

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING

April 1-2, 2008, Dept. of Agriculture
350 North Redwood Road, Salt Lake City, Utah

AGENDA

Wednesday, April 1, 2009

Left Fork Grill
68 W 3900 S, Salt Lake City
5:00 pm

Board Briefing Meeting

Items to be discussed:

- Open Public Meeting Act – Audio requirement – Staci
- Internet Input Discussion – Staci
- Board Variance Request Criteria – Judi
- Refund Statute – Greg
- 2009 Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL permit numbers – Ernie
- Non-residents applying for more than one OIAL species – Jim
- Potential elk herd expansion – Jim
- Guide & Outfitters Board Update – Rick

Thursday, April 2, 2009

Dept. of Agriculture
350 North Redwood Road, Salt Lake City
9:00 am

- 1) Approval of Agenda **ACTION**
-Paul Niemeyer, Chairman
- 2) Approval of Minutes **ACTION**
-Paul Niemeyer, Chairman
- 3) Old Business/Action Log **CONTINGENT**
-Rick Woodard, Vice-chair
- 4) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers for 2009 **ACTION**
-Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator
- 5) 10-yr Statewide Sharp-tail grouse transplant list **ACTION**
-Dave Olsen, Wildlife Program Coordinator
- 6) Sharp-tail grouse transplant proposal for Antelope Island –NR only **ACTION**
-Dave Olsen, Wildlife Program Coordinator
- 7) Sage-grouse transplant proposal for Anthro Mountain – NER, NR & SR only **ACTION**
-Brian Maxfield, Wildlife Program Coordinator

- 8) Designation of Board Representative and Board Nominee to the Guides and
Outfitters Board **ACTION**
- 9) Other Business **CONTINGENT**
-Paul Niemeyer

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
Summary of Motions
April 1-2, 2008, Dept. of Agriculture
350 North Redwood Road, Salt Lake City, Utah

- 1) Approval of Agenda (Action)

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

Passed unanimously

- 2) Approval of Minutes (Action)

MOTION: I move that we accept the minutes of the March 4, 2009 Wildlife Board meeting.

Passed unanimously

- 3) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers for 2009 (Action)

MOTION: I move that we accept Option 2 on the bison hunt on Henry Mountains and the Division notify the successful applicants of the number of permits issued.

Passed 4 to 2, opposed by Del Brady and Lee Howard.

MOTION: I move that we reduce the permits on the Paunsaugut by 10%.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we reduce the Northern region deer tags by an additional 1,000 tags this year. The intent of the Board is to restore these tags next year following actions to address options on expanding hunting opportunities, combining hunts and/or hunting seasons, season lengths and dates, archery tag distributions, and regional permit distributions.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we accept the Northeast RAC recommendation that we keep the permit numbers the same as last year, at 13,000.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we leave the Monroe permit numbers the same as last year.

Passed with Lee Howard, Keele Johnson and Rick Woodard in favor and Del Brady, Ernie Perkins and Tom Hatch opposed. Chairman Niemeyer voted in favor of the motion to break the tie.

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Bucks, Bulls OIAL Permit Numbers for 2009.

Passed unanimously

- 4) 10-yr Statewide Sharp-tail grouse transplant list (Action)
- 5) Sharp-tail grouse transplant proposal for Antelope Island –NR only (Action)

MOTION: I move that we approve the ten-year sharp-tail grouse transplant proposal, including Antelope Island.

Passed unanimously

- 6) Sage-grouse transplant proposal for Anthro Mountain – NER, NR & SR only (Action)

MOTION: I move that we approve the sage-grouse transplant proposal for Anthro Mountain for NER, NR & SR only as presented by the Division.

Passed unanimously

- 7) Designation of Board Representative and Board Nominee to the Guides and Outfitters Board (Action)

MOTION: I move that Paul Niemeyer be nominated as the Board Nominee.

Passed unanimously

- 8) Other Business (Contingent)

MOTION: I move that we go into Executive Session.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we come out of Executive Session

Passed unanimously

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING
April 2, 2008, Dept. of Agriculture
350 North Redwood Road, Salt Lake City, Utah

Thursday, April 2, 2009
Dept. of Agriculture
350 North Redwood Road
Salt Lake City, Utah
9:00 am

Board Members Present

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

RAC Chairs Present

Bob Christensen – Northeast
Jake Albrecht – Southern
Brad Slater – Northern
Fred Oswald – Central
Bill Bates – Southeast

Public Present

Todd Bingham
Don Peay
Byron Bateman
Paul Pace
Matt Morrell
Jay Walk
Ryan Foutz
Verlin King
David Brinkerhoff
Bill Christensen
Mike Laughter

Division of Wildlife Resources

Kevin Bunnell
Cindee Jensen
Anis Aoude
Judi Tutorow
Staci Coons
Alan Clark
Teresa Bonzo
LuAnn Petrovich

Martin Bushman
Kevin Christofferson
Kent Hersey
Randy Wood
Ron Hodson
John Fairchild

Doug Messerly
Boyde Blackwell
Craig McLaughlin

Chairman Niemeyer welcomed the audience and introduced the Wildlife Board and RAC Chairs. He then reviewed the agenda.

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

We need to add the DWR update between agenda items 3 and 4. Mr. Perkins would like to add under “other business” an executive session to discuss awards for the year. He asked that Director Karpowitz and Ms. Jensen sit in on that.

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

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

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

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the minutes of the March 4, 2009 Wildlife Board meeting.

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

Rick Woodard, Vice-chair said they have nothing to discuss under “Old Business.”

4) DWR Update (**Informational**)

Director Karpowitz went over the bills that went before the recent legislative session in terms of budgets. All agencies were asked to take a 15% budget cut for FY 2010, it is an ongoing budget cut which means every year hereafter. In some cases money was back filled so that all agencies did not take a full 15%. The Division did take a 15% budget cut in general fund appropriation. Only 11% of our wildlife budget is general fund, so it did not impact us as badly as it did some other agencies. The net loss to our agency was 1.2 million dollars and we will have to tighten our belts considerably to deal with those cuts. The biggest portion of cut and most controversial was a \$579,000 cut to our SITLA access payment. Two years ago the Division renegotiated with the Trust Lands Administration for an access and we pay about \$500,000 annually plus interest. We are not able to make that payment and that came through the legislature, not something we proposed. We are going to continue to work with SITLA and we would hate to see that agreement go away. It has been good for the sportsmen and other people in the state who have enjoyed those trust lands.

Some of the other cuts were \$111,000 out of our Sensitive Species program, \$126,000 out of our management program, \$131,000 out of travel and current expense, \$118,000 out of our law enforcement in Range Creek and \$100,000 out of our County Bounty program. We will backfill where we can, and are in pretty good shape with restricted dollars.

The good news is there are not going to be any riffs, furloughs or layoffs, but these are ongoing cuts. In terms of legislation, the Division was involved actively in about 14 bills. Some of these affect the Wildlife Board and he will highlight those today. HB-20 eliminated the wolf check off, because it was not bringing in enough funds to remain on the

tax form check off. We will spend the rest of that money this year for what we need to deal with wolves, assuming the delisting will take place and they work their way into the state.

