaugunt hunt date discussion.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the cactus buck hunt on the Paunsaugunt.

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

MOTION: I move that we set the Paunsaugunt rifle hunt date to begin alongside the limited entry hunt date and end on the last day of October; in addition, the Division may adjust the other management hunts accordingly.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Calvin Crandall, then withdrawn since either sex hunt was already in the elk management plan, but had not been implemented.

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a Division review of turning the muzzleloader elk hunts into an either sex hunt on units that are over objective and report back to the board next year.

Other items were mentioned with no action taken: boundary change on south Manti unit; and South Book Cliffs late season, limited entry primitive weapon hunt.

03:44:05

Discussion on season date change for archery elk action log request from Northeast region.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed 5 to 1. Kevin Albrecht opposed

MOTION: I move that we put on the action log a review of the season date change for archery elk hunting and add a survey concerning this issue prior to the next revision of the statewide elk management plan in 2022. The Division will report back next year to look at how season date changes would look with the requested change.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the balance of the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2018 Season Dates, Application Timeline as presented by the Division.

03:49:56 Lunch Break

04:39:50 8) R657-5 Taking Big Game Rule Amendments (Action)

Covy Jones presented the rule amendments.

04:49:08 Board Questions

The board asked for clarification on magnifying scope use for a crossbow.

04:53:44 RAC Recommendations

Northern and Central RAC passed R657-5 rule amendments as presented. Southern, Southeastern, and Northeastern RAC passed the amendments with some exceptions.

04:56:12 Public Comments

Public comments were accepted at this time.

05:01:52 Board Discussion

Chairman Woodward summarized the RAC recommendations. Southeast RAC chair explained their decision to maintain the draw weight. The board discussed the definition of cactus buck and draw weight. Rick Olson, law enforcement chief, expanded on the cactus buck discussion.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept R657-5 Taking Big Game Rule Amendments as presented by the Division including a definition change for cactus buck of 50% velvet coverage to antlers.

05:09:16 9) R657-71 Removal of Wild Mule Deer from Domesticated Elk Facilities (Action)

Covy Jones presented rule R657-71.

05:13:30 Board Questions

The board asked for clarification on 'major breach,' response timeline, and penalties.

05:16:27 RAC Recommendations

All RACs passed rule R657-71 unanimously.

05:16:55 Public Comments

Public comments were accepted at this time.

05:19:12 Board Discussion

The board discussed frequency of occurrence, reporting timelines.

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

MOTION: I move that we approve R657-71 Removal of Wild Mule Deer from Domesticated Elk Facilities as presented by the Division.

05:22:10 10) Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan (Action)

Randy Larsen presented the statewide pronghorn management plan.

05:28:45 Board Questions

The board asked about pronghorn population, the effects of shifting the harvest age, and breeding/reproduction.

05:31:22 RAC Recommendations

Northern, Central, and Southeastern RAC unanimously passed the management plan. Southern RAC also passed the plan with one abstention. Northeastern RAC passed the plan with an amendment.

05:33:18 Public Comments

Public comments were accepted at this time.

05:39:53 Board Discussion

The Board talked about reviving the working group.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan as presented by the Division.

05:42:00 11) Statewide Moose Management Plan (Action)

Kent Hersey presented the statewide moose management plan.

05:50:04 Board Questions

Donnie Hunter asked what moose compete with.

05:51:53 Public Questions

Public questions were accepted at this time.

05:53:20 RAC Recommendations

All RACs unanimously passed the management plan. Northeastern RAC included

an amendment.

05:55:32 Public Comments

Public comments were accepted at this time.

05:56:46 Board Discussion

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Statewide Moose Management Plan as presented by the Division.

05:57:11 12) NR Deer Management Plans (Action)

Jim Christensen presented the deer management plans.

06:09:41 Board Questions

The board asked about habitat issues.

06:11:54 RAC Recommendations

All RACs unanimously accepted the plan as presented.

06:12:19 Board Discussion

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the NR Deer Management Plans as presented by the Division.

06:13:12 Break

06:20:25 13) CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2018 (Action)

Mike Wardle presented the CWMU management plans and permit numbers.

06:29:50 Board Questions

The board asked about the statewide count of CWMUs, how long the program has been in place, and acreage requirements.

06:32:55 Public Questions

Public questions were accepted at this time.

06:42:46 RAC Recommendations

Central, Southeastern, and Northeastern RAC unanimously accepted the 2018 plans and permit numbers as presented. Southern RAC passed the recommendation with one abstention. Northern RAC unanimously passed the recommendation with changes.

06:45:30 Public Comments

Public comments were accepted at this time.

06:54:40 Board Discussion

The board asked the Northern RAC to explain their motion. Brad Crompton explained his decision to deny Jump Creek. There was further discussion about acreage requirements, variance process, and what options are available for Jump Creek.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve Jump Creek CWMU's three-year COR with the understanding that they will apply for the variance in February 2018. Contingent upon a favorable recommendation, permits will be issued for years two and three; otherwise, an unfavorable recommendation will bring it back to the Wildlife Board.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Byron Bateman and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2018 along with the recommended permit changes for Jacob's Creek and Woodruff Creek CWMUs for 2018 and 2019.

07:21:18 14) Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2018 (Action)

Mike Wardle presented the landowner association permit numbers.

07:25:30 Board/RAC Questions

The board asked for clarification on the difference between requested vouchers and qualified vouchers, the disparity of the Book Cliff's request, and the function of vouchers.

07:32:21 Public Questions

Public questions were accepted at this time.

07:39:25 RAC Recommendations

Northern, Central, and Southern RAC passed the 2018 recommendations as presented. Southeastern RAC passed the recommendation with an exception. Northeastern RAC had various stipulations which all passed with some degree of dissent.

07:44:31 Public Comments

Public comments were accepted at this time.

07:51:58 Board Discussion

Chairman Woodward summarized the RACs' motions. The Board discussed the RAC's vote for Book Cliffs and Three Corners, damage costs, conflict of domestic and wild sheep, and the need to continue cooperative efforts.

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

passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept Diamond Mountain Landowner Association's variance request; grant six landowner permits to the Book Cliffs and five landowner permits to Three Corners; and approve the remainder of the 2018 permit numbers as presented by the Division.

08:02:10 15) R657-67 Mentor Rule Amendments (Action)

Phil Gray presented the rule amendments.

08:10:32 Board/RAC Questions

The Board posed scenarios to help clarify how the amended program could be applied. Central RAC asked for justification of allowing two tags.

08:17:00 RAC Recommendations

All RACs passed the rule amendments with varying dissent and stipulations.

08:18:19 Public Comments

Public comments were accepted at this time.

08:23:42 Board Discussion

The board discussed the issue of harvesting more than one animal of the same species, limiting harvest to one antlered animal, and crafting language to meet specific needs.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve R657-67 Mentor Rule Amendments as presented by the Division.

08:33:55 16) Other Business (Contingent)

Based on the chairman's unease with a couple of the Division's management plans that appeared to lack public process or input, he opened a discussion on working groups and committees, suggesting that management plans should have working groups especially for sheep.

The following motion was made by Kevin Albrecht, seconded by Byron Bateman and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we recommend to the Division that they form a sheep working group or committee prior to the next statewide sheep management plan.

08:48:40 Meeting adjourned.

**Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Summary of Motions
December 2017**

2018 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments

NRO Motion – Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Division’s proposal as presented with the exception to accept the recommended changes from the sportsman letter and add the fall season dates to the La Sal, San Juan and Book Cliffs, and extend those dates on the letter (Aug 6-Nov 6 with hound hunting restricted through Aug 18-24 and Sep 8-25) on the La Sal, San Juan and Book Cliffs.

Motion Fails – 5 in Favor, 6 Opposed

Motion – Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Division’s proposal as presented with the exception to accept the recommended changes from the sportsman letter, add the dates only pertaining to the Book Cliffs, and extend those dates on the letter (Aug 6-Nov 16, hound hunting restricted through Aug 18-24 and Sep 8-25) on the Book Cliffs alone as a trial.

Motion Passes - Unanimous

CRO Motion: To accept the alternate recommendation as proposed by the Utah Houndsmen Association (Aug 6 - Nov 16 with hound hunting restriction dates of Aug 18-24 and Sept 8-25) proposal for LaSal, San Juan and Book Cliff Hunt Unit season hunt dates

Motion Fails for lack of a 2nd

Motion: To accept the alternate recommendation as proposed by the Utah Houndsmen Association (Aug 6 - Nov 16 with hound hunting restriction dates of Aug 18-24 and Sept 8-25) and eliminate the early archery bait hunt in August for the Book Cliffs Hunt Unit.

Motion Passes 7 in favor, 2 opposed

Motion: To recommend the wildlife board to add an action log item directing the DWR to look at similar season dates for LaSal and San Juan as this RAC amended for the Book Cliffs (Utah Houndsmen Association proposal).

Passed unanimously

Motion: To change late season hunt start date on the San Juan and LaSal Units to August 6.

Motion Passes 8 in favor, 1 opposed

Motion: To accept the remainder of the Division’s proposals as presented

Motion Passes 7 in favor, 2 opposed

SRO Motion: Motion Brayden Richmond Liberal units at increase to maximum allowable adjustment, to allow the Baiting season to start an additional week early, accept the la Sal, San Juan Book Cliff fall season dates of 2018 to be changed to the following Aug 6-

Nov16 with the hound hunt restrictions date of Aug 18- 24th and Sept 8-25th. With an amendment to include the boulder and paunsaugunt units to be able to increase tags to the maximum allowable adjustment. Second by Brian Johnson.

Motion Passes: 9-0 Unanimous

SER Motion: To accept the 2018 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments as presented, with the amendment that the La Sal, San Juan and Book Cliffs fall season dates for 2018 be changed to Aug. 6 through Nov. 16, with hound restrictions from Aug. 18-24 and Sept. 8-25 for those units, as well as hound restrictions during the October general rifle deer hunting seasons on the La Sal and San Juan units.

Motion Passes 6-4

NER Motion to accept Divisions proposal along with the Utah Houndsmen Associations Proposal

Motion Passes: Eight in favor and one opposed

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Civic Center
110 South Main Street, Springville
December 5, 2017 @ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Ron Camp, Chair
Kristofer Marble, At-Large
Brock McMillian, Sportsmen
Kenneth Strong, Sportsmen
George Garcia, Forest Service
Joshua Lenart, Sportsmen
Ben Lowder, At Large
Jacob Steele, Native American
Mike Christensen, At-Large
Danny Potts, Non-consumptive
Christine Schmitz, Non-consumptive

Member Absent

AJ Mower, Excused
Mike Gates
Greg Mcphie
Alan White

Others Present

John Bair, Former Wildlife Board Chair
Karl Hirst, Wildlife Board Member
Jason Vernon, CRO Reg Supervisor

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

VOTING

Motion was made by Kristofer Marble to approve the agenda and minutes as written
Seconded by Ken Strong
Passed unanimously

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

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

Wildlife

· Deer captures is underway throughout the region. The Division is capturing does and fawns to record and track health and mortality. The same animals will be captured again in the spring to see how they did over the winter.

· Dennis Southerland will be retiring at the end of the month after 30 years with the Division. He will be missed and we appreciate all he has done for the Division and especially for wildlife. We have hired Rusty Robinson to fill in behind Dennis. Rusty was formerly working as the sheep and goat biologist stationed out of the Salt Lake Office. We are excited to have Rusty in the region and look forward to working with him.

- The trapping portion of the Urban Deer Program is getting underway. Over the next several winter months we will be working with Herriman and Provo cities to trap and remove deer located within their city limits. We target deer that are year round residents and move them to areas throughout the state to augment populations throughout the state that are below objective.
- As with any of the activities that we carry out, if RAC members are interested in volunteering and helping out, you can contact Jason Vernon or Riley Peck.

Habitat

- With the continued moderate winter weather, our habitat section staff continues to work with our partners on habitat restoration projects including the fires that occurred this past summer.

Outreach

- There will be a few ice fishing seminars coming up in the region as well as an ice fishing day. Still working on determining where that will take place, but stay tuned we will keep you updated on our website and social media.

4) 2018 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments Darren DeBlois, Mammals Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Kris – You talked a little about the performance metrics or management strategies that are found in the plan; and also you mentioned all the recommendations were within those metrics, I didn't see any literature or any information on unit by unit by what supported those increases particularly with the amount of tags that we are increasing statewide which is roughly 14%. Do we have any metrics that you can show us to support those recommendations unit by unit?

Darren – I do, if you want we can go through the ones that increased or if you have specific units that you are curious about.

Kris – I would like to take the La Sal. If I am remembering correctly, I think it had a 25 permit increase for example, why is that?

Darren – La Sal, San Juan and the Book Cliffs are the three units that have the biggest density of bears. I should have made this into a handout, but on the La Sal's their managing under a moderate harvest structure so they are in one of those middle groups. There are two things we look at which are percent of adult male and percent of adult female. On the La Sal's the adult males on the harvest is 49 ½ which would put it into a light strategy. The percent on the females is 26.2 which again would be in a light strategy, so both metrics are out in a positive direction. The plan would say that we would increase permits 20-40% so that is between 24-50 total permits. They are recommending within that range. One of the challenges that we are looking at maybe next year down there is that is a lot of people to put on a unit. This year the bulk of those are going into that spot and stalk hunt which is a low success hunt but we feel like if we could look at structure there; maybe divide that up, we might be able to get more people in the field during higher success hunts and the La Sal is one example of that, but there are other units in the state where we kind of would like to look at that.

Kris – It's helpful when we go through these recommendations to be able to support especially such a big tag increase, at least for me to be able to look at a handout, but I won't

make you go through them all. Darren – That’s fine. I will make a note so next time I will provide that chart to the RAC so you guys can kind of see what we were looking at when we made recommendations.

Brock – So what you are saying Darren, all the recommendations that you are making are consistent with the management plan? Darren – If there is an increase, it’s outside of a positive direction and then we have kind of a bracket that we make those recommendations within. As a general rule, we want to provide opportunity where it is available and units where we have specific concerns about livestock or we intend to recommend within the perimeters, but we maybe go a little on the high end just to handle some of those problems.

Ken – On my way to this meeting, I had a phone call stating that there were 17 bears killed in the watermelon fields down on the Green River this year. Can you elaborate on that or is this close? Darren – I don’t have a specific number for bears that were taken specifically there. I do know that they had a lot of bear problems down there. Dustin Mitchell was working something along that number of bears but he is also trapping and moving. The late frost that we had last year; a lot of the mass crop of the berries and acorns didn’t come on and those guys were scrambling to figure out places to put bears that were showing up in the watermelon patches and sunflower fields and things, so they did take some of those bears because they couldn’t keep them away but they did move a lot too. I can see if I can find a number from the region for you but I don’t know how many exactly what they wound up lethal removing opposed to other. I know I have seen from wildlife services probably four, but I kind of get stuff as it moves through the system but specifically were taken because they were doing agriculture damage. I do know that there were a lot of bears that were showing up in places that they don’t normally if they have food on the mountain. Ken – I was curious because he did mention that there were 17 and I didn’t know how accurate that figure was. Darren – I have a figure by unit of how many wildlife services took and again I know they had some hunters take some bears that were causing problems. Usually we try and do that if we can find someone quick enough to handle the problem that would be our preference. So if you remember the graph that kind of showed the sport harvest that would include those bears so we do try and get sportsmen out whenever we can. Overall wildlife services took about 50 bears this year.

Mike Christensen – With the increase in sports harvest and the increase in population, what is the increase of nuisance complaints been? Darren – Again this year, this year seemed to be a berry year and I think it had to do more with that mass crop failure than anything. We are sensitive to that and we want to keep an eye. We kind of get these blips and you know when you look at that depredation graph it bounces all over the place. It is seasonal but at the same time we try and manage units. We know we have dense bear populations and concerns about private land and livestock under that liberal strategy, so we really are trying to suppress bear populations on those units and some of these permit increases reflect that so we are managing. We don’t want to get rid of all the bears but we do want to keep the population low and minimize conflicts on those units. Mike - What about the no dogs on the San Juan/La Sal’s during the limited entry elk hunt. Is that stipulated in the plan? Darren – The plan gives us a lot of latitude in terms of season structure. That is something that the region recommended three years ago to try and address concerns. One of the things I should have pointed out is that during that fall season we had a lot of archery hunters complain this year. Instead of changing the structure, they opted to reduce

permits so they are actually taking more permits overall, but they are moving some of those permits to the spring hunt. They will go from 10 on the fall hunt to five and you can see that on your charts. They felt like when they had five permits down there they had less conflict between the guys with dogs and archers. That is what we're looking at this year and we think there might be other ways we can address that. This is the plan going forward next year. Mike – So if there was a change one way or the other it wouldn't go against the plan? Darren – No, the season structure...we have a lot of lead way. Ben – Mike, a little more clarification on that. They mentioned reduction of permits from 10 to five. This year we had 10 permits on the fall hunt. Previously not sure on how many years we only had five so we doubled permits this year and that is when the increase of complaints happened. When there were five permits there wasn't really an issue. Mike – Yes and that is why I wanted to clarify. I have heard from archers too. Ben – I also want to clarify that the majority of the complaints were directed from the La Sal Unit not on the San Juan. Darren – We had about 90 people that grabbed a Conservation Officer in the field and complained, about 60 on the La Sal's and about 30 on the San Juan. So yes, primarily it was from the La Sal's.

Josh - What mechanisms does the Division use to get these depredation bears taken by sportsmen? I know if it is out of season there is nothing that can be done, right, but do you maintain a list and are you are actively calling people? I am wondering how many more of these bears can be killed by hunters and not farmed out to wildlife services. Darren – What we usually do is we go with the draw list and so people that are the next in line that would have drawn or we will call unsuccessful hunters from a hunt that ended. The Division does have authority to authorize if a hunt is over there is a guy that didn't harvest we can see that in our harvest data and we may call them and say if you can get here now we have a bear that we need to have removed and you have to take the bear even if it isn't a big bear or not the right color of bear. Josh – So they are allowed to do that because it is depredation outside of a season? Darren – So either we would be doing that or wildlife services would do that and it is usually something where we would take a hunter and try and find the bear and let them take it. Having said that if we can't get them there quick enough to address the problem or its private land or something like that, then we may opt to do it ourselves or have wildlife service's come take it.

Danny - Is there a relationship between the age of bears and the problems that the bears are causing? Is it primarily much older bears or is it primarily younger bears? Darren – It seems to run that the spectrum and I think if there was a theme some bears figure it out. Some years when food is scarce they will take whatever they can get. Some bears get good at it and some can kill a lot of sheep in one evening and it is just a singular bear. Our strategy for depredation is two-fold, one when we know we've got mixed units we try and keep the bear population at a reasonable level. Also, deal with those individual bears causing problems and take those because once you remove those a lot of times it doesn't continue to occur. Danny –It really isn't hard to run down a watermelon. So with that, I don't have a follow-up question.

Mike – On the August 11 start date on the San Juan and the La Sal's Units, would there be a problem to move that earlier or is there something that would interfere with that? Darren - Fall is tough! Most complaints we get are when we put a lot of hunters with hounds in the field during an archery hunt. This seems to be when people are mostly complaining. So I guess to answer that earlier than that that is something that we looked at in the group and it is something that we

would like to have a chance to really look at this coming spring and look at something for next year. The concerns are if earlier they are concerned about running dogs when it's hot. We'll have some hounds man, I'm sure that will speak on that tonight. Mike – I will say why I am asking that and that way they can give their input because I would love to hear it. If we shifted that forward five days and shifted the end date back five days that would give archers that last week of the archery season without hounds present but not cut the hounds mans time afield.

Danny – We are basically going into the sixth year of drought and they are just struggling to exist so I can understand the take. It makes common sense to me entirely; however does that mean that once we come out of the drought and things start looking better that we are going to pull back the reins and stop increasing the harvest at such? Darren – We will manage to the plan and the plan has us look at it throughout the life periodically so as new information comes we have an opportunity to look back at that. So the answer to that we will manage to the plan and the plan should account for that kind of thing.

Kris – Just to clarify on the performance metrics was around population growth through DNA, so we aren't doing that today? Darren – So the performance, maybe we can go back to that. Kris- I don't think you actually had it up there but it is in the plan though. Darren – If we have the data, we do look at population in terms of birth pulses and so some regions have sows with GPS collars on them and they visit the dens in the spring and see if they have cubs and measure the cubs and things like that, so on units where that data is available, that can enter into the management decision. For most of the units in the state there isn't sufficient data there so that is why it doesn't show up here so these really are the metrics we're talking about tonight.

Kris - Just curious how many units are we doing that on and using the data on? Darren – The La Sal's and San Juan have pretty good numbers of bears. The Book Cliffs has some good data. For some of those we detect birth pulses and that can enter in as well. Kris - The Wasatch is a slightly different issue, right? It's not so much sheep and things like that. Darren – There are two units where they detected a birth pulse and they detected once during the three year period. One was the Wasatch, the Avintaquin/Current Creek and the other was South Slope/ Yellowstone.

Ben – On the summer pursuit seasons with that pursuit study we are doing on the southeastern region, do we have enough data to draw any conclusions on that study yet? Darren – We have run it for three years and we have only done it one way. I talked to Guy and it's going to be a little tough so far. They would like to switch it and go for three more and see but I think this kind of thing given weather porosity and stuff like that it may be too short. But the region would like to do it and we've committed to go ahead and do that for another three years. Since we just brought up on the Wasatch, we are recommending to go back to limited entry and eliminate the harvest objective on the spring, have we found that the last three years of the harvest objective hunt has been successful in what we were trying to accomplish on that unit and we are at that point then where we can return to limited entry. Darren - Yes we are and the increase in permits represents we're trying to maintain the amount of harvest moving forward so when we switch from a quota to a limited entry system you need to offer more permits just based on success rates. This is something that we are going to have to keep an eye on and see what harvest winds up being over the next few years.

Questions from the Public

John Bair/Self – Darren, you are doing away a week with baiting before the season starts, are you doing that just to ruin my life or do you have a reason? Darren – John as you remember, when the two week pre-baiting season was introduced, we had concerns. We are worried about cubs coming into those baits and getting picked up by a pack and on the 7 O'clock news have dead cubs. It's also a critical time...a sow lays at the den but a lot of the times they will kind of hang around with cubs, if they have them, and they don't start making the rounds until later so we felt like we could let people start hunting a week earlier and we are comfortable and that gives about a week for that bait to be out there and bears may take them couple days, three days to start finding that. We have fewer concerns about hounds finding bait and appearing to run off the bait and that kind of thing. When we discussed it, we felt like the initial proposal was to go ahead and just let people start hunting at the beginning of those two weeks and just have it overlap, this is a kind of compromise position to do that.

Jason Binder/Self – Can you tell me what our bear population is? Darren – Yes, let me explain the population estimate. I don't know how far in the weeds you want me to get Jason. There are different ways you can calculate a population on animals that are hard to observe. You can't fly helicopter and count them and that kind of thing. You can calculate a minimum population based on the bears that you can actually get your hands on that are harvested. The way that you do that is a four year old bear shows up at our office that has been taken in 2017, we know that the bear was a three old bear the year before. We also know that there was certain number of three years old bears killed the year before that. You just back calculate. You add that bear to the last years population and so on and you can work your way back. That gives you a minimum because those are real bears that show up to our office that we know. We know if it was four years old this year, it was three years old on the mountain last year. You can work back through. Where it gets a little bit tricky is our bear harvest tends to be mostly male. People select males and try to select for older bears. The other thing is that you can only go so far forward into history because you can only calculate (for example if you're calculating for five years back your estimate is a little bit older). So what we did here is we collapse the adult age classes that get us as far forward in time as we can get. We estimate the number of females based on the number of females that are treed in proportion to the number of males on the landscape. We are not calculating cubs or yearlings because they tend to be selected against and obviously you can't take cubs and so this is a minimum estimate of adult bears two years and older. It looks like were floating just under 3,500 two year olds or older, minimum. The other things that enter into that we don't take in account natural mortality, bears that die from other things other than hunters that bring them in or wildlife services. That estimate can vary depending on what that annual natural mortality is. What was really critical here is the trend doesn't change. Even if there are more bears or less bears the trend is up. Does that make sense? Jason – Yes and no. How does the trend not rise every year after we continue to raise tags? As we raise tags the trend is going to go up but then we just keep raising tags and we never had a stable year of two or three years of the same amount of tags to see if the trend stays true. Darren – It is based on the ages of animals in the harvest and so what would you would expect to see if you were over harvesting you would see younger and younger bears because a person wants to take an older bear. It tends to be skewed toward that end and that is why one of our management perimeters is those old age classes in the harvest. If we start seeing fewer older age class animals, we cut permits. The

other part of the equation is females. If you don't have reproducing females then your population isn't going to grow and so if we see those targets fall below our management objectives you'd see permits cut. That is how the plan is put together and that is how we make decisions about permits Jason – What was the overall state wide female percentage this year? Darren – Females taken were 31.4 %. Jason – We are talking about the conflict between archery elk hunters and hound hunters; if I put in for a bear tag that takes me 14 years to draw a tag, why is an elk hunt that takes 14 years anymore precedence over a hound hunter? Darren – These are the social things that we have to deal with so I guess number wise there tend to be more elk hunters than bear hunters but these are all things that we do need to sit down and look at and take into consideration.

Kelly Christensen/Self – Question on how you were stating that all the acorns were froze this year, have you got any data on the numbers rising or declining on a consecutive number of years of a drought back when the study was done on the Wasatch. I know on the years when we had consecutive years of drought, the sows would go into the den and never come out with cubs. A lot of yearling cubs go into the den and starve to death. Like you said we are going into a six year of drought and then you are adding more tags on these units where there is no feed for these bears so our mortality rate is going to go way up. Guaranteed it's going to. It's going to happen and you know that if you have studied them. How do you justify in giving more tags on years like this? We should give more when there is feed and everything is healthy, the bears are producing more regular, but when you go through a six years of drought you're losing a lot of bears every year mortality. Have you noticed the population is still going up? Darren - This is a statewide estimation based on bears that show up harvested. It will vary depending on individual units. One thing that we are committed to do is getting more sows collared and getting more data on those birth pulses so we can kind of monitor. Bears are slow reproducing. Kelly – So is there still a study going on any of the units? Darren – No. Kelly – So it's all completed? Darren – Yes. An official university study we don't have anything going on, but we got more collars coming and we are planning on putting an effort into those bears and monitoring over time. Kelly – Another question relating to the San Juan Unit; I have hunted it over 30 + years, and like you said last year you increased the amount of tags up to 10. I have been hunting on it for the last three years with people with tags and noticed a difference. When you give 10 tags, most of the guys that have a tag don't own the dogs but yet they'll get three to five hound man in every camp. So if you got 10 tags and you're three to five you're 30-50 hunters on that unit. That is where the problem is going. That is where to regulate. If a guy wants to go run a bear for himself, take the dogs out and run a bear. He doesn't have to hire everybody in the state and gather them up and have a hound's club field trial down there to run bears. That is where the problem starting on the La Sal's. One more problem is the out of state pursuit. Darren – Those are actually subjects that came up that we discussed. I think there is more discussion to be had on those. The hound's man association committed to really try to outreach their members and say this is multiple use but we don't want to give ourselves a black eye; let's be smart. I am comfortable at this point in not making regulations if the groups are willing to try and police their own. Kelly – What about the out of state pursuit? Darren – Again we did talk about it and I think we didn't have enough discussion in the group that I am comfortable recommendations yet but there are other ideas from other states about how we can do that. I think this is something we will be talking about this next season. Kelly – For this year?

Darren – This next cycle, for next year. Whether we recommend a new thing or not, I don't know. Kelly- They should regulate that a little bit because of the guy from out of state, which I know they want to hunt, in their states they can't, but when they park a trailer on the mountain from April until June and there is eight to 10 in that camp, the in state hunters don't even have a place where we can actually go run a dog. I feel like something needs to be done about that.
Darren – Okay, thanks.

Colton Christensen/Self – Do you have a number on the increase for nonresident tags that you are proposing for the 102 compared to resident tags? Darren – Yes, Colton, I might have to do math and that is a bad thing but we can sum it up. I can show it to you. I don't know if I have a total here but we can go through the tables and you can see what we did. I don't know if you remember last year, but the Board recommended for bear permits instead of rounding up at five, they would not give another nonresident tag until we hit 10. That is still in effect this year. I don't know if you got a handout that shows how many nonresidents permits per unit so you can get a feel for that. Colton – You say that you only have 90 recorded incidents or whatever you call it about archery hunter's conflict with hound hunters, do you honestly keep a list of the names and where these people are from? Are they resident or nonresident hunters? Are these bow hunters from Utah or Colorado? Are these hound hunters from Utah or Colorado?

