

**Utah Wildlife Board Work Session
December 1-2, 2010, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Revised November 29, 2010**

AGENDA

Wednesday, December 1, 2010, 1:00pm

1. Approval of Agenda
– Rick Woodard, Chairman

ACTION

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.

What is being done to increase the deer population?

- Introduction – Jim Karpowitz
- Habitat/Watershed – Tyler Thompson – 30 min.
- Predator control – Kevin Bunnell – 30 min.
- Disease – Leslie McFarlane – 15 min.
- Poaching – Law Enforcement – 15 min.
- Highway Mortality – Ashley Green – 15 min.

Monitoring and Managing Deer Populations

- Estimating deer populations – Justin Shannon – 30 min.
- Research – Anis Aoude – 30 min.

Review of Thursday Agenda Items – Alan Clark – 30 min.

**Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
December 1-2, 2010, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Revised November 29, 2010**

Thursday, December 2, 2010 – 9:00 am

- | | |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda
– Rick Woodard, Chairman | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
– Rick Woodard | ACTION |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log
– Ernie Perkins, Vice-Chair | CONTINGENT |
| 4. DWR Update
– Jim Karpowitz, DWR Director | INFORMATION |
| 5. Statewide Deer Management Plan Amendment
- Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 6. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2011 Season Dates and Application Timeline
- Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 7. CWMU Permit Numbers for 2011
- Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 8. Landowner Permit Numbers for 2011
- Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 9. Rule R657-5 Taking Big Game amendment
- Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 10. Rule R657-44 Depredation Rule amendment
- Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 11. Depredation Policy amendment
- Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 12. Conservation Permit Audit
- Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Section Chief | ACTION |
| 13. Conservation Permit Allocation – 1 yr permits
- Alan Clark, Assistant Director | ACTION |
| 14. Convention Permit Rule Amendment – Military Exemption
- Alan Clark, Assistant Director | ACTION |
| 15. Other Business
– Rick Woodard | CONTINGENT |

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING
Summary of Motions
Dec 1-2, 2010, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

1) Approval of Agenda (Action)

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

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

2) Approval of Minutes (Action)

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the September 22, 2010 Wildlife Board work meeting.

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the September 23, 2010 Wildlife Board meeting with the noted corrections.

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Ernie Perkins and passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the October 19, 2010 Wildlife Board work meeting as corrected.

3) Statewide Deer Management Plan Amendment (Action)

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed 4-2 with Ernie Perkins and Bill Fenimore opposed.

MOTION: I move that the Wildlife Board pass Option 2 and establish a comprehensive mule deer management system that establishes individual mule deer herd assessment wherein the many diverse, unique and dynamic factors that affect the mule deer growth and sustainability will be identified and pro-active interventions will be implemented to assure long term health and viability of the geographic area where the herd members are born, live, and die, including their year round migration locations. The number of units shall be established, by the Wildlife Board, consistent with well-established and well-known herd units throughout the State.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed 4-3 with Bill Fenimore, Ernie Perkins and Del Brady opposed. Chairman Woodward gave the tie breaking vote.

MOTION: I move that archery hunters choose a unit starting in 2012.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that the DWR consider allowing blind hunters to use a laser sighting device & companion hunter, and bring a recommendation to the Board within a year.

The following motion was made by Del Brady, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we do not accept the three point or better proposal.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed 4-2 with Ernie Perkins and Bill Fenimore opposed.

MOTION: I move that we address the trap check rule in the January Wildlife Board meeting.

- 4) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2011 Season Dates and Application Timeline (Action)

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Del Brady and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that the Nine Mile boundary and existing Range Creek issues be sent back to the region, to work with the affected parties and look toward resolution. This will be put on the action log.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2011 Season Dates and Application Timeline as presented by the Division.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that the Division work with landowners in the area north of Highway 491 to consider the option of a general season open bull hunt.

- 5) CWMU Permit Numbers for 2011 (Action)

The following motion was made by Bill Fenimore, seconded by Del Brady passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the variance request for Woodruff Creek allowing them to increase acreage, but stay in the third year of their management plan.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the CWMU Permit Numbers for 2011 as presented by the Division.

- 6) Landowner Permit Numbers for 2011 (Action)

The following motion was made by Del Brady, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the Diamond Mountain Landowner Association variance request.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of Landowner Permit Numbers for 2011 as presented by the Division.

- 7) Rule R657-5 Taking Big Game Amendment (Action)
- 8) Rule R657-44 Depredation Rule Amendment (Action)
- 9) Depredation Policy Amendment (Action)

The following motion was made by Del Brady, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the amendments to Rule R657-5, R657-44 and the Depredation policy as presented by the Division.

- 12) Conservation Permit Audit (Action)

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Conservation Permit Audit as presented by the Division.

13) Conservation Permit Allocation – 1 yr permits (Action)

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passes unanimously

MOTION: I move that we accept the Conservation Permit Allocation as presented by the Division with the addition of the San Juan Elk Ridge buck deer tag going to Utah Bowman for Habitat.

14) Convention Permit Rule Amendment – Military Exemption (Action)

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the Conservation Permit Rule as Amended.

15) Other Business (Contingent)

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, a second was not given and a vote was not taken.

MOTION: I move that the Division look at using deputy sheriffs and other law enforcement agencies during the first few days of a season to help catch poachers. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Approved

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING
December 2, 2010, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

Board Members Present

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

RAC Chairs Present

Terry Sanslow - Southeastern
Fred Oswald - Central
Doug Messerly – Southern
Bob Christensen – Northeastern
Robert Bynes – Northern

Public Present

Ron Perkins
Tony Abbott
Mike Welch
Brayden Gardner
Kayden Gardner
Lance Roberts
James Thomas
James Rames
Marty Leavitt
Rich Juluson
Todd Black
Jimi Gragg
Miles Moretti
Michael Anderson
Steve Madsen
Jon DeYoung
Ken Strong
Holly Betteridge
Blanche Smith
Branden Davis
Mike Sadowski
Tye Boulter
Brad Horrocks
Dave Chivers

Division of Wildlife Resources

Alan Clark
Anis Aoude
Boyde Blackwell
Greg Sheehan
LuAnn Petrovich
Staci Coons
Cindee Jensen
Martin Bushman
Judi Tutorow
Kevin Christopherson
Kenny Johnson
Ron Hodson
Justin Shannon
Charlie Greenwood
Rhianna Christopher
Ashley Green
Kevin Bunnell
Darin Bird
Heather Bernales
Heather Grossman
Nathan Kota
Jason Vernon
Leslie McFarlane
Mike Canning
Greg Sheehan
Walt Maldonado
Jodie Anderson
Ray Loken
Chance Gremorro
Randy Wood
Amy Canning
Kent Hersey
Brad Crompton
Anita Candelaria
Brandon Bara
Rick Olson
Tony Wood
Cory Maylett
Keeli Marvel
Craig Clyde
Mike Roach

Public (continued)

Michael Christensen
Joe Deluca
Jim Hiatt
Kyle Fullmer
John Black
James Gilson
Paul Kendall
Ryan Foutz
Steve Dalton
Scott Hacking
John Chartier
Richard Williams
Jerry Hill
Mike Roring
Wade Heaton
John Bair
Jeff Hansen
Jeremy Chamberlain
Kenneth Oetker
Cody Christensen
Lee Howard
Byron Bateman

Division Employees (continued)

Parker Jones

Mike Styler – DNR
Robyn R. Pearson – DNR

Public (continued)

Jason Hawkins
Don Peay
Todd Abelhouzer
Sam Hutchinson
Nolan Gardner
Mitch Hacking
Ben Lowder
Charles Sipes
Rick Danvir
Chris Kilmer
Kim Hansen
Deloss Christensen
Kevin Albrecht
David Woodhouse
Lance Postma
Gordy Bell

Chairman Woodard introduced the Wildlife Board members and RAC Chairs. He welcomed the audience and our internet listeners. Mr. Messerly is sitting in for the Southern RAC Chairman. Today's meeting is one of the most important meetings on the deer hunt in the last 20 years. There has been a lot of public input. The Division has invested 120 million plus into highways and habitat to help our deer herds. We have a huge agenda to get through today and we expect the audience to respect everybody's opinion. We will not tolerate any disruption of the meeting today. This is an emotional meeting for many people and there are feelings on both sides of the fence.

1) Approval of Agenda (Action)

Director Karpowitz said when we get down to "other business," the letter the Board is going to send to UDOT has been prepared. We will review it and have the Board sign it.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

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

2) Approval of Minutes (Action)

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the September 22, 2010 Wildlife Board work meeting.

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the September 23, 2010 Wildlife Board meeting with the noted corrections.

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Ernie Perkins and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the October 19, 2010 Wildlife Board work meeting as corrected.

3) Old Business/Action Log (Contingent)

Mr. Perkins said on p. 2 of the action log, the two middle items, unit-by-unit proposal and permit fees survey will be closed today. The Division has concluded that under none of the options being considered would a fee increase be considered this year. That may come back in a future year.

4) DWR Update (Information)

Director Karpowitz thanked those who attended yesterday's meeting. He encouraged people to listen to the meeting on the web and the powerpoint presentations are posted there also. There were great presentations done yesterday. There is a copy of a publication on mule deer on the side table for anyone interested. It was developed by the Mule Deer working group, which is comprised of biologists from the western states.

He said that since we met last month, he has done three emergency closures on hunts, Panguitch Valley antlerless deer hunt, Parker Mountain doe/fawn hunt and the last hunt on the Fish Lake cow elk hunt. All were closed for various reasons. Hunters were notified and refunds given.

The Kamas Hatchery is now out of commission. A sinkhole developed above it and contaminated the water supply. We will lose production for at least a year and that is a real concern to us.

Winter has come on early and hard. We have started collecting our winter condition reports a month early. We have biologists out looking at the condition of the deer and elk, their body condition as well as habitat, along with snow conditions. We are watching this closely. We could be getting into a difficult winter situation.

He introduced six new conservation officers, Devin Christensen assigned to Price, Preston Mickelsen assigned to North Sanpete county, Wyatt Bubuck assigned to Davis county, Orin Neil assigned to Park City, Russell Stoker assigned to Salina and John Owen assigned to Roosevelt. These officers all did very well in post. We feel very

fortunate to have these officers with us. He has sworn in 54 of the 75 officers during his five years as Director. We have a young work force. We are concerned and saddened for the Park Ranger that was shot down by Moab. We have been participating in the search for the suspect. We were actually flying bighorn sheep in the area when that occurred and were able to turn the helicopter over for the search.

We have ongoing issues with quagga mussels that we are working on. We have a new plan signed for San Paulo and are moving forward with the protection of the waters in our state. This concluded the update. Are there any questions?

Mr. Albrecht said he has a suggestion on the closures with the elk and antelope. The Board gets lots of calls when this happens, could the Division please let them know.

Director Karpowitz said they should be on the list of those emailed with the Division employees. It may be going through your Utah.gov email.

Mr. Albrecht said he didn't get anything.

Director Karpowitz said that will be resolved.

Chairman Woodard went over the process and procedure of the meeting, including public comment.

5) Statewide Deer Management Plan Amendment (Action)

Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator said he will be presenting three options on the general season deer hunting. The first two options will help increase buck:doe ratios and will reduce hunting opportunity. The 3rd option is a slightly modified version of the current system, and is similar to option 1. None of these options are geared toward increasing deer populations. We presented a lot of data and information yesterday on how we are approaching population increases and what we are doing in the state. It is no small effort. This presentation will deal with how we actually hunt the bucks. He then went on to present the three options, the pros and cons, considerations and rule changes that would need to be done relative to the permit drawing for all the options. (See Powerpoint Presentation) This concluded the presentation. Status quo is always an option, but not one we usually present.

Director Karpowitz said we will not do permit numbers in this meeting, but by the time we do, we will have another year's classification, so the numbers on the chart may go up or down, depending on this year's classification. It will change before we do actual permit numbers.

Mr. Hatch asked if on Option 2, is 29 a hard and fast number.

Mr. Aoude said no, it is the number that makes the most sense biologically and socially on the three units in the northern region. That would be our recommendation if we go that route. These are herds that are mainly within that range. You may be cutting herds in half if you go to a smaller level.

Mr. Brady said on permit numbers we are saying numbers would change if we go with option 2.

Mr. Aoude said the numbers are rough estimates that could go up or down slightly. They are not going to double or triple.

Mr. Perkins said he went to three RAC meetings and it seems today's presentation is a little different. It has to do with hunting by unit or statewide. He thought he heard him say that the DWR preferred option was to continue statewide, however it was the option of going by unit under option 2. This is concerning archery.

Mr. Aoude said he presented it the same in all meetings. Under archery option 1 and 3, 1 is our preferred option so we would recommend staying statewide. Under option 2, it has always been an option to stay statewide, but when we were given direction to propose unit-by-unit, the Board wanted to also have the option of having archery unit-by-unit. It can be statewide or unit-by-unit.

Mr. Albrecht asked to look at the screen on unit-by-unit pros and cons. He said on unit-by-unit there were law enforcement problems that could occur, because of covering more area. On the same token with yesterday's informational meeting, on unit-by-unit, if you know where the hunters are and who they are, wouldn't it make it easier to start an investigation.

