

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Jr. High
165 S. 700 E. Springville
November 13, 2008 @ 6:30 p.m.

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda

MOTION: To accept the agenda as written
Passed unanimously

Approval of Minutes

MOTION: To accept the minutes as transcribed
Passed unanimously

Statewide Deer Plan

MOTION: To increase the percent of five year or older bucks in the harvest on the Henry Mountains to 50 to 60 percent and on the Paunsaugunt to 40-50 percent and to accept the remainder of the plan as presented
Passed unanimously

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Proclamation and Rule R657-5

MOTION: To maintain the statewide archery hunt as it is and recommend that a committee made up of all interests involved be formed to bring back a recommendation next year
Passed unanimously

MOTION: To accept the mobility impaired proposal with the exception of the permit numbers and areas which would be decided at a later date
Passed 6 to 2

MOTION: To recommend the wildlife board put the Utah Bowman's Association's recommendations regarding an urban deer hunt on the action log
Passed unanimously

MOTION: To keep the early October opener on limited entry deer hunts (not move them to Oct. 17th)
Failed 3 to 5

MOTION: To allow any legal weapon to be used for the proposed management deer hunts
Passed 6 to 2

MOTION: To accept the balance of the deer recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously

DOUG JONES WAS EXCUSED FROM THE MEETING

MOTION: To accept the all elk recommendations as presented
Passed 4 to 3

MOTION: To accept the balance of the big game recommendations
Passed unanimously

CWMU Recommendations

MOTION: To accept the CWMU recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously

Landowner Permit Recommendations

MOTION: To accept the recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously

Depredation Rule R657-44 Amendment

MOTION: To accept the rule as presented
Passed unanimously

Bonus Point Recommendations

Limited Entry/OIAL

MOTION: To accept 1A with the addition that if you surrender your tag you would not get a point for that year

Motion dies for lack of second

MOTION: To accept 1A

Passed 5 to 2

MOTION: To accept #2, a person would lose points if they do not apply for three consecutive years

Passed 4 to 3

MOTION: To NOT accept #3

Passed unanimously

General Season

MOTION: To accept 1 (1)

Passed 6 to 1

MOTION: To accept #2

Passed 4 to 3

MOTION: To accept #3

Motion dies for lack of second

Dedicated Hunter Program Recommendations

MOTION: To approve the recommendations as presented

Passed 5 to 2

Antler Gathering Recommendation

MOTION: To accept the recommendation as presented

Passed 5 to 2

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Jr. High
165 S. 700 E. Springville
November 13, 2008 @ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

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

Members Absent

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

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

**Motion was made by Allan Stevens to accept the agenda as written
Seconded by Doug Jones
Motion passed unanimously**

2) **Approval of the September 16, 2008 summary (Action)**

**Motion was made by Jay Price to accept the minutes as transcribed
Seconded by George Holmes
Motion passed unanimously**

3) **Deer Survey Results (Information)**

- **Kent Hersey, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

4) **Statewide Deer Plan (Action)**

- **Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

Questions from the Public

?- For the last three years what is the average age of harvest on the Henrys and the Paunsaugunt?

Anis Aoude – The three year average of the percent of bucks five years or older on the Paunsaugunt is about 40 percent and on the Henrys it is about 60 percent.

Comments from the Public

David Bailey – Utah Farm Bureau – We would like to voice our support for the plan as presented. We do not support changing the deer and elk season dates. Just as Anis talked about animals are still on the mountain.

Dave Woodhouse – Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife (SFW) – Regarding the age objectives on the Paunsaugunt and the Henrys, in the mule deer committee, which I was a member of, we were not given those numbers. We were told that it would be like trying to raise an 11 year old bull to get that many bucks over five years of age. As a representative for SFW we would like to request that number be raised on the Henrys to 50 percent of the harvest over five years of age and on the Paunsaugunt 40 percent of the harvest being over five years of age, which is what it is currently and what it has been over the last three

years. That would keep the quality where it is now. We are fine with leaving the deer hunt where it is now. Most people like where it is. On general season units, in the mule deer committee we talked about when the buck to doe ratio falls below 15 bucks per 100 does to make changes after one year not when the three year average falls below. So if a unit falls below the average it would go to a five day hunt the following year, not wait for a three year average.

Chris Jensen – I would like to talk about the habitat and migration routes of deer. I would like the DWR to consider putting up fences along highways to help increase deer populations. I have seen several hundred deer killed on the highways. While hunting in Colorado I saw lots of fences along highways and I think we should do the same.

RAC Discussion

Fred Oswald – Anis, could you respond to the comment about a one year verses a three year average?

Anis Aoude – The reason we didn't go with a one year plan is basically what you end up doing is reacting and changing management every year. If a unit drops below the 15 bucks per 100 does one year it will likely drop the three year average and your management approach would change. A three year average mitigates the up and down management. I know a one year approach was discussed in the mule deer committee. We need to keep in mind that the committee was an advisory committee and we took most of what we discussed in the plan. I would also like to touch upon the fact that they said we didn't supply them with the data. That was misconstrued. The information we said we couldn't reach was that five year old average. I never said we couldn't reach 60 percent of five year olds in the harvest. Managing for a five year old average is the one that is hard to attain. All the information that was presented today was available to the committee. Any information they required was available. As far as the mitigation issue. That is a project that UDOT would have to do. The Division cannot put fences up on right of ways. We do work very closely with UDOT and things are getting better in regards to our relationship with UDOT. Strictly fencing highways does not help mule deer. By cutting migration routes or cutting deer off from winter ranges would kill more deer than you would preserve. You have to have crossing structures and those are the costly items.

Fred Oswald – Are we not going to be voting on the management hunt on the Paunsaugunt when we vote on the big game rule? That is not part of the deer management plan, right?

Anis Aoude – It is part of the plan itself because it is a type of hunt we have never had before and it would be a way to deal with premium limited entry hunts only.

Fred Oswald – What we are voting on is the mule deer management plan as presented. That includes leaving the hunt dates for deer and elk as they are now and adopting the management hunt for the two premium units. We will open for discussion and possibly a motion.

Richard Hansen – Do you look at the three year average each year for the prior three years?

Anis Aoude – Yes. If a unit is below objective you are going to change the management quicker and come out of it later. The one low year stays with you three years so it actually benefits the unit more to use a three year average.

Richard Hansen – If a unit goes to a five day hunt you said it would be the last five days of the general season.

Anis Aoude – Yes. Some of the rationale for that is that our data shows that about 70 percent of the harvest takes place the opening weekend. Although this was not specifically discussed in the committee it is something we as a Division got together on and tried to figure out the best way to use a five day hunt. We realize that just shortening the hunt is not going to do a lot. We have seen that in the southern and southeastern regions not really change much. We figured if we move it in time and put it at the later part it is less likely that harvest will take place.

Fred Oswald – For clarification, are we also voting on including those five recommended units to go to a five day hunt?

Anis Aoude – Not the units specifically but the concept, yes.

John Bair – It was a lot of fun being on the mule deer committee and representing the RAC. A lot of good information was brought out. I appreciate Anis clarifying the information about the Paunsaugunt and the Henrys. We are almost 60 percent on the Henrys and we are upper 40s on the Paunsaugunt. Those are two units that we charge almost three times as much money for and are classified as premium and therefore should be the best hunting. I think if we increase the percentage of bucks in the harvest over five years old on the Henrys to 50 to 60 there is still room to increase permits but we are protecting the premium classification. The Paunsaugunt should be raised as well to 40 to 50 percent. That would be the only thing I would change in the plan.

Fred Oswald – How does that differ from what was proposed?

John Bair – In the plan the average for all limited entry units is 30-40 percent of the harvest five years or older. Because those two units are classified as premium and we do charge almost three times as much for a tag we feel we should raise the minimum to make sure those units are kept premium. We are above those averages already so there is still room to increase permits as it is.

Anis Aoude – Basically the reason we put it in the plan that way is to increase opportunity on that high end as well. The reason the averages are as high as they are currently is because we were trying to reach a five year old average which is almost impossible to reach. We were holding permits lower than they probably could be. Having said that, the way SFW wants to manage it would keep it the way it is now, which I think is too restrictive but that is a recommendation they want to make. Our recommendation would allow a little bit more harvest.

Allan Stevens – Is the opening of the deer hunt still a state law issue?

Anis Aoude – They changed the law. You can now start it as early as October first.

John Bair – Moving the five day hunt to the end of the season is something people I have talked really like.

Motion was made by John Bair to increase the percent of five year or older bucks in the harvest on the Henry Mountains to 50 to 60 percent and on the Paunsaugunt to 40-50 percent and to accept the remainder of the plan as presented

Seconded by Doug Jones

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

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

- Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Allan Stevens – Would the extended range creek hunt be for all weapon types?

Anis Aoude – Just the late rifle hunt.

Gary Nielsen – What is the thinking in discontinuing the management elk hunts?

Anis Aoude – There are a lot of schools of thought on that. Initially when it was implemented, although the Division did recommend, it was with the understanding that there would be some smaller bulls taken and that is what happened. The committee that recommended it thought that there would be more older five points taken and that hasn't happened. Both sides agree that it isn't working the way it was intended to.

Gary Nielsen – It is a really short hunt and it is harder to find a five point. If we want people to be able to take a five point we need to give them more time.

Anis Aoude – The problem with lengthening those hunts is all those animals have to be checked in and it really ties our folks up.

Fred Oswald – I understand the Division's rationale for the statewide spike hunt but we have had a number of emails and contacts from people who are opposed to a statewide spike hunt. Their rationale seems to be that we are going to killing elk that are going to turn into older elk. I understand the Division's rationale that if we don't kill the spikes we will have to kill the cows which will reduce our elk population. On those units that currently have spike elk hunts what is the percentage of yearlings that are not harvested or are yearlings that are larger than spikes and move on to older age classes.

Anis Aoude – Success rates on the spike elk hunt is about 15 percent. We probably harvest about 65 to 70 percent of the yearlings on those hunts. About 30 to 35 percent are moving into that older age class. Every year that is happening and we don't harvest them again until they are four, five or six years old depending on the unit. When they reach that there is six years of buildup of 30 percent of the population moving into those older age classes. Plus once they get there they still have six or seven years of life left. There is always going to be enough bulls in the older age class to harvest on the limited entry hunt while maintaining bull to cow ratios that are going to be healthy for the herd to produce more spikes to make it to that older age class. We have ten units that are currently under this management and have been for over ten years. We are still able to offer limited entry hunts and we are still within our age objectives on these units. If we diffuse the spike hunters statewide each specific unit would probably have less spike hunters on it than it does today and you may harvest less than 50 percent of the spikes in the future.

Richard Hansen – Did you consider picking a few units that you are having problems with the bull to cow ratios?

Anis Aoude – We did consider that but it is working on units with all different age objectives. If it works on those units to maintain healthy herds that produce a lot of calves why not go statewide with it and produce a lot of calves on all the units?

Richard Hansen – If you did that would you be able to reduce the number of antlerless permits for those units? The Nebo, for example, is a mess right now because they have slaughtered the antlerless elk trying to keep it within the management objectives.

Anis Aoude – The Nebo has a spike hunt on it now.

Richard Hansen – That is the problem. In 1999 they killed 253 spikes, in 2000 they killed 273 and in 2007 they killed 70. There is something wrong with the production. I don't want to see us kill a lot of spikes without killing fewer cows.

Anis Aoude – There are population objectives on every unit so if you are killing more spikes you can kill fewer cows. That is exactly why you would produce more calves.

Richard Hansen – So that would be part of this, right?

Anis Aoude – That is the main reason we are doing it.

Questions from the Public

Ben Lowder – Last year the Division presented data that showed there is no biological reason to eliminate statewide archery. Is there currently a biological reason to eliminate statewide archery?

Anis Aoude – This is strictly a social issue.

Ben Lowder – I have a cousin who considers the mountain crowded if he sees another hunter. How does the Division determine what overcrowding is and whether or not there is a crowding issue?

Anis Aoude – As a Division we can't define what overcrowding is. We can only deal with specific situations as they come up. As we showed in our survey data overcrowding depends on who you ask.

Ben Lowder – Are the rifle deer hunters in the southern region complaining of overcrowding issues similar to what we are hearing from the southern region for archery?

Anis Aoude – There are some complaints but certainly not to the level of the archery.

Ben Lowder – How many rifle hunters are there in the southern region versus archery?

Anis Aoude – Probably about 13 to 14,000 rifle hunters in the southern region.

Ben Lowder – I know you heard this question last night; I am going to ask it again. So 13,000 is not crowded but 7,000 is?

Anis Aoude – The fact of the matter is that although there may be fewer hunters during the archery hunt there are more people recreating in the same area who wouldn't be there during the rifle hunt. The problem isn't just the archers, it is that there are a lot of people trying to recreate at that time.

Ben Lowder – Then is the Division doing anything to work with other organizations such as the BLM and the forest service to regulate these other recreating groups such as we are trying to regulate the hunters?

Anis Aoude – As a Division we don't really have any say on how people use public land other than the number of hunters we put on the land.

Ben Lowder – I understand, but have you talked with these other agencies?

Anis Aoude – No, nor do we feel we really have a position to do so. To take people off of public land so hunters can use it is almost as bad pulling hunters off for other users.

Ben Lowder – Exactly, thank you.

Lee Tracy – Cedar City – How is this information gathered, where do complaints come from?

Anis Aoude – Basically we hear it through the southern region RAC and it comes from whatever their constituents are.

Kyle Witherspoon – My understanding is that the reason for making archers pick a region is to gather statistical data to support the overcrowding issue, is that correct?

Anis Aoude – It is not to refute or support the overcrowding issue. It is to get data as to where archers would choose to hunt that first period of time if they were forced to choose.

Kyle Witherspoon – Has the Division considered some other plan to get that data without reducing our opportunity?

Anis Aoude – We have considered it but there isn't anything that would get you the same data as making somebody choose knowing they would have to hunt there that period of time. You could have a survey or even let them hunt and then ask them after where they hunted but if you could hunt here today and somewhere else tomorrow and you didn't have to choose to hunt for a specific period of time you may have a different outcome. That is why we are forcing people to choose to gather this data.

John Bair – I have a procedural question. I think we know where all these bow hunter questions are going. I think we all know what they are getting at and I think we have all seen the emails and the proposals. This is all leading to a recommendation to leave the archery season as is this year and recommend that there be a committee formed to deal with this issue and bring forth a joint proposal with the archers and the Division next year. Would it be out of line to make that motion now in the interest of time? I am fine listening to all these questions but we know where this is going.

Fred Oswald – There are some folks here who want to have their five minutes.

Mike Christensen - Why were the early deer hunts first put in place for deer on certain limited entry units?

Anis Aoude – Mainly it was law enforcement driven.

Mike Christensen – Does it have anything to do with the migration on some of these public land units where the deer are on the public land early on in October and then they move off onto the private land?

Anis Aoude – There was a little bit of that but it was not the main issue.

Mike Christensen – Nothing on the Paunsaugunt with the migration?

Anis Aoude – Actually having an early hunt on the Paunsaugunt made it a harder hunt.

Mike Christensen – That's what I'm getting at.

Anis Aoude – So this would make it a better hunt for those who draw that permit.

Mike Christensen – If we were to manage our elk herds to our current age objective would there be a need to harvest spikes on these smaller elk herds?

Anis Aoude – There would be on units that we are managing for the higher age objectives because you can't harvest enough at that age objective to get bull to cow ratios where you need them.

Mike Christensen – Can smaller herds that have 1,000 elk or fewer sustain spike harvest and offer quality elk hunting in the quantity they are now?

Anis Aoude – I believe so because the same concepts apply no matter the size of the herd. You are looking at composition of number of cows and bulls and the number of calves born given that your success rate is not higher than the average.

Mike Christensen – In your opinion will a statewide elk hunt reduce permits five years down the road.

Anis Aoude – It won't reduce them from what they are currently. It may reduce from the potential that we could get to currently.

Mike Christensen – That we could already be at if we actually passed the recommended permit changes recommended by the Division at these RAC and board meeting which we haven't been doing over the last five or six years.

? - Along the same lines, could we issue more big bull tags on the units that don't currently have a spike hunt and achieve the same goal?

Anis Aoude – No because we are managing for an older age class in the harvest. You can't kill that many and stay within that age class and have a healthy bull to cow ratio. When we did the calculations if you get to a point where you are shooting everything you could in that age class you would still be above 70 bulls per 100 cows.

? – I guess we don't know what people are going to shoot. Not everyone shoots a bull in that age class. If some people are taking three to four year old bulls wouldn't that do the same thing?

Anis Aoude – It would but that would require changing our management plan and reducing age objectives. That was tried for a year and then we went back to high age objectives.

? – What does the public think of raising mature bull tags now as opposed to a statewide spike hunt?

Anis Aoude – I think we could raise them as long as we stay within our objective but that won't get us to the objective that we want for our bull to cow ratios to keep producing animals.

Bart Hansen – I noticed that there is a recommendation to change the rifle hunt dates so there is not a conflict with the spike hunters. Was that ever considered for the archery hunters who will now be competing with archery deer hunters, archery elk hunters, limited entry elk hunters and limited entry deer hunters on units like the Book Cliffs and San Juan?

Anis Aoude – No it wasn't and the reason for that is the archery hunt is so long that you can't put it anywhere else. We could shorten it and allow them to hunt by themselves for a period of time.

Bart Hansen – Or you could just do away with it. Another question about the elk hunt, wouldn't it be reasonable to assume that since your survey shows that archers are most satisfied hunters that maybe the majority of archers are happy with statewide archery?

Anis Aoude – I think that is a true statement.

Bart Hansen – But we are willing to recommend doing away with that because a small percentage of the archers are not happy.

Anis Aoude – It is not the archers we are doing it for, it is other folks that live in the southern region.

Josh Luke – Do you think the spike hunt would hurt limited entry units like San Juan and Pahvant as far as the number of bulls people see because I know a lot of people are pleased with the number of bulls they see.

Anis Aoude – If we thought that would be the case we would not recommend it.

Josh Luke – Has the Division thought of a proposal instead of statewide spike such as putting a cap on spike hunters on each unit? I am worried that if you let anybody who wants go anywhere in the state there will be a lot of hunters flooding to those places and you will have crowding problems and you will kill more spikes than you would otherwise.

Anis Aoude – That was certainly discussed. We keep striving to simplify things and really hunters do spread themselves fairly evenly when you give them the opportunity to. In the spirit of simplifying and

giving more chances to hunt wherever they want we decided to go this way. We have a lot of room before it would hurt the hunting on the top end.

Kyle Witherspoon – Does the Division have an estimate as to what the lead free program would cost to implement?

Anis Aoude – Probably upwards of 90-100,000 dollars a year.

Kyle Witherspoon – Where will that money come from?

Anis Aoude – From grants that we would apply for from different organizations.

Kyle Witherspoon – Is there any reason to believe that program will result in an increase in fees or decreasing money from other programs?

Anis Aoude – No it will not.

Comments from the Public

Fred Oswald – This is what I would like to do if it is okay with everybody. I would like to separate discussion into deer, elk and other. So we will first take public comment on the deer proposals and then we will review it as a RAC and then do the same with elk and other. We will take comments on behalf of organizations first and then after I would like to take a sense of the audience in terms of audience members if you were going to get up and speak how many would support the organizations proposals or not. By doing that we are trying to reduce the number of people who are speaking but still give you an opportunity to show your support for the proposals.

DEER RECOMMENDATIONS

Gordy Bell – Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would like to address the joint proposal by Bowhunters of Utah (BOU) and Utah Bowman's Association (UBA) – Basically the initial feedback these two organizations have received is that what the Division is going to do will not result in accurate data. A person that must choose a region is either going to go to that region because they see that as their last chance to hunt that area or they are going to avoid that to artificially slant the results. This is an issue that we have dealt with for the past several years. What the two bow hunting organizations in the state propose to you as a RAC in hopes that you will recommend would be to establish a committee that would deal with this issue once and for all. We would propose that the RAC recommend that we leave the statewide archery hunt under the same format that it was last year. Let us sit down as a group and work this out and bring back to you as a RAC a workable solution next year. This proposal is supported by every big game conservation group in the state as well as several local manufactures. What we are trying to do is bring an amicable solution next year and basically have a win win for everyone involved. As Anis told you, he has the numbers. He knows where we're at. This issue is not going to away until we sit down and work this out.

Mike Anderson – I want to quickly underscore what Gordy Bell just said in regards to the statewide archery hunt. While I appreciate the hard work the DWR has done to gather data regarding this issue the fact is there is a lot involved that has not been considered. Statewide archery does not occur in a bubble. The statewide archery deer hunt is going on at the same time as the statewide elk hunt. The fact that the Division is recommending to allow the statewide elk hunt to continue contradicts their own beliefs that statewide deer hunt should not continue. There are a number of issues here including the value of families being able to hunt together. With all these different issues that need to be addressed adding more discussion and information could only help us. We don't need to rush through this. There is no reason we can't take time to make a responsible decision.

Ben Lowder – UBA – We all know the Division is always looking for ways to draw youth into the sport of hunting. In addition to that the wildlife board has taken tags from the general deer cap. This is doing a couple things. For various reasons that I will talk about it is hurting youth recruitment as well as decreasing revenue for the Division of Wildlife. To help address these issues we as an organization would like to present two proposals tonight. The first of which is to propose a statewide unlimited

archery youth deer hunt. There are several reasons for that. Currently for a youth to take advantage of the three season youth deer hunt they have to compete in the draw for a rifle or muzzleloader tag and they may not draw. Also since we have dropped the legal age to hunt big game to 12 there has been concern from certain people that putting a rifle in a 12 year olds hands is a bad idea. Personally I don't feel that way, I think it is great but to address that issue this archery hunt would be a way to get them interested. We predict that as many as 2,000 youth could take advantage of this program if it were implemented. In addition to that, bow hunting success rate as we all know is very low and we feel these increased tags given to youth would have an insignificant impact on the deer populations. The second proposal we have is that an additional 1,000 archery deer tags be allocated to the archery deer hunt cap thus raising the cap from 16,000 to 17,000. This would increase revenue for the Division. Also the archery hunt has become very popular over the past few years and we have seen archery tags sell out earlier every year. Next year they may sell out in draw. Again we see this as an insignificant impact to the deer herds because archers have such a low success rate. We see both of these proposals as a win win situation for everybody as it would increase revenue for the Division and increase opportunity. In addition to this I would like to support Gordy Bell's comments. Thank you.

Dave Woodhouse – SFW – I would like to note that one of the big concerns about the archery hunt and over crowding in the mule deer committee was brought up by the representatives from the BLM and the Forest Service.

My concern is with the management deer hunt. The reason for that hunt is because there is a large population of older age class deer that are not being targeted on the premium units. In the overall picture it includes the limited entry units too. People want a large non typical or a four point that scores well and that is what these hunts are designed for. A lot of the deer are mature three or four points that are not being targeted and harvested. That is an opportunity that is not being taken advantage of. This management hunt is a vehicle to do that. On the mule deer committee we talked about this being a late season any weapon hunt not a primitive weapon hunt like was proposed by the Division. We have to remember these are deer we want to target. The orientation will help hunters understand what to harvest and what animals we are targeting. People need the best opportunity to harvest these animals and not make it harder. Archery success rate is low. This hunt needs to be an any weapon hunt with more days to hunt. This would make it worth using your points on and get more people through the limited entry system and still have the quality hunt we want.

Fred Oswald – The RAC doesn't ordinarily ask for votes from the audience. The reason we don't do that is because we are all representing our own individual constituencies and we get emails and phone calls and we also hear from you folks and based on all of that input we make our best judgment about these recommendations. But there are a lot of you out there who are supporting the BOU and UBA recommendation and rather than have you come up one by one and talk what I would like to do is have those of you who are here tonight in support of these groups recommendation please stand up. Thank you.

We are dealing not only with the bowman's recommendation but also the deer management plan. If you have a comment to make with regards to the deer management plan please do so now.

Mike Christensen – I would like to advocate that we maintain the early October limited entry deer hunt dates. There are reasons for those dates. On the Oak Creek and the Thousand Lakes units those deer are only hunted on public land and if you get any snow the deer move out of the limited entry unit and into the general season unit. Currently we already have on the Thousand Lakes a deer hunt that opens on October fourth which coincides and overlaps the spike elk hunt. The Paunsaugunt hunt was moved earlier so they weren't targeting so many deer that had already made it down to the winter range and they were shooting the high end bucks really easy. The Paunsaugunt rifle tag is not as desirable as the muzzleloader tag because the deer are already down on the winter range. On the Oak Creek you only have a few hundred elk so you are not going to have a whole lot of spike hunters. It would be much easier to enforce these limited entry units on a separate date rather than if they opened on the same day as

the general season units. I would also like to recommend that if you do vote for management hunts on the Paunsaugunt and the Henrys that they be any weapon hunts. The reason for that is they are everybody's deer. I love to bow hunt and I can draw my bow but my 70 year old dad can't and my wife will never have the persistence and the perseverance to shoot with a bow or a muzzleloader so it stands to reason that those tags should be placed as any weapon tags. And finally I want to say that it is my opinion that we have a statewide spike elk proposal because we haven't been managing our units to objective. We have been shooting all our cows so we can have all these big bulls around.

Fred Oswald – I am going to shut you down and have you come back when we are talking about elk.

Bart Hansen – It is true that the land agencies brought up the issue of overcrowding this year but doing away with statewide archery has been an issue for several years. I spoke with a representative from SFW from the southern region and he admitted that the majority of people making these complaints are not archers but are rifle hunters frustrated that they cannot draw a southern rifle tag and they see us outsiders coming into their area and being able to hunt with an archery tag.

Justin Fuller – First I would like to thank the RAC for opportunity to address you tonight. I want to make two proposals. The first is that we are requesting a special limited entry draw for disabled hunters. These hunts would be for limited entry deer, elk, and antelope. The chair bound hunter would have to meet the requirement that he is permanently confined to a wheelchair and would have to have a doctors statement just like the CORs we have now for disabled hunters. We would like to adopt a system New Mexico uses in which the disabled hunter is issued a four digit number and he uses that number to put in for the hunt making it so people couldn't abuse the hunt. The reason that we need a separate draw is simply that we need to increase the odds for disabled hunters because studies have shown that people that are in a wheelchair live relatively less than able bodied people because of all the health issues that we deal with day to day. So I will probably not draw a deer or elk tag before I die. There are similar programs in other states. Arizona gives 10 deer tags, 20 elk tags and 20 pronghorn tags for disabled hunters which are equal to our limited entry tags we have here in Utah. New Mexico also allocates 700 elk tags 3,000 deer tags and 300 antelope tags. A portion of these are equal to the limited entry tags here in Utah. Wyoming also issues 30 premier antelope tags on units that are known for producing big buck pronghorn. On your handout is listed the units we feel are the most accessible to chair bound hunters and also listed is the permit numbers requested. You may have looked over those and thought they were a bit high but we are pretty optimistic and we are going by what we have seen in other states but we are willing to compromise. Even two or three tags per species would be great. We would like you to keep in mind that there are 130 disabled hunters here in Utah that currently have a COR. Any questions?

Fred Oswald – Other than the numbers of spike elk permits we are not dealing with any numbers of permits tonight.

Justin Fuller – We thought that it might be helpful to see the kind of numbers we are looking at.

Fred Oswald – I can appreciate that but you need to understand that we are happy do deal with your proposal but we probably wouldn't deal with the numbers.

Justin Fuller – I can understand that because permit numbers are not set until spring. Our next proposal is regarding the general season extension. I would like to thank you for making this possible two years ago when you approved a five day general season extension. After three years of experiencing this hunt we feel it is necessary for us to have a weekend because many disabled hunters need our friends or family to go with us. The extended hunt starts on a Monday and goes to Friday before the hunt and many people aren't able to get off work five day before their hunt starts to assist us with our hunt and many times disabled hunters sit home because no one has been able to take them hunting in the five days. We feel if we have a weekend then our friends and family could take us out. We would like to make a change to that hunt because if you move it to the second Saturday in October it coincides with the spike and any bull hunts. We feel it would be better to have it the second weekend in November. Anis has said he has no problem with that because it is not during any other hunts. Keep in mind there are only 130 people so we would not be harvesting a lot of the deer. For example there are 3 to 4,000 archers who hunt the Wasatch

extended and their success rate is very low yet the buck to doe ratio is very high and we feel our harvest rate would be compared to that of the archers on the Wasatch. I would like you to recommend to the wildlife board to put this proposal through because it would encourage a lot more disabled hunters to be able to enjoy the outdoors like everyone else.

RAC Discussion

Allan Stevens – What are the proposed dates for the management hunt on the Henrys?

Anis Aoude – November 2nd to November 6th.

Allan Stevens – So it ends the day before the bison hunt starts?

Anis Aoude – Right.

Allan Stevens – I think that is crazy. It is a once in a life time hunt. I was down there this year on the first bison hunt and it is crazy two or three days before the hunt. I think if we are going to do this management hunt on the Henrys we should move it closer to the either sex bison hunt.

Anis Aoude – The unfortunate thing is that all the bison hunts are one after another.

Allan Stevens – The either sex hunts are the premium hunts and I don't like having it right before that hunt.

Anis Aoude – The reason we wanted it in that November timeframe is because it is closer to the time when the deer are in the rut which makes it easier to look at a lot of bucks and pick a management buck.

John Bair – I think with the number of people who have come out and the comments we have received on statewide archery I would be inclined to follow the other RACs lead on this and make a recommendation that we refer this to a committee. All the discussion we had on the deer plan hasn't drawn as much comment as this statewide archery has. I think it would be wise to refer this to a committee and let them sit down and figure out their problems rather than try to sit in judgment on something that is this big. I think we would be wise to refer it to a committee and get the Division's stamp of approval on it as well as the organizations and then bring it back to us next year.

Motion was made by John Bair to leave statewide archery as it is this year and recommend that a committee bring back a proposal next year.

Seconded by Gary Nielsen

Allan Stevens – I have no problem with that but I think what will make this fail is if we have only archers and people who are pro archery on the committee. I think we ought to have people who represent the other point of view on the committee. Some of the proposals I have seen only propose a committee made up of archers. I think you are going to have the same problem if you do that.

John Bair – I wouldn't have a problem amending my motion to state that we want people from the southern region who are concerned... all interests involved would be a good recommendation.

Amended motion

To maintain the statewide archery hunt as it is and recommend that a committee made up of all interests involved be formed to bring back a recommendation next year.

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

Motion was made by Richard Hansen to accept the mobility impaired proposal with the understanding that the DWR will make the determination of the hunt areas and permit numbers

Seconded by Doug Jones

Allan Stevens – I have no problem with disabled hunters having a longer hunt or something like that but I do have a problem with catering to special interests. I know that this may be unpopular but are we next going to get hunters with cancer coming in and asking for some of the overall permits? Where does it end? If you look at the number of disabled hunters and the total number of hunters and were to allocate

permits based on the number of hunters, the number of permits issued to disabled hunters would be very low. I have some problems voting for a proposal to allocate some of the public's permits to special interest groups. However I don't have any objection to if they do draw a permit to allowing them an extended season for weeks or even months but I do have a problem allocating permits to a special interest group regardless of what that special interest group is.

Fred Oswald – The motion does include the late season dates and a weekend.

John Bair – How many hunters would fit into this category?

130 average.

Is the public going to get to comment?

Fred Oswald – Yes, because of how this worked the public did not get a chance to comment on this and we will take those comments now.

Comments from the Public

Bart Hansen – I am kind of stunned right now and I want to keep my emotions in check. New Mexico gives out 700 of these tags. It is a no brainer. These are not people that will get up and walk some day. These are people who need help. They are passionate about hunting. They need to be given that opportunity. They deserve that. They didn't ask for the state they're in. It is the least we can do to give them a few tags in the rut. These people have to be on a road. They are not going to be having an impact on the quality even on the Henrys. They cannot pack in. They cannot go down in the deep canyons where these big bucks hang out. This is a hunt they deserve to have and it is the least we as sportsmen in Utah can do.

Kyle Witherspoon – I would also voice my support for the proposal. I think we do a disservice to this portion of the hunting population by not considering this proposal and doing so very seriously. I also think we would represent ourselves poorly as a Division and as hunters by failing to do so.

RAC Discussion

Fred Oswald – We do have a motion on the floor and a second.

John Bair – Why Anis, have we not had a committee to deal with this issue?

Anis Aoude – Probably the reason we haven't had a committee is the group involved is not a large group and we can deal with them almost on a one on one basis. This recommendation came up late in the process. They did contact us before the RACs started but it was not early enough that we could get with them and formulate a recommendation together so I told them to bring their recommendations to all the RACs. There wasn't anything in their proposal that we really opposed to be truthful, that's why it played out the way it did.

John Bair – The reason I ask that question is I have a hard time not agreeing with Bart on this that this is a unique situation that needs to be addressed. I might feel better about supporting something knowing that it had gone through a process with the Division and knowing all parties involved had gotten together and come up with something rather than putting the decision solely on our shoulders. I would rather see this go through the process, not that I am opposed to it.

Fred Oswald – We could vote against the motion and send it on to the wildlife board as an action item on their action log. The only difficulty with that is that puts it off for this year. The reason they're here tonight is because they want something to happen in regards to 2009.

John Bair – I understand that but like they mentioned other states have similar programs and if it's worth doing it is worth doing right.

Jay Price – How many hunters are there?

Anis Aoude – Currently we issue 130 CORs. Having said that I don't know how many disabled people are hunters and that number may increase. Realistically it will not increase that much.

Jay price – We could approve this and still have a committee and make changes to it next year.

Doug Jones – It seems we are behind the curve on this.

Anis Aoude – We are behind on this but the numbers of permits they are presenting aren't the quality type permits we have in a lot of our premium and limited entry units. It is apples and oranges. There are a lot more permits but it is not at the same level. I am not saying we shouldn't have any permits but the number of permits would have to be tweaked.

Motion restated -

Motion was made by Richard Hansen to accept the mobility impaired proposal with the exception of the permit numbers and areas which would be decided at a later date.

Seconded by Doug Jones

In Favor: John Bair, Richard Hansen, Micki Bailey, Doug Jones, Jay Price, George Holmes

Opposed: Gary Nielsen, Allan Stevens

Motion passed 6 to 2

John Bair – Can I make another motion concerning this? I would still like to see the Division form some kind of a committee to look at this and make sure we are doing enough and are in line with what is being done around the country.

Fred Oswald – I am not sure we need to put that in the form of a motion. We do need another motion in regards to UBAs proposal that we have an urban hunt, a youth hunt and additional permits. You can choose to pass or not pass or you can pass it on to the board as an item on their action log.

Allan Stevens – If the numbers are altered on the number of bow hunters does that affect the overall management plan.

Anis Aoude – Here's the thing. People currently could hunt in those urban areas if that was legal. The problem isn't that there aren't permits for urban hunts. The problem is that those municipalities do not allow hunting. Unless that changes any permits we put in there are useless. It has to be a grass roots type movement to get those municipalities to change their laws before anything like this can take place.

Allan Stevens – I understand that one. My question was on the additional youth permits. Is that doable?

Anis Aoude – It is doable it's just that I would hate to have a bunch of permits out there that are useless.

John Bair – If we approve a hunt that's not legal, what's the point? I agree there needs to be some hunting in several places I can think of but if it is in a municipality and it is not legal that's like issuing California condor permits.

Fred Oswald – How about if we take the UBA recommendations and pass it on to the board as an action item on their action log?

John Bair – Yeah, do that.

Motion was made by John Bair to recommend the wildlife board put the Utah Bowman's Association's recommendations regarding and urban deer hunt on the action log

Seconded by Doug Jones

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

Fred Oswald – We need to address keeping the early October season dates for limited entry units.

John Bair – I agree with Mike on this. I think we need to keep the early October dates.

Mike Christensen – My recommendation it to keep it as it is.

Fred Oswald – Anis, would you like to comment.

Anis Aoude – Obviously that goes against our recommendation. The rationale we gave for moving it is not only the spike hunt but to make it more consistent. I know there are issues with migration on some of these units but that is not our recommendation.

Mike Christensen – But you already have a spike hunt that overlaps on one unit.

Anis Aoude – That is not the only reason.

Motion was made by John Bair to keep the early October opener on limited entry deer hunts (not move them to the 17th)

Seconded by Gary Nielsen

In Favor: John Bair, Gary Nielsen, Richard Hansen

Opposed: Allan Stevens, Micki Bailey, Doug Jones, Jay Price, George Holmes

Motion failed 3 to 5

John Bair – It has been brought up about having the management hunts archery and muzzleloader only. I have talked to several people about this and received some emails. I think it would be easier to achieve our objective of these hunts if you had a little more range in your weapon.

Fred Oswald – Anis, do you want to comment on that.

Anis Aoude – Sure, the reason we recommended them be short range weapon hunts is precisely because they are management buck hunts and we want people to be up close and be sure that it is truly a management buck. Currently some folks shoot 400 or 500 yards with a rifle and walk up to the animal and find out it was not what they thought they were looking at. Even though muzzleloaders can shoot further, with open sites you have to be pretty close to know what the animal is. I understand the arguments that we have good optics now and all that but not everyone owns good optics and can tell. That is our rationale for recommending that.

Motion was made by John Bair to allow any legal weapon to be used for the proposed management deer hunts

Seconded by Allan Stevens

In Favor: John Bair, Gary Nielsen, Richard Hansen, Allan Stevens, Jay Price, George Holmes

Opposed: Micki Bailey, Doug Jones

Motion passed 6 to 2

Motion was made by Allan Stevens to accept the balance of the deer recommendations as presented

Seconded by John Bair

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

DOUG JONES WAS EXCUSED FROM THE MEETING

ELK

Questions from the Public

Bart Hansen – You mentioned that 60 to 70 percent of the spikes are harvested each year. On a unit like the Monroe that has basically 100 elk and is well under objective what are you going to do to assure that there is not an over harvest that will result in a major decrease in mature elk tags down the road?

Anis Aoude – We do hunter surveys every year so we know how many spikes are harvested on each unit every year.

Bart Hansen – You earlier made a recommendation that the statewide deer hunt be done away with because of overcrowding issues. Will having spike hunters on the southern units bring in more archers because there is an unlimited number of archery elk tags and will that create more overcrowding issues in that region?

Anis Aoude – It may but since there are more units it would probably spread archers further.

Bart Hansen – You mentioned there are 10 units that have spike tags and the other 19 don't. What is the number of elk on those 10 units compared to the number of elk on the other 19 units?

Anis Aoude – About 23 on the 10 and about 29 additional on the additional 19 so you are adding more than 100 percent.

Bart Hansen – So if you don't sell out the 17,000 tags what is the DWR going to do at that point?

Anis Aoude – Let hunters who purchased a tag hunt the 29 open units.

Comments from the Public

Dave Woodhouse – SFW – We are in opposition to a statewide spike elk hunt. We feel there is a better way to address the issue. Either perfect the management hunt or as Mike alluded to, increase the big bull hunting opportunity. There is room for increase on those units each year. The last couple of years at these meetings to set permit numbers this room has been packed with people who are passionate about issuing too many tags on those units. I feel like when word gets out to the general public about spike hunting on limited entry units there will be a lot of opposition to that. I would urge the RAC to vote against this recommendation.

Bart Hansen – UBA – I would like to make a suggestion that because this is such a big issue that this go before an elk committee formed by the DWR to address this issue. This is going to have huge ramifications for the 50,000 plus people who have limited entry elk points as well as future elk hunters who have the desire to hunt mature bulls in the state of Utah.

Jon Crump – I concur with the comments to oppose the statewide spike hunt. I would like to put forth an alternate option. I have given each of you a copy of that. That option is a management type bull hunt on all those units instead of unlimited spike. These management bull hunts would be limited in number which would be set by the Division at the meeting in March. We certainly need to bring down the bull to cow ration. That has been what Anis has said. We need to harvest the bulls so we don't damage the overall longevity of the populations. Instead of having unlimited spike hunters we would have a limited number of management hunts, five point or less. This does a couple of things. One is with the four management hunts that exist now there were several hundred people who applied for those tags. If we did this across the board odds are you are going to get several thousand people applying for those tags and odds would become better across the board. The objective is to help the Division meet the bull to cow ratio management objectives and give hunters the opportunity to harvest these bulls. Not everybody wants or needs to go out and kill one of these great big bulls. Many of us would be happy taking a five or six year old mature bull that is not necessarily a trophy bull. As hunters we have plenty of opportunity to hunt spikes and many of us would like to hunt something a bit bigger. The season dates for that could be any number of things. You could run it concurrent with the general season or with the limited entry hunts that exist now. You could get a lot of people in there and increase the odds for everybody.

Steve Carlton – I appreciate the opportunity to address you. Over the last 16 years of putting in for limited entry elk I finally drew a permit this year on the Monroe limited entry area for elk. When I started putting in for this 16 years ago it was probably the number one area in the state. Now there are other areas that are better but I put in for that area because I knew that area and what it held for elk. Over the years it has become not as appealing for elk as other units. What I would like to see is less permits on this unit and there are several units around there that are in the same boat. I have talked to hunters this year giving back tags because they couldn't find the quality of bull that they are looking for. After 16 years I was looking for something 375 or better and other than the spider bull I cannot say that I saw one 375 bull on that mountain. I took a 300 bull but after 16 years I want a quality hunt because I want a trophy bull and to me a trophy bull is not a 300 bull. I would like to see the number of tags limited. There are over 100 tags on that particular unit.

RAC Discussion

John Bair – Out of all the email I have got, and that's a bunch, I've only got one email in favor of statewide spike. Personally I think if we do statewide spike on some of these units we are going to be burning the candle at both ends. I used to count the seconds until I could draw a Manti or Wasatch tag and now I wouldn't burn my points on either one of them. I think we have tipped those units upside down and the thought of doing that to the Pahvant or the San Juan and turning that many spike hunters on those units is scary. Those are the two best elk units in the world. If it was a limited number it may be different but I don't think this is the thing to do. I also don't agree with running a management hunt for

two years and pulling the plug. I think the elk committee can get together and make a management hunt work. I like the management bull idea that came forward. At least people would be burning their points and moving people through the system and they know they are hunting a management bull. Like the gentleman said if you waited 16 years you ought to have the bull you waited for. I think there are a lot of us that feel like we have waited 14 or 15 years just in time to see the quality take a dive. That is a frustrating thing and I think statewide spike would add to that dramatically. I think we should leave spike hunting the way it is and find a way to make our management bull hunts work.

Allan Stevens – It is interesting to me that we always ask the division to manage from a biological sense and when they do we complain about it.

**Motion was made by Allan Stevens to accept the all elk recommendations as presented
Seconded by George Holmes**

Fred Oswald – So we are voting on the statewide spike hunt as well as shortening the limited entry rifle elk hunt, discontinuing the management bull hunt and adding a general season bull hunt on the San Juan and continuing a mid November youth rifle elk hunt on the south slope/bonanza unit.

Gary Nielsen – We talk about using good biology and I agree with that but we have watched this in action on other units where we pound the spikes and we still have the big bull tags, which is almost not anymore, and we still slaughter the cows. Theoretically it should work but the way we are doing it is not working. The animals are all but gone on some of those units. That is what we are nervous about. The Pahvant has lots of elk on it right now so 17,000 spike hunters are going to go there for the opening of the spike hunt. Why wouldn't you go there were there are actually some spikes? I don't think we are ready to take that step yet. There is the possibility of shooting some spikes and biologically that is a good idea but we have got to back off in some of the other areas if we do and I don't see that mentioned anywhere. This is not a good blanket solution.

