

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING

Summary of Motions

March 31, 2010, State Capitol
Senate Room 210, Salt Lake City, Utah

1) Approval of Agenda (Action)

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

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

2) Approval of Minutes (Action)

The following motion was made by Bill Fenimore, seconded by Tom Hatch and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the minutes from the March 4, 2010 Wildlife Board meeting as presented.

3) Statewide Elk Management Plan (Action)

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed 5 to 1 with Ernie Perkins opposed.

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

4) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers of 2010 (Action)

The following motion was made by Del Brady, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed 5 to 1 with Tom Hatch opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the permit recommendations on the bison as presented by the Division.

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the remainder of the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers for 2010.

5) 2011-2013 Direction (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Del Brady and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we table the discussion on permits and fees and have the Division put a survey together to gather information accordingly, this is to be added to the action log.

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the 2011-2013 timeline as presented by the Division.

6) Donation of 2009 CWMU Vouchers (Action)

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the request for the donation of a 2009 CWMU deer voucher from Weathered Horn Outfitters to Wheeling Sportsmen.

Utah Wildlife Board Executive Work Meeting
March 30, 2010, DNR, Soldier Hollow Conference Rm.
1594 W. North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Revised March 29, 2010

AGENDA

Tuesday, March 30, 2010, 1:00 pm – 6:00 pm

1. Approval of Agenda

ACTION

– Rick Woodard, Chairman

Items of Discussion – NOTE: The Wildlife Board will not be taking action on any of the following items. This meeting is discussion only. The meeting is open to the public however no public comment will be accepted.

- Summer WAFWA – Jim Karpowitz – 15 min.
- Legislative Review and Update – Jim Karpowitz – 30 min.
- Review of Wednesday Agenda Items – Alan Clark – 60 min.
- Mandatory Tooth Reporting – Alan Clark – 15 min. **added March 29, 2010**
- Role of Board Members on Committees – Rick Woodard – 30 min.
- Disabled Hunter Accommodations Discussion – Greg Sheehan – 30 min.
- Agenda items for future RAC/Board meetings – Jim Karpowitz – 30 min.

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

March 31, 2010, State Capitol
Senate Room 210, Salt Lake City, Utah

Wednesday, March 31, 2010, 9:00 am

1. Approval of Agenda **ACTION**
– Rick Woodard, Chairman
2. Approval of Minutes **ACTION**
– Rick Woodard, Chairman
3. Old Business/Action Log **CONTINGENT**
– Ernie Perkins, Vice-Chair
4. DWR Update **INFORMATION**
– Jim Karpowitz, DWR Director
5. Board Appeal – Motion to Dismiss – Jared Jensen – **Time Certain 1:00 pm ACTION**
6. Elk Hunter Survey Results **INFORMATION**
– Kent Hersey, Wildlife Program Coordinator
7. Statewide Elk Management Plan **ACTION**
– Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator
8. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers for 2010 **ACTION**
– Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator
9. 2011-2013 Direction **ACTION**
– Alan Clark, Assistant Director
10. Donation of 2009 CWMU Vouchers **ACTION**
– Robert Nielsen, Wheeling Sportsmen
11. Other Business **CONTINGENT**
– Rick Woodard, Chairman

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

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING
March 31, 2010, State Capitol
Senate Room 210, Salt Lake City, Utah

Board Members Present

Rick Woodard – Chair
Ernie Perkins – Vice Chair
Jim Karpowitz – Exec Sec
Keele Johnson
Tom Hatch
Jake Albrecht
Bill Fenimore
Del Brady

RAC Chairs Present

Kevin Albrecht –Southeastern
Fred Oswald –Central
Steve Flinders-Southern
Robert Bynes-Northern
Bob Christensen - Northeastern

Public Present

Byron Bateman
Roy Hampton
Ben Lowder
John Keeler
Paul Pace
David Brinkerhoff
Verland King

Division of Wildlife Resources

Staci Coons
Cindee Jensen
LuAnn Petrovich
Judi Tutorow
Alan Clark
Justin Dolling
Kevin Christopherson
Kent Hersey
Mike Fowlkes
Kevin Bunnell
Anis Aoude
Charlie Greenwood
Doug Messerly
Bill Bates
Rick Larsen
Dean Mitchell
Mark Hadley
Greg Sheehan
Boyde Blackwell
John Fairchild

Chairman Woodard welcomed the audience and introduced the Wildlife Board and RAC Chairs. He then went over the agenda.

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

Item #5 has been removed from the agenda.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

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

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

The following motion was made by Bill Fenimore, seconded by Tom Hatch and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the minutes from the March 4, 2010 Wildlife Board meeting as presented.

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

Mr. Perkins said they have no changes, additions or action items that need to be covered today.

4) DWR Update (**Information**)

Director Karpowitz said the DNR has approved the travel to WAFWA. For board members it will be half of the expenses. He then turned time over to Mr. Clark to discuss sage grouse. He attended a meeting in Wisconsin where this decision was given relative to listing.

Mr. Clark said they split sage grouse into two segments. We are with the largest segment and in both cases were warranted, but precluded by higher priorities. They categorized it as a candidate for endangered species. They assigned it quite low as to priority and they will do an annual review of the status of sage grouse. The bi-state population which is California and Nevada has been issued a higher priority. The decision on sage grouse was issued on a Friday and the group that did the initial lawsuit filed it on Monday. They have asked the court to remove "precluded." Four groups have signed on and the court cases have not stopped.

The western states continue to work very hard. There are not a lot of additional things that Utah should have done. The main risk in the west is in the Great Basin into Nevada with invasive species and wildfire. From the Colorado Plateau going east and north, main risk is energy development. The Executive Oversight Committee is continuing to seek funding to do projects and they will continue to meet at intervals. There is lots of discussion going on at a lot of levels on what to do next.

Mr. Perkins asked if this requires significant reporting from each state for the annual review.

Mr. Clark said not necessarily for us, it goes with the priority status. The bi-state population will have to do a lot more. Our people have done a great job on the information and projects that have been submitted on sage grouse. It has been a phenomenal effort and they will continue to work on this issue. Our record is still in tact holding up our goal of no more endangered species. Endangered species mitigation money has helped us do this and has been a great investment for the state. The published rule will go into effect unless the court overturns it. Which court it is in will enter into the decision.

