

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING
January 8, 2008, 9:00 a.m., DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Revised January 7, 2008
AGENDA

Tuesday, January 8, 2008

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda
-Paul Niemeyer, Chairman | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
- Paul Niemeyer | ACTION |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log
- Rick Woodard, Vice-Chair | CONTINGENT |
| 4. DWR Update
- Jim Karpowitz, DWR Director | INFORMATION |
| 5. Procedure for Updating Elk Unit Plans
- Craig McLaughlin, Wildlife Section Chief | INFORMATION |
| 6. Otter Management Plan – Amendment
- Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Program Coordinator | INFORMATION |
| 7. Board Appeal – Doug Wong – Time Certain 1:00 p.m. | |
| 8. Prairie Dog Conservation Plan
- Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 9. Bear Proclamation and Rule R657-33
- Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 10. Fishing Contest Rule R657-58
- Drew Cushing, Warm Water/Community Fisheries Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 11. Board Variances
- Judi Tutorow, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator | ACTION |
| 12. Other Business
- Paul Niemeyer | CONTINGENT |

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MOTIONS
January 8, 2008, 9:00 a.m., DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

1. Approval of Agenda

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

Passed unanimously

2. Approval of Minutes

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the November 29, 2007 Utah Wildlife Board meeting as corrected.

Passed unanimously

3. Prairie Dog Conservation Plan

MOTION: I move that we approve the Prairie Dog Conservation Plan as presented by the Division.

Passed 4 to 2 with Lee Howard and Keele Johnson opposed

4. Bear Proclamation and Rule R657-33

MOTION: I move that we accept the Bear Proclamation and Rule R657-33 as presented by the Division.

Passed unanimously

5. Fishing Contest Rule R657-58

MOTION: I move that we approve the Fishing Contest Rule R657-58 as presented by the Division.

AMENDED MOTION: I move that we approve the Fishing Contest Rule R657-58 as presented by the Division and we ask the Division to expeditiously bring back a revision that more clearly provides statements of tournament policies and COR procedures.

Passed unanimously

6. Board Variances

MOTION: I move that we deny the variance request for Michael Prows on his 313-Central Mountains Manti Unit permit.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request for David Johnson on his 352-Central Mountains Manti (late) bull elk permit-any legal weapon.
Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request for Penny Thomas on her 943-Henry Mountains-cow only bison permit-any legal weapon.
Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request for John R. Brownlee on his 844-Dutton/Paunsaugunt buck pronghorn – any legal weapon permit.
Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request for Brent M. Cook for his 337- South Slope, Diamond Mtn bull elk–any legal weapon permit.
Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we deny the variance request for the 987-Central Region buck deer-any legal weapon permit for George A. Zilifian.
Failed 4 to 3

MOTION: I move that we approve the variance request for George A. Zilifian on his 987-Central Region buck deer-any legal weapon permit.
Passed 5 to 1

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request of Elizabeth Mitton for her 354-Wasatch Mountains (early) bull elk-any legal weapon permit.
Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we deny the variance request of Shauna Mayer on her 364-Fillmore, Oak Creek South (late) bull elk–any legal weapon permit.
Passed unanimously

7. Other Business – CWMU Advisory Committee Member

MOTION: I move that we appoint Brad Slater to serve on the CWMU Advisory Committee.
Passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we authorize the Division to go ahead and appoint another member to the CWMU Advisory Committee with confirmation to occur at the next Wildlife Board meeting.
Passed unanimously

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING
January 8, 2008, 9:00 a.m., DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

Board Members Present

Paul Niemeyer – Chair
Rick Woodard – Vice Chair
Ernie Perkins
Tom Hatch
Del Brady
Jim Karpowitz – Exec Sec
Lee Howard
Keele Johnson

RAC Chairs Present

Amy Torres – Northeastern
Jake Albrecht – Southern
Bill Fenimore (vice) – Northern
Ed Kent – Central
Jim Gilson – Southeastern

Public Present

Kirk Robinson
Roy Aanerod
Scott Martin
Ray Schelble
George Sommer
Kenneth Duncan
Calvin C Duncan
Cody Warren

Division of Wildlife Resources

Staci Coons
Teresa Bonzo
Craig McLaughlin
Alan Clark
Cindee Jensen
LuAnn Petrovich
Kevin Bunnell
John Fairchild
Boyde Blackwell
Justin Dolling
Bill Bates
Ron Hodson
Martin Bushman
Drew Cushing
Judi Tutorow
Mark Hadley
Robyn Pearson (DNR)

Public Present (Continued)

Penny Thomas
David Thomas
Mike Prows
Derek Iverson
Virgel Fangel

Chairman Niemeyer welcomed the audience and introduced the Wildlife Board members and RAC Chairs.

1. Approval of Agenda (Action)

Under “Other Business,” we need to add the subject of a CWMU Advisory Committee member for Board approval.

The following motion was made by Rick Woodard, seconded by Ernie Perkins and passed unanimously.

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

2. Approval of Minutes (Action)

On p. 12, 4th paragraph, second line change “5 and 20” to “15 to 20.” On p. 19, add “RAC” to the Southern recommendation. They did not pass the DWR recommendation. P. 35, 6th paragraph. Add that, “Mr. Perkins had some reservation on the scope of the motion.” On p. 42, 4th paragraph from the bottom, clarify that Mr. Perkins did vote and it was a different Chris Dallin. On P. 44, correct spelling on Bruce Bonebrake and John Buissonette. On P. 46, paragraph four, add “questioned” after “Mr. Hatch.”

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Rick Woodard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the November 29, 2007 Utah Wildlife Board meeting as corrected.

3. Old Business/Action Log (Contingent)

Rick Woodard, Vice-Chair went over the action log. There will be three items discussed. One is nonresident black bear pursuit. He asked if that is ready or are we waiting for legislative action?

Mr. Bunnell said we will be updated on that during the Bear Proclamation agenda item.

Mr. Woodard said the other issue was on the management bull elk hunt. He asked if we are going to look at the success of that hunt, before we do numbers.

Director Karpowitz said we will have that information in the future.

Mr. Woodard asked Ms. Coons about the RAC Chair presenting recommendations to the Board. She said she would have a letter for signature. Mr. Woodard then asked if any of the Board members have anything to add to the action log. There were none.

