

Central Region Advisory Council  
Central Region Conference Center  
1115 N. Main St, Springville  
April 28, 2009 @ 6:30 p.m.

### **Motion Summary**

#### **Approval of the Agenda**

MOTION: To accept the agenda as written  
Passed unanimously

#### **Approval of the March 24, 2009 summary**

MOTION: To accept the summary notes as transcribed  
Passed unanimously

#### **Antlerless Addendum, Rule and Permit Recommendations for 2009**

MOTION: To recommend 1,000 total antlerless elk permits on the Wasatch Mountains, West (Central Region) unit  
Passed unanimously

MOTION: Recommend to allocate more of the antlerless elk permits on the Wasatch Mountains, West (Central Region) unit in the Wasatch county area  
Passed unanimously

MOTION: To reduce antlerless elk draw permits on the Central Mountains, Nebo unit to 115 (from 230) and close all antlerless elk hunts after the general elk hunting season in the boundary defined as from I-15 at Nephi to Nebo loop road to Santaquin Canyon road to I-15 back to Nephi.  
Passed 6 to 2

MOTION: To increase permits on the West Desert, Deep Creek unit to 40 draw permits  
Passed unanimously

MOTION: To approve the balance of the recommendations  
Passed unanimously

#### **Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2009**

MOTION: To approve the recommendations as presented  
Passed unanimously

#### **AIS Amendment R657-60**

MOTION: To accept the amendment as presented  
Passed unanimously

Central Region Advisory Council  
Central Region Conference Center  
1115 N. Main St, Springville  
April 28, 2009 @ 6:30 p.m.

**Members Present**

John Bair, Sportsmen  
Calvin Crandall, Agriculture  
Byron Gunderson, At Large  
Richard Hansen, At Large  
George Holmes, Agriculture  
Ed Kent, Chair  
Gary Nielson, Sportsmen  
Jay Price, Elected  
Larry Velarde, Forest Service

**Members Absent**

Micki Bailey, BLM  
Fred Oswald, Non-consumptive, excused  
Allan Stevens, At Large, excused  
Duane Smith, Non-consumptive

---

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

**VOTING**

**Motion was made by Byron Gunderson to accept the agenda as written**

**Seconded by Gary Nielson**

**Motion passed unanimously**

2) **Approval of the March 24, 2009 summary (Action)**

**VOTING**

**Motion was made by Jay Price to accept the summary notes as transcribed**

**Seconded by John Bair**

**Motion passed unanimously**

3) **Regional Update (Information)**

- **John Fairchild, Central Regional Supervisor**

**All Sections**

- Finalizing work plans for the upcoming fiscal year
- Main topics covered at regional meeting held April 22

**Wildlife**

- Completed bear denning operations this spring; a new program for the regions
- Sage-grouse lek counts still being carried out by biologists
- Riley Peck, new biologist intern selected from BYU
- Biologists evaluating winter loss/winter range conditions on key wintering areas
- Beaver working group meeting to develop statewide beaver management plan

**Aquatics**

- \$1 million federal grant for carp control at Utah Lake
- Conducting gillnetting operations at Yuba to monitor walleye, pike and yellow perch
- Preparations being made to resume restoration work in Diamond Fork next month

- Antennae array installed in lower Spanish Fork River to monitor June sucker movements
- Stocking Kokanee at Strawberry May 4-5
- Gillnetting Deer Creek Reservoir May 6
- Gillnetting Jordanelle Reservoir May 7
- Stocking rainbows and cutthroats at Strawberry may 18-21

### Habitat

- The South Sanpete WMA HMP is currently being reviewed internally, will be presented to the RAC later this year.
- Met with OHV race representatives and BLM near Little Sahara to review a race course proposed in sage-grouse habitat
- Attended the UPCD annual coordination meeting in Richfield earlier today

### Conservation Outreach

- Salem Pond Fishing Derby scheduled for May 12
- Utah Lake Festival June 6

### Law Enforcement

- Several large deer poaching cases under investigation
- Fishing picking up at Urban Fishing Ponds, officers busy making the rounds

#### 4) **Antlerless Addendum, Rule and Permit Recommendations for 2009 (Action)**

- **Craig Clyde, Regional Wildlife Program Manager**

### **Questions from the RAC**

John Bair – On the Wasatch are we 400 elk over objective?

Craig Clyde – It is more than that. The estimate is 3,000 and the objective is 2,600 so it is 400 but you have to include the production coming up as well.

