

Northern Region Wildlife Board Advisory Council

November 19, 2007

6:00 P.M.

Place: Brigham City Community Center, Brigham City, Utah

RAC Present

Darwin Bingham, Agric
Ryan Foutz, At Large
Mark Marsh, Sportsman
Bill Fenimore, At Large
Robert Byrnes, At Large
Brad Slater-Chair, Elected
Paul Cowley, Forest Service
Jon Leonard, Sportsman
James Gaskill, Sportsman
Shawn Groll, At Large

DWR Present

Phil Douglass
Jodie Anderson
Lenny Reese
Dave Olsen
Anis Aoude
Randy Wood
Craig McLaughlin
Darren Debloois
Justin Dolling
Ron Hodson
Mike Fowlks
Boyde Blackwell
Scott McFarlane
Kirt Enright

Wildlife Board

Ernie Perkins

RAC Absent

Ann Neville, Noncon
Lee Shirley, Noncon

Public Present - See Attached Roll Sheet

Meeting Begins: 6:00 p.m.

Number of Pages: 21

Introduction - Brad Slater, RAC Chair

Agenda:

Regional Update
Statewide Unit-by-Unit Hunts in 2009
Statewide Spike Elk Hunt in 2009
Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for People with Disabilities
Hunter Education Rule R657-23 (5 yr review)
CWMU Approval
North Book Cliffs Bison Management Plan

Bucks, Bulls and OIAL Proclamation & Rule R657-5
Caliber Restrictions
Other RAC Business

Approval of Main Agenda (Action)

Adopted by Consent

Brad Slater acknowledged Bret Selman and his family for receiving the Leopold Conservation Award.

Approval of Minutes - (Action)

Adopted by Consent

Item 3. Overview of DWR Northern Region Activities

Ron Hodson, Regional Supervisor

Ron Hodson reported the following:

- Volunteer check stations were set up to allow the Division to check the deer that were harvested. The deer hunting numbers were lower this year by 6% overall for the region as compared to previous years. The Cache unit station numbers were higher than years past. The number of yearling bucks taken in those units was also higher than it has been in previous years.
- A buck and bull combo hunt was implemented this year in the northern region where individuals could take their deer during the general elk season. The Division will not know exactly where those tags were used until they receive the harvest data.
- The swan hunt has been going well. There are currently 31,000 swans around the Great Salt Lake which is close to the peak number which is 55,000.

Item 4. Statewide Unit-by-Unit Hunts in 2009

Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

Shaun Graves- Does this plan include a mandatory reporting provision so the Division is aware what is taking place?

Aoude- This plan does not require mandatory reporting. The Division currently uses phone harvest surveys to get statistically sound samples for that unit. We may or may not utilize mandatory reporting, depending upon what feedback the Division receives from the public.

Graves- Would the Division consider requiring mandatory reporting? It is not a bad thing for the public to hold some responsibility for the Division obtaining their data.

Aoude- When there are smaller units, it is easier to obtain that data. Our data is sufficient. If we

continue to gather data on a unit by unit basis, there would not be a need for mandatory reporting but we would entertain the idea.

RAC Questions

Foutz- When does the deer management plan come up for review?

Aoude- It is reviewed in 2009.

Foutz- I would assume this proposal will be discussed heavily by the mule deer working group.

Aoude- The deer working group will likely discuss this issue but statewide management plans look at hunting schemes. We do not necessarily consider how the animals are being harvested. We do not like to put hunting schemes in management plans because they can potentially change within the five year time frame.

Cowley- If you were to go to a unit by unit basis, what regions would those be in?

Aoude- I do not have them all memorized. Several of them are in the Central Region and a few of them are in the Southern Region. I do not think there are any in the Northern Regions.

Cowley- Are those units that are under objective being masked by the other regions because they are being averaged out?

Aoude- That is correct.

Cowley- Would there be additional administrative costs associated with this?

Aoude- The costs may increase a little bit but the number of permits issued will remain the same. It is considered a restructuring rather than a cost increase.

Gaskill- Is this an attempt by the Division to improve your biological data or is it an attempt to manage hunters?

Aoude- The Division has been requested to submit this proposal to the Advisory Councils to obtain feedback. I would characterize this proposal as an attempt to manage which area the hunting pressure occurs.

Gaskill- If units equate to deer herds, why are we managing a biological unit rather than a political unit.

Aoude- Some units are managed politically. We will be managing on a smaller scale. It could be moving more towards biological units. It is difficult to determine how it will effect the herds until we try it. We will be targeting units that are falling below objective which is not a bad thing.

Gaskill- It seems in some of the other areas, the move has been to increase hunter opportunity.

This proposal seems to reduce hunter opportunity.

Aoude- It will reduce a hunter's flexibility, not their opportunity. Overall opportunities will be the same but individual opportunity may not.

Public Questions

Craig Bailey- How do you substantiate the 15 bucks to 100 does ratio? How does that ratio compare to the management objectives of surrounding states and how does it compare to the trophy units within the State?

Aoude- The number came from a long term data set which considers what the buck to doe ratios have been in past years to sustain the population. General season hunting is meant to optimize the number of buck tags available without hurting the population. Some of our limited entry units allow for 25 to 30 bucks per 100 does. Most states are getting away from general season hunting so it is difficult to compare. They are managing for higher buck to doe ratios for a quality hunt. We are trying to combine both types of hunts.

RAC Questions

Slater- Do limited entry hunts bring bigger bucks and does it increase the opportunity for hunters?

Aoude- Colorado has eliminated their general season hunts and has reduced the number of tags issued by half. Their success rate is not significantly higher than that of our general season hunt. Colorado has a larger elk hunt so when their deer hunters are displaced, they have different hunts available. If Utah were to displace 50% of their hunters, they would not all have the option to switch to the elk hunt.

Slater- This is an informational item that will be considered by the RAC Councils prior to a decision being made.

Aoude- If there is enough public input in favor of the proposal, the Division will likely make a recommendation next year.

Item 5. Statewide Spike Elk Hunt in 2009

Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

Marion Long- Will the spike only hunt and limited entry hunts be combined or would the spike hunt occur after the limited entry hunt?

Aoude- It will be just like the general season. It will not be at the same time. The archery hunt will overlap.

Long- My recommendation is that they have the spike hunt way after the limited entry hunt since

it takes so long to draw out a limited entry hunt.

Aoude- In most cases, the hunts are held at different times except for the archery hunt which does overlap.

Bart Hansen- It does make sense to overlap the limited entry hunt with the archers since archery is the least effective weapon. The rifle is the most effective weapon and those hunters do not have to compete with anyone.

Aoude- We do not want to have to restructure everything to accommodate one user group.

Hansen- I will not put in for a limited entry archery unit that also accommodates spike hunts because I do not want to have to compete with other hunters if I draw out a once in a lifetime hunt.

Aoude- There are many hunters who will continue to put in for the limited entry archery units. It is impossible to please all of the hunters.

Hansen- The current elk management plan calls for a reduction in spike tags to maximize the number of mature bull tags. This proposal seems to be going 180 degrees in the opposite direction.

Aoude- That is actually incorrect. The current statewide management plan went through several drafts. The first draft lowered the age class objectives and lowered the spike cap as well. Now we have gone back up but we did not address the spike aspect of it.

Hansen- The current elk management plan that is on the DWR website is to reduce the number of spike tags and increase the number of mature tags. This proposal is the complete opposite of that. It won't increase the number of mature permits. It will definitely increase the number of spike tags.

Aoude- This is an informational item. Our previous recommendations have been denied so we have not been able to reach the potential numbers I showed. In order to get to a healthy herd, we need to maintain the older age objective but we also need to harvest bulls. We recommend they be harvested as spikes so it does not effect the older age class.

Hansen- Wouldn't this be a good way to get the elk committee back together to find better alternatives to increase opportunity? Many hunters do not consider spike hunts as an increased opportunity?

Aoude- I do not think we should reconvene the elk committee. A five year plan is not of value if we reconvene the elk committee every year.

Hansen- It seems the Division is going away from that five year plan.

Slater- The Wildlife Board has requested that the Division submit this proposal to the RAC to

receive input. This will not be an action item at this time.

J.B. Carling- What is the benefit of a spike hunt in some of these premium limited entry units as opposed to the management five point type hunts that you have in the San Juan unit or late season hunts? Has there been any consideration as to where the spike hunters will hunt? I worry that all of the hunters will go to a certain unit and kill all of the spikes.

Aoude- Management bulls basically target five point or less animals. We are still not certain if that will be effective. In many cases, younger bulls will be taken that would have had potential to be bigger bulls. It is basically like a spike hunt but on a limited basis. It will not bring 30 bulls to 100 cows because there will not be enough tags out there. If you put enough tags out there, it may actually harm the older age component by harvesting animals that are close to being in that age class. As far as the concern about hunters killing all of the spikes, we currently have 1/3 of the units in the state in that type of management and that has not happened. Spikes are actually hard to find and we have proof of that on 1/3 of the units. We do not see it affecting the population.

RAC Questions

Foutz- I represented the northern RAC on the elk committee. I remember the cap being 16,000, not 19,000, then we lowered it to 11,000. We never sold out of spike tags. My concern is that as the elk committee, we did talk about age objectives. After the committee convened, we agreed that we should raise those age objectives, which we did. It seems this proposal may be a little premature. There should be more tags for opportunity. I find it hard to believe that individuals would rather harvest a spike than a 5 point. I was disappointed that the management company tried to portray to the Division how to manage that hunt. We should be trying to take care of some of the excess bulls in the premium units.

Selman- With this proposal, would bow hunters be hunting spikes on the bow hunting limited entry?

Aoude- Yes, that currently occurs in 1/3 of the state, including the Cache unit. We will not have rifle spike hunters.

Gaskill- As far as the management issue is concerned, if we do not have sufficient data to know whether it is working, shouldn't we wait until we have that information.

Aoude- We are waiting to obtain additional information. This is just an informational item.

Gaskill- There were law enforcement issues when we had 3 point or better deer. Will that be an issue with this proposal?

Aoude- I don't think that will be a problem to the same extent because this only applies to limited entry hunts so we know which individuals have tags. There will be issues with hunters shooting the wrong type of bull but it will not be as big an issue.

Gaskill- Have we seen that occurring on the existing spike units?

Aoude- Yes, but it is not a significant problem.

Public Comment

Bart Hansen (Utah Bowmen Association)- I have two recommendations. We feel this proposal differs enough from the previous plan so we recommend that the elk committee reconvene. Limited entry hunters would have to compete with the spike hunters, while the rifle hunters do not have to compete.

Ben Jensen- As far as the management bulls are concerned, it would be great if they were just shooting the 3, 4, or 5 points. I have seen a couple come off of those units that are broken up. They are still legally within the context but they are being shot because they are broken up. As far as the archery hunt being overlapped, it does overlap in this objective but there are still 400 class bulls being shot off those units in the archery hunt. Therefore, I agree 100% with the spike only hunt for the different areas.

Craig Bailey- The Wasatch Mountain Unit does have a spike only unit. I think there a small number of tags issued given what a large area it is. From my experience, the hunters are concentrated in several areas. There are other areas that are not getting pressure at all so there are bulls dying of old age. We should consider dividing that unit into smaller units or increase the number of tags.

Marion Long- My concern is the Argyle unit. I understand there is a move by the Indian tribe to annihilate the elk on Anthro. I had a nephew draw out and hunt hard for a week, yet he only saw one bull. I also had a friend go out who did not see a cow. I am thinking something needs to be done if the Indians are killing off the elk. One of the slides showed a 24 buck ratio on that unit but that is not the case.

RAC Comment

Ryan Foutz- I just so happened to draw the Wasatch archery unit with 9 bonus points. I will use the spike hunt limited entry hunt as an example. I hunted hard and killed a nice bull. I hunted for 4 days and never ran into another limited entry hunter but ran into a large amount of spike hunters who were hunting with bugles and cow calls. It made my once in a lifetime hunt very difficult. I had to move to another area that did not have spike hunters. I noticed in the packet that there is a proposal that may be able to alleviate the pressure during the last week of the hunt.

If the archery hunt/elk hunt/spike hunt is open at the same time as the general season deer archery, that would push that hunt up a week so there would not be an overlap. We need spike hunters to harvest the animals and lower the bull ratio on those units but it would also be nice for the archers to have the woods to themselves.

Cowley- Can you address the tribal hunt issue. It would be educational to explain the tribal rights that are associated with the elk hunts.

Aoude- I am not familiar with the situation that Mr. Long is referring to. The Indians do have tribal rights which means they own the right to the animals on their lands so the Division does not have the right to tell them how to harvest those animals.. Dave Olsen would be more familiar with the situation at Anthro.

Dave Olsen- The Ute Tribal Fish and Game Board has a Council and Divisions which oversee their wildlife department. The Ute Tribe has moved the Anthro unit into the north unit which is general season on their property. The Utah Wildlife Division has been working with them. If it continues, it could influence our hunt. We are still working to resolve this issue.

Aoude- Although it does effect us, we can not manage their wildlife. We will have to change the way we manage our wildlife.

Item 6. Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for People with Disabilities

Mike Fowlks, Law Enforcement Chief

See Handout

RAC Questions

Gaskill- How many people will this affect?

Fowlks- I am not sure. For the cross bow, there may be 40 or 50 people affected.

Gaskill- Are there 40 or 50 people who are taking advantage of the disabilities act in general?

Fowlks- That is just for the cross bow. I don't know how many will take advantage of the visual acuity for the muzzle loaders.

Gaskill- We have had disability accommodations for a while so I am surprised the Division does not know how many people are taking advantage of them?

Fowlks- We have a whole myriad of disability accommodations. I could not tell you the exact number. It is less than 5,000 people who utilize the accommodations.

Public Comment

Bart Hansen (Utah Bowmen Association)- I want to thank the Division for their efforts. I was the individual who recommended that provisions be made for hunters with disabilities so I appreciate the work that has been put forth. I highly recommend that this proposal be approved.

Larry Mower- I think the DWR has made great steps to accommodate disabled hunters. Right now the DWR has the authority to grant the opportunity for individuals to hunt big game from a vehicle. Yet, if I want to hunt a coyote or a rabbit, I do not have that opportunity without contacting the sheriff's offices in every county. I would like to see something done for that to take place. I appreciate the DWR's efforts to accommodate the disabled and to provide depredation hunts where disabled individuals can shoot in areas when they can not get down the canyons.

RAC Questions

Marsh- What are the regulations and stipulations the counties have for handicapped hunters in regards to shooting from a vehicle? Is this a provision that we should consider adding?

Fowlks- We do not have the authority to regulate non-protected wildlife. This would be something that we could take to the legislature.

Slater- The Criminal Code and Traffic Codes have specific provisions that prohibit the firing of a firearm from a vehicle. There are some things that cross from criminal to traffic to wildlife. If there is an interest, our office would route that concern to that person's representative or senator because it is a legislative item. If that representative is willing to consider it, they will start the process in motion. Once that occurs, the law enforcement division and Wildlife Division would be contacted to give input. It can take 2 to 3 years to complete the process.

Larry Mower- Is there something I could do?

Slater- Yes, I would suggest that you contact your representative or senator to discuss the issue. The other effective groups would then be called into play. Now is a good time to contact them if you have the time since they are gearing up for next year's legislative session.

Motion- Cowley- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for people with Disabilities R657-12 as presented by the Division.

Second- Marsh

Motion Carries- Unanimous

Item 7. Hunter Education Rule R657-23 (5 Year Review)

Lenny Reese, Hunter Education Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Questions

Fenimore- How many hours of actual instruction would there be for the student course?

Reese- There would be five to six hours of practical exercise. It has been extremely successful for the last five to six years.

Cowley- How are instructors currently trained through the Division without the on-line course?

Reese- For the last 50 years, we have had 3 trainers who teach in different parts of the State one to two nights per week for six weeks. 18 hours are spent in the class room and 4 hours are spent on the shooting range. This new program will provide additional classes which will allow more people to become hunter education instructors.

Motion- Foutz- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Hunter Education Rule R657-23, as presented by the Division.

Second- Cowley

Motion Carries- Unanimous

Item 8. CWMU Approval

Boyde Blackwell, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator
Justin Dolling, Northern Region Wildlife Manager

See Handout

RAC Questions

Marsh- Were properties acquired on the Grass Valley/Clark Canyon to make the boundaries contiguous?

Randy Wood- Property was acquired that had previously been used for hunting but it was not used as a CWMU. It will now be used for a CWMU.

Slater- Could you please explain where these properties are located.

Dolling- Blind Springs is in Box Elder County, Cotton Junction is in Box Elder County, Grass Valley/Clark Canyon is in Summit County.

Cowley- What is the Division's recommendation regarding those issues where there was disagreement?

Blackwell- It has been approved in all of the regions to accept the Division's recommendations for their permits. In several areas, they were requesting one more permit than what they currently have. Being that the Division is not making any significant changes at this time, the Division recommends that the number of permits remain the same.

Selman- Due to a potential conflict of interest, I would like to excuse myself from the vote.

Foutz- I would also like to excused himself from the vote due to a conflict of interest.

Motion- Marsh- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the CWMU Permit Numbers and Season Dates, as presented.

Second- Leonard

Motion Carries - 8 in favor with 2 recused

Item 9. North Book Cliffs Bison Management Plan

Dave Olsen, Regional Wildlife Section Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Questions

Robert Byrnes- Can you give me a time estimate for the herd numbers to multiply to 450.

Olsen- A lot of that will depend on the tribe interaction. If the movement continues as it has in the past, it could occur in about 15 years.

Byrnes- Would you consider moving that up by transplanting more animals?

Olsen- We would like to take a conservative approach since the area has experienced drought. We have made the commitment to allow it to grow in a slow fashion. We would like to reconsider it within the first few years of the bison proposal. If the plan is approved, it would be for a five year period, at which time it could be reconsidered.

Byrnes- When the population becomes huntable, will there be permits reserved for the Ute Tribe?

Olsen- The agreement with the Governor and the Ute Tribe would allow them to have permits after we have reached a huntable population. The Division would issue the permits.

Byrnes- If 45 bison are taken from the Henry Mountains, how would that effect the hunting opportunity in that area?

Cowley- The 45 bison would mostly be made up of cows and young of the year. We would propose that the adult cows be eliminated from the Henry Mountain so there should not be a significant impact. The Utes would prefer giving us younger animals but there will be a mix of both.

Selman- What is the attitude of the remaining ranchers? How will it effect their operations?

Olsen- Bert DeLambert was the only rancher to participate. Tom Jenkins was extended an invitation on behalf of the Alameda Ranch but he did not choose to participate. I am sure their attitude would be against it based on previous working relationships.

Selman- The Farm Bureau is concerned about the drought issues. I don't know if there are voluntary BLM reduction cuts or if they are mandatory but they have already experienced cuts on their ranches.

Olsen- To my knowledge, they were not asked to cut but they did have winter range that they were asked to stay off of since it was impacted from the past drought. We have tried to cooperate by keeping our elk herd down as well.

Selman- I was informed that the Uintah County Commission was not in favor, is that correct?

Olsen- Their initial concern had to do with mineral stipulations. They did not want bison interfering with oil field development. When we made that concession, that concern was resolved. They are concerned about House Bill 264 and removing AUM's from private ownership. When we met with them, 2 of the 3 commissioners felt comfortable remaining

neutral on the issue. Prior to the Vernal RAC meeting, those two commissioners opposed the proposal. They are more concerned about the philosophy than the impact.

Public Comment

Byron Bateman (Sportsmen for Fish & Wildlife)- We are greatly in favor of this Northern Bookcliffs herd. They are expanding the range. Historically, there is proof that bison were in this area. It is a great opportunity for another free ranging bison herd. Part of the management plan for the Henry Mountains is to do transplants. We are also doing habitat work in the Book Cliffs. The conservation work can be done so there is plenty of foliage for all of the wildlife. We can have another bison herd in the State of Utah and the Book Cliffs can support that.

Public Questions

Larry Mower- Have you discussed this proposal with the oil companies that are in the area?

Olsen- We have not had outright discussions. Mustang Fuels questions whether they will be liable if bison are harmed or equipment is damaged. There is also a risk involved with the construction traffic in the area. Mr. DeLambert requested that the Landowner Association be considered in the future for landowner permits. We informed Mr. DeLambert that under the current law, there is no provision for bison to be provided to the Landowner Association.

Motion- Cowley- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the North Book Cliffs Bison Management Plan, as presented.

Second- Foutz

RAC Deliberation

Foutz- I appreciated the materials that were included in the packet. It was very informative and easy to understand.

Selman- I am concerned about the ranchers because that is my charge. I am also concerned about disease and AUM's. I would feel more comfortable if there was support from the Farm Bureau. I do not want to approve something that I will later regret.

Groll- Maybe in the future we should consider giving compensation to the landowners since they will be impacted.

Bingham- I would like the AUM balance to stay in effect where the domestic holds their own compared to the wildlife.

Motion Carries- 8 to 1

Item 10. Buck, Bulls and OIAL Proclamation and Rule R657-5

Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

Larry Mower- Do you feel the shed hunt season has been a success and how do you quantify that?

Justin Dolling- Just to give you a little background information, we had a deer working group in the Northern Region. They were looking at ways to try to minimize stress on wintering mule deer, especially for those areas that had low quality foliage or low quality winter range. We have some anecdotal information based on phone calls that come into the office that we had some voluntary compliance but we also had some disregard for the regulation. Many calls that came into the office were those who had abided by the new rule but had witnessed others hunting for sheds. The only tangible data I have comes from the Wildlife Law enforcement section that created an action plan that addresses the shed antler gathering season. In summary, they made 14 contacts over the course of the winter: 4 of those contacts resulted in citations, 3 resulted in written warnings, 2 verbal warnings and 6 incidences where action was not taken. Since this is only the first year, it is difficult to determine what impact it may have. The message is that disturbance on winter range can be detrimental, especially under habitat conditions that are less than optimal.

Mower- We need to think of wildlife but this does not prevent individuals from going to those areas. It only prevents them from picking up the sheds. Individuals are being punished because they are obedient to the law. It is difficult for shed hunters to understand.

Dolling- A lot of people share your concerns.

RAC Questions

Fenimore- The recommendation mentions that the area east of Montezuma is mostly private land. Is the change going to provide opportunity on those private lands?

Aoude- If there is that level of depredation, they would have incentive to let people on. If they do not cooperate, it will be for the Division to justify paying them.

Fenimore- Could the walk-in access program be employed in this type of situation?

Aoude- In the future that might be a good tool but that is not currently available in that area.

Cowley- I received a number of e-mails regarding the Thousand Lakes limited entry proposal. How did the Southern Region respond to this issue.

Aoude- They voted against it. The comments varied. A lot of the comments likely came from private land owners who have it well right now.

Gaskill- Are you saying you are frustrated that you can not do what you want regarding the Thousand Lakes area?

Aoude- It is basically a general season hunt now so we should let people hunt it.

Gaskill- Are you able to manage it?

Aoude- Not with the current size and location. It could be managed as a limited entry unit if the entire area was limited entry but the private land owners are not willing to participate in that.

Foutz- You said you couldn't manage the 25 bucks to 100 doe ratio which is the target for limited entry. What are we at now?

Aoude- Over the past ten years it's varied from 15 to 25. It's met it's objective one of ten years. On average, it's about 19 bucks to 100 does which is basically a general season unit.

Gaskill- What kind of a statement will you add to the responsible OHV statement? The statement in the packet only states that helmets should be worn. Will you state that riders should stay on the roads?

Aoude- We can make any statement we want but that does not mean we are able to enforce it.

Gaskill- That doesn't mean we shouldn't make the statement.

Aoude- I am not familiar with the part you are talking about. I can look into it and recommend we add something more substantial.

Byrnes- Could we continue the Thousand Lakes hunt for one more year then go to the unit by unit management? Aren't we going to redo all of the deer management plans at that point?

Aoude- No, we are redoing the statewide plans. The unit plans were redone about a year ago. They mostly deal with population objectives issues.

Byrnes- In the code section of the Proclamation, there seems to be a new section called *Special Hunts*.

Aoude- I think that section has always been in the proclamation.

Byrnes- I did not see it in last year's printed Proclamation. What is the purpose of that section? It seems to allow the Division to approach the Board for special hunts without going through the RAC process.

Aoude- Although that rule may not be printed in the Proclamation, it has always been in place. We do not print the entire rule in the proclamation.

Cowley- My question deals with Item #14. In view of the Book Cliff proposal to actually pull cows off of the Henry Mountains, does that resolve the population control issue if we're looking at 45 head compared to the 3 that are suggested under this proposed hunt.

Aoude- The proposal refers to three hunts, not three permits. It will remove an excess of about 50 animals in one year. It would only be taking 15 animals from the Book Cliffs in any given

year. If the Book Cliff proposal passes, the hunts would still be in place but we would reduce the number of tags that would go to these hunts.

Leonard- What did the Southern and Southeast Regions act on the 9 day season?

Aoude- The Southern Region passed it but the Southeastern Region did not.

Public Comment

Shaun Graves (Bowhunters of Utah)- You have all received a letter from the Bowhunters of Utah dated November 19, 2007. Due to the growth of the deer herds and the need for population management found on the Ogden Bay, Harold Crane, and Salt Creek Waterfowl Management Areas (WMA), Bowhunters of Utah would like to propose that the General Archery Deer hunt be used to manage the deer populations on these WMA's. There is a lot of very good reasons as to why we should do this. There are high deer populations, many of which are in areas west of I-15 where they are not being hunted. With the expansion of these deer herds, it becomes more of a concern with collisions, as well as with agriculture. Our farm is located in that area and the deer herd has increased from 5 to 30 in the past 5 years. We feel that archery equipment would have the least amount of impact on the WMA's. The expansion would likely reduce the pressure on the Northern Deer herd which is in recovery mode. The weapons restrictions are already in place. The only adjustment that would need to take place is the dates. It still provides a buffer time between the end of the General Archery Deer hunt and the beginning of any waterfowl seasons that would reduce the conflicts and disturbances incurred through multiple use by sportsmen. We would ask that you expand the bowhunting opportunity onto the waterfowl management areas.

Slater- Have you had these types of discussions prior to this meeting?

Graves- Yes, we have had this discussion with some managers. It was actually their ideas. There have been times when it was expressed but nothing came of it. We are having a great time seeing the deer but we should provide opportunities for hunters. Archery equipment can be used without decimating populations.

Slater- I had a discussion with an archer who thinks that archery tags should be limited in hunts or by unit or special hunt. There would actually be a limit on the type of archery tag that would be used. Have you discussed any of these issues with the association?

Graves- We participated on the equipment committee. At this point we have not had a lot of discussion as far as that goes.

J.B. Carling- I am representing myself. I have comments on the proposal to extend the rifle hunt to 9 days. I am a dedicated hunter and spend a lot of time in the Southern Region. I have noticed that the herd quantity has increased over the last few years. I think limiting the rifle hunt to 5 days has helped that unit, especially to get older deer there. People hunt the Southern Regions because it is a quality area. As far as the data regarding harvest, I do not know if that is attributed to winters. The difference between 5 and 9 days on a year with a mild winter will be minimal. If there is an early winter and an extended rifle hunt, there will be a significant impact

on the herds. The 5 day unit is great and there is plenty of opportunity in the area with other weapons.

Slater- Jerry Baxter wants to know when will we be able to put higher power scopes on black powder rifles. I also spoke to Mr. Coleman from Eden, Utah who would like to see a primitive weapon hunt created.

Hansen- No one has approached Utah Bowman Association regarding that or we would have addressed it. We would be more than happy to correspond with those individuals. The Utah Bowman Association submit the following proposal to the members of the RAC:

UBA Proposal #1a

“Archery Elk season to open on the 3rd Saturday of August with a 5 day extended Limited Entry Bull Elk Archery Hunt period, and a 12 day extended Any Bull Archery Elk hunt period.” (Proclamation Section R657 5-43).