Mr. Johnson asked what the lawsuits are about.

Mr. Clark said in his opinion, this is not done to necessarily protect sage grouse, but it is part of a bigger agenda, such as grazing on public lands and energy development. Sage

grouse are used as a tool in this larger agenda. The Service says they do not have the resources or ability to manage sage grouse effectively.

Director Karpowitz said Mr. Bushman is at the Samuel Ives Case, the young man that was killed by the bear three years ago, which is being heard by the Supreme Court. They are looking to decide if the lower court made the right decision in exempting the state from the lawsuit.

The last time we did a board meeting, the Director had just done an emergency extension on the application period and it resulted in 28,000 applications with the one-week extension. By extending it we had more grateful people than we had complaints. Our applications are up significantly this year because of this, just over 300,000 for big game permits.

Mr. Fenimore said he gets emails and postcards periodically from surrounding states as reminders for drawings. Utah ought to do an email reminder for application periods.

Director Karpowitz said Nevada does send out postcards for all applications. Email would be a good possibility. The sportsmen's groups met yesterday and funded one million dollars for watershed projects. We really appreciate this. It still leaves us short and if we cannot get some more funding, this will be the first year we have turned away watershed projects. We are going to work with conservation groups and try to get money to go forward. We want to make sure we do these projects while we can. There are some fairly big law enforcement cases going on presently that you will be hearing about. Because they are still under investigation and in process, I will not go into detail on these poaching cases.

Mr. Perkins asked about the conservation permit funding. Isn't that a significant decrease?

Director Karpowitz said it is down some and we are going to have to press those organizations to step up the funding. They are required by rule to spend the money they have, especially while we have projects to be done. They cannot hold it beyond two years, but we are going to encourage them to spend their one-year money also.

Mr. Perkins said there should be around $\frac{3}{4}$ of a million dollars sitting from this year's receipts that has not been committed.

Director Karpowitz said there is going to be some and we are going to work with them to get our projects in place and the money committed. Also, our appropriation for habitat council was raised by \$300,000. That matches the increase we have in hunting licenses.

Mr. Fenimore asked about the bighorn sheep update.

Director Karpowitz said they have removed all the bighorn sheep on Goslin Mountain in the eastern corner of the state. They had to do that because of the close proximity of the Bear Mountain herd. So far we are not seeing a disease problem in the Bear Mountain herd, but you just never know. We are up to 9-10 die offs in five surrounding states. It

was a bad year for bighorn sheep and we are very concerned about this problem in the west.

Mr. Perkins said he is concerned if we are not getting conservation permit dollars committed. Since these come from the public and we tell them it is going into habitat work, and this issue is bothersome unless there is some good specific reason.

Director Karpowitz said we are not final by any means and it is not usual for us to go back and get additional funding. It is premature to get too concerned, until we get through this funding cycle. This concluded the update.

5) Elk Hunter Survey Results (**Information**)

Kent Hersey, Wildlife Program Coordinator said the reason they did the survey was to seek input from the elk hunting public about their preferences and opinions regarding management of elk in Utah. (See Powerpoint Presentation) The Division met with the Elk Committee for input on the specifics for the survey. After they met twice they were happy with the end product. He then went over who was surveyed, survey methods, survey questions, and response rate. 5,791 responded out of the 16,641 invited to participate and 45% of those who participated responded in the first week.

Mr. Hersey said he is not giving the results for every single question in this presentation, but selected those most pertinent to the elk plan. The results are for all individuals combined. He then went over the elk hunting experience section of the survey, which included reasons for hunting, any bull expectations and spike bull hunt expectations. Being with family & friends is top, then meat, nature, harvesting a large bull, getting away, excitement, and finally harvesting any elk was the order of the responses.

Management preferences in overall opinion of the spike bull elk hunt was 25% opposed, 25% neutral and 50% in favor. Management preferences with personal philosophies was covered, how limited entry characteristics affect draw choice, and the current balance between quality and opportunity were presented with graphs shown reflecting the survey results on all questions.

Mr. Hersey then went over the age objectives discussing quality verses opportunity options on limited entry elk. Large bulls, public access, close to rut, high success, and easy to draw were the answers given on the survey in this order. On limited entry management and the current balance between quality and opportunity, 28% of the responses were to increase opportunity, 28% to increase quality and 44% were all right with the current system. The current system is managed with age objective.

He then went over the expected percent success according to how often hunters could draw with various Boone and Crockett scores depending on how often they might draw. Limited entry management options for increasing permits were also explored. In summary, on general season hunts, opportunity is important; however, quality is important on limited entry hunts. Most hunters favor our current structure offering any bull, spike, and limited entry hunting opportunities. Based on desired B&C score, limited entry ages need to be increased and to increase opportunity, hunters would rather see

lower harvest success than lower age objectives. This concluded the presentation of the data.

Mr. Hersey said that the Elk Committee kept a lot of this information in mind as they put together the management plan. He asked the Board to keep the results of the survey in mind as they listen to the proposed elk management plan.

Mr. Albrecht said on question 32 that was not covered, it says that over the past five years the watershed initiative has spent thousands of dollars improving thousands of acres of habitat for wildlife in Utah, do you think this was money well spent for improving wildlife populations? 35% definitely, 25% said a little and between 10-15% said not much, 5% said none at all and another 25% said did not know. The Board and Division need to get examples out to the hunters so they can see how this money is spent.

Mr. Hatch said a solution to that might be doing some signing on habitat work that has been done and who contributed to help make it possible. The hunters could see this when out in the field.

Mr. Albrecht said the one they did by the sand ledges, there is a state lands project sign. On the other hand, the project in Salina Canyon is hard to see, and it might be pointed out.

6) Statewide Elk Management Plan (**Action**)

Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator presented the statewide elk management plan, which was developed with the Elk Advisory Committee, and they did rely heavily on the elk survey that was just presented. The groups were well represented and they held eight meetings from September 2 to February 18. They used the first two meetings to develop a survey of elk hunters. During the next six meetings, the committee used the survey results to guide them in developing goals, objectives, and strategies. We incorporated all but two of the committee's recommendations. The dates covered by the plan are March 2010–March 2015. In summary, they raised limited entry age objectives on some units and increased spike hunting opportunity.