John Bair – So if we have the same number of tags and harvest success is around 60 percent that will put us down to about 2,200 elk which is below objective.

Craig Clyde – If we get that kind of success. We look at a three year average.

John Bair – Last year we had 1,366 tags and our harvest was 842. Even if we get 50 percent success that still puts us well below our objective.

Calvin Crandall – Didn't you say that is not counting the calves?

Craig Clyde – That is correct.

John Bair – How many is that?

Craig Clyde – Normally we will end up with anywhere from 53 percent to 63 percent.

John Bair – Of the total population?

Craig Clyde – Yes. We run that through the model.

John Bair – When you look at 2007 and what we ended up with post season 2008 we were still down 850 elk. If we do that again it will put us well below objective.

Craig Clyde – We shoot for below objective.

John Bair – Why?

Craig Clyde – Because we hardly ever hit it.

John Bair – That just seems to be aggressive.

? – Does that account for your spike and any bull tags too?

Craig Clyde – No.

Ed Kent – Did that answer your question?

John Bair – I understand what he is saying. I think we are double what we ought to be on those tags. I would rather shoot for the objective and be a few over.

Craig Clyde – The model we are using is a new model we have used for the past two years. As we use it each year it also builds in any error factors that it has. We are trying to work that through to where it is more predictable but we think that it may be a better model than the one we were using before.

John Bair – So if we are 400 under objective could you bring that back in a year?

Craig Clyde – Yes. When you get 62 percent of the herd back each year in one year you can bring it right back.

George Holmes - When you say the estimated elk population is 3,000 what is the cow population?

Craig Clyde – On the Wasatch unit, we are carrying about 35 bulls to 100 cows. We are over objective on the bulls so we have to have the cow numbers down.

? When did you last fly that unit?

Craig Clyde – That unit was flown last year.

Richard Hansen – On the Manti, Nebo unit there is some information on the internet with a lot of disparities. In 1999 we killed 252 spikes on that unit and in 2007 we killed 83 and yet we are saying there are 1,493 animals in 1999 and in 2007 there are 1,530 but we only killed 83 spikes.

Craig Clyde – That is the total population. Here is a slide for the Nebo unit for the limited entry bull tags. Our objective for that unit is between a five and six year old bull. As you can see we are above our objective on our age class every year since 1999 when we started keeping ages. What we are doing there is stockpiling bulls. You can only have so many elk on that unit and we have to stay within that by law. If we go over that we have to reduce the population and we do that by killing cows because they are the producers and that is what is going to hold the population. The more bulls you have the fewer cows you can have. The fewer cows you have the less production you get. Fewer calves means fewer spikes you will have to hunt.

Richard Hansen – Looking at past population estimates the numbers are similar now to what they were ten years ago. I don't know how to look at this and say it is as good as it was ten years ago.

Craig Clyde – What you are looking at there is the difference between the estimated population and the trend count. When we fly a unit we fly every ridge around the whole mountain up and down and we count everything we find. It is hard to count the bulls because they will be separated out from the main herd. We get a pretty good count on antlerless and calves, however we don't get them all so we add 20 percent to that. Counts depend on weather conditions and sight ability. If one year we count most of the elk and we add the 20 percent we are saying there are more elk than there really are. The next year we might fly again and have poor conditions and we miss 30 percent of them but we only add 20 percent so we are off the other direction. It is not an exact science so you can get some fluctuations in this data.

Richard Hansen – Do you know what the bull to cow ratio is?

Craig Clyde – Again, I mentioned that we don't go by bull to cow ratio because bulls are hard to count. That is why we go by age of the bulls in the harvest.

Richard Hansen – I wonder how you got 35?

Craig Clyde – I can't say that for sure because we don't collect that data. Those are animals we miss when we fly.

Richard Hansen – I can understand that but I can tell you from being in the field and talking to hunters that for example in the Reese Flat area we used to see 300 elk there. The most I saw this year was 13 elk and it has been that way for four or five years. They aren't in the surrounding areas either. That is my concern. I think that the antlerless hunt really focuses guys on areas that you can get to easily and they are absolutely hammering them. The late hunts keep the elk high and it also runs the deer all over. If I went and chased the deer like cow elk hunters chase them I could get in a lot of trouble, but they do it legally because they are hunting elk. I don't like the

extended hunt. It causes more damage than good. I think we should stop that extended hunt and end it in November or December.

