

**Northern Region Wildlife Board Advisory Council**

**August 22, 2007**

**6:00 P.M.**

**Place:** Brigham City Community Center, Brigham City, Utah

**RAC Present**

Robert Byrnes  
Ann Neville  
Paul Cowley  
Brad Slater  
Mark Marsh  
Lee Shirley  
Darwin Bingham  
Jon Leonard  
Shawn Groll

**RAC Absent**

James Gaskill  
Ryan Foutz  
Bret Selman  
Bill Fenimore

**DWR Present**

Jodie Anderson  
Randy Wood  
Darren Debloois  
Boyde Blackwell  
Justin Dolling  
Mitch Lane  
Ron Hodson  
Greg Sheehan  
Tom Aldrich  
Dennis Southerland  
Justina Parsons-Berenstein  
Scott Davis  
Kirt Enright  
Scott McFarlane  
Leslie McFarlane

**Wildlife Board**

Ernie Perkins

**Public Present** - See Attached Roll Sheet

**Meeting Begins:** 6:00 p.m.

**Number of Pages:** 16

**Introduction** - Brad Slater, RAC Chair

**Agenda:**

Welcome and Introductions  
Review and Acceptance (or Rejection) of Agenda Items  
Review and Acceptance (or Rejection) of Previous Meeting Minutes  
Regional Update  
Fee Proposal  
Convention Permits Rule R657-55  
CWMU Rule R657-37  
Waterfowl Proclamation and Rule R657-09  
Turkey Proclamation and Rule R657-54  
Other RAC Business

## **Item 2. Review and Acceptance (or Rejection of Agenda Items)**

### ***July 10, 2007 Meeting Minutes***

**Motion-** Marsh- Move that the Northern Region Advisory Council approve the minutes of the July 10, 2007 meeting.

**Second-** Cowley

**Motion Carries-** Unanimous

### ***Adoption of the Agenda for this meeting***

**Motion-** Neville- Move that the Northern Region Advisory Council adopt the agenda for the August 22, 2007 meeting.

**Second-** Leonard

**Motion Carries-** Unanimous

## **Item 3. Regional Update**

Ron Hodson, Regional Supervisor

Reported on the following:

***Weber River Fish Population Survey:*** A video was shown illustrating how fish are marked by fin clipping. It is estimated that approximately 14,000 white fish, 10,000 brown trout and 1,000 cutthroat or rainbow fish are in the 11 mile section that was surveyed. DWR Biologists are asking for anglers to participate and assist in the fish population survey by keeping a diary of the fish they catch between August 1<sup>st</sup> and October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2007.

***Wildlife Review Magazine:*** The publication of the Wildlife Review magazine has ceased. It is now available on-line and will reach approximately 30,000 people per month.

***Deer Forecast for Fall 2007:*** Graphs of the deer population were displayed for the following deer herd units: East Canyon, Kamas, Morgan and South Rich, North Slope, Chalk Creek, Ogden, Cache and Box Elder.

### **RAC Questions**

Marsh- Have the dedicated hunters been notified that their magazine is available on-line?

A Division representative said the Division is in the process of notifying the dedicated hunters that the magazine is now offered on-line.

Cowley- According to the graphs, a lot of the public objectives seem to be about 2,000 to 3,000

below the population objectives. Are the objectives realistic given the amount of winter range being developed or are they unrealistic objectives that need to be brought down to a more realistic number?

Hodson- We have not lowered those objectives because we are trying to do habitat projects on those units in hopes that we can increase the numbers. We may, at some time, have to adjust the numbers and assume that they are not realistic.

Bingham- I do not think the deer numbers are that high but it sounds like you are trying to increase the deer herd numbers.

Hodson- We hope we can improve things over the long term so we can meet those numbers but we realize that might not be the case.

#### **Item 4. Fee Proposal**

Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Chief

See Handout

#### **RAC Questions**

Cowley- Will the pond permit be \$200 for the full five years or \$200 each year?

Sheehan- It would be \$200 for five years. We are trying to simplify the process so the paperwork does not have to be done every year.

#### **RAC Comment**

Bingham- Does the fee charge cover the costs?

Sheehan- The costs cover a number of things such as research, monitoring and law enforcement activity.

Bingham- My concern is that the cost should carry itself.

Sheehan- I think most of these costs do. Some of the permits, such as pronghorn may be vague, since there is a lot involved in the pronghorn management plan.

Cowley- How will the \$1,000 brine shrimp permit fee increase effect those involved in that industry?

Sheehan- I do not think that we have specific industry information as to what the brine shrimp revenues are. That information is guarded closely. We increased the fee last year from \$10,000 to \$13,000 and plan to increase those fees over the next few years.

**Motion-** Marsh- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Fee Proposal, as presented

**Second-** Leonard

**Motion Carries-** Unanimous

**Item 5. Convention Permits Rule R657-55**

Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Chief

See Handouts

**RAC Question**

Neville- In regards to the ruling, the applicant was awarded in 2005, does anyone else get to apply before the five year period is over?

Sheehan- No one else will be awarded for the five year period.

**RAC Comments**

Byrnes- I provided Greg Sheehan with some proposed wording changes. If the Division agrees with them, I would like them to be incorporated into their proposal to the Wildlife Board. I have several copies of the changes, if the members of the RAC would like to review them.

Sheehan- We will review the proposed text amendments with Attorney General's office representative. They are not substantive changes that will affect what the rule is trying to accomplish. My recommendation would be that the NRAC adopt what is included in their packet until the text changes can be considered.

**Motion-** Cowley - Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Convention Permits Rule R657-55, as presented.

Byrnes- I would request that the motion be amended to include the text amendments that I submitted to Mr. Sheehan.

Cowley- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Convention Permits Rule R657-55 with further consideration given to the proposed text amendments that were submitted by Robert Byrnes prior to the Division giving their final presentation to the Wildlife Board.

**Second-** Byrnes

**Motion Carries-** Unanimous

**Item 6. CWMU Rule R657-37**

Boyde Blackwell, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Program Manager

See Handout

## **Public Questions**

Jim Collins- I noticed there is an internal satisfaction survey for department use. If an individual wants to pursue a CWMU private permit, would they have access to the customer satisfaction rankings?

Blackwell- Yes, we would probably want to add that to the website so individuals know which CWMU they want to put in for.

## **RAC Questions**

Neville- I have a question on the wording that is in Section 7- Permit Allocation. Is the intent of Section 7 to provide comparable hunt opportunities for both the public and the private.

Blackwell- Yes.

Cowley- How many public land acres are within CWMU's?

Blackwell- Less than 4% of public lands are used in CWMU's. I do not have the exact figure with me.

Cowley- As you include some public lands in the CWMU, is the public land manager viewed as a Land Owner Association member?

Blackwell- No, they are excluded from that even though the land they manage is within the CWMU.

Cowley- Can you help me understand why that is?

Hodson- The reason for that is we consider these CWMU's to be like mini-limited entry units. When we do limited entry units on Forest or BLM lands, we do not necessarily ask them to sign off on those. We are really only changing the types of permits that can be on that unit. We are not changing the land management or access for the public land. We are basically indicating that certain properties are limited entry units.

Cowley- We have received a number of comments from the public regarding improperly posted CWMU's on public land. Is there a Division individual that periodically checks CWMU posting to make sure it meets the Division's standards?

Blackwell- If the Regional Biologist receives a concern regarding the signs that are posted, they will visit the property and determine whether the signage meets the Division standards. They also visit new CWMU's to make sure that the boundaries are consistent with what is shown on the map. The signs are not checked frequently but they are checked.

Cowley- If an individual noticed a problem with signage, should that individual contact the individual region about that CWMU?

Blackwell- Yes, that gives the Region the opportunity to visit the property and make sure the CWMU operator is following the rule.

Cowley- What is the consequence if the sign is not posted correctly?

Blackwell- If a sign is posted incorrectly, we would contact the CWMU. If the signs are not corrected, then we would take that information to the Advisory Council who would go through the steps and make a penalty recommendation to the Wildlife Board.

Byrnes- When public land is included in a CWMU and is posted, is permission received from the Land Management Agency to place that posting on public land?

Blackwell- No, we do not pursue a letter or request permission.

Byrnes- How many CWMU units will be effected by the change that corner to corner does not constitute contiguous for obtaining minimum acreage?

Blackwell- I believe there are two that are on the minimum acreage. There is a clause that makes an exception for those CWMU's, similar to the grandfather clause provision that exists for the acreage.

Marsh- What was the reason for the antlerless hunt having a two day window compared to four days where hunters would have an opportunity to hunt two weekends, if necessary for reasons such as bad weather?

Blackwell- CWMU owners and operators are good to work with. If they have a problem and need to meet their antlerless objective over three years, they will do what they can to get the hunters on their property. At the same time, the antlerless hunt is more of a population management. It is definitely not a trophy hunt. We felt like they really did not need the extra days so providing a minimum of two days is adequate.

Groll- Is the Division concerned about any repercussions from out-of-state hunting groups as a result of the antlerless permits being made available to residents only?

Blackwell- We are not concerned about out-of-state hunting groups opposing this proposal. This is a different scenario than the Commerce Clause where there are out-of-state individuals who come to Utah to guide/make a living. They are not trying to make a living by harvesting an antlerless elk.

### **Public Questions**

Wes Shields (CWMU Association)- If the 27 permits were made 50/50 instead of 60/40, how many of those permits will go to the public?

Blackwell- I can not determine that without reviewing the data.

Shields- With the total number of moose permits available now, would the public significantly benefit by receiving more permits at 50/50?

Blackwell- Yes, if the land owner would take the extra permit. I have had some tell me that if it is up to them (and they had 2 and 1), if we asked them to take the extra permit to make it 50/50 so it would be 2 and 2, they would not do that because they would have to put more effort into taking the public permit out.

Shields- If they felt they had 3 mature bulls and they could offer 2 and 1, and they felt forced out of a 50/50 to take one additional bull, is that going to cut down on the quality of their bull resource?

Blackwell- I believe that the biologist that is in charge of that area would make a recommendation based on the moose population for that area.

Shields- I have a concern with this proposal, as do other members of the CWMU Association.

### **Public Comment**

Ernie Perkins (representing self)- I commend and recognize the individuals who participated in that committee. I was the non-voting RAC representative to the committee. The committee members traveled to the meetings during bad weather and worked through many difficult issues.

Wes Shields (CWMU Association)- The CWMU Association appreciates the efforts of the review committee. We are pleased with many of the outcomes of the committee, such as the survey that will benefit the public, as well as the CWMU operators. We strongly oppose any changes to the permit ratios, including the moose permit ratio which is recommended to go from 60/40 to 50/50. There are several moose CWMU's that would be significantly impacted through this proposed change. There are 2 of the 27 CWMU's that would lose 1 permit if they are forced to take the split. The number of public permits will not likely increase on those 2 units or the other 25 units. We accept the Division's proposal regarding the corner-to-corner issue, no separate boundaries by species, and obtaining minimum acreage. These proposals are needed to make large blocks of property contiguous so they are quality, huntable properties. However, I am concerned that there may be some CWMU lands that will not be able to qualify. If the CWMU operator can prove that they have good biological conditions and good hunting opportunities, perhaps there should be an opportunity for a variance to be given so we can keep the open space open for hunting and for wildlife.

Dave Freiss (Advisory Committee)- I was a CWMU representative for the review committee. I operate two CWMU's in Box Elder County. As we started that process about one year ago, we looked at the main problems that we saw in the program. Most of those problems have stemmed from comparable hunting opportunities. 90% of the CWMU operators treat the public well so the public has good experiences on those units. The rest of the CWMU operators are not good to the public. The CWMU Association and the Division want the CWMU operators to be held to a high standard. The committee created positive recommendations. We may have overstepped

our bounds regarding permit allocation for moose and boundary issues. We should not be excluding private land owners from becoming a part of the program with acreage and other requirements. We should encourage land owners to participate so there is more land protected for wildlife. However, there are definitely some properties that should not be recommended as CWMU's. During the discussions, my personal opinion was that there should be a biologist on the ground making that decision as to whether the units are viable. There are many quality lands that are 7 to 8 acres so they do not meet the 10 acre requirement. My recommendation is that we further consider the private land issues and the standards that have been set for those land owners to qualify as a CWMU. I am opposed to the ratio being changed. The ratio has been in tact for 13 years and has proven to be a benefit to both the public and private sector. We are doing a disservice to private land owners to alter that ratio.

### **RAC Comment**

Neville- In regards to the equity, I agree that the public and the private should have the same opportunity. When there is a public document that states that the public permittee shall be allowed to hunt the entire CWMU except areas that are excluded from hunting to all permittees, as a CWMU operator, that could cause some issue, not in equity but in potential liability for the CWMU owner. I think the wording should address comparable hunting opportunities and not indicate that individuals can go anywhere on the CWMU.

Bingham- I was impressed with the public comment. My suggestion is that each situation be considered individually, according to acreage. The biologists would need to determine what amount of acreage is needed for each species. Those who run their CWMU's properly should have an opportunity for it to be profitable.

Marsh- I like the 50/50 split since it makes it more feasible for the public hunter, who I feel has been getting short changed. I think it can be resolved in the fact that if there is a 3 permit unit and 2 of the permits go to the landowner one year and one to the public. The following year it will reverse so the public receives 2 permits. I also like the idea for the antlerless harvest objectives to be met. Coming from the Chalk Creek drainage, where we have a fair number of CWMU's, there have been 2 to 3 groups applying for antlerless permits of cow elk to protect the herd numbers. In all reality the herd management objective is higher than it should be and we need to get that down.

Leonard- Did the committee agree on the 50/50 split or was there disagreement?

Blackwell- At the close of the committee meetings, I did not receive any negative feedback from the committee members.

Leonard- Have the concerns expressed tonight arisen since the committee adjourned?

Blackwell- They may have always had those concerns. However, the individuals may have accepted the 50/50 proposal in an effort to work with the group.

Leonard- It would be easier to make a decision if I had information as to what impact there will

be on the number of public permits that are issued.

Blackwell- If we were to stay at 2 and 1, in order to meet that 50/50, we would do the exact same thing as we do with the 1 and 0. One year there would be two private and the next year there would be two public. If there were 3 and 3, it would stay at 50/50. Under the 50/50, once you get past the 3 and 3, you would go three to the private and four to the public. We do not have any that are more than 5 and 3. If we were to use the 50/50, the public would receive that fourth permit.

Leonard- I am a retired land surveyor so I know that the public land survey system does not always, in its rectangular nature, fit well on the topography of the land. There is merit to the idea that some subjective analysis be given to individuals who have that land ownership pattern, and yet could feasibly qualify as an adequate CWMU, even though their land is not a certain acreage and a rectangle.

Cowley- Can you respond to the comment that a CWMU owner may be at risk if the text includes the word "hunt"? If there is inclement weather, it may make sense to reduce the number of days allowed to prevent a liability issue for the CWMU owner.

Blackwell- That situation currently exists if a CWMU owner opens up their land to an individual. Every CWMU and walk-in access is covered by the State so there is not a liability involved.

Cowley- I am concerned that the change to the percentages will exclude certain landowners, but we should consider the benefit to the public since it is their wildlife.

**Motion-** Cowley- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept CWMU Rule R657-37, as presented

**Second-** Shirley

### **RAC Discussion**

Leonard- I would suggest that the ratio and land configuration proposal be further reviewed by the Wildlife Board.