Mr. Hatch asked if that was a fixed amount.

Director Karpowitz said that was whatever people wanted to donate. HB-32 was the Criminal Penalties bill that said anytime there was a criminal activity that could result in jail time, the legislature felt like that needed to be in code and not in rule. Mr. Bushman has worked closely with the legislative analysts to get that in a form that could be worked with in the Division.

The bald eagle penalties bill passed. When they came off the Endangered Species List, they went back to being \$100 restitution. We asked the legislature to raise the penalty to \$1000. HB-92 is the hunter orange bill and it says hunter orange is not required on any OIAL hunt and the Wildlife Board has authority to determine on any limited-entry hunt whether it is required. On the low density hunts the Board can make that decision. It also makes camo hunter orange legal. There were amendments to the Criminal Trespass Code with new penalties and fines. Anyone caught trespassing will be eligible for new civil penalties, with a minimum of \$500 for damages and \$250 in attorney fees plus court costs. We worked on some other wording in that bill and made a statement during the session that we do not condone trespassing. Sportsmen need to be on alert.

The Migratory Bird Area bill passed and gives some protection to private waterfowl areas. The Guides and Outfitters Bill passed in last day of session. We helped guides and outfitters draft and develop this bill. There were some changes at the last minute that applies only to public land, and only to big game, cougar and bear hunting. Anyone involved in guiding will now need to be registered with the Division of Occupational and Professional Licensing (DOPL). The Wildlife Board is going to have a position on the Board that regulates that and will designate another to sit on that Board.

The Streambed Bill was something that we worked with the sponsor, trying to get it in a format that would work for landowners and anglers. It failed. There may be multiple bills on this during the next session. The Wanton Destruction of Livestock bill passed with enhanced penalties for killing livestock and we strongly supported it, making it clear we do not condone the killing of livestock. It also allows under tight sideboards, for the DWR to periodically remove domestic sheep that get into our bighorns. This is something we needed in code and we appreciate the sponsor. We think this will act as a model for bills in other states.

The OHV Penalty bill that Mr. Perkins worked on passed. It did not turn out quite like we wanted it and we will work with Representative Noel in the future to enhance penalties of off road use. A Loaded Firearm bill passed. Originally this bill said you could have any type of loaded firearm in your car at anytime, as long as it was not concealed. It allowed any weapon of any type and the Division was concerned about this, especially with kids out there with high-powered rifles and shotguns. In the end rifles, shotguns, and muzzleloading rifles were removed from that bill, and you can only have a loaded handgun in the vehicle as long as it is not concealed. If it is concealed you have to have a Concealed Weapons permit.

Finally, there was one Senate bill we worked on, the Administering Substances bill. It states that only the Wildlife Board has authority over who can administer chemicals or other substances to wildlife. This will keep others from giving hormones, birth control, or any other substances to wildlife. They must have approval from the Wildlife Board if they want to do this for research or whatever. There is a new drug for birth control in deer and we disagree with managing deer that way. It was a good session at the legislature and we appreciate the way they listened to us and the things we were able to accomplish.

Mr. Howard asked about winter-feeding.

Director Karpowitz said this does not involve our emergency feeding program.

Mr. Howard asked that Director Karpowitz expand on the sideboards of killing of domestic sheep in our sheep areas.

Director Karpowitz said if bighorns wander off and get into domestic sheep, we have to remove them. If domestic sheep wander off and get into bighorns, the new law says we should immediately contact the county. They can deal with it or the Division can handle it if the county says it is all right. We have to immediately contact the owner and offer to reimburse them. If we cannot contact the owner we have to put an equivalent amount of money into the Predator Control program. It is pretty much what we have been doing, but this codifies it. We talked with the Wool Growers during this session and they are ok with it all.

Mr. Hatch said with the failure of HB-187 and the Conaster decision, what is the impact on "walk-in access?"

Director Karpowitz said the Supreme Court decision left some things unanswered and Representative Ferry's bill addressed some of those. We are going to continue to enforce trespass laws and the Conaster ruling as best we can. We will still prosecute people who get outside the easement that has been defined by the Supreme Court. We want everybody to look at this on our website and understand it. We knew all along that whether this passed or not we would need to look for various accesses across rivers and other private lands. I do not think the Supreme Court ruling, in any way, says it is all right to access on private land anywhere except through the streambed. We want to continue to pursue this and work with landowners, compensating them for access. This situation increases the importance of our "Walk-in Access Program."

Mr. Hatch said the people in his area he has talked to say they have always allowed people to fish the streams. This has them upset and might very well lead to holding people to the letter of the law. It might lead to some confrontational situations.

Director Karpowitz said we are going to track our trespass that is not related to fishing and the fishing trespass separately this year and see if there is an increase. Our officers understand how to enforce the law and what they need to do. There is some confusion out there and some people think that some of the provisions in the bill are in place and they

are not. It falls back to what the Supreme Court said and that is how we are going to enforce it.

Mr. Howard asked about the budget cut on Range Creek.

Director Karpowitz said that \$118,000 showed up in the University of Utah's budget and if the trade goes through that we have been working on with SITLA, that money will be there. We will enforce and protect that Division land regardless.

Mr. Slater asked who enforces the OHV bill.

Director Karpowitz said any county, or state law enforcers. There are so few federal law enforcement people out there, we needed a state law. This gives a lot more eyes out there. What we did not like about the law is it had some of the minimum penalties that got turned around to be maximum penalties. Any of these bills can be seen on the legislature's website.

Chairman Niemeyer asked if the money on the County Bounty was cut because it was not being used.

Director Karpowitz said there was about \$150,000 that was going to the counties, to the Country Bounty program and for county contracts for coyote control. \$100,000 of that is now gone. Of that original amount, not much was going to the program, most was going to contracts. There is still \$400,000 coming through the Division for predator control plus another \$75,000.

5) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers for 2009 (**Action**)

Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator presented this agenda item. (See Powerpoint Presentation for details) We are under a new statewide management deer plan that passed last November. He started with the 2009 general season and limited entry deer permits, going over the three different ways we hunt. The general season is to maximize opportunity where some big bucks are taken, but that is not the main intent. Limited-entry provides better quality buck with bigger antlers and premium limited entry is the top end, where folks expect a really big buck, and wait years to draw out. He then went over the 2008 general season deer harvest chart by weapon types and then the general season harvest trends 1997-2008.

With the new statewide plan, we are putting every unit back up to its original cap and deal with the fact that if it falls below the buck:doe ratio on a unit by unit basis. If they fall below 15 bucks per 100 does, we would shorten the season. We have done that on five units throughout the state already through our November proclamation. If they fall below 10 bucks per 100 does we would remove that unit out of the cap and issue just enough permits to hunt it, but at a light enough rate so the buck:doe ratio would rebound.

Mr. Aoude went over the specifics on buck:doe ratios in the Northern region. The three year average bucks/100 does= 17. Several units in that region suffered winter loss in 2008

resulting in a substantial decline buck:doe ratios. They are recommending keeping permit numbers as they are at 1,000 less permits below the regional cap.

