

**26 March 2008
Northern RAC Meeting**

Approval of Agenda:

Motion: Lee Shirley 2nd Paul Cowley. Pass Unanimous.

Approval of minutes from last meeting:

Motion: John Leonard, 2nd Paul Cowley. Pass Unanimous.

Least Chub Experiment – Accept as presented

Motion: Darwin Bingham 2nd Lee Shirley. Pass Unanimous

Bucks, Bulls and OIAL Permit Numbers for 2008 –

Motion to accept DWR deer permit numbers as amended – Ryan Foutz 2nd Ann Neville Passed unanimous.

Amended Motion – Muzzleloader deer permit numbers for Crawford Mt Unit same as in 2007. Shawn Groll moved. 2nd Ryan Foutz. Passed 7 for 2 against.

Motion Elk as recommended: Mark Marsh 2nd Ryan Foutz. Passed unanimous.

Motion Sheep as recommended: Lee Shirley 2nd Mark Marsh. Passed Unanimous with 1 recusal.

Motion OIAL, excluding sheep, as recommended: moved Mark Marsh 2nd Darwin Bingham. Passed unanimous.

Motion Pronghorn as recommendations: Moved Shawn Groll 2nd John Leonard Passed unanimous.

Motion Elk Unit Management Plans as recommend –

Moved: Robert Byrnes 2nd Paul Cowley. Passed unanimous

Amendment to motion by Darwin Bingham –

Motion Big Horn Sheep Statewide Management Plans as recommended by DWR – moved Robert Byrnes, 2nd Lee Shirley. Passed Unanimous.

Motion CWMU Rule R657-37 (5 yr review) as presented. Moved Ryan Foutz, 2nd Paul Cowley. Passed Unanimous.

Motion for Hunting closures R657-34 as presented. Moved Paul Cowley 2nd Mark Marsh. Passed unanimous.

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Jr. High
165 S. 700 E. Springville
March 25, 2008 @ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

John Bair, Sportsmen
Calvin Crandall, Agriculture
Byron Gunderson, At Large
Richard Hansen, At Large
Fred Oswald, Non-consumptive, Vice Chair
Duane Smith, Non-consumptive
Allan Stevens, At Large

Members Absent

George Holmes, Agriculture
Doug Jones, Forest Service
Ed Kent, Chair
Gary Nielson, Sportsmen
Jay Price, Elected

Others Present

Lee Howard, Wildlife Board Member

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

VOTING

Motion was made by Allan Stevens to accept the agenda as written

Seconded by Duane Smith

Motion passed unanimously

2) **Approval of the February 19, 2008 summary (Action)**

VOTING

Motion was made by Duane Smith to accept the summary notes as transcribed

Seconded by Richard Hansen

Motion passed unanimously

3) **Regional Update (Information)**

- **John Fairchild, Central Regional Supervisor (attached)**

4) **Upland Game (Information)**

- **Dave Olsen, Wildlife Coordinator**

Calvin Crandall – Are you recommending the pheasant hunt to run from November 1st to December 31st?

Dave Olsen – That is the recommendation from the advisory committee. As you look at surrounding states that is biologically feasible. It becomes a social issue with landowner access.

Calvin Crandall – That would be my concern, people wanting access from landowners and trespassing issues for sixty days. Also, the pheasants would all be gone if the hunt went for sixty days.

Fred Oswald – We don't usually take comment on informational items but I know there are some people here who have come specifically to comment on this and we don't want to turn them away.

Travis Proctor – Upland Game Advisory Council – We have been meeting for about five years to come up with the best way to increase the upland game hunting opportunity, protect upland game

populations and simplifying the regulations. Handout given to RAC. They will be back in June to talk about recommendations.

Tracy Nielson – Utah Chukar Foundation – We support the changes to the proclamation. Our group has provided funds for research that is being coordinated with Brigham Young University and Utah State University for chukar and sage grouse. We have done a lot of work with the Division and the Upland Game Advisory Council to look toward the future of upland game in Utah. Letter given to RAC members and will return with recommendations in June.

Dave Woodhouse – I am opposed to a sixty-day pheasant season. If we have a sixty-day pheasant hunt in Utah County we will kill all the roosters.

- 5) **Least Chub Experiment – NRO & CRO Only (Action)**
- **Krissy Wilson, Native Aquatics Program Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Q: Duane Smith – Why do you want to move away from using gambusia?

A: Krissy Wilson – It has been documented that they prey on native species.

VOTING

Motion was made by John Bair to approve as presented

Seconded by Duane Smith

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

- 6) **Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers for 2008 (Action)**
- **Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Q: Fred Oswald – With such good news about bigger bulls and more permits have you announced that you are running for governor?

A: Anis Aoude – Contrary to popular belief it's probably not the most popular recommendation to increase permits on some of those units. A lot of people covet those units and have been putting in for a long time. Our recommendation is to slowly get to objective without diminishing the quality of the bulls.

Q: John Bair – Did you show the unit specific permit increases in elk permits?

A: Anis Aoude – There was not a slide. There is a handout you should have and has been made available to the public.

Q: John Bair – Do you know what your roadkill counts are this year for deer?

A: Anis Aoude – No. We don't get very good data on roadkill. We have started this year using a database to collect that information. Any roadkill data would not be comparable except in the central region where we have data further back.

Q: John Bair – I have been hearing concerns for the first time in a long time about winter kill on elk. Was that taken into consideration?

A: Anis Aoude – The recommendations are based on population models. Most of the bulls that are dying are dying of old age. They probably would have died regardless of the type of winter. We had a few bulls die last year also. We are starting to see older bulls die because we are not harvesting them.

Q: John Bair – You don't think it is the winter?

A: Anis Aoude – It hasn't been that hard of a winter to kill elk.

Q: John Bair - It seems like there are more this year than in the past.

A: Anis Aoude – We have been building elk for a number of years and eventually some of those bulls are going to get old enough to die. The majority I have seen this year have been 15 years or older.

Comments from the Public

Dave Woodhouse – SFW – We are concerned about deer numbers. I would be interested to see the break down of buck to doe ratios on sub units like the Nebo. We would ask the RAC to look at cutting an additional 2,000 permits from the central region general deer allotment in regards to the high number of winter kill and two consecutive years of low fawn production. We have lost a lot of deer on the roads. We would like the RAC to take that into account as you approve the general deer numbers.

Fred Oswald – Was the recommendation the same as last year?

Anis Aoude – The recommendation is 1,000 permits below where it should be. I can speak to the number of roadkill in the central region specifically and they are not higher than last year to date.

Dee Freeman – Regarding management bull elk permits. San Juan was an early hunt before the rut other units were later after the rut. The bulls you are trying to eliminate will have already had a chance to breed. Also any six-point trophy that has had the misfortune to have had a point broken off will be classified as a management bull and can be taken on that hunt.

Anis Aoude – We made the same argument when this hunt was recommended. The key to this hunt was to kill more bulls. The Division initially wanted to recommend more permits but the committee that was charged with coming up with some new ideas recommend we try this. We have tried this and we will continue to try it. If we continue to have younger bulls killed we will see what the public wants. We are also likely going recommend a spike only hunt on most if not all of these units in the coming years and if that does happen we will recommend eliminating the management bull hunt. Contrary to popular belief you can't manage genetics by harvest.

Allen Larsen – I also have seen more roadkill deer this year. I live off of State Street in Lindon. This year we have had 12 dead deer in front of my house. That doesn't include all the others on State Street. At least in my area there was a significant increase in roadkills.

John Fairchild – In response, you have to take into account that we are increasing the number of deer that are being supported by people's backyards and there is a greater chance that these lower elevation deer that never do go to their summer range are getting hit by cars and that is a real problem we have year round. Our biologist and our depredation specialist are spending a considerable amount of time dealing with nuisance wildlife in areas where we have habitat available to sustain them year round. When we do get a winter like this last one you will see significant losses as you did in Midway and in Lindon and all along the Wasatch front. We are talking about managing a herd that

goes from its winter range to its summer range. Not necessarily managing based on the losses we sustain in town.

RAC Discussion

Richard Hansen – There are areas in the central region that are struggling even if other areas are doing well. What are we doing to address that?

Anis Aoude – Currently we don't have any plans to deal with that. We have discussed a plan to manage unit by unit and we will likely be recommending that this fall. If we are managing on a smaller scale that would address the concern you have.

Byron Gunderson – When we use ratios it doesn't really give us a handle on how many animals we are dealing with. I think if we were presented population numbers over the last five years we could establish some kind of trend. I have a feeling that more bucks survive a winter than does and definitely more than fawns which would throw your ratio out of line if that were true. I would like to see some raw numbers of what you think our deer populations are.

John Bair – I am going to disagree with Byron. I think the bucks go into the winter in worse shape and they probably sustain more mortality than does and fawns. Our fawn production has been down the last couple of years and we have had a harsher winter than we have been used to. I think we have a lot of deer that haven't dealt with a winter like this for a while if ever in their life. The smart thing for us to do is to be proactive. There are some units in rough shape. I think another 1,000 permits would reduce pressure across the region. On the elk, I am not saying that we are not due for an increase but I am concerned about the winter kill on the elk. I think our numbers might be a little bit aggressive. We did agree at one point to manage toward those age objectives but this might be a little too aggressive.

Duane Smith – John hinted at this. As we look at the data on mule deer mortality in winter it is the mature bucks that die more readily in a winter such as this because they have just gone through the rut and they come into winter in a run down condition.

VOTING

Motion was made by John Bair to reduce the central region general deer permits by an additional 1,000

Seconded by Richard Hansen

Allan Stevens – I hope that we don't support this motion. The Division has already reduced permits where they feel it is needed. They are the people out on the ground. Also we are trying to get young people into hunting and one of the main ways to do this is deer hunting. If we reduce the numbers we are working against the things we are trying to do to recruit youth hunters.

Richard Hansen – On the other side of that, I think if you want to recruit youth hunters they need to have a good experience when they go out. They want to see bucks to hunt and shoot. I have had high school kids say to me that this isn't any fun. The recommendation that is coming out in the future to address specific areas may help to better manage herds. At this point a reduction in permits may be the best opportunity to help the herds.

In Favor: John Bair, Richard Hansen, Byron Gunderson, Duane Smith

Opposed: Allan Stevens, Calvin Crandall

Motion passed 4 to 2

Motion was made by Calvin Crandall to accept the balance of the recommendations as proposed

Seconded by Byron Gunderson

In Favor: Richard Hansen, Byron Gunderson, Duane Smith, Allan Stevens, Calvin Crandall

Opposed: John Bair

Motion passed 5 to 1

- 7) **Elk Unit Management Plans (Action)**
- **Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Q: Fred Oswald - How often does the committee meet?

A: Anis Aoude – They usually have one or two meetings and plans are good for five years.

Q: Calvin Crandall – How long have you been keeping objective numbers? What do the long term historical records show, are we in an increase?

A: Anis Aoude – Statewide the elk population is at an all time high.

Q: Calvin Crandall – Do you know what past numbers are?

A: Anis Aoude – They are clearly lower. We have been in an elk increase mode. The current plan has a goal of 80,000 given that if we increase the objective we include local input which is what we did.

Calvin Crandall – Do you think the resource can handle up to 80,000 elk?

Anis Aoude – The resource can probably handle more. It is more of a social carrying capacity than a biological one. We are looking at things like competition with livestock, depredation issues and things like that.

John Bair – I appreciate what the Division has done with the committees and I am glad to see the increase in objectives.

Questions from the Public

For units that didn't have a committee, how did the division decide on numbers for those areas?

Anis Aoude – In areas we did not think we could handle increase, committees were not formed.

RAC Discussion

Richard Hansen – When numbers are established and counts are done in the spring is there any consideration given for the number of elk available to the public on public land. There are some areas that have a lot of elk but they are on private land and are not available to hunt.

Anis Aoude – The way we address harvest for bulls is based on age objectives and for cows we hunt them on winter range which is where we count them. Managing harvest is different than managing the population. The population is managed by antlerless harvest.

Richard Hansen – There are areas where there are antlerless permits but no public access.

VOTING

Motion was made by John Bair to approve the plan as presented

Seconded by Calvin Crandall

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

- 8) **Big Horn Sheep Statewide Management Plan (Action)**

- Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Q: John Bair – Do have a handle on the sheep here on the face, are they still tipping over?

A: Craig Clyde – They do have **pasturella** which causes pneumonia and no we don't have a handle on it. This sheep that just died has been there for a few days. We have been taking them down to the lab in Nephi to have them tested and they all have the same thing. Earlier this year there were some domestic sheep in that area. We aren't sure where they came from but they were eliminated. Green grass is hard on them which we will have the next little while. Any stress is hard on them such as shed hunters or dogs chasing them. That stimulates the bacteria to grow which causes the pneumonia.

Q: John Bair – Can different herds spread different strains of **pasturella** back and forth to each other?

A: Craig Clyde – There are many different strains of **pasturella**. If a herd has one strain and you move that herd to another herd that is established and is used to a different strain then it can be passed back and forth.

Q: John Bair – It takes a while to run its course.

A: Anis Aoude – Usually about ten years. It presents itself in lamb production first so lambs are born but they never make it to a year old. It takes a while to get the lambs used to it but it takes a long time to come back because you don't have lamb production. The adults build up an immunity to it pretty quick. There is one certain strain of **pasturella** and if that comes into the herd it will tip over the adults even.

Questions from the Public

Lee Howard – I didn't see the **Newfoundland Mountains** in your presentation. Did I miss it?

Anis Aoude – It should have been there under the California sub species. That is an oversight, it is in the plan.

Bob Friel – You mentioned in the plan there are some provisions being made to penalize domestic sheep and goat people that violate the buffer zone. I wondered what kind of penalties those would be. That would have a significant effect on the sheep and I was wondering what you are doing to help solve that.

Anis Aoude- There is not a penalty. It is just a way to work through whatever may come up. Basically if a domestic sheep shows up we try to identify it and if we can't then we would try to remove and if there is identification on it we would contact the owner of that sheep and try to make restitution. We are trying to deal with it on a case by case basis.

RAC Discussion

John Bair – I think the Division has done an excellent job with the big horn sheep program all the way around. It is a good example of wildlife conservation in action. I think our state has the most aggressive sheep program in the country and our biologists are doing a great job with that.

VOTING

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

Seconded by Allan Stevens

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

- 9) **CWMU Rule R657-37 (5-yr review) (Action)**
- Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

VOTING

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

Seconded by Duane Smith

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

- 10) **Procedures for Confirmation of Ordinances on hunting closures R657-34 (5-yr review) (Action)**
- Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

VOTING

Motion was made by Duane Smith to accept the rule as presented

Seconded by Richard Hansen

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

in attendance

Next board meeting April 10th at the DNR Auditorium

Next RAC meeting is a teleconference meeting on April 29th at Springville Jr. High School

Regional Update
Central Region Advisory Council
March 25, 2008

Wildlife

- Lost four bighorn sheep to pneumonia in the last week (two rams, one ewe and a lamb) between Rock Canyon and Springville.
- Deer in high mountain valleys and around towns suffered significant losses this winter. Biologists will spend time on foothill winter ranges this spring to assess range conditions and determine if we had any significant winter losses in any areas.
- We're starting our sage-grouse lek counts on lower elevation strutting grounds.
- Ise, a rehabilitated golden eagle was released at a ceremony at Camp Williams last Saturday. The release was timed to honor the soldiers from Utah that have died in the war on terror. Patti Richards, local wildlife rehabilitator, deserves a lot of credit for working with the bird for over a year so it could be released back into the wild.