### **Questions from the Public**

Ken Strong - On your internet home page there is information about the possibility of more antlerless deer permits on the Central Mountains, Nebo unit. Where is that boundary? It says there are 150 doe permits plus mitigation permits. It also says we are at 50 percent of what we want our deer population to be on the Nebo. We have cut the Nebo deer hunt to five days and yet we are going to kill off the does?

Craig Clyde – As you mentioned there are two different types of hunts there. The hunts we are recommending are the Levan and Sanpete valley hunts. Those are within the Nebo management unit but not on the mountain, just in the valley. Those permits are to help the landowners push the deer back up on the mountain. They are valley deer that do nothing but damage crops. There are 150 permits on three different hunts. The others are mitigation tags. We are estimating what we may need to give out. Under the depredation law and rule we have, if a landowner is experiencing damage to crops we can give up to five antlerless deer permits they can use on their property.

George Holmes – What time of year is that?

Craig Clyde – We can run those from August first to December 31<sup>st</sup>. We can work with the landowner to see when the deer are on his property. We usually don't spread the hunt out that long.

Ken Strong – So the 150 permits are on valley hunts?

Craig Clyde – Yes.

Dave Woodhouse – Do those run from August to December also?

Craig Clyde – No, there is a shorter season on those.

Mike Christensen – So are there really only about 180 elk on the Deep Creeks?

Craig Clyde – No, there are more elk than that. When we flew that we counted 180 there and most were bulls. The biologist had a hard time finding those elk. He felt that those elk had moved into Nevada. We do a pretty good search on the mountain but when you start spreading out into Nevada then it is hard to tell if they are our elk or their elk or how far we need to go. We do know the number of elk we are having problems with during the summer time eating the hay fields. They get a pretty good idea around that time and the biologist will make his recommendation with those added in.

Mike Christensen – Does Nevada have late cow hunts in that area?

Craig Clyde – I don't know. I am sure they have but I don't know if it is exactly in that area.

Mike Christensen – What is the success rate?

Craig Clyde – I could get that for you. The average during a general season hunt is around 50 percent. We usually have later hunts out there to focus on animals that are feeding a certain winter range heavily or doing damage during the winter to hay stacks and fences. We try to do the best we can to control the numbers of elk that are depredating and focus on the problem causing elk.

John Bair – A lot of these valley deer hunts are archery, shotgun and muzzleloader hunts.

Craig Clyde – That is just a safety issue.

John Bair – Are the mitigation tags the same?

Craig Clyde – No but they are limited to only hunting on the persons property.

### Comments from the Public

Dave Woodhouse – I would recommend to the RAC that we are very cautious with our cow elk hunts. I brought my dad here today. He is an old time crop duster pilot around here. He flies these areas every winter. Every year, for the past six years the elk herds have gone down.

George Holmes – Have you counted them?

Dave Woodhouse – Yes we have.

George Holmes – And what were the numbers?

Dave Woodhouse - On the backside of front mountain here we used to see a herd of about 300 year in year out. This year you are lucky to see 30 to 40 head. They may be more scattered but there are not the elk we had in the past. Maybe we were way over objective ten years ago but they have steadily declined.

George Holmes – Which units on this list are you talking about?

Dave Woodhouse – Wasatch, Nebo and Manti.

George Holmes – When was it last flown by the division?

Craig Clyde – The Wasatch, West was last year and it was 3,000.

Dave Woodhouse – They are counting other areas in that too. I can tell you that there are just not the elk we had ten or even six years ago. I am not saying there is no room for cow hunts but we need to be cautious and take into account that we don't have the elk we have had in the past.

Mike Christensen – For the most part I think we need to be cautious with our cow permits but the Deep Creek is an interesting mountain range. It is a high desert mountain range and habitat in that area is heavily affected by the elk herd. There are 20 permits recommended. With a 50 to 60 percent success rate we are looking at taking 12 cows off that unit. The division flew that unit this year and counted 180 bulls. The herd objective for that unit is 200 elk. It is a unit that is near and dear to me. The elk in the tops of those high desert mountains are really having a negative affect on the habitat. To take 12 cow elk off there will not control the herd and maintain objective. I don't know if we can come up with a number here tonight but it should be more than 20.

### RAC Discussion

Byron Gunderson – What was the average age on the Deep Creek?

Craig Clyde – I can tell you it was over objective and it seems like it was around seven.

Ed Kent – Counting mitigation permits there are 32 permits.