Fawn production trends for 1998-2008 were presented. The trend is basically a function of the weather relative to drought in 2002, and then it climbed some and recently dropped again. We want to stay at least 60 to above to grow fawns. He went over the specific numbers for general season.

Mr. Aoude presented the premium limited-entry deer recommendations, including the rationale for an adjustment in average age objectives. He presented the limited-entry information and the specific numbers for premium limited-entry and limited-entry permits.

The limited-entry elk permit recommendations were then covered including a discussion on age objective trends and the specific permit numbers. Pronghorn, and OIAL moose, desert bighorn, Rocky Mountain bighorn, Rocky Mountain goat and bison recommendations were presented.

The Henry Mountain bison were specifically discussed including a presentation of two options that will move that unit toward objective. This concluded the presentation.

Chairman Niemeyer asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Peay said on the Henry Mountains you have two parameters, the percent of bucks that are barely below objective and the second is buck:doe ratio where we are on the upper end. If you take an average of those, the Division would probably recommend the same as last year, with one slightly above and one slightly below.

Mr. Aoude said that is not how we are managing on that unit. We are setting permits separately based on separate criteria, because the two never mesh together. You cannot take an average because the ages will never match the buck:doe ratio. The two parameters are one to set the premium permits and one to set the management buck permits.

Verlin King asked about the budget cut that will effect the SITLA access payment.

Director Karpowitz said it covers sportsmen access, with nothing to do with SITLA grazing permits or leases.

Mr. Albrecht said when we set up the management hunt on the Henry's, wasn't the goal to take the larger bucks that people did not want to take off that unit?

Mr. Aoude said it is set up to lower buck:doe ratios without taking the high end bucks.

Mr. Albrecht said the discussion was to remove the unwanted large bucks.

Mr. Aoude said it is for management of the buck:doe ratio. It has no genetic component.

Mr. Albrecht said on the Monroe Mountain deer unit, we have it scheduled for the last five days of the hunt. He is concerned that there might be a large amount of hunters come from different regions for the last five days and he is wondering if it might be best to switch on those.

Mr. Aoude said we did that by design, and we did it to find out how it would work. It makes no difference when it is on the front end.

Mr. Albrecht asked why the objective is unreachable on the Henry's.

Mr. Aoude said the objective is too high and we will not reach it very often.

Mr. Albrecht asked about bulls and their average age, is there another way to get additional information as to the size of the animal?

Mr. Aoude said we get that information on the mandatory reporting.

Mr. Albrecht asked if that information is available to the public.

Mr. Aoude said it is a lot of data to go through and analyze, but they could do that.

Mr. Albrecht said if people were able to look at the information on the Monroe, which is controversial, it might be helpful.

Public Comment

Mike Laughter of the Mule Deer Foundation (MDF) said given the condition of the Northern deer herds, they are asking for a 5,000 tag reduction, including the 1,000 that was reduced last year. They do not feel they have rebounded and the buck:doe ratios are still low. They have a lot more tags than they do bucks. The sportsmen's groups are behind this request as well as the general public. They are willing to do this in small steps, and will bring the tags back when deer numbers increase.

Bill Christensen representing the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation (RMEF) has been directed from 8,000 families in Utah that he represents to ask the Board to consider reducing the Northern deer tags by 5,000, which includes the 1,000 recommended by the Division. There is too much pressure on the bucks and they have public support. As things improve we will be in favor of bringing the permit numbers back.

David Brinkerhoff of the Henry Mountain Grazer's Association and a member of the Bison Committee has an issue with the bison recommendation. No one seems to want to address the winter range, which is the most critical part of the plan. They put a few projects in place, but bison will not use certain lands no matter what. Winter ranges are also critical to the deer herd. There is a situation presently on the summer range where bison are overgrazing, throughout the area. The winter range is impacted year round. In late summer, often bison go onto the winter range and take the feed before the livestock can get to it. Case in fact, is this present year. We are permitted 500 head of livestock there and have never been able to fill it. We went with 250 and had to get two loads of

feed because the range was gone. As of two weeks ago there were 150-175 buffalo on our winter range that I could have utilized this year. Right now there is a drought going on in that part of the region. On the working committee, they agreed to look at some of these issues before we went on to implementing any more buffalo onto the range. Projects were supposed to be put in place for two years and then evaluated. It impacts the livestock owners greatly when they have to feed their livestock because the bison are over populated in the area. We need to reach our objective on bison, then look at the range situation for evaluation, not just start increasing right now.

Verlin King – Henry Mountain Grazer’s Association President and a member of the Bison Committee. He is speaking to the bison objective at 275. The summer of 2007 we counted 563, 108 were calves and the rest adults. The bull to cow ratio was 50 to 100. He went over the numbers and concluded that too much growth will occur in the herd. Sight ability is a problem in counting and the winter mortality rate is too high. He is in favor of Option 2 as presented by the Division to get the population down quickly. If we go with Option 1, we will be back next year hunting the same amount. The percentages being worked in the models are not getting it done. The Bison Plan gives an objective of 275. We need to get down to objective sooner, monitor the range and then slowly work up.

Paul Pace is representing the Wayne County Commissioner and he read from a letter of concern about bison on the Henry Mountains, signed by Stanley Wood, Thomas Jeffery and DeRae Fillmore. (See Attachment #1) They are concerned about the proposal of the DWR to increase bison numbers. They do not feel the management plan is being followed. There has been some miscommunication between the DWR and Wayne County Commission. Why were numbers brought to the RACs without being run through the Bison Committee? Mr. Pace quoted from the management plan and the winter range is the limiting element on the bison issue. We need to bring bison numbers to 275, before changing numbers. They are in favor of the Bison Management Plan.

Ryan Foutz has sat on the Northern RAC for almost eight years, and is representing himself on one reoccurring issue, the deer herd in the Northern region. We have had committees and working groups, but there is relatively no change. There are a lot of things that enter into that. He asked for numbers on deer and population objectives that he thought would be in the RAC packet and received them the day of his RAC. It is imperative that we look at this information. Our population objective on the Cache is 25,000, Morgan/South Rich 12,000, and East Canyon is 7,000. Population estimates are 13,700 on the Cache, Morgan/South Rich is 6,100 and East Canyon is 6,200. We are at about 60% of objective on those three units. The buck:doe ratios are down on the Cache also. It was reported that 2/3’s of the hunters hunt the Cache. He thinks permit numbers need to be reduced. There are not enough deer to sustain the number of permits being sold. He is asking that they reduce northern deer tags by 5,000. Listen to sportsmen and experience out there. This is not a study about youth recruitment, or opportunity, but a fairness issue to sportsmen and hunters. He has no problem with bringing tag numbers back when the herd recovers.

Paul Pace said that someone said that it does not matter who speaks last and Mr. Peay and I have had that discussion several times. Today I thought since I handed my comment card in last, I could speak last, but I have lost again. As a landowner representing himself

and being aware of the crowding issue that occurs on the Henry Mountain's, he said the volume of cars driving by his place makes him aware of how many are coming to hunt. He does not see what one more year will change in that experience. The Henry Mountains Unit is a small area. When someone gets a OIAL permit they bring everybody with them. We need to stand by the integrity of the management plan and get the numbers down to the 275 as agreed. We should start at that point and see if there is room for increase.