**Motion Carries-** Unanimous (Ann Neville abstained from the vote)

Leonard- I would recommend that there be further consideration to the ratio. It appears that the review committee that presented this proposal is no longer unanimous. There could be significant financial implications to the land owner and/or the operator. If there is a significant benefit to the public sportsman, I would certainly support that.

Slater- Was that a standing committee or was it an ad hoc committee that considered the CWMU proposal?

Blackwell- It is a standing committee. It was approved by the Wildlife Board and it is by Rule.

**Motion-** Leonard- Recommend that the Wildlife Board give further consideration to the moose permit ratio and possible variance for land configurations and acreage of a CWMU.

**Second-** Shirley

**Motion Carries-** Unanimous

**Item 7. Waterfowl Proclamation and Rule R657-09**

Tom Aldrich, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

**Public Questions**

Drew Romney- What was the purpose of making the first long term closure of the units motorless?

Aldrich- Just to give a variety of different opportunities where foot soldiers and canoe paddlers would have a special opportunity.

Romney- Has there been adequate research to the advantages that will happen should you allow motors.

Aldrich- There has not been research done.

Brad Smith- Will there be discussion given to the idea of opening the youth waterfowl season at an earlier time?

Aldrich- We did have an internal discussion about that. There were varying opinions. We decided not to recommend that for safety reasons having to do with the recent change in the small game license age restrictions that now allow kids of any age to hunt. We did not want to do anything to increase the likelihood of an accident occurring. Other RACs have recommended it this year. The Division, as with all recommendations that come from the RAC, will reconsider it based on the RAC's recommendation.

Chuck Sorenson- When was the last time that the geese in Utah met their long-term averages?

Aldrich- I am guessing it was three years ago.

Kevin Booth- Do you think the roosting, resting and feeding patterns of the Tunder Swan will be affected in the Pintail area?

Aldrich- We have increased number of Tunder Swans in that motorless area. That increase will not likely occur to the same degree once we reopen it. We do not know where they go when

they are not at the Pintail unit.

Booth- Will that create additional law enforcement issues in that area by offering additional access? Will there be an increased amount of accidental or purposeful shootings of swans in that area?

Aldrich- I do not believe so.

Craig Olsen- Are there boat ramps in the ponds that are north of the highway?

Aldrich- There are some small boat ramps.

Chuck Sorenson- Has there been any studies done on the duck habitat in the northern ponds compared to that of the Pintail unit?

Aldrich- There have not been studies done. The manager probably has a good idea how many birds are in those relative areas. I am not aware of what they are.

Drew Romney- I would like to know why the area north of the Bear River Refuge was closed to swan hunting.

Aldrich- Everything north of the Bear River Refuge was closed to swan hunting quite a few years ago. The Fish and Wildlife Service was in the middle of a lawsuit. They determined that the Division had to close some additional areas to swan hunting or we would likely lose the swan hunt.

Romney- Was that closure due to the number of Trumpeters being taken?

Aldrich- Yes.

Romney- Do you think there would be an adverse affect to the Trumpeters if motors are allowed?

Aldrich- We harvest between 0 and 2 Trumpeters a year. Most of that harvest occurs on Harold Crane and Ogden Bay. When hunting was allowed, it was occurring at public shooting grounds at Salt Creek. I do not believe that hunting at the Pintail unit will have a measurable effect on the number of Trumpeters and Tundras that are taken.

Romney- Do you think that would push the swans further south towards the Refuge, Ogden Bay or Harold Crane?

Aldrich- The Trumpeter Swans that we know of are already south so I do not think it would make a difference.

## **Public Comment**

Carl Taylor (Utah Waterfowl Association)- The earlier opener for the youth hunt has historically been at 8 a.m. Tom Aldrich proposed an early opener which would be one half hour before sunrise. In the west, we are the only state that does not allow the early opener. The Director was opposed to it because of the safety risks that are involved. The Utah Waterfowl Association feels that so long as safeguard measures are in place, this is a key opportunity for these young hunters (with adult supervision) have a safe hunting experience. There are not limitations for the young hunters after opening day so why would they not be ready for the early opener hunt? According to Rich Hansen, there were 856 hunters on the WMA's checked in 2006 which is not a significant amount of youth. There are 18,000 licenses sold for the regular season. It is my personal opinion, that the youngsters are ready for this. I have not met any one who is opposed to this. I understand the safety issue but feel that if the Director was more educated on the subject, he would have understood that these hunters are ready.

As for the area closure at Farmington Bay. The Learning Center has been moved northwest. Rich Hansen approached Tom Aldrich to begin the process of closing 234 acres. There should be some concerns that the habitat in that area is conducive to jump shooting so there should be a buffer for those who visit the Learning Center. The area should be turned into a rest area.

John Niemeyer- I think youth hunters should be allowed to hunt one half hour prior to sunrise. They are required to pass hunter safety courses before they can hunt so they should already be safe hunters.

Craig Olsen- I do not understand why motors are being allowed in that lake. Previous generations did not use motor boats. They traveled the area by walking or using canoes or kayaks. Most people that use the motorless lakes appreciate the fact that they are motorless.

Drew Romney- I would like to submit 27 signed letters opposing the proposal to allow motors in the lake. I feel that there will be an increase in the number of Trumpeter Swans being killed. This area is a roost, as well as a primary feeding area. This proposal will force the Trumpeters to travel south where they will likely be shot. That lake is a primary source of food for most of the birds in northern Utah. If those birds are forced to relocate, they will travel to the Bear River Club. The other lakes in the area can not sustain the swans because they do not hold as many birds as Pintail does. I feel that the Waterfowl Committee has made a poor decision and hope that the RAC will rebuke this proposition.

Wyatt Olsen- I may take my kids to hunt the opener in Idaho so they can hunt at an earlier time. It does not make sense to prevent the kids from hunting early on the youth hunt, when eight days later they are allowed to do so. The youth hunt would actually be a safer time to start early since the adults are not hunting and are better focused on their children. It is my hope that the youth hunt will be opened earlier which will increase the number of birds that are taken and the youth's desire to hunt. I am a motor boat user but I value the places where motors are not allowed since more effort is required and it allows me to take more birds. There should be areas that are rest areas where motors are not allowed.

Joe Draxler (Top of Utah Delta Waterfowl Association)- I am in favor of the youth hunt being

opened earlier for the same reasons that have been mentioned by the others who have spoken tonight. If the youth have adult supervision, safety should be less of an issue. I do not think motors should be allowed on Pintail Lake. The fact that it is being underutilized by foot soldiers is a benefit to the ducks, which is what we should be considering.

Jason Morgado- (Top of Utah Delta Waterfowl Association)- I propose that there be an earlier hunt for the youth. I agree with the public comments that have been made. I think it will be detrimental to the duck populations to allow motors in Pintail Lake. I think we will lose a valuable resource for the duck hunters that like to walk in. There is already a good concrete path that could be used by the handicapped individuals who want to visit that lake.

Kevin Booth (Top of Utah Delta Waterfowl Association)- Although I respect the safety concerns, I do support the early opener of the youth hunt. I am opposed to motors being allowed on Pintail Lake. There is a lack of research as to the effects to the area. There are many issues that will be effected if this is proposal is approved. Research before action is always the best course. Pintail Lake is unique in that it has a handicap accessible dike. If the birds are forced away as a result of motors being allowed on the lake, it will limit the amount of opportunity on those dikes for individuals who are already limited. I am a boat owner and user but this access should be kept for those who are willing to do the extra work. To access that lake with boats will affect the roosting habits of the geese in that area, as well as other areas. I would like to see the Kamasback limit remain at one so that population has an opportunity to increase.

Chuck Sorenson- It is difficult for the youth (and the adults) to wait for the opener of the hunt. I can not imagine a safer hunt in the entire season because the adults are there to assist the youth. My opinion is that the time factor is not a true factor. If the Pintail unit is open to motorized boats, the public will be pushed out of that area unless they own a boat. I have witnessed a lot of hunters who walk in and out to hunt that area. It is my opinion, after hunting at the back of that refuge, that motorized boats will disturb the flight patterns of the birds. When birds are disturbed enough, they will leave the area. I think we need to allow public access for non-motorized users.

Steve Phillips- Early hours are the best opportunities for the youth to be able to shoot a duck or a goose. By starting at 8 a.m., we are handicapping the youth on their day. We are the only state that does not allow the early opener. Safety should not be an issue since the youth are hunting with an adult. One-half hour should not make a difference. In order to protect the handicap access that currently exists on Pintail Lake, motors should not be allowed.

Steve Moore- I hunt the Pintail area several times each year. We travel by foot or canoe. This area should be protected because it is a feeding and resting area. This area should not be motorized. It would drastically change the flight patterns and resting area for the birds that use the area.

A card was turned in for Jim Whitaker stating that he is in favor of the youth hunt opening at sunrise.

Brad Smith- I am hopeful that the obvious show of support for an early opener for the youth is

not in vain. There is still time to make that change for this season. I was surprised to hear that Utah is the only state that does not allow the early opener for the youth. I think if the statistics were studied, there would have been a different decision made. If there was a safety issue, it is doubtful that the other states would have allowed the youth to access the field and harvest birds one-half hour early. I also wanted to state that I appreciate areas that do not allow motors since those areas are more serene and the work is more rewarding. It would be nice if the Pintail Lake manager were present to hear the public comment and the argument to leave this area non-motorized. I am hopeful that this process will allow that change to be made since there is strong support for not allowing motors in that area.

### **RAC Comment**

Neville- How many acres are in Pintail Lake?

Aldrich- 100 acres are in Pintail Lake.

Neville- Are you proposing that motors be allowed on certain areas of the lake?

Aldrich- No, the entire lake will have the same standard.

Neville- In that area, where is the next closest non-motorized area?

Aldrich- Harold Crane which is approximately twenty miles south of Pintail Lake.

Leonard- I have worked extensively on the youth hunting bills and am familiar with the available statistics, and have found that youth hunters are very safe hunter. I would not have any concerns about allowing that early opener. I respect the Director's position, but I am a little disappointed that he had a different opinion regarding the safety aspect. I would encourage the RAC members to support the change to the youth hunt proposal, especially after hearing the strong amount of support that has been expressed tonight.

Cowley- How many other areas have handicapped access to hunt in an area that is not motorized? Was the handicapped access installed there because it is not motorized?

Aldrich- There are no other handicapped areas initiated at this time. We are considering adding one at Farmington Bay this fall. I have asked all of the WMAs to consider it so there will be additional opportunities in the future. The Pintail unit became motorless approximately five years ago. The handicapped blinds existed prior to that time. I do not see a connection between the handicapped access and the type of boats that are allowed. Motorized boats may actually lead more birds over the handicapped blinds. These are long units that have a road through the middle. The handicapped blinds are along the road on the edge of the Pintail unit so they get the advantage of birds passing from Pintail over the dike to some of the other units.

Cowley- The general hunting season allows these kids to hunt one-half hour before sunrise when the adults are carrying their own guns. I am trying to understand why we would restrict the early opening of the youth hunt when the adults are available to instruct and teach the youth.

Aldrich- If an early opener is allowed for the youth hunt, the Director's office is concerned there is a small increase in risk associated with less daylight. The Division would be comfortable reconsidering this if the RACs support the change. Three of the other four RACs have voted to change to an early opener.

Byrnes- Was the original proposal to shoot from sunrise to sunset or was it one-half hour before sunrise to sunset?

Aldrich- We initially considered a proposal that was one-half hour before sunrise. Right now sunrise is about 8 a.m. on that particular day so the opener would be at approximately 7:30 a.m.

Marsh- I am in favor of allowing the youth hunters to hunt one-half hour before sunrise. I have participated with the youth during the youth waterfowl day and have always had safe hunts without incidences. Most adults take care in mentoring their young hunters. After considering the handicapped issue at Pintail Lake, I would recommend that the area be left non-motorized.

Slater- Is the Director's office concerned about the political issues that may be involved as a result of the age restriction change that occurred at the Legislature?

Aldrich- I think that is at the heart of the issue.

Slater- The Division is doing an excellent job of representing hunting interests, particularly during the Legislative suggestion. There are many individuals who are opposed to hunting in general so they lobby against the youth hunts. I appreciate the public voicing their opinion in this forum. It is also helpful when the public expresses their opinions to their Legislators.

**Motion-** Shirley- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Waterfowl Proclamation and Rule R657-09 with the following exceptions: 1) the opening day for the youth hunt shall start one-half hour before sunrise; 2) the Pintail unit shall remain closed to motorized boats and vehicles.

**Second-** Neville

**Motion Carries -** Unanimous

### **Item 8. Turkey Proclamation and Rule R657-54**

Dennis Southerland, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

### **RAC Questions**

Leonard- According to the hunt tables, the southeastern region is opening one week later under Option 2, is that correct?

Southerland- Yes, they are because the hunt for higher elevation birds works better if it is opened one week later. I believe that would make the number of days shorter in the C hunt.

**Public Comments**

Jody Rose (Utah State Chapter of the National Wild Turkey Federation)- The Turkey Recommendations and Rule that is proposed by the DWR has been reviewed in detail by our national headquarters and the State Board. The NWTF supports the DWR's Option 2. We believe this phased transition of increasing permits over the next three year period will better prepare Utah hunters for the time in the near future when unlimited permits are made available. We want to recognize that the increased number of hunters in the field is a legitimate concern. However, there will be a benefit by the regions be broadened. The NWTF would prefer to see Option C adopted statewide.

**RAC Comments**

Leonard- I want to thank Dennis Southerland for his efforts while serving on the team who worked to create this rule. We strongly believe that turkey hunters would rather have the opportunity to hunt every year and would trade away the success rate. We also believe that turkey hunters will figure out how to disperse themselves across the landscape to avoid hunter interference.

**Motion-** Marsh- Recommend that the Wildlife Board accept Option 2, as presented.

**Second-** Shirley

**Motion Carries-** Unanimous

**Meeting Ends:** 9:35 p.m.

Central Region Advisory Council  
Springville Jr. High  
165 S. 700 E. Springville  
August 21, 2007 @ 6:30 p.m.

**Members Present**

Ed Kent, Chair  
Fred Oswald, Non-consumptive, Vice Chair  
John Bair, Sportsmen  
Calvin Crandall, Agriculture  
Doug Jones, Forest Service  
Duane Smith, Non-consumptive  
Byron Gunderson, At Large  
Gary Nielsen, Sportsmen  
Richard Hansen, At Large

**Members Absent**

Allan Stevens, At Large  
George Holms, Agriculture  
Jay Price, Elected

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

**VOTING**

**Motion was made by John Bair to accept the agenda as written**  
**Seconded by Duane Smith**  
**Motion passed unanimously**

2) **Approval of the July 11, 2007 RAC minutes (Action)**

**VOTING**

**Motion was made by Duane Smith to accept the summary notes as transcribed**  
**Seconded by John Bair**  
**Motion passed unanimously**

3) **Old Business (Contingent)**  
**- Ed Kent, RAC Chair**

Ed welcomed Richard Hansen and Gary Nielsen as the two newest members of the Central Region RAC.