4. DWR Update (Information)

Director Jim Karpowitz, DWR Director said that Clair Jensen passed away. He was actually the first RAC/Board coordinator. During the month of December, we lost another ten employees to retirement or resignations. The turnover in the Division continues. Denise Blaylock, Leny Rees, Greg Henderson, Bruce Knight, Nancy Fennern, and Nancy Keat retired. Janet Sutter, Mike Mills, Adam Kozlowski and Angie VanScoyk resigned. We are up to more than half of the Division in new jobs in the last two years. This creates some challenges and we continue to struggle with that in the Division.

Director Karpowitz discussed the status of big game transplants this year. They had a successful sheep transplant on Antelope Island, removing 55 and sending them to Newfoundland and Stansbury Mountain to supplement populations. There are a few other transplants pending. The Book Cliffs bison transplant is still pending as they are

working through some things with the disease protocol. There is a pending transplant in the Avintaquin area.

He then updated the Board on the status of the legislature. There are five bills we will be watching closely. One is the Private Aquaculture bill, sponsored by Representative Mike Noel, of which we have not obtained a copy as of yet. We met yesterday with the Private Aquaculture Association and the Farm Bureau to try to find some resolution to their concerns. It appears that is not likely to happen. We will have to deal with it when we see it.

There is an Administrative Rules bill that directly affects the Wildlife Board in a big way. There is a hearing on the bill tomorrow morning, and a conference call this afternoon with the sponsor. Mr. Bushman will draft an informative statement on this bill for the Board members, and he will e-mail it to them. If the bill does not change again, it looks like something the DWR would support. The sponsor is Representative Ben Ferry and Senator Howard Stevenson.

There is a deer hunt opener bill that has been opened by Senator Christensen and while it is not a Division bill, it is something we will support. They have asked Senator Greiner to support a quagga mussel bill. The Guides and Outfitters bill is being sponsored by Mike Noel. These are five bills we will watch very closely throughout the session and we will keep the Board updated.

They just returned from mid-winter WAFWA meeting. It was a very interesting meeting. One thing that happened that is very important is that a 9th circuit court judge rejected the petition of the FWS to not list sage grouse as an endangered species. It has been remanded back to the FWS for a ninety-day review. In all likelihood, the FWS will come back and it will warrant listing. That triggers a twelve-month review. The ramifications of listing sage grouse are huge and would affect many natural resources. It is one of the biggest issues we have dealt with in years. Fortunately, in Utah, we are well ahead on improving sage grouse and their habitat. We have good information on our populations and they have been improving because of these projects. Hopefully we can convince this judge to not have them listed in Utah. Their best chance for survival is with state management. The Governor has been briefed on this issue and Mr. Clark attended that meeting. It is good that we have been so proactive with an endangered species mitigation fund in Utah and a watershed restoration program. Hopefully this will keep them from being listed here in Utah. 11 of 23 states had commissioners at the mid winter meeting and there were a lot of issues discussed. Any questions?

Mr. Niemeyer asked about the re-seeding after the Milford Flat fire.

Director Karpowitz said we had personnel in place, a warehouse full of seed and watershed money available. This made it so we could respond quickly. We have put two million pounds of seed on the ground and rehabbed a large part of the Milford Flat fire with watershed money and other parts were reseeded with fire rehab money. We were able to be reseed the Salt Creek burn and some of the other burns. Several states have

visited us to see what we are doing in these cases. It keeps us ahead of some very serious problems.

Mr. Howard asked how the other western states are doing on their sage grouse programs.

Director Karpowitz said nearly every state has been giving a lot of attention to sage grouse since they were first proposed for listing several years ago. They do not have the habitat component that we do, at least to our extent. We are very glad we have that component to enhance sage grouse populations.

Mr. Howard asked if we should look at eliminating our sage grouse season.

Director Karpowitz said when they do decline to a certain point, we stop the hunting, but we do have some viable populations where we hunt them without impacting the populations. Hunting has little impact on the overall population of sage grouse.

Mr. Johnson talked about a news show and the various wild fires. It used to be very uncommon to have a 100,000 acre fire, but it is now quite common place. He discussed the various fires we have had this year. He then commended the Division for the reseeding program.

Director Karpowitz said we had a lot of people who worked very hard for the last few months on this. We have biologists in our regional offices, which are able to work with private landowners, as well as our huge public land program.

Mr. Perkins commented about the various fire reseeding and habitat projects that were done this year. We spent over 20 million on fires and habitat projects here in Utah this past year.

5. Procedure for Updating Elk Unit Plans (Information)

Craig McLaughlin, Wildlife Section Chief said we have a Statewide Elk Plan that was passed in 2005, and following that, we always go back and review all of the individual unit plans in order to bring them into balance with the new plan. The population objective for 2005-2010 is for 68,400 elk statewide. We also will search for opportunity to increase on individual units, to achieve 80,000 elk statewide. Two other population objectives are to achieve average age of harvested bulls within established objective on the various units and to maintain minimum post season ratio of 15 bulls:100 cows or 12 bulls:100 antlerless elk on any bull units.

Also, related to habitat objectives is to maintain elk habitat throughout the state by protecting existing critical habitat, mitigating for losses due to human impacts, and improving the quality of forage vegetation on 100,000 acres of elk habitat by 2010. We have made considerable progress on this.

Mr. McLaughlin then went over the process that was followed in reviewing the individual elk units. All the elk units were scrutinized and the limiting factors were considered, such as capacity of range, depredation, and competition with livestock. From this, they identified whether there was potential for increased population objectives. The regional staff identified 15 elk units where objective could be increased.

Public committees were then formed to gain input and take recommendations for the new objectives. Membership on the committee included representation from local sportsmen, the Division, Conservation organizations, US Forest Service, BLM, SITLA, cattlemen, Farm Bureau, County Commissions., SFW or RMEF, and RAC members. All of these members were not present on all committees, but all were invited to be part of the committees. The remaining 23 unit plans updated with no increase in population objective. He then went over the 15 units where increase was recommended and the details relating to unit objectives, population estimates, and committee recommendations.

During the summer and fall of 2007, we asked the regions to go back and reconvene the committees. Most were reconvened or members were contacted individually to review the recommendations for some increased population objectives. No unit committee wanted to change their original recommendations.

In summary, the DWR attempted to increase the statewide elk population objective by identifying 15 units with potential to support more elk, convening committees to assess public input/support, reviewing the initial committee recommendation and reconvening most committees in fall 2007. The end result is that there was no substantial increase in the statewide elk population objective, because of concern with competition with livestock, and a few instances of depredation. There are managers here today that can speak to the individual units and how the process developed in their particular regions.