Jay Walk of the Utah Bowmen Association said they have been working closely with the other sportsmen's groups. They agree with reducing permits in the Northern by 5,000. They recommend taking at least 1,000 of those permits and put them into the archery to help keep opportunity up. The Division has a program going teaching archery safety and skill in high schools. We feel when these people come out of high school; it would be great if they could get a permit to hunt.

Don Peay of Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife (SFW) thanked the Board for taking the time to refine the process. He said they support a 10% cut in the permits on the Henry's and Paunsaugunt. We utilize our deer resource more than any other western state. These two units are world class. He is glad the Division is taking a slow approach on the elk. We do not want to ruin the trophy quality. On bison, 13% of AUMs on Henry's are attributed to bison and 87% are attributed to cattle. We have spent a lot of money down there and if somebody else does not step up and spend a lot more, maybe it is the Wayne County Commission, then if there are further cuts the 87% to 13% stands as is. The number of bison on the mountain is pretty small compared to all the other mouths on the mountain.

Matt Morrell representing the Wayne County Farm Bureau, they support the county commission and the letter that was read by Mr. Pace. They also support Option #2 on bison permits. There is a reason for overcrowding on the bison and it got out of hand up to 600 head. The Division and the Committee had a plan to get the numbers down to 275. The Committee agreed to that and some of the problem is there has not been another committee meeting prior to any RAC meetings in the last year. There is no need to increase numbers until the objective is met. The only critical asset is habitat and nothing has been done to show change in the range. In the plan it said that vegetation monitoring will be established on habitat projects prior to implementation. After implementation there is a two-year wait to evaluate success or failure. That has not happened and the objective of 275 should be reached first.

Byron Bateman, representing SFW said they are a permittee on the Henry Mountains, which contains almost 900,000 acres. 98.5% is public land. The largest private landowner there is an oil company. We were a former member of the Henry Mountain Grazing Association until we were kicked out because we did not have any cows on the mountain. Because of drought, we did not want to put cattle out there. We followed the plan and signed up for three more habitat projects on the Henry Mountains. The amount of forage we have increased there is very substantial. We did several projects related to water and it is the main component in a desert climate. By putting different water sources out there, we distribute the bison along the mountain. We are only talking 30 bison different from where we want to end up. We own enough AUMs, along with the Division, for 600 mouths. The winter range that is being discussed is public land. We

have done projects to help permittees and they haven't done anything to help the bison or the deer. We committed close to \$100,000 to habitat projects on the Henry Mountains. We have put in a well, guzzlers and a pipeline. We moved 35 bison off that mountain last year in a transplant. We should have 425 bison on that mountain to have a genetically viable herd. We are in favor of Option #1. Let's get to where we need to be in a fair, equitable way. We want a win-win situation down there. Bison are an American icon.

Mr. Hatch said he indicated that SFW has spent a lot of money in range improvements in that area. Do you know how much?

Mr. Bateman said around \$200,000 and that does not include the acquisition of those permits we have taken non-use on. We drilled a well that cost close to \$80,000 and repaired two different guzzlers. We did a chaining re-seed on Cedar Bench, an enclosure of mountain spring. These are in conjunction. We have gone and done a lot of the work ourselves. The BLM and the Division have also spent a lot of money.

Mr. Hatch said Mr. Bateman inferred that SFW has spent a lot of money and the permittees haven't spent any, is that correct?

Mr. Bateman yes, not to his knowledge.

Mr. Hatch asked where the money came from.

Mr. Bateman said it came from the conservation permit program.

Mr. Bateman said SFW is in favor of a 5,000 reduction on deer permits in the Northern region. There are two public land units, Cache and Box Elder. They lost a lot of deer last year. He took his grandson for three days during the hunt last year and they did not see a deer after hunting hard. We need to do something in Northern region, not just on the buck:doe ratio, but the entire population.

RAC Comment

Central – Mr. Oswald said they had five motions. One was to reduce Central region deer permit numbers by 1000 and it failed 6 to 2. Second, a motion to approve deer recommendations statewide and it passed 6 to 2. Third, the elk recommendations were approved unanimously. Fourth, there was a considerable discussion on the bison and the recommendations to adopt Option 1, passed 7 to 1. Fifth, there was a motion to accept the remainder of the bucks and bulls recommendations and this passed unanimously.

Southeast – Mr. Bates said he would sit in for Mr. Gilson. They had a motion to pass Option 2 on the bison and it passed 6 to 2. The remainder for the balance of the Bucks, Bulls and OIAL recommendations passed with the motion that the statewide deer and elk committees to reconvene passed unanimously.

Northern – Mr. Slater said they have three motions. First to reduce the deer permits in the Northern region by 5,000 and this passed 6 to 5. Second was to accept the desert and bighorn sheep recommendations, 10 with 1 recusal. The last was to accept the remainder

of the different species with the exception of the mule deer with Option 1 on bison, and it passed 9 to 2.

Southern – Mr. Albrecht said they had their meeting in Richfield and it went really well. The first motion was on the deer permits. Friends of the Paunsaugunt was there. They want a 10% cut on the Paunsaugunt Unit. The Southern RAC supported this. The other deer numbers were passed as presented, except for a 10% cut across the board on the Paunsaugunt. On the elk permit numbers; we had a poor hunt on the Monroe, even though they killed one of the biggest ever. They voted to accept the proposed numbers with the exception of the Monroe to stay the same as last year even though the age objective is high there, and this passed 6 to 4. On pronghorn there was little discussion, but they brought up that the working group needs to be kept going. They voted unanimously to accept on the pronghorn numbers. The next item was the bison and there was a lot of discussion. A few years ago, the Wildlife Board voted to get those numbers back to 275 as well as to form a working group. One of the RAC members said there has never been a working group on the Henry Mountains. They support Option 2 and it passed 9 to 1. They want to go back to what we did a couple years ago, get to objective and preserve the integrity of the management plan.

Northeast – Mr. Christensen said they had five motions, the first to split the permit numbers for vote by species and this passed unanimously. Second, to accept the DWR's deer recommendations, excluding the Northeast region increase of 1000 general season buck deer permits. Stay with the 13,000 like in 2008 and this passed unanimously. Third, To approve the 13% elk increase and recommendation as presented and this passed 3 to 1. Fourth, to accept the pronghorn numbers as presented and it passed unanimously. Fifth, to go with the numbers presented by the DWR on OIAL and Option 1 for bison and this passed unanimously.

Board Discussion

Chairman Niemeyer summarized the RAC and public comment. The CWMU operators were at the RAC meeting and have already set their permits for this year. They are willing to take the 10% cut on the premium tags next year.

Mr. Hatch said we have three things to discuss, Northern region deer numbers, the Paunsaugunt reduction, options on bison on the Henry's, and management deer.

Chairman Niemeyer said they would talk about the bison first.

