

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Leave it alone your survey data reinforces that hunters aren't asking for changes, harvest increase was minimal and most hunters don't shoot over 200 yards there is absolutely zero reason to remove scopes unless you are moving the general muzzleloader season back to November.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 3:30 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Leave the scopes on the current muzzleloader hunt and cut the tags in half to create a primitive muzzleloader (flintlock/percussion, open sight) season in November. Make both seasons 5 day hunts.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 4:25 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Removing scopes will result in more wounded game. I personally wounded two elk years ago when the zero power rules were in place. Since being able to utilize magnification I've not wounded a single animal, and have harvested 1 deer and four elk. I'm 72 and discriminating against aging eyes is a poor idea. Allowing scoped rifles will attract more young hunters also as successful experiences will promote our declining participation

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 4:48 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Before drastic changes are made with regard to scopes on muzzleloaders, I think the data should be reviewed as well as harvest success. A 4x or less scope should be allowed.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Why does it matter what other states are doing? I agree that most muzzy hunters don't feel comfortable shooting past 200, but the confidence to shoot under 200 sky rockets with and optic. If you want a muzzleloader primitive then get ride of inlines entirely. Pretty easy to enforce a 1 inch scope tube requirement. All you need is a measuring tape. I don't feel like this survey accurately depicts the majority of opinions. And yet you guys will just change whatever you want a month before the season starts anyway I.e electronic archery sights (which you guys don't even know how those work) if you want to enforce it put it in the proclamation before it prints. Too many high horses on the committee imho.

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 5:34 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** If you are going put technology restrictions on muzzleloaders you need to do the same for ride and archery. People are going to take unethical shots with open sights it's not going to change. Leave scopes on muzzleloaders.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 5:53 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

If you are going to ban muzzleloader scopes because of technological keep technology out of reporting/hunting in general!

---



Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 10:19 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

Some of the earliest memories that I have involve hunting. I have been hunting since I can remember. Now I know I was too young to hunt when I was little. But hunting for my family is also about family time. Now I can remember hiking with my grandfather in the woods, I learned many things from that man about how to hunt. I also remember sitting and watching a field with my grandmother, she also was able to provide much needed knowledge regarding hunting, and those memories are memories I carry with me and now am teaching to my sons. Now I bring up these memories because as we well know the hunter is a dying breed. The generation that taught my parents to hunt, and encouraged our family to continue hunting is no longer with my family. The DWR knows this and that is why over the most recent years they have decreased the hunting age from 14 to 12, as well as made it possible for the youth to hunt with another hunter using the mentor program.

Now these programs were introduced to get the youth, ( which is our future)involved interested, and wanting to continue hunting. I have eager nieces and nephews that cannot wait until they are old enough to go out on the hike for the elk hunt. So the point that I am trying to make is that hunting is not just about hunting, but it is also about family, family time, and the opportunity to teach our youth how to become even better hunters than we are ourselves. Now I remember when the General Deer season went to a draw, and I will tell you that hunting deer, has never been the same. This is due to my family and I not all being able to have tags to be able to go out and hunt together. This has divided our family and therefore caused some disinterest from the younger of us in participating in hunting.

Now I guess I am saying all of this in hopes of catching the attention of the DWR on the problem that is ongoing. I want to point out that over this last week I had the opportunity to spend time with and attempt to help my Mother fill her deer tag which took her 4 years to draw. As I am riding around in the truck with her on the dirt roads, it is sad to say she had to point out to me that due to our states current management plans of the Deer in Utah; I will need to pay for my sons to experience hunting out of state in order to hopefully hold their interest in hunting. As I sat in the back of the truck and thought about this, I came to the realization that my own mother who is now in her 50s likely will only experience maybe 5-6 more deer hunts in her life time given the current ridiculous average drawing period of 3-4 years for General Buck Deer Any Legal Weapon. I then think of my children who I only have with me for 18-20 years, they are unable to hunt until the age of 12 then I put the 3-4 year drawing average into the equation and I will maybe be lucky enough to enjoy 2 hunts with my children before they are grown. Maybe 3 if they are lucky enough to draw a youth hunt which is also not guaranteed.

If I take into account my own hunting and being able to take my children with me I may have 1-2 hunts with them while they are young (ages 3-8) for me to be able to involve them. Now we all know how challenging it can be to hunt with a 3 year old, so that is not realistic.

I feel it is ridiculous for me as a hunter to have to pay more money to hunt out of my own state in order to allow my children to be able to hunt and keep their interest in hunting. Which in doing so benefits the State of Utah.

So now the DWR proposes more restrictions on deer hunting, on units that I hunt. I have to say that I disagree. I would make the regulation in Pine Valley any point count of 3 or higher on one side.

I disagree with limiting the number of days to hunt to 5. This is a terrible proposal, this does not allow people enough time to be able to hunt, track, and find an animal. With how busy today's world is, it is nearly impossible to do any scouting and so in my opinion the first couple of the days of the hunt unless you are lucky are often used to find the herd/animal to be able to potentially harvest a deer. You will also be putting more of a time crunch on people and towards the end of it in my opinion they will be more prompt to fill their tags which will ultimately result in them harvesting younger deer as the younger bucks are more often seen.

I strongly hope that we as hunters and sportsman are able to come up with a solution that is less restrictive for an already restrictive hunt. I also hope that this message will hit home with someone on the board that the current draw system is not working and needs to be addressed for the betterment of our youth, and the future of hunting.