Mr. Hatch said New Mexico State University did a study on elk numbers as counted by the Division there. Their methodology showed they had double the elk that they had counted. Their methodology was very much the same as what we do in Utah. He wondered if it might be the same here.

Mr. McLaughlin said we probably are not counting all the elk on every unit. In some areas we have problems with sightability. This would be something we should take a hard look that.

Director Karpowitz said we build a sightability factor into our model. We estimate we only count 80% of the elk. Our counts are pretty independent as we invite livestock operators and sportsmen to participate.

Mr. Hatch said New Mexico did too. The big difference was they spend a lot more money and time flying.

Director Karpowitz said it is very expensive. We spend \$300,000-\$500,000 annually.

Mr. Perkins asked if deer/elk competition was a factor on any of those areas.

Mr. McLaughlin said it was on the Paunsagunt and the Cache.

Mr. Johnson said the Division has not done a good job on educating the public on the competition ratios between elk and livestock. People who raise cattle and elk say they can feed 2.3 elk per every cow on hay. Elk can reach higher than cattle and run steeper country. When it gets down to it you can run 6-7 elk for each cow. The competition ratio is not one for one and we have not educated the public on this issue. Elk do not compete with cattle like the livestock industry thinks they do. The research is available.

Director Karpowitz said he would challenge that statement. He has spent his entire career trying to help people understand elk and elk management. When the plan was written, there was a whole section on competition. There is a whole section where it refers to other studies on elk and livestock competition. We have participated in numerous studies over the years and invested a lot of time and money. The information is there and we have tried to educate. We have not neglected it or overlooked it. The information is available to those who want it.

Mr. Johnson said the information is there, but the public does not know about it. We have done a lot of habitat projects and spent a tremendous amount of money. He said he has a real problem with our elk management plans and the fact that they do not recommend an increase. He does not agree with the plans and is going to vote to have them looked at again when it comes to a vote in March. He is also concerned about the elk transplants that were scaled back. The livestock industry cannot keep pushing back the wildlife. Politically, the scene has changed.

Mr. Hatch said there has to be balance and he commended the elk plan. We cannot arbitrarily increase these objectives. There is competition between elk and cattle, and both look at range utilization and the land itself. There is competition between elk and cattle, but that does not say there is not room for both. Agriculture is becoming a minority in this state, but they still hold the prime lands in the state. We need to make sure we do not alienate them.

Mr. Howard said he can see wisdom in what both these gentlemen have said. We should still increase our goals to reach the 80,000 soon.

Mr. Albrecht said he sits on the elk committee and they are interested in increasing the elk units. He thinks it might be effective to reconvene in something more than a question/answer situation.

6. Otter Management Plan – Amendment (Information)

Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Program Coordinator presented this item. He said that through the RAC process, this item changed from an action item to an information item. We became aware that there were some issues we needed to discuss with some of the

counties in detail. There is not anything imminent and we have time to let the process work and have everyone on the same page. There are not real problems with otters.

This Utah River Otter Management Plan amendment is to add more release sites to the plan. Mr. Bunnell then went over the life history of the otters and the objectives of the plan. (See Powerpoint Presentation) There are three areas being considered for release sites, the Middle Provo River, between Jordanelle and Deer Creek Reservoirs, the whole extent of the Weber River where we are working closely with Aquatics to make sure everything works with the fishery there, and Joe's Valley/Straight Canyon in Emery County. The Joe's Valley site may change after some coordination with the county. This concluded the presentation and he asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Hatch asked how they are doing in the Escalante.

Mr. Bunnell said as far as they can tell quite well. It is a hard area to survey. We have not gotten to the number we want to yet and we continue to release some there.

Mr. Johnson asked where they are releasing them.

Mr. Bunnell said right below Calf Creek where the bridge crosses. We know they are down in Lake Powell.

Mr. Brady asked about the impacts of the otters on fishing.

Mr. Bunnell said the impacts are minimal.

Mr. Brady said he fishes the Green River frequently and feels that the number of fish is going down. There might be a concern as we continue to release otters there.

Mr. Bunnell said otter go for the slower fish first.

Mr. Brady said he saw an otter catch a cutthroat and he was very adept at it.

Mr. Kent asked Mr. Bunnell to expand on the details with the counties. What problems have come to light?

Mr. Bunnell said in Northeast region they brought an issue to their attention that they were not aware of. He feels these problems and details can be worked through fairly easily. There is no reason to rush this issue.

Mr. Gilson asked about the winter stream flow on the Joe Valley's location.

Mr. Bunnell said otters do not need a lot of water, just the food base. Our Sensitive Species biologist is meeting with the county today.

Mr. Gilson said he feels that after the county is totally informed, there will not be a problem.

Mr. Albrecht asked how far up the river they have gone.

Ms. Bonzo said up to Maybe Creek.

RAC Comments

Mr. Fenimore said the Northern was very much in favor of these transplants.

Mr. Kent said Central was also in favor.

Ms. Torres said Northeastern was in favor.

Mr. Albrecht said Southern had some discussion as to whether all parties had been involved in the process and voted unanimously to accept.

Mr. Gilson said Southeastern had some local government concerns and one of the agriculture people voiced some concern. It all worked out and they were in favor unanimously.

Public Comment

Scott Martin, Council for Emery Water Conservancy District addressed the Board. His concerns are primarily procedure. They operate and maintain the Joe's Valley dam and reservoir. They are concerned about the release location, which is Straight Canyon. Above all, the concern is less with the otters, and more the procedure. They ask that the Emery Water Conservancy District be involved in the dialogue with the respect to the release of otters in Straight Canyon. They have great concerns with respect to the operation of the dam as well as the winter flows in Straight Canyon. It is of paramount importance that the otter release program respect the long term operation and success of the Joe's Valley project which is a Bureau of Reclamation Project. The dialogue with the counties was very fruitful, but there are other interests above and beyond the counties, including the Emery Water Conservancy District. The Emery Water Conservancy District, as well as other agricultural and water concerns in that area, need to be involved in the process. This otter release program only recently came to the attention of the water district. They ask the Board as well as the DWR that not only the counties, but also Emery Water conservancy District, and all other agricultural concerns in the area be involved in the discussion and proposals. They expect all disclosure and discussion of environmental impacts, concerns, as well as water infrastructure operation, including the Joe's Valley dam will be included. Mr. Jay Humphrey is the contact for them.