Director Karpowitz gave an explanation on the bison options. The region recommended Option 2, because of the 2007 Wildlife Board recommendations along with the new management plan. If we strictly adhere to what the Board said in 2007, you should go with Option 2. Based on experience for the last two years, the Board has consistently pursued a philosophy that we should ease into working toward the objective. He has had input to get out of the boom and bust on the management on the Henry's. The difference in the two options is 30 bison. If we are going to strictly adhere to plans, the bison should be taken in 2009. There is some concern about overcrowding and having so many hunters on the mountain as to its effects on habitat. We will be down to 305 in 2010 whichever

plan. I will take responsibility for the two options. He felt enough relationship had been built that this might be viable, but it doesn't look that way.

Mr. Hatch said the problem is we did not involve any of the affected parties on the extra option. It is just a lack of communication.

Chairman Niemeyer said we need to try to reconvene committee meetings before the RAC meetings.

Mr. Hatch said we have a bison working group and when we dealt with the bison on the Book Cliffs, we had some similar problems with the Uintah County Commissioner. Is this a different working group?

Director Karpowitz said yes. It is a different committee. The region was going to have a spring range ride and that was going to be the annual meeting.

Mr. Bates said they did make an effort to call people on the committee just to let them know the two options were out there and that they should come to the RAC meeting.

The following motion was made by Lee Howard, seconded Del Brady and it failed with Lee Howard, Del Brady, Keele Johnson in favor and Tom Hatch, Ernie Perkins and Rick Woodard opposed. Chairman Niemeyer broke the tie by voting against the motion.

MOTION: I move that we accept Option #1 for the bison hunt on the Henry Mountains.

Mr. Brady said they have received a lot of comments about the quality on the OIAL hunts and what has been put forth by the conservation groups, he seconds the motion.

Mr. Hatch spoke against the motion, because of the management style we use. It seems like we do not stick to long-range plans. Many are frustrated because of this. There was a management plan and a reduction plan agreed to and we are looking to rework it without giving it a chance to work. He can see the frustration of the grazers since they have had letters from the Forest Service saying be prepared to take reductions in AUMs and we are looking to increase bison numbers by 30 head for this year.

Mr. Johnson spoke in favor of the motion. He is interested in sustaining a genetically pure herd on the Henry's and keeping bison available to transplant to Antelope Island to accomplish this at that location.

Mr. Perkins said he applauds what Director Karpowitz shared with us. Prior to today, he was totally for Option 1 because of sportsmen input and the relative small number of permits being discussed. After today, he is looking at the Board's integrity and sticking to management plans and is against the motion.

Mr. Woodard said he is of similar frame of mind as Mr. Perkins. We need to stick with management plans and he is against the motion.

Mr. Johnson asked about the letter the grazers got from the Forest Service that their grazing will be cut.

Mr. Brinkerhoff said the Henry Mountains is in the area of the Forest Service there is still a drought in that area.

Mr. Perkins made a request that we advise the permittees that are successful applicants of the number of permits allocated this year.

Director Karpowitz said we can do what Mr. Perkins suggested in the packets we send to bison hunters.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept Option 2 on the bison hunt on the Henry Mountains and the Division notify the successful applicants of the number of permits issued.

Chairman Niemeyer said they will now discuss the 10% cut on the premium limited-entry hunts, except on the management tags.

Director Karpowitz said with the previous motion, the Board made a strong point to follow the management plan. If we are going to follow the management plan, we stay where we are. We had an exhaustive discussion of management plans just last fall of where we wanted to be on the Paunsaugunt and the Henry's. I am not an advocate of this stand, because sometimes you just have to use some common sense, but the Board did just make a very strong point.

Mr. Hatch said there are times when things become controversial, but when they are not that sheds a different light on it.

Chairman Niemeyer said when we came out with the proposal for the later hunt, the guys that live down there and know that unit, know they are going to kill more and bigger bucks. The opinion of these hunters is driving this 10% cut.

Mr. Albrecht said it is very unique that a group of landowners would come together for a cut like this.

Mr. Perkins said he applauds that group for getting together. He was hoping a member of that group would be here today. He sees 15 buck deer out of 3,600 as trivial, but we are still over herd objective. What is the game plan on the population on the Paunsaugunt?

Teresa Bonzo said currently our population estimate is quite a bit over and we have a reduced population objective, because of declining habitat conditions, so we are above objective.

Chairman Niemeyer asked where the habitat problem areas are.

Ms. Bonzo said most of it is down on the Buckskin, south of Hwy 89.

Mr. Johnson said he wonders how we could have so many deer in the '60s. There were lots of deer back then and the habitat supported them just fine. There has not been development in that area and he feels there are not really habitat problems. I grew up in an agriculture situation and have watched it, and you are up in the night if you think we have lost habitat.

Mr. Aoude said the habitat problem comes from vegetation data that is collected on those winter ranges and it is a trend data that goes back a long time. The trend has been downward for a period of time. This is not data we are pulling out of the air. Vegetation data is collected on a five-year rotation basis. The range trend is down.

Mr. Albrecht said the Friends of the Paunsaugunt were concerned about the 50 management tags and moving the hunt back two weeks to see what happens to the larger class of bucks.

Mr. Hatch said he grew up in that part of the state and they have not had a lot of urban encroachment, but we have had a long-term drought in the southern part of the state, and the biggest factor might be pinion juniper encroachment onto winter ranges. The open sagebrush and bitterbrush flats have now got pinion on them, everywhere. There is not the habitat there that there was 20-40 years ago.

Director Karpowitz said 15 bucks either way is not a big deal. What is a big deal is the lack of recognition that habitat has significantly changed throughout the state of Utah. It is not a matter of opinion, it is a matter of looking at the data that we have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to collect, that shows a very severe decline in range condition throughout this state in regards to mule deer habitat. The Paunsaugunt has significantly changed. Why have we put so much money and effort into habitat the last three years if there is no problem? It has nothing to do with 15 bucks, but it really concerns me when I hear that habitat is not a problem and that our personnel are up in the night. Mr. Johnson, our people are not up in the night. Our range people are as good as they are anywhere in this country in collecting range trend data and we spend a lot of money to get it right.

Mr. Johnson said we are a long way off, probably 20% of the deer we used to have in San Juan county. We have not had a five fold decrease in habitat in San Juan County. Deer numbers have decreased five fold compared to the loss of habitat. I stand on what I have said.

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

MOTION: I move that we reduce the permits on the Paunsaugunt by 10%.

Chairman Niemeyer said we will now discuss the Northern region 5,000 permit cut, including the proposed 1,000 permit cut by the Division.

Mr. Hatch asked if this is a proposed cut with a target date, or criteria that needs to be met for the length of this type of cut.

Mr. Foutz said in the RAC it was vaguely discussed that permits would come up when the deer herds increase. He does not think they can put 25,000 deer on the Cache at this point and that was the population objective set in 1994. Things have changed dramatically since then. What is interesting is that we manage deer on buck:doe ratios and not on population objectives when it comes to licensing and this is not a fair way to do it for sportsmen. If we start looking unit by unit, instead of region wide, we could adjust population objectives. The plans would have to be adjusted when the herd numbers come back.