4) **Regional Update (Informational)**  
**- John Fairchild, Central Region Supervisor**

Wildlife – This has been a year of nuisance bear and we are actively educating the public and handling problem bears on a case-by-case basis. Antelope are being classified, General Season deer permits have sold out, and we have hired a new employee, Jo Proctor, as our new Walk-In Access program biologist.

Aquatics – We are currently hiring biologist to help with the New Zealand quagga mussels as we have confirmed reports in Lake Powell.

Habitat – The Salt Creek fire has impacted over 20,000 acres of winter range and rehabilitation efforts are underway.

Law Enforcement – Ryan Karren has been hired as our new officer in the Heber area.

Conservation Outreach – Those Dedicated Hunters hoping to join the archery hunt tomorrow will need to give us until about noon to get the hours entered from this RAC meeting.

**5) Fee Proposal (Action)**

- **Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Chief**

This action item was presented by Kenny Johnson, Information Analyst. His power point presentation discussed four fee proposal changes for FY2008 and updates for FY2007. He explained that the Division brings the fee changes to the RAC process for input and from there to the Wildlife Board for their approval and finally to the Governor's office for consideration and ultimately to a Natural Resources Appropriations Subcommittee hearing for approval, and if approved, voted upon by Legislation.

\*Commercial brine shrimp COR fee change from \$13,000 to \$14,000 and eventually increased to \$15,000.

\*Nonresident cougar hunters and pursuit permits: Nonresident fee \$135 which is subject to the outfitters license proposal upcoming this February.

\*Five year Private Pond Permit COR increase from \$195 to \$200 thus saving \$40.00 in yearly handling fees over the next four year.

\* Limited Entry resident Doe Pronghorn permit fee change from \$20.00 to \$25.00.

**Questions from the RAC**

Q: Ed Kent – Do you have any idea how much revenue the fee changes will generate?

A: There are presently 75 CORS for brine shrimpers so \$1000.00 each brings practically no significant impact yet.

Q: Doug Jones – What is the difference between an outfitter and a guide?

A: The outfitter is the top tier and the guide works in conjunction with the outfitter.

Q: Doug Jones – So does each of the guides need to pay the fee?

A: That one we have scratched as an action item before the RAC tonight because it is a bill be proposed this winter.

**Public Questions**

Q: Steve Maxfield - Is there a sponsor on the proposed legislation and any way to get a copy of the proposals before February?

A: I'm not sure but will talk with you after the meeting.

It was proposed last year to have regulations on outfitters and guides but the proposal was late and never got written. This year we were hoping just to have the written proposal in place.

**VOTING**

**Motion was made by John Bair to accept the fee proposals as presented**

**Seconded by Doug Jones**

**Motion passed unanimously**

**6) Convention Permits Rule R657-55 (Action)**

- **Kenny Johnson, Financial Analyst**

Was put into effect in 2005 and our first Convention was held in January of 2007.

\*Eliminate the wording "voucher" due to it being an unnecessary step. We know who are awarded those permits and we will send a letter from to the successful applicants.

\*Increased the number of alternates as ten alternate names proved to not be enough.

## Questions from the RAC

Q: Richard Hansen – How much money was received from these permits?

A: I haven't seen those figures but approximately one million dollars.

## Public Questions

Q: Ben Shoppe – How does the million dollars compare to years previous program?

A: This was the first year for Convention permit; however in comparison, we issue roughly 300 Conservation permits and an additional 200 Convention permits

Q: Is there is a way to compare the dollars put toward wildlife in the previous system with the current system?

A: The latter doesn't replace the previous system so there is comparison just additional revenue. John Bair – The DWR received all monies from the Convention permit fees. They were not sold it was a draw system. The Conservation permit fees generated, this year, between 2–3 million dollars. The sportsmen groups generate their money from the application fees and the Division makes their money from the permit fees.

## VOTING

**Motion was made by Duane Smith to accept the Convention Permits Rule as presented  
Seconded by Doug Jones**

**Motion passed unanimously**

### 7) CWMU Rule R657-37 (Action)

**- Boyde Blackwell, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Program Manager**

**\*In Section 1**, under the purpose and authority, an important statement was added that the rule would provide incentive to landowners to manage lands to benefit wildlife habitat and wildlife.

**\*In Section 2**, we have defined the landowner association as individual or group of landowners applying to become or operate a CWMU. We have also defined landowner association members as individuals participating in the landowner association.

**\*In Section 3**, in the requirements for the establishment of a CWMU, we are recommending that no parcel shall be included in more than one CWMU and no separate boundaries by species. There will be one map for each CWMU. We are removing the authorization for a CWMU with less than 5000 acres. "Corner-to-corner" does not constitute contiguous parcel for purpose of obtaining minimum acreage.

**\*In Section 4**, we are recommending management plans approved for a three-year registration period rather than annually. The plans will include antlerless harvest objectives, dates the general public with buck and bull permits will be allowed to hunt, detailed explanation how they will offer comparable hunting opportunity for their private permits vs their public permits and that the Division will review these management plans and make recommendations to the Wildlife Board.

**\*Section 5**, under application for CWMU CORs, with a three-year registration there will only be changes if changes in the boundary and requires a new application. An amendment can be made for certain changes but must be in writing by August 1<sup>st</sup> prior to the hunting year. The amendment then is forwarded to the DWR RAC and Wildlife Board for review.

**\*Section 7**, the CWMU must provide a minimum of five days to hunt antlered and a minimum of three days to hunt antlerless. The general public will be allowed to hunt the entire CWMU with exception of these areas excluded to all hunters. Where public land is used to define the boundary we are requesting posting every 300 yards. Moose permit splits will be considered on a 50/50 split. CWMUs must meet antlerless harvest objectives established in the management plans.

**\*Section 14**, under discipline of violation, the Wildlife Board may change permit numbers or allocations. CWMU Advisory Committee shall include one RAC member.

All CWMU buck and bull hunters must complete survey to help address concerns or issues that may arise. We will also be recommending that all public draw antlerless permits to go to residents only to provide more opportunity to our resident but the CWMU can still sell their permits to whomever they choose. Putting the management plans on the website will provide greater information to our hunters and we will be asking operators to contact buck and bull hunters by August 1 and antlerless hunters by September 1.

#### **Questions by RAC members:**

Ed Kent thanked John Bair for his participation and dedication on the CWMU committee.

Q: Fred Oswald – Were there any recommendations from the committee that didn't end up in the rule?

A: There were some recommendation that didn't get passed by everyone but there were many recommendations brought to the table.

Q: Frank Oswald – Were there parts of the rule the committee where they decided on something else?

A: John – There were boundary issues and operator accountability. There was a very conscious effort to make things fair between general public draw permits vs purchased permits.

A: Fred Oswald – If the Division sets objectives, can an operator refuse to allow public or private hunters to hunt antlerless? Can the CWMU refuse to have any antlerless permits?

A: The operator and biologist are to work together to decide on the appropriate number of animals to be harvested. If that doesn't happen then the CWMU committee gets involved to see if the allocation should be changed. You have the ability to integrate sanctions if they don't help the Division meet their objectives.

Q: Fred Oswald - Is there a way to adjust the numbers due to fires like we just had?

A: Yes the numbers can be changed at any time based on the situation.

Q: Gary Nielsen – You said most of the people were not affected by the 50/50 split, but a few were. The ones who were on 60/40. How many permits is that going to cost them?

A: Some are on a 2/1 split, some are on a 3/1 split.

#### **Questions/comments from the public:**

Q: Kay Preston – The minimum days for the hunt consecutive?

A: Yes.

Q: Kay Preston - Will the season dates be established prior to the hunt and then for the next three years?

A: Yes. That is in the management plans, which will be on the website.

Q: Ben Shoppe – Can you clarify the splits on various species?

A: It starts off with a 90/10 for bucks/bulls or an 85/15, 80/20, 75/25.

Q: Ben Shoppe – How is that determined whether more those permits go to public or the landowner gets 90%?

A: Lets use the 90/10 split for example. The landowner sits down and says he wants 90% of the permits and we figure his unit can take 10 elk permits. So he will get 90% and the public will get 10%. On antlerless, the public gets 100% of the permits and landowner none.

Q: Ben Shoppe – Is there potential language to prevent a landowner from purchasing one acre of land to develop so he can acquire permits for that land?

A: We must have land that constitutes good hunting units.

Q: Mike Christensen – Do all public hunters have option to choose the November hunt?

A: Yes for all permit holders.

### **Public Comment**

Dan Clegg/President of CWMU Association read a letter of appreciation and support.

Two concerns they have are:

- 1) They would like to see the moose split changed.
- 2) Corner-to-corner boundaries – There should remain in the application an approval process with adequate discretion on the part of personnel to decide local circumstances. They recommend the possibility of a variance to the hard line rule, in the CWMU process, so significant overriding exceptions may be recognized.

(Get copy of letter for the records)

Mike Christensen/Sportsmens Rep on CWMU committee – The biggest issue the public is the moose split. This moose split number was recommended at the associations meeting. If a unit has ten moose tags, the first tag goes to public and the next nine tags goes to CWMU. If it changes to eleven tags then the extra tag goes to the public. Under the current moose split, if there are three permits, two permits go to the CWMU and one permit to the public. That is not a 50/50 split but a 67/33 split.

### **Comments by the RAC**

Ed Kent – Clarification on section 7, paragraph 3ai – On the number of days to hunt, are those days consecutive and you might want to change that.

John Bair – We wanted to make sure they were entitled to those days but to work it out with the operator. Regarding the corner-to-corner clause, if there is a working CWMU we don't want to lose a good CWMU over this. Neither do we want new CWMUs coming to us with the corner-to-corner boundary. We want to get away from this. We would like to see the allowance for a variance on existing CWMU but not on new CWMU applicants.

Boyde Blackwell A: There is a grandfather clause on existing CWMUs however there is not language in there that would allow a variance if it was a good CWMU and corner-to-corner boundaries.

John Bair – This new rule takes huge strides to make it user friendly and formalizing the complaint process with some maintenance and compromises.

Fred Oswald – Would like to thank Ken Clegg for his comments and agrees with the committee recommendations.

### **VOTING**

**Motion was made by Fred Oswald to accept the CWMU Rule R657-37 as presented**

**Second by John Bair**

**Motion passed unanimously**

**8) Waterfowl Proclamation and Rule R657-09 (Action)  
- Tom Aldrich, Wildlife Program Manager**

Habitat has greatly increased this year and breeding populations are up. The optimal regulations decision for this year is a liberal regulation package consisting of a 107-day season and a seven basic bag limit. All seven can be mallards but only 2 can be hens. We are recommending only one change of two canvasbacks for this year. The one non-season change would be to change Public Shooting Ground WMA to a motorless area, allow motors on Pintail units and disallow motors on units north of Hwy 83.

**Comments from the Public**

Cody King – I would like to propose changing the opening time for the youth waterfowl season ½ before sunrise to increase their chances for harvest and identification.

**Discussion from the RAC**

Tom stated a couple of RACs were willing to change the opening date. Ed Kent expressed having mixed emotions on the youth hunt opener change. \_\_\_\_? is in favor of Cody's comment. Doug supports the 8am opener.

**VOTING**

**Motion was made by Richard Hansen to accept the Waterfowl Proclamation and Rule with the change to the youth hunt opening time to ½ prior to sunrise season opener**

**Second by John Bair**

**In favor: John, Calvin, Byron, Gary, Duane, and Richard**

**Against: Doug and Fred**

**Motion passes by majority vote**

**9) Turkey Proclamation and Rule R657-54 (Action)  
- Dennis Southerland, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

I will be covering the 2007 harvest results and two options for 2008 recommendations. Option 1 would be the same strategy as last year and Option 2 is our DWR preferred option with liberal permit numbers, gradual progress to over the counter sales. In comparing our turkey populations, harvest percentage, and number of hunters with other western states, we closely compare to Colorado. The turkey harvest model used in Utah include the winter flock survey assuming 46% of the population are male and harvest to be no greater than 30% of males which is very conservative. We want to leave the limited entry hunt units the same as last year with the same season framework and the same boundaries with 20% of the permits going to landowners and 15% of the permits going to those under the age of 18. **Overall recommendation is 4043 permits, up 30% from 2007 thus increasing permits by 223 from last year for a 23% increase.**

Option 2 is aimed to the eventual over the counter sales with three hunt date options. This will be done through a limited entry draw with bonus point and eliminating the two-year waiting period. The 20% of permits will still be available to the landowners and 15% of the permits available to those under the age of 18. The late hunt (Hunt C) will have the option to allow region wide or unit boundary. All regions may choose a region wide unit boundary except Northeastern and Southeastern have chosen to remain with their unit boundary. The permit calculations towards over the counter sales shown in the model should take about three years to realize. When the

permit numbers come within 10% of the number of applicants for all hunts over the count sales will begin. **Overall recommendation is 7706 permits, up 148% from last year thus increasing permits by 923 permits from last year for a 133% increase.**

### **Questions from RAC**

Q: Fred Oswald – Are you asking us tonight to vote between option 1 and option 2?

A: Yes

Q: Gary Nielsen – Is there a reason for getting rid of the waiting period?

A: By eliminating the waiting period, hunters won't have to wait and increase the permits on option 2 then that would be a mute point to have bonus point.

Q: Byron Gunderson – On the numbers calculated it states using the current formula. What is the current formula?

A: Where we take different biological parameters and we fill in the hunter flock counts and hunter success rates to derive the numbers to be recommended and input from the biologist.

Q: How many permits were involved in the 10% drop in success. How many increased with the drop in success.

A: About 300 permit. That was 300 more opportunities.

Q: Fred Oswald - What percentage of number of birds in public land versus private land.

A: I'm not sure. There is private land open to hunting and this will be a learning process.

Q: Richard Hansen – Did you ever consider making certain areas limited entry only?

A: Yes that is what the Southeastern region has done on two areas. That is subject that was discussed in the committee. Even if we go over the counter we are still looking at making certain areas limited entry still.

Q: Byron Gunderson – If we do go over the counter, will there still be hunts A, B, and C? About 70% of the turkeys will be killed in the first two weeks huh?

A: That will have to be discussed at the committee. I think it's less than that and we will be more or less educating turkeys rather than killing turkeys.

Q: Ed Kent – Fred, when I drew my permit, I arranged to hunt on private land. With this ever increasing new walk-in access program I believe that will alleviate some of the pressure and focus on public ground as well.

Byron Gunderson - It just looks like me that if we eliminate the two-year waiting period and go to over the counter sales that we will have as many people buying permits as we have turkeys.

Dennis Southerland – If we eliminate the waiting period there will be more applicants so it will take longer to raise the permits to equal within the 10% of those applicants.

John Bair – Don't we depend on the increased hunter pressure to increase opportunity? If we want to maintain the higher hunter success and worry about crowding we will never move toward over the counter sales. We are transplanting turkeys as fast as we can. If our goal is to increase permits and opportunity we are going to need to increase hunter pressure to drive down hunter success.

Q: Byron Gunderson – Can you draw a parallel between elk and turkey? What if we applied the same reason and technology to elk hunting?

A: John Bair - Turkeys replenish quickly and it doesn't take eight years to grow a big tom.

### **Questions from the public**

Q: No name – How do we come up with the estimate of 18,000 turkeys?

A: Our winter counts.

Q: What are the procedures for obtaining landowner permits?