Aquatics

- An automated pit tag reader is in place this spring on the lower Provo River to document the movement of June sucker moving up the river to spawn. All suckers that have been implanted with pit tags will be detected by the equipment. It's expected to greatly enhance our ability to gauge the status of this endangered species.
- Gillnetting at Yuba Reservoir this Thursday to evaluate the walleye population.
- Starting spotted frog surveys in West Desert wetlands (count egg masses at small ponds).

Habitat

- The USFWS has initiated a 12-month review to determine if listing sage-grouse is warranted in all or parts of its range. Over the next couple of months, the Division will be compiling a report that identifies all conservation actions that have been undertaken in Utah to benefit the species. Mark Farmer, habitat biologist from our office will be participating in that review.
- Still working with UDOT on plans to include big game crossing structures and ROW fencing into each segment of the Highway 6 Reconstruction Project.

Law Enforcement

- Holly Riddle, new Central Region CO, graduated from the P.O.S.T. academy last week and will be assigned to work with DWR field training officers for the next couple of months before she assumes her new assignment at Strawberry.

Conservation Outreach

- Reminder to all Dedicated Hunters to get your volunteer hours done while it's comfortable outside. Plenty of projects available. Look them up on our website or contact Sue Robinson.

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY-MOTIONS PASSED
Western Park, Vernal/March 20, 2008

1,2 & 3 APPROVAL OF AGENDA, MINUTES AND OLD BUSINESS

MOTION: to accept as presented
Passed unanimously

7.BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2008

MOTION: to accept the recommendations as presented
Motion passed 7 to 1
Rod Morrison: I think we should lower our Northeastern tags 700 more

8.ELK UNIT MANAGEMENT PLANS

AMENDED MOTION: to approve with the following changes:
Habitat section: will read, "There is some exclosure data from summer range on the Anthro subunit that indicates elk may be inhibiting aspen regeneration."
Population section: will replace, "If we experience a decline in harvested bull age, harvest success rates, and/or hunter satisfaction..." with, "If harvested bull ages decline below age objective, and we experience a significant decline in harvest success rates, and/or hunter satisfaction..."
Passed unanimously

9.BIGHORN SHEEP STATEWIDE MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION: to accept as presented
Passed Unanimously

10.CWMU RULE R657-37 95-YR REVIEW) AND
11.PROCEDURES FOR CONFIRMATION OF ORDINANCES ON HUNTING
CLOSURES R657-34 (5-YR REVIEW)

MOTION: to approve both as proposed
Passed unanimously

NORTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY

Western Park, Vernal

March 20, 2008

Started at 6:30 pm; Adjourned at 9:00 pm

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kirk Woodward-Sportsmen
Rod Morrison-Sportsmen
Beth Hamann-Non-Consumptive
Kevin Christopherson-NER Supervisor
Amy Torres-Chair
Rod Harrison-Elected Official
Bob Christensen-Forest Service
Floyd Briggs-At-Large
Dave Chivers-Agriculture
Curtis Dastrup-Agriculture

UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Anis Aoude-Big Game Coordinator
Dave Olsen-Upland Game Coordinator
Torrey Christophersen-NER L.E.
Ron Stewart-NER Conserv. Outreach
Gayle DeCamp-NER Office Manager
Charlie Greenwood-NER Pgm Mgr
Randall Thacker-NER Wildlife Bio
Dax Mangus-NER Wildlife Bio
Craig McLaughlin-Wildlife Section Chief

EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

Karl Breitenbach-At-Large

WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS:

Del Brady

UNEXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

Carlos Reed-Ute Tribe

1.REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA: Amy Torres

MOTION by Beth Hamann to accept the agenda

Second by Floyd Briggs

Passed unanimously

2 AND 3.APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND OLD BUSINESS: Amy Torres

MOTION by Beth Hamann to approve

Second by Floyd Briggs

Passed unanimously

4.REGIONAL UPDATE: Kevin Christopherson (INFORMATIONAL)

Five wolves were reported in Daggett County several weeks ago by a credible source. UDWR personnel flew over and took snowmobiles into the area. They found a possible set of tracks. Working with Wildlife Services, they set some bait stations with motion sensor cameras but never got a visual sighting or pictures. Their presences could not be positively confirmed. There is no evidence they are there now. Wildlife Services still has some bait stations going but hasn't reported anything so far.

Depredation has been hard hitting this year. UDWR was feeding about one ton a day in the Duchesne area to keep the animals out of haystacks but have discontinued that last weekend.

Whirling disease was found last year on the West Fork of Duchesne. While inspecting a private pond, they checked the river and a report came back positive. UDWR plans to install a barrier to keep fish from moving upriver. It may be a temporary solution. They have found one fish testing positive above the original proposed barrier site and wonder if it was an isolated case. Sentinel fish were put in to help determine the extent of the disease. We'll keep monitoring the situation until a barrier goes in this spring.

Personnel Changes: We've hired three species fish biologist Matt Breen. He will monitor the three fish species that are not listed as endangered to make sure they don't become endangered.

We have hired Dustin Schaible as the Diamond Mountain/Three Corners wildlife biologist to replace Charlie Greenwood who has been promoted to NER Wildlife Program Manager.

Legislative: Deer Season Start Date Change: This bill gives the Wildlife Board the authority to set the start date for the general rifle deer season, but not prior to October 1.

Two million dollars for sage grouse projects as requested by the oil industry has been approved. This will also help ensure sage grouse are not listed as endangered.

5.UPLAND GAME: Dave Olsen, Wildlife Coordinator (INFORMATIONAL)

UDWR has been asked by the Wildlife Board to have a discussion with the RACs and public regarding upland game. The intent is to inform and invite participation in the process; present recommendations received from the public to-date; and to review the upland game proclamation recommendation process

Chukar

Strive to unify season dates statewide

Currently there are three season closing dates

Move season opening to October (1st Sat)

Currently September 15

Rationale: habitat impacts from OHVs and hunters parking at guzzler sites in the west desert and destroying the habitat around the water sources

Extend and unify season closing to mid-February

Currently Nov 30, Dec 31 & Jan 31

Sage Grouse

Move season from September to October

Currently September 15, desire 1st Sat in Oct

Hunting would continue under limited permits

Earlier in September hens would still be with broods and be the first birds flushed. By moving it closer to October, the broods would be older and might save a few hens. With sage grouse permits being harder to come by there is interest in trophy value for mounting the birds. They are easier to mount if they are harvested later.

Sharp-tailed Grouse

Initiate a Cache County hunt (new)

Forest Grouse (Blue and Ruffed)

Move season opening to 1st Saturday in September

Currently opens on 2nd Saturday in September

Extend season closing from November 30 to December 31

Controversy involves archers and shotgun hunters

Pheasants

Unify with a statewide season date

Desire 1st November Saturday opening with December 31 closing

Currently divided

Nov 3-9 Utah County

Nov 3-18 statewide except Utah County

Nov 3-Dec 2 extended on state and fed lands

No proposed changes to other species except California quail. Had one hunter from the outside make a recommendation to include San Pete County in areas open, which hasn't been in the proclamation in the past. No changes on any other species

Public input is welcome at the local or state level

Formal UDWR recommendations are developed considering the above and begin the final phase with public meetings (May/June)

Questions from Public: none

Questions from RAC: none

Comments from Public: none

Comments from RAC: Bob Christensen: With sage grouse in Anthro, the broods are breaking up in late August.

6. LEAST CHUB EXPERIMENT-NRO & CRO ONLY

7. BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2008: Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator (ACTION)

(See handout)

Deer

Last year, hunters had a 33% success rate for big game deer overall.

Buck to doe ratios on public lands:

Northern 18/100, Southern 17/100, Southeastern 19/100, Northeastern 16/100, Central 16/100

Fawns in the last two years have gone from 65% to 60% survival.

For the past couple of years the Northeastern and Central Regions have had 1,000 fewer permits each because they were below the 15 bucks per 100 does objective.

Both regions have since reached objective but because of this winter's conditions, we may have increased fawn mortality so we want to maintain that 1,000 fewer permits this year.

We are proposing a standard breakout of permits to include 60% any weapon, 20% muzzleloader and 20% archery permits

Elk

We are recommending a 16% increase in total bull elk permits.

Pronghorn

We propose standardizing to the 80/20/20 split which bumps up the number of archery permits

Once in a Lifetime

Moose: increase

Bison: increase (which includes 2 permits from Antelope Island)

Desert Bighorn: reduce by 3 because of drought on the desert hunt units

Rocky Mtn Bighorn: increase

Rocky Mtn Goat: 1 permit increase

Questions from Public: none

Questions from RAC: Bob Christensen: Do we have any idea on our fawn mortality numbers yet?

Anis Aoude: Not yet. We haven't done our spring range rides yet. We get our best data from check stations and finding out how many yearlings are in the harvest.

Floyd Briggs: Are permit numbers for Conservation permits set yearly?

Anis Aoude: Those are set for a three-year period so they know how to market them.

Floyd Briggs: By units?

Anis Aoude: Yes. The ones I'm presenting here are just going to go into the draw.

Kirk Woodward: This year we're worried about losing fawns and how hard the winter is, yet our numbers are the same for open general season.

Anis Aoude: The only reason for that is for the quality of the hunt. We're only hunting bucks. The population will not be a problem.

Kirk Woodward: Then we'll learn from that hunt how hard this winter was?

Anis Aoude: Yes. We will know something in the spring but we have to set our numbers now.

Kirk Woodward: So that may affect the quality of the hunt but in the general season that may not be as big a factor as a limited entry hunt?

Anis Aoude: Yes. The limited entry hunt has a higher buck/toe ratios and nobody usually harvests fawns in those units.

Comments from Public:

Brad Horrocks: I appreciate Charlie for all he's done and congratulate him on moving up. We would like to know more about the buffalo in the Book Cliffs sometime.

Kevin Chrisotpherson: I'll answer that at the end if you'd like.

Brad Horrocks: Charlie, I thought on the Diamond Mountain deer objective, were we supposed to go into a premium hunt at the end of a five-year program?

Charlie Greenwood: We're going to move the unit toward a premium hunt in the next few years and see if we can achieve that.

Brad Horrocks: When you drop the permit numbers, how come the buck numbers are fluctuating on Diamond?

Charlie Greenwood: We dropped the buck numbers four years ago and our fawn production has been down two years so that's why.

Brad Horrocks: If our buck numbers get back up it may change it to a premium unit?

Mitch Hacking: We talked before Charlie about raising the age limit on bull elk. We want to go to the 6-7 year age. Are we still shooting for that?

Charlie Greenwood: Last year they were raised to a 5- and 6-year old and I know you guys have recommended going higher but the RAC and Wildlife Board took that into consideration last year. You can make your recommendation here but it will not go into effect until the end of the five-year program. This is only the second year of the five-year program.

Anis Aoude: To clarify, there are limited number of limited entry elk units that can be in that 6-year unit so unless you can get one of the other units to lower, you'll have a hard time breaking into that. That was probably the scenario last year. The reason you were not able to get the 6-year bull unit was because only four units in the state can have those and the other four were considered a higher priority. It is unlikely the other units would choose to go down but it could happen.

Clay Hamann: Your presentation seems very reasonable. My personal observation is that it seems like the winter has produced more road mortality this year. I agree with keeping the 1000 permits down in our region again this year.

David Bailey (Utah Farm Bureau). A comment on bison: We support the increase in tags and appreciate the process and the Division for work they've done.

Comments from RAC:

Rod Harrison: Uintah County Commissioner Mike McKee says they have been in negotiations with UDWR and are very close to removing any reservations on that buffalo herd down there.

Kirk Woodward: Are the buffalo numbers included in the ones in the transplant? Why are the only 25 bison listed in the plan to be transplanted?

Anis Aoude: We have money to transplant more if we need to and can harvest less next year but didn't want it predicated on the move.

Kevin Christopherson: The buffalo plan has been in development for a number of years through citizens' committees, the RAC, etc. The RAC's and Wildlife Board approved that plan last year. You started out asking why only 25 were to be transplanted. The plan is to start slowly. We had planned to introduce buffalo in January of this year because that is when they congregate and are most easily captured. We need to do disease testing. It was a crazy, snow-filled January and based the weather and Uintah County commission/Department of Agriculture concerns we postponed the reintroduction. We have had several meetings with Uintah County and a lot of communication still needs to be done. We're now moving forward. The Wildlife Board passed it, and we plan to move forward. It will probably be November before the Henry Mountain bison will be grouped enough to be trapped, tested and transplanted.

MOTION AND DISCUSSION

MOTION by Bob Christensen to accept the recommendations as presented

Second by Rod Harrison

Rod Morrison: Is this 15/20 buck/doe ratio post season? I don't feel that it's quite that high. I feel that with the high road mortality and winter conditions, we should lower our Northeastern tags by another 700 permits from 13,000 to 12,300.

Amy Torres: Is the RAC interested in amending the motion?

Bob Christensen: We're already 1,000 less, so I think that keeping the numbers the same is okay.

Favor: Curtis Dastrup, Dave Chivers, Floyd Briggs, Bob Christensen, Rod Harrison, Beth Hamann, Kirk Woodward

Opposed: Rod Morrison (I think we should lower our Northeastern tags more)

Motion passed

Kirk Woodward: A suggestion after a motion has been made is not valid.

Kevin Christopherson: It will be helpful to have the mortality data.

Charlie Greenwood: We will be doing spring range rides in the next month and a half and collecting road data. That will give us a little better information on mortality.

Kevin Christopherson: RAC members are welcome to go on these rides. We'll let you know when they are scheduled.

Dave Chivers: I didn't want to bring this up before, but I think we have a hole in the way that we take care of our deer herds. We're managing our deer herds in bucks per 100 does but in some areas the deer numbers are terrible. We need to get a handle on that. I can increase your buck numbers if you'll let me kill some of your does. Also, we have years that if you lose a certain number of does to winterkill and some of the young bucks make it through, we may be managing with less total deer. Deer herds in the Book Cliffs are not good.

Anis Aoude: Increases happen from does. If you shoot does you're not going to increase bucks.

Dave Chivers: If you have 3% loss of doe herd in the Book Cliffs, the next time you count, it will still look okay on paper when in actuality there are fewer total animals. It would help us to know the total numbers counted each year.

Anis Aoude: We can do that next year. We have so many charts and graphs now that if we shoed them all, we would be here until morning, but we can include that graph next year.

Kirk Woodward: Wouldn't it be easier to change numbers in smaller sub-units like our neighboring states?

Kevin Christopherson: We brought that before the RACs a year ago.

Kirk Woodward: Where does that public process come up again, at the end of the five-year process?

Anis Aoude: Next fall. Colorado did it in a different way, on limited entry units and unit-by-unit public.

Kirk Woodward: But we can certainly manage deer herds more precisely.