Mr. Howard asked if an informational letter would be adequate.

Mr. Martin said it would be a good start, but as the dialog continues they want a seat at the table. They want to be part of the discussion.

Mr. Howard asked if the county commissioners aren't notified prior to any transplant.

Director Karpowitz said yes they are notified.

Mr. Martin said they were made aware of this through the county commissioners, but they want to be contacted directly.

7. Prairie Dog Conservation Plan (Action)

Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Program Coordinator will present this item.

Mr. Howard said he e-mailed Mr. Bunnell a question on this issue on December 4th. He got a response on the 19th, by e-mail. At the Central RAC meeting, Mr. Howard asked why there were not any sportsmen on this committee. Mr. Bunnell was very rude in his response. Mr. Howard went back and reviewed the plan, and would like to point out the many problems with it. He would like to do this prior to the presentation, because it is a poor plan and he would like to see it rejected before it gets to the Board.

Chairman Niemeyer asked that this might be done during the discussion, after the presentation.

Mr. Bunnell said if an apology is in order, he would offer it. He did not mean to appear rude. He went on to give an overview of the plan. Through a WAFWA agreement, all the states agreed to have a plan by December 2007. This is a range wide planning effort. We need to have the Utah Gunnison and White-tailed Prairie Dog Conservation plan in place to preclude the listing of these species.

Mr. Bunnell then went over Utah's draft plan which included the details of range wide monitoring strategy, short-term range wide management triggers, various objectives and strategies for prairie dog management, the involvement of a statewide planning team and the broad, extensive public review process. The NRCS has been an especially important partner in this and we hope to be able to use Farm bill programs to create incentives for landowners, relative to prairie dogs and we have also begun to develop and disseminate public information so we can educate people as to the concerns with these two species. (See Powerpoint Presentation) This concluded the presentation.

Mr. Johnson said we are seeing more prairie dogs, why?

Mr. Bunnell said in drought years, they expand their distribution, but that does not mean there are actually more of them.

Mr. Johnson asked if we have been watching them. Do we have them mapped?

Mr. Bunnell said that is what we have been doing with the model. We do not have status on every individual prairie dog town. In about three years, as we go forward, we will have this information. Over time we will be able to track the trends.

Mr. Hatch asked if these prairie dogs are hunted. Colorado used to have a big prairie dog festival.

Mr. Bunnell said they have a shooting closure on public lands from April 15 to June 1st to protect them during breeding and when they are whelping their young. Other than that people are free to go out and shoot on public land. Private land is not part of that closure currently. The studies that have been done do not show that shooting is a high level threat, disease has a lot greater impact. In Colorado they have black tailed prairie dogs and they occur at a lot tighter densities, more of a grassland species. They might be the ones that people go out and have festivals for.

RAC Comment

Southeastern – Mr. Gilson said they voted to accept with two opposed.

Southern – Mr. Albrecht said they discussed some of the problems with prairie dogs coming onto golf courses and voted unanimously to accept as presented.

Northeastern – Ms. Torres said they had concern about how accurate surveys can be obtained without including tribal lands. Otherwise they voted to accept as proposed unanimously.

Central – Mr. Kent said they were in full support of the plan. There was no public comment. They voted unanimously to accept.

Northern – Mr. Fenimore said it passed unanimously. There was a question about lead and lead contamination and Mr. Bunnell addressed this.

Board Discussion

Mr. Howard said he was concerned that there were no sportsmen on the committee. He then went through the plan and his various concerns:

- ❖ P. 30 – no research available regarding shooting
- ❖ A-3 – list of people on the committee – sportsmen not included

Mr. Howard said the sportsmen do have issue with this. They hunt and they pay the bill.

- ❖ A-5 – The DWR was not successful in contacting all five landowners during the survey in San Juan County.
- ❖ A-13 – There were comments from Karen Fullen, a State Wildlife biologist, that were negative.
- ❖ A-16 – Specific comments that reflect a lot of negative feedback.

Mr. Howard would like some sportsmen members added to the committee and have it run back through the process. They should reject the entire plan. He has not received any e-mails on the plan. The Board has not been informed as to what is going on. They have been left in the dark on the overall plan. SFW should have the chance to give some input by way of the committee.

Mr. Bunnell said they included the comments that Mr. Howard was going through, as an appendix to illustrate that we did review all of them. If these comments are looked at and then referred back to the plan, those comments have already been addressed.

Mr. Niemeyer asked if we reject this plan, does it put Utah in jeopardy of getting the prairie dogs listed.

Mr. Bunnell said he cannot answer that directly, but the FWS is due to make a listing decision for Gunnison prairie dogs by February 1st or 28th.

Director Karpowitz said if this was rejected it would draw attention to Utah. This has been an exhaustive process. We invite people who can add to the process and we do not always invite everyone. We invite the Board to be involved on key issues. Had we known the Board was interested, we would have asked someone to sit on the committee. Given the exhaustive review, I do not know what we would have changed.

Mr. Bunnell said this plan has been through a more extensive review than any other plan that he is aware of. Through the process, the plan has held up very well.

Mr. Perkins said the management goals and strategies are included in this plan. He does not see anything in these proposals that are a disservice to the sportsmen, or anything that would cause any problems. He does remember several times over the past nine years where we have been informed and included. He does not feel the Board has been left in the dark.

Mr. Johnson said on D-2 in the plan, it refers to shooting permits. What is that about?

Mr. Bunnell said that is from a list of potential management actions that could be taken. It is not recommended at this point, but if it is determined in the future that shooting is taking a large impact, this would give a mode to look into this.

Mr. Woodard asked if this will come up for review.

Mr. Bunnell said it is a ten-year plan and is dynamic.

Mr. Woodard said it is a work in progress and will be brought forward for review periodically.

Mr. Howard said he brought this forward to inform the Board that the sportsmen were not involved. We need to be better informed by the Division.

Mr. Niemeyer said he would also like to be better informed on the shooting of these types of species.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Ernie Perkins and passed 4 to 2, with Lee Howard and Keele Johnson opposed.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Prairie Dog Conservation Plan as presented by the Division.

8. Bear Proclamation and Rule R657-33 (Action)

Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Program Coordinator presented this item. The topics discussed were a research update, bear incidents summary, nonresident pursuit, the overall Bear Management Plan including population goal and objectives, and performance targets, a review of 2007 harvest and mortality and the present 2008 recommendations.