Thank you for your time in reading this.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

5 days is not hunt  
Put antler restrictions state wide 3 point or better cut tags quit sale of opportunities and manage game get rid of spike elk hunts and make all elk hunts a draw

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?**

We need to transplant to keep herds alive

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

5 day hunts are to short period  
3 point or better on antler point restrictions should be state wide  
Scopes don't matter on muzzy loaders  
Quit the sales of opportunities and manage game  
Get rid of spike elk hunts  
Make elk until same as and all limit to draw

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Keep scopes  
5 days is not a long enough time to hunt  
If get rid of scopes hunts should be in rut like old days  
Limit amount of hunters per unit on elk hunts just like deer  
3 point or better on deer hunts  
For the love of [REDACTED] get rid of spike hunts

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

I have been a dedicated hunter since started the charge is to high  
Need to make dedicated hunter programs for elk since dwr is all about money

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Private land is Private  
Private land owner tags and cwmu tags need to stay on Private and no aloud on public to hunt  
It should not matter how much land you own to get tag you should be able to get a tag and hunt your land dwr dose it with cow elk tags so it should be good for all species 5 day hunts should be banned

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?**

Private tags stay on Private grounds for which was issued not on public purposes  
Any land owner should get a tag for grounds they own regardless of acreage

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

Cwmu tags stay on Private grounds  
More public access if going to be in program

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

---

After watching the video here a few things that bothered me

1. your survey size of 2500 people and a response size of 650 people is a very small percentage of the hunting public. But what the hunting public did respond with is that they wanted to keep scopes. The question needed to be asked, what range do rifle hunters feel comfortable at shooting. I believe that you would see similar results.
2. Changing the rules just to match what other states are doing is following, just to follow.
3. All the data shows an increase of harvest of 2.6% since the regulations changed that allowed scopes of all powers. by removing scopes completely the harvest rate will go down and the rate of woundings/not recovered animals will go up and then people will shoot another animal, and that will result in less animals overall. REMOVING SCOPES WILL HAVE A NEGATIVE EFFECT ON THE OVERALL NUMBERS.
4. If this proposal is approved then you will see a lot of muzzleloader hunters change back over to the any legal weapon hunts and this will make point creep worse.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I would rather see a maximum scope power. Maybe 4 power.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I am vision impaired and use of weapons as currently described would make hunting impossible for me, Will COR exceptions for optical sights, crossbows and season extensions be maintained for hunters with physical challenges?

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I am nearly 60 years old as I write this. I have seen the changes over time that technology has brought into the hunting world. I believe much of the thrill of getting in really close to be able to harvest an animal has been largely lost in the current hunting climate. We have gone away from hunting and essentially are target shooting using long range weapons to make up for our lack of hunting prowess. In turn, many animals are wounded and lost because hunters who shoot too far do not think the hit the animal and failed to walk over and check for signs of a hit. This wounding loss would go unreported but would impact the real wounding losses.  
Personally I believe this has been part of the elk herd decrease in the Book Cliffs Bitter Creek South unit.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** I feel strongly that large tracts of public lands that are in-holding of ranches like Deseret Land and livestock should require the CWMU to open trade lands in equal amounts or provide proportional public benefit. The presentation does not go into specifics of public benefit. It would be helpful to show a specific example of this principle by showing how the CWMU permit/public permit numbers would look if no consideration were given for in-holdings vs. what the numbers are with the operator providing additional public permits as compensation for in-holdings.

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** think this will be good you could add a management hunt in the future For the youth but you need to no the Rule does not state no inline muzzleloader it just says cap must be Visible

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I have muzzleloader hunted for over 30 years and this needs to happen

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 27, 2023 12:52 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I am strongly in favor of removing scopes from muzzleloaders. I have powder hunted for over 20 years and would like to see it back the way it was before people were shooting animals at 500 yards with a muzzleloader. If hunters insist on using a scoped gun, there is an any legal weapon hunt they can use it on. Thanks

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 28, 2023 10:31 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Somewhat agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I agree with all changes except the weapons restrictions of the compound bows and muzzleloader. Why would I need to buy new equipment when bows and muzzleloader are generally harder hunts as it is. With Longbows and flintlocks people are less experienced and could lead to more errant shots and wounded animals. As with rifle, taking away scopes will only add more errors. I believe if it's just point restrictions and shorter season dates that majority of hunters will still hunt those units but will Not with the weapons restrictions

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I like the shorter hunting days  
I like the weapon restrictions.  
I don't like that 1 unit will be the sacrificial lamb.  
I believe there needs to be more units across the state to implement these changes, not just the Boulder unit.  
Please choose 4-8 more units to restrict throughout the state.  
That will give better data than just 1 unit.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

The division should be making it harder to join the Dedicated Hunter Program. People that are complaining about the requirements are too ██████ Lazy.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** I don't believe in spending resources to add to a population on Antelope Island unless it is a transplant from another herd on the island.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Any unit with shortened seasons should include an antler point restriction obviously given less time reduces selectivity.

What gives more deer hunting opportunities a larger population of breeding age does or fewer bucks killed during hunting season I think that answer is obvious and nothing here addresses that issue. Removing scopes from muzzleloaders doesn't give us more hunting opportunity.

Let's get to the point and admit many factors in this are financial. Eliminate Dedicated Hunter programs taking those tags and maybe an allocation of a few other tags and create "Special" tags that cost 5-10 times more to apply. Create a 1 year waiting period for any legal weapon tags that doesn't apply to the "special" tags. Waiting does not apply to tags remaining after draws those are sold first come first served.