Mr. Aoude said it might be easier to investigate after something occurs, but it makes it harder to make sure people are hunting where they are supposed to during the hunt.

Mr. Albrecht said another thing on the health issues like on the LaSals. Knowing who the people are, there are probably some programs we could work into there so they could have a mandatory check in on their deer, or some other type of thing so we know what the health issues are.

Mr. Aoude said by making it mandatory, we won't get better data than we have currently. You could make it mandatory, but it is better to sample. When we get data, we ask for location of where they took their deer.

Mr. Johnson said getting biological data on the buck:doe ratios, he looks at their situation on the San Juan. Half of the counties in the Elk Ridge, and half the county is more open with the CWMU, is the Elk Ridge limited entry unit included in the buck:doe ratio for the rest of the San Juan.

Mr. Aoude said they are supposed to be split out. The general season unit is classified separately from the limited entry unit. The number on the chart is the San Juan general season unit.

Questions from Public

Chris Kilmer from Payson and hunts the Southeastern unit. If the focus is to make a change now and get 18 bucks per 100 does, why wasn't the limited entry included in the plan?

Mr. Aoude said limited entry units are considered for a higher number, 25-35 bucks per 100 does, because we manage for a higher antler quality aspect, not the opportunity aspect. That's why they weren't included.

Deloss Christensen asked if the Board chooses to go to unit-by-unit, would it be possible for the Division to establish a task force group that would allow them to bring together the best minds in the universities to identify all of the dynamics that affect the condition, growth and decline of mule deer in the state. Could we come up with a task force today?

Director Karpowitz said Mr. Aoude belongs to the best task force in North America, the WAFWA Mule deer working group. The Director is presently the Director sponsor for that group, so he sits in on a lot of their discussion. The MDF is also heavily involved in that group. They developed the North American Mule Deer Plan. He is confident that our plan has all the most important elements in it that the best mule deer experts tell us need to be there. That is what we spent all day yesterday talking about, those aspects of the plan that will increase mule deer populations. We brought in all of the interest groups in the state of Utah when we wrote our plan and they had a great deal of input. We are doing what you have requested now. I am confident we have the best science available right now. We can always do more in certain areas.

Mr. Christensen said after that task force does its work, could they establish a task force in each of these units where they could start out having public meeting like the RAC meetings through online sources. People could be identified who have passion and knowledge of the specific needs and dynamics that are taking place in that unit. They could then meet with the brilliant people you have mentioned, but specific to the unit. Then we could have meetings with government agencies, land people and the business community. We could then begin to get at the very unique and dynamic nature of the individual herds. Would that be a possibility?

Director Karpowitz said every unit in the state has a unit herd management plan. They involve who sits in on that planning and it is spelled out in state law. It involves federal land managers, private landowners, livestock operators, sportsmen, DWR and also local elected officials have been added. Those plans will be revised and we will involve all those interest groups. The plans are on the internet now. We will involve all the stakeholders on a local basis as we revise the plans, to make sure their input goes into the plans.

Mr. Christensen said he is directing his question to the Chairman. He asked if the task force could be formed in conjunction with the larger task force today, if the Board chose to do that.

Chairman Woodard said yes, and the Board could do that working closely with the Division and what is in place.

Mr. Albrecht said in Mr. Christensen's comments, if you went to unit-by-unit, then each plan would be updated.

Director Karpowitz said regardless of what option you choose; those unit management plans will be revised. A lot have a 2006 date on them and are due to be done in 2011. It is in our biologists work plans to do those during this fiscal year.

Mr. Aoude said actually when they come up in 2011. We may modify that to have the most current data on range trend, before we redo them on a five-year rotation.

Chris Kilmer said if we have extra bucks on limited units, if it is so critical we get to 18 bucks per 100 does for every region, if you took the limited entry units and kept the permits the same, you would avoid a lot of the problems, but still obtain your objective.

Mr. Aoude said 18 bucks per 100 does is not a biological number, it is social number. We don't have to be there on all units. We choose that number so hunters can see more bucks. On limited entry units we manage for a higher buck to doe ratio than 18, because we want hunters who draw those units to see even more bucks. Those are geared to those hunters that are willing to wait 10-15 years to draw a permit and harvest a big antlered animal. They are managed differently.

Charles Sypes said with the management plan in place to increase the overall herd size, would that not also increase exponentially the number of bucks that we are seeing out there and achieve all the same goals we are talking about by making changes.

Mr. Aoude said by increasing deer numbers in general you would increase the buck:doe ratio given the same number of permits, but a lot of things we are doing in the plan will not show results for 5, 10 or 15 years. If hunters want to see more bucks in the field now, we would have to reduce permits. If hunters are willing to wait for some of these treatments, the net result may be the same.

Tony Abbott said on the charts it says we want to manage 18-25. If we fall below 18, we lower permits, if above 25 we will raise permits. Statewide, if we want to have 25 bucks per 100 does, we can only have 40,000 hunters, so in reality once the permits are dropped, they will not come back up.

Mr. Aoude that is correct on most units.

Mike Christensen asked if the Division is currently managing overall deer herds on a unit basis.

Mr. Aoude said yes.

Mike Christensen asked if the way we are taking bucks now, is that what is holding the deer herd down.

Mr. Aoude said no, until we fall below a certain level it does not limit population growth.

Kim Hansen, Salem, Utah said he attended all five RAC meetings. At all of those meetings, the overwhelming concern was we do not have enough deer. The options presented today are just band-aids over a severed artery. Are we willing to put more money and effort into predation control, rather than habitat? We have enough habitat for the deer we have.

Mr. Aoude said we are willing, if that is the limiting factor. That might be the case on some units. To say we have enough habitat is not what we see. The data does not show we have enough habitat to have 425,000 deer.

Jeff Hansen, Riverton, Utah asked how we do deer counts for the state of Utah.

Mr. Aoude said we don't do counts, we do deer classifications which give us buck:doe ratios and fawn:doe ratios. We look at the number harvested, survival rate and all the ratios, and come up with the number to have to be out there in order to produce those numbers that are there. Neither does any other state count their mule deer due in a survey methodology, due to the sheer numbers and sight ability.

DeLoss Christensen asked if there is any correlation between the buck harvest to what they believe is the total population of the number of deer in the state.

Mr. Aoude said yes. It is a great correlation and that is why we manage by buck:doe ratios. The number of bucks relates directly to the number of deer out there. If you over harvest the bucks, the buck:doe ratio will go down. You have to have a certain number of bucks out there in order to harvest the number we do and also maintain a 15-18 bucks per 100 doe. We are managing by populations.

Lance Post, Logan, Utah said we have talked about how the DWR spent so much time with the mule deer committee developing a strategy and a plan for increasing our deer herd sizes. Would someone name the organizations that are bringing these proposals to the table? He sat on the mule deer committee for a year in northern region and he would like to know who is being alluded to in many of the meetings.

Chairman Woodard said no specific organization came forward and asked us to redo the plan. The Board decided discussing it last March and they asked the DWR to revisit this and come back. We have had two work sessions on it since. The Board had the concern and we had a very hard winter last year. We had a lot of personal feedback from a lot of sportsmen. That is why the Board has gone this direction.

Mr. Johnson said this is strictly a Board move. No outside group has been pushing anything. We are very concerned about our mule deer populations. We are in big trouble with our mule deer. This is a Board issue.

Chairman Woodard said the Mule Deer Committee is greatly appreciated.

Mr. Post asked if so much effort has been put into it, why consider option 2 with such drastic change, if the Division is not in favor of it.

Chairman Woodard said it came from within the Board.

Mr. Johnson said the mule deer population has dropped dramatically over the last 35 years. The Board knows what we are presently doing is not working. We are extremely concerned about building our deer populations. Mule deer is a very high priority in the state of Utah with our citizens. Yesterday we talked about various ways to rebuild the deer numbers and he read from the yesterday's agenda. He believes at the current level of deer, we have plenty of habitat. When we get back to where we're supposed to be, we'll need more habitat. Mule deer are a high priority in our state.

5 minute break

RAC Recommendations

Northern – Mr. Byrnes said they had two motions. There was a motion to adopt Option 3 and it failed 4 to 8. The second was to adopt Option 1 and it passed unanimously.

Central – Mr. Oswald said they had twelve RAC members present and over 200 public. There were lots of questions during the meeting. There was a motion to adopt option 2 and it died for lack of second. The next motion was to adopt option 1 and it passed 10 to 1, with the descending vote preferring option 3.

Northeastern – Mr. Christensen said it was well attended by the public. They had over 100 emails prior to the RAC meeting and these were considered. They had a split between option 1 and 2 overall. The comments at the RAC tended to follow emails favoring option 1. The public was also split between option 1 and 2. Their motion was to go with option 2 with 3 point or better hunt for 2 years, and do away with all antlerless hunts except in agricultural areas or severe depredation problems. The motion was amended to be for option 2 with 3 pt or better for 2 years. With antlerless part of original motion, it was geared toward population problems. The motion passed 5 to 3.

Southeastern – Mr. Sanslow said they had good attendance and also lots of emails. There were a few motions that dealt with some things SFW suggested. One was for blind hunters to use laser sighting and a companion hunter, which passed unanimously. Another thing brought up by SFW was the 72-hour trap check. The RAC discussed it and decided it should be deferred to the furbearer meeting. There was a motion to allow archery hunters to choose regions rather than statewide and it failed 3 to 7. There was a motion to accept option 2 and it passed 7 to 3.

Southern – Mr. Messerly said they had good attendance (about 190) and lots of email prior to the meeting. It was a lengthy meeting. There was a motion to accept option 2 as presented. It was amended to include the requirement that archery hunters are required to choose their unit if option 2 were adopted. There was a vote on the amendment and it was 7 to 2 in favor. There was a vote on the motion to adopt option 2 and it carried 6 to 3.

Public Comment

Ben Lowder of Utah Bowman's Association said they prefer option 1. It provides for increased quality that we continue to ask for. There are benefits in restricting the number of hunters in under objective units, keep as is, and allows bow hunters to hunt statewide as was supported last year. If they decide option 2, please keep archery statewide. The incentive of statewide is to bring hunters into the archery category. Option 1 continues to allow families to do traditional family hunts. When we went to 5 regions they believed it was a limiting factor for family hunts, 29 units will devastate family hunting. UBA is against unit-by-unit, option 2. The deer committee shot down this plan and the recent deer survey does not support unit-by-unit.

Ron Perkins, from Panguitch and he is representing a group of sportsmen from the Beaver Mountain Unit. They have a great passion for their deer herd in the state. They support option 2 with all 5-day hunts. They do not support a 30-day hunt for archery statewide. They know there are does that are not getting impregnated, because there are not enough bucks on the unit. He went over the advantages of option 2. You can still have the program by distributing permits in each of the units and control where they hunt. You may have to cut some permits. All weapons will be five day hunting. They support a year-to-year deer management plan, because we do not know what will happen. If Northern and Central want option 1, why not let the others be a pilot program for option 2. They ask for no big game draw until June 2011 and they know that Beaver, Mt Dutton, Monroe, Panguitch Lake and other units cannot wait another year to have a plan in place. If can't implement this in 2011, close the hunt down for a year. Common sense beats all education and technology.

John Baer from Springville said he doesn't care if we go option 1 or 2, but would like the buck:doe ratio to go up. He thinks the option 1 verses option 2 thing is a cultural issue amongst the hunters and we'll never agree on it. He would like to see archery season long and fairly liberal, because it is a good way to extend opportunity. Having served on the deer management committee, he commended the Board for looking at it. It was a big discussion. Whatever you do, do it for the deer.

Chris Kilmer said they like to family hunt and it gets to be fewer and fewer people each year. The Board says they are concerned about the deer management, so they're going to up the buck:doe ratio, even though it has not biological reasoning behind it. Quit trying micro manage and change the hunters. Focus on the does, but get good information and then make changes. Be more focused, quit jerking the hunters around. He has had to do more to defend his opportunity to hunt in the last few years than ever in his whole life. His daughter is turning 12 and his boy is coming up on that age. What is it going to be in a couple of years? Don't use the hunters to question the biology.

Jeff Hansen said he would like to talk about the deer counts. We need to make harvest reporting mandatory for all hunters. Right now we do a sample, but we don't get an overall feel for what is happening. It would help in doing better population estimates. Micro managing hunters and deer is the best thing to do. It keeps people in smaller areas and makes it all easier to manage. A lot of guys think that if we go 29 units, we'll turn it into a bunch of Henry Mountains units, then nobody will be able to get tags as the cuts happen. Need more predator control. If you micro manage, do what other states do, if

you draw your first choice, you lose your points, on down the line you retain your points. Therefore you'd be able to hunt a harder unit to draw every 3-4 years.