Anis Aoude: Yes but it will be smaller units.

8.ELK UNIT MANAGEMENT PLANS: Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator (ACTION)

See handout

When we reviewed the initial committee recommendations there were no substantial increases on most units. The committee reconvened in fall with a result net proposed increase of 525 animals.

Questions from Public:

Brad Horrocks: On Diamond Mountain have any landowners complained about having too many elk?

Charlie Greenwood: In past years yes but not recently.

Brad Horrocks: 35% of Diamond Mountain is private and the landowners aren't complaining. We have increased our elk numbers by 5 or 600 over objective. The state needs to look at the numbers.

Anis Aoude: Did we recommend decreasing populations?

Brad Horrocks: No, we just want to increase the age limit.

Anis Aoude: It has nothing to do with who's doing their share. It has to do with population objectives or age objectives.

Charlie Greenwood: We flew last winter and it was over objective so we put out cow permits last year and we'll be putting out cow permits this year so it won't be over objective.

Anis Aoude: We can't revisit a 5-year plan every year or it wouldn't be a 5-year plan.

Alan Smith: Was there a committee formed?

Anis Aoude: We only had committees where we wanted to recommend more animals.

Kevin Christopherson: So are you recommending increasing population objectives?

Brad Horrocks: No. We asked to raise our age limit last year and they're telling us it's a 5-year plan and it's set in stone.

Clay Hamann: It does seem a little odd that we don't put the age objective in with the population objective in the same year.

Anis Aoude: It was a two-phase process. The age objectives were resolved last year. This year we're addressing the population objective.

Clay Hamann: Well if we're asked to vote tonight, it should be adjustable. And if we're getting asked to address the entire management plan, the entire management plan should be addressed.

Anis Aoude: To go through them again seems counter-productive because it already went through the public process last year but if you want to do it, it's up to the RAC.

Questions from RAC:

Bob Christensen: On the North Slope habitat barriers NEPA clearances, I was wondering what the background was.

Charlie Greenwood: When we've proposed habitat projects in the past it has been denied because of lack of manpower and money to get projects done. That has been a problem in the past.

Bob Christensen: That's being addressed better this year.

Rod Morrison: I'm concerned about the bull herd numbers on Anthro. I understand the age objective was met but I'm concerned about increasing the permits.

Dax Mangus: The success was lower on archery than it was in the past. Based on the age of the harvested permits, it was an increase from 24 to 28 permits this year. That includes archery, muzzleloader, premium hunts, limited entry, etc.

Dave Chivers: Do we count that whole herd?

Dax Mangus: Yes. The objective was 700 and last time we counted there were over 1,100.

Kirk Woodward: It's hard to count that unit if we don't count Tribal lands.

Randall Thacker: We do include Tribal lands.

Anis Aoude: Let's not confuse this. Age objective is independent of the complete amount of animals, so if you reach an age objective, it doesn't mean you have reached the population numbers.

Comments from Public:

Alan Smith: I read the online recommendations for the elk management plans. I want to commend the Division for the detailed work they've done. I suggest that you pass the recommendations that are proposed here. I do think that changes should be made to address changes in population goals if a committee wasn't developed on Diamond Mountain last year when it was addressed. I approve of the habitat improvements that are going to be made. There would be a tremendous amount of increase in population in the future as a result and could be achievable.

Mitch Hacking: On Diamond Mountain we have a population objective of 2,500 elk. The Fish and Game has worked well with us. It takes 10 years to draw a tag there and most sportsmen want a nice bull. Diamond has extras. Right now the age is 5-6. A bunch of hunters want an age increase, which may help keep the permits at the same level while not getting more hunters. We would like to increase the bull elk age limit to 6 and 7. We need to get with the Diamond Mountain Landowners Association and submit a proposal. We think if we do, we'll provide a unit the sportsmen will appreciate.

Kevin Christopherson: Let me remind you that older age won't change the population numbers. If you want the number higher, we can address that tonight. If not, we'll be hunting cows.

Mitch Hacking: We can bring the numbers down by taking cows. Cow hunts are good meat hunts. In the past, the Fish and Game have proposed not only killing cows but bulls too.

Kirk Woodward: If I understand, to manage numbers, you get extra cow tags. The only way we're going to get extra bull tags is to change the age numbers. So you're worried about having an influx of bull hunters in there. That won't happen because of population.

That will only happen with age objectives. It's the Wildlife Board that sets that so we can't visit that plan tonight but we can address how many elk permits you want.

Comments from RAC:

Kirk Woodward: Is the Diamond Mountain Landowner Association happy with the population numbers?

Brad Horrocks: As a sportsman, yes.

Bob Christiansen: On the Nine Mile Anthro, regarding habitat conditions up there, the Forest Service has been concerned with the aspen communities. The mature stands are declining. There are several factors to that. We have a couple exclosures up there. The elk herd is inhibiting regeneration of the aspen stands on the Anthro. So under Habitat Conditions section, I think we ought to mention something about the aspens up there and their degeneration due to elk browsing.

And then another comment was on the Anthro's subunit, there's a statement there that says because of the management on the Tribe that they're experiencing a "decline" in harvest age and satisfaction. One comment I'd make is in the part that talks about the decline in age objectives. The 3-year average is 6.7 last year and in '07 the average was 7.1 but we're managing for 5-6. We actually want to see that age objective come down, so the wording should be changed to not a decline, but if it goes below age objective. Anthro took a long time to get some older bulls out there and I it would be a shame to change too radically.

Anis Aoude: We haven't recommended that in the plan but it's something we can look into in the future.

Bob Christensen: With the habitat barriers, my suggestion would be to have aspen regeneration mentioned. I think the management objective is 700 head and if we could get those numbers down from 1000 to population objective, we need to do that.

MOTION AND DISCUSSION:

MOTION by Rod Morrison to approve as presented

Second by Beth Hamann

Bob Christiansen: I agree with that but include the suggestions I have addressed.

Rod Morrison: That would be fine.

AMENDED MOTION:

Dax Mangus: So on the *Habitat* section of the Current Status of Elk Management Plan for Elk Herd Unit #11, it will read, “There is some exclosure data from summer range on the Anthro subunit that indicates elk may be inhibiting aspen regeneration.”

In the *Population* section, we’ll replace, “If we experience a decline in harvested bull age, harvest success rates, and/or hunter satisfaction...” and replace with “If harvested bull ages decline below age objective, and we experience a significant decline in harvest success rates, and/or hunter satisfaction...”

Passed unanimously.

9.BIGHORN SHEEP STATEWIDE MANAGEMENT PLAN: Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator (ACTION)

(See handout)

Questions from Public:

Del Brady: What was the percentage of rams taken?

Anis Aoude: 12% of the total ramp population or 30% of rams 6 years or older.

Questions from RAC:

Kirk Woodward: Looking at the proposed reintroductions for Ashley Creek in Rocky Mountain Bighorn. What has to happen to make the transplants possible?

Anis Aoude: There is a plan in place so as sheep become available; there is a list of sites in place.

Kirk Woodward: How is that list established in priorities?

Anis Aoude: The place with the best habitat and conditions gets the sheep first. Habitat suitability, sometimes, which is the nearest sheep allotment, the best conditions if they stray. We usually ask the region to prioritize their own sites. Some years there are sheep available to transplant, some years there are not.

Del Brady: On those proposed areas for reintroduction, are they free of domestic sheep?

Anis Aoude: Those with the asterisk on the screen currently have domestic sheep, which would have to be addressed.

Comments from Public: none

Comments from RAC:

Bob Christensen: I want to thank you. It looks like you incorporated the comments from the Forest Service. Ashley Creek and Brush Creek Gorge have just retired sheep allotments so they will be available in the future.

Anis Aoude: We appreciate the fact that you responded.

MOTION by Rod Harrison to accept as presented

Second by Kirk Woodward

Passed Unanimously

**10.CWMU Rule R657-37 (5-year review) combined with
11.PROCEDURES FOR CONFIRMATION OF ORDINANCES ON HUNTING
CLOSURES R657-34 (5-year review): Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator
(ACTION)**

Questions from Public: none

Questions from RAC: none

Comments from Public:

Alan Smith: On behalf of the CWMU landowners, I suggest the RAC approve the CWMU Rule and send it on to the Wildlife Board

Comments from RAC: none

MOTION by Dave Chivers to approve both as proposed

Second by Kirk Woodward

Passed Unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 8:45.

Next meeting on Antlerless Proclamation and permit numbers to be held April 29: 6:30 pm at Western Park in Vernal.

MOTIONS MATRIX
SOUTHEAST REGIONAL WILDLIFE ADVISORY COUNCIL
JOHN WESLEY POWELL MUSEUM IN GREEN RIVER
March 19 2008

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

MOTION: to approve the agenda as written.

PASSED: unanimously

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

MOTION: to approve the minutes of the last meeting as written.

PASSED: unanimously

BUCKS, BULLS AND ONCE-IN-A-LIFETIME PERMIT NUMBERS

MOTION: to approve the Bucks, Bulls and OIAL permit numbers as presented, except that 10 permits be added to the San Juan management bull hunt; 5 permits be subtracted from the San Juan early hunt; and 15 permits be added to the San Juan late hunt.

PASSED: with a majority vote: 5 for the motion; and 4 against the motion.

ELK UNIT MANAGEMENT PLANS

MOTION: to accept the Elk Management Plan as presented.

PASSED: unanimously

BIGHORN SHEEP STATEWIDE MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION: to accept the Bighorn Sheep Statewide Management Plan as presented.

PASSED: unanimously

CWMU RULE R657-37 5-YEAR REVIEW and
PROCEDURES FOR CONFIRMATION OF ORDINANCES ON HUNTING
CLOSURES R657-34 5-YEAR REVIEW

MOTION: to accept both of the above rules as presented.

PASSED: unanimously

SOUTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY

John Wesley Powell Museum in Green River

March 19, 2008

Commence at 6:30 p.m.; Adjourn at 8:35 p.m.

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Albrecht, Kevin	U.S. Forest Service
Bayles, Lyle	At Large
Byrnes, Verd	At Large
Gilson, James	Sportsmen
Hatch, Jordan	Agriculture
Hoskisson, Wayne	Environmental
Riddle, Pam	BLM
Sanslow, Terry	At Large
Sitterud, Drew	Elected Official

EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

Adams, Bruce	At Large
Kamala, Laura	Environmental
Larson, Rick	Regional Supervisor

UNEXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

Lewis, Kurt	Agriculture
Maldonado, Walt	Sportsmen

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Johnson, Keele

DWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Aoude, Anis
Bates, Bill
Beagley, Kyle
Crompton, Brad
Kerstetter, Roger
McLaughlin, Craig
Mitchell, Dean
Olsen, Dave
Paskett, Wade
Shirley, J.
Stettler, Brent
Stilson, Randall
Wallace, Guy
Washburn, Paul

PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE 12

CONDUCTING THE MEETING

-James Gilson, Chairman

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Drew Sitterud to approve the agenda.

SECOND by Kevin Albrecht

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 Terry Sanslow to approve the minutes of the previous meeting as written.

SECOND by Verd Byrnes

PASSED unanimously

OLD BUSINESS

-Terry Sanslow, RAC Vice Chairman

Terry summarized notable actions from the last Wildlife Board meeting. Free Fishing Day will now coincide with Free Boating Day. Senate Bill 59 passed, which gives the Wildlife Board the liberty to choose the opening date of the deer hunt. The need for a COR for private ponds has been eliminated.

UPLAND GAME

-by Dave Olsen, Wildlife Coordinator

Questions & Comments from the RAC:

Terry Sanslow, representing the Utah Chukar Council and Upland Game Advisory Committee, expressed support for the proposal to overlap the pheasant with the quail hunt.

James Gilson expressed concern about lengthening the pheasant season from 30 to 60 days, in light of the species' gradual disappearance across Utah.

Dave Olsen responded that studies show that hunting of cocks/roosters plays an insignificant role in the pheasant population.

Kevin Albrecht expressed concern about the potential damage to chukar populations posed by lengthening the season, especially those flocks close to human population centers.

Dave Olsen again cited literature, indicating that hunting made an insignificant difference on chukar populations.

Kevin Albrecht also expressed concern about the potential for increasing problems with landowners, resulting from season lengthening.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

MOTION by N/A Informational presentation only.

SECOND by

PASSED

BUCKS, BULLS AND ONCE-IN-A-LIFETIME PERMIT NUMBERS

-by Anis Aoude, DWR Big Game Coordinator

Questions/Comments from the RAC:

Verd Byrnes asked about the deer harvest break-down from 2007.

Anis Aoude didn't have that data available.

Verd Byrnes asked about the rate of dedicated hunter success.

Neither Bill Bates nor Anis Aoude had that information available.

Verd Byrnes asked about the percentage of elk tooth returns.

Anis indicated that the return percentage was 83%.

Lyle Bayles asked why more permits had not be recommended for the San Juan late season hunt.

Guy Wallace provided data on last season's hunting success and permit numbers, supporting the Division's rationale.

Bill Bates and Anis Aoude defended their recommendations, and explained the balance with other permit number allocations for the multiple season structure for the San Juan unit.

James Gilson expressed concern about the number of mature bull permits recommended for the Manti unit. He contended that the DWR might be too liberal in the number of permits recommended. James questioned the ability of the herd to maintain its quality over the years at the proposed rate of harvest.

Anis Aoude contended that the Division's recommendation was conservative and sustainable.

James additionally challenged the large number of permits recommended for the North San Rafael unit.

Both Bill Bates and Anis Aoude defended the Division's recommendations, citing aerial survey data and population models.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Paul Pace of the Henry Mountain Grazers expressed concern about the number of bison on the winter range and any future increase in the bison population objective.
Verlan King of Henry Mountain Grazers reiterated concern about the number of bison on the Henry Mountains winter range. He urged additional study of the sightability index and questioned the natural mortality factor and AUM allotment conversion.
Bill Bates affirmed that research on sightability is still planned, pending funding.
David Bailey of the Utah Farm Bureau expressed support for the removal of additional bison on the Henrys. He asked about the future proposal to transplant 25 bison to the Uintah Basin.
Bill Bates answered that the plan remained intact, but that work with bison health issues, capture techniques and Uintah County politicians still lay ahead.
Bill Bates, James Gilson and David Bailey discussed the current population agreement for bison.

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Verd Byrnes expressed satisfaction with the recommendations, affirming we are moving in the right direction.

Terry Sanslow cautioned raising the number of bison permits too much at the expense of hunt quality.

Bill Bates agreed that the mountain is already overrun with people during the hunt. Each permittee brings about 10 other people with him.

Verd Byrnes asked about bison harvest success for all seasons in 2007.

Bill separated harvest success by hunt, and predicted that the herd would be at its agreed objective within two years.

Lyle Bayles urged the RAC to increase the number of bull elk permits on the San Juan unit in the interest of providing more public opportunity. Lyle recognized that the early hunt was saturated, and did not support additional tags during that hunt, but recommended that more tags be issued for the later season hunts.

James Gilson and Anis Aoude debated elk management strategies, including spike bull hunting, management bull hunting, and mature bull permit recommendations.