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** It is foolish to think removing a scope from a weapon is going to increase opportunity those don't correlate. If most of the population doesn't shoot over 200 yards why limit their capabilities. If a hunter has a weapon that can shoot 150 yards I believe they will take a shot regardless of aiming device. Which is less likely to produce a wounded animal?

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

I believe the program should be disbanded and tags should be allocated in an increased cost "special" tag drawing. If the benefits of having hunters complete service hours is significant enough put a value on general deer season bonus points and let hunters volunteer for points guaranteed you get more volunteer hours.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 30, 2023 10:52 am

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I'm all for the mandatory harvest reporting. The data probably won't change, but the public confidence will.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I really like the idea of trying some new hunting strategies. A major concern I have is the lifetime license holders grabbing a huge majority of the tags in the 4pt or better units. Pine Valley already has about 500, and I think it will more than double. I think there should be some sort of cap, similar to the Dedicated Hunter Program, around 15% or so

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---



**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

So, the technology committee recommended to restrict the use of range-finding bow sights that cost \$800-\$1,000. A small percentage of hunters were using these and were affected by the change. On the rifle end of things, riflescopes that do similar things were restricted. The Burris Eliminator (\$1,500+) and the Swarovski DS (\$4,000+) are the only two mainstream scopes that do that. Again, very few people were affected by this change, with the vast majority of hunters using regular scopes with a turret/dial system. Almost EVERY muzzleloader hunter in the state will be affected by this proposal, and per the DWR's own survey data, there's "Not a lot of support for change". Also, no majority was in favor of the muzzleloader sight restrictions, the majority was in favor of the status quo - their words! So who is really pushing for this? If someone is looking for a "unique experience", what is stopping them from using iron sights right now? It doesn't make sense to me to make such a drastic change, without majority support.

The survey says that "Most people aren't comfortable harvesting animals beyond 200 yards" That's because most people are still in the 200-300 range, and I know a LOT of people with long-range muzzleloaders capable of shooting a long way. People like to be accurate and ethically harvest animals! Was that not even part of the conversation? Do we purposefully want to reduce people's accuracy and effective ability to cleanly and quickly harvest animals? I don't think it's a good idea to go backwards there.

Here's the big issue I have and I would like the RAC and Board to discuss:

The technology committee recommends that we restrict the optics that allow muzzleloaders to shoot similar distances to rifles. What are we doing to restrict the optics and sights on archery equipment that allow them to shoot more than 100 yards, crossing into muzzleloader territory? Shooting those extreme distances with a bow is far less accurate, predictable and ethical than some shooting 500 yards with these new muzzleloaders. And people ARE doing shooting those extremely long-range bow shots, because their sights allow for it! If you surveyed the general hunting public, a HUGE majority would say that people should not be shooting 100 yards (or more) with their bows. If we are going to restrict these optics on weapons, let's do it equitably and fairly. Let's not pretend like archery hunters are exempt from their weapons pushing the limits of an effective and ethical range. No preferential treatment.

I respectfully request the RAC's and Wildlife Board seriously discuss and vote on restricting archery sights to a maximum of 5 fixed pins and NO SLIDING or ADJUSTABLE SIGHTS. And only then I will be in favor of the proposed muzzleloader restrictions.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I agree with the change. I think the fee should be big enough to make a difference, 200-500\$ fee. 50\$ isn't enough to make anyone want to report for the consequence. Utah need a way to keep people honest, maybe in the process Utah need a way to make people take a picture of the notched tag and a picture of the animal. people aren't being honest about it.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** once again nothing for the Uintah basin. we have so much country for different things and nothing is ever said about the basin.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I agree 100 percent with the 3 point or better. but why aren't we trying this up here in the Uintah basin? why is this only happening in southern Utah? I personally would love to see this go around the state not just in one place. make this a law everywhere. try it for a couple years and see what happens, the deer numbers are down so much in the Uintah basin it could make it worse. the Uintah basin is used and the go to spot for everyone in salt lake. the deer population is dissipating. and I think this could give it a chance. but the biggest thing is I don't think it should just be southern Utah. there are so many of us that would donate time to come help with studies and counting, we just want to be a part of it and for these things to affect our deer herds too not just southern Utah.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

great get rid of the technology and make things fun. give the animals a chance. muzzleloaders are not what they used to be I know guys that kill deer at 1000 yards. that is farther than I can shoot a rifle accurately. get rid of compound bows on a general season standpoint all together for deer and elk. get rid of the spike hunt and let big bull tags use compound bows, and maybe not just make the whole state compound bow free. get rid of them. technology is a real problem and Utah is going to see major changes to the animal population if things don't happen now.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

get rid of the dedicated hunter program unless the hours are going to be used for wildlife uses only water ways plant base, things to help the animals. the approved list is not all for the animals.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

get rid of private land tags. stop worrying about private land and the animals on it. Utah lets farmers and private land owners run the amount of animals. Utah needs to realize that private land is a safe heaven for these animals. giving out an unlimited amount of land owner tags isnt going to push the animals back up because those are the animals from the mountains and they are going to get wiped out, and we are seeing that in the Uintah basin, the elk population is getting really bad. get rid of cow tags and spike tags.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 30, 2023 7:24 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Land owners should not get tags!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?** Land owners should not get tags!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** No compound bows is excessive. Strongly disagree with that proposal.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** All though not directly related to these rule changes to dedicated hunter program but indirectly related. The idea of restricting archery equipment to not allow compound bows is excessive.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** Deseret has over 15,000 acres of public land... with no trade land... wow that seems excessive.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 1, 2023 3:02 am