The Utah Bowmen’s Association would like to propose the following:

- 1. That the General Archery Elk hunt and Limited Entry Bull Elk archery hunts opening day be moved forward and open on the 3rd Saturday of August. This would then open on the same day as the General Archery Buck Deer Hunt.*
- 2. That the General Archery “Spike Bull units” Elk Hunt (archery Elk Hunts on Spike Bull only units) would be a 23 day hunt period (same as current hunt period) which would then close on the 4th Sunday after the opening day.*
- 3. That the Limited Entry Archery Bull Elk unit hunt periods be extended by 5 days to become 28 day hunt periods closing on the 4th Friday after the opening day. This would end on the same day as the General Archery Buck Deer Hunt.*
- 4. That the General Archery “Any” Bull Elk hunt periods be extended by 12 days to be 35 day hunt period closing on the 5th Friday after the opening day. This would extend one week past the end of the General Archery Buck Deer Hunt and coincide with the youth Bull Elk Hunt.*
- 5. The same rules and restrictions will apply on elk harvest according to Spike Bull Units and Any Bull Units.*

This proposal has no significant down side for any management group. The overall success rate for Archery Elk hunters remains relatively low. By moving the opening of the Archery Elk Hunt to coincide with the Archery Buck Deer Hunt opening, the general bowhunter intending to hunt both species will realize a more enjoyable hunt opportunity. The 12 day extension for Any Bull units and the 5 day extension for Archery Limited Entry Bull units would greatly improve the hunt enjoyment and overall satisfaction of these hunters by eliminating the Spike bull and Cow Elk hunter conflicts during the last 5 days of the Limited Entry Bull elk archery units and by allowing the Open Any Bull Elk hunters to hunt closer to the rut. Due to the relatively low

historical archery success rates, these additional days of hunting opportunity may only slightly increase the mature bull archery hunt success rate, which would be insignificant in total. Neither of these changes would create any new conflicts in existing General Season Rifle, Spike, muzzle loader, or any Limited Entry Bull Elk any weapon or muzzle loader seasons.

Hansen- There was a comment made earlier that limited entry archery hunters enjoy an 80% success rate. According to the DWR website, in 2004, limited entry archery hunters in spike hunting areas enjoyed a 45% success rate while those without spike hunting in the area enjoyed a 62% success rate. In 2005, limited entry archery hunters in spike hunting areas enjoyed a 35% success rate while those without spike hunting in the area enjoyed a 59% success rate. In 2006, limited entry archery hunters in spike hunting areas enjoyed a 32% success rate while those without spike hunting in the area enjoyed a 40% success rate. Over a 3 year period, there is an average of 16.5% for those hunts that are not competing compared to those that are. This is a once in a lifetime hunt. We are requesting that we be able to hunt five days without competing with other hunters.

Clint Sorensen- I represent Antler Fest. My concern is that you are not controlling when people pick up sheds. You are only controlling those individuals who are doing it properly. You will lose many shed hunters because of the law and rule. How will you police the illegal pick up of shed antlers? If the regulation is left in place, there should be modifications such as to not let it go past I-15 to the west. Cache County and the Wasatch Front areas need to be controlled. By changing the boundaries, you could alleviate the pressure since antler hunters will relocate to different areas.

Gordy Bell (Bowhunters of Utah)- I would like to second the proposal made by UBA. The season dates are not going to change except for the beginning of the hunt. I would also like to offer support for our own proposal, as well.

RAC Questions

Foutz- Has UBA talked to the Division about these proposals? The proposal regarding the season dates does not seem unreasonable.

Aoude- I met with them before they made their recommendation. I told them it is not out of the realm of possibility. I believe the Region has heard their proposal regarding deer archery hunts on the WMA's but I am not overly familiar with it.

Foutz- Does the Division have concerns about the proposals?

Aoude- I am concerned about extending the General Any Bull season because there is a youth elk hunt that is taking place. Even though there is only 300 hunters statewide, they would have to wear orange during the last five days. The reason we staggered the hunts initially is because some bowmen wanted them staggered. I don't see a problem changing it back.

Foutz- Is the shed antler regulation working?

Aoude- It is difficult to enforce such a large area. The same can be said for poaching. We hope individuals will turn in those who are violating the regulation. This is a pilot program that has

only been in affect for one year so it is difficult to assess the success of the program. We will relay more on public comment to determine if the program continues.

Cowley- If you are concerned about the antlerless pickup, you could do an area closure with the Forest Service or the BLM. If anyone travels in that area, they could be ticketed for going past the closure. There is more than one avenue to bring people into compliance.

Selman- From a private landowner stand point, there is already trespass laws. I have private land owner friends that were against this but I voted for it because it is another way to address the issue. I understand the dilemma but I think it has benefitted our situation by stopping people from harassing the big game when they are wintering there. I would also like to comment that I would be against the on-line applications.

Slater- Justin, are you aware of any dialogue about hunting on the WMA's?

Dolling- We have had internal dialogue with the Waterfowl Management department. The organization that made the proposal did not make contact with me. There is a big interest in trying to capitalize on the deer that are on WMA's. We need to work through the issue internally and not violate the primary purpose of the WMA's. I did not think we had enough time to consider all of the issues for the current Proclamation.

Public Clarification

Bart Hansen- Anis Aoude mentioned that the bow hunters originally asked for the staggering dates on the deer and elk but that was prior to the limited entry specific elk permits for archery hunters. We are now seeing conflicts with the limited entry archery hunters on those ten units. We are trying to keep those conflicts down and allow those hunters to have their dream hunt without competition with the spike hunters.

Public Comment

Tye Boulter- How do you feel personally about UBA's proposal?

Aoude- It is difficult for me to say how I feel personally. I think it could work. I agree there is competition on those five days nearest the rut with the limited entry and spike hunters. This is a good solution. The only hesitation I have is that we have not heard from the other side, which is how it will affect the youth hunters.

RAC Comment

Foutz- I am for opportunity and keeping opportunity. I have received a lot of phone calls regarding Oak Creek, Thousand Lakes, as well as the Southern and Southeastern areas. I would like to see the Thousand Lakes stay limited entry deer and elk. I understand there are depredation problems on Oak Creek but I don't want to see it go back the other way. I think we need to hold on to try to create some level of quality. There are social and biological issues that could skew the date for 3 to 5 years. Everyone I have talked to wants to hunt for 9 days but they prefer staying with the 5 days because the quality of the hunt has improved. Kids actually get to hunt all three weapons so we are not depriving them. UBA's proposal seems solid to me. It would be great to separate the spike hunt from the limited entry archer hunters. It sounds like the Bowhunter's of Utah has not been communicating with the Division regarding the waterfowl.

It does not sound like there are a lot of obstacles to overcome to make that happen.

Motion- Foutz - Recommend the Wildlife Board keep the South and Southeastern Regions Any Weapon Season Deer Hunt at 5 days.

Second- Cowley

RAC Deliberation

Fenimore- I am inclined to encourage the 9 day season based on the information the Division has presented to us.

Gaskill- I hunt in the Southeastern Region on the LaSal. I do not know anyone who spends 9 days down there. I do not think there will be a significant impact either way since the biology is good. If the hunt is extended to 9 days, it allows hunters additional days if they can not get off of work.

Selman- I am in favor of the 9 day hunt because it allows the youth to hunt at the end of the hunt if they were not successful using other weapons.

Motion Fails - 6 to 5

Motion- Fenimore- Recommend the Wildlife Board approve Item 1 (Online only Application Process) of the Overview of 2008 Big Game Proclamation, as presented.

Second- Bingham

Motion Carries- 9 to 1

Motion- Cowley- Recommend the Wildlife Board approve the remainder of the Bucks Bulls and OIAL Proclamation and Rule R657-5, as presented.

Second- Fenimore

Motion to Amend Previous Motion - Foutz- Recommend the Wildlife Board leave the Oak Creek LE Elk and Thousand Lakes as Limited Entry Units.

Second- Byrnes

Fenimore- According to the information that was presented by the Division, the Thousand Lakes area was only been subjected once in 10 years. They have a difficult time managing it as a limited entry area given the location so I do not support the motion.

Gaskill- I received a lot of emails regarding both proposals. It is usually my responsibility to represent the Sportsmen but the DWR has made a good case for changes so I will oppose the amendment.

Byrnes- Most of the comment I have received from the public is that they appreciate the hunting opportunities but they would like to see the quality improve. Even though these limited entry areas are not meeting objectives, they are providing a higher level of quality than the general season units. When they can draw one of those tags, it is a more quality experience than that of the general hunt.

Motion Carries - 7 to 3

Original Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board approve the remainder of the Bucks and Bulls and OIAL Proclamation and Rule R657-5, as presented.

Motion Carries- 6 to 4

Motion- Foutz- Request additional consideration of the UBA Proposal by the Wildlife Board.

Second- Selman

Amended Motion- Marsh- Recommend the Wildlife Board remove the overlap with the Youth Elk Hunt.

Second- Fenimore

Gaskill- I prefer that we keep the motion clean without complicating the situation.

Groll- I agree that the limited entry hunters should have an opportunity to use their points without competing with the spike hunters. They should have time to themselves but the time should not be arranged more than 5 to 7 days.

Marsh- All archery hunters would have to wear legal orange in order for the hunts to coincide.

Motion Carries- 7 to 2

Original Motion- Foutz- Request additional consideration of the UBA Proposal by the Wildlife Board.

Gaskill- I do not see how that differs from recommending it. We voted against it but the motion would recommend what we are voting against. It seems inconsistent.

Byrnes- I voted against Jim Gaskill's motion because it did not take the public comments into consideration. I do not see a problem with asking the Wildlife Board to take UBA's proposal into consideration.

Motion Carries- 6 to 5

Item 11. Caliber Restrictions

Mike Fowlks, Law Enforcement Chief

See Handout

Motion- Gaskill- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Caliber Restrictions, as presented.

Second- Fenimore

Motion Carries- Unanimous

Meeting Ends: 10:23 p.m.

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Jr. High
165 S. 700 E. Springville
November 13, 2007 ⌚ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

John Bair, Sportsmen
Calvin Crandall, Agriculture
Richard Hansen, At Large
George Holmes, Agriculture
Doug Jones, Forest Service
Gary Nielson, Sportsmen
Fred Oswald, Non-consumptive, Vice Chair
Jay Price, Elected
Allan Stevens, At Large

Members Absent

Ed Kent, Chair
Byron Gunderson, At Large
Duane Smith, Non-consumptive

Others Present

Rick Woodard, Wildlife Board Member

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

VOTING

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

2) **Approval of the September 18, 2007 summary (Action)**

VOTING

**Motion was made by Allan Stevens to accept the summary notes as transcribed
Seconded by Gary Nielson
Motion passed unanimously**

3) **Regional Update (Information)**

- Craig Clyde, Wildlife Manager

4) **Statewide Unit-by-Unit Hunts in 2009 (Informational)**

- Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Q: Calvin Crandall – Will the season dates stay the same?

A: Anis Aoude - The general season deer dates are set by the legislature so we cannot change that.

Q: Calvin Crandall – You want to change where you can hunt and how much pressure you put on one area. Basically micro-manage within the regions.

A: Anis Aoude – Yes.

Q: John Bair – If the dates were not set by the legislature would there be instances where you could change the dates and have some different seasons?

A: Anis Aoude – You could do a lot of different things. You could even split the season in half and have half the hunters hunt an early season and half hunt a late season. It would be more flexible. Right now all the other dates revolve around the general season deer hunt.

Q: Fred Oswald – If the Division decides to go with the unit-by-unit proposal when would it come before the RACs as an action item?

A: Anis Aoude – It may come as early as next year at this time for the 2009 season depending how it does as an information item.

Q: Fred Oswald – Besides bringing it to the RAC as you have tonight are there other plans to get public input?

A: Anis Aoude – Not currently although the statewide management plan is due to be updated next fall so there will be a committee put together for that. We have not looked at other types of surveys.

Q: Fred Oswald – Members of the audience, I would encourage you if you have opinions about this to make those known to members of the RAC or the Wildlife Board because this would be a major change and we would like to have your input.

Q: Allan Stevens – If we do move into this type of management how are the dedicated hunters going to fit in to it? What if a dedicated hunter signs up thinking they will be able to hunt a particular area and then the program changes and they cannot?

A: Anis Aoude – That is one we struggle with a long with the lifetime license holders. There are still details to work out.

Q: Allan Stevens – Do you want a recommendation from us here tonight?

A: Anis Aoude – That would be helpful to give direction to the Wildlife Board which will ultimately give us direction.

Fred Oswald – Would the RAC to like make a motion to give the Board a sense of how you are feeling about this proposal?

Richard Hansen – I would like to see if you can work out more details. I think it would give you an opportunity to manage the herds better. It may be more difficult in some ways but I would like to see us try it.

Comments from the Public –

Burke Davis - SFW committee member – I think this is long over due. Right now we have five units that we manage 15 bucks per 100 does anywhere in the unit. If we break it down into 27 units we increase the number of areas that are being managed for those same numbers. Overall I think it will increase hunter opportunity.

Dave Woodhouse – I would like to see this voted in and started next year. We are really struggling here in the central region because the Nebo herd is so far down but the Division can't manage that one area and stop hunters from going there to bring that buck to doe ratio up. I would like to see you vote on it so the Board can get the idea and to let the Division know we are serious and there are people who would like to see it done.

Bart Hansen – I love this idea but I don't think this is the place where we should be trying to implement it especially where you have a mule deer committee getting together to come up with a new deer management plan for the next several years. I think that would be the best place to address it. I think micro managing is the way to go but I don't think we should rush into it without understanding all the ramifications.

Mike Christensen – I think unit-by-unit management can be a good thing but too many times we rush into things thinking Colorado is so great and we should be doing what they are doing. We need to also look at Arizona, Nevada and New Mexico where their deer herds are micro managed however their deer herds are not flourishing. The central region is struggling a little bit. I know the Division's stance on the five day hunt has been that it is not very productive but my family owns a ranch on the Nebo unit and I have seen the good that the five day hunt did. All the big bucks killed on the Nebo in 2004 on the nine day hunt were the product of the three year span of the five day hunt. Like Bart said we shouldn't rush into anything.

RAC Discussion

Fred Oswald – Rather than getting a motion I think we should get a sense from the RAC as to how many of you think we ought to encourage the Division to go forward and continue to study this and bring it back to us.

John Bair – I think we need more details things like the dedicated hunters. I am sure that deer management committee will address those issues. There is obviously some support for this but like we have heard we need more details and not rush into this.

Allan Stevens – I think we need to look at all the units and possibly change them because a lot of the units right now are not geographically or biologically based. The unit-by-unit proposal may be a good one if we can break those units into geographical and biological areas. Another potential problem I can see with this is the way we do the draw. Right now we don't know the numbers until after the draw and that is a big problem.

Theoretically on some units you could cut half of the tags to help manage bucks which wouldn't be a bad thing and I don't think most hunters would have a problem with that if they knew that those permits were going to be cut in half before they put in.

Anis Aoude – We would never recommend cutting more than ten percent of the tags in any given year. Buck only hunting never hurts the population it only hurts the buck portion of the population. It doesn't matter if we overshoot them one year you can always back off the next year.

Allan Stevens – I think this is the time to get away from the statewide archery hunt and make archery hunters hunt within a unit. It seems to me that there is some bias against anyone who does not hunt with archery equipment. The archery hunt is also more crowded than any other hunt.

Gary Nielson – We are talking about micro managing hunters but I think we need to look at the other factors such as habitat and predators if we are going to have an effect on the population. In central Utah we have had a reduction in hunters and there are fewer deer than there has ever been. We could virtually eliminate the hunters and still have a deer problem in some areas.

Fred Oswald – All the comments will be included in the minutes. I don't think we need a formal vote although I would like to get an idea of how many of you think this an idea that should be continued to be studied. Please show this by raise of hands.

It is unanimous in favor of additional work on this subject.

5) **Statewide Spike Elk Hunt in 2009 (Informational)**
- **Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Q: Calvin Crandall – Would the number of spike elk permits be the same as in 2004 with the same season dates?

A: Anis Aoude – Yes.

Comments from the Public

Bart Hansen – I don't think this would be a good idea. Most people would rather shoot a mature bull than a spike. I want to clarify that the statewide archery hunt is not the most crowded hunt. There are only 16,000 archers and 81,000 rifle hunters.

Q: John Bair – How many more units would be open to spike hunting?

A: Anis Aoude – Nineteen more units.

John Anderson – The majority of individuals here do not want more spike hunting. We want to do away with spike hunting not add more.

Dave Woodhouse – A couple years ago SFW made a proposal to rotate the spike hunt between the limited entry units every other year. That proposal was shot down and was not popular with the public so I don't know how well this would go.

Q: Gary Nielson – Why wouldn't we just increase some of the mature bull tags?

A: Anis Aoude – That is certainly a proposal we have made again and again but there is a perception that we will over harvest those big bulls and the guys that have 14 or 15 points won't be able to hunt a big bull when they draw. That is why we are looking at a different angle.

Bill Littlebrook – I am wondering if there has been any consideration given to limited entry spike.

Anis Aoude – No because spike harvest is such a small percentage; basically 12 to 14 percent success rate. I don't think people would put in for a limited entry spike hunt if they knew their success rate was going to be so low.

Stuart Bond – A part of this that nobody seems to be talking about is the landowners that are involved in the limited entry units, I happen to be one of them. I own ten square miles. I have always thrown the doors wide open to the hunters because I only have to deal with about two dozen of them. If there are any more hunters I cannot handle it. It takes time to show these people where to hunt to not shoot my cows and my troughs and my signs and my locks and my other things that I have to deal with. I am not a cop. I am expected to go out on the general hunt and catch these people on ten square miles. I

control all the access to the public lands in the Leamington Pass area, about 20,000 acres. I have been real nice about this all these years but if you change the status of this and want more hunters to show up and have me show them around I can't do it. You all know my place. It is the one where the two bulls locked horns a few years ago. We have had some really big bucks come off of our place and huge elk. If you change the status to non limited I will stop all hunting; duck, geese, chukar, elk, deer. Everything will end. I will allow no one to cross my private ground. If you want more hunting this is not the way to do it. I wrote a letter to Mike Styler and am still waiting for a response. I did hear from Doug Messerly who explained the situation very well. I have been left out of this equation. I run a particularly productive part of this state as far as the game go and I can't handle any more. We were at one point according to Sean Kelly the largest population of chukar on private ground in the state of Utah. I have never told anyone no yet. I expect to be consulted when people are going to change things. When I went and talked to them at DWR they denied it was going to happen. I heard it from my neighbors. If you guys want to hunt leave it the way it is and I will try to accommodate you. If you decided that I need to have even more burdens put on me then it will all end. There are other places that they can go to hunt true enough but is that what you want? I am giving you your options. I am asking for help not hindrance.

Kevin Christensen – I am wondering if this spike hunt brews more revenue. I agree with adding limited entry hunts. Just kill more big bulls. We don't want them dying of old age.

RAC Discussion

Fred Oswald – I think the Division and the Board would appreciate a sense from the RAC in terms of whether you think this is a good idea. I will ask by raise of hands how many think this is an idea that the Division should continue to pursue.

In Favor: Richard Hansen, Jay Price, George Holmes, Allan Stevens, John Bair, Doug Jones

Opposed: Calvin Crandall, Gary Nielson

Calvin Crandall – I agree that it needs to be looked at but I also agree with the individual about more pressure on the limit entry units.

6) Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for People with Disabilities (Action)

- **Mike Fowlks, Law Enforcement Chief**

Comments from the Public

Justin Fuller – I would like to see the draw lock system approved because right now the only option for people that are disabled to hunt the archery hunt is a crossbow.

Crossbows are bulky and you have to crank it back and that usually takes five or so minutes. Other people can use a regular bow. Using the draw lock system gives you better kinetic energy with the arrow which gives you better penetration to lethally kill an animal. I am one of the representatives for the Utah Bowmans Association and we would like to see this approved for disabled hunters.

RAC Discussion

John Bair – Several years ago the Utah Bowmans Association brought this before us and I think it is long over due.

VOTING

Motion was made John Bair to accept the proposal as presented

Seconded by Doug Jones

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

7) Hunter Education Rule R657-23 (5-year review) (Action)

- Lenny Rees, Hunter Education Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Q: Allan Stevens – Can anyone go through the online course with out signing up and paying?

A: Lenny Rees – Yes, either from the Division of Wildlife Resources website or simply go to the International Hunter Education Association website. There is a white tail deer on the screen. You can go through the entire online portion at no cost but you not be certified until you complete the whole program.

Questions from the Public

Q: Mike McArthur – I am an instructor and I noticed that the instructors are not required to score any higher than the students on the shooting test. Can you tell me why?

A: Lenny Rees – Both students and teachers have to pass the shooting test with 50 percent. As you well know shooting is a learned skill. It takes practice. I have always felt that a good hunter education instructor does not necessarily be an expert shot but they do need to know how to teach people how to become an expert shot.

VOTING

Motion was made by Doug Jones to approve the rule as presented

Seconded by George Holmes

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

8) CWMU Approval (Action)

- Boyd Blackwell, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Q: Fred Oswald – What are you asking us to approve this evening?

A: Boyd Blackwell – The overall CWMU recommendations. There really are no problems with the permits in this region. Also with the landowner associations we need to decide whether to go with the DWR recommendations or those of the private landowners.

Q: Gary Nielson – Why would a landowner association request 35 permits if the acreage they own only allows for 21?

A: Boyd Blackwell- That is a good question. We do have several around the state that make this request annually. We provide them that opportunity because there are some cases where we may recommend less permits than what they qualify for depending on available habitat, the quality of the habitat and so forth.

VOTING

**Motion was made by John Bair to accept the CWMU proposal as presented
Seconded by Calvin Crandall**

Allan Stevens – Does that include the landowner association permits?

John Bair – Yes as presented by the Division.

Jay Price – How is the percentage of public versus private permits decided?

Boyd Blackwell – There are different options. It totally depends on what they are going to want to take on the antlerless. Right now that is not the issue. That comes up when we do the antlerless in April.

Jay Price – Is that ever reviewed?

Boyd Blackwell – We reviewed that in June of this year.

Jay Price – I think the percentage should give more public permits.

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

9) North Book Cliffs Bison Management Plan (Action) - Dave Olsen, Regional Wildlife Section Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Q: Gary Nielson – Do you anticipate any conflicts with the Ute tribe?

A: Dave Olsen- They are working hand in hand with us on this. They were part of the committee. We cooperate with them similarly on elk and everything else that cross back and forth. We also conduct our flights as close together as we can so we don't double count or miss some. We don't foresee any major conflicts.

Q: Calvin Crandall – I know there has been a big concern with changing livestock AUMs to wildlife and I presume that those have been addressed.

A: Dave Olsen – Not from a statewide perspective. This initiative was put together under old rules and the recommendations were made through technical committees to the BLM during their initial planning process and then after house bill 264 passed obviously that is law and we will live to that in the future. It didn't have verbiage in it to be retroactive.

Q: Calvin Crandall- What is HB264?

A: Dave Olsen – It was passed in 2005 I believe and it basically limits or defines how the Division can purchase federal AUMs in the future. While it doesn't limit it totally it does have a process that we would have to go through that would be fairly difficult.

Q: Calvin Crandall – So the issue was resolved.

A: Dave Olsen – It was resolved in the fact that it is a law but it didn't really apply to the Book Cliffs AUMs because they were purchased under old law.

Q: Calvin Crandall – What region does this fall in?

A: Dave Olsen – The proposal it self is in the northeastern region.

Q: Calvin Crandall - How did the other RACs vote?

A: Dave Olsen – They all passed with a split vote. The comments dealt with as you have mentioned here taking AUMs out of public ownership and some question about how bison would be treated if they moved off the area.

Questions from the Public

Q: DJ Biggler – By taking animals off the Henry Mountains will that impact the permit numbers for those residents who are trying to draw?

A: Dave Olsen – No. The intent is to take a few mother cows off the Henrys and the Utah tribe has offered juvenile animals.

Q: DJ Biggler – Years ago there was a millionaire trying to buy the school trust deeds on the roadless part of book cliffs. Is there some guarantee that the state won't let someone take over the school trust deeds?

A: Dave Olsen- There is nothing hard and fast in dealing with livestock permits but the intent at the governor's office was for the Division to maintain ownership and pay the difference.

RAC Discussion

George Holmes – Did the working group agree on the number of 450?

Dave Olsen- Yes, with the caveat that the Division move slowly toward that goal.

George Holmes - What is the plan to maintain that number?

Dave Olsen – Hunts would be the way to do it.

VOTING

Motion was made by John Bair to accept plan as presented

Seconded by Allan Stevens

**In Favor: Gary Nielson, Richard Hansen, Allan Stevens, Doug Jones,
John Bair**

Opposed: George Holmes, Jay Price, Calvin Crandall

Motion passed 5 to 3

10) Buck, Bulls and OIAL Proclamation & Rule R657-5 (Action)

- Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Q: John Bair – There was some question about dates on the elk unit in the southeastern region. Is that something that Division can work with them on?

A: Anis Aoude – We can work around the dates. If we want to kill those elk we can kill them any season. There is some concern that some San Juan elk move into that county later in the season.

Q: John Bair – What region is the Thousand Lake deer unit in and what did they vote?

A: Anis Aoude – Southern region and they voted against our recommendation.

Q: Calvin Crandall – Is this the first year that people will be required to have a hunting license to put in for the draw?

A: Anis Aoude – It took effect at the start of the fiscal which is July first. The people who put in for the draw last year did not have to have a license but they will have to this year.

Q: Calvin Crandall – Have there been comments back and forth on this?

A: Anis Aoude – The fee increase and the license requirement went through the RAC and Board last year and there were comments on both sides but it ended up passing. We are hearing some negative comments but most of the surrounding states have a similar requirement. Some groups were proponents of it because they thought it would discourage a lot of people from putting in and increase their odds of drawing.

Q: Calvin Crandall – What is the reason for changing the spike season?

A: Anis Aoude – Just to make the any bull and the spike season the same.

Q: Calvin Crandall – They opened the Fillmore Oak Creek several years to general season and they took a lot of the animals. Is this the same area you are proposing to open now?

A: Anis Aoude – You are talking about the Oak Creek North which is still currently a general any bull unit. We are talking about opening the Fillmore Oak Creek South unit because it has similar problems as we had in the north.

Q: Allan Stevens- I noticed that my permit number was already in the system when I applied for the sportsmen draw. Is that something that will be kept track of online?

A: Anis Aoude – They do keep track of that.

Q: Allan Stevens – I ask this every year, why does it take so long to do draw? Why can't we shorten that up and put in after permit numbers are approved?

A: Anis Aoude – The draw is streamlined but we have to wait until we set the permit numbers to do the draw.

Q: Allan Stevens – Why don't we wait until after we set the numbers to have the draw?

A: Anis Aoude – We have recommended that in the past but people like to know when they are going to schedule their time off.

Q: Allan Stevens – If the dates are already set they could still ask for the time off.

A: Anis Aoude – I guess people like to plan ahead.

Q: Gary Nielson – It seems like the turn around time should be even faster this year if it is all online. I also think we should put in later and have the results faster.

A: Anis Aoude – People have told us that they don't want to put in later so they can plan ahead for their time off.

Questions from the Public

Q: Dave Woodhouse – How large of a survey have you done to get the number of days afield on the five day hunts versus the nine day hunt?

A: Anis Aoude – It depends on the unit but it is a statistically sound sample for every unit.

Q: Dave Woodhouse – Because we are going all online with the application process could we add a questionnaire to fill out before you can apply?

A: Anis Aoude – We looked at that. It is somewhat cost prohibitive as far as how much it takes to survey everybody. If you make it mandatory it would leave a lot of folks out of the draw the following year.