Richard Hansen – If we are going to increase spike permits we are going to have to decrease other permits and if there is not a plan in place to reduce the number of antlerless permits and the animals you are taking off the units where are we going to end up? I don't think we know right now. I think we are right if we back off on cow permits and we kill some spikes and increase production but until there is something written so we know that will happen I am really nervous about just saying we should kill spikes on every unit.

John Bair – We have spent 20 years building the best elk herd in the world and it seems the last couple years we just cannot wait to tip it upside down. Biologically we don't need any big bulls. We don't need big bucks to cover the does either. We are talking about the best trophy units in the world tuning loose 17,000 spike hunters on those units, bad, bad, bad move.

Fred Oswald – We need to understand that there are strong opinions on this proposal in both ways and we do need to respect each others opinions about this proposal. Please be courteous to those who have opinions that may be different than you own. We do have a motion with a second on the table.

In Favor: Allan Stevens, Micki Bailey, Jay Price, George Holmes

Opposed: John Bair, Gary Nielsen, Richard Hansen

Motion passed 4 to 3

Motion was made by John Bair to accept the balance of the big game recommendations

Seconded by Jay Price

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

6) **CWMU Recommendations (Action)**
- **Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

Questions from the Public

Aaron Copple – The CWMU association’s website was mentioned. Is there going to be a place on that site for hunters who have actually been on these CWMUs to write reviews or comments so others can see? Anyone can call a CWMU operator and get told everything you want to hear but actually hearing from people who have hunted the unit might shed some light on the actual situation.

Boyde Blackwell – The CWMU association and the Division are two different entities and they will have their own website. We have our own and on that informational page will be a section with hunter satisfaction. We ask that question all the time on our questionnaires. So a hunter can look at that and see if a hunter had a satisfaction rating of 4.5 it must be pretty good. That will be on our website and come from our data.

RAC Discussion

Richard Hansen – What is the minimum acreage for a landowners association?

Boyde Blackwell – That depends on the size of the unit. They need to have at least 51 percent of the private lands on that unit to form an association.

Richard Hansen – But there is no minimum size?

Boyde Blackwell – If there is a landowner who has 10 acres and they want to be part of the unit the association has to allow them to be in the association however they can also put in their bylaws how they will distribute permits.

Richard Hansen – So say there is a landowner association and they have 1,000 acres how do you determine if they get permits?

Boyde Blackwell - The biologist determines where the private land is and we look at plat maps to determine how much private land there is and how much is elk habitat on the overall unit. It takes a bit of work and effort on everyone’s part but we would determine whether it fits into that management unit and all that.

Boyde Blackwell – I have one clarification, for the southwest desert that should be 22 permits not 21, there was a mistake in my table.

Motion was made by John Bair to accept the CWMU recommendations as presented

Seconded by Micki Bailey

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

7) **Landowner Permit Recommendations (Action)**
- **Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

RAC Discussion

John Bair – I think the Division has done a good job at sticking to their plan. I am in a landowner association on the Book Cliffs. I qualify for a third of a permit. I would love to recommend that I get a permit every year. It just doesn’t work that way. I know that every four years I get to go hunt. The Division has done a great job keeping that level across the board. When you are dealing with permits that are that valuable they really need to play by the same rules as everyone else.

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

Seconded by George Holmes

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

- 8) **Depredation Rule R657-44 Amendment (Action)**
- **Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

**Motion was made by Jay Price to accept the rule as presented
Seconded by George Holmes**

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

- 9) **Bonus Point Recommendations (Action)**
- **Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Section Chief**

Questions from the Public

Josh Luke – It seems to me if you let everyone buy points for everything what that is going to do is allow people to draw one limited entry and one once in a lifetime permit in their life and then everything will be so clogged up that you will never be able to draw anything else. Do you think that will help?

Greg Sheehan – I don't think that this will solve those issues. Here is how it will help you but maybe not a youth or somebody new who comes in two years from now. It would give you a competitive advantage because you are building points for the other species. Once you draw your elk permit you may be eight or ten points ahead of someone new coming in verses if you drew your elk and now you are at zero for deer and there is a 14 year old who is at zero and you are going to start working through the system together. It is going to pile up more points. We are not saying that this is going to solve anything. There is not anything I presented tonight that is going to solve any problem or get overall, anybody out in the field any sooner. We've got 5,000 tags and 5,000 people are going hunting next year. That's all there is to it.

Ben Louder – Could we see the slide that showed the breakdown of pronghorn, deer and elk and the number of tags issued verses the number of tags that were turned back. Do we know how many of the people were in a group that surrendered a permit?

Greg Sheehan – I think we do but I don't have it here.

Judi Tutorow – For elk, 19 of 148 were in a group.

Greg Sheehan – We are also starting to see more and more people who have waited so long for these tags and when they draw and head out in the mountains and scout up until the hunt starts and if they feel like they can't see a good enough animal they show up in our office and give the permit back. I don't know how you best address that. Where it is frustrating is that they wait until the day before the hunt and we can't always reissue those and we have just taken some opportunity away from somebody.

Ben Louder – I agree that is a concern. I just did some quick numbers here and if 19 of 148 permits are surrendered from group applicants verses the total number of elk tags we issue then that is less than one percent of tags. Is that enough to warrant eliminating group applications?

Greg Sheehan – Not necessarily, like I said, I don't mean to portray that we have a huge problem here. There are not a lot of people out there doing it. Just because you are doing it doesn't mean you are drawing a tag every year. If you are averaging your points you are going to be a lot less than someone with a high number of points. It isn't a major problem we have. Part of the reason we talked about eliminating groups is to try to get some different parties out in the field enjoying that wildlife. If two people draw together in a group you are going to have half a dozen people go with you, maybe family and friends. If two separate individuals draw two tags they are probably each going to have five or six people go with them. We think we need to have people out there enjoying that experience. These are not about meat hunts. They are about a quality opportunity and that is part of why we are saying that on the group. We would be spreading that out exactly like we have done on the once in a lifetime.

Comments from the Public

Ben Louder – My comments concerning the group applications as I pointed out are that I don't think this is a big enough issue to warrant eliminating group applications across the board. I think some of the

proposals that have been presented are a very good idea. The idea that if you turn your tag back in you don't get a point I think is a good compromise. Two people from a group may want to hunt together particularly out of state hunters who are coming here to enjoy this resource. It would be hard to get someone to take off work to come join you on a hunt if they don't have a tag. I am very opposed to the proposal to allow you to purchase points for all species. We are always looking for ways to recruit youth and that will do nothing more than discourage youth. Their opportunity would be almost none.

Mark Lindsay – I agree with Ben. I would like you to seriously look at if you turn a permit in you don't get a point for that year. I am a little torn on this one. I have talked to a lot of people who hunt in other states and they say that we have probably the best point system of any state around. I would like to see somebody in the system for a couple years before they are eligible for the draw just to see that they are dedicated to what they want to do. I realize that takes away some of the youth opportunity.

Dave Woodhouse – SFW – We definitely oppose the ability to purchase a point for every species besides the one you are actually applying for. You could do that when the point system started so I have one antelope point. If that had continued I would have 10 points and the kids that are coming in now wouldn't have a chance. I agree with the proposal to lose your points if you have not applied for three years.

Dee Jay Bigler – My comment is regarding number 2 that would be that you forfeit your points if you don't apply for anything in three consecutive years. The original proposal I saw on internet has been changed and did not say anything about applying for some other permit during that time. I started putting in before we had points and it took me 14 years to draw my desert big horn sheep permit. This year I will have 14 points for limited entry elk. I have points for rocky mountain big horn, bison, goat, deer and antelope. I wouldn't want to see them wiped out. I have a monetary investment in those points because I paid for the points. If the state wants to take those points away they better buy them back from me.

Paula Richmond – I am representing myself and my twins that are 21 months. I wanted to oppose number three about allowing everyone to apply for all species because of the opportunity that may take away from my twins in the future. When they get to that age I want them to put in and hunt and be able to have opportunity to hunt and with this proposal I don't think they would get that opportunity.

John Bair – If they draw as a group shouldn't they have to surrender as a group?

Greg Sheehan – We talked about that but you can apply as a group with up to four people and if you have hunted in groups before you know you may be distantly related to the other people in the group. You may have you and your brother and his friend from work and his friend. If that third friend decides he doesn't want to hunt you don't want him pulling you out of the hunt.

Lee Tracy – If we could purchase bonus points for all species that would be good for me but down the road you would have 30,000 people looking for 21 sheep tags. I recommended to two of the RACs and they adopted a third proposal to the group hunt and that is to limit the number of times a person can turn in a permit. That allows people to go to the weddings and other things. The southern RAC recommended two times and the northern RAC recommended three consecutive years. I recommend we limit the number of times a person can surrender a permit. That allows for emergencies but it stops those people who are selling their points from doing it for very long.

Mike Pritchett – I support 1B for the group applications in which points in a group would still be averaged but if permit is surrendered a point for that year would not be given. I also support that if you don't apply for a three year period that you are taken out. I oppose the ability to purchase additional bonus points. Also I oppose capping the current bonus point system. I would support giving youth a point for completing hunter education.

Josh Luke – When I went to the southeast RAC they made a proposal and I have circled the ones they approved. They are 1B, number 2 and for general season 1(2) and number 2 and 3. If we are allowed to buy points for everything it will make a huge mess.

RAC Discussion

John Bair – I am glad to see the public comment come out the way it did. The one thing I received a lot of disagreement with and I personally disagree with myself is the ability to purchase bonus points for all species. You are literally taking silver dollars and turning them into pesos. We might as well not have points if you are going to do that. I hope the Division put that out there just to let the process kill it once and for all.

LIMITED ENTRY/OIAL

**Motion was made by John Bair to accept 1A
Seconded by Allan Stevens**

John Bair – and I need to add to my motion that if you do surrender your tag you don't get a point for that year.

Greg Sheehan – One advantage you have with 1A is that if you are not in a group and you draw a tag but you surrender it even as an individual you will not get a point. We are not treating group people and everyone else different. Under 1A you would get a point back and you may have some legitimate reasons for why you want to surrender your permit. Maybe your daughter is getting married and you can't go that year.

John Bair – I guess that depends on where your priorities are, do you want to go hunting or do you want to go to a wedding Greg? I am sticking with it; you don't get a point if you surrender your permit.

Motion amended

Motion was made by John Bair to accept 1A and if you surrender your tag you would not get a point for that year

Second withdrawn

Motion dies for lack of second

**Motion was made by Allan Stevens to accept 1A
Seconded by John Bair**

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

Opposed: Gary Nielsen, Micki Bailey

Motion passed 5 to 2

Motion was made by Richard Hansen to accept #2, a person would loose points if they do not apply for three consecutive years

Seconded by John Bair

In Favor: John Bair, Richard Hansen, Allan Stevens, Micki Bailey

Opposed: Gary Nielsen, Jay Price, George Holmes

Motion passed 4 to 3

John Bair – I make a motion that we execute whoever thought #3 up. I am kidding but I think we ought to leave that alone and let it die.

Allan Stevens – One other thing to think about, someone with kids who apply is putting out a lot of money just in application fees for each point. This is a rich man's game if we do this as well.

Motion made by John Bair to not accept #3

Seconded by Allan Stevens

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

GENERAL SEASON

Motion was made by Allan Stevens to accept 1 (1)

Seconded by John Bair

In Favor: John Bair, Gary Nielsen, Richard Hansen, Allan Stevens, Jay Price, George Holmes

Opposed: Micki Bailey

Motion passed 6 to 1

John Bair – I have a problem with number two. You are giving someone a bonus point and a tag, bad move. If you are going to go hunting that is like buying a point.

Fred Oswald – Like Greg said it is an effort to discourage people from not putting a second and third choice so you don't have 16,000 left over tags.

John Bair – Are you trying to avoid selling them over the counter?

Greg Sheehan – Partly we are trying to do that. We get 16,000 people saying they would have taken this permit on the draw but I really want my southern tag and you are forcing me to come stand in line here because I really want to earn that southern preference point. We are trying to get these permits to people in the draw rather than them having to camp out at Sportsman's Warehouse and our office to get these tags.

John Bair – So if they don't draw the south and then they come buy the northern over the counter they still get their southern preference point?

Greg Sheehan – Yeah, they are going to get the point and a permit. We can either sell them the permit in the draw or we can do it sitting on our front steps at three in the morning. The tags are going to get sold to those people one way or another.

Motion was made by John Bair to accept #2

Seconded by Richard Hansen

In Favor: John Bair, Gary Nielsen, Richard Hansen, Micki Bailey

Opposed: Allan Stevens, Jay Price, George Holmes

Motion passed 4 to 3

Motion was made by Allan Stevens to accept #3

Motion dies for lack of second

10) Dedicated Hunter Program Recommendations (Action)

- Rhianna Christopher, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Fred Oswald – So the second year of the draw there would be a number of people with preference points because they applied the year before and they didn't get in. In that draw there will be a bunch of people who will apply with a preference point and a bunch of people who will apply without a point and then what will happen? The draw would take place and everyone who has a point will get in before those without a point?

Greg Sheehan – Yes.

Fred Oswald – So really no one accumulates more than one preference point because as soon as you have one and you apply again you get in.

Greg Sheehan – Unless there are more applicants with points than available spots in the program. That is how our southern region deer are now. I don't anticipate we would see that in this program.

Fred Oswald – All of the emails I am getting are indicating that the people currently in the program want preference for already being in the program. My question is why don't you give everybody in the program a preference point?

Rhianna Christopher – Ultimately they have preference because they are in the program right now. This is not a lifetime program.

Fred Oswald – What people are saying is that the old timers who have put in the hours and everything aren't going to be treated any differently than brand new applicants and they are saying there ought to be some way to treat us differently and I am saying why don't you give them a preference point?

Greg Sheehan – That would be an issue for you to discuss.

Fred Oswald – So that means the first year around everybody who is in the program gets to stay in the program.

Jay Price – It is a three year program. If they didn't get in they would only be out one year.

John Bair – You are never going to sit this thing out longer than one year.

Rhianna Christopher – Each year there are a certain amount of people expiring. We have certainly had those comments from those folks who think that they should automatically get back in.

Allan Stevens – Why is there a cap?

Rhianna Christopher – That was a number that was decided on by the RACs and board 14 years ago.

Allan Stevens – So if we as a RAC wanted to we could make a recommendation to do away with the cap.

Rhianna Christopher – Sure, but then we are looking at a whole other animal because then we are taking more tags out of the public drawing.

Allan Stevens – It seems to me that is where we ought to be going. If we did that we could have everybody on the dedicated hunter program and we could issue one third more tags than what we do now because as a dedicated hunter you can only kill two deer every three years. Plus you get more service hours and the money. I don't see what the down side would be. You could draw for your region.

John Bair – When we had the dedicated hunter committee and they talked about raising the cap, was taking more tags out of the regular draw a major concern.

Rhianna Christopher – That was just one of the many concerns.

Questions from the Public

Todd Gilles – You are saying it is harder to find hours for people to do?

Rhianna Christopher – We are looking at a matter of quantity verses quality projects. We feel like we are in a really good spot with the number of dedicated hunters that we can provide quality projects. Even now it is a challenge in the central region.

Todd Gilles – If that is a problem why not cut the hours that are required to 16 hours. I don't see the problem with getting more work done and more materials donated.

Rhianna Christopher – Cutting service hours really isn't an option.

Jeremy Anderson – After that explanation my question is if it ain't broke why fix it? I don't see what is broken. It sounds like there are more paper work and more clerical issues that you are going through than anything. This is an amazing program to people. People are willing to put their hours in and go stand in line and do whatever they have to do.

Rhianna Christopher – It's not a matter of being broken. There are two elements here one of those being last year we had some serious system issues. When there are 3,000 people trying to access the system at once there are bound to be issues and there were. The second element is we are trying to provide this opportunity and make it fair for everyone who is interested. More and more people each year are learning about the program. We are trying to make it as fair as we can to try to give everyone an opportunity. It is all about the opportunity.

Jeremy Anderson – It can be all about the opportunity if it is first come first serve. If you are dedicated to dedicated hunter you will get it done right away.

Rhianna Christopher – That is the problem, everyone thinks they have to get in during the first few days because if they wait it will fill up and the system crashes.

Lonny Fallio – Why did the program change to require all 24 hours by the second year? I know why they did.

Rhianna Christopher – I inherited that and it is my understanding that it was because after folks harvest their first two deer they would not do the last eight hours.

Lonny Fallio – My understanding is if they then put in their eight hours they can get back in the program. Jo Proctor told us that when she was over the program.

Tim Park – If there is not a cap you are saying that will take away from the general draw but isn't it all the same people? If you raise the cap to 20,000 that will be 10,000 less general season applicants.

Rhianna Christopher – Not necessarily. There are a lot of folks who simply can't put in the time that is needed to focus on the program or who don't have 180 dollars to put in the application fee.

Tim Park – But it would be close wouldn't it?

Rhianna Christopher – No.

Tim Park - Isn't the program a win win for everyone?

Rhianna Christopher – Yes.

Tim Park – You get service hours and dedicated sportsmen that are going to the RAC meetings and they are being educated so why is there a cap?

Rhianna Christopher – It was a number that was decided on years ago.

Tim Park – You said you have the cap because you don't want to take more permits from the southern region. Could you not make the dedicated hunters draw for the southern region?

Rhianna Christopher – Yes, if the program were changed. People in the program can change each year and that is the region they get. If all 10,000 people want southern region they would all get southern region.

Tim Park – Couldn't you put a cap on how many could get southern to address the overcrowding issue?

Rhianna Christopher – I don't know that there is an overcrowding issue.

Greg Sheehan – Certainly the program could be reconfigured to take the cap off but the first requirement would be to make you draw for your region. What we have in our southern region now is not only are there 5,000 to 6,000 dedicated hunters you also have about 2,000 lifetime guys going to the southern region and then the youth take 15, maybe soon to be 20 percent, of the permits and pretty soon there will not be anything left. If the program is reconfigured which we are not proposing tonight, that could happen and maybe that would be a good thing down the road to look at.

Comments from the Public

Lonnie Fallio – I have been in the program for nine years. I am concerned because I may not get back into the program next year. I think it is a great program because I can hunt with my family. I have grandkids coming up and I would like to be able to hunt with them. If the young kids now don't have the opportunity to hunt every year they are not going to stay interested in it. I think if there are too many changes you will ruin the program.

Mark Lindsay – I have been dedicated hunter for ten years. I think it is becoming too easy to be a dedicated hunter. I think a dedicated hunter needs to commit the time and the effort that the title stands for. If this passes there will not be a RAC required. We used to have to go to three and I think at least one should be required, I would prefer two along with the ethics course and everything else. I don't think the hours are enough. I am up next year and I am going to apply again and if I don't get in I am still going to go work the Santaquin check station the opening weekend because that is what I like to do. I think there needs to be more commitment and dedication to the program.

Gary Copple – I want to echo what was just said there. I have been to quite a few of these RAC meetings now and I understand that a lot of the dedicated hunters don't want to hang around. It seems to me it is an

entitlement issue. A lot of people want to get as much as they can for as little as possible. We should up the hours and have a RAC every year. If they miss a RAC they shouldn't be able to reapply. Dedicating more time to the program would make it more valuable and if people get ticked off about that and fall out of the program, maybe that's not the kind of people we want in the program.

RAC Discussion

Richard Hansen – I got in the program the first year and I am bothered. I paid my money and did my hours and now its thanks a lot, well see ya. I have never punched a tag in all these years. It bothers me that the ones who have been in for a long time are not given some consideration. There are people who drop out every year and people can apply for those spots. If you are in the program you should have the option to stay in the program. I don't see the problem with raising the cap. It may be an administrative problem for you but I am sure those things can be adjusted. Most of the comments I have received echo that.

Fred Oswald – Of the 10,000 people in the program now, how many of them is it their last year?

Rhianna Christopher – This year there will be a little more than 3,000 expire. Each year that number will be a different number.

Fred Oswald – So 3,000 new people will be allowed in the program?

Rhianna Christopher – No, those 3,000 people who are expiring may reapply for 2009.

John Bair – I have been in the program except for one year. I don't know how else once you are at a cap besides a draw to be fair. I don't think you will sit out of the program longer than one year. I feel like I should have some consideration for being in the program and participating like I have but I have kids who are going to want to get in it too and how do I say I am going to sit on my tag and not let you have a shot at it? I think the draw they have come up with is probably as equitable as anything they could do.

Motion was made by Jay Price to approve the recommendations as presented

Seconded by George Holmes

In Favor: John Bair, Gary Nielsen, Micki Bailey, Jay Price, George Holmes

Opposed: Richard Hansen, Allan Stevens

Motion passed 5 to 2

11) Antler Gathering Recommendation (Action)

- John Pratt, Law Enforcement

Questions from the RAC

Fred Oswald – Was there consensus for the recommendation from everybody including law enforcement and the antler enthusiasts?

John Pratt – Yes. I won't say that everyone was happy with everything but we all agreed we could do nothing, we can take an educational approach or we can start doing some closures. The biggest issue here is people on winter ranges, and the Division can't control people on winter ranges. We agreed that an educational approach was the best approach. This does a couple of things enforcement wise. It puts people on notice. Now the intent level is there. If they have had the course and they continue to violate I have the intent to show to a judge.

Gary Nielsen – If you are only going to warn them why call it a violation?

John Pratt – There are two laws already. The definition of take includes harassment so a person deliberately chasing animals to knock antlers off is harassment and that is a take and it requires a certain level of intent. Those laws are already on the books and we can enforce them now, we just need to raise the level of intent.

Richard Hansen – How is this going to be any easier to enforce than what is already in place?

John Pratt – It won't be any easier.

Richard Hansen – I know it won't so what is the point. I understand what you are trying to accomplish but people who do this already know it is illegal. They already know it is wrong to go up and chase animals to knock antlers off. My point is you are just adding another layer of something that is going to be just as hard to enforce if not harder.

John Pratt - We are trying to take the educational approach first.

Richard Hansen – You don't need to educate them; they already know it is wrong. This is not going to stop them. I don't understand how this is going to help your COs.

John Pratt – It puts a level of intent there. You say they know it is wrong. I have got to show that they know it. If you have taken the course, I have that.

Richard Hansen – But maybe the guy says he is just out for a hike.

John Pratt – That is the basis that this can't address. Right now it is illegal to take an OHV where it is not posted or published open but the BLM and the forest need to be on board with their travel plans. It is a complicated issue.

John Bair – I think this deserves a chance but I am very skeptical that we are ever going to solve this problem. I don't know that this is going to keep one deer or elk from being chased. Because the effort was made by the Division and the groups involved we need to consider this.

Motion was made by George Holmes to accept the recommendation as presented

Seconded by John Bair

In Favor: John Bair, Micki Bailey, Gary Nielsen, Jay Price, George Holmes

Opposed: Richard Hansen, Allan Stevens

Motion passed 5 to 2

Meeting adjourned at 12:03 a.m.

200 in attendance

Next board meeting December 4th at 8:00 a.m. at the DNR complex in room 1040

Next RAC meeting December 16th at 6:30 p.m. at Springville Jr. High School

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY-MOTIONS PASSED
Weston Park Hotel, Vernal/November 6, 2008

6.STATEWIDE DEER PLAN and 7.BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL PROCLAMATION
AND RULE R657-56

DEER

A. MOTION to defer the wheelchair bound limited entry proposal to the Wildlife Board and would like to see the proposal come back to the RACs at a later date.

Passed unanimously

B. MOTION for the general handicapped hunt to extend into November to give them an extra weekend. at the end of the hunt (Monday – Sunday hunt)

Passed unanimously

C. MOTION to make a recommendation to the Board to form a working group to address the Southern Region archery overcrowding issue.

Motion passed 6 to 3

D. MOTION to accept the deer management plan as proposed by UDWR and make any other recommendations separately.

Motion failed 3-6

E. MOTION to accept UDWR's deer management plan as presented except bring up age objective from 15 to 17. (17-22 instead of 15-22).

Motion Withdrawn

F. MOTION to accept UDWR's deer portion of the proclamation

Motion passed 6 to 3

G. MOTION to request that the Board look into a predator control fee (concept only)

Motion passed 6 to 3

H. MOTION for the Board to consider a management buck hunt concept for the future, on South Slope Diamond Mountain and Book Cliffs.

Passed unanimously

ELK

I. MOTION to leave the statewide spike elk plan as it is with only 10 units and keep the season dates at 11 days.

AMENDED MOTION to accept UDWR's proposal as presented except we keep the 10 units the way they are and the 11 day season intact. Also, keep the two seasons for Diamond Mountain.

Motion passed 5 to 3 with 1 abstention

8. CWMU RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION to accept as presented
Passed unanimously

9. LANDOWNER PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION to accept as proposed
Passed unanimously

10. DEPREDATION RULE R657-44 AMENDMENT

MOTION to accept as proposed
Passed unanimously

11. BONUS POINT RECOMMENDATIONS

A. LIMITED ENTRY HUNT MOTION to accept **1 a**, amended to say they would not get a bonus point if they surrender, and accept **2** or limited entry and once in a lifetime.

Motion passed 7 in favor, 1 abstention

B. GENERAL SEASON HUNT MOTION to accept DWR recommendations for **1-1)** and **2** and **3**. Reject 1-2).

Passed unanimously

12. DEDICATED HUNTER PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION to accept as proposed
Passed unanimously

13. ANTLER GATHERING RECOMMENDATION

MOTION to accept as presented
Motion passed 5 to 3

14. PRONGHORN MANAGEMENT PLANS-NERO ONLY

MOTION to approve management plan
Motion passed 6 to 1

NORTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY
Weston Plaza Hotel, Vernal
November 6, 2008

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

UNEXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

Carlos Reed-Native American

WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS:

Del Brady

DIVISION PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Kent Hersey, Wildlife Pgm Coordinator
Anis Aoude, Wildlife Pgm Coordinator
Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Pgm Coordinator
Judi Tutorow, Administrative Services
Rhianna Christopher, Wildlife Pgm Coord.
Mitch Lane, NRO Sergeant
Dean Mitchell, Wildlife Pgm Coordinator
Clint Sampson, NER C.O.
Charlie Greenwood, NER Wildlife Pgm Mgr
Randall Thacker, NER Wildlife Bio III
Dax Mangus, NER Wildlife Bio II
Gayle Allred, NER Administrative Aide
Ron Stewart, NER Conservation Outreach
Torrey Christophersen, NER Lieutenant

1.REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

MOTION by Curtis Dastrup to accept the agenda

Second by Rod Morrison

Passed unanimously

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

MOTION by Bob Christensen to accept minutes and old business

Second by Beth Hamann

Passed unanimously

4.REGIONAL UPDATE: Kevin Christopherson (skipped in order to allow more time for a long agenda)

5.DEER SURVEY RESULTS: Kent Hersey, Wildlife Program Coordinator (INFORMATIONAL)

See handout.

Questions from Public:

Mitch Hacking: The main reason hunters wanted to go was to be with their family but didn't want to give up their hunting for big bucks but they don't have to give up hunting; they can go on cow elk or other antlerless hunts.

Kent Hersey: We talked about a hunt where if you hunt, you're guaranteed a 24" buck. People would have to give up that opportunity.

Scott Allred: Couldn't they still go hunting and still have antler restrictions?

Kent Hersey: We have had those in the past and it doesn't work. It increased illegal harvest and it does not produce bigger animals.

Brad Horrocks: At least you saw a buck.

Kent Hersey: It did not increase buck/doe ratios.

Brad Horrocks: I know in the Book Cliffs you saw bucks.

Kent Hersey: The Book Cliffs was the same. The ratios were very similar. Not many more bucks and fewer mature bucks.

Questions from RAC: None

Comments from Public: None

Comments from RAC: None

6.STATEWIDE DEER PLAN and 7. BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL PROCLAMATION AND RULE R657-5: Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator (ACTION)

See handout

Population Objective: by 2013, increase the statewide mule deer population by 50,000 to an estimated post-season herd size of 350,000.

Habitat Objective 1: Maintain mule deer habitat throughout the state by protecting and enhancing existing crucial habitats and mitigating for losses due to natural and human impacts.

Habitat Objective 2: Improve the quality and quantity of vegetation for mule deer on a minimum of 500,000 acres of crucial range by 2013.

Recreation Objective 1: Maintain a hunting program for mule deer that encourages a variety of quality hunting opportunities while maintaining population objectives.

Recreation Objective 2: Increase opportunities for viewing of mule deer while educating the public concerning the needs of deer and the importance of habitat.

Limited Entry Recommendations

Manage for a 3-year average of 25-35 bucks:100 does.

-If the buck:doe ratio exceeds 35 bucks:100 does, limited entry permits will be increased, if it falls below 25 bucks:100 does, permits will be decreased.

Premium Limited Entry

Manage for a 3-year average of 40-50 bucks:100 does and 30-40% of the harvested deer being 5 years of age or older.

-Establish management buck hunts on these units to provide additional hunting opportunity

-If the 3-year average buck:doe ratio exceeds 50/100, management buck permits will be increased.

-If >40% of the harvested bucks (3-year average) are 5 years of age or older, premium limited entry permits will be increased.

General Season Recommendations

-Option 1 (DWR preferred, committee recommendation)

-Regional hunts with 9-day season length, except on 5 units below 15 bucks:100 does

-NRO deer/elk combo hunt remains

-Option 2

-2010 hunting season

Unit-by-unit hunting

No deer/elk combo hunt

-2009 hunting season

Regional hunts with a 9-day season

Statewide archery for the entire season

2009 Deer Recommendations if the General Season Change IS Adopted

-2009 General Deer Season Dates

-Archery 8/15-9/01 region picked

9/02-9/11 Statewide

-Muzzleloader 9/23-10/1

-Any Weapon 10/10-10/18

-If option 1 of the statewide plan is adopted the South Slope, LaSal, Nebo, Oquirrh Stansburry, and Monroe Units Any Weapon season will be 10/14-10/18

-If option 1 is not adopted season dates will remain as above

Other Committee Recommendations – Outside of the Deer Plan

-Flip-flop the season dates of the general season deer and elk any weapon hunts

-Due to conflicts with other hunts, it can't be an exact flip-flop

-Deer would be 1 week earlier (due to waterfowl opening day)

-Elk would be 10 days later

DWR RECOMMENDATION:

-Keep season structure the same as in previous years

-Rationale

-DWR does not believe success rates will change on either hunt

-Vast majority of hunters are neutral or satisfied with the current deer season (83%)

-Don't want to impact the tradition of the general deer or general elk hunts

-Cattle allotment off-dates

24% statewide on or later than October 15

43-45% in SRO on or later than October 15

2009 Deer Recommendations

NO General Season Change Adopted

-2009 General Deer Season Dates

-Archery 8/15-9/01 region picked

9/02-9/11 Statewide

-Muzzleloader 9/23-10/1

-Any Weapon 10/17-10/25

-If option 1 of the statewide plan is adopted the South Slope Vernal, LaSal, Nebo, Oquirrh Stansburry, and Monroe Units Any Weapon season will be 10/21-10/25

-If option 1 is not adopted season dates will remain as above

Statewide Archery Recommendations:

-To deal with public concerns about hunter crowding in the Southern Region during the archery season, we are recommending that archers will have to choose a region to hunt until September 1, after which they can hunt statewide.

-There will be no regional cap for archery permits.

-We are also recommending leaving the archery cap at 16,000.

-This will allow the Division to gather more precise data on what region hunters are choosing during the early part of the season for use in future decisions on permit allocation.

2009 Elk Hunt Recommendations:

Statewide Spike Recommendation

-Expand the statewide spike hunts to include all Limited Entry Units

-Increase spike-only permit allocation from 11,000 to 17,000

Recommendations to Implement Statewide Spike

-North Slope Three Corners Unit would not be included due to Interstate Agreement with Colorado.

-South Slope Diamond Mountain Unit late rifle hunt will have to be discontinued because dates of that hunt conflict with the General Season Spike hunt dates

2009 General Elk Season Hunt Dates and Permit Caps

General Season Change Adopted

-Archery Spike Bull	8/15-9/6	
-Archery Any Bull	8/15-9/11	
-Any Weapon Elk	10/21-11/01(Wed. Opener)	
-Youth Any Bull	9/12-9/20	
-Muzzleloader	11/4-11/15	
-Archery Elk		Unlimited
-Spike Bull Permit Cap (Statewide Spike)		17,000
-Spike Bull Permit Cap (No Statewide Spike)		11,000
-Any Bull Permit Cap		14,300
_Youth Any Bull		315

2009 General Elk Season Hunt Dates and Permit Caps

NO General Season Change Adopted

-Archery Spike Bull	8/15-9/6	
-Archery Any Bull	8/15-9/11	
-Any Weapon Elk	10/3-10/15 (Sat. opener)	
-Youth Any Bull	9/12-9/20	
-Muzzleloader	10/28-11/6	
-Archery Elk		Unlimited
-Spike Bull Permit Cap Statewide Spike		17,000
-Spike Bull Permit Cap No Statewide Spike		11,000
-Any Bull Permit Cap		14,300
-Youth Any Bull		315

2009 Deer Management Plan

Questions from Public:

Mitch Hacking: There was nothing mentioned on predator plans.

Anis Aoude: There are predator plans on all units. It's dealt with on a unit-by-unit basis. If they fall below a certain percentage of what they should be, we write up a predator management plan. It is in the statewide plan and in the unit plans.

J C Brewer: From 300,000 to 350,000 increase in deer with proper habitat improvements is achievable, however, I see a lot of habitat work being done on forage vegetation. We need to focus on water development. I've read the water plan and they're telling us that this drought isn't going to end any time soon. If we're going to achieve 350,000 deer in this state we need to do some serious work on water developments. Does the Division have any plans to work on water development or water systems or just guzzlers, etc?

Anis Aoude: I can't speak specifically to plans; some habitat projects are water development. If we have water issues, certainly we're going to have water development.

Greg Gilroy: The deer management unit had a South Slope 5-day season but that would actually be the second part of the normal deer hunt. I have concerns because I could hunt one part of this region on the first part of that region and everybody could go to the second part. Why isn't that with the first part?

Anis Aoude: We see that the majority of hunters harvest deer in the first weekend, so there are fewer people who could be eligible to hunt the second part. The data shows almost 70-75% of people who do harvest a deer, harvest it in the first part. If we do see that problem, it's something we can fix fairly easily the following year.

Judy Slauch: Regarding choosing a hunt on your archery season, is there any biological reason for that?

Anis Aoude: No there's not.

Tracy Henline: You had mentioned in the elk management plan that the management hunts did not work. Why, and if so, why would you be implementing a deer management plan?

Anis Aoude: The reasons it didn't work were that there weren't enough permits issued because they were trying to ease into it. The people who proposed it initially wanted to kill older bulls that had 5 points or less. There were very few older than 3-year olds that were killed. The Division didn't want to recommend that and warned the committee that all the issues with the elk would happen with the deer. The committee still felt they were willing to have a few younger bucks be taken rather than taking the top animals. The same things could happen on that hunt. That's why we recommended taking an online course showing what we're wanting and guides showing what we want. Recommending statewide spike would negate the need. There is no need to manage for genetics.

Brad Horrocks: Having a spike hunt, don't you lessen the opportunity for big bulls?

Anis Aoude: We're not harvesting the big bulls we have. By having an age objective you can only harvest so many to stay in the age objective. If you kill them at the older age class you will lower your age objective.

Brad Horrocks: Can we get clarification on the South Slope Deer Management Unit?

Anis Aoude: It is being managed for 25-35 bucks:100 does. It's not a premium unit.

Josh Horrocks: I really like your idea on the premium entry units. Here on the Book Cliffs and Diamond you see some big 3-points. You want those big bucks breeding your does, don't you?

Anis Aoude: Biologically it doesn't make any difference; on an open population you can't manage genetics.

Daniel Davis: Are you going to limit this to a point basis?

Anis Aoude: A management buck has 3-points on one side.

Daniel Davis: I'm referring to applicant points.

Anis Aoude: Yes. I think we will have a lot of people putting in for them.

Questions from RAC:

Floyd Briggs: On your buck:doe ratios, when do you do your surveys?

Anis Aoude: November to December

Floyd Briggs: And then you do a regional average?

Anis Aoude: Currently it's a regional average. If the new plan passes it will be on a unit average.

Bob Christensen: With the management buck hunts, when will you do those?

Anis Aoude: As close to the rut as possible so they will be seen and available.

Kirk Woodward: Regarding statewide elk archery, how has that been received in the other RAC meetings?

Anis Aoude: There has been a lot of discussion. Southern Region decided to have the Board deal with it as an action item. The Southeastern Region recommended status quo on statewide spike.

Kirk Woodward: From discussion and emails it seems the vast majority of outspoken are that we keep it status quo.

Anis Aoude: For somebody who's hunted statewide it would be hard.

Kirk Woodward: What's the reasoning again?

Anis Aoude: Overcrowding in the Southern Region. It's in a time of year that people are recreating, not just archers. You end up with a lot of folks on public land. It's a crowding issue. We wanted to get more solid data on when the people are choosing to hunt those areas. Some may say it's a perceived problem. We need to get to the real point.

Kirk Woodward: Can you do a survey?

Anis Aoude: We could but nothing tells you more than making a person choose on a hunt. That is absolute that that's what they're doing. A questionnaire may get to it but it wouldn't be as solid. Every time we get questionnaires and surveys, people don't believe them. This way there would be no questions asked.

Kirk Woodward: On micro managing smaller units but continuing to hunt larger units, we're doing that partially based on survey results because it's a social thing where the Division's belief is that if we manage that in smaller units we would help the deer herd.

Anis Aoude: I think this is a good way to do both.

Rod Morrison: On the South Slope deer unit a lot of sportsmen feel the 17:100 deer ratio is not accurate. You went to the 5-day hunt.

Rod Morrison: What if that's not enough? Could we do something with antlerless tags to help the ratios?

Charlie Greenwood: There is not an antlerless hunt.

Rod Morrison: I'm not sure this 5-day hunt will be enough. I'd like to cut back on tags.

Charlie Greenwood: The buck ratio on the Vernal unit was only 12. 17 was for the whole South Slope.

Kirk Woodward: If we manage for units, we could manage this subunit as opposed to the entire region.

Rod Morrison: We have a lot of concern about bucks not being seen in this area.

Bob Christensen: Statewide archery would have no cap on region?

Anis Aoude: If we capped them we wouldn't accomplish anything.

**Comments from Public:
Deer plan or deer proposal.**

David Bailey (Utah Farm Bureau Federation): We support the recommendation made by UDWR. We strongly support the no date change and the swapping of the deer and elk hunt. It's important to our grazers to come off the mountain before hunters go on. As the deer herd does increase, we don't want them to go too far. Also, dealing with predator control, there was a proposal last night we hope you guys would consider tonight. Currently cattlemen and sheep pay .25 cents/head on sheep and 75cents/cattle predator control. There was a proposal from a rancher that would use that concept for wildlife.

For every tag that's sold, there would be a dollar fee increase (as a legislative action). The RAC supported it last night and made a motion on that.

Amy Torres: Could you explain that a little bit more?

David Bailey: Currently Fish and Wildlife Services gets some money. I think Anis also said there is money going out because of predator problems.

Ken Labrum (Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife): Our recommended deer plan would be to up the Henries to a 5-year age class and Paunsaugunt. We agree with the management hunts and would like to go with one in the Book Cliffs also.

Josh Horrocks: I wish they'd do it on Diamond Mountain and the Book Cliffs. I really like what they said they'd do with premium entry units.

Ken Labrum: We'd go along with the Diamond Mountain recommendation also.

Judy Slauch (Utah Bowman's Association):

See handout

Our initial feedback concerning the UDWR proposal indicates that one of two things is likely to happen. Either bowhunters will remove themselves from the Southern Region or bowhunters will see this as their last opportunity to hunt the Southern Region before regional tag allocations are put into effect. BOU and UBA believe that any data gathered by the UDWR will show these scenarios and not be an accurate measure of a typical hunting season.

BOU and UBA propose that the RACs and Wildlife Board instruct the UDWR to assemble a committee that is directed to:

- Review data from the past several years concerning bowhunter density per region.
- Review the social and political aspects of changing the general season statewide archery hunt.
- Account for all contingencies involved in changing the format of statewide archery.
- Ultimately present a plan that is accepted by all concerned parties.

Regarding the deer youth hunt, DWR is looking for programs to attract and retain youth hunters.

Proposal 1. Initiate a statewide unlimited archery youth hunt.

Proposal 2. an additional 1000 archery deer tags be allocated to the archery deer hunt cap

Brad Horrocks: I support the Farm Bureau and the concept of fees to be added to regular control. I'd like to add the Diamond Mountain and Book Cliffs units. As a sportsman, I would like to see us manage our deer herds instead of 15 bucks/100, let's wait till it gets to 20; manage it in the top end instead of the low end.

Scott Allred: I am a lifetime license holder. I would hope they wouldn't change the opportunity to be able to choose to hunt all three seasons and choose where I go.

Justin Fuller/Brian Hatch (Chair bound hunters of Utah):

A chair bound hunter's life span is typically 20 years less than an able-bodied person.

Proposal 1: Request a special limited entry hunt draw system for the wheel bound hunter. Chair bound hunters would apply for and receive a card. This will enable a hunter to apply for the hunts. Need a separate hunt to increase the odds for chair bound hunters.

Proposal 2: simply a date change to our current general season date. Currently we get 5 days prior to deer season. State law is that we have to have a companion with us to hunt. Right now we don't have a weekend and it's difficult to get somebody to take time off work. The reason we request the second week in November is because there are no other seasons. There is a very low number of mobility impaired people across the state and will not affect the deer herd at all. 130 people are the most people who have obtained a COR for disabilities. With average percent taken, that would be 50 deer.

We ask that you make a motion for this tonight and send the recommendation to the Wildlife Board.

Amy Torres: I'm interested in your proposal and I think the best forum would be to hold off and get this to the Wildlife Board. I want to get this into a better proposal where we can get this into an actual proposal to put before all the RACs. I think that we have a chance to develop your proposal into the next plan in 2010 and expand and work with this idea.

Brian Hatch: That would be great.

Dave Chivers: I agree with that. There's no way we can shove it in with what we've got going on currently. When you bring it back to the RAC, a proposal like this needs special attention. Be careful that you don't turn people off with numbers because other sportsmen might be turned off with so many people getting permits while they're still waiting.

Karl Breitenbach: What about general hunt for disabled extending hunt into a weekend?

Anis Aoude: If you overlap before, it would extend into another hunt. In November, it would be fine.

Amy Torres: Do we have a motion to defer this proposal to the Board and would like to see the proposal come back to us at a later date but give them the weekend in November.

MOTION by Karl Breitenbach to defer the chair bound proposal to the Wildlife Board and would like to see the proposal come back to the RACs at a later date.

Second by Rod Morrison

Passed unanimously

Rod Morrison: You'd need to have a waiting period for the disabled people who get a tag.

Brian Hatch: In the proposal we have the same waiting period as anyone else.

Kevin Christopherson: I suspect the Board will make this an action item in the future.

Kirk Woodward: So we are going to make a motion tonight to make a proposal for the general hunt to extend into November?

MOTION by Karl Breitenbach for the general handicapped hunt to extend into November to give them an extra weekend.

Second by Rod Morrison

Passed unanimously

MOTION by Karl Breitenbach to make a working group to address the Southern Region archery overcrowding issue.