A: The landowner has to qualify with 20 acres for Rio Grandes and 350 acres for Merrimans to meet suitable or critical habitat. Then notify a biologist within a determined window of time, have the biologist approve the application. Now that the landowner application will now be available on line, the regional office will fax the list of qualified landowners prior to the draw.

Q: Chett Anderson - Does the two-year waiting period hinder those who were in a waiting period as some of the units are harder to draw than others. For those currently in a waiting period, if we eliminated the two-year waiting period would they have a harder chance in drawing a permit or because of the increased permits it would even out?

A: Hunters who have been waiting the longest will still have the most bonus points and with the increased number of permits we should be down to one bonus point in the future.

My recommendation would be phase the waiting period in just so the people who have not drawn for the past 4-5 years would be able to draw a permit.

That would be up to the RAC.

Q: Ben Shoppe – Will the removal of the two-year waiting period be retroactive to those already in a waiting period.

A: Yes.

### **Comments from the Public**

Newton Gaskill – Washington hunting addresses these same question on over the counter sales. Washington currently has the largest population in the United States while having over the counter sales. Utah management is definitely the correct model and would highly recommend going with option two.

Mike Pritchett/Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife State Board/Sportsmen for Habitat director – All boards overwhelming support option two and pleased with the phased increase in hunting opportunity over the next three years that option two will provide. **(See attached letter)**

Steve Maxfield/Dedicated Hunter – Lives down in the Pahvant area where turkeys are thriving and becoming a nuisance. Increasing opportunity is important to his family and greatly supports the Division's recommendations and option two.

Clint Player/NWTF State Board – Overwhelming support the Division's recommendations and management plans and supports option two.

### **Discussion from the RAC**

Richard Hansen – For Clint Player, how does the NWTF feel about overcrowding this year?

A: Clint Player – We are very protective of our turkeys and turkey hunters and we are all for it if we are allowed to go out and hunt.

Richard Hansen – We have 16,000 applications for turkeys but how many small game licenses do we sell for pheasants these days? You have a one-to-one ratio of licenses versus turkeys we shoot. I think we need to think carefully about what we are doing here.

A: The national average harvest is 25%. There is crowding opening weekend but then it settles down and hunters spread out into other areas. There is a 33% to 60% chance of still harvesting a bird on any given day after the opener.

Byron Gunderson – Colorado has twice as many turkeys as hunters and they have 24% success ratio. Utah has one to one.

Ed Kent – It seems to me that based on what Dennis has indicated, the Division is approaching this very conscientiously based on the committees recommendations. There are checks and balances and we can tweek the permits numbers as we are approaching option two, is that correct?

Dennis - Yes

John Bair – The number of toms killed has virtually zero percent effect on the overall numbers of turkeys.

Dennis – It has no effect on the reproductive potential as one tom can breed with many hens during the spring. In the turkey model we say we don't want to harvest more than 30%, when in all reality we could leave 30% and not adversely effect our turkey population.

## **VOTING**

**Motion was made by John Bair to accept DWR recommendations with option 2**

**Second by Doug Jones**

**Motion was set aside**

**A second motion was made by Gary Nielsen to keep the two-year waiting period in effect for an additional two-years**

**Seconded by Duane Smith**

**In favor: Gary, Duane, John, Byron, Calvin and Richard**

**Against: Doug and Fred**

**Motion passed by majority vote**

**Voting on first motion which was set aside**

**Motion passed unanimously**

*Meeting adjourned*

## **CHAIR ELECTION**

**Motion was made by John Bair to keep Ed Kent in as the Central Region RAC chairman and Fred Oswald for an additional term**

**Second by Richard Hansen**

**Motion passed unanimously**

*Next CRO RAC will be held **September 18th**  
Wildlife Board meeting will be held **September 6th**  
Total in attendance: **164***

**NORTHEASTERN REGION ADVISORY COUNCIL MTG MOTIONS PASSED**  
**UBATC, ROOSEVELT, UT**  
**August 16, 2007**  
**Started 6:30pm; Adjourned 9:40 pm**

5. FEE PROPOSAL

**MOTION:** to accept as presented by UDWR  
Passed unanimously

6. CONVENTION PERMITS RULE R657-55

**MOTION:** to accept as presented by UDWR  
Passed unanimously

7. CWMU RULE R657-55

**MOTION:** to accept as presented by UDWR but keep the 60/40 split  
Passed unanimously

8. WATERFOWL PROCLAMATION AND RULE R657-09

**MOTION:** to accept as presented by UDWR except change the time to 1/w hour  
before and after sunset.  
Passed unanimously.

9. TURKEY PROCLAMATION RULE R657-54

**MOTION:** to accept as presented by UDWR  
Passed unanimously.

**NORTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY**  
**UBATC, ROOSEVELT,UT**  
**August 16, 2007**  
**Started 6:37 pm Adjourned 9:30 pm**

**UDWR MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Kevin Christopherson-NER Supervisor  
Boyde Blackwell-Wildlife Pgm C  
Tom Aldrich-Wildlife Pgm Coord  
Dennis Sutherland-Wildlife Pgm Coord  
Greg Sheehan-Fiscal Section Chief  
Sean Davis-NER Law Enforcement  
Rose Fedelleck-Office Technician  
Ron Stewart-NER Conserv. Outreach  
Randall Thacker-NER Wildlife Biologist

**UNEXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:**

Kirk Woodward-Sportsmen  
Karl Breitenbach-At-Large  
Rod Harrison-Elected Official

**EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:**

Floyd Briggs-At-Large

**RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Beth Hamann-Non-Consumptive  
Dave Chivers-Agriculture  
Nancy Bostick-Ebbert-Non-Consump.  
Amy Torres-Chair  
Curtis Dastrup-Agriculture  
Everett Manning-Ute Tribe  
Rod Morrison-Sportsmen  
Bob Christensen-Forest Service

**1,2,AND 3.APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA, MINUTES AND  
OLD BUSINESS: Amy Torres**

**4. REGIONAL UPDATE: Kevin Christopherson**

We would like to welcome new Book Cliffs Wildlife Biologist Dax Mangus, Walk-In Access Biologist Derrick Ewell, and Conservation Officer Clint Sampson. We would also like to congratulate Marcia Keddy on her promotion to Support Service Coordinator.

We are working with UDOT the Forest Service on the Wildlife Through The Ages Scenic Byway. We are hoping for All American Road status. We are working to secure angler access at Sand Wash Reservoir. I met with Colorado and Wyoming to try to coordinate our elk management Three Corners area.

The Archery deer hunt starts August. 18<sup>th</sup>. We are still receiving two to three calls a week concerning bears and we are asking that campers keep area clean and food put away.

**5.FEE PROPOSAL: Greg Sheehan**

See “Fiscal Year 2009 handout”

**Questions from public:**

**Comments from public:**

Larry Knight: Noticed there are a lot of guides and hunters around Strawberry as well as some cougars.

**Questions from RAC:**

Rod Morrison: What about the \$1000 guide fee?

Greg Sheehan: We are not sure about the bill yet. Legislature will set the fee.

**6.CONSERVATION PERMIT RULE 657-55: Greg Sheehan**

Slide program

**Questions from RAC:**

**Comments from RAC:**

Curtis Dastrup: The word “voucher is still on page 8 D-4

Greg Sheehan: Glad you caught that. We will fix it.

**7. CWMU Rule R657-37 Boyde Blackwell:**

Slide program

**Questions from the RAC:**

**Comments from the RAC:**

**Questions from the public:**

Bill Frew: What is the purpose of CWMU?

Boyde Blackwell: To ensure healthy habitat for our animals. It also gives good incentive to landowners to let wildlife range on private land.

Larry Knight: I feel there is poor information given to sportsman about the CWMU, how about a paid depredation for ranchers?

Boyde Blackwell: CWMU is not a depredation program.

Larry Knight: I feel sportsman are losing out on 9 to 1 split, taking it in the shorts.

Curt Case: What role does law enforcement play?

Boyde Blackwell: Most landowners hire private security.

### **Discussion about CWMU corner-to-corner regulations**

**Letter read from Wildlife Board by Alan Smith. (See attached)**

#### **Comments from RAC:**

Curtis Dastrup: On specific species, did you say change boundaries to one boundary?

Boyde Blackwell: All have the same boundaries. There are boundaries within boundaries; operators are trying to help give equal hunt time.

Curtis Dastrup: If we go corner-to-corner there could be big problems.

Rod Morrison: CWMU gives good odds to draw and a quality hunt.

Bob Christensen: The public does not have an opportunity but the changes should help.

Curtis Dastrup: I am in favor of CWMU but it does not open up land to the public.

Jayson Golly: I can't hunt all land area in a CWMU? I need an operator to tell me where I can hunt?

Boyde Blackwell: Yes, But we are working on an Internet plan.

**Motion by Curt Dastrup to accept as presented but keep the 60/40 split  
Second by Rod Harrison**

**Passed Unanimously**

**8. WATERFOWL PROCLAMATION AND RULE R657-54: Tom Aldrich**

Slide Presentation  
(Goose and Swan)

**Questions from the RAC:**  
**Comments from the RAC:**  
**Questions from the public:**  
**Comments from the public:**

Kurt Case:

1-Issue on youth hunter day, they can't start until 8:00 am, missing the prime opportunity.  
2-youth hunt day moved back one week, giving two weeks between youth and regular opener.

**Beth Hamann: I motion to send this to committee; we want to teach ethical hunting to our youth.**

Tom Aldrich: Its not too late to make those changes this year, however the director was unsure about young hunters.

Curt Dastrup: How many non-ethical hunters are there at daylight?

Tom Aldrich: As many as always.

Beth Hamann: Start date for youth should be the same for everyone.

**Discussion**

**Motion to accept as proposed except change youth hunting hours to 1/2 hour before sunrise and 1/2 hr after sunset.**

**Second Rod Harrison**  
**Passed Unanimously**

**9. Turkey proclamation and Rule r657-54: Dennis Southerland**

Slide Presentation on options

**Questions from the RAC:**  
What is the success rate on transplants?

Dennis Southerland: Starting with 25-30 in 3 years will be 100

**Comments from the RAC:  
Questions from the public:**

**Comments from the public:**

Larry Knight: I love hunting turkeys

Dennis Southerland: We are good to go, other states don't have many more than Utah.

Discussion

Everett Manning: The Ute Indian Reservation will follow the recommendations. Turkeys will be healthier.

Sean Thacker: I hate to see too drastic an increase that would put back what we have been working for.

Bob Christensen: We have good populations. It might hurt a little at first but hunters would be satisfied in years to come.

Randall Thacker: With two units, public and private. Public has less habitat, new populations, they are not established, we don't want too much hunt pressure. We want to keep turkeys on public land and not chase them on to private land.

**Motion to accept option two as proposed by DWR  
Second by Rod Harrison  
Passed Unanimously**

**Meeting adjourned at 9:30 pm**

**MOTIONS MATRIX**  
**SOUTHEAST REGIONAL WILDLIFE ADVISORY COUNCIL**  
**JOHN WESLEY POWELL MUSEUM IN GREEN RIVER**  
**August 15, 2007**

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**MOTION:** to approve the agenda as written.

**PASSED:** unanimously

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**MOTION:** to approve the minutes of the March 15 meeting as amended.

**PASSED:** unanimously

**FEE PROPOSAL**

**MOTION:** to approve the Division's fee proposal as presented.

**PASSED:** with a majority vote. Two members opposed the motion.

**CONVENTION PERMITS RULE R657-55**

**MOTION:** to approve the changes proposed for the Convention Permit Rule as presented.

**PASSED:** with a majority vote. Two members opposed the motion.

**CWMU RULE R657-37**

**MOTION:** to reject all proposed changes on the page, titled: *CWMU REVIEW, Highlights of rule changes.*

**FAILED:** with a majority of members voting against the motion.

**MOTION:** to approve three bullets under *Highlights of rule changes*, while rejecting three others. Approved bullets were: "Definitions," "Population management," and "Boundary issues." Rejected bullets were: "Comparable opportunities for public hunters," "Certificate of Registration issues," and "Permit split."

**PASSED:** with a majority vote. Two members opposed the motion.

**WATERFOWL PROCLAMATION AND RULE R657-09**

**MOTION:** to approve the waterfowl proclamation as presented.

**PASSED:** unanimously

**TURKEY PROCLAMATION AND RULE R657-54**

**MOTION:** to approve Option #2 of the Turkey Proclamation and Rule.

**PASSED:** unanimously

**SOUTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY**

**John Wesley Powell Museum in Green River**

August 15, 2007

**Commence at 6:30 p.m. Adjourn at 10:10 p.m.**

**RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Adams, Bruce	At Large
Albrecht, Kevin	U.S. Forest Service
Byrnes, Verd	At Large
Gilson, James	Sportsmen
Hatch, Jordan	Agriculture
Hoskisson, Wayne	Environmental
Kamala, Laura	Environmental
Larson, Rick	Regional Supervisor
Riddle, Pam	BLM
Sanslow, Terry	At Large

**EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:**

Bayles, Lyle	At Large
Maldonado, Walt	Sportsmen
Sitterud, Drew	Elected Official

**UNEXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:**

Lewis, Kurt	Agriculture
-------------	-------------

**UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

**DWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:**

Aldrich, Tom  
Bates, Bill  
Blackwell, Boyde  
Johnson, Kenny  
Jones, Stacey  
Larson, Rick  
Robertson, T.J.  
Southerland, Dennis  
Stettler, Brent

**PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE 30**

## **CONDUCTING THE MEETING**

-James Gilson, Chairman

### **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**Questions from the RAC:**

**Questions from the Audience:**

**Comments from the Audience:**

**Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

**MOTION by** Terry Sanslow to approve the agenda as written.

**SECOND by** Bruce Adams

**PASSED** unanimously

### **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**Questions from the RAC:**

**Questions from the Audience:**

**Comments from the Audience:**

**Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

James Gilson noted that Brent Stettler had emailed SER RAC members three drafts of the minutes for the July 17 meeting.

**MOTION by** to approve the minutes of the July 17 meeting as amended.

**SECOND by** Verd Byrnes

**PASSED** unanimously

### **REGIONAL UPDATE**

-By Rick Larson, Regional Supervisor

**Questions from the RAC:**

**Questions from the Audience:**

John Bartlett asked how many additional bison permits had been issued.

Bill Bates replied that 75 had been allocated for the public drawing, and that the Board had approved an additional 64 permits, based on the most recent population survey.

**Comments from the Audience:**

**Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

**MOTION by** N/A  
**SECOND by**  
**PASSED**

**FEE PROPOSAL**

-By Kenny Johnson, DWR Information Analyst

**Questions, Comments and Discussion from the RAC:**

Jordan Hatch challenged the notion that non-residents and outfitters were considered one and the same. Jordan considered the proposed fee increase premature. James Gilson noted that the Utah Legislature is getting closer to passing a “Guides and Outfitters” bill.

**Questions from the Audience:**

**Comments from the Audience:**

**MOTION by** Terry Sanslow to accept the fee proposal as presented.  
**SECOND by** Pam Riddle  
**PASSED** with a majority vote. Bruce Adams and Jordan Hatch opposed the motion.

**CONVENTION PERMITS RULE R657-55**

-By Kenny Johnson, Information Analyst

**Questions, Comments and Discussion from the RAC:**

Jordan Hatch expressed disfavor with the Rule for a number of reasons. He questioned how the Convention Permits Rule benefited Utah’s wildlife, and protested the 5-year advantage gained by the Foundation for North American Wild Sheep (FNAWS), as well as the fact that 200 permits had been withdrawn from the public drawing.