Charles Sykes said part of the problem with attendance is the timing of the Wildlife Board meetings. He has 13 friends who would like to be here today, but can't because of work. Maybe additional primitive weapon hunts would be good. If we see increases in population as our buck management plan calls for, we will see the higher numbers of buck. It is because they choose to hunt in the less hunted areas. It is as much about selection as it is opportunity. My friends and I are all going to suffer because we choose to hunt in Northern and Northeastern regions where there are more population control problems. In hunting magazines it says don't go to Utah because of their poor management styles and decisions. This will further force that. Collect harvest collection data online.

Chairman Woodard said that is why we have the RAC meetings to get public input. We value the comment made at the RAC meetings.

Kim Hansen representing Utahns for Wildlife said he is talking mostly depredation today, but we must consider everything including habitat. What we have been doing over the past 20-30 years has not been working. He has a proposal that will increase opportunity and not decrease tags. Predators are designed to kill. If we look at the DWR numbers, there are about 2,900 to 4,300 cougars in the state of Utah. If you took 2000 of them, that is 100,000 deer. Coyotes and bear are also a problem. If we killed an extra 200 cougars a year, it would translate into 8 to 10 thousand deer. We could increase tags by 32-40 thousand tags per year just by killing the 200 cougars. He then gave an example of the San Juan Elk Ridge Unit referring to a survey between 1950 and 1970 and cougars relative to the deer herd. When hunting opportunity goes away there become less and less financial opportunities and support from those who have contributed to wildlife in a significant way and that are the hunters. Predators and their supporters never will pay their way. If he has to support an option, it is option 2, but would like to utilize each unit to study what is going on. Dr. Richard Stevens believes that our habitat is good for the deer numbers we have now. We should take some of the habitat money and use it to get rid of predators.

Kenneth Oetker said he is for option 1 if we must choose. He would rather see us follow through with the deer plan we have right now. As far as cutting tags, in the last 35 years we have cut tags from over 1/4 million down to 90,000. How much farther do we have to cut tags? If cutting them hasn't worked, why will it now? He is concerned with some of the recovery efforts and they will turn into a Book Cliffs scenario where some of these units will never go back to general hunting.

Kevin Albrecht of Ferron, Utah representing himself thanked the Director and Division for all their time and effort. He is in support of option 2. This is an opportunity to manage for many social aspects and uses. If we lose interest from people in Utah because of lesser quality, many of them will go outside Utah. His fear is we don't have overall hunter support. He complimented Director Karpowitz to continue to address habitat in following Kevin Conway's vision.

Brayden Gardner said he tried emailing the Board about a week ago, then tried again yesterday and didn't get a response. He hand delivered that same email to them this morning, which summarizes his opinion. He is in favor of option 2. He has a lot of friends and family who couldn't make it to the meeting, so he started a petition where he collected about 400 signatures, all in favor of option 2.

Mr. Perkins said yes, all the Board members got both of Mr. Gardner's emails. They have been inundated with emails and he is sorry they couldn't answer them all. He felt that if he started to answer emails, especially this last week, it would take away from the time he needed to prepare for these meetings.

Jeremy Chamberlain representing the Friends of the Paunsaugunt Committee, said they are in favor of option 2. They have taken interest in the direction the Paunsaugunt was going and the results have been wonderful. They are quite a diverse group. It has gotten them closer to the Fish and Game and the policies and strategies they use. If we can go to the 29 units, implement groups with each unit and have a good representation, attend the RAC meetings, act in a civil manner and make some progress, it will have good results. They have seen this done over the last two years and they are making great strides.

Lance Roberts from Monroe, thanked the Board for their time and effort. Last year he presented some information on unit-by-unit. If we continue down the road we're on presently, it will not help the deer herds. Micro managing with option 2 will help us accomplish what we need to with the units and manage toward specific needs.

Wade Heaton said today he realized that everyone has their own issue. All units are different just like people. He is in favor of option 2, because the Division needs some better tools to manage these units in order to address each specific problem. We can't fix all issues today. The issue is five regions or 29 units. All the details can be fixed later. This is a long-term issue and we should go with option 2.

DeLoss Christensen thanked the Board for their efforts in reviewing deer management. He read from the publication that they picked up today. "No two deer populations are alike, because where they differ from one part of their range to another." That is so true. He was very active in 1980's and the concern about buck:doe ratios. He doesn't care about it any more, but does care about opportunity. In 1983 hunters in Utah harvested 82,000 deer. In 2009 they harvested 22,000 deer. The Division said this morning, there is a correlation between harvest and total population. If that is true, 22,000 harvested equals 300,000 deer. 82,000 harvested equals a lot more deer. We have lost our deer. It is possible we can lose 150,000 more before it stops. Please establish a system to replace the one that got us here today.

Lance Postma representing Utah Hunting and Shooting Sports Retailers Association of Utah, said the consensus from 22 members on their Board thus far is that opportunity is waning as well as the deer herd. We all feel methods for data collection are reliable. They would like to see on the ground herd counts because data is lacking. In a hunter survey of 9,000 hunters getting more deer is the number one concern of sportsmen in Utah. They would like to see status quo on the deer plan, but option 1 if change is necessary.

Byron Bateman, President for SFW thanked the Board and Division for yesterday's presentation. It's too bad everybody wasn't able to see the quality of work that is done for all the different aspects of wildlife. It is good to see this information will be online and the public can access it. The main reason they are here today is health of deer herd and opportunity. Mr. Aoude said the more precise management and biological method is option 2. Option 2 manages everything in the equation. That is what we need to do and look at the resource. How can we help mule deer and retain our youth? Coyotes were identified yesterday as the number one problem for deer in state. Habitat is critical, but without deer it's not working. Look for ways to increase funding and managing coyotes. They also want 3 point or better for 2 years. 17 years old and under can shoot whatever they choose. The other thing they propose is to change the trap check law on coyotes. We need to get serious. Utah has done more wildlife work than anybody in the western United States. We need to be first in predation. Three RACs voted to go with option 2 and the other two RACs are very back and forth on option 1 or option 2.

Mr. Bateman said he will not be here this afternoon during the Conservation Permit part, but he has a check for the Division \$371,513.69 for 57 habitat projects that were completed last year. He complemented the Habitat section for all the work they do. All conservation partners in the state participate in this program to help raise money. The list of the 57 projects is attached to the check.

Tony Abbott said he is with the local radio program, "Inside the Ourdoors." It has always been his main concern to build the mule deer herd and always about the opportunity to get out and do what we love. On the radio he has never had a hotter topic than this. At the Central RAC it was well attended with lots of public input. The second it was closed to public comment, a RAC member made a motion. There was not one second of deliberation on public comment. The perception at the Central RAC was that the decision was already made before they got there. He doesn't perceive that here. It's too bad this meeting is only about killing bucks. It is irrelevant to him of how you want to kill them. What is relevant is how this ties into our families. He then went on to tell about hunting deer with his 11-year-old daughter in Arizona. If you are going to take tags away, give them to youth or archers.

Gordy Bell, representing Bow hunters of Utah thanked the Board for the work they have done. This situation has created a lot of rhetoric and very few facts. A few weeks ago he emailed the Board information on unit-by-unit in Colorado. This did not bring their deer herds back. He asked that the Board stick with the plan that has all the input rather than reinvent the wheel.

Miles Moretti, MDF said we have received more calls on this issue than ever. This is a problem across the west. Mule deer have been declining for many years. Habitat is long term and what have led us to this is people who are dissatisfied with the deer hunts the last few years. Predator control needs to be stepped up. He hates that we have to pick an option. MDF was a member of the statewide deer management working group and they hate to see that set aside after a short time. They support option 1, but they really hate to see that loss of hunters and opportunity. They are very concerned that we might prevent more of our youth from coming into the sport. MDF just received their largest grant ever

from Midway USA, 1.25 million dollars over the next five years for a youth shooting program. His fear is loss of opportunity and families hunting together with option 2. The other problem is short seasons. In this state kids have maybe one day to hunt on a Saturday. They support option 1. MDF recently wrote a check for over \$400,000 to the Division and it is going into habitat work.

Cody Christensen representing himself said he is in support of option 2. Mr. Aoude said we are managing unit-by-unit now, but we lose control of that once the season starts. Unit-by-unit is just step one in fixing things. As far as the family hunting, that is his biggest concern. He has young children that are coming into hunting age, he is afraid if we stay the status quo, opportunity for them will go away. Hunting for him doesn't necessarily mean he has to have the rifle. He can go out with his son and enjoy his hunting.

Kayden Gardner said he is in favor of Option 2 and will give us changes to maybe increase deer herd giving better focus. He then gave a list of ideas to be used unit-by-unit such as antler restriction, increasing buck:doe ratios on the same or different unit, half the tags to youth etc. Predator control also needs to be increased perhaps with specific regulations on a problem unit. The idea of family hunting being shut down is not going to happen. It's about spending time with your family. He supports option 2.

Michael Christensen said no one corners the market on their passion for mule deer, no matter which side of the fence they're on with these issues. Nobody is satisfied with the mule deer situation, but all we've done today is cloud the waters. What we need to decide today, is how we are going to kill bucks. Whether or not the data is valid, that is the data they are going to use, once they decide. He is in favor of option 1, because it follows the management plan and addresses the units that have a specific problem. The San Juan is a great example of what micro managing cannot do for us. 80% of Colorado's herd growth came solely through buck numbers. It didn't grow more does and fawns. They only had enough habitat for that. He supports option 1.

Jim Gilson representing Carbon County SFW said the RAC approved the option to look at laser sights for blind hunters. With the technology available today, blind hunters can become the shooter. Also, he read the data on 3 point or better and they are asking for 2 years of that. Things have changed since they tried that before. We have a different attitude and equipment than they did back then. If you want to get the buck:doe ratio up, that would do it in a hurry and we could still protect youth hunting. There are lots of things in studies that were different than in today's world. He looked at yesterday's meeting and noticed some things on the coyote information. There was a lot of good information there. It was identified as the number one culprit. Waldo Wilcox said when he was a boy they had to hunt all day up on Range Creek for a deer to shoot for camp meat. Then they introduced 1080 and the deer herd exploded and he didn't see a coyote for 20 years. We need to relax on the trap check to take coyote numbers down. We closed a doe antelope hunt and a cow elk hunt, which his 14-year-old neighbor put into because it was during the holidays. We can do some things to effect fawn survival.

Dave Woodhouse, SFW Utah County Chapter said relative to the family hunt, their members have come to him and told him his kids do not want to hunt, because they go

out and do not see any deer. During the bow hunt it's a little better. We are losing our youth because of our lack of bucks. His daughter shot a deer in Colorado and turned her Southern region tag back in. We need to have youth only hunts on limited entry units. The trap check issue needs to be changed to the 7 day. It's hard to take kids out with all their activities to check traps that often. Trappers take more coyotes than anyone else. There are things we can do. He was on the deer management committee and 29 units were not considered in detail. He is in favor of Option 2. We need to save our deer herd for hunting in the future.

Lee Howard said he has never seen so many people at a Board meeting. We are doing a good job on habitat, but if we do not have any deer it's not doing much good. We need to increase deer herds. On predator management we should open season on cougar and put a bounty on coyotes. We need to build doe populations by creating the herd before looking at buck:doe ratios. We should look to transplant deer out of cities, in spite of loss. He complimented Del Brady for his remark that if the Division doesn't fix the deer herd, the Board will. Mr. Howard hopes they will do that, this year.

Tye Boulter representing himself and his family said they support remaining with the status quo managing under the current plan. He thanked Mr. Bateman for the check, it will go a long way to replace lost revenue if option 2 is passed.

Ben Jensen said he supports option 1. In government, there is no budget that is adequate to manage the deer. With option 2, there will not be more funding for more biologists and they will continue to manage as they are. The mule deer will not get special treatment if we go that way. Biologists have so much to do other than just deer. It is all money driven and they will not have the money to do it. He supports option 1 for the reason of hunter opportunity.

Chairman Woodard said the check we received will go into a restricted fund and we cannot use it for the general DWR fund. He thanked everyone for their comments here and at the RACs. They appreciate the sportsmen for getting re-engaged and hope they will stay engaged. That is the end of the comment cards.

Mr. Hatch commended those who have taken the opportunity to speak today with respect and civility. We as a Board really appreciate that.

Board Discussion

Chairman Woodard summarized the motions. He said he would like to take it item by item. He asked if they want to look at the amendments from the RACs or go right to the options.

Mr. Fenimore said he has some general comments to make before they start discussion. He appreciates everyone who attended RAC meetings, sent emails, attended today and gave input. Years ago he remembers when his children were young, he took them out sledding. They went to a huge hill and as they went he realized he may have made a mistake. As momentum picked up, they crashed. As they get ready to make this decision, he is concerned about the momentum of heading down this hill. As a

businessman, he has always been concerned in his career about increasing his share of the market. All three options today decrease the share of market. He reviewed some of the hunter survey. Number one response was hunters are out to get away, next was a social event with friends, enjoy nature with family and memories. None in top five referred to killing a deer. You had to get to #10 to harvest a big buck as a choice.