Karl Breitenbach: Also we're not doing a good job of simplifying the hunts.

Bob Christensen: The regions are not capped so anybody who wants to do so can hunt the Southern Region. It's not limiting anybody yet. I think the committee is probably a good idea but I'm also wondering if since it's not really limiting anybody where they want to hunt that, the DWR wanting to collect the data is still valid as well as forming a committee. They could use the data in the committee.

Kirk Woodward: I agree, but from the emails we've received and the comments we've had there's a perception we're limiting availability and choice. We're making sportsmen unhappy by making them choose a region for the first two weeks. I would say we go with the way that it is until we have more information to make a better decision on how this really affects the sportsmen.

Kevin Christopherson: I think they misunderstood the proposal. We're hoping this will give us some information. If we can actually get good hard data by doing this, this may go away. If we have the hunt as proposed, the committee will have a lot more concrete information.

Amy Torres: It would be harder if the committee didn't have hard data.

Karl Breitenbach: If you change the data will that really give you good information:

Bob Christensen: I don't know that you're really changing the variable though.

Kirk Woodward: When we get a tag, we have to state we will hunt the NER for the first two weeks and then the statewide afterwards? That perception is that we're limiting opportunity, and the bow hunters pointed out that will change the perception. The Southern Region will say this is my last chance and so they will flood the region and skew the data.

Dave Chivers: I like what the Division proposed. Most of us have to pick an area when we have a tag and after the first two weeks, they still get to go wherever they want. If they have other problems than that, I don't think most of us understand what's going in their areas anyway. I don't think it hurts for them to choose the first two weeks.

Bob Christensen: I think if they understand that they can still hunt wherever they want after the first two weeks, they won't flood. There's no cap.

Amy Torres: **To Finish Karl's MOTION to form a committee.**
Second by Kirk Woodward

Favor: Rod Harrison, Kirk Woodward, Floyd Briggs, Curtis Dastrup, Bob Christensen, Karl Breitenbach

Opposed: Rod Morrison, Dave Chivers, Beth Hamann

Motion passed.

Amy Torres: We could drop second half of motion to decide what we want to do with archery tags, whether statewide or how it's proposed after that

Dave Chivers: I like the statewide deer plan. A fee increase should be looked at in the future. All cattlemen pay now. I think the limited entry management tags need to be looked at in the future. Any animals killed in that proposal I would hope would come out of the total animals killed but there are a few terribly inferior animals running around out there. Those two items need to be looked at in the future but not here.

Amy Torres: We can send that to the Board.

Kirk Woodward: So we could recommend to the Board that fee increase go to legislation.

MOTION by Curtis Dastrup: to accept the deer management plan as proposed and make any other recommendations separately.

Amy Torres: Does that include archery plan as proposed?

Curtis Dastrup: Yes

Karl Breitenbach second

Bob Christensen: I think unit-by-unit was a really good idea into deer management plan.

Kirk Woodward: I like the unit-by-unit management. I think we'll be better managed but I don't think we have enough information to make a wholesale change for archers at this point. I think we need to wait until we have more information.

Amy Torres: Statewide for now.

Karl Breitenbach: I like what Brad said about managing to the top of the objectives instead of the bottom.

Kirk Woodward: Can we make that a recommendation later?

Amy Torres: Yes.

Kirk Woodward: I think we need to do that.

Amy Torres: Proposal AMENDED to accept the proposal except for to manage at the top of the objective class.

Bob Christensen: I know what you're saying but if we're saying we're going to manage for the high end, the management of 15 bucks at the top end, shouldn't the plan need to be changed to 17 or 20 bucks?

Anis Aoude: I can clarify some of that. We did discuss managing to a high objective. As long as you're managing in the range, you're in the range and objective. To go higher would reduce opportunity so that's why they did the range. They increased the high end but they didn't change the low end. The committee dealt with that and had quite a discussion. It would give you bigger bucks but would reduce opportunity by about 20%.

Kirk Woodward: 20% by how much?

Anis Aoude: 5 bucks / 100 does total.

Kirk Woodward: How does that change in unit-by-unit?

Anis Aoude: If it falls below 10 we would change that. There would be fewer people hunting that unit so it would lessen the pressure. If the lower end came up, hunting opportunity is reduced.

Karl Breitenbach: I'd like to see a show of hands. Would you like to see a reduction in opportunity to raise the 15/100 ratio?

Kevin Chrisotpherson: Remember, the survey statewide was not a consensus. It was not even close. The statement was deer hunting was considered to be a social event.

Floyd Briggs: The RAC Council represents the sportsmen from NER. I'm in favor of going from the 20 instead of 15.

Amy Torres: Recommendation to the Board for the next Bucks Bulls and OIAL proclamation that we look at raising the age objective, but for this year this will give us a chance to have it discussed on a bigger scale with the Board and we can discuss it with ourselves as informational and vote for next season, because we're not going to come to a consensus tonight.

Curtis Dastrup: I know the feelings of the people who are here tonight and I know the feelings of a lot of people who aren't here tonight who wanted more hunting opportunity vs. big bucks. Of course the avid hunters want big bucks because that's where their money is. I still want to go along with what's been recommended.

Karl Breitenbach: On behalf of the non consumptive enthusiasts. I'd like to do what's right for the deer. I think hunters want to see some bucks. I still want to see some better bucks. Habitat's shrinking; the deer can't take it.

Curtis Dastrup: I don't think the number of deer has to do with the bucks. The habitat's going to limit the deer herd. Whether or not you're going to have big bucks or more bucks depends on the habitat.

Amy Torres: Motion still stands to accept DWR's motion as presented

Second by Karl Breitenbach

3 favor

Motion failed

Amy Torres: What do we need to change?

Dave Chivers: I think we ought to increase the bottom age limit a little bit. All Brad asked for was to manage from 17 or 18 bucks/100 on up. We don't need to chop all the hunter opportunity off.

MOTION by Dave Chivers: to accept UDWR's deer management plan as presented except bring up age objective from 15 to 17. (17-22 instead of 15-22).

Bob Christensen: There are 97,000 statewide deer permits, so if you increase the buck/doe ratio to 17-22 then according to the plan, there are going to be quite a few deer units that fall into that deficit and need to be adjusted to a 5-day category. That's going to decrease hunter opportunity there. With that other 10 bucks/100 does, if you're going to increase that too, there will be a change in permits too.

Dave Chivers: I didn't stop to think that far down the line.

Clay Hamann: That would make the entire region the late five-day hunt.

Anis Aoude: All of this data has been cranked through. The data has been crunched and that's why we came up with the recommendation. You can still change this but there are a lot of ramifications that will go along with it.

Dave Chivers: That would throw most of the units statewide into a 5-day hunt.

Anis Aoude: Yes. Keep that in mind.

Curtis Dastrup: It's up to this NER RAC to make the recommendation about 15 or 17 bucks/100 does.

Kevin Christopherson: And it's a three-year average.

Dave: I WITHDRAW MY MOTION. If we want to do something, we need to do it in this region.

MOTION by Karl Breitenbach: to accept UDWR's deer portion of the proclamation
Second by Bob Christensen

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

Motion passed.

MOTION by Dave Chivers: to request that UDWR look into a predator control fee (concept only)

Second by Rod Harrison

Karl Breitenbach: If we applied the same money to habitat development it would be better.

Anis Aoude: Already almost \$5 is taken out of every permit that goes toward predator management.

Kevin Christopherson: It's there now. It's not earmarked; it's built into the cost. We can modify the predator management plan.

Curtis Dastrup: Would it be better for the Division if we had it earmarked on the license and be able to increase your fee for predator control?

Anis Aoude: More money's never a bad thing. We can get more accomplished.

Dave Chivers: I was trying to come up with added money. I'm just asking them to look at the idea.

Favor: Dave Chivers, Rod Harrison, Floyd Briggs, Curtis Dastrup, Bob Christensen, Karl Breitenbach

Opposed: Beth Hamann, Kirk Woodward, Rod Morrison

MOTION by Dave Chivers: for the Board to consider a management buck hunt concept for the future, on South Slope Diamond Mountain and Book Cliffs.

Second by Rod Morrison

Passed unanimously

Questions from Public on Elk and other:

Tracy Henline: The committee came up with a deer management plan. Was there any type of committee for the spike plan?

Anis Aoude: The spike hunt currently exists in the statewide plan. We're just implementing it on the rest of the units. There was not a committee to do it. We got favorable comments on it last year when we brought it to the RACs as an informational agenda item.

Tracy Henline: So there was no committee to look at the possible effects?

Anis Aoude: No, it was brought to the RACs.

Tracy Henline: Regarding the 10 existing units in place, was that spike-only hunt incorporated later after the limited entry was already established?

Anis Aoude: No, it started out that way.

Tracy Henline: So do you have information as to how it will change when you change to spike only?

Anis Aoude: We can look at information when we model the information.

Tracy Henline: So you've not seen, if you're managing for a 4-5 year old, you've not seen the effects on the spike.

Anis Aoude: There will be no effect the first year.

Tracy Henline: Where is your new average?

Anis Aoude: The age class is limited entry; the spike hunt is general season.

Ken Labrum: Do you sell out of spike tags?

Anis Aoude: Yes, for the last three years.

Ken Labrum: Do you think you can sell all of those additional tags?

Anis Aoude: We don't know but whether we sell them out or not, as long as we get some spike harvest, it will be a benefit to reduce bull/cow ratios that are high and increase opportunity.

Brad Horrocks: For the management of Diamond Mountain, Charlie, how does that fit into our program?

Charlie Greenwood: Right now, we manage for a 5-6 year old bull. We're right in that age. Last time we flew 34/100 cows so that's a good ratio. That's not too high for bulls.

Brad Horrocks: If we start killing spikes, what's that going to do to our ratio?

Charlie Greenwood: It will lower it.

Brad Horrocks: The average age of elk is 5 ½. If you take 30 spikes out of the program, I think you're going to have to take 30 big bulls in the next 5 years.

Dick Bess: I am against the statewide spike hunt.

Question: Is every limited entry unit, are they allotted a certain amount of spikes on each unit, so an easily accessible unit could get flooded with hunters?

Anis Aoude: Yes

Dick Bess: We should limit the tag numbers per unit.

Anis Aoude: There's not a need for that because we currently do it on units. Spike bull success is only 15%.

Dick Bess: Those have always had spike tags.

Anis Aoude: It's not that much different.

Stoney McCarrell: Where did the recommendation come from originally; the Wildlife Board or from biology?

Anis Aoude: It was initiated from biology because we currently have it on 10 units. What happened now is we have high bull/cow units and it has worked on the existing 10 units so Board asked that we recommend it.

Tracy Henline: Do any units, Book Cliffs, Anthro, Diamond, or Three Corners have a problem with bull/cow ratios?

Charlie Greenwood: Our Northeastern Region RAC has supported our recommendations so we've not had a problem with too high bull ratios in this region.

Scott Allred: Then if we don't have a problem, can we ask for it not to be?

Anis Aoude: By harvesting spikes, it's not going to reduce bull average all that much.

Scott Allred: Do you propose to lower the amount of days you have to hunt if you draw a Diamond Mountain or a Book Cliffs tag?

Amy Torres: The NER RAC does have the opportunity to pick unit-by-unit in our area whether we want to have it be spike or not.

Gale Rasmussen: How did you know people were in favor of spike hunts?

Anis Aoude: We presented it last year and got no negative feedback so we went to the Board and recommended it.

Daniel Davis: Are you guys doing it a lot to manage the herd in certain ways?

Anis Aoude: To increase opportunity.

Daniel Davis: Do you see it being flooded just for the success ratio?

Anis Aoude: Right now we sell all the permits we have, it's not minimal participation.

Tracy Henline: Is this set up as a management tool to bring the bull numbers down?

Anis Aoude: Yes.

Tracy Henline: Isn't it 15% success ratio?

Anis Aoude: Yes. That's what we manage for.

Scott Allred: Was it brought to NER RAC?

Anis Aoude: Yes

Jeff Johnson: Anybody that's lucky enough to draw a limited entry hunt and you're turning it into a general season.

Anis Aoude: They won't overlap the general season. They will be separate.

Josh Horrocks: Where you open the spike bull elk hunts statewide, those people are going to flock to those units where it's easy to kill a spike bull. It's going to wipe out the quality of hunting in those units. It's going to hurt the limited entry permittees.

Anis Aoude: No, the top end is still being managed for that age class. It's still the same quality being managed for in that age class.

Josh Horrocks: How many bull elk have to be born to meet the maturity level of 5-6 year limited entry unit to make that age?

Anis Aoude: It doesn't matter how many are born. We don't manage by points. We manage by age objective. If it goes below that we reduce numbers of tags. If it goes above that we increase tags.

David Daniels: So you will alter the bull/cow ratio.

Anis Aoude: We're not harvesting all the bulls that are there.

David Daniels: But still you're going to take a significant amount of bulls out of there that would have reached that maturity level, so now as a hunter I've got to put in more years.

Anis Aoude: We are still harvesting fewer bulls than are born. You still will have that same number of bulls in that age class.

Questions from RAC:

Karl Breitenbach: I'm struggling with the same thing you guys are.

Anis Aoude: In that older age class you will still have the same amount of bulls. Once they make it into that 2-year old age class they are safe and they will make it to the 5 - 6 year class. Right now there are a lot of surplus bulls we are not harvesting. It's better to reduce the numbers in the younger age class.

Karl Breitenbach: So if we didn't harvest these spikes then we could be harvesting more mature bulls.

Anis Aoude: But with the restrictions we have on age objectives, we may have to lower the age objectives and becomes more like an any bull tag. We're trying to maintain the

quality at the upper end and reducing the amount at the lower end. You're actually going to produce more animals if you reduce the bulls.

Kirk Woodward: How can we assure where the spike elk hunters are going to go?

Anis Aoude: You can't.

Kirk Woodward: It seems that elk numbers have increased over a short period of time. We've now reached the level where we're trying to limit numbers. Is that apples for apples?

Anis Aoude: Elk are going great in the state and we want to maintain bull/cow ratios to keep production level.

Comments from Public:

Clay Hamann: The spike hunt is a good idea but I think it needs to be used on a limited basis rather than a statewide hunt, in areas where we have a problem with bull/cow ratios. In our area we're not in trouble with bull/cow ratios so it doesn't make sense for us unless we do it on a draw i.e. with 50 tags for the Book Cliffs. Deer on Dry Fork have low buck/doe numbers because hunters go to the easiest spots to hunt.

Stoney McCarrell (Diamond Mtn. Landowners): We began a partnership with UDWR in 1993 on a limited entry area. Landowners have approximately 90,000 acres of fee ground, or 35% of the total acreage. With no prior history of biological data to support how many are going to be killed, we can't support the spike elk hunt. We would like to see it used as a management tool. If we need to reduce the number of bulls/cows we can do it as a management tool. Our herd is capped at 1000 animals and we have 330 bulls. The success ratio is quite high. To turn an inordinate amount of hunters up there to kill spikes, we will have 2- to 3,000 hunters up there. I suspect the Book Cliffs will have an inordinate amount of hunters also. The age class right now is right on where it's supposed to be. We would affect that somehow, I'm convinced. We only do a classification every three years. By the next count, if it is in the outhouse; we have wrecked the entire train. Most of the accessible area for the hunters that don't go on horses or foot or actually hunt is not public ground. So the landowners themselves would bear the brunt of the spike-only hunters trespassing on their land.

Losing the second season up here would really limit the public's opportunities. I know Brad has a system in place. I personally have taken folks and allowed them access just because I was a hunter long before I was a landowner. If you cram everything into a reduced nine-day season, public hunters are out because we're going to have to use it just for our people who are hunting. We began this to control the numbers of hunters. There were extreme conflicts between landowners and public. This would go against that, and it's working very well right now. Date changes we can't support because we all have cattle and that would mess up everything there. The predator control thing, we didn't have a chance to talk about that as a committee. This year we have given the ADC folks

\$7,000. We've had a match from the county. Last year it was about \$13,000. We get about 90 tags so I think we're exceeding the \$5 a head by quite a bit. We're also managing since 2006 or 7 as a premium limited entry deer unit, moving towards joining Paunsaugunt and the rest of them.

Mitch Hacking (Landowner and livestock producer on Diamond Mtn): The elk on Diamond Mountain have been a liability to the livestock industry in the past. The last few years the landowners have worked with UDWR to maintain a balanced elk population to produce quality bulls. A spike hunt would be nothing but a huge step backwards.

Boedy Oaks: (Comment) I'm against spike hunts.

Gale Rasmussen: ditto

Mark Chivers: ditto

Josh Horrocks: ditto

Ken Labrum: I'm opposed to spike hunts and in favor of the management hunt. If you issue a management tag it takes one more person out of the pool to draw big bull tags and the odds get better.

Brad Horrocks: I would favor no spike hunting on Diamond Mountain or the Book Cliffs. Diamond Mountain Landowners are willing to donate to management bull units.

Tracy Henline: I oppose the spike hunt. Limited Entry hunts in NER are quality hunts. People put in a lot of years for the opportunity to hunt Limited Entry. The way they're managed right now is really good.

Scott Allred: I agree with everybody else. Right now we don't need a spike hunt because our bull/cow ratios are intact, not just turning hunters loose all at once.

Rick Pedersen: I agree with everybody else. All limited entry hunt areas are different. Diamond Mountain is unique. There are a lot of landowners and a small area to hunt. There's a lot of effort that has gone into a program that works, rather than implement something that might not work.

Scott Allred: The Southern Utah one by San Juan that they wanted to open to any bull almost all private land. If it's all private land, isn't that where landowners would have to let people on their land?

Anis Aoude: Yes. It gives them an option.

Comments from RAC:

Rod Morrison: I'm proud of our elk herd in the state. When a person draws a limited entry tag he ought to have a quality hunt. There would be too many people on the mountain and reduce the quality of the hunt. I oppose shortening the limited entry elk hunt. I would like to keep the 11-day hunt.

Kevin Christopherson: Statewide or in the region?

Rod Morrison: I would like to keep the statewide units that they have.

Kirk Woodward: I agree with Rod and I think I understand; Anis finally drilled it into my head how that could work and not affect our age objectives but I don't think we can control where those hunters are going to go and I don't think that we can control that on a statewide basis. There will be an inordinate proportion in certain areas. That might affect us. As far as trophy hunts go, our area has produced quality bulls and sportsmen are really feeling good about the management of the elk. This is a step in the wrong direction how sportsmen would receive this direction.

Curtis Dastrup: I agree with the spike-only. I think it is a good management tool where you have too many bulls. As far as the management in this region, it ought to be up to us to make this decision but I don't think we ought to limit the other regions. I recommend we not do it in our region but let the other regions make their own decisions for their regions. There are a lot of other places in this region besides the Book Cliffs and Diamond Mountain. When the number gets to the point where there're too many bulls, then we can deal with it.

Dave Chivers: So you think we should just recommend for our region?

Kevin Christopherson: What we're doing is working pretty well here because of our RAC setting numbers where they need to be. We have places where there are 60 bulls/100 cows. In the future that won't be good because there won't be enough cows to produce more elk. There are places in other regions this could be a very useful tool.

Kirk Woodward: So you're suggesting management hunts instead of spike hunts statewide?

Kevin Christopherson: What I'm saying is because what we're doing is working here, let's be careful about taking it away from other regions where it's not working as well.

Curtis Dastrup: The Diamond Mountain Association has done a good job. If that's what they want to do and it meets the management objectives. That's the way it ought to be.

Kirk Woodward: Diamond Mountain has a great landowners association that has done that. Book Cliffs doesn't have that same representation so that's our job then as a RAC to manage this region, so I go back that if we want to use spike hunts, we use it unit-by-unit as we need it.

RAC MOTION and Discussion:

MOTION by Rod Morrison: to leave the statewide spike elk plan as it was at 10 units and keep the season dates at 11 days.

Curtis Dastrup: It's in our interest yes, but we don't have the information for those other regions. I don't like that.

Rod Morrison: I feel like I have a good idea on some other area because I've hunted them. I've been there.

Clay Hamann: We need to make it more specific.

Second by Kirk Woodward

Bob Christensen: The muzzleloader elk hunt starts the day after the rifle hunt, so you've got a limited entry rifle hunt, then muzzleloader starts the day after, so not only do they not have bulls to choose from, there's too much pushing around. I like the 2 day rest to let things calm down. With the 9-day you ought to consider that as one of the factors to give a little better hunt for the muzzleloader hunt.

Kirk Woodward: On these limited entry hunts there isn't a ton of pressure. That's part of the reason they're such great hunts. Earlier the comment was made the animals were killed in the first couple of days. They're not running the bulls around very hard after that point. It's not like the general season deer hunt where they are getting pushed around. There are a few hunters but I don't think they're bothering them as much as a general hunt.

Amy Torres: Does your motion include that everything else is okay in the proposal?

Rod Morrison: And the two seasons for Diamond Mountain.

AMENDED MOTION: To accept UDWR's proposal as presented except we keep the 10 units the way they were and the 11 day season intact. Also, keep the two seasons for Diamond Mountain.

Bob Christensen: The bull/cow ratios for NER okay, but you're still recommending this motion go statewide? I would think we probably ought to go with Northeast for this RAC and let the others do theirs.

Favor: 5

Opposed: 3

1 abstained

BREAK 10:20-10:30 PM

8.CWMU RECOMMENDATIONS: Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator (ACTION)

Questions from Public: None

Questions from RAC:

Rod Morrison: Is Sand Wash Sink Draw okay?

Boyde Blackwell: Yes, it would operate as normal. If we have a problem, it would be noted.

Rod Harrison: Isn't the Sand Wash Sink Draw in the process of being purchased by UDWR?

Boyde Blackwell: They still have enough land to make it a CWMU.

Comments from Public: None

Comments from RAC:

Bob Christensen: It's good to see that you are addressing problems and making sure they're resolved.

Boyde Blackwell: In order for this program to work successfully, we need to do everything we can for our public.

MOTION by Karl Breitenbach: to accept as presented

Second by Kirk Woodward

Passed unanimously

9.LANDOWNER PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS: Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator (ACTION)

See handout

Questions from Public:

Ken Labrum: Does that include Anthro?

Boyde Blackwell: Yes. They have 20,677 acres, or 53%, so they qualify for two permits.

Questions from RAC: None

Comments from Public: None

Comments from RAC: None

MOTION from Dave Chivers to accept as proposed

Second by Karl Breitenbach

Passed unanimously

10. DEPREDATION RULE R657-44 AMENDMENT: Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator (ACTION)

Questions from Public: None

Questions from RAC: None

Comments from Public: None

Comments from RAC: None

MOTION by Bob Christensen to accept as proposed

Second by Kirk Woodward

Passed unanimously

11. BONUS POINT RECOMMENDATIONS: Judi Tutorow, Administrative Services Section (ACTION)

Limited Entry and Once in a Lifetime Recommended Changes

1. Eliminate group applications/hunts for Limited Entry Elk, Deer, and Pronghorn OR, if item 1 not approved then UDWR would recommend item 1a or 1b as follows:

1a. Group applications would enter the drawing with only the bonus point total of the *lowest* group member. Bonus points would not be averaged across applicants. If successful and a permit is surrendered, the person surrendering the permit would still accumulate a bonus point as currently allowed.

1b. We would still average the bonus points. If you are successful drawing as a member of a group and then surrender your permit, you would not add a new bonus point for that year but would keep your points accumulated up to that draw. The only exception to this would be that if you surrender due to being activated in the military or if you have an

injury that precludes you from hunting then you could accrue a bonus point upon surrendering a permit.

2. A person would lose all bonus points for all species if they skip three consecutive years applying in a big game drawing for at least one bonus point species. If you apply for at least one Limited Entry or Once-in-a-Lifetime species in the big game draw you would keep your points for all species (L/E and OIAL).

3. An applicant could purchase points for all species each year but could only apply for one Limited Entry and one Once-in-a-Lifetime permit.

Other possibilities for RAC Consideration:

1. Cap the Bonus points at a specific number
2. Change the percent of permits from 50% for those with maximum points.
3. Allocate 5% of permits to those applicants with 1-5 bonus points.
4. Make applicants apply for 3 years before they are actually in the drawing
5. Give a youth a bonus point upon completion of Hunter Education

General Season Recommended Changes

1. 1) Group applications would enter the drawing with only the preference point total of the lowest group member. Preference points would not be averaged across applicants. If successful and a permit is surrendered, the person surrendering the permit would still accumulate a preference point as currently allowed. OR;
2. If you apply in the general season deer draw and are not successful at your first choice then you would accumulate a preference point even if you are successful in obtaining your 2nd-5th choices.
3. Increase youth buck permits in the draw from 15% to 20%.

Items discussed by the Division but not recommended:

1. Give youth a preference point for completing hunter education

Questions from Public: None

Questions from RAC:

Karl Breitenbach: Seems like our present point system keeps becoming less and less meaningful.

Judi Tutorow: We're not recommending the cap yet because there are many hunters who have maximum points who won't like that option after taking this long to get there.

Karl Breitenbach: Is there another state that has a better system?

Judi Tutorow: Colorado has a cap of 3 points. If we'd capped it at the beginning, it would be okay, but people at this point might be unhappy.

Kirk Woodward: If we capped it but increased it to more than 50% drawing out, we would balance out a little more, right?

Judi Tutorow: That's a possibility.

Curtis Dastrup: Group applications. I like the part where you were going to average the points of those that apply and not let them accumulate for the current application.

Bob Christensen: Did they look at not allowing people to surrender their permits unless they're ill or injured?

Judi Tutorow: We didn't look at that too seriously because there are so many reasons outside ill or injured such as reallocated permits or getting CWMU permits, having to move, etc.

Karl Breitenbach: Seems like there should be a fee to surrender.

Judi Tutorow: They don't get a refund unless they're ill or injured.

Curtis Dastrup: Do you get many surrendered permits?

Judi Tutorow: We probably have around 200-250, deer, elk, pronghorn, which we reallocate.

Comments from Public:

Clay Hamann: I don't like any of the proposals. If people are using their points to be able to draw tags for other people, that's not right. Unless you have a valid reason, you should surrender your points and start over again, to stop the manipulation.

Brad Horrocks: I don't like the manipulation of points, that's not right. But my wife and I both drew out on once-in-a-lifetime hunts so she surrendered hers so we could dedicate all our time to an effective hunt and still use her points for next year so that was nice, because we only have time to hunt one hunt and want to make a week out of it.

Scott Allred: Point manipulation is wrong and if they put in and surrender they shouldn't get a point next year. I think the points should be averaged to the lowest. I also think if you don't put in for three years you lose your points. I like to be able to purchase bonus points to help with kids now. I don't like changing the cap changed. It helps to have the 50% go to the people with the most points. I like the way it is now where my kids have a slim opportunity to draw which is better than nothing. I like the three years before you can draw to give others with more points an extra edge. I'm all for anything with the

youth. Give them a bonus point if they take hunter safety. Give them the 20% of the permits. They're the ones who will be taking your place in a few years.

Ken Labrum: SFW doesn't want to see any changes in the Bonus point system. The manipulation thing needs to be addressed.

Email comment James Brewer: Opposes the buying of bonus points for all species. That would hurt people who couldn't afford to put in for them all.

Tyson Cannon email: disagrees with DWR bonus point proposal. Opposes the proposal to allow be able to purchase a bonus point for each species.

Mitch Hacking: #3 worries me about everybody spending money purchasing bonus points and still being in the same boat.

Randall Thacker: the manipulation needs to be addressed. 1. If one person surrenders, they all have to surrender permits. The second would be to average with the lowest point.

Comments from RAC:

Bob Christensen: Everybody still has the opportunity to put in as individuals. If they don't want to be caught in that situation, they have the option of putting in individually.

Karl Breitenbach: I don't like #3. I like #1 and #2. We have to start getting the bonus points down.

Bob Christensen: Other Possibilities for RAC consideration: I think there are problems with the first four. Somebody's going to get gypped. The bonus point system we have currently is not the best but the only other one is 1A.

LIMITED ENTRY HUNT MOTION by Karl Breitenbach: to accept 1 -A, amended to say they would not get a bonus point if they surrender, and accept 2 or limited entry and once in a lifetime.

Kirk Woodward: Add recommendation that if one surrenders, they all have to surrender?

Karl Breitenbach: No. It seems unfair.

Floyd Briggs second

Favor: Beth Hamann, Dave Chivers, Rod Harrison, Floyd Briggs, Curtis Dastrup, Bob Christensen, Karl Breitenbach

Abstentions: Kirk Woodward, Rod Morrison

Motion passed

GENERAL SEASON HUNT MOTION by Bob Christensen: to accept UDWR's recommendations for 1-1 and 2 and 3. Reject 1-2.

Second by Karl Breitenbach

Passed unanimously

Floyd Briggs left

12.DEDICATED HUNTER PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS: Rhianna Christopher, Wildlife Program Coordinator (ACTION)

Questions from Public: None

Questions from RAC:

Dave Chivers: Would they never have to attend a RAC?

Rhianna Christopher: Not required but encouraged to go.

Bob Christensen: What were the problems with applying?

Rhianna Christopher: Some applied at the beginning and mailed their payments which were never received. Others waited until the last day, crashed the system.

Comments from Public: None

Dick Bess: I agree.

MOTION by Karl Breitenbach: to accept as proposed.

Second by Rod Morrison

Passed unanimously

13.ANTLER GATHERING RECOMMENDATION: Mitch lane – Law Enforcement Northern Region (ACTION)

Questions from Public:

J.C. Brewer: This is the wrong approach. I've been working with BLM curtailing use of OHVs off road. Education needs to be done and limited entry efforts into enforcing the laws that are on the books now.

Torrey Christopherson: If a person were required to get authorization and we have a season in place, if that person is found in violation, take an OHV, etc. Would they be taken out, would the authorization letter be revoked for years?

Mitch Hacking: That wasn't discussed.

Torrey Christophersen: So it's not built in the system currently

Mitch Hacking: Lane:

Questions from RAC:

Curtis Dastrup: Propose season from Feb 1 to April 15, then it says you can go any other time without authorization. So what's the purpose?

Mitch Hacking: The purpose was to require that those people who are out in February 1 – April 15 receive some education and info on the issue surrounding antler gathering during those months.

Curtis Dastrup: what I'm getting at is the only time you can gather them is Feb 1 – April 15?

Mitch Hacking: During those months, you would need authorization because that's when the animals are being harassed. This doesn't take anything away. WE already have laws on the books and will continue to enforce them. The division does some other things as well to prevent these kinds of things on our lands. We close WMAs to prevent these types of things. Other land management agencies could look at those options. This is merely an educational approach to what is going to become a bigger problem.

Dave Chivers: You going to write a ticket to someone who has picked up an antler if they haven't taken the course.

Mitch Hacking: I'm going to use the HIP number program as an example. After 10 years, sometimes we still write warnings. Initially we just give verbal or written warnings. After it's been around long enough, people should be aware and we write some citations. We're not trying to set up a speed trap.

Dave Chivers: If I'm driving along and see an antler and pick it up, I'm probably going to be the one in trouble for not taking the course, whereas the guys who spend every waking day gathering antlers and ruining the habitat.

Mitch Hacking: We're really hoping to create an awareness of the problems.

Karl Breitenbach: I'd rather see you be stricter than this. I think we ought to issue tags that they could put on antlers.

Mitch Hacking: That was one of the recommendations.

Amy Torres: I think something else that will help. the Vernal BLM did pass a decision for the Resource Management Plan which will limit off-road travel to existing roads and trails only. That will help a lot. Enforcement's another whole issue. At least that will be there for law abiding people.

Bob Christensen: Forest Service is going the same way with the travel management plan but enforcement is still a problem.

Comments from Public:

Comments from RAC:

MOTION by Beth Hamann: to accept as presented

Second by Curtis Dastrup

Bob Christensen: It's a problem. I don't know if there's a real good answer for it right now but I don't see how it hurts for a person to go through an educational process so I'd vote for it.

Favor: Beth Hamann, Rod Harrison, Kirk Woodward, Curtis Dastrup, Bob Christensen

Opposed 3 Karl, Dave Chivers, Rod Morrison

Motion passed

Dave Chivers left

14.PRONGHORN MANAGEMENT PLANS-NERO ONLY: Dax Mangus, Wildlife Biologist (ACTION)

Questions from Public: None

Questions from RAC:

Beth Hamann: Why do you keep transplanting them out there if there's no habitat to support them?

Dax Mangus: We have a really active habitat program which has done thousands of acres of lop and scatters and burns. Also, we can't anticipate what the weather is going to do. So maybe you have a couple years when you don't have good water or fawn production, it doesn't work. Other years we may have better success.

Beth Hamann: Are you doing guzzlers so there's water for them?

Dax Mangus: Yes. We've had a guzzler repair crew out and repairing them.

Beth Hamann: Have you thought about not transplanting them so there is a year for the habitat to grow to sustain them?

Karl Breitenbach: If the habitat's down where deer and elk may be struggling, and bison transplanted, antelope are certainly low on my list.

Dax Mangus: Where we anticipate the bison will be in the book cliffs is not an area where we have antelope.

Bob Christensen: The habitat has really improved and we have fixed some guzzlers and plan to fix some more.

Beth: How many years have you been transplanting?

Dax Mangus: Three years.

Beth: How many have survived?

Dax Mangus: I don't know because we haven't radio collared them.

Curtis Dastrup: My biggest concern is predators. Out of 26 deer we saw, there are 3 left.

Dax Mangus: Wildlife Services killed 60 coyotes last year from helicopters.

Curtis Dastrup: We saw 1 – 5 coyotes every day.

Comments from Public: None

Comments from RAC:

Dax Mangus: Part of this is because Parker Mountain is over objective and they're going to round up animals anyway. There is a cost to take trailers down and bring them back but we'd be incurring roundup costs regardless so the cost is not as high.

MOTION by Rod Harrison: to approve management plan

Second by Kirk Woodward

Favor: Rod Harrison, Kirk Woodward, Rod Morrison, Curtis Dastrup, Bob Christensen, Karl Breitenbach

Opposed: Beth Hamann

Motion passed

Meeting adjourned at 12:30 am

Next RAC meeting December 11, 2008 at the Uintah Interagency Fire Center

Draft

Regional Advisory Council Meeting
November 12, 2008
Weber Commission Chambers Ogden, Utah

RAC Present

Darwin Bingham
Robert Byrnes
Ann Neville
Bret Selman
James Gaskill
Jon Leonard
Paul Cowley
Bill Fenimore
Ryan Foutz
Mark Marsh
Shawn Groll

DWR Present

Jodie Anderson
Ron Hodson
Scott Walker
Randy Wood
Justin Dolling
Boyde Blackwell
Rhianna Christopher
Kent Hershey
Anis Aoude
Judy Tutorow
Mike Kinghorn
Kirt Enright
Cindee Jensen
Craig Mclaughlin
Darren Debloois
Scott McFarlane
Greg Sheehan
Kevin Bunnell
Dean Mitchell
Clint Brunson
Keith Fullenkamp
Phil Douglass
Jim Karpowitz
Cathy Rasmussen
Vicki Summers
Jon Pratt
Kevin Labrum

Wildlife Board Present

Ernie Perkins

RAC Absent

Brad Slater
Lee Shirley

Meeting Begins: 6 p.m.
Number of Pages: 26

Agenda

Review and Acceptance of Agenda

Accept Sept 17, 2008 Meeting Minutes

Deer Survey Results

Statewide Deer Plan

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Proclamation and Rule R657-5

CWMU Recommendations

Landowner Permit Recommendations

Depredation Rule 657-44 Amendment

Bonus Point Recommendations

Dedicated Hunter Program Recommendations

Antler Gathering Recommendation

Item: 1. Review and Acceptance of Agenda

Motion: Ann Neville

Second:

Discussion on the Motion

Gaskill- Comments on the length of the agenda from Sept 17, 2008 meeting compared to the number of agenda items for this RAC.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item: 2. Accept Sept 17, 2008 Meeting Minutes

Motion: Ann Neville

Second:

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item: 3. Deer Survey Results

Kent Hersey, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Questions

Gaskill- When did you have the results of this? Is it available somewhere?

Hershey- We have yet to put out the final report. These are preliminary results. Once we do more research, we will put out a full report that will be on our website.

Gaskill- The reason for the summary tonight is because you wanted us to have some information to move forward with tonight?

Hershey- Yes that is a large part of it.

Item: 4. Statewide Deer Plan

Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

Guy Perkins- Question regarding the premium limited entry management and recommendation to go to management buck and doing away with the management bull elk. If you are going to do away with the bull elk management, I am going to assume it did not work well. What makes you think it will work well for premium buck?

Aoude- That is not the main reason we are doing away with the management bull hunt. The elk committee had in mind that older bulls would be harvested which was not the case for the most part. The deer committee was more willing to take that chance than the elk committee.

Brenda Freeman- Clarification regarding the 500,000 acres. What was that?

Aoude- Range land improvement for mule deer in the next 5 years.

Brenda Freeman- Are there any plans to consider more Wildlife Management units for the public?

Aoude- That is basically on all crucial deer range in Utah. It does not specify public or private.

Brenda Freeman- The assumption is until 2013, that ratio would remain constant.

Aoude- I am not sure what ratio you are talking about?

Brenda Freeman- Public vs. private land.

Aoude- There are different programs to do habitat on both private and public. It just depends on how much money we have for each. The ratio probably would not change much.

Brenda Freeman- There was nothing in the plan that would make plans to obtain more public or Wildlife Management units for the purpose of increasing deer herds?

Aoude- There are some different lines in the plan that say we will try to protect land where we can.

Jay Anderson- I just want to make a comment.

Hodson- Comments will be coming later.

Lee Tracy- Those units that fall below the goal and become limited entry, are the hunters that get those tags limited to that limited entry?

Aoude- They will be limited to that unit.

Steve Gaskill- Have you tracked hunter satisfaction when you have made major changes to the deer plan?

Aoude- We do surveys. On average, we do them about every 10 years.

Steve Gaskill- Are you concerned that a major change may decrease hunter satisfaction?

Aoude- That is why the committee decided to leave general hunting the same with some modifications.

Russell Lee- Buck to doe ratio's.

Aoude- I am not clear on that?

Russell Lee- I don't understand how you are ever going to get 15-25 bucks per 100 doe with the way things are laid out.

Aoude- Most units are currently above 15 bucks per 100 doe.

Russell Lee- Are those all southern?

Aoude- They are all over. Statewide, we are not having a problem.

Russell Lee- Is that post season?

Aoude- Yes.

RAC Questions

Foutz- For the northern region, what is the population objective and what are we at currently?

Aoude- I don't have that specifically.

Foutz- I think at one point you told be about 62%, is that correct?

Aoude- Yes.

Byrnes- If we had a 5 day hunt in a unit that is setting a proclamation isn't it?

Aoude- Yes, but not the actual dates.

Byrnes- How the drawing is actually conducted for a unit limited draw would be setting a proclamation right?

Aoude- Right.

Byrnes- In the plan, you get down to general season management and talk about changing the season length of any weapon hunt. Is there a rationale behind that?

Aoude- Yes, about 71% of deer is harvested during that season and that affects the number of deer killed.

Byrnes- You just decided from the working group to try this management deer hunt?

Aoude- This is a point restriction where it has to be a certain number or smaller and you are limiting the number of tags.

Groll- On limited entry hunts, specifically the Crawford one, is there any plan where that is mainly a migratory deer herd?

Aoude- There is not really a lot we can do except reduce permits and we have reduced them on that unit as much as we could.

Selman- Is there any chance that this new mule deer plan would allow more limited entry hunts in the Northern region?

Aoude- The committee as a whole felt like they did not want to add any new limited entry.

Gaskill- Population objective and strategies. How important is hunter management in the overall deer population? Can you control deer population by simply controlling hunters and hunter activity?

Aoude- We are managing the population by improving habitat.

Gaskill- Deer/vehicle collisions. Difference between deer killed by cars and trucks vs. hunters?

Aoude- That is a hard number to get a handle on. It is probably close to 10,000 deer annually.

Gaskill- How many with hunters?

Aoude- On general season, we are killing about 25,000.

Gaskill- What do you think the impact of poaching is number wise?

Aoude- I don't know.

Gaskill- No guess?

Gaskill- It hurts the populations for hunters.

Aoude- Yes, it does hurt the buck population.

Gaskill- Are we going to get more information about what you are going to do on A-P.

Aoude- Those are spelled out in the plan. I am not sure what specifics you would like but we can provide you information.

Gaskill- For example, we are going to do 500,000 acres of range land improvement. We have done 80,000 in the last couple of years?

Aoude- Annually, specifically to benefit mule deer.

Gaskill- Have we seen a measurable increase in herd size that can be attributed to habitat improvement.

Aoude- Not yet. What we are restoring is winter ranges. You are probably not going to see any market increase for the next 5-20 years.

Gaskill- Do we have some studies in place that will tell us?

Aoude- We have vegetative transects on a lot of our habitat treatment.

Gaskill- We are relating that to increase?

Aoude- Yes, we also look at use and utilization.

Gaskill- Are there really specific items in your plan to make it better for families?

Aoude- It is not easier but it is not any harder. We did not reduce opportunity. The plan does not go any further to increase opportunity.

Gaskill- Why didn't it go any further to increase opportunity?

Aoude- You are limited by the size of the resource you have. To increase opportunity, you would have to put more hunters out there which would reduce your buck to doe ratio.

Gaskill- In the plan, did you consider an increasing problem of urbanized mule deer?

Aoude- We did not address this specifically other than in the habitat portion.

Gaskill- So you discussed it in the committees but did not come up with any ideas?

Aoude- The only idea would be to try and get the laws changed to harvest animals in city limits.

Ron Hodson- We are trying to deal with that as a region, specifically in Bountiful. It is a matter of finding enough time.

Gaskill- That was my question.

Aoude- Ryan, I have an answer from your question earlier about the objective in the Northern Region. The objective is almost 100,997 and we are currently at about 74% of objective.

Foutz- That was in 2007 I would assume?

Aoude- Yes.

Foutz- That did not take into account last year's winter?

Aoude- No.

Cowley- Why did we set the population objective at 350,000? Loss of habitat through expansion?

Aoude- The number was based on production given that we do not have long-term drought.

Cowley- Do you feel like we are being constrained by weather conditions?

Aoude- Mostly it is production limited and most production is on summer ranges. We are not getting the plant growth to produce those animals.

Foutz- We seem to manage for buck to doe ratios. Maybe you can explain to the public why we don't manage licenses or permit numbers to accommodate? Why is that not a part of the equation?

Aoude- We actually do take populations into consideration by using buck to doe ratios.

Foutz- If you have 100,000 deer in a population and you maintain 15 bucks per 100 doe, you have more bucks to hunt. When you have 75, you have less bucks to hunt. Right now we are hunting 75% of the objective with 21,000 tags and we are doing just fine, is that correct?

Aoude- Yes.

Foutz- So, when we get to 100,000 in our population objective, would the recommendation be to raise the permits?

Aoude- Only if buck to doe ratio goes above 25 bucks per 100 doe.

Foutz- I would think there would be happier hunters.

Aoude- There would be in that short period where it is climbing to 25. Once it gets above 25, we would recommend more permits.

Foutz- Where is the threshold when that population objective vs. the permits starts to make that decline? Do we have to get that 50% of objective before we would impact?

Aoude- There is not a need to make that calculation because once it falls below, we reduce permits.

Gaskill- Are we trying to let hunters go out and satisfy those top 5 survey preferences?