Darren – We asked the region to track that this year. They indicated they were having a lot of complaints in the field during those hunts. I don't think we have a total breakdown Colton, so I think we could talk to the region and get a better feel for this. To be honest, sometimes they didn't know. They probably had an archer come up to them and say hey, this is happening and I'm not happy. There may be an opportunity to do a survey or something like that so we can get a better feel for what's going on. Colton – I feel like there is a lot of I don't knows. The hound hunter/archery conflict, do you have any hound hunters complaining about too many archery hunters getting in their way, shooting dogs, harassing camps. Is there any conflict from the other end? Darren – Yes, we do hear it from both sides. Colton- How many on record hound hunters do you have complaining about too many archery hunters? Darren – I don't have a number. Colton – Can you tell me what the dollar amount is on a limited entry bull elk tag? What it costs to actually pay for the permit once you have drawn? Darren – I don't know off the top of my head, but it is in the guidebook. Colton - I was just curious to know the number on the dollar amount between a limited entry bull elk and a limited entry bear? Jason stated, "How do these elk hunters have more say than a hound hunter?" They love the sport and we love the sport! Is it because there is a \$400 amount on a limited entry bull tag and a \$83 amount on a bear tag that gives them more say? How many limited entry elk hunters are here that have hunted in the last five years and drawn a tag, raise your hands please? So we have three. How many limited entry bear tag holders in the last three years are here? That's it for now, thanks. Is anyone from the hound club here that is actually a chairman or something other than just a member (higher level)?

Comments from the Public

Rodney Smith/Utah Hounds man Association – I handed out a memo for the recommendations, do you all have one? The UHA representatives had representatives attend the bear committee this year. It consisted of Dan Davis and Guy Webster discussing the bear management plan social issues and strategies for the upcoming 2018 bear season. The UHA supported the DWR's 2018 bear hunting recommendations and they also had an addition to that the UHA requested the

following changes be made to the current 2018 recommendations. One being the La Sal, San Juan and the Book Cliffs fall season dates for 2018 change to the following: August 6 – November 16 with hound hunting restrictions from August 18 – August 24 and to September 8 – September 25. That might answer your question on about the dates on first week and the last week of the archery hunters. It should be noted that the fall season dates above have been discussed in the bear committee in great deal length and supported unanimously by the attendees. The UHA believes that these will drastically reduce complaints and increase harvest and provide more opportunities for the sportsman. In addition to that these recommendations we also had the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation along with the SFW support these recommendations. The reason being is they conflict on the mountain. We want to support all the bow hunters out there and we want them to support us as well. Do you have any questions? Kris –So in your proposal, you're suggesting no hounds from August 18-24 and September 8 -25? Rodney - Yes.

Josh – The question about the five day move forward is that a way to potentially mitigate conflict? Can you explain a little more on how much does this effect time afield for hound's man? Rodney – I have had a limited pursuit when I was out to the Book Cliffs two years ago. I never turned out my dogs just because of the heat factor. I'm not going to lose an expensive dog just because of that. That's one thing on the Book Cliffs is that restrictive pursuit. A lot of people generally put in for the La Sal's because it is higher elevation and it is cooler and stuff like that. Like you said, all these hounds man are afraid to turn out their dogs just because they don't want a heat stroke and lose a dog out there. Josh – Thanks for clarifying that.

John Bair/SFW – SFW supports the Division's recommendations with one exception and that is to go ahead and incorporate the UHA proposal. One thing on the conflict; I can think of many times hunting elk where I have had troubles with other hunters. One time it was a hound hunter, the other 500 times was another elk hunter. I have had many more run-ins when I was hound hunting with other hounds man but ever did with elk hunters. We looked at this a couple of years ago a lot of the complaints were from the same guy calling 30 times because he is an ass. A few complaints do not make a crisis. If we're going to make changes and put one species in one season over another, I understand if it's just an obvious disaster, we got to do something, But just because someone calls in and stirs the pot a little bit; it's your job to look at that and I understand that. I have been there but make sure if we're going to change it or cost people opportunity whether it is hounds man or elk hunters, let's make sure it's a crisis first. I know finding that balance is a hard thing to do. It's an easy decision until it's your decision and I understand but you know that these guys I'm making a point not to agree with Jason but I am going to agree with him on that one thing. A lot of the conflict is just because it's a hound hunter and an elk hunter, why does the hound hunter have to lose? Let's make sure that we're fair at that. Thank you for your time.

Sadie Young/Wasatch Caps Program – Sadie didn't want to talk but Jason read her comment. The Wasatch Caps Program supports the Division's proposal as presented and would like to thank Riley Peck and Dale Liechety for taking the time to hear or opinions on recommendations.

Chet Young/Self – I would just like to thank Dale Liechety and Riley Peck for giving me a little time in their office before these meetings started. I support the Division's recommendations. I told Riley I would come talk because we are going to see an increase on tags on the spring bear

hunt on the Wasatch, but it is going to a limited entry. I think it will help a lot with the problems and so many hounds man out there. You should still get the same bear harvest. Instead of having 300 people after bears; you are going to have 30. Thanks.

Kelly Christensen/Self – You kind of answered one of my questions before I wrote that down and that was on the harvest objective on the Wasatch. I would like to propose you do away with all harvest objectives. All you're doing is lining the pockets to the outfitters of this state. There are unlimited numbers of tags sold; they have two to three hunters come in per week...all you're doing is lining their pockets. You're not doing anymore but making them rich and hurting the guys that are out there just trying to hunt for themselves and enjoy the sport. Another one I wish you would look at is the out of state pursuit. This is one of the biggest problems on those two units you talked about.

Bill Topham/Self – Not present. Ron read the comments. The agenda topic was #5 and he would like to see no increase on bear tags.

Mike Eduleson/Self – Not present. Ron read the comments. The agenda topic was #5 and he would like no increase on bear tags.

Tony Bettis/Self – Not present. Ron read the comments. The agenda topic was #5 and he would like to no increase on bear tags.

Darren West/ Mule Deer Foundation – We have heard several things from the hounds man that we do believe need to be heard but as a Mule Deer Foundation, we do support the plan as presented by the Division.

Jason Binder/Self – I would like to thank Riley and the guys that worked hard on proposing by putting Wasatch back on limited entry rather than harvest objective. It has been a joke up there and it will be really nice to have that back where it needs to be in the perimeters of the management plan. I have a really hard time with the other 92 tag increase though. I look at the trends; the tag numbers go up every year but the harvest never goes up every year. Somewhere we need to find a balance. We need to level the tags out somewhere and then see what the trend does. Increasing tags every year, of course the trend is going to come up and we are always going to meet the perimeters because the tags are always increasing. We need to keep the tags the same they were last year and leave it for three years and see where the trend goes, not keep increasing tags because the numbers always fit within a certain perimeter. The sow harvest is a little lower this year, but the tags were also raised last year. Somewhere along the lines as a RAC I would like to see you guys propose that we balance the tags out, but stay with a even number for a few years until we see actually what the trend and the population and the harvest is. We have no clue. We can manipulate numbers in a computer by raising tags but it's not true fact. I would also like to disagree with the UHA proposal of changing the hunting season. Leave the season the way it is. Everyone just needs to be on the mountain and get along. Everybody's tags are just as valuable as yours!

Ron Camp – I do believe that we do have some data and that would be the percentage of harvest vs. tags and that seemed to be fairly level. If I looked at the chart right earlier tonight, it looked

like it was up actually last year higher than the year before even with the increase of tags. So I look at a number of people that are actually out hunting; the more hunters are going to have to kill more bears to get that percentage to stay the same or go up. My own personal experience in hunting up in the Chalk Creek area we set bait and had nine different bears hit one bait. I think it is extremely difficult to actually put a total number of bears that we have in the state because of the allusiveness of the bear, but if I was going to guess I would probably guess on the side that we are probably under estimate more than over estimate the number of bears that we have in the state, my own opinion.

RAC Discussion

Danny – My main concern was with the relationship between younger and older bears and depredation issues. I am a little bit concerned that the depredation harvest by hunters continues to go to up and yet I can't square that with everything. Can you respond to that a little bit?

Darren – I think that this slide is a little bit confusing. The red line is for harvest not all of that is for depredation related so a small portion of that is depredation related. Danny – So that is just misleading? Darren – Right and I am sorry. The yellow line are bears that are either taken by wildlife services or our “people” that are in depredation situations. The point I was trying to make with the slide is we try to keep that level and if we have a growing bear population that the sportsman get to take those bears. Danny – My concern also is with the drought and these conditions are that we are kind of harvesting a “surplus” relative to the resource. I was going to try and split the vote but I have changed my mind just having heard what your response is.

Thank you.

Brock – Darren, can you tell us why you aren't following the recommendations of the sportsman groups? Darren – There is nothing wrong with the recommendation. We took it and had a good discussion and there wasn't a whole lot of argument, but when we brought it back internally and started thinking about it; and again I guess it maybe helps us to point out. We were just talking about the Book Cliffs with this season structure. The southeastern region was there and they kind of looked at it and said, “You know some of these ideas we kind of like and we might want to incorporate that.” We also had some other issues come up during our discussion. We felt like it's a bigger issue than just those hunts and there are other season perimeters or structures that might make more sense for our unit like the La Sal's or the San Juan where we have a lot of bear hunters trying to all use the mountain at the same time. Our recommendation is this is the third year of our second cycle let's take the three years worth the data and take a look what has happened over this new structure and take that into account and look at structure seasons across the board and make any changes that we want to make all in one year beginning with the next cycle. So this is why we are recommending that we stay largely the same this year. We feel like there's more discussion that needs to be had. We probably want to make more changes than just that.

Ben – Wouldn't 2018 be the start of that next three year period? Darren – It would Ben and I will take responsibility for some of that. I started in this job and some of that stuff probably should have happened earlier in the year but we are kind of where we are. Ben – Can I take a minute to address the hound's man proposal? I was fortunate to sit on the bear committee with Darren, SFW, RMEF, UHA had representation. There was Byron from the Wildlife Board was there and a lot of that discussion was the centered around that Book Cliffs fall hunt. I want to

add some color to this. There is a real issue out there right now. The hound's man approached me about it last year over a year ago, last October, and the issue is stepping back three years for a little history there was an issue and from a bow hunting prospective, from a Utah Bowman's membership, the Book Cliffs is unique and is the only unit I have ever received complaints from membership about conflicts with hounds during the archery hunt. Stepping back three years we removed hounds from that time period to try and address those issues. Obviously there haven't been any complaints for the three years because there haven't been any hounds there during that archery hunt. What the issue is now and this is what the hound's men approached me about is when we change the season the fall bear season now starts coinciding with the general season rifle elk hunt. I think it was largely missed when it was implemented that was the case. Now the hounds man are in the struggle of they went out there to hunt bears and realized being out there that they are going to be dumping dogs on how many general season elk hunters and didn't feel comfortable in doing that. In my opinion they have been kind of self regulating trying to keep those conflicts down but they approached me and approached the Division in saying there is an issue here we want to move this date so we're not conflicting with that many hunters. I believe there is a real issue there and it needs to be addressed. This is where this proposal came from and this is what we came up with in that bear committee and the compromises here are and to me, that this plan was created from that committee. In my opinion it is a win for all groups. The reason why is it implements a very long fall bear hunt in the Book Cliffs or as they are proposing Book Cliffs, San Juan and La Sal starting in early August and going through mid November. For somebody who wants to spot and stalk or hunt, or hunt over bait it is a very long liberal season. A lot of opportunities and also a lot of opportunity for the hounds man if you look at their current fall dates on the Book Cliffs compared to what this proposal brings they are gaining a lot of time in the field, Josh, you had asked that question. The other thing that you see here is a hound restriction which the hound man association was happy to abide by. For the first seven days of the archery hunt, which on the Book Cliffs we felt it gives an opportunity for the archery deer hunters out there to have some time without hounds. The last seven days of the archery deer and elk hunt which we designed that to address limited entry elk hunters, the last week of the archery elk hunt kind of that prime week of that hunt. The entire limited entry rifle elk hunt which in our discussions we learned where the majority of the complaints were coming from were during that limited entry rifle elk hunt and a few days into the muzzleloader elk hunt. I understand that the Division isn't comfortable in addressing this at this time, as Darren has said the southeastern region was involved in these discussions and they did say they liked this idea for San Juan and La Sal's as well. Personally I think it is a great compromise. I am disappointed that the Division isn't ready to move forward with it. Darren, Justin, Bill and I have sat down and discussed this at length and I still don't know that I quite understand why we are not ready to move forward. In my opinion this is a solid proposal. Sorry I am taking a lot of time, but I felt like that an explanation was worth the time for this RAC to hear. Whether we address this now or kick the can to next year, I would really like to see it addressed sooner rather than later because I know there is a real issue out there and we are coming into the next three year cycle of the bear plan. The plan was implemented as a 12 year plan but the intention was to implement it in three year cycles. The year 2018 is the first year of the next three year cycle. For what that is worth I will leave that for the RAC for further discussion. Ron – Question on those dates is this going to also effect the heat problem in the Book Cliffs as far as the hounds go? Ben – That would put them being able to run in early August and obviously it could be very hot out there. It allows them to run clear until November 16. Ron – Right, so it gives them a little bit of an opportunity to run in

the fall. Ben – It gives them a lot of opportunity. They have some opportunity in September and all of October and half of November. It also removes the opener coinciding with the general season elk hunt. Ron – We usually have hounds in there during the general season elk hunt? Ben – Yes, so when we first implemented this last three year plan those season dates started on the exact same day, that Saturday. I don't know if it was last year or two years ago we changed that where the hound's season opens on that Monday prior rather than the Saturday. It is still kind of that same time frame. This is where the hounds man issue came from are that potential conflict there.

Kris – So we currently have two proposals on the table as far related to the San Juan, La Sal and Book Cliffs as we talked about. Jason, you're right you have spent a lot of time here and would like to ask you a few questions if you don't mind particularly about your concerns. Here is what I am seeing and I would like to understand so for La Sal and San Juan it's a little different for the Book Cliffs, let's just talk about San Juan and the La Sal's for now, it looks like this proposal adds roughly six to seven weeks to the hunt. Jason Binder - I never saw that proposal so I didn't understand what that was so I really don't have a problem with that part of it. Kris - So what I am seeing is your adding six to seven weeks to the overall hunt from the time that you can be out chasing bears. What you are giving up is two weeks during the elk hunts to get six to seven weeks. Jason - I never saw that proposal before so that is why I wasn't agreeing with it. Kris – I'd love to hear the concerns.

Kelly Christensen – The last three to four weeks of that bear hunt is totally useless with dogs. Those bears are in their dens by end of October, all 99.9% of them. Go by your studies and it will even show that. Kris – I just want to be sure that we're on the same page. So what I see being added is five days to early August. Kelly – yeah that would be good. Kris – The last week of September, all of October and a few days in November with this proposal being added to the bear hunt. Kelly – Is all of October you're saying we're going to be able to run hounds during the rifle deer hunt? Kris – Correct.

Ben- That is the way it is proposed.

Colton – Can we see a graph of that? Kris – I don't know if we have a slide but that is what is being proposed.

Ben – Kris, also to clarify when we are talking about the difference in this proposed plan to the current dates, the current dates on the San Juan and the La Sal are different than the current dates on the Book Cliffs. Kris – Right, let's just talk San Juan and La Sal.

Kelly – The proposal is stating running dogs in October during the rifle deer hunt? Kris- That is correct. Kelly – Dogs or bait or spot and stalk only? It is showing dogs. Kris – The dog's restriction is only adding two weeks to the current restrictions.

Mike - They are only restricting dogs during the first week of the archery hunt and during the last week of the archery or rifle elk hunt. Kelly – How about the deer rifle?

Darren- I need to make that point. When we discussed this again was primarily discussion was for the Book Cliffs. The southeastern region expressed some interest in some of the ideas and primarily early fall. I think we are asking for trouble if we introduce new hound hunts during late season big game hunts on the La Sal's and San Juan. Kris – Let me ask you a question to that point. I'm hearing Chet over here say he feels like the hounds man with that much time would be able to spread themselves out quite a bit. Do we anticipate an issue with all of a sudden there are rifle deer hunt being a popular time to run hounds? Darren – And again that is why my position that any of these ideas are necessarily bad we just felt like a lot of these issues we actually recognize after the group met and felt like we need to talk about this more. We need to talk about maybe splitting hunts up on the La Sal's and the San Juan and that might alleviate some pressure and allow more opportunity but just given the time frame we didn't feel comfortable putting all that together. It may require some surveys and things like that to do. Again our recommendations would be to keep it the same, let's look at all these issues out of state hunter and all of those issues and kind of make all the changes at once and then we have a new there year cycle. Ben is right it would put a year off of what the plan recommends but we feel like we could come back with a better more thought out recommendation. Kris – So I just want to make sure that I understand your concern because what I am hearing and trying to sift through before I personally make up my mind on this is I am hearing the hound's man get additional time in the field. I am hearing elk hunter get more time on these specific units where elk hunters seem to have a lot of anxiety about it get more time without hounds and deer hunters as well by default. At least on the archery hunt. So what specifically is your concern with this proposal? Darren – There is a couple of thing. One thing I think that we have figured out is the La Sal's, San Juan and the Book Cliffs are kind of apples and oranges. There are different things going on. Currently we are seeing complaints on the La Sal's and the San Juan with those overlapping hunts and so the region addressed by reducing tags. Kris – Which overlapping hunts? Darren – Specifically the archery hunts. So right now on the La Sal's and San Juan the hound and bait fall hunt overlaps entirely with the deer and elk archery seasons. Then it shuts off and you can only hunt with bait during the limited entry any weapon. Kris – So with this proposal alleviates some of that problem? Darren – Yes and I think that is why the region said there may be something there but they needed more time. Now the Book Cliffs we currently don't have any hunting during the archery seasons and we don't get any complaints. The complaints have been pointed out from the hound's man on the back end where they feel like they are in the field with 1,000 orange soldiers. There is a little bit of conflict there. The region and talking with Dax and Clint some of those later hunts you actually start and get a separation between bears and big game and they are more comfortable and they do have that later hunt because of that. They feel like bears stay high later in the season while and deer and elk kind of roll down and there isn't a lot of overlap in time and space, but having said that the hound's man did express concerns about having to hunt late with spike hunters. Kris – So from my perspective....Ben – Kris let me add one more thing real quick. I have got the proposal and the Division's proposal here. Let's talk tag numbers. Book Cliffs we are talking six tags in the fall. San Juan and the La Sal are five each. I bring that up because somebody had asked about the hound's man spreading themselves out over that much time. We are talking about five or six tags over August-November, four months. Kris – I am talking about a positive net not a negative net effect. Ben – I agree, I just wanted to add to that. Kris – So let me just wrap up my comments here and I will pass the microphone here so from my perspective we are looking at a proposal here and I understand you got a little anxiety over it, but it seems like to me it makes

sense. It's a win win situation. It is something that we can always come back and fix later. I don't see any major hurdles or conflicts that this is going to create again understanding your reservations about it. But it just seems to make sense. You're going to alleviate pressure from some of your elk hunters and archery hunters and you're going to give hounds man a lot more time in the fields. With the hope and we will never know until we try it, right to actually spread themselves out a little bit? It makes sense to me and I would tend to support that proposal.

Mike – If we did go with that proposal how does that affect the spot and stalk and no dogs on the San Juan and the La Sal hunts. Darren – We would obviously have to go back and restructure some things. Mike – Because that is the whole month of October, right? Darren – Right and the idea there was that this is a way to put bear hunters in the field and maybe even hunters that have big game permits that father out could take a bear on that spot and stalk hunt. Mike – And that is a low percentage success rate. Darren – And there are a lot of permits on that hunt. There are still an opportunity to spot and stalk during a bait and hound hunt, you can hunt spot and stalk during that season if you want, but we will have to go back and figure out how we are going to change things. Ben – Is there a reason we couldn't run those in conjunction with each other? Darren – I guess not. That's probably what we would have to do Ben, because we don't want to dump all those spot and stalk tags in that fall hunt where there are five and now there are 30. We would have to figure out how we wanted to adjust if we did that.

Mike – I love the idea of giving more dates afield for any hunter. I don't care what kind of hunter you are. Bears are not more important than elk or vice versa. Hunters are hunters in my opinion. I do worry a little bit about how this addresses archery hunters and archery hunters and archery hunters, and then limited entry elk hunters but it doesn't address rifle hunters. It doesn't address other hunters that could be the conflict. I am not a hound's man but I have dogs and I have livestock dogs and I don't know that I would want my dogs in the field when other people have rifles. So I know that is a gamble on the hound's man to take his hounds in and do that and that's up to him but I worry that this could create other conflicts. We're trying to protect this one conflict but we are going to create other conflicts and not being as sage as some of the members in this group on this topic, I'm a little bit hesitant to go along with this proposal without knowing more compelling reasons.

Kris – And that is fair Mike. I just want make a couple of clarifications. You bring up some good points. We are only talking about a specific few units where particularly the San Juan going back to that unit, there were a few tags for elk hunters. They felt like spent a long time waiting for them and the conflicts. The conflict issue was there was real. We look at a lot of these other units during those limited entry hunts or other rifle hunts. Some of those are restrictions are not there from the other units. But what this proposal does do at least adds to make sure it adds the entirety limited entry elk unit does not have dogs with the new proposal. Mike – I understand that but it puts the entirety of the limited entry rifle deer hunt having dogs and if we want to compare people, this person waited 18 years and this person waited 12 years, a six years difference I'm hesitant to make such a change. Kris – And just to be clear it is already there on the Book Cliffs, it's all of October. Mike – Yes and I do understand that. The San Juan that includes the San Juan Abajo general season deer unit and the San Juan Elk Ridge limited entry units correct? Even the hound's man is split on it, which is interesting to me.

Rodney – Like I said, I am not a public speaker; I don't do very well but as far as this proposal we have added an over abundance of the committee. It was unanimous with this proposal and I forgot to mention this to Ron, we would like the RAC to vote on that tonight.

Danny – It seems to me that we need to keep the Book Cliffs separated from the San Juan and the La Sal's proposals.

Ben – That is where I was going to go. One thing that we didn't discuss in the bear committee is the effect of this kind of season structure on San Juan and the La Sal's with those spot and stalk tags. I think Darren had some good merit there and maybe needing some time to think about that. Book Cliffs though, was the primarily discussion was and I still think it's a good idea. One other thing that I will mention, if we were to implement this on the Book Cliffs, the other recommendation that I don't think we have discussed yet but came out of the committee is if these seasons were to be implemented on the Book Cliffs, there is currently a August season archery only bait hunt that really wouldn't make any sense anymore. It was the committee's recommendation to eliminate that if we went forward with these season structures. I might be of the opinion that we give the Division the time that they are asking for San Juan and the La Sal. But I still think that the Book Cliffs has significant merit to look at tonight.

Mike – I can see that on the Book Cliffs being a possibility more than on the other two with the different hunt structures. General season and limited entry tags might be a good one to try it on. What would you do with those permits that you would take of the archery bait hunt?

Darren – We would have to figure out how to do archery only is a much lower success hunt and so permits don't necessarily equate, we'd have to figure out what we wanted to do there. We'd go to the plan and figure out where we needed to be. Ben – For reference Mike, there is two units. There is the Bitter Creek South and the Little Creek road less on that archery hunt.

Mike - 11 tags? Ben – There are 13. There are seven and six. I think that is an increase from last year. In the last two years I don't think that we have killed more than maybe three bears in the last three years on those hunts. It has a very low success hunt. Mike – So we could put those three tags into the hounds hunt or we could put them into a spot and stalk or something like that. Ben – Or the spring or summer. I think that might be the better place to put them as opposed to where we kind of figured out the fives kind of the magic number on at least the San Juan and the La Sal's.

Chet Young – Ben, is there are only six tags in the fall for the Book Cliffs the one that we are trying to address. What's wrong with just mimicking the San Juan and the La Sal's season's dates? That is what it has been for years and years. The hound hunting for bears in the fall time was there long before these big bulls hunts started. The Book Cliffs are huge. You're talking six hounds man. Why just not mimic the San Juan and the La Sal and keep it the way it has been for years. Ben – The reason behind that, and yes the Book Cliffs are a large unit, however as we discussed at length in this committee a lot of the habitat in that August and early September season it is holding both bears, deer and elk is all very concentrated as well as the road access to where it puts all those hunters on top of each other at that time frame. In addition to that I would add that as I mentioned earlier throughout the entire state the Book Cliffs are the only unit in the entire state that I have actually received feedback from membership that they are having significant conflicts with hounds man during that archery hunt. I haven't received that feed back

on any other unit in the state except for the Book Cliffs. I believe the reason why is because of the concentration of all the game and all the hunters, even though it is a big unit, all in one small area at that time. Chet – Okay and just for feedback I spent three weeks out there about four years ago with hounds and never had any conflict with anybody on that fall hunt. I never saw any other hounds man. That tells me the spread of the hound’s man was pretty wide. Kris – Did you get a bear? We caught a couple but never killed one.

Jason - Now that I have heard the whole proposal to answer Kris question, I agree with Chet to put the Book Cliffs back to the same season as the La Sal and the San Juan back to where it was originally was. The question you asked me earlier, the answer is no, I don’t agree with that. Thanks Kris.

VOTING

Motion was made by Kris Marble to accept the alternate recommendation as proposed by the Utah Houndsmen Association (Aug 6 - Nov 16 with hound hunting restriction dates of Aug 18-24 and Sept 8-25) proposal for La Sal, San Juan and Book Cliff Hunt Unit season hunt dates

Motion failed for lack of a 2nd

Motion was made by Ben Lowder to accept the alternate recommendation as proposed by the Utah Houndsmen Association (Aug 6 - Nov 16 with hound hunting restriction dates of Aug 18-24 and Sept 8-25) and eliminate the early archery bait hunt in August for the Book Cliffs Hunt Unit.

Seconded by Danny Potts

In favor: Christine Schmitz, Danny Potts, Joshua Lenart, George Garcia, Kris Marble, Mike Christensen, Ben Lowder

Opposed: Ken Strong, Brock McMillan

Motion passed 7 to 2

Motion was made by Brock McMillan to recommend the wildlife board to add an action log item directing the DWR to look at similar season dates for La Sal and San Juan as this RAC amended for the Book Cliffs (Utah Houndsmen Association proposal).

Seconded by Ben Lowder

Motion passed unanimously

Motion was made by Mike Christensen to change late season hunt start date on the San Juan and La Sal Units to August 6.

Seconded by Danny Potts

In favor: Christine Schmitz, Danny Potts, Joshua Lenart, George Garcia, Brock McMillan, Kris Marble, Mike Christensen, Ben Lowder

Opposed: Ken Strong

Motion passed 8 to 1

Motion was made by Ben Lowder to accept the remainder of the Division's proposals as presented

Seconded by Brock McMillan

In favor: Joshua Lenart, George Garcia, Kris Marble, Ken Strong, Ben Lowder, Mike Christensen, Brock McMillan

Opposed: Danny Potts, Christine Schmitz

Motion passed 7 to 2

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 pm

In attendance: (20 Public, 12 RAC Members, 8 DWR Employees)

Next Board meeting: Tuesday, January 11, 2018 @ 9 am DNR boardroom, Salt Lake

Next RAC meeting: Tuesday, March 27, 2018 @ 6:30 pm Springville Civic Center, 110 South Main Street, Springville

**Northern Regional Advisory Council
December 6, 2017
Brigham City Community Center
Brigham City, Utah**

Draft Meeting Minutes

Meeting Begins: 6:00 p.m.

RAC Present

Paul Chase- Forest Service
David Earl- Agric
Christopher Hoagstrom- Noncon.
Randy Hutchison- At Large
Aaron Johnson- Sportsman
Matt Klar- At Large
Mike Laughter- Sportsman
Kevin McLeod- At Large
Justin Oliver- At Large
Darren Parry-Shoshone Nation
Kristin Purdy- Noncon.
Bryce Thurgood- At Large

DWR Present

Jodie Anderson
Nicaela Haig
Justin Dolling
Darren DeBloois
Randy Wood
David Beveridge
Jim Christensen

Wildlife Board

Byron Bateman

RAC Excused

Chad Jensen- Elected
John Blazzard- Agric

RAC Unexcused

Matt Preston-BLM

Agenda:

Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure
Approval of Agenda and November 8, 2017 Minutes
Wildlife Board Meeting Update
Regional Update
2018 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments

Item 1. Approval of Agenda

-Bryce Thurgood, Chair

Agenda Approved

Item 2. Approval of November 8, 2017 Minutes

-Bryce Thurgood, Chair

Minutes approved as circulated.

Item 3. Wildlife Board Meeting Update

Randy Wood, Regional Wildlife Manager

Waterfowl recommendations- Passed unanimously. Discussed our recommendation from this region to have the scaup season the last 86 days of the hunt. We were the only region that recommended that so they did not accept and went as recommended by the division.