Kenny Johnson was unable to respond to Jordan’s query about the fiscal benefits accorded the Division and State of Utah.

James Gilson asked that RAC members focus on the proposed changes, rather than debate the Convention Permits Rule.

**Questions from the Audience:**

**Comments from the Audience:**

**MOTION by** Verd Byrnes to accept the changes to the Convention Permits Rule as presented.  
**SECOND by** Terry Sanslow  
**PASSED** unanimously

**CWMU Rule R657-37**

-By Boyde Blackwell, CWMU Coordinator

**Questions, Comments and Discussion from the RAC:**

Terry Sanslow asked for clarification on hunting season options available to CWMU operators. Boyde Blackwell indicated that the DWR had oversight over any proposal made by operators. Jordan Hatch asked why the DWR had recommended that antlerless permits go to Utah residents, and if the CWMU association had agreed to this decision. Boyde answered that the DWR wanted to provide more opportunity for residents, and indicated that CWMU representatives had agreed with that decision. Jordan asked if antlerless permits ever go undersubscribed. Boyde said that permits are always sold. Verd Byrnes spoke in favor of the proposed changes, and championed the cause of public hunters and their complaints. Bruce Adams contended that operators go out of their way to satisfy the public hunter and spoke in favor of operator rights. Various RAC members discussed the gamut of proposed changes. Discussion items involved the 50:50 ratio of moose tags, CWMU boundary qualifications, unequal treatment of public vs. private hunters, and compliance with population management objectives. Arguments against the proposed changes included monetary and workload repercussions borne by operators.

**Questions from the Audience:**

David Redd, CWMU Association representative, asked if RAC members had received the letter sent by the association. Most RAC members answered that they had not received the letter. In the letter, David Redd explained that the CWMU association had expressed disagreement with a number of proposed changes, which included antlerless harvest objectives, percentages of private/public permits, hunting days for public permittees and boundary requirements. Blair Eastman, CWMU operator, disagreed with buck/bull hunter percentages, antlerless harvest objectives, proposed changes in minimum boundary limitations, and minimum days afield for public hunters. Boyde Blackwell defended the changes, explaining that surveys are mailed to all public permittees. The proposed changes attempt to resolve the problems observed. Blair Eastman complained about the volume of phone calls he receives, and the cost and time devoted to public permittees.

**Comments from the Audience:**

David Redd asked that antlerless permits be made available to paying clients. He also protested the monetary loss suffered by the operators impacted by the 50:50 split in moose permits. David Redd complained about antlerless harvest objectives and the volume of phone traffic from public permittees.

**MOTION by** Jordan Hatch to reject all “bullets” on the page, under the title: *CWMU REVIEW, Highlights of rule changes*

**SECOND by** Bruce Adams

**FAILED** Two members voted in favor of the motion. These were Jordan Hatch and Bruce Adams. Kevin Albrecht abstained. Remaining RAC members voted against the motion.

**MOTION:** by Jordan Hatch to approve three bullets on the page, titled *CWMAU REVIEW, Highlights of rule changes*, while rejecting three others. Approved bullets were: “Definitions,” “Population management,” and “Boundary issues.” Rejected

bullets were: “Comparable opportunities for public hunters,” “Certificate of Registration issues,” and “Permit split.”

**SECOND by:** Bruce Adams

**PASSED:** with a majority vote. Two members opposed the motion. They were Terry Sanslow and Wayne Hoskisson. Kevin Albrecht abstained.

### **WATERFOWL PROCLAMATION AND RULE**

-By Tom Aldrich, DWR Waterfowl Program Coordinator

**Questions from the RAC:**

**Questions from the Audience:**

**Comments from the Audience:**

**Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

**MOTION by** Kevin Albrecht to approve the waterfowl proclamation as presented.

**SECOND by** Terry Sanslow

**PASSED** unanimously

### **TURKEY PROCLAMATION AND RULE R657-54**

-By Dennis Southerland, Wildlife Program Coordinator

**Questions and Comments from the RAC:**

Terry Sanslow asked if Option #2 would eliminate the 2-year waiting period.

Dennis Southerland answered that it would.

Wayne Hoskisson noted that the harvest success percentage was wrong on the packet of printed material.

**Questions from the Audience:**

**Comments from the Audience:**

Stan Baker, representing the NWTF, read a letter from the federation president, expressing support for Option 2.

Kevin Albrecht asked if the NWTF supported Option #2 on a statewide basis.

Stan Baker answered that it did.

**Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

Kevin Albrecht congratulated the DWR and NWTF on the progress they had made in turkey management.

James Gilson expressed concern about the possibility of over-crowding on the San Juan, LaSal and Henry's units.

Bill Bates was also worried that over-hunting would occur on newly established units or those too close to population centers.

Kevin Albrecht asked where landowners could hunt.

Dennis Southerland answered that a landowner could only hunt on his own property.

Terry Sanslow asked about a landowner, who bought a permit over-the-counter.

Dennis answered they could hunt anywhere.

**MOTION by** Terry Sanslow to approve Option #2 of the proposed Turkey Guide.

**SECOND by** Pam Riddle

**PASSED** unanimously

**ADJOURNMENT**

James Gilson adjourned the meeting at 10:10 p.m.

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting  
Beaver High School  
Beaver, UT  
August 14, 2007  
7:00 p.m.**

**REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA. (page 4)**

**MOTION:** To accept the agenda as written.

**VOTE:** Passed Unanimously.

**REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES (page 5)**

**MOTION:** To accept the minutes as written.

**VOTE:** Passed Unanimously.

**FEE PROPOSAL (page 8)**

**MOTION:** To accept the Fee Proposal as written

**VOTE:** Passed Unanimously.

**CONVENTION PERMIT RULE R657-55 (page 11)**

**MOTION:** To accept the Convention Permit rule as written

**VOTE:** Motion passed 6-1, one opposed.

**CWMU RULE R657-37 (Page 18)**

**MOTION:** To accept the CWMU rule as presented with the exception of leaving the 60:40 split as an option for bull moose CWMUs.

**AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION:** To provide an appeal process through the CWMU advisory committee for CWMUs who need to take advantage of corner to corner properties in order to meet the minimum acreage for a CWMU.

**VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT:** Passed 6:1.

**VOTE ON ORIGINAL MOTION:** Passed Unanimously.

:

**WATERFOWL PROCLAMATION AND RULE R657-09 (Page 22)**

**MOTION:** To accept the Waterfowl proclamation as written with the exception of changing the starting time of the youth waterfowl hunt to one half hour before sunrise.

**VOTE:** Passed Unanimously.

**TURKEY PROCLAMATION AND RULE R657-54**

**MOTION:** To accept the Turkey Proclamation and rule as written supporting Option 2.

**VOTE:** Passed Unanimously.

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting  
 Beaver High School  
 Beaver, UT  
 May 15, 2007  
 7:00 p.m.**

<b>RAC Members Present</b>	<b>DWR Personnel Present</b>	<b>Wildlife Board Present</b>	<b>RAC Members Not Present</b>
Jake Albrecht chairman Steve Dalton Jack Hill James Edwards Rex Stanworth Clair Woodbury Del LeFevre Gary Hallows	Dustin Schaible Jason Nicholes Gary Bezzant Lynn Chamberlain Autumn Jensen Jim Lamb Douglas Messerly Dan Sorenson Mike Kinghorn Hal Stout Teresa Bonzo Kenny Johnson Boydee Blackwell Dennis Sutherland Tom Aldrich Bruce Bonebrake	Paul Niemeyer	Harry Barber Steve Flinders Sam Carpenter

Chairman Jake Albrecht called the Meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. There were approximately \_\_\_ interested parties in attendance in addition to the RAC members. Chairman Jake Albrecht asked the RAC members to introduce themselves. Rex Stanworth, I'm from Delta and I represent at-large. My name's Steve Dalton; I'm from Teasdale, I'm an at-large representative. My name is Jake Albrecht; I'm the Chairman and I am a government type of person that I represent. My name's Doug Messerly, I'm regional supervisor for the Division of Wildlife in the Southern Region from Cedar City. I and my staff act as executive, non-voting members of this council. I'm Clair Woodbury from Hurricane; I'm an at-large member representing the public at-large. I'm Jim Edwards from Delta and I represent the sportsmen. I'm Jack Hill from Cedar City; I'm non-consumptive representative.

Jake Albrecht: Okay at that I'd like to recognize that the Chairman of the Wildlife Board is here with us tonight, Paul Niemeyer. And also, Tom Hatch from Panguitch is also on that board, but I don't see him here yet. We'll wait and see if he comes in. Okay our next item is Gary. I'll turn

the time to you for dedicated hunters and RAC credit.

Gary Bezzant, the volunteer services coordinator with the Division of Wildlife Resources explained the process by which the dedicated hunters would receive credit for their RAC attendance.

Jake Albrecht: Okay our next one is review and acceptance of the RAC meeting agenda. And tonight on our agenda we have Wildlife Board update by myself, the Chairman, Regional update by Doug Messerly, a fee proposal by Greg Sheehan, convention permit rule by Kenny Johnson, CWMU rule by Boydee Blackwell, Waterfowl proclamation and rule by Tom Aldrich, turkey proclamation and rule by Dennis Southerland, and then to the end of the meeting if we have any other business or comments we will take those. So with that I would ask for a motion to accept tonight's agenda.

Jack Hill: Mr. Chairman, I would move for the acceptance of the agenda as written and the minutes as written.

Jake Albrecht: Okay I'll take the motion on the agenda but I'd like to do the minutes separate.

Jack Hill: Okay. I would move for the adoption of the agenda for the August 14<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Southern RAC.

Jake Albrecht: Okay so we have a motion to approve tonight's agenda, right, by Mr. Hill?

Jack Hill: Yes sir.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have a second? By James Edwards. All in favor please raise your hand. Any against? Motion carries.

### *Review and Acceptance of Agenda (Action)*

#### **Questions from the RAC:**

None.

#### **Questions from the Public:**

None.

#### **Comments from the Public:**

None.

#### **RAC Discussion and Vote:**

**Jack Hill made the motion to accept agenda. James Edwards seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Our second thing is last month's minutes. On page 32, and Steve Flinders is not here with us tonight but when he abstained from voting the reason he did that is because he represents the Forest Service, and he thought maybe it wasn't appropriate where he voted on something that wasn't Forest Service related. And I was wondering whether we wanted to include that into the minutes or whether we want to accept them the way they are? But Steve's not here so, if everybody's okay with the way they are we'll go ahead and vote.

Jack Hill: You need a motion Mr. Chairman.

Jake Albrecht: That's correct.

Jack Hill: I would so move.

Jake Albrecht: We have a motion by Jack to accept the minutes. We have a second by Del LeFevre. Okay, all in favor? None against. Motion Carries.

### *Review and Acceptance of Minutes (Action)*

#### **Questions from the RAC:**

None.

#### **Questions from the Public:**

None.

#### **Comments from the Public:**

None.

#### **RAC Discussion and Vote:**

**Jack Hill made the motion to accept minutes as written. Dell LeFevre seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

#### **Wildlife Board Update**

-Jake Albrecht, Chairman

- At our last month Wildlife Board update the cougar proclamation and rule was voted in favor by all the RACs and was approved by the Wildlife Board.
- The furbearer proclamation was also approved by all the RACs statewide and it went through also.
- And on the Henry Mountain bison there was, out of the five RACs the Southern RAC was the only one that had some exceptions: 1. Was the closing of the roads on a seasonal basis. 2. Was keeping that bison committee together as a working group. And then there was a couple of items on there that pertained to making sure that the habitat

work was done and completed before the bison plan went into effect. And after their presentation at the Salt Lake Wildlife Board meeting DWR had already taking out the language for the seasonal closings. And the people who were there from the Henry Mountain Grazing Association agreed to keep the working group together as well as the DWR did. And some of the other issues were already taken care of in the management plan. So that also passed through the Wildlife Board. And then I don't know but I think Doug will probably give us more information on the bison when he talks here in a second. And I'll turn the time to Doug to give a few comments.

### **Regional Update:**

-Douglas Messerly: Southern Region Regional Supervisor.

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'll try to keep this brief in the interest of time.

- With regard to the bison what transpired between our last RAC meeting and the Board meeting was that the Division and the Grazers together completed an aerial survey of the bison on the Henry Mountains and the numbers were substantially above any objective that's listed in any of the plans. Do you recall exactly what that number was Steve? 460 something. In any event the current objective is:

Steve Dalton: Yeah we counted 463. That's adults and 100 head of calves.

Douglas Messerly:

- Plus 100 calves. The current objective is substantially below that, so one of the actions that the board took was to increase bison permits this year by 60 on the Henry Mountains. That's spread over three hunts. The result of that is that some people who applied for bison permits but were notified that they were unsuccessful in the drawing will be re-notified that they were actually successful. We keep track of the drawing numbers for people who apply for those permits and we'll just go down the list for each of those hunts, twenty more people. So that's a significant change and the Wildlife Board agreed in concept to continue this plan for the next three years in order to reduce bison numbers to the existing objective. And it was a good example of all the groups working together to resolve this issue.
- I'm sorry to report that according to a news release issued by the National Park Service Quagga Mussel young have been confirmed in Lake Powell, which means that we obviously have Quagga Mussels in Utah. This will change our efforts to contain these animals in as few of waters as possible. This is a continually evolving process and we'll continue to do the best we can to control these animals. That effort is largely going to depend on private boat owners themselves becoming familiar with how to properly disinfect their boats when they've been in Quagga infected waters. Lake Powell is probably one of the worst ones we could do in the state of Utah because boats from all over the state and many western states use Lake Powell, as many of you know. So efforts along those lines to contain Quagga Mussels where they are and keep them from spreading to other waters will continue and we'll do the best we can to minimize the infection.
- Our first general season big game hunt opens this weekend, the archery deer hunt. The elk hunt opens on the 23<sup>rd</sup>, archery elk hunt opens on the 23<sup>rd</sup>. We have had some of the antlerless hunts that this committee and the Wildlife Board approved in the

proclamation that began on August 1<sup>st</sup>. And because it's been a dry summer most of those hunts are aimed at depredation issues, and animals are plentiful in those situations this year because they are moving toward the fields and off of the dry feed on the mountains, as a general rule. So people have been successful and, I think to some extent, and those hunts have probably alleviated some of the problem. And we will continue to monitor the situation and see where we go from there.

- The sage grouse permits, I thought I'd just mention, went on sale on August 7<sup>th</sup>, for the Parker Mountain. They were on sale online and also at our offices. They went fairly quickly and they all disappeared that day by fairly early in the morning, if I'm not mistaken. So those permits are all gone.
- A final announcement that I'd like to make is that Gary Bezzant, who just gave the presentation on dedicated hunters, has accepted the position as a wildlife restoration biologist for the Southern Region replacing Tyler Thompson who was promoted to a position in Salt Lake. We look forward to great things from Gary and you'll probably be seeing somebody different for the dedicated hunter program. He's done a great job there and we look forward to great things out of him in the habitat section. That's my presentation Mr. Chairman, unless there are any questions.