Jordan Hatch and Bill Bates debated the Division's recommendation for bison permits on the Henrys. Jordan contended that the Division's permit recommendations will not be enough to bring the herd within objective by the allotted time.

James Gilson indicated that if too many permittees are on the mountain at the same time, hunter pressure would drive the herd into the Glen Canyon Recreation Area.

MOTION by Terry Sanslow to accept the Bucks, Bulls and OIAL permit numbers as presented, except that 10 permits be added to the San Juan management bull hunt; and that 5 permits be taken from the San Juan early hunt; and that 15 permits be added to the San Juan late hunt.

SECOND by Verd Byrnes

PASSED with a majority vote. Voting for the motion were: Terry Sanslow, Verd Byrnes, Pam Riddle, Jordan Hatch, and Wayne Hoskisson. Opposing the motion were: Kevin Albrecht, Drew Sitterud, and Lyle Bayles.

ELK UNIT MANAGEMENT PLANS

-by Anis Aoude, DWR Big Game Coordinator

Questions/Comments from the RAC:

Jordan Hatch asked about the number and disposition of AUMs in Range Creek, consequent to landowner's proposal to shift a portion of their grazing allotment from cattle to elk. Brad Crompton indicated that the landowners wanted to save the 2,700 AUMs for wildlife. The change was intended to accommodate an additional 250 elk.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Drew Sitterud commented that regardless of the number of permits allocated for the Range Creek unit, the harvest objective would be impossible, due to restricted access. David Bailey of the Utah Farm Bureau stated that the Bureau supported reducing the elk herd statewide.

MOTION by Verd Byrnes to accept the Elk Unit Management Plan as presented.

SECOND by Drew Sitterud

PASSED unanimously

BIGHORN SHEEP STATEWIDE MANAGEMENT PLAN

-by Anis Aoude, DWR Big Game Coordinator

Questions/Comments from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Verlan King asked how the Division arranged bighorn sheep transplants with the BLM. Bill Bates responded that agreements are negotiated through the RMP process. Verlan asked about the buffer between domestic and wild sheep. Bill answered nine miles.

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Lyle Bayles to accept the Bighorn Sheep Statewide Management Plan as presented.

SECOND by Terry Sanslow

PASSED unanimously

**CWMU RULE R657-37 5 5-YEAR REVIEW and
PROCEDURES FOR CONFIRMATION OF ORDINANCES ON HUNTING CLOSURES
R657-34**

-by Anis Aoude, DWR Big Game Coordinator

Questions/Comments from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Lyle Bayles to accept recommendations on both rules as presented.

SECOND by Drew Sitterud

PASSED unanimously

ADJOURNMENT

-by James Gilson, RAC Chairman at 8:35 p.m.

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Beaver High School
Beaver, UT
March 18, 2008
7:00 p.m.**

REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

MOTION: To accept the agenda and minutes as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2008

MOTION: To accept the deer permit numbers as presented with the exception that there be no increase in permit numbers on the Paunsaugunt unit.

VOTE: 7 in favor, 3 opposed.

MOTION: To accept the elk permit numbers as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

MOTION: To accept the pronghorn permit numbers as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

MOTION: To accept the OIAL permit numbers as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

ELK UNIT MANAGEMENT PLANS

MOTION: To approve the elk management plans with the corrections identified during our discussion and otherwise as presented.

VOTE: 6 in favor, 4 opposed.

BIG HORN SHEEP STATEWIDE MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION: To accept the big horn sheep statewide management plan as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

CWMU RULE R657-37 (5-YEAR REVIEW)

MOTION: To approve the CWMU rule as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

PROCEDURES FOR CONFIRMATION OF ORDINANCES ON HUNTING CLOSURES R657-34 (5 YEAR REVIEW)

MOTION: To approve the Procedure for Confirmation of Ordinances on hunting closures as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
 Beaver High School
 Beaver, UT
 March 18, 2008
 7:00 p.m.**

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Chairman Jake Albrecht Sam Carpenter Steve Dalton James Edwards Steve Flinders Gary Hallows Jack Hill Dell LeFevre Cordell Pearson Rex Stanworth Clair Woodbury	Anis Aoude Teresa Bonzo Scott Dalebout Lynn Chamberlain Gabe Patterson Micah Evans Giani Julander Dave Olsen Sean Kelly Robyn LaLumia Jim Lamb Douglas Messerly Dan Sorensen Jason Nicholes Tawnya Hunt Dustin Schaible Heather Perry Hal Stout	None	Harry Barber

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. There were approximately 106 interested parties in attendance in addition to the RAC members, Wildlife Board members and DWR employees.

Jake Albrecht: We've been waiting for a minute or two to get a quorum; we have a quorum now. My name is Jake Albrecht. I'm the chairman. I want to excuse Tom Hatch, with the Wildlife Board and Paul Niemeyer who is still in Salt Lake. And I seen him a couple of weeks ago at the Wildlife Board meeting; he looks really good and I think everything is as positive on as far as his treatment to his cancer. So hopefully everything will work out there. But I got a message from Tom today to excuse him; he had another meeting tonight. I'll start on my left and ask the RAC members to introduce themselves. Jack.

Jack Hill: My name is Jack Hill from Cedar City.

Clair Woodbury: I'm Clair Woodbury, an at-large representative.

Steve Dalton: My name is Steve Dalton from Teasdale, at-large.

Cordell Pearson: Cordell Pearson from Circleville, at-large.

Douglas Messerly: I'm Doug Messerly, Regional Supervisor with the Division of Wildlife in the Southern Region from Cedar City. I and my staff act as executive secretaries to this committee, nonvoting.

Rex Stanworth: Rex Stanworth from Delta, representing at-large.

James Edwards: Jim Edwards from Delta, representing the sportsman.

Gary Hallows: Gary Hallows representing agriculture.

Steve Flinders: Steve Flinders represent Fish Lake and Dixie National forest here in Beaver.

Dell LeFevre: Dell LeFevre, Boulder Escalante area, agriculture.

Jake Albrecht: Okay before we get into the agenda items I want to mention if you want to make comments tonight you need to fill out a comment card that some of the DWR representatives and people have in their hands. Those need to be filled out and brought up to us so that we have your name and what you want to talk about. Comments from the public will be three minutes long. If you're representing a group we'll allow five minutes. But after each presentation we'll have questions from the RAC, questions from the public, and then we'll have comments from the public, and then comments from the RAC, and then a RAC motion discussion and vote. And that's after each presentation. With that I'm going to turn the time, oh, one other thing I wanted to bring up is we'll have a tentative break at around 9:30. Hopefully we'd be out of here by then but I doubt it. So with that I'm going to turn the time to Heather Perry.

Procedure for Dedicated Hunters to Receive RAC Credit (Informational)

- Heather Perry, Southern Region Dedicated Hunter Coordinator

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Heather. Our first item of business tonight is to accept tonight's meeting agenda. Do we have a motion?

Review and Acceptance of Agenda (action)

Jack Hill: Mr. Chairman, I would so move.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a motion by Jack Hill and a second by Rex Stanworth. Any other discussion? All in favor please say aye. Any against? Motion carries.

Questions from the RAC:

None.

Questions from the Public:

None.

Comments from the Public:

None.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Jack Hill made the motion to accept the agenda as written. Rex Stanworth seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Review and Acceptance of Minutes (action)

Jake Albrecht: Second part of that is to approve last month's minutes. This is an action item. Jack.

Jack Hill: Mr. Chairman, I'd move for the acceptance of the minutes as distributed.

Jake Albrecht: Motion by Jack Hill and a second by Cordell Pearson.

Questions from the RAC:

None.

Questions from the Public:

None.

Comments from the Public:

None.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Jake Albrecht: Any other discussion? All in favor, aye. Any against? Motion carries.

Jack Hill made the motion to accept the previous month's minutes as written. Cordell Pearson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Jake Albrecht, RAC Chairman presented information regarding the December Wildlife Board Meeting.

Jake Albrecht: Okay it's time for the Wildlife Board Update. And as you guys know last month's meeting was about 28 minutes long and we were out of there. So I'm not going to talk about the Wildlife Board Update. What I'm going to ask is tonight we have a lengthy agenda. And I want to remind all RAC members that we need to do away with a lot of our chit-chat back and forth among some of ourselves and try to stay with the conversations and give the time to presenters that's doing the case to us and give him our full attention and maybe we can get through this a lot quicker. And I'm going to turn the time to Doug for a regional update.

Regional Update:

- Douglas Messerly, Southern Regional Supervisor

Douglas Messerly: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Since we met last the legislature has concluded and I just wanted to thank any legislators that are in the audience or that maybe come aware of this information that we appreciate their support. The Division of Wildlife fared pretty well.

- One of the most significant actions that was taken was some funds were approved to help us try to control the spread of Quagga mussels from Nevada to Utah and we intend to put that to good use.
- Bear results were recently posted; big game results will be posted in late April.
- Ice is off of Otter Creek and Minersville for those that are interested in fishing. Right at ice-off is a good time to go to those two lakes in particular.

And in the interest of time Mr. Chairman that concludes my remarks unless there's some questions.

Jake Albrecht: Does anybody have any questions for Doug from the RAC? Rex.

Rex Stanworth: Somewhere along the line it comes to my mind that we talked about that there would be a bill pertaining to guides in the State of Utah. What happened to that?

Douglas Messerly: It was guides and outfitters legislation that was never, that never did make it to the floor for a vote. It died essentially for lack of participation, essentially by the advocates that were sponsoring it. The legislation was written, the sponsor of the bill asked the Division of Wildlife, actually the Attorney General assigned to the Division of Wildlife, to help draft the legislation. But that legislation never made it to the floor. It was never voted on. So this is about the fourth time that's happened with legislation such as that.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, our first item on the agenda is upland game. This is an informational item. Dave Olsen. I'll turn the time to you Dave.

Upland Game (Informational)

- Dave Olsen, Wildlife Coordinator

See attachment 1

Sam Carpenter came in during beginning of presentation.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Dave. Do we have any questions from the RAC?

Questions from the RAC:

Jack Hill: I've got one.

Jake Albrecht: Jack Hill.

Jack Hill: How would you restrict hunting around a guzzler?

Dave Olsen: Well it's, what my input back to those folks was that the Division really doesn't have much authority in that. That would be a land management activity. Their main concern was vehicles and vehicular damage to the vegetation around guzzlers that they're seeing up north. So I don't see a way for the Division to do that unless it was some broad scale law where you couldn't hunt within so many feet of a guzzler and that's pretty unenforceable.

Jack Hill: It would seem to me, I applaud the idea of parking near a guzzler, that's a great idea. However, the policing of hunting near a guzzler I think would be impossible.

Dave Olsen: We agree at this stage of the discussion too.

Jake Albrecht: Rex Stanworth.

Rex Stanworth: The date on the forest grouse, that should help a little bit with our limited entry elk hunts, because that's always been a sore point with the guys. So moving it to the first Saturday I think would be good. Archery guys may not like it but the limited entry hunters will like that. Also, on the pheasants, am I correct, you're thinking about the entire state would have from November 1st to the 31st, that's private land, state land, everything?

Dave Olsen: That's the committee's suggestion to us is to consider just what you've described, that's correct.

Rex Stanworth: Okay, awesome. I think that's great.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions? I have one. Moving those dates that were suggested all the way through there, there must be some type of a meaning there.

Dave Olsen: There is. Beginning with chukars, it was mostly protection of the habitat around guzzlers. And some chukars by mid, by the 1st of October there's some evidence that they are less dependant on water so they wouldn't be held to the guzzler areas or the water areas nearly as tight. So that was a suggestion to help alleviate some of the pressure around guzzlers and the vegetative damage. The rest of it, most of the rest of it is social. It's just preferences on season openings. When I looked at the other states they were fairly close in what we do but there's a week or two differences in openings throughout all of the west here. So it's mostly social issues and it really won't have much impact biologically. I can go species by species if you want but I think generally that probably covers it.

Jake Albrecht: You're okay. Clair.

Clair Woodbury: Yeah Dave, I think those are a lot of great recommendations. I did have one question on the pheasant. That's quite a dramatic increase in days on pheasant.

Dave Olsen: It would be, biologically, as you know pheasants are in trouble in Utah. It isn't like it was when we grew up. And biologically that season would not have any impact because we're only harvesting males. It would mostly be a social issue. As you note there are three closing, or dates, or hunts in Utah. Mostly those are sociologically based. Whether resistance against longer seasons for whatever reasons and that, so.

Clair Woodbury: Okay. Well I think it's great by the way. I was just curious.

Dave Olsen: Okay. We're in the process of development so we don't know where we're going for sure.

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

Questions from the Public:

None.

Jake Albrecht: Seeing none, do we have any other comments from the public? No cards here.

Comments from the Public:

None.

Jake Albrecht: Comments from the RAC? Rex.

RAC Discussion:

Rex Stanworth: Dave I just wanted to say that, at least from my opinion on the drop the nonresident youth upland hunting requirement, I think that's a good idea myself.

Dave Olsen: I think it's got a lot of opportunity there I think.

Rex Stanworth: So I would tell you I would whole-heartedly support that one.

Dave Olsen: When we come back in May I doubt that will be a part of the recommendation package this year because it's going to take work outside the Division, administratively and legislatively, to probably do anything that way; but we're considering it.

Jake Albrecht: Okay if anyone else has any other comments they can go on to the DWR and probably e-mail those in to the State Division and they can look at those and take your recommendations. Okay, our next item is Bucks, Bulls, Permit numbers for 2008. This is an action item. Mr. A, how are you?

Anis Aoude: Good. How are you?

Jake Albrecht: I'm great. Go ahead and pronounce your name for us again and then we'll all have it right.

Anis Aoude: I'll do that in one second. Okay, my name is Anis Aoude. I'm the big game coordinator. And I'm happy to be here today to present the Bucks and Bulls, and Once In A Lifetime Permit recommendations.

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers for 2008 (Action)

- Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

See attachment 1

Jake Albrecht: Thank you. I don't know how the best way to do this, but I think overall if we went through them individually rather than jumping from like deer to pronghorn to bison and back and forth, is maybe we could start with the deer and work our way through the once in a lifetime. Would that work for you guys? Okay what we will do is we will first start with the deer, and we'll have questions from the RAC starting right now.

Deer

Questions from the RAC:

Jake Albrecht: Sam Carpenter.

Sam Carpenter: One of the things that I've always wondered, on your deer counts is when these deer counts are conducted and how do you go about, you know, doing these deer counts? I mean, when you go out and count, say the Paunsaugunt, how is that done? What time of year is it done?

Anis Aoude: One thing is we don't count deer; we classify deer. And basically those classifications where we go out, it's usually post hunting season, so basically right after the hunt is done and usually close to the rut. We go out and we classify deer and get a sufficient sample size to tell us how many buck to doe ratios we have and how many fawn to doe ratios we have. And then that plugs into a model with the harvest and all of that to give you a number of what the population is.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. Along the same lines, when you go out and you do these counts how many days do you actually spend in the field counting? I mean you go out and you spend two days, and how many people?

Anis Aoude: No it's a sample size issue. It's not a how many days issue. If you get a sufficient number, usually it's between 400 and 800 adults. A lot of times we get over 1000 deer classified. So it's basically a sufficient sample size that statistically tells you what's in the population. And that number can vary from unit to unit depending on the size of the unit.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, so you probably have a pretty good margin of error in those models.