Aoude- That is part of it. On a general season hunt, you want to put as many hunters out there while maintaining buck to doe ratios.

Gaskill- We have too many tags but the buck to doe ratio does not indicate that. Could we use more hunters and not hurt that ratio?

Aoude- We can't use more hunters, but we don't need to reduce hunters either.

Gaskill- How do we know we could not use more hunters?

Aoude- Well we could but I don't know what that would do. The number of hunters now is keeping it steady.

Public Comment

Russell Lee- Unless you have a limited entry permit or access to private property, the quality is fair at best. Utah offers no quality option. The recommendations are basically what we have had in the past. My recommendation is for 3 point or better hunts.

Shane Hirst- If the public is happy, why are there less hunters every year?

Jay Anderson- Concerned about hunting unit this year. Do not agree with management plan based on old information that has no reality. There are no moose left and elk herds are down. Deer are also down. I recommend we go to a 5 day season in Northern Utah and cut permits in half.

Shawn Grace- Bow Hunters of Utah- Urban deer hunt population. Discuss urban deer and pass on to the Wildlife board to come up with a plan to deal with that. Special regulations committee to foresee some of these regulations to be changed.

RAC Comment

Foutz- We have continually dealt with the Northern Utah deer herd. No significant changes have been made. We are not really addressing the issue in the Northern Utah region and what to do to fix it. Premium limited entry unit's change. I feel we did not get all of the information when we made that decision.

Leonard- Share Ryan's concern for the northern region. There are a lot of people concerned.

Gaskill- Complement the DWR and their committee for this management plan. I think it is a good one. I think they need to do a lot more in other areas.

Selman- Predators is where our deer are going.

Neville- How to reach objectives because you may spread yourselves thin. I would like to see some prioritization over strategies.

Byrnes- We are only changing the weapon hunt length, the other hunts are staying the same. When we get to making a motion, I am going to either amend or make a motion to change to affect all hunts in that unit.

Aoude- There is not one slide that has recommendations because we are voting on the plan itself. The only main recommendation is the season structure for general season and you can deal with limited and premium limited entry.

Cowley- 3 year average and tough winter. Is there anything that allows for one hard season to then kick in to place some management actions to protect those?

Aoude- If you get a bad year, one year will bring the average down. It depends on how hard of a year it was.

Cowley- We still run a field of hunters out there that come in the preceding year after a hard winter and not taking that winter into account. Or am I wrong?

Aoude- The numbers are set in the spring when we already have our classifications done.

Foutz- When do we do our buck/doe ratios?

Hodson- It starts just after the season ends and continues until there is a chance of bucks starting to drop antlers.

Foutz- Would that be through March?

Aoude- No, mid December.

Foutz- Our buck/doe ratio seems to be fine in the Northern region. I think we are counting bucks that are coming off managed lands on to public lands. It seems like these numbers may be inflated.

Hodson- Talking about buck/doe ratios on public land units. There is possibly some interchanged. It is not widespread interchange.

Gaskill- Are we going to be asked to accept this option 1 recommendation and then accept the deer plan. Could you clarify what the committee is trying to do here?

Hodson- We can do it however the RAC members decide. We want to end up completing recommendations to the Wildlife board on this management deer plan as it has been presented.

Motion

Motion-Gaskill

Second- Bingham

Discussion on the motion

Foutz- This is for general season only.

Gaskill- Yes.

Byrnes- If you accept that, it will only affect weapon hunts. I will vote against your motion because I would like to see all of the hunts in a unit when it drops below 15 bucks per 100 doe to be produced proportionately.

Motion Fails: For 3, Against 7

Motion

Motion-Byrnes- Change wording of the general season management to be reduced proportionately across all hunts for any weapon.

Second- Gaskill

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Motion

Motion-Foutz- Henry to maintain 50-60% range and Ponsacont to maintain 40-50% range for the 5 year average with the requisite management hunts.

Second- Marsh

Aoude- Range instead of number.

Discussion on the motion

Cowley- Ryan, based on what you have told us, the division has meet these percentages?

Foutz- Yes.

Motion Carries: 9 to 1

Motion-Gaskill- Accept remaining deer management plan as presented.

Second- Byrnes

Discussion on the motion

Cowley- It would be helpful to prioritize strategies as Ann mentioned.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item: 5. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Proclamation and Rule R657-5

Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

Todd Black- In regards to San Juan portion. Can you tell us who everyone is and how many landowners in that area actually have their land in a CWMU?

Aoude- I don't know.

Todd Black- There are three landowners that are complaining. There are over 15 landowners that are in a CWMU.

Guy Perkins- 16,000 archery licenses available correct?

Aoude- Yes.

Guy Perkins- You mentioned that there would not be a cap on the licenses.

Aoude- That is for elk.

Guy Perkins- For deer?

Aoude- It is capped.

Guy Perkins- Ok, maybe I did not understand that.

Aoude- There is no regional cap, there is a statewide cap.

Guy Perkins- On September 1st you would be able to move around the state?

Aoude- From September 2nd on.

Guy Perkins- Why do we continue to hunt elk with a hunting tool that is so efficient and harvesting elk during the red?

Aoude- It is what the elk committee wanted to do with the statewide plan.

Lee Tracy- Split season for archery. Do we have any dynamics as to who is making these complaints?

Aoude- There is no specific group.

Lee Tracy- Did the committee come to any kinds of numbers or conclusions as to what constitutes overcrowding?

Aoude- They did discuss it, but could not come to any one decision about it.

Overcrowding depends on the person you ask.

Lee Tracy- Were recreationists considered in the overcrowding portion.

Aoude- They play into it and that is a big part of it. The Division of Wildlife cannot control other people that recreate.

Brett Perkes- You listed a number of units that are going to have a delayed start under your plan. In the Cache unit, what are your ratios there and why it is not included in that list?

Aoude- I believe they are around 16 bucks per unit.

Ben Louder- Is there any biological reason to eliminate statewide archery?

Aoude- No.

Ben Louder- This region has been explained as to get an idea how many hunters go to each region for the first couple of weeks of the hunt. We currently have mandatory reporting set up for limited entry. Could we not use that as a tool rather than restricting access to the archers?

Aoude- Certainly we could get the data that way, but it is not making someone make a choice for that period of time.

Ben Louder- Wouldn't making them pick a region possibly change influence where they are going to hunt?

Aoude- It would be a different dynamic. We want to get at where people are choosing not jumping around.

Ben Louder- It has already been mentioned that there is no definition to overcrowding. I can't help but wonder if these people that are complaining about crowding issues in the south, if they would complain about the same crowding issues in other places. Do we have any data to show crowding or numbers for these different areas?

Aoude- We don't currently.

Norman Newell- Extended Park City archery. Have you looking into the ski resorts and access?

Aoude- Access is limited. That will be constant.

Norman Newell- Have you thought of extending the archery part where you have access because you can hunt that.

Aoude- We are only doing it in places where we have to do it.

Jerry Slaugh- How many archers hunt the south?

Aoude- Currently 5,000 hunt the southern region plus 2,000 dedicated hunters.

Jerry Slaugh- How many rifle hunters in the south?

Aoude- It is probably around 13,000 or so.

Jerry Slaugh- Is there overcrowding for rifle hunters?

Aoude- It depends on who you ask.

Jerry Slaugh- 13,000 rifle hunters is not overcrowded and 7,000 archers is overcrowded?

Aoude- Right.

Kurt Wood- Did you say that you already knew how many archers hunt the south?

Aoude- Yes, we are trying to find out the timing of that. We do know the numbers but not the timing.

Kurt Wood- Is there a reason we need to know the timing?

Aoude- Yes, because the issue is in the first portion of the season.

Kurt Wood- So, 5,000 people are hunting that area right now over the season?

Aoude- Right.

Kurt Wood- You make people pick their region. I think we all know the north is struggling on deer. Do you really think that we are only going to have 5,000 people in the first 2 weeks of the archery hunt if you make us pick?

Aoude- I don't know what we will have. That is what we are trying to find out.

Russ Sheridan- Spike elk hunt statewide. If there is a surplus of bulls, why aren't we issuing more tags? Why do they have to be archery tags?

Aoude- We do manage for an age objective.

Russ Sheridan- Is the cow to bull ratio taken into consideration?

Aoude- You cannot manage for that high of an age objective and still have an acceptable cow to bull ratio.

Russ Sheridan- Is there a statewide average?

Aoude- I am not sure of the question.

Russ Sheridan- Are other units taken into consideration?

Aoude- Yes, those are the units we want to lower.

Brandon Park- Concern in archery changes proposed. Is it the goal of the state to limit the archery hunters and then put a hold on it?

Aoude- It is not what the state wants. It is what the people want. We are just gathering data for us.

RAC Questions

Foutz- Clarify archery permit regions.

Aoude- On your license, it will print specific regions.

Foutz- It does force you to choose to hunt that region?

Aoude- Right.

Byrnes- When a unit drops below 15 bucks per 100 doe, you stated that you would stagger opening days. How do you feel we would have less harvest with 2 opening days that were staggered?

Aoude- The rationale behind that is a large proportion takes place that first weekend.

Byrnes- But you would still have 25% left that normally that probably would not harvest.

Aoude- They could still hunt the rest of the region as well.

Byrnes- Describe the methodology of drawing a general limited tag if the unit falls below 10 bucks per 100 doe.

Aoude- We would probably still use a preference point system.

Byrnes- In the past, limited entry muzzleloader elk was quite a few days later. Do you have any feel about muzzleloader hunters?

Aoude- We are not changing when the muzzleloader hunt starts, we are just changing when the rifle season ends.

Byrnes- They could actually move up 2 days.

Aoude- We are trying to avoid that because we have had a lot of folks displeased with their last 2 days of the hunt.

Byrnes- You don't do that between archery and rifle?

Aoude- That is true.

Byrnes- Is the Condor recovery plan going to affect hunting in Zion and Ponsagont if we don't control kills by lead.

Aoude- I don't believe so.

Byrnes- Enlarging Newfoundland sheep hunt.

Aoude- We are actually reducing. That is a mistake.

Marsh- Where are your boundaries on the Park City hunt?

Aoude- It will be like the current boundaries but when you hit the summit, Wasatch boundary; it is going to follow the county line to Hwy 40, then Hwy 80, then back to the original boundary.

Marsh- Have you explored accessibility at all.

Aoude- There is not a lot that we can do about that. All we are worried about is if they have access.

Neville- Management bull hunt. Was there a 3-5 year plan put in place?

Aoude- It could work if certain things were to fall into place.

Fenimore- Do you have a concern in limited entry units with spike hunters potentially taking a trophy bull and having problems with illegal shooting because of the abundance of those animals in that area?

Aoude- Yes. The benefit outweighs that.

Fenimore- Do you worry about recruitment?

Aoude- By reducing the bull to cow ratio that will increase recruitment because you will have more calves being born.

Gaskill- All of these recommendations can be changed next year, correct?

Aoude- Yes.

Gaskill- These are not permanent in the plan, this is for next year?

Aoude- Yes.

Gaskill- If it proves these don't work then you will make some other changes?

Aoude- Certainly.

Gaskill- The hunt on the LaSal-Delores triangle, that is a buck only hunt?

Aoude- Yes, it is a limited entry.

Gaskill- Assuming the recommendations we made on the previous item that all of the various weapons would fall in the same general season and times. The muzzleloader hunt would be the 5 days at the end?

Aoude- On those units only.

Foutz- If we are going to have a primitive weapon hunt for the management hunt on those units, why are we using primitive weapons when we are targeting those animals. Why wouldn't you want to use rifles to go in and target animals and take them out?

Aoude- We want people to be close so that they can tell exactly what the animal is.

Foutz- I will define primitive as being muzzleloaders that can shoot 250 yards.

Aoude- They can shoot but most people can't see what they are shooting with open sights at 300 yards.

Cowley- I am wondering if the division is making any efforts in the archery to define what overcrowding means?

Aoude- The only way we can quantify overcrowding is if it is hurting buck to doe ratios and it is not.

Gaskill- You are recommending archers not be able to hunt statewide. Why do we have regional restrictions for anyone? Is it proven to be effective?

Aoude- It has in the fact that we are better able to manage how many bucks are taken in a certain area.

Public Comment

Ben Louder- Utah Bowman's Association- Proposal for youth programs in deer archery hunt. Initiate statewide unlimited archery youth deer hunt. Also, to add an additional 1,000 archery deer tags to the archery deer cap.

Brian Hatch- Chair Bound Hunters- Proposals for wheelchair bound hunters. Requesting special limited entry hunt draw system set up for wheelchair bound hunters to include deer, elk and pronghorn. Date change for rifle deer to our current general season extension. We would like this to change to begin on the second Saturday of November and run for 5 days after that.

Guy Perkins- AJH (Average Joe Hunter) - Wildlife restoration act. Committee of Average Joe Hunters to explore options.

Gordy Bell- Utah Bowhunters Association- 2009 season leaving current format as is. Set up a committee and come back with a good plan.

Brett Perkes- Limited unit hunting spikes. Issue more permits.

Lee Tracy- This program will not cancel the overcrowding issue, it will just postpone it.

Ethan Morse- Future of bowhunting. Concern on limited bowhunting. Legitimate reason for overcrowding in the southern region. Deal with that region without affecting everyone else.

Mike Laughter- Mule Deer Foundation- Reduce Northern Region Deer permits.
Jerry Slaugh- In favor of proposal made by Utah Bowman's Association to form a committee to address these problems. Mule deer tags from northern region go to archery. Keep statewide archery as it is.
Toby Heywood- Statewide spike hunt. Limited entry is about the experience and not the harvest. The hunt should be 10 days instead of 5.
Ross Lapray- Residency requirements for bucks, bulls and hunting proclamation. Particularly the residency requirements for small children of divorced and separated families. Requirements in guide book do not make provisions for this. Reduce the fees for non-residents or children living out of state.
Tom Morse- Support for the UBA proposal to keep statewide archery.
Jerry Woodland- Archery elk season is too early. We lost money because Utah hunters went to Idaho.

RAC Comment

Gaskill- I have received more input from the public via email regarding this meeting. I appreciate that and read every e-mail. The two things of most interest are the statewide archery proposal and the spike elk proposal. No one was supportive of the statewide archery proposal.
Foutz- We actually lowered the spike permits statewide. The management elk hunt was never set up properly. We don't know what we are killing when we kill spikes. It is clear what the archers have done and I commend them. Urban deer hunting opportunities to explore.
Selman- We shoot the spike bulls so we have more cows in the herd. In the winter, we go on a cow hunt and shoot the cows. Maybe that is not happening in all these areas.
Byrnes- Ryan, Did the deer committee discuss the start dates on the delayed start date?
Foutz- On respective to what?
Byrnes- A hunt that was under 15 bucks per 100 doe?
Aoude- We did. That is where we got the idea from.
Byrnes- I am going to make a motion to extend the disabled hunt to 7 days instead of what it is currently.

Motion

Motion- Byrnes- Disabled extension to be 7 days.
Second- Gaskill

Discussion on the Motion

Selman- You wanted that to go behind the season instead of in front of it.
Byrnes- They can apply for an extension on a regular tag that they draw.
Selman- In the guidebook, you can get extensions on spike bull elk and any general weapon deer if you apply for them. They are only 5 days.
Marsh- That would also cross over into a following hunt.
Byrnes- It would extend into a previous hunt but we are talking about maybe 130 people.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Cowley- I would like to push this over to the state to best deal with the limited ability deer hunts.

Motion

Motion-Foutz- Ask the elk committee to reconvene to strategize for a management elk hunt and not go statewide spike elk hunting on remaining limited entry units.

Second- Leonard

Discussion on the Motion

Gaskill- If we pass this motion, this RAC will be on record as opposing the statewide spike proposal by the division. Is that correct?

Fenimore- That would be correct. If we vote in the affirmative.

Gaskill- It presents a dilemma to me. I would like to vote for part of that motion but not another part of that motion. I think it is 2 motions that I think ought to be separated.

Foutz- If you are asking me to concede on the motion, I am not going to.

Motion Carries: 8 For, 1 Against, 1 Abstention

Motion

Motion- Foutz- Accept BLU and UBA recommendation and leave archery hunt as 2008 statewide.

Second-Marsh

Motion Carries Unanimous

Byrnes- I think we need to have a motion to keep the current management bull elk hunt for the next year since we are not going to have a spike hunt.

Foutz- I think that reverts back if we do not accept the current one. The current elk management hunt would stay the same if we don't adopt the spike statewide.

Aoude- We recommend doing away with it.

Motion

Motion-Byrnes- continue management bull hunt for one more year.

Second- Cowley

Motion Carries: 9 For, 1 Against

Neville- Ask the Wildlife board to look into the non-resident minor children of divorced parents to attach exceptions. How to address that in the rules.

Cowley- Is that a question that the Wildlife Board can take care of or is that going to go to the legislature?

Neville- They can investigate that. That is what we need to find out.

Hodson- It is a recommendation to the Wildlife Board and they can recommend that to the legislature should they care to.

Motion

Motion- Marsh- Accept remainder of the bucks and bulls and once in a lifetime as presented.

Second-Cowley

Discussion on the motion

Gaskill- Southeast where depredation is occurring. I am hearing two different stories.

Hodson- How did the southeastern RAC vote on that one?

Aoude- They voted for it. The CWMU may not be in agreement because they are hunting around them they are also not willing to help with the depredation that goes on.

Gaskill- If they don't like it, they don't need to let any hunters on their land.

Groll- Northern region possibly reducing tags. We will set numbers in the spring and we can address that then when we see how this winter goes.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 6. CWMU Recommendations

Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

Public Question

Lee Tracy- What other criteria besides acreage is taken into consideration when the CWMU gets its allotment?

Blackwell- They take into account the acreage and the overall permits available to the public on that unit.

Lee Tracy- My son and I had a permit for a cow elk and we never saw a cow elk, deer or moose on that unit. We found out he was running cougar hunts with dogs at the same time.

Blackwell- We have a very good official complaint program to voice your concerns.

Lee Tracy- Can we get that type of information while making the decision.

Blackwell- Yes.

Lee Tracy- Other than the fact.

Blackwell- It is all in the proclamation.

Lee Tracy- Do we have access to those complaints?

Blackwell- You asked for a complaint that is public knowledge and it can be provided.

Three recues from RAC members Ann Neville, Ryan Foutz and Bret Selman for CWMU Recommendations.

Public Comment

Norman Newell- Altercation this year on a CWMU. Bigger posting of land. Equal rights to fair hunters and CWMU holders.

Shawn Savage- Dealing with boundary issues. What does it take before something happens?

Russell Fern- CWMU above land. Animals feed on ground and wreck fences.

Ben Sessions- Oppose renewal of Jacob's creek CWMU certificate of registration.

Randy Sessions- Ask for document renewal of Jacob's creek to be postponed until there is time to submit items to the Wildlife section chief and advisory committee.

Foutz- Has this all been communicated through you?

Blackwell- No.

Sessions- I was handed a complaint form tonight and we will expedite that.

Hodson- Can you remind us when the committee is scheduled to meet? Blackwell- The committee is scheduled to meet February 10th which is after the deadline. That is when we meet annually. We then take care of it the following hunting season.

Byrnes- Have you had complaints about animals feeding on surrounding land owners

Blackwell- I have not received those complaints. That would come through the region if they have received the complaints. I would probably defer that question to the area biologist.

Justin Richins- Bear Springs CWMU- Change dates on deer hunt from September 1st to the end of October. I would like it to start on September 11th and go until November 10th.

Floyd Hatch- Lazy H LLC- 5,000 acre requirement verification.

Foutz- Your concern is that we do not make the deadline prior to the Wildlife Board to accept the Lazy H Ranch into the CWMU program?

Floyd Hatch- I will do whatever we need to do but we will be in excess of 5,000 acres in a matter of days.

RAC Questions

Cowley- On Hardscrabble, can you remind me again what that was going to be put in this year because it has had problems 2 of the 3 years.

Blackwell- We had a complaint 3 years ago; they had to change their signs. There was another complaint this year about the same thing. The division is recommending they be put on probation.

Cowley- I thought the original document cancelled out that one?

Blackwell- No.

Cowley- That helps me better understand.

Blackwell- We meet in February because of the time schedule. We have to wait until the hunts are through.

Foutz- Is this an owner/operator or an operator that leases the property?

Blackwell- Hardscrabble is an operator and it is leased.

Byrnes- If we go with your recommendations, then Hardscrabble will be denied correct?

Blackwell- No. We want to put them on probation and get a recommendation from the advisory committee to take to the Wildlife Board.

Byrnes- It has changed since you did our handout? Our handout says that posting issues are a concern, 2 out of 3 years recommended denial until issue has been resolved.

Blackwell- I have got recommend probation so it has changed. I probably updated that table.

Byrnes- My date is October 8th.

Blackwell- Yes, mine is October 23rd. I have had to update it since I have gotten more material.

Motion

Motion-Cowley- Recommend a conditional approval for Lazy H based on verification of acreage.

Second-Byrnes

Motion Carries: 7 For, 3 recues

Motion

Motion Byrnes- Recommend approval of remainder and include variance request for Jacob's creek on requested date changes.

Second-Gaskill

Discussion of Motion

Cowley- I encourage you to follow the regular process on your complaint.

Randy Sessions- I understand.

Cowley- We are not trying to disregard your comments or your neighbors comments, we hope you can work that out.

Motion Carries: 7 For, 3 recues

Item 7. Landowner Permit Recommendations

Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Questions

Gaskill- It is the obligation of the division to help conform these? To help meet their qualifications or is it their obligation?

Blackwell- It is a partnership.

Byrnes- Have they met the requirements in the past?

Blackwell- No, they have not.

Motion

Motion- Selman

Second- Cowley

Discussion on the Motion

Gaskill- If they don't reach that by May, you will deny them?

Blackwell- It will be denied and their permits will go back to the public.

Motion Carries: 9 For, 1 Recues (Bingham not available for vote)

Item 8. Depredation Rule 657-44 Amendment

Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Question

Selman- Is that voucher something they have to drive to Ogden to get a tag for or can they get it off the computer?

Blackwell- They need to get that from the landowner specialist. They need to get the vouchers from Ogden or Vernal.

Gaskill- There is a procedure. They can take care of it with the division representative?

Blackwell- Yes, as we already do.

Hodson- The vouchers can be handled that way but the vouchers have to be redeemed at division offices. We could probably handle it through the mail but that takes some time.

RAC Comment

Selman- That has been the only concern I have heard from these outlying areas are these landowners that would like to take a doe but is it really worth \$40 of gas to drive all the way to Ogden to get a tag. I wonder if there is another way to issue a handwritten permit so they don't have to drive to Ogden.

Motion

Motion-Cowley- Accept rule as proposed.

Second- Foutz

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 9. Bonus Point Recommendations

Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services chief

See Handout

Public Questions

Brett Perkes- Can you tell me under what circumstances someone can surrender a permit?

Sheehan- Anyone can surrender a permit up until the beginning of the hunt at their discretion. Once the hunt has begun, that is a different situation. The only way to

surrender it then is if they have an injury and we have some guidelines or if they are activated into military service. If they die, there are some provisions.

Brett Perkes- If I am awarded a permit in the drawing, I can turn the permit in before the hunt.

Sheehan- Yes, if it is before the hunt begins.

Brett Perkes- What happens to the surrendered permits?

Sheehan- On limited entry, we reallocate those.

Steve Gaskill- How many people apply as groups each year in Utah?

Sheehan- Total number of groups is about 8,300 and 20,000 people.

Steve Gaskill- How many of those do you estimate are gaming the system?

Sheehan- It is hard to say. We don't know for sure.

Steve Gaskill- Your preferred response is to get rid of groups altogether?

Sheehan- On limited entry.

Steve Gaskill- Why not just craft a rule that would prohibit people from gaming the system for game.

Sheehan- We are advertising it.

Steve Gaskill- Maybe I did not understand.

Lee Tracy- When you find somebody who is playing the system, is there any recourse that you have?

Sheehan- No.

Hodson- There will be after this session if we approve these things.

RAC Questions

Gaskill- Did you attempt to come up with a solution that punished those or make it more difficult for them to play this game?

Sheehan- Surrendering is not always a bad thing. There is not a lot of gamesmanship going on. It is not a predominant overriding issues. Most people have legitimate things going on for why they surrender.

Gaskill- Is there ever a way that you can deny a surrendering?

Sheehan- Not right now.

Gaskill- Was that considered as an option?

Sheehan- We could pass a rule that said that. We feel there are legitimate reasons that people surrender and we don't want to penalize for that.

Gaskill- Could we craft a set of guidelines so that if they come in with a reasonable request for a surrender?

Sheehan- It could be done. It can become very subjective.

Byrnes- Would you consider having a deadline for surrendering a permit?

Sheehan- We have talked about that with code changes. We may give some timeframes.

Public Comment

Bret Perkes- Advocate for group hunting. Taking away opportunity. I don't like either proposals for surrendering. Fix how permits are surrendered.

Lee Tracy- There is another option which is recommended by Southern RAC which is to limit the number of turn ins. 3 strikes and you're out.

Gaskill- Explain that just a little bit more.

Lee Tracy- They will allow a person to turn in their permit for whatever reason. They can only do it 3 times.

Gaskill- In a row or just period?

Lee Tracy- No, just 3 times. It puts a stop to this abuse that is going on.

Gaskill- After 3 times they lose their bonus points?

Lee Tracy- Yes.

Ben Lowder- There is not enough abuse of group applications to warrant eliminating group applications. Allowing people to buy points for every species is a bad idea.

Toby Heywood- I like the group applications. Group applications should be put together for those who want to hunt together.

Lynn Betts- Advocate for group applications. Bonus points for each species.

Lee Tracy- Buying points is a problem.

Tom Morse- Once in a lifetime buying bonus points. It is a lot of money to put away without a chance to draw.

RAC Comment

Foutz- Out of all of these recommendations, I think there are some that make a lot of sense. Lots of youth opportunities. Group application is for only deer, elk and pronghorn. Group application in limited entry does not make sense. Greg, on number 2 it says a person would forfeit bonus points if they skipped 3 consecutive years. If those people are taken out of the system, you cut the opportunity to draw by almost 50% waiting time correct?

Sheehan- You are talking about how many people we would eliminate?

Foutz- Yes.

Sheehan- We would eliminate 36,000 people.

Foutz- I like the fact that the people who are committed to the division are purchasing a license and putting in for bonus points. They are the people who should draw those tags.

Byrnes- I am not in favor of allowing people to purchase bonus points for species they are not applying for. I can see a limit on surrendering tags.

Foutz- Was that one time?

Byrnes- Twice.

Cowley- I struggle with the individual who does not apply for a tag for 3 years to lose the points they honestly earned. I could see a real value in just leaving those on the books.

Motion

Motion- Foutz- Approve elimination limited entry group applications on deer, elk and pronghorn as recommended. Approve a person forfeiting bonus points if they skip 3 consecutive years but not to approve applicants being able to purchase points on other species.

Second-Byrnes

Discussion on the Motion

Bingham-

Motion Fails 3 For, 7 Against

Motion

Motion-Cowley- Allow group applications but if someone surrenders permit 3 times consecutively, they would lose all points. Recommend against purchasing points.
Second- Groll

Discussion on the Motion

Bingham-

Cowley- I am ok with adding consecutive in there. If they get a repeated pattern just to get more points, I think they are playing a game.

Bingham-

Cowley- What I am saying is after 3 times, they would lose all of their points.

Bingham-

Motion Carries: 6 For, 5 Against

Motion

Motion-Foutz- Forfeit bonus points if a person skips 3 consecutive years.
Second- Byrnes

Discussion on the Motion

Gaskill- I can see the value in forfeiting bonus points if they skip years. We have a provision if someone goes away to college which is 4 years. I would like to see it go to 4 years.

Motion Fails: 3 For, 7 Against

Motion

Motion- Groll- Leave as is currently.
Second- Bingham

Discussion on the Motion

Foutz- Clarification on currently sits?

Groll-

Foutz- You just keep them and somebody can play the game.

Groll-

Foutz- She has Wyoming residency?

Groll- Yes.

Foutz- So she is hunting Wyoming?

Groll- No, she is not.

Foutz- But she can.

Groll-

Gaskill- She has to buy a license before she can apply.

Groll-

Foutz- So make a motion for 4 years.

Gaskill- I think there is a motion on the table.

Motion Carries: 7 For, 3 Against

Motion

Motion- Neville- Approve #1 part 2 and #2-3 as presented.

Second- Marsh

Discussion on the Motion

Sheehan- We have a choice here.

Neville- For general season?

Sheehan- Let me recap while she is handing that out. On general season deer, it basically says if you go in as a group and the first one is you go in with the points of the lowest group member. If one of the group members decides to surrender after the fact, then they can get their points back plus add a point. The second choice says you can go in with whatever points people had and you would average them as we do now. But if you elected to surrender your permit, you would not add a new point on top of what you had the year before. It would be the same as what you had the year before.

Neville- It is only on number 1 that we have a choice.

Sheehan- Right.

Groll- Is this any different than what we just did with the limited entry as far as the groups and turning them back?

Sheehan- Yes.

Groll- If it is good for one item then why change it? It seems easier to just keep them both the same.

Sheehan- Let me tell you what is different. Limited entry is going to take a lot more points to draw those and you are not going to have a frequency of people doing a lot of those surrenders.

Foutz- Clarification if we do #2, we still have people out there who have 6 or 7 preference points that they put in as a party application and everybody draws. The person then surrenders it and they don't get a preference point but still has 6.

Sheehan- Yes. It is just kind of slowing them down.

Foutz- But #1 you eliminate if I read it correctly.

Neville- The group average is

Sheehan- On the first option. You use the lowest group member. The second one averages. You can either use the lowest or average them.

Groll- If they turn it in twice then they lose all of their points. How would that be any different?

Sheehan- That would kind of split the difference of these two because our option 2 you could surrender forever. The benefit of all of the points would not help them under option 1.

Motion Carries: 6 For, 3 Against, 1 Abstain

Motion

Motion- Byrnes- Limit to surrendering a general season tag 3 times then use it or lose it.
Second- Gaskill

Discussion on the Motion

Bingham-
Groll- It was not combined with general.
Bingham-

Motion Carries: 8 For, 2 Against

Item 10. Dedicated Hunter Program Recommendations

Rhianna Christopher, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

Public Question

Jim Jones- Reason why we could not continue with the online process?
Christopher- It is a contractual agreement that I don't really understand.
Jim Jones- Right now we can go on the website to buy certain licenses as well as training.
Why can't we do this like a fishing license?
Sheehan- Overload issues on big sales days.
Jim Jones- Would it be possible to take the online training prior to the actual start date?
Sheehan- We are trying to do some of that. We are still concerned there will be too many people and our system will have a hard time.
Hodson- It is a drawing. We will need that drawing.
Jim Jones- I don't understand the difference between this and the deer hunt.
Christopher- There are a lot of requirements for being in the program. Our system simply cannot handle that.
Clayton Jones- How would you define the dedicated hunter? Somebody who walks into something they have no idea like you have said?
Christopher- It happens all of the time because people are looking at the tag and not the actual permits.
Clayton Jones- There should be some questions.
Christopher- You are right. Under the current process, the conservation course explains what the program is but unfortunately people are keeping their eye on the prize.
Clayton Jones- Maybe you could come up with something a little more competitive and weed some people out.
Christopher- That is what we are trying to implement.
Lee Tracy- That 10,000 people cap, is it going to remain that?

Christopher- It was an arbitrary number that the Wildlife and RAC boards came up with 14 years ago. I don't see that there is a way to increase that.

RAC Questions

Neville- In your ethics course, are you going to include anything about responsible ATV use? That was part of the mule deer issues.

Christopher- That has not been discussed. It is up for suggestion.

Byrnes- Buying preference points.

Christopher- That is something that has evolved since I started. It is part of the program that has been written for the other drawings.

Byrnes- We would be creating another monster where you can apply and build preference points.

Christopher- This is also up for discussion.

Gaskill- This is going to require some kind of background check. Will this complicate the types of violations or will this facilitate the background checks?

Christopher- Currently, we are just monitoring what is going on in Utah.

Gaskill- Which one is more difficult to do?

Christopher- The current process.

Jon Pratt- It is due process.

Gaskill- My question is more to get an answer that would educate. This change would in fact make the process easier.

Pratt- It is all computerized.

Bingham- Way to do things quicker?

Christopher- Are you suggesting we accept applications on a regional basis?

Bingham- Take a certain number and let them do their dedicated hunter activities in their region.

Christopher- Currently there is not a regional cap.

RAC Comment

Selman- We have too many people so the price should go up.

Gaskill- I oppose eliminating RAC requirement.

Bingham-

Neville- Ethics course. I would encourage not to have it be a onetime thing.

Byrnes- I would like to see more requirements for dedicated hunter. Against preference point purchases.

Groll- How hard is that going to be to implement?

Christopher- Yes, we have 10,000 people in the program and 6 people administer this. We would like to continue the quality of projects we are providing right now.

Gaskill- Your recommendation is that we have 16 service hours and 8 service hours?

Christopher- That is what we currently have right now but it is my understand that he is asking to increase.

Groll- It just got mentioned that if there are that many people that want it, either charge them more or get more hours from them.

Christopher- We would love to see people doing more service.

Foutz- What if you bring in a coyote, you are in. There are 10,000, we could really knock back the predator.

Motion

Motion- Byrnes- Accept proposal with no preference point purchase. Opposed to #2 as presented by RAC. Approve #3.

Second- Gaskill

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 11. Antler Gathering Recommendation

Jon Pratt, Law Enforcement

See Handout

Public Questions

Clayton Jones- How did you pick February 1st to begin to have authorization? Is that just a date you came up with?

Pratt- We have guys out there trying to kill elk on February 1st.

Jones- I think it should be January 1st.

Pratt- Then you have elk hunters on the hill actually trying to kill animals during the timeframe that we do not allow other hunters to go do it.

RAC Questions

Foutz- Written permission. Authorization will be online? Do they have to have that in possession?

Pratt- Yes.

Gaskill- What if you don't?

Pratt- You would be in violation.

Gaskill- What kind of violation?

Pratt- Class C misdemeanor.

Groll- Any potential for emergency closures on bad winters?

Pratt- The Wildlife board has that prerogative already.

Byrnes- The rule states specific dates and methods to take will be published in the bucks and bulls proclamation. There is nothing in here about shed antler season.

Pratt- That will vary from year to year. The rule has to indicate back to the beginning.

Byrnes- When we passed the proclamation earlier we would to have included that data.

Pratt- I can't tell you where that would be found. I would have to check.

Byrnes- In the actual rule, it refers to the proclamation.

Pratt- Correct, because the rule does not change. The proclamation is where that needs to be.

Byrnes- I would suggest you amend what you have and put that in.

Public Comment

Joe the average hunter- Wanted to see a shorter season.

Motion

Motion-Gaskill- Accept proposal as presented.

Second- Foutz

Motion Carries: 8 For, 1 Against

Meeting Ends: 12:35 a.m.

Draft

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

November 5, 2008

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

MOTION: to approve the agenda as written.

PASSED: unanimously

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

MOTION: to approve the minutes as written.

PASSED: unanimously

STATEWIDE DEER PLAN

MOTION to stipulate that 25-30% of post-season bucks be 3 ½ years of age or older.

PASSED by a majority vote.

MOTION to keep the five day general season deer hunt in southeastern Utah.

PASSED by a majority vote.

MOTION to manage the Henry Mountains such that the harvest consists of at least 50% five year-old or older bucks. On the Paunsagunt, manage for a harvest of 40-50% 5 year-old or older bucks.

PASSED by a majority vote.

MOTION to accept the remainder of the Statewide Deer Plan.

PASSED by a majority vote

BUCKS, BULLS AND OIAL PROCLAMATION AND RULE R657-5

MOTION to maintain a five day rifle deer season in the southeast region.

PASSED by a majority vote.

MOTION to cut the season length for all weapon types with the same percentage reduction, when hunting restrictions become necessary.

PASSED by a majority vote.

MOTION to give wheelchair-bound hunters seven days at the beginning of each big game hunting season.

PASSED by a majority vote.

MOTION to reject the new statewide spike elk hunt. Bull elk management should be left unchanged from the previous year.

PASSED by a majority vote.

MOTION to keep the statewide archery deer hunt unchanged from last year.
PASSED by a majority vote.

MOTION to accept the remainder of the Bucks and Bulls and OIAL Proclamation as presented.
PASSED unanimously

MOTION to add a 50 cent surcharge to each big game license for predator control, and invite the Wildlife Board to encourage the legislature to approve the fee increase.
PASSED by a majority vote.

CWMU RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION to approve CWMU recommendations as presented.
PASSED unanimously

LANDOWNER PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION to approve landowner permit recommendations as presented.
PASSED unanimously

DEPREDAATION RULE R657-44 AMENDMENT

MOTION to accept the Depredation Rule Amendment as presented.
PASSED unanimously

BONUS POINT RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION to approve selections of the Division's recommended options from the blue hand-out printed on 10-30-2008. Motion to accept 1b, and 2A from the top third of the hand-out. From the bottom third, members voted to accept 1.(2), 2. and 3.

PASSED by a majority vote.

DEDICATED HUNTER PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION to leave the dedicated hunter program unchanged, except that the application period run from 12/29-1/20 at which time fees must be paid. In addition, a deadline of July 31 be imposed for completion of service hours.

PASSED by a majority vote.

ANTLER GATHERING RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION to accept antler gathering recommendations as presented.
PASSED by a majority vote.

SOUTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY

John Wesley Powell Museum in Green River

November 5, 2008

Commence at 6:30 p.m.; Adjourn at 1 a.m.

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Adams, Bruce	At Large
Albrecht, Kevin	U.S. Forest Service
Bates, Bill	Regional Supervisor
Byrnes, Verd	At Large
Gilson, James	Sportsmen
Hatch, Jordan	Agriculture
Hoskisson, Wayne	Environmental
Kamala, Laura	Environmental
Lewis, Kurt	Agriculture
Maldonado, Walt	Sportsmen
Riddle, Pam	BLM
Sanslow, Terry	At Large
Sitterud, Drew	Elected Official

EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

Bayles, Lyle At Large

UNEXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lee Howard

DWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Aoude, Anis
Bates, Bill
Blackwell, Boyde
Brad Crompton
Christopher, Rhianna
Gramlich, Carl
Hersey, Kent
Kerstetter, Roger
Lane, Mitch
McLaughlin, Craig
Mead, Leroy

Mitchell, Dean
Paskett, Wade

Draft

Draft

Stettler, Brent
Tutorow, Judi
Wallace, Guy

PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE 78

CONDUCTING THE MEETING

-James Gilson, RAC Chairman

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Drew Sitterud suggested that the deer survey results be addressed last.

Anis Aoude explained that the survey was an important preface to the statewide deer plan.

MOTION by Drew Sitterud to approve the agenda as written.

SECOND by Bruce Adams

PASSED unanimously

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Terry Sanslow to approve the minutes as written.

SECOND by Kevin Albrecht

PASSED unanimously

OLD BUSINESS

By James Gilson, Chairman

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Bill Bates provided a report from the last Wildlife Board meeting. The Board approved the recommendations from this RAC, including new regulations at Scofield and a relaxation of regulations at Joes Valley Reservoir.

MOTION by N/A

SECOND by

PASSED:

DEER SURVEY RESULTS--INFORMATIONAL

-Kent Hersey, Wildlife Program Manager

Questions from the RAC:

Kevin Albrecht asked if the survey exaggerated the length of time a hunter would need to sit out from the general season hunt.

Kent Hersey defended the 5-10 year waiting period based on projections of hunter numbers and resource limitations.

Questions from the Audience:

Kenny Gunner asked if the survey was general or specific in nature.

Kent Hersey answered that regional data but not unit data could be split out from the survey.

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by INFORMATION ONLY

SECOND by

PASSED

STATEWIDE DEER PLAN

-Anis Aoude, Big Game Program Coordinator

Questions and comments from the RAC:

Terry Sanslow asked why the Division had not considered shortening the statewide deer archery season.

Anis Aoude answered that because the archery harvest represented such a small fraction of the whole, he chose to focus on the rifle harvest, which was responsible for the majority of the deer taken.

Verd sided with Terry Sanslow and took issue with the Division's failure to shorten the month-long archery season.

Kurt Lewis questioned Anis about his focus on the rifle hunt. He asked about the factors leading to limited entry status. Kurt suggested the possibility of archers bombarding a limited entry unit, restricted from rifle hunting.

Anis responded that he didn't think bowmen would bombard a unit under protection for its poor statistical performance.

James clarified the issue, adding that if a unit were withdrawn from the general season, because it dropped below 10 bucks: 100 does, it would not be available to general season archers.

Terry Sanslow asked why we dropped the management objective of 25-30% mature bucks in the male segment of the deer population. Terry chided the Division's exclusive attention to numbers of bucks per 100 does, while neglecting the age classification of bucks in a population.

Anis answered that if we have 15 bucks: 100 does, we will automatically have that percentage of mature bucks in the unit.

James Gilson challenged Anis' representation of Utah's deer population. James contended that the deer herd was far from its population objective and that more attention needed to be given to restoring Utah's deer population. James suggested that predators needed to be managed much more aggressively than they have been.

Walt Maldonado asked Anis why the LaSal unit had not recovered from its present low condition.

Anis responded that drought adversely affected the quantity of plant leader growth. What may seem like adequate forage to a casual observer, is actually a serious deficit of good forage, when range transects are conducted. The forage on the LaSal's has been seriously limited by drought.

Drew Sitterud challenged Anis on a statement in his management plan, which seemed to contradict Anis' response to Walt.

Questions and comments from the Audience:

Sue _____, assistant field manager of the Hanksville BLM office, asked if the deer committee had been aware that the proposed late deer hunts on the Henry Mountains would be overlapping a hunter's choice bison hunt. The BLM was concerned about safety issues.

Public: Disagreed with the DWR's estimate of the statewide deer herd; opposes the proposed return to a nine day deer hunt.

Anis responded by saying that the statewide committee had agreed to the recommended nine day hunt.

James disagreed, saying that he had spoken to committee members who said that concurrence had not been reached on that issue.

Derris Jones asked if a season were shortened, would data be collected to determine which part of the season would best be cut.

Anis responded in the affirmative.

Public: Question about five vs. nine day hunt in terms of deer harvest.

Shayne Thompson asked about hunting pressure near the rut, affecting reproduction.

Gary Fox asked about general participation in a management deer hunt and if bonus points would be lost.

Anis said that bonus points would indeed be lost.

Kenny Gunner asked for clarification on hunter success and population objectives.

Brad Timothy suggested splitting the deer hunt, rather than going to a 9-day hunt.

Butch Jensen asked that we give predator control more attention.

John Barrett of SFW recommended that we raise the age of deer at harvest, especially on premium units. He recommended that at least 50% of harvested buck deer on the Henry's be at least five years-old at harvest; and at least 40% of deer on the Paunsagunt be five years-old at harvest.

Bart Kettle spoke in opposition to a nine day hunt; suggesting that the southeast region remain at five.

Kenny Gunner asserted the need to keep the hunt short (5 days).

Shayne Thompson suggested staying at five days and cutting permits.

David Bailey of the Utah Farm Bureau recommended leaving the dates of the deer and elk hunts alone. He reported range condition to be poor across the state, and implied that the range could not support an increased deer herd.

Derris Jones stated that we need to raise the buck: doe ratio objective, if hunters are dissatisfied with buck quality and season length.