Mr. Hatch said what he is hearing is that Mr. Foutz would like to adjust population objectives in the future.

Mr. Perkins said two years ago we had a Cache Deer Working Group that invested probably 800 man-hours on this topic. The conclusion of this group was we were not ready to cut the population objective, because we thought with some good emphasis on habitat work we could maintain that.

Director Karpowitz said he would like to make a comment about cutting tags in general. Our people make the recommendation according to the management plan. The region is at 17 bucks per 100 does on public lands units and they made the right recommendation. If they would have made the exact recommendation, the 1,000 would have gone back up, but they felt like in applying some common sense to this, let's stay down 1,000 until we see what happens. Before we cut 4,000 tags from the Northern region, and 1,000 tags from the Northeastern region, the Board needs to consider some things. There is really only about 55,000 tags available in the state for rifle and muzzleloader hunters. If you take 96,000 tags, take out 15,000 archery, 10,000 Dedicated Hunters, 4,000 lifetime license holders, 2,000 deer/elk combo hunters and 9,000 nonresidents, it leaves about 55,000. We have 90,000 applications this year for general season big game permits in this state. A 5,000 tag reduction is going to be about a 10% reduction and is not an insignificant number. That is 5,000 families that will not go hunting. Will it improve buck:doe ratios? Maybe and maybe not. We have already cut 6,000 tags out of the Northern region in the last ten years and everybody seems to have forgotten about that. We were at 30,000 in 1999. I am concerned that we are getting into the slippery slope of continually cutting, cutting and cutting. I am concerned that it is a lot all at once. There will be a lot of folks who do not get to hunt.

I also want to point out that this is a \$330,000 loss of revenue to the DWR and on top of our 1.2 million dollar cut we took from the legislature, that is not without significant cutbacks. We will not be able to maintain management programs and the things we do without that money. We can sustain it for a while because we have a surplus, but there has not been much tendency on the side of the Board to raise tags back up. These become permanent cuts and that is a permanent loss of revenue for many years. The only person that hurts is the sportsman in the state. This is significant.

Having said that, Director Karpowitz said he is quite nervous about the low buck:doe ratio on the Cache and Ogden units and the management plan says if it drops below 15 next year, it will go into a five day hunt. He really does not want to see that and maybe some reduction is appropriate. That is why we recommended 1,000.

In response to Mr. Foutz' comment, there is a safeguard. If it falls below 10 bucks per 100 does, we drastically cut permit numbers. That is in the management plan. If it is headed down that path, it will be in a limited entry in a couple of years.

Director Karpowitz said let's not over react to this. We had one bad winter and we have had bad winters before. Some cut is probably appropriate, but 5,000 is way too many and will have far reaching effects on our hunting.

Mr. Howard said those deer will probably never come back to that area. He thinks we need to take some drastic cuts in northern region. It is going to be a budget crunch again. We need to look at it and ask if we want to save the deer herd.

Director Karpowitz asked the Board where they want the DWR to make cuts, biologists, habitat programs, what? We have safeguards in place and if we do not think they are adequate, let's change the management plan.

Mr. Howard said we are having another pretty rough winter and we do not know the number of deer we are going to lose.

Director Karpowitz said we are not having a rough winter.

Mr. Hatch said he is concerned about making too big of changes. We need consistency. We are making cuts without knowing when we need to revisit these issues. These should not be permanent.

Mr. Howard agrees with that also.

Mr. Perkins asked Mr. Slater why the RAC had such a close vote on this issue.

Mr. Slater said the discussion was heard more after the vote was taken. The concern of at least three or four of the council members was the need for an assessment on the population objective and other things that are in the management plan. The 25,000 population objective needs to be looked at. Some felt the management plan needs to be revisited. How much carrying capacity is realistic in Cache and Box Elder public land areas? The other question was, are we seeing less deer on some of the public land? Is it because the deer have also been conditioned to stay on the CWMUs and has that been factored in appropriately? A substantial part of that region is covered with CWMUs. While there is a need to do something, some of the RAC members thought perhaps a compromise could be reached without going clear to 5,000 permits.

Mr. Perkins said he is heavily into providing opportunity, probably more than any other Board member. He goes hunting every year and is perfectly happy whether he gets a deer or not. That said, there is another constituency out there that is starting to talk relative to

quality. This year I am prepared to give that some credence and support. He is trying to figure out why we are having this discussion just six months after we completed the deer management plan and the conclusion is because of some long term and medium term unresolved issues that were touched upon, but not agreed upon in the Deer Committee, and other issues that have been kicked back to the action log. Some issues have just continued to fester after 10-15 years. Mr. Foutz said there is nothing magic in the 5,000 number and I cannot support a 5,000 permit reduction number, but he can support some reduction for one year while we ask the Division to step into the social arena and moderate a discussion from our sportsmen on how we are going to manage these issues. If a 1,000 reduction will keep us from 5 day hunts, maybe 1,000 more would be a little more insurance for that same goal.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Tom Hatch and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we reduce the Northern region deer tags by an additional 1,000 tags this year. The intent of the Board is to restore these tags next year following actions to address options on expanding hunting opportunities, combining hunts and/or hunting seasons, season lengths and dates, archery tag distributions, and regional permit distributions.

Mr. Hatch asked Mr. Perkins about revisiting some of the items in the agenda.

Mr. Perkins said he would hope that by next November with some pre-looks and all the rest of it, some forward looking options would be available at the bucks and bulls informational and we would have some of these topics addressed.

Mr. Johnson said one of the things that we talked about was if it falls below the buck:doe ratio of 15, it would go to a five day hunt. Over the last few years we have been told the harvest was greater on a five day hunt than a nine day. He thinks if there is credence to that we need to look at some other option that would kick in. The other item is going unit by unit, instead of by region. Where are we at on that?

Director Karpowitz said all of what Mr. Johnson just said has been addressed in the recent Deer Management Plan that the Board adopted last fall. We can do it again, but that is what we just went through in the development of that plan.

Mr. Woodard said he sat in on a lot of those Deer Committee meetings. The five day was a compromise. As far as unit by unit, there was a lot of positive from the group to go that way until certain members of the group found out how that would effect them and their hunting methods, then the whole tide of the committee changed.

Mr. Aoude said for all intents and purposes we are managing unit by unit. We are not looking at a regional basis for averages, but if we fall below objective, we shorten the season on that specific unit. We moved the shortened season to the later part, because when there is harvest it is usually around the first weekend. We will take another look if this does not remedy it and look at other options.

Mr. Woodard said when we survey we go unit by unit and if that particular unit falls below then we start dropping the permit numbers.

Mr. Johnson said he has gotten a lot of negative feedback from people on going to a five day from a nine-day hunt. He has been explaining the harvest should decrease, instead of increase.

Mr. Howard said on the Northeast, did the Division recommend the 1,000 permit cut?

Mr. Aoude said no.

Mr. Howard said he would like to wait a year before doing this.