Nongame wildlife mammal action- passed unanimously.

Bucks, bulls and once-in-a-lifetime species broken into several motions:

Bighorn sheep hunt on the Oak Creek unit- passed unanimous.

Archery only OIAL bighorn sheep hunts on the Newfoundland mountains and Zion units- This vote came tied and 3-3 and chairman Woodward voted in opposition of this. So, that failed 4-3.

Multi-season elk hunt with 5,000 permit cap for spike units and 5,000 cap for any bull units- This motion died for lack of a second. Multi-season elk hunt as presented with a caveat that the division would conduct a survey gauging permit holder success rates and weapon types and provide that information to the board next year which passed 5-1.

Early rifle season hunt- excluding the Panguitch Lake unit which passed 4-2.

Late season muzzleloader limited entry elk hunt- accept division alternate recommendation provided by the mule deer management committee that allows for late season muzzleloader hunts, limited entry hunts on units that exceed buck to doe ratio objective. Keep last year's units, minus plateau boulder and Carpowitz and add the beaver and north slope units. Follow deer plan which indicates that we can have the late season muzzleloader hunt on units that are under the 18-20 bucks per 100 does as their objective and meet or exceed that. The alternative was to follow that plan and that motion passed unanimously.

Bison recommendation- with addition of creating a working group modeled after the Henry Mountain working group on the Bookcliffs. That passed unanimous.

Cactus buck hunt on the Ponsegaunt- passed unanimous.

Ponsegaunt rifle deer hunt- date to begin alongside the limited entry hunt date and end on the last day of October. In addition, the division may adjust any other management hunt accordingly which passed unanimous.

Muzzleloader elk hunt- either sex hunt on units over objective and report to the board next year. This motion was withdrawn because it already allows for that in the elk management plan and we have not implemented it yet.

Archery deer hunting season dates- add a survey concerning this issue prior to the next revision of the statewide deer management plan in 2022. The division will report back next year to look at how the season dates change would look with the requested change- that passed 5-1.

Balance of buck and bull OIAL 2018 season dates-passed unanimous.

Taking big game amendment rules- passed unanimously.

Removal of wild mule deer from domestic elk facilities- To approve the removal from elk facilities as presented-passed unanimously.

State Pronghorn Management Plan- passed unanimously.

State Moose Management Plan- passed unanimously.

Northern Region Deer Management Plan- passed unanimously.

Jump Creek CWMU, 3 year COR- Division recommended denying. Understanding that they will apply for variance in February 2018 contingent upon a favorable recommendation, permits will be issued for years 2 and 3, otherwise, an unfavorable recommendation will bring it back to the wildlife board- passed unanimous.

CWMU management plans and permit numbers for 2018- Permit changes for Jacobs Creek and Woodruff Creek for 2018 and 2019 which passed unanimous.

Landowner association permits for 2018- Diamond Mountain landowner association variance request and grant 6 landowner permits to the Bookcliffs and 5 landowner permits to the 3 corners and approve the remainder of the 2018 permit numbers as presented passed unanimously.

Mentor rule- passed unanimously.

Recommend to the Division that they form a Sheep Working Group- motion passed unanimously.

Bryce Thurgood- On forming the sheep committee, are they forming that in the next few months? Will that explore the archery hunts that were voted down.

Byron Bateman- Within the next few months.

Item 4. Regional Update

- Justin Dolling, Regional Supervisor

Wildlife Section- capture bighorn sheep on Antelope Island and Newfoundland Mountains. Pre-disease testing to be done before capture. Deer collaring project on Cache unit. Biologists finishing up post-season deer classifications.

Aquatics Section- walleye study at Willard marking hatchery fry. Working with Mountain West Muskies at Pineview to tag 120 tiger muskies to potentially do a mark-recapture analysis, also collected 90 fin ray samples for aging. Worked with several partners to replace a culvert in Jacob's Creek.

GSL program- released over 2,000 pheasants. Tundra swan peaked at 60,000. Great waterfowl opener, best in 10-15 years. Brine shrimp harvest at 28 million pounds which is close to the record which is about 32 million.

Licensing department- turkey applications being accepted from November 29th-December 27th. New fishing guidebooks have arrived at regional offices and will be distributed shortly. Expect buck, bulls and OIAL application guidebooks to arrive by the end of December or early January.

Outreach- Hardware Ranch opening this Friday and the elk festival is planned for December 9th. There are 15 schools signed up for Trout in the Classroom program. Several ice fishing clinics scheduled for Jan and Feb.

Law enforcement-winter patrols on deer winter range across our region looking for illegal activity on deer winter range.

Habitat Section- finished up scalping project on Henefer/Echo WMA to remove weeds and reduce moisture.

Item 5. 2018 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments

- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Program Coordinator

See RAC Packet

Public Questions

Kirk Robinson (Western Wildlife Conservancy)- How you get population estimates? Ways of improving your methods of testing?

Darren DeBloois- There are a couple of things. The estimate I presented tonight is based on harvest. It's not complicated but might be a lengthy explanation. We age the animals that are checked in that are harvested. If you have a 4 year old bear in 2017 checked in, you know he was alive and three years old the year before. You can add back through the years that way. That gets you to a bare minimum. Those are bears you see and know were alive. We do a couple of adjustments because we know females and cubs are not taken. We look at bears that houndsmen tree and we get a ratio from that. The estimate I show is a conservative low end of where we think we are population wise. The trend, however, would not change. We are interested in continuing our bear denning effort, especially on units we have large densities of bears. Resources in collaring and GPS to see what kind of habitat they are using. BYU has been working with chemists on some scents that are attractive to bears. Something we have not done is a scat based that might be worthwhile to look into.

Tami Price- If you are using collars for your population, don't they get the collars off fairly easy?

Darren DeBloois- It depends on the bear. If you are collaring an adult, they maintain those collars pretty well. Where we have problems is the cubs growing and replacing those. They are pretty reliable and will stay on. We are interested in sows. We want to see when they are having cubs and how many they are having. We can adjust our estimates based on the number of cubs born. They are relatively slow reproducing.

Kirk Robinson- Change in summer pursuit where you remove the 2 weeks and lengthened the season. I know why you are doing that but I am wondering how you are going to monitor the results. What are you going to be looking at?

Darren DeBloois- Most of that, we are going to rely on our officers that are in the field. It is going to be important, with that overlap, to monitor. There is a potential for conflict, although I do not think it is a great potential. We will keep an eye on it and see. We have discussed doing a survey to get a sense for how people are interacting on the landscape with regard to bear hunting. That might be an option as well. Did I answer your question?

Kirk Robinson- [not speaking into the microphone]

Bryce Thurgood- You need to come back up.

Kirk Robinson- Interested in how it might affect the bears.

Darren DeBloois- From a biological standpoint, I think it is a good compromise. Allowing people to hunt over bait a week earlier, we shouldn't see a lot of females out with cubs when that occurs. States around us are debating or have debated the use of hounds to hunt bears. We are sensitive to hounds discovering a bait and beginning to run off for that. This puts a person in a tree at a bait station so we feel like that might help people police each other out on the mountain.

RAC Questions

Aaron Johnson- Examine the fall season dates for Bookcliffs. I don't think it changed.

Darren DeBloois- It didn't change. The committee got together and discussed it and we did come up with some possible compromise seasons. One thing we realized when we brought it back is that it was not the ideal solution and we also discovered that there might be parts of that that other regions would like to adopt. We are just talking mainly about the Bookcliffs. As they looked at the season structure, there were things they possibly wanted to do too. The other challenge down there is they have a lot of bear permits. We felt like we wanted to keep things the same for one more year. We will get together in the spring and look at ideas on the Bookcliffs in addition to these other issues and come back with changes all at once. This is the second three year period. We will get data in and have discussion in the spring. Next cycle, we would like to make changes based on that effort and then move forward. That is why we are not recommending any changes to that this year.

Public Comments

Dan Cockayne (Utah Houndsman Association)- We sent an email to RAC members which I have copies of. Bookcliffs, San Juan and La Sals are the blue ribbon bear hunting places in the state. When the Bookcliffs season was changed, it was changed because of conflict with the elk hunt. Those are premium units for all game. Over the last several years, the division has indicated to us that they are receiving quite a few complaints from the La Sals, San Juan and Bookcliffs about conflicts with hounds and people who have waited 10-15 years to get an elk tag. Takes 14-15 points to get a bear permit on these units. We have been discussing this with the RAC's and board. Last year, the board said they knew they needed to do something but the next year was when that 3 year cycle was up. This is next year. We got the committee together along with sportsman groups and collectively came up with a plan that we felt would help solve some of these conflict problems. In the letter, there were some dates suggested that will let the hounds on the mountain earlier in August, take them off the mountain for the first week of the bow hunt and then also the last week of the bow hunt. Spoke with Darren and the division felt this was a social issue and the RAC is the place to air those things out and that is why we are here. We are concerned that the answer this year to the complaints on the La Sal are to reduce the opportunity. The fall La Sal hunt was reduced from 10 to 5 permits which makes that harder to get a permit. There are enough bears there that permits were raised by 25 permits but the opportunity was reduced by half for that season. I realize those units don't affect you here but those changes talked about would potentially affect the whole state. We would ask you to approve the recommendations from the division with the one exception and that is changing the La Sal, San Juan and Bookcliff fall seasons to August 6-November 16th with hound hunting restriction dates of August 18th-24th and September 8th-25th. We think this will help with the problem and these conflicts will go away. We can raise those spot and stock permits all we want and we may not kill a lot more bears but we will be less selective.

Aaron Johnson- Can you pass out some of those letters?

Kirk Robinson (Western Wildlife Conservancy)- Three issues to address. First, the proposal to eliminate the two week pre-hunt bait and extend the summer hunt by a week. We favor that and think it is a good thing. Our concern is not the social issues and conflicts but we think it would be interesting to find out how it affects bears. We encourage the division to do what they can, within reason, to make an assessment of the impact on the bear population in terms of age demographics and sex demographics of animals taken. We are particularly concerned about orphaned cubs. It would be nice to have data to show that orphaning cubs or having subjected to dogs, being killed that way, is being effectively reduced. The other concern is population estimates. About a year ago, a paper was published on a study done in Colorado. There are a lot of recreational type homes in the area and there had been more reports in recent years about various kinds of conflicts with bears. It appeared that the bear population was growing but when they did a long term study, they found it had actually shrunk. They had misinterpreted the data. I think this would be worth looking in to. Bear were moving in for food because it was scarce. The population had probably actually shrunk. Urge the division to revisit that at some point to see if they can find ways to further substantiate their population estimates and that they are not misinterpreting data. The third point has to do with depredation. It is an ongoing problem. Justification for increasing the number of bear permits based on the fact that there are depredation problems. Wondering why, if general bear hunting is effective at reducing incidents of depredation, we are not seeing that happen. Is there any data to support the hypothesis that general bear hunting actually does tend to reduce the amount of depredation on melons, beehives, sunflowers, or whatever it may be. If there are no studies to show that, maybe we need to instigate more. I would like to see the division reporting more on the issue of non-lethal deterrents each year. What has been done and what has not been done?

Brett Selman (Utah Woolgrowers and Farm Bureau)- The farm bureau is unable to come tonight so I am representing them too. Both organizations appreciate the divisions efforts in keeping up to the increasing bear populations in the state. Last year, on bear and lion losses, we got paid 83% of our value of confirmed losses. That is the first time that had happened. Bear and lion are a combined sum, so it has gone up. We appreciate the efforts made to raise the number of bears to be hunted. Support the divisions recommendations.

RAC Comments

Kevin McLeod- In regards to the recommendations from the houndsmen, the gentleman indicated that they had talked with you Darren about that. I would like to know what your study and wildlife resources feel like that would or could do with that change?

Darren DeBloois- We talked about the Bookcliffs in the group and that season structure with regards to that particular hunt. The San Juan and La Sals is a little bit different. Season structure is currently different. It is more similar to general season. their fall bear hunt on the La Sal and San Juan runs concurrent with the archery season. Last year, we had about 90 complaints on those two units. We felt like it was something we need to address. The concern is if we hunt during archery seasons on the Bookcliffs, it will get us similar number of complaints which is the regions concern and the history on the Bookcliffs. The reason we moved out of that fall season and did it later was because of complaints. This year the solution was to cut those tags in half. The region felt like when they had 5 permits during that season, there was not that conflict in the field. Our recommendations include that. Some of those permits, shifted to the spring season. They actually increased permits but moved some to another season and others are going to the spot and stock season. It is something we know is a concern. We felt like we needed a bit more time. There are other issues we would like to look at. Our recommendation would be one more year as we are and take a look at these issues specifically and additional issues in terms of other units. Currently, this season runs late into the fall. Right now, it doesn't. We would be adding hound hunting on those units where traditionally it has not been and people don't expect during those late season any weapon hunts. We may see more complaints if people draw those tags and encounter hounds in the fields.

Justin Oliver- With the houndsmens proposal, how many additional days are they looking to add to the season. August 6th-November 16th with approximately 3-4 weeks taken out of it? Is it extending the hunt quite a bit?

Darren DeBloois- It is.

Justin Oliver- 45 days or more in the season?

Darren DeBloois- It is an extension.

Aaron Johnson- Last year, on the San Juan and La Sals, they have the same season dates. Houndsmen were given 35 days on the mountain. Under the Houndsmen Associations letter, they would be given 31 days in August and September. They would lose 4 days during premium months. In October, it starts to get colder and food sources diminish and it is harder to kill bears. They would gain the month of October which is a less desirable time to hunt possibly. In November, the bears are asleep.

Darren DeBloois- Another thing on the Bookcliffs is that as you move later into the season, you get a separation between big game and bears. Bears tend to stay high and big game come down the hill. They hunt later there. This season structure made sense for the Bookcliffs as we were talking about it because they currently hunt those late October hunts. They feel like they have not had a lot of conflict during those hunts because big game start to move. Although, the houndsmen on the panel had concerns about being in the field during those late season, like the spike hunt. Bookcliffs is a big area but when you look at the habit, it can concentrate people.

Aaron Johnson- Everyone knows this letter comes from the houndsmen association but SFW and Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation support the houndsmen letter in changing these dates. New proposed dates would reduce conflicts. Our concern is that we are fighting with each other. We don't want to see hound hunting pay the price. We have asked that the Bookcliffs change because the houndsmen are asking to hunt the general spike hunt on the Bookcliffs. Why don't we put the trophy elk in at that time and let the houndsmen have the trophy elk time. Someone has to give here. If you look at the drawing odds, the hardest tags to draw on those units are bear tags. A lot of sportsman groups are for this letter. 3 years ago we moved the Bookcliffs season dates as an experiment and it really has not worked if you talk to the houndsmen. In the meeting, were there any groups in opposition of this?

Darren DeBloois- No, it was one meeting. We met for 3-4 hours and this was the main thing we talked about. This structure was mainly talked about in terms of the Bookcliffs. I don't think it quite fits the La Sal or San Juan structure for the reasons I mentioned. No one had any concerns. We brought those ideas in internally and kicked them around. There is some interest in the Southeast region in looking into doing different things. It would probably be more than just this because of the number of permits available down there. We are going to need to try and split people up in time and space because we are putting a lot of houndsmen on top of each other. We felt like we needed more time to look at all of those things together.

Bryce Thurgood- They asked to target the Bookcliffs specifically. Could we maybe take a happy medium and do the Bookcliffs for one year and make sure it is good. Then, add this next year on the San Juan and La Sal if the Bookcliffs is a success? It seems like that is what they have been after and the San Juan and La Sal got thrown in the last minute.

Aaron Johnson- I had no opposition to that. Part of the concern is the huge number of complaints on the San Juan and La Sal and if we keep kicking this problem down the road, where does it boil over? Speaking from sportsmen point, I really do believe they solicit these complaints. If you buy a bear pursuit permit, you get a phone call to ask if you had conflicts. No one asked me if I have complaints with the water skeeter while I was fishing. If you are soliciting complaints, are you going to get zero or 6? That is part of the problem. The southeast region RAC the push came from representatives that hunt that area and their fear is if we do nothing on San Juan and La Sals, are we going to lose as hunters and outdoorsman?

Bryce Thurgood- I have said in this meeting, it is the guys hunting bears with their points have just as much as guys that draw on the elk.

Aaron Johnson- I agree.

Bryce Thurgood- In the same sense, it would be nice to have data on the Bookcliffs saying it works so you could implement it on the San Juan and La Sal.

Aaron Johnson- I agree, and about the complaints we need to look at how big those mountains are and how few permits they give for bear hunters and that is not with hounds. At some point, the division has got to realize that those complaining are the problem.

Bryce Thurgood- Is that a question on a survey, if they harvest, if they are using bait?

Darren DeBloois- When they check in they do. I probably should have had that available. The majority tend to be guys that use hounds. The guys that are successful and turn in a bear are the ones we talk to. As far as soliciting, there are a couple of ways we get feedback. We ask on a survey when they get a random call. We have satisfaction numbers for hunters on different hunts. It is a 1-5 scale, 3 being neutral. The ones we are talking about here, the 60 on the La Sals, 30 on the San Juan was officers making regular field contacts and

being either approached and complained to. They did not ask them in those instances, that was just part of the conversation that came up. There may be better ways to look at this. You get feedback from both sides and this is not unique to these two particular things.

Aaron Johnson- On those complaints, speaking from personal experience, I do run hounds. If a dog barks in the mountains, it does not mean a deer runs. I like some of your suggestions Bryce. This letter and season dates are not the hound associations idea. This came from other sportsman groups.

Bryce Thurgood- The bear committee.

Aaron Johnson- From the bear committee and other sportsman groups. It does benefit all sportsman. Lets experiment on these units. If it is a problem, we can adjust next year.

RAC Motions

Motion – Aaron Johnson – Accept the Division’s proposal as presented with the exception to accept the recommended changes from the sportsman letter and add the fall season dates to the La Sal, San Juan and Book Cliffs, and extend those dates on the letter (Aug 6-Nov 6 with hound hunting restricted through Aug 18-24 and Sep 8-25) on the La Sal, San Juan and Book Cliffs.

Second – David Earl

Motion Fails – 5 in Favor, 6 Opposed

Motion – Justin Oliver – Accept the Division’s proposal as presented with the exception to accept the recommended changes from the sportsman letter and add the dates only pertaining to the Book Cliffs and extend those dates on the letter (Aug 6-Nov 16, hound hunting restricted through Aug 18-24 and Sep 8-25) on the Book Cliffs alone as a trial.

Bryce Thurgood- Same motion, but only the Book Cliffs and not the La Sals or San Juan.

Mike Laughter- Have a separate motion for dates on the Bookcliffs.

Bryce Thurgood- Where there is only one exception ,we can do both together.

Second – Matt Klar

Motion Passes – Unanimous

Motion to adjourn

Meeting Ends- 7:37 p.m.

SOUTHERN REGION RAC MEETING
Sevier School District Office, Training Lab
Richfield, UT
December 12, 2017 5:00 p.m.

1. REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

MOTION: To accept the minutes and agenda as written.

VOTE: Unanimous.

2. 2018 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments

MOTION: Motion Brayden Richmond Liberal units at increase to maximum allowable adjustment, to allow the Baiting season to start an additional week early, accept the la Sal, San Juan Book Cliff fall season dates of 2018 to be changed to the following Aug 6-Nov16 with the hound hunt restrictions date of Aug 18- 24th and Sept 8-25th. With an amendment to include the boulder and paunsaugunt units to be able to increase tags to the maximum allowable adjustment. Second by Brian Johnson.

VOTE: 9-0 Unanimous

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Rusty Aiken Verland King Dave Black William (Gene) Boardman Wade Heaton Brian Johnson Nick Jorgensen Sean Kelly Craig Laub Brayden Richmond Riley Robert	Johnny Neil Phillip Tuttle Darren DeBloois Teresa Griffin David Smedley Jim Lamb Gabe Patterson Jeremy Wilcox	Donny Hunter Steve Dalton	

Dave Black called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m. There were approximately 19 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.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)

Dave Black- K thank you. First action item is to approve the agenda and the minutes from our last meeting. I'll assume you guys have read those and I'll entertain a motion.

Craig Laub- I'll make a motion we accept the minutes and the agenda.

Dave Black- Do we have a second?

Rusty Aiken- I'll Second it.

Dave Black- K got a second from Rusty. All those in favor? Hold on just a minute, it looks like we have some discussion.

Verland King- Alright the way I remember the minutes, well maybe clear me up on the minutes a little bit, let's just, I noticed that we didn't have anything that was presentations in the minutes, is that just the way it is?

Dave Black- Right we just have our discussion typically as we go through.

Verland King- Okay so we had some comment at the first part of the meeting after we had a report from the Wildlife Board Meeting, um, there was some comment from a RAC member about what they perceived went on at the meeting up there and I noticed that wasn't in the minutes, is there a reason for that?

Dave Black- Um I don't know. I know,

Phil Tuttle- It should have been.

Dave Black- We can go back and check the recording and make sure that gets on the minutes.

Verland King- Yeah it was in the recording but it wasn't in the minutes

Phil Tuttle-So you are referring to the Wildlife Board Meeting?

Verland King- No I referring to the RAC meeting in Cedar

Phil Tuttle- Oh okay.

Verland King- There was a comment by one of RAC members about,

Dave Black- Mike Worthen I believe.

Verland King- About uh something that well he thought we were kind of misled on that RAC about what some of the maybe the hunters or the trappers wanted that that they didn't when he got up to the board meeting and was listening there.

Dave Black- That's right I recall that discussion.

Verland King- I couldn't find that in the minutes and I was just wondering why.

Phil Tuttle- We can check, I mean we send the recording off and they get it all typed up but we can check and make sure that it's in there. I can follow up with you or whatever you want to do there. But yeah it needs to be in there if it was discussed, so.

Verland King- Okay.

Dave Black- Thank you for pointing that out. With that exception then are you still good with your motion Craig?

Craig Laub- Yep.

Dave Black- Good with the second?

Rusty Aiken- Yeah.

Dave Black- K and then we'll get that updated and get that out to you so you can review it. Thank you Verland. So, we would like to do an update as well on the last Wildlife Board meeting and there was a lot of items if you recall but some of the main ones I'd like to go over and if I've misstated any of this then somebody speak up. I got this on a couple of different sheets so hold on just a minute. I might have thrown the baby out with the bath water but I do have some notes. The water fowl recommendation rule and amendments was approved as presented, taking of non-game mammal rule amendment was approved as presented, the big one was on the Bucks Bulls and Once in a Lifetime Season dates and application deadline. The recommendation for the early rifle hunt passed as presented with the exception of the units listed the Panguitch Lake unit was not included. The cactus buck hunt on the Paunsaugunt passed unanimous and also they talked about the rifle hunt on the Paunsaugunt will end on the last day of the month and so that passed. The late muzzleloader hunt did not pass and what they decided to do was to wait until the deer management plan comes out in 2019 and that will be addressed again so the units that already had the late muzzleloader hunt will stay the same, there was the addition of the Beaver Unit and I think one other up North but that was according to the deer management plan the way it is now. So, is that right Donny is that the way you remember that? Thank you. The Boulders taken off? According to the plan, ok. The Oak Creek Sheep Hunt was passed as presented. The motion to add the late muzzle loader hunt for units that were managed 18-20, that's what we talked about right? So, we talked about that. Adding the archery hunt to the Zion and Newfoundland Sheep units, that failed, its gonna go through the work group and then it will come back through the RAC process so it's not a dead item but it will come back through but it didn't pass at this time. The multiseason elk hunt tag that passes with the provision that they will do a survey after the first year to survey the hunters and look at satisfaction and so forth. Here at the Southern Region we also included in our motion to reduce the cost from 150 dollars to 100, that failed that is not something that we can do without going through legislation for that so that did not go through. The, we talked about, they discussed at the Wildlife Board the motion that we presented on being able to shoot cows and bulls like on the archery on the muzzleloader hunt, that was discussed but it wasn't included in any motion so that didn't go through the board. The discussion on the cactus bucks they are going to put in the provisions that it has to have 50% or more velvet, that was a recommendation from our RAC and that went through. We discussed a recommendation on the COR for hunters with limitations, that did not go through, there is already a COR for (inaudible) use a scope and that can be any power on the crossbows. So that didn't go through and the, we had a recommendation from our RAC to address hunter orange on the premium limited entry hunts and there wasn't a motion to address that so that didn't go through the board. Looks like everything else on the agenda went through and passed as presented. We're gonna have a regional update, Phil and then I'll entertain some questions before we start with our next action item.

Craig Laub made the motion to accept the agenda and minutes as presented. Rusty Aiken seconded. Motion carried unanimously. 9-0 unanimous

**Wildlife Board Update and Regional Update:
-Phil Tuttle, Southern Region Outreach Manager**

Phil Tuttle- So just a couple quick things we wanted to mention, first of all just today, just kind of neat, kind of interesting, we're moving sheep from the Zion National Park over to somewhere over on the San Juan which is exciting, this is the first time we've been able to move sheep out of the park so we've got a big crew and a lot of our biologists that would have been here now, but they are absent cause they are helping with that sheep capture and Teresa rallied all the way from Zion to barely make it here so, we are happy she is here. Also, we collared 30 bucks and a bunch of does, I don't know the exact number of does we collared on the Paunsaugunt Unit, just this past month as part of the migration (inaudible) and it will be really interesting to follow those deer as they move across the landscape. We've never collared bucks before in Utah so it is kind of a new deal that we are pretty excited about and it will be really interesting to get that data back. We'll also be collaring more deer this weekend in Arizona that migrate back up into Utah so we will be collaring I believe another 20 bucks and another (inaudible) of does as well. The biologists are currently wrapping up deer classifications which has kind of proved to be a little difficult this year with lack of water and weather, its been pretty rough go as far as we all know. And that's all I have. I have to excuse Tammy who sent an email that said she was in Vegas. Thanks.

Dave Black- Thank you Phil. Did you have a question Brayden on that?

Brayden Richmond- Yeah and I'm not quite sure how to address this, I think I may actually try to approach it as a motion today later on but just a concern on that crossbow and the COR, there is some misunderstanding there, that I want to clarify, do you want me to talk about that now or do you want me to wait and try to do it as a motion or should I bring it up now, what would you prefer?

Dave Black- Talk about your concern.

Braydon Richmond- So the concern of the board is it was misunderstood and frankly you know we got a unanimous vote on it at our RAC and I probably didn't take the time explaining it that I should have. I'm well aware that there is a COR that allows for a multi powered scope. I'm aware of that. It was represented as though we weren't aware of that so we didn't need to talk about it because that option was there. That's not the case. So the issue is, crossbows are a less efficient weapon than a compound bow. We have an opportunity for a person to get a COR if they have some physical limitations to hunt with a crossbow in the archery hunts and there is people that really enjoy doing that. A nice season, nice time of year, the problem is currently you are required to use a one power scope on that. If you'll notice, crossbows don't come with one power scopes, they all come with power scopes. And now that we got rid of one power scopes on muzzleloaders, it makes it real difficult to even find one power scopes. So, using some of the same logic that we got rid of them on muzzleloaders would also be some of the logic of getting rid of them on crossbows. Now you can go get an additional COR that will let you put a power scope on a muzzleloader but in order to get that you have to have 20/40, worse that 20/40 corrected vision. Now, you know that's more difficult to get than the original, that's fairly limiting so what you are doing is you are already taking people that have physical limitations, you are further restricting them and giving them an inferior weapon. Now in addition to that lets just talk about some of the reasons you would want a crossbow scope on your crossbow. Anybody that's ever archery hunted knows you have either multiple pins or you have movable pins. With a fixed power scope, so let me go back, you are using a less efficient weapon, this may be hard for some people to grasp but a crossbow is a less efficient weapon than a compound bow. You get more drop you can store less energy than a compound bow and now what you are doing is you are only allowing them to put one pin out there so they have to sight in for 30 yards and that's what they shoot. It goes out to 40 yards you gotta rough estimate, under that, same thing. You are using one pin whereas on a compound bow you have multiple pins so my proposal

is we should have done it when we did the muzzleloaders, we need to get rid of that one power scope off the crossbows. Kind of interesting, I've actually been contacted by several people since this was brought up at the last meeting, said oh please its about time, I've been bringing this up now for a couple of years and last year I brought it up at the wrong meeting and told it was the rules meeting and the rules meeting wasn't on the agenda, this year, and I probably messed up by not bringing it up and trying to get it on the agenda but we had the crossbow rules amendment so I thought it was the time to do it but then it wasn't communicated to the board correctly or understood correctly and so my intent today is to try to get this thing through again.