Q: Dave Woodhouse – Wouldn't it be more effective if you were to attach it to the application?

A: Anis Aoude – The cost comes from tabulating the information.

Q: Dave Woodhouse – In the end would it help you with the overall structure of the hunts?

A: Anis Aoude – It may or may not. We are getting a good enough sample size right now that we feel confident enough to make decisions as we are making. The data I showed today I stand behind.

Comments from the Public

Burke Davis – I think the five day hunt in the southern and southeastern regions is working. They are still two of the most popular units to put in for. Buck to doe ratios seem to be higher on some of those units than some other regions. People are harvesting more bucks yet the buck to doe ratios stay up.

Dave Woodhouse – I am with SFW and we have had some comments about the Oak Creek unit. People in the area want to leave the unit limited entry. I also think that we should look at a five day hunt for the central region because our buck to doe ratios are so low. A few years ago when the Nebo and Loafer areas were on a five day hunt the buck to doe ratios were higher.

Chris Kilmer – I like the nine day hunt. The benefits I see are that people are more selective in what they shoot. I also think people are less inclined to take all five days off and hunt the whole time as opposed to hunting just the weekends. I agree with extending spike hunt season to the same as the any bull. It would give families another opportunity to get out with their kids.

Michael Christensen – The Thousand Lakes limited entry deer unit was created in the early 90s. The odds of drawing that unit are up there with the book cliffs. There is a demand there and does provide opportunity. The Division is going to review the deer management plan next year and I think they should address that then. Also, I talked with Ron Taylor, the manager for Antelope Island State Park. They have tried to make the park more multiple use but they were not allowed to let the shed hunters on until May first and by that time the buffalo and antelope were calving. It was a real concern to him and I would like to see you recommend taking Antelope Island State Park out of the northern region shed antler season and let them regulate that themselves.

Shawn Syme – I agree with the Antelope Island shed gathering restriction. Along with that I feel that the whole season seems a bit off. I think the reasoning behind the season is to eliminate pressure on the herds. It seems odd that only the shed hunters are restricted but you can lion hunt, hike, and take pictures. You can do anything you want but you can't pick up sheds while you are there. It seems discriminatory to me. Another thing I want to talk about is the five day season. I know the data shows the hunting pressure is only changed by half a day. I don't know what the harvest would be in that half a day but to me something is better than nothing. I would like to see us change the central region to a five day hunt at least until we are at or above objective.

Rob Johnston – I want to address the one power scope regulation for muzzleloaders. That is a scope that you can't buy anymore so I would like to see that raised to a higher power that is available.

Kevin Christensen – I would like to talk about the deer numbers in southern Utah. My family is from Marysville and I can remember counting 2,000 deer driving from the Otter

Creek side. I hunted there a couple of years ago and there are no deer left. I hunted about four days. It is not the hunters that are taking the deer it's the cougars. I have heard that a cougar kills at least one deer a week. If there are 100 cougars they take 5,200 deer in a year. I went for a walk and found three carcasses in less than an hour. The cougars used to be killed to protect cattle but that is illegal now. I don't think we need to worry about the buck to doe ratio as much as we need to worry about deer at all. The range is the same as it has been for forty years. Development down there is minimal.

Neil Clayton – I represent the SFW from Delta and we would like a five day hunt in the southern and central regions. I have also heard comments about leaving the Oak Creek unit a limited entry unit. You are going to have a lot of conflict with people who have been trying for years to draw that unit and the landowners in the area if you change it.

Jerry Slaugh – Utah Bowmans Association – I sent this proposal to Ed Kent and hope that you have received it. UBA proposes the archery elk season open on the third Saturday in August with a five day extended limited entry bull elk archery hunt period and a twelve day extended any bull elk period. We propose that the general archery elk hunt and the limited entry archery bull elk hunts opening day be moved forward to open on the third Saturday in August. This would be the same day as the general archery buck deer hunt. Also that the general archery spike bull elk hunt be a 23 day period. The same as the current hunt period which would then close on the fourth Sunday after opening day. The archery bull elk unit hunt period would extended five days to become 28 days closing on the fourth Friday after the opening day. This would end on the same day as the general archery buck deer hunt. The general archery any bull elk period would be extended 12 days to be 35 days closing on the fifth Friday after the opening day. This would extend one week past the end of the general archery buck deer hunt and coincide with the youth bull elk hunt. The same rules and restrictions will apply on elk harvest according to spike bull and any bull units.

John Bair – So on the limited entry units you want to leave that last week open just for the limited entry archery hunters basically.

Jerry Slaugh – Yes.

Roy Hampton – UBA – The reason for this proposal is that a person waits his whole life to draw that limited entry tag and he is contending with spike hunters the whole time. I have seen it for five years. If you draw that tag you ought to have at least five days to yourself. By extending the season on the any bull units it allows those hunters with a shorter spike season to go to the any bull units and hunt the bulls in the rut.

Bart Hansen – UBA – Currently the limited entry any weapon elk hunters enjoy an eleven day season with no spike hunters and no deer hunters and they have the most effective weapon and they hunt during the peak of the rut. The muzzleloader hunters have the same length of season and compete with muzzleloader deer hunters only. The limited entry archery elk hunters compete with the archery deer hunters, the archery spike elk hunters and the grouse hunters. Success rates average nine percent lower on limited entry units with spike hunts versus those without. All we are asking for is to move those dates forward on the spike units. They have the same number of days but it gives those hunters who draw a limited entry tag five days without the spike elk hunters.

John Anderson – By extending on the open bull units which have no rifle hunts coming up you don't interfere with another hunt and you are closer to the rut. I understand this gentleman here doesn't like the archery hunters and feels like we have so much more. Having done both I guarantee as an archery hunter I don't have the luxury of shooting at 400 yards at an animal. I have to be more skillful. Even with more opportunity archery hunters still will have a lower success rate than rifle hunters.

RAC Discussion

Fred Oswald – Thank you all for your comments. I would like to make a recommendation on how we proceed. My recommendation would be that we go ahead and deal with the bow hunters proposal and after we have done that we simply go through the highlights 1 through 14 in that order and if anyone on the RAC has things they would like to talk about with the highlights we go ahead and deal with those issues and I think all of the issues that came from the audience members will have been addressed except for the shed proposal which we can talk about after.

John Bair – I think the proposal from UBA is good. Giving the limited entry archery hunters that week is fine. You still get the same number of days if you are a spike hunter and on the any bull units I think there is a week where there is nothing going on and by sliding the archery hunt in there also extends opportunity. I would be inclined to go along with UBAs proposal.

Anis Aoude – One concern is on the any bull units the season will coincide with the youth any bull hunters so they would have to wear orange. There are also once-in-a-lifetime hunts going on. In talking to them they are willing to wear hunter orange. Our law enforcement folks may have a different take on it.

Mike Fowlks – Whenever we have that situation it causes concern because of the hunter safety issue. By statute they would be required to wear hunter orange.

Richard Hansen – There are a lot of hunts that over lap and I wonder if there is any time for animals to relax. The resources if valuable and I don't think it would be a bad thing if there were a week that there is not a hunt.

Bart Hansen – There are only a handful of youth hunters with minimal interaction. Right now on the Wasatch front archers have to wear hunter orange when the center rifle hunts are going on. It is not that big of an issue and has not caused any conflicts that we are aware of.

VOTING

**Motion was made by John Bair to accept the UBA recommendation as proposed
Motion dies - lack of second**

**Motion was made by Allan Stevens to move the spike elk season back to start the same day as the general archery deer season which would allow limited entry archery elk hunters on units with spike hunts five days without spike hunters
Seconded by John Bair**

In Favor: All

Abstaining: Doug Jones

Motion passed 7 with 1 abstention

Fred Oswald – We will then move to the highlights. Are there any recommendations regarding highlight #1 dealing with the online applications?

Gary Nielson – Is the application period shorter?

Anis Aoude – It is the same length we just shifted the dates.

Allan Stevens – I would like to recommend to the Division that they look into having the application period after we set the permit numbers in March.

Fred Oswald – Moving to highlight #2 regarding the nine day season. The Division's proposal is that we have a nine day season statewide and there are a number of citizens who proposal we keep the current five day hunts at five days.

Allan Stevens – I think the data that Division collected last year, I would like to thank them for doing that, shows that there is no rational for a five day hunt. We are actually hurting buck to doe ratios by going to a five day hunt. The five day hunt also hurts recruiting new hunters because it takes away the second weekend and that is the only time many youth hunters can hunt. Another thing I have had quite a few comments about from the rural community I am from is that a lot of the business owners are economically negatively impacted because of the five day hunts.

John Bair – We seem to change this every couple years. Rather than change this again I think we should let the Division know that this is something we would like the deer management plan committee to discuss this when they meet.

Richard Hansen – I think we should consider what was presented by the Division about exploring the possibility of changing the management plan to unit by unit. We could address a lot of problem areas like unit 16a with that type of management. If hunters are willing to sacrifice some opportunity I think we can make the herds better.

John Bair – The reason I say to leave things alone is the fact that the Division is putting together a deer management committee and all these things will be addressed in depth and then brought back to the RAC.

Motion was made by Allan Stevens to accept the statewide nine day general deer season

Seconded by Jay Price

In Favor: Jay Price, George Holmes, Allan Stevens, Doug Jones

Opposed: Gary Nielson, Richard Hansen, John Bair, Calvin Crandall

Motion is tied 4 to 4 - Fred Oswald votes against motion

Motion fails 5 to 4

Motion was made by John Bair to leave the five day general season for the southern and southeastern regions

Seconded by Gary Nielson

In Favor: Gary Nielson, Richard Hansen, Doug Jones, John Bair, Calvin Crandall

Opposed: Jay Price, George Holmes, Allan Stevens

Motion passed 5 to 3

Fred Oswald – Is there any discussion on highlight #3? No comments. How about highlight #4?

John Bair – Once again because this is going to come up in the deer management committee I don't think we should change this unit right now.

**Motion was made by John Bair to leave the Plateau, Thousand Lake deer unit as a limited entry unit for another year
Seconded by Calvin Crandall**

Gary Nielson – It seems like people are pleased with the bucks that are coming off that unit. The Division has said however that it is difficult to manage because of the private land.

John Bair – The motion was to leave it

Anis Aoude – The reason we are recommending the change is because it is a difficult unit to manage by our objectives. If we can't manage by our objectives we need to change it so we can. The reason we can't manage by our objectives is because they are hunting the same bucks we are trying to manage for limited entry unit on the general season hunt.

In Favor: Gary Nielson, Richard Hansen, Allan Stevens, John Bair, Calvin Crandall

Opposed: Jay Price, George Holmes, Doug Jones

Motion passed 5 to 3

Fred Oswald – Highlight #5 is the antler gathering season date change. There has been no comment about that. Would we like to address the possibility of taking Antelope Island out of the restriction?

**Motion was made by Gary Nielson to make Antelope Island exempt from the northern region shed antler gathering season date
Seconded by John Bair**

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

Fred Oswald – There have been no comments about #6, extending the spike bull season to match the any bull season. There has been some discussion about #7 regarding changing the Fillmore Oak Creek South unit to a general season any bull unit.

Calvin Crandall – I would have to agree with the individual that commented earlier about leaving that a limited entry unit to limit the amount of hunter pressure on the private property in that area. I happen to be a landowner in the area so I will be abstaining from voting. I would encourage the RAC to leave the unit as a limited entry unit. The only way I can have any recourse from the damage from the elk is to be part of that limited entry unit and get some of the income back.

Gary Nielson – We have heard from many of the landowners in the area and I have a petition here with approximately 250 signatures and they are all opposed to doing this. Besides the issues we have with the landowners, I think we need to consider the hunters who have been putting in for that unit for years.

Motion was made by Jay Price to leave Fillmore, Oak Creek South as a limited entry elk unit

Seconded by George Holmes

In Favor: all

Abstaining: Calvin Crandall (he is a landowner on the unit)

Motion passed 7 with one abstention

Fred Oswald – Are there any comments on numbers 8 through 14? Have we addressed all the public comments? I want to make sure we have not left out any of the subjects that have been brought up we need to discuss. The issue of a one power scope for muzzleloaders was brought up.

John Bair – Does a one power scope have any magnification?

Mike Fowlks – No, the only advantage is it gives you cross hairs to aim by. I don't know about the availability of them as was mentioned earlier.

Gary Nielson – The whole idea behind the muzzleloader season is that it is a primitive hunt. With a scope and today's muzzleloaders the primitive concept is about gone.

Fred Oswald – If there is no motion we will proceed.

Motion was made by John Bair to accept the balance of the Division's recommendations

Seconded by Allan Stevens

In Favor: all

Passes unanimously

11) Caliber Restrictions (Action)

- Mike Fowlks, Law Enforcement Chief

VOTING

Motion was made by John Bair to accept the proposal as presented

Seconded by Jay Price

In Favor: all

Passes unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

65 in attendance

Next board meeting November 29, 2007 at the DNR Auditorium

Next RAC meeting December 18, 2007 at Springville Jr. High School

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY-MOTIONS PASSED
Western Park, Vernal/November 8, 2007

7.HUNTING AND FISHING ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

MOTION: to accept as presented
Passed unanimously

8.HUNTER EDUCATION RULE R657-23 (5-YR REVIEW)

MOTION: to accept as presented
Passed unanimously

9.CWMU APPROVAL

MOTION: to accept as presented, including UDWR's position on the Moon Ranch
Passed unanimously

10.NORTH BOOK CLIFFS BISON MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION: to support the Division in reintroducing the bison plan
Motion passed 6 to 1 with 1 abstention

11.BUCK, BULLS AND OIAL PROCLAMATION & RULE R657-5

AMENDED MOTION: to accept the hunting season dates for elk as proposed but to have UDWR do a study group regarding bow hunters extending their season
Motion passed 7 to 1 with one abstention

MOTION: to accept UDWR's proposal to turn Oak Creek into a general season unit
Motion passed 5 to 3

MOTION: to accept turning Thousand Oaks into a general season unit as proposed by UDWR
Motion passed 7 to 1

MOTION: to approve the rest of UDWR's proposal as presented
Passed unanimously

12.CALIBER RESTRICTIONS

MOTION: to accept the Division's recommendation as proposed
Motion Passed 7 to 1

NORTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY

Western Park, Vernal

November 8, 2007

Started at 6:30 pm; Adjourned at 10:00 pm

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Karl Breitenbach-At Large
Floyd Briggs-At Large
Dave Chivers-Agriculture
Bob Christensen-Forest Service
Kevin Christopherson-NER Supervisor
Beth Hamann-Nonconsumptive
Rod Harrison-Elected Official
Rod Morrison-Sportsmen
Carlos Reed-Native American
Amy Torres-Chair

UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Jack Lytle-NER L.E.
Charlie Greenwood-NER Wildlife Biologist
Randall Thacker-NER Wildlife Biologist
Dave Olsen-NER Wildlife Pgm Mgt
Gayle DeCamp-NER Office Mgr
Ron Stewart-NER Conservation Outreach
Lenny Rees-Hunter Education Coordinator
Anis Aoude-Big Game Coordinator
Boyde Blackwell-Lands Coordinator

EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

Curtis Dastrup-Agriculture
Kirk Woodward-Sportsmen

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

MOTION by Karl Breitenbach accept the agenda, minutes and old business.
Second by Beth Hamann

Passed unanimously

4. REGIONAL UPDATE: Kevin Christopherson

Cottonwood Reservoir had to be drawn down for repairs. A few fish were lost. We asked the water users to drop the water down at the last possible minute. We lost about 15 tiger muskies but a lot of water 80 cfs going in there and repairs are completed.

Deer hunt seemed like harvest was down a little bit but I don't have harvest data yet. Weather related.

There is an aquatic nuisance species in the west called the Quagga Mussel. It came from the Mediterranean and showed up first in the Great Lakes. It has had a major impact on the great lakes fishery, intake pipes, etc. Last year it was found in Lake Mead. Each region has hired a new person educate people and make sure boats are properly cleaned before being transported. Our new biologist is Natalie Muth. What the Quagga means to the public is that they are asked to wash their boats when they leave waters to stop the spread. Minnesota was aggressive about stopping it in advance and only four lakes have it. We suspect it's in Lake Powell, so we may be too late for some waters. But we hope to save as many waters as possible.

Nikki Merrell is our new Accounting Technician III.

Our youth pheasant hunt this weekend at Mallard Springs. Thirty young people signed up.

The Walk-in Access Program is up and going and Derrick Ewell is our region's contact biologist. It is a program where we reach agreements with landowners to allow access to hunt on their property. Our region was picked for a pilot program. The Northern region was first. By next year we think sportsmen will have access to lands they haven't had in the past.

Paul Neimeyer from the Wildlife Board has been in the hospital but he's home now. We have kept him up to speed on the issues.

5. STATEWIDE UNIT-BY-UNIT DEER HUNTS IN 2009 – Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator (ACTION)

Hunters have asked DWR and the RACs to look at the pros and cons of a unit-by-unit deer hunt.

Pros:

- More precise management of general season units
- Allows us to distribute hunting pressure more evenly.

Cons:

- Limits hunters to one general season unit
- Makes it harder to draw popular units, hunters that like to hunt a particular unit may not get to hunt every year.
- More difficult to administer
- Getting sufficient classification will be difficult on some units
- General season landowners permit issues.

Management Strategy Proposal:

- Keep the current statewide cap of 97,000
- Keep the archery hunt statewide with the same cap of 16,000 permits.
- Allocate the remaining 81,000 muzzleloader and any weapon permits amongst the 27 units based on past permit use patterns.
- Dedicated hunters and lifetime license holders would have to choose a unit instead of a region, they will be limited to 20% of the total permits on any unit.
- Would adjust unit permit number allocation to reach and maintain a three-year average of 15-20 bucks per 100 does.

Questions from Public:

Randall Thacker: If the unit dropped below 15 you would decrease tags, if the unit went above 20 permits, would you raise number of tags?

Anis Aoude: Yes

Questions from RAC:

Bob Christiansen: Have you looked at other states and what their success has been unit by unit?

Anis Aoude: It depends on what the success is. As far as administering, they've been able to do it. Most of them didn't remain in a general format. They went to limited entry and decreased permits. We're not doing that. We're still managing for a general hunt.

Rod Morrison: On the graph you had 13,000 tags for Vernal last year had 14,000 this year. I was curious why we were offering more this year.

Anis Aoude: We recommended 14,000 last year, but it didn't pass.

Karl Breitenbach: Have you thought about any implications for your L.E.?

Anis Aoude: It won't be easier. Those are things we will have to work out. That's why this is just informational.

Comments from the Public:

Michael Cook: One concern is that we really like, as a family, bringing the kids and having a reunion. If you go to a unit-by-unit area, there are some advantages to decreasing the pressure but there's a chance that only one or two people would draw for it. I'd hate to see that aspect of hunting win in this day and age when we're trying to keep families together. I feel there are different management strategies that would allow that aspect of hunting like buying a two-year tag but harvesting only one year.

Clay Hamann: I wholeheartedly support unit-by-unit. The reason we didn't vote for 1000 tags in the last couple of years was because of the unit north of Vernal that was way below the 15/100 buck to doe average but was brought up by some of the other areas. If we go unit by unit, we could decrease or stop hunting in the low/weak areas and increase them in other areas.

Comments from RAC:

6. STATEWIDE SPIKE ELK HUNT IN 2009 – Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator (Informational)

Pros and cons of managing all limited entry elk unit as general season spike units.

-Allows for the harvest of more bulls and lowers the bull-to-cow ratio while maintaining older age class bulls in the population that will be available for limited entry harvest.

-Provides more elk hunting population.

-The trade-off is the number of mature bulls that have the potential to be harvested will decrease slightly.

Propose:

-No change to the general any bull elk units

-Increase the current statewide spike bull cap back to the 2004 level of 19,000 permits, to take advantage of the opportunity that will be available by opening up the rest of the units to spike.

-Keep archery hunt with no cap.

-All limited entry elk units will become part of the general spike-only elk season.

Questions from Public:

Rod Weaver: Would there be conflicts with drawings?

Anis Aoude. No.

Rod Weaver: Could an archer hunt the Book Cliffs for limited entry?

Anis Aoude: For spike, yes.

Rod Weaver: On a general season tag.

Anis Aoude: Yes.

Dave Hemphill: Would that include Diamond Mountain?

Anis Aoude: Yes. Only the units that are currently limited entry.

Questions from RAC:

Karl Breitenbach: Why does harvesting more spike bulls increase production?

Anis Aoude: If you kill bulls, you have more cows producing calves.

Dave Chivers: This is just informational now. You're talking for 2009?

Anis Aoude: If the RACs or people attending the RACs approve, the Wildlife Board may want to go forward with it as an action item in 2009.

Rod Morrison: What do you plan on doing with the number of trophy bull tags?

Anis Aoude: We'll still age all teeth find out if we're at objective.

Rod Morrison: I'm worried about the trophy quality going downhill.

Anis Aoude: It hasn't happened on the Manti and LaSal units.

Dave Chivers: How long have you been doing the spike bull units?

Anis Aoude: 9 or 10 years.

Dave Chivers: On Diamond Mountain, if you take so many spike bulls, it will take awhile but it's got to affect the number of bulls eventually.

Anis Aoude: I showed that the total number of bulls won't be affected if we harvest to our potential.

Carlos Reed: Have you talked to our Ute big game manager about your ideas? Is there a possibility you can involve us?

Anis Aoude: We haven't yet. We would love to involve you.

Comments from Public:

Comments from RAC:

Karl Breitenbach: I think the spike hunt should not be at the same time as the mature bull hunt.

Anis Aoude: They don't coincide except for the archery. There have been some concerns about that.

Kevin Christopherson: Carlos, would you like to have DWR come present this?

Carlos Reed: Yes. We have a Board that would love to hear this information.

7. HUNTING AND FISHING ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES – Lenny Rees (ACTION)

See handout Slide show

Questions from Public:

Questions from RAC:

Comments from Public:

Comments from RAC:

Karl Breitenbach: What a nightmare. From experience, it's tough to figure out if someone can draw a bow. The vision issue will be much easier.

MOTION by Dave Chivers: to accept as presented

Second by Rod Harrison

Passed unanimously

8. HUNTER EDUCATION RULE R657-23 (5-yr review): Lenny Reres, Hunter Education Coordinator (ACTION)

Questions from Public:

Questions from RAC:

Amy Torres: In your handout there's a comment that you need 80% to pass, but farther down, it said 75%.

Lenny Rees: That was a mistake. It should read 80%.

Bob Christensen: Do students get a small game license for free with no fee?

Lenny Rees: No, the course changed from \$6.00 to \$10.00 and the additional \$4.00 was for the license, so it's not free but it is a reduced price.

Dave Chivers: If the old instructors have to re-do their training under the new system?

Lenny Rees: No. It just affects the new instructors. This will allow us to get more instructors, through the training. I will be training the first trainers this month in southern Utah.

Comments from Public:

Comments from RAC:

MOTION by Karl Breitenbach: to accept as presented

Second by Bob Christensen

Passed unanimously

9. CWMU APPROVAL: Boyde Blackwell, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator (ACTION)

Slide Show

Questions from Public:

Questions from RAC:

Bob Christensen: On the Moon CWMU, what's their reason for requesting more permits?

Boyde Blackwell: Sometimes they just ask for more every year and the region looks at the data and leaves the permits as they are.

Carlos Reed: Would you be willing to bring the information about how you calculate CWMUs to our advisory committee?

Boyde Blackwell: I would be happy to do that. Just let me know when.

Comments from Public:

Allan Smith: I have no complaints. Boyde and the managers before him have greatly streamlined the program, making it much easier for the operators. There are fewer mistakes, thanks to the coordinators, landowners are much more willing to tolerate wildlife.

Comments from RAC:

Amy Torres: It is now open for a motion. Keep in mind the Moon Ranch did request three additional permits.

MOTION by Karl Breitenbach: to accept as presented, including UDWR's position on the Moon Ranch

Second by Beth Hamann

Passed unanimously

10. NORTH BOOK CLIFFS BISON MANAGEMENT PLAN: Dave Olsen, Regional Wildlife Section Coordinator (ACTION)

David Bailey (Utah Farm Bureau): Did the Bison plan proposal come from the entire committee? Was it based on consensus or did everyone support it?

Dave Olsen: All that were in attendance supported it, but there were a few we invited but chose not to attend.

David Bailey: What about the BLM? What are their proposals through the RMP?

Bart Zwetzig: There were five alternatives. Three supported it, one was neutral and the other one was against it.

David Bailey: Why go ahead now when the BLM does not yet have a position:

Bart Zwetzig: The BLM can't take an official position until the RMP comes out. The preferred alternative supports the AUM's for wildlife.

David Bailey (Utah Farm Bureau): Is it wise to proceed with BLM's RMP still pending?

Amy Torres: It is so close we (BLM) would feel good about proceeding.

Kevin Christopherson: Dave and his committee have put in hundreds of hours. There has been lots of public comment over the years. Also, it's not all on BLM land. If the BLM refused, we could still proceed.

David Bailey: Don't they have half of the land?

Kevin Christopherson: Yes, but if BLM refused, we could manage a smaller herd on DWR and SITLA land.

David Bailey: Are you going to keep them off?

Kevin Christopherson: Through Harvest. The way we manage numbers for all big game species.

Dave Olsen: We could do it through hunter harvest or trapping removal/transplant.

David Bailey: How many times did you meet?

Dave Olsen: We met twice and conversed and mailed several other times.

David Bailey: Do we know how many permit holders there are?

Dave Olsen: Two cattle and two sheep operators who are there in the winter.

David Bailey: When something like this goes forward does it become an item on the agenda prior to when the committee's going to meet? How does the public get more involved in the process?

Dave Olsen: The way our process is organized right now, the committee represents that group. Right now is the time when the public gets involved.

Kevin Christopherson: This (the RAC) is the public process.

David Bailey: The reason I asked it is because now we are hearing informational items for the future. I had no idea, and it's a fairly large-scale plan.

Kevin Christopherson: The Bison plan was posted on the DWR web site and has been presented to the RAC as informational before. This has been in the works for many years. The local landowners could have contacted you when we contacted them. They chose not to.

Jay Brewer: Buffalo and brucellosis in Yellowstone is almost a nightmare scenario. I heard Dave say the existing herds have been tested for brucellosis. In the event that we find there is brucellosis through hunter sampling, what is the plan?

Dave Olsen: In 1963 when the Henry Mountain herd contracted brucellosis, we worked with the ranchers, the Dept of Agriculture and Veterinary Services and were able to eliminate it through kill and removal. That would include brucellosis or tuberculosis. The key to that is that bison traditionally contracted it from domestic herds. If you have good animal husbandry on both parts it shouldn't be an issue.

Carlos Reed: The Ute bison herd has been disease free for decades. We test and vaccinate every year. This issue can be managed.

Questions from RAC:

Karl Breitenbach: Is Colorado on board with this?

Dave Olsen: We haven't involved them yet. The release site are a long way from the border.

Karl Breitenbach: How do you think it will involve the deer and elk herds?

Dave Olsen: Right now, we've been holding back elk herds because of drought. If we see overlap problems, we would go through the Wildlife Board and the management plan to determine the balance in numbers.

Karl Breitenbach: There are quite a few feral cattle. Have you been able to regulate the feral cattle? Are they destroying the habitat?

Carlos Reed: We are working the BIA to roundup those feral cattle. When we tried to implement it last year, a member who had a personal interest in the cattle opposed it. This year, we are working the BIA to get those cattle rounded up and out of there.

Dave Olsen: We worked cooperatively with the Tribe and BLM last year to have a round up and eliminate them. Our land is available for trapping as well.

Dave Chivers: Have you [Tribal members] hunted any of your bison?

Alloin Myore: Yes. We put out 25 cow permits and 10 bull permits. And our Department of Recreation sells one permit to the highest bidder. Then we use one for our ceremonial purposes.