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed changes to the**  
**taking big game rule?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 1, 2023 3:14 am

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed changes to the**  
**taking big game rule?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** This is a very disturbing stance from the DWR. You know one word you guys never use is Family. You are too focused on catering to the wade lemons of the world to realize you are ruining a whole new generation with the lack of opportunity to hunt with their families. You guys are trying to turn Utah into a trophy only state and it's disgusting. Shame on you guys.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Ban the long range muzzle loaders and keep things the same.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Brian you do a great job with the dedicated hunter program. Please do not change. Removal of the orientation course is asking for trouble. There are already people who don't understand the rules. You will significantly amplify the bad behavior by eliminating the orientation course.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Great idea and plan.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

The number of available tags to the public is a joke. These Animals are public land animals they should get a higher percentage of the tags. This comes from a cattle landowner

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 1, 2023 3:37 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I 100% disagree with getting rid of scopes for muzzleloaders. As your data shows there's only a 2.6% increase in success rate and I don't think the scopes have a lot to do with that. Another point is as a muzzleloader hunter, we really only have 1 shot to make it count. As far as shooting longer shots on game, there's going to be those guys that will take those unethical shots and I promise you they will continue to do so even with open sights or a peep sight. As far as I am concerned you don't need to change a thing. If anything there will be less wounded animals if we keep scopes.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** This is a long overdue change. A+

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** I mostly agree with this proposal, but one area I am not in favor of is Antelope Island, I feel they need to get a handle on the very over abundant coyote population before putting more animals out there.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I commend the DWR for this out of the box thinking, and am willing to see how these proposals shake out.

A couple of issues that I am not a fan of, for the restrictive weapons hunts, I feel the archery restrictions are vastly over kill. Archery is already a very low success rate that I feel moving to long bow tech is to far. To me a fair restrictive hunt for archery would be to limit hunters to a 3 or 5 pin NON SLIDING site. to me this would help to reign in the archery equipment and lower success some. As I said its already very low compared to rifle and even muzzleloader.

I also feel that the muzzleloader restriction is to much, I feel that removing scopes as your have with rifles would be a fair take for that weapon type.

To me you went too far with your restrictive weapons definitions, I was ok with-it last year as a proposal, but only because I thought it would be used to add and additional hunt rather than completely replacing a hunt especially something as big as a whole general season unit.

One other issue, the proposed archery season is to start the first weekend in September, I feel you should keep the original start date in August as one of the draws to the archery hunt is hunting velvet bucks, if you move the hunt to September the velvet is not as pristine as it is getting ready to be rubbed off.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

This is a very disingenuous proposal, all of the feedback shows that the majority of hunters, and especially muzzleloader hunters do not support this change.

This is not a biological issue, the success rate did not see a significant jump, I see no reason to change the current rules. Hunting with a muzzleloader even one of the new ones is not even remotely close to the same as hunting with a rifle.

The DWR, or the Tech committee never did give a good valid reason that they feel this rule needs to change. I fully reject this proposal and I hope that you on the WB will as well.

KEEP SCOPES ON MUZZLOADERS.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

I agree with most of this, the only thing I do not like is them automatically adding a year to the program if the hunter draws a LE tag.

I personally had this happen to me as I drew a LE deer tag on the second year of my Dedicated hunters enrollment last year, this allowed me to be extra selective this year as I was able to hunt for a bigger buck this year knowing that if I did not kill one I could extend my dedicated to next year. But in the chance I did find a buck I wanted this year (which I did) I would still be able to use last year (the year I drew LE) as my no kill year. This allows me to now put in for a general hunt next year and either build a point or draw a tag.

Ultimately if you do this you will essentially be taking away a year of eligibility from the people that draw a LE tag while in the system. We all want as many years as possible to hunt, this rule would take a year away from someone depending on how it is implemented.

Everything else looked good.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

It does not say in this video, but in the new rules that passed last year, the people buying a voucher would have access to the entire LOA per the rule. I am wondering if that rule would still be in effect for Option 2 of the LOA rules?

Something to think about.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

I feel the public hunters do not get enough of the tags, should be 20% go to the public.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 8:49 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Dear Sirs and Madams,

I am writing in response to the proposed restrictions for optics on muzzleloaders. I did watch the video in its entirety, and I have some thoughts and concerns. I have hunted in Utah for over 40 years. I have used muzzleloader rifles throughout that entire period. I own and have used traditional TC rifles (cap and ball) as well as more modern in-line rifles. According to the data presented in the video, adding scopes to muzzleloaders insignificantly increases the harvest ratio, does not increase the wound ratio, does not increase the distance of the hunter taking a comfortable shot and therefore really has no scientific data to show that removing them entirely would have any significant effect except to appease a small fraction of people who are traditionalists or just don't like them or to match what other states are doing.

I would propose leaving the regulations as they are unless:

- 1) The scientific data shows an overwhelming advantage in harvest numbers.
- 2) The data shows an unacceptable increase in the number of wounded animals.
- 3) Biologists need to slow the buck harvest to increase buck-to-doe ratios or to help a specific area herd to recover. Make it a useful tool, like they are doing in our southern regions, not a blanket regulation.

As far as technology is concerned, I think it would be easy to argue that all methods have significantly increased over time, especially in the last 30 years. For example:

- 1) Compound bows have gone from 50-60% let off to 90% enabling longer hold periods.
- 2) Newer materials have shortened bows with higher speeds and less vibration.
- 3) Optics, specifically range finders, have dramatically improved accuracy and range.
- 4) The increase in the speed of compound bows allows greater arrow choices.
- 5) Rifles have also benefited from optic technology.
- 6) Rifle bullet technology has made effective shooting ranges more than double.