Anis Aoude: No it's actually a very small margin of error because that statistical sample is high enough that can tell us probably within a 95 percent confidence interval of where we're at.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, and on the buck to doe ratios you're simply counting bucks. We're not...

Anis Aoude: We do classify them three points or better as well.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. And on your ratios, especially on your premium units, when you say the buck to doe ratio is 59:100 . . .

Anis Aoude: Right, that's just bucks, yep.

Sam Carpenter: Do you ever break it down into the fact that this is a premium unit and we should have a certain ratio of those bucks that would classify as . . .

Anis Aoude: No we don't, because given what you have, if you have a high enough buck to doe ratio you are going to have all age classes in that sample.

Sam Carpenter: Okay.

Anis Aoude: Because you're not shooting yearlings. You're not shooting two-year olds. You're mainly shooting the older age classes and very few of those.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, Steve, go ahead.

Steve Dalton: Yes Anis, I have a couple of questions. Has there been any more consideration given to population of the deer herd rather than just managing for buck to doe ratios?

Anis Aoude: Yes. I mean certainly populations play into it. You can only harvest what you have there. So our recommendations are based on both buck to doe ratios and populations. Basically we take the buck to doe ratios and figure out how many bucks we have given the population numbers and that's how many we draw from.

Steve Dalton: What about the issue we had with uh, that was brought up at the last RAC meeting about kind of micro-managing our deer herds. Has there been any more discussion or?

Anis Aoude: Well that's, you know that's uh, I guess that's for another RAC meeting. We certainly do, we currently do manage our limited entry units unit by unit. But as far as the general season that was an informational last year and it looks like people like it so we will probably bring it around next year in November as an action item and see how it goes. It looks like that will be the way we might be managing, depending on public input of course.

Steve Dalton: Okay.

Anis Aoude: But yeah, I mean it seems like people liked it and so I think we will be bringing it back as a recommendation. But as for now, in November is when we set those things and those have already been set. So at this RAC meeting all we can do is set numbers.

Steve Dalton: Okay. Yeah people have watched it with the elk and we've got the elk going the direction everybody likes, it looks like. So I'd sure like to see the deer managed the same way so we've got some better control.

Anis Aoude: Sounds good.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions? Rex.

Rex Stanworth: I was just wondering, are we getting anywhere with control over the archery hunters and where they go? And the dedicated hunters from arbitrarily being able to say we're going to go to the southern? We are getting by far our bigger percentage of those. They are not jointly shared by other regions. Are we getting anywhere close to having those done?

Anis Aoude: Well I don't know what you mean by that. That's the way it is, it's set in rule that they can choose their region or whatever. I guess I don't understand what . . .

Jake Albrecht: If I might jump in Rex. Lets maybe stay to the permit numbers and then when mule deer management plan comes up, I think it's in November, we'll see if we can address that.

Rex Stanworth: You don't want to take that on this year, I mean now?

Jake Albrecht: Not now. If it's okay with you. Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Okay just one more question. This would be to Hal. Hal are you the one that did the deer count on the Paunsaugunt this year?

Anis Aoude: The classification.

Sam Carpenter: Classification, excuse me. Are you aware of the 3- point problem that exists out there? I mean I don't know how many days you spend out. I spent an awful lot of time out there this year. And I did notice that we do really have an awful lot of 3-point, mature 2-point bucks on the unit; that we have kind of degraded the quality through the years. Did you notice that?

Hal Stout: Well post season what we generally notice is that a lot of the bigger bucks are gone, obviously because of the hunt. So I'm confident that we'll have big bucks again next year. But when we do our counts is post season and so we're not looking at what was there before the hunt started. So yeah, and uh, so I guess that's the best answer I've got for you on that Sam.

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

Questions from the Public:

None.

Jake Albrecht: Seeing none we'll move on to comments from the public. Our first one is Wade Heaton and he's representing the Alton CWMU. Wade.

Comments from the Public:

Wade Heaton: Thank you Sir. I just wanted to get a clarification they were going to increase permit numbers on the Paunsaugunt. There had been some discussion about that before the meeting. The way that I understand is there's actually been a 20 tag, or about a 13 percent increase into the Paunsaugunt numbers. And I've talked at length with the Southern Region office and our biologist Hal and the reason for them doing that, recommending that increase is simply because of the buck to doe ratios. The post-season classification was 59 bucks per 100 does on the Paunsaugunt. And that was the trigger that motivated them to go ahead and increase the permits by those 20. The problem is, as many of you will remember you cut the permits in half on the Paunsaugunt about 4 years ago, roughly 4 years ago. And what we've seen in the meantime is about a two-tenths of one-year increase each year. So it was started, the first year we started our age objective and started taking that data we were about 4.2 years old was the average age. It went to about 4.4 years. In '07 we were at 4.8 years, was the average age of the deer we're killing. So we're making some headway on there. And my point is that the cuts that you made 4 years ago were good and we've made some progress. Things look better than they did 4 years ago. But we are not ready for a permit increase, at least a trophy permit increase. And I think most of the people would recognize that, is that we're just not there. We need more time. To address the issue of the uh, the concern the DWR, with the 59 bucks per 100 does. I've got an alternate proposal for you; that would be to leave the number of permits on the Paunsaugunt the same, where they are at now, which is 150 total. It's 30 archery, 90 rifle, 30 muzzleloader. Leave that number the same and implement, we have a few different options for ya, but one that would go in effect for '08 would be this, and give me just a minute here to give you the details of this; it would be in essence they would get a packet along with their permit. In that packet it would state that they could harvest a management type buck, and we'll need to go into details of a management type buck, and this was only going to be for '08, keep in mind, what we wanted to do was implement maybe some kind of a management hunt later on, but obviously that's not going to happen for '08, we're past that timeframe, so we're looking at '09. So for '08 we wanted to get something implemented something started. So this is the plan; have them harvest a

management type deer with their trophy permit, those that draw out in '08. With that they can bring it in, check it into a DWR official, and given some criteria, and we've worked out some of this criteria and I'll get long if I go into it but I guess I need to as well, is that it has to be 3-points or less on a side, eye guards are not included, points around the bases are not included. The deer needs to be 4-years old or older. And if they will bring that deer in, and obviously these are going to be people that shot this deer late in the season, as they didn't see anything they wanted to harvest. They shoot this deer bring it in. This is going to affect our buck to doe ratio in the way the Division wants it to go. In essence we'll be lowering that age objective a little bit, or that buck to doe ratio from the 59 to 100. We lower that down with these extra cull bucks that we kill and these people having incentive to take them out of the population just because they get their bonus points back and only have a one year waiting period to come back in two years later. Then in '09 we could implement a management plan if that means additional permits that would be fine. And that's going to affect this buck to doe ratio without negatively affecting our trophy permit numbers. The bottom line is we cannot tolerate any more trophy permits right now. We're just not there. We have some bucks, some fawn to doe ratios coming up in the next few years that are going to help us but we're not there yet. I think that's kind of a given amongst everybody. And this is an alternative to increasing trophy permits is to go this other route and look more towards culling some of these management bucks. Thanks. Any questions on that? I know I covered a lot there real quick but.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Wade. We'll go on to the other comments and then if you have any questions from the RAC will address those. Our next one is Jeremy Chamberlain. He's representing Kane Garfield Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife, Paunsaugunt buck permit numbers. You've got 5 minutes.

Jeremy Chamberlain: Thank you. I represent the Kane Garfield SFW Chapter. We are in favor of this proposal. We are against increasing the number of buck, trophy buck permit numbers for the Paunsaugunt. I have spoken with a number of people from the, I guess the east side of the Paunsaugunt, Tropic Escalante area. They weren't able to make it here tonight but they are also in favor of this proposal. And thank you for your time.

Jake Albrecht: Jeremy Houston. You have 3 minutes.

Jeremy Houston: Thank you. I just wanted to address kind of and concur with what Wade Heaton and Jeremy Chamberlain already mentioned. I represent a few folks from the Kanab area and we spend a lot of time out on the Paunsaugunt, especially after the hunts are over and get to look at a lot of the deer. And most of us feel that an increase in permits on the Paunsaugunt by 20, as Wade had mentioned, is we feel that that's too soon. We haven't been seeing a lot of the big bucks that we've normally seen after the cuts were handed out a few years back. We started seeing some good improvements and we hope to continue to see those improvements. And again, I'd just like to say that we feel that this increase in 20 permits is too soon. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Rusty Aiken, SFW Cedar, Paunsaugunt deer numbers. You've got 5 minutes.

Rusty Aiken: I appreciate the opportunity to speak. I also spearheaded a group called Friends of the Paunsaugunt about 4 years ago that was instrumental in helping reduce the permits on the Paunsaugunt. We concur with Wade Heaton's proposal not to increase the tags on the Paunsaugunt and to do some type of management hunts similar to what they've done on the elk hunt. What's happening on these units is they're, they leave these non-desirable bucks, these trophy hunters, the guys that put in year after year on these hunts, they don't want them to make. They grow up and they're the ones breeding the females. And we need some type of program to try to cull those out. So that would be it.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, that's all the comment cards we have from the public. So we'll go to comments from the RAC. Sam I guess we're to you.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Sam Carpenter: I spend a lot of time out there and I have a great concern with what we're doing with the unit. I actually spent 21 days on the unit this winter, from November 13th to December 10th, counting deer. I dedicated 12 full days in doing these counts. My numbers don't coincide with the State's by quite a ways. But I did come up with a count and did the ratios. I come up with 45 bucks per 100 does in my counts. I counted a total of 1821 deer in these 12 days that I was out there. And of these 45 bucks that I seen on the Paunsaugunt 26 of those bucks are juveniles, I mean less than 2 years old. 13 of the bucks were mature but they were 3-points or 3x4's, 2x3's. We have an abundance of large mature deer on the Paunsaugunt that have poor genetics. I counted out of the 45 bucks 6 mature bucks that had 4 or more points on each side. That's about 13 percent. I could go down and do the percents; I don't really feel that that's necessary. Some other problems we have out on this, on the Paunsaugunt unit is we have a total of 49 tags on this unit that are guided. We have 20 CWMU tags, 21 landowner tags, POWA is the name of the association that has those, and we have 8 conservation tags. And when we get this many hunters out there with the optics, the guides, the money involved, these tags, all of them sell for thousands of dollars. These guys do not want to go out there and take an inferior buck. In our status quo hunters, right now these guys it's a once in a lifetime opportunity for them to hunt this unit. We're talking about increasing that and adding more people to the hunts. These hunts are hunted generally early. The majority of them are hunted in the first of October, the ten-day hunt there. These people give up those 13 points, or their 13 years of waiting to draw a tag only to go down there and see a lot of inferior bucks. The quality bucks are generally taken by these guided tags and it's just not a really fair opportunity to be calling this a premium unit when we just do not have premium bucks left on the unit. We've got it down to a point to where, when I did my count when I was out, uh, these inferior bucks this inferior gene pool is doing all the breeding. By the time the hunts are over and we're post hunt we've taken most of the quality out of the deer. And I think that's kind of what Hal said when he was talking about going out there. You know it's not, we know the bucks will be back because the, I believe they call it mitochondrial DNA that is passed on in the females, is generally what is keeping us going and keeping quality bucks out there. I mean we do have the DNA on the unit to do this but we've got to a point where we really need to remove some of these, cull some of these bucks. And I think they've come up with a good plan on how to do that. Another problem that we're not addressing is Arizona. This year in 2008 there will be 250 tags on the 12B unit. They have created a special hunt in Arizona, this is its 3rd year running. There will be 175 tags for that unit that run from the 23rd of October to the 4th of November, strictly to take advantage of this migration of the bucks coming off of the Paunsaugunt and wintering in that area in Arizona. They'll also have 25 tags that they hunt November 23rd to December 2nd that take place right there along the border. These are some more of our bucks. So by the time breeding and everything is over we have lost all of our quality bucks. And I would challenge, you know, Hal or anybody out there on what they've seen too, and I think they will agree that we've really got a problem when it comes down to the rut on this unit.

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

Jack Hill: Yeah. I've got a couple.

Jake Albrecht: Jack Hill.

Jack Hill: Sam was kind enough to send me a copy of the information he generated. And as a result of that I, what the hell is poor genetics Sam? And how do you determine poor genetics in deer?

Sam Carpenter: Genetics, as far as concerning this unit and the Paunsaugunt, or antler . . .

Jack Hill: Now wait a minute Sam. If you're going to define something it's going to have to be applicable to all deer. How do you define poor genetics?

Sam Carpenter: Okay and it will. And it is applicable to all deer. And you've got a biologist out there that can answer that better probably than I am. I certainly don't claim to be a biologist.

Jack Hill: You were the one that used the term and I thought maybe you could define it for us.

Sam Carpenter: Genetics is, if you have deer out there that are non-typical that is a genetic trait that is carried with that animal. This comes with maturity along with the fact that the gene was passed on to him. As this turns out we have the same problem I think with elk with the 5-point elk. It's a genetic trait. It's not something I invented to do this. This is just something, I read a lot of biology work and I've studied some of that stuff. It's something that is passed on from generation to generation. And it has to do with the size and the antler structure of these animals.

Jack Hill: Okay, in your statistics here the mature 4x4 or better, would you consider those good animals or poor animals?

Sam Carpenter: That is a good trait. These animals are scored. One of the reasons these people hunt these is to get one with a high score and that is part of that formula.

Jack Hill: The numbers that you provided us, are those 4x4 or better animals, are they quality bucks?

Sam Carpenter: Though . . .

Jack Hill: Yes or no?

Sam Carpenter: No.

Jack Hill: They're not?

Sam Carpenter: They are 22, 24 inch. They will be in time if they are allowed to reach maturity, yes.

Jack Hill: Okay then if that's the case then there are 52 of them and 837 does, and I'm assuming that if they are 4x4 or better they're the big kids on the block. Is that correct?

Sam Carpenter: Yes, pretty much.

Jack Hill: Okay. In any animals that I see that breed multiple females, the big guys get the pick of the does and they have a big harem if you will. Is that correct?

Sam Carpenter: They do not have a harem in mule deer. Elk that is true.

Jack Hill: Well okay. Let me change, they generally service a lot of female animals. Is that correct?

Sam Carpenter: Hal would be more qualified to answer that. From what I understand a doe will come into estrus five times during the rut until she is bred. So yes you could assume that. But you have to have the quality there to have the breeding done. It is not there at the end of the hunts.

Jake Albrecht: Okay Jack where we going with this?

Jack Hill: Where we're going is I'm trying to point out to Sam that if he's got that many good bucks and if you divide 52 into 837 you get something like 15, 16 to 1. That means that everyone of those 4x4 bucks are going to breed about 15 or 16 does and they're going to produce good animals. I don't know where the problem is. Couple that with the fact that . . . Go ahead.

Sam Carpenter: No that's fine. You're doing fine. It's 13 percent is what that formulates down to if you're talking about the formula with the does and the 52 bucks.