Chairman Niemeyer said the Northeastern said they do not want the 1,000 additional permits recommended by the Division. They want to just stay the same as last year.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Northeast RAC recommendation that we keep the permit numbers the same as last year, at 13,000.

Mr. Brady said we have cut the Division's permits substantially, why don't we take 1,000 additional tags and put them onto the statewide archery. This could offset the cuts.

Chairman Niemeyer asked how do we control where they go?

Mr. Johnson said we control the first two weeks they have to stay in their region. Archery does not have nearly the harvest success as the rifle hunt.

Mr. Brady said it is still some opportunity.

Mr. Johnson said we need to pay attention to this tight budget. 2,000 permits is a pretty big hit. This would be a way to put some money back in. The Division is right at their limits as far as workload goes.

Director Karpowitz said do not do the archery thing for budget reasons. We can absorb the cut. We need to look at how this will impact Southern and Southeast regions. We can handle this for a while, but at some point we will have to go back to the sportsmen for a license increase.

Mr. Brady said this does give opportunity. My real goal would be to go back and look at region-by-region population objectives. As I look at acreages per region, we need to look at numbers and acreage for the long term.

The following motion was made by Del Brady.

MOTION: I move that we increase the statewide archery permits by 500.

Mr. Hatch spoke against the motion because we have not thought this out. None of us have the deer we used to have. There are a number of factors that contribute to that. He would like to leave it the way it is and come back and evaluate it next year. We could have some discussion at the RACs in the interim.

Mr. Brady said he is trying to help out, but he talks to a lot of hunters who are willing to pay a little more for a quality type of hunt.

Director Karpowitz said we increased the amount of the hunting license last year. The sportsmen are not going to be happy with another increase in the near future. We promised them we would not come to them again for a while.

Mr. Brady withdrew his motion.

Chairman Niemeyer said we will now talk about Monroe Mountain elk. The Monroe is under herd objective and we just put the spike hunt on there. It is an easy unit to hunt. There is concern by the local people that last year they did not kill, other than the Spider bull, the quality they wanted to kill. That is what came out of the RACs.

The following motion was made by Lee Howard, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed with Lee Howard, Keele Johnson and Rick Woodard in favor and Del Brady, Ernie Perkins and Tom Hatch opposed. Chairman Niemeyer voted in favor of the motion to break the tie.

MOTION: I move that we leave the Monroe permit numbers the same as last year.

Mr. Perkins spoke against the motion. The Monroe history over the last four years stands out in how little we increase the permit numbers, because of worrying about what is going to happen and continuing to remain 2 ½ years over objective, year after year, after year. He does not know if the decrease in the bull quality is due to forage or bulls being hidden, but he is concerned about the 10,000 sportsmen who could have had a limited entry tag in the last ten years and we still would have been at age objectives in the state. The Monroe is the glaring example of trying to keep the unit at a 7-8 year unit. It is a 5-6 year unit. I understand what the people are voicing, but we have tried it that way for four years and it does not do any good at all. We need to go this way.

Mr. Johnson said it was good to go to spike only genetically and to give more opportunity, but he is concerned with the drop of quality by dropping the spikes out of there. We should raise the age objective on the Monroe by at least one year so we do not have a decrease in the larger bulls. Another way to handle that is to shut it down for one year, kick the whole bunch in and then open it up to spike only again. As we go into the elk management plan, we need to look at the age objectives on quite a few of the units if they need to go up one year. This would keep the quality to get a big mature bull.

Mr. Albrecht said if you take out the one bull on the Monroe, the Fishlake had better quality.

Chairman Niemeyer said they counted the Monroe this year with 104 mature bulls, 24 branch antlered bulls and 71 spikes, adding another 20% that they did not see makes 240 total bulls. Right now they want 118 bull tags plus the spikes, plus landowner and conservation tags. I do not think this unit can take the pressure, especially with the spike hunting. A lot of the old bulls are just not trophy size. I do not know how you deal with that. The public was very upset about going to the spike hunt and now we are talking more permits.

Director Karpowitz said hunters kill old bulls that are not necessarily good bulls. That is the problem with continuing to stay way above the age class objective. Hunters who think that old bulls are the trophies, it is only true to a certain point and after that point it begins to work against you. With the average age of 8 or older, more than half of those are in declining condition. Spike only will help that over time. Raising age objective will work against the hunter for quality. Horn condition declines after 7 or 8 years old. We are carrying these old bulls, half of them, and nobody wants to kill them.

Mr. Albrecht asked if there is another way to look at them rather than tooth age.

Mr. Perkins said if the problem is the elk are too accessible with roads, maybe we the Board should send a letter to the Forest Service asking for season road closures.

Director Karpowitz said closures would make it worse.

Chairman Niemeyer said he is nervous about the amount of tags that are on the unit, regardless of the age. Closing roads would be tough, but if you would get that hunt out of the rut it would help a lot.

Chairman Niemeyer said the only other issue is for the working committees to meet before the RACs.

Director Karpowitz said they would work on that.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers for 2009.

- 6) 10-yr Statewide Sharp-tail grouse transplant list (**Action**)
- 7) Sharp-tail grouse transplant proposal for Antelope Island – NR only (**Action**)

Dave Olsen, Wildlife Program Coordinator presented these agenda items. He gave some background information on the Utah Columbian sharp tailed grouse, including their locations and the fact that they are categorized as a Utah “Sensitive Species.” (See Powerpoint Presentation) He then showed two maps on the historic and current sharp tailed distribution.

Mr. Olsen went over the long-term management intent to protect and manage sharp tailed grouse consistent with DWR missions and goals. There are two proposals: Present a transplant list that will guide future statewide reintroduction activity and to present the first proposed reintroduction effort with the Antelope Island project. He went over the list.

Mr. Olsen then went on to the Antelope Island Project, agenda item 7. The intent is to move around 60 birds from Box Elder and Cache counties. They are looking at both fall and spring releases onto Antelope Island. (See Powerpoint Presentation) As part of the project they would radio and monitor birds to be able to track their success. This concluded the presentation and he asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Howard said he is concerned with Antelope Island because of the number of coyotes. Is that a problem?

Mr. Olsen said that is a consideration, but there are chukars out there and they have made it.

Chairman Niemeyer asked about killing coyotes on the island.

Director Karpowitz said they used to kill coyotes, but they do not any more. As a quick informational item, he is meeting with the Antelope Island people later this month to talk about bighorn sheep hunting out there. The only hunting on the island now is for five bison a year.

Mr. Perkins said he has two requests. Idaho has a successful transplant south of Twin Falls, and we might check with them on their process. Idaho has been providing more birds to Oregon and Washington than we have. We might be able to jump-start this by asking Idaho for some birds.

Mr. Olsen said that is their intent and they would try to get some from Colorado as well.

RAC Recommendations

All the RACs voted unanimously to accept the recommendations as presented.

Board Discussion

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the ten-year sharp-tail grouse transplant proposal, including Antelope Island.