Carlos Reed: We have a Native American Scholarship Program at UVSC. When they call and request, we harvest an animal for the dinner. These requests go through the Advisory Board for knowledge and approval. We have a program under Alloin, who has tribal members as guides who help clean and take care of the animal. The reason we support the program with DWR is that our animals are already roaming back and forth. If we have an opportunity to help in any way, we'll be more than glad to. Our animals have been disease free. We treat them every August and we tag them. Those animals that are wandering off the tribal lands cannot be stopped but we want to help DWR and are in full support. I think you'll find this is a very valuable and rewarding experience and you will love this tradition and culture as we do.

Bob Christensen: What is your method going to be to determine when you will be able to hunt the bison and when the population will support that?

Dave Olsen: I've been told that we can probably expect a hunt within a five-year period if the expansion occurs that we expect.

Comments from Public:

Clay Hamann: I spent most of about three nights reading through the information sent out to the RACs on the bison program. It really is an in-depth look at bison reintroduction in the Book Cliffs and I wholeheartedly support it. When the Book Cliffs Initiative brainchild was established 15 years ago, a lot of people put forth a lot of effort to purchase those ranches and make that happen. I was on the committee for ten years as hunting public into laying the foundation for this. One fellow mentioned that he hadn't heard anything about this, and this has been in the works for probably half of his lifetime. I commend Dave and his committee for the effort they put into the program.

David Bailey: Utah Farm Bureau. I also spent a little bit of time going through the Bison plan. It only took me about forty-five minutes. It was very thorough. I think Farm Bureau is concerned because of some experience livestock owners have had in the past. On the Henry Mountains, buffalo can certainly be detrimental to fences. Especially with the BLM RMP still pending, do we need to wait for it to come out? Our concern is to go cautiously. I have a question about the 450 number.

Dave Olsen: 450 was a figure based on density the range would carry, comparable to what the Ute Tribe has. There are enough AUMs picked up under the 1986 RMP plans, coupled with the SITLA permits and DWR deeded, fee title lands, to cover the herd objectives for elk, deer, bighorn pronghorn and bison.

David Bailey: Does DWR pay for those?

Dave Olsen: Yes. I know they make a big bulk payment that covers all SITLA fees and grazing permit fees are done separately. It is the standard rate for block lands. SITLA sent a letter of support for the Bison Plan.

David Bailey: In talking with the county commissioners, they're nervous. In the other RACs, there was some discussion as to whether they supported it. I would urge caution and possibly tabling it and, if it does pass, starting with a lower number. I think that objective needs to be tweaked.

Dave Olsen: The last time we met with the Uintah County Commissioners two out of three (the majority) said they were officially neutral. If they have changed that position, they have not notified us. . In the Southern Region I was going on information from commissioners that said the concerns they had had been addressed. The management plans in the Division are redone every five years. That number is where we would like to be eventually. The herd won't be to 450 any time soon; it was just an objective

Comments from RAC:

Rod Harrison: I got a call from the chairman of the Uintah County Commission. He wanted me to express his opposition based on House Bill 264, replacing grazing that has been lost in the area. I followed that up with a meeting this afternoon and that's what he left me with.

Karl Breitenbach: I don't understand why.

Rod Harrison: I haven't read the house bill but he said where grazing permits were lost in the area, they need to be replaced.

Carlos Reed: Does he know there are approximately 35 head that are already on the area?

David Bailey: HB 264 backs up the federal Taylor Grazing Act. It bona fides that on a state level.

Kevin Christopherson: As Dave mentioned, the issue was raised in the committee and our understanding is that law was not retroactive. These were applied for before the law went into effect. Besides that, DWR leases more than enough AMUs, from SITLA to cover the bison. Also, HB 264 does not apply to the Nature Conservancy and RMF that have purchased AMU's for wildlife. This is not only a Uintah County issue, but also a Grand County issue, and Grand County commissioners do not oppose it.

Dave Chivers: Who lost what grazing rights? As an AUM holder, I'm wondering who come up with the notion that the Division can't use their AUMs to feed buffalo. These lands and AUM's were purchased by DWR from willing landowner sellers. No AUM's were lost. Is it the Farm Bureau's or Uintah County's position that land owners can't sell their property if they want to?

Dave Olsen: As far as ranchers in the area, no one lost AUM's. If you look at it as the total system and if the BLM Resource Management Plan went the direction that the technical committees in the early stages went, some of those AUMs that were picked up and spread through the lands that were purchased. Some went to water rights, and some to AUMs, some 8000 AUMs held in limbo right now through the RMP process, could go to water rights, to AUMS, or reallocated to ranchers or put on the market. DWR has enough AUM's to cover the bison without the 8,000 in question in the RPM.

Dave Chivers: But we didn't take them away from somebody who owned them they were willing sellers.

Dave Olsen: When the AUMs were picked up on the Cripple Cowboy, the AUMs were picked up and then the Alameda Corporation picked those up through Gary Spouse, got half of the AUMs. The other half was acquired through the RMP process. On the other side of the Book Cliffs, AUMs were exchanged with The Nature Conservancy, Burt DeLambert and BLM. It was a three-way exchange. Everyone won and we were better able to distribute in the process. They have been grazed. TNC had cows and grazed in cooperation with Burt DeLambert. Others are being grazed in cooperation with other agencies. In fairness to the Book Cliffs Landowner Association, in a letter, he mentioned for the landowners to get bison permits in the future.

Under current law, landowners associations are only allowed pronghorn deer and elk. No OIAL species are there but if that is important to them, to put it in a letter. There are opportunities through conservation groups, and that could be a possibility for a landowner, possibly through a third party arrangement in the future. The Division can't do it.

Floyd Briggs: After you reach your objective in your five-year management plan that is the numbers you want to take? If we hit a drought year, do you have to go before the Board or is there something in the plan to reduce your numbers?

Dave Olsen: In looking at our track record with elk, we've intentionally reduced the elk herd during the drought years for all concerns, not only for ranchers, but to help take pressure off the range. We have a cooperative atmosphere. We haven't addressed it specifically in terms of numbers but that's our intent. Regardless of whether we have 350 buffalo or 450, if there's a problem, we will target it. That's part of the cooperation and trust. We are going out on the ground with permittees, so we should be able to stay on top of that. It is outlined in the plan.

Bob Christensen: Bart, the BLM Resource Management Plan has several alternatives. Is there a preferred alternative?

Bart Zwetzig: Yes. It is in support of the 8,000 AUM' going to wildlife..

MOTION by Karl Breitenbach: to support the Division in reintroducing the bison plan.
Second by Beth Hamann

Favor: Bob Christensen, Rod Morrison, Beth Hamann, Karl Breitenbach, Dave Chivers, Carlos Reed.

Opposed: Rod Harrison (Duchesne Co. Commissioner)

Abstention: Floyd Briggs (Daggett County Commissioner).

Motion passed.

11. BUCKS, BULLS AND OIAL PROCLAMATION & Rule R657-5: – Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator (ACTION)

- DWR is recommending the 2008 big game application process go online only.
- Have to buy a hunting license to apply

- Big Game application period is January 2 – 31, 2008
- Application for bonus and preference points will be open until Feb 9, 2008
- Wildlife Board will approve limited entry permit numbers in March and April, 2008.

Recommended 2008 Deer Season Dates:
Archery 8/16-9/12

Muzzleloader 9/24-10/2
Any Weapon 10/18-10/26

Recommend continue the existing NR combination deer/elk hunt

2008 Elk recommendations:

Archery 8/21-9/12
Any weapon elk 10/4-16
Youth any Bull 9/13-9/23
Muzzleloader 10/29-11/6

Archery elk: unlimited
Spike bull permit cap: 11,000
Any bull permit cap: 14,300
Youth any bull: 300

Want to add a mid-November youth rifle hunt on the South Slope, Bonanza Unit in the Northeastern Region to harvest bulls that live on private land during the any bull general season and become available for harvest on public land in mid-November.

Pronghorn recommendations:

Northern and Northeastern regions change the boundary between the two north slope moose, pronghorn and bighorn sheep units to make it clearer. Make it Burnt Fork Creek instead of the drainage divide.

Questions from Public:

Questions from RAC:

Dave Chivers: Charlie where's the hunt on Bonanza?

Charlie Greenwood: The Bonanza sub-unit would not involve Diamond Mountain.

Comments from Public:

Kim Lawson: Proposal from Utah Bow hunters Association.
See handout

Clay Hamann: I want to tell the Division thanks for working out these hunting logistics. One thing I would like to see the Division go towards, is going with an early and late hunt separate it out so there's less crowding for the elk and deer. You see these Japanese Quarter horse 4-wheelers racing by and it gets too crowded.

Michael Cook: I agree with Clay on his comment. We have a Japanese Quarter horse but it sat in camp. It is pretty annoying when somebody takes a 4-wheeler up a mountain to look at deer that I look at with my binoculars. Suggestion: Montana has a law that if you're off the trail during hunting season it's a double fine of up to \$1000. For deer/game retrieval, they allow you

to leave the trail if you have an animal down. There is a legitimate use for 4-wheelers if you have an animal that's a mile off the trail. I would like to see enforcement if 4-wheelers are going off the trail for any other reason.

Rod Weaver: (Split Mountain Archers): I support the proposal by the Utah Bow Hunters Association (UBA). An extended archery season is not going to conflict with any rifle season and will occur during more ruts to give better opportunity.

Scott Mansen: I like to hunt with archery. I've hunted here for 20 years. Last 5 years I gave up on archery hunting in Utah. The elk weren't rutting until the last 2 or 3 days this last year. Based on the statistics, it wouldn't change the hunter harvest numbers substantially so it would be a win-win situation if we extended the end of the archery season.

Matthew Broadbent: I support the archery extension proposal. I had a limited entry permit on Diamond Mountain this year and with another two or three days, I would have harvested an animal.

Email Comments:

Jerry Slaugh supports UBA proposal

Gordon Poppitt: comment on change in application period for big game. He wants it back from mid-Jan to Mid-February.

Anis Aoude: Gordon's concern was when a hunter education class finishes up at the end of January, there won't be able to apply. We will put information on the web site to let them know to take classes before the application.

Received nine comments on the conversion of the Thousand Lakes deer hunt to a general hunt. The comments were not in support of the change from limited entry to general hunt because of overcrowding in hunt areas and they feel there would be less fawn production. Anis could you address that?

Anis Aoude: There's no truth to that. If we manage for what we do on our general season 15 bucks/100 does, that's sufficient numbers to impregnate the whole population. Some of the opposition may be coming from private landowners because there are so few who hunt on public land that they are reaping the benefits. There was some opposition in the Southern and Southeastern Region as well. We have to manage to our objectives and find ways to get harvest on animals.

Brian Kohls (SRO) had concerns about Oak Creek limited entry going general.

Anis Aoude: There is some movement of bulls from Pahvant to Oak Creek and there's fear that Oak Creek hunters would be hunting Pahvant bulls. There's very little migration, but there is some possibility.

Comments from RAC:

Bob Christensen: I like the idea of the youth hunt on the South Slope Bonanza. It says it's primarily private land. Is there public too?

Charlie Greenwood: It has private land but public land the bulls move onto later in the year.

Karl Breitenbach: It would be nice to coincide the opening day of the archery elk hunt with the archery deer hunt. It would help bow hunters to maximize their hunting opportunity. Would extending the season late disrupt the rut?

Anis Aoude: Extending the bow hunt into the rut would overlap the youth hunt so they would have to wear orange. Another thing that could happen is you could increase success because they're hunting in the rut. If it does go through we would have to monitor closely the success rates and see if we would have to back off.

Dave Chivers: The youth rifle hunt that the Division is proposing is for 13 days. It coincides with the regular hunt so I don't have a problem with that. I can sympathize with what the archers are talking about it being difficult for them. But I also think the hunting season is long enough. Those poor animals are tormented long enough. I think if we need to move our season dates, I know it's like playing chess, but to extend the archery hunt earlier is a mistake and too hard on the animals. I know with cow hunting on Diamond Mountain, the only way we have to control our numbers is through cow elk hunts and it went a long time. Finally, Charlie made us (Diamond Mountain Landowners), this year, choose a season that we were going to hunt the cow elk, and we accomplished what we wanted to and the animals haven't been nearly as chastised. When Charlie does his data, I think he will see the landowners are self-harvesting within the time limit given and has been successful.

Bob Christensen: I somewhat agree with Dave Chivers. I do some archery hunting myself, but I think the hunting time we have should be ample.

Rod Morrison: On the Pole Creek South Management Unit, I think we're taking a step backwards if we make it a general season hunt. We need some of these lesser units that a person can draw with maximum points. I think we should look at UBA's proposals because of the difficulty factor.

Rod Weaver: Given a choice between a long season and a later season, I'd go with the latter.

MOTION by Karl Breitenbach that Wildlife Board look at the possibility of overlapping the archery elk and deer hunt even more, beginning on the same day and moved as far into the rut as the Division feels would be good for wildlife. But August 21st is too early. Maybe push that date back.

Second by Floyd Briggs

Randall Thacker: Even one day later will affect people who have limited entry permits and youth hunts. They are not going to be happy about an archer who has already hunted 23 days, coming into their hunt area. No general season hunt is going on during that hunt. It's all limited entry.

Karl Breitenbach: So the only thing we could do for the bowmen is to start the elk hunt earlier to coincide with the deer hunt.

Amy Torres: Do you want to amend your motion?

Karl Breitenbach: I withdraw my motion.

Floyd Briggs withdraws second.

MOTION by Karl Breitenbach to open the elk archery to the same as the deer archery and go to the end of the period as it is now without overlapping the limited entry seasons.

Second by Floyd Briggs

Dave Chivers: I'm not sure that's a better solution to start earlier.

Anis Aoude: The bow hunters are the ones who recommended staggering the deer and elk archery hunts originally. Now there is some change of thinking amongst some bow hunters. As far as the Division's concerned it could be done.

Karl Breitenbach: Would that work for bow hunters?

Rod Weaver: No.

Karl Breitenbach withdrew his motion

Floyd Briggs withdrew the second

MOTION by Dave Chivers to accept the hunting season dates for elk and dates as proposed.

Second by Bob Christensen

Comment by Karl Breitenbach: could we attach to our resolution to do a study group so they can come to some kind of consensus of what's good for wildlife and good for bow hunters?

AMENDED MOTION by Dave Chivers: to accept the hunting season dates for elk as proposed but to have DWR do a study group regarding bow hunters to extend their season.

Second by Bob Christensen

Favor: Bob Christensen, Rod Harrison, Floyd Briggs, Beth Hamann, Karl Breitenbach, Dave Chivers, Carlos Reed.

Abstained: Rod Morrison

Motion passed.

MOTION by Karl Breitenbach: to accept the rest of the Division's recommendation as proposed except for Oak Creek and leave that limited entry.

Bob Christensen: The reason for not including that in the motion is what?

Karl Breitenbach: It's already hard enough to draw a limited entry elk tag so this would be one that is available for people with bonus points.

No second

Motion dies.

MOTION by Bob Christensen: to accept UDWR's proposal to turn Oak Creek into a general season unit

Second by Karl Breitenbach

Favor: Carlos Reed, Dave Chivers, Karl Breitenbach, Beth Hamann, Rod Morrison, Bob Christensen

Opposed: Karl Breitenbach, Floyd Briggs, Rod Morrison

(Karl: I'm opposing it, even though I seconded the motion)

Motion passed

MOTION by Bob Christensen to accept turning Thousand Oaks into a general season unit as proposed by DWR

Second by Karl Breitenbach

Favor: Carlos Reed, Karl Breitenbach, Beth Hamann, Floyd Briggs, Rod Harrison, Bob Christensen, Rod Morrison

Opposed: Dave Chivers

MOTION by Karl Breitenbach to approve the rest of the DWR proposal

Second by Bob Christensen

Passed unanimously

12. CALIBER RESTRICTIONS: Lenny Rees (ACTION)

Leave as is

Questions from Public:

Questions from RAC:

Comments from Public:

Clay Hamann: We've looked at this a couple of times and I feel the Division has backed off a couple of times because of pressure by hunters. I think it is irresponsible to leave things as they are. The calibers as is are not effective in killing a bison. It is irresponsible of the Division to leave the regulations as they are.

Comments from RAC:

MOTION to accept as proposed

Second by Beth Hamann

Karl Breitenbach: I think we need to research it more.

Lenny Rees: I have done research. I looked for wounding loss results. The only one I could find was for wounding loss for archery equipment, which was very minimal. Rifle, I've looked at it as, a well-placed shot. I've yet to find a 17b, a 17 caliber bumblebee. I've killed deer with .22 hornet. I've killed deer with 22-250. A well-placed shot with a lower caliber is better than a poor placed shot with a higher caliber. It's really a social issue.

Karl Breitenbach: It's really about a marginal shot. You may not have a complete kill with a larger caliber, either.

Floyd Briggs: on the Draw-locks on archery, I really think you might have less wounded elk with them than without them. Some archers get on draw and stay there for a long time.

Lenny Rees: If you get into the general public using draw-locks, it really gets into a hot topic with cross bows.

MOTION by to accept the Division's recommendation as proposed.

Favor: Rod Morrison, Bob Christensen, Rod Harrison, Floyd Briggs, Beth Hamann, Karl Breitenbach, Dave Chivers.

Opposed: Carlos Reed

Motion Passed

Meeting adjourned 10:00 pm

Next meeting will be December 13, 2007 at the UBATC in Roosevelt.

MOTIONS MATRIX
SOUTHEAST REGIONAL WILDLIFE ADVISORY COUNCIL
JOHN WESLEY POWELL MUSEUM IN GREEN RIVER

November 7, 2007

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

MOTION: to approve the agenda as amended.

PASSED: unanimously

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

MOTION: to approve the minutes as written.

PASSED: unanimously

HUNTING AND FISHING ACCOMMODATIONS FOR DISABLED PERSONS

MOTION: to approve accommodations for persons with disabilities as presented.

PASSED: unanimously

HUNTER EDUCATION RULE

MOTION: to approve rule changes as presented.

PASSED: unanimously

CWMU APPROVAL

MOTION: to approve Division recommendations as presented.

PASSED: with one abstention, due to a conflict of interest.

NORTH BOOK CLIFFS BISON MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION: to approve the above named management plan as presented.

PASSED: with a majority vote. Six members voted in favor of the plan. Three opposed.

BUCKS, BULLS AND OIAL PROCLAMATION AND RULE R 657-5

MOTION: to change the proposed “any bull” elk hunt east of Highway 191 to “any elk” and set the season before October 1st. (Regarding the issue, refer to the memorandum by Anis Aoude on 10-19-07, Overview of Highlights #8)

PASSED: unanimously

MOTION: to maintain a 5-day any weapon deer hunting season for the southeast region and leave Thousand Lakes as a limited entry deer hunting unit.

PASSED: with one opposing vote.

MOTION: to approve the remainder of the Bucks, Bulls and OIAL Proclamation as presented.

PASSED: unanimously

CALIBER RESTRICTIONS

MOTION: to accept the Division’s recommendations as presented.

PASSED: unanimously

SOUTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY

John Wesley Powell Museum in Green River

November 7, 2007

Commence at 6:30 p.m. Adjourn at 9:50 p.m.

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Adams, Bruce	At Large
Albrecht, Kevin	U.S. Forest Service
Bayles, Lyle	At Large
Byrnes, Verd	At Large
Hatch, Jordan	Agriculture
Kamala, Laura	Environmental
Larson, Rick	Regional Supervisor
Lewis, Kurt	Agriculture
Maldonado, Walt	Sportsmen
Sanslow, Terry	At Large
Sitterud, Drew	Elected Official

EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

Gilson, James	Sportsmen
Hoskisson, Wayne	Environmental
Riddle, Pam	BLM

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Johnson, Keele

DWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Aoude, Anis
Blackwell, Boyde
Bushman, Martin
Crompton, Brad
Kerstetter, Roger
Larson, Rick
Olsen, Dave
Paskett, Wade
Rees, Lenny
Robertson, TJ
Shirley, J
Stettler, Brent

PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE 14

CONDUCTING THE MEETING

-Terry Sanslow, Vice Chairman

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Rick Larson asked that the RAC dispense with the regional overview this month.

MOTION by Kevin Albrecht to dispense with the regional overview and accept the balance of the agenda as written.

SECOND by Walt Maldonado

PASSED unanimously

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Walt Maldonado to approve the minutes of the previous meeting as written.

SECOND by Kevin Albrecht

PASSED unanimously

OLD BUSINESS

By Terry Sanslow, Vice Chairman

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Terry Sanslow indicated that he had no old business to review.

MOTION by N/A
SECOND by
PASSED:

STATEWIDE UNIT-BY-UNIT HUNTS IN 2009--INFORMATIONAL

-Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Kurt Lewis asked about permit caps, if they may be shifted from one region or unit to another, and under what circumstances a unit would be allocated more permits.

Anis Aoude indicated that the southeast region currently has 13,000 deer permits. In the future, these may be shifted from one place to another. Additional permits would not be allocated unless a unit showed particularly good buck:doe ratios and were at population objective.

Verd Byrnes asked about continuation of the mature buck ratio with respect to the 15 bucks:100 does objective.

Anis Aoude said the point was moot, but said that a state mule deer committee would be seated to discuss changes resulting from a unit-by-unit hunting strategy.

Questions from the Audience:

Jim M___ asked why archers were still allowed to hunt statewide in light of the proposal to further restrict where a rifle hunter can hunt.

Anis Aoude replied that archery success is very low, so advantages have been added to encourage participation.

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Throughout his career, Kevin Albrecht reflected on positive outcomes for forest rehabilitation or game management, when smaller units were individually managed.

As a CWMU operator, Kurt Lewis indicated that individualized management of smaller units produces more and better quality game than management that is broad and generalized.

Verd Byrnes spoke in favor of the unit-by-unit concept as a means to promote quality in our deer herds.

MOTION by INFORMATION ONLY
SECOND by
PASSED

STATEWIDE SPIKE ELK HUNT IN 2009—INFORMATION ONLY

-Anis Aoude, Big Game Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Lyle Bayles asked if the spike hunting concept would be applied across the state.

Anis Aoude answered in the affirmative, but said that the impact on each unit would be reviewed annually.

Lyle Bayles asked about the potential for limiting the number of spike tags on each unit.

Anis Aoude indicated that spikes were difficult to find during the hunt, and that restricting spike tags wasn't necessary. Success has only been around 12-14%.

Lyle Bayles asked about season structure under the new proposal.
Anis Aoude suggested using the same season timing as now occurs for the general season elk hunt.
Kurt Lewis asked if the “management hunt” strategy would continue under the new concept.
Anis said it would not.

Questions from the Audience:

Troy Bennett asked about the impact the proposed change would have on “any bull” units.
Anis responded that any bull units would not be affected.

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by N/A. Informational.
SECOND by
PASSED

HUNTING AND FISHING ACCOMMODATIONS FOR THE DISABLED

-Martin Bushman, Asst. Attorney General

Questions from the RAC:

Terry Sanslow asked if there would be a limit on scope magnification.
Marty Bushman said the matter had been left open to help visually-impaired persons meet the minimum sight requirements.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Drew Sitterud moved to approve the proposed accommodations as presented.
SECOND by Kevin Albrecht
PASSED unanimously

HUNTER EDUCATION RULE R657-23 (5-Year Review)

-Lenny Rees, Hunter Education Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Kurt Lewis asked about stickers, vouchers and temporary licenses. The hunter education program and proposed changes may be reviewed at:
<http://www.wildlife.utah.gov/huntereducation/>

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Walt Maldonado to approve changes to the Hunter Education Rule as presented.
SECOND by Kevin Albrecht
PASSED unanimously

CWMU APPROVAL

-Boyde Blackwell, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

From the audience came a question about the inclusion of public land in CWMUs. Boyde Blackwell explained the reasons for incorporating public land within a CWMU. Troy Bennett asked if “trade lands” were available in the southeastern region. Boyde answered in the affirmative, and indicated that maps on the Division website showed locations.

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Bruce Adams to approve the Division’s CWMU recommendations as presented.
SECOND by Verd Byrnes
PASSED With the exception of one abstention by Kurt Lewis, due to a conflict of interest, all members voted in favor of the motion.

NORTH BOOK CLIFFS BISON MANAGEMENT PLAN

-Dave Olsen, Regional Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Jordan Hatch asked many questions and issued a number of challenges about the proposed North Book Cliffs bison management plan. Jordan expressed distrust about the DWR and the oversight advisory board. With regard to wildlife AUMs, Jordan posed a number of questions about their nature, timeframe, and propriety. Marty Bushman of the Attorney General’s office asserted that acquisition of AUMs was legal and could be allocated for wildlife through the federal RMP process.

Jordan asked for a high level of detail about AUM specifics, which could not be provided. Unsatisfied about his unanswered questions, Jordan accused the Division of unprofessional conduct and printing “half truths.”

Walt Maldonado asked about potential changes in bison ownership as the herd wanders. Dave Olsen acknowledged that ownership would depend on which property the bison landed. Walt Maldonado asked what steps would be taken if bison became a nuisance. Dave Olsen replied that they would be either hunted or trapped and moved.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Dee Taylor of the Utah Cattleman’s Association expressed opposition to the proposed plan. John Baer of the SFW praised the plan.

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Bruce Adams commented on the unfairness of federal land managers restricting grazing for domestic livestock growers, while tolerating established or even increasing populations of wildlife.

Laura Kamala indicated that a new RMP was under development, and that public comment would be taken until the end of November.

Disagreeing with Jordan, Verd Byrnes upheld the right of land owners to sell their property and AUMs to whomever and for whatever reason they wanted.

MOTION by Kevin Albrecht to approve the management plan as presented.

SECOND by Lyle Bayles

PASSED with a majority vote, comprised of six members. The three members voting against the motion were Jordan Hatch, Bruce Adams, and Kurt Lewis.

BUCKS, BULLS AND OIAL PROCLAMATION AND RULE R657-5

-Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Verd Byrnes asked about the outcome of 2007 big game hunts and incidence of chronic wasting disease.

Anis answered that data was sketchy and incomplete. Much more would be known in the spring. Terry Sanslow asked about ramifications on limited entry deer hunters if the Filmore, Oak Creek South elk unit were changed to “any bull.”

Anis answered that season differences would prevent conflicts.

Lyle Bayles asked if bull elk tags had been issued to compensate landowners for damage.

Anis replied that they had not. The Division is reluctant to do so, fearing an outcry by sportsmen.

Lyle Bayles expressed concern about the proposed general season any bull hunt east of Highway 191. He believed the hunt would fail to take the resident depredating animals.

Questions from the Audience:

Lloyd Nielson asked about “management bull hunt” results on the San Juan unit.

Anis answered that four bulls had been taken.

Travis Pearson complained that the Division justified extension of the deer season as being advantageous to youth. Youth already are privileged to hunt all three seasons anyway.

Anis agreed, but said that most success occurs during the rifle hunt. Since most youth hunt with their dads, they get the most opportunity for harvesting a buck during the any weapon hunt.

Dee Taylor of the Utah Cattleman’s Association expressed concern about the rumor that the DWR planned to raise the San Juan elk herd by 15%. Dee also complained about unfair competition between elk with cattle during periods of drought. Elk can cause serious damage to an already stressed resource.

Comments from the Audience:

Gil Conover proposed expanding the Range Creek limited entry elk unit to the Nine Mile Canyon Road.

John Baer of SFW expressed support for continuance of a 5-day deer hunt in southeastern Utah.

Troy Bennett proposed changing the entire Nine Mile elk unit to “any bull” status.

Lloyd Nielson spoke in favor of continued “management bull hunts” on the San Juan unit, and conceded that bull elk permits should be considered for landowners, suffering from elk depredation.

Kent Johnson spoke in favor of extending the deer hunt to nine days.