I respect that trying to effectively manage the states game animals is a daunting task and there are a lot of voices to be heard. However, I believe taking scopes away from muzzleloaders is the wrong choice and an ineffective rule with no real benefit for the wildlife at this point in time.

Sincerely,  
Robert M

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Somewhat agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I think there needs to be studies implemented in northern Utah as well. I say we need to try a few of these things in the northern part of the state where winters are more extreme. Then it would give a more diverse study throughout the state. Thanks for your time. I think we are headed in the right direction with these studies.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I get going backward in technology. But to go almost all the way back on muzzleloaders, and not even mention the any legal weapon hunt is the wrong move. If we aren't going to address anything on rifles then I say and least keep scopes on muzzleloaders 4x power or less. I think going absolutely no scopes is back tracking too far without addressing rifles. Thanks for your time.

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

If you are saying scopes only increased success rate by roughly 3% what is the big deal does it hurt having the scope because anyone that has shot a muzzle loader knows that about 200 yards is max and anyone shooting beyond that has either taken the time to be able to make that shot and can ethically make a clean shot just because Utah and Arizona are the two states that allow it why do we have to be like everyone else if that is the case you need to change the hunt dates like other states if you want to be like everyone else and allow muzzle loader hunting strictly in November when they are in the rut like Utah did do until the mid 90s then you would have my full support for no scopes or even like Colorado and no in line muzzle loaders but you won't do that so leave it alone your survey said that people won't shoot past 200 yards and I shot open sight for years until you lifted the 1x power scope rule because I felt it was stupid to have a 1x power scope didn't make sense but now I have a scope on my muzzle loader so my kids can get a muzzle loader tag and feel more comfortable with it because using open sight makes it very difficult for youth hunters to enjoy the hunt when they are inexperienced trying to get them excited about hunting and telling them line the dots up then they get frustrated and you have a harder time getting them out again because they get discouraged so don't remove scopes doesn't give you a advantage so why change it

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

First, I do not support having different rules for different areas. It is already way too confusing and this will make it exponentially worse. Many people are not following the rules now and most of the time it is not intentional, the rules are just too complicated. Also, some of these recommendations are needed on all units and some should not be implemented on any unit. It is not logical to wait until 2029 to implement statewide.

I support 4-point or better on all deer units in Utah with an exception for youth 12-16 years old that should be able to harvest any size buck. This does multiple things including: increases number of mature deer, doesn't deprive youth of being able to have reasonable success and continue hunting in the future, and provides a way to cull out those deer with bad genetics that may never be a 4-point.

I absolutely do not support the shorter season proposals for any unit. Hunting is my passion and I cherish every day spent in the field. Your own data shows that shorter seasons do not significantly impact totals days hunted or harvest. It only increases hunter crowding and takes away from time in the field of those that are passionate. Please do not shorten seasons.

The weapon restriction proposals are ridiculous. We may as well go back to using spears and atlatls. These restrictions will significantly reduce hunter satisfaction, instantly make peoples equipment obsolete and force them to make significant expenditures to purchase new equipment, and result in much less ethical shots being taken and more wounded game. It simply is impossible to hunt more ethically with a long bow, re-curve, or non-inline muzzeloder when compared to modern technology.

Also, please divide the Manti unit into a north and south unit split on the most logical boundary of Highway 31. The unit is simply too big to manage as one unit. Populations and trends are not the same across that large of a unit and there is no way to control hunter crowding. Please consider this comment even though it is mostly unrelated to the current proposal.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I do not support this recommendation at all. I fully believe this will result in less ethical shots being taken and much more wounded and unrecovered game.

People do not shoot more than 200 yards generally with a muzzleloader because of the gun, not because of the optics. Muzzleloaders have no doubt improved, but are still far from being on par with a modern rifle. The fact that they are single shot, the diameter of projectile, worse accuracy, pain to clean and tune, etc. all lead to them being significantly different and less efficient than modern rifles.

Many of us need scopes due to our eyesight. I would hardly call most people with vision problems impaired since it impacts almost every single person as they age. It is very difficult to focus on open sights as you age as well as seeing clearly at all ranges. I don't think the visual impairment is meant to mean just older people. Seems very hard to enforce.

Will the RACS, Wildlife Board, or Division be buying back our now obsolete equipment? I worked very hard to obtain my equipment and will not be able to afford to replace it to meet the new restrictions. My muzzleloader didn't come with open sights or even drilled for open sights. It will place a very unfair burden to retrofit or replace equipment and result in expensive equipment with no reasonable market to get our hard earned money back.

Please do not implement this proposal.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Please don't go back to open sights on the muzzleloaders. The wound rate will increase. I agree something needs to be done about the longer ranges that are happening but 1 power scopes will do that . If I want a primitive muzzleloader hunt I'll do the hams hunt. Isn't that one of the points of the hams hunts?

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** You should add more sites to the Parker unit. This used to be one of the best units in the state and now there's hardly any animals.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** While I don't mind some of the other recommendations, I disagree with the weapons restrictions. Not allowing compound bows? Archery hunting is Challenging already.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I completely disagree with your recommendations to not allow scopes on muzzleloader. I do agree the muzzleloader season should be separate, but do not agree at all that limiting optics is what makes the muzzleloader season unique. The unique and also challenging part of muzzleloader hunting is that you basically only have one shot and are limited by distance.