Jack Hill: Well I don't see a problem Sam. That's the point I want to make. It's all gloom and doom. And it would look like to me if those big 4x4 bucks get into those lovely young ladies they're going to have a lot of good fawns.

Sam Carpenter: When you talk about these good bucks and getting into those does you probably have a 3-point buck there that is older and more mature that is the master buck and will not allow that smaller buck to breed until he reaches genetic state and gets big enough to dominate. So I don't really know where we're going with this other than, I took the time to do the survey, there is a problem on there. If you'd like to talk to guides, different people that do participate on this premium unit I think you will find that there's, we have a problem with mature bucks getting into the breeding season.

Jack Hill: Okay. The last thing I want to say is the professional biologists have not pointed out a problem on the Paunsaugunt. And that's all I've got to say.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we've had some comments from people in the audience as well as from here on the RAC that we have possibly a genetic problem on the Paunsaugunt. Some people have brought up management deer. And we talked about management elk a year ago. And our management elk turned into a shooting 2 and 3-year old elk and not doing away with the problem. So to me I think we need to decide a way to get through the meeting tonight and then the CWMU on the Paunsaugunt as well as the hunter and that come up with a plan that they can get to the RAC members well in advance so that we can see what's happening, along with the DWR, and maybe come up with some type of plan rather than sit here and try to hash it out back and forth. Rex.

Rex Stanworth: I'd like to just ask one question on this. The management elk hunt, and I'm jumping ahead but I'm relating it back to this management deer hunt, the management elk hunt, were there any face to face seminar training for those hunters as there is for say somebody that goes after a bighorn sheep?

Anis Aoude: No there weren't.

Rex Stanworth: Okay. That was a recommendation by the elk committee, was that those management hunt individuals would meet and have a face-to-face meeting to where discussions could take place of exactly what the Division was looking at. Obviously we couldn't mandate it. We were trying to get them to make sure that they understood, A: the consequences if they squeezed the trigger on a big bull

and 2: what the idea of the formula or what we were trying to do with the management and what their final animal that they shot would have a lot of repercussions for the future hunts down. So that never took place.

Anis Aoude: No.

Rex Stanworth: It did not. And I guess my comment for Wade is that unless there can be a face to face discussion on what exactly you want you're probably not going to get the results that you're looking for. So you know, when we get to elk I'll make some discussions on that. But anyway that's my comment in relationship to the deer. He's going to have to have more information.

Jake Albrecht: Cordell Pearson.

Cordell Pearson: This is for the gentleman from DWR. Do you people feel like there's a genetic problem on the Paunsaugunt? And we've heard your . . .

Anis Aoude: No we do not. And you cannot manage genetics by hunting. It's been tried over and over and over again. More than 50 percent of the genetics are in the doe. You're not going to manage, you would have to kill more management bucks than you do trophy bucks to manage it and that would mean so many permits out there that the guy trying to hunt his trophy buck is going to be over run by people. The only way to deal with this problem is to have more permits. So you will have some hunters that are going to shoot a 3-point, some are going to shoot a 4-point and it all works out in the end. I think we're trying to, we're over thinking this whole thing. Management hunts do not work unless you have a real controlled environment as they do in high fence areas. It does not work on wild populations. It never has and it never will.

Jake Albrecht: Steve Dalton.

Steve Dalton: Yes, I have a comment on the genetics. We were taught and I've read repeatedly in livestock publications that 65% of your genetics come from your bulls. So maybe wild animals are different?

Anis Aoude: In a controlled setting where they are bred into each other again and again and again, yeah you do have that bias. But in wild populations no, it doesn't work that way. Because you're basically breeding the bull into the same strain or you're trying to get that strain. The bull has been bred into it. It really does not, it's not 65 percent on the bulls, on the bucks.

Jake Albrecht: Rex Stanworth.

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion pertaining to the deer numbers. I'd like to recommend that we accept the State's DWR's recommendation with the exception of the Paunsaugunt. I would like to make the number for archery at 31, that the any weapon would be somewhere around 97, and I'm talking just about resident, and that the muzzleloader would be somewhere around the same number as last year, around 31.

Jake Albrecht: So what is your net increase on the total?

Rex Stanworth: Well let's see, 1 on archery, 7 on any weapon, 1 on muzzleloader.

Jake Albrecht: So you're a plus 9 total?

Rex Stanworth: Yes.

Jake Albrecht: So we have a motion by Rex Stanworth to accept DWR's numbers on deer statewide and also on the Paunsaugunt to increase by a total of 9 permits. Am I correct on that Rex?

Rex Stanworth: Yes.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have a second? Okay motion dies for lack of a second.

Jake Albrecht: Sam Carpenter.

Sam Carpenter: Yes, I would like to make a motion that we accept the Division's numbers on all of the units but the Paunsaugunt and that we have no increase in tags, that we keep them the same as they are. And I'd also like to make a recommendation that we allow this culling opportunity the way it was suggested by allowing a 3-point or less buck to be taken, checked in and if this does meet the requirements, the 4-year age requirements, that the hunter will be allowed to waive his points and only have a 1 year waiting period before he can reapply for this hunt.

Steve Dalton: I'll second that.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we have a motion by Sam and we have a second by Steve Dalton. And the motion was, if I'm correct, is we support the DWR in the statewide numbers with exception of the Paunsaugunt which stays the same as it was last year and that we also come up with a process that anybody who takes a 3-point or less would only forfeit their points for one year. Am I correct on that?

Sam Carpenter: They will not lose any points. They will have a one-year waiting period and this must be a 4-year or older buck. Okay, hold on.

Anis Aoude: That can't be done unless it's already in the proclamation because folks have to know ahead of time when they put in. They've already put in for this hunt basically. You can't tell them after the fact that if you shoot a 4-point or a 3-point you may or may not forfeit your points. If something like this has to be done it has to be put into the proclamation, which is done in November. So you should have had some forethought if this was going to happen instead of doing it at this late date. If you want to cut the permits go ahead but this is going to be a nightmare to administer.

Sam Carpenter: Okay and I agree that it would complicate things. Can I restate this motion then?

Jake Albrecht: Will you reject your second?

Steve Dalton: I'll retract my second.

Jake Albrecht: Okay Sam Carpenter, back to you.

Sam Carpenter: Okay I agree with the numbers that the state has presented on all the units but the Paunsaugunt, and that we have no increase on the Paunsaugunt in tag numbers, all the way across.

Jack Hill: Would someone clarify the motion for me.

Jake Albrecht: Okay I will do that for you Jack Hill. We have a motion on the floor to accept the DWR's recommendations on the statewide deer with the exception of the Paunsaugunt will stay the same on the permit numbers, as was last year. We have a second by Steve Dalton. Any other discussion? Seeing none, we have a call for a motion. All in favor please raise your right hand. I count seven. Is that correct? All those against please raise your right hand. Against we have 2, 3? Motion carries.

Sam Carpenter made the motion to accept the deer permit numbers as presented by the DWR with the exception that the Paunsaugunt numbers remain the same as last year with no increase. 7 in favor, 3 opposed (Dell LeFevre, Steve Flinders, Gary Hallows opposed)

Jake Albrecht: Moving right along we will now go to elk units. We had the presentation so now we'll go to questions from the RAC.

Elk

Questions from the RAC:

Jake Albrecht: Okay I have one. In the management plans, looking at the Monroe unit, is the management plan calling for a change to, I think it's 6-7.

Anis Aoude: Those were already changed last year.

Jake Albrecht: Okay in the management plan in here, right here on the Monroe it's got it classified as a 6-7.

Anis Aoude: Okay that might be an error. I'm not sure. Do you have a copy of that?

Jake Albrecht: On the second page it says bull harvest composition will be maintained at 6-7 years on this unit. Second part of my question on the Monroe is it says the elk population on this unit is currently under the objective of 1800. The population is increasing. It goes down about a paragraph and it says, over the last 5 years the population has been in a downward trend. So is it increasing or decreasing?

Jim Lamb: Yes, the population according to the count, or according to the classification data that we do from the air with a helicopter, the population is in a downward trend.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. The first part of the population it says the population is increasing. And then we go into the paragraph a little lower and it says that it's in a downward trend.

Jim Lamb: Yeah you're right it doesn't make any sense. I wanted that on the record so, and that's my fault.

Jake Albrecht: If you're correct it's in a downward trend.

Jim Lamb: Yes it is.

Anis Aoude: And that is a mistake in there on the 6-7. It should be 5-6.

Jake Albrecht: The second part is 5-6?

Anis Aoude: Yes. That got changed last year but I guess it didn't make it into this draft of it. And that was already voted on by the board.

Jake Albrecht: And if we had left it in there it would have been 6-7 this year?

Anis Aoude: No, that part of it was already changed. This is only changing the population objectives. This RAC and Board process is only focusing on the population objectives.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Questions from the RAC then. Any other discussions, questions?

Steve Flinders: Yeah Mr. Chairman. Anis aren't we looking at everything in these management plans, age objectives?

Anis Aoude: No the age objective was already voted on last year. The only thing that was left to do was to look at the population objectives and finalize those plans. It's been a three-year process.

Steve Flinders: So the Beaver changed as well then; I see it in your table there.

Anis Aoude: Yes.

Steve Flinders: My question is about any weapon hunts, they're 57 to 60 percent of the permits. I guess that's dictated by the statewide plan, right?

Anis Aoude: Right.

Steve Flinders: Is the discretion on the distribution between the early and the late hunts left up to the regional biologists?

Anis Aoude: Yes, that's left up to the regional biologist. The reason for that is we want to take so many in any weapon type but some feel that some of the elk are more vulnerable on winter ranges than others. So we had a couple of units where they ended up having a higher success rate. And that hunt was really meant to have a lower success rate so they decided to put fewer permits to try to maintain a more even success rate, I guess. So yeah the big chunk that goes into the any weapon total is preset, but where they put them percentage wise is at the discretion of the region.

Steve Flinders: Thanks

Jake Albrecht: Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: I kind of have a couple of questions. Number one was on the 5-point,

Anis Aoude: The management bull?

Cordell Pearson: Yes. What were the age of bulls that were killed on the Monroe?

Anis Aoude: The Monroe you said? The Monroe was an average of 3.7 years old.

Cordell Pearson: So this did not work out at all for that particular mountain then, right?

Anis Aoude: Well it worked as far as providing opportunity. If you're managing for older age class, no it didn't. And to be truthful I guess we didn't really expect a lot of older bulls getting killed on a management bull hunt. Unless you have somebody guiding them most people are going to pull the trigger on the first or the last 5-point they see whichever.

Cordell Pearson: My other question is, just real quick, if the Monroe herd is going down why are we issuing more permits?

Anis Aoude: Well the herd is going down but the bull numbers are not down. These are bull permits, which don't effect population; in fact they may help to increase populations if you remove bulls from a population. Because basically you have a number you have to set and if there's more bulls there's fewer cows so fewer calves are being born. So we're actually trying to kill more bulls to increase the population. It sounds counter productive but actually that's how it works.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, you've answered probably part of my question on this. If I look at the numbers on Monroe, with the management bulls, you're looking at taking approximately 110. On the Dutton you're looking at taking 148. And if I have my numbers right on the Pahvant you're right close to 100. The Monroe and the Dutton are 5 to 6-year old units. The Pahvant is 6-7. And you said in your presentation that all of them are over about a year and a half in age. The Pahvant has approximately 1400 head of elk, or that's what it's allocated for. The Monroe is, I think we counted with 80 percent and a 20, I think we were around 900 to 1000, at the last count. And on the Dutton I think we were at 1250 to 1300. My question is why the Monroe tends to pull more numbers than the Pahvant when they all have similar age structure being over a year and a half and the Pahvant has more elk numbers?

Anis Aoude: I don't understand the question. Each unit is looked at separately and how far it is above objective. And that's the percentage we would like to recommend for permits to increase. So say it's 20 percent over objective, by age objective, we would like them to be able to recommend from 10 to 20 percent increase on that unit. So they are all done individually. We don't lump them together and say let's do this on that. So say it's a 6 to 7-year old objective, and they are at 5. And say they're 20 percent over that age objective. Well our formula says you can increase permits from 10 to 20 percent. Not to go above the 20 percent and not to increase more than 100 percent in a 2-year period. So it is all formula driven. So everything in here is to get us to approach the goal that is the objective. So I guess I can't answer on multiple units. If you want to break it down unit-by-unit I can tell you what percentage it was over and then what percentage they recommended.

Jake Albrecht: Well on the Pahvant it says you have 58 bulls to 100 cows a year ago. And their total number on that elk unit counted, Doug help me if I'm wrong, is around 1400 head. That was in your aerial count, right. It's a little higher than that. So my question was, is why wouldn't that produce a similar number of elk being killed on it as what the Monroe would be?

Anis Aoude: Well the thing is our, the way we set our permits doesn't look at populations. It looks at the percent that you're over objective on your ages. And then once we set our number we make sure that we're not over harvesting the bulls, which we're not. So we're, and some units it's going to seem like we're going slower than others and on some units it's going to seem like we're going faster, but the

net result is to get to the objective. And we believe the increase we're recommending is going to get us closer. I guarantee we're not going to overshoot it.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, so when you get your samples in each year from the people killing their elk and that, that tells you your age structure.

Anis Aoude: Right, exactly.

Jake Albrecht: So on the Monroe approximately all of your elk that came in last year would have had to have been really high in age.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, exactly.

Jake Albrecht: And on the Pahvant maybe a few at the 400 and less in, is that what you're saying?

Anis Aoude: I'm not sure what the 400 means. But it's ages is what we're at.

Jake Albrecht: A big bull.

Anis Aoude: Yeah we're looking at ages. So 400 doesn't correlate with age very well.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, Steve go ahead.

Steve Flinders: Hey Jake, it's a good question you raised. And Anis, you know he's talking about the permits, bull permits based on per capita elk. And if you look at it, at the Beaver unit for example with 70 or 72 permits for that 1000 head, that's a high rate of harvest for those bulls at 6 to 7 year old age objective compared to the Pahvant or compared to others around the state. And I bet it's been 5 years since the Division's left that and all the eggs are in the age objective basket now and to see where it takes us. We're going down that road to find the window that 6-7 or 5-6. But the numbers do the same things to me. You know, how can we keep killing this number of bulls on Monroe or Beaver? And when we run out we'll have the answer.

Anis Aoude: And that's the thing, the reason we are able to kill that many bulls is the elk are long lived and you have about 10 years worth of surplus. We haven't killed these bulls, they're still out there, they're living. They can live to 15 years old. So you've got about 10 years worth of surplus bulls built up. So you're not killing what you're producing; you're killing what you have in the bank. So until we cut that number to a point where we're starting to kill what we're producing we're not going to know where that magic number is.

Jake Albrecht: Okay I have one more question. Would we be better off increasing permit numbers by a few and doing away with the management bulls?

Anis Aoude: That was our original recommendation way back in the day, but obviously someone thought that this management bull hunt was a good idea.

Jake Albrecht: If I remember DWR presented it to us a year ago.

Anis Aoude: No, it wasn't our recommendation. It came from the committee. In any case we presented it but it was a committee driven thing. So I guess we can't really go I guess what the committee recommends.