Dave Black- So I'm just thinking about this and Phil maybe you have an idea but I guess what I would say is two things. One is at the end we could maybe recommend it be an action log item to be discussed and then the other thing is definitely when we have next years November meeting that it comes up again so the only thing I could recommend right now is we try to go through it again with an action log item. I know that we had 2 board members that were at the last RAC meeting so I think that they understood your concerns then and all the board members read your meeting minutes of the last RAC meeting and but so I would just say they will read your comments again today which was explained very good. Thank you. And we'll suggest that it be put on an action log item and we can vote on that and we'll add that to the agenda after we do the bears.

Brayden Richmond-So wait until after the bears?

Dave Black- Yeah.

Brayden Richmond- Cause there is a, we are going to be discussing some archery rule changes on the bear proclamation as well so I thought that may be an appropriate place but I don't want it limited to just bear archery equipment so and it doesn't need to go in the guidebooks, its just a rule change that you have to find out anyway so, lets get to it. Thank you.

Dave Black- Alright we will move to the next action item which is,

Riley Roberts- Um just in regards to the board meeting, since the board meeting there has been a lot of kick-back I'm not sure if the other RAC members have received that same kind of input back but there are a lot of sportsmen especially that are up in arms and have a very strong concern about our process right now which has been something that we've stood by for quite a few years as being one of the greatest processes in the Western United States with the RAC program and the board meeting. In regards to the decision to not support a proposal that was unanimously passed by all of the RAC's in fact only opposed by one RAC member in the entire state and, and the board went against that and there are sportsmen that are very concerned, very concerned and I think that both the RAC members and the board members need to be aware of that, that this very process is being, its in jeopardy of being questioned because of that and to speak bluntly people are, because people are people and they say what they say, they are throwing allegations of pushing personal agendas which always happens when you get in a public setting and and we have strong opinions of our own but I think we need to be very aware of that. We do represent each of us, a specific group and all of us here represent the Southern Region and I hope that we as RAC members and especially the board recognize that as we move forward through these next few years and processes.

Dave Black- K, I appreciate your comments. Ok, lets move to number 5. That's the 2018 Black Bear

Recommendations and that will be Darren.

2018 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments (action)
-Darren DeBloois, Mammals Program Coordinator

Darren: Good afternoon everybody, before I start with bears, since Verland brought up the trapping thing, I thought maybe I'd give you a quick update on that, specifically the trappers felt like I made it sound like in the RACs that they instigated that trapping rule process. I went back and kind of looked at the way the presentation was formatted, and the things that I said and I feel like they have a good point, I did go to their rendezvous and apologize to that group and said that I didn't intended to make it sound that way and didn't intend to put them on the hot seat and make it sound like they instigated the program, it sounds like I owe the RAC an apology as well cause I think that I left that impression last time that this was something the trappers were shopping and it is more of a law enforcement thing on our side, we're also concerned about non-targeted species and then just to wrap up we have asked the Wildlife Board to put a group, a committee together to look at landowner issues regarding trapping specifically of coyotes and see if maybe we can tweak the rule a little bit for next round so I hope that helps a little bit and with that again I apologize. I try to be accurate, I try to not to do things like that so having said that lets go ahead and move on with the black bear recommendations for this year.

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black- Do we have any questions from the RAC? Brian.

Brian Johnson- Um, out of the working group that you had, the committee, what was the dates on the summer season that came out of that?

Darren DeBloois- I think the houndsmen will present that tonight, but let me, so for,

Brian Johnson- Yeah for the summer baiting season what dates did you guys come up with in that work group?

Darren DeBloois- So this is summer its actually fall hound season

Brian Johnson- No I'm asking,

Darren DeBloois- Oh for the baiting season?

Brian Johnson-I'm asking what was the dates that you guys came out of the committee, what was the recommendation from the committee.

Darren DeBloois- The, the committee we talked about letting hunting, letting them start hunting two weeks early, um, the Division has had concerns about pushing,

Brian Johnson- No I was just wondering, so you got nine different groups,

Darren DeBloois- Right,

Brian Johnson- Of people and the houndsmen are included in that group.

Darren Debloois- Yeah,

Brian Johnson- And they were totally fine about,

Darren Debloois- That was what the group talked about. The Division still, we still had concerns about that. And so we sat down with the bowmen were the ones that proposed this season, this extension, but we did sit down with Yuba and worked out this compromise.

Brian Johnson- And I understand why Yuba, I understand why the bowmen are actually concerned about that because it used to be you couldn't bait unless you were hunting with a bow, now everybody can hunt with a, or bait and so that's why I just think its interesting , and that's a thing I don't understand its (inaudible) just maybe, I'm trying to decide if this is a comment or a question, how was it, I just don't understand that when I drew my Zion tag back in 2002 , how I was forced, forced to bait from April from the second week of April and it was over by the last day of May, I was forced to bait those days and it was biologically a good idea then, and now that we can shoot them with a rifle its biologically a bad idea to do it 2 weeks earlier like this committee says and you don't need to answer that because I mean it, maybe you should answer it, yeah.

Brian Johnson: (Continues off mic).

Darren Debloois- The Division has always had concerns about that early baiting season in fact we recommended that we not start baiting 2 weeks before the beginning of that bait season but

Brian Johnson- (Off mic).

Darren Debloois- So again given the current status of things we felt this was a compromise we could live with.

Dave Black-Thank you. Brayden.

Brayden Richmond- I didn't have a question but now I do. You said the Division had concerns with it but you haven't said what the concern is. And if the working group didn't have a concern then yeah I am curious.

Darren Debloois- There are actually some members of that group here tonight. Guy and Bryce so they can maybe speak to how the group felt about that. But,

Brian Johnson- My understanding is that the group was unanimously okay for having it 2 weeks early.

Darren Debloois- Um yeah I mean our biggest concerns are the earlier you get, with bait the more likely you are to have cubs find those set baits and we want to avoid, the reason we separate those hunts in time, the reason that we allow to, initially there was no early baiting, the initial proposal, the initial structure was the bait hunt started at the end of the hound hunt and we, we were okay with that because those sows come out of the den, they tend to kind of hang around with small cubs for a while, they don't really start getting out and around until that bait hunt kicks off and then the hounds will be out of the

field but we feel like a one week extension on that is still not early enough that we will see a lot of sows and cubs. The biggest thing is we have concerns about running hounds off of bait and when you bait in the field and hounds in the field, there is a potential for that to happen. One good thing about this is that now you will have someone sitting in the tree, watching the bait and so there may be a little bit less of that. But again it's something that we felt like was better than having a whole 2-week period.

Brayden Richmond- Alright and maybe I'm just not understanding something here, cause I thought that what you said was that the later you go, or the more likely you are to have cubs and so now we are baiting later so that would lead me to believe we are more likely to have cubs and the earlier you go the less likely you are to have cubs but we don't have it earlier because cubs might be there?

Darren Debloois- What I mean is the longer the bait is in the field the more likely a sow is to discover that bait.

Brayden Richmond- Alright so the longer it is in the field?

Darren Debloois- Right.

Brayden Richmond- And the concern there is having hounds run off the baits?

Darren Debloois- Right.

Dave Black- Riley.

Riley Roberts- I've got a couple questions not nearly as controversial, I promise. Do you happen to have any of the harvest statistics on the spot and stalk specifically?

Darren Debloois- Its low.

Riley Roberts- I'd imagine it would be.

Darren Debloois- I could look it up but its probably,

Riley Roberts- That's just something I'd be curious on and then in addition, how I mean we have 102 additional, there is a ton more bears and I think we all that have been in the field see that and that's a good thing, how do you allocate those, is there an algorithm or you just throw them, how do you decide which,

Darren Debloois- It's up to the region how they want to divvy those out between the hunts. One thing though you know we talked about season dates and I'm sure we'll talk more about it but one of our concerns is that we are starting to get, you know we have these long dates, we're starting to get really, especially on these dense units have a lot of guys in the field hunting at the same time and one of the things we want to look at next Spring and talk about possibly about next cycle is you know we may need to split some of those up or come up with some new opportunities. These units generally they need bears harvested and so you know you can put a lot of people in the field on a low success hunt but that's not necessarily what we are trying to do with the plan either, so, we're looking at having a good discussion about structure as well.

Riley Roberts- K, thanks.

Brayden Richmond- I have more questions but I wanted to pause so I could change gears cause these are different, totally different. My first question, I don't understand the pack size where that came from, is that a Division concern, was that a public concern?

Darren Debloois- It was a public concern. It came out of the Southeastern RAC, it was something they brought up in their RAC.

Brayden Richmond- It was a public concern. Alright, just curious, and then the real, the real question I had, could you walk me through the Beaver, I'm not sure I am understanding particularly the Beaver recommendation where, on that sheet where it is saying percent adult male and percent female is that what was, walk me through that I guess where I am really going with this, I'm surprised we are only recommending an increase of 2 permits on the Beaver being that's my backyard you know what I'm hearing is people are seeing significantly more bears on that so, just kind of curious if you could walk me through an example of how we came up with those.

Darren Debloois- Yeah I can tell you how it works and then of course the region is here and they can address it as well. So, the stats on the Beaver, 26.5, you know what let me cause its important how the, what the, management strategy is on that. It's a liberal unit. So, you want to see low male harvest and high female harvest on that unit so 26.5 male, 45.9% female, so what the plan says is that unit can be adjusted 20% a max of 20% one way or the other. So, you can go from 0 according to the plan to 4. So, 4 would be the max, um, as far as the recommendation of one,

Brayden Richmond-What do the numbers 26.5 and 45.9 represent?

Darren Debloois-So that's the percent, so 26.5 are the percent of adult males in the harvest. 3 years of, yeah that's based on the last 3 years.

Brayden Richmond- And so the missing percentage are cubs?

Darren Debloois- Right no we don't, we don't look at cubs, so the percent female are the total number of females in the harvest, but yeah okay adult male so that would be 5 years or older.

Brayden Richmond- Okay so that's, right that was, okay thank you.

Darren Debloois- Sorry about that.

Dave Black-Any questions down on my right? Go ahead Gene.

Gene Boardman- Um it used to be that when the Spring hunt started when the bears came out the houndsmen showed up and they pursued bears to tree em and if they happened to run into somebody with a kill permit they were pretty happy about it now do they we've got all these pursuit hunts do they still pursue during the Spring rifle hunt?

Darren Debloois- No you can pursue,

Gene Boardman- Do you have to have a kill tag in order to pursue bears during the Spring rifle hunt

Darren Debloois- Yeah the exception of that if you are a guide and you know there is some, if you are a guide and you are registered you can guide someone that's got a kill permit in Spring but for the most part yeah you've got to have a kill tag in your pocket.

Gene Boardman- And then you have the separate hunts for just pursuit?

Darren Debloois- And then the pursuit seasons are different.

Unknown off mic- (inaudible).

Darren Debloois- Do they overlap, is that what you mean? Oh okay, okay, I got you, sorry about that.

Unknown off mic- (inaudible).

Gene Boardman- So it's the same as it was before on the Spring hunt? Okay, appreciate that.

Darren Debloois- Okay, sorry I was wrong before.

Dave Black- Anybody else on my right? Gene or Craig.

Craig Laub- Um I spent a lot of time on the Boulders this year and I saw a ton of bears and I'm wondering how come there are no more permits over there? I mean I've been hunting over there for 25 years every in the fall, I see a bear occasionally, this year I saw 3 and I know of 5 different bears there.

Darren Debloois- Right, do you want to answer that?

Teresa Griffin- Why there is no more permits?

Craig Laub- No permits yeah.

Teresa Griffin- We increased by 2. We're asking to increase by 2.

Craig Laub- (Off mic).

Teresa Griffin- It says its going from 48 to 50. So, unless I've got the wrong paperwork my sheet says its going from 48 to 50, am I off?

Darren Debloois- Yeah it didn't show up, I must have missed that.

Craig Laub: (off mic).

Dave Black- So the total is 50 is that correct?

Darren Debloois- Yeah let me, yes.

Dave Black- Okay, thank you, any other questions from the RAC? Go ahead Verland.

Verland King- Now when you were talking about the Book Cliffs and the La Sal, this group that you invited to discuss issues was, is there depredation, much depredation problem out there with bear, is that why?

Darren Debloois- The Book Cliffs no the La Sals and San Juan it is more of an agricultural problem, sunflowers and melons and things like that.

Verland King- Okay so on this list of people who were invited is that, I guess a non-hunting representative?

Darren Debloois- There was one and they,

Verland King- Was there livestock or agriculture represented there on that?

Darren Debloois- No. Just the list there that we were talking about season dates.

Verland King- K so that's all you discussed was season dates?

Darren Debloois- Right yeah and the specific question was can we take the San Juan season and implement it on the Book Cliffs, that's what we were looking at.

Dave Black-K thank you before I open up questions to the audience if you want to make a comment we need to have comment cards and so far I have 3. At this time we do open it up for questions and we will ask that you keep that to questions if you want to fill out a comment card, give it to the guys in the back and they will bring them up. So do I have any questions from the audience? If you do have a question come up to this mic and be sure you state your name. Okay, lets go to the comment cards then. The first comment is John Keeler and he'll be followed by Guy Webster.

Questions from the Public:

NONE

Comments from the Public:

John Keeler- John Keeler with the Utah Farm Bureau, in this graph that was presented the permits issued and sports harvest it looks like that graph continues to widen, we have had a lot of conflicts this year with bear and sheep in particular but with cattle as well, in several areas and we have some livestock operators here tonight, but on the Paunsaugunt it is reported you know the Heaton's had a lot of conflict there, the Hansen's in North San Pete, extension agent in Beaver indicated there were a lot of activity there as well It appears that the permit numbers or at least the harvest is not keeping up with the numbers and even though it looks like there is a leveling off of the population, we need to be very aggressive especially in those areas that have these conflicts. These sheep operators are losing a lot of animals and part of the management goals is to be concerned about the economic situation that these animals create with these operations and so it looks like there is opportunity to have a few more permits issued and I

certainly don't know the magic number but um, it appears that the Beaver, the Central Mountains even though there is an increase of 7, there is considerable conflicts and you gonna comment, he'll comment on that, so we would recommend that there be even more permits issued in these conflict areas because of their significant problems.

Dave Black- John could I get you to list those again, you talked about Beaver, Central Mountains, you mentioned the Paunsaugunt was there something in addition to that?

John Keeler- The Heaton's had indicated that they had a lot of sightings, had a lot of conflicts on the Paunsaugunt. And Beaver Mountain and Hansen's can address the,

Dave Black- Okay thank you next will be Guy Webster followed by Bryce Pilling.

Guy Webster- Guy Webster here representing the Utah Houndsman Association. I was the member on the committee that we put together. We had 2 meetings, discussed a lot of what it was that come up with this, this was part of the 12-year management plan that we reviewed it in 6 years, this was the 6th year so the committee was put together, and things. To address your questions on the archery being allowed, or the baiting coming a little bit earlier, that was, we did have a bit of discussion on that and the Houndsman Association in agreeance with everybody else agreed to allow that one week earlier to be there on baits. And that was initially from our perspective to deal with conflicts on the hounds getting on baits, somebody setting a bait out and hounds coming through and chasing that bear off partly was a good share of why that was separated. We agreed to go back with that with the understanding that if your bait people come back next year and say oh well we had dogs running off our bait that the hound guys don't lose that, that we allowed that to come back, that was a big concern and stuff but we think we can we can both be on the mountain at the same time and (inaudible) the opportunity for each other and not have problems that way. This, through this, hopefully you all got this e mail but I just had him hand it out again the Hound Association we are in agreeance with the plan of the DWR with the exception of the La Sals, Book Cliffs, and San Juan, big portion of this discussion that was unanimous, I wish we would have voted on it, but I can tell you that the vote would have been unanimous vote that we do change those season dates, the Book Cliffs has been just in October, very very minimal harvest on that October to November season, people don't want to run their dogs during the spike elk hunt which is a general spike hunt, rifle deer hunt, people aren't running their dogs up there so the opportunity is not there for a fall bear harvest. The La Sals and San Juan, we chose to look at this, there is a lot of complaints coming out from those areas, anywhere from 30 to 60 documented complaints, its, I haven't seen the complaints but that's what we are getting told, we decided to take an active approach of lets do what we can to minimize or reduce those complaints all together and so therefore we have proposed a fall season dates of all 3 of these units to mirror each other, to help law enforcement to minimize these complaints of being August 6th to November 16th. But hounds would not be allowed on the mountain August 18th to 24th. That's the first week of your archery elk, your archery deer hunts. On La Sals primarily talking to the biologists during that committee meeting, the bulk of the complaints from archery deer hunters was the first week of the archery hunt. They felt confident that if we did away with the first week of hounds being on the mountain the deer hunters would be happy, the bowmen's were actually fully supportive, actually come up and proposed this. And then again being closed September 8th to 25th, that is the last week of the archery elk, the last week of the archery deer, the entire limited entry elk and goes into the muzzleloader elk. If you still had a valid bear tag in your possession you could still harvest a bear, during those dates any of those dates outside of it but you wouldn't be allowed to have dogs on the mountain. I think that putting this off for a year is irresponsible, we know there is a problem we need to address that

problem, Living in Green River, I attend the Southeast RAC, I have for decades, I've been (inaudible) for well over 30 years I've been to meetings for every one of those years and we just need to do something now. I hope you'll look at that, I hope you'll address it as a board and you make a motion on this. Yeah we've talked about the possibility of reconvening another committee next year and that goes outside of the plan who knows what will or won't happen with that but that doesn't fall within the plan guidelines, the plan guidelines calls for it this year and we did what this year said and followed the management plan that you guys as well as the Wildlife Board voted and adopted that plan and stuff and with those fall dates you know we're talking 6 bear tags on the Book Cliffs, 5 on the La Sals, 5 on the San Juan, not a great deal of hunters but for those hunters that are fortunate enough to draw those, a very very valuable hunt, anywhere from 12, 13, 14 years to draw those tags for those hunts. Don't want to lose that opportunity and yet we feel through all these groups SFW is on board with this, Elk Foundation was on board with this, Utah Bowmens was actually the ones who proposed it, Mule Deer Foundation has not come out strongly for or against it but it was a consensus of everybody in that room that we go with these dates and it would address the problems. The majority, you know there was nobody saying this isn't gonna work so you know we're coming here and we're asking for that with support of all of those groups. If you have any questions I would be happy to answer and go through this like I said I was on the committee, attending all of the meetings on it be more than happy to try to help you if you have questions on what the committee did come up with and what we did discuss and the reasoning of why we did what we did. Thank you.

Dave Black- Thank you.

Rusty Aiken- I have a question. There is 2 Book Cliffs listed (inaudible).

Guy Webster- (Inaudible) list would not change. Currently there are no dogs allowed in the (inaudible). That is something that we will address in the future but it will not apply to the (inaudible).

Dave Black- Thank you. Following Bryce we'll have Cam Albrecht.

Bryce Pilling- Bryce Pilling Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife. Thank you Mr. Chairman. We support the DWR's recommendations. We also support the Houndsmens recommendation. And I set on that committee (inaudible) so thank you.

Dave Black- Thank you. After Cam we'll have Will Talbot.

Unknown- It's not Cam.

Dave Black- Oh, we have an Albrecht here. Carl? Oh I'm sorry.

Carl Albrecht- Thank you Mr. Chair I just want to thank all of you, I know it's a thankless position to be in, it's a tough group out here to satisfy everybody's wishes. I'm just speaking for myself, personally, since I retired almost 4 years ago I've kind of got in the habit of putting out game cameras and the area I want to speak to is the Boulder, I've had over 20 cameras from the Antimony Rim all the way up to the top of Boulder on the West side, and steadily increased in bears on those cameras from 5 the first year to 8, to 12 to 13 this year. I just feel like in that area it would be good if we took more than 2 increased more than 2 that your recommendation is. The Boulder for some reason holds a lot of bears, they do well there, and they are beginning to be a problem not only for the sportsmen but the cattlemen, the

sheepmen, all of us in this room and I think we need to take another look at the Boulder Mountain and I appreciate you listening to me, thank you.

Dave Black-K after Will we'll have Michael Hansen.

Will Talbot- Will Talbot Paiute County Commissioner, Rancher. Just a few numbers for you, when we got home this fall with our herd of sheep that comes off that Boulder Mountain, we were setting about 295, 6 head short so I question the other 2 permittees that is out there with a herd of sheep and found that their numbers were very high over 200 almost for each of them so that added to another 400, almost 700 deaths on three herds on the Boulder Mountain. We also have a herd on the Monroe Mountain which I refuse to go back because of the predator problems but the other guys I've talked to, Stan Gleave on the Dutton with 2 herds, one herd on the Monroe lost 813 head of sheep, I'm not going to say its all bear, its contributing factors of a lot of things, lions, coyotes, ones that just want to die but there is more conflict with bears, its, especially in the last 4 to 5 years, and on the Monroe I hate to look at the sheet and see one bear permit put on the Monroe because I've lived there my whole life and you just see it increasing. What Carl said about the cameras, I haven't talked to a hunter that had a camera up there that didn't have a bear on it from each end of the mountain so you know, and to echo what Carl said that the Boulder Mountains clear full of them to recommend just 2 tags I would like to see that go up so, thank you.

Brayden Richmond- I have a question, I'm just curious you said the number 700 but for me I have no idea what that represents. I don't know what it was 3 years ago, I also don't know how many you run, could you maybe clarify that a little bit, what you've seen 3, 4 years ago and what it is now and how many total sheep that is. Is it 1%, is it 20%, I don't even, I have no idea.

Will Talbot- So them 3 herds on the Boulders is pretty roughly 1500 head give or take just a few head, so what is that, that's 4500 head of ewes that go on the Boulder Mountain and that don't even count the other that I have on another part of the Boulder but uh, the guard dogs have been pretty effective, but I'll tell you what they must have been asleep all summer. Actually we had one attacked, didn't kill him but he was bit up pretty hard so you know they are there, we have went from almost 150 head increase on death from last year on that. And if you really want some numbers if you total what they lost on the Dutton and the Monroe and the Boulder Mountain say them were all lambs 100-pound lambs, that's 75,000 bucks a truckload, that's 3 truckloads. That money comes out of the economic of Paiute County and Wayne County and Sevier sees a lot of it too. When them guys are spending money so.

Dave Black- Thank you Will.

Michael Hansen- Michael Hansen Sanpete, raise sheep. And I would take an increase on that North Manti, I can't even guess the number. I'm so tired, I'm tired of the losses we're taking. Since 07 when they started transplanting them when they pulled that boy out of the tent and killed him and its on the news and you see them transplanting, our fatalities have quadrupled we went on those 2 permits we got, we've got 2 permits side by side, between the 2 we used to lose 25 to 35 average, 50 a summer, total losses and we're 135 to 160 a year. Guaranteed, I mean you are talking 15 to 18,000 dollars every year and the bear I mean my dad herded there for 30 years and he was the sheep herder. He never pulled the trigger on a bear and since 07 on those 2 allotments, I mean we used to get with the trappers maybe 1 out of 3 years they'd get a bear on one or the other, if you had a bear in the sheep, they'd come with the dogs, 7 out of 10 times chase it to the neighbors and you were done for the summer. They are getting 7 to 10 bear between those permits a year. That they are killing and you guys as sportsmen, why aren't you

I mean, because they don't have the tags, that is what is, I mean it's ridiculous. If you can't find a bear on a permit, get off your 4 wheeler, and I herded there for 5 summers religiously and I hunted from the, and I never saw a bear from 89 to 93 and never saw a bear and we always had em, I mean they were there you could find the tracks you could find everything now you can't go anywhere without it, I mean a couple years ago I'm sorry I don't remember the exact year but on that permit had 9 bear and my herder called me in September and they kind of quit in September cause your berries and everything else come on. He called me and says problems, problems, I says what, he says 5 more bears (inaudible) and I says horse shit, I says there is 7 bears that got killed out of that canyon it's the line between the 2 and he says one guy is coming speaking 5 more bears, I says what he's got a camera, yeah I says 1 or 2 bears he says no I've seen the pictures, 5 different bears after we got that. And the majority are tagged and that's frustrating I mean they are transplanted. If they are gonna dump bear then dump tags. Or don't dump bear so.

Dave Black- Thank you that's all the comment cards that I have. Okay, I'll close this part of the discussion then. Do we have comments from the RAC? Brayden.

RAC discussion and vote:

Brayden Richmond- I'm taking more than my fair share of mic time tonight but I do have another question just curious, do we have any sort of objective that we try to stay under on bears, do we have any units where we are trying to decrease populations? You know we love to decrease animals we like to look at.

Darren Debloois- We do, there are 6 units that are managed under the liberal harvest strategy. And that is intended to reduce bear numbers and I can tell you what they are here.

Brayden Richmond-Okay and so that maybe answered my question, the liberal harvest is intended to reduce bear numbers that's the intent of it?

Darren Debloois- Yeah that's the intent I mean I've got it here if you want to know what units. There is 6 that are managed that way and that's intended to,

Brayden Richmond- I may have more comments Mr. Chairman but I have one to follow up this. So now, my comment, not question, if our intent is to reduce bears on these, it sure seems like we get more aggressive reducing elk and antelope and everything else besides bears when we are always asking to go over the recommendation but we aren't even meeting the minimum allotment here would be my comment, so you know, especially on our liberal units lets at least meet the maximum adjustment by the rule.

Dave Black- Um I just have a question, with the liberal units do they include some of the ones that were addressed today like the Beaver and the Central Mountain, the Paunsaugunt?

Darren Debloois- Yeah let me tell you which ones, the, let's see Wasatch Mountains (inaudible) Current Creek is liberal. Wasatch Mountains West is liberal. Let me make sure I'm on the right one. The Nine Mile, Central Mountains Nebo and the Beaver are all liberal and then most the rest are moderate. And those you go either way, you try to maintain but if you got problems then we do try to address them.

Dave Black- K any other comments from the RAC? Riley?

Riley Roberts- This is actually a question as well, on some of the units that we've heard discussion on, I'm a firm believer that the individuals that show up are the individuals that get the voice at these and so we've had had comments on the Manti North which I completely understand the concern there with the increase but it looks like the increase is at the max on that one, with the increase of 7 which falls within the management plan, and although I, trust me a lot of these board members RAC members here can tell you that I am not a firm believer in a lot of the management plans especially when it comes to like cow elk on the Dutton, but that is the plan that we have to work within and so even though we may have that opinion I can appreciate that the Division's recommendation at least is going to the max on that. The question I would have is like the Boulder we do have that was one of the ones that was mentioned, there was an increase there of 2, with a max adjustment of up to 10, I would actually like to get some input from our houndsmen that are here tonight and what their thoughts are, the sportsmen, because that's who I represent. What are your thoughts on the numbers, I know we got the email that says that the Houndsmen Association supports the recommendations but there is also talk I mean there is some of these areas that may, may need to be increased. I'd like to hear some thought there if possible.

Dave Black- Do I have somebody from the Houndsmen that wanted to address that? Please state your name when you come to the mic.

Jeff Brewer- Jeff Brewer is my name I am a member of the Houndsmen Association. I've had hounds for 36 years, I guess I'm getting old. Run dogs all that time. I've hunted the Boulder a lot, I like the Boulder. Lot of the people in the Boulder see me and know me that are there. The bear population on the Boulder is good, is it out of control, no. Is it hard to find a big older male bear, yeah. Are there some, yes. Is it a place that we should have a host of increase of tags in my opinion, no. No the last fall tag I had with a guy, we hunted 9 straight days and we caught a couple smaller bears, but no big bears, nothing that someone would be proud of, of course there is always circumstances and situations you know and everybody questions your dogs and but I've actually been at it a long time and caught a lot of bears over the years. The big thing I would say is we don't swing too hard too fast one way or another. We make smart decisions. I'm not trying to hurt these guys and their livelihood or anything like that, I think that's what we got Wildlife Services come in and also assist them you know I'd like to ask did they come in and kill some of those bears?

Unknown off mic- (inaudible).

Dave Black- Can we have you come to the mic, we need to keep our conversation on the mic or off the floor.

Jeff Brewer- I'm sorry I mean we all want to get along, we want to make it work, you know the recommendations are could you slide it some yes, yes, does it need to be shifted way hard, you know there is always danger in that, there is always those groups I don't know that there are any in here tonight or trying to take away from us, we want to get along, Guy made a great presentation, we want to get along with the bowhunters, you know we backed up and let them bait a week into what we think is our season, in the Spring, you know because they accuse us of running off with their baits but that's really not how it works, I think somebody needs to explain when you are hunting down a road with dogs and there is a bait up on the hill, you don't know that bait is there, my dogs don't know the bait is there, they smell bear and they go to it. And there is lots of logical places that we as houndsmen run roads and hunt

and we just try to get along and make it work and I think that proposal will work you know originally when we threw the baiters into the summer season that was to kind of split us up so, I don't know, did I answer the question on the Boulder, you know if you wanted to increase it a couple I think you could, is it mass out of control, lets see what this season brings.

Dave Black- K thank you. Okay one more question, we need to keep the conversation to the table but go ahead.