Mr. Aoude then went over the population goal and objective. (See Powerpoint Presentation) Elk populations will be looked at on a unit-by-unit basis to determine if the elk population can be increased in that area. A graph was shown on the overall trend of population estimates 1995-2008. Habitat goal & objectives and recreation goal and objectives were presented.

In Utah the limiting factor for elk is probably summer range more than winter range. It will be hard to improve 250,000 acres of elk habitat, but it will help us do more habitat work. Emphasis will be on calving habitat and upper elevation elk winter range.

Mr. Hatch asked what is upper elevation.

Mr. Aoude said it is the transition range consisting of mixed shrub juniper range, or a little higher.

Mr. Perkins asked what the habitat improvement goal for deer was over the 5-year plan.

Mr. Aoude said 400,000 acres. A lot of the treatments we do overlap into different species.

There will be an effort to provide more statewide spike bull hunting opportunity. In 2010 and 2011, set the spike bull permit cap at 13,750, and if harvest success remains below 20%, increase the spike bull permit cap to 15,000 for the remaining three years of the plan. They will continue to provide any bull elk hunting opportunities on the current any bull units. The any bull permit cap will be set at 14,300 for the life of this plan.

Mr. Aoude then went over limited entry recommendations, which has changed. Limited entry units with early and late rifle hunts will have the following weapon splits: 60% rifle, 25% archery, and 15% muzzleloader. Limited entry units that do not have a late rifle hunt will have the following weapon splits: 50% rifle, 30% archery, and 20% muzzleloader. He then summarized the limited entry hunting. Average age objectives and the corresponding units were discussed.

He then discussed the impacts of increased age objectives on hunting opportunity. It reduces limited entry opportunity, but maintains antler quality, short term permit numbers will be stable or slightly increasing, and when we reach our age objectives we could have 250-300 fewer permits as compared to the current plan. The increase in spike hunting opportunity would go from 12,500 to 15,000.

Committee recommendations that were not incorporated are the change of the 5.5-6.0 age objective to 5.7-6.3 because it will further reduce opportunity and it is not consistent with other objectives. Next the Wasatch weapon split 50% archery, 30% rifle, 20% muzzleloader, because it is not consistent with other units and would have too large of an impact on rifle hunters. They did offer trying this on a smaller unit, Nebo, but the committee was not interested in doing that. This concluded the presentation.

Mr. Johnson said we seem to categorize into weapon types, it would be interesting to see who hunts with all three. If we move toward more primitive weapon permits, there would be more opportunity.

Mr. Aoude said that is true, but the information we have is what people are applying for and there are more rifle hunters.

Chairman Woodard said he found it interesting that a private landowner of a CWMU was the one who wanted an increase on the Fish Lake Unit.

Mr. Aoude said his property is not on that unit.

Mr. Hatch asked what the triggers are in going from 13,750 to 15,000 spike permits.

Mr. Aoude said we would start with the 13,750 the first two years and if we do not exceed 20% success rate, we would move on the third year to 15,000.

Mr. Brady asked about success on the spike hunt.

Mr. Aoude said it varies from 15% to 17% .

Mr. Fenimore commended the good job done on the survey and the committee using that information to develop the plan.

Mr. Johnson said on the average age objectives, 7.5-8, what is the number of elk? We did not use the number of elk in that age category.

Mr. Aoude said actually they used the population not the percentage of the units. Those age category in the middle have the most elk in them.

Mr. Fenimore asked about bull/cow ratio.

Mr. Aoude said the Division does not use that number to manage elk, because we are more comfortable managing with the age objective. To get a good bull/cow ratio it would have to be done during the rut.

Mr. Albrecht said on the committee they talked about different ways to come up with other alternatives than age class such as tooth data and B&C scores, but it goes back to the age objective data that is collected by the Division.

Mr. Johnson asked about the Southwest Desert Unit, the top age objective did not move, why didn't it go up?

Mr. Aoude said there was a lot of discussion on a lot of these units and why or why not. Many members felt the Monroe should and it took the place of that unit. It was a compromise to not have too many units in that highest objective.

Mr. Johnson asked about Nine Mile Range Creek, why so low on age objective?

Mr. Aoude said it is hard access on that unit and it is hard to reach a high age objective where there is not a lot of harvest.

Mr. Brady said on North Slope Three Corners, one of the landowner's requested lower or previous age objective, but we have not even reached objective on it. By increasing it we would automatically reduce permits, right?

Mr. Aoude said yes, that is what we would have to do.

Mr. Johnson said on the La Sals, if Colorado would manage the same way we do, it would be better.

Mr. Aoude said we have some coordination with them, but they have their own public process and have to manage accordingly. It would be nice if they would manage the way we do.

Mr. Johnson said he has never been invited to the tri-state meeting and he would really like to attend it.

Questions from Public

Roy Hampton said on the elk committee they talked about mandatory tooth return. Are they recommending that? It was unanimous that it should be mandatory. If these people are going to shoot the elk, they should have to return the teeth.

Mr. Aoude said the Division is not proposing mandatory tooth return, but we did put some things in the plan to make more incentives to do so.

Mr. Hampton said the reason he is concerned is we only got 50% of the teeth and we are managing our elk on tooth data. If they are going to hunt our quality elk, they should turn the teeth in. If they would, we would know what the age of the elk are that are being harvested. In answer to why we have more people put in for rifle is because they do not want to give up the 85% success.

Mr. Johnson said muzzleloader is the best hunt on the San Juan.

Mr. Hatch said we did talk about mandatory tooth return in our work meeting yesterday. The thing that came out of that is the data doesn't necessarily change once you reach a certain sample size.

Mr. Hampton said he was not at the meeting because they were spending the conservation dollars at the other meeting. He agrees that there is a decline in quality if we keep killing five year old bulls and the hunter who kills them might not turn in the teeth.

John Keeler, Farm Bureau said in the plan it calls for the formation of local committees on units where increases can be made. Is it known who will take the lead on this? Mr. Aoude said the Division will take the lead and they hope to have the committees formed within six months of the approval of the management plan.