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

With respect to the proposed nine day deer hunt, Verd Byrnes said the people he had talked to had all expressed concern about deer numbers and quality. Drew Sitterud said the people he had talked to had been in favor of extending the season, and were not in favor of changing Thousand Lakes to an open deer unit.

Kevin Albrecht cautioned against opening Oak Creek, South as a general season elk unit, due to hunter safety concerns and over hunting.

Lyle Bayles expressed concern that Elk Ridge is overrun by deer with inferior antlers. Lyle suggested that a management buck hunt should be considered. As the DWR develops a mule deer working group to develop a unit-by-unit deer hunting strategy, Lyle suggested that the group consider management hunts as an additional tool.

Kurt Lewis correct the notion that the DWR was trying to push for an increase in elk numbers in San Juan County. A letter to the editor in the local newspaper had spawned that misconception. Lyle Bayles and Kurt Lewis urged the Division to reconsider its proposal for an “any bull” hunt east of Hwy 191. At issue was the proposed season and target animals. Both believed that the season needed to be earlier to catch the offending animals and that the target animals should be generalized to include “any elk.”

MOTION by Lyle Bayles that the new elk hunt east of Highway 191 be broadened to include “any elk” and that the season be set to occur prior to October 1st.

SECOND by Kurt Lewis
PASSED unanimously

MOTION by Drew Sitterud to maintain a five day rifle deer hunt in the southeastern region and to keep Thousand Lakes a limited entry deer unit.

SECOND by Laura Kamala
PASSED with one opposing vote cast by Jordan Hatch

MOTION by Lyle Bayles to approve the remainder of the Bucks, Bulls and OIAL Proclamation as presented.

SECOND by Kevin Albrecht
PASSED unanimously

CALIBER RESTRICTIONS

-Lenny Rees, Hunter Education Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Bruce Adams to approve the Division’s recommendations on caliber restrictions.

SECOND by Verd Byrnes
PASSED unanimously

ADJOURNMENT

Terry Sanslow adjourned the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Hurricane High School
Hurricane, UT
November 6, 2007
5:00 p.m.**

REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

MOTION: To accept the agenda and minutes from the September 12, 2006 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

STATEWIDE UNIT-BY-UNIT HUNTS IN 2009

MOTION: For the DWR to proceed to make the unit by unit management plan an action item to be presented to the RACs as soon as possible.

VOTE: Unanimous.

STATEWIDE SPIKE ELK HUNT IN 2009

MOTION: To continue studying the Statewide Spike Elk Hunt proposal for 2009

VOTE: Unanimous.

HUNTING AND FISHING ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

MOTION: To accept the Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for People with Disabilities as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

HUNTER EDUCATION RULE

MOTION: To accept the Hunter Education Rule as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

CWMU APPROVAL

MOTION: To accept the CWMU Approval as presented and that the landowner association rule be reviewed regarding tag allocation through the RAC process during 2008.

VOTE: Unanimous.

NORTH BOOK CLIFFS BISON MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION: to accept the North Book Cliffs Bison Management Plan as presented.

VOTE: Motion carried 6-2.

BUCKS & BULLS ONCE-IN-A-LIFETIME PROCLAMATION & RULE R657-5

MOTION: To leave the Thousand Lakes Unit limited entry and not open it to general season hunting.

VOTE: Unanimous.

MOTION: To leave the South Oak Creek Unit limited entry and not open it to general season hunting.

VOTE: Motion carried 6-2.

MOTION: To accept the remaining Bucks & Bulls Once-in-a-Lifetime Proclamation & Rule as presented.

VOTE: Motion carried 5-4 (chairman voted due to tie vote)

CALIBER RESTRICTIONS

MOTION: To accept the Caliber Restrictions as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

2008 RAC SCHEDULE

MOTION: To approve the 2008 RAC Schedule as presented by Jake Albrecht (April meeting in Richfield, May in Cedar City, July in Panguitch, August in Fillmore, all others in Beaver).

VOTE: Motion carried 7-1

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
 Richfield High School
 Richfield, UT
 November 7, 2006
 5:00 p.m.**

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Jake Albrecht Harry Barber Sam Carpenter Steve Dalton James Edwards Steve Flinders Dell LeFevre Cordell Pearson Clair Woodbury	Anis Aoude Boyde Blackwell Martin Bushman Teresa Bonzo Josh Carver Lynn Chamberlain Mark Ekins Wade Hovinga Giani Julander Sean Kelly Jim Lamb Douglas Messerly Jason Nicholes Dave Olsen Heather Perry Lenny Rees Dan Sorensen	Tom Hatch	Gary Hallows Jack Hill Rex Stanworth

The meeting was called to order at 5:03 p.m. There were approximately 120 interested parties in attendance in addition to the RAC members, Wildlife Board members and DWR employees. Chairman Jake Albrecht asked the RAC members to introduce themselves.

Jake Albrecht: My name is Jake Albrecht. I'm the Chairman. I'm from Sevier County. And I'm going to start on my left and ask each member to introduce themselves and whom they serve.

Sam Carpenter: My name's Sam Carpenter. I represent the sportsman. I'm from Kanab, Utah.

Steve Dalton: My name's Steve Dalton. I'm from Teasdale, and I'm an at-large representative.

Dell LeFevre: I'm Del LeFevre. I'm from the Boulder/Escalante area. I represent agriculture.

James Edwards: I'm Jim Edwards, and I'm from Delta and I represent the sportsman.

Douglas Messerly: My name's Doug Messerly. I am the Regional Supervisor with the Utah Division of Wildlife out of Cedar City. My staff and I serve as executive secretary, non-voting members of this committee.

Steve Flinders: Steve Flinders representing the Fish Lake and Dixie National Forests, from Beaver.

Harry Barber: Harry Barber. I work for the BLM out of Kanab. Represent the BLM in the south, Southern Utah.

Cordell Pearson: Cordell Pearson. I'm from Circleville, Utah. I represent at-large.

Jake Albrecht introduced Wildlife Board members, explained the RAC process and reviewed the agenda. Heather Perry explained the process by which the dedicated hunters would receive credit for their RAC attendance.

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:

Jake Albrecht: Our next item is to review and accept the RAC meeting agenda tonight. Can I have a motion on that?

Del LeFevre: I'll move.

Jake Albrecht: A motion by Del. And a second by Jim Edwards. Any other discussion? All in favor? Any against? Motion carries.

Dell LeFevre made the motion to accept the agenda as written. James Edwards seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Sam Carpenter made the motion to approve the minutes from last meeting as written. Harry Barber seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Wildlife Board Update (Informational)

- Jake Albrecht

- We voted to accept the preauthorized personal collection of amphibians and reptiles 6to4. And at the State Wildlife Board they accepted that unanimous.*
- They also accepted the brine shrimp rule. The commercial harvesting of protected aquatic wildlife rule. That passed unanimous.*
- And then as you know we had some discussion on our fishing proclamation, here in our Southern Region which passed 9to1 here. And at the State Wildlife Board that was passed unanimous.*

Jake Albrecht: I'm going to turn some time to Doug Messerly for Regional Update and then we'll talk about RAC procedures.

Regional Update (Informational)

-Douglas Messerly, Southern Regional Supervisor

- Probably the most significant thing that's going on at this time are the rehabilitation efforts on the Milford flat fire. We've got somewhere in the neighborhood of ten aerial seeding contracts going at this time. A very busy time of year for us to get those things done and it's a major effort on the part of the personnel in our office.
- Our hunts are mostly through at this point. The management bull hunt that we discussed at length here in this meeting and also at the Board meeting begins Saturday. We're geared up to meet those people and check those animals as per the proclamation after they're harvested..
- We're having some personnel changes at the Regional Office. You just met Heather Perry. The turnover there continues. Sometimes there are some interruptions in service to the public for which I apologize and ask you to bear with us. We've got new people and in some cases we've got positions that aren't filled. So work with us on those and we'll get up to speed as quick as we can. But the folks that are there are doing a great job covering and it's been quite an experience for all of us to live through.
- So with that unless there are any questions we'll turn the time back to you.

Jake Albrecht: Does anybody have any questions of Doug on the RAC? Okay we'll move right along then.

RAC Process (Informational)

- Jake Albrecht

Like Doug was saying this agenda is quite lengthy. We'll get into quite a bit of discussion. We've been starting this meeting at 7:00, sometimes it gets over at midnight, sometimes it's 1:00 in the morning. We have chosen tonight to start at 5:00, hoping that maybe we can get out of here by 7, or 9 or 10. But anyway, we want to hear all of your comments. And hopefully we'll make the right decisions. Okay, RAC meeting procedures. After each presentation the following procedures will be followed, we'll have questions from the RAC and then questions from the public. And then we will have comments from the public, but if you wish to speak you need to fill out one of these yellow cards and get it up here to us so that we know who you are, what you want to talk about and where you fit in the agenda. You have three minutes if you are an individual, or five minutes if you are an organized group or organization. After the comments from the public we'll have comments from the RAC. And then we'll have a RAC motion discussion and vote if it is an action item. Some of the things that you'll see here tonight right off the start of our meeting is informational only. I'm going to ask that the RAC discuss and see which way they would like to go on that so that the other RACs as well as the Wildlife Board kind of know our opinion from down here. So with that we're going to go to Statewide Unit-by-Unit Hunts in 2009. This is an informational item. Mr. Aoude.

Statewide Unit-By-Unit Hunts in 2009 (Informational)

-Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

See attachment 1

Questions from the RAC:

Jake Albrecht: Okay, do we have any questions from our RAC members? Steve Dalton.

Steve Dalton: Yes, Anis. I'm wondering why we never see what the management objective for population is on these individual deer units.

Anis Aoude: Why you don't see it?

Steve Dalton: Yeah.

Anis Aoude: We do see it every time we do our antlerless recommendations. Those numbers are always there. Where they are and what they are.

Steve Dalton: Well I don't see it on any of this information.

Anis Aoude: Because buck harvest doesn't really affect populations so it doesn't really matter how many bucks you harvest. Buck harvest affects the number of bucks per hundred does. The number of does that produce fawns is what controls populations. That's why we don't show the number in the population. It doesn't really matter how many bucks you harvest as long as your buck to doe ratio remains at a certain level, your population growth won't be affected.

Steve Dalton: Are we under objective on some of these deer units?

Anis Aoude: We're under objective on a lot of them. Yeah, the majority of the units, statewide, are under objective. So that's a given and that has nothing to do with harvest of bucks. That has to do with habitat, drought conditions that decrease production. Harvest of bucks does not affect population levels.

Steve Dalton: What about getting a copy of this that you put together?

Anis Aoude: The presentation?

Steve Dalton: Yeah, this (unintelligible) presentation. Do you have a paper copy I could get?

Anis Aoude: Yes. I could send you one.

Steve Dalton: That would be great. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Yes, what's this going to take to be a recommendation? I mean what, you say that this right now is just a proposal? What's it going to take?

Anis Aoude: Yeah basically if... We're running it by the RACs. If the folks here and you guys think it's a good idea, you run it up the chain and the Board recommends that it become... they give us the task to try to make it a recommendation and we'll put together a more solid recommendation at that point.

Sam Carpenter: Are you saying this is going to be in the form of an action then, in the future? Or this is something we need to . . .

Anis Aoude: It may be. It just depends what the board decides they want to do with it.

Sam Carpenter: I think it's about time. I'm glad to hear that, they're looking at it.

Jake Albrecht: Jim.

James Edwards: Has any consideration been given to, in some of these units, in fact all of these micro-units to have two five-day hunts and decrease the hunters by in half for the pressure?

Anis Aoude: That's an interesting question. I don't understand what you mean by two five-day hunts. How would you decrease pressure? If you have the same number of tags you're going to kill the same number of bucks.

James Edwards: I'm talking about hunting pressure. Only 15,000 hunters out there, rather than 30, makes a lot of difference in your opportunity.

Anis Aoude: Yeah I guess, you know that's never been brought up. But it's certainly something we can take under consideration.

James Edwards: Yeah I think we ought to. Would you write that down and make a proposal of that?

Anis Aoude: One thing that you need to know that the general season is set by the legislature. It has to start at a certain date. So once you start having two five-day hunts you're going to end up not having enough space just to have some of the other hunts. So that's why we have a nine-day hunt instead of splitting it up. And when would you split it up? Would you split it up during the one season? So there's a lot of things that need to be considered along with all the other hunts that go on.

James Edwards: Yeah they found out that really works in Colorado, and Nevada, Arizona, Wyoming. They all have the more than just a one-day hunt on each unit.

Anis Aoude: Yeah but they're not limited like we are by when they can have their seasons either. We can't have a general season that starts before the last Saturday in October.

James Edwards: But that can be changed.

Anis Aoude: That can be changed but through the legislature, not through or the Wildlife Board.

Jake Albrecht: Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Now how is this going to effect if you do indeed go to this program, how would this effect say the archery hunt, muzzleload hunt, dedicated hunters. If they draw a tag they put in for one certain region that means they're limited to that . . .

Anis Aoude: One unit.

Sam Carpenter: They're limited to that unit throughout their three hunts, is that true?

Anis Aoude: The archery is still Statewide.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions? Okay I've got one. The five-year mule deer management plan is coming up, I think in March and April. Is that correct?

Anis Aoude: No it won't be up until 2009.

Jake Albrecht: 2009. So you could have this ready for action and be part of that plan at that time.

Anis Aoude: Possibly yeah. And that's why we're sending it out now so if it needs to be part of the plan it can be.

Jake Albrecht: And I guess the second part of my question is for those people in the audience who want five-day hunts to nine-day hunts, to twelve day hunts, or whatever, we could control those by the unit?

Anis Aoude: You can but it's been shown that reducing the time hunted doesn't effect how much gets harvested. Only the number of tags issued controls what gets harvested. I mean you can put a five-day hunt if that's what the public chooses. It's just not going to reduce the number of harvest. Only the number of tags issued reduces the number of harvest. And that's why we've done that in both the Central and the North Eastern region, and it has worked. So that's not a recommendation the Division would make to decrease the five-day hunt.

Jake Albrecht: Okay do we have any questions from the public? Please come forward Gordon and state your name.

Questions from the Public:

Gordon Poppitt: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Gentleman. I'm Gordon Poppitt from Central. My question relates to if I saw it correctly, the logic of trying to now perform a long over due duty of trying to work by managing by units. And then what seems to be at the opposite extreme, still remaining statewide on archery that seems to be defeating the purpose. Is that something that the region can explain the logic behind please? Sorry not the Region, the Division, I beg your pardon. Sorry Doug.

Anis Aoude: Basically archers get to hunt for a lot longer period. And if you limit them to unit-by-unit you're going to lose a lot of archers that are going to go over to rifle and basically you'll kill more animals. And that's why we're encouraging people to hunt in the archery and sell that 16,000 into the archery population, instead of limiting them to a unit which may push them into the rifle or the muzzleloader. And that subsequently will harvest more bucks and decrease our buck to doe ratios. So that's the logic behind leaving archers statewide. They don't have as high of a success rate and if you wanted to put them unit-by-unit I guess you could, but they are hunting such a long period and if they get to know one unit their harvest is even going to increase. So the reason we did initially go statewide for archery is to encourage people to go into archery and still be able to offer as many permits. And that's the same rational I would give here.

Jake Albrecht: Okay do we have any other questions? Please come forward and then state your name.

Garth Jones: I'm going to comment later but I just have a . . . My name is Garth Jones. I live in Enoch. Two things: in 1973 the legislature passed a bill; I was a co-sponsor to limit out of state hunters to 20,000. That was the first bill that passed. That's probably the best thing the legislature has done ever in its life. And the other comment is if you wait until 2009 you're not going to have any hunters.

Jake Albrecht: Your turn.

Anis Aoude: Was that a question?

Unknown: That's a statement.

Jake Albrecht: Okay these are questions.

Nolan Gardner: Okay I got a question on how you do the studies, from the five day to the nine-day. What units do you compare? And how do you compare a unit like we have out here that's completely burned off versus one that's got plenty of cover? And in your comparisons do you compare units that have the same buck to doe ratios post season? I don't understand how you get that number if you make the right comparison.

Anis Aoude: Well there was no data there on five and nine-day hunts. It was all data on general season hunting. So it didn't compare any five or nine-day hunts.

Nolan Gardner: Isn't that what your paper said that you compared the five and nine-day hunts and the success was the same?

Anis Aoude: That's another presentation. This presentation deals with going to unit-by-unit, statewide.

Nolan Gardner: One more question though. You said that the rifle tags were set, a set number of rifle tags but yet you wanted to push the statewide archery and that if the statewide archery went, if you did away with the statewide archery and made them go unit by unit you'd kill more deer because you'd have more rifle tags. Well you've already got a set number of rifle tags.

Nolan Gardner: No we don't. We have a cap statewide of 98,000, of which 16,000 are archers.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we are discussing statewide unit-by-units. And then we will have the bucks and bulls presentation where we can argue number of days and things like that later. So if you have a question on statewide unit-by-unit. Go ahead Bart.

Bart Albrecht: Yes. Bart Albrecht. I was wondering why you don't show your sample sizes on your buck to doe ratios per unit.

Anis Aoude: We do and I showed them. They are per unit. (Anis brought the table back up from his presentation). Those are the units and that's the buck to doe ratio per unit.

Bart Albrecht: What's your sample size?

Anis Aoude: Sample size is statistically sound sample for the size of the population. It varies. It's usually about 400 to 1000 animals. It's statistically significant. I mean we run the stats on it. It's not something that we just pull out of the air.

Bart Albrecht:: Well I understand that.

Jake Albrecht: So will we have that information under bucks and bulls?

Anis Aoude: Yes.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. We'll discuss that later then. Okay. Moving back to the RAC, which direction would you guys like to see as a recommendation for this to go? Do you want it to go forward or? Sam.

Comments from the RAC:

Sam Carpenter: I would like to see us go forward and make this happen as soon as possible, to go to the unit-by-unit management. That would be what I would like to see the RAC recommend at this time.

Jake Albrecht: Is that in the form of a motion then?

Sam Carpenter: That is in the form of a motion.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a motion by Sam.

James Edwards: I'll second it.

Jake Albrecht: And a second by Jim. No other discussion. All in favor or do you want to comment? Steve's got a comment.

Steve Flinders: Anis I think that was a great presentation. Several years ago Steve Cranny introduced the idea to the RACs and didn't quite make it all the way. I think you've taken several of the things into consideration that he ran up against. And I think it would be great to maintain the opportunity for archers to pull people into archery and keep them out of those stronger weapon hunts. And I think it's a great idea.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, any other comments before we vote then? Okay, all in favor please raise your right hand. None against it looks like.

Sam Carpenter made the motion for the DWR to proceed to make the unit by unit management plan an action item to be presented to the RACs as soon as possible. James Edwards seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Statewide Spike Elk Hunt in 2009 (Informational)

-Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

See attachment 1.

Questions from the RAC:

Sam Carpenter: Just to make sure I understand you correctly on this plan, if I was to buy an archery tag or a spike tag I can basically hunt in any of the limited entry units to kill a spike elk.

Anis Aoude: Right. And you can now on some limited entry units.

Sam Carpenter: Yeah on some, I know you can on some.

Anis Aoude: Right. But you will be able to on all, yes.

Jake Albrecht: Harry Barber.

Harry Barber: Hey Anis it looked like there was a significant number of elk tags that would be... or spike tags that would be available.

Anis Aoude: Right

Harry Barber: Any thought into making those more available for youth hunters?

Anis Aoude: That can be accomplished but we have so many opportunities for youth. Youth can be a part of that but if that's the way the Board and RAC want to go, you know, we don't have anything in the plan right now. So, yeah. Right now we're giving youth opportunity to hunt mature bulls during the rut with the special 300 permits that they get. So yeah, anything's possible.

Douglas Messerly: Harry, are you referring to the spike only tags?

Harry Barber: Yes

Douglas Messerly: They're over the counter. So all we've got to do is get the youth there early and they can get the tags.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, we've only sold out a few weeks before the season started. So yeah, it's not something they have to draw out. So youth can be a bigger part of that hunt. But we don't have to set them aside. We do have some youth hunts that come out of the any-bull units that go to youth and that puts them in a different, when they can hunt bulls in the rut basically which increases their success rate.

Jake Albrecht: A unit like the Monroe mountain which is so small and so open, would you limit the amount of spike hunters that would be allowed to go there or would you open it up?

Anis Aoude: No we wouldn't. Spike harvest has such a low success rate, it's between 12 and 14 percent success rate, that the fewer spikes you have the less they're going to be able to find them, the fewer you're going to harvest. There's a point of diminishing return. So it doesn't matter how small the unit is, they're only going to take them in proportion to what they are on that unit. So it wouldn't make any sense to lower, we would have to manage unit-by-unit then. That's something we're trying to avoid with elk on a spike general season.

Jake Albrecht: If you went to this would we eventually go away with the management units?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, that would be our recommendation. Because basically you'd be double dipping if you still had the management bull hunts. And we haven't really reached a level of harvest on the management bulls to make a difference to the buck to doe ratios. We're still trying it out and we'll see how it pans out.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Any other questions from the RAC? Seeing none, do we have any questions at all from the public? No. Excuse me, no cards so back to the RAC.

Questions from the Public:

None.

Comments from the Public:

None.

Comments from the RAC:

Jake Albrecht: Which way would you like to go as far as this is informational? Jim.

James Edwards: I think this is a good idea to take some of these spikes that we've got on these, especially on these limited entry units that haven't had any spike harvest for many years. So I think it's a good idea and give a lot more opportunity to the sportsmen.

Jake Albrecht: So is that in a form of a motion that you'd like to see them continue studying this?

James Edwards: That's in form of a motion.

Sam Carpenter: I'll second it.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a motion by Jim and a second by Sam Carpenter. Any other discussion? Okay all in favor please say aye. Any against? Okay motion carries.

James Edwards made the motion to continue studying the Statewide Spike Elk Hunt proposal for 2009. Sam Carpenter seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for People with Disabilities (Action)

-Martin Bushman, Asst. Attorney General

See attachment 1.

Questions from the RAC:

None.

Questions from the Public:

None.

Comments from the Public:

None.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Jake Albrecht: Just a comment. There is a number of individuals out there who have some serious eye injuries that are out there hunting that have a hard time identifying certain animals without the binoculars and then back to things. So personally I don't think its all bad. I would like to see it move forward to the Wildlife Board if somebody has a form of a motion.

Steve Flinders: I'll make that motion Mr. Chairman that we accept as proposed by the Division.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a motion by Steve Flinders and a second by Jim Edwards. Okay, any other discussion? All in favor? Any against? Okay motion carries.

Steve Flinders made the motion to accept the Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for People with Disabilities as proposed by the division. James Edwards seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Jake Albrecht: Okay our next item is Hunter Education Rule R657-23 (5-year review). This is an action item presented by Lenny Rees, Hunter Education Coordinator. Lenny. While he's pulling that up I kind of waited for some other people to show up but they haven't. We have excused tonight by Rex Stanworth, Jack Hill and Gary Hallows, who has some personal conflicts today. We're still hoping that Clair Woodbury will show up with us because he had a late meeting that he needed to be to also.

Hunter Education Rule R657-23 (5-yr review) (Action)

-Lenny Rees, Hunter Education Coordinator

See attachment 1.

Questions from the RAC:

Jake Albrecht: On the 80 percent, if they fail did they have to go through the course again or they could retake the test?

Lenny Rees: They would have to go through the course again. And basically is what the course is, is on-line. The 22 years of experience I have in the hunter education program we've had one person fail that test in the 22 years. It's a comprehensive test but yet it's made for the instructors to pass.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, any other questions from the RAC? Harry.

Harry Barber: Would anything that you presented be applied to current instructors or is that just for new instructors?

Lenny Rees: Well that would be just for new instructors. The only thing that may be part of the instructor base that we have now is that we may in the future have the trainers put on workshops around the state. That would be the only thing.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, any questions from the public? Please come forward. Gordon.

Questions from the Public:

Gordon Poppitt: Unfortunately I'm still Gordon Poppitt and I'm still from Central. Lenny just for clarification I read on the difference between the online instructor course and the physical one there's a difference between the required passing grades. As I recall from memory it's 80 percent on the online and it's 85 percent in the practical or the living person course. Can you explain that please?

Lenny Rees: Yes Gordon that is basically a misprint. I did have it at, for years it was 75 percent for the passing score. I changed it. It was suggested to go to 80 percent and so I changed it on the Internet. In the Internet course it should also be changed on the traditional course. It would be 80 percent.

Gordon Poppitt: And then the other aspect, with the online course is it one of those where you go through but if you get the answer wrong you keep playing with it until you get the right answers and still (unintelligible) it?

Lenny Rees: The Internet course, first of all a person would go in and study the policy and procedure manual. They would then do a quiz. They would fill out a quiz; send it to the Salt Lake office. At that time then they would go to the International Hunter Education Association student online hunter education course. They would then complete that course with 100 percent on the quizzes at the end of each chapter. At the completion of that they would then attend a 6-hour workshop presented by a trainer.

Gordon Poppitt: That's it. Thank you gentlemen. I appreciate your patience. Thank you Lenny.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Gordon. Okay, no other questions from the RAC and we have no comment cards. Do we have any other comments from the RAC then?

Comments from the Public:

None.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Jake Albrecht: Seeing no other comments a motion to approve? Del LeFevre.

Del LeFevre: I'll make the motion only move the test score back to 75, that we approve their recommendation.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a motion by Del LeFevre to move the test score back to 75. That fails for a lack of a second. Do we have another motion?

Del LeFevre: I'll make a motion that we accept the DWR recommendation on the hunter safety.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a motion by Del LeFevre to approve Hunter Education Rule R657-23. Do we have a second? A second by Harry Barber. Any other discussion? All in favor please raise your right hand. Any against? Motion carries.

Dell Lefevre made the motion to accept the Hunter Education Rule as presented. Harry Barber seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

CWMU Approval (Action)

-Boyde Blackwell, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator
See attachment 1.

Questions from the RAC:

Sam Carpenter: Concerning the landowners, are the CWMU and the PLWA, Paunsaugunt Land Wildlife Association, is that what you're referring to on landowner permits?

Boyde Blackwell: That would be in there, yes Sir.

Sam Carpenter: Okay we certainly do have some controversy. The word has probably not got to you on this but those twenty permits that you issued to the PLWA in turn are any season permits which in turn are muzzleload tags which increases by nearly 40 percent the number of hunters on the Paunsaugunt during the muzzleload hunt. These hunts are all guided. They're selling for tens of thousands of dollars per permit and this is throwing the whole ratio out. What we met on and would like to recommend, and I don't know if this is the time, this is more of a question I guess than to be making a recommendation, but is there a possibility that these tags can be allocated as archery, any weapon and muzzleload and split up instead of the 20 tags all representing any weapon which allows them to hunt the muzzleload hunt with those tags.

Boyde Blackwell: Mr. Carpenter I'll defer that question to the region. I'll let them answer that.

Jake Albrecht: Teresa you have the mic.

Teresa Bonzo: With the landowner association permits once they get those permits they are allowed to keep those vouchers for themselves within the association. I think a rule may need to be changed in how they allocate tags within landowner associations because at this time they can, I think, give them whatever season. Boyde you're more familiar with that rule. And I see what problems it does present with this, but I think it would take a change in the rule. Boyde, is that correct?

Boyde Blackwell: The landowner association once they receive those tags they can distribute those tags how they see fit during the seasons that they choose. So if you want to, if you put in your articles of your association, if you put in your articles that you're going to distribute 10 percent to muzzleloader, 5 percent for archery and 30 percent for rifle that's within your prerogative to do that as your landowner association. Am I hearing you correctly? Is that what you're wanting to do?