Jake Albrecht: Any questions from members of the RAC? Okay, to the audience, this is a comment card. And if you want to address the RAC and the DWR tonight we need to have you grab one of these, fill it out with your name, your agenda topic so that we can discuss that. We do need that for comments. Okay after each discussion we're going to have questions from the RAC, and then questions from the public, and then we'll go to comments. The comments is if you're an individual you get three minutes, if you're representing a group we'll give you five. So we'll go to our first item on the agenda, the fee proposal which is an action item, and I have Greg Sheehan.

Kenny Johnson: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Actually Greg Sheehan couldn't make it tonight. So I'm Kenny Johnson, Information Analyst from the Salt Lake City office. I'll be filling in for Greg, so I'll do both of his and mine back to back.

### **Fee Proposal (Action)**

**13:37 to 20:17 of 2:24:46**

-Kenny Johnson, Information Analyst

### **Questions from the RAC:**

Jack Hill: On my agenda it shows a proposed fee for commercial outfitter and commercial guide.

Kenny Johnson: Oh thank you Jack. Thanks for bringing that up. Yes, we determined, there's legislation that is sort of trying to shape up for this next legislative session for outfitters and guides, and kind of a change in how that relationship might look. And so in your RAC packet, each of the RAC members, there is a proposal in there for that. We decided that it was premature to go ahead with that, having not seen a finalized rule and not knowing where that was going to end up. So we tabled that one until some future date.

Jack Hill: That's great. The reason I asked, I have a nephew that is somewhat of a guide and

he said, how the hell can you propose a fee if we don't even know what we're supposed to be doing?

Kenny Johnson: That was kind of my sediments exactly. So we're going to table that one until some future meeting and it will be public at that point.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any other questions from the RAC? Explain that nonresident cougar and black again. You said that, have you met with those people of something there?

Kenny Johnson: No that one, traditionally what, the reason that is what it is, it's a thirty dollar fee to pursue cougar; it's a thirty dollar fee to pursue bear. And that's across the board, residents and nonresidents. And so the reason that has been, historically, and I'll explain it to the best of my knowledge, it has to do with our interstate commerce laws. The permit essentially is authorizing that activity, maybe not to the specific person who wants to go but to some business. And so when they come into the state to pursue, if you're out of state, we had to make that, we couldn't make that a resident and a nonresident fee historically. And so if this new bill that is being proposed that would create some different, you know I don't know enough about it to speak intelligently about it, but essentially would create an outfitter guide relationship, a monetary-permit relationship every year. Then we could charge the increased nonresident fees up to the \$130.00. So that's the crux of that one.

Jake Albrecht: Okay do we have any other questions from the RAC then? Do we have any questions from the public?

**Questions from the Public:**

None.

Jake Albrecht: Seeing none we'll move on to comments. Do we have any comment cards Doug? We have received no comment cards on this particular item.

**Comments from the Public:**

None.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any other comments from the RAC then? Seeing no comments and no other discussion I guess we're open for a motion which way we want to go.

**RAC Discussion and Vote:**

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman I make a motion that we accept the fee schedule as proposed by the DWR.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a motion to accept by Rex Stanworth.

James Edwards: I second it.

Jake Albrecht: And a second by Jim Edwards. No other discussion. I call for a vote. All in favor please raise your hands. Any against? Okay motion carries.

**Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept the fee schedule as written. James Edwards seconded. Motion carried unanimously**

Jake Albrecht: Okay Kenny, you're up with Convention Rule.

**Convention Permit Rule R657-55**

**24:28 to 27:55 of 2:24:46**

-Kenny Johnson, Information Analyst

Jake Albrecht: Okay do we have any questions from the RAC?

**Questions from the RAC:**

Jack Hill: I've got one. Under 657-55-4(5), an incomplete or incorrect application may be rejected. I'd like to see that may changed to will for one big reason, and that is that if I'm going to apply and that I know going in that my application will be thrown out if it isn't complete and accurate I'm going to do a good job of making it complete and accurate. But if we say may then somebody gets the privilege of making an exception and saying ah, we'll take yours because you're such a nice guy. And I'd like to see will rather than may. I'm not a nice guy. If we're going to play hardball let's have hardball rules.

Jake Albrecht: Okay so where was that on there?

Jack Hill: It's obtaining authority to distribute wildlife convention permit series. And it's, under that it would be down to third, one, two, three, four, fifth line from the bottom of the page. It would read an incomplete or incorrect application will be rejected.

Jake Albrecht: Is there any other questions then? I have one. I thought I read in here somewhere, maybe you can help me, that all the permits will be allocated to one sportsman's group, is that correct?

Kenny Johnson: Right. It's a group of them that get together and so the entity, the entity ends up being one group. That's correct.

Clair Woodbury: Mr. Chairman I think when we were at Cabela's, if I understood correctly, if there was a second group of people that wanted to put together a show and if they could meet the criteria then at that point in time, my understand was that they would split those permits between the two groups, in other words if there were two conventions held in the state of Utah.

Kenny Johnson: That's a fair question. I honestly, I don't know where that would end up. That seems logical but yeah, I don't know. I guess at some point that that becomes, uh, you know, in existence we'd have to review it. But for now, essentially what happens is we issue those permits to, their acronym is WHCE. But it does encompass most of the local conservation groups. So that may be feasible. I just don't know that there's groups out there that would be

able to do that.

Clair Woodbury: Well I know that Rocky Mountain Elk wasn't inside of that. So the possibility is there if they went and found up three and four and came into Utah and said gee we want to hold a convention, not in January but in June or something like that.

Kenny Johnson: Yeah and I'd have to review the rule to see if, to see what guidelines we have there to make that happen. So I can get back to you on that one.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, any questions from the public?

**Questions from the Public:**

None.

Jake Albrecht: No other questions from the RAC? We don't have any comment cards.

**Comments from the Public:**

None.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any comments from the RAC?

**RAC Discussion and Vote:**

Jack Hill: Yeah, may I? It says that any group, any organization that came forward that has a history of successfully running a convention, has a historical background of running a convention, knows how to have a competitive draw and is honest and above board. There's only one organization, the one that just had the convention last January. How in the world are we going to get any competition for them in terms of holding a convention other than the group that has held the convention? I don't see any way that it would occur. The gentleman on the end of the table brought it up. Wasn't it you Rex? Yeah, I don't see there being any competition at all. I think it's, I think it's tailor made to fit the requirements and the regulations are tailor made for that one group. No one has any history of running a convention.

Rex Stanworth: Well the only point I made Jack was that there was at least one major entity that did not participate and that was Rocky Mountain Elk.

Jack Hill: Well you know very, and I think the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation is a great organization. I have no axe to grind against them. But boy they are out in left field when it comes to holding a convention because they don't have any history of holding a convention or doing a fair and honest draw. So it looks like to me that this thing is tailored to continue the way it was last January.

Jake Albrecht: Okay that's your perception on that Jack. Rex do you have any other comments then?

Rex Stanworth: No.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any other comments from the RAC? Okay I'd entertain a rule then.

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman I would make a motion that we accept the convention permit rule as presented.

Jake Albrecht: We have a motion by Rex Stanworth to accept the convention permit rule as presented. Do we have a second?

Clair Woodbury: I'll second that.

Jake Albrecht: And we have a second by Clair Woodbury. Okay, all in favor? Any against? Okay motion carries. There was one against, Jack Hill.

**Rex Stanworth made a motion to accept the convention permit rule as presented. Clair Woodbury seconded the motion. Motion carries 6-1. (Jack Hill opposed) Favor: James Edwards, Clair Woodbury, Dell LeFevre, Steve Dalton, Gary Hallows, Rex Stanworth.**

Jake Albrecht: Okay our next item is the CWMU Rule by Boydee Blackwell.

**CWMU Rule R657-37 (Action)**

-Boydee Blackwell, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Program Manager

**Questions from the RAC:**

**35:01 to 51:07 of 2:24:46**

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Boydee. Do we have any questions from the RAC? Jack Hill.

Jack Hill: What kind of authority does a CWMU agent have?

Boyde Blackwell: He has the authority to manage his private property as he sees that he needs to.

Jack Hill: Well as I read this it says that a CWMU can appoint an agent to?

Boyde Blackwell: Right. He can appoint an agent to guide people on his property. He can appoint an agent to patrol his boundaries.

Jack Hill: That's the point I'm getting at. What kind of authority does that person have? Because I've been, I come from a family that has a pretty sizeable ranch down in Cedar City. And on a couple of occasions during deer season I've had an opportunity to see somebody on the ranch and I ask them what they're doing and they become very belligerent. And I'm just wondering what kind of authority that CWMU agent has, because I would hate to be that CWMU agent in that kind of an environment.

Boyde Blackwell: There's a potential for issues to arise there. What they need to do, they can ask the person to leave. If they choose not to leave, most of them carry cell phones and call

immediately to the sheriff's office and that person can be arrested for trespass.

Jack Hill: I guess my question is they don't have any authority. The answer is.

Boyde Blackwell: Um, to patrol and look at, take care of their own property they do but they can't, I mean. . . Go ahead Doug.

Douglas Messerly: Thanks Boyde. The answer to your question Jack is no. No authority is conferred on these people by this rule. It outlines what their responsibilities are. However, they have no more police powers than an average citizen. There is a law that provides for a citizen's arrest. Most citizens don't exercise that, obviously. And in most cases these people are appointed in an official capacity to patrol the areas. And frankly, in the places that I'm familiar with where they are being hired they are usually police officer on side jobs, is what they are. In any event no authority is conferred on these people by this rule. The best thing to do for them would be to be a darned good witness.

Jack Hill: Thank you very much.

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman. Boyde I guess one question I've got, you're indicating that there's no corner to corner. You're trying to get away from the corner to corner. But on smaller units is it better to have a little bit than nothing or are you thinking that you'd just as well be without if you have to do the corner to corner?

Boyde Blackwell: Well we'd like to draw a line in the sand so that we can say this is what you need, this is how you can start out. Then you can branch from there and you can have the corner to corner. But we feel that it's important for us to draw a line and make it very understandable that you have to have 10,000 acres for an elk CWMU, a block of 10,000 acres or a block of 5,000 acres for a deer.

Rex Stanworth: Then the other question I had for you, from what I'm reading, and I'm glad to hear that you're going to do the survey of the hunters, especially the public hunters coming off that, but those folks should have the same ability to hunt on that CWMU, the same acreage, the same spot, in other words the CWMU guy can't say by the way you're not allowed to go over on this, on that quarter section, don't go through that gate. That's a no-no. They can't do that any more, is that correct?

Boyde Blackwell: Well that's what we're recommending here. Yes.

Rex Stanworth: That's good. Awesome.

Jake Albrecht: Boyde, I have one question. On 37-9, A and B, it talks about a CWMU owner failing to meet antlerless objectives. My question is if there's 15 head of elk, for example, that he has permits for and those elk aren't there at that time of year and he doesn't meet those objectives how do you separate that out?

Boyde Blackwell: Well he's got three years to meet that. And we believe that over that three year time period he can meet that objective that he will have in his management plan that he

needs to, that's he's worked out with the biologist, that he needs to remove a certain number of antlerless elk. We use antlerless, the antlerless elk hunts as a population management tool. And so the biologists should know where their populations are, what needs to be taken out, and therefore give them a number that they need to meet overall. Then they can take those number of permits and maybe one year they'll have ten, maybe another year they'll have two, you know, and so-forth so that they can meet their objectives.

Jake Albrecht: Okay do we have any questions from the public?

Boyde Blackwell: Mr. Chairman I believe Rex.

Jake Albrecht: Rex do you have one more?

Rex Stanworth: Yeah I just had one. In regards to your committee, was it unanimous the presentation that you've given us, was it a unanimous decision on this from the committee?

Boyde Blackwell: Yes, we had an excellent committee put together. They worked very well together. We met often way late at night and I don't think anybody got everything. And that's you know, a lot of committees are formed from different walks of life. I don't think everybody got absolutely everything that they wanted but they were happy with what was there and felt that they could live with what we were going to present.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, no other questions from the RAC and seeing none from the public.

**Questions from the Public:**

None.

Jake Albrecht: I have one comment. Wade do you want to come forward. Wade Heaton from the Utah CWMU Association.

**Comments from the Public:**

Wade Heaton: I wanted to let Mr. Blackwell and the committee know that God bless them for all the work they did. This has been needing to be done for a long time and they did great work on this. And it really helped out the CWMU program as a whole. And from an association standpoint I want you to know that we're proud to be a part of this program. Just the success and the opportunity, it's a win-win situation for everybody and we're happy about it. What I stopped and asked Boyde was, I hope you all have a copy of the letter that the Association sent to you. This is obviously a long complex rule and they've done a great job. There are a few little fine points that we wanted to bring up, seven points in the letter. I hope each one of you got that. First point was with issue, about the antlerless permits going only to residents, they had changed that or we'd misunderstood that and so we no longer have issue with that. I just want to make two other quick points, with regards to the second; in section 4 it talks about the CWMU and the corner-to-corner idea that you brought up, Mr. Chairman. Maybe that was you Rex. Here's the problem, in principal what the committee attempted to do is good, we need to block up the CWMUs and make them a more definable boundary. The

problem is there will arise the potential of small tracts of property that only do touch corner-to-corner. And I'm kind of with where Rex was headed, to deny a piece of property even if it's around the 5,000 mark to obtain the 5,000 mark in order to be qualify for the CWMU application even if there's one corner to corner, in reality this is good enough program, I don't know that it warrants making this a hard and fast rule and just absolutely denying their application. Our proposal would be rather than make it a hard and fast rule, we've got great talented biologists out there that know these properties well, and if it warrants an exception we would like them to have that leverage and let them be the ones who make that decision rather than us here who really don't know what the property or the things that affect it. There will be CWMUs that should qualify that this rule will exclude, I'm certain, over the next years. Second point and last one, was just with regards to the ratios. Changing the moose ratios from 70:40 to 50:50. The problem we have is it does affect, and as Boyde brought up, 90% of them are already operating on essentially a 50-50 basis. But there's that 10% and it does affect. We've got two or three CWMUs where this rule change from 60:40 to 50:50 does change their permit numbers, the private permit numbers, but it doesn't change the public permit numbers; which is okay, but when given the extremely limited nature of these moose permits that's a huge impact to a CWMU. We had the problem with the turkey rule on the CWMU and the ratio there nearly crippled the program. It's not nearly as popular. And as we talked about the incentive for these landowners to do something, this is a sensitive subject with this ratio idea. And so it's something, it needs to be balanced but I just don't know that the logistics of changing 60:40 to 50:50 warrant what we need to do. The program operates real well the way it is and we'd ask that you leave that at 50:50. Hopefully you had a chance to read through some of the others. I won't take your time to comment on those but I'd be happy to answer any questions if you've got any. Thanks.

Jake Albrecht: Does anybody from the RAC have a copy of the letter?

Jack Hill: No, I never received one.

Jake Albrecht: Wade, nobody on the RAC has a copy of that letter.

Wade Heaton: The one that I have, Boyde and each of you were supposed to get one so I'm sorry for that.

### **RAC Discussion and Vote:**

Jake Albrecht: We do not have any other comment cards on this particular item so we will go to comments from the RAC. In listening to Wade's discussion I picked up two items that he would like us to talk about and if I understood them right the biologists would be able to give an exception on a piece of property that was less than 5,000 acres or corner- to- corner. Is that right Wade? You're saying the biologists should have an exception on something that is close to 5,000 or corner-to-corner?