Final RAC comments:

Terry Sanslow stated that the archery season was too long, and needed to be shortened by at least a week. His constituents definitely opposed the deer management hunt concept. The percentage of five year-old deer in the harvest must be increased. A mature buck objective must be reinstated in our deer management plans.

Kevin Albrecht referred to a letter received from the Hanksville BLM office, citing safety concerns during late season hunts.

James declared the BLM out-of-line in their presumption that hunters were entirely responsible for the number of people recreating on the Henry Mountains.

Kurt Lewis addressed Terry Sanslow's position against deer management hunts. Kurt has found that the management hunt to be a useful tool on his CWMU.

Wayne Hoskisson applauded the BLM for its attempt to better manage the land under its administration. Range conditions are worsening and forb numbers are diminishing across the state.

James Gilson spoke in favor of the management hunt strategy for eliminating inferior bulls from a herd, and providing hunting opportunity at the same time. James alleged that many recommendations presented tonight did not come from the statewide deer committee. He aired contempt for the DWR's failure to study fawn mortality in light of so many years of poor reproductive success. James blamed predation as the primary cause for poor fawn survival.

Kevin Albrecht clarified that hunting season dates have changed since the BLM letter was written. Their concerns about safety during late season hunts have been lessened.

MOTION by Terry Sanslow to stipulate that at least 25-30% of the post-season buck population be 3 ½ years of age or older.

SECOND by Verd Byrnes

PASSED by a majority vote. 8 For. 3 Against. Opposed were: Bruce Adams, Jordan Hatch and Kurt Lewis.

MOTION by Verd Byrnes to keep a five day general season deer hunt in southeastern Utah.

SECOND by Terry Sanslow

PASSED by a majority vote. 8 For. 2 Against. 1 Abstention. Opposed were Wayne Hoskisson and Jordan Hatch. Kurt Lewis abstained.

MOTION by Verd Byrnes to manage the Henry Mountains deer herd such that the harvest consists of at least 50% five year-old or older bucks. On the Paunsagunt unit, manage for a harvest consisting of at least 40-50% 5 year-old or older bucks.

SECOND by Terry Sanslow

PASSED by a majority vote. 9 For. 2 Against. Opposed were Wayne Hoskisson and Jordan Hatch.

MOTION by Kurt Lewis to accept the remainder of the Statewide Deer Plan.

**SECOND by Drew Sitterud
PASSED by a majority vote. 9 For. 2 Against. Opposed were Terry Sanslow
and Jordan Hatch.**

Following the vote, Jordan Hatch took issue with the way James Gilson ran the meeting. Jordan argued that just because an issue was raised doesn't mean the RAC has to vote on it. Jordan complained that James encouraged the council to vote on the issues he was interested in, but failed to raise those issues he was not in favor of. Jordan illustrated his complaint by referring to a letter from the City of Blanding. They complained that a 5-day hunt hurts business. Blanding City had asked the RAC to recommend a nine day season. Jordan contended that because James opposed a nine day season, he did not bring the letter to the RAC's attention.

James countered by saying he was simply conducting the meeting the way he had seen the chairman of the Wildlife Board do. James rebutted that Jordan could have raised the issue, while season length was being discussed.

BUCKS, BULLS AND OIAL PROCLAMATION AND RULE R657-5

-Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Manager

Questions from the RAC:

Walt Maldonado asked Anis why the management bull hunt had not worked, and wondered if the plan would have worked, if it had been administered the way it came from the statewide elk committee.

Walt Maldonado asked why Anis assumed a management deer hunt would work, when the management bull hunt had failed.

Anis replied that because deer were not as long-lived as elk, the outcome would be different.

Walt questioned whether all units could support a spike hunt.

Anis thought they could.

Kevin Albrecht asked how many more units would be involved.

Anis said there would be 19 more units.

James queried Anis about the number of spike tags issued, percentage of yearlings harvested and expressed concern that we could over-harvest that segment of the bull population. Concern was also aired about overloading a unit with hunters.

Terry Sanslow complained that boundary descriptions had been dropped from proclamations.

Anis said that descriptions were removed in an effort to trim the proclamation. Boundaries are now printed on permits.

James asked why we were abandoning the statewide elk management plan so soon after its implementation. We haven't given it time enough to work.

Several RAC members aired concern about the change in the statewide deer archery hunt, suggesting that data about participation by region could be collected in another way.

Questions from the Audience:

Gary Fox was angry that the antlerless elk hunt on the Mohrland unit had interfered with his limited entry elk hunt on Gentry Mountain. He asked why the DWR had changed its antlerless boundary to incorporate Gentry Mountain.

James responded that the RAC would address this issue with the antlerless proclamation next spring.

John Barris of SFW expressed concern about DWR's intention to issue so many spike elk tags.

Ben Lowder asked if there were biological reasons for the change in statewide archery. He questioned the perceptions of overcrowding as legitimate.
Jared Butler forecast dire consequences for the Paunsagunt under the proposed spike elk plan.

Comments from the Audience:

John Barris recommended that the statewide elk committee be reconvened to review the proposed spike hunt concept. All of the feedback he had received was negative. The SFW is adamantly opposed to the idea.

Brad Timothy recommended that we focus more effort on predator control.

Justin Fuller of the Chair-bound Hunters of Utah read a statement to the RAC and asked for special limited entry hunts for the handicapped hunter, and that an extra week be allowed the chair-bound hunter at the end of big game hunting seasons.

Todd Black of Bowhunters of Utah asked that the archery season not be changed and that a committee be convened to study overcrowding issues.

Ben Lowder of the Utah Bowmen's Association recommended the implementation of a statewide youth archery hunt.

Justin Briss spoke against changing the statewide archery hunt.

Josh Luke of the UBA protested the proposed change in the statewide deer archery hunt.

Shayne Thompson stated he was against the spike hunt recommendation. He urged more predator control.

Ryan Hatch, a mobility-impaired hunter, stressed that the extra week at the end of a hunting season would motivate more chair-bound hunters to participate in hunting.

Brad Bartell spoke in favor of continuing a 5-day hunt in southeastern Utah.

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Jordan Hatch expressed concern about James' neglect of some issues coming before the RAC.

Lee Howard of the Wildlife Board spoke to the complaint, urging all members to take the initiative to steer the discussion, when important issues seem to be overlooked.

Walt Maldonado stated that his constituency overwhelmingly favored continuing the statewide archery hunt without change.

Terry Sanslow commented that some people believe the 30 day season is too long and should be shortened by a week or so.

Jordan Hatch stressed the need for aggressive predator control and described the lamb losses he has suffered from coyote predation. Jordan recommended adding a 50 cent surcharge to all big game licenses for predator control.

Kevin Albrecht related that USFS personnel were concerned about the overuse of camping areas by hunters.

James relayed concerns from sportsmen in the southern region who claim that statewide archers are having a big impact on them.

James itemized the issues before the RAC. He referred to Blanding City's concern about the negative economic impact caused by a five-day deer season.

Several RAC members discussed opening the Abajos for nine days, but decided against it, due to the hunter overcrowding such a decision would cause.

Drew Sitterud concluded that we need to standardize the five day hunt across the entire region.

MOTION by Drew Sitterud to maintain a 5-day rifle deer season in the southeast region.

SECOND by Laura Kamala

PASSED by a majority vote. 6 For. 4 Against. Opposed were: Jordan Hatch, Bruce Adams, Walt Maldonado, and _____?

Kurt Lewis abstained.

Verd Byrnes raised the issue of fairness, when we consider imposing hunting restrictions on a unit. We shouldn't expect the hunters of one weapon type to suffer cutbacks, while hunters of other weapon types remain unrestricted.

MOTION by Verd Byrnes to cut the season for all weapon types equally with the same percentage reduction, when hunting restrictions on a unit become necessary.

SECOND by Terry Sanslow

PASSED by a majority vote. 9 For. 2 Against. Opposed were: Jordan Hatch and Pam Riddle.

With regard to mobility-impaired sportsmen, Walt Maldonado commented that he would have liked the matter to come to the RAC as an information item, so that members would have had more time to consider the matter.

Kurt Lewis stated that it wasn't fair to allow chair-bound hunters to have an extra week at the end of a hunting season, since they already have five days at the beginning. Kurt recommended giving them an extra two days at the beginning of the season as a fair compromise.

MOTION by Kurt Lewis to give wheelchair-bound hunters seven extra days at the beginning of a big game hunting season.

SECOND by Verd Byrnes

PASSED by a majority vote. 9 For. 2 Against. Opposed were: Terry Sanslow and Verd Byrnes.

MOTION by Jordan Hatch to accept the balance of the Bucks and Bulls Proclamation as presented, except that the Wildlife Board look at adding a 50 cent surcharge to each big game license sold for predator control.

SECOND by Bruce Adams

FAILED The motion failed. 2 For. 9 Against. For the motion were Jordan Hatch and Bruce Adams.

MOTION by Kevin Albrecht to reject the new statewide spike elk hunt. Bull elk management should remain unchanged from last year.

SECOND by Verd Byrnes

PASSED by a majority vote. 8 For. 3 Against. Opposed were: Jordan Hatch, Bruce Adams, and Wayne Hoskisson.

MOTION by Terry Sanslow to keep the statewide archery deer hunt the same as last year.

SECOND by Walt Maldonado

PASSED by a majority vote. 9 For. 2 Against. Opposed were: Jordan Hatch and Wayne Hoskisson.

MOTION by Terry Sanslow to accept the remainder of the Bucks and Bulls and OIAL Proclamation as presented.

SECOND by Laura Kamala

PASSED unanimously

MOTION by Jordan Hatch to add a 50 cent surcharge to each big game license for predator control, and invite the Wildlife Board to encourage the legislature to approve the fee increase.

SECOND by Pam Riddle

PASSED by a majority vote. 9 For. 2 Against. Opposed were: Laura Kamala and Wayne Hoskisson.

CWMU RECOMMENDATIONS

-Boyde Blackwell, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Bruce Adams to approve CWMU recommendations as presented.

SECOND by Jordan Hatch

PASSED unanimously, except for an abstention by Kurt Lewis.

LANDOWNER PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS

-Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Bruce Adams to approve landowner permit recommendations as presented.

SECOND by Terry Sanslow

PASSED unanimously

DEPREDAATION RULE R657-44 AMENDMENT

-Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Bruce Adams to accept the Depredation Rule Amendment as presented.
SECOND by Verd Byrnes
PASSED unanimously

BONUS POINT RECOMMENDATIONS

-Judi Tutorow Administrative Services Supervisor

Questions from the RAC:

James Gilson asked how many persons were manipulating the group application system. Judi said there were three or four persons who consistently manipulate the system.

Questions from the Audience:

Josh Luke asked if a hunter could buy a preference point.

Judi said, "No."

Ben Lowder asked if such a small number of people warranted such concern.

Judi replied that the RAC could decide that.

Ben Lowder pointed out that allowing a hunter to purchase a bonus point would not help a youth hunter.

Judi agreed.

Daniel Luke spoke against changing the present system, believing the change would cause further congestion.

Josh Luke expressed opposition to changing the system.

Shayne Thompson agreed with the above two gentlemen.

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Kevin Albrecht stated that maintaining youth hunter numbers was important. Allowing hunters to buy a bonus point would put youth at a further disadvantage.

James noted that sportsman fathers were finding it is very hard for their sons and daughters to draw limited entry permits.

MOTION by Bruce Adams to make no change to the Bonus Point Program.

SECOND by Jordan Hatch

FAILED

Pam Riddle proposed accepting a selection of options from the hand-out which the RAC received that evening. The hand-out presented a list of options provided by Judi Tutorow, and dated 10/30/08. For Pam's first motion, she proposed a combination of selections that resulted in a tie vote. After making a few changes in the selections, Pam finally put together the following motion:

MOTION by Pam Riddle to approve 1b, and 2A from the top third of the hand-out. From the bottom third, Pam voted to accept 1.(2), 2. and 3.

SECOND by Wayne Hoskisson

PASSED by a majority vote. 6 For. 4 Against. Opposing the motion were: Terry Sanslow, Bruce Adams, Kurt Lewis, Jordan Hatch.

DEDICATED HUNTER PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

-Rhianna Christopher, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

James asked Rhianna how many persons wanted to get into the program this year, but were unable to do so.

Rhianna didn't know.

Various RAC members asked why a draw was necessary. Most seemed to favor the first come-first served strategy of enrollment.

Rhianna explained that the current system was too difficult to manage. A drawing would relieve DWR personnel from a lot of work.

Terry Sanslow protested the proposal to drop 16 violations from the list of wildlife crimes that would exclude a person from participating in the program.

Rhianna replied that minor violations took a great deal of time to investigate and process. She and her staff didn't have enough time to deal with the workload.

Terry replied that she needed more staff.

Rhianna agreed.

Questions from the Audience:

Jared Butler opposed the drawing and protested the \$10 application fee.

Rhianna replied that the application fee and drawing process had been designed to be compatible with all other hunts on the big game application.

Comments from the Audience:

Todd Huntington asked if the DWR had considered dropping service hours from 24 to 16.

Rhianna said that it had not been discussed.

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Walt expressed dismay at the proposed changes. He opposed the draw and elimination of the RAC requirement, saying that the RACs would lose the audience they have previously had.

James Gilson complained that the DWR seemed to always look for more ways to push application fees.

Judi Tutorow explained that part of the application fee goes to the drawing contractor, part helps pay for licensing work by DWR, and the rest helps run the agency.

Terry Sanslow protested the elimination of the RAC requirement, suggesting that dedicated hunters be assessed 2 ½ hours of service in lieu of this requirement.

Several RAC members expressed opposition to a draw system, and questioned the need for this change.

Judi Tutorow explained the difficulty and length of time needed to process applications. Judi said there will be a lot of hunters who won't know if they have a place in the dedicated hunter program by the deadline of the big game application period.

MOTION by Terry Sanslow to leave the dedicated hunter program unchanged, except that the application period run from 12/29-1/20 at which time fees must be paid. In addition, a deadline of July 31 will be imposed for completion of service hours.

SECOND by Walt Maldonado

PASSED by a majority vote. One against. The single opposing vote was cast by Wayne Hoskisson.

ANTLER GATHERING RECOMMENDATION

-Mitch Lane, Law Enforcement Officer

Questions from the RAC:

Terry Sanslow raised the issue of enforcement of new antler gathering restrictions, when existing laws can't be enforced, because of manpower limitations.

Mitch Lane defended the on-line certification as an education tool to help everyone understand the issues.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Jared Butler hoped that no new fees would be associated with the on-line course.

Todd Huntington suggested that the certification deadline be moved from April 15 to May 15.

Mitch explained that the April 15 date coincided with the annual opening date for all WMAs.

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Verd Byrnes to accept the antler gathering recommendation as presented.

SECOND by Pam Riddle

PASSED by a majority vote. 7 For. 4 Against. Opposed were: Terry Sanslow, Bruce Adams, Jordan Hatch, and Kurt Lewis.

ADJOURNMENT

James Gilson adjourned the meeting at 1 a.m.

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Beaver High School
Beaver, UT
November 4, 2008
5:00 p.m.**

REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

MOTION: To accept the minutes and agenda as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

SELECTION OF SOUTHERN REGION RAC REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE KOLOB FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOTION: To nominated Clair Woodbury as the RAC representative for the Kolob Advisory Committee.

VOTE: Unanimous

STATEWIDE DEER PLAN

MOTION: To accept the Statewide Deer Plan as presented.

VOTE: 6 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstained

BUCKS, BULLS, & OIAL PROCLAMATION AND RULE R657-5

MOTION: To accept the Bucks, Bulls, & OIAL Proclamation and Rule R657-5 as presented.

VOTE: 6 in favor, 3 opposed.

CWMU RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION: To accept the CWMU Recommendations as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

LANDOWNER PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION: To accept as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

DEPREDATION RULE R657-44 AMENDMENT

MOTION: To accept the Depredation Rule R657-44 Amendment as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

BONUS POINT RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION: To accept item number 1 regarding the elimination of groups for limited entry drawings as presented on the handout titled "Changes in Draw Processes".

VOTE: 4 in favor, 3 opposed, 2 abstain

MOTION: To accept item number 2 regarding the loss of bonus points if a person does not apply for 3 consecutive years as presented on the handout titled "Changes in Draw Processes".

VOTE: 5 in favor, 4 opposed, Chairman voted to break tie

MOTION: To accept item number 3 regarding the purchase of bonus points for every species in the limited entry drawing as presented on the handout titled "Changes in Draw Processes".

VOTE: 6 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstain

MOTION: To accept option number 2 under item number 1 regarding general season deer applications and the averaging of preference points and to not add a preference point if a permit is surrendered. In addition to approve item number 2 regarding the accumulation of a preference point if the applicant is successful for their second through 5th choices. In addition to accept item number 3 which is to increase youth buck permits in the draw from 15% to 20%.

VOTE: Unanimous

DEDICATED HUNTER PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION: Paul Briggs made the motion to accept as presented.

VOTE: 6 in favor, 2 opposed

ANTLER GATHERING RECOMMENDATION

MOTION: To accept the Antler Gathering Recommendation as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

Draft

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
 Beaver High School
 Beaver, UT
 November 4, 2008
 5:00 p.m.**

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Dell LeFevre Jack Hill Steve Dalton Chairman Jake Albrecht Sam Carpenter Clair Woodbury James Edwards Paul Briggs Steve Flinders Cordell Pearson	Douglas Messerly Natalie Brewster Teresa Bonzo Heather Perry Micah Evans Lynn Chamberlain Brent Farnsworth Jason Nicholes Sean Kelly Dustin Schaible Mitch Lane Anis Aoude Boyde Blackwell Greg Sheehan Kent Hersey Rhianna Christopher Dean Mitchell Tawyna Hunt Judi Tutorow Jim Lamb Keith Day Gabe Patterson Mark Ekins	Tom Hatch Paul Neimeyer	Gary Hallows Rex Stanworth

Chairman Jake Albrecht called the Meeting to order at 7:01pm. There were approximately ____ interested parties in attendance in addition to the RAC members, Wildlife Board members and DWR employees.

Jake Albrecht: . . . As well as Rick Woodard. We welcome him here. He also sits on the Wildlife Board. And then I don't see Tom Hatch, yet, but he still could show. I also want to welcome Jim Bowns, past member of the Wildlife Board, welcome here tonight with us. Before we do the introductions of our other members I'm going to turn the time to Paul Briggs, he is our new representative from the BLM and I'm going to let him give you a minute of his history and what he brings to our board.

Paul Briggs: Is that working? My name's Paul Briggs. I'm the fuels program manager for the Color Country District of the BLM, that's the old Cedar City office if you haven't caught up with

our reorganization terminology. A little bit about me, I grew up in, just up the road a little ways in Salina, Utah. Went to school at SUSC, SUU, Utah State University. Graduated and went to work for BLM in Fillmore, Kanab and now in Cedar City. So I'm happy to be here and happy to have the opportunity to serve.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Paul. We'll start with our introductions on my left with Jack Hill.

Jack Hill: Jack Hill, I'm in Cedar City, representing the non-consumptive.

Jim Edwards: Jim Edwards from Delta, I represent the sportsman.

Dell LeFevre: Dell LeFevre from Boulder, represent agriculture.

Clair Woodbury: Clair Woodbury from Hurricane, I represent the public at-large.

Douglas Messerly: Hi, I'm Doug Messerly, Regional Supervisor for the Division of Wildlife Resources out of Cedar City. Myself and my staff act as executive secretary for this committee and we don't vote.

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

Sam Carpenter: Sam Carpenter from Kanab. I represent sportsman. And you've met Paul.

Jake Albrecht: We have a couple of members that are not here with us. Rex Stanworth is, has been excused. He's in Wyoming hunting whitetail and I don't know what else. And probably Gary Hallows will be here a little later. He usually shows up, really good to show up. There's some handouts that are still outside that were still being prepared. If you missed some of those why you can walk out, walk back out and pick those up. They were being stapled together out there. Or that's probably them that they're bringing in, if you want some of them. A little history about how we do the meeting is we have the introduction, or the presentation, and then we have questions from the RAC, and then questions from the public. Then we have comments from the public, which require a comment card. And our DWR people have some of those in their hands. You need to get one of those, fill it out, and put on there what you want to talk about and then we'll get you in the right agenda order. After we have comments from the public we'll have comments from the RAC. And then we'll have a motion, hopefully, and then a RAC discussion on the motion to clarify the motion, and vote. And then we'll move on to the next agenda item.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)

-Jake Albrecht, Chairman

Jake Albrecht: Our first agenda item tonight is review and acceptance of the RAC meeting agenda and minutes. Do we have any comments on the minutes? If not I'd entertain a motion.

Jack Hill: I would so move Mr. Chairman.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we have a motion by Jack Hill to accept the minutes and the agenda for tonight.

James Edwards: I'll second.

Jake Albrecht: A second by Jim Edwards. Any other discussion? All in favor say aye. Any against? Motion carries.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, our next item is procedure for dedicated hunters to receive RAC credit. This is an informational item. Heather Perry.

Procedure for Dedicated Hunters to Receive RAC Credit (Informational) 4:51 to 5:27 of 6:00:47

-Heather Perry, Dedicated Hunter Program Coordinator

Wildlife Board Update:

-Jake Albrecht, Chairman

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Heather. Appreciate that. Our next item is Wildlife Board update. This is an informational item. I've been asked to read a letter into the minutes concerning the Panguitch Lake fisheries. This is to whom it may concern. As a member of the Panguitch Lake Committee I was sincerely disappointed with the actions of the Wildlife Board at their September meeting. The action of the Board to remove the rainbow trout from the slot limit came as a bolt from the blue. For staff members of the Southern Region office and committee members. The slot limit was part of the total plan that was developed by the committee and approved by both the committee and the Southern RAC. The removal of the rainbow trout had never been officially discussed. There had been some discussion regarding modification of the slot limit however. That modification addressed raising the length of both the rainbow and cutthroat trout at the lower end of the slot limit. Removal of the rainbow trout was never discussed. The plan for Panguitch Lake recovery was not a plan that was arrived at easily or rapidly. The membership of the Panguitch Lake committee was composed of members from Garfield County, City of Panguitch, RAC member, Wildlife Board member, Forest Service, businesses from the lake and professional staff from the Southern Region office. The plan resulting from the meetings held over several months was approved by a large majority of the committee members. It now appears that the minority of members have prevailed. There are several issues that should have been impacted by the motion made by Mr. Hatch to remove rainbow trout from the slot limit; a motion that received the unanimous vote of the board. The largest business owner at Panguitch Lake spoke at a recent RAC meeting and publicly supported the plan for Panguitch Lake, including the slot limit. The biologist from the Southern Region office that worked with the committee stated that treatment such as that planned for Panguitch Lake would very likely not be possible in the future due to the environmental concerns and escalating cost. Consequently the committee should proceed with caution regarding any change in the action plan. Finding following all gill netting that was done at the lake following treatment were very positive, and a very surprising finding was that very few tiger trout were netted. It appears that these fish migrated to the tributaries and left the lake.

The last gill netting was completed at the end of the summer. The result of that netting showed that sixty percent of the fish in the nets were outside the slot. That means that they were keepable fish. This writer communicated with Mr. Hatch via e-mail on several occasions regarding treatment of the lake and follow up activities. Every concern that was voiced by him was responded to and resolved, or so it was thought. It is impossible to compare Panguitch Lake to Strawberry to impose the slot limit currently in place at Strawberry is perhaps a bad idea. The two are not similar fisheries for example Strawberry is a much larger and deeper lake. More importantly is the fishing pressure. The bulk of people fishing Panguitch are people from Southern Nevada. Very few of these people fish in Panguitch are interested in catch and release. The slot limit currently in place at Strawberry has evolved over many years. The slot limit that was in place at Panguitch was in the process of evolving. Sadly it never had a chance to reflect the true needs of the lake based on some sound strong scientific evidence. We now have the Strawberry slot limit. Jack Hill. Sets on our Board member. Okay. I have read those into the minutes as Jack requested. With that I do not have any other informational items. And I also think that Doug, do you have anything informational that you want to pass on?

Regional Update:

-Douglas Messerly, Southern Regional Supervisor

Douglas Messerly: No. Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'm going to forgo the Regional Update in the interest of time for this meeting. Maybe an introduction to the next agenda item if that would be all right. As you recall at our last meeting we talked about convening a committee to discuss the future management of Kolob Reservoir over the next year. That committee is very well on its way to being fully organized. We do need, however, a member from this body, the Southern Region Advisory Council, to represent the RAC on that committee. And if we can take care of that as the next agenda item, that's all I have.

Selection of Southern Region RAC Representative for the Kolob Fisheries Management Plan Advisory Committee (action)

-Jake Albrecht, Chairman

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Doug. And before the meetings tonight I asked Clair Woodbury of Hurricane, who would be very close to the situation down there, if he would be willing to sit on that. And he said if the board would approve him he would be glad to. So it would be my recommendation we approve Clair Woodbury for that position.

Jack Hill: Mr. Chairman.

Jake Albrecht: Jack Hill.

Jack Hill: I would formally move that we recognize Mr. Woodbury as a member of that committee.

James Edwards: I'll second.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we have a motion by Jack and a second by Jim Edwards. Any other discussion? All in favor please say aye. Any against? Okay motion carries. Clair they will be in touch. There's a meeting, I think it's on the 14th, if I'm not . . . 19th.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, our next agenda item is deer survey results. This is an informational item. Kent Hersey, Big Game Project Leader.

Deer Survey Results (informational) 10:53 to 25:50 of 6:00:47

-Kent Hersey, Big Game Project Leader

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

Questions from the RAC:

Jake Albrecht: I have one Kent. Why did we use hunting every year and then 5 years? Why wasn't that like maybe like 2 to 3 years, for example?

Kent Hersey: This survey was a modified version for Utah off of a survey that Idaho Fish and Game did, that they had developed with the University of Idaho. So that was a question that pretty much came directly from their survey that their people had set up. And we certainly could have, you know, done different categories and tried to see what the results were comparatively to that. But if we shifted to an all limited entry scenario where we actually, you know, could produce a big buck, for the big buck I don't think we could get everybody what they call a big buck who applies for the hunts in this state in anything less than 5 years. And it depends for a medium buck on what your definition, or what you view as the opportunity to harvest a medium buck to whether that could be accommodated in 5 years as well.

Jake Albrecht: And I guess that follows up to my next question, was it ever discussed what a medium buck or a large buck is?

Kent Hersey: Yeah we gave a definition. I think the large buck was greater than 24 inches, 4 points, greater than 24 inches spread. Medium buck was, I can't think of what the low range was, but I think antler width doesn't extend outside the ears, a 3 or 4 point. And a small buck was less than that.

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

Comments from the RAC:

None

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any question from the public? Please come up to the mic and state your name and a question. Anybody with questions or comments has to be at the mic so we can get it into the minutes.

Questions from the Public:

Todd Scott Abelhousen: Todd Abelhousen from St. George. By a show of hands how many people in the room were surveyed on this survey?

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Todd. Okay, any other questions from the public? We don't have any comment cards from the public.

Comments from the Public:

None

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any other comments from the RAC? Seeing none, thanks Kent.

Jake Albrecht: Our next item is the Statewide Deer Plan. This is an action item. Anis, how are you tonight?

Anise Aoude: Good. How are you Mr. Chairman?

Jake Albrecht: Welcome. Anis, before you get started

Anise Aoude: Sure.

Jake Albrecht: I want to welcome Tom, He was just a second late getting in but we want to welcome you here and we want to welcome ya. Tom Hatch. Go ahead Anis.

Statewide Deer Plan (action)

29:14 to 56:02 of 6:00:47

-Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Jake Albrecht: Anis, on the one slide where you had the two options, I don't think you finished the whole presentation on that.

Jake Albrecht: Anis on the one slide

Anis Aoude: This one?

Jake Albrecht: Option A or Option B.

Anis Aoude: This one. It's the general season deer you're talking about.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, yeah okay.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, do we have any questions from the RAC for Anis? Sam.

Questions from the RAC:

Sam Carpenter: Anis, I just want some clarification to make sure I understood you correctly. On the general units you did say we are going to be capping the units for designated hunters,

is that correct? On, dedicated, yes I'm sorry.

Anis Aoude: No. Not under what we're proposing. If unit by unit were to go we would have to do that. But that's not the option we're recommending.

Sam Carpenter: So the dedicated hunters can still, regardless of, I know we have a cap on them. . . .

Anis Aoude: Uh huh.

Sam Carpenter: . . .But they can all put in for which ever region they want and they won't be turned away at this point.

Anis Aoude: That's correct

Sam Carpenter: Okay, another question, sub units. You talked about subunits; I missed exactly how many subunits there were. I didn't see it on here but I know there was a slide that I missed.

Anis Aoude: Unit by unit would be about 25 to 30. That's not exactly flushed out how many exact units would be depending on what units we want and things like that.

Sam Carpenter: So we're going to do counts and ratios on all these units?

Anis Aoude: We already do that.

Sam Carpenter: We already do?

Anis Aoude: Uh huh.

Sam Carpenter: Okay.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions from the RAC? Clair.

Clair Woodbury: A couple of things Anis, on the unit by unit, you said the results of it wouldn't be any different than just leaving it as the five regions. Why do we want to micromanage it if the results are not going to be any different?

Anis Aoude: That's exactly why we're not recommending going to unit by unit. We're recommending still hunting on a regional basis but dealing with those units that do fall below 15 bucks per 100 does, separately. Right now what we do is lump them all together and take an average. So there could be a unit that fell below 15 but the regional average could stay above.

Clair Woodbury: Ok, just looking at it the 29 units we've got, all but one are 14 or above.

Anis Aoude: Uh huh.

Clair Woodbury: It seems almost like much to do about nothing.

Anis Aoude: Yeah but I mean there was, there's a, there's a lot of folks that feel that those units that are below objective need to be dealt with instead of lumping them with the others one. And that's why this will actually let us hunt, still on a regional basis, but deal with those units that are chronically below buck to doe ratio.

Clair Woodbury: By going to a five- day hunt on those.

Anis Aoude: On those, yeah, initially, and if they fall even lower then we would actually pull them out and deal with them with the number of permits.

Clair Woodbury: If I remember right last year you did a survey on the five-day hunt as opposed to the nine-day hunt.

Anis Aoude: Uh huh.

Clair Woodbury: And if I remember right, the five-day hunts had an average of 3.5 hunter days and the 9-day hunt had 4 hunter days.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, about a half day difference.

Clair Woodbury: And the harvest was actually less on the nine-day hunt.

Anis Aoude: That's correct.

Clair Woodbury: Wouldn't we want to go to a nine-day hunt on those units that aren't (unintelligible)?

Anis Aoude: That's why we're recommending a nine-day hunt statewide.

Clair Woodbury: Just doing the math (unintelligible).

Anis Aoude: Well I mean on the units that we want to manage differently . . .

Clair Woodbury: That fall under.

Anis Aoude: . . . Yeah, what we've done instead of having the five-day hunt start at the same time we actually moved it to the latter end of the season so folks that are out there initially on the opener could not hunt that unit.

Clair Woodbury: Okay, I see.

Anis Aoude: And then they could hunt it after. So a lot of people harvest their animal that first weekend. So there will be a lot fewer potential hunters to hunt on that unit.

Clair Woodbury: I see what you're saying, okay.

James Edwards: Yes, Anis I have a questions, it involves both the elk hunt and the deer hunt. I see where you're recommending on the elk hunt that they can have all the limited entry elk hunts go to a spike unit, which essentially opens up the whole Southern Region to spike only.

Clair Woodbury: Right.

James Edwards: Why don't we have a five-day deer hunt to go along with that so that we have like the Northern Region.

Anis Aoude: Well the Northern Region only has that hunt on any bull units, not on spike units. Because if you did it on spike units I think you would have a crowding issue. Currently any bull units don't have that many hunters as spike units do because of the number.

James Edwards: Well I don't think you'd have a crowding issue because the spike hunters are the same ones that are hunting deer. It's not a different group.

Anis Aoude: And it could be. It's just something that, it really never came up but it's something we could certainly look into, yeah.

James Edwards: I had a guy e-mail me and he thought maybe that to eliminate the crowding issue that a lot of people think we have here is to take and go to a two, two five-day hunt. One that would go in conjunction with the spike hunt and another one that starts on the 20th.

Anis Aoude: That was something that came up during the committee and it wasn't an option they thought they wanted to do. So you know, given there's so many options out there and if you ask ten different people you'll probably get ten different options. So we kind of wanted to go with the option that this, you know, the doable option that this committee came up for because that's basically why we put the committee together.

James Edwards: Well the management hunt, or the management unit then at least discussed it then, okay?

Anis Aoude: Yeah. Yeah they did discuss it.

James Edwards: Okay, thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Natalie for the minutes that was Jim Edwards. Okay. Any other questions from the RAC? Clair.

Clair Woodbury: I'm sorry I missed this one Anis. On the management hunts, on the limited, the premium entry, I think we found on the spike, or on the elk that that wasn't very successful. Are deer going to be, are they different? Or are we just going to try it and see?

Anis Aoude: Right. This is one I struggled with a lot because I know biologically it's going to be one of those things that you're going to have to wait and see what happens. But yeah, one of

the things I made clear is you're going to kill younger animals and you're probably potentially going to kill, you know, three-year-old bucks that could have been bigger than next year. And they would rather do that they said than issue more premium permits. So even though the committee felt that that was a good trade off, just to see if we could get it, yeah. So yeah it was brought up and I totally agree. I think we're going to kill young animals. There are those folks that are out there on the last day that are going to shoot any three point or maybe even a yearling. So it's going to happen. That's why we decided to have this course and try to educate people that are going to go out and hunt this hunt.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions? Steve Dalton.

Steve Dalton: I don't really know where to start with this thing. We've kind of got an issue with the Henry Mountain age class on those bucks. The last three years we had 63 percent, 55 percent, and 52 percent of the bucks harvested were five-years -old or older. And if we adopt your proposal of the last three years average down 40 percent what we're going to end up with is a whole bunch more permits issued on the Henrys.

Anis Aoude: Right and for the past, I don't know how many years, we've been under harvesting those animals on that unit. There is a potential to increase harvest on the Henry Mountains. Now keep in mind we can never increase permits on any given year more than 20 percent. So even if we wanted the most tags we could put on that unit is 8 permits, additional. So that's kind of the checks and balances that we put in place to make sure that we don't jump too fast.

Steve Dalton: 20 percent increase in one year is the maximum, right?

Anis Aoude: Right. That's in the plan.

Steve Dalton: So if we issued 40 permits last year that's an increase of 8 permits the next year.

Anis Aoude: Right. That's correct.

Steve Dalton: Okay, but that management will continue then apparently if we adopt this plan the way it's written?

Anis Aoude: Right.

Steve Dalton: Until we change it.

Anis Aoude: Correct.

Steve Dalton: If we're not in agreeance with this 40 percent.

Anis Aoude: I don't understand the question.

Steve Dalton: Well you're proposing 40 percent of the bucks have to be five-years-old or older.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, thirty to forty.

Steve Dalton: For a three-year average.

Anis Aoude: Right.

Steve Dalton: Well that's not what we've had for the harvest the last three years.

Anis Aoude: As I explained, the last few years we've been, you know, very restrictive in our harvest and we could always harvest more on that unit. So in this plan we will harvest a few more higher end bucks but it won't be to the point where you're depleting that, that gene, or that pool of big bucks. There's always going to be big bucks out there because you can never increase permits on any given year more than 20 percent. So if you can only increase it by eight, that's probably, I don't know, 600 bucks that made it to the next year. So they're, now they're five-years-old, they were four-years-old. So you're never going to increase enough to harm that higher end, bigger buck population. That's what the checks and balances are there for.

Steve Dalton: Well it was done in the past on the Paunsaugunt so I guess. . .

Anis Aoude: But not under this system. I mean this is a system where you can only increase X amount per year. I think in the past they just increased it whatever they needed to get the buck to doe ratio in place, or the age objective, or whatever. This is a system we put in place to basically not be able to increase faster than you can produce the bucks.

Steve Dalton: I understand. I'm just reluctant to increase the number of permits. I would rather lean towards more quality, at least until we have a population objective reached on that unit. We're still way below objective. I would like to see the buck numbers and the age class stay really high at least until we've reached the population objective on the Henrys. Anyway, I guess it turned into a comment more than a question. Thanks Anis.

James Edwards: Anis?

Jake Albrecht: Jim Edwards. Go ahead.

James Edwards: I'm sorry. Mr. Chairman. I have a question. These permits we're talking about increasing on these limited entry, aren't they management buck permits?

Anis Aoude: No there's two, there's two ways we manage them. We are managing premium permits one-way, and that's they have to fall within 30 to 40 percent of the harvest has to be five-years or older. And that's how you measure how you increase the premium permits. Now the other is the buck to doe ration. Buck to doe ratios go above 50 that's when we increase management buck tags. So there's two methods of management there.

James Edwards: Okay, thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Sam, do you have a question?

Sam Carpenter: No. I don't have a question. I've got a question for you.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. A couple of other questions; was there any discussion from raising the buck doe ratio from 15 to 20 to 25 bucks per 100 does?

Anis Aoude: There was a lot of discussion about it. What that does is decrease opportunity. And the committee did not want to decrease opportunity on general season.

Jake Albrecht: Okay on you're slide it said that unit by unit the quality or the, I think it's right there, where was it . . . A unit-by-unit management will not result in increased buck quality. It could if each one of them was not under this guideline where you had 15 to 20 bucks per 100 does. If some of them were set at 20 to 25 you could increase quality. Everything does not have to be at the same . . .

Anis Aoude: It does if it's general season.

Jake Albrecht: But if they're on a unit by unit you guys could change that if you wanted to, couldn't you?

Anis Aoude: No, not unless you want to make them limited entry units, not general season units. General season is managed for opportunity and we manage for 15 to 25 bucks per 100 does. Now if you change that unit to something else it becomes a limited entry unit. It doesn't become a general season unit. And then it falls into the under the limited entry which would be 25 to 35.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Okay do we have any other questions, other questions from the RAC? Questions from the public? I know there's some out there. Come up to the mic and state your name and your question. These are questions and not comments, okay.

Questions from the Public:

Nolan Gardner: Yeah, what consideration, or Nolan Gardner from St. George. I was wondering what consideration the overall population was given on each unit? I know you're judging, or you're counting the buck to doe ratio but what about the population per unit? At what point do you shut the hunt down or regulate to increase the population?

Jake Albrecht: Did you get that Anis?

Anis Aoude: Yeah. Basically you're talking about reducing buck harvest to effect populations. Now reducing buck harvest will not effect populations. Reducing buck harvests reduces and increases buck to doe ratios. Only antlerless harvest can increase and decrease the actual population because only females bare young. So unless, that's why we deal with these things separately. When you're dealing with buck harvest you talk buck to doe ratios. When you're dealing with populations you talk antlerless harvest. So it really, even though we worry about what the population levels are on these units we can only manage buck harvest on the buck to doe ratios on those units. I hope that was clear.

Jake Albrecht: Are you okay with that Nolan?

Bart Hansen: Bart Hansen. I've got a couple of questions for Anis. On your slide show you showed option 2 on like unit by unit. Can you pull that up?

Anis Aoude: Sure.

Jake Albrecht: Did you state your, Barth Hansen?

Bart Hansen: B-A-R-T, BART, Simpson, Hansen. On here you show an option 2, 2010 hunting season unit by unit. And then in 2009 you address the statewide archery. What would the 2010 for the archery be?

Anis Aoude: That would be decided in 2010.

Bart Hansen: Okay, all right. And the other one is on the management tags, are they going to be using point, bonus points the same way as the limited entry, or the premium or what? And what's the possibility about having them be for youth or disabled or senior citizens?

Anis Aoude: Yeah you will have to spend your points if you put in for a management buck hunt. And we didn't really discuss much the split for youth and all that. And that can be a recommendation to the RACs. We just thought it would just be to the general public, anyone who wants to put in. We could split it out, kind of like we did the management bull elk hunt, but that's not our recommendation. Our recommendation is to just keep it simple and let anyone who wants to put in put in.

Sam Carpenter: Can I say something? Anis, we did discuss the uh, we were going to go 30 percent with youth, 30 percent with 65 and older and 40 percent general public on the management hunt. We discussed that thoroughly.

Anis Aoude: You discussed that in the Paunsaugunt group but not statewide.

Jake Albrecht: The plan for management too is spelled out that way.

Anis Aoude: Yeah I may, we may have done it and I just uh, I apologize for that.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions from the public? Please come forward and state your name.

Anis Aoude: So it is in the management plan that they are split out in those categories.

Jake Albrecht: Go ahead Greg.

Greg McGregor: Greg McGregor, Santa Clara. Just help me explain a little, understand a little bit here, for example, if the Pine Valley unit in the Southern Region falls below the 15 per 100 it would automatically get kicked into a subunit management, correct? So it would either,

depending on how bad it fell, it would either be limited entry or, well it would be a certain amount of tags or limited entry, is that right?

Anis Aoude: Yeah. Basically if it falls below 15 bucks per 100 does we would shorten it to a five-day season first. If it falls below 10 we would pull it out, pull that number of tags that it usually has in that unit out of the cap and then issue fewer permits to bring that buck to doe ratio up.

Greg McGregor: So that would be a barometer that would automatically kick in for any units in the region, right? So that could in effect help the problem that we're, we have with the five-day hunt in the region now, right? And I think the thing that Nolan was trying to get is the fact that on the general population objective statewide does the region; does each region have a certain population objective also?

Anis Aoude: No. Population objectives are unit- by-unit basis. They always have been. And when we redo our unit plans we look at habitat objectives on those, habitat conditions on those units and set what the population that can be carried on that unit based on those habitats are. So those are done on a unit-by-unit basis. They're summed up and it gives you the statewide number. So every unit has a population objective currently.

Jake Albrecht: I know there was another gentleman. Come up.

Rusty Aiken: Rusty Aiken from Cedar City. Question on option 1, what's the archery recommendation statewide?

Jake Albrecht: Please get next to the mic so we hear the question for the minutes.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, we'll get specific recommendation when I go to the Bucks And Bulls Recommendations. It's going to be, well you'll see. It will be recommended that that they choose their season for (unintelligible) still September 1st.

Rusty Aiken: I was on this management plan committee for the Paunsaugunt and there's a couple of issues I wanted to check on. The mandatory check in, was that in the plan? The mandatory check in was in the plan?

Anis Aoude: Yes it is.

Rusty Aiken: And then the youth I guess we talked.

Anis Aoude: Yes.

Rusty Aiken: A five-day hunt, rut hunt?

Anis Aoude: Uh huh.

Rusty Aiken: And the weapon?

Anis Aoude: Weapon, well you'll see the recommendation. It's in the Bucks and Bulls.

Jake Albrecht: Those will all be in the next presentation. Those are in the next agenda item. Any other questions? Okay.

Dallas Smith: Dallas Smith from Leeds, Utah. Anis, on the population objective of 50,000, the increase over the next five years, with that increase will that allow more opportunity for general season hunting and if not where would we, what numbers would give us more opportunity to?

Anis Aoude: Yeah if we get to that point that certainly would increase, you know, there would be more bucks out there which would increase buck to doe ratios and could potentially increase opportunity. Now I'm saying could potentially because buck to doe ratios on general season would have to get above 25 for us to increase. So most units are between 15 and 18 currently, so it would be, it may not. I mean we would have to increase it quite a bit to get to that point. Realistically though I don't think we could get above 50,000 increase in the next 5 years of deer total.