Public Comment

Roy Hampton, representing self, sat on the elk committee. He is in favor of the plan. He would like to see the split on the Wasatch at 50%. It might enhance the quality and maybe we could go back to the rifle in a few years. Archery is the way to manage for lower success. He thanked the Division for the opportunity to be on the committee and is in favor of plan.

Byron Bateman of SFW thanked the Division for the time and effort in working with the elk committee. They provided a wealth of information to the people. They support the elk plan as presented today 100%. Now we can look to the future and perhaps tweak the plan after a few years. It is great that the state involves the people of the state in this process. At their Habitat Project meeting yesterday they committed dollars to projects in

the state. Looking at the forage produced in last 5 years and forage in future, there are areas where we can increase our elk numbers. We do not want to impact livestock or mule deer, but there are areas for elk. They are down 25-30% on elk tags, due to quality of elk that has dropped off, and part of it is economy. It is difficult to see where it will go over the next few years. They committed half million dollars in projects, and have several hundred thousand dollars in projects presently. They will get the money put back on the ground.

Merlin King, representing himself, said in the presentation they talk very little about the biology and the habitat. Everything is increase age and increase opportunity. When you increase the age objective, you must increase the habitat. This also filters down to not only the mule deer, but also the livestock. On the committees that are an important part of the process, they need to have local people represented.

Ben Lowder, representing UBA, supports the elk plan with one alteration with the different weapon percentages on the Wasatch Mountains Unit with 50% archery, 30% rifle and 20% muzzleloader. The idea behind this is to experiment on a unit in an effort to increase opportunity and quality. Archery has a lower success rate and archers are generally less concerned with size of bull. This proposal is supported by the survey also. The reason they proposed this on the Wasatch Unit is it is a very visible unit and the results would be seen by a large number of people. In the Central RAC meeting, a comment was made that the survey was primitive weapons based. He feels it was very broad across all weapon types, even in the categories of response.

RAC Recommendations

Northeastern – Mr. Christensen said there was concern on spike hunting on limited entry units, mandatory tooth submission, overcrowding, public concern about public incentive program on public lands, questions on the funding process of habitat projects and the Three Corners unit staying at 5-6 age objective. The motion was to accept as presented and it passed 9 to 1. The opposing vote was because of spike hunting.

Northern – Mr. Bynes said they had a lot of public comment centering around primitive weapons. Most of the RAC comment was centered around the public grazers incentive. There was approval with the addition of excluding Forest Service Lands in the population objective 1, strategy F section of the plan. The proposal passed 8 to 4.

Southeastern – Mr. Albrecht said there was lots of concern about statewide spike hunting. This is no way to manage if there was a lot of harvest on a unit. There was a lot of discussion on mandatory tooth return and a lot of the public felt that even though there was a good return, the bias is if you harvest a smaller animal, they might not send the tooth in. The elk committee did vote for mandatory tooth return. There were comments in the RAC if there is a better tool than tooth return. The Division did point out that age class is the best tool they have. Since this is the case they would like to get a better return on the teeth. If tooth return does not go to mandatory and goes to incentive and it does not work, please put mandatory in the plan so they can return to that.

Central – Mr. Oswald thanked Mr. Perkins and Chairman Woodard for being at their meeting. He said they had seven RAC members present, good citizen and stakeholder participation. There was lots of discussion on age objectives and percentages on the Wasatch. After all they voted to accept the plan as presented unanimously.

Southern – Mr. Flinders said they had a lot of public comment. The topics were the same as what has been discussed today. MOTION: To accept as presented passed 6 to 3. The amendment was to stay with old age objectives and it failed 7 to 3.

Board Discussion

Chairman Woodard asked about excluding Forest Service Lands.

Mr. Flinders said he has a letter he could provide from the Southern Region's perspective by the Forest Service supervisor in Fish Lake National Forest in support of the public process, support of the plan and looking forward to local working groups.

Mr. Fenimore said on p. 9 of the Southern RAC minutes Rex Stanworth said RMEF and SFW wanted to see a better return for their money. So some of the discussions that will take place with those committees will be to say we've got money available and it can be made for that particular unit, but wanted to know what they were going to get back in terms of elk numbers. (See Southern RAC meeting minutes) He asked Mr. Flinders to elaborate on that.

Mr. Flinders said that was brought up in the meeting, but they had a more thorough discussion in the Elk Committee. They want to focus the habitat projects to areas where it will make a difference. Are we addressing limiting factors on a project? What is going on with carrying capacities and multiple use?

Mr. Aoude said what the conservation group concerns are they have spent a lot on some of these projects and are not seeing more animals.

Mr. Flinders said other side benefits you would see better distribution of animals across the property, less depredation, maybe bigger antlers and things like that.

Mr. Kevin Albrecht said they had a Forest Service Representative on the elk committee and he spoke well to the plan. When it went to the local working group the Forest Service and the agencies have a say, and their opinion will be heard there.

Mr. Albrecht said referring to the Southern minutes, the comment by Mr. Stansworth was more comment coming from the elk committee, not necessarily from SFW or RMEF. There were some heated discussions. The Forest Service and BLM representatives took notes and forwarded emails to their people. They worked very well with us. What he got out of the elk meetings is we will be able to address the concerns on a local level.

Mr. Hatch said he agrees with Mr. Albrecht and the comments might have been taken out of context, but it did set the tone as to what are we going to get out of it. We have a huge investment here, but on the other side, livestock people have made investments in AUMs

and are they guaranteed a return on their investment? Sportsmen are not the only stakeholders invested in this process.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed 5 to 1 with Ernie Perkins opposed.

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

Mr. Hatch said the key to the plan is the 80,000 population objective. Also the local committees working on each individual unit will weigh in heavily toward success. Most of the population increase will come south of I-70 and it is important that all stakeholders are represented. Mr. Aoude said rule does say who has to sit on it and in the plan there are some suggestions as to who it would be.

Mr. Hatch said as we move forward we need to balance all of those interests and make sure the committees are well represented.

Mr. Johnson said we are trying to increase the size of the pie and it is important to keep moving forward on habitat. We also need to make sure the local people are involved.