Sam Carpenter: No. I am wanting the state to regulate these and give them tags delegated archery, any weapon or muzzleloader. What it's doing is it's really creating a problem on the Paunsaugunt. I'm telling you there's something like 40, well right now there's probably 27 tags out there that are guided and 28 for the status quo to go out there and hunt. These guided hunts have four or five guys working for them. They are spending an awful lot of time and money to do this and it's throwing, making this hunt really not fair to the general public. We would, I'm saying we again because I met with the group on this, but it would be a recommendation to, and I'm just doing this for me now when it comes to making recommendations maybe would be a better time to do this, to have the state delegate these tags when they pass them out as a rifle tag, as a muzzleload tag or an archery tag as opposed to 20 tags do what you want with, because they sell them as muzzleload tags. That's where the money is. I don't blame them for doing that at all.

Boyde Blackwell: I see what you're saying. Doug, were you going to say something.

Douglas Messerly: Yes I was just going to address your concern Sam. I'm well aware of what you're bringing up. But the issue really lies in the landowner association rule rather than the big game rule, which is what we're dealing with today. So when that landowner association rule comes up you need to make that motion that those tags be distributed according to how the limited entry tags are distributed. Unfortunately it wouldn't be fair to treat one landowner association differently than the rest of the landowner associations in the state. The proper place to do that would be in the landowner association rule.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, any other questions from the RAC? Harry Barber.

Harry Barber: This is the first year that I was approached by a member of the public in terms of hunting on BLM lands in the Alton CWMU. I was looking down through the other CWMUs, Alton has about 3,845 that are BLM

and I think there are two others that are bigger, Deseret and Double Cone. I'm not necessarily advocating a certain direction this evening in terms of how that BLM land is treated but this individual and his family were a little upset when they, in their minds determined that that's not really public land during the hunt because they can't hunt on it because it's part of the CWMU. Can you just maybe briefly give an explanation on how BLM lands are treated or other public lands are treated within these CWMUs for the benefit of the public, and maybe the RAC who's not familiar with that?

Boyde Blackwell: Sure you bet. This has been within this rule for probably 15 or more years where they are allowed to take in a certain amount of public land to make a definable boundary, or if there, the public land is completely surrounded by private land, in those cases. In those instances the CWMU has a couple of choices that they can make. One, they can provide other lands somewhere else that a hunter can go and hunt on. And as I stated in there, there was some 26,000 acres available that we call trade lands. And right now there's 8,000 acres of public land that's being used but we're receiving 26,000 acres in trade land. That's one way that they can make up for that. Also, depending on the percentage of private land or public land that they take in they have to provide that percentage of additional permits to the public in order for them to be able to take that land in, whether they have to or not. So we try to make up for that. For example there's one CWMU up in the Northern Region, for example. He takes... he provides an additional seven permits to the public out of his eleven permits to hunt his private land as well as that public land that's taken in order to make that boundary more definable

Jake Albrecht: Did you get what you wanted out of that Harry?

Boyde Blackwell: Also in the new rule that's coming up that will go into effect for the 2009 hunting season that was passed recently by the Wildlife Board, that CWMU has to post that land that they've taken in public every 300 yards so that people that hunt down off of there can see that they're on public land and not, so that they know where they are and where they're going.

Harry Barber: You're explanation was excellent, I don't think that all the members of the public actually think about that when they draw some of those tags, like on the Paunsaugunt. They simply come in, purchase a map that shows ownership and they see it's BLM and they want to be able to hunt on BLM lands.

Boyde Blackwell: Sure, you bet.

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

Questions from the Public:

None.

Comments from the Public:

None.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Boyde Blackwell: Excuse me Mr. Chairman. There was a couple of issues of concern on landowner associations that I did not address that Teresa just brought to my attention.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we'll go ahead and go through those.

Teresa Bonzo: There is a disagreement on the number of permits for the Indian Peaks Landowner Association in the southwest desert. The association is asking for three. We are recommending two based on the amount of land and the permits enrolled. There's a formula that goes through it. The other issue is one of our later recommendations with the South Oak Creek Elk Unit. There may be some ramifications, we're recommending

that that go to a general elk unit. If that does then we've got a landowner association in a general unit so we'd have to deal with that. So those are two issues in the Southern Region with landowners association that I just wanted to make you aware of.

Jake Albrecht: Okay you've got to start over because I missed part of that. The Missouri Flat, is that what you said?

Teresa Bonzo: No not Missouri Flat, Indian Peaks was the first one, that there is a discrepancy. They've asked for three and we're recommending two. That's on the southwest desert. And then the one that would be affected the South Oak Creek Unit, the Fillmore South Oak Creek that is the Oak Creek Landowners Association. And later in the presentation in Anis's presentation we are recommending that that go to a general bull. I just wanted to let you know that if that recommendation went through there may be ramifications for the Oak Creek Landowners Association because then it would be no longer in a limited entry unit. It would be in a general bull unit, which there is not a provision for landowner associations in a general bull unit. Does that clear it up?

Douglas Messerly: Let me try to explain it. It's a tentative thing. We've recommended that the South Oak Creek limited entry elk unit be turned into an any bull general season unit for 2008. If that passes there will be no point in a landowner association receiving tags because they're entirely enclosed within a general season unit. So those tags would be of no value to those people and they would be of no value for selling because anyone can go take any bull on that unit. So anyone can come to our office and buy a permit over the counter. So if that passes then that landowner association will essentially be rendered moot. But we're going forward with the recommendation in the event that it doesn't pass then the landowner association will remain intact and they will get their permits as per the formula that we've derived at this point.

Steve Flinders: One caveat being if they wanted to sell trespass permits to those people who have any bull permits. Charge for trespass on their private land. They may stand to make more than they did on those private bull permits.

Douglas Messerly: That's some speculation but it's certainly a possibility. Yes.

Steve Flinders: But they still maintain control of their private land.

Douglas Messerly: That's right. This doesn't change that. And then the other issue I think, the Indian Peaks Landowner Association, it's a long standing tradition, Mr. Chairman, that they ask for more than we are willing to give. We need to go through those and determine if there are issues, or if there are people to speak to those associations or CWMUs. I don't have any comment cards if there are.

Jake Albrecht: Sam do you have a comment?

Sam Carpenter: I have one more question. You told me that I needed to bring this up for the land association rule. I have the 2008 schedule in front of me and I can't find it on here. Can you tell me when that will be that we'll be holding that meeting that the RAC will be voting on this?

Boyde Blackwell: Do you know what Mr. Carpenter, I'm not sure if it's scheduled for review in 2008. Those are done every 5 years. And I don't, I can't give you an answer really quick as to when it's up for review. However, if your RAC would request us to review that rule I'm sure that that's a possibility. Yes.

Sam Carpenter: Can I make a motion that we indeed do that next year? Is that viable at this venue?

Jake Albrecht: You can certainly make that motion. We can make it part of the whole motion or you can make it individually like you did right then.

Sam Carpenter: Okay let's make it part of the whole motion if it's okay with everyone to accept the proposal as recommended and add in there that we review the land association rule on the tag allocation sometime during the next year, 2008 meetings.

Jake Albrecht: Okay do we have a motion. James

James Edwards: I have a second.

Sam Carpenter: That was a motion.

Jake Albrecht: His was a motion.

James Edwards: I'll second it.

Jake Albrecht: We have a second by Jim Edwards. Any other discussion?

Steve Flinders: Just a question? Does that mean their permits for next year are being set right now?

Sam Carpenter: And that's fine. I'm not trying to affect next year's permits.

Boyde Blackwell: Under the current rule they've got the permits for next year, make a change by 09.

Sam Carpenter: I just want to be able to review it and see if we can, this is a viable change and I think if it was presented to you you'd understand a lot better why. So yes it would be for 08.

Jake Albrecht: Any other discussion?

Doug Messerly: One thing that may influence that, Sam, is there is some talk about changing season dates on that unit. And I don't know if we'll hear that tonight when we get to the bucks and bulls proclamation. But if we do there's a possibility the muzzleloader hunt will be in September.

Sam Carpenter: And there will be no hunt during the rut?

Doug Messerly: That's right. So that may change your motion to review the rule to apply to all associations.

Sam Carpenter: Okay but looking ahead let's, can we make a motion and if we don't need to do it then, or if they do bring it up then we can adjust it from there just so we get it in the agenda for next year?

Jake Albrecht: You've already made the motion to do that and we have a second on your motion. And if things don't work out then we don't have to include it as part of that at that time. Okay, any other discussion? Okay all those in favor of the motion please raise your right hand. None against. Okay, motion carries.

Sam Carpenter made the motion to accept the CWMU Approval as presented and that the landowner association rule be reviewed regarding tag allocation through the RAC process during 2008. James Edwards seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Jake Albrecht: Okay our next item of discussion is North Book Cliffs Bison Management plan. This is an action item to be presented by Dave Olsen, Regional Wildlife Section Coordinator. After this presentation and vote we're going to take a ten-minute break.

North Book Cliffs Bison Management Plan (Action)

-Dave Olsen, Regional Wildlife Section Coordinator

See attachment 1

Clair Woodbury arrived at 6:30 and was present for the Bison presentation.

Questions from the RAC:

Jake Albrecht: Okay Dave, thank you for your presentation. Do we have any questions from the RAC? Harry Barber.

Harry Barber: You mentioned the wild horses Dave, I'm just wondering it seems like there used to be some issues with, on the Ute side, Hill Creek in particular, of horses coming back and forth across there. I was wondering are there still issues with those horses? And the BLM horses?

Dave Olsen: Yes there are. The wild horses that we were discussing on the slide are the Winter Ridge wild horse herd that is recognized by the BLM. The Ute Tribe has been working on their wild horse herd and gathered, and I'm not sure of the number they gathered again this year, and have been trying to eliminate those or bring them way down from the current populations. Obviously we don't have much control there. We do cooperate with the Ute Tribe and advise them where we find horses that we would like to have them removed, they're moving off of tribal trust land. But the issue here dealt principally with the BLM herd.

Jake Albrecht: Mr. Dalton.

Steve Dalton: Yes Sir, I'm wondering how long is it going to take to reach these 450 animals, do you anticipate? Quite a while?

Dave Olsen: I would guess it would be a while. We don't anticipate further transplants at this time. We're not considering those and we would like to just let the herd slowly build and watch it and try to work with it that way. So it would probably be ten years or better under those rates depending on how much we get off of the tribe as well.

Steve Dalton: Okay. What will be the response if they leave the area you intend for them to stay in?

Dave Olsen: We wouldn't anticipate that happening for 20 years or so based on what we saw or what the Utes have seen with their herd. However, in our plan we viewed that as being handled the same way we would handle wandering moose or bears or anything else out of the unit. We could address them that way, either through hunts, moving them through capture.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions? Harry Barber.

Harry Barber: The slide showed the slide of the people that were involved, Tim Faircloth and Bart, but the other I wasn't familiar with. Is he a range person?

Dave Olsen: Kevin Lloyd, yes. He just moved into Challis.

Harry Barber: So it's wildlife and range folks that are involved.

Dave Olson: Are you going to ask me another question or can I sit down?

Harry Barber: Sit down first.

Jake Albrecht: Okay I have a couple of questions. Being a representative of the elected officials Mr. McKee was not at your meeting at the last, is that correct?

Dave Olsen: You're right. He did send a representative and we met with him. We knew that he was going to be absent so we met with them ahead of time.

Jake Albrecht: But the commission of Uintah County is in favor of this?

Dave Olsen: Two of the commissioners have felt like their concerns have been resolved. It was mostly around stipulations on mineral extraction. So two of the commissioners felt comfortable with us going ahead. They weren't comfortable with giving us a letter of support or anything like that. The third commissioner had some other issues that went back several years so I'm not sure if, I don't know where he would be. We've talked with him as well but all three of them together and we feel like the original issues they had were mineral extraction and House Bill 264 have been resolved to the extent that they can be.

Jake Albrecht: So their representative at this meeting is he listed on this paper here?

Dave Olsen: Yes, it should have been Darlene Burns and up above that, somewhere on the list was from Uintah County Public Lands Committee. It's a lady. I can't remember her name.

Jake Albrecht: Diana Colhort.

Dave Olsen: Colhort, that's the one, yes.

Jake Albrecht: But they weren't willing to give you a letter of support?

Dave Olsen: They chose to be, to stay neutral on it.

Jake Albrecht: Do you have any grazing permittees in this area?

Dave Olsen: yes, Bert Delambert, the rancher, both of them were on the committee. Bert Delambert, is also the chairman of the landowner association for the area, he sent us a letter supporting it. And he had discussed it with, I'm assuming, most of the landowner association. I don't know if he got all of them but felt that they were okay as well. The other rancher that I mentioned is the Alametia Ranch that's north, kind of north of Bert Delambert's grazing allotments, that's Oscar Wyatt. And I'm sure that they'll have some misgivings over it.

Jake Albrecht: And one final question. Do you expect a lawsuit from the people with the wild horse?

Dave Olsen: I guess that would be something that the BLM would have to deal with and I'm sure that there are people that are opposed to eliminating that wild horse herd. However, in the new RMP if the herd does remain they have set a population ceiling on that. So I think it will probably be more acceptable to everyone with the new ceiling. And I had addressed the ceiling number because I haven't seen their new plan.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have one more question from Steve Dalton.

Steve Dalton: How did you respond to Burt Lambert's letter here when he mentioned that they thought they should be entitled to some permits for bison?

Dave Olsen: Of course under the law right now there is no provision for bison or those species, so we advised him of that and advised him that that would have to be dealt with outside through either the legislative process or the rules, that actually go through the legislative process to get that animal included. There probably are some other options. If conservation groups wanted to work with them, who receive permits, that option may be available. But right now that's kind of where it's been left.

Steve Dalton: Because there's not a rule in place at this point it would have to go through the legislature then?

Dave Olsen: If I'm not mistaken I think moose, elk, deer and pronghorn are the only things that are listed under the rule for landowner associations.

Jake Albrecht: Have we got any other questions from the RAC? Questions from the public? Do we have any comment cards? No comment cards from the public.

Questions from the Public:

None.

Comments from the Public:

None.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Jake Albrecht: Just a comment and maybe this is none of my business but if this goes back to the Wildlife Board for approval I would strongly urge that maybe we could get some type of commitment from the County Commissioners up there in a form of a letter or possibly be there to the Wildlife Board meeting. Del.

Del LeFevre: I really have problems with this whole deal; I see another Henry mountains deal. And I don't think you have the support of them commissioners. I really don't. I'm with Jake; I think you definitely need a letter of support from the commissioners. There's lots to materialize and you take the make up of your board, you have to put together a board, and it really bothers me.

Dave Olsen: Can I address one thing there? Mike McKee was the elected official that was assigned to our RAC, that has since changed and he's the Duchesne County Commissioner now and they are conversing over the issues.

Jake Albrecht: Okay any other comments from the RAC? We need to move on to some type of discussion and vote on this. I guess my suggestion is if we vote to approve it on the conditions that the county commissioners would be in favor of it. If they don't have that support why then we would be against it. Harry Barber.

Harry Barber: I was going to make a motion, in fact I'll make the motion that we accept it as presented, even though in theory I agree with what you just said. I don't know if that's our job to make sure that there's representation in that fashion. I thought they had a process to be able to, I thought they already had a process in place in terms of having a county commissioner there. So I guess my motion would be to accept as presented.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a motion by Harry Barber to accept it as presented.

Jim Edwards: I'll second it.

Jake Albrecht: We have a second by Jim Edwards. Any other discussion? Seeing none I'll call for a vote. All in favor please raise your right hand. We have five in favor. Those against? We have two against. So motion passes.

Harry Barber made the motion to accept the North Book Cliffs Bison Management Plan as presented. James Edwards seconded. Motion carried: 6 in favor, 2 opposed (Dell LeFevre and Steve Dalton opposed)

(Jake said 5 in favor but there were 6 hands held up. Jake corrected this mistake off the microphone.)

10 minute recess

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we're going to proceed with the rest of our meeting. We're to Bucks and Bulls Proclamation and Rule R657-5, Mr. Aoude. Now we have a lot of cards that we're going to need to go through at the end of this but before we get into that part, just a reminder, if you're covering the same thing that somebody in front of you has already talked about please try to keep your remarks brief or try not to repeat what somebody else has done. But that will come after this presentation. We're to you.

Bucks & Bulls Once-in-a-Lifetime Proclamation & Rule R657-5 (Action)

-Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

See attachment 1

Jake Albrecht: Okay we're to the point of the meeting where we have discussion on Bucks and Bulls, or questions from the RAC. Do we have any? Steve Flinders

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Flinders; I'll jump in Mr. Chairman. Anis is there any discussion about expanding that combined elk and deer permit on any bull elk units across the state?

Anis Aoude: No, we don't have the data yet from the first year so we can't recommend anything really. Until we get the data and see what the actual affect was on both the deer and the elk populations in that small unit we, you know, I guess the biggest one we're worried about is the North Slope because that's a public land unit and a lot of people may go there. And if you add 2000 hunters, you know, killing deer in a time of year when they may be more available than later when the regular rifle season is for deer. So until we get the data we're not recommending it anywhere else. It may work through other places but it might be a nightmare. So I guess the jury is still out.

Steve Dalton: Yeah they're kind of special units, those any bull units, either limited access whether it's private land or public land. It might be neat.

Anis Aoude: Exactly.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions from the RAC? Sam.

Sam Carpenter: I didn't hear you bring this up but, I know that me being from the extreme southern end I mostly deal with issues in this end. And on the Paunsaugunt we start the rifle hunt early in October. It doesn't correspond with the rest of the hunting in the state. Why is that that we do that?

Anis Aoude: Well I don't know if I'm the best person to address that. The Paunsaugunt is a migratory herd so unless, I'm not sure the reason they set it but I think it has to do with the migratory patterns of those herds. They also have the muzzleloader later than the other units do. So, if you moved it into the regular season you would almost harvest too many bucks on that unit because you'd have, the rifle hunt would be later in October and then the muzzleloader would be even later and you have a potential of killing more bucks than you would want to on that unit. But I'll let maybe . . .

Teresa Bonzo: And Sam the other issue that we have on this, I know it's been brought up in the past years, the amount of law enforcement that we have to patrol the area. If we had it during the general season our guys are so spread out. When it is a couple of weeks before we can put more of a law enforcement presence there and I think serve the people better by being out there, whereas if it was in the general season we just wouldn't have the personnel to handle it.

Sam Carpenter: Well you do realize that the general elk is during the Paunsaugunt hunt so I don't really understand why it would have that big of effect to law enforcement. They need to enforce the elk hunts don't they? The general hunt's going on during the Paunsaugunt.

Teresa Bonzo: Yes it is, absolutely. But still though the workload, we would be able to put more attention at that time to have more of a presence. And also what Anis says is correct. There may be more harvest so we'd have to look at it and then in future years maybe adjust the permit numbers. Another thing is if we are going to put it with the general season we may consider moving the muzzleloader hunt from November back up into September to coincide if we're going to standardize all of the seasons.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. You are aware that Kane County offered to assist in, and have the training to assist if you did move the hunt?

Teresa Bonzo: Yes. And we have had that offer in the past. I believe a couple of years ago they actually had some help on that. Doug is very intimately, he was working still as an investigator, I believe, but he might be able to answer that a little bit better.

Doug Messerly: Good question. The history of this Sam is that these hunts were separated from the general season hunts, the timing of the general hunts. These are for all the limited entry hunts in the Southern Region. When we first started using this program was so that we could address concerns that people were bringing to our attention. Unfortunately back in times previous when the whole of southern Utah turned orange on the opening day of the deer hunt there were a lot of people in orange driving around on the Paunsaugunt. And there were people that were quite concerned that they were not Paunsaugunt hunters. And so we got a lot of complaints and there were a lot of issues of us not being able to provide the service or the level of law enforcement presence on the Paunsaugunt that it deserved, at the time. And so we separated them in time, not with respect to affecting the harvest by any stretch of the imagination, but so that when people were driving around on the Paunsaugunt during the general deer season in orange we knew there was a problem and we could address it. And that is the case now during the general season elk hunts also because it's not open to general season elk hunting. And during the general season deer season we're able to address the concerns of the public. If that is no longer a concern then the potential exists, certainly, to move it back. However, what you're going to have is a lot of people in orange driving around on the Paunsaugunt and we're going to have a lot of questions about whether or not they have permits. And I can't provide enough officers to cover it. And we deeply appreciate the help that Kane County has offered. And they are a great resource. But let's face it they have other priorities. And they are not flush with people either, so. In reality as far as providing the level of law enforcement service that we can this is the best scenario. If we move the seasons to later in October it is very likely we'll increase harvest and we have to take that impact into account, but that's what we raise them for. But it could affect, you know, as harvest success goes up it could affect the number of permits down the road, etc. There's only X number of deer to take. So that's what it boils down to. And you know it brings up the idea of moving the muzzleloader hunt out because essentially you're hunting those deer on the winter range when you move to the end of October anyway. And you're already hitting them once. It doesn't make much sense to hit them again, as per the concern you brought up earlier about so many muzzleloader hunters out there. So I think that we have to consider that, the pressure that we're putting on those biggest bucks. They'll be more vulnerable and they'll be in an area where they're more easily harvested if we move it too late in October.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. Well my main concern on that is the fact that it is a migratory herd. The deer, and this is probably, and I'll be somewhat cautious on the figure I use, but I would venture to guess that 60 percent of the bucks are still up on the CWMU and the general public does not get a chance to hunt these. They get to hunt a small portion of the herd during the rifle hunt, which is the majority of the tags. And it's more in the interest of the sportsmen, and I do understand there's going to have to be changes made to address it if we do move the hunt. And that's the concern.

Douglas Messerly: Certainly. And my only comment to that would be is you can only kill them once. And so I don't have any data to support that it's 60 percent of the bucks are on private land and unavailable to the

sportsmen. But I do know that we struggle to meet the objectives on that unit. And I do know that the more bucks we harvest the harder that's going to be with the current number of permits that we have. So everything's a tradeoff is what it boils down to.

Jake Albrecht: Okay any other questions from the RAC questions? Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: My question is why do we have an archery hunt that lasts a month long? I think one of the big problems, a lot of the areas, and maybe when you go to units you're going to solve that problem, but right now I live in an area where every unit and mountain around there gets hammered to death for 30 days with archery hunters. By the time they get through there's no animals left there. And the ones that aren't hunting, they bring 97 people with them with 4-wheelers to run up and down the roads, you know. I think that the archery hunt should coincide with the rest of the hunts. If it's a 10-day rifle hunt it should be a 10-day archery hunt.

Anis Aoude: Well the reason the archery hunt is longer is because archers aren't as effective at killing things. So we give them more time to be able to go out there and actually harvest something. Their success rate is so low I don't believe that they're effecting the population, the buck population. Because on most units we are meeting our 15 bucks per 100 does. So it's working. If we go to unit by unit we will adjust the number of tags if that happens. But we still recommend that the archers still be able to hunt statewide just because it's a harder method of take. If you limit them to 9 days I don't think a lot of guys will even go out. So basically we'll end up with more rifle hunters, which means we'll kill more bucks. Again it's a tradeoff.

Cordell Pearson: Okay just to say something there. When did it start going to a three- week hunt? Last year it was almost a full month hunt. You know before . . .

Anis Aoude: But the season length hasn't changed since, I don't know. I'll have to go look back.

Cordell Pearson: Yeah it has changed.

Anis Aoude: Not in recent times.

Cordell Pearson: Well in the last, let's say 7 or 8 years it's changed.

Anis Aoude: How many years?

Cordell Pearson: 7 or 8 it's changed.

Anis Aoude: It changed in I think in . . .

Cordell Pearson: But I think one point that you're missing because I don't think you have any idea how many bucks these people kill.

Anis Aoude: Well it doesn't matter how many they kill as long as we maintain a buck to doe ratio on a unit. That's what we look at.

Jake Albrecht: Del LeFevre.

Del LeFevre: I'd like to second what Cordell said. And I'm sorry bow hunters; you're the worst of the lot. And whoever invented Letterman.

Jake Albrecht: These are questions Del.

Dell LeFevre: My question is, is we've got to shorten the hunt up. It is too long. They're out there way too long.

Jake Albrecht: Question. How do you come up with your count of buck to doe per 100?

Anis Aoude: Buck to doe ratio is our surveys that are done post season. The biologists go classify deer. They usually classify between 400 to 1000 animals and then get the ratios that way.

Jake Albrecht: Are those done only by the biologists or by working groups?

Anis Aoude: Well they are mostly by the biologists. Some of the conservation officers also collect that data. So it's an effort of the region to get enough numbers on each unit.

Jake Albrecht: Is the rest of it done by computer modeling?

Anis Aoude: No. There's none of that ratio is done by computer modeling.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, any other questions from the RAC? Sam, one more.

Sam Carpenter: On your general archery hunt, I really like what you're doing by allotting all the tags and allowing people to get out and hunt, but we've really created a monster down here in Southern Utah with that hunt. And the fact that the majority of the archers in the state show up down here on Cedar Mountain and in the southern area and it's really become a problem and really taken a lot of the interest from the locals out of even participating any more. Is there any provision or have we looked at anything to control the number of hunters on these certain areas?

Anis Aoude: I think we looked at that recently, actually and it didn't end up being that many that were coming down to the southern region. It's more of a perception issue than an actual issue.

Sam Carpenter: Oh no I'm one of them. And it's kind of like a circus. . .

Anis Aoude: Well we can, I don't have the data here but I know we presented on it last year.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, do we have any questions from the public? Greg McGregor, please come forward.

Questions from the Public:

Greg McGregor: Thanks for entertaining my question. I have 2. I will ask the first one and expect a response and then I will ask the second one after that. What is the rationale given for closing the Oak Creek limited elk unit?

Sean Kelly: I'm probably sure most of you are familiar with Oak Creek elk herd. I'll kind of back up and give you a little background real quick. The Oak Creek is kind of unique. It's got some pretty good elk habitat but most of it is winter range. A lot of the summer range on the Oak Creek is, well there's not a whole lot there so what that does is during July and August the only things that are green are usually agricultural fields. So we've got a chronic depredation problem on the Oak Creek ever since elk were introduced. We've been trying to control that population for several years now with varying amounts of success. One of the problems we have is that a lot of the crops that are grown there are corn. It's difficult to get the elk out of the corn. We can't kill it before August 1st. The strains of corn they're using they're high enough they hide the elk and so we have a pretty high potential for damage on the Oak Creek. Especially now, they used to grow the corn for silage, now they're growing it for grain. The price of corn has really gone up in the last couple of years too. So we have the depredation problems, been there, we've solved that to some extent the landowner association. The value of the crops is almost getting to the point where it's exceeding the value of the permits. The second problem is a lot of these are bulls that we're focusing on for depredation. Since its good winter range we have a pretty good migration over from the Pahvant and our limited entry hunt has been mostly migratory bulls that we're killing that come over from the Pahvant. The Utah Department of Transportation has been extending the high fence along I-15. They are slowly cutting off the migration. Two years ago they finished the high fence from Fillmore to

Scipio. There are still places where they can cross but they are getting fewer and fewer and the migration is starting to decrease. And that's causing a second problem. The quality of the limited entry hunt has decreased in the last 3 or 4 years. We had a guy tag a spike on a limited entry permit last year 2006. And the age, the average age of the elk has gone down. We've got about 60 percent, about 70 percent of the elk killed on the Oak Creek are less than 5 years old, 5 years or less compared to about 10 percent on the Pahvant. So we're getting people a tag that is very difficult to fill and we have a lot of complaints on the Oak Creek that it's not a worthwhile hunt. We've had people consider turning in their permits after they scout and some that do. And so that's the second issue that's come up. And as that high fence is completed in between, along I-15, and it will be extended all the way from Cove Fort on up one day, then that migration will pretty much stop. And we'll have a situation of the hunt quality. What precipitated this is we were rewriting the elk plans at a committee, and that was one of the things that the committee supported, was moving from a limited entry season to a general season hunt on the Oak Creek. Does that answer your question? Any other questions from the RAC?