Wade Heaton: We just want it to, there will be circumstances where it should be denied and some that it should be, and we want the biologists on the ground staring at it to be the one that maybe makes that decision, or at least recommends.

Jake Albrecht: Only if it's corner-to-corner?

Wade Heaton: Yes sir.

Jake Albrecht: And then the other one is they would like the rule left at 60:40 instead of a 50:50. So do we have any comments from the RAC?

Rex Stanworth: Personally I was under the impression that we were trying to encourage participation with the public, or the private people on their land. I guess I have a little bit of heartburn with not allowing someone to look at that. Oak City for example is a prime example of a small area that could possibly not qualify on their 5 to 5, and I may be wrong. But it seems like to me that it's better to have something there with some input on that private land than to exclude them where they become totally anti-game. That's my comment.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any other comments? Jim, Jim Edwards.

Jim Edwards: Yeah, I think we ought to keep it at the 5,000 acres. I don't think we should be allowing a partial to come in as a corner-to-corner and still not have the 5,000 acres. And I think that's what we're referring to is to keep the 5,000 acre but allow a partial that is corner-to-corner to make it up to the 5,000 acres. But I don't think we should lower the 5,000 acres even if we allow the corner-to-corner. So that's my comment.

Rex Stanworth: I'd just like to get a feedback if I may from Boyde in regards to the 60:40, his comments on the 60:40. Is that improper?

Jake Albrecht: Is this a question?

Rex Stanworth: Well I guess I'd like to have his comment on the 60:40.

Jake Albrecht: Okay let's do it under the comments. That's the next step. Okay do we have any other questions from the RAC? We are at comments. I skipped over it didn't I. Rex I'm sorry, we are at comments, go ahead.

Rex Stanworth: Boyde, give us a comment on that 60:40 versus 50:50.

Boyde Blackwell: Okay, as I stated, about 90% are 50:50 anyways, and they are either a private permit one year and then a public permit the next year. And so most of them work out to a 50:50. There is that 10% though where they do get more permits, of the bull permits, and so therefore it would affect them. They, you know, right now they get 60% of the bull permits and the public gets 40% of the bull permits. And then the public gets 60% of the antlerless and the private gets 40%. And so we felt like in order to make this clear and concise that we would just go to a 50:50 and leave it at that.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we only had one comment card from the public so we're to comments from the RAC now so. Is there any other Jim?

Jim Edwards: Are we on comments? I would just like to know how much impact it is on these 10% that it affects. Is it just one bull, two bulls, ten bulls?

Boyde Blackwell: It would be, it would be two to three, three bull, four bull permits which can be an impact. If they're selling the bull permit for \$10,000, you know, it can be an impact.

Gary Hallows: We're three landowners here just kind of talking on the side when we should be listening occasionally but what's going to start to happen, I think between the three of us we probably feed thousands of deer and elk, ten or eleven months out of the year. And here you're trying to cut out these little squares and corners. I'm trying to figure out how to capitalize on feeding all these deer. That little check I get don't even, anyway it's pretty insignificant. Sometime in this whole system the scheme of things you've got to be able to tie in all these hay fields and landowners into this situation somehow. The time is coming when you're going to have to do something anyway. That's something you need to be thinking about. I sure wouldn't seclude these little cornered, I'm trying to figure out how to get a damned corner stretched a little. I could about do it if I can stretch it a half a mile. Anyway don't be cutting out something that you might could make work.

Jack Hill: Mr. Chairman. Seems to me a couple of years ago we had a presentation about CWMUs, and the issue of size came up. And it said that the smallest we should consider would be 5,000 acres for the usability and the manageability by both the CWMU and taking care of it from the prospective of the DWR. So I would be opposed to any kind of limitation in terms of that 5,000 acre. If we're going to say well let's give this guy a CWMU, he's only got 4,500 acres but if we stretch it over and let him corner up over there; then the next guy comes along and he's going to say well I only got 3,850 acres and if I can fudge a little bit then I can manage that. What we're going to do is we're going to see the diminishing of the size of the CWMU. And I would be adamantly opposed to that because of all of the logic and rational that we received a couple of years ago about sizes of CWMUs. I think it was the now director of the DWR that made the presentation to us.

James Edwards: Boyde, isn't it right now we're only taking affecting the new CWMUs not the old ones, they're going to stay like they are? Or if they come in with a boundary change then does that put them into a new category?

Boyde Blackwell: Yes that's correct.

Jake Albrecht: Okay I have just one comment and then we'll move on to see if we can get a motion on this. If you look at this corner-to-corner you could actually have five piece of property with one being in the center, and one on the left hand, one on the right hand above, one on the lower left, lower right, that all tap a thousand acres. Each one of them touching a corner but it wouldn't meet what you're taking about. Or you could have a 4,000- acre on the bottom and 1,000 on a corner and it wouldn't meet it, what we was talking about. So there's many scenarios there where the acres is there, you'd have BLM between ya, Forest Service, or maybe even some other private owner. So there is some other things to consider there. So with that on my comment let's go to motions.

Jack Hill: Mr. Chairman, I would move to accept them as written with the exception we change it to the 60-40.

Jake Albrecht: Okay if I understand that motion right, you want to accept it as written with the exception that the 60:40 stay the way it is?

Jack Hill: Yes sir, that is correct.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a motion.

James Edwards: I'll second it.

Jake Albrecht: We have a second by Mr. Edwards. All those in favor raise your right hand. Hold up, we have a discussion. Clair.

Clair Woodbury: Would it be possible to add an addendum onto that motion? What if we passed it as Jack proposed, with the exception of on this corner-to-corner they have an appeal process that they could bring with the Division officer who could approve it and then maybe we could make an exception on an individual basis?

Jake Albrecht: If I understand what you're talking about there would be an appeal process with the DWR or certain biologist where they could maybe have an exception to the rule.

Clair Woodbury: Exception on the corner- o-corner if they could show that that's the only way it would work. Pass it as is with the possible appeal to us or whoever would make that decision.

James Albrecht: Clair, would that only be on the new applicants?

Clair Woodbury: I think we should just, it could be either way. I see what Boyde wants to do but if there's a piece that will only work with corner-to-corner there should be a way that we could make it work.

Jake Albrecht: Would uh, just as a comment, would that be something that the working group would do or would you rather see it go to the DWR and the local biologists?

Clair Woodbury: I think the working group on the ground would be a better option.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have some comments but we don't have any other motion on what's there right now unless you want to make it Clair.

Clair Woodbury: I would make the motion we approve Jack's motion with that addendum that there's an appeal process on that.

Jake Albrecht: Okay you need to make a motion to amend the motion.

Clair Woodbury: I make that motion.

Jack Hill: What's the motion?

Jake Albrecht: State your motion.

Clair Woodbury. My motion is to accept your motion with the appeal process that the working group can convince the RAC or the Division that the corner-to-corner would work, only work in a certain situation.

Jake Albrecht. Okay I think Clair is trying to get me in trouble, but if I read your amendment to the motion it is that the corner-to-corner would have an appeal process with the working group.

Clair Woodbury: Yes.

Jake Albrecht: Is that correct?

Clair Woodbury: Yes. Other than that we accept it as Boyde proposed it.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have a second to that amendment?

Gary Hallows: I'll second that.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a second by Gary Hallows on the amendment. So we will vote on that first if there's no other discussion. This is a vote on the amendment only, by Clair Woodbury. All those in favor please raise your right hand. Okay we have six. Do we have any against? Jack Hill is against. Motion carries 6-1.

Jack Hill: The amendment negates the motion.

Jake Albrecht: But we will vote on the rest of it with that exception. Okay we are now going to vote on Jack's motion to accept the rest of the plan as written, plus leave the 60:40. Am I correct? Okay all those in favor of Jack's motion as I just stated. Please raise your right hand. Okay motion carries. Is there any against? Thanks Clair. None against.

**Jack Hill made a motion to accept the proposal as presented with the exception of leaving the 60:40 split for bull moose CWMUs. James Edwards seconded.**

**Clair Woodbury made a motion to amend the original motion to provide an appeal process through the CWMU advisory committee for CWMUs who needed to take advantage of corner to corner properties in order to meet the minimum acreage. Motion seconded by Gary Hallows.**

**The vote on the amendment to the original motion regarding corner to corner properties was taken. Amendment passed 6:1, Jack Hill voted against.**

**A vote on the original motion by Jack Hill was taken. The motion carried unanimously.**

Jake Albrecht: Okay, next up is our Waterfowl Proclamation and Rule, Tom Aldrich, it's to you.

**Waterfowl Proclamation and Rule R657-54 (Action)**

**1:15:58 to 1:25:04 of 2:254:46**

-Tom Aldrich, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Jack Hill: Mr. Chairman?

Jake Albrecht: Okay Jack, do you have a question?

Jack Hill: Yes sir I do.

**Questions from the RAC:**

Jack Hill: We have two letters from sportsmen complaining about the 8:00 AM start time for the youth hunting day. And they are asking to have it coincide with the rest of the hunting, half hour before daylight. Is there, is there a reason for the 8:00 AM start?

Tom Aldrich: Initially we started the youth program about ten years ago. And when we went into it we went into it very conservatively because we didn't know if duck identification would be a problem. You're putting youths in the field for the first time. We wanted to just make sure it was a safe hunt. I think we've got a lot of experience with that hunt now and we did consider changing it this year but in the final analysis we decided we just reduced the minimum age for hunting small game; we want it to be a real safe hunt and at least for the first couple of years we thought it would be prudent not to make any changes that could potentially increase a safety hazard. That doesn't mean we won't consider it in the future but that was sort of the rational. I think the Division would reconsider it's proposal if all the RACs came in with the recommended change, but at this point in time for this year we aren't recommending it.

Jack Hill: I appreciate the idea for ducks. It would be hard for a youngster to identify a duck in a real situation. However, these two letters are speaking specifically about goose hunting and I don't think a kid could mistake a goose.

Tom Aldrich: I think you're right but I don't think you could enforce a law that allowed you to shoot a half hour before sunrise on geese but required you to wait until eight for ducks. Doug you can comment on that. That would be virtually impossible. So I don't know that we could enact a different regulation on the opening day of the youth hunt for ducks versus geese. I think we either need to stick to eight or you need to recommend both would go to a half hour before sunrise.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions from the RAC, Rex?

Rex Stanworth: Tom, have we had any gravel or road improvements in those northern areas up there?

Tom Aldrich: Well your comment last year was for Bear River Refuge. I noticed that they do

have an appropriation, did have an appropriation to get it paved that was lost in the final minutes. So there are people working on it. There's a lot of inertia to get it going. I think they still believe it's going to happen, but it wasn't approved for this year.

Jake Albrecht: We've got another question from Clair Woodbury.

Clair Woodbury: On the motorless north of 83, you're saying there's only two people using the motorless area. Is that a small area kind of reserved for them, or is there any reason not to just open that all up?

Tom Aldrich: Well we kind of made the commitment that we would try to have some areas for motorless folks, and the pintail unit is a real popular boat unit. The units north of the highway, that now we're planning on making motorless aren't as popular, but there's some good hunting. So we want to maintain our commitment but we just want to move it around to try to get rid of the crowding that's occurred south of the highway by boat.

Jake Albrecht: Okay do we have any other questions from the RAC? Seeing none do we have any questions from the public? Please come forward and state your name.

### **Questions from the Public:**

Mark Messina: My name's Mark Messina and my question is on the youth hunt you're required to have a adult with the youth, correct?

Tom Aldrich: Correct.

Mark Messina: So why would duck identification be a problem if there's an adult there?

Tom Aldrich: Right now our, I think you're right. We are asking for an adult to be there to help kids identify ducks. I don't think right now the identification issue is the problem. I think right now it's just an increased risk of an accident because it's dark. I mean I think that's the Division's concern at this point in time. And I think after we get a year or twos experience with the younger hunters on opening day, you know, I think we can become more comfortable with it. But right now it was a safety issue that drove our lack of consideration for it.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Tom. Question please come forward.

Donnie Hunter: My name's Donnie Hunter. I'd just like to address the youth hunt on the waterfowl. I think that was made for opportunity for these young hunters. And I think this early start with give them that opportunity that they need. Why not give them all weekend? I think with an adult there, they're supervised and it's going to give them a little better hunt. And we need to keep those young men interested in hunting. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Do we have any other questions from the public? Okay we're going to go to comments from the public. And I have one card. And I thank you for your comments Donnie, I really do. Ferrel Reynolds, is from Elsinore.

## **Comments from the Public:**

Ferrel Reynolds: I'm a grandfather and a great-grandfather and I feel we are losing some of our youth to more than one hunt. But I feel this early hunt for the waterfowl, for the youth day, will bring more interest into the youth. I'd like to see it go to a half an hour before sunrise. That's about all I've got to say for it.

Jake Albrecht: Thank you for your comments. Okay is there any, I don't have any other cards, but I have two letters and I'm not going to read the whole thing but I'm going to address some of their major concerns. The first one is from John Peterson, and he is asking you to open the youth waterfowl opening at one half hour before sunrise instead of 8:00 AM. This is the one day a kid has to have a really good chance to get a goose. As it is now we hunt the fields and the geese come into the fields before 8:00 AM. So if you make the kids be legal and wait until 8:00 the geese are out of the fields and back to the reservoirs where you can't get at them. A lot of people just let them shoot early which is illegal and teaches them not to respect the law. So he's asking us to make a change to a half hour before daylight. The second one is from JD Nielson of Annabell. It says, please open the youth waterfowl hunt up to one half hour before sunrise just like the regular waterfowl-opening day. And he goes on to say that he puts his decoys and everything's out into the field and the geese move away from the decoys before the 8:00 AM time and so the kids don't have the opportunity. Also as a RAC Chairman I had several calls today asking that we reconsider that to make it a half hour before daylight. So with that, are there any other comments from the RAC? Gary Hallows.

## **RAC Discussion and Vote:**

Gary Hallows: Let's just not make it to where we give another excuse for them to give us a ticket. It would be kind of hard to patrol wouldn't it? I look kind of young. How are you going to determine? It sounds to me like that's just another way to get violated or get a ticket.

Jake Albrecht: Are you saying the half hour before daylight or the 8:00 AM.

Gary Hallows: The half hour. I mean, is this just for the youth? Is that just a youth day?

Jake Albrecht: Well the other one is, the half hour before sunrise is for everybody.

Gary Hallows: There's not other hunters hunting then, is there but youth?

Jake Albrecht: This is on the youth only hunt.

Gary Hallows: Oh. Okay I don't have a problem with that. I was just thinking that was for youth any time they went.

Jake Albrecht: We just worry about you guys over to Wayne County.

Gary Hallows: We sometimes are slow getting the news over there.

Jake Albrecht: Any other comments? Rex.

Rex Stanworth: Well, I certainly support the youth, the youth hunt. And I honestly believe that with the adult next to those youth I think we're foolish not to allow that to happen. So I'd encourage the Board to make that happen. And then Tom, I wanted to make one comment with you since you're the guy over all the waterfowl. In our area we got a special guy, Lynn Zubeck, does a heck of a job. Our little refuge is a wonderful place to go. It's great for the youth to come. He does a super job. I just wanted to make sure that you had that comment about how valuable he is, not to you but to us as a community.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Any other comments? Okay, the only issue that we have heard any comments on is the starting time so let's address some form of motion and get through this.