Mr. Perkins spoke against the motion. There are a couple of topics that need discussion, specifically spike and age objectives and opportunity.

Mr. Bynes asked for justification on excluding the Forest Service Land.

Chairman Woodard said it is turned back to the local level. We have heard from them and it will go back to the local committees.

7) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers of 2010 (**Action**)

Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator presented this agenda item. (See Powerpoint Presentation) He went over a table on the 2009 general season deer harvest success for archery, muzzleloader and rifle. Graphs on general season harvest trends 1997-2009, post season buck:doe ratios on general season public land units 2007-09 by region, buck:doe ratio trends 1998-2009 statewide, and fawn production trends 1998-2009 were shown and discussed. The fawn to doe ration is at about 60 and it must be above 60 to see increase in population.

The 2010 general season deer permit recommendations are for no increases in permits and stay at 94,000. They revised the premium limited entry age objective that was passed in November to 40%-55% of harvested bucks 5+ for both units. Under this revised objective the Henry Mountains, would return to 2008 permit numbers of 44 (approved by the statewide committee) and the Paunsaugunt would have the same permit numbers as 2009. Numbers were given on premium limited entry deer permits and management buck deer permits.

Mr. Aoude went over the limited entry deer units post-season buck to doe ratio for 07-09 and the 2010 limited entry deer permit recommendations, with a slight increase.

He then went over the limited entry elk permit recommendations with additional spike permits and the new limited entry elk age objectives. He went over the average age of harvested bull elk in the various units. There are still many units above objective. Pronghorn and OIAL permit recommendations were also presented.

The Henry Mountains bison unit management plan has an objective of 305 adults post season 2010. The unit objective before this plan was approved was 275 adults post season. The DWR has been following the plan diligently. The recommendation is 39 total permits for 2010 to start increasing the population to 305 adults post season. In the past three years the DWR and partners have treated 8,046 acres of habitat and developed multiple water sources at cost of \$1,106,495. Range trend shows an increase in forage. The DWR has issued 487 bison permits in the past three years to get to objective and transplanted 71 bison from the Henry's to the Book Cliffs. This concluded the presentation.

Mr. Hatch said the range trend is upward or static on that last slide. In southern region we were told the range had declined.

Mr. Aoude said this is overall.

Mr. Hatch asked if the BLM recognizes this data.

Mr. Aoude said this is range trend data that is a cooperative between the BLM, Forest Service and the Division.

Mr. Albrecht asked about fawn survival at 60. Does the division have any data on does and bucks, and fawning rates?

Mr. Aoude said no.

Mr. Albrecht said the Southern region and some of the other regions had buck:doe at 18-19. The Monroe is 9-10. Where is the big increase? Are there other units that are really high in Southern?

Mr. Aoude said there are units in southern that are in the 20's. This is a weighted average based on sample size. The numbers presented are regional averages.

Mr. Albrecht said further north we have five units that are below objective.

Mr. Aoude said those are five units out of nearly 30 units, so when you average them out that is where it falls out.

Mr. Albrecht asked if there was winter mortality on deer or antelope this year.

Mr. Aoude said not anything substantive.

Ms. Bonzo said they have checked into the rumors of antelope mortality and they found four dead antelope. They never found anything to support the rumors of hundreds of antelope lost. They are continuing to survey the area. John's Valley and Panguitch Valley winter mortality may be a little heavier than normal, but nothing really substantial. We started the deer radio collar study and have an even better measure.

Mr. Flinders said we are hearing more and more about the bison management plan and had about an hour of public comment on bison permits and such. He appreciates the Southeast personnel coming to their meeting to answer questions and keep the discussion moving along. On the bison management group, has the Division met with them since 2007?

Mr. Aoude said they meet annually at least and they met before this meeting.

Questions

Ben Lowder asked to look at the first slide. There is nothing over 17.5 percent on deer harvest success for archery, how does the average get to 20.6?

Mr. Aoude said since archery can hunt more than one region it compounds it.

Public Comment

Jon Keeler, Utah Farm Bureau said they are vitally interested in the process. It was asked how often the local bison committee meets and two years ago they did not meet, and last year they left some people off. They have supported RACs, local committees, the Wildlife Board and the legislature. They are concerned with the bison process. Things are happening that should not be happening. In the committee meeting that was held this year, there was a recommendation that was made and refused by the DWR and there was no opportunity to talk about it. They were notified by email. There is a level of discouragement in parts of the process with some members of the Division. There was a local recommendation of 300 post hunt animals and held at five years. The Division said you cannot change the plan, but the plan is an outcome of the process. At the end of the local bison committee meeting it was very contentious and looked like it would collapse. The Division said if they did not stick with the plan, they would stop spending so much money out there. Those comments should not happen. The plan can change and this is how it happens. They are concerned about the committee structure, because in the new elk plan the local units will form a committee and make recommendations. They do not want to do this if they are not going to be listened to relative to the local resource. The resource is critical and we need to protect it. We need the recommendations of the bison committee listened to.

Paul Pace representing Wayne County, read in a letter from the county commissioners. (See Attachment #1)

Mr. Hatch asked if there is somewhere in the bison plan that defines countable bison.

Mr. Aoude said on p. 11, under objective, it says post season adults and yearlings.

Director Karpowitz said it has always been post season adults and yearlings. To be consistent, it carried over this way. It could have been different, but this was maintained because of what has been there for the past 35 years on the Henry's.

Mr. Hatch asked if everyone understands that.

Mr. Pace said they understand that now, but wondered for years why the numbers were different.

Mr. Johnson said the key to this is consistency and if that has been managed that way for 35 years, that's the way the numbers were set up. If we want to manage the way the livestock industry does, we would raise the objective by 79 to match their numbers.

Mr. Pace said we have never managed to the objective.

Mr. Johnson said we have addressed that issue to get the numbers down since 2008.

Mr. Albrecht said we met two years ago on the plan, wasn't the county in favor of it at that time?

Mr. Pace said definitely. The problem is the winter range. They are in favor of an increase of the herd when winter range is available.