The video talks about limiting all this "technology", but all we are talking about is a scope to help you make a better shot.

I strongly ask you to keep the hunt regulations how they are now.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

While I am not sure if this management plan will work I am happy the DWR is trying something to improve our deer herds. Having said that I think there are some other changes that can be made.

I would like to see Utah go away from having two types of deer draws. I do not like that we can apply for limited entry deer and general season deer. I think we should go to just one type of draw. All the units are in the same draw. This way people can choose if they want to hunt more often for less desirable units or wait longer to hunt units considered more trophy type units.

Also if a unit is not over objective please stop giving out antlerless tags. That would include for landowners. With a small increase to permit prices the DWR could pay for crop loss instead of offering landowners tags. Or even offer antlered tags for private land only. This would help chase animals away from areas they are constantly getting "harassed" and the landowners could get some compensation in the form of trespass fees from hunters willing to pay for the right to hunt on that particular piece of property.

Lastly even if the shortened season and or weapon restrictions do not reduce the percent of success please leave them in place. This would reduce the number of days the animals are being pressured. If those days are reduced to me that would mean less stress on the animals therefor increasing the chance they have of surviving a harsh winter. If more animals survive winters that would logically increase the amount of tags that can be offered and increase opportunity.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I agree with removing scopes from muzzleloaders. I believe it should be more of a traditional hunt. I have hunted with a muzzleloader in Utah and I have used a magnifying scope. I believe a high powered scope make most muzzleloaders a single shot rifle. If it does not increase the harvest success or number of wounded animals I do not see a reason to have scopes. I understand there are some people who enjoy using scopes on muzzleloaders, but with the ability to use those scoped muzzleloaders during the ALW hunt they still have that opportunity.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Who cares what other states do? Are we going to allow gambling now?!?

I guarantee removing scopes will lead to more wounded game and wasted game, not having a scope will not stop most hunters from taking 100-200 yard shots on a nice buck. However when the front bead covers an entire deer body past 100 yards it's not possible to make an ethical shot, yet because the gun "can" shoot that far people are still going to take that shot. Please don't take away scopes!!! If you must then please just restrict the scope power. The excuse for officers being distracted while looking at a scopes power is a bunch of crap! They do just fine checking every shell on my person for lead duck hunting or my muzzleloader for a primer when it's already put away, checking a scope IS NOT going to cause them harm!

---



Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 6, 2023 3:40 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** With the data presented in this video I see no reason why Scopes should be removed from the Muzzleloader seasons! Leave the hunt the way it is.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 6, 2023 3:58 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I am writing mostly about scopes on muzzleloaders. There is only a 2.6% increase in hunter harvest with using scopes versus not using scopes and I suspect that there is less wounding loss when using scopes. I can't see a biological reason to disallow the use of scopes on muzzleloaders. Voting to not allow scopes on muzzleloaders won't increase our big game herds at all.

I am over 70 years old, and it is almost impossible to focus both the front sight and the rear sight on a muzzleloader for me and most people near my age. A scope really helps me make a better and more ethical shot on an animal, especially in low-light conditions. We hunt spike elk with muzzleloaders and it is hard to keep track of a legal spike and a spike with extra points that isn't legal when both are moving around in a herd and changing places. A scope really helps.

I was at the Wildlife Board meeting clear back when they had the two-board system when they made the 1 power scope rule for muzzleloaders. There was an older gentleman by the name of Jerry Mason on the Board who really liked to hunt with a muzzleloader, but he couldn't see very well so he wanted to be able to use a scope. He didn't think that he had enough support for a law to be able to use scopes so he made a motion to use 1 power scopes and it passed. He didn't realize that a 1 power scope makes things look farther away than they really are, and the crosshairs are so thick that they almost cover up a whole target at a hundred yards and it was really hard to even sight one in. This is why hunters pushed to be able to use regular rifle scopes.

I don't like the idea of people shooting animals with muzzleloaders at the yardage they claim. The trouble is that you can't legislate common sense, morals, or ethics. I never shoot at anything over 200 yards and almost never over a hundred yards. I don't have one of those new long-range muzzleloaders and don't plan on buying one. Basically, most muzzleloader bullets have very poor trajectory so the only way that you can hit anything at the ranges they claim is to have a scope with a lot of magnification that you can dial up for yardage. If you shoot a scope that doesn't have an adjustment for yardage, you are just guessing where you hold your crosshairs when you shoot. At the ranges, some of them claim to shoot a muzzleloader that would drop between 10 and 15 feet. That would be really hard to guess the holdover with a fixed low-power scope.

I would hate to see you vote to disallow scopes on muzzleloaders but if you think that you want to make a change, I suggest that you change the rule to say "Only fixed 4 power scopes or less are allowed on muzzleloaders". That would really cut out all this really long-range shooting but would still allow a decent short-range rifle that more follows the spirit of muzzleloader hunting. Scopes have been used on muzzleloaders clear back in the Flintlock days. People of my age have plenty of issues with hunting as they get older but please don't make it harder than it already is for us.

I was the southern region RAC chairman for several years before I was appointed to the Utah Wildlife Board. I have been active in all kinds of wildlife conservation groups for over 50 years. Every year sportsmen were complaining about low buck numbers. Throughout all these years I have been around when the legislature passed buck-only hunting when we have gone through antler point restrictions, shortened seasons, cutting permit numbers and all kinds of measuring ideas like bucks per 100 does and age classes and the list goes on. All the while our deer herds just keep dwindling and as part of it we just keep seeing fewer bucks and for sure older bucks.