- 8) Sage grouse transplant proposal for Anthro Mountain – NER, NR, & SR only
(Action)

Brian Maxfield, Wildlife Program Coordinator presented this agenda item. He gave some background on some translocations in the past and they have often had poor results. (See Powerpoint Presentation) Often the failure is due to high dispersal and high mortality. He then gave some background on Anthro Mountain. The proposal is to augment the population, increase distribution, genetic diversity, and to facilitate study. They will release 60 hens over two years on Anthro Mountain in the spring and then release 20 juvenile grouse over two summers. The proposed capture sites: are Parker Mountain (hens), Diamond Mountain (juveniles) and Box Elder/Rich Counties as an alternate. He then showed a release site Map.

Mr. Maxfield explained the methods they use for translocation. It will be similar to the Baxter transplant in 2008. They are requesting the approval of the Board to carry out this transplant. This concluded the presentation and he asked if there are any questions.

Mr. Albrecht asked where we are as far as listing goes.

Mr. Olsen said we are supposed to hear form the Fish and Wildlife Service in July.

Mr. Johnson asked if it is these birds or the Gunnison sage grouse that have been proposed for listing.

Director Karpowitz said both.

Mr. Woodard asked if they are still doing predator control in Strawberry Valley.

Mr. Olsen said yes, for the next three years, including other areas.

RAC Recommendations

The Northern, Northeastern and Southern RACs voted unanimously to accept the recommendations.

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the sage-grouse transplant proposal for Anthro Mountain for NER, NR & SR only as presented by the Division.

- 9) Designation of Board Representative and Board Nominee to the Guides and Outfitters Board (**Action**)

Chairman Niemeyer appointed Rick Woodard to this Board.

The following motion was made by Del Brady, seconded by Tom Hatch and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that Paul Niemeyer be nominated as the Board Nominee.

10) Other Business (**Contingent**)

Chairman Niemeyer said it would be nice to have all the RAC meeting minutes before the Board Meeting.

Ms. Coons said the Northern RAC is held the day before the minutes have to go to print and that is why they do not have them. Northeastern RAC's minutes were five days late.

Mr. Woodard said that Southeast's RAC meeting has the briefest minutes of any of the regions. It is really hard to get a feel for the meeting.

Mr. Bates said he will address that with his staff.

Chairman Niemeyer called for a motion for executive session.

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

MOTION: I move that we go into Executive Session.

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

MOTION: I move that we come out of Executive Session

Mr. Johnson said at last night's meeting we got to talk about some things that we normally do not get to talk about. It was an effective meeting and time well spent.

Director Karpowitz said another good thing about that meeting was when we started drifting off topic, Chairman Niemeyer called us back onto subject. We cannot get too far the agenda. We have to make sure when we set the agenda for a briefing meeting that the topics are broad, so there is not a problem.

Director Karpowitz went on to talk about the Training Meeting on August 19, 2009. We will have two new Board members by then.

Ms. Coons said the Board members need to plan on staying August 19, 2009, because we will have a recognition banquet that night for Paul and Lee. There will be a Board meeting the next day where we will welcome the new Board members.

Chairman Niemeyer asked if there is anything else for "other business?"

Director Karpowitz said the Parks Board has invited us to come to their Board meeting. They are considering their management plan for Antelope Island and he is going to try to get them to consider hunting for bighorn sheep. We are getting into a problem there with excess rams. We should hunt some of them. We are going to push that issue and see where it goes.

Mr. Howard asked if would be a draw or selling a permit.

Director Karpowitz said they have talked about having an equal number on the draw, matched with a conservation permit that they could use to enhance the resource. It will take a rule change.

Director Karpowitz said when Chairman Niemeyer was elected Chairman of the Board, it was done by the outgoing Board. It can be done by the old Board or the new Board. They need to think about that. The two new Board members could come from anywhere in the state and that may influence the way you pick a Chair. By the June Board meeting, you need to decide how this is to be done.

Chairman Niemeyer said he thinks it is an advantage to pick the new chair with the old Board, because they are more aware of the capabilities of the people who have been here.

Mr. Perkins said he totally agrees.

Mr. Howard said we want someone who has been with the system for a while.

Director Karpowitz said they are getting ready to fill the slots for the nominating committee. They will meet May 5th and will nominate two for each Board position, out of 57 applicants.

Mr. Hatch asked if there is anything in rule or statute that would prevent us from electing the Chair with the old Board members.

Director Karpowitz said last time we came to the conclusion that it could go either way. It has gone that way for the last 2-3 times.

Mr. Perkins said the other thing he has seen is if someone is elected who has no experience with Roberts' Rules of Order, the first few meetings are very difficult.

Mr. Woodard said he also heard that the legislature is looking at changing the makeup of the Wildlife Board.

Director Karpowitz said that on the master study list, there is a topic that says, something to the effect of, "the makeup of the Wildlife Board." It was actually on there last year too and they never got around to discussing it. They may or may not get around to discussing it this year. I think a lot of that has died down. There are some groups that still want representation on the Board. We tell them, that is great, but you get it through this process. The nominating committee is a special interest Board. Get your representatives on that Board to get your candidate to the top of that list.

Mr. Howard asked if part of the selection stated that people need a biology degree to be on the Board.

Director Karpowitz said, what it says is you have to have an expertise in one of four areas, one is wildlife management. At one time we had three people with wildlife degrees on this Board, now we have none. But it is not a long stretch to say that people who have been on a RAC for several years have wildlife management experience. There are some good candidates that have wildlife degrees in this mix. We will see where it goes. It is not a dead set requirement, it just says expertise in one of those areas and we have to have representation from each geographical area of the state.

Mr. Hatch asked if there are criteria for each position.

Mr. Perkins said one per region.

Chairman Niemeyer said it is one in geology, business, private lands and such areas.

Director Karpowitz said he could make a case for each Board member to fit in at least one of those areas. The main criteria are no more than two per region and at least one per region. It is interesting that these current two can come from anywhere in the state.

Mr. Perkins said the nominating committee takes care of making sure the nominees meet criteria.

Chairman Niemeyer said he was on the first nominating committee and Governor Leavitt said there will be two women on the Wildlife Board.

Director Karpowitz said the overall Board rule for state government says that these Boards need to be gender balanced. He does not know if the Governor's Board person is going to insist on that. There are some qualified women on this application.

Mr. Howard asked if we as Board members can recommend someone to the nominating committee for our position.

Director Karpowitz said yes.

Chairman Niemeyer said he had a bunch of guys calling him to ask him to nominate them and he felt like he could not do it.

Mr. Bushman said that legally, you can do it, but be careful.

Mr. Hatch said he has written a few recommendation letters and he did not do it as a Board member. He has not turned anybody down.

Director Karpowitz said that the code read, "the members of the Board shall have expertise or experience in at least one of the following areas: wildlife management or biology; habitat management, including range or aquatic; business, including knowledge of private land issues; and economics, including knowledge of recreational wildlife uses. We have to have all areas of expertise represented. I am comfortable that we have all those areas covered. I would be more comfortable if we had a wildlife degree in the mix, but we are okay. There are some really good candidates in the 57.

Chairman Niemeyer asked how many are on the nominating committee.

Director Karpowitz said it is an 11-person committee and three are being replaced.

The meeting was then adjourned.