Mr. Fenimore went on to discuss the projection of demographic projections of populations. He is worried about where all those people are going to live and how many more sideboards we are going to put onto hunting opportunity. Director Karpowitz told him if we go to unit-by-unit hunting, we will be one of the only states that restrict both elk and deer hunting opportunity. Then you start losing family hunting and keep hunting interest. He talked about when he first came to Utah and the deer hunt was a paid holiday. Deer are a larger economic impact than elk in Utah. In some of the smaller communities in Utah, the deer hunt is really big. He is worried about shrinking opportunity. The increase of elk numbers has impacted our deer herd also. Predation is also a problem. There are no limits on coyotes. ATV is also impacting wildlife. These are all obstacles to the deer herds and limit us. We want to create more opportunity.

He also said he is worried about unit-by-unit management and what the unintended consequences might be. It will be difficult to enforce unit boundaries. Also, if we are going to raise the number of bucks per 100 does, we need to reduce hunters. Some sports organizations would rather see quality than quantity. That perspective is not reflected in the hunter survey. Cutting up the pie and whittling it away brings diminished returns. He would like to see more out of the box thinking and he gave several examples. He wants to stay with the status quo and let the deer plan work things out.

Mr. Johnson said he doesn't care what the buck:doe ratio is, he just wants to get the deer herds back. Local people are saying we need to close the San Juan, one of the greatest deer herds in the world. In 1983 on the Elk Ridge, the harvest was 2500, which if the success was 50%, there were 5000 hunters. Last year we gave 40 tags. Since he has been on the Board he has been asking for the statistics from the 1950's and 60's. What is going on here? Colorado has more deer than us. He talked about when the coyotes were wiped out with poison in the past and the deer coming back. He also talked about highway mortality, poaching, and disease. The Division has considered many of the obstacles the deer herds face. To him, buck:doe ratios cloud the waters. We used to have smaller management units and we had lots of deer. He went on deer count rides when he was young, and there were lots of deer. This is a disaster and he does not want to see it continue. We might have to make some sacrifices to get the herds back. On archery he does not have a problem with putting more tags for them. It is a less efficient way to hunt and gives more opportunity. He would like to see a proficiency course required before they hunt archery. There is too much wounding. The deer are not there now and it is very frustrating.

Mr. Brady said we also have people in Northeast region that want to shut the hunt down. There are some in the audience who got up a 5 am to drive here to hear someone say something like that. We have no deer out there, but if you build it, they will come. This is not a dead end street. Today we will take the first initial step. Those who spoke for option 2, look to protect the resource. Those who spoke for option 1 are looking out for

themselves. If we have 18:100 buck to doe ratio, he agrees that it is fawns we need to talk about in the long run. The Division said when we hit 25 buck per 100 doe, we can increase permits, his contention is when we have 18:100 buck to doe and 10,000 deer out there, and we are at one point. If we have 20,000 deer and we still have 18 per 100, we have more bucks we can raise permits without hitting the 25. Is that not right or am I thinking wrong?

Mr. Aoude said if you had more deer, you would have more bucks, therefore the buck:doe ratio would go up, so you could not be at 18 and issue more tags, it would be reflected in the buck:doe ratio.

Mr. Brady said you've got 100,000 deer, 18,000 are bucks; you've got 50,000 deer, 9,000 bucks. You've got a resource that is available for hunters. Why aren't we taking the other 9,000?

Mr. Aoude the buck:doe ratio should reflect exactly what the overall population is. If you have more deer, you'll have more bucks, therefore with the same number of hunters you should have a higher buck:doe ratio.

Mr. Brady said if we do all the habitat work, take care of predators and highway mortality we are going to help the deer. He thanked the Division for the great presentation yesterday. If we do these things, we will be able to turn this around. If we take a hit on population or hunt numbers today, it is not going to happen five years from now. If we continue going like we are, we're never going to dig ourselves out of that hole.

Mr. Hatch said he would like to echo some of what Mr. Johnson has said. It is upsetting when long-term hunters come and ask for a hunt to be closed. We cannot remain with the status quo. Deer are not going to come back on their own. He agrees with the man who talked about predators. Predators are having more and more impact when a herd gets down. After getting information and input, he is convinced it is better to micro manage. We need to be innovative and think outside the box. What we have been doing for the last 40 years is not working.

Mr. Albrecht said in response to some of Mr. Fenimore's comments, the economic impacts were felt years ago in Southern Utah. Our deer hunt has declined dramatically in those areas. Unit-by-unit and individual assessment will help us bring back the deer herds. This is not about buck:doe ratios, but getting our deer herds back.

Mr. Perkins said the civility of this meeting is to be commended. It is a model for what we need in government. He is delighted that this round of meetings has occurred. He doesn't think that any of these three proposals have a lot of bearing to getting our deer herds back. He is delighted that we have drawn so much concern and interest. In getting the topic raised, hopefully we will get the sportsmen in the state really united in providing resources and political support. He wants to get this topic done and get on with trying to fix the deer herds. He echoed Mr. Fenimore's comments on losing hunters and losing opportunity. He is terrified that going limited entry statewide will head us down the road that Nevada has gone down. He respects everybody who spoke here today and every one of the Board members. Good people can disagree on what the solutions and specifics are.

He also takes great pleasure in noting the MDF and SFW can also come to this meeting and disagree on what needs to be done. They will still work together in the future.

Chairman Woodard said they heard a lot today and really appreciate the public getting engaged with the civility shown. They are all concerned with opportunity, especially the youth.

Mr. Perkins said let's address the option first and the secondary motions can be addressed from there.

Mr. Albrecht said it is good we had a large turnout here today, folks from all over the state. There has been a lot of interest in this topic. The Board is concerned with our deer herds statewide. The Northern and Central RACs voted against option 2, but in order to grow our deer herd statewide, they have to be involved also. It is important we do this on a state level.

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed 4-2 with Ernie Perkins and Bill Fenimore opposed.

MOTION: I move that the Wildlife Board pass Option 2 and establish a comprehensive mule deer management system that establishes individual mule deer herd assessment wherein the many diverse, unique and dynamic factors that affect the mule deer growth and sustainability will be identified and pro-active interventions will be implemented to assure long term health and viability of the geographic area where the herd members are born, live, and die, including their year round migration locations. The number of units shall be established, by the Wildlife Board, consistent with well-established and well-known herd units throughout the State.

Mr. Albrecht has the motion written out to give to the recorder.

Director Karpowitz said we will need a little more direction on hunt strategy. He was glad to hear the focus on doing things that will help the deer herd.

Mr. Albrecht said a lot of the direction needed couldn't be done today. We might need to have a work session or follow up. I am supporting Option 2.

Mr. Aoude said he wasn't clear and if it is looking at different unit boundaries, we need more direction.

Mr. Hatch said the motion leaves the option of establishing the number of units.

Mr. Albrecht said that is why he said the number of units shall be established by the Wildlife Board, going on the same basis as what the Division presented today.

Chairman Woodard said so if we go with option 2, we have a year's lag time and it will be implemented in 2012. In this interim period we would work out the details.

Mr. Albrecht said there will be some minor details. 29 units are probably pretty close, but there might be some inconsistencies there. It might end up at 35 or maybe 25.

Director Karpowitz said if this is different than the options presented, it needs to be taken back through the RACs and public. The unit boundaries were established long before he came to work for the Division. They were established, based on the biology of the herd and trying to contain the animals with the unit boundary. There has been little change and they are very good. The integrity of the herd unit boundaries is important. If we are going to talk about different herd units, it is an entirely different story from where we have been for more than 30 years. The process is in place to do much of what is in the motion. Every unit has a plan and it addresses the problems of those individual units. He is nervous that this has almost taken us into a start over process with a different number of units.

Mr. Albrecht said that was not his intent. If there is something that comes along to increase or decrease the number of units, we could do it.

Director Karpowitz said if his motion would say something to the effect that with option 2 with the flexibility to adjust unit boundaries as necessary. We would need to take it back through the RACs and public process for the final time. What we took to them was 3 options, but if it is option 2 with some flexibility we would probably be okay.

Mr. Bushman said we have always tried to hold to the principle that if there are any fundamental changes in a proposal, we try to take them back to the RACs. If it is simply to look at and in the future reevaluate it, it is all right. When you start changing hunting unit boundaries, it must go back to the public.

Director Karpowitz said we are doing a plan amendment and the proposed option 2 was to manage 29 general season units. He appreciates some flexibility as we get into the details. We may have to combine some units. He prefers to hear option 2 with some flexibility, rather than open-ended.

Mr. Albrecht went back over the motion.

Chairman Woodard said we could include in the motion that if there is a drastic change in the number of units, that portion will go back through RACs.

Mr. Hatch said he is comfortable with the way the motion was stated, simply because the number will be determined by the Board. If the Board approves something different it would go through the RACs first, so it is appropriate as stated.

Chairman Woodard asked if Mr. Johnson is still holds with his second.

Mr. Johnson said yes, but he would like 31A and 31B on the Elk Ridge and the rest of the San Juan. They have always been managed that way.

Mr. Brady said he is in agreement. If he were to simplify, he would leave it with 29 units with the flexibility, but he would agree with Mr. Hatch on the wording.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins and was seconded by Bill Fenimore. It failed when it was voted on.

AMENDED MOTION: I move that we adopt Option 1 for Northern and Central regions and Option 2 for Northeast, Southeast and Southern regions.

Mr. Johnson said you cannot amend the motion, only a substitute motion under Roberts Rules. We have to vote the first motion up or down.

Mr. Hatch said you cannot amend a motion, but can do a substitute motion, under Mason's Rules. The first motion has to be voted up or down, then make another motion.

Mr. Perkins read from Roberts Rules of Order, "amending process allows the group to change the proposed motion to more clearly represent the will of the group. Roberts calls this perfecting the motion. Three ways to amend a motion, to add words or phrases, strike out words or phrases or to substitute by striking out and inserting words, or by substituting an entire motion or paragraph."

Mr. Hatch said what you failed to read was the rest of it. It must be germane to the motion on the floor. It would be an opposite motion in his view.

Mr. Perkins said it is germane in that it tries to make the motion, perhaps more agreeable to the entire body. In effect, it amends part of the motion and it doesn't reject option 2.

Mr. Hatch said we should just vote.

Mr. Fenimore made a second on the substitute motion for discussion.

Chairman Woodard said we probably should go ahead and vote on the first motion. We can consult Mr. Bushman.

Mr. Albrecht asked Director Karpowitz if his position is still in favor of doing unit-by-unit statewide, if we are going to do it.

Director Karpowitz said I probably made that statement for simplification. One of the criticisms the Division gets repeatedly is our regulations are too complex. Whether this is more complex or not, he'll let the Board judge that, but I know when I made that comment I was talking about simplification.

Mr. Bushman said this is not a legal matter. Our rule says the Board should follow Roberts Rules of Order, although it is not mandatory. However the Board handles it is appropriate.

Mr. Perkins said he believes Roberts Rules would say if you have a second on the amendment you first discuss and vote on the amendment. If that is not adopted, you then discuss and vote on the original motion.

Mr. Hatch was in agreement.

Mr. Fenimore said he has a question for the Director. If we cut 13,000 tags as option 2 suggests would take place, we find out we have hunter remorse and they do not buy licenses, how much would we have to raise license fees. Do you think the legislature would be supportive?

Director Karpowitz said whatever the number of tags is cut, unless the Division can replace those funds, we will have to cut some services, such as law enforcement, habitat work, predator control etc. The sportsmen would probably support fee raises because they don't want to see any of the programs cut. We would have to figure out how to make up the revenue in 2012 and Mr. Sheehan will tell them how much it would be.

Mr. Sheehan, Administrative Services Chief said there are two categories of consideration when we talk about what it is going to cost us. A large part of the revenue from deer permits translate to federal funds, application fees, and combination licenses. He tried to build a spreadsheet to determine what those impacts are and it really became frustrating. There are so many variables. For today, he is going to assume those things will remain constant. With Option 1 if 7000 permits reduced, \$404,600 reduced revenue. It also assumes that 90% of the permits go to residents and 10% to nonresidents. It varies each year. In order to compensate for that with a fee change, you would have to raise resident from \$35 to \$37.91 and nonresident from \$263 to \$284.83. On Option 2 if 13,000 permits reduced, \$751,400 reduced revenue. The fee change would go from resident \$35 to \$40.81 and nonresident from \$263.00 to \$306.66. On Option 3 if 3000 permits reduced, \$173,400 reduced revenue. The fee change would go from resident \$35 to \$36.19 and nonresident from \$263.00 to \$271.94. We never do pennies and we round them.

Mr. Fenimore said so those would be the fee increases projected. If the legislature didn't permit a fee increase, the Division would have to reduce services.

Director Karpowitz said we would have to cut some way.

Mr. Fenimore said this is one of the fears of reducing opportunity.

Director Karpowitz asked if this included federal aide.

Mr. Sheehan said no. Federal aide is based on hunters buying a license, then qualifying for the draw. Federal aide is about \$22.00 per person who buys a license. The application fee is 10.00. They hinge up or down depending on how many people apply.

Mr. Hatch asked how much the budget has gone up in the department since Mr. Sheehan has been there.

Mr. Sheehan said in 12 years, 38 million to 68 million, counting all the other funds.