Greg McGregor: Thanks Sean. Next question would be, does anybody have the information or recall when was the 5-day hunt initiated on the Pine Valley, do we know that? 99? Those are the statistics I saw on the, 99 is that a good guess? Do you recall what the buck to doe ratio was prior to that 5-day implementation? Does anybody recall? 5, thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, any other questions from the public? One more question. If any others please come forward and state your name please.

Scott Walker: Scott Walker. My question is more toward Cordell. You mentioned that the archery hunters came into your area or near your area and hunted, killed all the bucks in your particular area. Was there no bucks left for the muzzleloader or rifle hunts and where did you get your data from?

Cordell Pearson: No I didn't say they killed all the bucks. I said you couldn't find any bucks. Okay?

Scott Walker: Oh, okay.

Brian (unknown last name): My name is Brian and I'd like to maybe instead of when everybody gets or don't draw their tag you guys give them a tag for an archery permit. I think that's what causes all the havoc with wounded deer and everything because half the guys when they said that archery hunters basically suck they don't. You get a true archery hunter and he's one of the most honest hunters there is on the hill I believe. But I think if we'd get to where we could get the, if you put in for that draw hunt and if you don't draw it you can go buy an archery tag. I'd like you guys' input on that.

Jake Albrecht: Once again, our comments are later. Make sure we have a question, okay? Do we have any other questions?

Corey Bundy: I just wanted to address and find out and see if anybody has possibly looked at the dedicated hunter program from the standpoint of when somebody actually signs up for the program if they have to actually sign up for a particular region for all three years and actually make it to where they have to hunt the archery muzzleloader and rifle in that region, they can't jump back and forth. Like I know with the archery statewide, I have friends up north that come down on the weekends, hunt archery down here and they hunt at home during the week. So you get a lot more people here on the weekends but not during the weekday so those locals hunt mainly weekdays not weekends, if that makes sense. What I'm trying to ask has anybody looked at that?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, the dedicated hunter rule actually was just renewed in the last RAC go around, RAC and board, go around and they didn't make any changes like that. Currently they can change their, they don't have to pick it for three years and archery is still statewide. So that hasn't changed. And they just renewed the rule. So I guess until it comes up for review again. Or it could be addressed here if you wish. But the rule was just reviewed and they had a panel of both dedicated hunters and sportsmen that were not dedicated hunters and all kinds of people weigh in and they decided not to change that.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. I think that's all of the questions from the public. We're to that part of the meeting where we accept comments from the public. These comment cards, like I say are 3 minutes per individual. Doug has the timer. 5 minutes for an organized group. We have like 20 or 30 of these so if they are all 3 minutes we're 90 minutes. So like I say, if somebody has already made your comment why just come up and say it's been presented by so-and-so and we'll move on to somebody else. Our first one is Gordon Poppitt and he will be followed by Michael Carter. And please only one speaker per group.

Comments from the Public:

Gordon Poppitt: My request is for considering that the application period for the 2008 big game permits be actually from January 2nd to February 15th. I had sent out e-mails to all of the RAC chairs, the Wildlife Board members and the Division management. And I apologize that Del, Steve, Gary and Cordell didn't get e-mails but I don't have your e-mail addresses. So that's my fault. Just for the minutes and for the record let me clarify what I'm talking about and what my reasons are. For the past two years the application window has been from January 15th to February the 15th or 16th thereabout. The main reason for the Division's moving up to the first possible application date in 2008 is because it's the introductory year for any applicant to have a hunting license or a combination license prior to applying online. The 2008 wildlife convention begins this year, or this coming year I should say, approximately January 15th, hence the need for to provide convention permit draw applicants, they sell some 15,000 tickets I believe for special permits. It gives them time to be able to purchase those licenses before they go in and attend the convention and then have the chance to put in there. The interesting fact is that this recommendation from the Division is for one year only. Where my advisement that I've had from talking to a staff, both up in Salt Lake and around here, is the Division plans to actually revert back for the 2009 season back to the 15th. I did check with Marty, there's no legal policy, which mandates only a four-week period for the application window. So my question is why then can it not be left or expanded to a six week for this 2008 schedule? Now the logic is that we've got to have a cutoff date, the deadline. Not that it's a good example but the IRS even they keep the 15th even though they change the ruling. So my main reason is because of my concerns originally were with the hunter education program. It was a concern because when we run classes in January we'd never quite predict the weather. We've still got to have the necessary number of hours in there. I did check with St. George who have a monthly program. Am I over? Okay. In essence what it boils back to is the response in November and December for hunter ed. classes is somewhere about 8 to 10. When I run a class in Enterprise in January it's between 36 and 50. I want to make sure that those people that go through the class have a chance to be able to put in. That's it shortly. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Gordon. I wrote that down as a consideration so we'll make sure we look at it. Our next one is Michael Carter, he will be followed by Gordon from Central Utah and that's all I have.

Michael Carter: I would simply like to comment in support of the recommendation for the 9-day hunt. The 5-day hunt in the experience of many of my hunting colleagues basically boils down to the 1-day hunt or at most a 2-day hunt. In addition to that I'd like to echo the sentiments of Mr. Pearson. I believe that the early hunts, however long they are, tend to drive the animals into the cedar trees and diminish the availability or the opportunity for many of us who don't have the luxury of being able to hunt from August 1st to December 1st or whatever it amounts to be. The last thing I'd like to make mention of is relative to people of age, disability and perhaps veteran status that there be given some consideration for them to have preference points in the drawing process to recognize their longevity in terms of participation and other contributions they've made in other areas. Thanks.

Jake Albrecht: Okay is there another Gordon from Central or did you have two Gordon? You have a different point, is that what you're saying? Okay, have at 'er. Come up forward then.

Gordon Poppitt: Thank you. It's still me, Gordon Poppitt. This is a lot briefer. But my concern is the format that's been presented for the comparison between the 5 and 9-day hunts. I think there are factors that are built in that we obviously don't know. But one of the things that needs to be considered is that, number one, the 5-day hunt areas, for example southern, southeastern, correct me if I'm wrong, but in the main are on private land. The 9-day hunts

which are in northern, central and northeastern, as I understand it from people that live up there and hunt up there, they tell me that the great majority of that is on private land. So there's an access issue that affects numbers taken. There's an access issue that probably affects the amount of time they put in on the hunts. So whether you're in favor of the 5-day or the 9-day I think that needs to be considered as how the data is compiled. And if I may just address a question from Cordell, and I would only go back to my memories, this southern RAC has in the past tried to make recommendations to reduce that archery hunt to a three-week period. We have also made recommendations or the RAC has made recommendations in the past to in fact limit it to not being statewide, not reduce the numbers but in fact limit it to where you apply to hunt in a region. That would relieve a lot of the pressure and spread it out a lot more. So that's just a comment I will share with you. And the only other thing is I think we need to examine, accelerate in this unit management plan. It is a well worth plan. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Garth Jones. He will be followed by Kelly Rollins.

Garth Jones: I'd simply like to support what's been presented here today for the 9-day hunt. It was interesting to me to note that the kill number of bucks killed in the 9-day or a 5-day really doesn't make much difference. So if you are for family traditions then you'll support what's been presented here. If you are against you'll vote against it. If you want the youth to get involved you'll support what's been presented here. If you're against youth getting involved you'll vote against it. Now I have sons and grandsons that will come to Utah and buy a nonresident tag if we have a 9-day hunt. And I'd just like to know that sometime my sons and grandsons and I can get together on the same hunt and hunt together, if it is every other year, whatever. But there are bucks out there. I'm one of these crazy archery hunters. I could hunt forever and never hit one. But they are the most dedicated hunters in this room. And if you can get close enough to hit one then so be it. And if it chases the deer around then so be it. But anyway I support what has been recommended here and I think we ought to get on with family traditions and it's not free, you understand how much this stuff does cost. So who in their right mind is going to buy three \$45.00 tags with a small chance that all three of you are going to land on the same deal at the same time and be able to hunt. So that's my comments. And I know you've got some tough decisions to make and. And the other thing is I think you need a woman on the board.

Jake Albrecht: Kelly Rollins, please come forward. Mike Dutson, please come forward, you're next.

Kelly Rollins, Beaver County Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife: I'm supporting, I'm with the Beaver County Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife. And we recommend that we keep this 5-day hunt for 2 more years or at least until you get your management plan into affect with micromanaging. And we'd like to see the archery hunt shortened. A good week would help. And we'd also like to see it on the limited entry too to where you have to draw for your region. Thanks.

Jake Albrecht: Mike Dutson. And then you are followed by Kelly Erickson.

Mike Dutson: I just wanted to express my opposition to opening Oak Creek South to general season hunting. It doesn't make a lot of sense to me. It seems like there's maybe better ways to manage that unit than to have a circus up there like we had two or three years ago when they opened the north end of that unit up. I know they did that for mainly for the depredation problems in Nephi and Elberta. I think a lot of those issues were resolved with that. Maybe not all, I know Nephi still has problems but you know we might want to consult Kevin Snow there in Nephi who owns a lot of the private property where those elk hang out. I know they've had problems, specifically with their corn and stuff there. Maybe a couple of other issues with fields in McCormick. I know that on the south end of that unit those elk do migrate off of the Pahvant but I know on the north end those elk are resident elk and there's a fairly healthy herd there. These guys that put in and complain about it, they should maybe do a little bit more research before they look at the odds and see that the draw odds are fairly good. This is one unit in the state you can actually draw a permit in your lifetime. And if you do your research you know what's expected and why the draw odds are good. I know on some of the deer hunts there's an asterisk that says, you know this isn't a trophy unit. Maybe there could be something said that, you know, don't expect to kill a 400 inch bull every outing. But I think with a little effort and maybe some changed plans this unit could be managed so you can at least go out and kill a branch antlered descent bull. I think that's a possibility. I don't think the answer is just to open that thing up to another circus, like I said they had a few years ago. Thanks

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Mike. Kelly Erickson you are followed by Dustin Greenhalgh.

Kelly Erickson: I would like to give my opposition to the extension of the hunting to a 9-day season. I think the 5-day season in my observation has been the most significant thing that the fish and game has done to increase the number of hunt-able bucks and the quality of bucks that I've seen in a long time. I too have sons and grandsons and I don't think it does any good to have a 9-day or a 14-day hunt if there's nothing left to hunt. I think that it's very important. It's been significant to the hunters that I know. I don't think that the fish and game's data is accurate. I think that every hunter that I talk to they wonder how they come up with these recommendations. I think that every deer hunter should have to fill out a harvest report, online or by phone. Let's get some real information into that process. 15 bucks per 100 is not enough. I'd like to see bigger bucks, more of them. And I'd like to see them do whatever they have to do to get to that point. Let's get some quality hunting going on in this state. And that's it.

Jake Albrecht: Thank you. Dustin Greenhalgh. You are followed by Bart Albrecht.

Dustin Greenhalgh: Mr Dutson covered pretty much all what I was going to say. I'd just like to say I oppose them opening the South Oak Creek to an any bull unit. But he covered most of it.

Jake Albrecht: Thank you, we appreciate that. Bart you are followed by Nick Blake or Danny.

Bart Albrecht: My main comments are towards the Thousand Lake unit being opened up to a general unit. And well you guys have my letter up there but just to state the facts that a lot of those deer will intermingle during the rut and it will also up-breed your southern end of your Fish Lake herd and the northern end of your Bolder herd as well as the Parker Mountain area. So if you're going to open it up you're going to eliminate a lot of potential breeding and a lot of potential there back out on the ground as well as, going by some of this data I just gathered up today, as far as satisfaction ratings on your hunters on the Thousand Lake, your archery was at 28.6 percent, your any weapon was at 90 percent and your muzzleloader was at 71.4 percent. And comparatively speaking with your Paunsaugunt, which was at 83 with your archery, it was down to 69 percent on your any weapon and 73 percent. So your hunter satisfaction is really quite high on the Thousand Lake unit, being as small as it is. And it has greater potential. It is one of the only units in the state that the landowners can let anybody who they want to hunt their land hunt an animal there and they have killed some pretty good critters on those lands. But you compare it with the San Juan; it was a 53 on the archery, 71 on the rifle and 12.5 on the muzzleloader as far as satisfaction. So if your hunters are satisfied with the unit being the way it is you ought to think seriously about keeping it that way. I mean we could throw the Henry Mountains in there but then we all know how the Henry Mountains is on their satisfaction. So I thank you for letting me have this opportunity.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Bart, we appreciate your comments. Nick Blake or Danny. They have left the building. Heath Burchinal.

Heath Burchinal, Utah Bowmen's Association (see attachment 3): Hi my name's Heath Burchinal. I'm representing the Utah Bowmen's Association. And I believe that you guys have the proposal that's been mailed to you or emailed to you, possibly? Do you guys have that?

Jake Albrecht: I never did get a copy.

Heath Burchinal: I'll go ahead and read this out loud. In summary I'll give a short explanation of what we're going to be proposing here. The Utah Bowmen's Association is proposing that archery elk season to open on the 3rd Saturday of August but the five-day extended limited entry bull elk archery hunt period and a 12-day extended any bull archery elk period. The first point is that the general archery elk hunt and the limited entry bull elk archery hunts will be opening on the, opening day to be moved forward and opening on the 3rd Saturday of August. This would pretty much put it to coincide with the 1st day of the deer hunt so it would be able to provide more enjoyable and successful hunting opportunities for the archer to have those both coincide. The second point would be that the general archery spike bull unit would be a 23-day hunt period, which would stay the same, but it

would close on the 4th Sunday after the opening. So it would end one week earlier. This would allow limited entry hunters to have less competition as the rut nears. As a hunter that drew out this year that was a big competition, competing against the spike hunters. And as the rut nears it gets important to be able to start making things count. The third point is that the general archery any bull elk time period is to be extended by 12 days to be a 35 day hunt period closing on the 5th Friday after the opening day. This would extend one week past the end of the general archery deer buck hunt and coincide with the youth bull elk. This would provide a more of a rut hunt for a general archery any bull elk hunter but it would create an issue where they may need to wear hunter orange being that it's going to be coinciding with the bull elk hunt. And the last point would be that the same rules and restrictions will apply on elk harvest according to spike bull units and any bull units. And that will be it.

Jake Albrecht: Have you got a copy of that letter that we should have got that you could leave with us?

Heath Burchinal: Yeah, that's fine; yeah I can leave it with ya.

Jake Albrecht: Greg McGregor, I'm sorry you're next. You're followed by Nolan Gardner.

Greg McGregor, Sportmen for Fish and Wildlife: I'm representing the Dixie Chapter of Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife. I appreciate your hearing us out tonight. I know what an effort it is on your behalf, time and sacrifice and energy. I've been there, done that so I appreciate that very much. I'll hurry and look through a couple of these issues. First of all, the five-day hunt. I believe that just because it pencils out on paper doesn't necessarily mean that it's right. And like I said before the buck to doe ratio on the Pine Valley before we went to this 5-day was 5 per 100. That has increased and has maintained at that. I believe that most of the people that we talked to out and about concur that that hunt has been a benefit to the hunters and the animals in this area. So we would like to suggest and recommend that it stay at the 5-day hunt. Regarding the Thousand Lakes unit. We would like to see that that, some effort be made on that unit's behalf. You've got a great hunting unit to the east of there, the Henry Mountains is a great hunting unit. It's one of the best in the nation. You've got another great unit to the south and the east in the Paunsaugunt. Close it for a couple of years. Put some effort into it. Kill some predators. Do some habitat management. Tend it a little bit. Let it take its course. It can be another great limited entry unit if we'll put some time and effort into it. Okay? We just need to not throw our arms up in the air and say, you know we tried. Let's give it some time and let's make some effort out of that. Regarding also the back to the 5-day real quick, the youth hunters, if they draw a rifle tag we all know that they've got the opportunity to hunt the archery, the muzzleloader and the rifle. So they do have that opportunity. If they can't do that then let's take the second 4-days of that 9-day hunt and let's give it to the youth only. And I've heard the arguments, well there's policing it, and there's control, and sure the dad's maybe going to shoot the buck if the kid doesn't. Well if it's a 9-day hunt and that dad's got a tag anyway that buck's dead anyway. Let's give those kids a chance to get out and benefit from that. Even though, let's us adults sit back and give that opportunity to those kids to be able to do that. We're losing them and we need to generate some programs to get them back. Let's keep the South Oak Creek unit in limited entry. Not only that let's bring back the north unit too. You know that was a good unit. And when that unit got made an open unit, several years, 78 good bulls were killed on that unit that year. And because somebody elected not to build a fence somewhere where those animals are depreddating in on those crops and such, we had to go in and eliminate those animals. I'm sure there's other viable options and we need to consider those. So let's not only not close the southern one, let's reopen the northern one and let's make that a great hunting unit also. I think I've basically expressed the concerns that we had as the Dixie Chapter for Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife. Once again we appreciate your time and your energy on our behalf. Good luck and thank you very much.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Greg. Nolan Gardner followed by Troy Babb.

Nolan Gardner: Greg touched on most everything but I wouldn't feel right if I didn't get up here to bother Doug anyway. But again the 5-day hunt, and we can sit here and argue all day, but if we open this up and especially in the southern end of the state to a 9-day hunt you'd just totally wipe out everything that we've gained, all those big nice bucks. And I'm all for the youth. I agree. If we could put that second weekend to the youth I'd do it in a heartbeat. But to see what we had out there last, before we went to the 5-day and you couldn't find anything but a forked horn. I don't know how you could justify putting it back and losing it. At least keep it the 5-day until we

do the deer management plans and regroup then. I'm all for doing away with statewide archery. I think that it eliminates a quality hunt. You take away the opportunity for people that put in legit. And then also, I've heard several people slam the archery and people thing, I'm against archery hunters. What I'm against is I'm against an archery hunter that can go there half way through the hunt and buy a tag and go buy a bow and go out and wound a deer. You guys, I commend you guys that are good archery hunters, and avid archery hunters. I think that's great. But I also think that you ought to try to promote sportsmanship and promote people to, I don't know, be a little better shots or something. I'll shut up there before I get shot in the back with an arrow. One more thing, I feel there's a problem with having to buy the small game or the fishing or the combination tag. For a lot of people, just to put in for a deer tag. I've heard some comments over through the deer hunt that you know, a lot of people it has taken two or three years for them to draw a tag and especially I'm talking to women that might not want to hunt too much but they enjoy going out with their family. And now it might cost them \$120 dollars before they ever get that tag. I think that's something we ought to look at is to eliminate or somehow figure out so that they get a tag, if you put in every year you should get one every other year. I don't think that's happening. And if we need to change the point system or make it so that they don't have to buy that tag just to put in, or buy the hunting license just to put in for a deer tag. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks. Troy you're followed by Todd Abelhouzen.

Troy Babb Oak Creek Land Owners Assoc.: I appreciate your time. My name's Troy Babb. I represent the landowners association for the Oak Creek unit and 236 sportsmen that signed that paper in the last three days (see attachment 4). We strongly oppose opening the Oak Creek Elk Unit to an any bull unit. I have two letters there. One, the first one is from the biggest landowner in our association which pretty much says if you open it to an any bull unit he will close his land to all hunting to anyone. He doesn't want to deal with all the people it's going to create. The second one is from a Landowner in the McCormick area that gets hit pretty hard by elk in his fields. And you can see that he strongly disagrees with opening it and that he thought that putting this landowner association together has done away with most of the elk, the landowner problems. And I did too. I've only heard of one, last year, one complaint in the McCormick area. And I believe that the elk that are causing the problem should be done away with, not the elk on the entire unit. And as far as habitat, I don't know what the Division considers habitat but our mountain is $\frac{3}{4}$ burned off. Most of it is grass and elk eat grass. So to say it's not elk habitat is false. And as far as the migratory elk, I agree with the migratory elk being in the Cove Fort area. That is a migratory herd. They cross back and forth there. The northern part of the unit has been fenced for a long time. Those elk are resident elk. They've been there a long time. We get a few bulls that might cross over an overpass, under an underpass to the Oak Creek side but it is not a migratory unit on the north side. And as far as small bulls and people complaining about small bulls, I believe that's the DWRs fault. I believe we are putting out way too many tags for this unit and that it should be cut back to where we have some quality elk again. And I believe that if this is open to an any bull unit it will be an any bull unit for one year and 90 percent of the elk will be gone because everybody that's got an any bull tag will be on that mountain next year. And I appreciate your time, thanks.

Todd Alehouzen, Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife: I just brought some controversial issues up with me. Todd Abelhouzen. And Greg McGregor represented our organization. It's my wife's birthday. I was going to have you sing happy birthday to her but she left, so I'll save you that hassle. I also feel very strongly about the 5-day hunt and some of the other things that were said. And I want to complement the Division for having a new thought process. Since I've been involved I've seen a change. I've seen it focus on working with the conservation groups. I've seen it focus on working with landowners and conservation groups; where we may have been pitted against one another previously. County commissioners, landowners and conservation groups and sportsmen and even the non-sportsmen seem to be looking a little bit more at it like an overall protecting the resource which is not only these wonderful animals that we have the opportunity to hunt but the youth and the ability for us to go out and enjoy seeing these animals the other 360 days a year rather than just on a 5-day hunt. And so I appreciate the effort by the Division. I also appreciate the willingness by the RAC. I was asked to read a letter from Brian Coles, from Oak City, Utah, who could not attend. He will attend another one of the RAC meetings and he sent this to our website and SFW asked me to read this. "I am writing about the proposal to do away with the Oak Creek limited entry elk hunt. I am planning on attending the RAC in Springville next week to voice my disapproval but wanted to write my reason for official record. Number 1: First I have a question on the agenda

and propose reasons are given in each hunt proposed changed but this unit. No reason is given why they want to open the area to general season. Why is this being proposed?" And I think we've received a really good answer from that from Sean. Good job Sean. Um, "why is it Utah is known for too many hunters going to areas like this and devastating herds. It isn't just those that traditionally hunt the area that go to it, it's everyone that can. Examples are what happened on the Book Cliffs deer when they removed the three-point or better restriction, the Fish Lake unlimited cow tags, the Oak Creek North elk hunt when they opened it. The result is long term loss of elk and deer numbers that take years to come back. Worse are the safety concerns this proposal raises. The Oak Creek elk herd congregates to just a small area for the unit. I had this tag and so have my son and several friends. The area is small and if you get that many hunters in these small areas bad things could happen. That is just unwise. Another issue is the Oak Creek limited entry deer unit. The general season hunt is at the same time as the limited entry Oak Creek rifle unit. This would create conflicts between elk and deer hunters and ruin limited entry area hunter opportunities. This would also increase numbers scouting and spooking the deer. Lastly not every elk hunt has to be a 400-bull unit. The Oak Creek unit does not go undersubscribed. Individuals want to hunt this unit limited entry. It takes the pressure off of the other areas like the Pahvant and better units and offers more hunting opportunities in the state. It gives more opportunities not less. Please do not support or pass this proposal." I'm going to leave this for the RAC for you guys Jake. And one other point I wanted to make, Nolan brought up the youth. Just a real quick point, that Nolan brought up the youth and the women that are not able to buy a tag every year. And I have proposed through Dixie Wildlife that we create a special fund, and feel free to contact me, 703-0224. We're going to put together a special fund every year where we help people that are having challenges financially, or families that are trying to get their kids involved, where we actually help them with those permit fees. Set aside \$500 or \$1,000 and try to build upon that. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Todd. Okay we have used up all of the yellow cards, which is a comment from the public. I handed out a packet to each board member that has maybe 8 to 10 letters addressing the Thousand Lake unit. (See attachment 2) Since I put that packet together at noon today I have received probably 10 more. I don't know whether you guys want me to read each one of them or just kind of give you a consensus. Out of all these there's not one in favor of opening the thousand lake. I'm going to take time to read a couple of them. This one was from Paul Pace who was here a couple of months ago when we were addressing the buffalo issue. "As a landowner in the Thousand Lake hunting unit I am against the opening of this unit for any reason. This unit stands as an island which protects the gene pool and helps all the units surrounding it. Recently in the local paper, The Insider, I read that the DWR was considering the Thousand Lake limited entry deer unit to be changed to a general season. The Thousand Lake unit provides a better gene pool for the areas surrounding units. Bucks come into our fields and cross onto the Fish Lake and Boulder units. This increases and produces better bucks. I feel this would be a mistake and would ruin a great gene pool. For these reasons I support Thousand Lake as is." This one talks about the same. I had one in here that I wanted to read because it was from a lady who, oh it's right here. Brandon Chase and Nancy Barton, Salina, Utah. "I would just like to take a moment to let you know that I am opposed to turning the Thousand Lakes into a general entry deer unit. My husband and I have enjoyed viewing the mature bucks produced in Thousand Lakes and would like to share that with our son and future generations. If this limited entry unit is converted into a general entry unit it will greatly reduce the number of mature deer in our region." So in other words she's not a hunter but she enjoys looking at the wildlife. Anyway, I've got ten or twelve more of them to read. They are all in favor of leaving the Thousand Lake unit as is. Okay, our next part of our meeting is comments from the RAC.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Jake Albrecht: I wrote down some of the issues that we need to cover. The first one was Gordon Poppitt's, extending the deadline into February. We had several people comment about family tradition and youth and they'd like to extend it to 9 days. We had three or four people, one from Beaver and a couple from the Dixie Wildlife who wanted to leave it at 5 days and shorten the archery, as well as look into the southwest area of the state as trying to make it better. We also need to talk about the Oak Creek South on the elk unit. Conflict with the deer season or something there, we'll probably go over that. Did you guys get anything else that we need to discuss on that? Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Someone brought up something about changing archery date hunts on the elk hunt. That was brought up and as an archer and someone who was involved in the limited entry archery elk hunt. Right now the rifle tags are during part of the rut. The primitive weapon tags are before and after. And I think it would be a good idea to give them another week on that archery hunt and to have some kind of a gap between that archery and the rifle hunt. The last three days of my archery hunt was inundated by rifle hunters up there scouting. It kept everything on the wild. So I think that is a valid suggestion to possibly move that hunt one week deeper into August. Isn't that the comment that was, isn't that what you said?

Jake Albrecht: I think that was, the archery elk season was brought up by Heath Burchinal.

Sam Carpenter: Right.

Jake Albrecht: Yeah, I have that down. Okay. I don't know exactly how to deal this but I think the best way to do it rather than jump back and forth on our comments is let's start with Gordon's on the extending of the deadline from January 31st to February 15th? Okay, let's comment on that for a minute. The main reason that he wants to do that or needs to do that is because of the people that are coming into the program. He felt like he needs the extended time to get those youth through that. I don't know what conflicts that will make with DWR of whether there's any at all. So let's start from there.

Anis Aoude: The conflict that we have is the permits that are allocated for the convention permits. We're trying to get the drawing done before the convention happens so people when they have to buy their license aren't having to buy it at the convention, basically. So that's the reason we set the date to the end of January. In the future when the convention no longer happens it will probably be the whole, until February whatever. But that's the main reason for that date. As far as the hunter ed stuff, I've got some data on how many youth... I mean the ones that go in the January class will be able to put in for the draw. The only ones that won't be able to put in, it's a February one. And it's a small number, the classes are usually the smallest in February. So what we planned on doing is notifying all the instructors and putting it on our online, when they go online, that you need to have your hunter ed finished by the end of January if you want to put in for the draw. So that was the way we were going to deal with that aspect of it

Jake Albrecht: So you're stating that the January 1st deadline will be for another 3 to 4 years?

Anis Aoude: Probably 2 more years. '09 I think is the last year.

Jake Albrecht: Wasn't that approved for like a 5-year convention period?

Anis Aoude: It's 5 year, yeah.

Jake Albrecht: And we've had one.

Anis Aoude: I'm not sure how it's going to play out.