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman.

Jake Albrecht: Rex Stanworth.

Rex Stanworth: I make a motion that we accept the waterfowl proclamation as given to us by Mr. Aldrich, with the exception of the youth hunt starting a half an hour before daylight.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a motion by Rex to accept the proclamation as written, with the exception that the youth hunt will start a half hour before sunrise. Am I correct? And we have a second by Gary Hallows. Any other comments

Clair Woodbury: That starting time, now that would be the geese and ducks, right, not the split?

Jake Albrecht: That is waterfowl.

Clair Woodbury: Okay.

Jake Albrecht: Okay seeing no other comments do we have any, we'll call for a vote then. All those in favor please raise your right hand. Any against? Motion carries. Thanks Tom for your help there.

**Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept the Waterfowl proclamation as presented with the exception of changing the starting time of the youth hunt to one half hour before sunrise. Gary Hallows seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Jake Albrecht: Okay we're to our last item on the agenda, which is the turkey proclamation and rule, Dennis Southerland.

**-Turkey Proclamation and Rule R657-549 (Action) 1:36:52 to 2:00:54 of 2:24:46**

-Dennis Southerland, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Jake Albrecht: Okay do we have any questions from the RAC for Dennis?

**Questions from the RAC:**

Steve Dalton: What's the Division's preferred alternative here?

Dennis Southerland: Our Division preferred alternative is Option 2.

Jake Albrecht: Where we heard the whole presentation on all five RACs, or areas, but we're actually voting on the southern region only, am I correct?

Dennis Southerland: Yes. I guess, is that right Doug?

Jake Albrecht: Just a clarification on that.

Doug Messerly: It's a little complicated but if this RAC had an issue with a recommendation in another region they could certainly make a recommendation to the Wildlife Board under those circumstances. So if for example you were considering moose permits or the issue of moose permits which we discussed before, we have no moose in the southern region that we hunt currently. So if you took that tact presumably we couldn't make recommendations on the moose permits. So this RAC makes recommendations to the Wildlife Board on the Division's recommendations. If you want to have, I would presume that the Wildlife Board would consider recommendations on the northeastern region units from the Northeastern Region RAC more than they would the Southern Region RAC but I don't know that you can exclude parts of the presentation unless there's a specific recommendation on that. That would be my thought on the subject.

Jake Albrecht: Mr. Woodbury.

Clair Woodbury: Is there a weapons, any type of weapons restriction in your proposal, like are high powered rifles legal weapons?

Dennis Southerland: No they're not. Just shotgun and archery only. And I think there is a restriction on pellet size.

Clair Woodbury: Okay. I think it's a great day when we get over the counter turkey sales but if rifles were legal then I could see a problem.

Jake Albrecht: No other questions from the RAC? Do we have any questions from the public people? You have a comment, right? Do you have a question or a comment? Okay. You want to turn that into one of the, while he's coming down the hall there and he'll get it up to us. Okay, no other questions from the public. We'll now go to comments from the public.

**Questions from the Public:**

None.

Jake Albrecht: And with this gentlemen's we have two. The first one will be Greg Abbott. Do you want to come forward Greg?

**Comments from the Public:**

Greg Abbott: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'm Greg Abbott from Monroe. I represent the National Wild Turkey Federation, specifically the Sevier Valley Chapter out of Richfield. I also serve on the state board of directors here in Utah for the National Wild Turkey Federation. I've got a letter here that our state chapter president John Leonard has submitted to you and I'd like to read it to the RAC and the public, about what we think should happen here. Last year the Utah State Chapter of the National Wild Turkey Federation or the NWTF raised the issue of increased hunting opportunity for wild turkeys in Utah. As a result DWR created a working group to review and update their wild turkey management plan with special emphasis on making recommendations for increasing hunting opportunity throughout the state. I along with our staff turkey biologist and a representative from the Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife join DWR field biologists from each region in monthly meetings from January until June drafting a new strategic plan for wild turkey management in Utah. The turkey recommendations and rule before you represent the culmination of the working group's yearlong effort. The turkey recommendations and rule as proposed by the DWR has been reviewed in detail by our national headquarters out of Edgefield South Carolina and our state board. The NWTF overwhelmingly supports DWR's option number 2. We are especially pleased with the phased increase in hunting opportunity that option number 2 will provide over the next three-year period. We believe this phase transition of increasing permits over the next three years will better prepare Utah hunters for the time in the near future when unlimited permits are made available. All recent research indicates that spring gobbler hunts have no detrimental effect on wild turkey populations; however, we do recognize that with increased numbers of hunters in the field there is a legitimate concern over hunter to-hunter interference. In the northern, southern and central regions hunts C, under Option number 2, provides a key element in avoiding this hunter interference by allowing hunters to disperse themselves within regional boundaries. The NWTF would prefer to see this important element adopted statewide. In other words we'd like to see this happen also in the northeast and the southeastern regions. The NWTF wishes to recognize DWR and their dedicated professionals for the tremendous effort put forth in wild turkey management throughout Utah. We greatly appreciate being given the opportunity to participate as members of their wild turkey working group. Sincerely, John Leonard. Any questions?

Unidentified Man: So you'd like us to do 2-C, right?

Greg Abbott: Yes sir, we'd like Option number 2. And we'd kind of like to see the northeastern region and southeastern region go along with the northern, central and southern regions in allowing hunt C to be a region-wide hunt as opposed to just statuesque.

Gary Hallows: I guess you couldn't do that turkey gobble for us like they do on TV?

Greg Abbott: I can't do a gobble very well but I can yelp a little bit.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, thanks Greg. Andy Anderson.

Greg Abbott: Mr. Chairman, you have a copy of this letter, is that correct?

Jake Albrecht: I do.

Greg Abbott: But we need to give them an additional one, is that right?

Jake Albrecht: I will.

Greg Abbott: You will or would you like me to do it?

Jake Albrecht: I have it here.

Andy Anderson: Okay, my name is Andy Anderson. And I'm a landowner with a small parcel of property, but I happen to have the opportunity to get a landowner turkey tag. My concern is I'm on the committee for the NWTF, Southern Spurs Chapter there in Cedar, and I would like to be able to donate my landowner turkey tag along with all the other ranchers, I live in Pine Valley, that have the opportunity to get turkey tags also. They, I've talked to four of them and three of them have agreed that they would give the landowner turkey tag to the Wheeling Sportsman for the NWTF. Now we gonna want to change anything in the way that the organization or your thing is made up on, how would I put it, in your proclamation. I just would like to add the Wheeling Sportsman to the donor, or to the individual, how would I put it, to have the landowner be able to donate his landowner tag to the Wheeling Sportsman. And our chapter, the Southern Spurs, has offered to pay the \$40.00 investment for that along with give the Wheeling Sportsman a guided hunt. So we will be willing to do that if it's possible for you to see that the landowner's that give their landowner to the Wheeling Sportsman. And that's all I have.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Andy. We'll probably address that under comments from the RAC here in just a second. Okay, we don't have any other cards from the public so we'll go from comments from the public, oh we have one more. Please had it to that officer right behind you there. Just keep coming while you're that close. This deals with a non-agenda item but we can discuss that under other. And then we can't vote on it but we can hear your comment so it will be later on the agenda. Okay? It will be one more item. Okay, we're discussing turkey proclamation and rule and we're to comments from the RAC right now. Comments. Mr. Hill.

### **RAC Discussion and Vote:**

Jack Hill: I think the current population of turkeys in the southern region is a result of good biology and good management. I've watched the turkeys closely on the Zion unit up on Cedar Mountain for over ten years now and the poults that I've seen over the summers of that ten-year cycle have increased now 300% on our ranch, in the one area that I watch closely. I think that it's time for Option 2, frankly, from my perspective. I think we can certainly increase the number of permits available or opportunities for hunting for people in the southern region, dramatically. And I think Option 2 is certainly a good option for everyone. I wanted, the gentleman that just spoke about the Wheeling Sportsman. If I understand it correctly those

landowners can give those tags to anyone they want can't they?

Jake Albrecht: I'm going to let Doug address that in just a minute. Clair.

Clair Woodbury: I'd like to echo Jack's comment. I think all you Division of Wildlife Resource people should give yourself a big pat on the back on the turkey management. It's a great day that we've reached this point that we can increase these tags. And as a lifelong upland game hunter, the statement I heard back when I was young that you can't stockpile upland game is really true. So we might as well use this resource and I think Option 2 is a great option.

Jake Albrecht: Okay any other RAC comments? Okay I'm going to let Doug talk about the last comment card.

Douglas Messerly: First of all Mr. Chairman I spoke with Mr. Anderson about this topic in our office and I commend him for having the gumption to come to this meeting and present it. That's what I suggested that he do. As I spoke with him at the office the primary problem with what he proposes, although it sounds like a great idea and a worthy cause, is that it would require a pretty major change in the rules as to who is eligible to receive landowner permits. Currently that's not an option to give or sell the rights to those applications to other people that are described in the rule. So it would require essentially a transfer of the ability to be able to apply for landowner permits and frankly would open up, probably a large market for people selling that opportunity to be able to do that. And that may or may not be something that we want to pursue or see at this point. At this point there's nothing, we're not prepared to make those changes to the rule unless this RAC and the Wildlife Board directs us to do that. To be able to allow landowners, and we couldn't restrict it to a certain group of landowners, we'd have to make that option available statewide to people to donate to, again, an unrestricted list of groups. So it's kind of a Pandora's box in some ways. And it's something that could be addressed, I guess, by the committee; but I think as we go to over the counter permits it's going to be less and less of an issue because people are going to be able to just buy permits, essentially at will. Those are my comments.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. We had a kind of a clarification on that. Do we have any other comments? Okay we need to move along with a motion then.

Jack Hill: Mr. Chairman, point of clarification. Do we need, if I make this motion do I make the motion supporting Option 1 or Option 2 or both of them? I would move that we accept the turkey proclamation as presented supporting Option B. B all right? 2. Well that's 2, A, B. 2.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a motion by Mr. Hill to accept Option 2 and we have a second by Clair Woodbury. Any other discussion? All those in favor please raise your right hand. Vote is unanimous.

**Jack Hill made the motion to accept the Turkey Proclamation as written with Option 2. Clair Woodbury seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

## **Other Business**

-Jake Albrecht, Chairman

Okay we are to the last item on the agenda which is other business. I just want to take a couple of seconds and talk about the RAC information day that we had last week up at Cabela's. And out of that meeting I got a little information, and Rex you can help me on this, but when we get comment cards from the public and we have one here tonight that was not an agenda item we can receive their comments but we cannot vote on them because it is not an agenda item. So the other thing that we will do is we'll take those comments and when that meeting comes up further down the line we're going to maybe notify that person in advance so that he can be there to make those comments and his suggestions so that they will be heard. The meeting that you want to talk about, if I'm not mistaken is our November meeting, am I correct Doug? I think it's bucks and bulls.

Doug Messerly: Yeah that would be the November. Do you have a date (inaudible)?

Jake Albrecht: The way I remember it that is our November meeting, and if I'm not mistaken it is in Hurricane. Now we can keep your comment card here and I can get with you and get your name and address if that's good enough for you? Okay. We want to make sure that everybody has the opportunity to comment and express their feelings and bring out some maybe some real good ideas. But like I say, if there's not an agenda item then we're not allowed by law to vote on them. But we want to make sure that everybody gets the opportunity so we'll have a place at the end for other where we can maybe help people along and get them to the right meetings.

Jack Hill: Mr. Chairman, under other business could I have a point of privilege please?

Jake Albrecht: When I get done here. Rex, help me out a little bit. Their point of order on bringing things back to the Wildlife Board, what was that called?

Rex Stanworth: It was called an action rule, wasn't it? Action log, yeah action log.

Jake Albrecht: Okay so maybe in the future maybe we could keep that so that it works its way back to the Wildlife Board. And that would come under certain things. And Doug you can help me with that also. Well if a person comes up and has an idea that's not on the agenda but we want to work it back into the RAC system then we'll put it on an action log so it eventually come back on, if it's something that's not addressed.

Doug Messerly: I guess my comment on that would be that if this RAC feels that that item needs to be brought to the attention of the Wildlife Board and ask that the Wildlife Board put that on the action log then that would be appropriate. It's probably safe to say that this RAC would not want to forward all of the comments and ideas that they hear. So we probably need to come up with a process to direct you when you present to the Wildlife Board to ask that those items be put on the agenda, or on the action log, excuse me.

Jake Albrecht: And that's something that we can learn and work our way into, to make sure that we're covering everybody's bases. Okay, Mr. Hill.

Jack Hill: Oh I think most everyone in the room if they don't know Jim Bowns they at least know of his name. He is the outgoing chairman of the board. He had major surgery three weeks ago. And there were a couple of bumps in the road but he's home. And any of you that want to call him and give him a high-ho and get better. I'm sure he'd love to hear from ya. I tried to get him to come to the RAC meeting tonight and he told me that the doctor told him to take it easy and he was going to take advantage of that advise as much as he possibly could. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thank Jack. We want to make sure that Jim Bowns knows that we certainly appreciate him and hope he considers to get along well. Del you have one comment.

Dell LeFevre: I don't know where this fits but the state plows that Boulder Grover road. And these sportsmen, don't get me wrong, I hate these damn deer. But the deer go along there and eat this salt and this dirt and we're wacking them. If one of my cowboys killed one of them deer I don't know what it would be worth. And you killed eight or ten does and four or five fawns this summer alongside that road. And I wonder if the Fish and Game wouldn't take a look into that and salt them back off the road or doing something to keep them deer from licking that dirt along the road. The Fish and Game used to salt and now the deer are just along the road there. And these two are in such a hurry that they don't even slow down. I don't like the tourists or the deer so it's kind of (unintelligible).

Jack Hill: I saw that coming back from Panguitch. There was salt all over that road and those sheep were right in the middle of it eating it.

Jake Albrecht: Rex.

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman, one of the things that become obvious to me is that a number of our members have been asked to serve on committees, but we never know until it's all over with, and a prime example was Steve on the buffalo. I was given the opportunity when I served on the elk committee to be able to address this board as I went through those committees and asking for advise and giving information and allowing the public to know what was going on. I would like to suggest that if we have members that are serving on boards, I would certainly like to know about it. And I would like to have comments from them when they go to these meetings, give us a few minutes of their time and tell us what they've done. I think that's only right and appropriate. So I would like to make a recommendation to you as a chairman that as these folks are funneled through you for committee positions that you allow us as a board to know so that we can draw on their expertise.

Jake Albrecht: And that's a good point Rex. And I think we could do that under Wildlife Board update as it goes through myself as a chairman and you guys are sitting on some of those subcommittees.

Rex Stanworth: That's great.

Jake Albrecht: Good point. Okay, next meeting fishing proclamation and rule, brine shrimp rule, fishing stock procedures, September 11<sup>th</sup>, 7:00 PM, Beaver High School. Be here on

time. Thanks. How about a motion to adjourn?

Jake Albrecht: We have a motion by Del to adjourn. Do we have a second? Seconded by Rex. All in favor? Any against?

**Del LeFevre made a motion to adjourn. Rex Stanworth seconded. Unanimous. 9:30 PM**