Dave Brinkerhoff, Elk Committee and Henry Mountain grazers member, said the 275 objective accepted in the 2007 plan was never reached. Many objectives were never reached and winter range is the critical part. Only three trend studies were done on winter range, the rest were on summer range. Currently there are bison, livestock, elk and deer competing for them. The feed is not there to support them. We have to find a better way to eradicate the elk that the DWR does not want there. Currently the AUMs that have been used for actual use, not including the 3,000 suspended AUMs is 1093 and available currently 120 which is a voluntary use.

Yesterday 85 buffalo were counted on that range. We need to watch the critical winter range, without it we cannot support the increase in numbers. The safe guards built into the management plan have not been followed. All that has been followed is the increase in permits.

Byron Bateman, SFW said they are part of the bison committee. SFW is a permittee. They could run cattle on the Henry's but they choose not to because of drought conditions. 1.1 million dollars in habitat projects were done to increase distribution of livestock and bison on the mountain. There was \$100,000 committed to a project on Indian Springs and a continuation of the pipeline on Tarantula Mesa where they put the well in. They talked about transplanting 30 bison up onto Tarantula Mesa. Between the Division and SFW they have enough AUMs to run over 600 bison. He asked that they please stick with the management plan. Collars for counting will be purchased with \$160,000 from SFW to increase sight ability. The Division has worked hard to get the

numbers under control. They have been very open to bringing the committee together each year. Permittees do get a seat in the helicopter to help do the counts. We need to follow the Division's recommendation to stay with the plan. SFW also supports the plan overall.

Merlin King, President of the Henry Mountain's Grazers Association said he is a member of the Bison Committee. They were disappointed with the outcome of it. In 2007 they were here and adopted the bison plan. They were back in August, after the count, to recommend doubling the permit numbers to get us to the 275 objective. The slide said they issued 487 bison permits in 2007. Every time we count there are more bison there than anticipated. There is a problem there and they should count the total buffalo. The committee recommended a set number for five years and it is obvious that it takes more than two years to get it going. There is plenty of feed on the mountain, but the winter range is the problem. The livestock AUMs are for livestock and it is against the law to convert them for buffalo. We would recommend that the permit numbers be doubled. What will help this is if the sight ability study is done right, it will eliminate a lot of the problems. We look forward to this and appreciate the funding available to do this.

RAC Recommendations

Southern – Mr. Flinders said the comments heard here today reflect the controversy that went on in their meeting. A member on their RAC is a member of the bison committee and had a lot to say about the process. MOTION: To pass everything except bison and it passed 9 to 1 MOTION: On Bison (See Southern RAC minutes) - passed 8 to 2

Central – Mr. Oswald said their minutes reflect their discussion with regards to the bison. Mr. Thornock was at their meeting representing the grazers. MOTION: To accept permit numbers as presented and it passed 5 to 1.

Southeastern – Mr. Albrecht said they had a lot of discussion on bison numbers. There were comments that the current system of classification is confusing. The BLM supports the proposal and the Henry Mountain Grazing Association was also there. There were public comments and questions on deer survival in southeastern and concerns about the Manti at 50% of deer population with this hard winter. They asked if the DWR is ready to reduce tags if they find a huge winter mortality. MOTION: To approve as presented and it passed with one opposing vote. MOTION: The Board start considering a revision of the bison management plan, starting now rather than wait 2 years and it failed 4 in favor 6 opposed.

Northern – Mr. Bynes said most of their discussion was around bison permit numbers and it passed unanimously.

Northeastern – Mr. Christensen said there was concern about bison on the Henry's and a little bit of confusion on the plan, still it was cleared up at the RAC. There was discussion on deer permit numbers in their region and whether they should be decreased or not. Also, discussion on the number of spike hunts. MOTION: To go with permit

numbers with two exceptions with the Anthro Unit and general season spike hunt passed 8 to 1 with 1 abstention.

Board Discussion

Director Karpowitz said this bison issue has to do with process. When the Board passes a management plan, they do not have the option to not follow it. Committees have that same responsibility. When a plan is adopted, they should adhere to it until it is amended or modified. A plan should not be changed until it goes through the public process of RAC and board meetings. It is dangerous to give committees too much authority that belongs to the RAC and Board. If the Board wants us to change the plan, we can do it, but today is not the time because it is not an agenda item. Today we are setting permit numbers and the difference between the Division's recommendation and the committee's recommendation is five permits for 2010. If the Board wants the Division to look at revising the management plan, we can do it, but it needs to be done in a separate RAC/Board meeting. The committee is proposing a five-year recommendation and that is beyond what we are supposed to do today. That is beyond what we can do today. It would be better to deal with just the permit numbers today.

Mr. Hatch said he agrees on setting numbers today. When the letter was read from the Wayne County Commissioners, he indicated that if we only issue 39 permits, with the new calf crop and the yearlings coming up, we are going to be way above objective.

Director Karpowitz said that is all taken into count in the population model we use to predict harvest. That does work better some years than others. If the count is high again this summer, the Division is always the first one to ask the Board for new permits. It is always easier to add permits than take them away from hunters.

Justin Shannon said this summer with the calves we will have 352 adults. If you minus 30, we are at 322 with 5% natural mortality that occurs with bison and next years calves. Once we are stable, we can just take off the production the next year.

Director Karpowitz said three conservation permits and seven permits that will carry over this year are in addition to the 39.

Mr. Brady said he did hear that the BLM has approved the plan with 86% of the land owned. He is in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Perkins said they went with increased harvest last year, especially with the admonition from the committee to stick with the plan. Now this year, we are being asked to ignore the plan. He has trouble accepting that. On the elk plan he is not in agreement, but will support it for the next five years since it has been passed. He supports following the plan.

Mr. Albrecht asked how many elk we have that are staying on the Henry's. If that is a continual problem, can we do like in Arizona and when they cross the line, dispose of them?

Mr. Shannon said there are 20-30 elk. It is a any bull unit and the way we addressed it last year, if you had a permit down there you could take a cow. It is a population objective of zero and we have tools to remove those elk.

Mr. Albrecht said he does not know if we are getting any migration, but each year there are 10-20 in there. Couldn't the Division take those elk?

Director Karpowitz said they have had more complaints about people going down there to hunt and not being able to find them. He would hate for the Division to get into killing elk on public land and would rather allow sportsmen to do it.