Jake Albrecht: Greg, have you got another question?

Greg McGregor: Also, if going back to the situation that I brought forward earlier, is what would happen to the dedicated hunters and the statewide archers if that was to go in a limited entry? Would they be exempt from hunting at that point?

Anis Aoude: That's the wildcard I guess. We would have to get another committee together and figure out how to deal with those, with those issues. Because that would be something that we would have to deal with and I guess I can't give you an answer of what exactly would have happened to it. It would have altered it substantially.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions from the public? If not we'll go to comment cards from the public first. Our first one is Greg McGregor. Get your exercise.

Comments from the Public:

Greg McGregor: I'd just like to make the comment on this. I think overall the plan is pretty status quo. I like these options up here as far as having those kick in. They're uh, they help in any unit in the state that goes under them management plan and I think that that is good. It would help a lot in some of those units. And I'd just like to go on record as saying I think that's a step in the right direction. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Greg. We have one other comment card but he wasn't able to stay here for the meeting or something. This is from the Beaver SFW. They recommend changing the mule deer herd management goal from 15 to 20 bucks per 100 does to 20 to 25 bucks per 100 does on all regular hunt units statewide. So we have our two comment cards read in. Do you have a comment card? Abelhousen. Did you fill one out?

Todd Abelhousen: Do you want me to do another one? I think a bow hunter took it.

Jake Albrecht: Todd Abelhousen, come on up.

Todd Abelhousen: I've got to keep the bow hunters on their toes. Todd Abelhousen. SFW has requested that I make a general statement on behalf of the SFW Board. Specifically concerning the premium limited entry hunt units, the Henry and the Paunsaugunt. And I echo what Steve Dalton was commenting concerning the age population. That should be a major focus. And I'm sure we're working on predator management, and habitat, and make sure that they're not shooting any does out there. But the Henrys needs to be kept at 50 to 60 percent ratio, for buck to, buck to doe ratio. And the management tags is a key part of keeping those bucks controlled. But I also, I think that needs to be part of the number. Does that make sense? Okay. They all said yes. Do you want me to make . . . Okay. The Henrys bucks to doe ratio needs to be at 50 to 60 percent. Oh, of the age class. The age class objective I mean. The age class objective needs to be kept 50 to 60 percent age class above 5-years. Does that make sense? Am I? Okay, sorry. Thanks Jack. That's why we have you up there. Paunsaugunt in same consideration, 40 to 50 percent. Um, SFW Dixie Chapter has also asked me to specifically discuss the 5-day hunt versus the 9-day hunt. And we have continually and will continually fight to keep the 5-day hunt. We've sacrificed that second weekend of the season. I understand that some of the people want, or that Anis recommended that we make that, if the buck to doe ratio drops we make it a 5-day hunt the last weekend. Our real concern on some of these unit areas like the Coral Pink Sand Dunes, the Pine Valleys, if we get a big storm that moves those deer off the mountain and they get decimated. And we don't want to fight over the last two-point. But guys really do want to have big bucks to be able to go out there and chase. So we're going to still focus on fighting for a 5-day hunt. And we don't want it to be the last 5-days of the season. The farther we go into the season the higher potential for a storm that will move those deer off. So we want it to be the opening of the season just like it has been, maintain it throughout the Southern Region. We had some real problems when we just did the Pine Valley and it affected the Beaver. And we did the Pine Valley and Zion and it affected some of those other units that second weekend, so we want to maintain that. Okay.

Jake Albrecht: Did we miss anybody's comment cards? I think we hit them all. Did you fill a comment card out?

Rusty Aiken: I want to comment on the 5-day as well. We had some issues with the Pine Valley being 5-day; it put pressure on the Zion unit. Buck doe ratios went in the dirt. When the Zion unit went 5-day Beaver and Panguitch got added pressure. So you're just moving deer hunters from one unit to another unit when you're doing the subunit. You need to create a 5-day tag for those subunits that are under objective.

Jake Albrecht: Rusty I need to have you fill out a comment card and get, have that, because we don't have one here.

Rusty Aiken: Jake, you should have it.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. We'll dig into it. Okay, any other comment cards that we missed? Okay, we are to comments from the RAC.

Comments from the RAC:

Jake Albrecht: Clair Woodbury.

Clair Woodbury: I'd like to comment on the 5-day hunt also. Going by Anis's survey the top five reasons that the people in Utah love to hunt deer are social. Also, the 9-day hunt, according to your figures has a less kill than a 5-day hunt. I, hunting the Southern Region is like hunting 5 opening days. I strongly recommend that we go to the 9-day hunt. That disperses the pressure almost in half.

Jake Albrecht: Cordell Pearson

Cordell Pearson: I just want to comment on the 5-day hunt also. You've got to do one or the other; you can't have both. You can't have a 5-day hunt in three areas down south and leave the rest open because what happens is you get that added pressure. I mean you can say what you want but you do. Okay. So I don't know how you're going to figure this out. You either got to have a 5-day hunt or you got to have a 9-day hunt. Or you've got to issue a special tag for a 5-day hunt. So I say we go to 9-days.

Jake Albrecht: Sam Carpenter.

Sam Carpenter: Yes I've always been an advocate of the 5-day hunt because it really has improved the quality of the hunt. And I definitely agree with what Clair's saying, that it is like 5 opening days. We have an awful lot of people down there in certain areas. My question would be if we're going to go to a 9-day hunt is there a possibility we can move that hunt up a week to where this problem that we have when it does snow and we have the heavy weather that we don't deplete the herd in a year or two? Is that a possibility, Anis? Has anybody brought that up or would that help?

Anis Aoude: Yeah it was brought up. That was the option basically we showed. The thing is in the Southern Region has a high buck to doe ratio so there is not a need to really move anything anywhere. There's only 5 units statewide that are below buck to doe ratio. So uh, yeah, anything is an option. It's not easy to move seasons because everything bumps everything else. So it wouldn't be something that if we wanted to do may not be able to be done in 2009. So it would be something we could look at, yeah.

Jake Albrecht: Steve Dalton.

Steve Dalton: Yes Anis. I'm wondering has there been any consideration given to an emergency closure on a unit where you do have that situation where a big storm has brought all the deer off? Can't you just shut her down and say it's closed? The Beaver unit's closed from . . .

Anis Aoude: I mean that can always be done by the director. The thing is, we're talking about hunting bucks. It's not going to decimate the population. It's going to kill a lot of bucks. So you'll find out the next year that that buck to doe ratio is low, you'll act accordingly. That's how you manage deer herds. You can't always prevent things from happening.

Steve Dalton: Okay. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Steve Flinders.

Steve Flinders: I think some of this debate about 5-day hunts is probably more appropriate in the next agenda item, Jake; that's you call as the chair. But in reference to how it fits in the statewide deer plan, and I think Anis and the Division have done a great job and nailed down some of the more vague and highly debatable things that we've had in the past. And they'll have time, and we can debate in the next agenda item whether to open that 5-day hunt, whether to have it at all, or whether to open it on Monday or every other day. Maybe one of the units is completely non-motorized. I guess we need to buy off on the plan itself and whether we want to go down this road of how we're going to rest a unit inside the larger region if there's a problem with a particular unit. And if 5-day's not the best then we can discuss that further. But I think it's the statewide deer plan we need to focus on and it looks like a good plan.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Steve. Sam Carpenter then.

Sam Carpenter: One more thing, and this doesn't pertain to the 5-day. I was part of the committee on the Paunsaugunt where we discussed the buck to doe ratios and the age objectives. When we did this and set these numbers we were talking about the Paunsaugunt and not the Henrys. But it being a premium unit it seems to me when you compare the Paunsaugunt and the Henrys, I mean the only thing that they have in common is we have mule deer on them. From that point on they're totally different. They don't have, you know we have a totally different set of problems on the Paunsaugunt that don't exist on the Henrys. Why is it that we cannot manage the Henrys different than the Paunsaugunt and still keep it a premium unit with the, just the differences and the whole aspect of trying to keep this truly a premium unit?

Jake Albrecht: Good comments. Any other comments?

Jack Hill: Mr. Chairman.

Jake Albrecht: Jack Hill.

Jack Hill: I would agree with Mr. Flinders. I think we ought to stick closely to dealing with the statewide deer plan and worry about 5-day hunts and 9-day hunts on the next item.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. I've got a couple comments and then we'll go on to motion. In reference to what Sam just talked about. We have a system set up for premium deer units. But the Henrys and the Paunsaugunt, in my own mind are two different units also. And I don't know why we can't change that so that they have different objectives. To me the Henry Mountains is a premier premier unit compared, and it could produce humongous bucks that people are after and still give them plenty of opportunity. Whereas on the Paunsaugunt if we don't kill so many of those bucks Arizona will. So I think they need to be managed but I think they need to be managed separately. And I'd like to see us keep the plan that we had on the Henrys the way it was before rather than moving it to so we're taking more deer off that unit. Okay. And uh, I

had one other comment on the uh, the Monroe unit has been a 5-day hunt for 4 or 5 years. Am I right there Anis?

Anis Aoude: Yep.

Jake Albrecht: There has not been any change on that unit. It has not produced any more bucks than when it was a 9-day unit. The way I look at that is those people are killing those bucks that come off there. But if I read this right and we pass that plan the Monroe unit would probably go into the next phase the next year. Am I correct?

Anis Aoude: The next phase being?

Jake Albrecht: The 5-day hunt and possible limited entry.

Anis Aoude: Right. It would only be limited entry if it falls below 10.

Jake Albrecht: That's correct.

Anis Aoude: That's correct.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Okay, we don't have any other comments? We need to go to the motion part on the Mule Deer Plan.

Jack Hill: Mr. Chairman.

Jake Albrecht: Jack Hill.

Jack Hill: I would move for the acceptance of the Statewide Mule Deer Plan as presented.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we have a motion by Jack Hill to accept the Mule Deer Plan as presented. It is seconded by Steve Flinders. Do we have any other discussion? Seeing none, we'll call for a vote. All in favor please raise your right hand. How many do we have Natalie? Six. All those against raise your right hand. 6 – 3. Okay, motion carries.

Jack Hill made the motion to accept as presented. Steve Flinders seconded the motion. 6 in favor, 3 opposed. Sam Carpenter, Steve Dalton, and Dell LeFevre opposed. Motion carries

Jake Albrecht: Our next item on the agenda is Bucks Bulls Proclamation and Rule. This is an action item. Anis.

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Proclamation and Rule R657-5 (action) 1:36:17 to 2:02:16 of 6:00:47
-Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Anis. Questions from the RAC. Sam Carpenter.

Questions from the RAC:

Sam Carpenter: Good job Anis. The questions that I've got on here, on your archery hunt, on your split season and them having to choose a hunt. What's the point if there's no calf? I mean is this just like a survey?

Anis Aoude: It is it's to gather data and see where people are hunting that first two weeks. It's not a survey but it's to make people choose and to know where those people are choosing.

Sam Carpenter: Okay and what's the point then? Is that so we can find out that we're seriously over crowded in an area?

Anis Aoude: Right, exactly.

Sam Carpenter: And then we'll act on that at a later date or something?

Anis Aoude: Exactly.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, and how are you going to enforce that? Are you going to actually be writing tickets if someone does not have the proper (unintelligible)?

Anis Aoude: Correct. When they get their permit it will say what region they picked from X to that date and then they have to hunt within that region those dates.

Sam Carpenter: Well if you're going to go this far why not put a cap, do it now? We know there's a problem. And I know it's perceived in some people's opinion but . . .

Anis Aoude: Well I guess, I don't, yeah. To say that is a problem, we didn't recommend that. Let's put it that way. We want to find out a little bit more.

Sam Carpenter: Mr. Chairman, can I continue. I've got a few more questions if . . .

Jake Albrecht: Go ahead Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, on the Paunsaugunt hunt dates. Being a part of that committee I know we voted unanimously, not unanimously, it was 7 to 3 I believe, to leave the hunt dates the same.

Anis Aoude: Uh huh.

Sam Carpenter: I take it that recommendation didn't carry any weight.

Anis Aoude: Well, no. WE recommended changing it because we didn't want spike hunters on top of . . .

Sam Carpenter: Spike elk?

Anis Aoude: Yeah. Spike elk hunters on top of people that will be hunting almost a once in a lifetime hunt.

Sam Carpenter: Okay well when we were trying to get these hunts changed to this later date a couple of years ago the problem was law enforcement and was the reason we couldn't do it.

Anis Aoude: Right.

Sam Carpenter: So now that we're changing to the statewide archery that changed the game plan on all this?

Anis Aoude: Well not only that, other units do it and don't have law enforcement problems. The Henrys is at the same time as the general season unit.

Sam Carpenter: Okay.

Anis Aoude: It's not an issue anywhere else so I think we can deal with the law enforcement problems.

Sam Carpenter: Ok another thing

Anis Aoude: Okay. And another thing that came out of the committee that I see the recommendation didn't carry any weight was the management hunts where we were having it after the muzzleload hunt and during the heart of the rut. We recommended, 7 to 2 I believe was the vote, to use a rifle in that hunt.

Anis Aoude: Right.

Sam Carpenter: And is there a particular reason that that was not followed?

Anis Aoude: There is. We felt that to be able to tell whether a buck is truly a three point it's best to have a limited range weapon where you have to be up close to the animals to tell better whether it is or not. We don't want people taking 300-yard shots, walking up to an animal and saying oops, it's not a three point.

Sam Carpenter: During that time of the year they won't have to be taking 300-yard shots.

Anis Aoude: We didn't want to take that chance.

Sam Carpenter: But also, we've also got youth and elderly using 60 percent of those tags. That kind of straps, especially the elderly where scopes are not allowed with muzzleloaders and so on. Aren't we concerned with that aspect?

Anis Aoude: Not enough of a concern to overwhelm the other concerns.

Sam Carpenter: Okay.

Jake Albrecht: Jim Edwards.

James Edwards: Sam I was just wondering on this cap that you're talking about on the archery, was you talking about a cap on each unit or was it? Because the statewide cap is 16,000 on archery still, isn't it?

Anis Aoude: It is. Yeah I think he was talking about regional (unintelligible).

Sam Carpenter: Right, regional, yes.

Jake Albrecht: Are there any other questions from the RAC? I have one Anis. Was there any consideration on the spike unit hunts of not holding a spike hunt on the unit that does not meet at least 80 percent of their objective? Something similar to that would be the Monroe unit where their objective's at 15, and I think their count was somewhere around 800.

Anis Aoude: Are you talking population objectives?

Jake Albrecht: No. Not hunting on that unit as a spike unit.

Anis Aoude: Are you taking about population objectives?

Jake Albrecht: Uh huh.

Anis Aoude: No. Population objectives are not taken into consideration because we're harvesting, again, males. And we look at age in the harvest and bull cow ratios.

Jake Albrecht: On the La Sal Delores Triangle on the archery, does that interfere with any of the other dates?

Anis Aoude: No

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Then I have one more question; the way I remember the spike elk hunt used to end on a Tuesday and now we end on a Thursday. It seems to me like years ago it was brought up to end on a Tuesday because they felt like the last two days or three days that there was huge numbers of spike success. Do you remember the history on that?

Anis Aoude: I don't remember the history but we had the same recommendation last year and it passed. Basically it's to make it the same as the any bull. And harvest success on spike hunts are very low, I mean we're talking 15 percent success. So it's not, I don't think it's going to spike up anywhere near what people think it will.

Jake Albrecht: Ok I remembered one other question; on muzzleloader deer, it starts on 9/23 and goes through 10/1. On muzzleloader elk it starts on 9/23 and goes through 10/1. Is there a way that we could give the muzzleloader limited entry people a couple of days where they're

not, I mean basically that's once in a lifetime also. Is there a way that we could give them a couple of days without having the interference?

Anis Aoude: Interference with, all of the rest of the deer hunters.

Jake Albrecht: Limited entry muzzleloader deer.

Anis Aoude: Uh, no. We didn't consider that. I mean if that's something you want to recommend feel free to do so. As far as the way we could fit everything together it doesn't . . .

Jake Albrecht: If I'm correct that probably starts on a Thursday, right?

Anis Aoude: Which?

Jake Albrecht: The 9/23.

Anis Aoude: I think it's a Wednesday.

Jake Albrecht: I think that's kind of the history on the muzzleloader units.

Anis Aoude: Right. But I think it's moved to a Wednesday this year.

Jake Albrecht: And uh, your cut off day on the rifle hunt was on a Monday? So you gave them two days. So there's not much room there either is there.

Anis Aoude: Right.

Jake Albrecht: Is there a way that you could start the muzzleloader elk on the 9/23 and bring the deer hunters in on, like that Friday and let them go their . . .?

Anis Aoude: There's, I mean there's a lot of innervations but really the only way it works for us now is the way it is and that's why we recommended it. I mean you could change things, multiple different ways but then other things would have to change and it creates a chain reaction. I guess we could do it but that's not what we're recommending.

Jake Albrecht: Question Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Can you go back to your item number 6 on this? Doesn't that address exactly what Jake was asking or am I mistaken?

Anis Aoude: That was archery.

Sam Carpenter: According to this it says the gap between rifle and muzzleloader hunt. This is item number 6 in the handout that you sent us.

Anis Aoude: Right, right. No you're talking about limited entry elk and limited entry muzzleloader elk. What he's talking about is muzzleloader deer hunters general season and

muzzleloader elk limited entry.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Do we have any other questions Jim?

James Edwards: Anis I have a real problem in perceiving in my mind of this general season deer hunt starting the same time as these limited entry hunts. It seems like to me that's going to be a real boundary enforcement problem for the Division. And they have so few people to enforce I can't, it just seems like to me it may be real hectic.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, Like I mentioned in all the other limited entry units are that way already and have been and they haven't been an issue. So we're just changing these to align and make everything similar. I mean the folks are out there already in full force for the general season so, you know, everybody's out, both all the law enforcement and all the hunters.

Jake Albrecht: Steve Dalton.

Steve Dalton: Yes Anis, I'm still having problems trying to get along with this change of season dates on the rifle opening on the Paunsaugunt unit. Part of those season dates on the Paunsaugunt was so that you didn't have all the rifle hunters crowded into one little unit down next to the Arizona boarder and that's looks like exactly what you're going to have right now. It used to be with the earlier opening dates some of those deer were still up a little higher in that country and hadn't made their move yet.

Anis Aoude: Currently the rifle season on the Paunsaugunt has the lowest satisfaction rate of all the hunts, which tells me that hunters are having a hard time finding the deer. So actually putting it later will increase the satisfaction rate because they can find the deer. They're not during their migration and the satisfaction rate will actually go up. They may kill a few more bigger bucks but it is a once in a lifetime opportunity. It's a premium limited entry. And we have a lot of complaints about that early October hunt. Not to mention if we go statewide spike. If we leave it where it is you'll have spike hunters interfering with a premium limited entry deer hunt. So, I mean there's lots of reasons why it needs to move.

Jake Albrecht: Ok does that conclude our questions from the RAC? Okay, questions from the public. Please come up to the mic. If a lot of these questions are answered in some of the other people's questions I'd ask that you not come forward and repeat what's, you know, very similar in what's going to be presented.

Questions from the Public:

Ben Louder: My name's Ben Louder. I've got a few questions for Anis. Anis, first of all the Division provided data to the RACs that showed there was no biological need to force archers to pick their region, and thus the Division recommended statewide archery last year. My question now to Anis is, is there a biological reason at this point to do away with statewide archery?

Anis Aoude: No there's not a biological need.

Ben Louder: Thank you, my second question is; it's been stated that the reason that you're recommending that archers pick their region is to find out the numbers of hunters that are hunting in the various regions the first two weeks of the hunt. My question to that is could that not be accomplished with a survey or a mandatory reporting kind of a thing?

Anis Aoude: Yeah it possibly could be. The thing is nothing that gets you better data than making people choose actually where they're going to hunt. So yeah you could get to it that way but it won't be as good a data.

Ben Louder: My third question is, it's been mentioned that the reason that we're looking at statewide, or picking your region for archery is due to crowding issues. My question to that is how many archers, according to your current numbers, are there hunting the Southern Region as opposed to how many rifle hunters are currently hunting the Southern Region?

Anis Aoude: There's currently about 5,000 arches and 2,000 dedicated hunters that hunt archery in the Southern Region. Now what we don't know is when they're actually hunting it so that's why we're doing this. As far as rifle and muzzleloader combined it's 18,000 cap. How many of those, it depends from year to year which is more, it's about 13,000 rifle hunters.

Ben Louder: Thank you.

Dallas Smith: Dallas Smith from Leeds. Anis, I have three questions. The first one pertaining to the statewide spike; what consideration have we looked at for collateral damage on the mature bull populations in those units?

Anis Aoude: I'm not sure what you mean by collateral damage. Like people shooting them by accident.

Dallas Smith: How many mature bulls will accidentally be or purposely be taken.

Anis Aoude: Yeah. Uh, that hasn't been an issue on the current units we have, we have that. At least not to the level where, you know, I'm sure it happens but not to the level where it concerns us going this direction.

Dallas Smith: And then on the archery proposal to choose your region, what criteria will be used to determine whether it's over crowding? Are we going to use hunters per acre, hunters per deer, based upon the regional caps? What will the criteria be and why isn't that being recommended along with your data survey?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, being a social issue it's hard to put criteria on it. Everybody perceives crowding differently. Really what we're trying to figure out is get the number and then try to figure out . . . We know what the population of deer is. We know how many can be harvested. When it comes to overcrowding it becomes more of a who things it's overcrowding. So it's not really not for me to say what is overcrowding. I can just say X amount hunted there and leave it up to whoever's going to decide what overcrowding is.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any other questions from the public? This is questions and not comments people.

Lee Tracey: This is a question. Lee Tracey, Cedar City. I have three questions. Would the split statewide hunt affect any of the archery extended areas and programs?

Anis Aoude: No.

Lee Tracey: Can you give us the reason why the split season ended on September 1st as opposed to some other date? This includes more than half of the season because it includes three out of four weekends and eleven out of twenty weekdays, was there a reason for that particular date?

Anis Aoude: Not a biological reason, basically it was a good break point. That could be changed. Our main intent is to at least include two weekends in that first week.

Lee Tracey: And the third question is about the spike elk hunts; would the statewide spike elk hunt require a spike only tag and prohibit hunting, those people from hunting any bull units? In other words I live in Cedar City, do I have to make a choice between south of SR-14 or north of SR-14?

Anis Aoude: Are you talking archery or . . . Archers currently don't have to but if they're in a spike unit they have to shoot a spike and if they're in an any bull unit. Everybody else does have to pick whether they buy and any bull unit or a spike unit. But it's currently in place archers can hunt either.

Bart Hansen: Bart Hansen. My first question for Anis is the very first survey they did showed the hunter satisfactions and dissatisfaction, archery was on every single one had the highest satisfaction yet now we want to go ahead and change it. So I was curious as to what the motive is on that. And also, on the way they came up with that data was on a survey that was random with a very small sampling relative to the number of people hunting. Why is that good enough for that but it's not a good enough database to decide how many archers you (unintelligible) area for what opening weekend?

Anis Aoude: Yeah and archery tend to be, I'm not sure it's the archers that are pushing this. I think there are other social factors. So it really has nothing to do with archer satisfaction, it has to do with other issues. Now as far as why would this be a better way, because basically you are getting everybody versus a sample. Not saying that satisfaction, I mean you could do it both ways and you'd come up with the same solution. This would be more definitive because a lot of times when we do surveys we get exactly that, you know you only pooled X amount. Well statistically it's valid but since this is an issue that's mostly what people perceive we want it to be more definite than just doing a survey.

Bart Hansen: On follow up on that would a mandatory survey from all archers work?

Anis Aoude: I don't know how you'd enforce a mandatory compliance.

Bart Hansen: Okay. Second question is on the statewide spike issue, the current elk management plan calls for a reduction in spike tags and an increase in mature bull tags yet this recommendation will do the exact opposite, it will increase spike tags and decrease the number of mature bull tags you can give as you lower the number of bulls being recruited in the herd. What is the purpose for that?

Anis Aoude: I think what you are referring to is the first iteration of the statewide plan, the one we actually had lowered the age objectives. When we lowered the age objectives they recommended decreasing the number of spike tags. But then we subsequently increased those age objectives again so now we have higher age objectives so we don't need that lower harvest in the spike hunting. So that changed about, that's statewide's plan. Yeah but that plan has gone back and forth a few times. It's probably an old copy that's on the website.

Bart Hansen: Okay. And my third one is um, currently right now I heard some comments about changing the rifle season dates so that there's not the conflicts with the new spike tags and what not, and there's concerns about even with, a mention about the muzzleloader. If the archery guys, excuse me I am an archer if you haven't figured that out yet. Archers have to compete with the limited entry, I had a limited entry archery tag this year so I'm speaking from personal experience and I have no complaints, but my point is the limited entry archery guys compete with the general deer hunters the whole hunt and they compete with the spike hunters all but the last five days that was a new change this year. Now you're going to make that statewide. Are you going to give the archers the same benefits that you're giving the others or are we just kind of the afterthought on that?

Anis Aoude: I guess I'm not sure what the question gets to. There's muzzleloader elk hunters have muzzleloader deer hunters that they compete with. It's true the rifle hunters don't compete with anyone but I guess everybody has made some kind of concession.

Bart Hansen: Okay, but the limited entry muzzleloader hunters do not compete with spike hunters and the archers do. But now we're going to introduce that out to every limited entry unit. So I was curious as to why are we concerned about changing that for the limited entry deer or for the elk, like on the Paunsaugunt, but now on the San Juan for a limited entry archery hunt you, for a deer, you're going to be competing with spike hunters and limited entry archery elk hunters at the same time?

Anis Aoude: I guess that's just the way it is.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions?

Rick Carter: My name's Ray Carter. Anis has already said that there's no biological reason for having us go to a 9-day pick your season then go wherever. The big thing is personal feelings, the overcrowding. A lot of people in the southern unit feel that there's overcrowding. Now we want to add in the spike hunters. What's going to be done to I guess offset the overcrowding that's going to happen on the muzzleloader and all the other seasons that are going to go with that?

Anis Aoude: None of the other spike seasons overlap so they'll all have their own seasons. So there shouldn't be a crowding issue. You're only adding 6,000 permits that are going to be defused statewide. So it shouldn't, there should not be a crowding issue.

Rick Carter: So nobody's going to be going to any other units in the southern unit. Right now we had a big problem with the Fish Lake. You don't think that's going to carry on to any other areas of the southern unit?

Anis Aoude: Are you talking archery, specifically or?

Rich Carter: Yeah.

Anis Aoude: Because archery there may be. But the other weapon types probably not.

Rick Carter: So there is a potential for statewide . . .

Anis Aoude: There is a potential, yes.

Steve Nielson: My name's Steve Nielson. I'm representing the Monroe Mountain Landowner's Association. With the major decline in size and amounts on the limited entry units that we're obviously seeing, why would the Division even consider, this is my question, why would the Division even consider hunting spikes on these limited entry units?

Anis Aoude: What was the first part of your comment, or your question? Considering . . .

Steve Nielson: With the obvious decline in size and amounts of the elk on these limited entry units why would the Division even consider a spike hunt on any of these units?

Anis Aoude: The reason we are considering spike hunt on all of these units is because all of them have a high bull to cow ratio that needs to be decreased.

Steve Nielson: On these limited entry units we manage the mature bulls by age class not by cow to bull ratio. So why are we managing the spikes this way?

Anis Aoude: There comes a point when your bull to cow ratio becomes so high that actually your production suffers. Basically on populations where you have to maintain a certain number you end up killing more cows than you bulls. So when you have fewer cows in the population that produce fewer calves, which hurts your population long term, it's best to have a lower bull to cow ratio, not real low, but then we have current, to increase production of calves.

Jake Albrecht: Are we out of questions? Okay, we're going to go to comments from the public. If you're an individual you are allowed three minutes. If you're representing the organization you are allowed five minutes. We have a couple of cards in here where I kind of made an exception for the Bowman Association have three different proposals they'd like to bring to us and they only have two gentleman doing that so one of the people will be presenting one additional item there. The one thing I would say is if somebody's already made your comment, it's very similar to yours, per time if you could just come up and say this

proposal's already been presented and we'll go on to the next one. Our first one is from the Big Game Recommendation; this is from the Beaver SFW. It says, we support as written the DWR proposal of the spike bull only hunt. We recommend a 5-day rifle hunt, a 7-day muzzleloader hunt, and a 21-day archery hunt for the Southern Region beginning in 2009. And I'm assuming that's for deer. So that one is out of the way. Our next one is Lee Tracey; he's an individual, which agenda is Statewide Archery Proposal. Lee you have three minutes.

Comments from the Public:

Lee Tracey: In light of the fact that I didn't realize that there would be no cap on that statewide archery hunt I'm going to have to modify my presentation a little bit. First of all you have in your hands a map of the State of Utah. That contains the ownership of all of the State of Utah. And just to let you know why the Southern Utah unit is so popular, the Northern area is primarily private land and there isn't much public land up there plus there's a high percentage of the population. That's the same with the Central unit. The Northeastern unit has quite a bit of public land but it also has a lot of Native American or Tribal Lands. The Southwestern unit has a lot of public land as well but there's a lot of slot canyon country there and it's not real contiguous for most of us to go hunting in those types of areas. That's why the Southern unit is so popular. We have the most public land there is and we have flat top mountains and beautiful scenery and so people tend to come here for some of those social reasons as well as the other. So even though we're not talking about limiting the statewide archery hunt to region only this year, or at least there's no cap on it, and I can still hunt up my Cedar Mountain, but that's something to consider when that comes up. Also, the perception that the area is crowded is not necessarily due to the hunters that are in the area and certainly not due to the deer hunters in the area because the elk hunt goes on at the same time and that the Southern unit is very, very popular with a lot of other recreationists who tear up and down the mountains in their ATVs, and the local woodcutter, firewood cutters and stuff are very popular there. And since there's no real biological reason for this change I can't imagine why the Division of Wildlife Resources who's designated to manage our herds are doing anything that would jeopardize the hunters. I know if we end up going to the split season I'm going to switch to rifle and those rifle hunters are going to have more competition.

Jake Albrecht: Our next one is Scott Weatherspoon. And Tim Park, you're following if you want to come up also.

Scott Weatherspoon: Okay, I'm against the statewide spike proposal. This proposal does two things, it hurts the guys applying for limited entry tags and plugs up the bonus point system. Here's my example; I'm going to use the Dutton and the Boulder limited entry units. These limited entry units sit side by side and are pretty much separated by an asphalt road. The Boulder gives spike tags and the Dutton does not. The Dutton issues a total of 145 big bull tags. The Boulder spike area only issues a total of 83 big bull tags. That is a difference of 62 big bull tags. To put this into perspective you have to look at the bonus point system as well. If a hunter had 5 points with the current system right now for the Dutton early hunt, he or she is guaranteed a tag in 37 years if you are the last one in the point group to draw. That is a long time for a shot at a branched antlered bull. In fact, if I had 5 points I'd be 73-years-old before I'd be guaranteed a shot at a branched antlered bull. This is excessive. The new proposal would further hurt the 50,000 plus people putting in for the chances at a branched antlered bull

every year. A bull is a bull whether you kill them as a spike or as a 6-point. I personally believe the guys putting in for these units need their chances at a branched antler bull; that is what they want. I believe we should keep the statewide spike units we already have. I just don't believe we should have any more. There is enough opportunity in this state to meat hunt or to fill your freezer if you want by applying for already spike elk hunts, cow elk hunts, antelope doe hunts, mule deer doe hunts, cow moose hunts, rabbit hunts and bird hunts. There is not enough opportunity to hunt a branched antlered bull in this state. I'd like to see more big bull tags increased instead of having spike hunts.

Jake Albrecht: Tim Park, you're followed by Ed Muir.

Tim Park: My name's Tim Park, I just represent (unintelligible) archers and UBA. And I would just like to concur with what the UBA recommends about keeping the archery season the same way it has been and not having to select, or say what you wanted to do the first nine days or whatever it is. And then also about, I don't know if it's been proposed yet, about the 1,000 additional archery tags and about the youth tags. That's it. Thanks.

Jake Albrecht: Ed Muir. You're followed by Bart Hansen.

Ed Muir: Ed Muir, Springville, representing Timpanogos Archery Club and UBA. First of all we had a proposal brought up by UBA and it needs to be read before we bring our comments into it.

Jake Albrecht: Who's going to do that and we'll let them do that.

Ed Muir: Jerry Slaw. Is that okay?

Jake Albrecht: That will be great. Maybe we ought to get all three of those in and then we'll have the comments after that. So the other gentleman will come up and we'll hear those. Go ahead.

Jerry Slaw: Thank you for your time. My name's Jerry Slaw, representing the Utah Bowman's Association and Bow Hunters of Utah. We have a proposal here, it talks about in an effort to collect data on bow hunter distribution the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources will be proposing to the RACs and the Wildlife Board that bow hunters should choose a hunt in one region until September 1st, during the general archery deer season. This proposal contains no restrictions that would limit the amount of hunters per region. Our initial feedback concerning the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources proposal indicates that one of two things is likely to happen, either bow hunters will remove themselves from the Southern Region or bow hunters will see this as a last opportunity to hunt the Southern Region before regional tag allocations are put into effect. BOU and UBA believe that any data gathered by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources will show these scenarios and not be an accurate measure of the typical hunting season. Utah Bowman's Association and Bow Hunters of Utah propose that the RACs and the Wildlife Board instruct the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources to assemble a committee that is directed to review data from the past several years concerning bow hunter density per region, review the social and political aspects of changing the general season statewide archery hunt, account for all contingencies involved in changing the format of statewide archery, ultimately

present a plan that is accepted by all concerned parties. The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources has a proven track record of success in their ability to resolve issues and receive input in a committee type format. Utah Bowman's Association and Bow Hunters of Utah request that this same format be followed. The committee should be made up of representatives from the sportsman's groups, the RACs, the Wildlife Board members, interested parties from the involved areas, as well as independent individuals that would like to provide input concerning this matter. Utah Bowman's Association and Bow Hunters of Utah would propose that the 2009 general season archery hunt follow the same format at the 2008 season. If you have any question I can answer any questions on that.

Jake Albrecht: We don't do any questions here. Brian Johnson, are you going to do the other two? Oh, Ben Louder.

Ben Louder: Yeah. Ben Louder, also representing Utah Bowman's Association. I've got a copy of the proposals I'm going to be presenting if you guys would like to see them I can bring them up to you. Yes, no?

Jake Albrecht: That would be good.

Ben Louder: Okay. Okay, current situation the DWR is currently looking for effective and lasting programs that attract and retain youth hunters. The archery deer hunt is a great way to introduce youth to the sport and to the outdoors. The DWR has removed tags; deer tags from various hunts and has expressed an interest in possibly removing additional tags from the Northern Region. Currently the DWR is issuing tags below the deer management cap, which is resulting in revenue loss for the DWR. Utah Bowman's Association is interested in helping to find effective solutions that add value to the DWR and Wildlife Board's initiatives to increase deer herd populations, habitat, and other conservation needs. We also recognize the need for programs that support the financial needs of the State in order to keep progressive wildlife management focused and to insure a healthy long lasting state program. We further recognize that all sportsmen's groups need to cooperate and find common ground to improve all hunting opportunities in the state. Our intent is to work towards these goals and insure that if opportunities or any restrictions on any group is imposed that the end outcome supports the overall DWR and Wildlife Board objectives without bias to any single hunting group. That being said here are our current proposals; the second proposal from the Utah Bowman's Association we are proposing to initiate a statewide-unlimited archery deer youth hunt. Supporting details for that is that there are many problems and difficulties in recruiting and developing and mentoring youth into the hunting and shooting industry. The current three season youth deer hunt is a great program but today is restrictive by nature of requiring the youth to participate in the general region rifle hunting drawing. This proposal would be to make available an unlimited number of statewide archery specific youth deer tags. The primary purpose would be to attract youth to the hunting and shooting sports industry in a safe and controlled way. Under this program youth would be required to hunt with a legal guardian. It is predicted that more youth might participate with the elimination of the firearm element for those youth whose parents are not comfortable with the current rifle youth hunt. It is predicted that roughly 2,000 youth might take advantage of this program, which would create additional to all current deer tags available. This would also create a gauge for the DWR on future hunting recruitment and retention of youth. Bow hunting success rates are among the lowest of all hunting groups. The

addition of additional unlimited-statewide youth archery deer hunting opportunity would have an insignificant impact on harvest rates as the youth portion of the archery hunters would be far less than the normal archery success rate. The third proposal that UBA is making tonight; UBA proposes that an additional 1,000 archery deer tags be allocated to the archery deer hunt cap, which would put it to 17,000. In the last few years the archery deer licenses have sold out and it is predicted that in 2009 all archery deer tags will be sold during the draw process. Adding an additional 1,000 tags to the archery deer cap will increase revenue for the DWR. Under the current statewide archery hunt these additional tags would be distributed normally which would insignificantly increase archery hunters in all regions. With the low archery success rate these additional hunters would not significantly increase overall harvest but would again increase DWR revenue and would still keep total deer licenses under the management cap. Success rate of selling all 1,000 additional tags would further improve the understanding and demand for archery deer hunting licenses in the state which could help the DWR in future planning of total deer license allocations between the various hunting groups. We see this as a true win-win situation for all sportsmen. Thank you. If there's any question I could field those. No questions? Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, if I understand that right that's the three proposals by the Bowman Association. Am I correct? Okay. Our next one is Bart Hansen. You will be followed by Greg McGregor.

Bart Hansen: I don't think that Ed got his comments in if you wanted them first. Okay, my name's Bart Hansen. I am representing the Stansberry Oquirrh Bowman Association. I didn't put that on there, I apologize. First comment is, is my concern on the statewide spike cap or limit on the region is because of population issues and now they're wanting to go statewide spike hunting for elk, which will push how many more additional archers into the Southern Region during the archery season, which will increase to the perceived overcrowding issue. I think that it's kind of you're being counterproductive there. And also by forcing archers to pick a region you're going to have skewed data because as was mentioned by Mr. Slaw, you're going to have archers trying to play the numbers game trying to manipulate the numbers. I think a survey is sufficed in the management decisions made by the deer committee. They should be good enough for statewide archery as far as whether it's an overcrowding issue or not. Thank you.

Greg McGregor: Greg McGregor, Santa Clara, Utah. Mr. Chairman. Chairman Albrecht, Mr. Messerly, members of the RAC, we appreciate the fact that you are here this evening. I know what a sacrifice it is on our behalf, first hand. We all appreciate; you should be applauded for your efforts. The Southern Region gets 18,000 deer tags of which 6,500 more or less, it's been told to me that 60 to 65 percent of those tags are taken up by the dedicated hunters who are on top of the list to choose their region of choice. Those tags are drawn before the general season happens. They can hunt all three seasons. They hunt the archery, they hunt the muzzleloader, they hunt the rifle. That is about a six-week period of time, not including the couple of weeks that are in between those hunting dates. Lifetime license holders are given their region of choice. I don't know the number of lifetime license holders but they also come off the top of the cap for the Southern Region. Same perhaps, that the same percentages hold true are the 60 to 65 percent of those are going to be included in that percentage for the Southern Region. The youth draw takes another 15 percent off the top before the general draw

happens. You take the 15 percent, that's 2,700 more tags that come off the top before the general season happens. The youth, if they draw a rifle tag, they can also hunt all three seasons, they hunt the archery, they hunt the muzzleloader, and they hunt the rifle. More pressure. Based on those numbers plus or minus 10,000 tags are already drawn out of the Southern Region before the general draw happens. Add to that the 16,000 statewide archery tags that come into that, and I'm not saying they're all from other areas; I'm including hunters that are from the Southern Region also. I'm not going to exclude the Southern Region hunters. If the percentages hold true with the dedicated hunters, and say there's 50 to 60 percent of statewide archers that come to the Southern Region to hunt that would be another 8,500 hunters in the mountains of the Southern Region. Now granted I empathize with the Northern Region, private property galore, not enough habitat, no areas to hunt. What we're dealing with here is a social issue not a biological issue. According to the biologists we have the numbers to back what the management objective has for our mule deer population. What we need to do is for all these groups to come together and some have got to give a little and some have got to give more than a little in order to pacify the masses. As it stands right now our average age of our average hunter is declining and declining rapidly. Youth recruitment is on the, is almost nonexistent and if we don't do something to get those kids some rewards, other than, and hunter's rewards. Standing, sitting there in the RAC several years ago I heard time after time, time after time, how the average urban farmer or rancher that just wanted to draw a tag and go hunt deer. That opportunity is almost passed him by. He throws his arms in the air and says, to hell with it I'm not going to hunt anymore. We're losing masses. We lose masses, we lose our support base. The legislature will look at us at 25,000 hunters and say they're a minority out there; we don't need to throw any money at them. We have got to do something. We have got to do something with the statewide archers. And I archery hunt. I'm not saying it has to go away. There has to be some concessions given. The dedicated hunters have to give a little bit. There has to be some, the Beaver unit, the Cedar unit, the Pine Valley unit, they're just get inundated with hunters. A youth goes out there and hunts and if he isn't going to see a buck or isn't going to have a chance to kill a buck he's not going to want dad to take him back the next year. The numbers may vary a little bit but you can see the train of thought here. It hold true. I presented this to the Wildlife Board for several years, these gentlemen have heard it, and they have concurred that it needs to be looked. Also, I think one thing we really need to look at is ATVs. We need to develop some programs with the BLM, with the Forest Service and get those ATVs out of the backcountry. That's going to be our demise right there. And also, I say no spike hunting in those limited entry units. We need to grow big bulls. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Greg. Jeremy Snell.

Ed Muir: Ed Muir, Timpanogos Archery, Utah Bowman's Association. A lot of the crowding issues that we're dealing with, bow hunters in the southern part of the state is the time of the year we're lumped in with all recreation use, wether it's camping, ATV or what. I've hunted the Monroe during the bow hunt. There's not a place you can go on the Monroe that this Piute trail, or whatever, we have the trail system that you people advertise all the time. These people are competing with the bow hunters, or lumped in with the bow hunters. That's part of your crowding issue. That's something, it needs to be looked at. I'd like to concur on all three issues that the Utah Bowman's Association has put up. Thank you for your time.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Ed. Jeremy Snell, and then you're followed by Cody Bracken.