He said they tried to use conditioned taste aversion, a method to deter bears from eating in dumpsters around campgrounds. It did not work very well, they just did not eat as much when they came back. There are a few more things we can try and there will be one more year of that research going on down in the La Sal Mountains.

The question that is always prominent is how many bears are there. They are very hard to count. The mark-recapture study is a tool they are going to try in the future. This is a study to determine the population size in a 100 square mile area near Kamas. They are also refining techniques for collecting hair for DNA analysis.

Occupancy modeling is a new technique they have looked into. This does not give a number, but it is a potential tool to look at trend. Early results are not very positive and we probably will not go any further with that.

In regards to nonresident pursuit, the issue is because pursuit is directly tied with guiding in the state and there is an economic tie there, we cannot treat nonresidents any differently than we treat residents. The Privilege and Immunities clause of the U.S. Constitution prohibits the DWR from discriminating against commercial nonresident pursuit unless the regulation is closely related to the advancement of a substantial state interest.

There is some light at the end of the tunnel on this issue. If the legislature passes a "guides and outfitter bill" and it is applicable to bear guiding and the legislature approves a nonresident fee increase, then we will be able to increase nonresident pursuit permits from \$30 up to \$135. That may help address that to a certain extent. We are also trying to document the impact that pursuit is having on some of these areas. They have contacted many bear hunters to gather information. (See Powerpoint Presentation for details) The majority of these contacts have been on the La Sal and the San Juan mountains.

Mr. Bunnell then went over the black bear management plan. He covered population goals, maintaining a healthy bear population, expanding distribution while considering human safety, economic concerns and other wildlife species through 2010. He also discussed the performance targets, illustrating these issues on various graphs. A summary of 2007 mortality was covered. They did stay within the guidelines of the bear management plan in spite of the higher mortality.

In 2007 there were 200 bear incidents, which are much higher than in past years. The DWR is looking to prevent another year like 2007. Mr. Bunnell went over the reasons for this high number of incidents and discussed what is being done throughout the state to prevent bear problems.

Next, new programs for 2008 were covered. Volunteer houndsmen will be used to help hunters harvest bears in areas with chronic nuisance bear problems. This comes with a recommendation on 10 units for total of 25 permits. These ten units accounted for 60% of all bear incidents in 2007. The objective is to focus harvest into areas that have a history of bear incidents around campgrounds and cabins. Spring harvest seasons will be extended by one week on chronic depredation units. This is recommended on six units. The objective is to shift bear mortality from depredation to sport harvest. They are also recommending opening more units to summer dog training. From Law Enforcement, they have a recommendation to make archery equipment and firearms regulations consistent with big game and from licensing a recommendation to change the permits to a 365-day format.

A graph on shifting mortality from depredation to sport harvest was shown. The 2008 recommendations by Unit and the 2008 pursuit recommendations were presented, along with season dates.

Mr. Howard asked if they might recommend that the bear conservation permit could go statewide.

Director Karpowitz said it is for any opening at present.

Mr. Clark said the rule would have to be amended in order to do this.

Mr. Woodard asked on the extended hunt into June, why?

Mr. Bunnell said we are recommending that on those units where there has been a history of depredation.

Mr. Gilson asked about the legislature and what would need to happen for them to look at the number of nonresident permits.

Mr. Bunnell said we started looking at it in increased impacts before we knew the legislature might go forward with the guides and outfitters bill. If it passes, then it would remove the economic portion of bear pursuit. Then we could treat nonresident pursuers

differently than we do residents. We could do more than just raise the price of the tag, but also potentially limit the number of nonresidents.

Mr. Gilson pointed out that there is a huge impact in the two units discussed.

Mr. Bunnell said we need at least another two years of data to support exactly what the impacts are.

Chairman Niemeyer asked for questions.

Kirk Robinson said given the drought period we have been through, why does the information reflect a strong bear population?

Mr. Bunnell said it does not take many years of good weather conditions for the population to respond. We can have just one good year of cub survival and this will boost the population. We had one of those years in 2006.

RAC Recommendations

Northern -Mr. Fenimore said they had a discussion on bear awareness programs in other states. There was concern on bear pursuit seasons and what impact that might have on cubs. On the San Juan unit with 458 hounds in that area, that is a lot of pursuit. There is not another game animal in the state that has to deal with that type of continual disruption. Their RAC passed the recommendations 7 to 3.

Central – Mr. Kent said they talked about looking to have an entire bear awareness program, even to the extent of fining people who leave food out in a bear area. The proposal for additional tags was seen as perhaps too many, but there was also support of more sportsmen opportunity. They had a failed motion to reduce the increase on permits. The Division's recommendation passed to accept as presented unanimously.

Northeastern – Ms. Torres said they passed the proposal unanimously and there were no questions or comments on it.

Southern – Mr. Albrecht said they passed the recommendations unanimously.

Southeastern – Mr. Gilson said they had a RAC member concerned about data and how the Division counts the number of bears. He asked Mr. Bunnell for a letter explaining how the Division comes up with the counts. They had a lot of questions which were answered by the Division. The RAC voted to accept the proclamation with one opposing vote.

Public Comment

Ernie Millgate – He had to leave the meeting, but Chairman Niemeyer read his card. He supports the Division's recommendation and commended Mr. Bunnell for the hard work

he puts in and his concern for the animals in his charge. The presentation today shows that the Division is following the bear management plan. Mr. Millgate is concerned about bear and human interaction and by increasing tags and trying to concentrate hunting in problem areas, it may ultimately save a few bears with less human confrontation.

Kirk Robinson of the Western Wildlife Conservancy said his concern is about the increasing number of nuisance bears. This needs to be addressed and recognized by the public. He has faith in the Division that we will see the ten-year bear management plan through. From a scientific and humane point of view, we need to try to use non-lethal methods in dealing with nuisance bears. We need to see bears as the amazing creatures they are. They are intelligent and interesting. There could be a more positive spin on bears as part of our ecosystem. He would ask for no increase of permits and a removal of one of the pursuit periods.

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Robinson what he would suggest on the non-lethal methods.

Mr. Robinson said the Division is already looking to avoid bear problems. He would just encourage them to use these methods first. He does not believe that translocating bears is very effective. He would encourage more education about bears in a positive way and look to increase appreciation of bears. It would not hurt to use more enforcement in bear issues. Most likely, a lot more could be done in that respect.