Verland King- Yeah kind of help me out I mean I'm a livestock man and when we get a bear in the cow you know a kill we call the government trapper and he comes and tries to catch it so, but in your line of work, like if you are guiding someone with a tag, are they hunting trophy, or are they just want to get a bear?

Jeff Brewer- Depends on who it is, I'm not representing myself here as a guide, I'm a sportsmen and recreationalist but it is all the trophy is in the eyes of the beholder, I mean you know I took, I went with Gary Hallows years ago over on the Boulder and he killed a male bear 125 pounds and he was in 7th heaven, on the other hand, you know years back I killed a bear on the La Sals that was 500 pounds, you know I was in 7th heaven, so,

Verland King- Do you ever have a hunter who doesn't kill because its not big enough?

Jeff Brewer- Yes. Or sows, just to tell you straight. Yeah I don't want to kill any sows. I want a boar.

Dave Black- Thank you.

Unknown off mic: (Inaudible).

Dave Black- No we have stopped our conversation.

Jeff Brewer- Did I answer your question sir?

Dave Black- We don't have any we have closed the comment session and so this is, we want to stay at the RAC level. Thank you. Do we have any other comments from the RAC? Wade.

Brian Johnson- I just I mean I have asked for this the last 4 years and I'm gonna ask for it again I think we need to move that summer season up to where it starts on May 19th, I mean last year it was, or two years it was because of the conflict and now its because of the cubs and next year its because of a summer storm in Florida, I mean who the hell knows but I think that if you are, if you are the guy who doesn't have hounds and you don't want to pay someone a lot of money to chase em, this is the most effective way to get it done and to harvest a bear. And I'm grateful for the opportunity to hunt into June and I know a lot of guys that do it, the problem with June is you start losing fur real quick. That second to third week in June you start losing it. I've been fortunate enough to play down on San Juan elk ridge with a couple of my dad, my brother, two of my nephews have had those tags, and we've killed a lot of bears down there and we've baited 2 weeks early and houndsmen have run off the bait and we don't care, that doesn't bother us, the bears come back, you can ask these guys, if you guys rig our road and your dogs run by our bait, and you don't catch that bear and kill it, its gonna be back to eat that donut 2 days later, its not that big of a deal. The conflict I don't understand because if you are that worried about

the conflict with the tag guys you just don't hunt until they are out of the field, you choose to put yourself in a situation where that conflict may or may not exist. So, I, I'm gonna obviously make the recommendation that we move the baiting season up to May 19th, I don't know if we're ready for a recommendation yet chairman but when we are I would like a chance at the microphone for that, so.

Dave Black- You will have an opportunity to either make a motion or an amendment to the motion. Okay go ahead Wade.

Wade Heaton- Mr. Chairman I am just curious if I could ask the Division without opening it back up to massive comment, the Division, what obviously the Houndsmens recommendation with regards to La Sal and these other hunts are different than yours, what is your concerns with their recommendations?

Darren Debloois- Um not specific, so we've met as a group, this is a discussion that primarily, is this turned on, I can't tell, can you hear me, primarily focused on the Book Cliffs, so the question was can we take the La Sal, San Juan season and put it on the Book Cliffs. And this compromised season was discussed in the group pertaining to the Book Cliffs. Guy Wallace was part of that discussion and he started looking at some of this and said you know I think there is some of the stuff that maybe we could work with down here. The biggest concern is on the La Sals and San Juan currently there is not a fall hound hunt on those seasons that overlaps any weapon deer and elk seasons so our concern would be putting, having it go as late as that Book Cliffs recommendation did. That would be something new on the La Sal and San Juan. Whether we get complaints we don't know, we got about 60 complaints that our CO's reported on the La Sals, last season and that was during the archery hunt we had hound hunting and archery and that's the way its been for a while. But we got a lot of complaints and then on the San Juan we got about 30 and these are just you know CO's out in the field checking people and people, archers complaining about dogs messing their hunt up so what we're recommending this year is we reduce those tags, Guy felt like 5 tags they'd have the problems but I think the region would still like to look at maybe looking at some season structure changes but maybe not exactly what the houndsmen are proposing. We'd like to look at that too and in addition to some other things I've talked about a little earlier, I talked about a lot of people hunting one big long season we may want to, we'd like a chance to look at that, we'd like a chance to look at some of these units where we have chronic depredation problems and see if there is ways we could target problem areas by having a specific hunts and permits, so, we're not recommending a change this year but we would like to, we would like to look at a lot of things over the Winter and into the Spring, and maybe come back next year with more so, those would be the only concerns that we would have.

Dave Black- Thank you. Lets go with Verland, then we'll go with Gene.

Verland King- I just kind of needed a question on the, on these bear numbers. Are you running off of a model like we do on everything else like the buffalo and the elk?

Darren Debloois- Uh this is the, so the way we calculated that population estimate is based on dead bears that have come in and are checked in at our offices. So anytime someone takes a bear they have to check it in. So, if you check in a 4-year-old bear in 2014, you know he was alive and a 3-year-old the year before so you add back and that's how we come, so this is a minimum this is how many there had to be there in order to harvest that bear that year.

Verland King- K so that sounds to me like it's not,

Darren Debloois- We don't go count individual bears, yeah.

Verland King- It's not very good, cause a lot of these guys talked about, you know when I asked him, he wants to kill, his hunters want to kill a trophy and they won't kill something that maybe not and then you've got it skewed on the females too, so, you know and these ranchers are telling ya how many bear are out there, the sportsmen with the cameras and that,

Darren Debloois- Yeah we agree that the bear population is growing. We don't disagree there.

Verland King- Yeah from a agriculture rancher part it's a problem and those dollar values they put on that they didn't just pick it out of the air, its important so yeah I think if you could help us out on these problem areas, and hunt more bear there and somehow get the hunters to harvest not, turn it loose.

Dave Black- So Verland just let me, that will be a part of what we will discuss today and so, if that is part of your desire or a motion or an amendment to increase tags, something like that, that's why we're here to have that discussion and discuss it as a RAC. Gene.

Gene Broadman- Okay we talked a lot about depredation most of it seemed to be on the Boulder, what is the, what is the, fish and game doing about that situation, are you going in and killing bears where they're, they're a problem?

Darren Debloois- I'll let the region speak to that specifically but just in general there is several strategies when it comes to depredation. One is picking a harvest strategy that tries to lower populations overall on units where we know we've got chronic problems. Secondly, would be to work with Wildlife Services and give them the leeway to take problem bears so if we know we have a bear taking livestock we want them to take that bear. And then thirdly we try whenever we can to get a sportsmen involved in that process so you know we had in the Southeastern Region we had some bears that were getting into sunflowers, they were able to get a hunter to come and they told them, we need to get this bear taken and it doesn't matter if its big, you need to take it and they had to agree to take whatever bear they treed and so those are some of the tools that we use. I don't know if you want to talk specifically about the Boulder, Teresa?

Teresa Griffin- So in the region the Wildlife Services staff when they go out and verify loss they call and report that to us. I think we had one on the Zion Panguitch this year that was a verified loss and you know aside from that I know you guys are losing animals but we didn't have any, unless the Wildlife Services agents aren't giving me a call and letting me know that, we haven't had any other than the incident on the, and those are livestock loss only. We've had other conflicts with bird feeders and cabins on the Paunsaugunt, but livestock loss, none were reported to me through Wildlife Services, so, unless I get that information, you know we are not aware of that and you know they do go out and verify kills and let us know.

Dave Black- K, thank you

Teresa Griffin- So unless we are missing a piece of the pie there.

Dave Black- Riley.

Gene Boardman- Have you guys been losing 750 sheep and not reporting it or verifying it?

Michael Hansen- I got a comment on that. Verifications and most of those bears that I said were killed are the Wildlife Services, k, most of those are. But your verification, the kicker in the ass is that, is they have to get there in time to verify them. These guys are putting their name on there and they are not signing something that they are taking your word. I mean I'm not saying that they think I'm dishonest but if they started taking everybody's word, hell we could zero out our losses through this so they have to get there, you've got wildlife, or trappers I call them, ADC, I don't know the, I mean I don't know how many permits our guy has, 28, and if you are getting hit on everyone of those, hit and miss, he can't get to those in time, and in the summer months, in June, July and August, that animal is gone before he can get to everyone and verify it. So your verification is not an accurate deal and these guys are doing the best they can, I'm not arguing that, but they are putting their name on there that that is honestly going to be paid and honest and they can't I know my guy wants to take my word for it but if he takes mine he's gotta take yours, shit we could zero out our losses and you know the majority of people are good but there are those that would cheat it. So,

Dave Black- Sure thanks for that explanation. Let's try to keep our comments to the RAC, thank you.

Riley Roberts- Is the thermostat broke? I'm freezing, if we are, if we paying for this,

Dave Black- That's why we'll get out of here quicker if you get cold feet.

Riley Roberts- First Mr. Chair, I probably owe the RAC an apology, I did not mean to open up to the, to public comment but I did feel like I needed a little more information to make a more informed decision and I believe I can do that now and I appreciate both the houndsmen, the special interest groups and, and the other conservation groups that are here tonight and I can support this now knowing that so thank you for that.

Dave Black- K, do we have any other comments or are we getting close for a summary?

Wade Heaton- Mr. Chairman I want to throw out just an idea. This is just kind of my broad brush stroke of the whole thing. The Division, not the Division, the climate for the entire State for the last 20 years has been grow bigger populations. And that's what we've done Statewide. I mean we've seen the population increases, I'm not necessarily thinking that's a bad thing. Obviously we have 6 units where we are trying to control the population, everywhere else we are letting the population rise. And which is fine, if it provides an opportunity, people love to go out and chase them, that is great, I do think we need to be mindful of a couple of things, one is, just the problems that we have with the livestockmen. I mean that's a real issue obviously more with the sheep than anything else but I do think we need to be mindful of that and we need to be a little aggressive at times. We have been, I'm not going to say this is the Division cause this is all of us, RAC, Board, Division, we've been very slow to increase bear permits. In the area where I live, I've watched the bear population for the last 10 years, and then I've watched the permit numbers for the bears in that same area. Its very slow to react. And I think that comes from the mentality we're trying to grow bear populations almost everywhere unless there is a huge problem or a blow up and then we go in and try to address it. I wouldn't mind us being a little more responsive a little quicker similar to what we are to big game. Obviously this is a tougher species to model, to have estimate populations and all that sort of thing so I understand some of the drawbacks and disadvantages.

The second thing I think we need to keep in mind is we've got an awful lot of big game hunters out there. Considerably more big game hunters than bear hunters and I do think we need to be mindful of the impact that we're having on those hunts if that's the majority of the people out there we may need to be mindful of what they are doing as opposed to just a select few on this other side.

Dave Black- K, I just want to summarize some of the comments that we heard from the audience. John Keeler came and mentioned 3 units specifically, the Beaver, Central Mountain, Paunsaugunt that are experiencing higher numbers of bears and problems. The Houndsmen came and indicated that they are in favor of the DWR's proposal with the exception that we have on the email and the paper in front of us and that's on the La Sal the San Juan and the Book Cliffs, of the fall season dates and we have that to consider. We had an individual from the audience that indicated he is seeing more and more bears on the Boulder Mountain each year with his cameras that he has out which he has quite a few. We had a County Commissioner, Will Talbot from Paiute County that is indicating increases in lost sheep from year to year and we also had an individual from the North Manti area that is seeing a considerable increase of bear sightings and situations in that area as well. And then we've had a bunch of discussion amongst ourselves so if, in summary, then if we're ready to entertain a motion.

Brayden Richmond: Let me see if I can make a motion here. I make a motion to accept the Division's proposals with 2 exceptions. One, I would like to see the liberal bear units tags increase to their max adjustment, across the board on the liberal units,

Dave Black- Hold on just a second, lets make sure we get this,

Brayden Richmond-I was talking real slow. Maximum allowable adjustment and the second one would be to allow the bait season 2 weeks early. Or one additional week to what is proposed, as the committee voted.

Dave Black- Does that address the houndsmens proposal or not?

Brayden Richmond- Three, third I would also like to accept the houndsmens proposal, can I just say it like that or do I need to read it?

Dave Black- Read it.

Brayden Richmond- The La Salle, San Juan, Book Cliffs, fall season dates for 2018 be changed to the following, August 6th through November 16th with hound hunting restriction dates of August 18th through 24th and September 18th through 25th. I said that faster cause you have a cheat seat.

Dave Black- K, do we have, we need a second first. Okay we have a motion on the table, do we have a second on the motion. We have a second, Rusty. Okay now we'll, any discussion on the motion? Craig?

Craig Laub- I would like, if we increase those liberals to the maximum I would like to know what those numbers will be on those units.

Darren Debloois- Yeah there is a hand out that shows the bracket, the minimum and maximum adjustment but let me read what, did you get which units are liberal cause that is important and that's not on that sheet. So, that would be the Beaver, the Central Mountains Nebo, the Nine Mile, the South Slope

Bonanza Diamond Mountain Vernal, I think I missed that one on the last go-through, Wasatch Mountains (inaudible) Current Creek, and Wasatch Mountains West Central.

Dave Black- So of the ones we discussed that doesn't address anything on the Paunsaugunt or the North Manti but it does address the Beaver and Central Mountain Units and it doesn't address the Boulder. Any further discussion? Brian.

Brian Johnson- I just want to make sure that I understand what I'm voting on here, (inaudible, off mic)

Dave Black-Do we need to read it to you again do you want to read it?

Brian Johnson- I'm just trying to get clear on the Houndsmen proposal, it sounds like there is a less days in the field with your proposal than with the Division's proposal, is that correct?

Unknown off mic- (inaudible).

Dave Black- Verland do you want to make a comment?

Verland King- Yeah so the Boulder Mountain isn't in on that because it's not a liberal unit.

Dave Black- So the numbers that they have proposed according to the motion would be the DWR's proposal. Unless you make an amendment to the motion.

Verland King- Can we make an amendment to the motion to include the Boulder and the Paunsaugunt?

Dave Black- Okay and you need to propose an increase if that's your intent.

Verland King- I propose that we go to the maximum adjustment that's listed here, 10 and 3, I guess.

Dave Black- Okay, so we have an amendment to the motion, to include the Boulder and the Paunsaugunt, to increase the number of permits to the maximum adjustment for the Boulder and the Paunsaugunt. Do we have a second to the amendment. We have a second from Craig, so we'll just, discuss the amendment right now.

Wade Heaton- Can we read that back.

Phil Tuttle- Do you want me to read the whole thing? So I have it, the amendment to include the Boulder and the Paunsaugunt to be able to increase the number of tags to the maximum allowable adjustment.

Dave Black-So any discussion on the amendment? Gene?

Gene Boardman- I like that amendment, we've been, we've had information that bears are really increasing on the Boulder, we've had information that the depredation is bad on the Boulder, and I think we need to increase, I've noticed with big game and with everything else that we usually increase with caution and decrease more heavily and uh, I think that we need to, we need to be a little aggressive on increasing that Boulder bear tags.

Dave Black- Anybody else? Rusty?

Rusty Aiken- So did we cover all your guys concerns with this motion?

Discussion with several people off mic-

Dave Black- Okay let's read it again where we are at.

Phil Tuttle- Okay so Brayden motioned to accept the Division's recommendations with 3 exceptions. #1 increase the number of tags on units with liberal management to the maximum allowable adjustment, that includes the Beaver, Central Mountains Nebo, Nine-Mile, South Vernal, what was the name of that, South Slope and then there is 2 Wasatch Units, correct? So that's exception number one. #2 allow the bait season to begin one week earlier than proposed and #3 accept the Houndsmen's date proposal which is the La Sal, San Juan and Book Cliff fall season dates for 2018 be changed to August 6th through November 16th, with hound hunting restriction dates of August 18th through the 24th and September 8th through the 25th and the amendment to the motion to include the Boulder and Paunsaugunt, to increase the number of tags to the maximum number of allowable adjustment according to the Plan.

Dave Black- K, lets deal with this amendment before we do any other amendments or anything else. So, we are just talking about the amendment. All those in favor. Okay, all those opposed. Okay so the amendment passes so it's now part of the main motion. Do we have any further discussion on the main motion? Okay, all those in favor. Okay that is unanimous. That concludes this item. We will turn some time over to Brayden and again probably what I would suggest is a motion that this be an action item and then I'd also suggest that as you get the minutes for review that you look at that and if there needs to be any corrections before we get it to the Wildlife Board so its clear on your concerns.

Verland King motion to accept an Amendment to Include the Boulder and Paunsaugunt to be able to increase tag to the maximum allowable adjustment Rusty Aiken Second 8-1 passes

Motion Brayden Richmond Liberal units at increase to maximum allowable adjustment, to allow the Baiting season to start an additional week early, accept the la Sal, San Juan Book Cliff fall season dates of 2018 to be changed to the following Aug 6-Nov16 with the hound hunt restrictions date of Aug 18-24th and Sept 8-25th. With an amendment to include the boulder and paunsaugunt units to be able to increase tags to the maximum allowable adjustment. Second by Brian Johnson. 9-0 Unanimous

Other Business

-Dave Black, Chairman

Dave Black: I appreciate you letting me do this Chairman and frankly I take some ownership here because I should have written an email, I actually had intentions of going to the Board Meeting, some work obligations came up but as I discussed it with people it was always received really well so I kind of thought it would fly through so I didn't take it maybe as serious as I should have. So, this time I will write an email to the board members to let them know what I am proposing and be a little more specific. Let me just add one more clarification that I kind of left out before too. I mentioned that when you are buying a crossbow, particular the hunting crossbows, they almost always come with a scope, what I left out of that is those scopes actually have grids or dots for the yardages. So just having a higher-powered scope isn't the solution, it's that you actually have marks for your yardages. Just a side note but the

action item I would like to make a motion, I would like to make a motion for an action item to revisit the rule on crossbows and to allow crossbows to have a powered scope and I think the way I'll address that is through an email to the board with some clarification.

Dave Black- K, so we don't want to confuse it again, because they do have a COR for a crossbow, with a powered scope, you want to make a distinction,

Braden Richmond- What I would actually ask is to get rid of the additional COR for the scope which requires a 20/40 corrected eyesight, I would just like to get rid of that COR and make it so crossbows can have powered scopes.

Dave Black- Okay, that's clear. Do we have a second? Okay do we have any discussion? All those in favor? Unanimous. Okay that's all the items I have I call this meeting adjourned.

Brayden Richmond Motion to accept action of getting rid of additional COR for Scope Second by passed 9-0 Unanimous

Meeting adjourned at 6:56 p.m.

**Southeast Regional Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell River History Museum
1765 E. Main
Green River, Utah
Dec. 13, 2017**

Motion Summary

Approval of agenda and minutes

MOTION: To accept the agenda and minutes as written

Passed unanimously

2018 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments

MOTION: To accept the 2018 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments as presented, with the amendment that the La Sal, San Juan and Book Cliffs fall season dates for 2018 be changed to Aug. 6 through Nov. 16, with hound restrictions from Aug. 18-24 and Sept. 8-25 for those units, as well as hound restrictions during the October general rifle deer hunting seasons on the La Sal and San Juan units

Passed 6-4

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

Dec. 13, 2017 @ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Members Absent

Kent Johnson, Vice Chairman · Public at large
Sue Bellagamba · Non-consumptive
Lynn Siterud · Elected official
Jeff Christensen · Agriculture
Jace Guymon · Public at large
Eric Luke · Sportsmen
Darrel Mecham · Sportsmen
Darren Olsen · USFS
Kirk Player · Public at large

Trisha Hedin, Chairwoman · Sportsmen

Todd Thorne · Public at large
Dana Truman · BLM

Helene Taylor · Agriculture

Chris Wood, DWR Regional Supervisor

Gerrish Willis · Non-consumptive

Total public attendance

9

Others Present

Kevin Albrecht, Wildlife Board member

1) Welcome, RAC introductions and RAC Procedure

- Kent Johnson, RAC Vice Chairman

Kent Johnson: I'd like to welcome everybody out. Thanks for coming. This is our December RAC meeting, December [13], 2017, held in Green River, Utah, Southeastern RAC. I guess I probably ought to talk about the procedures and make sure. The Division will make their presentation and then after the Division makes their presentation, we'll have questions from the RAC then we'll open up questions from the audience. Following that, we'll have comments from the audience. If you have a comment make sure you get a comment card and fill it out and bring it up here. Keep your questions simple if you can. During question period, make sure it's questions and not trying to interrogate or anything

like that. If you have anything that you'd like to elaborate on make sure you put down a comment card and we'll take care of that in the comment section. The first thing we've got is the approval of the agenda and minutes from the last meeting. Is there any discussion about that?

2) **Approval of Agenda and Minutes**

Todd Thorne: I'll make a motion to approve the agenda and the minutes.

Kent Johnson: We have a motion from Todd, and Kirk seconded it. All in favor. Any opposed? Looks like it's unanimous.

VOTING

**Todd Thorne made a motion to approve the agenda and minutes as written
Seconded by Kirk Player
Motion passed unanimously**

3) **Wildlife Board Update**

- Chris Wood, DWR Regional Supervisor

Chris Wood: Good evening. Welcome, and Merry Christmas. There's a Christmas present for you on the table, take one of these coolers home with you. Then, there is lots of candy. Chocolate will keep you happy throughout the night, hopefully. We appreciate you service on our RAC so this is just a token of that appreciation. We hope you have a great Christmas and holiday season. Thanks for spending an evening in December here at our RAC meeting. Trish Hedin is not here tonight. She is at a cross country meet in San Francisco. She runs a Moab running club and they went to a race over there. She regrets not being here but she did attend our Wildlife Board meeting and she represented you guys very well and brought up the motions and concerns that you had that were passed at the RAC meeting. I'll try to do my best to report on the meeting and maybe answer any questions that you may have. I did send out an email a week or two ago to update you on the bison issue and also sent you the draft motion summary that came from the Wildlife Board. I'll quickly run through some of the things that were passed. I should say too, our director apologized for the long agenda and said that won't happen again so I hope that's the case. It was a killer agenda. I applaud Trish and you guys for powering through it though. I think the meeting only lasted 3½ hours. The meeting in the Northeastern Region went until 1 a.m. Good job with the meeting management last time.

Our Waterfowl recommendations that we passed here unanimously, the Board also passed unanimously. Non-game mammals rule that involved the prairie dog issue, that also passed unanimously at the RAC and at the Board. Then we get into the bucks, bull and once-in-a-lifetime recommendations. Like it happened at our RAC, at the Board

meeting they broke that down into numerous motions. Maybe I'll address the bison issue first.

The last few years as an agency, as we've gone to different RAC meetings and we've heard different recommendations come out of the RAC meetings and different motions there are times as an agency, where we'll hear a motion or recommendation and if it's more of a social issue instead of biological concerns, we often times adopt some of the recommendations and use that as our recommendation to the Wildlife Board. And that's what happened this last go-around. If you remember, this RAC voted to remove the Range Creek area out of the bison hunt boundary and we took that idea back as an agency and decided that that is a good idea and is something we proposed to the Wildlife Board. Brad Crompton gave a presentation at the Wildlife Board about the bison issue, the past, what the current situation is and what the future strategies are going to be. We were able to give that presentation and clarify some things and take what came out of this RAC and use that as part of our recommendation. The Wildlife Board did approve that portion of the buck, bulls, once-in-a-lifetime recommendation. They approved the Range Creek area as no longer part of the hunt unit.

So when bison come into Range Creek, there are two things we're going to do as an agency. One is to immediately call the tribe and request that they herd their bison back to their property. We've done that in the past. You get a helicopter, you push the bison down Range Creek, up the Green River across the river, back up on top of their tribal lands and they have some holding facilities there and best-case scenario, they sell them off to slaughter. That's what we're going to do first and foremost, ask or request the tribe to do that. And the second thing we'll start doing is calling hunters. Every time we have a draw, there's an alternate list of those that didn't draw but are next in line. We'll call those people off the alternate list and give them a description of what they are going into. They'll need horses and hiking and we'll paint the scenario for them. We'll give them the opportunity to hunt bison in the Range Creek area. We'll work with the University of Utah and the museum folks there to help them get better access to those bison. The good thing we're able to do now is if they don't harvest a bison we can give their points back to them. There hasn't been a shortage of interest in this hunt, but that will definitely alleviate some of the concerns because some years, access is impossible. Snow flies, and we're unable to get into Range Creek.

There are a few different strategies that identified in the paper that I gave you last week too. Improving Turtle Canyon is still a strategy we're committed to and committed to putting money towards. The other thing we're going to do is to work with our partners—the Department of Ag, and look at some gates and fences to try to prevent bison from coming into some of the canyons. We realize that it's not a fool-proof solution. They can still get around those areas and bison will still move and get where they want to but it will deter them for a little bit, or deter them from coming into some canyons. Those are the strategies we're doing.

The Wildlife Board also passed the motion to create a bison working group modeled after the Henry Mountain bison working group. That passed unanimously so as an agency, we'll be working with the landowners and the Department of Ag, BLM and the university to develop this working group so we can meet together often and implement these strategies that we've identified and talked about. Since our last meeting, we called the tribe and they did get the helicopter and they actually pushed 275 bison out

of Range Creek and the Green River canyons. They were scattered throughout that area. They pushed 275 bison back up onto the tribal lands. I wish I could say that the majority of those 275 were sold off to slaughter. That's not the case. The last update that I heard, 57 of those bison were sold off to slaughter. As they rounded them up and tried to push them up to the pens, bison got scattered and their holding facilities are only so big so this go-around, only 57 were removed. But that's 57 less, and that's a lot more than we can do with hunts. We'll continue to do that throughout the winter if they come back. That's the bison issue.

I'll quickly go over the other items here that we discussed. The multi-season elk hunt passed 4-2. With the caveat that they ask the Division to conduct a survey gauging permit holder success rate and weapon types and provide a report back to the Wildlife Board next year. The early-season general rifle hunt proposal also passed, but they excluded the Panguitch Lake unit. Next year we'll have an early season rifle hunt in seven units. Chalk Creek, Filmore, Camas, Nine Mile, Pine Valley, Plateau/Fishlake and the Zion units will all have that early rifle season hunt. They also discussed at great length the proposal to have a limited-entry deer hunt on general season units that meet or are above buck-to-doe ratio objectives. That proposal did not pass at three of the five RACs. It did pass at our RAC as you accepted the remaining recommendations as proposed. It had a lot of discussion. In the end, our agency had an alternate recommendation, and the Wildlife Board ended up passing the alternate recommendation. That we provided by the mule deer management committee that allows for late muzzleloader, limited-entry units that exceed the buck-to-doe ratio. They'll also keep last year's units minus the Plateau and Boulder and Kaparowitz, but add the Beaver and North Slope units. The difference there was, instead of "meets," what was passed is it had to "exceed" the buck to doe ratio objective.

Other things that passed. The cactus buck hunt on the Paunsagant passed. This RAC talked about two things that I'll address right now. One is the boundary change in the Nine Mile Unit and the Manti Unit that would allow people to allow people in Green River to hunt both the valley and also the desert. The other thing was to create a South Book Cliffs late-season archery hunt. The board decided that those were two pretty huge proposals that probably need to go through the mule deer working group committee and then go to all of the RACs. They heard that concern, it was presented but it was something they didn't want to move on without going through the right process. There was no action on those things. Maybe I will just say that from the Division's prospective, the Green River/Nine Mile boundary change, the last several years we've been trying to align our boundaries. Our mule deer boundaries with our bighorn sheep boundaries and have all the boundaries be consistent throughout the different species. This would deviate from that. As an agency, it's not an idea that we love. But of course, ideas that we don't love get passed all the time and that is what this process is for. I just thought I'd throw that out there.

The statewide pronghorn management plan passed as presented. So did the moose plan and they also reviewed the Jump Creek CWMU variance and that passed. I can go into more detail if you have questions or you can talk to me after the meeting. The Diamond Mountain landowner association variance request passed and so did the Book Cliffs landowner association issue. That all passed. That's the report, hopefully you reviewed the motion summary that I sent out last week. If there are any questions about

that I can try to answer them or we can talk after the meeting.

Kent Johnson: When I looked at that motion summary, I think the Wildlife Board amended, they did grant a variance for the Book Cliffs Landowner Association, but I think they amended the permit numbers from what we passed out of the region here. What was passed out of the RAC here was what the landowners were requesting with the elk numbers and I think that the Wildlife Board reduced that but they split the difference between the recommendations out of the RAC and what the Division was recommending. OK. Thanks Chris.

4) **Regional Update**

- Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor

Chris Wood: Things are slowing down for our Aquatics Section. Their surveys for the year are finished but they are analyzing data and going to workshops and doing some career development. Those are some of the things that they have been working on the last few weeks.