Jeremy Snell: My name's Jeremy Snell. I'm from Eureka, Utah. I'm here tonight to present an idea to the council. We met with the Wildlife Board a few years ago; I believe it was four years ago about trying to establish some hunts for mobility impaired. Before that we didn't have anything. We had a COR that allowed individuals to shoot from a vehicle but that, and a 30-day extension on limited entry hunts but that was about it. Four years ago they passed a special season for any bull hunts during the youth hunt as well as a five-day extension on the deer hunt prior to the general season deer. What we've looked at is it's been hard for us to try and harvest any animals on those hunts. And what we're proposing is the establishment of a mobility impaired limited entry hunts. And I gave each of you a copy of our proposal. A lot of it mimics what New Mexico does. There are quite a few of our neighboring states that does some sort of mobility impaired hunts for handicapped individuals. And we're proposing that we implement some sort of a system for that. It's hard for us to harvest an animal. I mean if we can't do it from roadway or off of an ATV or something it's not going to happen. We can't get out and tramp the hills like we used to and it makes it difficult. And as mobility impaired hunters we've started to get together and we've started to recognize that need. And as we talk with the general public we think that there's enough support behind this that we think that this is the time that we need to try and propose something. And I don't want to belabor this and go through this point-by-point but the first thing that we want is a mobility impaired limited entry hunt. And that is setting aside some tags from deer, elk, and antelope limited entry units that are across the state. We went through and we provided a list of recommended units to you guys but by no stretch is that set in stone. Those are just units that we felt some of have had experience on and we feel that they are more accessible units than some of the others across the state. And as you can see the tag numbers that we are requesting are quite low compared to other states. For example, New Mexico they issue 7,000 mobility impaired tags between deer, elk, and antelope. So the 60 tags that we're requesting pales in comparison to that. We just want to try and get something set aside to where we can put in for that and if we can draw that then we can go out and have a good quality hunt. And as it stands it's hard for us to try and enjoy a general season hunt. It's almost impossible. Evidently tonight the overcrowding is a hot topic. But at least folks that are able-bodied can get up and can go out and still get away from the roads and get away from the people by choice. We can't. We are limited to that. So that's why we want to implement this limited entry hunt. And a lot of the verbiage is included there for you guys to look over, and we certainly, we'll take any recommendations on that. The second part of our proposal is a change in the general season deer extension. Currently it's 5 days prior to the hunts which starts on a Monday. That makes it difficult for us because we, as mobility impaired hunters; we need an able-bodied person to be able to go hunt with us. We can get in the truck and we can go but if we harvest an animal, what do we do, you know? We can't, we can't handle that. So what's happened is where that starts on a Monday we have to have an able-bodied person take off work to try and accompany us on that hunt. And it's getting harder and harder in these economic times to try and talk somebody or one of your buddies or family members into dumping five days of work to try and take you out and go hunting. So what we're requesting is that that special season, I think that's the wording that's in the proclamation, special season extension be changed from the 5 days prior to the general deer season to the second Saturday in November and to run for 5 consecutive days. So the reason we came up with that was that's the first weekend that's available that there's no other general season hunts that are going on. And we feel that if this season extension is going to be beneficial to us then it's got to be a time where there's no other general seasons that are going

on that we can get out and we can actually have a chance of harvesting an animal. The 5 days prior to the general season, as it stands, you know most of us will go out, if we spend two or three days before the hunt scouting it and we're competing with scouters, they're mad at us, they're wondering why we're in the field with a rifle, and it hasn't been a pleasant experience for us. So there's really two items there, one is the limited entry hunts and the second is the consideration of changing that special season extension. I just, again, you guys have that and I would hope that you would take the time to read through it. And if you have any questions contact us or whatever need be. But I just appreciate you guys taking the time to hear me.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Jeremy for your time and effort. Cody Bracken, you're followed by Brian Johnson.

Cody Bracken: Cody Bracken from St. George, also a member of Dixie Wildlife and a very avid bow hunter. There's a lot of talk about the 5-day rifle hunt being a basically a 5-day opener. There's no difference between the 5-day rifle hunt and the archery hunt. I spent 18 days this year in the field on the archery hunt and I dealt with 18 different guys every single day. It took me 19 days to finally catch up with the buck that I ended up killing on the muzzleloader hunt as a dedicated hunter. The statewide archery is a huge problem. Where it's way overcrowded. Like I said, I'm a huge bow hunter. You know we bitch and complain but as archers we, it's as good as it gets. I mean we've got the longest season, I mean we hunt 28 days. We don't have a statewide rifle hunt. We don't have a statewide muzzleloader hunt. So why the hell would we have a statewide archery hunt? I would propose to do away with the statewide archery hunt and let the guys that want to hunt archery take a chance and draw for it. Thanks.

Jake Albrecht: Brian Johnson.

Brian Johnson: Brian Johnson. I live in the Southern Region. And I also am an avid archery hunter. I spent I don't know how many days on the unit. I didn't perceive an overcrowding issue. I got off the road a little bit. It seemed to work out just fine for me. When I was on the road it was pretty bad because there were cars going both ways but as soon as I got off the road it seemed to work out pretty good. So I propose, I am in agreeance (sic) with Utah Bowman's Association, all three of their recommendations. As far as the statewide, I like the statewide archery. I'm all for opportunity. There's not reason, in my mind there's no biological reason, was stated earlier, I don't see a reason to take opportunity. And I think that the numbers are going to skew this year if we go to pick your region. And I thank you guys for your time. , I really appreciate it. Thanks.

Jake Albrecht: Jeff Barlow, you're next, followed by Nolan Gardner.

Jeff Barlow: Jeff Barlow, St. George, Utah. I am also an avid bow hunter. And by the way I do get off the road a long ways. And I do run into people. I do run into people everywhere I seem to go in the Southern Region. The proposals that the DWR has come up with with the split season on the archery seems to work very well in my mind. I guess we'll, to me a survey can be skewed because people can lie on a survey. When they actually have to put down information and choose that's a different story. That can't be skewed. So that's my comments. I would do away with that statewide archery and move it to split season archery.

Jake Albrecht: Nolan Gardner, you're followed by Stan Nielson.

Nolan Gardner: Nolan Gardner, St. George. One thing on the management tags, I'd like to see a bigger percentage of those go to the youth. I think it benefit us as hunters better. Also, a question, I'm sure I should have asked this earlier but when the survey was taken on the 9-day and 5-day hunts and they said that they killed more on the 5-day, I'm wondering what is the buck to doe ratio, I got a question and who do I ask it to? What was the buck to doe ration on the 5-day versus the 9-day hunt, when this survey was taken? Can I ask that question now?

Anis Aoude: Well it was taken over a long period of time. It wasn't a survey. It was data from harvest data. And buck to doe ratios have fluctuated throughout those years. They've been high and low. There wasn't one, it was over . . .

Nolan Gardner: Isn't the 5-day a lot higher buck to doe ratio?

Anis Aoude: No.

Jake Albrecht: No, it's all the same hunt.

Nolan Gardner: Huh?

Anis Aoude: No. We compared a different period in time when they had 5-day hunts and when they had 9-day hunts. So it wasn't at the same time. So I'm not sure. . .

Jake Albrecht: Okay, Nolan, so what's your comments then?

Nolan Gardner: All right. I don't trust that study. But she knew that's what I'd say. Uh, I like the proposal that the Division's doing on the split archery. I think that's a good start. I hope that the archery hunters appreciate that we've sacrificed the 5-day hunt all these years so they could have these nice bucks to come and chase. But anyway, thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Nolan. Stan Nielson, you're followed by Donnie Hunter.

Stan Nielson: I am Stan Nielson, representing myself to begin with and also the Monroe Cabin Owners Association that we have up on Monroe. We have a real concern with the lack of elk on Monroe Mountain. We have a cap, apparently, on Monroe Mountain set up by the legislature of 18,000 elk. And last year on their flight they counted 800. And I think you brought that up Jake earlier. That's got to be a concern that we're down 1,000 elk. As an example I spend weekends, just about every weekend on the Monroe. I have a cabin up there. And we go out every weekend and look for elk and look for quality elk. Besides the spider bull, which I was not privileged to see but I've seen lots of pictures of, we didn't see many quality bulls up there this year. We hunted, my son and I hunted all but one day of the muzzle hunt, all but one day of the rifle hunt. The total elk that we saw, we don't want to talk deer right now, just elk, I saw 12 cows, 8 calves, and one rag-horn bull in that time. That's prime time of the morning, prime time of the evening. The elk herd is basically depleted on Monroe Mountain. It's a concern for me. When we start talking about the spikes, on limited entry and they're going to take spikes off that mountain, spikes grow up to be big bulls. And if we take the

spikes, we are already eliminating the big bulls and if we take the spikes off we're going to be really hurting on that mountain. The, I know we have a management plan. And that management plan was for 5 years. That management plan if it's not working and we have to go another 2 or 3 years with that there won't be any animals up there if we keep hunting that way. And so my recommendation is number one, let's totally do away with the limited entry spike hunts, especially on Monroe Mountain. It will devastate the herd. I have a really good friend, he said if you go down there and speak say, no, and not only no but hell no, we don't want spikes taken off that mountain because they will grow up to be big bulls. And that's my recommendation that we do away with the spike hunt. Don't even consider it. Let's not take any cows off of that. Spikes grow up to be big bulls, as I've mentioned. Let's build a herd not destroy it. It has been a privilege to, I've had people from all over the state come down and go to my cabin and we go out for a night. We used to go out for a night and ride and see big, big bulls; we're not finding them anymore. We're not finding the big bulls. And I think Paul had an opportunity of hunting there last year and probably was quite shocked when he realized the big bulls are not up there any more like they used to be. Let's build that herd back and make it a premium herd. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Stan. Donny Hunter, you're followed by Todd Abelhouzen.

Donny Hunter: Chairman, RAC, I appreciate the opportunity to address you tonight. I'm Donny Hunter; I'm representing SFW, Iron County. First I'd like to talk about our deer and the way we hunt. The last few years our deer herds are starting to come back a little bit. It's looking a little better each year. Our mature bucks are looking a little better. Our habitat are looking a little better so we're doing some things that are working for us. We're liking it, at least the people that I talk to and I talk to a big variety of sportsmen. But we're liking what we're seeing and we're interested in staying with what we've been doing. And we think that the 5-day hunt is something that we need to stay with. We're willing to give up a little bit more to keep gaining. We're not there yet but we're getting there. We've talked a lot about archery, and this has been a recommendation that's been around for a long time but I think we need to just roll our sleeves up and do it. But we need to have a statewide draw. The permits need to be allocated for each region. And we don't want to sell any over the counter. I think that will take care of our problem there. And then I'd like to talk a little bit about our elk. Utah's got world-class elk hunting right now. And I don't want to take any chances to hurt that, what we've got. And I think adding these spike hunts to these other units will do that. If we have to have some more bulls harvested on those units maybe we could have a very limited spike hunt on them. I'm talking about 20 or 30 permits but not 17 or 16,000 and anybody can go anywhere they want. I think that would be a disaster. Appreciate your time.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks. Todd Abelhouzen, you're followed by Mike Twitchell.

Todd Abelhouzen: First of all a message from my wife, she said that this is a bad night to have this meeting. But an election update would be Obama leads in the electoral vote with 30 states, numbers in, 202 to 80. The popular vote is neck and neck, Obama is like 50 to 49 and the other two guys are splitting 1 percent. So that's a little stressful. So that my make me believe we all need to become bow hunters because we're not going to have any guns, potentially. And if we do have guns they uh, never mind. Um, the SFW position on the spike bull hunt is they do not want a spike, statewide spike bull hunt. The comments have been

made about why. Chad Nowers from Beaver called me and explained to me kind of their reasoning and how it has not affected Beaver. But it would really be nice if some of those spike bull hunters could go to other units to make Beaver a little bit better. So if it hasn't affected Beaver they shouldn't really care but they do. And I love Chad. And I'm sure all his guys had to drive a long ways to get here. So God bless America. A little history about the statewide archery hunt, and a group of us loaded in my wife's suburban and drove up to Salt Lake in a snow storm and we stayed up until 3 in the morning trying to get there, and got up at 6 and met with the SFW Board. The Dixie Wildlife Federation was not a chapter of SFW at the time but they respected our strength and our vision, and our vocality. Is that a word? Vocalization. We were strongly against a statewide archery hunt. It happened anyways. We also fought against the dedicated hunter program not being allocated 20 percent per region. And if you guys look back, we weren't prophetic, but the majority of the archery hunters, or a larger number, a ratio of archery hunters come to the Southern Region. For whatever reason they come. At least 49 percent and possible more of the dedicated hunters, and I think the numbers are right on at 49 percent, so that's 49,000 out of 10,000 come to the Southern Region. If we keep giving the perception ain't a perception, it's going to become a reality that it's going to be crowded in the Southern Region. So I heard a lot of predictions from, is it SUBA, UBA and BOU, and I want to complement the strength that they brought to this meeting. They brought them from Tooele. They brought them from, where else? Cedar City.

Jake Albrecht: Your time's about up Todd.

Todd Abelhouzen: Don't I get 5 minutes?

Jake Albrecht: Yeah. Did you set it at 5 or 3? Go ahead.

Todd Abelhouzen: Um . . . Chet, when does your term expire? Okay. Some of the myths are the archers don't have a negative impact on deer then why carry a bow, why not carry a camera? Um, I want to after I throw a few darts back because I've been getting them for the last 6 or 8 weeks, constantly. 15 to 20 e-mails a day. And we respect sportsman for all that we're trying to do. And if we sit here and fight amongst each other and act like a bunch of cry babies because we're not getting our own way, we're not going to have a 2-point to fight over. So let's get along. If you need to have a committee have it in Northern Utah and we will drive up. And we will come to your meeting. And we'll find a solution to this problem and we'll do whatever we can. There's no reason why you can't ask the bow hunters to pick their region this year. And if the bow hunters want to unite and try to screw up the numbers that's fine; but the reality of it is we've got to find a way to solve these problems. Because if we fight amongst ourselves we're going to get nowhere. And I think we just saw that, or we're going to see that tonight when we all drive home and realize that we're going to be run by a bunch of liberals in this country. So, thanks for your time.

Jake Albrecht: Mike you're next. But before you go I'd like to make a couple of comments. We've got about 30 more cards here, which is probably another hour. So if you're comments have already been spoke by somebody just say I agree with those and let's move on. But if they're not we'll be glad to hear them.

Mike Twitchell: I'll make this pretty short and concise then. If we want to do things in the state

of Utah that make sense let's do them. Let's pay attention to numbers; let's pay attention to studies and things that give us tangible proof. Okay? I think that crowding happens. Utah is in the top five, especially our little communities, for urban growth. It's going to make sense that we have more crowding issues. People are going to want to go to where they can hunt. My fear is in Cedar City if I leave or we change it then I'm not going to be able to hunt my back yard. And if it's a social issue and that's where my family's hunted for years that's where I want to go. So I'm going to agree with UBA to keep that, that's the way it is. So I recommend that we follow that. As far as the numbers things and the thing that I said that makes sense, let's go to a 9-day hunt. That's supposed to be addressed on this issue, if I remember correctly. If they're killing more deer in a 5-day hunt let's do a 9-day hunt. People can hunt longer. They can have that social aspect. But yet at the same time they're not taking as many animals. I think if people are judging the quality of the hunt on the social aspect, let's give them that and let's save our deer. Number 3, is I think that it's absolutely foolish to go to a no lead hunting bullet. I've reloaded for years. I come from a family that's reloaded. I am familiar with the products. And if the Division is going to go ahead and spend lots of money, unless these products are donated, I know the price that's involved, all no lead hunting bullets that I've ever seen are premium bullets. I use them. I believe in them but I believe also that we need to keep our budgets low. Let's put our money into conservation, not into some of these other things that don't make sense. Thank you. Mike Twitchell from Cedar City.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have Ray Carter and you're followed by Bart Hansen. Bart didn't you already speak once?

Ray Carter: First off I want to say I agree with the disabled hunters. I think we need to give them a little more. Second, most of my stuff's already been hit upon through people. Just really quick, SFW actually did a poll on their website about how many people are in favor of choosing their regions or going statewide. And it was almost 3 to 1 that want to keep it as it is with statewide archery. So just keep that in mind. I am against the statewide spike hunting just because of the overcrowding. Me, myself I hunt the southern area. Being one of the most populated areas that get hit, up on the Manti, I had the whole place to myself everywhere I went this year. As long as I got off the roads I had it to myself. So I don't think the overcrowding is specifically bow hunters, it's the campers, it's the elk hunters, it is the archery guys. And statistically it's only 31 percent of the bow hunters that are actually coming down here to bow hunt, so there's a lot of other things that are coming into play.

Jake Albrecht: Roy Hampton. You're followed by Randy Quail.

Roy Hampton: Roy Hampton, I'm from Utah Bowman's Association, Timpanogos Archers. I sat on the Mule Deer Committee and got hammered on this issue pretty heavily. So we beat it to death and I think needs to be buried, you know. We all like to hunt. We're all going to see hunters in the field. You're never going to get away from people. And the numbers are, there's 5,000 archery hunters that come to the south. 26,000 of you guys live in this south. Okay, so there's only 50 percent coming down. The dedicated problem is very big. Very big. There's 2,000 of them that hunt in there. So now there's 7,000. I still couldn't put the numbers together when I said 7,000 is less than 18,000 rifle hunters. And I hear that you do have a crowding problem with your rifle but it doesn't seem to be as bad as your archery hunt. Why is that? 7 is less than 18. I just don't understand why you guys are beating archery right to

death. You just hammer it. So, you know, I'm in favor of keeping statewide archery. I don't even hunt in the south but I feel like you, and that's why we sell all the tags. And that's why the Division went to statewide archery so they could sell them tags. It's hunter opportunity. We kill 20 percent statewide. We only kill 14 percent in the south. Do you know how many rifle killed? 40 percent. So 40 percent is getting killed by your rifle hunters, 14 percent is getting killed by your bow hunters. We don't have any reason not to be hunting in the south. You have the most huntable ground. It doesn't make sense. The north has the most tags and has less ground. So I'm in favor of keeping statewide archery. Another thing, on the youth, there was 1,500 youth that didn't draw. You lowered the age to 12 and then they can't draw a tag. So we felt like why not give them an opportunity to at least by a tag; and that would be that statewide-unlimited youth. At least they'd have an opportunity to buy a tag and keep hunting. I heard that just a little while ago about youth. So here's an opportunity they can still hunt. They might have to buy a bow to do it, and you know my opinion of bow hunting and rifle hunting is two different stories. You know bow hunting you learn how to hunt, rifle hunt you learn how to kill. So you know, you teach a kid how to hunt he's going to become a better hunter. So and then the 1,000 tags we feel like, you know we're selling the tags out, why not give us 1,000 and see if we can sell them. If we can that's more revenue, we're saving that many more deer. So, thank you. Appreciate it.

Jake Albrecht: Randy Quail. You're followed by Tom Nickerson.

Randy Quail: My name is Randy Quail; I'm from here in Cedar, Utah. I've been bow hunting for over 40 years and I'm going to do what you ask and make a long story short. I'm going to concur with what the Utah Bowman's Association asked in all three of their proposals. And over crowding is something that's going to be everywhere. It's not just unique to the south; you're welcome to Utah, that's just how it is anymore. Anyway, that's all I got to say.

Jake Albrecht: Thank you. Tom you are followed by Kenneth Edger.

Tom Nickerson: Tom Nickerson from Wayne County. I'm a southern archery hunter. I'm retired and I've hunted almost everyday of the deer archery for the past three years. And I don't see very much hunting pressure. And I don't see the need to eliminate statewide archery. The big decline in hunters nationwide is a serious issue for the future for this sport. We lose old hunters and we can't recruit youth for a variety of reasons, one of which is the increasing complexity of all these hunting regulations. I don't see any reason to add further to this complexity by eliminating statewide archery and replacing it with a much more complex system for no reason. We don't need any more senseless government regulation, got too much of that already. How can we be losing hunters and yet we're getting more overcrowded situation. I mean that doesn't add up. And the south is going to end up with a cap under this statewide archery loss. And a lot of southern hunters are going to be prevented from hunting the first two thirds of the season in the south where we live and I don't see any reason for that either. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Kenneth, you're followed by Allen Thompson.

Kenneth Edger: I am Kenneth Edger from (unintelligible) Archery in Yuba. I also support not getting rid of statewide archery. Statewide archery was originally made to retain and

encourage new hunters into the pool to help extend our sport for longer. To get rid of that is just another reason for people not to enjoy this great sport we all love. As they were saying, the archery hunters are only 30 percent of them are coming down here from statewide for the 16,000. It's nowhere near the 60 percent that was stated earlier. And as they said, an extra 2,000 are coming from dedicated hunters. So I just wanted to say that I agree with what UBA is proposing, and thank you for your time.

Jake Albrecht: Allen I have two cards here. If you can do those at the same time.

Alan Thompson: Absolutely, absolutely. Allen Thompson, Ivins, Utah, with the Bow Hunters of Utah. I concur with the statewide archery, so let's get that out of the way. We have a proposal. Due to the rapid growth in many areas of Utah and the loss of habitat deer populations find themselves in urban areas where there currently is no plan or means for their management. Numerous examples exist on the Wasatch Front and with continued building throughout the state it is certainly become an increasing issue. For this reason we propose that work begin on the establishment of an urban deer management program with archery as a principal means of harvest and the establishment of a committee to begin work on education and specialized training plan for those sportsman wishing to participate. This program would apply only to those deer populations residing within city limits or identified urban areas where the most practical method of harvest would be with a bow and arrow. It would not be recommended for application on the Wasatch Front extended area hunt. This program has been established in other states and has been found to be very effective at population control and management while providing the fish and game department with an economical way of managing these urban deer populations. Furthermore without such a program Utah sportsman will continue to lose opportunity and other costly measures will be needed draining the Division's needed resources. This program can become a tool for the Division to help municipalities find answers to increasing deer populations found within their city limits. In recent meetings with archery shops throughout the state BOU has found overwhelming support for such a program and has received numerous (unintelligible) to certify individuals to help teach this program and provide resources for the specialized training to take place. We encourage the RACs and Wildlife Board to be proactive in this measure for the reactive will only result in lost opportunity and further frustration for those seeking viable and economical means to control deer populations. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thank you. Steve Neilson, you are followed by Mitch Carter.

Steve Neilson: Steve Neilson, Monroe Mountain Landowners Association, I'm representing. I've listened tonight and I have not heard one person speak up in favor of the spike hunts, if I'm not wrong. The limited entry units going into spike hunts. And I have to agree with this 100 percent. I do not feel like we can afford hunting these spikes on these units. I have a cabin on Monroe Mountain. I spend a lot of time up there. I've seen what's happened since we've gone into this elk plan. The elk herd has diminished drastically. The size has gone down drastically. Quality is not there. We still have, I think 35 permits to be taken up there this year. I wouldn't be surprised if a lot of these people don't get elk. So I recommend no spike hunting on these units. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Mitch Carter has left the building. How about Dallas Smith, statewide archery.

Dallas Smith: My name's Dallas Smith. I'm out of Leeds, Utah. I'm also an avid archer. Hunt all over the state, not just in the southern but I do enjoy hunting the southern along with several of the other regions. For ten or twelve years now we've been, I used to sit on the Central RAC for ten years. We would hear this proposal come out of the south that there's overcrowding. I've hunted the south and I have my opinions on that, and it's my opinions. What I'd like to hear and what I've encouraged the Board to do, the RAC and Boards to is set up criteria to determine what overcrowding is. Some people in this room if there's 100 archers in the south it's overcrowded. So even if they cap the Southern Region, based on the same percentages as they do the general hunt it's only going to displace approximately 1,000 hunters. So is 1,000 hunters really overcrowding? I'm not in favor of the current system that they're talking about here. I think we need to do some studies. Mr. Abelhouzen said let's sit down and let's figure this out, what are the right numbers? Right now we're just throwing darts in the air and everybody's getting emotional. There are very passionate people in here. It's an emotional issue but let's put some type of sanity to it. Let's put some numbers to it that's manageable, controllable and can go across the board statewide. Because now we have the problem in the south, eventually the herds will come back in other parts of the state and we're going to start having problems there. So let's set precedence here. Let's put the numbers in place and let's manage to those numbers. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Jerry Slawth, bucks and bulls.

Jerry Slaw: Hi my name is Jerry Slaw, from Lehi, Utah. And all of my questions and concerns have been addressed. Personally as a representative from UBA want to thank the RAC and thank those for listening to what we had to say. And thank the Division for making recommendations and actually making things for forth. And we, I thank you for listening and listening to our recommendations. Thank you very much.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. We have one other letter that we need to read in. It's submitted by the BLM Henry Mountain Field Station. Is this out of the BLM office? Hanksville office. Okay. For 2009 the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources proposes to add an extra primitive buck hunt in the Henry Mountains, a premium limited entry unit. We are unclear as to why this unit is proposed under recreation objective number one the plan states that premium limited entry units should be managed for a three year average of 40 to 50 bucks / 100 does, and 30 to 40 percent of the harvest deer being 5-years of age or older. Table 5 shows that for the Henry Mountain herd the 3 year average buck doe ration is 46.3 below the 50 to 100 ratio established for increasing buck permits. The percentage of bucks 5-years-old is 57 percent which exceeds the 30 to 40 percent objective. This extra hunt has been described as targeting bucks with three points or less which would tend to further skew the age structure of bucks to an older age class, further than the 30-40 objective. The BLM has safety concerns with the proposed additional primitive buck hunt because it overlaps with the first 5 days of the second bison hunt. This results in mule deer archery and muzzleloader hunts occurring at the same time as the bison rifle hunt. The BLM has concerns with the cumulative effects of the successive hunts that occur in the Henry Mountain permit August through December. These effects include nearly continual disturbance to the animals being hunted and to other wildlife in the area. The long hunting season increases potential for road and resource damage caused by driving on wet muddy roads. The BLM lacks the ability to have hunter patrols and law enforcement to

monitor hunter activities, especially OHV use throughout the long hunting season. Also, there is little opportunity for other recreationists to enjoy the area where there isn't a hunting season. The following table of the 2009 proposed hunt season shows that there are few breaks in the hunting season, especially in November and December when wildlife are in a critical winter season. To alleviate this problem the BLM suggests that the bison hunts be condensed into fewer hunts, each with more hunters. These hunts could be spaced so that there would be more time between hunt seasons allowing animals and other resources a reprieve from continual activity in the area. And I'll give this to Doug so that we can get it into the proper minutes. Okay, since I read that letter we have one more that came in, it's Curtis Roundy from Cedar City; and he's talking for himself.

Curtis Roundy: It's been interesting sitting here listening to all the comments. And in the time that I've been here I've also developed some comments of my own. I am a dedicated hunter and a very avid sportsman. And I hunted this past year, the archery, the muzzleloader and the rifle hunt, very valiantly; and ended up taking a deer in the rifle hunt. My experience was that there were a few crowding issues but I didn't feel overcrowded. I felt like I had a fair chance at hunting the game in the area that I wanted to hunt. And I primarily hunted the Southern Region. My comments today are mainly on the 5-day versus the 9-day rifle season. My opinion is that the 5-day is beneficial in both ways, in number one, managing the deer herds to the status quo of what the Division wants to meet, and also, managing the deer herd for mature bucks. From what we've observed in the numbers the deer herds as far as being killed, numbers of animals being killed on the 9-day versus the number of animals being killed on the 5-day was less on the 9-day. My opinion on that is because people were holding out on the 9-day hunt for a more mature buck. And on the 5-day they felt a frantic need to kill the first deer that they seen on the 5-day. So the number of deer killed on the 5-day were up but the number of mature bucks were also up. The bucks that were being killed were primarily the smaller bucks. So I think it's beneficial to keep the 5-day and I also want to agree with the statements and the proposals of the UBA to keep the statewide archery. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Okay thanks. That concludes our comment cards so we'll go to comments from the RAC. Jim Edwards.

Comments from the RAC:

James Edwards: Mr. Chairman I have a couple of comments. One is if this is just a perceived crowding then maybe all these people ought to come down and go on just Beaver Mountain on the first day of the bow hunt and on Fillmore, because it is overcrowded. It is unbelievable. That area up there on Beaver Mountain is ten miles long and about two miles wide and there's got to be 15,000 people in there. Now that's overcrowding. Of course a lot of them's on the trail too, on the ATV trails. And then with this, the bow hunt of the uh, what we're talking about is the bow hunters, all 16,000 of them can put in for the Southern Region and they can hunt for 14 days. Then they can go anywhere they want. So what's the problem? I don't see where there's any problem. If you want to put in for the Southern Region you can hunt all 14 days. Rifle hunters only get to hunt 9. Muzzleloaders get to hunt 7. So I don't see where there's a problem with what Anis is trying to do. We're trying to get some data and I don't see any problem with that.

Jake Albrecht: Jack Hill.

Jack Hill: Yeah the thing that puzzles me is I think all these people that are hunting are all citizens of the State of Utah. And I've always thought that the Southern Region and the rest of the regions are part of the State of Utah. And as citizens of the State of Utah I think anyone can hunt in the Southern Region if they have the proper credentials and the equipment and everything is copasetic. I can't understand that. I... sorry.

Jake Albrecht: Any other comments from the RAC? Clair Woodbury.

Clair Woodbury: Yeah I just want, like Steve here said, where do we start? We had a lot of great comments from the public and from these hunting associations. I will just limit mine to one area so we can get on. The spike unit elk hunt, I think I counted seven or nine limited entry hunting areas in Southern Utah, or in the Southern Region, that would be opened up to hunters. And the spike elk hunt is the last, really the last over-the-counter rifle tag anybody can buy if they want to get their family together and go hunt. I think it's a great opportunity. I, I've hunted the Fish Lake unit and the Beaver unit for all of my adult life. And the spike hunt has not hurt the elk herds in these two mountains. If you drive up here to Kevin's Conoco you can see his brother's near state record elk hanging there that he got here on Beaver. I think it's just a great idea to open up all of the state to the spike hunt.

Jake Albrecht: Sam Carpenter.

Sam Carpenter: I agree with everyone else on where to start with all of this. I, myself I'm an avid archery hunter and have hunted the Southern unit and definitely, maybe have been being greedy because I've done it long enough that I have seen the crowding issue come in since the dedicated hunter program. What I would like to do if it is in order is to make a motion to try to set up a committee to try to resolve this issue, which was suggested by Todd earlier. And I don't know if that's something we can do at this point, to make a recommendation to do that because we've got, it's an awful lot of emotion. A lot of people come in here tonight and I can see there are some battles going on out there. I'm definitely, would like to see something resolved to where we really find out if we are crowded. I think the State's come out with a plan with the choosing their hunt to give us a base to see exactly what is going on. I think that is a good idea in that respect. Another thing, getting away from the archery issue, is that we did put together a committee, as many of you know, to make recommendations for these other hunts, the Paunsaugunt is what we put this committee together for and this is where we come up with the management hunt. If I didn't misunderstand Jake and what he read from the BLM, they were opposed to that hunt on the Henry's. Is that the way I can see that, that you read on the BLM? And really, when we come up with this management hunt idea it was for the Paunsaugunt. The Henrys were never discussed. The fact that it is a premium unit it was put into that bag because it is a premium unit along with the Paunsaugunt. So, I really think that there is a need here to look into some kind of a plan on these premium units to try to break these units apart in strategy. I know we voted on that already but I think we need to maybe look into that and it will resolve a lot of the problems that we're dealing with and people's thoughts on this management hunt. Have you got another comment on there? Are we ready to try to put together recommendations or? That's all I have for right now.

Jake Albrecht: I've got a couple of recommendations that I would like to address to the board and maybe we can clear up some of those before we get too far into it. But Doug and I was just going over all of our comment cards and we might have missed one. Rusty Aiken, we need to give you your time to . . . But what you talked about is the Paunsaugunt deer plan which has already kind of gone through and then your late hunt, I can't read that. But go ahead and address it and then we'll go on.

Rusty Aiken: I just want to make a comment on the primitive hunt on that management hunt. I'd strongly urge the RAC to reconsider that and look at a rifle hunt. But the hunt is intended to be 100 percent successful. You're going to have youth and seniors involved and a rifle hunt is going to be much more effective, the committee thought. And if the spike bull goes through, Anis is proposing that later hunt for the Paunsaugunt rifle, if that happens I would recommend a shorter number of days if you're going to put that later. That migration will be pretty much ended and those deer will be settled in and it will be a pretty easy hunt. It will be a detriment to that unit.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, thanks Rusty. We appreciate ya. Sorry I missed ya. Going through the comments and some of the things that I wrote down is, uh, was recommended as we form a committee for archery, adding 1,000 additional tags for archery, a deer youth hunt for archery for approximately 2,000 hunters, and then we have the urban deer presentation that was brought to us, as well as the mobility impaired by Jeremy here. I think the best way for us to do that is if we recommend to the Wildlife Board that they look at putting these on their action log and they could look at, over the period of the next year, of seeing which direction they would want to go on that. And I hate to put all the pressure on them but I've seen that action log work and I think it's a good tool. So that would be my recommendation on those. As a matter of fact I'd entertain a motion that we do that.

Jack Hill: Mr. Chairman I would so move that those items be placed, asked to be placed on the Board's action log.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. We have a motion by Jack Hill that the Southern RAC requests that these items be put on the Wildlife Board's action log. And a second by Sam Carpenter. All in favor? Any against? Motion carries.

Jack Hill made the motion that the Southern RAC request the following items be put on the wildlife board action log, A committee be formed for archery, adding 1,000 additional tags for archery, A deer youth hunt of approximately 2,000 for archery, committee be formed to look at ways to handle urban deer populations, impaired mobility hunter issues. Sam Carpenter seconded. Unanimous vote

Jake Albrecht: Okay, do we have any further comments from the Southern RAC then? Steve Dalton.

Steve Dalton: It seems to me most of the discussion I've heard tonight is, everybody's talking about the resource, the number of people that want to utilize the resource. We are crowding more people on fewer acres, population is increasing all the time, demand for use of the resource is increasing from all avenues. I don't know, it's not an unlimited resource. Wildlife in

the State of Utah is not, it's just not going to keep up with the demand from the public, and the increase of populous and the increase in the people's want to use that resource. So I think everybody, it's been mentioned before but everybody utilizing the resource here is going to have to give a little bit. You can't just have unlimited use by all potential users of the resource. It just won't work that way. And everybody's pretty stingy about it; don't want to give up anything for themselves. Put the pressure on us to decide who's in and who's out, who gets picked on, who doesn't, and it's really not fair you guys. You need to start thinking about this a little bit different. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Steve. Okay, we're to the part of the agenda where we need a motion one way or another. Steve.

Steve Flinders: I got one more comment. A follow up on Steve Dalton's, I agree and we ought to pay particular attention to areas where we may have left some opportunity on the table. And it's nice to see the Division get to spike hunting statewide. It might be nice to see some classification data to help people understand how it is that we're leaving some of this opportunity on the table. We have phenomenal elk production in Utah, envious of, we are the envy of many western states that just try to maintain stable increasing elk herds. We know half of those calves that are born are males. You know many of these limited entry units because of impressively high bull to cow ratios, those bulls they just don't fit in, they don't feel welcome, they've got several years before they're able to hold their own. And uh, from a biological point of view it's really hard to go find those spike bulls. You know they're there. Where do they go? So it's a classical example of compensatory mortality, where we might as well harvest these bulls. We've got good examples going back for fifteen years on some of the premier units in the state, Wasatch, Manti, Fish Lake. Here's a chance to spread some of that pressure out if you're an individual that lives in Millard County, your chances of drawing an elk tag anywhere close to home are almost nil. So here's a chance to hunt the Pahvant, Indian Peaks. So from a biological point of view, and the forest likes to see active management of the resources and maximizing opportunity without impacting resources inversely. So that's all I've got to say in support of that.

Jake Albrecht: Clair, go ahead.

Clair Woodbury: I make a motion that we accept the Division's proposal for the Big Game, as proposed.

Jack Hill: I would second.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we have a motion by Clair Woodbury and a second by Jack Hill to accept the Division of Wildlife Resources proposal as presented. Any other discussion? All in favor, right hand. Six. Natalie? All against? Six-three, motion carries.

Clair Woodbury made the motion to accept the action proposed as presented. Jack Hill seconded. 6 in favor 3 opposed Sam Carpenter, Steve Dalton and Dell LeFevre

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we are going to take a five minute break and it is only going to be five minutes so hurry.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we're going to go ahead and get started so all you guys that are visiting if you could sit down or exit the building, which ever. Our next item is the CWMU Recommendation, Boyd Blackwell, go ahead.

CWMU Recommendations (action)

3:51:39 to 4:00:01 of 6:00:47

-Boyd Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Jake Albrecht: Boyde, every year that comes up on that Johnson. What is the deal? Is it just more tags or do they think they have the qualification?

Boyd Blackwell: They feel that they want an additional private tag. These tags are worth a fair amount of money and therefore they keep asking. And the region has done their homework on that and have come out with that they actually qualify for less.

Jake Albrecht: Well every year it's just been the one.

Boyd Blackwell: Yes, yes.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we're to questions from the RAC.

Questions from the RAC:

None

Jake Albrecht: Seeing none we'll go to questions from the public. Come forward please. State your name.

Comments from the Public:

Lee Tracey: Lee Tracey. In getting a CWMU are they required, or what is required other than the acreage? We had an experience, unfortunately a CWMU that didn't have anything to do with the acreage but in my estimation they should never have been a CWMU because the hunt was the worst one I have ever been on.

Boyd Blackwell: Thank you. The, there's a lot of different things that they have to do in order to be a CWMU, acreage is just one of the things. The biologist needs to go on and make sure that it's a good CWMU that it's huntable, that their boundaries are well defined. That they are able to provide the animals. In some cases you know, a hunt's a hunt and sometimes you don't shoot what you really want to shoot. But in 90 percent of the time if you were to check through, and you'll be able to do that this year on our informational page, you're going to look and see what our satisfaction index is for that CWMU. And it will be between 1 and 5. That will be all of our questionnaires go out to the people that have hunted on CWMUs and they'll check off, or they'll put in the number, 1 to 5, and people will be able to see okay that's a really good CWMU because people have been satisfied with it. Or that's a poor CWMU and they can put

in for a different one.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Boyde. Any other questions from the public? We have no comment cards so we'll go to comments from the RAC. We've got one question from the public.

Curtis Roundy: If under the terms you stated a cooperative wildlife management unit is deemed a poor management unit is there any terms for making it no longer a cooperative wildlife management unit? My name is Curtis Roundy.

Boyde Blackwell: Okay, yeah there is. We have an official complaint process where the sportsman can fill out; it's also a complement process if they'd like to do that. But they fill out the form and I take that to a meeting with the CWMU advisory committee, every February. We look through and address each and every complaint and they will make a recommendation to the Wildlife Board. Now there are several things that the Wildlife Board can do, they can say okay this is no longer a CWMU. We've had enough complaints, enough problems with that that we recommend that it not be a CWMU. They can recommend a change in distribution of permits, allocation of permits. They can put it on probation and take a look at it next year to make sure that they don't get any more complaints. But the CWMU advisory committee in the official policy will make recommendations to the Wildlife Board and that's what they can do to handle that.

Jake Albrecht: Okay I missed one item. I needed to ask a question on Boyde. Old Woman Plateau. They requested an elk season variance.

Boyde Blackwell: Oh. Yeah on those elk season variances you'll see, if you look through all of them there's a lot of elk season variances. And they discuss these with the biologists and the biologist goes through them with the CWMU and just to make sure that the elk, sometimes the elk don't get down into those CWMU areas until later in the season so they'll ask for a season variance.

Jake Albrecht: Okay so if you approve the season variance then you'll have some comments there.

Boyde Blackwell: Correct. Or if we don't. If we don't approve it we'll put the comments there. And in some cases because that's on a different, which actually goes on a different screen, I many have neglected to put that the biologist concurs. And we didn't have any where the biologist didn't concur this year.

Jake Albrecht: Ok so the dates will actually probably stay the same on that particular one then, right?

Boyde Blackwell: Yeah, yeah.

Jake Albrecht: So you refused his. . .

Boyde Blackwell: Oh, no. Let me look it up.

Jake Albrecht: Because under DWR recommendation if different I don't see anything.

Boyde Blackwell: Well if there's no recommendation from the DWR it's because we accepted it. If we didn't accept it we'd have said no. Um, let me just get to it. What page is it on? What do you have it on there? Which one?

Jake Albrecht: 19 and 19.

Boyde Blackwell: Okay. Oh yeah, it says, and this may be because, okay it says CWMUs request elk season variance, biologist in agreement. And that may not be on yours.

Jake Albrecht: It's not on ours.

Boyde Blackwell: Because I had to go through and had to send out that information before I had it all completely, completely entered, however I've got another one here. But it's been accepted by the biologist.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Do we have any other comments from the RAC? A lot of these CWMUs we in the Southern Region are not very familiar with. I'm sure we're familiar with the ones in the Southern Region so I'd ask for a motion to approve the presentation.

Cordell Pearson: Jake, I make a motion that we approve the recommendation of DWR.

Jake Albrecht: We have a motion by Cordell Pearson to approve the CWMU Recommendations that have been presented. We have a second by Sam Carpenter. Any other discussion? All in favor please raise your right hand. Okay, motion carries unanimous.

Cordell Pearson made the motion to approve the CWMU as presented. Sam Carpenter seconded. Unanimous

Landowner Association Recommendations (action) 4:07:24 to 4:10:04 of 6:00:47

-Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

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

Questions from the RAC:

Sam Carpenter: Yeah, Boyde. The fact that we're awarding these permits to these different landowners, do we have anything or are there any rules or bylaws in place about them complaining of the depredation issues and things of that nature, due to the fact that they're already being awarded permits? Do we have anything in place for that?

Boyde Blackwell: Yeah they can don't, they cannot, they cannot have us do depredation management on their places. We would take the amount of money that they would probably get from those permits and take it out of what their damage would be and then we would go from there. They could still claim damages, however, as I said we would take those number of

permits. So if you had say two elk permits and he could sell those elk permits or the value of those elk permits are \$10,000 then we would take a look at his damage and reduce that amount of money out of those damage claims.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, well one of the things that came up last year, on the Paunsaugunt unit was 50 doe tags that were slated to be hunted this last summer and that was due to depredation. And I'm wondering how that could have happened.

Boyde Blackwell: Well if he's got damage and it is deer damage and they're in his fields we would issue depredation permits, or voucher permits for that person to try and manage the population to keep them from damaging his property.

Sam Carpenter: Now isn't that mitigation? Isn't that how you address that?

Boyde Blackwell: I would turn that over to the region to address that. I'm not familiar with the tags or who they went to.

Sam Carpenter: It's okay. It's okay. For time constraints and everything. That's fine. I just wondered how that happened if they're supposed to be bound to certain bylaws, rules that prevent that from happening.

Douglas Messerly: Would you like me to address that Mr. Chairman or should we pass? Real fast, as we explained at the last meeting Sam, we're over population objective on the Paunsaugunt unit. The primary purpose of that hunt was to reduce the deer population on the unit. We like to focus those removal efforts on our problem deer first. In years past we've had problems in those fields. In years past we've had problems in those fields. We're trying to alleviate that and at the same time reduce populations. That was the purpose of that proposed hunt, and unfortunately the deer didn't show up so we had to extend it. And it's my understanding that hunt's probably in progress now or close to it.

Boyde Blackwell: Mr. Chairman, Sam, Mr. Carpenter also had a question last year that I would have some information on that I would like to address today.

Jake Albrecht: Go ahead.

Boyde Blackwell: You're concern was making, if we could make some of these permits, force them to be muzzle, archery or any weapon. And I went back, as I told you I would, and looked up that data and information. Rather than going through a rule and adding a rule and making a lot of changes we felt like that was already happening. For example, on the Paunsaugunt 75 percent of those permits went to primitive weapon hunts. And that was also, we had also a pretty good split on the next largest amount of permits was the Diamond Mountain. So we are getting that split. It allows the landowner to say well I can sell this to you, you know the guy comes to him and says I'd like to buy this permit but I'd like to use it for archery, I'd like to use it for muzzleloader. So I think they're getting the change that you were concerned about.

Sam Carpenter: Okay well the problem that is they were all the majority of them were being used as the muzzleload tag which threw the numbers way out of perspective. There was some

complaints along that line. But that's okay. That's fine. I appreciate you doing that, thank you.

Boyde Blackwell: Okay. I told you I would and I wanted to make sure I got it done.

Sam Carpenter: I appreciate that.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions from the RAC? I have one. Not to take up a lot of time but Thousand Lake unit, has anybody approached them about being a landowners association over there that you're aware of? Jim, would you know?