Mr. Hatch said the point is, most of the general fund dollars that are discretionary revenue for the Division come from hunters. He is frustrated that the budget has doubled in the last 10 years and our deer herds have declined.

Director Karpowitz said they tried to keep that out of the argument, but we will adjust with whatever is decided.

Mr. Perkins said in speaking to the motion, the stake holders are divided on how to fix the herds. His motion is a compromise that might recognize that division. The one thing everybody agrees on is fixing the herds, worrying about fawns and does. All of the research says none of these proposals will fix the deer herds, only the present system. Building the buck:doe ratio does not do as much as building the deer herds. An example of that is the Cache Unit, which are 10,000 short of its 25,000 objective. It has been 5,000 or more below that in recent years. If you change the buck:doe ratio by three on the Cache, you add 300 bucks. If you fix the deer herd, you will add 1,500. The 2008 Deer Survey says the majority of our hunters want to hunt every year, not necessarily to take a big buck. The survey is basically the only scientifically gathered data we have. In Northern and Central RACs, that represent 70% of Utah's hunters did a good job of representing the public. He spoke to the integrity of the RAC system in accommodating the opinion of the public. In the Northern and Central RACs, they had 22 votes for option 1, with 1 against and it was for option 3. In Southern, Southeast and Northeast, 18 of 28 votes were for option 2. This motion supports the majority of the state's sportsmen and slows the continuing swing towards trophy hunting, reductions in tags and lower opportunity, etc. In summary, this motion preserves more opportunity for hunting, rather than taking the entire state to limited entry.

Mr. Fenimore said the creativity of this motion becomes a pressure release valve. We may avoid some of the unintended consequences and hunters remorse.

Mr. Brady said if we go with the motion as is, the 13,000 cut is going to change, to probably around 11,000.

Voting then occurred

The amended motion (Mr. Perkin's) was voted on and failed 2 to 4 with Jake Albrecht, Tom Hatch, Keele Johnson and Del Brady opposed.

The original motion (Mr. Albrecht's) was voted on and passed 4 to 2 with Ernie Perkins and Bill Fenimore opposed.

Mr. Johnson said he is so proud of the public and their passion for the deer herds. He thanked them for participating.

Chairman Woodard said we need to address several amendments to this that were proposed by the RACs.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed 4-3 with Bill Fenimore, Ernie Perkins and Del Brady opposed. Chairman Woodward gave the tie breaking vote.

MOTION: I move that archery hunters choose a unit starting in 2012.

Mr. Perkins said that 4 of 5 RACs voted for archery statewide, including two that voted for option 2. How can we possibly vote against 4 RACs?

Mr. Brady asked if they go statewide, does that muddy the waters for permits.

Director Karpowitz said they will not be included in the number of permits for each unit. The 16,000 archers will be able to hunt any unit. They will go as they distribute themselves.

Mr. Fenimore asked how many archer permits would be allowed.

Director Karpowitz said 16,000 if we stay with the current numbers. Permit numbers are not decided today.

Mr. Brady said he has opposed a long archery season. The wildlife needs a break. He is more in favor of giving archers a statewide option, but cutting some days off their hunt.

Mr. Aoude said they will discuss season dates on the next agenda item today for 2011.

Director Karpowitz said they are trying to see how option 2 fits into this which does not kick in until 2012.

Mr. Fenimore spoke against the motion and reducing opportunity, confining it to the point where people will lose interest and drop off the board.

The motion was voted on and passed with Chairman Woodard breaking the tie. Jake Albrecht, Tom Hatch and Keele Johnson were in favor and Bill Fenimore, Ernie Perkins and Del Brady were opposed.

Chairman Woodard said we can talk about blind hunters using laser devices and a companion hunter.

Director Karpowitz said this is not an agenda item.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that the DWR consider allowing blind hunters to use a laser sighting device & companion hunter, and bring a recommendation to the Board within a year.

There are a lot of things we don't know about on this issue such as what type of qualifications are necessary and so forth. It would be imprudent to act upon it without more information.

Chairman Woodard said now we'll talk about 3 point or better for 2 years.

Director Karpowitz said he managed two units that had this regulation for years. This issue does get into biology and can have some real impacts down the road. After seeing 3 point or better on the Book Cliffs and the Henry's for all those years, it was pretty clear that year in and year out we were removing the best bucks from the population prior to the rut. Every state that has tried it has abandoned it. It will not accomplish what hunters really want to see, it makes for fewer mature bucks. Also law enforcement problems are increased and waste is associated with it.

Mr. Perkins said every RAC was asked to consider this and 4 out of 5 rejected it.

The following motion was made by Del Brady, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we do not accept the three point or better proposal.

Chairman Woodard said we need to discuss the trap check proposal. It needs to go out to the RACs and public. The meeting for this consideration is in the July RACs.

Director Karpowitz said since it is already in print in the furbearer proclamation, we should do it at the normal time. It needs some careful consideration.

Mr. Hatch said we need to get on this. We will miss a whole season of trapping coyotes if not.

Director Karpowitz said they can change it, but an issue this big should go to the public.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Jake Albrecht and it passed 4 to 2, with Ernie Perkins and Bill Fenimore opposed.

MOTION: I move that we address the trap check rule in the January Wildlife Board meeting

Director Karpowitz said nobody has been a stronger advocate of predator control than him. The Division has put a lot of money and effort into it. Predator control of coyotes is critically important. They had a long discussion at the Agricultural and Wildlife Damage Prevention Board earlier this week about how we can do some accelerated coyote control to benefit mule deer. The consensus of the group is in order to have any effect on wildlife populations, coyotes have to be removed at the right place, the right time and the right coyotes. Just changing the trap check rule may or may not accomplish that. We changed the trap check a few years back from 48 to 96 hours for kill sets and also instituted team trapping so people don't have to out as often. He has trapped bobcats

professionally and personally and he does not like the idea of an animal in a trap for more than 48 hours. He has no problem with kill sets. It will put trappers in an awkward position if there's non-targeted wildlife in those traps. He prefers to see more money put into the Wildlife Services program for targeted removal. It needs to occur during the March, April, May time period, prior to denning and fawning for it to have any effect. If we hope to do something for mule deer, this would be more helpful. The public needs to hear this discussion. He has no problem with accelerating our take of coyotes.

Mr. Brady said voting for the motion is just moving it to go to the RAC and he is not discounting the Director's comments, because he agrees with what he says. The public needs to hear both sides of that issue.

Mr. Perkins would ask for a good media blitz to let the public know this topic is coming, because we have three RACs coming up next week.

Lunch break

6) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2011 Season Dates and Application Timeline (Action)

Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator presented this agenda item. He will also be covering some of the changes in the RAC schedule with things that need to take place into a new way of setting dates and recommendations. He then reviewed the 2011 season dates. (See Powerpoint Presentation) With the adoption of Option 2, there would be five units that would be shortened. For archery it would be August 20-September 24, for muzzleloader September 28-October 2 and rifle October 22-October 26. Those are the proposed dates for general season deer. Limited entry season dates are also on the handout. He then went on to discuss the 2011 general elk season hunt dates and permit caps, and key dates for 2011 big game and antlerless seasons. They cut the spike bull archery season shorter by seven days so those folks that draw limited entry elk tags will be able to hunt the seven days closest to the rut without having competition or disturbance.

Mr. Hatch asked if they also have competition from the archery deer hunters.

Mr. Aoude said yes the archery deer hunters would be on that unit as well. We don't get as many complaints from the deer hunters.

Mr. Aoude went on to give the season dates, including the key dates that occur before they have the drawing. He also discussed the shed antler season dates and the online course requirement.

Mr. Fenimore asked why they have to take the class every year.

Mr. Aoude said they want to make sure people know that when they go out every year. It is a good reminder. He continued presenting key dates for big game and antlerless seasons and RAC/Board meeting date changes. This concluded the presentation.

Mr. Albrecht asked if the Plateau is the full Fish Lake.

Mr. Aoude said it is just the Boulder, Kaiparowitz subunits of the Plateau.

Mr. Brady asked Mr. Aoude to go over the spike archery elk conflict with the limited entry elk.

Mr. Aoude said the spike hunt ends seven days earlier, so those with limited entry tags can hunt throughout the 28 days. The last seven days they have without any spike hunters in the field. We get complaints that spike hunters are out there and they have carved out the last seven days for them to have for themselves.

Charles Sypes said on the approval of Option 2, how is it going to affect the draw? In 2012 it will take effect, but what about 2011.

Mr. Aoude said for this coming year, nothing should change, but in 2012 with unit-by-unit, the rule change will have to take place. The division will take out the rule change at that time.

Mr. Sypes said is a three year program, because people apply thinking they will get permits for three years out. Those changes should be considered now, because those hunters going in now will be affected by the rule change. Is that to be decided now or defer it to another day?

Mr. Aoude said not now, they will put in for whatever region. When you put in for the program, it states that if rules change you have to abide by those rules.

Mr. Sypes wondered if we can't move the draws closer to when we know how many permits are available. Does it really benefit the state to have people put in for a draw that they are not even sure there will be any permits?

Mr. Sypes wants to know why they have to apply so much earlier than when the permit numbers are out. Right now permits are done all online by March 3. We don't know anything until May 14.

Director Karpowitz said they could have put the application later, but that's when hunters are used to applying. This gives the Division more time to get more accurate information. It will be a more accurate recommendation. They could cut a whole month out of the process if we didn't try to be more customer friendly.

Mr. Sypes asked why not just extend the time frame. It's not when the timeline is, it is when is it open and it always seems to be people wait to the last minute anyway.

Director Karpowitz said it can be longer, but just thought they would keep it where it has been traditionally.

Mr. Sheehan said part of the results is not just on the front end, but when you get the results is sooner. There are lots of things that happen in the background. We try to have the Board meeting and get the results out as soon as possible. Our draw contractor needs

some time to make sure people aren't applying as multiple people. We try to get the results out as soon as we can, trying to keep it early.

Mr. Sypes asked if we are trying to get people to figure out when they are going to hunt, why do we need to apply so much earlier, because if we don't have the timeline so early and we waited until it was closer to when they were going to find out, credit card numbers are less likely to be bad because you're going to pull the draws, have the results and they'll know whether they're hunting that year or not. Why do we have to wait so long from the time we apply to when we start doing anything.

Mr. Sheehan said the thing dictating when we are doing the draw is when we have our data in and we can get it out in a Board meeting and we want to do the drawing as quickly after that as possible, so people know where they're at. We have done this for many years and it is a public service the way we are doing it now.

Chairman Woodard said we need to discuss this issue .

Mr. Sheehan said there are several things to discuss. Do you want to cap permit numbers on any of the units? Dedicated Hunters could take all the permits on a unit without a cap. We need to let Dedicated Hunters and Lifetime License holders know ahead of time.

Chairman Woodard said one of the options the Board would have is give a percent of the tags to dedicated hunters.

Mr. Aoude said that is true.

Director Karpowitz said 2011 is already set. People can enter the program in 2011 for a 3-year program. We will come back with a rule for 2012. 2011 is already done and we are locked in. They will have to change the rule to read region or unit. People will be grandfathered in until a rule change takes place. The program will remain as is for 2011 and a rule change will be brought to change it to a 1-year program.

Mr. Johnson asked where the crap the one year thing came from. There are lots of other options and we will make a recommendation as a Board after we talk about it.

Director Karpowitz said it was presented in the September Board meeting as an option to the Board. They saw that the program would need to change and that was one option. We couldn't do anything until you voted today. Now we have to bring the rule back to the public so you can act on it for 2012 and beyond.

Mr. Johnson said there are different lengths of time, put in for four different units and other creative ideas.

Mr. Sheehan said all we brought out in September was a fee change for a one year , if you need to go to that. There are lots of ideas. There isn't a one-year program yet and the three-year program hasn't gone away yet.

Mr. Hatch was excused from the meeting.

Mr. Albrecht said the dedicated hunters that come on in 2012 will have to pick a unit.

Mr. Sheehan said another possibility is if you are concerned about the new 2011 group, you could limit the number of people allowed into the program.

Mr. Perkins asked when the recommendations are available to the Board, would they have the option of refund for years that are signed up for.

Mr. Sheehan said it lends itself to some awkward things, like if someone has harvested yet. There are a number of things to address and consider. This is the most complicated thing we have to address.

RAC Recommendations

Northeastern – Mr. Christensen said there was not a lot of comment. There was some discussion on putting antlerless, bucks and bulls in the same month. Their motion was to accept as presented and it passed unanimously.

Central and Northern said they passed the recommendation unanimously.

Southern – Mr. Messerly said they passed the recommendation 8 to 1. There was an amended motion (See Southern RAC minutes) and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Perkins said he read the Southern RAC minutes on the discussion on changing season dates to minimize impacts and conflicts. What he read was the RAC tried to work through it and in the end decided it was too tough, and passed it back to the Division. He asked the Division if they came up with anything on this.

Mr. Aoude said they wanted to cut five days off the hunt on the front end, but when we explained it, they backed off. They wanted us to look at minimizing interference.