Our Habitat Section is busier than ever this time of year though. This is the time of year that most of the restoration work that happens in our state is implemented. They try to get the ground turned and seed on the ground before the snow flies. They'll do some in the spring as well but this time is the busiest time of year. The group that approves these Watershed Restoration Initiative projects or habitat projects is UPCD, it's the Utah Partners for Conservation Development. This time of year, they are writing proposals and entering them into a database and this UPCD group meets several times this winter to review projects, try to collaborate better with each other and eventually approve projects and then rank projects. Some things that are happening on our Division properties, we're looking at planting some shrubs at Desert Lake and creating some better upland game habitat there. Then on the Matheson wetland in Moab, we're looking at a prescribed fire next fall so we're writing that plan and meeting with partners now to figure out how we can implement that.

Our Law Enforcement guys are busy, of course, as well. They're always making cases. Trapping season is in full swing and that is what is keeping them busy. They are responding to poaching calls all the time. They had one last night actually. Someone shot three or four deer last night. They were eating their shrubs, and they got mad and they shot three or four deer. People are keeping our law enforcement officers busy and they are responding to things and making great cases. If you've seen some of our officers in the last few weeks they have facial hair, which is against policy. But for November and December they have the ability to buy a beard card. They pay \$25 towards this charity and the Utah Conservation Officers Association matches that so \$50 goes towards this charity and with that money they buy coats for local kids. All of our officers, because they can, they're allowed to, for two months, grow facial hair. They all participate in that activity. Just this week, our officers received those coats and are handing them out and it's been fun to see.

Our Outreach Section, Walt and Morgan, have been busy as well. They are

preparing for some clinics that we are doing this winter. The last few years we have done these clinics in the Price area. We don't have any dates or locations for sure yet but we are thinking about doing an ice fishing clinic in Moab and maybe using Ken's Lake. Then also having our predator clinic down in the southern part of the region as well. I'm not sure about the turkey. We've done them up in the Price area for the past few years and our attendance has been really good. People are interested and increasing their knowledge and learning how to do to these different activities so we thought we'd bring it down south. Our state NASP tournament—NASP is National Archery in the Schools Program—throughout the region and throughout the state we have different school with archery equipment in their schools. And either after school or before school or during school itself, kids of all ages and skill levels get together and learn about archery and they shoot at targets. That statewide tournament is February 10, and that attracts thousands of kids from all over the state to the convention center in downtown Salt Lake City. Same place and time that the expo goes on so it's a big draw and a big event.

Our Wildlife Section is busy as well. Very busy. They have been doing bighorn sheep transplants this week actually. They bighorn sheep in the Zion units are clean and healthy and there is a lot of them. There are too many of them, so we're receiving some of those Zion sheep. Their genetics are really good too, they grow some really nice rams in that unit. We're taking I believe 50 sheep from Zion and transplanting them to the North San Juan. They transport them in trailers to the Hite area and once we get to Hite, we'll take the bighorn sheep that are in these little cages, maybe four or five in each cage, and we'll string them up to a helicopter and we'll take them to a remote area in the North San Juan and release them out there. For several years, that population will be protected and be allowed to thrive and of course they will move to areas that are more accessible and visible. They'll be accessible to sportsmen as well. We're doing a lot of deer captures as part of our migration initiative and our deer study. So we'll capture deer and put GPS collars on them and research their movements. We're doing that this year in the San Juan, the Book Cliffs and the Manti. And then, of course, we're doing our annual deer classifications this time of year too. With that, I'll take any questions, and if I can't answer them I'll ask my guys. Thanks.

- 5) **2018 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments**
- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Kent Johnson: Thanks, Darren. Questions from the RAC?

Darrel Mecham: When you gave the handout here it shows percentage of males and all that on your stuff, why don't you have an age structure there? How's your age population going? I know you said you wanted to put it in two year and above, but I know you know the ages of it. What's the ages doing?

Darren DeBloois: It depends on the unit. We do it unit by unit and this is kind of complied statewide so it depends on the unit. I think that overall, we've seen similar to that population trend we've seen sort of leveling off in ages.

Darrel Mecham: A leveling off, or are you having a dip?

Darren DeBloois: I'm pretty sure it leveled off over the last three years. I can get you the numbers for sure. I've got them here but I think average age is, well I probably ought to look at it. Go ahead, do you have any more questions and I'll look it up?

Darrel Mecham: I'd like to see that. One of the other things when you're taking about your group, maybe the houndsman will get into that is your late fall hunt where you have the minimum tags. Do you have, and maybe this is more for your law enforcement, where the guy draws his tag and then he has 5 buddies show up with all their dogs? Have you solved anything? Did you solve anything?

Darren DeBloois: That would be a good question for the region. Maybe they can talk a little bit to those specific units and what they are seeing. We did have a lot of complaints this year during the archery season. One thing we're recommending is a reduction in the permits in the fall. In the past, it seems like when those fall permits were around five, we seem to have less conflict. This year we had about 60 archery hunters complain to our officers when they are in the field about dogs in the field at the same time. About 30 on the San Juan. Guy or somebody, do you want to talk about people with their friends showing up with dogs, and is that an issue?

Darrel Mecham: I was going to have one of them come up here anyway.

Ben Wolford: It's always an issue because when someone has one permit they've always got four or five trucks out there. Then there's also six, seven, eight dogs in that one truck. For the actual hunt, I don't believe there is actually a number that we restrict it to. We were trying in the past to restrict a pursuit season to eight dogs. That's never really been an issue but during the hunt, there's always a lot of dogs out there. Most of the houndsmen that we talk to, they don't put all their dogs out there it seems except when there's a big bear. And the little bear they'll usually hold off. But if it's a big bear, they want to make sure they get that bear. Does that answer your question?

Darrel Mecham: There's another one here. Are you law enforcement?

Ben Wolford: Yeah.

Darrel Mecham: I'll use Adam as an example. Adam's a good guy; he's picking up quick. When he first showed up after the hunts closed, he said, "I stopped on a lion hunter in Willow Basin that had a lion up there and had a lion caught." No they didn't, they were bear hunting on a predatory management unit on a lion tag. Have you guys got anything on a loophole on the San Juan, La Sal? All I have to do is have a lion tag, I'm going hunting. What are you going to do about it? It's happening. Tell me where that's at and

have you guys addressed it? It's getting bigger and bigger.

Ben Wolford: Yes, it is and we've dealt with a lot of issues in that aspect. The best that I can tell you is we do it on a case-by-case scenario. And—

Darrel Mecham: I can tell you from being in law enforcement, I don't think there's a thing you can do with it.

Ben Wolford: There's not really. If they've got a valid permit right there, we try to take it by their word. But you're law enforcement, you know how that works. It's a discussion that we need to have on a higher level probably, especially with our chief in Salt Lake and with the director's office.

Darrel Mecham: Also looking at your graph here and your depredation and that, a 102-tag increase is huge when you have 860 tags. Your depredation is not up so—

Darren DeBloois: It was up this year. The biggest increase in depredation this year was bears on sheep. We had to prorate this, we have \$180,000 that we pay to guys on confirmed losses. We had to prorate this year at about 83% on the dollar. That was largely due to bear depredation. That's centralized on specific units. With bears there's a few ways you can address it. One is to try and keep populations at an acceptable level but also work with Wildlife Services, and we try to work closely and get individual bears. That was a concern this year and that's something that did enter into our considerations on permits.

Darrel Mecham: One more thing that I've seen a lot is your unlicensed outfitters. Why do we even entertain having a system where they have to deal with DOPL and license themselves when you guys pretty much have a hands-off, we're not going to worry about it? We don't have the time; it's DOPL's issue. And DOPL don't deal with it. So why do people that I know, like GT, they pay their stuff, the legal outfitters, why should they do it? Why? Because there's not teeth in it, it's a wildlife issue and I'd like someone here to explain to me why.

Darren DeBloois: I'm going to steal the houndsmen's thunder a little bit. They are going to talk a little bit about season structure changes that they would like to recommend. But we felt like after our discussions with them, that there are other issues like this that need to be addressed. In our recommendations, the reason we didn't change anything this year is we feel like we need to have a bear summit, something where we can get people together and put all of these concerns on the board and say how are we going to address these things. There's still issues with pursuit, like you said, guiding, all of those things and see if we can hammer through some of that stuff. So again, we'll get an opportunity to talk about season structure, but regardless of how that goes, I think obviously there's still issues on the table that I think warrant a lot of stakeholders getting in a room and talking about it. We'd still like to commit to do that.

Darrel Mecham: Is this not the start of the next stretch of the bear management plan?

Darren DeBloois: It is and part of that's my fault, you know, being new. I didn't realize we were in that third year until we were pretty late in the process. There were some things that literally came up at the last minute that we realized that we probably should have talked about in the group that hadn't been looked at thoroughly. We'd like to wait a year and address that stuff but this is a public process.

Darrel Mecham: I understand that. Maybe you can tell me who is the ultimate decision on licensing outfitters? Is that DWR, DNR, DOPL?

Darren DeBloois: I think it's in statute.

Darrel M: So does statute need to be changed so that someone actually enforces it?

Darren DeBloois: I'm not in enforcement.

Darrel Mehcam: I know that. I'm asking.

Darren DeBloois: I don't know how we've been enforcing it.

Darrel Mecham: You're the guy in the hot seat.

Darren DeBloois: I know, I wish I had a better answer, I'm afraid I don't. I understand that when you've got another agency and I've actually dealt with DOPL on other things for drug licensing, and they have a lot of balls in the air over there. If it's something they don't know what's going on they're not familiar with the issues then maybe it doesn't get the enforcement that it needs. That's definitely something we need to look at, sounds like. I'll still get those ages. I had to set up a hot spot here.

Keith Johnson: Any more questions from the RAC?

Eric Luke: Darren, can you explain this a little better. I'm not certain I understand it. You have a minimum, a maximum adjustment?

Darren DeBloois: Right, so this is a huge table and I tried to condense it. So what you've got in the first two columns, the percent adult male and percent female, those are the management parameters that we're looking at. Those will vary depending, the targets vary depending on how you manage an individual unit. Those are the numbers. So percent adult males are the percent of adults in the harvest that were five years old or older. The percent females are the number of females, all females, that showed up in the harvest. The way the plan works is if you're within your target range you can adjust depending on the management strategy So that percent adjustment is how you're allowed to adjust permits according to the plan, 20 percent, 20 to 40. So just doing the math on that where you currently are, what you can adjust. The minimum you can adjust, and for a lot of those, it's zero. So you could stay the same according to the plan. The max is the absolute max number of permits you can adjust that year. This is all based on a three-year

running average so it's based on the previous three years of harvest data.

On the Beaver, the biologist has the option to adjust between zero and four permits. They just adjusted two on that specific unit. For the La Sals, which is one of our premier units, they're both management parameters look like they were good so they were able to adjust between 20 and 40 percent. So they either needed to go between 24 and 50 permits. They opted for 25 on those units. So there are just above the minimum adjustment that the plan requires.

Eric Luke: So 24 permits is 20 percent?

Darren DeBloois: Right.

Eric Luke: Fifty is 40 percent? OK.

Jeff Christensen: Does depredation play any part in that whatsoever?

Darren DeBloois: It does. When we consider how we want to manage a unit, that's one. Whether it's a liberal unit or a moderate unit.

Jeff Christensen: You mentioned you had quite a few problems last year with sheep depredation. I know we had quite a few problems in this valley for famers. How do you adjust for that?

Darren DeBloois: Depredation take would be on and above this. This is just sport take so with bears there's a couple things that seem the weigh in with depredation. You might get an individual bear that figures out killing sheep is a good way to go. Our strategy there is to take care of the bear and by that, I mean get Wildlife Services out there and take the bear. Same thing with melons and sunflowers, if we've got a bear that keeps coming back our first option is to try and move them according to policy we do have a policy on how to respond to these things. If it's a habitual bear that comes back, we do a lethal removal.

Jeff Christensen: What happens when you have numbers of issues in that same area?

Darren DeBloois: We would adjust numbers accordingly. You'll see on some of these units like the Manti they're making their maximum adjustments. They are doing two things, they're handling specific problems but they are also recommending as much as they can according to the plan in order to try to suppress that population.

I've got ages here. Thanks, Guy. It looks like average age last year was 6.1 and that's actually a little bit higher. It's been about 5.5. It came up last year. Average since about 2000, it's about 6.2 so it's been high and low and high.

Kent Johnson: Any other questions from the RAC?

Kirk Player: How do you decided how to allocate those? Let's say on the San Juan, the 25 tags across the season? And kind of piggybacking on that question, are you noticing that they are taking a lot more females with a spot and stalk tag versus a bait or a dog

where they can get a better look?

Darren DeBloois: It's up to the biologist and the region how they want to divide those tags up. One of the other issues that came up this year for a unit like the La Sals is a lot of permits, how do you, they increased by 25, 15 of them went into the spot-and-stalk season which is a relatively low-success hunt. But we also need to take bears off of the unit. It's got a good healthy, growing population. So how do you set up a season structure to do that? Those are some things that we'll be looking at with the region and across the state. That's how we allocate permits. What was your second question about? Oh, I remember, about females. The most selective way to take bears and be sure you are taking older males, which is the most desirable if you're managing on a population level, is either using hounds or bait because you get to see the bear up close before you pull the trigger. They tend to have lower female, they pass females over on purpose so they have lower females in the harvest on those hunts. With the spot-and-stalk hunt you're seeing a bear across the canyon and that might be the only bear you see so they're a little less selective on those.

Kent Johnson: Any other questions from the RAC?

Questions from the Public

Bob Brister: My name is Bob Brister. I had a question about the bear cubs left over from the hunt. Do you have any figures on how many bear cubs left over in the last three years and how many more or less you anticipate with this proposed hunt?

Darren DeBloois: It varies a lot, Bob. We had seven bear cubs this year that we rehabbed up in Cache Valley. They weren't all hunt related. We know that one was related to a hunter taking the female and not realizing it had a cub until after he had taken it. We had a second one that was an illegal take, the female illegally. We had a couple, some twins that came in because the sow had been hit on Highway 6. Then we had a couple that showed up in towns. With cubs, we will rehab cubs and re-release them where they came from. This year we had seven, last year we had zero. The year before I think we had zero and four years ago, I think, 5. So it varies a lot. Some of it varies according to weather. If the sow's not getting the nutrition it just seems to be hit and miss.

Bob Brister: So there's no way to tell how much the next hunt?

Darren DeBloois: Yeah, it's hard to predict. Although I mentioned this collaring effort where we look at birth pulses that might help us see when we have a lot of cubs hitting the ground and maybe we can gear up for it.

Bob Brister: Thank you.

Kent Johnson: Any other questions from the audience?

Comments from the Public

Kent Johnson: Anybody else who wants to get a comment from the audience before we get started, bring a comment card up. First one we have is Dan Cockayne.

Dan Cockayne: Dan Cockayne, I'm president of the Utah Houndsmen Association. I sent an email this letter to the RAC, if there's any that didn't get it I have some copies.

Kent Johnson: Would you bring me a copy please?

Dan Cockayne: We appreciate the Division and the progress that we've seen with bears. The bear population in Utah is healthy, and we feel like the Division is doing a good job with it. We support the Division's recommendations with one exception. At the other RACs we've kind of talked about the history and you all have been a part of the history. A few years ago, we moved the Book Cliffs all season into October and one of the unintended consequences of that was this tag that takes more points than an elk or deer tag on the Book Cliffs was pushed into a season where we had spike hunters, over-the-counter spike hunters, out there on every ridge, and so the hound guys found it was too hazardous to even turn their dogs loose. We've spent a lot of time with our people taking about being good sportsmen and sharing with everyone and trying to avoid these conflicts and we feel like it created more conflict. We've come to the RAC for several years asking to switch that back. There was a ton of discussion last year at the board meeting about that and the decision was 2017 is the year we open the management plan and we look at it so let's wait until then. This is then.

At the discussion group this recommendation, these dates for the San Juan, La Sal and the Book Cliffs was discussed and pretty much agreed upon by all the parties. Those dates, to change those seasons to Aug. 6 to Nov. 16 with hound hunting restriction dates of Aug. 18-24, that's the opening of the archery deer hunt and then Sept. 8-25, that's the end of the archery elk hunt and the big bull rifle hunt. The idea was that it's a compromise so all the sportsmen can be on the mountain together. There's just not enough mountain and not enough days in the year to balance so everyone can have their own time on the mountain. We feel like this is the time to take this action and to adjust these seasons to try to avoid the conflicts. With the La Sal it takes about 15 points to draw that bear tag and it's easy to draw an archery deer or elk tag, so we don't think it's very fair to cut the permits in half on this very good, coveted unit to try to avoid the conflict. We feel like this will help avoid the conflict also. We'd just ask you to accept the Division's recommendations with the exception of these dates on the La Sal and the Book Cliffs and San Juan units. Appreciate it.

Aaron Johnson: My name's Aaron Johnson. I'm the vice president of the hound association. I live in Weber county so I drove a long way to talk to you today. I helped on the bear committee a little bit. I met with Darren. I spoke to a lot of the different sportsman's groups and I just wanted to let you know that the letter that the houndsman association drafted an email to you and we presented it tonight is also supported by the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation and Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife. They'd also like

to see these changes take place. I wrote a couple of notes when some of the questions were going on. There's been some talk about complaints so I spent a little bit of time on the La Sals and I was there last fall and every chance I get to come down in the summer restricted pursuit time I come down. For about three or four years in a row now I've been able to come down and I can say for me personally, I've had zero run-ins with any type of outdoorsman enthusiast, whether they're a hunter or just someone enjoying the mountains. It's just been the opposite. This last fall when I was down there hunting with a friend we took two or three bow hunters into bear trees so they could take pictures of it. We had a humongous bow camp, small city camp next to us about seven or eight trailers that had been going there for years. They came over and their kids played with the puppies and they got to know us. We exchanged phone numbers, we had a lot of positive interactions. It seems like we always focus on the negative or complaints that come in. On one occasion we walked into a bear tree with a family and a 14-year-old daughter had never seen a bear and the bear come out and ran towards us and it was wild for a minute and I promise you that's very most memorable bow hunt experience that she'll probably have in her life and it was because we're all outdoorsman sharing the mountain together. What doesn't happen is no one writes a letter and says how positive it was with other outdoorsmen. Although there was a lot of complaints, I can assure you that there's a lot of positive interaction that happens among the outdoorsman.

Someone talked about these houndsman that are out there catching a lion during the bear season. The houndsman association does not condone that. We feel like something needs to be looked at. A rule change or a law change to be able to enforce the law so that that type of activity doesn't take place and make it bad for all the other sportsmen. I appreciate your time, I appreciate the Division's time and want to let everyone know that everyone can share the mountain. These dates, and I think Dan hit on it, they give time for everybody to have a little bit of the mountain to themselves. That's why it's on again, off again, so to speak, on the dates. We really think that this is a good compromise and I think it was initially brought up by the Division. It just started to snowball and the dates were massaged a little bit. At the bear committee meeting it was unanimous on these dates on how well they thought it would work. That's all I have, thank you.

Guy Webster: Guy Webster. I was the fortunate or unfortunate one that I sat in on the bear committee two different nights. The time to go up and travel and meet with the different groups and discuss the concerns that we've talked about here. We come up with a lot of ideas, a lot of proposals. There was a lot of stuff that hasn't been discussed here, being able to get dogs back in on the roadless was something that was brought up kind of hasn't gone anywhere. There's still some ideas on that. The biggest thing that we did focus on and it came from here. You guys all know me. I'm here at the Southeastern RAC every year and I took this and I took it to the committee with a very important purpose of trying to address the problem we're having with complaints on the La Sals and San Juan. During the course of that meeting, the discussion did come up and these season dates did get hashed out and everyone in the meeting was in agreeance. The Bowman's Association, he was actually kind of ramrodding these season dates. Talking to the biologists, the first week of the archery deer seems to be where most of the deer hunters complain. A side note to that, let's keep in mind that that archery deer hunt, you

can pretty well draw every year. It's not a premium unit. Then it comes from the archery elk hunters on the last week of the archery hunt. This is taking away, taking dogs off the mountain at those times. Eliminating those complaints, definitely reduce them and it also goes into the rifle limited-entry elk hunts. We think it's a good compromise. The Elk Foundation, SFW, Bowman Association, mule deer association, different group all in agreement that they think this will work. This is the year to make changes. We're talking about some changes next year. Well, whether that does or doesn't happen will have to wait and see in a year. But the management plan that you all voted for on the RAC, that the Wildlife Board voted on was a 12-year plan with a review at six years and we fell exactly in line with what that management plan did have.

We request that you do take this. These dates come right from that committee's recommendation. The hound association is fully supportive and we're wanting to make it—one little side note, we're getting a little talk about wanting to have dogs in October. Let's keep in mind that these dates are for bear tag. There's nothing in this proclamation in these regulations that say you have to hunt with a dog. It is you have a tag in your hand. Somebody that has this tag in their hand and they hunt with dogs, they don't harvest a bear before the general season spike elk hunt comes along, they do have the opportunity to choose to hunt that unit for spike elk or if they have a rifle deer it gives them the opportunity to take that bear during those time. There's nothing that says you have to have a dog on the mountain during those times. It's just allowing for more opportunity. We just ask you to discuss this recommendation as a RAC and make a vote on it. I appreciate your time.

Chris Dunham: I'm a melon farmer here in the valley and bears are definitely a big problem for us. Not only do they threaten our crop but they threaten us personally. I've had bear come from me to you, big bear two or three years ago and I really didn't know whether he was going to take me or not. Fortunately, he came to the conclusion I wasn't fat enough or something. This year we had workers in the field and we had at least one bear working within 50 to 100 feet of our workers several different days. They took three different bears in that field. They really threaten our livelihood here. My question would be, can I shoot them if I see them?

Kent Johnson: Maybe Darren should speak to this. I think the Nine Mile recommendation is to have it harvest objective this year.

Darren DeBloois: Yeah it has been. There's a couple of options. There is for agricultural damage, you can get a permit to take bear. You can work through the region to do that. If you've got chronic problems and you've got bears coming and taking melons, you can get a permit to take that bear.

Chris Dunham: Is that an annual permit that we go for? We have them every year.

Darren DeBloois: Yeah. You just work through the region and they can issue those. There's a similar program for lions and livestock. For bears it is focused specifically on agricultural damage. Get with Guy or your local biologist and work with that.

Brett Behling: I'm Brett Behling. I'm with the Utah Farm Bureau. I'm replacing John Keeler in the future. He's retiring. I'm his replacement. I'm going to echo some of the comments that were made in Richfield last night. We had some sheep producers specifically that were talking about bear conflicts. They have had significant losses in that country. They were talking about approximately 700 head of sheep killed in the last year in their association amongst permittees. If you do the math on that, you're looking at somewhere around \$200,000 to \$225,000 dollars in economic losses to these ranchers. Not all of it is due to bears but a significant amount is. With the increase in bear populations, we're seeing more complaints from farmers and ranchers like Mr. Dunham. We propose that you increase the permits to the maximum level allowed within the plan. In addition, we also would ask that you look at moving some of those units that are in the moderate or light category into the liberal category so that in the future you have more leeway to take care of these problem bears. As Mr. Dunham addressed, a lot of times a farmer or rancher, they have a conflict with a bear in spring, and in May or June, bears are killing sheep. It's hard to get someone there and document the kill. So a lot of these statistics we don't feel are reflected because a lot of them are not reported accurately. We think the depredation tags need to be increased. We think the bear population, based on the statistics if you're going from approximately 1,200 bears 15 years ago to 3,400 bears, obviously we're having more conflicts. We've got the antidotal evidence and we've got some more statistics. We think that maybe there's a better way to measure that because obviously we want the sportsmen to take as many bears as they possibly can and we also want them to take as many depredation tags as allowed within the plan. We think that if you're only increasing the permits by 102 and you've got a 50 percent success rate, you're only going to take another 50 bears. Your trend is clearly going up. So on a long term basis, we'd really appreciate the assistance with the conflicts with agriculture. Thank you very much.

Bob Brister: My concern is that wildlife watchers' interests are not being heard or represented. When you have an increase in the number of bear hunts, then there's less opportunity for wildlife watchers to see bears, obviously. The Division has a public trust responsibility to the entire public. There's a lot more wildlife watchers than there are hunters and I ask you to take our interests into consideration as part of the public trust. Thank You.

RAC Discussion

Kent Johnson: I wanted to make one comment in recognition of the Utah Houndsmen Association and their emphasis on ethical behavior. They denounce the bad actors, and I'm pretty certain that there isn't a bad actor among them. They're all ethical, fine, upstanding individuals. What Darrel brought up about having unlicensed guides, I think that is something that does need to be addressed. I'm a licensed guide. I paid my dues, I do what I'm supposed to do. Darrel has been, I think you still are. Guy Webster, not only does Guy run his hounds but he guides for deer and elk, sheep whatever else too. I think that it's a black eye with regard to the general public on hunting and guides in general,

those that don't get licensed and those that don't behave according to the rules. And they step outside the lines and I would encourage the Division to do whatever is possible in conjunction or partnership with DOPL to get that addressed.

I had a question, kind of a comment so I reserved it for this part. Maybe you could speak to that, Darren. With the season dates being so weird on the Book Cliffs and not just being in line with what the recommendations clearly have been?

Darren DeBlois: The committee, I feel like we did adopt some things that came out. Some other things came up that we felt like we needed to look at moving forward. Most of the discussion centered around the Book Cliffs. So this season structure that the houndsman are taking about was primarily focused on the Book Cliffs. The difference between that and the La Sals and San Juan, obviously we'll let Guy weigh in but if I can get it right Guy, is a on the Book Cliffs you have kind of a separation in time and space in the fall. If you're hunting bears you're not necessarily on top of guys hunting other things. That's why they put their fall season late. They felt like the bears are high and the deer and elk are low. My understanding is on the La Sal and San Juan, that's not necessarily the case. If we adopted the framework on the La Sals and San Juan as proposed, we'd be putting a late fall hunt, an October hunt, on top of general season deer hunters and elk hunters that hasn't been there yet. That'd be a new thing. Given the amount of concerns and complaints that we got this year, we're afraid we might just be asking for more concerns. I think as you kind of weigh through this, that's probably something worth thinking about. I'll let Guy talk more specific about just the structure. Especially on the October stuff, Guy, if you've got concerns.

Guy Wallace: We have the La Sals and San Juan already have an earlier start to their season and we did that years ago to move back that season because of the conflicts we were having during the early rifle elk limited-entry season. So we moved that back then closed that hunt during the rifle season. We're already starting a week earlier than the Book Cliffs. Then with the October, we started the spot-and-stalk seasons where we issue spot-and-stalk permits that they can hunt while they are out during the deer and elk hunt and harvest a bear. The success has been fairly low so we can have a high number of permits and give a lot more opportunity for that season. Basically, the way we adjusted our structure was to try and move some of the hound seasons out of the high conflict seasons that we have. I might go back and say part of the recommendation that we have now is it's been kind of a long history with the fall season. We've had different levels of permits in fall. We've gone from five to seven to 10 back to seven back to five then back to seven trying to adjust and find a level where we don't have a lot of conflicts but can still give as much opportunity as we can. Last year we increased those permits to 10 in the fall when we had been at five. Having that many more people on the mountain hunting bears seemed to be, what we believed anyway, was part of the conflict. Or why there were more conflicts because we just had more out there. We had reduced it from 10 in the past for the same reasons because at 10 permits we had a lot more complaints than we did at five. And five, we get some complaints but not as many as we had this year.

That's kind of why we adjusted our structure we have with our seasons. I want to echo what Darren said about that October season, there is a concern that if we keep that open for hounds during October that we're maybe trading problems and that we've got a

lot more deer hunters on the mountain that time of year. I think we could have potential for some pretty good conflicts during those seasons. Also like I said we've got our spot-and-stalk bear hunters as well during that October season.

Eric Luke: I have a question, Guy, maybe you can address it. I understand that the higher number of general season hunters seems though that the houndsman proposal addresses a time when you have limited-entry hunters in the field. Now the opening of the general season archery isn't that way but the last week of the archery hunt is when your limited-entry archery hunters are in the field. I kind of like the idea of not having that conflict for guys that have been putting in for 15, 20 years. There's obviously a lot fewer of those people in the field than there are general season but what does the Division feel, obviously you feel general season takes a bigger precedence because the numbers or you wouldn't have made the recommendation the way you did. Is that correct?

Guy Wallace: That's why we've kept it that way and that's why we started the spot-and-stalk seasons to give an opportunity to hunt bears during that period of time. That seemed to not have any conflicts during that time by not having hounds in the October period. As far as the, in talking to our officers, most of the complaints that they were receiving was that was correct. Early in the archery deer season or late in the limited entry archery elk season. So the first and last period seemed to be the time that we had most of the complaints that we did have.