Mr. Johnson said on eliminating the pursuit season, pursuit does make bears more afraid of people and it drives them away from the roads and campgrounds.

Mr. Robinson said this might be true, but often our intuition about bears and other animals is way off. He would like to see data to support that idea. He also said that we have a responsibility to bears and we need to respect them. On an individual level, they do have personalities and worth.

Roy Aanerud of the Utah Federation of Houndsmen said they have a membership of over 500. They fully support the recommendations of the Division.

Board Discussion

Chairman Niemeyer said this concludes public comment, and he does not think the Board can enforce clean camps and such.

Mr. Howard said he was at a RAC meeting where the Forest Service expressed that they do keep camp grounds clean and work hard to be diligent in that area.

Director Karpowitz said after the fatal bear attack, they had a lot of opportunity to get the word out. People need to change the way they camp. They will just keep pushing this.

Chairman Niemeyer summarized the RAC recommendations.

Mr. Howard said on the Central RAC, the person who made the motion to reduce permits was a representative of nonconsumptives, but he also understands the Division position.

Mr. Perkins asked Mr. Bunnell to give more information on how we will reduce nuisance bear problems and use non-lethal methods, rest periods and plans for education.

Mr. Bunnell said the best non-lethal method we have is prevention. We do try to harass bears and do some other non-lethal methods, but sometimes it works and sometimes it does not. The process on how to accomplish this is ongoing.

Mr. Johnson asked about the percentage of females harvested, is that because the hunters are getting better educated as to what the females look like?

Mr. Bunnell showed the slide reflecting this information. It goes up and down and it is hard to see a trend. A spring hunt is a tool for reducing the number of females taken. Also, relative to education, every bear hunter has to go through a course to help him or her determine if they are shooting male or female bears.

Mr. Johnson asked if the female harvest would decrease even more if we eliminated the fall hunt.

Mr. Bunnell said there are a higher number of females taken in the fall than in the spring. If we increased the number of tags in the spring to compensate, we really do not have the data to tell how that would fall out.

Mr. Woodard asked if they get a lot of complaints on pursuit from the big game hunters. He said he has talked to two elk hunters that encountered hounds and were not happy.

Mr. Bunnell said we have less pursuit during the fall, but they still need to respect each other.

Mr. Woodard brought up the fact that Wasatch County has put out non bear proof dumpsters at their cabin area on a voluntary basis.

Mr. Bunnell said if he knows of a specific area, the Division would really like to know about it. To the point that they are aware of those situations, they are willing to work with anyone who is willing to listen.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Bear Proclamation and Rule R657-33 as presented by the Division.

Lunch break

9. Board Appeal – Doug Wong – Time Certain 1:00 pm

The tape was changed at this point

Mr. Hatch addressed the officers who were present for the hearing. He feels the Division should have intervened immediately after the fish were given away. Officers should be down circulating amongst the fishermen.

The following motion was made by Del Brady, seconded by Lee Howard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we address the Board variances at this point in the agenda.

11. Board Variances (Action)

Judi Tutorow, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator addressed the Board. She said that three of the variance requests will be presented in person by those asking for the requests. She will present the other six requests.

Michael Prows said he drew a limited entry bull elk permit from the big game drawing. The area in which he was hunting, was compromised by antlerless elk hunters. He was in direct competition to cow elk hunters. He would like to request a variance to hunt in the 2008 season.

Mr. Johnson asked if Mr. Prows applied for that area in the previous years.

Mr. Prows said they were for rifle in other areas.

Mr. Johnson asked how many days he hunted.

Mr. Prows said probably 15-16 days.

Mr. Johnson asked if the antlerless hunt went the entire length of that season.

Ms. Tutorow said there is not an antlerless hunt listed in the addendum that took place in that area.

Mr. Bates said that the only thing he can think of that was going on was maybe a CWMU hunt east of there, or some mitigation permits for private land.

Mr. Johnson asked if those hunters were there the whole time.

Mr. Prows said not toward the end. He was very frustrated with the competition.

Mr. Woodard said he had a similar experience, but since Mr. Prows did hunt he had opportunity.

Mr. Howard said since he did have opportunity, the Board feels these variances should not be granted.

Mr. Hatch asked how many of these archery permits were given.

Mr. Bates said around 42 permits.

Mr. Prows said there were many hunters in the area. He would not make this effort to request a variance if it was not a serious situation.

Mr. Howard said it has been the way of the Board to deny these types of requests, especially when the hunter has had opportunity to hunt.

Chairman Niemeyer said the Board usually does not grant a variance if the entire hunt has been hunted.

Mr. Perkins said if we granted this variance, it would open the door to all sorts of situations similar to this.

Mr. Johnson said what Mr. Prows should have done is contact the Division immediately about the situation.

Mr. Prows said the proclamation should have listed all the hunts and let hunters know just what to expect on the mountain.

Mr. Woodard said the various hunts are listed in the proclamation.

The following motion was made by Rick Woodard, seconded by Lee Howard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we deny the variance request for Michael Prows on his 313-Central Mountains Manti Unit permit.

David Johnson said he drew a limited entry bull elk permit from the big game drawing. He has been putting in for this hunt for over 20 years. He finally drew it this year and about a week before the hunt became ill on November 7th and was unable to hunt. He would like a variance to hunt in the 2008 season. He did not surrender the permit ahead of time, because he thought he would get feeling better. The pneumonia made it so he could not breathe. He includes a copy of the doctor's statement.

Mr. Johnson asked how many points he had.

Mr. David Johnson said he had maximum points, but that was before the change. He knew right where the elk were since he has hunted that area for so many years.

Mr. Howard asked if we can reinstate the bonus points.

Director Karpowitz said normally the Board just extends the hunt.

Mr. Perkins said he hopes when we get our rule on variance requests, it specifies what type of illness.

The following motion was made by Lee Howard, seconded by Del Brady and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request for David Johnson on his 352-Central Mountains Manti (late) bull elk permit-any legal weapon.

Penny Thomas drew a limited entry bison permit. Her mother-in-law passed away and also because of her work schedule, she was unable to hunt. She would like a variance to hunt in the 2008 season. She contacted the DWR and surrendered her permit prior to the end of the season. She did not hunt at all.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Rick Woodard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request for Penny Thomas on her 943-Henry Mountains-cow only bison permit-any legal weapon.

At this point Ms. Tutorow presented the remaining variance requests. John Brownlee drew a limited entry buck pronghorn permit. He was appointed as a Superior Court Judge in California and could not in good conscious take a week off after only 15 days on the bench. He requests a hunt extension.