Rex Stanworth: I'd like to just make one statement. You're correct, the committee recommended it but the Division did not follow the instructions. The instructions were that the people going on the management hunts would be given a class and those classes would determine, would help determine and give those folks some idea of what we wanted them to do. That didn't happen. So now you had people that went out and they just had a, they had a hunt. So uh, when I drew a bighorn sheep I went to a class. I understand that used to be the case on buffalo but I'm not sure that happens any more. But anyway, that was our recommendation was if we had the management hunt we need to educate these people as to what that management hunt is. And if we go to a management deer hunt I would suggest that we have the same kind of a situation. So it's tough to say that it was unsuccessful because the ideas that were given out were not followed.

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

Questions from the public:

None.

Jake Albrecht: We don't have any comment cards from the public so they must be happy.

Comments from the public:

None.

Jake Albrecht: So we're to the comments from the RAC now.

Comments from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: Jake I'll just follow up on my question and voice support for that late any weapon hunt in November. I think we're still one of the few states in the west that hunts elk at the rate that we do in the peak of the rut with a rifle. And any time we can push some permits into that late hunt and let some bulls come through that September hunt, you know anybody can hunt them when they're bugling they say. And that's not the case everywhere but I know it is here on this Beaver unit. And there's been some discussion about there are actually fewer permits on the Beaver this year in November than there were last year, and they went to the September hunt. But anyway no folks commented on that tonight but . . .

Jake Albrecht: Okay I've got to back up just one second because I did get an e-mail from Norm McKee and he had a comment on the elk and I forgot to read that into the minutes. But he's talking about the proposed Kaiparowits unit management plan. And he goes on to say it appears elk habitat on the USFS and BLM is not sufficient for a large population of elk, but 25, that's like nothing. A more reasonable number would be 100 or so. That would allow for natural movement of elk onto these adjacent federal lands from the Plateau unit to the north. Elk are a native species to these lands and without viable concern it does not make sense to control the small population of elk from using the federal lands on the Kaiparowits unit. So he's stating that he would like to see, unless there's some viable concerns, the elk

management plan go from 25 to approximately 100 or something like that, if I read that right. (See attachment 2)

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any other comments on the elk numbers then? In my opinion I would rather see the Division increase some permit numbers on these units that have management bulls and do away with the management bull process. And I don't know that you can do that so we will skip that. And we need to go to a motion to either accept or amend the recommendations.

Jack Hill: Mr. Chairman, I would move to accept the recommendations as written.

Rex Stanworth: I'll second that.

Jake Albrecht: We have a motion by Jack Hill to accept the DWR's presentation and a second by Rex Stanworth. Any other discussion? All in favor please raise your right hand. All against? Motion carries. Unanimous

Jack Hill made the motion to accept the elk permit numbers as presented by the DWR. Rex Stanworth seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Pronghorn

Questions from the RAC:

Jake Albrecht: Our next item is antelope. Do we have any questions from the RAC?

None.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any questions from the public?

Questions from the Public:

None.

Jake Albrecht: We don't have any comment cards.

Comments from the Public:

None.

Jake Albrecht: So we're to comments from the RAC.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Jake Albrecht: Steve Dalton.

Steve Dalton: I wanted to complement Jim Lamb for having a meeting today on the antelope. I think that helped a lot. It kept me from asking Jim a lot of questions today so. It looks like we're going to be to objective with our antelope by 2009 so that will be great if that happens. That's all.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, do we have a motion? Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: I made a motion we accept DWR's proposal as recommended.

Jake Albrecht: We have a motion by Cordell to accept the DWR's proposal on antelope. We have a second by Steve Dalton. Any other discussion? Okay, seeing no other discussion, all in favor please raise your right hand. All those against? Motion carries.

Cordell Pearson made the motion to accept the pronghorn permit numbers proposal as written. Steve Dalton seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Once In A Lifetime Permit Numbers

Jake Albrecht: Okay our next one is One In A Lifetime Permit Numbers. Questions from the RAC.

Questions from RAC:

Jake Albrecht: Rex Stanworth.

Rex Stanworth: Just for information, the late cow hunt that was on Bison, that uh, do you know what the success ratio of that was? I was going to ask Steve about that.

Anis Aoude: Yeah it was about 65 percent.

Rex Stanworth: So there was quite a number of those cows killed.

Anis Aoude: Yes.

Rex Stanworth: I just heard today from one gentleman that had a permit that it was extraordinarily tough hunting in those late hunts for cows. And he was concerned that maybe there was not enough harvest on those.

Anis Aoude: No we had sufficient harvest.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions from the RAC? Any questions from the public?

Questions from public:

None.

Jake Albrecht: We have no comment cards other than I have one from Norm McKee in his letter he sent me.

Comments from public:

Jake Albrecht: And Norm would have liked to have been here but he's had some family problems that he needed to attend. He talks about statewide management goals and objectives, the population management plan. Establish an optimum population of bighorn sheep in all suitable habitat within the state. Increase the total numbers of bighorns managed by the DWR by 50 percent. And increase all existing herds to be at least a minimum viable level of 125 bighorns. These management goals will not

be accomplished unless some changes are made. At present the coordination and communications between the staff of the Southern Region DWR and federal agencies is sorely lacking. As for the bighorn sheep plan no discussion has occurred with the BLM personnel regarding the proposed amendment to the plan. Currently the BLM's Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument has science and restoration plans under review. Both these documents contain pertinent suggestions for desert bighorn sheep, both in habitat need and expansion of populations. DWR staff were invited to participate in the development of the monument's plans and submit suggestions that would allow the plan to complement the amendment so the statewide plan now proposes. The DWR personnel expressed no interest to coordinate the efforts thus the item "E" is meaningless at this time in the southern region. With regards to transplant on the Grand Staircase new populations of desert bighorn sheep should be seriously considered in the following areas: Kaiparowits- Escalante, which is Little Death Hollow, Horse Canyons, Calf Creek, Sand Creek, Mamie Creek, Death Hollow Canyons, 25 Mile Wash. Kaiparowits-east is Paradise Escalante Drip Tank Canyons, Paunsaugunt, Buckskin Gulch. In addition several areas on the nearby Glen Canyon National Recreation area should be considered: Cow Canyon, Long Bowns Canyon, Kaiparowits- West is Lake Powell shoreline area, Padre Bay Canyon, Warm Creek Bay Canyon. As shown several other important bighorn sheep habitat areas should be considered for transplants and augmentations that are not mentioned in the proposed plan. He goes on to say that he was appointed by Director Kevin Conway to serve as a member of the new BLM's Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument Advisory Committee. He was thus reappointed by Director Jim Karpowitz to serve as the sub term. And he goes on to say unfortunately how I have often struggled to maintain some dialog with the one agency that I need most to promote their interest, the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources. The information that I have mentioned above only illustrates the problem that others and I are having with the DWR and coordinating the interest of wildlife in this region of Utah. Norm McKee. (See attachment 2) So that's the only comment that we had from the public so we'll go to comments from the RAC, unless any of you guys want to comment to that. Okay, Doug.

Douglas Messerly: Mr. Chairman I guess the first thing I would like to know is if Mr. McKee is writing representing the Bureau Of Land Management or himself? And I presume he was representing himself. We do meet and talk with Grand Staircase personnel, had coordination meetings as recently as mid February. I haven't heard this complaint before and I'm sorry that this complaint had to be aired in such a public setting. I will be glad to continue to work with Harry Barber who sits on this committee, who I have never heard this complaint from, and see what we can do to rectify the situation. Mr. McKee is a retired biologist from the Division of Wildlife and I think one of the reasons he was appointed was to be that liaison between the Division and the BLM. And I'm not sure what the issue is or why he chose to air it in this fashion but I can assure you that we work very hard to coordinate with the BLM folks and we comment on their plans. And personally I have attended RMP planning sessions etcetera with them. And we'll do the best that we can to rectify the situation and the problems that Mr. McKee points out.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, thanks Doug. We did have a couple of cards come in. Okay we have a couple of other comment cards that have come in. First one is from David Brinkerhoff; he's a permittee on the Henry Mountains Grazer Association. He wants to talk about bison. Dave we'll give you five minutes.

David Brinkerhoff: I have a couple of concerns and some comments that I'd like to make here. A year ago we put, we presented a plan for the management of the bison. Already we're into it one year and we're already out of compliance with the plan that we've had. I think that the DWR is trying to make up the difference there with the next couple of years but the thing that kind of bothers me a little bit about this is things have gone on like this before in the past and we've never ever reached our objective. So I hope that the DWR can stay with this plan and reach that objective. Another concern that I have right now is that the buffalo that were counted on the winter count there was 311 head of those that were

counted on the winter permit. We've talked a little bit about doing projects on the mountain; very few projects on the winter range. These projects, we have feed that was left on the mountain this year and already the point that we're trying to make here is that those buffalo no matter what kind of projects you do most of them are going to end up on the winter range for three or four months. 311 head on the winter permit at this time of the year does devastation to those permits at this point in time. 74 AUMs is what they're allowed there. There's a problem there that we need to address with these numbers right here. One of the problems that I see with the management plan is the sightability part of it. I think there's a sightability there that needs to be raised from 95, or lowered from a 95 down to at least an 85. And then let's see if maybe some of these numbers might come out a little closer. This is why I think one of the big reasons is why they're always over on their numbers, or their projection is over because of the sightability. They don't take into a factor the sightability and the mortality part of that. That's about what I have to say. Thanks.

Jake Albrecht: David, what's your recommendation then as far as permit numbers? You got anything there?

David Brinkerhoff: As far as permit numbers go right there I think the DWR is making an effort at this point to try and reduce them. My point is I think that we need to stay with it and make sure that we reach that objective before any other programs or increases are talked

Jake Albrecht: Okay, thanks David. Verland King, Henry Mountain Grazers.

Verland Kind: We're excited about the hunting more buffalo, on the fact that we need to reduce the numbers. I didn't, well this year the success rate was in the 80's. Varied with hunts. I don't know whether you know it but I was in and out of that country while they were hunting them and this year was a real good, the weather was real good to hunt all except for the last hunt when they had some snow and some moisture. When you're hunting those numbers on the Henry Mountain it's hard on the mountain. We need to get the numbers of the buffalo down as quick as we can. My problem is the sightability is too high. If it was lower then we would hunt more buffalo, we'd get the numbers down quicker. We wouldn't be in this, wouldn't be having the problem we have now where we've got to hunt almost 200 head a year, well 166. You have to hunt that many a year it's hard on the mountain. So, you know, where we're at now is not good for the mountain and we've been telling you all along the forage resource damage that we're seeing and experiencing. So our recommendation would be to the DWR to lower the sightability rates so it's more accurate. And to substantiate that when we counted the buffalo with the helicopter in the end of July, first of August there's 563 head. We hunted roughly 80 percent so we killed like 115. When we flew and counted again in February, post hunt, with 95 percent sightability there was 515. So there should have only been, if you subtracted the 115, 448. So we really didn't make much headway in the hunt, but mainly because we didn't see the buffalo the first flight. And the bison plan says well if we've got good conditions we'll go 95 percent, if we've got bad conditions we'll go 85 percent. And we were told we had good conditions on the first count and I guess we had better conditions on the second count. But if we don't get these values in where they need to be, sightability and mortality, the mortality they expect 5 percent based on a study done a long time ago, but I don't think they're dying off at that rate. But we applaud the DWR's action that they've taken trying to get the numbers down. We don't expect that in 2 years that it will happen. We think they need to hunt, need to have higher numbers to hunt, and based on the sightability and mortality rate. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Verland. Okay, that's the end of our comment cards from the public. So we're to comments from the RAC, leading up to a RAC motion. Steve Dalton.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Steve Dalton: I wanted to comment on some of the stuff that Verland said. I strongly agree with the sightability percentage being a major issue with us. I think that's where the problems arise to begin with. And I've been harping that for quite a while. We counted, like he said, in August of last year and they used 95 percent sightability percentage to estimate their population. And we counted in January and counted more than we should have in January; based on our high August count, and they used 95 percent again. I just don't understand. It really needs to be looked at by somebody other than DWR I guess, because that's all they can come up with 95 percent even when they disprove themselves every time they count. So, anyway I'm in strong agreeance with that. Hopefully they can in two years get down to the population they need. I think that impact on the herd is 3 years worth of heavy hunting on the mature animals is going to have, I hope it's not a devastating effect on that bison herd but it's for sure going to have an affect on their social structure in the herd and the hierarchy and the way that herd responds. Hopefully there's enough mature animals left there so they know where to go and how long to stay and where to go next. Anyway, that's probably enough comments. I've said enough.

Jake Albrecht: Rex.

Rex Stanworth: I've got a question for Steve. Steve, what's your take on the number of permits? We're roughly 166 permits this year.

Steve Dalton: I think that's enough. And hopefully we'll do 2 counts again this coming season. And I would like to see some radio collars put on some animals so we can get a little better handle on that population so we don't fall back to where we were where they're counting 275 head and we got 500 out there. We don't need to have that happen again, so. We've got to have a little more effective way of doing it than what they've done in the past. Yeah, I think that's enough for this year. That's a lot of buffalo to hunt.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. I'm going to go over this Once In A Lifetime Permit Recommendations. Bull moose will increase from 151 to 184. Bison, statewide, will increase from 145 to 172. Desert Bighorn sheep will decrease from 39 to 36. Rocky mountain bighorn sheep will increase from 18 to 23. And Rocky Mountain goat will increase to 91 from 90 a year ago. So with that I would ask for a motion to approve DWR's presentation on Once In A Lifetime.

Jack Hill: Mr. Chairman, I would so move.

Jake Albrecht: We have a motion by Jack Hill. And a second by Gary Hallows. Any other discussion? All in favor please raise your right hand. Any against? Motion carries. I think we're at a break time. We'll take a 15-minute break.

Jack Hill made the motion to accept the OIAL permit numbers as presented by the DWR. Gary Hallows seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Elk Unit Management Plans (Action)

- Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

See attachment 1

Jake Albrecht: Okay, questions from the RAC? Rex Stanworth.

Questions from the RAC:

Rex Stanworth: Just one comment and Sean Kelly and I talked a little bit about this up on the Pahvant, maybe Sean will want to offer some observations. As they did their winter count, if I remember Sean, what you were telling me south of Kanosh there was probably what, 85 percent of the elk, and to the north there was hardly any. Is that right? 75 percent. I guess one of the questions I've got is distribution of these elk across these territories, I mean north of Kanosh Canyon, back to Scipio is a huge amount of real estate. And I guess one of the questions is how do we distribute those elk from all on the south end to evenly distributed along that? Is there? I know they did this at Mt. Dutton. Years ago they opened up the unit from a limited entry to a general and put the hunters in there and they distributed the elk. And I think that was probably successful. But is there other units that are like that that we need to look at distribution?

Anis Aoude: Right. Really the only way if you want elk to be using that whole area, they're going to use the best area in any unit. So, and they currently are in the best area. Now as populations increase they may use the other areas. But if you don't increase populations the likelihood of them using the other area is not likely. Just because if they were stressed where they are they would go into the other areas. Right now they are happy where they are. There is really no need to distribute them if they don't want to be distributed. We're not seeing any detriment to the harvest. We're not seeing detriment to production. I guess the only way to get them in those areas is to increase population objectives, which clearly didn't happen.