Jake Albrecht: It was approved for 5. Gordon, do you have another comment? Come on up to the mic.

Gordon Poppitt: I think in the confusion Anis used the wrong word. One of the things he said was that they have to have the drawing before the convention. That's not what he really, I hope that's not what he really meant because according to Allen Clark the intent is in fact to provide the opportunity before the convention so that they can get those necessary combination licenses. So they have them, if they're going to be planning on putting in for one of the special permits they have that in place. If the prior date that we've carried over for the last two years was you could apply between the 15th of January until the 15th of February. That would put them where they wouldn't have a chance to get that application in before then. The logic of extending it to the 15th, like Anis said, it is not a necessity, but it makes it a little bit tight if you've got to ensure that hunter ed classes do finish. The concern is we could get inclement weather and it would shoot it back. School opens on the 2nd, which is a Wednesday. You couldn't start a class until the following week. It makes it very close and that's my concern. If

instructors are aware of it and they can get it in that and complete it that's fine. It's not a major controversy, please believe that. It's just a suggestion. There's no real reason since, and again Allen Clark told me specifically they plan to change back to the 15th of February in 2009. Now maybe that he didn't convey to Anis. So anyway that's it. And I'm sorry. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Comments? We really don't have any comments but I'd like to move forward off this with some type of motion and treat them individually.

James Edwards: I think Gordon pretty well answered it. He's not opposed to it. We just thought maybe that it would be better for the youth that's trying to get the license. And I think with his understanding that maybe the Division is going to put that on their website and also to the instructors. I think that pretty well answers that question that we can just go ahead and approve what the Division wants from January 1 to January 31.

Jake Albrecht: And if you don't want to change it from January to February then we'll just leave it as is and approve it as part of the general plan. Okay? So if we've gone through discussing that one the next one is the Thousand Lake unit that I wrote down. We only had one speaker here tonight, which traveled probably 3, 4 or five hours to get here from Loa. But we've had strong opposition, as you've seen with your packet. It's not very often that I, since I've become chairman that I get to voice an opinion like I probably should. But this unit is east of Loa and Forsyth. It's quite a large size. It has Capitol Reef as part of its boundary. My family loves to hunt in that area. We don't see a lot of, there's not a lot of bucks to does over there, that's why I question. But once in a while you'll come upon a good buck and we take that chance. And Thousand Lake feeds them other areas as well as from Bart's comments, the hunters are quite successful and they're happy with that unit. It gives people a chance every 3 or 4 years, 5 years or whatever, to hunt a good unit that produces a 30 inch buck or down. My boy got one this year that was 28.5 and scored 191. The only buck we seen on the opposite side. I'd like to see it stay the way it is for now and see which way the state goes with their management plans. I'd ask for a motion that we deny the DWRs request to open it to a general season and leave it as is.

James Edwards: I have one comment too on that. The Division has stated that they have trouble keeping the 25 bucks to 100 doe ratio on it. So to me rather than open it up, that's just a good reason to leave it as a limited entry. If we can't even keep it, struggle to keep it to the 25 bucks per 100 does now. Let's keep it the way it is.

Del LeFevre: Do you need a motion on that Mr. Chairman or are you going to do them all?

Douglas Messerly: I guess I'd just like to make one comment on that. And it's obvious what's going to happen here, but one of the reasons that we have a difficult time maintaining that objective, and the same thing is true on the Oak Creek, the circumstances don't really provide us an opportunity to manage to the objective. In both the Oak Creek management plan and the Thousand Lake management plan, which this committee or at least some members of this committee passed, we predicted that both these things would be recommendations and there was very little comment at the time. But on the Oak Creek unit, some of the members may not be aware but all the private lands that are within the unit are general season. So when the deer move into the hay fields they are taken without restriction. They are taken as general season. I'm sorry, the Thousand Lake. I'm sorry, you are right. And it is the same on the Oak Creek actually with the deer. But we have a difficult time maintaining that buck to doe ratio as a result of that. It doesn't matter how many permits we have on the Thousand Lake. What matters more is how successful they are in the fields surrounding the Thousand Lakes. So it's a difficult proposition for us to manage to objective. What has been said about the deer that are there is certainly true. Numbers aren't great and it is a good opportunity for people to go view animals if they want to. But we can provide more opportunity this way by opening it up to general season. And frankly we're relieved of the burden of trying to meet an objective that we just can't meet.

Jake Albrecht: Just a comment on Doug's. If we open that up to a general season we will provide more opportunity for about 2 years, and then we'll be back to spikes and two points and dissatisfied hunters. I'd ask for a motion.

Dell LeFevre: I'll make that motion that we leave it as a limited entry, the Thousand Lake unit.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a motion by Del LeFevre to leave it as a limited entry unit, and a second by Jim Edwards. Any other discussion? If not I'll call for a vote. All those in favor please raise your hands. So we've got 4 on this side, 5,6,7. Any against? You abstained Harry? Okay 8. All in favor? All of us were in favor of that. Motion carries.

Dell LeFevre made the motion to leave the thousand lake unit limited entry. James Edwards seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Jake Albrecht: Okay next one is the Oak Creek unit. Jim I hate to put you on the spot but we need some advice.

James Edwards: You know when I was first talked to about this from several of the sportsmen in the Delta area I kind of had mixed emotions and I thought that maybe that what Sean and the Division wanted to do is correct. But the more that I've discussed it with these sportsmen and they've exerted their opinion onto me, I think that we should leave it as it is. And I think that Greg had a really good idea. I think we should maybe extend the Oak Creek South to include the Oak Creek North unit and make it all a limited entry with the same numbers that we've got on the Oak Creek South.

Jake Albrecht: Okay so what you're stating is combine the two together?

James Edwards: Yes I think we should bind the two together again and keep it as a limited entry unit for both the Oak Creek South and the Oak Creek North as one unit. I know that they had some depredation problems on that Oak Creek North, there on the church farm, but I think that's all been resolved now, and of course all of those bulls have been killed now. I think we ought to take and keep that as a limited entry unit and keep both of them together. I'll make that as a motion that we keep the Oak Creek South unit as it is and add the Oak Creek North unit to it to combine as one limited entry unit with the numbers of the permits that's on the south now. Not increase the permits just keep the same as what's on the south unit now.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a motion by Jim to combine the two units and leave the numbers (permit) as they are now.

Anis Aoude: We can't set numbers now anyway, so the numbers part may not be important.

Steve Dalton: I'll second that.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a second. Any other discussion?

Steve Flinders: North of the river is the central region?

Jake Albrecht: A comment from Doug.

Douglas Messerly: One brief comment. If in fact we do that, and it's my understanding that it might affect the current landowner association on the South Oak Creek because we would then have to consider all the private property in the entire unit and it may disqualify them as a land owner association so that is a consideration with combining those units.

Jake Albrecht: State that again.

Doug Messerly: Okay if we combine two units and make it one limited entry unit the landowner association rule requires that 51 percent of the habitat that is privately owned in the unit be represented in a landowner association. Currently the landowner association in the South Oak Creek meets that objective. If we include all the property in the North Oak Creek unit in this one limited entry unit, my guess is there's going to be a lot more private land that's introduced into the management unit and therefore would require more landowners to join the

association in order for the association to meet the 51 percent requirement. So I guess the long story short, this may have implications if this were to pass the Wildlife Board. It may have implications on the landowner association.

Jake Albrecht: How many tags does that association have, do you know? 5? Okay.

Audience Member: Can I make a comment on that?

Jake Albrecht: We're comments from the RAC right now. Let's see what this goes for a second. Okay so we had a motion to approve the two and then it was seconded. Do we have any other discussion here? Harry.

Harry Barber: I'm just worried that we're muddying the waters by trying to include the central piece without really knowing how it's going to impact these other issues like Doug just described. If we could I'd rather just keep it to the point that the DWR made this evening rather than bring that other issue into it.

Jake Albrecht: Steve, do you have a comment?

Steve Flinders: I was just thinking about the management plan on that Oak Creek unit, north part, this would be a dramatic change what that management plan reflects, north of that river. I think it still stands as the highest depredation payment ever made by the state for one crop of \$38,000. There's still a lot of bad blood about the management direction and the changes that were made up there. And at some point maybe those changes could be made but they probably should be addressed at management plan first with those landowners that do continue to provide what would be the best habitat out there. It is a grassland from one end to the other but it's dry, really dry in July, and those elk get desperate and usually come to town.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, if we vote on the motion as presented we might have some implications with the CWMU as well as maybe some other gray areas that maybe we shouldn't be going into. But we could call for a vote and then if it's rejected why we'll go from there.

Clair Woodbury: Can we amend that?

Jake Albrecht: If you want to amend a motion you always test my ability, you're welcome to Clair.

Clair Woodbury: I don't want to test you this late.

Jake Albrecht: Thank you very much. Let's call for a vote to see how people vote. If it doesn't go through why we'll go back through it again. Okay all those in favor of the motion please raise your hand. All those against? .

James Edwards made a motion to combine the Oak Creek North and Oak Creek South into one limited entry elk unit with the same number of permits currently allotted on the South unit. Steve Dalton seconded. Motion failed. 0 in favor, all 8 against. Motion failed.

Jake Albrecht: Okay so everybody's against. So Jim we're back to you

James Edwards: I'll try this one more time. I think we ought to take and leave the South unit as is and not open it and I'll make that as a motion to leave the South Oak Creek unit as is.

Steve Dalton: I'll second that.

Jake Albrecht: Now we have a second by Steve Dalton. Any other discussion?

Steve Flinders: You're sick of hearing from me but to speak on behalf of Sean Kelly's behalf a little bit. I was part of that management plan process; the Forest Service was, along with the BLM and some landowner representatives, as well as county commission representatives. And Sean's recommendation's in concert with

what that working group came up in the management plan that I guess will be presented next spring?
(Unintelligible)

Jake Albrecht: So with what you're saying a year down the road we'll be looking back at the management plan sometime?

Sean Kelly: No this spring

Steve Flinders: This spring.

Jake Albrecht: This spring, okay. All right, any other discussion? All in favor please raise your hands. One, two, three, four, five, six. All against? 6-2, motion carries.

James Edwards made the motion to leave the South Oak Creek Unit limited entry and not open it to general season hunting. Steve Dalton seconded. Motion carries, 6 in favor, 2 opposed. (Steve Flinders and Harry Barber opposed.)

Jake Albrecht: We had a little discussion about this archery elk season. You guys, as well as myself, never got anything as far as an alert to this. And that's why I asked him to turn that into the DWR. So my recommendation on that, where we really haven't looked at that, would be to leave that and bring it back in, ask Heath to come back next year and have his proposal written and everybody get a copy of it so we can look at it before the meeting and make some rational decisions. There was a lot of things that would change in that. I think it would muddy a lot of different things. So that would be my suggestion not to turn Heath away from what his suggestions are but I don't think you can make the right decisions on what information you got. Do you guys feel comfortable with that?

Sam Carpenter: Doug, do you agree? I mean what kind of a nightmare would that be to try to move that hunt back a week? You'd have to change basically the entire rifle structure and muzzleload wouldn't you to do that? Well I know the rifle hunt falls right behind the archery hunt, there is no break.

Douglas Messerly: The day after. At this point on limited entry units the rifle starts the day after the archery hunt ends. So they're, one could argue they're at the same time, you know, they're during the rut, which varies from year to year.

Heath Burchinal: (speaking from audience, not recorded)

Jake Albrecht: Heath, you're not going to get on the tape so please come up to the mic and we'll give you just a second.

Heath Burchinal: With how it's proposed the only date that will change back to a later date would be the general archery any bull units, or any bull hunt. And that would, and as far as I understand that would not affect any limited entry bull units because that doesn't exist for those to overlap on the same unit. Correct?

Jake Albrecht: I am too and that's why I think we need to look at this later.

Sam Carpenter: I thought you were talking about limited entries and the rifle hunt being butted right up against each other and wanted to hunt a week deeper into August in the limited entry hunts.

Heath Burchinal: The limited entry hunt would change 5 days earlier it would end at the same day that it ends now. It would start 5 days earlier coinciding with the archery deer hunt. So they would both start at the same time. The open bull, any bull hunt would be extended 5 days further back which would give those hunters an opportunity to hunt the rut, but it would be a general season any bull hunt. So it shouldn't affect any hunts.

Sam Carpenter: Okay I've got to agree with Jake here that we need to maybe put this down the road a year and do some more, get some support, get some documentation, something we can really look at and everybody be on the same page before we make any motions or carry it any further.

Heath Burchinal: Okay. Yeah it was supposed, I was told that it was sent off. I know that you knew about it a little bit. But we'll get you the information.

Jake Albrecht: We'd really like to have those a week in advance, if possible.

Heath Burchinal: As far as I understand it was several weeks but I'm not sure who it was sent to.

Jake Albrecht: I'm kind of speaking as part of the group here but I think if we delay this a year and give us a chance to look at that we can make a rational decision.

Heath Burchinal: Okay, I think it's going to be proposed at other RAC meetings but I don't, we'll see how that goes. I thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks. Clair, have you got a comment?

Clair Woodbury: Yeah, Heath that sounds like some really good stuff that we need to look at. But if we can put that on the action log, maybe you could send a letter to us and get on the action log then we can study it out and be a little bit more prepared for it next time.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, I think other than to pass the main part of the whole plan is, the next item is decide whether you want to go 5-day or 9-day. Greg, Dixie Wildlife, 5 years ago you guys came in, I think, with that area around Pine View, it was the only one that was opened to 5-day, is that correct? Pine Valley, excuse me. The southern part and the southeastern part joined 2 years ago, is that correct? Was part of the Carmel area part of that Pine Valley when you originated? I'm just going to make some comments on some people that have called me. They didn't send me any e-mails. But I've had comments from people who don't want to hunt on Sunday who have to work on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. That leaves them one day. They would like to go back to the 9-day hunt where they actually have 2 weekends, or two days, excuse me, two out of the 9 days to hunt. And then we've had some comments that people want to leave it at 5-day because they think that it's going in the right direction. My question is if the Monroe unit really needs some help. I think part of that has got to do with the cougar study that's on there. I don't know that, I can't prove that as a fact but since we've been doing that study why that unit's been going down every year. I think it needs to stay at five or less, or closed. But you know this is kind of like a planning and zoning meeting where you can't satisfy everybody but yet you try to do the best. There are a lot of people that want to hunt more days and have a chance to see a bigger buck. And my suggestion is they better put in for Thousand Lake. So anyway, it's split 50/50, 60/40, whatever you want to do. It's a tough decision. But we're open for comments.

Steve Flinders: It's after 9:00. I'll cut to the chase and make a motion and see where it goes. These, there's been a lot of folks here that have commented on these items and the Division made a good presentation to the 9-day or 5-day hunt. I would move that we accept all the Division recommendations, the balance of the recommendations. I think we have handled the contentious issues; so the balance of the Divisions recommendations with the exception that the Pine Valley be a 5-day.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, if I get your motion correct you would approve the rest of the Division's recommendations with the exception of Pine Valley staying at a 5-day hunt. Is that correct? Okay, do we have a second on that?

James Edwards: I'll second that.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we've got a second by Jim Edwards and now we have discussion. Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: I think you've got to do it one way or the other. I think we went through this before. And if you leave Pine Valley 5-days they hunt 5-days down there and then they come on up to the rest of the southern area and hunt the other 4. So I don't think you can do a split. I think you've either got to have a 5-day hunt or a 9-day hunt.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, thanks Cordell.

Sam Carpenter: Yeah I'd like to comment. I've really delved into this one heavy. And I've got with an awful lot of sportsmen. There's been an awful lot of mixed comments about it. There's probably, I'll say 3 out of every 10 hunters that I talked to about it, or sportsmen, is opposed to the 9-day opening. When we brought up the unit to unit and start micromanaging the units then everyone was in favor of the 9-day hunt to take place. Once we control the number of hunters that go into each one of these units. Now what happens, it's like what's been brought up several times here tonight, if we take these, I think it's been six years now that we've been doing the 5-day hunts, and we start opening this up to 9-day hunts we're going to lose what we've gained, when we sacrificed those years doing the 5-day hunt. So the consensus, I'm not going to make a recommendation at this time, but I do want to make the point that I think we need to stay with the 5-day hunt until we go to unit-to-unit management. And find out where we're at then on that when we do that.

Jake Albrecht: Okay Clair Woodbury.

Clair Woodbury: Sam you and I agree on just about everything but not this one. We tried to split 5-day 9-day hunt in the past where Pine Valley was 5-day and the rest of the unit was 9. Exactly what happened is Pine Valley got hunted 5-day and the second weekend everybody moved to the Sands, to Beaver Mountain, to all of the other areas that were still open. And it was a disaster for the east side of I-15. We either have to stay 5 or go to 9 on the whole unit. Now my personal opinion and I hope I don't waffle here, is that a 5-day hunt we should dig a great big deep hole and dump it in there and never bring it up again. A 5-day hunt is terrible. Quality of hunt is a lot more than just seeing a lot of big animals out there. What we've got now is 5 opening days, in a lot of areas. As our statistics has shown by Anis the harvest stays the same 5 or 9. And I trust those figures. What we do is we double the length of the hunt. We cut the pressure in half by the hunters. All of the people that I've talked to are 100 percent on going to the 9-day. Let's get rid of this 5-day once and for all. Did I waffle on that?

Jake Albrecht: Any other discussion?

Steve Flinders: I hear a consensus building. I can amend that motion. Did I say emotion or motion? Too much emotion. Mr. Chairman I amend that motion.

Jake Albrecht: Marty do you want to deal with this now or later?

Steve Flinders: I'll withdraw this motion and make a new one.

Jake Albrecht: Actually I think we'd be better off to vote on the motion and see where it goes.

Steve Flinders: I hear a consensus of 9-days. Now you can't talk me out of it. Accept the balance of the proclamation as recommended. That means the region's 9-days.

James Edwards: I will second that.

Jake Albrecht: We did this once before and I spent time.

Gordon Poppitt: (speaking from the audience, not recorded)

James Edwards: I withdraw the second.

Jake Albrecht: Well what's wrong with just voting? Okay. Marty you didn't hear anything but both the motion and a second have been withdrawn. We have a new motion now to accept the DWRs proposal as presented, the remainder of the items, which would include a 9-day hunt.

James Edwards: I'll second that.

Jake Albrecht: That is seconded by Jim Edwards. We are open for discussion. Seeing no other discussion, Harry Barber.

Harry Barber: Just a question for Teresa, item 13 on the memorandum that was provided to us, I'll just read it to you. Recommending a change in the boundary for North Slope moose, pronghorn, big horn sheep. I'm thinking about the Kaiparowitz. I had a number of phone calls this year from folks that were hunting pronghorn on the Kaiparowitz and those folks were calling from Escalante wondering where the pronghorn were because the Kaiparowitz is a big unit. Is it possible to adjust that boundary description for pronghorn? I know it's easier to keep that in the Kaiparowitz unit as described but we don't have pronghorn up in the Escalante desert.

Teresa Bonzo: So you want to tighten that up?

Harry Barber: I'd like to tighten up the pronghorn description for that part of the Kaiparowits. Do you understand what I'm saying? East of Kanab is where we have those pronghorn but we don't have them up in Escalante. We may not want them. But folks are going out there because when you look at the description for pronghorn.

Teresa Bonzo: They just look at the great big Kaiparowitz unit.

Harry Barber: Yeah but they don't know the area. They just look at the great big area that's called the Kaiparowitz and they're going out there and searching and they're not finding anything. Maybe that's the way you want to keep it.

Teresa Bonzo: And we do have some defined boundaries, like you said, that coincide with the sheep hunt. We've got the Escalante, the Kaiparowits East and West.

Anis Aoude: We're actually trying to go in the other direction to make units units, and then that way if they're not there, if the guys go out and scout they should be able to find where they are. Or they could call the biologist or whatever. It's easier to have a unit than so many subunits for the proclamation part of it. But you guys can do whatever you please, I guess.

Douglas Messerly: Harry I'd just like to respond to that too. If you'll just have them call our office instead we'll take care of the calls. Another opportunity, we may have another opportunity to send them a letter. There's only a hand full of permits, right? And say, this is where to find an antelope. And that might solve this problem.

Jake Albrecht: Are you okay with that Harry?

Harry Barber: Always, always fine.

Jake Albrecht: Any other discussion on this motion then? Seeing none all those in favor of the motion please raise your hand. We have one, two, three, four. A little higher please. Are we still at four or five? Okay we have four for. All those against? One, two, three, we have four against. Thanks a lot guys. How far is it out of town? I'm going to give you a little rationale for my decision before I vote.

Jake Albrecht: I've had most of my people that have called me have been in favor of extending the unit to a 9-day hunt. In the area where I've been hunting the last two or three years the numbers have decreased from what they were before we went to a 5-day from 9-day hunt. And I will say that for all of the Fish Lake, the Monroe. I can't speak for the West Mountain and I can't speak for the Southern Region, down here is St. George. But I vote in favor of a 9-day hunt. So I vote for the 9-day and the recommendation of the DWR. Motion passes.

Steve Flinders made the motion to accept the remaining Bucks & Bulls and Once-in-a-Lifetime Proclamation & Rule as presented. Motion passed 5 in favor, 4 opposed (Cordell Pearson, Del LeFevre Steve Dalton, Sam Carpenter opposed) (Jake Albrecht voted in favor due to tie vote).

Caliber Restrictions (Action)

-Lenny Reese, Hunter Education Coordinator

See attachment 1.

Questions from the RAC:

James Edwards: Is this just for deer or is this for all big game?

Lenny Rees: It's for all big game. The State of Utah right now has any center-fire rifle is legal for big game and as the presentation showed there were several other states that had the same restriction.

James Edwards: So we can use a 17 grain 17 caliber to kill an elk?

Lenny Rees: As long as it's center-fire, yes Sir.

James Edwards: It's center-fire.

Jake Albrecht: Was the Wildlife Board's action on this to look at larger rifles being able to shoot 1000 yards, for example, and actually not giving an animal any type of, you know what I'm saying?

Lenny Rees: I'm not sure. I couldn't speculate on that. I'm not sure what the Wildlife Board, the only thing I was told was to look into the surrounding states, what type of regulations they had on caliber restrictions. So I better not speculate on the Wildlife Board's thoughts.

Jake Albrecht: I've often wondered that since we went up to the convention a year ago and there was one group that had a video there, I think it was an antelope, you could barely see it in. And you know when you hear the sound of the gun go off and then you wait about four or five seconds and the animal rolls over. And I was wondering if maybe that's which direction is maybe the sporting chance, is we're getting some guns that are shooting way too far or optics that are putting us to where there is no sporting chance for the animals.

Lenny Rees: Sure. And the only state that has a restriction on that is Idaho. And they didn't restrict the caliber they restricted the weight of the rifle, which in turn restricted the 50 caliber.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, any other questions from the RAC? All right Clair.

Clair Woodbury: Is that 50 caliber something we need to look at in a moral and ethical hunting situation?

Lenny Rees: That's a social issue.

Clair Woodbury: Do we address social issues here?

Lenny Rees: Oh definitely, there is no question about it. I think one thing on 50 caliber, if we look into it, for example at 1,000 yards a 50 caliber with a 661-grain bullet it drops just under 20 feet at 1,000 yards. But I would have to look into that a little bit deeper to get into that. I'm not prepared to really make a statement other than what I have.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have no comment cards and I don't believe we have any additional comments from our RAC members. So do we have a motion? Harry? Do you have a question Gordon?

Questions from the Public:

Gordon Poppitt: I received an e-mail from Mike Small, and I didn't know whether you had received that same e-mail, it was regarding a potential change in Arizona to get away from the use of lead bullets. And I think they were looking at alternative materials. But what it relates back to is has any consideration been given to muzzle energy which relates to, obviously, the bullet, and the weight and so on, and the trajectory?

Lenny Rees: Not to my knowledge. One thing that was really conclusive on every state that I've talked with, a well placed shot with at 17-caliber is more effective than a poor shot with a 30:06. So you know, you can get into the bullet weights . . . We did about 15 years ago, as I recall, we eliminated the, we went to a 23 or 24-caliber or larger. It was in the proclamation. That rule was changed before the deer hunt come around because of the outcry of the public and the sporting goods stores that had purchased a lot of 22:25s. Like I say, this is what the other states use. There's definitely a whole bunch of different things, look at our handgun calibers with the different weights, the different calibers, the different muzzle velocity, velocity at 100 yards, things like that. There's a whole spectrum of rules that could be implemented on the rifle caliber. There certainly is.

Jake Albrecht: Okay any other comments? Clair

Comments from the Public:

None.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Clair Woodbury: Just throw it onto the action log for next year because we're not prepared to do it, but let's look at that 50-caliber issue. There's a handful of people using that for an ego trip, to blast away at 1,000 to 2,000 yards with a 50-caliber. Maybe for next year let's think that over.

Jake Albrecht: Harry, are we back to you?

Harry Barber: I'd like to make a motion to accept as presented.

Jake Albrecht: We have a motion by Harry and a second by Sam. Any other discussion? All in favor? Any against? Motion carries.

Harry Barber made the motion to accept the Caliber Restrictions as presented. Sam Carpenter seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

2008 RAC Schedule

Jake Albrecht: Our next and last item, I hope, is your 2008 RAC Schedule. This is scheduled for an action item unless you want to not do it tonight and put it onto the agenda for next month. But what I have come up with, if you guys are okay with this, is everything will stay in Beaver that has to do with like Bucks and Bulls Management Plan, 5-year Reviews, because I feel it's more of a central location, it gets a better turnout. It gives more people opportunity from all over the state. What I would suggest is our April meeting which is all RACs meet the same night, I would suggest that that's either held in Richfield or Cedar City because of the colleges that are there. So I put Richfield there. I put May is in Cedar City. I put July in Panguitch. And I put August in Fillmore, which is turkey hunting, which I thought was a good area for that. And the rest will be in Beaver.

Jake Albrecht: I tried to get one in Boulder but there wasn't enough chairs at Del's house to do it.

Harry Barber: Where's Kanab?

Jake Albrecht: So if you guys are okay with that let's vote for it? Action item.

Doug Messerly: Lynn I guess, I don't know have we ever done one in Panguitch, have we?

Lynn Chamberlain: Yeah we did one at Panguitch High School several years ago.

Del LeFevre: Yeah we got the Triple C now we can handle ya.

Douglas Messerly: Yeah and it would be contingent on us being able to find a place to hold the meeting, of course.

Del LeFevre: The Triple C has plenty.

Douglas Messerly: Do they charge, do you know Del?

Del LeFevre: I think I can get you in free.

Douglas Messerly: July from Panguitch.

Del LeFevre: Panguitch is definitely July.

Douglas Messerly: That is my only comment Mr. Chairman is that this is contingent upon us being able to find a place to hold it.

Jake Albrecht: You didn't catch on to why I had it in July did ya, ice fishing. A motion to present as presented.

Clair Woodbury: I will make the motion that we approve the RAC Schedule as presented.

Jake Albrecht: Okay a motion by Clair, a second by Jim. No other discussion. All in favor? None against? You're against? Okay, Del's against.

Clair Woodbury made the motion to approve the 2008 RAC Schedule as presented by Jake Albrecht (April meeting in Richfield, May in Cedar City, July in Panguitch, August in Fillmore, all others in Beaver). James Edwards seconded. Motion carried 7 in favor, 1 opposed (Dell LeFevre opposed).

Jake Albrecht: With that our next meeting is the Bear Proclamation and Rule, Prairie Dog Conservation Plan scheduled for December 11th, 7:00 pm, Beaver High School.

James Edwards: Mr. Chairman I make a motion we adjourn.

Jake Albrecht: We have a motion by Jim Edwards to adjourn. Second by Harry Barber. All in favor? Any against? Please state the time Doug Messerly.

James Edwards made the motion to adjourn. Harry Barber seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:31.