Director Karpowitz asked how many of these we have done.

Ms. Tutorow said we have done some when the permit was turned back in on time. We approved extensions on these others.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Lee Howard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request for John R. Brownlee on his 844-Dutton/Paunsaugunt buck pronghorn – any legal weapon permit.

The next variance request is for Brent Cook who drew a limited entry bull elk permit. His father passed away on September 17 and he was unable to hunt. He did not go out and attempt to hunt at all.

Mr. Johnson asked how people know about being able to do a variance request.

Ms. Tutorow said it is in the proclamation, but many hunters are unaware of it.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request for Brent M. Cook on his 337- South Slope, Diamond Mountain bull elk – any legal weapon permit.

The next variance request is from George Zilifian who drew a general buck deer permit for Central region. He became ill on October 19th and was unable to hunt.

Mr. Perkins said there is a big difference between a general season permit and an OIAL permit.

Mr. Brady said this would not be a big concession to make in granting this request. He believes our good will goes further than anything. I might make the same request if I were in the same situation. I would be in favor of granting this.

Mr. Johnson asked how long he was ill with the food poisoning.

Ms. Tutorow said the emergency report does not reflect this. We have granted general season variances in the past, especially to those who are out of state because of travel.

Mr. Johnson said he thinks he had opportunity. Food poisoning does not last that long.

Mr. Perkins said out of 9,700 hunters, probably many of them did not feel well. We need to cap how many people we give a free pass to.

Chairman Niemeyer said that the doctor's letter did state that Mr. Zilifian was too ill to travel to Utah.

Mr. Howard said he agrees with Mr. Brady and we should grant this.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Keele Johnson and failed 4 to 3 with Del Brady, Lee Howard and Tom Hatch opposed. Chairman Niemeyer broke the tie.

MOTION: I move that we deny the variance request for the 987-Central Region buck deer-any legal weapon permit for George A Zilifian.

The following motion was made by Del Brady, seconded by Lee Howard and passed with one opposed, Ernie Perkins.

MOTION: I move that we approve the variance request of George A. Zilifian on his 987-Central Region buck deer-any legal weapon permit.

Elizabeth Mitton drew a convention permit for bull elk. Ms. Tutorow read her letter verbatim to the Board. Her daughter Brooke passed away from a health related illness on September 12th. With getting all the affairs in order Elizabeth was only able to hunt a few hours on the last day. She would like to request a variance to hunt in the 2008 season.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Ernie Perkins and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request of Elizabeth Mitton for her 354-Wasatch Mountains (early) bull elk-any legal weapon permit.

Ms. Tutorow then presented the variance request of Shauna Mayer. She drew a limited entry bull elk permit. Because of the recent reseeding of the unit she felt the quality of the hunt was destroyed. The permit was surrendered before the season. Ms. Tutorow said there was an e-mail from the biologist in that unit relative to this request. He said it is unrealistic to guarantee permit holders a certain level of quality on any particular area of the unit. (See Variance Requests) We had eight hunters receive permits on that unit. Four of the five who actually hunted were successful.

Mr. Perkins said she would still be able to reinstate her bonus points.

Ms. Tutorow said yes.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Lee Howard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we deny the variance request of Shauna Mayer on the 364-Fillmore, Oak Creek South (late) bull elk – any legal weapon permit.

The next variance request was for Richard Rubin, MD PHD who drew a limited entry pronghorn permit through the 2006 big game drawing. He was required to be present at the Katrina proceedings as an expert witness, which prevented him from traveling to Utah for his hunt. He contacted the guide and asked that the information be forwarded to the Division. The Division never received the information. He is now asking for an extension. This is a 2006 permit.

Mr. Perkins asked if an expert witness gets paid, and if so it sounds like a business decision.

Mr. Hatch said he thinks an expert witness is usually there voluntarily.

Mr. Bushman said most expert witnesses are hired, but that is not to say that the federal government could not subpoena someone to come in and testify. It may well be that this gentleman had special information that somebody else wanted and they were not paying him. It would be well to ask that question and get more information.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Rick Woodard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we table this motion, which is a request for a variance from Richard Rubin, and wait for further information.

Ms. Tutorow said she would get more information on the subpoena and a statement from Mr. Lemon, Mr. Rubin's attorney.

Director Karpowitz said he thinks that on two year old permits, the Board decided not to extend them more than one time. We should investigate whether we have ever extended a permit twice.

Mr. Woodard asked if there is anything in the guide and outfitter bill that would take care of this type of situation. We have a lot of issues where the hunter throws the situation back to the guide and he drops the ball.

Mr. Johnson said we would not want that kind of detail in the bill. It should just be as general as possible and just a skeleton outline. The Board who handles this should make those decisions in rule.

Director Karpowitz said DOPL sets up a Board review on each type of license. We suggested that there be someone from the Wildlife Board and someone from the Division on that Board. We will remain in that loop.

Mr. Johnson asked if the Board is involved in the reinstatement of bonus points.

Mr. Bushman said these are things that are set in rule. That is why we look to season extensions. Now that we are drafting this rule there will be a full complement of options to deal with variance requests.

10. Fishing Contest Rule R657-58 (Action)

Drew Cushing, the Warm Water/Community Fisheries Program Coordinator presented this agenda item. At the 2007 spring RAC and Wildlife Board meetings the fishing contest rule was identified as an item for potential change. This was discussed in the fall fishing RAC more specifically with options for the public, RACs and Wildlife Board to consider and provide input to the DWR. Today this item is being presented as an action item.

In order to have more flexibility in handling this rule, it is being separated from the taking of Fish and Crayfish Rule R657-13-4. An aquatic nuisance species protocol is included in the rule, along with a reduction in COR processing time from 60 to 45 days. To make the smaller contests easier to put on, the minimum dollar amount will be increased from \$500 to \$2000 before a COR is required. The tagged fish process and regulations has been added along with revocation of “poor” contest sponsors and the fact that all live weigh contests will require a COR.

Mr. Cushing then went over some definitions in the rule, the general COR requirements and the various types of contests and the details necessary to hold these contests. (See Powerpoint Presentation) The various types of contests include type I and II warmwater contests, type I and II coldwater contests, and tagged fish contests with the approved waters listed. In summary, a flow chart of the process necessary to get a COR was presented, according to the type of fishing contest that will be held.