Mr. Perkins said they did not come up with a solution that they could agree on.

Mr. Aoude said we made the best recommendation we could.

Southeastern – Mr. Sanslow said the motion was made to accept as presented, but with a boundary change in the Nine Mile elk unit, moving the northern boundary to the Nine Mile Canyon road. It passed unanimously. (See Southeast RAC minutes) In hind sight he has received comments that they shouldn't have done that because some of the landowners didn't get to give input. There was no public comment on that. The other motion was to look at making the north of Highway 491 a general season open bull unit, if that is what the majority of the landowners wanted. That passed unanimously. If the change is done it would do away with the Landowner Association. There was a letter from the San Juan County Commission asking the Division not to do anything on this until they had time to discuss it with the Division and work out some of the details.

Chairman Woodard said because of the public official comment this will be set aside temporarily until things come into place.

Mr. Sanslow said they had no idea this was coming up and it was some that was added to the motion. Landowners in the area did not know there was going to be a change. The DWR is not in favor of boundary change, also.

Mr. Perkins said boundary changes are complicated and contentious enough that it shouldn't be done spur of the moment. These and similar proposals need to be left to the region until we can give consideration of the Board.

Mr. Johnson said on the Nine Mile situation they are talking about is open bull. The landowners want to go onto public lands with a 60/40 split. Landowners want to go open bull the private lands and limited entry on the public land. That is a bad idea and it was done on Range Creek quite a few years ago. We need to get them in line with what we are doing in the state. It should be left open bull on public land. He made some other suggestions to remedy this problem.

Public Comment

Kyle Fullmer is representing 42 other private landowners north of Hwy 491. He farms 6,000 acres in this closed area. They are requesting an open bull hunt north and east of 491, which was the old boundary line. He gave some background on the elk, which were introduced 20-25 years ago. A two-year season was offered to them, then shut down immediately after, because one herd came off the Blues and many were shot. Promises were made, but money and the trophy respect withstood opportunity. Two years ago the area south of 491 was open because of depredation. We have always had more of an elk problem on the south side, but more elk on north. They raise the same crops, but because of three different landowners they opened it up for that situation. The proposed area is mostly private land. He has signatures of 42 landowners with approximately 37,000 acres, not in the CWMU or landowner association, who have requested to hunt on their own property. Utah's current options are the CWMU or landowner association, but they do not allow the private landowner to hunt their own land. It has been open to draw on the Blues. He has put in for this for 14 years and never drawn. It is hard to retain the permits where they will turn around and give the CWMUs double their tags this year. He currently has a herd of 80-100 elk eating on his land presently. He has given the 72 hour notice and tried to work for landowners to hunt elk which were transplanted here so we could have the same opportunity as everyone else. The elk boundary is arbitrary where the elk cross into Colorado where there is a general season. No respect is given for property owners north of 491. (See Attachment #1- letter)

Charles Sypes said as a dedicated hunter who's permit expires this year, he will have to evaluate if he going to participate with whatever changes come about. The people who expired out this year will be able to continue to select their hunt region or unit for the next three years, no matter which way the Division ends up going. We need to see something should happen today on that. Back to application timeframe, he doesn't understand why we have to apply so early.

Todd Black asked if there will not be a boundary change today. Is that correct?

Chairman Woodard said they will vote on that today and make a recommendation one way or the other.

Mr. Black said there are reasons to not vote on the boundary today. It has not gone through the RAC process. Depredation is another option. There are opportunities for those landowners to join the larger San Juan landowners' association where they can also receive permits and compensation. Also, Mr. Fullmer and other landowners can choose whether or not to be part of the CWMU. There is opportunity to hunt spike elk too. The Wildlife Board has already approved a three-year management plan on CWMUs. If boundaries change it will affect those plans. He has a letter from the San Juan landowners association that comprises the whole unit. They have approximately 14,000 acres and they do not support this. Approximately 95 landowners and over 83,000 acres in this unit do support it. They also have the landowner association Chair for the Spring Creek Dodge Unit who is a farmer and supports keeping that as part of the limited entry unit and keeping the CWMU management plan the way it is.

Ben Lowder, representing the UBA said he would like to express their opinion on the archery season dates and would like them to stay the same. They spent a lot of time in the field during the week and there was very little competition. We are currently giving the limited entry rifle hunters the seven days at the end of the hunt and that is sufficient for those tags. Prior to Option 1,2,3, it was on schedule to address the new hunt structure that came about last fall. They were looking forward to see this and they support this. He hopes it hasn't been forgotten and it will come back in the future when the Division feels it is appropriate.

Mike Roring, landowner representative of Spring Creek Dodge said he supports what Mr. Black said. They are not in favor of an open bull unit. They are pleased with the way the CWMU is being managed. He is also a farmer there. If an open bull herd management goes into place that is the only way to keep it mutually beneficial for all. Keep it as is. It is the only fair way. He appreciates what the Division is doing.

Chairman Woodard summarized the RAC recommendations.

Director Karpowitz said as much as we can do today without it being a specific agenda item.

Chairman Woodard suggested that we might need to put the elk impacting deer study into an action item and let the Division have time to work on it.

Mr. Perkins said he thinks the Division has heard the recommendation, but they have also told us there have been multiple studies done in other states and cost is prohibitive.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkin, seconded by Mr. Fenimore and it failed 3 to 2, with Del Brady, Keele Johnson and Jake Albrecht opposed.

MOTION: I move we ask the Division to look at pieces of any available study or sub components that could be achieved concerning the impact of elk on mule deer.

Mr. Johnson referred to a book called North American Elk, Ecology and Management. It is nothing but studies addressing the elk verses deer issue. They do not draw a conclusion to it. He went over some of the attributes of elk and deer. There is probably not an answer to it and they say there is no proof that elk affect deer.

Rick Larsen said this is very complex issue. He is in constant contact with universities and always on the look out for good studies. To come up with a good quantitative, defensible answer to that complex question is hard. That is why there are not a lot of studies. If there is any progress in this, it needs to come from WAFWA. It would be a comprehensive study with universities and scientists involved. We are always on the look out for good studies, but to do one unilaterally in just Utah would be cost prohibitive.

Mr. Perkins said his motion is not an action item. It is an ongoing request.

Mr. Brady said it sounds like one of those fuzzy little things that you vote yes on and then forget about it without being on the action log.

Chairman Woodard asked if we want to deal with minimizing the impact to limited entry, especially archery hunters.

Mr. Albrecht said Mr. Aoude has covered that for today.

Chairman Woodard said there will be no action by the Board on that issue. Do they want to address the boundary change on Nine Mile? He asked Mr. Bushman if we can do this today.

Mr. Bushman said this is a hard question on how much needs to go back through the process. This is a problem that the Board needs to weigh the gravity of the situation and decide.

Brad Crompton clarified how this came about. Some private landowners on the unit have had some concerns on the quality of elk on their CWMUs diminishing. They asked for the boundary to be extended so they can get the protection of having limited entry around them. It was brought up at the RAC and it passed. It is not something the Division has wanted to tackle. Biologically there is not an issue so did not make that recommendation.

Mr. Johnson said he would like to send it back to the region and have them look at the situation on Range Creek. He is concerned about open bull on private land and limited entry on public land right next to it. He would like to see the Board give direction to the region to deal with both of those issues, including the Nine Mile boundary.

Chairman Woodard asked if he is talking about the Highway 491 issue also.

Mr. Johnson said no.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Del Brady and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that the Nine Mile boundary and existing Range Creek issues be sent back to the region, to work with the affected parties and look toward resolution. This will be put on the action log.

Mr. Perkins asked that the area north of 491 be taken back to the region also.

Chairman Woodard asked what about the area north of Hwy 491. We have a letter from Mr. Fullmer with landowner signatures relative to this request. He explained the situation with the landowners out of the CWMU and the CWMU landowners. The Board likes to hear from the County Commissioners and if they weighed into the RAC Chairs, they would like to hear on that.

Mr. Sanslow said Bruce Adams wanted to work with the Division before any decision was made.

Mr. Johnson said he has been concerned about this for some time. A transplant took place. In the early 80's Colorado has an area called Disappointment Valley where about 3,000 elk wintered. They gave 400 cow permits in this area and many of these elk came into Utah. At that point elk continued to get established in the area. By the time we got the transplant approved, it ended up being supplemental. Something needs to be done for these landowners. Kyle Fullmer and Fred Snyder are feeding these elk. Mr. Snyder said the Division gives him some cow tags, but he just wants a bull tag. He then went over several different options that might help this situation. This problem has been placed on the action log. If a private landowner is made a major player and they can see wildlife as an asset, instead of a liability, you'll have an expansion of wildlife. He said it should go back to the group, throw out some options and let them figure it out. Something needs to change.

Mr. Perkins asked if we should just leave it for the landowners to develop it further.

Mr. Johnson said what he talked to Mr. Snyder about was as soon as Mr. Johnson gets back he wants to get the people together and start talking about this. It is something we don't want to drag out for years.

Mr. Perkins asked if they are asking the Southeast region to do that.

Mr. Johnson said yes.

Mr. Albrecht asked if the action log item that Mr. Johnson referred to was done in June. Will it be addressed by fall?

Director Karpowitz said it would have to be done by this time next year.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that the Division work with landowners in the area north of Highway 491 to consider the option of a general season open bull hunt.

Chairman Woodard asked how we want to handle the issue.

Mr. Sheehan said for 2011, everything that was proposed by the Division, we would like to keep that as is. If you apply now, you enter the program, as is, for three years. We would like to make people aware that when they apply, possibly their second and third year, they may not get their unit of choice. Those are all the details we have to work through. We will give new applicants fair warning that some terms of the program might change. He read from the existing rule, "participants entering or re-entering the program shall be subject to any changes subsequently made in this rule, during the three year term of enrollment unless a variance is authorized by the Division." We have this next year to figure this out.

Chairman Woodard asked if we have something in place to give them a refund if they decide to opt out.

Mr. Sheehan said no.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2011 Season Dates and Application Timeline as presented by the Division.

7) CWMU Permit Numbers for 2011 (Action)

Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator presented this agenda item. He went over the applications for CWMUs. 103 three-year application/management plans were approved Dec 2008. They added six CWMUs in 2009. He said there were 14 applications requesting approval this year, 4 brand new and 10 changed boundaries or operator change. They have been trying to get the CWMUs to not change their boundaries frequently. He went on to do the 2011 CWMU overview, discussing number of requested permits, private and public split and application recommendations by region. (See Powerpoint Presentation) At the Southern RAC, they had a request to remove a piece of public land (SITLA Land) from the Mini Maude CWMU. The Division and the region both concur with that. If that takes place, it will also require a reduction of one public permit, both one for elk and one for deer.

Chairman Woodard asked if that parcel has public access to it.

Mr. Blackwell said yes. It was approved the year prior and determined it would make a more definable boundary. The region feels they can make a good boundary without it. He then went over the CWMUs in Southern region. This concluded the presentation.

Chairman Woodard asked if there were any Board questions.

Mr. Albrecht asked if on the Old Woman Plateau CWMU, was that just a voluntary issue because of deer numbers?

Mr. Blackwell said yes.

Mr. Johnson said on the Emma Park, right now they have 8 CWMU permits and one public and they want to go to 9 CWMU permits and two public.

Mr. Blackwell said no. For deer and elk they have 36 and 5 was the request with the SITLA land in it. Their request would go down to 36 and 4 for each, because of the exclusion of the public land.

Questions from Audience

Chris Kilmer said we are setting permit numbers right now. Why aren't we waiting until March?

Mr. Blackwell said on CWMUs and landowner association, we work from the prior year and those numbers of permits will extend forward. CWMUs, as businesses have to go out and sell their permits. With a limited number of permits, it is better to do it this way.

Mr. Kilmer asked if their numbers are tied to the general numbers of the population, specifically deer.

Mr. Blackwell said they are. They have a proportion of the permits and it is figured into the number available to the public and the proportion to the size of the CWMU.

Mr. Kilmer asked if you cut public permits, do you cut CWMU permits.

Mr. Blackwell said yes.

Mr. Perkins said isn't it true that all of the CWMUs are applying for their permits at a much lower number than what they would be entitled to as their share.

Mr. Blackwell said yes, most of them are.

Mr. Johnson said they are running a business there and he has seen the Spring Creek Dodge operation not use all vouchers because they felt the quality was dropping.

Mr. Byrnes asked about Jacob Creek looking to decrease permits, was it in today's proposal?

Mr. Blackwell said no, but it has been worked out.

RAC Recommendations

Central, Northeastern and Southern voted unanimously to accept the recommendations as presented.

Northern voted unanimously to accept the recommendations as presented with 2 recusals.

Southeastern – Mr. Sanslow said their motion to exclude the public land from the Mini Maude CWMU is now part of the recommendation. It passed unanimously. They accepted the recommendations presented and they passed unanimously with 1 recusal.

Public Comment

Chairman Woodard read the comment of Todd Abelhouzen. CWMUs are critical to growing our herds on private land and critical to building good relations between ranchers/landowners and sportsmen! Protect the CWMUs.