Rex Stanworth: Sean, maybe you can answer this? Are we still looking at on the antlerless hunts of keeping north, the north area off from shooting cows?

Sean Kelly: Yep, probably. Like I said, it wasn't actually from Kanosh south it was from Meadow Creek South. So it's a little more country. But the vast majority of the elk were in the southern end of the unit. And last year we did hunt, we restricted that to the southern end and it didn't seem to help any. We still had fewer elk on the northern end.

Rex Stanworth: But you're looking at making that recommendation?

Sean Kelly: Well we have to kill 400 head of elk. We're estimated at about 1800 and we need to get down to 1400. We'll be hunting a lot harder on the southern end, for sure, and the northern we'll probably have to revisit that. But we sure didn't count nearly as many cows on that north end when we flew it.

Rex Stanworth: The total number of cows on the unit, which you counted?

Sean Kelly: Increased, yes.

Rex Stanworth: Increased to what was that 900 and some odd, that's 900, some odd units?

Sean Kelly: We had 1250 in 2005. We had, we counted, well close to 15 almost 1600 this year. So we had a significant increase. And part of that was movement based on the winter. Some, I believe, moved off the Beaver because the snow depths are so high on the Clear Creek side of the Beaver. But we still have, wherever they are we have to deal with that. They were on the Pahvant unit; we'll have to kill 400 head of elk.

Rex Stanworth: Okay, thanks.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions from the RAC? On these plans, when we make the motion are we approving everything that's in the book or everything that's in the southern region?

Anis Aoude: Everything that's in the book.

Jake Albrecht: Did everybody read the whole book?

Anis Aoude: Well that's a summary of it what I showed. I can go back and go through it slowly if you would like.

Jake Albrecht: It's okay because a lot of the areas we don't know anyway.

Anis Aoude: Okay.

Jake Albrecht: But I would hope that the questions and the comments that we receive here tonight mainly deal with the ones that we know a little bit about.

Anis Aoude: Certainly.

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

Questions from the Public:

None.

Jake Albrecht: We have no comment cards.

Comments from the Public:

None.

Jake Albrecht: So we are to comments from the RAC. Clair.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Clair Woodbury: Yeah, Anis, I'm having a hard time believing that we're not getting any more than 525 animals proposed increase. I don't know who was on these committees but that's not the folks that I'm representing. I look, you know it's a good cross section but what were there, two people on sportsman's on all of those committees?

Anis Aoude: Yeah there were 2 sportsman's representatives on each committee.

Clair Woodbury: And the rest, the other 10 were various people?

Anis Aoude: I don't think there were 10 probably on it, on any given committee. They vary quite a bit. I mean we tried to include everyone that was pertinent to the decision.

Clair Woodbury: Uh .

Anis Aoude: Yeah, we had a hard time with it too. That's why we reconvened them and reconvened them. That's just the way.

Clair Woodbury: I'm not buying this. I'm not buying it for a second. You know I look at that Fish Lake Plateau, and Teresa and I have had a little go around on this, 4800 animals on that is about half of what that area will carry. And what traditionally it's been 7-8000 chopped back to 48.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, as a Division we did all we could to try to . . .

Clair Woodbury: I think we need to reconstitute those committees to get some real people on there.

Anis Aoude: That was done so. And we urged everyone that was involved the sportsmen involved to uh . . .

Gary Hallows: What do you call us if we're not real people?

Teresa Bonzo: And then also we've got the land management and the livestock operators. We've got all those people.

Clair Woodbury: Well those are automatically anti elk.

Teresa Bonzo: Well we've got a pretty diverse group. We tried to have it quite balanced. So we've got, if there's landowner associations or CWMUs we've got representatives from that, sportsmen, so it's pretty balances. But we've also been doing a lot of habitat projects in order to long-term, increase the carrying capacity of elk on these units.

Clair Woodbury: Yeah I realize that and that's good.

Teresa Bonzo: Until these habitat projects have the ability to respond and start growing we don't want to immediately start increasing the elk objective until they're growing and when they are in the form of forage on the ground.

Clair Woodbury: I understand that. Even on a place like the Southwest Desert and all that.

Teresa Bonzo: It has been a real struggle. But also, in the entire state we I think we've formed committees on all of our units except for one. And Anis has a graph table that shows. The southern region we formed committees on almost all of our units.

Clair Woodbury: Right I saw that.

Teresa Bonzo: Where the rest of the state didn't even form committees, or the rest of the regions.

Clair Woodbury: What I'm saying is I look at those committees and I see a lot of anti elk people on there and two representatives from the sportsman's groups. So that's. . .

Teresa Bonzo: We felt it was pretty balanced. Also some of the sportsman, some of them said right at this point we don't want more elk. So we got some of that.

Jake Albrecht: Can I jump in? Clair? Can I jump in here for a minute?

Clair Woodbury: Sure. I've said my piece.

Jake Albrecht: On the Monroe unit, the committee that I sat on there recommended that we get to the 1800 elk before we ever increase that one. And look at what's happening on the mountain. It's never reached it's objective yet. And as far as the Fish Lake Plateau, the people that were on that committee felt like that we should stay at that number until some habitat work is done. Cattle users have taken reductions the last several years with the drought and different things. And I didn't set in on the Boulder one but basically the same thing I would think. We need to do some legwork before we increase.

Anis Aoude: And the thing we need to keep in mind is elk increases effect everybody not just sportsmen and that's why we included all those folks on these committees. And that's how those committees voted, so.

Clair Woodbury: I'm just saying they looked fairly one sided.

Gary Hallows: But they were real people though.

Clair Woodbury: Gary I apologize for that comment.

Gary Hallows: I think that was asinine.

Clair Woodbury: I'm glad I could get a rise out of you this way though.

Anis Aoude: And I'd just like to say we appreciate everybody's involvement in those committees. And we did put them through a couple in three times just to make sure that, you know, it wasn't biased.

Clair Woodbury: And I appreciate that. Let's leave this open ended. When these habitat improvements happen let's, you know, even if the management plan isn't up let's get those elk numbers on the ground.

Jake Albrecht: One comment I thought that would be really helpful, if I was to look at an elk management plan is if it has a description. But if it had a map that showed where it was at, associated with it. I thought that would be really helpful to me looking like at the Southwest Desert, which I'm not you know really associated with. I went through all of our ones that were in the southern region. I told you about the two corrections that I thought needed on the Monroe.

Anis Aoude: Yep, I've done that already.

Jake Albrecht: It seems like there was one other. Let me go through my notes while we're doing little comments.

Teresa Bonzo: A point of clarification. Just a map of the unit? Okay just to show the boundary?

Jake Albrecht: Attached with the management plan so if I wanted to go into say the Monroe management plan and I wasn't familiar with the area.

Teresa Bonzo: Okay.

Jake Albrecht: Or do something like that.

Anis Aoude: We'll make sure we insert those before they go on the website, if they do get approved.

Steve Dalton: Can I make a comment?

Jake Albrecht: If you won't make Gary mad.

Steve Dalton: Okay I'll try my best not to. Everybody needs to understand that the forage allocation on the public lands, Forest Service, and BLM, it's already allocated. Most of it is allocated to livestock in the form of AUMs. And if you're going to increase the use on that forage resource there needs to be more forage. So these burgeoning elk herds in the state of Utah are utilizing that same resource that the livestock operators already have allocated to them. And consequently when you've got an elk herd that's doing really good, like the Fish Lake Plateau, you've got a bunch of livestock operators there that are having a reduction in the number of AUMs that they are allowed to activate because of the lack of forage and you've got a herd of elk eating the forage you're going to have some controversial issues. And that's essentially what's happened with most of the livestock in the state of Utah. And wildlife conflicts, the bison, I mean that's the issue we have out there. And so yeah there needs to be something there for those animals to eat.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, my other comment has to deal with the Fish Lake. It says permit numbers for bulls have remained constant over the last 5 years and there have been no antlerless permits during the same time period. But if I remember the last two years we've had 2-300 head of . . .

Jim Lamb: Those particular comments haven't been revised since the 2006 writing of that document.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, so those have been updated?

Jim Lamb: They need to be updated in the final copy. When we do this over a three-year period it's hard to keep up with what changes need to go line by line.

Jake Albrecht: Dell LeFevre.

Dell LeFevre: I want to thank the fish and game for putting this elk committee together. And some of us are really taking a hit. I've got 160-acre alfalfa field this is how it goes. I raised 2700 bales last year. I bought hay all winter. And very little do I get back out of the fish and game. And I don't think these sportsmen realize how much us farmers and cowmen are doing to keep your elk herd going. It's just devastating. And I just get so upset when they say well we want more elk, we want, we want. This is fine, I'll feed your damned elk but you sportsmen pay me.

Clair Woodbury: I've been sitting on this one way too long. Gary, I come from a livestock background, pioneer stock. I'm just looking at the Fish Lake Plateau that we were talking about. As my partner next to me said, most of the graze goes to the livestock on that mountain. 15 percent of that mountain is private, 85 percent is public. Your cows are eating our elk's feed. Livestock have owned the mountain for 150 years and it's time it went to the sportsmen again and the regular public.

Jack Hill: I've got a comment on that. I don't think you can find too many mountains around here that had elk populations prior to 1930, 1920? So when you say it belongs to the sportsmen, I don't think you quite understand the problem. Well then let's talk about multiple use rather than your need.

Jake Albrecht: Let's stay with our. . .

Clair Woodbury: I do a lot more photography than I do shooting the animals.

Jake Albrecht: Let's stay with our agenda gentlemen. Okay with that Rex I'll ask for a motion.

Rex Stanworth: Yeah I'd like to make a motion that on the elk management plan with the corrections of some of those items that the plans be approved.

Steve Flinders: Second.

Jake Albrecht: We have a motion by Rex and a second by Steve. Any other discussion? All in favor please raise your right hand. All those against? So what's the count? 6-4 for, motion carries.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to approve the elk management plans as presented. Steve Flinders seconded. Motion carried 6 in favor 4 opposed. (Sam Carpenter, Dell LeFevre, Gary Hallows, Clair Woodbury opposed.)

Jake Albrecht: Next item on the agenda is Big Horn Sheep Statewide Management Plan. This is an action item.

Big Horn Sheep Statewide Management Plan (Action)

- Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

Jake Albrecht: Okay, questions? Questions? Rex Stanworth.

Questions from the RAC:

Rex Stanworth: On page 9 it says use and demand. It indicated there's big horn sheep on Antelope Island. Are those Rocky Mountain or Desert?

Anis Aoude: Those are Californias.

Rex Stanworth: Californias. And what is the population there of those?

Anis Aoude: It's about 200.

Rex Stanworth: About 200. Are you using that as a transplant?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, I mentioned that in the presentation. That's basically our source population for all of our Californias.

Rex Stanworth: So the sportsmen paid for it but they're receiving the benefit from it by being able to transplant those into other areas.

Anis Aoude: Right, exactly.

Jake Albrecht: Question. The goats that are on the Beaver.

Anis Aoude: Goats? But this isn't goats.

Jake Albrecht: Rocky Mountain goats.

Anis Aoude: Well these are Big Horn Sheep. This is the Big Horn Sheep plan.

Jake Albrecht: Right. But I have a question on that.

Anis Aoude: Okay.

Jake Albrecht: Is there any other areas in the southern region that those could be?

Anis Aoude: We haven't looked at that. That would be at the goat plan, which is coming up next.

Jake Albrecht: Well I was just wondering because I was pondering that the last several months.

Anis Aoude: Yeah that's a whole different species and we will be looking at that, at that statewide plan as well.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we don't have any other questions from the RAC. Do we have questions from the public? Please come forward to the mic and state your name please.

Questions from the Public:

Lee Tracy: I'm Lee Tracy. Are there any areas further south than Oak Creek that some of these sheep could be transplanted or placed, for instance on Beaver Mountain?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, we don't currently have Beaver Mountain as one of the transplant sites. But if we were going to transplant there we would probably put Rockies instead of Californias But that's one transplant site there we've looked at. But it didn't play out in the model as a good spot and then we have the goats there as well.

Lee Tracy: Any other places?

Jake Albrecht: So was there any other areas?

Anis Aoude: Not that came out in the model that would be suitable. That's why we didn't recommend. And a lot of that has to do with not only do we look at suitable

Douglas Messerly: I was part of the project several years ago, Jeff Grandison headed up with the sheep habitat experts, where they evaluated many mountain ranges in the southern region. And marginal at best, there were sheep allotments as Anis alluded to. We're aggressively trying to find new places for sheep. We're aware of all of the potential habitat and we are evaluating it. It's just that opportunities don't present themselves very often. So yes we are looking. Yes we're aware of the high mountain

ranges that may be suitable for sheep and we've evaluated many of them. And any specifics anybody would like on any of those ranges let us know and we'll give you what we have.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any other questions from the public?

Comments from the Public:

None.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, comments we have none. Comment from the RAC discussion and vote.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Rex Stanworth: I make a motion that we approve the Big Horn Sheep Plan as given.

Clair Woodbury: I'll second that.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a motion by Rex and a second by Clair Woodbury. Any other discussion? All in favor please raise your right hand. Any against? Motion carries.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to approve the Big Horn Sheep management plan as presented. Clair Woodbury seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Jake Albrecht: We're to CWMU Rule R-657. Action Item.

CWMU Rule R657-37 (5-yr Review) (Action)

Procedures for Confirmation of Ordinances on hunting closures R657-34 (5-yr review) (Action)

- Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

See attachment 1

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we're going to handle these separately. The first one will be the CWMU Rule. Any questions from the RAC?

Questions from the RAC:

None.

Jake Albrecht: Questions from the public?

Questions from the Public:

None.

Jake Albrecht: No comments.

Comments from the Public:

None.

Jake Albrecht: No comments, so we're to comments and motion from the RAC. Steve.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman I'd make a motion that we accept R657-37 regarding CWMUs and approve it.

Jake Albrecht: Motion by Rex. Second by Cordell. Any other discussion? All in favor please raise your right hand. Any against? Motion carries.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to approve CWMU Rule R657-37 as presented. Cordell Pearson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Procedures for Confirmation of Ordinances on hunting closures R657-34 (5-yr review)
Questions from the RAC:**

Jake Albrecht: The next one is R657-34. Any questions from the RAC?

None.

Jake Albrecht: Any questions from the public?

Questions from the Public:

None.

Jake Albrecht: No comment cards.

Comments from the Public:

None.

Jake Albrecht: So we're to comments from the RAC, discussion and vote.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to accept R657-34, Procedures for Confirmation of Ordinances on hunting closures.

Jake Albrecht: A motion by Rex a second by Steve Flinders. Any other discussion? Seeing none, all in favor please raise your right hand. Any against? Motion carries.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept the Procedures for Confirmation of Ordinances on hunting closures R657-34 as presented. Steve Flinders seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Other Business (Contingent)

Jake Albrecht: Next meeting will be at Snow College South, April 29, 2008 at 6:30 PM. April 29th it says. Antlerless Addendum and Rule. I want to thank everyone for their participation. Be careful.

Gary Hallows made the motion to adjourn. Sam Carpenter seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.