Mr. Woodard asked if there will be somebody from the Division at all the fishing contests.

Mr. Cushing said they want to go to a lot of them, but probably not all of them.

Chairman Niemeyer asked if they wanted to do a contest during the county fair on Piute Reservoir, what type of contest would be good to have?

Mr. Cushing said that would be a hard time to have any type of contest. He would recommend doing it another time of year.

Mr. Brady said this year is out completely for tagged fish, since the deadline is already past.

Mr. Cushing said State Parks were the ones interested in the tagged fish concept. They have some venues on the State Parks. We asked them for a short list of where they might be interested in doing a tagged fish contest, so we have that going into our work plan. This will assure easy transition.

Mr. Perkins asked if we are going to allow culling of fish in type II contests.

Mr. Cushing said we do not have control over type II contests. There are so many of those that take place, it is impossible to be involved with all of them.

Mr. Perkins said then, we would fall back on the general regulation where, if we put a dead trout back in the water, it is wanton destruction.

Mr. Cushing said yes.

RAC Recommendations

Southeastern - Mr. Albrecht read Mr. Gilson's recommendation. They had no questions or comments from the audience and voted unanimously to approve.

Southern - Mr. Albrecht said the RAC voted to approve on the condition that the COR fee be set high enough so the Division is not putting money into it. It passed with 6 in favor and 1 opposed.

Northeastern - Ms. Torres said they voted unanimously to accept the DWR proposal.

Central - They voted unanimously to accept the DWR proposal as presented.

Northern - Mr. Fenimore said on posted notices there was some concern about people who were just going out to enjoy a day of fishing and then find out there was a fishing contest. The Division should post contests on the website to give the public fair warning. They made a motion to this effect and it failed for lack of a second. The main motion passed 7 to 3 on the Division's recommendations.

Mr. Hatch said a tagged fish contest would require a COR. What if the resort owners at Panguitch Lake decided to get together and offer a \$5000 prize for someone who catches a tagged fish. They get a COR and can they make that good for the whole summer?

Mr. Cushing said Lake Powell had one that was good for a year. They can go on for an extended period of time.

Chairman Niemeyer asked for clarification on the Northern RAC motions.

Mr. Fenimore said he mis-stated the motion. The posting of contests on the website passed. The motion that failed to get a second was a request that the Type II contest come down from 50 to 25 participants and from \$2000 to \$500.

Mr. Howard said they could not have a \$5000 prize on a tagged fish, because of the \$2000 limit, is that correct?

Mr. Cushing said there are three sections, Coldwater which you cannot have over \$2000 and then tagged fish, which is completely different. There is no limit in a tagged fish contest, just a COR is required.

Mr. Perkins said that the Northern RAC did discuss giving public notification of tournaments and passed a motion to that unanimously. In response to public comment at the meeting, Mr. Cushing responded that would be a good idea. He would like to see the Board adopt public notification of tournaments in contests that the Division is aware of. They could do that just by putting them on the website.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, but there was no second and no vote.

MOTION: I move that the Division post public notification of fishing contests on the DWR website.

Mr. Niemeyer said that is a win-win. It lets the boaters know there will be a contest and lets the people know in case they want to get out and participate. He then asked what else Mr. Perkins had to share.

Mr. Perkins said he is planning on voting to adopt the rule as presented as it is much better than what we have now and considers it a good start on a work in progress. He thanked Ray Shelble and George Sommer for their participation and work with the Division. In the tournaments area, we still have a lack of policy statements and process definition. The draft COR which we have not seen yet lists things like multiple weigh ins, days of the week, immediate release, and pre-fishing, but there are no real policy statements to go with those. I conclude that in the tournaments area, the Board is not setting any policy other than the Division will have a COR, and at that point the process for the COR is not really detailed. Are we going to have five different regions making judgment calls on tournaments without specific policy statements, or are we going to have the Salt Lake office as the approving authority? We are very clear on waters and species for contests, but not on tournaments. We never allow the taking of a tiger muskie in contests, but we do not even address them in tournaments. We need policy definitions that encourage the small guys and put constraints on those who might do damage to the resource.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, but there was no second and no vote.

MOTION: I move that the Division expeditiously bring back a revision, including the COR and the COR process that more clearly provides some stipulation of tournament policies.

Mr. Howard said at the Central RAC, there were a few people that were concerned that these contests would create over crowding and make it so the general public couldn't participate in their normal fishing. He talked to an individual who has done these contests, and he said they are very conscious of the public being able to access the boat ramps and other issues. The reason you get complaints is when you get an individual who comes and fishes every day and someone is parked in his spot. He might have to park somewhere else and walk a little further, then grumble about it. Generally though, those doing the contest are very aware of the locals.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, and seconded by Rick Woodard.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Fishing Contest Rule R657-58 as presented by the Division.

The previous motion was amended by Ernie Perkins and seconded by Rick Woodard to read as follows and it passed unanimously.

AMENDED MOTION: I move that we approve the Fishing Contest Rule R657-58 as presented by the Division and we ask the Division to expeditiously bring back a revision that more clearly provides statements of tournament policies.

Mr. Clark asked what the Board wants from the Division on this, specifically. They are just going with the general COR requirements at this point.

Mr. Perkins said this is a unique COR as it exists. It has fees in it and some remediation in it. He wants to see some tournament policy and have some idea of whether they are going to be approved.

Mr. Cushing said they had a discussion in the Northern RAC where Mr. Perkins was concerned about there being five different regional managers reviewing the CORs and that policy might not be consistent. There might be the possibility that people would apply for CORs in different regions and receive different treatment.

Mr. Clark said all the CORs are issued through the Aquatics Section in the Salt Lake Office. There will be consistency.

12. Other Business (Contingent)

Boyd Blackwell addressed the Board concerning the CWMU Advisory Committee. He said they have some vacancies on this committee and they are going to be meeting in February to discuss issues and complaints. They would like to be able to get at least one of these positions filled. According to rule, the Director would like to nominate Brad Slater to fill the vacancy representing the elected official on the CWMU Advisory Committee. This needs approval from the Wildlife Board. He will be taking the place of Greg Buxton.

The following motion was made by Lee Howard, seconded by Ernie Perkins and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we appoint Brad Slater to serve on the CWMU Advisory Committee.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Rick Woodard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we authorize the Division to go ahead and appoint another member to the CWMU Advisory Committee with confirmation to occur at the next Wildlife Board meeting.

The meeting was then adjourned.