Wade Heaton had to leave and Chairman Woodard read his comment. Alton CWMU supports the permit number changes for 2011 for the Alton CWMU.

Rick Danvir of the CWMU Association thanked the Division and Board for their consideration of CWMUs and Landowner association. Keep in mind, given the right incentives we can help to grow the deer herds. The amount of information and focus presented yesterday was amazing. He hopes the Board will continue to support those efforts. Where can we spend our time and effort? Is it coyotes, is it habitat? He thinks they are on the right track. He commended the Division for their efforts. As far as the CWMUs, operators will get the same information to aim their efforts in the same direction as the Division.

Charles Sypes said their concern with the CWMUs, many of the units are taking out great areas that are very near where they hunt, especially in the Northern region. CWMU permits are great when we can draw out. We would like a higher percentage of their tags go to the public. Public access is also a problem across private property. CWMU is a good program, but as regular hunters we would like to be able to benefit. They would like to see closer to 20% of tags to public.

Ryan Foutz, operator of Woodruff Creek CWMU, said they worked to increase their acreage this year. In working with his biologist on this, he didn't understand it completely. By increasing acreage in a 3-year management plan, addressing moose, the first year they had 2 and 2. The second year, it went to 1 public and 2 private and the third year it will be 1 public and 2 private. He's in the second year of the management plan and went to increase the acres and this forced him to start the management plan all over again, so he's back to 2 public and 2 private, increasing the moose permits. They have killed 47 bull moose over the last 15 years and 17 went to the public. They are 100% success rate. They take great care of the public hunter. This is more of a resource issue and he is concerned about 14,000 acres starting over on his plan. He wants a variance for one year so this doesn't happen. When he was asked to kill cow moose, they killed 8 out of 9. He has seen a huge reduction in the amount of moose on the property, since we quit killing cows. The average age says they are four years. He has all of his

tooth data done on his deer and elk. For deer it is 5.8 and elk it is 7.2. He wants the Board to grant the variance for this year. If he adds ground next year, he'd have to go back to 2 and 2 again. He wants to respect the public's fair share of permits, but why have to start over, plus pay \$450 application fee again. The request is to stay at 2 and 1.

Mr. Bushman said the variance rule is written broadly enough to allow the Board to deal within a wide range. It is within the discretion of the Board to grant a variance if they so choose.

Board Discussion

Chairman Woodard summarized RAC Comment.

Mr. Perkins asked Northern to respond to the Woodruff Creek request.

Randy Wood, Wildlife Manager for Northern region said this was done purposely for this type of situation where they keep changing annually. They start out with the 2 and 2 the first year, so if anything happens the last two, the public got their fair share. This was done specifically to keep them going down the line. There is an option of going 1 and 1, it doesn't have to go to 2 and 2 to get them back on track.

The following motion was made by Bill Fenimore, seconded by Del Brady and passed 3 to 2.

MOTION: I move that we approve the variance request for Woodruff Creek allowing them to increase acreage, but stay in the third year of their management plan.

Mr. Perkins said this is a fairly new change. I don't think we should see this every time it comes up in the future. If we are considering this, we should also have the Division put this out clearly to every CWMU, before they sign up. They should acknowledge it before they renew.

Mr. Johnson said if a CWMU wants to get the percentages changed, they have to talk to the legislature.

Mr. Brady said the rule is there to punish landowners from changing. Is that right?

Mr. Blackwell said the rule was put in place to keep them from changing year to year, so we could have some consistency over a three-year management plan basis. It is not to punish them, but it does act as an incentive.

Mr. Brady says Mr. Foutz is already being punished by having to pay the application again.

Mr. Blackwell said yes, he is required to pay a small amount of what he might make on two moose permits.

Director Karpowitz asked what this does to the ratio over the life of the plan. Does it still come out 60/40?

Mr. Blackwell said if there is a variance it would reduce the 40. The public wouldn't get quite their share.

A discussion took place on the ratio over the three-year period.

Mr. Wood said the rule says it will never drop below 40%, during the 3-year period. If you're starting a new three-year contract, you start out with a 33/66 split, so you go against the rule. It is okay to be over it to start it off, but at the end of the three-year period, it has to be at a 60/40 split, at least 40% for the public.

Director Karpowitz asked what Mr. Foutz' plan is to get back to the 60/40 with this variance request granted.

Mr. Foutz says the issue is he just wants to finish his three-year management plan. In the CWMU program, just look at moose and have a little flexibility. They shouldn't be punished for making ourselves better.

Director Karpowitz said when this rule was made it was done with close consultation with the CWMU Association. We need to take this back to CWMU Association if we're not going to do the rule.

Mr. Foutz said he got the suggestion for a variance from Todd Black.

Chairman Woodard asked if he is adding existing private ground or public.

Mr. Foutz said 92% of the land is private. We give back more than double land back to public to hunt. It's a great program. I'm just trying to protect the program. Their satisfaction index is way up there.

Director Karpowitz said we need to make sure we follow the 60/40 split.

Mr. Perkins said when this change was made it was done very consciously, because the previous rule had produced situations where the public could not get their share. That is why the public share was set higher in the first year, at the beginning of the contract. The only problem is this might not have been clear to Mr. Foutz. If he would have known, he may have delayed making a change until the renewal period. We need to make that very clear to the CWMU operators, that when they make a change in acreage or boundary, they are creating a new CWMU.

Mr. Danvir of CWMU Association, his recollection was the agreement that adding or subtracting land from CWMU constituted making a new CWMU and you would start a new CWMU contract.

Mr. Johnson said Mr. Foutz is concerned about the age classification of his moose. Do we hunt these moose in the rut? How much movement is there?

Mr. Danvir said yes during the rut and they move around a lot during the rut. We lost 40% of the moose during the last bad winter and he is sure that is part of Ryan's concern.

The vote was then taken and it passed 3 to 2, with Jake Albrecht and Keele Johnson opposed.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the CWMU Permit Numbers for 2011 as presented by the Division.

Chairman Woodard said the variance that was just granted has some questions on the legality of it. We will set this discussion aside at this point. We will revisit it at the end of Mr. Blackwell's presentations.

8) Landowner Permit Numbers for 2011 (Action)

Boyd Blackwell presented this agenda item. He did the overview, applications, buck/bull voucher totals, landowner association application issues and rule/policy changes. (See Powerpoint Presentation)

RAC Recommendations

Northern, Central and Southeast accepted the recommendation unanimously.

Northeastern – Mr. Christensen said they accepted the recommendation unanimously with a variance request from Diamond Mountain landowner association. This remained the same as far as permit numbers. They have this variance every year and have to renew it.

Southern – Mr. Messerly said they accepted the recommendation unanimously. There is an item from other business that may fit well here. The RAC asked the Wildlife Board to consider an option for bison on private land. It could end up being a landowner association for the future.

Public Comment

Dave Chivers from Diamond Mountain landowner association. They have asked for this variance for the last 17 years. (See Attachment #1 -letter) Money that has been used on public ground is listed in the letter. Many landowners have done that much money in projects on their own property.

Mitch Hacking said we have done a lot on Diamond Mountain. SFW joined with us this year and they have helped us with some guzzler projects and others. All these projects are on public ground.

Chairman Woodard said they appreciate their efforts.

Mr. Fenimore asked what the variance is.

Mr. Blackwell said it is in R-657-43-8 in 6(B). It says “we allow them the variance to not have to allow the same number of public hunters with valid permits equal to the number of vouchers transferred to access landowner association’s private property for hunting during the appropriate limited entry hunts.” He then explained this.

Mr. Brady gave an example. This year there were 44 deer permits private and 81 for public. The landowners said they didn’t not want to open the gates cart blanche and let anybody on. They just want to have the discretion to know who is on their land and keep track. A well was one of the projects on public land, including solar panels to keep it running, providing a source of water on public land.

Mr. Fenimore said he was unfamiliar with this variance.

The following motion was made by Del Brady, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the Diamond Mountain Landowner Association variance request.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of Landowner Permit Numbers for 2011 as presented by the Division.

Chairman Woodard read the bison motion from Southern RAC. Mr. Messerly said it might be good to address at this point in the agenda. Motion: To propose that the Wildlife Board look at an option to create a rule to address the issue of bison on private lands on the Henry Mountain Unit.

Director Karpowitz said the basic policy of the Division has been for many years is not to put OIAL permits into the Landowner permit program and the Board has stayed with that for a lot of years. The thought is those opportunities are very few and far between. They ought to remain in the hands of the general public and people ought to draw for those permits.

Steve Dalton manages the Sandy Ranch and they are impacted by the bison every year on their land. There does not seem to be any consideration for the fact that they utilize private land and have done for years. He realizes this is a sensitive issue. What about bull moose, isn’t that a OIAL permit and don’t you allocate permits for them?

Director Karpowitz said only on CWMUs.

Mr. Woodard asked if he and the surrounding landowners have enough land for a CWMU.

Mr. Dalton said no. There are not 5,000 contiguous acres on the Henry's anywhere. Bison are an impact and feed on our private land every year, especially the high mountain property. It has been a point of contention for years. Part of it came from more bison on the unit than agreed to. This hasn't been addressed. There is no way to keep the bison off of there. They will continue to use it every year. It needs to be addressed.

Mr. Albrecht asked how many acres he is talking about.

Mr. Dalton said up on the high mountain property, there is 600 acres of their private land. The King Ranch and the surrounding private lands is an additional 2,000 acres total. It all gets impacted by bison every year.

Mr. Albrecht asked how many buffalo were there this past year.

Mr. Dalton said not anything really up high, mostly they were down on the winter range, where they are not supposed to be.

Mr. Perkins asked Mr. Blackwell about depredation on bison. What are we doing for landowners right now and what changes are we making?

Mr. Blackwell said the changes we are making will allow sportsmen to become involved in taking these bison under depredation or nuisance situations.

Mr. Perkins said previously the depredation policy did not cover bison, right?

Mr. Blackwell said no, there were no OIAL species on that.

Mr. Perkins asked how this will help landowners.

Mr. Blackwell said it allows the region to go off a list to be able to get a hunter in there to take care of it, or if they can't get a hunter, it allows the Division to be able to go in and remove the animal.

Mr. Albrecht said that doesn't help with impacts to the property owner.

Director Karpowitz said we just did a management plan for that unit a few years ago. To deal with impacts of bison on the unit as a whole, the Division agreed to do over a million dollars habitat work. It has been done. It is a huge benefit to the livestock operators on that mountain, much more than any landowner permit system would have accomplished. Landowner permits were discussed in the development of that plan and we are where we're at now. We are committed to ongoing work on that mountain to make the buffalo more acceptable. We have also shot a huge number of buffalo over the past three years. We are not ignoring the landowners there. We have a lot of communication with them.

Mr. Albrecht said the Director makes some good comments that we might not have picked up on, but on the same token, is there a way a landowner could get a OIAL permit every so many years, to offset the cost?

Mr. Perkins asked if there are already a deer tags being provided that have significant value.

Mr. Blackwell said there is a buck deer tag every three years for that landowner association available. They would get one this year.

Mr. Perkins asked what the deer tags are worth.

Mr. Dalton said last year the two Henry Mountain tags sold for around \$100,000 dollars each.

Mr. Johnson said he is concerned about there has been a lot of sportsmen's money go into the Henry Mountains the last number of years in development of habitat. Landowners have gone the other way on some of this. He feels very strongly that if we make landowners a player, they get much more interested in wildlife, but it's a two way street.

Mr. Dalton said the Division took the first step forward with this landowner deer association. When he first approached them with it with Southern region he thought they had it approved, but when it went to Salt Lake it stopped. They said if we couldn't qualify for at least one permit every year, they weren't going to consider it. That was an administrative decision, because there is nothing stated along those lines in the rule. He felt slighted and we are getting impacted by the deer on our land also. Now they've finely agreed to go ahead on it with the deer and get their bison back more in line with the population they agreed to.

Mr. Johnson said talked about a discussion with a Colorado Commissioner. He said that when they made the landowners a player in Colorado, they went to 300,000 head of elk. It was their legislature who did that. Landowners want those elk now. Looking at the Henry's and maybe that is one of the answers.

Director Karpowitz said there is not another state in the west that has more incentives for landowners, between our depredation program, landowner permits program, and CWMU program, Colorado pales in what Utah provides landowners. We far exceed everybody.

Mr. Dalton said with the depredation policy, the state has responded to any damages we've had.

No action was taken on the Southern RAC motion for a bison.

Alan Clark returned to clarify the Woodruff Creek variance request. He said the Board passed a variance, but didn't indicate what part of the rule you issued a variance to. What the variance you passed was, you let the CWMU add acreage, but not restart their management plan. So this year is year three of their plan of which they would have

gotten two and one. Next year, whether they add acreage or not, they have to restart their management plan because the three years is used up.