Basically, for the last 50 years we have had our focus in the wrong place, we have been worrying about bucks because we like to hunt them. The real thing that we should have been focusing on is fawn rates instead of bucks. For a deer herd just to maintain we need about 65 per hundred does postseason. In the past some deer units would have over 100 fawns per hundred does postseason. Now we have units with less than 40 fawns per hundred does postseason. If we want bucks they have to be born and allowed to survive to maturity and be able and reproduce. Large mature bucks are always a small portion of a deer herd so when you have low herd numbers you can't expect to have many large bucks whether we hunt them or not.

Now we are under 90,000 deer hunters hunting buck only and the deer are declining. In the banner years in the 60's and 70's, we had almost 3 times that many hunters and we were hunting either sex, and we still had a lot of deer. I don't agree with all this modern technology and don't want to make light of it, but the answer to having more and larger bucks to hunt is fawn survival. All these hunt-change strategies that have been tried over the years to create better buck hunting have failed. Sportsmen have been complaining and bickering forth with each other and the DWR for years and have accomplished really very little. We are so far below any reasonable threshold on some of our deer units that it would take almost some major intervention to ever bring them back. If we do ever get the deer herd back to some reasonable level there will be enough good bucks for all of us to share without all these changes.

I have been where you are sitting now, and I really appreciate all the time and commitment that you have for Utah's wildlife.

Paul Niemeyer

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

Mandatory reporting would be good  
But participation would be low  
Good lack of harvest data would be good to cut all tags in all areas

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?**

We need to cut tags quit harvesting  
Immature animals

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

Need to make it 3 point or better state wide quit killing immature  
Animals

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Have both type of hunts move primitive weapons to rut hunts with 3 point or better on elk and deer

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Make dedicated hunter program for elk also since all about the money

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Private land owner tags need to stay on Private ground  
Not on public and enforce it on outfitters  
Diamond and manti good examples of too many outfitters limited outfitters per area like other states

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?**

Loa tags need to stay on Private ground  
And no public tags should be issued

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

Cwmu need to have more public access  
And stay on Private ground  
Not be allowed to hunt public  
Limit amount outfitters in area

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 7, 2023 3:56 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Somewhat disagree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

To the Northeastern Utah RAC Representative,

My name is Scott B. Christensen. I have hunted in Utah all but one year of my eligible life. I started hunting at 14 and I'm 60 now. I just learned of several changes that will be discussed in your next RAC meeting. Many of which I disagree with.

First I would like to say I recognize there are problems with our Deer population. This year has been miserable for the rifle deer hunt. Two days of hunting and I saw three deer. A doe and her 2 yearlings. I hunted many areas and covered many miles. I also sat down with DWR officers that were stationed near Scipio. At the time I sat down with them they hadn't had anyone stop in and only one person call them. Last winter was terrible and the area must have had severe winter kill. Lets just say I won't be applying for a tag in that area for some time.

I'm also worried about CWD and welcome testing so long as it leads to ways of controlling it or eliminating it. Testing to just track it or to just say we know it's there is worthless and a waste of the money I contribute to DWR. I further recommend more information to the public about eating animals that test positive for it. IE: Its safety and possible harms it may pose. I think it needs to be shared on more media than your website.

Now to the proposed changes.

Muzzleloader - Only open sites.

Scopes help hunters make better and more humane shots/kills. With open sites you'll have more people making poor shots that could lead to more wounded animals and less ethical hunting. Scopes also help hunters make better identification of species and sex. Scopes do not change the effectiveness of the muzzleloader itself, it's killing capabilities, or it's range.

Sometimes when I hunt CWMU's I like to use a muzzleloader for the challenge and skill it provides. After all I get only one shot 99% of the time before it scampers off.

Muzzleloader - Inline Muzzleloader (Using 209 primers) restriction from Muzzleloader season

I'm stymied about the need to break this grouping up. A muzzleloader is a muzzleloader. Inline with a 209 primer doesn't increase the distance my muzzleloader shots. I still must load it from the muzzle. I still usually only get one shot per animal. Having a primer cap where someone can see it doesn't help, improve, or change the effectiveness of a muzzleloader. Both shoot primer sparks into the powder charge forcing one round ball, maxi ball or sabot out the end of the barrel. Forcing all inline or 209 primer muzzleloader people into the regular rifle hunt puts them at a disadvantage to modern-day rifle hunters. They aren't even the same class of hunting styles.

Concerning both of these above issues I'm asking you to oppose them.



They are counter productive and appear to be more to hassle certain hunters rather than keep things fair among hunters.

Concerning the memorandum about 2024 CWMU and LOA permit recommendations. There is a chart showing the number of private and public tags. Above it, the paragraph above says it shows the recommended tag numbers of, "...bucks, bulls and turkeys." However the chart doesn't show turkey tag numbers. I don't know if this is an oversight error or purposeful omission. I would like to have known the numbers.

I should also note that my wife, daughter and son all have licenses and agree with my thoughts on this matter. We love hunting in Utah and want changes to make sense and not be used to discriminate or as a political tool, such as the muzzleloader changes appear to be.

Happy hunting

Scott Christensen  
967 West Fremont Ave  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84104  
ID # 6489548

**Which best describes your position  
regarding the technology  
recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

To the Northeastern Utah RAC Representative,

My name is Scott B. Christensen. I have hunted in Utah all but one year of my eligible life. I started hunting at 14 and I'm 60 now. I just learned of several changes that will be discussed in your next RAC meeting. Many of which I disagree with.