Boyde Blackwell: Not that I'm aware of.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Questions from the public?

Comments from the RAC:

None

Landowner Permit Recommendations (action)

-Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Jake Albrecht: Have any questions from the RAC? Sam.

Questions from the RAC:

Sam Carpenter: K well one of the things that came up last year was

Boyde Blackwell: Well if he's got damage and it's deer damage

Sam Carpenter: And that's mitigation?

Boyde Blackwell: I'd turn that over to the region

Sam Carpenter: That's ok

Doug Messerly: Would you like me to address that Sam?

Boyde Blackwell: Mr. Chairman

Sam Carpenter: Well the problem there was

Boyde Blackwell: Ok

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions from the RAC?

Boyde Blackwell: Not that I'm aware of

Jake Albrecht: Questions from the public?

Questions from the Public:

None

Jake Albrecht: We have no comments cards, so comments from the RAC. Do you have a question?

Comments from the Public:

Bob Ott: I'm Bob Ott, I represent the Paunsaugunt Landowners Association. I guess I just wanted to clarify at this time if we're still in that portion of your meeting for the RAC that with respect to landownership we have been working directly with DWR to resolve this issue. But something I will highlight for you is that our bylaws require that members of our association have lands that qualify by one means, and that is that it's included in FAA designation, which means that it's used for agriculture, actively. And therefore it has actual depredation damage on it by deer. If it does not have damage on it by deer and it is not in a FAA classification it doesn't qualify. And the basis for that is if I own a piece of property within this unit but I'm not using it for agriculture, it has a summer cabin on it or something, then really why would we be wanting to pay damages or compensate people that really have no competition with deer or utilization of habitat for other means? So when we look at the available habitat in that unit there's a considerable amount of acreage that does not fit FAA classification, in fact it's been subdivided. So when land has been subdivided it's been taken out of that classification for us and it really doesn't meet the objectives of the landowners association which is to further enhance habitat for the deer. There's a lot of difference between an irrigated alfalfa field where you have considerable depredation than there is with somebody's cabin lot. So just so you know that those are the kinds of issues that we're going to be working through with DWR to reconcile this. There is something that goes beyond the simple rule of 50 percent of the private landowner ship, it has to be bona fide habitat and it has to have some rational for allocating the permits. Thank you.

Sam Carpenter: Good to see you. And I think the problem that we've been going over and back and forth on on the fact that the tags were muzzleloaders, now they've moved that hunt back, the rifle hunt back, I think that will be resolved. I think we can give that one up.

Bob Ott: Yeah and that's very helpful because I'm an advocate of that myself Sam. I haven't been a real big fan of having that hunt out in the rut. Thank you.

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

Comments from the RAC:

None

Jake Albrecht: Okay, just a quick question then, Southwest Desert a year ago was three and two, right? Same thing, okay.

Boyde Blackwell: Same thing, yes.

Jake Albrecht: And we don't have those people here tonight, so. So anyway, we're good the way we go? Okay, a motion to approve?

Jack Hill: So moved.

Jake Albrecht: Motion by Jack Hill. A second by Sam. Any other discussion? The motion was to approve it as presented. All in favor? Must be getting long, we're all in favor.

Jack hill made the motion to accept the Landowner Permit Recommendation as presented. Sam Carpenter seconded. Unanimous

Jake Albrecht: Our next one is the Bonus Point, am I correct?

Boyde Blackwell. No. Nope I'll be moving on to a change in wording of the Depredation Rule. This is an action log item that the Wildlife Board asked me to address.

Jake Albrecht: Oh I'm sorry, I missed that one. I was just wishing.

Boyde Blackwell: Yeah I know. I'm sorry. This shouldn't take long.

Depredation Rule R657-44 Amendment (action) 4:19:46 to 4:20:30 of 6:00:47
-Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Jake Albrecht: So it could be one or two.

Boyde Blackwell: One or two depending on the situation, yes.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, do we have a motion Jack?

Jack Hill: Sir I would so move. We have a motion by Jack Hill to approve as presented.

Cordell Pearson: I'll second to get the hell out of here.

Jake Albrecht: A second by Cordell Pearson. All in favor? Any against? Motion carries.

Questions from the RAC:

None

Comments from the Public:

None

Questions from the RAC:

None

Comments from the RAC:

None

Jack Hill made the motion to approve Depredation Rule R657-44 Amendment as presented, Cordell Pearson seconded. Unanimous

Jake Albrecht: Our next action item is Bonus Point Recommendations. Are you doing that Boyde?

Boyde Blackwell: No. I'm having so much fun but I think I'll (unintelligible).

Jake Albrecht: Judy, are you doing that one? Okay, before she gets started, did everybody get the new blue one? It should be a blue proposed.

Bonus Point Recommendations (action) 4:21:54 to 4:39:56 of 6:00:47

-Judi Tutorow, Licensing Coordinator

Jake Albrecht: I don't know if everybody's as lost as I am but . . . Questions from the RAC? Sam Carpenter.

Questions from the RAC:

Sam Carpenter: Do we have a number of people turning in their permits that they draw each year, is that what this is all about?

Judi Tutorow: That is what kind of started the conversation is looking at our data and seeing those surrendered permits come in and seeing them reapplying the next year with someone else and drawing permits and going down that process.

Sam Carpenter: So there is a large number then.

Judi Tutorow: It's not a large number but we are seeing some of that going on in both general season and limited entry.

James Edwards: Are most of them permits the people that have been activated or handicapped that can't go hunting that year? Or are they actually people that. . . I can't understand if you apply for a Paunsaugunt or a Pahvant permit and then you take and you draw out and then you resubmit and you can still hunt. I don't understand that.

Judi Tutorow: Yeah some of it is injured or ill. But then there's a lot of our hunters that draw permits and something comes up in their schedules, can't get off work, or things change, wife's

having a baby, we get a lot of that, and they surrender those permits with no refund and go back into the drawing. And there's some that just surrender them. And we have them tell us why they surrender them but don't know if that's always being totally honest on their part. And then we see them enter back in the draw with, you know, someone else. So not sure about all that's going on out there, we're just seeing kind of a record of some things happening out there that we thought we should bring it to your attention.

James Edwards: Okay, thank you.

Douglas Messerly: Mr. Chairman if I could, and Jim, it's actually becoming pretty prevalent that people come in, more common than you think, that people come into our office, they've drawn a Paunsaugunt permit, they've been scouting for three weeks, don't like what they see, two days before the hunt opens they come in and turn them in. And that happens on elk and deer units.

Jake Albrecht: One question and then I'll move on. When those people turn their tags back that goes to an alternate.

Judi Tutorow: That's correct.

Jake Albrecht: What is the latest that you will try to contact an alternate?

Judi Tutorow: Even if the hunt has started into it one or two days we will make those phone calls and see if they, you know, haven't made plans and they'd like to take up that permit. But usually when it's more into that we don't for the reason that they probably want to scout it. It's almost considered a once in a lifetime hunt on some of those units so we do our best to get those reallocated. But there is time that they come in too late and we're not able to do that.

Jake Albrecht: Cordell have you got a question?

Cordell Pearson: Yeah I do, I have a couple of them. One is when somebody puts in as a party, four people put in, just one person, the high point person pulls out and the other three get a tag?

Judi Tutorow: They all 4 draw the tag, is that what you're talking about? They all four draw the tag and then if any one of the four decide to surrender that permit, they can for whatever reason. The only one that gets back the, all their bonus points is the guy that was the holder of those points. He gets those back plus one more for the current year.

Cordell Pearson: So are we seeing professional people get involved in this so they can get hunters to go out?

Judi Tutorow: I don't know. I mean, yeah, we did, there was an advertisement on E-Bay, you guys are probably aware of that, where they were offering to go into a group hunt with someone who had a lot of points. And whether money exchanged hands and all that we're not certain but that was out there. And Marty Bushman looked at that and it was all legal. There was nothing that was illegal about it, but just the concept.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you.

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

Questions from the Public:

None

Jake Albrecht: Seeing none we'll go to comment cards. We have a couple. First one is Bart Hansen. You will be followed by Brian Johnson. Bart Hansen, has he left? Brian Johnson. You will be followed by Alan Thompson.

Comments from the Public:

Brian Johnson: I know that it's late. I'll try to keep it short. I just want to say that Utah has one of the best bonus systems in the west. We don't square our points. We don't divide them by pi. It's very simple, you put in you get a point. It's a beautiful system. Right now the way this works I have hope that my kids may actually be able to hunt something in the future. And my kids are just little. I hope they enjoy the sport. The other thing you can do to improve your odds is pick up a bow and hunt with me. It's not over crowded, come play. But, I'm sorry, I'm sorry; I'm a jerk. It's not my parent's fault either; I was born this way. But like I said, I really hope that the only change that you guys consider doing is maybe with this group hunting, it seems like it's a real problem. If you were just to take that and not let them get their point if they surrender their tag that sounds like it's going to solve the problem. I mean that makes sense to me. I don't know about everybody else. I know it's late so maybe that's why it's making sense. But if you could please just leave the bonus point system the way, make someone pick a species and go after it. I think that's the best system there is. And like I said, I thank you guys for your time.

Alan Thompson: Alan Thompson Ivins, UT. Reiterate what Brian said. I totally agree. Maybe one thing that we could look at, that the RAC could look at is instead of surrendering it a day before the hunt opens make people surrender a month before. Because if you get a chance to hunt a once in a lifetime tag and they call you a day before the hunt you have no time to scout. You have no idea what's even out there. And you didn't even know you had a possibility of drawing that tag. That would be my comment. Thanks.

Jake Albrecht: Tyson Cannon. You will be followed by Greg McGregor.

Tyson Cannon: I'm Tyson Cannon from Santa Clara. I just want to agree with Alan. I do think we need to make a set date though before the hunt, a month, two weeks, whatever it is, a day before just isn't time enough to scout for anybody that has a chance to draw that tag. Thanks.

Greg McGregor: Greg McGregor. I feel your pain. It's getting late. I think that if people want to surrender a point as in 1A or 1B they ought to be able to apply for a group as if, if they want to. If they know and perceive the ramifications that that's what will happen then I think either 1A or 1B would be good. Also, regarding capping points I'm adamantly against that. There

are a lot of people, me being one of them; I'm this close to desert big horn. I've got a knee that's been operated on twice and I'm due for probably a knee replacement pretty soon and I have a feeling that if that gets capped those points would die with me. So please don't make that recommendation. Thanks very much.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we have one more comment card that just arrived. Lee Tracey, is that you? What are you commenting on?

Lee Tracey: Actually I'm commenting on giving an explanation of the bonus point or what we refer to as banking a bonus point. There was an explanation given but it's sometimes a little more sinister than you think. The question was asked well why would anybody turn in the once in a lifetime or one of their premium hunts? The reason is because for instance I can apply for a tag for my mother who is 86 years old with no intention of her hunting, and if I've done this for 5 or 6 years I can continue to apply as a group with her and eventually we'll draw the tag and once we do that I can use my tag and turn hers back in. And then guess what? I can do it again next year. So the reason some of these tags are turned in is because the people who have applied or who someone has applied for have no intention of hunting at all. It's just the person who's hunting is banking points based on other people's applications. So that's the reason for some of this, some of these proposals. The other thing is, well, I uh, I highly recommend that we have an opportunity to apply for bonus points for all species. I'm at a point now, I'm almost to the point where I get a moose tag. And it will be just a couple of years and I'll max out. After that what do I apply for? Well I have to start all over for the once in a lifetime tags. And I may not live long enough to hunt big horn sheep. But if I've got some points based on big horn sheep or if I had had some points on big horn sheep maybe I could.

Jake Albrecht: Ok that concludes our comment cards from the public so we'll go to comments from the RAC.

Comments from the RAC:

Jake Albrecht: Judi I need your help. What exactly is the DWR proposing on all of this? What are their recommendations is what I?

Judi Tutorow: Back to the slides? I'll just go back to the slides and show you so I can go through them and show them to you.

Jake Albrecht: If we go, if you look at the sheet that you gave us. You guys either want to eliminate group application hunt for limited entry elk, deer and pronghorn.

Judi Tutorow: Right.

Jake Albrecht: Or if we don't approve that you want us to approve one of the following.

Judi Tutorow: 1A or 1B.

Jake Albrecht: 1A or 1B. Okay so that's one of the things that you're proposing.

Judi Tutorow: That's correct

Jake Albrecht: The second one that you want us to look at is item number 2 then?

Judi Tutorow: Right.

Jake Albrecht: A person would lose all bonus points for all species if they skip there consecutive years.

Judi Tutorow: That's correct.

Jake Albrecht: The forth one, the third one anyway is an applicant could purchase points for all species each year but could only apply for one limited entry and one once in a lifetime permit.

Judi Tutorow: Right, that's correct. That's the three ones for limited entry, bonus points.

Jake Albrecht: So we have the possibility of three different things there.

Judi Tutorow: That's correct.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. And then the other possibility for RAC consideration is the cap points that Greg was against.

Judi Tutorow: Any of those number 1 through 5.

Jake Albrecht: Right. But if I remember right one of the first things that you said was the number of people doing this were satisfied with the way the system works now, is that correct? Is that what you said?

Judi Tutorow: Yeah, we get a lot of complements on our bonus point system. And we haven't tweaked it or played it much since 1993 and it seems to do the job and get things done. The only thing that really became a big issue was the group thing. And of course you're going to get the complaints, the same complaints every year, why didn't I draw out? And basically we tell them because we don't have enough permits to (unintelligible) our applicants. And that's just a given. So these are just some ideas and some brainstorm they come up with was how could we make it better.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, and then if I go down to general season hunt recommended changes group applications would enter the drawing with only preference points. So you would like us to make a decision on one or two there?

Judi Tutorow: One or two, that's correct.

Jake Albrecht: And then if you apply in a general season draw and are not successful at your first choice then you would accumulate a preference point even though you drew a second or a fifth choice.

Judi Tutorow: That's correct.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. And then you want to increase the youth permits in the draw from 15 to 20 percent.

Judi Tutorow: 20 percent, that's correct. So three proposals under each bonus and preference point.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, gentlemen did she explain that to you as well as I think she did right now? Very well, I thought so. Okay. RAC comments then. Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: Yeah, I'll just kind of tell you my feelings on this thing. I think that we definitely should eliminate the applications for limited entry elk, deer, and pronghorn. Okay I think it should be you have to put in for those individually not as a group. That's just my feelings. Uh, you kind of go down the list and I think that uh, well we don't have to worry about A or B if you do that. I think number 3; I think that they should be able to buy preference point for another hunt. I don't think we should cap the bonus points. I think we should leave the general deer season as a group. And I think it should be an average on the preference points. And I agree with them that they should up the youth to 20 percent.

Jake Albrecht: We heard some comments earlier in the Wildlife that took us two or three hours to get through about youth, time to get more youth involved there. And I think there were a number of people that were actively in support of that so . . . Steve have you got a comment then?

Steve Flinders: I like what Cordell went through there. I'm stuck back at the top based on some of the comments tonight. And thinking about 1B where if you've got a teenage kid that's trying to get into hunting and a parent who's got quite a few bonus points can put in as a group and help that kid out. But 1B allows that but at the same time it takes away, you know, adds this incentive to turning that tag in. You don't get your bonus points back. You drew the tag; we're keeping your money and keeping your bonus point. And I think it's going to make people reconsider turning that in. Other than that I'm the same place Cordell is on all of the rest of that stuff. 1 A or B, it's group applications. It's not the problem it's the incentive, the disincentive in the system right now.

Jake Albrecht: Are you talking to me? The only thing there that I see is if a guy has 13 points and he's drawing with somebody that's got 6, he's still going to have the 13 the next year. And he can still go through the same process. Well he don't need it because on the Paunsaugunt you can draw out with 6 or 7. So anyway, Tom go ahead.

Tom Hatch: I know we aren't supposed to comment up here but I don't know if the RACs really understood this. When Greg talked to the Board about this a month ago there's people that have figured out that if they've got 12, 15 bonus points they can put them out on E-Bay or something and for a profit. And somebody that's got 3 say hey if you'll pay me a thousand bucks we'll put in as a group. Then those people can come back and turn their permit in and do it again next year, keep theirs, under the current system.

Sam Carpenter: Which one of these are the solution then?

Jake Albrecht: Clair, go ahead.

Clair Woodbury: I've got the solution Sam and it's not on the paper. Let's leave everything just like it is. If they turn it in more than twice that's all they can do. After that they lose their points. The third year they either hunt or they lose them. Or the second year they either hunt or they lose them. Let's cap the guys that are abusing the system not the rest of the state.

Jake Albrecht: We need to do it at the mic if you're going to comment.

Clair Woodbury: They can turn it once or twice, you guys decide, after that they either hunt or they lose their tag.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, any other comments from the RAC?

Paul Briggs: Jake is it too late to ask a question of clarification? We had a slide up there earlier, there was a real small percentage of people that applied as a group, was that true? On the limited entry applications, how many people? Back up one, that one. The graph.

Judi Tutorow: Do you want the graph or do you want the number of group apps?

Paul Briggs: Either one.

Judi Tutorow: This is the number of group apps for those limited entry species. It shows you the single applications for those and it shows you the group individuals and the total of groups that it breaks down into. Like you have 9,073 individuals that formulates into 3,990 groups into the drawing. So the group apps are a small percentage but they can do some damage.

Paul Briggs: Yeah, it looks like it's about 20 percent.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Where are we going to go with this gentleman?

Clair Woodbury: I'm going to make a proposal Jake that we keep the state draw process as is with the exceptions that I mentioned earlier that you turn it in two times. I mean I broke my leg five days before the elk hunt this year and those things happen. I missed the elk and the deer hunt.

(Paul Neimeyer, Wildlife Board not talking into the mic)

Jake Albrecht: Mr. Chairman, did you want that in the record?

Clair Woodbury: You've just fouled up my proposal. Not really, you clarified my proposal. Does somebody else here have a better proposal than what I've got? Cordell.

Jake Albrecht: Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: I'd like to make a motion that we eliminate group applications for limited entry elk, deer and pronghorn, and we leave the rest of it as it is as far as the bonus points go. Because there is something in place that if you break your leg or something that's not going to affect you. This is only going to affect these guys that are doing this for monetary gain.

Jake Albrecht: Oh, if I hear your motion right you want to accept Item 1, and then leave the system completely the way it is now?

Cordell Pearson: Except for the 20 percent for the youth hunters.

Jake Albrecht: So Items 2 and 3 you don't want to address?

Cordell Pearson: I don't have a problem with Item 3 if they purchase an extra bonus point.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, why don't we do this, let's go to Item 1 and have you make a motion like you suggested to eliminate group application hunts for limited entry, elk, deer and pronghorn. And then we'll go on down the list.

Cordell Pearson: So be.

Jack Hill: Mr. Chairman could I ask a question?

Jake Albrecht: We cannot do that under comments. We had a motion by Cordell, do we have a second? By Paul. Now do we have any comments or questions?

Jack Hill: I have one.

Jake Albrecht: Okay.

Jack Hill: What would happen if I wanted to apply with my son for elk? Couldn't do it huh?

Jake Albrecht: Not if this is approved by the Wildlife Board.

Jack Hill: See Cordell, that's a problem I see with it.

Jake Albrecht: Wait a minute, hold it. You can apply and he can apply, you just can't apply together.

Jack Hill: Yeah. But the point is if we apply together then we can hunt together.

Jake Albrecht: I know. But you're missing the point of what's happening here. We've got . . .

Jack Hill: I'm not missing the point at all.

Jake Albrecht: Well, no you've got people out there that's getting monetary gain out of these tags is what's happening. Okay? I understand what you're saying, okay.

Jack Hill: If I'm 73 years old and I got 14 points and my son's only got 3 we can average the points and pretty much be assured of going hunting.

Jake Albrecht: That's correct. Okay, you can. Any other questions or comments? I'm going to call for a vote on the motion then. All those in favor of Cordell's motion please raise your right hand. Item 1. We have 4 (four). All those against please raise your hand. We have 3 (three). Clair did you abstain? Okay, so we had 5 (five) to 3 (three) then. Is that right?

Jack Hill: Mr. Chairman I call for the question again . . .

Jake Albrecht: Okay, one more time. All in favor raise your right hand high. One, two, three, four. Correct? All against, high. One, two, three. Who abstained? Sam you abstained? Okay, motion carries.

Cordell Pearson made the motion to accept item No. 1 as presented. Paul Briggs seconded. 4 in favor Cordell Pearson, Paul Briggs, Steve Dalton Clair Woodbury. 3 opposed Steve Flinders, James Edwards, Jack Hill. Motion carries.

Jake Albrecht: Second item, a person would lose all bonus points for all species if they skip three consecutive years for applying in a big game drawing for a least one bonus point species. If you apply for at least one limited entry or once in a lifetime species in the big game draw you would keep your points for all species. So basically you have a lot of people in the system who are maybe, maybe dead or don't want to hunt anymore but we need to get them out of the system, is that right?

Judi Tutorow: Well we mark, if we know they're deceased we flag them, but these are guys that have just quit applying for some reason for three years in a row. They just haven't, they've quit applying. And so there's like, I think back on that slide there's about 30,000 of those that's setting out there with those points and just sitting, not using them.

Jake Albrecht: Does that plug up the system though or are they just sitting there?

Judi Tutorow: Nope, it doesn't plug up the system it just. . . .

James Edwards: It could be like me who's put in for over a decade on one other item . .

Judi Tutorow: And then not gotten back to it.

James Edwards: And just not got back but I am soon.

Judi Tutorow: Uh huh, that's correct. Yeah.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we're going to go with this one then.

??????: I have a comment to add. Again, about kids, you put your kids in for the draw, they grow up and they go to college, they're broke. Does dad continue to put them in? Or do they put in? Or do you wait until they get out of college and have money? Three years they lose

their bonus points.

Jake Albrecht: Any other comments, Clair? Need a motion guys. Steve Dalton.

Steve Dalton: I make a motion to accept Item Number 2. If they miss three consecutive years they lose their points. If somebody wants to keep them they can keep applying.

Jake Albrecht: I have a motion to accept Item Number 2, by Steve Dalton. Do we have a second? Second by Cordell. Any other discussion? Okay, all in favor raise your right hand. We have 4 (four). All against. We have 4 (four). I vote for Item Number 2.

Steve Dalton motioned to accept Item Number 2 as presented. Cordell Pearson seconded. 5 in favor 4 against. Motion carries. Jack Hill, James Edwards, Clair Woodbury, Steve Flinders against. Tie vote, Chairman Albrecht voted in favor of Item Number 2.

Jake Albrecht: Item Number 3. An applicant could purchase points for all species each year but could only apply for one limited entry and one once in a lifetime permit. Uh, I think there's some good ideas there but it might stack it even and make it longer to draw out even though they do that. I don't know.

James Edwards: Jake that also might be an impediment to those who might not have the funds to put in for several items every year. Knowing that they're going to have to do that for several years to have a chance to draw, it might penalize who are a little poorer.

Jake Albrecht: Paul, can you get up to the mic?

Paul Neimeyer: The way that that was explained is they can put in for once in a lifetime and then a, and a, like an elk, or an antelope or a pronghorn, but they could actually buy a bonus point. You put in for the bonus point. See like a lot of these kids that are on missions right now are putting in for, they go on a mission so they keep in the drawing and just put in for a bonus point. They don't put in for the . . .

James Edwards: But it's not a purchase then?

Paul Neimeyer: It's not a purchase, no.

James Edwards: Oh okay. I stand corrected.

Paul Neimeyer: And I'm not swaying you I just trying to so you understand.

James Edwards: I stand corrected on that.

Judi Tutorow: They do have to purchase a combination or hunting license first and then go through and buy the point.

??????: Which animal can you put if through, what can you purchase if you can only apply for

a limited entry and once in a lifetime? There's nothing left out there.

Judi Tutorow: Well you could apply for deer, elk, and pronghorn.

??????: Well pronghorn it's a limited entry, isn't it?

Judi Tutorow: Right. So you can apply for, say you apply for a point for elk and deer and you could apply for the hunt for pronghorn. So there's your two points and your one hunt. In once in a lifetime you could apply for bison and then buy points for the rest of those species.

??????: I see.

Jake Albrecht: Does it say purchase?

??????: It says purchase points. So do we need to change that?

Jake Albrecht: So how much is that purchase?

Judi Tutorow: Ten dollars.

Jake Albrecht: Ten dollars, okay.

Judi Tutorow: It's an application fee. We don't have a fee for points, just . . .

Jake Albrecht: It's an application fee for ten bucks then.

Judi Tutorow: For each one, uh huh.

Jake Albrecht: Okay.

???????? : I think this is kind of a good idea. I think it would take and give some more funds to the Division to take and do some habitat work.

Paul Briggs: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion we accept Number 3.

Jake Albrecht: Mr. Briggs made a motion that we accept Item 3 as presented. Second by Cordell. All in favor, right hand. We have 5 (five) for. All against. We have 2 (two). Motion carries.

Paul Briggs made the motion to accept as presented. Cordell Pearson seconded. 6 in favor 2 opposed Sam Carpenter and Steve Dalton. Motion carries

Jake Albrecht: Okay, the next one is General Season Hunt recommended changes. Number 1 is: Group applications would enter the drawing with only the preference point total of the lowest group member. Preference points would not be averaged. If successful and a permit is surrendered the person surrendering the permit would still accumulate a preference point. Or, Number 2: We would still average preference points. If you surrender a permit you would not

add a new preference point for that year but would keep your preference points accumulated up to that draw. The only exception to this would be that if you surrender due to being activated in the military or if you have an injury that precludes you from hunting then you would accrue a preference point upon surrendering a permit. So I like that Number 2 myself.

Steve Dalton: I'll make a re.....

Jake Albrecht: Or if you apply in a general deer season and are not successful at your first choice then you would accumulate a preference point even if you are successful in obtaining your second and fifth choices. So Item Number 2, I like. Number 2 on the second I like. And I like the increase from 15 to 20 percent. If somebody wants to make a motion on all three of those.

Judi Tutorow: On Number 1,

Jake Albrecht: On Item Number 1, I like Number 2.

Judi Tutorow: Number 2, okay.

Steve Dalton: I'll make that motion.

Jake Albrecht: We have a motion by Steve Dalton to accept Item Number 2 under Item 1, and to go ahead and approve Item Number 2 as well as Item Number 3 as presented. Do we have a second? Second by Sam Carpenter. No other discussion. All in favor please raise your right hand. Motion carries.

Steve Dalton made the motion to accept as presented Number 2 under Item Number 1 and Item Number 2 and Item Number 3. Sam Carpenter seconded. Motion carries.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, moving right along, Dedicated Hunter Program Recommendations. This is an action item. Sam Carpenter. Young lady, I need you to pronounce your first name and I know it's not Margaret.

Dedicated Hunter Program Recommendations (action) 5:12:54 to 5:28:03 of 6:00:47
-Rhianna Christopher, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Jake Albrecht: Any questions from the RAC, Jim?

Questions from the RAC:

James Edwards: Yes I have one question, what about the lifetime license holders, would they still be able to in time to get a permit if they wasn't able to get into the Dedicated Hunter program?

Rhianna Christopher: Judi. I'm not really sure how, he's asking if lifetime license, if they weren't able to get into the program would they be able to get their lifetime license?

Judi Tutorow: Yeah. The Dedicated Hunter drawing that we're proposing the season, the dates on that is before the big game drawing so that will actually end before and then we'll have the big game. So the answer would be yes. If he was trying to get in there and did not he could get the opportunity to get into the drawing where they lifetime guys get their questionnaire answered. Does that make sense?

Steve Flinders: Jake.

Jake Albrecht: Steve Flinders.

Steve Flinders: Rhianna what about, what's magic about the 10,000 number? I know in 1995 that number was . . .

Rhianna Christopher: You said it, it was just, I mean from what I understand in the history that I've learned about the program, it was basically pulled out of somebody's shoe.

Steve Flinders: Why do you think it's more popular now then it was then?

Rhianna Christopher: Because people are learning about the program and people want that guaranteed tag and that guaranteed region.

Steve Flinders: Probably the carrots that are there now are more significant. Are there other ways we could look at reducing those carrots? Under the proposals that I've heard were make those guys provide service in the region that they hunt.

Rhianna Christopher: Sure, but. . .

Steve Flinders: Or if we like the program wouldn't we like every single deer hunter in the State of Utah to be the ultimate dedicated hunter. Can we turn this, morph this program into something, you know what I mean, why hold it at 10,000? What's magic about that? Or what else can we do with it?

Rhianna Christopher: Well there, you know, I mean these tags are coming off the top as you know. And a lot of folks in the State of Utah or outside of the State of Utah simply can't give the time that's needed. I mean the program just simply isn't for everybody. It takes commitment and it takes planning and not everybody can do that.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions from the RAC? I know that the Southern Region has plenty of participants. Do the Northeastern and the Northern need more participants to make that more proactive up there, or with their jobs or the 24 hours to get some projects done?

Rhianna Christopher: I guess I'm not sure what your question is.

Jake Albrecht: Well if you look at that the Northeast has what, 1 percent?

Rhianna Christopher: Uh huh.

Jake Albrecht: And 4 percent in the Southeast.

Rhianna Christopher: In the Southeast, uh huh.

Jake Albrecht: So what I'm saying is the people who are doing the work with the Dedicated Hunter Program that are in charge up there they actually need more people to make it a better program is what I'm saying.

Rhianna Christopher: Well I know that from talking with the various coordinators folks travel all over. I know a lot of folks from the Central Region go into the North, Northeastern Region to do projects. So people aren't necessarily staying where they live to do projects. I think some people are looking for projects that interest them and they're willing to travel to work on a project that appeases them.

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

Questions from the Public:

None

Jake Albrecht: We have one comment card. Mike Twitchell.

Comments from the Public:

Mike Twitchell: First of all I'd just like to say that you know the Dedicated Hunter Program is a terrific program. I was in it several years ago for family reasons. We talk about the social aspect of the hunt to be one of the main reasons that people are hunting. The reason that I'm not a Dedicated Hunter now is because this year is actually the year that the rest of my family will be re-upping. I can do my work projects with them. I can hunt with them and we can do this on a cycle, hopefully. I think that the program's good for deer conservation. I find that the people that are involved in the Dedicated Hunter Program, the hunting mentality changes within those people from shoot the first thing you see because you've only got a limited amount of time to let's enjoy the hunt, let's enjoy each other and let's go ahead and try and find a nice animal if we can. And because that benefit people are happy to do the work and I think that that's a terrific thing. I think we need to be more, our mindsets need to be more geared towards the wildlife habitat management. My concern is however with what has been proposed here today is just with one single factor and that is the first come first serve thing. My concern is is that the people who, if we turn it into a draw the people who procrastinate doing their paperwork, getting the job done, are going to end up ruining it for those who put in, or get in there and get it done on time. My understanding is that it took eight days for the quota to be filled. The people who waited are the ones that didn't get the permits. If I'm the one that gets in there and gets my job done and fulfills my responsibility within the first two days then why should I be punished because I did what I was asked to do in a timely fashion? The fact of the matter is that those who procrastinate are the ones that are complaining because they did not get the permit. Okay? So I don't think that because they waited that they

should have an equal opportunity as me who maybe got in there and got the job done that I was asked to do to procure my own permit. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Mike. That's the only comment card we'll have so we go to comments from the RAC. Clair Woodbury.

Comments from the RAC:

Clair Woodbury: One of the changes you're proposing is the doing away with the requirement to attend a RAC meeting. Personally I'd never heard of the RAC until I was joined the program and was required to be here. I didn't know they existed. Went to a November meeting a few years ago, Doug got up after the meeting and said we need, we have three openings. Anybody want to join come and talk to me, you know. Three of us went and talked to him. And then here I am, for better or for worse. And I would say the vast majority of the people have no idea the RAC even exists. I'd like to see 10,000 people at least be aware of it.

Jake Albrecht: I'm going to comment a little bit, our Cedar City meeting four or five months ago, April, one of the last ones that . . . Anyway, those people were there for one reason, it was a requirement. The meeting went fairly well for a half hour to an hour and then if you guys remember it turned into a mess in the background. They weren't interested in what was going on. They were interested in getting the requirement and getting out of there. I kind of like the way the new program requires an online course, and yet it still gives an opportunity for those people to come and address the meetings if they have something on their mind or something that they don't like, or something they want to get changed. So that's my two bits.

Steve Flinders: Jake I've got a follow-up comment.

Jake Albrecht: Steve Flinders.

Steve Flinders: I was surprised at the number of e-mails and discussion that's been surrounding this. We have, the Forest Service loves this program. I mean I pull guys down from the Central Region to do projects because they hunt in this area, they're familiar with the area, they want to improve things. And we've been, we've got ATV barricades and . . . You know some of these guys are hunting, and I'm using them. I'm bringing them down here. But there are those who have been in the program since its inception, so they claim, and feel like, oh geeze now I've got to draw. They've a lot of ownership in the program and, are they going to grandfather me? But when you're up you're up. Some of the folks, also locally, who have been working with agencies and maybe some of your projects as well, that they're familiar with, well they're assigned to do maintenance on some particular item, like a guzzler, grazing disclosure, you know, a spring; it, it's nice. You're going to have them every year and they know what to do. And uh, anyway, this may cause some turnover, you know, through this draw, and it's unfortunate. I hope the drawing doesn't change the mindset of some dedicated hunters that I drew this now I'm entitled. I'm in the program and I know I'm supposed to do this stuff but hey I drew this. I drew it. That's where I put my effort at.

Paul Briggs: I would just like to echo what Steve said from the BLM perspective. We've been very pleased with the program. Used it to its fullest. Not only do we use it as a method to get

work done on these wildlife projects but to inform the dedicated hunters and the public of the hazard fuel reduction and the fire benefits of doing those projects as well. I'm in the Dedicated Hunter Program. I'm one of those guys, Steve, that's been in since the inception. And I understand exactly what you're saying with that about wanting to be grandfathered in but on the other hand I can see the Division's point if you're going to make this fair to everybody we've probably got to take a hard look at making it open to the draw.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Paul Briggs. Any other comments.

James Edwards: Mr. Chairman.

Jake Albrecht: Rex. Not Rex, Jim.

James Edwards: Rex is hunting in Montana. I wished I were there. I've been in the Dedicated Hunter Program since the inception too and I also have a lifetime license so it's costing me extra to do it but I love the program and I sure hate to think that I, after ten years, that I'm going to have to take and go into the drawing. That just uh, that really bothers me.

Jake Albrecht: But isn't your chances kind of the same if you don't get your application filled out being one of the first 10,000?

James Edwards: It looks like to me it would be a mass infusion on the computer. I don't know what will happen.

Jake Albrecht: If I'm not mistaken at one of the meetings in Salt Lake City they actually had some of the computers freeze up. Am I right on that? And that's part of the problem that they had.

James Edwards: I don't know what the answer is but I think that there ought to be some consideration for those that have been in the longest, you know, in my opinion.

Jake Albrecht: Should we just give you ten points and everybody else one then?

James Edwards: No, I'll take eleven.

Jake Albrecht: All right. I had a lot of guys call me and say if they've been in there a while they would like consider having a preference point going into the draw. How many people do you actually think will put in? Or do you have any idea?

Rhianna Christopher: I mean it's really had to tell. I personally receive phone calls everyday from people who are just learning about the program. So it's really hard to tell.

Judi Tutorow: Greg Sheehan's done some data on that and he feels like about 6,500 will apply.

Jake Albrecht: We had how many going out?

Rhianna Christopher: And we'll have just over 3,000 available this year.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Steve Dalton.

Rhianna Christopher: That's what it will look like every three years.

Steve Dalton: I have a question, how many youth hunters are involved in the program at this point?

Rhianna Christopher: Currently we have about 4 percent.

Steve Dalton: That's pretty low.

Rhianna Christopher: So there's about 324 youth in the program right now.

Steve Dalton: So if all of us old geezers stay in . . .

Rhianna Christopher: The youth would have a slim chance.

Steve Dalton: Okay.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. I think we've had enough discussion. Where are we going? Jim. Paul.

Paul Briggs: I make a motion that we accept the changes as proposed.

Jake Albrecht: Motion by Paul Briggs to accept the Division's proposal, am I correct on that?

Cordell Pearson: I'll second it.

Jake Albrecht: We have a second by Cordell Pearson. Any other discussion? Clair.

Clair Woodbury: I'd like to amend that proposal to still require the RAC meeting attendance. I think the one meeting you're talking about in the several years I've been here it was the one and only time that there was a disturbance. And I think we have enough Division personnel to handle that.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we had an amendment to the motion by Clair that they still require attending one RAC meeting. The motion fails for a lack of a second.

Cordell Pearson: I didn't know it needed a second. I'll second it.

Jake Albrecht: The way I understood it it calls for a second. Am I right Tom?

Cordell Pearson: I'll second it.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a second by Cordell. So we'll vote on the amendment first which would require dedicated hunters to attend one RAC meeting. All those in favor please raise your right hand or left hand. We have one, two, three, four. We have 4 (four) for. All against.

One, two, three, four. I like the online course. I vote for the Division. Okay, now we have a motion on the floor to accept the rest of the Division's recommendations and we had a second by Cordell, am I right? So all in favor of that please raise your right hand. 6 (Six). All against? 6/2 motion carries.

Paul Briggs made the motion to accept Dedicated Hunter Program Recommendations as presented. Cordell Pearson seconded. 6 in favor 2 opposed Steve Flinders and Clair Woodbury.

Jake Albrecht: Okay our last item of business is a five-minute item, Antler Gathering Recommendation. This also is an action item, law enforcement personnel. If you would introduce yourself we'll all know.

Antler Gathering Recommendation (action) 5:45:08 to 5:51:51 of 6:00:47
-Law Enforcement Conservation Officer Mitch Lane.

Jake Albrecht: Questions from the RAC.

Questions from the RAC:

Jake Albrecht: If you didn't do the online course, and you were out shed gathering and you guys came up on them, what are the consequences?

Mitch Lane: Under this scenario it would be a rule violation so it would be a Class C misdemeanor. However, because antlers have been deemed wildlife or parts there of it could be the unlawful take of protected wildlife charges could be a more serious approach. And I think we have the Attorney General's office representative support in that as far as antlers being protected wildlife.

Jake Albrecht: Well I guess in my, if I read the regulation change proposal I, you know, it doesn't say these types of circumstances would happen to a gentleman. But I guess when you go online and do your online course it tells you about those different types of things or how are you going to inform us?

Mitch Lane: That's certainly a big part of the authorization or the online course. And it would in fact, I think, allow enforcement to take an action and maybe hold somebody to a higher intent level if that information is spelled out in the course and they were required to go through that course and were told what the implications could be. You know if their actions deviated from what we say in the online course then yeah it could be used in towards an enforcement action.

Jake Albrecht: Sam, do you have a question?

Sam Carpenter: I was just going to ask what, are you going to make any provisions for people that don't have computers? I mean I know of several people that hunt sheds that are completely illiterate when it comes to computers.

Mitch Lane: Yeah, and I think the Division in general with online applications has had to deal

with those types of issues and I think we've been fairly successful in giving people different options as to where they can access a computer, whether it be a public library or at one of our offices to accommodate them in that manner.

Jake Albrecht: We don't have much of an audience, but do we have any questions from the public?

Comments from the Public:

None

Jake Albrecht: We have no comment cards.

Questions from the Public:

None

Jake Albrecht: Any other comments from the RAC? Steve.

Comments from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: I discovered today who the Forest Service Rep was. The information hasn't traveled through the agency very much and I'd love to get a copy of that presentation to let the units know kind of what's coming down. I think we see it as a great potential to partner with you guys in educating folks on ethical use of ATVs. It's against the law for sure on both southern forests and Paul can speak for the BLM on going off a trail. And we all know this goes on during shed antler season because you can cover a lot more country on a 4-wheeler going through the sagebrush than you can on foot or horseback. And we won't feel near as guilty citing them for that if they've got that authorization. Still got to catch them. But I see the potential there. So I hope that there's a way that the Forest Service can get some of our information, some of our rules and regulations, I understand it's statewide but I think some of that's pretty universal so (unintelligible) that connection.

Mitch Lane: It is and this is just an enhancement to laws that are already on the books as far as harassing wildlife and OHV and habitat destruction laws. I mean this does not in any way preclude any, you know, the enforcement of any of our existing laws. I think it just enhances the tools we already have.

Jake Albrecht: I think a lot of people know that they're not supposed to use ATVs and that for whatever purpose. But I think if this passes you're going to have to educate the people on that they know that they have to take this online course. And those who aren't aware of it I would hope that maybe the Division would be sympathetic with them a little bit, especially if they were on foot or horseback or something like that. If it's an ATV or a pickup going across, why I don't have any sympathy for those types of people. So that's my comments.

Mitch Lane: Sure. And we've used kind of a ramp up method for a lot of new regulations. And again, we can still rely on existing laws and regulations that are in place. You know if

somebody, there's a big difference between somebody who is harassing protected wildlife versus somebody who maybe unknowingly is out collecting shed antlers not harassing protected wildlife, but not knowing that this authorization is required. We can certainly, and it will, it will require a considerable outreach effort and a ramp up period before we are comfortable that everybody will want to, we're not trying to create any speed traps here, so we'll do what we have to to get everybody educated in as timely a manner as we can.

Jake Albrecht: So the people that are on this list were very supportive of what you're doing then? The Sportsman for Fish, Mule Deer, on and on and on?

Mitch Lane: Yes.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, any other comments?

Paul Briggs: I would just like to say from the BLM standpoint that everybody I talk to in the agency, we reviewed this somewhat, kind of puzzled how we missed the boat on being on the committee, but we're probably as impacted by ATV and antler gathering as anybody in the state with the amount of land and winter range that we administer. We welcome this any effort to educate the public on the impacts of their activities on the winter range and the habitat and the wildlife as well.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Any other comments? We need a motion to go one way or another on this gentlemen. Sam Carpenter.

Sam Carpenter: I make a motion we accept the proposal as presented.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have a second?

Steve Dalton: Second.

Jake Albrecht: Second by Steve Dalton. Any other discussion? All in favor please raise your hand. Motion carries.

Sam Carpenter made the motion to accept the Antler Gathering Recommendation as presented. Steve Dalton seconded. Motion carries unanimous

Jake Albrecht: I'm going to turn the time to Doug Messerly for a couple of action clean-up items or whatever he wants to talk about here.

Other Business (contingent)

-Jake Albrecht, Chairman

Douglas Messerly: Just some housekeeping items. There's a couple of papers in front of you gentlemen with regard to reimbursement. There are two documents; one is a volunteer timesheet. We like to keep track of the hours that you volunteer toward the effort of doing the RAC meetings. That's the one with the horizontal lines on it that says timesheet down here at the bottom. The other one is a reimbursement form. Those of you that traveled here today that

are eligible for reimbursement, if you have any questions about that let me know, but we'll reimburse those who drove for mileage and meals under certain circumstances. So if you have any questions you can ask Natalie or I about that. We need you to fill these forms out and then get them, ultimately to Natalie before we're through. If you'll leave them up here in a pile we'll pick them up or if you give them to me I'll give them to her. And that's it Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Okay our next meeting will be Bear Proclamation and Rule, December 9, 2008 at 7:00 PM, Beaver High School, Beaver, Utah. Motion to adjourn. Motion by Steve Dalton. Second by Sam Carpenter. All in favor? Any against? Motion carries. We're adjourned.

Draft