- 9) Rule R657-5 Taking Big Game Amendment (Action)
- 10) Rule R657-44 Depredation Rule Amendment (Action)
- 11) Depredation Policy Amendment (Action)

Boyde Blackwell presented these agenda items. He said that in the movement of bison in the state plus with a large herd out on the Book Cliffs with the Ute Indian tribe, it became obvious that we needed to make changes to some of our rules in order to make it possible for us to use sportsmen to remove some of these animals and also to provide us guidance on what we would do in certain situations. We started with R657-5 Taking Big Game, did some housekeeping, removed references to proclamation and replaced it with guidebooks, removed the Henry Mountain bison reference, also added in the opportunity to use a depredation hunter pool and added moose and bison OIAL species to it. We then made changes to the R657-44 Depredation Rule. We defined nuisance, including all OIAL species, changed wording for bucks and bulls depredation hunts, changed wording to allow a removal of all OIAL species in depredation and nuisance situations, changed wording for antlerless. The last change was wording change to allow the use of a hunter pool on units that don't have limited entry. We developed an online application process for the hunter pool opportunities. The next thing we had to amend the depredation policy to make it consistent with the others. This concluded the presentation.

RAC Recommendations

All RACs passed these three items unanimously

Board Discussion

The following motion was made by Del Brady, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept R657-5 Taking Big Game amendment, R657-44 Depredation Rule amendment and Depredation Policy amendment as presented by the Division.

- 12) Conservation Permit Audit (Action)

Greg Sheehan presented this agenda item. (See Attachment #2) He went over the background on the annual audit and how it came about. They have done the audits for six years now. There are audits of eight conservation organizations. He thanked Sarah Scott for performing the reviews and working closely with the organizations. She did a great job this year. He explained banking procedures and revenue stream. Ducks Unlimited was issued six permits. They did sell those and report to us how much they sold them for. Part of the problem we had was we weren't able to collect all the money until the last few weeks. He explained how much the groups keep and return to the Division when they sell the permits. The Division uses the funds on habitat projects generally associated

with that species. They were unable to get the continued audit information from Ducks Unlimited this year.

Mr. Fenimore asked if Ducks Unlimited explained their situation.

Mr. Sheehan said they had a change of staff in a difficult situation. We are working with them and they have committed to it being appropriately addressed.

Mr. Fenimore asked if these organizations are required to post bonds.

Mr. Sheehan said they are not required to post bonds, but they are required to have these in FDIC insured accounts and submit to these audits each year. They have been doing this for six years and this is the first time we've had a problem like this. We are working it out. He then went over the Executive summary audit sheet.

Safari Club has never kept any of the funds so we don't do much of an audit on them. Last year the Board asked if the Division ever goes out and field verifies what the permits are sold for. We had Division people go do this and all of the amounts for permits were verified. We will continue to do that.

Relative to recommendations, organizations need to ensure that all of the 30% collections be submitted by September 1st of each year. RMEF, Safari Club and Ducks Unlimited were late on that.

Ducks Unlimited did not successfully pass the audit. They are not asking for any permits next year. We are recommending that 60% of the funds be returned to the Division, until they come back for permits and successfully pass the audit. The Board can decide what they would like to do with this situation.

All other conservation organizations successfully completed the 2010 audit. This concluded the presentation.

Chairman Woodard asked if the \$300,000 that Mr. Bateman gave us today came off SFW's 60%.

Mr. Sheehan said yes.

Chairman Woodard asked if Ducks Unlimited have said when they'll have the money to the Division. They are a well-respected organization, have they said when this will be resolved.

Mr. Clark said he talked to them today and they look to get it resolved immediately. They don't know where the records are right now, but have guaranteed the money. They are a big organization and he has been assured this will be handled. They have had some internal problems.

Mr. Fenimore said he asked about going to these banquets last year and he commended the Division for doing this. We have a responsibility to be diligent in these areas and

continue to look for ways to improve. A couple suggestions are he would add some columns to the audit sheet including an average on tags, a total under all the money collected and how much money went to the organization. It might be prudent to validate the habitat improvement projects done by the sportsmen organizations. He asked if there is a performance value attached to the number of permits given to organizations. He is looking for an ROI and trying to continue to improve it. We need to encourage these things and reward the organizations that bring most money back to the table. Mr. Sheehan said on Safari Club they did generate \$148,000, but one of those permits was \$120,000 of the total.

Mr. Clark said on the multi year permits, they do it on a three-year average based on market shares. How well they performed determines how many permits they get, but we do it over three years. It is a self-adjusting system, based on performance over the previous three years.

Director Karpowitz said there is something in this that really concerns him. Yesterday we heard about 30 projects that were unfunded. We have three million dollars in these balances for the organizations. Hopefully they can explain this. He goes to the meeting every year on funding the projects, but we need to get the money on the ground.

Mr. Perkins said we voiced this same concern last year. He shares the Director's concern. How do we encourage or require the money to get spent and not just left sitting?

Mr. Sheehan said he could add a column and show how many dollars have been committed on projects. A lot of this deals with cash. These projects might not be finished yet. This might contribute to the lagging balance. Some of this is on our shoulders in that we get a project approval and it may take six months to a year to get around to doing the projects.

Mr. Brady said he is more comfortable with the money in the hands of private enterprise where it is going to do something and within two years they have to spend it. You've got to have \$100,000 in the bank in case Montana calls and says they have some sheep, do you want them? We need to give the option of them keeping a balance unless an opportunity comes up to obtain wildlife. He asked what chapter of Safari Club applied.

Mr. Clark said it was the Utah Chapter.

Mr. Brady then went on to say that we just opened a new Safari Club Chapter in Northeastern Utah. Last April they had their first meeting and it was the largest first year enrollment of any chapter SCI nationally. If you want to make some money, get tags to that Northeastern Utah chapter.

Mr. Clark said the rule says they can only issue conservation tags to one entity from any organization. We only let one entity apply. If there's a fight we let the top organization tell us who. We had that happen once when a chapter and a national applied at the same time. What can happen is the tags can be marketed in that Northeastern chapter. He

would encourage them to contact the Utah group, because they want to market it in the best place.

Mr. Moretti MDF said we shouldn't be holding three million dollars. Since he left the Division three years ago, it has been very hard to get billed for these in a timely manner. Some of this is timing on these balances. With the Watershed bill really cranking, it is not as big of an issue. We allocated to a lot of projects this year, but last year we showed a balance of 1.4 million at the audit in September, but in November we paid \$835,000 check to the Division. Some of it is timing. If Tyler or anybody calls and needs money, we are signing up. We helped after the Miller fire. We don't have to be holding that much money, but the system needs to be more efficient in billing it.

Director Karpowitz said that is a good point. We need a column on the audit sheet of committed funds and we need to be more efficient in billing it. After the project bidding last year, our habitat section came to the director, saying they were way short on funds, can't you get those organizations to spend more funds? Mr. Clark made some phone calls and yet we still have 30 projects unfunded.

Mr. Johnson said relative to FDIC, maybe they should split the money into more than one bank.

Public Comment

Don Peay said it was a tough Board meeting today with a no win earlier on the big deer decision. Yesterday's meeting was very impressive with all the information presented and all the work that has been done. As we are looking where the legislature is, where federal funding is, where the Division budget is, we've got to get a deer herd turned around very quickly. We need to make the coyote control program more effective with 5-6 components. We've got to figure out to get more money to do that. That is the disappointing part. We are in a dangerous situation with the possibility of losing hunters and the hard economic times. Regarding the conservation permit funds, another column on the audit sheet could be on what more gets done than just conservation tags. He hopes we can get with the Division and work out stuff with the legislature. There is one good bit of news about conversations between Secretaries of the interior and governors and U.S. Congress on an issue you all participated in.

Ben Lowder of UBA said the concerning the audit, the values on spreadsheet is what is in the bank accounts right now, not taking into consideration monies that have already been allocated to fund projects that have been committed to or not finished. As far as Utah Bowmen for Habitat is concerned, all or most of our money has been allocated for projects and we haven't been billed yet.

RAC Input

Northeastern – Mr. Christensen said he works with the Forest Service as a biologist and they use a lot of the money raised by conservation groups. They had a project this summer that they had to revise an agreement with the Division and it turned into a pay in advance agreement for \$45,000. They just completely that project two weeks ago. It was

awarded in 2009. There is also a deal with federal agencies in the state and our fiscal years are different, so in that money that is in accounts, he's sure it's money that hasn't been billed yet.

Board Discussion

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Conservation Permit Audit as presented by the Division.

13) Conservation Permit Allocation – 1 year permits (Action)

Mr. Clark presented this agenda item. In the packet there is a table that talks about one year conservation permit allocation. It shows what permits they identified as being available using the rule as a guide for 2011. It shows what the permit requests were. They received only one request and that organization requested six that were in the list and two that were not. The Division's recommendation is to approve the six that were in the one-year list and not approve the two that were not. The two were pronghorn archery tag and the San Juan Elk Ridge archery buck deer which is not available. He explained the information on the table. They received a late application from Ducks Unlimited, but it was denied.

Mr. Perkins said he sees one more inconsistency in the chart. In two cases the Wasatch Mountain bull elk permits, available permits are listed as any weapon and the request is archery. In other words you'll issue it as archery permit.

Roy Hampton, President of UBA said they requested the San Juan archery tag for a reason, because they wanted to send it to Minneapolis to Pope and Young's 50 year banquet, thinking that is the only way they could get it to a non resident. It would be very valuable for a nonresident to be able to bid on that. They thought they could get a great return on it. They thought they could get this tag. He knew the Plateau had been pulled away because of the closure, but this is the first time he knew they weren't going to get it. He knew it wasn't on the list and that is why they requested it. He talked to Ms. Candelaria and thought they would get the permit.

Mr. Clark said the Board has the ability to grant that tag. The Division cannot do that.

Chairman Woodard asked if there is any other input.

Mr. Sanslow said it would be a real benefit to the state to auction that tag at the Pope and Young banquet.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Conservation Permit Allocation as presented by the Division with the addition of the San Juan buck deer tag going to Utah Bowman for Habitat.

14) Convention Permit Rule Amendment – Military Exemption (Action)

Mr. Clark presented this item. It is in rule that you have to be present to validate their application. The amendment would be to allow individuals who are called to active military duty who apply for these convention tags be exempt from the rule that you have to be present to validate the application. Language has been drafted to grant exemption to this rule to military.

Chairman Woodard said they still apply on the internet, but if they get called to active duty, it would exempt them from the rule.

Mr. Clark said they would have to show their orders to qualify for the exemption.

Mr. Albrecht said so if someone is stationed in Japan, would he qualify for this?

Mr. Clark said yes.

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the Conservation Permit Rule as amended.

15) Other Business (Contingent)

Chairman Woodard said we have the thank you letter to UDOT from the Wildlife Board.

Director Karpowitz said the Division prepared the letter for the Board and he will have Chairman Woodard sign it.

Chairman Woodard said Mr. Abbott wants to ask a question.

Mr. Abbott asked for clarification on mule deer ruling. He is going to do his radio show in about an hour and he wants an explanation on how we came to the decision on statewide archery being eliminated. He wants to give a fair assessment for the Board.

Chairman Woodard said since he broke the tie, he felt it was counter productive to have one weapon type group to be able to hunt all the units instead of one specific unit. And where everybody else puts in for a unit, that could skew the numbers and permits of how they go out. He still feels that the popular units could really get hammered by the archers. That was his concern. We have nothing against the archers, but we hear from all weapon types.

Mr. Johnson said we had an action log item dealing with poaching. We had a presentation from law enforcement yesterday and he suggested we work with deputy

sheriffs. He got a poor answer from our wildlife people. It was a lot of talk about having to train them from the Division. We are talking about going and catching somebody the first couple of days of a wildlife thing and it's poaching. He can do that. He knows when somebody is breaking the law. Our Deputy Sheriffs know that too and they would need very little training. He would like to put it in the action log

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson and died for a lack of a second.

MOTION: I move that the Division work towards being able to use deputy sheriffs and other law enforcement agencies during the first few days of a season to help catch poachers.

Director Karpowitz said he doesn't mind that action log item, but he would like to hear from Mr. Messerly. He knows we have a close relationship in his region with many of the sheriff's offices. He could explain that relationship and how we work closely on poaching and other issues with these offices.

Mr. Messerly said they have tried this a few times to have them help on openings. They have a close relationship with the deputy sheriffs. They work in the rural parts of Utah and it is a matter of life and death to have a good working relationship with them. The fact is though, they have their priorities and we have ours. It would be nice and it has been suggested and offered. We have tried it a few times to have deputies assist us on opening weekends on patrols. The problem is they get called to their responsibilities. Sheriffs have been very helpful. We already have a close working relationship with those guys. If the proposal is to have their sheriff assign them to do wildlife patrols that would be welcome. The law provides that they can do that now. Any peace officer can enforce Title 23, the Wildlife Code.

Mr. Johnson said you're very good talking about Southern. He's talking about Southeastern. Another thing is the wildlife belongs to us and the poachers are thieves. He is a taxpayer in San Juan County and he expects the deputy sheriffs to protect his property. In Southeast they are not doing that. He is quite offended with their sheriff's office in not being involved in that.

Chairman Woodard says the Division is on board with this and this is the next step.

Mr. Messerly said any help they can get for wildlife law enforcement would be more than welcome.

The meeting was then adjourned.