Kirk Player: Are more of the complaints just dogs running animals off? I understand that will shut down some bugling, is that it? If it's just the bugling then in October it doesn't matter much. Or is it mostly just, they saw a dog and didn't like it?

Guy Wallace: I don't know, I might have to have Ben come and address that. Our wildlife officers took most of those complaints and the ones that I heard about were that they felt like they were stalking an animal and the hounds come running through the area and scared that animal off.

Ben Wolford: That's usually what it comes down to. Well the elk and the bear are usually are pretty close together in the same drainage. So if a hunter is out there hunting the elk then they hear dogs and are running a bear down the bottom of that drainage, it's kind of a side effect that happens that the elk decide to head out of the country as well at the same time. A lot of those complaints were because they could hear the dogs and they were afraid that they were running. I had one complaint that actually came to me that they thought the dog was actually chasing the elk but there was no evidence to go off of that one. A lot of it is just because they are hunting in the same drainage.

Darren DeBlois: Maybe just one more thing. We did have a few letters come to Salt Lake and the error committee did address a limited-entry archery hunter who wanted his permit refunded. We take that kind of stuff seriously, but that's one individual at that level.

Jace Guymon: What I've seen on social media, a lot of hunters that I know complained

about hounds. It was more of a trail cam thing that they would get a picture of a dog in the area they were getting an elk consistently and then they don't get the elk anymore. I think that that might be where a lot of it's coming from and archery hunters tend to rely more on that because the elk are actually patternable. With these broke up seasons that the houndsmen are suggesting it seems to me like you've got all that time prior to harvest. A lot of the guys are going to get weeded out and there's not going to be near as many people on the mountain and general season deer and elk hunts are so packed as it is that by the time it gets to those few houndsmen at the end I don't see it as it's going to be that big of an issue. I can't see it conflicting too much so I do think the date suggestion is good. We should maybe look at adopting those dates that the houndsmen association suggested just because, your elk aren't patternable by trail camera that time of year so that's going to eliminate that whole group. I think that is the main group at least from what I've seen. That's just my take on that.

Eric Luke: Can you give us an idea, Guy said most of the complaints were coming from those time frames. Is that 90 percent or 60 percent? Any idea?

Ben Wolford: It's just a guestimate, but most of our calls come right when the elk are bugling. I would say probably about 90 percent of them were during that specific time period right there. We don't receive many during the regular general seasons. We did receive some complaints the first weekend of the archery hunt but that's because every archer is out there that weekend. Then it goes down and towards the end it gets really a lot more complaints about it.

Eric Luke: I believe they mentioned the bear committee all voted unanimously to support this?

Darren DeBloois: I think it would be fair to say that at the end of that meeting everybody felt OK with it. We didn't, again, just so you have a clear understanding, most of this was about the Book Cliffs. I think there's some parts of this that Guy thought that, correct me if I'm wrong, Guy, especially with those weeks off that might have had some potential for further discussion on the La Sals and San Juan. The Northeastern Region is still nervous about running dogs during the archery season. They used to get complaints. That's why they moved it out. Then down here on those October hunts, those would be the concerns the Division would have. Does that answer your question?

Kirk Player: One comment more than a question that I had too is, I think the houndsmen can be everybody's best friend. The ag producers as well as the wildlife watchers because they're doing pursuit tags they're the ones that can take care of this and I know that just from down on the San Juan we had a sportsman that drew the spring permit and a good sportsman. It took him years to get it and he wasn't able to draw but they had a problem bear and he was able to go in with houndsman and everybody was happy. So those are the kind of solutions that I think we should—the Division did it, the biologist down there. Stuff like that, keep working toward because they're the ones that can really help us.

Kent Johnson: Any other comments from the RAC?

Darrel Mecham: I'm going to defer on a couple of things. If the Division and Wildlife Board don't get a handle on some of this stuff, I was going to call it a sad fact, but I guess it isn't a sad fact, the population of the state is going up, Castle Valley and Moab is about to explode. The mountain down there is going to get used more and more, so none of this is going to go away. San Juan is getting ready to put their water in down there and there's going to be building like you've never seen. I was going to make a motion to put the hounds back into the roadless area. Eighty percent of the bear I've ever caught was in the roadless. Caught the first one in 1981, and I know the premise as to why they closed it and it kind of came about because of a courtesy, we were asked to back out and leave Memorial Day alone. All the sudden no one went hunting Memorial Day it used to be a lot of people that hunted it. We talked about your criteria to why you did it doesn't meet it anyway. Your lion hunting on these predator management units, you need to address it, it's going to get worse. It's going to cause issues, it already is. It's an underreported, underdone. It's happening now. I guess I'll ask you, are they taking lions during that? Is there a lion take going on during that?

Darren DeBloois: I'd have to look, I don't have a number.

Darrel Mecham: Does Guy have a number of lions taken during the bear hunt?

Darren DeBloois: It's something I can look up but I don't have it for you right now.

Darrel: And your outfitters, it's a joke. It's a disservice to the people in the state that are legal and do what they're supposed to do.

Darren Olsen: Can I ask what have the other RACs done with this proposal?

Darren DeBloois: So far, I guess Central adopted the season structure that the houndsmen are proposing for the Book Cliffs and kept the current seasons on the La Sals and San Juan. Northern Region did the same. The Southern Region adopted the season structure for all three and then they made some recommendations about increasing permits and some things like that. With regards to the season structure that's how it's come down so far.

Darrel Mecham: I have just one more. When he's taking about comments and people getting long. I'll be honest with you, this is the first year I've really had people approach me that were upset. One of them had an elk tag that had his hunt busted up twice by dogs. But I also had the good side too. I also had some say they had been up there with no problem. It was more this year than ever. It's going to escalate, you're going to have to deal with it.

Jeff Christensen: Is it ever going to go away though? You've basically got a hunt from the middle of August to mid-November now with this late muzzleloader deal. Is there a time you can move this to where you're not going to have an issue?

Darrel Mecham: I don't think so. Not in the fall.

Kent Johnson: The year's still only 365 days long.

Eric Luke: I have a couple questions. Is it kind of new to the RAC, would it be appropriate for us as a RAC to make a recommendation and ask the Board to look at making an action plan to look at the outfitters and the non-licensed outfitters to take care of that issue?

Jeff Christensen: If you make a motion, I'll second it

Chris Wood: Yeah, I think that's appropriate.

Kent Johnson: Let's make it separate from the other stuff.

Eric Luke: And in the same sense with that, the statute, is it something the Board could do? Tell me what the other one was, Darrel.

Darrel Mecham: Which is that?

Eric Luke: I can't remember.

Darrel Mecham: Lion hunting on the predator management units?

Eric Luke: Yeah. Is that the one you said something was a statute?

Darren DeBloois: The guiding licensing is statute and that's done through DOPL, and I've got some notes here, I need to dive into that and see exactly what's going on there. The lion and bear issue is, if I understand it, if you've got an overlapping harvest objective lion unit on top of a bear unit anyone who buys a tag over the counter can go hunt lions during a limited-entry bear hunt and that's what they are doing. Whether they're trying not to take bears or whether they are trying to take bears and say they are hunting lions that's a problem. That's one thing we could look at. Where it's appropriate to have those units and that's probably something we need to talk about internally.

Eric Luke: If that's a statute, is that anything that the Board has as far as the licensing, is that anything the Bboard has control over? Asking them to make that an action plan probably doesn't do any good, does it? Kevin, do you have any insight on that?

Darren DeBloois: The Board's authority is with regard to wildlife. I think we're going to need to do a little homework on this. The Division doesn't regulate the licensing of guides, but we do have authority, the Board has authority in terms of hunting and pursuit and things like that. I made a note, I need to find out some more details and see what we can do. It would probably be a good discussion to have and between now and then I'd have a chance to do some homework and inform the Board a little bit about what's going on there.

Kirk Player: I'd imagine, if it's anything like any other license, I'm not a licensed guide but I've got a license from DOPL, if you see someone and you know it and have some sort of evidence, I don't see how they couldn't get you. From what I know from being licensed for what I am, if I found someone else that was not licensed and practicing whatever it be and could prove it, I think you could hang them out to dry.

Darrel Mecham: I spent seven years running the La Sals and see them and they know who they are and nothing happens. The response you get and I'm not going to name names is with the Division it is not a priority. That's DOPL's issue to enforce that. It's not ours, we don't have enough man power. And they don't. It's something that needs to happen and while I'm going here with Eric, I think maybe we ought to defer some of this stuff. We've brought it up, there's issues, this and that and we're really going to look into this stuff and he's got it and it's going, you got the bear working group and that, let's give them a chance to work through some of this stuff instead of mucking it all up this year.

Kirk Player: I agree, we need to look at it a little bit more, but my main point is to go straight to DOPL. If the Division doesn't have what they need, I'm pretty sure DOPL should. And if they don't, it's nothing we can solve here because we don't have the authority.

Kent Johnson: Any other comments from the RAC?

Jeff Christensen: I have a couple comments, but it's not anything on the deal, it's mostly, is there any kind of trigger that changed your classification to your liberal harvest? Is there a trigger on we've had this much depredation on this area, this unit, is there a trigger there that changes that? What changes that?

Darren DeBloois: The trigger would be the biologist in the region deciding that this needs to be liberal. Under the plan at any given time you only have so many units in that category, and I think the max would be six, which is where we're at now. Whether one needs to come off and another one go in, that's on the three-year cycle and the regions have some leeway. We have to work statewide to make sure we don't exceed the number in the plan. On top of that, we're committed to handle depredation issues on a case-by-case basis and give landowners and Wildlife Services and our folks necessary tools to handle that.

Jeff Christensen: I agree, and I think you do a pretty good job of it it's just kind of frustrating for everyone. Not only livestock producers but sportsmen as well when these animals are being killed by Wildlife Services. We're looking at going into a really bad bear year in my opinion. We had zero bear problems on our outfit and I expect we're going to have some this year. Like I said, I think we just really need to look into give the sportsmen the chance to take care of these animals, as well as, a guy in the room brought this up to me, something should probably happen with the Green River Valley. As far as turning it into a hunt through the summer that these sportsmen have the opportunity to harvest these bears and they're not being killed by Wildlife Services. I would ask us to

look into that. I don't know what that would take to restructure that but as far as the landowners, I think they would be alright with it as long as the private property rights are followed. I don't know that you can do that with dogs but I think a spot-and-stalk hunt over the Green River Valley to protect the melon fields is something we really need to look at.

Darren DeBloois: Those are all good ideas. That's something I think we could talk about. Also we try even in depredation situations to get hunters out to take these bears and what we'll do is, if we've got a problem bear, we'll call hunters and let them know that you've got to take the bear it doesn't matter what size it is. We've had success doing that too. You kind of have the general hunt but then we try to give sportsmen opportunities to take bears that are problems if they can do it in a timely manner.

Jeff Christensen: The timely manner is what worries me. How much damage is that bear going to do in that melon patch before you can get a hunter from the Wasatch front here?

Chris Wood: A few years ago, the farm bureau came to us with this issue and we changed our policy to allow melon growers to remove bears through working with us. Because bears can, in a melon patch, do thousands of dollars of damage in a few hours or a day or two. We worked with the Farm Bureau and develop the most aggressive plan possible to get bears out of the melon fields or out of the Green River Valley a place where we don't any bears at all. I think we're there. I think they're happy with it. We're happy with it. It's just maybe letting the farmers know that we have that tool in place.

Jeff Christensen: So the policy is they have to have a tag prior to the bear showing up? Or can they shoot the bear? On livestock issues, I can—

Chris Wood: Walt can probably touch on this better than I can. We have a working relationship with Walt and our wildlife guys and the growers before the season starts and they're in communication and as bears show up and even start thinking about becoming a problem we're working together to remove those bears.

Jeff Christensen: Walt will you tell us the policy is so we're clear and we know exactly? Because there's been some miscommunication on that.

Walt Maldonado: The way it's set up is they can get permits. I've worked with Chris but I haven't got him a permit. He hasn't asked for a permit yet. The Veteres have permits and they've actually killed two this year that were in the field. I encourage the landowners to try to do that because nine times out of 10, I'm not there when they see it. A lot of times with the Veteres when they shot their two bears, it was at noon in the middle of the day, hot as Hell, their pickers were out there and the bear was out there eating next to them 50 feet away. So they got the permits. That's the best way and that's what I'm going to do, I'm going to get Chris a permit and get him set up so that he's ready to do his thing. It's just me by myself. I cruise the fields all night long with a spotlight and my chances of seeing them are pretty tough.

Jeff Christensen: But they do need that permit prior?

Walt Maldonado: Yes, and once they kill it, they contact me or the office and we come get the bear and we take care of it. That's the best way to do it.

Jeff Christensen: Thank you.

Guy Wallace: I'm just going to add one more thing. This was a bad year for bears. You said we have a bad year coming, but we had a bad year this year. We had those late freezes, we had no acorn crops, no berry crops so we removed or handled more bears than we have in a long time this year. It happens every so often. It's happened about three times in my career where we've had a year like this where we have events that cause a lot of problems with bears. Last year we were trying to look through the information and I think last year we only had one that we killed in Green River, I believe. Last year was more of a normal year but this was a bad year this year.

Kent Johnson: Any other comments? If not, we'll entertain motions from the RAC.

Darrel Mecham: I make a motion that we accept the plan with the houndsmen's recommendation with the exception of the October on the La Sals and San Juans.

Chris Wood: Could you repeat that?

Darrel Mecham: Did I hit that right?

Kent Johnson: Did you get that right? Read that back, make sure we got it.

Darrel Mecham: Take the Division's plan with the addition in the houndsmen's recommendations except, and if I'm getting this wrong, Guy Webster, straighten me out. The running of dogs in October on the La Sals and San Juans is out. Did I get that right or get it wrong, Guy?

Guy Webster: Well if you're amending the season dates, let's have a proposal to have it closed on only just the first week of the archery deer and elk—

Darrel Mecham: No, no, I'm just, does your thing, give me the addressing of it in October. If we take your plan as it goes, does that allow running hounds on the La Sals and San Juan in October?

Guy Webster: Yes it does.

Darrel Mecham: I would just take the October hunt out, the deer hunt, and get them out of the general season deer hunt, the October.

Chris Wood: So you don't want any hounds on the La Sals in October, is that right?

Darrel Mecham: Correct, and San Juan.

Eric Luke: Is that what your proposal is, Guy?

Jace Guymon: No, it's to allow them—

Darrel Mecham: They're running dogs through the general season hunts on the La Sals.

Kent Johnson: I'll read you the houndsmen's proposal. The La Sals, San Juan and Book Cliffs fall season dates for 2018 be changed to the following: Aug. 6 to Nov. 16, with hound hunting restriction dates Aug. 18-24 and Sept. 8-25. So basically, the hound restrictions would be during when the archery and rifle hunters are rut hunting the bulls. Is that right, Guy?

Guy Webster: Yeah, it's the first week of the archery deer and elk hunt, the last week of the archery deer and elk hunt, the entire limited-entry elk hunt, and it also includes the first two days of the limited-entry muzzleloader hunt as written.

Jace Guymon: I do think that's a good compromise, that there won't be too many conflicts in October, that you're looking at a small enough pool of houndsmen with the people. I would think that we could pass it as suggested by the houndsmen association.

Kent Johnson: Well we've got a motion on the table.

Jeff Christensen: We got a motion, so you got to do something with it.

Kent Johnson: Do we have a second?

Chris Wood: Is the motion clear?

Darren DeBloois: Just so I'm clear, so basically you'd end it Oct. 1, no hounds during October? Now there is a November hunt currently, and maybe it opens up. Is that what you're thinking on the La Sals/San Juan?

Darrel Mecham: Yeah.

Darren DeBloois: And then the Book Cliffs would be exactly what they proposed?

Darrel Mecham: Right, leave the Book Cliffs alone. And where I'm coming with that is the public that approaches me all the time, it's deer hunt, deer hunt, deer hunt. They think the Division's up in the night over buck numbers this and that, and regardless of what you say, I think we do this in October during the deer hunt, you're going to have a blow-up of complaints. And I guess maybe if you want to do that one year and see what happens, but I think you're going to see the lid pop clear off. So I'm not going to change it. We can vote on it, do what you want.

Kent Johnson: OK. I'm going to, did you get Darrel's recommendation? You got it all? Did we have a second on Darrel's motion?

Jeff Christensen: I'll second it.

Kent Johnson: We have the motion by Darrel and seconded by Jeff. Any discussion further on the motion than what we've already had?

Eric Luke: I still need a clarification. I'm not 100 percent sure I understand, so you're proposing—

Darrel Mecham: The only difference I have from it, Eric, is the San Juan and La Sals, the October portion where dogs would be running during your general season hunt.

Jace Guymon: You're talking only exclude the general season deer hunt dates?

Darrel Mecham: Yeah, when you have the people on the mountain with general season tags.

Eric Luke: And just on the La Sal and San Juan?

Darrel Mecham: Right. I haven't heard any issues on the Book Cliffs. Haven't heard a thing.

Jeff Christensen: And you're saying just the use of dogs. The bear hunt can still go on?

Darrel Mecham: Oh yeah. It's just the dogs.

Kirk Player: Can one of the houndsmen explain the benefit of, obviously we all want to hunt as much as we can, but of hunting the fall versus the spring. Because obviously in the spring, we don't run into any of these issues. What would be wrong with just throwing all these new tags at the spring where there's very little issue and keeping them in the fall pretty low?

Dan Cockayne: I think the biggest issue is the quality of the hunt. In the spring, you can pursue with a pursuit tag and hunt. And so it's a matter of the quality of the hunt and the number of houndsmen on the mountain. And the proposal to go into October is a compromise because there's only five tags, and so if four of those are drawn by someone who wants to spot and stalk, that's how we brought all the sportsmen together.

Kent Johnson: OK, we have a motion made and seconded. Let's vote on it. All in favor. Opposed. It's six to four. Motion carries. That included the remainder of the Division's proposal, or was that a standalone? That included the remainder in that? OK. That concludes our business for this evening. We are adjourned.

VOTING

Darrel Mecham made a motion to accept the 2018 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments as presented, with the amendment that the La Sal, San Juan and Book Cliffs fall season dates for 2018 be changed to Aug. 6 through Nov. 16, with hound restrictions from Aug. 18-24 and Sept. 8-25 for those units, as well as hound restrictions during the October general rifle deer hunting seasons on the La Sal and San Juan units

Seconded by Jeff Christensen

Passed 6-4 (opposed: Kirk Player, Jace Guymon, Eric Luke, Lynn Sitterud)

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

The next Wildlife Board meeting will take place on Jan. 11 at 9 a.m. in the Department of Natural Resources' Board Room, 1594 W. North Temple, in Salt Lake City.

The next Southeast RAC meeting will take place on April 4, 2018, at 6:30 p.m. at the John Wesley Powell River History Museum, 1765 E. Main, in Green River.

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

Utah Wildlife Resources Office, 318 N Vernal Avenue, Vernal

December 14, 2017

NER RAC MEMBERS PRESENT

David Gordon, BLM
Randy Dearth, NER RAC Chair
Joe Arnold, Public At-Large
Dan Abeyta, Forest Service
Ritchie Anderson, Agriculture
Daniel Davis, Sportsman
Brett Prevedel, Public At-Large
Boyde Blackwell, NER Regional Supervisor
Tim Ignacio, Ute Tribe
Brad Horrocks, Agriculture
Andrea Merrill, Non-consumptive

NER RAC MEMBERS EXCUSED

Joe Arnold, Public At-Large

UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT

Clint Sampson, NER Wildlife Biologist
Amy Vande Voort, NER Wildlife Biologist
Bryan Clyde, NER Sergeant
Dax Mangus, NER Wildlife Manager
Rori Shafer, NER Office Manager
Kyle Kettle, NER Predator Specialist
Randall Thacker, NER Wildlife Biologist
Amber Stuart, NER Office Specialist
Trina Hedrick, Aquatics Manager
Tonya Kieffer, NER Outreach Manager
Ryan Mosley, NER Aquatics Biologist
Natalie Boren, NER Aquatics Biologist
Darren DeBloois, Mammals Program
Coordinator

- **WELCOME, RAC INTRODUCTIONS AND RAC PROCEDURES** – Randy Dearth
- **APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES**
MOTION to approve agenda and the minutes of the last RAC meeting with the adjustment of elk instead of deer for the archery hunt during the rut.

Dan Abeyta

David Gordon, second

Passed unanimously

Brett Prevedel: On the recommendation the Division look into scheduling some hunts during the rut, we voted on and you asked that they look into, the minutes reflect deer and we were having a discussion on elk hunting.

Randy Dearth: For the archery?

Brett Prevedel: For the recommendation to the Division that they look into scheduling a bow hunt during the rut. The minutes say deer.

Randy Dearth: Ok that was an archery elk, thank you. Any other discussion?

MOTION to approve the agenda as presented.

David Gordon

Dan Abeyta, second

Passed unanimously

- **WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING UPDATE – Dan Abeyta**

I've got a copy of the summary of motions that were made and how that turned out; kind of a long one. There was an old business log action item, a contingent on CWMU single permits, and that was not recommended. Action item number four was the waterfowl recommendation and rule amendments for 2018; there was a motion made, seconded, and passed unanimously. The taking of non-game mammals rule amendment; that motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously. On the bucks, bulls, and once in a lifetime season dates and application timeline; that motion was made, seconded, and passed unanimously. There was also a motion made to approve the Big Horn Sheep hunt on the Oak Creek unit; and that failed four to three.

Dax Mangus: Real quick I wanted to jump in. The division did modify the recommendation on the buck, bull, once in a lifetime season dates and hunt boundaries after the RAC process. The boundary was changed for the bison hunt, the Book Cliffs, Wild Horse Bench, Nine Mile bison hunt as was recommended in this RAC to remove the Range Creek portion in that hunt boundary. The division modified their recommendation to remove that which would go along with the way that most of the RAC's voted. That was part of the Divisions recommendation and it passed.

Dan Abeyta: Thank you. The motion here to accept the new archery only once in a lifetime Big Horn Sheep hunts on the Zion unit; that motion actually died. There was a motion made to accept the multi season hunt, for elk, and that passed four to two. I know there was a lot of discussion on that. Also a motion on the early rifle season, or any weapon season for deer, and that one passed unanimously excluding the Panguitch Lake unit. There was also a motion to accept the Divisions alternative recommendations provided by the Mule Deer Management Committee allowing for a late muzzleloader limited entry hunt on units that exceed the buck to doe ratio objective and keep last year's units minus the Plateau Boulder/Kaiparowits and add the Beaver North and that did go through and pass unanimously as well. Another motion was to accept the bison recommendations as presented and that passed unanimously, and like you mentioned Dax, the change with the boundary there. There was also a motion to approve the cactus buck on the Paunsaugunt and that passed unanimously. On the Paunsaugunt unit as well there was a rifle date to begin alongside the limited entry hunt date the last day in October; in addition the Division may manage the hunt dates accordingly; that passed on a five to one vote. Another motion to put on the action log a review of the season date change for archery deer hunting, and add a survey concerning this issue to the next revision of the statewide management plan in 2022. The Division will report back next year to report how the season dates would look with the requested change; and that passed unanimously as well. And a motion to accept the remainder of the bucks, bulls, and once in a lifetime season dates and application and that passed unanimously. Another motion to accept R657-5 taking big game rule amendments as presented by the Division with the definition change of a cactus buck of 50% velvet coverage of antlers; and I don't see a vote on that action. Moving here to the removal

of wild mule deer from domesticated elk facilities, that passed unanimously as well. The statewide pronghorn management plan passed unanimously. The statewide moose management plan, that passed unanimously. There were some Northern region management plans that also passed unanimously. The CWMU management plans and permit numbers for 2018, that passed unanimously. There was some discussion on the Jump Creek CWMU they are a three year COR with the understanding that they will apply for a variance. That was one that they didn't have quite the acreage, isn't that right Dax? And that passed unanimously as well, on a one year basis there. The Landowner Association permit numbers for 2018 passed unanimously. The mentor rule amendments passed unanimously.

Dax Mangus: Real quick on the LOA permits, a couple of the associations in our region had a different request from the Division recommendation. The Book Cliffs LOA had requested nine elk permits the division had recommended three and this RAC voted to give them six; that's what the board did as well. And Three Corners LOA had requested five, the Division had recommended four, and the board ordered Three Corners five as well.

Dan Abeyta: Ok, thanks for that clarification. I mentioned the mentor rule amendments passing unanimously. I think that was it, like I said it was a busy night.

Randy Dearth: Thank you. I think we are ready for Dax; do you have an update for us on the Region?

- **REGIONAL UPDATE – Dax Mangus**

We met so recently, I think we are just going to go real quick on a Regional update. One of the big projects that have been accomplished in the past week that we thought would be fun to highlight. We put 100 GPS collars out on deer in the Book Cliffs unit as part of the migration initiative study; including does fawns and bucks. That's been a big project and a lot of fun. Other than that I don't think we are going to have any other updates right now just because we met so recently. There will be an exact GPS location every two hours on those collars. We're really excited about what we're going to find out with that. I know a couple of our Board members and sponsor partners came and helped with some of this project and it's pretty neat to have hands on live bucks, we don't do that very often. Kind of a neat opportunity. We had one really neat (buck), our veterinarian from our Salt Lake office, or wildlife vet was there on the scene. One of the bucks they brought in had a big infected wound on its neck and its nose had been crushed. And it had a big cut on its hind quarter, from being attacked by a lion. Our veterinarian proceeded to clean out the infected cut and gave him some stitches in the nose so that he only has two nostrils now instead of three or four. Cleaned out all the wounds and it will be interesting to see what happens, if this buck survives. He had definitely been worked over by a lion a week or so before we caught him for this project. We do have a GPS collar on that buck and I think after the vet doctored him up a little bit he has a little bit better chance of making it. Tough bugger. And that's it for an update for now.

Randy Dearth: Thank you. We'll turn the time over to Darren.

- **2018 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments** – Darren DeBloois, Mammals Program Coordinator

See slideshow

Randy Dearth: Thank you Darren.

Questions from the RAC:

Daniel Davis: This will probably be for Clint, but you might have an answer, the trial hunting program with the late season bait hunt. In the last three years what has been our combined harvest between that archery only and our fall season? About six, seven?

Clint Sampson: I don't have all the numbers with me but I know last year the fall hound hunt didn't harvest any bears on that hunt, the two years before, looks like one bear a year.

Daniel Davis: Awesome, nice and easy.

Dan Abeyta: So Darren what was that slide at the beginning of the presentation about permits sold over the past 25 years or whatever. It seems like there for a decade and a half it was a pretty flat line there really, then all of a sudden from about 2006-2007 we really started to see more permits sold each year. Can you talk to that?

Darren DeBloois: So going back to the history, the first bear plan took effect in 1999-2000 and we had different management perimeters. So you can see it was increasing but not that fast. With the new process in '11 that's where you really see a big jump and what we did is we added a lot of different opportunity, lower success opportunities and the permits will reflect that, especially in '15 the last time we made big changes, we had a lot of those spot and stalk boot hunt type of things; and the management strategy changed a little bit, and we've been growing bears so what we've been seeing is we've been constantly growing our management objectives in a good way. We've got more adult males showing up in the harvest than in the perimeters that would mean an increase of permits and low female harvest so we adjust permits according to those strategies. Then when you lump it all together state wide that's what that looks like.

Daniel Davis: So does a bear management plan call out a population objective?

Darren DeBloois: No it doesn't, just adults five years and older and females. There is also a perimeter for these birth pulses. If we can detect those, if we have enough collars we can detect those that would enter into it. Most of the units in the state we don't have enough collars out. Again, that's an effort I'd like to really get after for the next little while.

Daniel Davis: So the bear population in Utah has been increasing 5-6% every year right? So when we went to this new strategy in 2015, from the 2014-2018 proposal we've recommended permits increase about 60% over that time period. In your population diagram where it is now with this liberal harvest are we going to see a 5-6 increase in permits, once we see that level out?

Darren DeBloois: It's a lot of moving parts so really is managed at a unit basis. It depends on how it adds up based on the units. On the units that have dense bear numbers we're having a hard time keeping up

with some of these big units like the La Sal and San Juan. We're starting to run into a problem of where do we put all these hunters how do we get them all in the field during the year when nothing else is going on and those are some big questions I think we're really going to need to tackle in the near future and maybe even for next year's recommendation site; that would be my objective. To answer your question I'd expect to still see those increases, again it's based on a three year average, so there is going to be a little lag. We did that on purpose because we don't want to react every year to changing numbers. Over time we should see permits adjust according to how the population is growing or where we're declining.

Joe Batty: This is just for personal information. You said that you were managing for genetic variability. Can you explain that a little bit?