Chairman Woodard asked about the blue light special.

Mr. Aoude said the blue light special is if you have bison, any bull or Henry Mountain deer permit, you can purchase a cow permit over the counter for \$20.

Mr. Johnson said another possibility would be to include an elk tag with any other tags that are given on the unit.

Mr. Hatch said the bison committee met, came up with an agreement and then something different was taken back through the RACs.

Mr. Shannon said the recommendation that came from the committee went against the management plan so the Division couldn't support it. He told the committee this. They did not meet back as a committee. Bill Bates sent out an e-mail explaining the reasoning of the Division's proposal, because they could not go with a recommendation against the management plan.

Mr. Aoude said there really was not time to have another meeting and come up with more recommendations. There is a timeline we have to follow in order to get public input.

The following motion was made by Del Brady, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed 5 to 1 with Tom Hatch opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the permit recommendations on the bison as presented by the Division.

Mr. Hatch said he would look at a compromise to raise the permits to 42.

Chairman Woodard asked if the Board would look at excluding the Anthro Unit from the general season spike hunt.

Mr. Brady said he does not think there are a lot of elk on the east side of the unit. On the west side they think there is an influx of elk off the Strawberry Valley area. We think there are more, but during the hunting season they are not there. We had two convention permits bought and they did not see an elk they wanted to shoot. I do not think there are a lot of elk. On the other hand he is more and more convinced that this spike tool is

working for us. He does not see a reason to exclude the Anthro from spike hunting in northeast region.

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the remainder of the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers for 2010.

Mr. Albrecht said he noticed in the Southern and Southeastern RAC minutes there are still a lot of people concerned about the deer permit numbers. They are looking at some type of adjustment or some type of fee change for the future.

Mr. Brady said he agrees and a lot of hunters in northeast are looking to reduce number and increase the price of the tags. They would rather have more quality. That needs to be addressed in the future.

Mr. Albrecht said we need to hear the concerns of those willing to come to the meetings.

Lunch break

8) 2011-2013 Direction (**Action**)

Alan Clark, Assistant Director presented this agenda item. The Board has asked the Division to consider three significant changes on how we hunt big game. We have spent a fair amount of time talking about these since last September. One of the items is the hunt structure change, next implementation of unit-by-unit deer management and lastly implementation of a three-year guidebook.

The Division would like to spread these issues over a three-year period. (See Attachment #2) One reason is the domino effect that making any one of these changes has on many other issues, timing issues and too much change to the public all at once.

For 2011, they would do the hunt structure change, RAC/Board timeline change November/December meeting would no longer be the bucks and bulls. They would be in February/March. At this same time we would do antlerless. The new hunt structure would be taken to the RACs in September 2010. It would be done and implemented a year from this fall.

Unit-by-unit deer would be taken to the RACs in May 2011 and implemented in May 2012. This would give the Board time to adopt this well ahead of time and give the Division time to work out the details.

In February 2013 the three-year guidebook would come before the Board, then it would be printed April 2013.

Mr. Hatch asked why wait for 2013 for the three-year guidebook.

Mr. Clark said they would like to run one season with everything in place, get the results back and then go to the three-year guidebook.

Mr. Hatch asked if they could put unit-by-unit in place by 2011.

Mr. Clark said it would not be impossible, but it would place a huge burden on employees.

Director Karpowitz said he is concerned about the big change for the public with totally restructuring seasons and doing unit-by-unit the same year. If that is what the Board wants, they can get it done, but it would be a whole lot of work in a short amount of time. Unit-by-unit is not just rules, but Dedicated Hunters and Lifetime license holders and how it would effect them.

Mr. Clark said the other thing they talked about doing is figuring out a way to make it revenue neutral. This might call for a new fee schedule that would be done through the legislature.

Director Karpowitz said when the Board makes a final on the hunt structure in September 2010, that meeting could also be the informational for unit-by-unit and it would not go into effect until 2012.

Mr. Perkins said if we tried to do hunt structure and unit-by-unit together, they would have to be proposed at the same meeting. That is a concern. Hunt structure has been quite well received thus far, but unit-by-unit has been taken out twice in recent years and failed toward the end of the process. By putting in too much we may lose both of them. We can do an education process on unit-by-unit after the hunt structure change is made.

Mr. Albrecht asked if we maxed out on Dedicated Hunter this year.

Mr. Clark said no, we are at 8,348.

Mr. Brady said so unit-by-unit could come as an information item in September.

Mr. Clark said it could also come as an informational in February.

Mr. Brady said if this comes to the Board in May 2011, does it give it time to have it go through the legislature?

Mr. Clark said it would. We are always going to be a year behind in that aspect.

Director Karpowitz said from the time the legislature takes action in February and March, we do not realize any fee increase for nearly two years.

Mr. Sheehan said if we felt like we wanted to create a tiered fee schedule in this direction and brought it out this August, it could go to the legislature and go into effect July of next year. If that is where we are going, we would need to have some internal discussion to put that schedule in place.

Mr. Albrecht said this September we will do the Dedicated Hunter five-year review. Is that something we could do an additional year or two before we pass a five-year?

Mr. Clark said that we will basically keep the current rule in place. You can amend it pretty much anytime. Five-year reviews are required by law.

Mr. Perkins asked if we pass the hunt structure in September, then implement in 2011 and for some reason unit-by-unit derails within the next 8-10 months, is there any reason we could not go to the three-year guidebook in 2012?

Mr. Clark said no, it could move up. We would still have one year to run before the three year guidebook.

Mr. Bynes said based upon the decision today, could the RACs receive a handout on this information today, based on the Board's decision?

Chairman Woodard said yes.

Mr. Hatch said if he heard right, the unit by unit could be brought to the RACs by May 2011, so by then wouldn't we have to have a proposal?

Mr. Clark said we would have an informational prior to that and then it would be a solid proposal out by May 2011.

Mr. Albrecht said it is still a good idea for Mr. Sheehan to work on a new fee schedule this year.

Director Karpowitz said they could have that ready for the informational for unit-by-unit in September 2010 or February 2011.

Mr. Christensen said for the hunt structure presentation in September, will those who are out hunting be unable to get to this meeting?