First I would like to say I recognize there are problems with our Deer population. This year has been miserable for the rifle deer hunt. Two days of hunting and I saw three deer. A doe and her 2 yearlings. I hunted many areas and covered many miles. I also sat down with DWR officers that were stationed near Scipio. At the time I sat down with them they hadn't had anyone stop in and only one person call them. Last winter was terrible and the area must have had severe winter kill. Lets just say I won't be applying for a tag in that area for some time.

I'm also worried about CWD and welcome testing so long as it leads to ways of controlling it or eliminating it. Testing to just track it or to just say we know it's there is worthless and a waste of the money I contribute to DWR. I further recommend more information to the public about eating animals that test positive for it. IE: Its safety and possible harms it may pose. I think it needs to be shared on more media than your website.

Now to the proposed changes.

Muzzleloader - Only open sites.

Scopes help hunters make better and more humane shots/kills. With open sites you'll have more people making poor shots that could lead to more wounded animals and less ethical hunting. Scopes also help hunters make better identification of species and sex. Scopes do not change the effectiveness of the muzzleloader itself, it's killing capabilities, or it's range.

Sometimes when I hunt CWMU's I like to use a muzzleloader for the challenge and skill it provides. After all I get only one shot 99% of the time before it scampers off.

Muzzleloader - Inline Muzzleloader (Using 209 primers) restriction from Muzzleloader season

I'm stymied about the need to break this grouping up. A muzzleloader is a muzzleloader. Inline with a 209 primer doesn't increase the distance my muzzleloader shots. I still must load it from the muzzle. I still usually only get one shot per animal. Having a primer cap where someone can see it doesn't help, improve, or change the effectiveness of a muzzleloader. Both shoot primer sparks into the powder charge forcing one round ball, maxi ball or sabot out the end of the barrel. Forcing all inline or 209 primer muzzleloader people into the regular rifle hunt puts them at a disadvantage to modern-day rifle hunters. They aren't even the same class of hunting styles.

Concerning both of these above issues I'm asking you to oppose them.

They are counter productive and appear to be more to hassle certain hunters rather than keep things fair among hunters.

Concerning the memorandum about 2024 CWMU and LOA permit recommendations. There is a chart showing the number of private and public tags. Above it, the paragraph above says it shows the recommended tag numbers of, "...bucks, bulls and turkeys." However the chart doesn't show turkey tag numbers. I don't know if this is an oversight error or purposeful omission. I would like to have known the numbers.

I should also note that my wife, daughter and son all have licenses and agree with my thoughts on this matter. We love hunting in Utah and want changes to make sense and not be used to discriminate or as a political tool, such as the muzzleloader changes appear to be.

Happy hunting

Scott Christensen  
967 West Fremont Ave  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84104  
ID # 6489548

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

the 4 point or better rule needs some serious attention! Big 3X3 need to be shot and killed. This rule will not allow that to happen. That is ridiculous! Our herds will eventually become nothing but giant 3X3's because nobody can kill them. Serious flaw in this. LE units allow for 3 points for this reason on the management tags. Pretty dumb to allow the genes to go to crap by not allowing anyone to hunt 3 point deer. Also, in my opinion we need to have a separate tag for youth and first time hunters and allow them to hunt anything with no restrictions on points. With the mandatory harvest surveys and a separate tag you can require proof of notching the tag or not and allow the first time hunter to try again next time if they were not successful. Youth I think should be allowed to hunt with no antler restrictions until the age of 18. First time hunter until they harvest for the first time. Again, the 4 point or better rule needs to be reduced to 3 point or our genes are going to go to crap and we will have nothing but 3 point deer running around and nobody to shoot them.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 8, 2023 7:36 am

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I strongly disagree with the proposed changes. I would also like to add, I have been hunting with a muzzleloader for 30+ years and spoke with 18 hunters who have hunted with them for 15+ years, to include hunting with them multiple times in the past 7 years... none of them received a survey and all share the same views as myself. Mr. Stringham states in his presentation that the use of scopes has only raised success rates by 2.6% as well as no significant changes over the past 10 years in wounding loss. So why change it? If a hunter wants to use open/peep sites then they can, why take the opportunity from those who use scopes away from them?

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

In 2002 we sold 72,900 permits, in 2022 we sold 73,075 we are NOT selling less permits...  
The point restriction would work great for the first few years, but beyond that it worries me severely. The book cliffs and the Monroe had a 3 point or bigger restrictions for years now they have the worst genetics of our LE units in the state. Maybe 4 point or bigger would fix that. But I'm not so sure.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

In this economy I'd really rather not be forced to buy another muzzleloader just because what was once legal, now is not. I've allowed disliked in-line muzzleloaders. But after becoming a dedicated hunter, I bought one. But now you're potentially forcing me to buy another one due to the fact my current one can't except open sights. We bounce around so much, Why not outlaw in-lines altogether? That is something I know alot of people would get behind.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

I absolutely love this idea. No more spending even more gas to turn a piece of paper in. The automatic year extension is also a great idea.

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Sportsman if we want to preserve and what to harvest mature bucks we need to sacrifice a little to help do our part. Support not using scopes for the muzzle load hunts. If scopes are to be used no more power than a 1 power. There needs to be regulations on the methods and size and shooting distant. The muzzles that shoot 400-600 yards and the ones that are being homemade are just like shooting a rifle. This hunting method is taking more mature bucks before that rut and have a big input on the mature bucks that are left for the rut. It like have the rife hunt during the muzzleload season. Muzzle loading technology has developed the ammunition that now has ability for the bullet in a casing the same as a rife bullet.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---