Darren DeBlois: So that's ideally what you would want; you don't want genetic bottle necks taking place. By that I mean you get so little diversity in genetics you can start seeing mutations that you don't want to see. It can actually lower the survival of a bear population. Usually the way you address that is by having interconnected populations. You have these Meta populations, bears move around, breed among different populations; and you can maintain a different genetic probability that way. There's some work that can be done there. I don't think we've done a lot of genetic work in this state so it's probably still a question that we can look at going forward.

Daniel Davis: Last one. This last year in the media, we've seen an increase on orphan cubs this year. Is that something to worry about in the future?

Darren DeBlois: I don't think so. It's kind of a random thing. We had seven bears that we rehabbed this year. Only one was a cub that the sow was taken by a hunter. He just didn't see the cub until after he'd harvested it. One sow was hit on Hwy 6 and we picked the cubs up and brought them back. It really varies. We had seven this year, we had none last year, I think we had three the year before. It really bounces all over the place. We do currently have a facility in Utah where they can do that, they do a really good job. They come in weighing about 30 pounds and they go out weighing about 130 pounds, they're butterballs. So we'll collar them, keep track of them. We'll see and if it looks like they are going to get in trouble we'll react.

Daniel Davis: Thank you Darren.

Questions from the public:

None

Comments by the public:

JC Brewer: I don't hunt bear with rifles or with dogs. I hunt bear with cameras. For about six years now I've been hunting bear, in fact all wildlife in the Book Cliffs with cameras. I don't have a 1, 2, 3 count like some of you folks do, I see trends. I have been advocating for some time for strict control of the predators; coyotes, cougars, and bears. In order to let our deer herd rebound at least get back up to the objective. It hasn't been to the objective for years. I applaud the Division for their habitat work, and for holding a line on the recommendations that are virtually the same numbers as years past. I think that might be helping because I see a trend and upward trend in our deer herd. But I would like to recommend that the Division continue to control predators, especially bears and cougars until we see that deer herd up

to objective. One other recommendation I'd like to make because I'm seeing a trend also on cameras is problem bears. Captured and re-located bears. They wear ear tags, plastic earrings I call them. I see more and more, seeing multiple pictures with bears with different color ear tags. Some I think come in from Colorado, but I know some are coming from Utah. I'd like to recommend that at least in the Book Cliffs where we have an issue with fawn survival rate particularly on the Summer Range that we see if we can't find another place to release our problem bears for a few years; see if we can reverse that trend. Thank you.

Randy Dearth: Thank you JC.

Cody Wilkins: I'm the President of the Uintah County Cattlemen's Association and also a chair board member of the Uintah County Farm Bureau. We are in favor of the increase of bear permits and in the split hunting and stuff.

Randy Dearth: Thank you Cody.

Aaron Johnson: I'm the Vice President of the Utah Hounds Men Association. I think a letter was emailed to the RAC from our President Dan Cockayne. I hope most of you got that. If you've had a chance to read our letter, first of all I'd like to thank Darren for the time that he's put into this; we're sure appreciative of all the hours that he's traveled across the state and the time he's put into it. The Hound Association supports the DWR's proposal as Darren has presented it with the following exception, the La Sal, San Juan, and Book Cliffs season dates for 2018 be changed to the following, August 6th, November 16th with hound hunting restriction dates of August 18-24th and September 8-25th. The reason that we are asking for this, and there are individuals here that were on that bear committee meeting, and they could probably do a better job than I could to explain it. There were some complaints and Darren said it in his presentation from sportsman. These season dates allow for the bow hunters to have 3-4 days to hunt by themselves and then the hounds come, then 3-4 days to hunt at the end by themselves. In a perfect world we'd all share the mountains and no one would complain and that's what I think we ought to do. People need to pull up their big boy pants and stop being snowflakes and complaining. But in the real world people want to fish by themselves and they want to hunt by themselves and they don't want to see anyone else so they complain. The unfortunate thing is I was on the La Sal's this last fall where a lot of those complaints were generated. I can assure you 100% that while I was down there hunting that I had more positive sportsman interaction than negative. On one occasion we took a 14 year old girl who was bow hunting with her parents into a bear tree; bear came out came running towards us not knowing where we were at. Man we was hollering and hooting and screaming. I promise you that girl will never have maybe a more memorable bow hunting experience. And it's because a hounds men took her into a tree and let her see a bear. That's what sportsman should be doing and that's what we have promoted within the Hound Association. Unfortunately I don't think that lady wrote a letter. So we hear about all the negative, but let me assure you there is a lot of positive going on too. Unfortunately sometimes the squeaky wheel gets most of the attention. We feel like these season dates would prevent some of those complaints, and it benefits all sportsman not just the hound's men. The Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife, they support this letter as well; we've been in contact with them and they'd like to see these season dates changed as well. Once again I'm thankful for the Division, I'm thankful for this public process that you guys can come and listen to us and I ask that you consider these recommendations and ask questions about them and hopefully we can get this changed. Thanks.

Randy Dearth: Thank you Aaron. I appreciate those comments. Darren I'll ask you, the recommendation that the season date changes, how does the Division feel about that?

Darren DeBloois: This was the season structure we talked about when we got the group together, I think at the end of the meeting it would be fair to say that the groups that were there felt comfortable with that. Primarily we are talking about the Book Cliffs when we talked about this. A couple of things happened, one is we brought that back in and kind of looked at it. The region is really concerned about hound's men in the field during those dates for the archery and that still remains the case, the reason that was moved initially so that's a concern that I think that the RAC should consider tonight. The other thing is on the La Sal's and the San Juan Guy Wallace looked at this and said especially on the front end there is some stuff here that we like the idea of with not allowing hounds during the first week of the archery season, when the deer hunters are out and shutting it off at the end when they are getting close to the rut for archery elk hunters so they can have the mountain to themselves close to the rut. The difference is, and Clint correct me if I'm wrong, but you kind of have a separation in time and space later in the year between big game and the bears and that's not the case on the La Sal's and San Juan. They have concerns about that October time frame. Right now they don't hunt with hounds they use a spot and stalk there and we're really worried about putting that hound season on top of general season deer, other general season hunts. So we'd prefer not to do that. The other thing is when we discussed it we identified some other things that we thought needed attention, we decided what we'd like to do is remain the same for one more year, put it together at some type of summit for bear issues. This group didn't have a livestock person in it; it was more about those specific things. We'd like to get Livestock, Farmers Bureaus and kind of have a big discussion and make all the changes in one year and move forward. That's where we're coming from on it.

Randy Dearth: Thank you Darren.

Comment by RAC:

Daniel Davis: I'll try not to take up all the time. I too want to say thanks to Darren, and Clint and Dax, I was able to participate in the small committee that was put together to discuss this. Thank you members of the RAC too, I sent out a letter last year that I couldn't make this RAC meeting and you guys addressed some of those concerns. I appreciate that. Those questions I asked earlier about that fall season is that the program allows for trial seasons to take place so we can try these alternative hunt methods and strategies to harvest these bears and minimize conflict. With the proposal UHA has was a very fair consideration amongst all sportsmen. I'm still that guy out there calling ourselves greedy, that we've got to have the mountain to ourselves and we can't share. Book Cliffs is huge, it's one of the bigger units in the state the conflict shouldn't be that way. I too myself have been on the mountain, summer pursuit, having other sportsmen come and ask hey I'm looking for a deer I drew out it took me 10 years; we share that information we use it as a tool cause they know how much time we spend in the field and I hunt everything. There ain't an animal I don't try to hunt. With that said, we're not killing the bears in the fall. Those season dates that we've been trying there for three years, we're not getting our bear harvest in the fall like we do typically hunting them with hounds earlier in the fall season increase that harvest. Some of these hunters, they aren't all hounds men, a lot of folks put in for bear permits. Those fall season tags take 12-15 years to draw and a lot of these complaints come from general season archery hunters that get a tag every other year if not every year. That's where that greed comes in and inconsideration. I'd like to

recommend considering UHA's proposal on that information because it's a nice balance for the sportsmen, it's going to increase our harvest, and increase success for those hunters who have waited a long time. They are hunting right now with the archery season, and if anyone's been in the Book Cliffs during the spike hunt, you kind of know what that's like. It's hard, those bears have held up they're not moving. To say a hounds men doesn't get out on his own two feet and cover some country is a short statement to make, cause that's not true. It's a great consideration and I recommend the RAC consider that.

Randy Dearth: Thank you Daniel.

Brett Prevedel: Clint and Randall, is it constant the conflict? Or is it just occasional between bow hunters and hounds men?

Clint Sampson: The whole reason we changed these dates is because of me probably. When I first started 10 years ago I was a Game Warden and every year it was pretty consistent across the field when those limited entry hunts would start as far as complaints from limited entry hunters. I didn't get many complaints from the general season hunters. I guess I took that into consideration after listening to it for about six years and put this proposal together to change the season dates to avoid the conflicts that exist. And it's not that we don't like hounds, Dax has hunted with hounds before and harvested a bear. I've hunted with hounds in pursuit type stuff. It's not that we don't have a love, and empathy, and consideration for the sport. Just the constant conflicts that we are occurring with the limited entry hunters and the hounds men appalled that we'd have the hound hunt on top of their limited entry hunt while they were out there trying to pursue game and its challenging enough and then you add hounds on top of it. So what we did was look at that and change the season dates, moved the hounds men into October a little bit later in the fall so they could still overlap with the muzzleloader hunt; we weren't having too many serious conflicts with it, also the limited entry deer hunters. We looked at it like we were solving a problem; we also created a new hunt. Like Darren mentioned we are always looking for new ways to get people in the field that don't allow for more conflicts. So we created a brand new hunt that had never been out there before in the Book Cliffs with that archery bait hunt in the fall. We created a great opportunity there and also felt that there is conflicts with the spike hunters but if you think the limited entry guys who have waited several years, many years, are going to be any less abrasive than the spike hunters I think that might be a misconception. Again, we thought we solved a problem, but if we got it wrong we got it wrong. We'll keep trying, like we said at the first of the meeting we are stewards, we are resources to be used so if we got it wrong we got it wrong. Thank you.

Brad Horrocks: On those permits are the non residents limited to those pursuit permits? You was talking about going to a bonus point system there, what are you doing with the nonresident permits on that?

Darren DeBloois: For limited pursuit it would be just like any limited entry permit, there will be certain number of nonresident tags available depending on the total number of tags. You'd have to get to ten at least to have one nonresident tag. But one thing that we weren't specifically asked to consider this, but the discussion started in the group of nonresidents, surrounded by states that have eliminated hound hunting and bait hunting there's a lot of interest in coming here and I think that's something we need to get some more data on and figure out. What we hear is anecdotally all these nonresidents are coming in here and running around and not respecting our ground, I don't know how real that is, but I hear it. That's

something I think that this bear summit scenario we'd want to look at and see if there are some things we need to do.

Brad Horrocks: What does a nonresident bear tag cost versus a resident?

Darren DeBloois: I can look it up I don't have the numbers right in front of me, about \$480.

Daniel Davis: I do want to say that through this the Division hands down are awesome guys to work with. And Clint is right, there were conflicts in the past and that's where the recommendation came up to modify the San Juan and La Sal last year. It takes that nine day period out of that rifle hunt and you're catering to those folks that have a lot of time invested in hunts and points over the years. So looking at that, that's where that suggestion came from. What these dates do with this trial is basically what they are asking and what was agreed upon with the committee is to try it. We've tried this alternative method for three years and concluded our third year this year and again it gets down to harvest, we haven't harvested too many. Restricting those hounds during the opening weekend of the archery hunt, I've archery hunted elk and deer most of my life, and then restricting them again during that rut period when they kick out the spike archery hunters, it's going to alleviate that pressure the amount of people out there at the same time. It's a fair statement to make that a lot of them hunters are going to harvest in that first time frame and disappear. We're talking about the minimal amount of permits available I believe the recommendation is six. What it does do away with I believe is that archery only bait hunt and the one thing I want to recommend about that is that hunt currently has 4-5 tags a year and you're talking 30 applicants that put into that and that is it. So it's not a desirable hunt, it's a great opportunity for those who want to take advantage of it. It's not being utilized by those who are taking it seriously. They are just taking advantage of what it's for. The suggestion would be to take those permits and divide them up between the other three seasons so we can go ahead and harvest those bears that are recommended for that time frame. And that was as a conservation group and sportsmen, what the consensus was of that committee.

Randy Dearth: Thank you Daniel.

Andrea Merrell: I'm looking at the fall black bear limited entry season, so we're talking about the Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek South unit, and it shows the season the way you currently have it from October 1- November 15th. Why is that one so different from all the others?

Darren DeBloois: The reason they did that, and Clint touched on this too, but we were getting a lot of complaints when it was earlier. So they actually do overlap those archery seasons state wide and on the La Sals and Book Cliffs. On the La Sals and Book Cliffs last year we had about 60 unsolicited complaints on the La Sals and another 30 on the San Juan. So they have concerns on there and what they've done is recommended lowering those permits from ten to five down there to try to put fewer people in the field. So that's what they've tried to tackle it. Up here what they did was they just moved that hunt later; moved it out of that season to try to address those complaints and I guess they haven't had any complaints since they made that change.

Andrea Merrell: So this change would be pretty significant for the Book Cliffs because the starting date for that now becomes August 6th if we went with it, so it would start a month or two months earlier.

Randy Dearth: Thank you Andrea. Darren what did the other four RAC's do?

Darren DeBloois: The first two voted to implement the hounds men's recommendations on the Book Cliffs but to leave the La Sals and San Juan as is. The Southern region voted to implement the recommendation on all three units as presented, basically adopted the hounds men's recommendation as presented. Last night in the South Eastern region they adopted it for the Book Cliffs as presented they adopted in on the La Sals and San Juan but there's some limits there. You've got the first week and the last week proposal, the South Eastern RAC also limited hounds during the any weapon deer season in October. Other than that it would be the same.

Joe Batty: In the last paragraph in the letter from the Houndsmen it states that at the bear committee meeting they were all in favor of what their proposal is. Is that correct? And who was in attendance in that meeting?

Darren DeBloois: Houndsmen Association was there, Utah Bowmen's Association had a representative there, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife. The only people on the list that weren't there, the Mule Deer Foundation didn't send anyone, and the non hunting representative wasn't able to make any of the meetings wither. Everybody else was there.

Joe Batty: And they were in favor of this proposal?

Darren DeBloois: Yes, I think that's fair to say.

MOTION to accept the Utah Houndsmen's Associations proposal as presented and the remainder of the Divisions proposal as presented.

Daniel Davis

Dan Abeyta, second

Passed 8 in favor and 1 opposed

Andrea Merrell: It just looks to me that the Houndsmens recommendation is, as far as the Book Cliffs, it does increase the hunting time but also they've added in two periods for hound restrictions so they've added in 23 days it looks like to me in the season where people can't use hounds. I'm guessing that its designed for those times that are most likely to have conflicts with hunting so that seems like they've put a lot of thought into it and its reasonable.

Brett Prevedel: I would prefer to stay one more year as recommended by the Division and revisit it on schedule.

Andrea Merrell: Brett, you think there will be more conflicts if we do this?

Brett Prevedel: In the Book Cliffs absolutely.

Daniel Davis: Again, this has been three years now included. So it's happened over a period of time and these recommendations come out after all this has transpired and we've tried. The bear harvest isn't there. That archery only season didn't harvest a bear the first two years. Hound hunting, which your percent of success is a lot higher hasn't been there. That earlier time is the optimal time for you to be able to take some of those animals out.

Brett Prevedel: Darren, when you were referring for it to continue for one more year, what is the date out there?

Darren DeBlois: This is the end of a three year cycle. Ideally, and this is probably more my fault than anything, this is my first time through so I've done everything once now. And as I mentioned, you've got to get way out ahead of this stuff so we mentioned after we all met that there were other issues so our preference would be to tackle everything at once and make all the changes next year. That would put us a year off of the cycle.

Daniel Davis: I do want to point out too that this isn't just a hounds men advantage by any means. Those restrictions allow for those other methods of hunting to minimize conflict. You have spot and stalk hunters that draw them permits, you have bait hunters that draw those permits; and those restriction dates don't apply to them. So Book Cliffs are remote, it's hard for people to get out here from the Wasatch Front. And having that opportunity is beneficial for all sportsmen alike.

- **Old Fort Pond** - Natalie Boren, Regional Aquatics Biologist

See slideshow

Scott Sowards: Just wanted to thank Natalie for the work she's done, and as you can see there's way more to that project than I would have thought. Kids Canal has been unusable now for 3-4 years, the DWR hasn't stocked it, and that was Uintah Water Conservatories and Department of Water Quality and they all had issues so Uintah Water Conservatories told them you can't put fish in the Canal anymore. So here we are. There's over 50 of these in Utah. I'm just asking that the RAC support it and get behind it cause we are out in rural Utah and you take the five mile deal and the valley is pretty much gone. I brought our scout troop tonight, we live in Maeser, several of these young men fish Condons pond which is just across the street. I grew up fishing on Kids Canal, I know you did. So the big losers in this were young people who haven't had a place to go. We support it; we volunteer to do anything as a scout group that can help with landscaping or anything. I'm just happy that we're getting something done because it's the kids that have taken it in the shorts for over three years and Natalie has worked hard for it. I know she is reporting to you but I want her to know that we support her and this project. The RAC can't do a lot about it but I hope you support it and speak highly about it. I'm sure it's well under way but there aren't any of these in the Uintah Basin; this is the first pond out here of its type that I'm aware of and there is over 50 in Utah. Just want to tell Natalie thanks again and I appreciate the RAC hearing us. Thank you.

Randy Dearth: Thank you Scott.

Question by RAC:

Dan Abeyta: I'd just like to echo what Scott said to Natalie. This is great for the community and have you had any chance to talk with Jeff Rusk the Forrest Archeologist? Good, he's a great resource he's got a lot of information that I think would be really helpful in terms of your adventure.

Brad Horrocks: Followed this for a couple of years. Thank you for your work. I think this is going to be one of those projects that will be an icon in the community. We truly appreciate it Natalie, thank you for what you've done. As county commissioner I would like to support you in any way we can. Thank you.

Natalie Boren: Thank you, much appreciated.

Dan Abeyta: Did you mention pets? People are going to want to take pets there. Is this going to be like a state park where you're going to have to have your pets on a leash?

Natalie Boren: That's all part of our management plan itself. There's distinct yes and no's to lots of questions there. Just things that we've been thinking about and then a lot of comments from immediate vicinity neighbors, so pets I've thought about I'm kind of going back and forth about it. A minimum they will have to be on a leash and people will have to clean up after them. There is other things we've thought about too like boats; are we going to allow people to launch water craft there? No, we're not. We're just too small for that type of thing and we've got Steinaker, and Red Fleet, and Starvation and every other thing around here. There are a lot of details in that management plan that we'll address daily operations in with that. Really what we want to do is, we want to keep it maintained, we want to keep it nice for the public. We want people to be able to go there and appreciate what it is. We are going to try to take that management plan and address all those little details within it; and we'll probably put that out with some kind of public comment when we get it all complete its going to take me a few more weeks to get it done. We will have that though.

Randy Dearth: Thank you.

- **Flaming Gorge Management Plan** – Ryan Mosley, Regional Aquatics Biologist

See slideshow

Daniel Davis: I seen an email come out today, a press release from Mark, encouraging anglers to keep more of the smaller lake trout. Can you elaborate on that?

Ryan Mosley: What we are currently seeing in the Reservoir is our small lake trout population is, for lack of a better word, exploding. Over the last years we've seen a 90% increase in the small lake trout population. Over that time period and even going back into the '90s we've also seen slower growth in lake trout. As growth rates have been slow and now we're seeing this small lake trout, it's going to be even more of a problem. The last thing we want to get into is a situation where impacting that trophy component because one, we have too many mouths to feed on the bottom end, and not enough to go around at the top end. There is actually a prominent fishing guide tonight and we actually had this discussion outside a little while ago. If we have too many fish in the bottom end we're going to have less fish making it through that slot barrier too; that 28" slot we mentioned earlier. We currently have a regulation that allows anglers to keep eight fish but only one fish over 28" to protect that trophy component. Very few anglers keep the eight fish limit. I don't expect we'll be making an increase in our recommendation in the near future but you're probably going to see more outreach like you saw today, trying to get anglers to keep more. They can be extremely difficult to catch but anglers are catching and releasing them anyway. So what we're trying to do is when they have them in hand we want to get them to keep them. They are extremely good to eat contrary to popular belief. And they are extremely high in omega three fatty acids which is of course very beneficial and nutritious. We hope we can make a difference in turning the tide with that.

Daniel Davis: Awesome, thank you.

Ryan Mosley: For cut throats we've been utilizing a Bear River stream that comes out of Wyoming. Been providing those eggs to Jones Hole Fish Hatchery and they've been performing really well this past year,

they actually went 50/50 Bear River and Colorado River cut throats. We haven't seen any returns up to this point for Colorado's; Bear Rivers have been doing really well, we've been hearing a lot of positive reports from anglers on Bear Rivers. We're going to wait and see what happens with the Colorado's. Basically what we're seeing so far, we've had discussions with the Fish & Wildlife Service and we'd like to see them continue Bear Rivers into the future. Ironically enough I was out fishing last week and I caught three cut throats, three Bear River cut throats and they don't even stock those cut throats in the Utah portion of the Reservoir. They stock them in Wyoming, that's a Wyoming quota and they were all the way down by the dam. They were extremely healthy impressive fish. They are showing up in the krill.

Dan Abeyta: Are there currently any restrictions on filleting fish up on the reservoir?

Ryan Mosley: You just cannot be in the act of fishing.

Dan Abeyta: Are you guys seeing any issues with that, with filleting fish?

Ryan Mosley: Not to my knowledge, Bryan is here he might be able to speak to that a little more, but as long as you're not in the act of fishing, if you've completed fishing you may clean your fish on the water. You're supposed to dispose of them in a way that won't be a public nuisance. As far as I know there have not been any issues.

Scott Sowards: We know the burbot are out of control and we're doing what we can to get rid of them. It's probably too early to tell, I know you're saying you've done what you can and you've got the contest and everything. It seems like the lake trout are surviving still spawning and that with the burbot. I guess you're just working with what you can to get rid of the burbot and public anglers are probably one of your best bets there.

Ryan Mosley: Definitely one of the best and cheapest. There are other options. As you know we've done everything we can with regulations. They are unlimited, they are must kill species, we've made it now in both states you can legally waister them. You don't have to utilize those species. That was a very difficult process for the state of Wyoming. In Wyoming the burbot are actually native and they are protected on the east side of the continental divide, where in the Green River drainage they are not. For them to go to unlimited must kill and allow waister that was pretty substantial. Having said that, we work with these derbies, promote harvest as much as possible, we do a lot of outreach to promote harvest as much as possible. There are obviously some other tools we could utilize. One thing that would jump to everyone's mind I'm sure is considering commercial harvest. That's a possibility but of course there's an expense with that. One thing that we've recently considered too is a harvest incentive program; where we would actually pay anglers to harvest. So if you went out and you caught 20 burbot you could take those to a check station where you would get a check for \$20; a dollar per tail or something to that nature. Those are some things that we are considering but we obviously want to do what we can, as much as we can. The burbot population isn't declining; it isn't really increasing, kind of flat lined. It has been pretty much since 2006 seen some fluctuation. We see downs and we get excited, we see ups we get depressed. Anything we could do to put more pressure on that population would be advantageous. It would be great if another predator would utilize them, it's unfortunate that lake trout don't. That's the cards we've been dealt, but we are considering those other options.

Randy Dearth: What's the regulation on that waste? Is that something that you can dispatch that fish and put it back into the water or do you have to take it with you?

Ryan Mosley: They just have to be killed. As far as I know you can dispatch them and put them in the water. We had issues when we first started doing that years ago where people were dispatching them and leaving them on the ice; you can't do that, that's a problem because then someone comes out onto the ice and they see a bunch of dead burbot laying on the ice. It's a public nuisance at that point. I think it becomes littering. You just have to discard them in a place they aren't going to be observed by the public, whether that's through the hole in the ice or up in the sage brush, or more appropriately in a land fill or your dumpster when you get home so you don't get into a questionable area. Would you agree Bryan?

Bryan Clyde: I agree.

MOTION to adjourn at 8:37 pm.

David Gordon

Daniel Davis, second

Passed unanimously



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

MICHAEL D. FOWLKS
Division Director

MEMORANDUM

Date: November 14, 2017

To: Wildlife Board and Regional Advisory Council Members

From: Nathan Owens, Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinator

Subject: Aquatic Invasive Species Reclassification of Deer Creek Reservoir from a “Suspect” waterbody to an “Undetected” waterbody.

Utah’s Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Program began in 2007 in response to the finding of invasive quagga mussels in Lake Mead. The invasive mussels destroy water infrastructure, clog water distribution pipes, diminish recreational opportunities, and cause significant ecological damage to fisheries and aquatic systems. The mussels have the potential to cost the state tens of millions of dollars per year in extra maintenance costs.

Since 2007, a number of waterbodies in the western U.S. have been infested with quagga mussels, including Lake Powell. Watercraft represent the most likely vector of spread; therefore, Utah’s AIS Program, like many of those around the country, revolves around a watercraft inspection and decontamination program. Watercraft are inspected for quagga mussels upon arrival at a Utah waterbody as part of prevention efforts. At waterbodies where quagga mussels are present, containment operations dictate that departing boats are also inspected to ensure they are not transporting quagga mussels away from the area. Watercraft posing a high risk of spreading AIS generally undergo hot water washing, or decontamination, of all internal and external areas of the watercraft before being allowed to launch in other Utah waterbodies.

Early detection sampling, including the collection and testing of water samples for the presence of larval mussels, SCUBA surveys inspecting for juvenile and adult mussels, and the deployment of artificial substrate samplers to attract adult mussels, is used to determine the status of a waterbody, based on definitions agreed upon by AIS Coordinators from 19 western states. Classifications range from an “Undetected” status (no positive findings) to an “Infested” status (adults and multiple age classes detected) and are determined by the type of detection (microscopy vs. DNA analysis) and the number of detections (the number of sampling events with detections). A “Suspect” designation or greater requires containment measures to be implemented in the form of exit inspections and draining requirements for departing watercraft in addition to the inspection of arriving watercraft as part of prevention efforts.



In October 2014, a single water sample from Deer Creek Reservoir tested positive for larval quagga mussels through both microscopy and DNA analysis, resulting in a “Suspect” designation by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR). However, both the UDWR and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) have collected water samples at Deer Creek Reservoir for the last three years and no other larval mussels have been found. In addition, six SCUBA surveys have been conducted at the reservoir and multiple artificial substrate samplers have been deployed. None have shown any evidence of invasive mussels.

In an effort to be consistent with regional aquatic invasive species waterbody classifications, three years of sampling at a “Suspect” reservoir with no detection of larval or adult quagga mussels is sufficient to reclassify a “Suspect” waterbody to an “Undetected” waterbody.

In January 2018, the UDWR will reclassify Deer Creek Reservoir as an “Undetected” reservoir. This reclassification will mean that all exit inspections of departing watercraft would cease. However, all inspections of arriving boaters would continue to ensure that Deer Creek Reservoir remains free of AIS in the future. Through the efforts of UDWR’s AIS Program and the cooperation of Utah boaters, Utah has been successful in preventing the spread of invasive quagga mussels to Utah waters outside of Lake Powell.



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

MICHAEL D. FOWLKS
Interim Division Director

MEMORANDUM

Date: December 13, 2017

To: Wildlife Board

From: Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief

Subject: Cooperative Wildlife Management Unit (CWMU) Advisory Committee Members

According to R657-37, CWMU Advisory Committee members must be nominated by the Director and approved by the Wildlife Board. These appointments are four year terms. To ensure staggered years of appointment, we are asking the Wildlife Board to approve the following committee member nominations and their terms:

- Two Sportsmen representatives:
 - Greg Wilding – term expires in December 2021
 - Matt Brimhall – term expires in December 2019
- Two CWMU representatives:
 - Wade Heaton – term expires in December 2019
 - Tim Freiss – term expires in December 2021
- One Agricultural representative:
 - Kelsey Berg (new representative) – term expires in December 2021
- One At-large Public representative:
 - Calvin Keetch – term expires in December 2019
- One Elected Official:
 - Evan Vickers – term expires in December 2019
- One Regional Advisory Council chairperson or member:
 - Mike Laughter (new representative) – term expires in December 2021

This committee serves as a third party representative in issues with CWMUs and will:

1. Hear complaints dealing with fair and equitable treatment of hunters on CWMUs,
2. Review the operation of the CWMU program,
3. Review failure to meet antlerless objectives,
4. Hear complaints from adjacent landowners,

5. Review changes in acreage totals for CWMUs that are under standard minimum acreage or parcel configuration requirements and evaluate the appropriateness of their continued participation in the program, and
6. Make advisory recommendations to the director and Wildlife Board on the matters.