Chairman Woodard said he thinks it will be important for those who have a vested interest.

Mr. Kevin Albrecht asked when the new fee schedule would be worked up if it has to go to the legislature.

Mr. Clark said July/August. We would tie this to the number of permits being issued. If the legislature will adopt a fee structure of tiers, that could work.

Director Karpowitz said we already essentially have a three tiered fee schedule with limited entry and general season. He is nervous about another fee increase since we had one just two years ago. If we could make this work within our existing fee structure that would be my preference.

Mr. Kevin Albrecht said so it went to the RACs in July, when would it get through the legislature?

Mr. Clark said fiscal year 2012.

Mr. Sheehan said they could show how it would be revenue neutral, but it might take some persuasion to get them to trust the Division with these fees.

Mr. Hatch said a lot depends on what the economy does in the next few years. We have already started down the slippery slope of hunting being only for the elite and we must keep this in mind on fees.

Mr. Brady asked if we could put something on the internet and get input from the hunters by August.

Mr. Sheehan said he thinks the fees are the easiest part of it. The hardest part is when you say it is \$75 and there are not very many hunters. It would be more the opinion on surveys with quality versus quantity.

Mr. Clark said if we assume the Board is going to work with the 94,000 cap, we do not have to look at a fee increase.

Director Karpowitz said if we see a drastic cut in permit numbers, we can then go for the revenue. Why are we getting into fees when we do not know if the public wants to go unit-by-unit?

Mr. Fenimore said he sees Director Karpowitz's concerns. If we throw out "what if" scenarios, we could create a real perception problem.

Mr. Johnson said we are talking about going to unit-by-unit management and assume we will have to cut back permits. The deer numbers have not changed, so why haven't we cut permits already? Why are we having this discussion?

Mr. Flinders said we have been batting this around for years, but why the departure in this discussion?

Mr. Perkins said it is very premature to discuss reducing permits and increasing fees before we know what the public wants. The Division could do that quickly by doing a computer based survey. He proposes shelving this part of the discussion at this point.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Del Brady and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we table the discussion on permits and fees and have the Division get a survey together to gather information accordingly, adding this to the action log.

Director Karpowitz asked how much information on willingness to go to unit-by-unit was done in the deer survey and was there any information on fees?

Mr. Aoude said the survey dealt with that extensively and that is why we did not go to unit-by-unit two years ago. There was a lot of public comment on unit-by-unit, but nothing on fees. That was the survey and the committee results. We are willing to look at it again if the Board thinks things have changed.

Mr. Kevin Albrecht said in working on the mule deer committee, the survey was already done. On the elk committee, the Division did a good job in involving them. The survey questions were done well with input from the elk committee. If a survey is formulated, it would help the Division to go to the mule deer committee and get a good representation.

Mr. Hatch asked what the cost is in doing a survey.

Director Karpowitz said there is not a lot of cost, mostly the time to set it up and get the questions right. We can get something together. It would be a value to do a survey that is a subset on limited entry and the willingness to pay for it.

Mr. Perkins said he does not think this survey is that complicated and does not warrant getting the deer committee together.

Mr. Fenimore said since permits and fees is not an action item today, he does not think it is necessary to make a motion.

Director Karpowitz said it is more appropriate as an action item.

Chairman Woodard said we need to address the timeline presented by the Division.

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the timeline as presented by the Division.

9) Donation of 2009 CWMU Vouchers (Action)

Robert Nielsen, Wheeling Sportsmen presented this agenda item. (See Attachment #3) He said he is here to request approval of the donation of a 2009 unused CWMU deer voucher, which will be used to provide a hunting opportunity to a physically handicapped Utah resident.

Mr. Perkins asked how many vouchers.

Mr. Nielsen said just one. They were not sure the CWMU operator could donate more than one. He was under the impression that he could donate one from each CWMU unit.

Mr. Blackwell said the rule was that a CWMU could donate one voucher. We have one voucher and with being a new situation, we will develop something to assist with protocol in the future.

Chairman Woodard said it would be appropriate to vote on just one now and if there are others, they could bring them in the future.

Mr. Johnson asked if it is possible to do an approval for each one that they could come up with a voucher for, like by tomorrow.

Chairman Woodard asked Mr. Bushman if they could approve four CWMU vouchers.

Mr. Bushman said if the Board could get verification that the CWMU wants to donate the permit, the only contingency is the actual transfer has to be approved by the Board and has to be completed by April 1, which is tomorrow.

Mr. Nielsen did not have all the specifics on this.

Mr. Johnson said with the time situation, perhaps we should just approve the one.

Mr. Nielsen said that would be fine.

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the request for the donation of a 2009 CWMU deer voucher from Weathered Horn Outfitters to Wheeling Sportsmen.

10) Other Business (**Contingent**)

Chairman Woodard asked about results for the 2010 big game application information.

Director Karpowitz said if you look at the graph it shows the trend in applications for big game permits. The trend is still upward, about 12,000 more than last year. This is just limited entry and OIAL.

Director Karpowitz said during our meeting HB141 and SB281 have both been signed by the Governor. It is already being reported in the Tribune.

Mr. Fenimore asked about the website being hacked into. Is there any risk of anyone altering points.

Director Karpowitz said the site they are getting into is the DWR website. There is a very tight firewall in the system with Falon and the drawing is secure. It is mostly just mischief on our website and they are working to stop that.

Mr. Sheehan said there are three main websites, drawing site, licenses site and our main home page. There are not any risks or issues with what came up the other day.

He then went on to discuss the 2010 big game application information. (See Attachment #4) These are the numbers that went through the draw period. There was some concern over what the draw extension would do to our numbers. He went on to discuss the table and the changes from last year. There were not a lot of surprises in the numbers. Overall of 309,000 applications total and in the last week only 229 withdrew and reapplied. 90 of those were people changing their general season deer choice. General season deer applications did increase about 6%, 18,000. We do not have this broken down into regions. We do not know if we will sell out all general season deer permits, yet. He asked if there were any questions.

As far as feedback on the draw extension, everything quieted down quickly after the last Board meeting. Overall, it did not have much of an impact on our application numbers.

The meeting was adjourned.