John Bair – On the Wasatch two years ago we were at 3,850 elk post season with almost the same number of tags as we are proposing this year and we dropped that population in a year by 850 elk. If we drop that amount again we are down to 2,200 elk and our objective is 2,600. Why have the objective at 2,600 if we are going to shoot it to 22,000. I think that is very aggressive. The season is structured basically the same and with the same number of permits we can see what the results would be. Instead of 1,289 tags as is recommended I would say we have 800 tags. We are still going to put the population down to objective or below.

### **VOTING**

**Motion was made by John Bair to recommend 800 total antlerless elk permits on the Wasatch Mountains, West (Central Region) unit**

**Seconded by Richard Hansen**

Calvin Crandall – What were the numbers in 2005 or '95 or '85 or '65?

Craig Clyde – I don't know but I could get that for you.

Dave Woodhouse – In '65 there were zero. In '85 there were only hundreds.

Calvin Crandall – What I am getting at is do we need thousands of elk there? Historically the elk were not there but there were a lot of deer.

? – Historically they were there.

George Holmes – If the population is 3,000 I think I heard you say 65 percent of them are going to be females and 50 to 60 percent of those will have calves. So in July how many elk are we looking at?

Ed Kent – Half of 1,500 is 750.

George Holmes – So there will at least be 3,750 and it will probably be more like 4,000. How many permits were there and what is the success ratio?

Craig Clyde - 1,289 and the success rate about 60 percent.

George Holmes – So with that we will be at about 3,000 elk maybe even higher. I think we are gaining elk.

John Bair – If you look at last year with the same number of tags we have taken the post season population from 3,850 to 3,000. We have knocked the population back by 850 elk.

George Holmes – We just looked at the numbers and got 3,000.

John Bair – We can see what happened last year and if we do the same thing we will get the same result.

Ed Kent – We know what the issue is. Any further debate? We have a motion we need to entertain.

Jay Price – I agree on both sides. I think the problem is that we kill elk in the wrong places. In our area you have all this private ground but the elk winter off the private ground.

Gary Nielson – That is the same thing on the face on Nebo. Some areas have been hunted out so bad it is hard to find an elk.

Larry Velarde – I think you make a good point. In the Cascade Springs area we used to see elk in there all the time and last year we might have seen 20 cows. If you look on Blake Roney's property or Robert Redford's private property you will find 300 head of elk.

Richard Hansen – We are sending hunters out to hunt 60 percent of the population, if that.

George Holmes – Could we make the hunts more area specific?

Calvin Crandall – Would that be a recommendation we could make?

Ed Kent – I don't know if you can do that at this point because of the elk management plan that is in place. The elk working group is going to be brought back together sometime shortly.

Craig Clyde – We can and do break hunts into sub units. On the Wasatch we have two hunts in Diamond Fork, east Heber, Park City, two hunts in Springville, two hunts on Timponogos, two hunts in Wallsburg, one hunt on the west side of Heber, one hunt with 400 tags on the whole Wasatch during the general season, a Strawberry, an Alpine hunt and a Salt Lake county hunt. We do break it down into these units and we do try to focus in areas where we are having problems. On top of that we have the CWMUS. The coyote little pole, the three C and Wallsburg. That is quite a number and it is all broken up based on the numbers we count on each unit when we fly. When we have problems like at George Holmes' place we can hunt that area.

George Holmes – Let's be specific. Where are you going to hunt those that are hitting George Holmes?

Craig Clyde – Some would have to be on private property. We also have the CWMU that has 80 tags.

Jay Price – The problem is the elk aren't coming from the CWMU they are coming out of Wolf Creek or Red Ledges.

Craig Clyde – We have a hard time controlling numbers on private property or reservations. You can't have too many hunters on a CWMU or they push the elk off.

John Bair – The more hunters you put on the success will go down. More permits does not always mean more harvest.

Craig Clyde - We do break up the tags to try to get the numbers killed to reduce the population to our objective.

Richard Hansen – The Nebo is not broken up.

Craig Clyde – The Nebo is not as big a unit as the Wasatch so no, it is not broken down as much.

Richard Hansen – Do you ever get calls with problems in that area?

Craig Clyde – We do and we give mitigation tags for those areas.

Richard Hansen - To me that is probably the best way to handle that.

Craig Clyde – By rule we can give a landowner two free antlerless elk tags that have to be used on his property. And we can give up to 20 percent of the population in additional permits up to 20 tags total.

John Bair – I would like to amend my motion to 1,000 permits on the Wasatch, West unit.

Second by Gary Neilson stands

**Amended motion by John Bair to recommend 1,000 total antlerless elk permits on the Wasatch Mountains, West (Central Region) unit**

**Seconded by Gary Neilson**

**In Favor: Jay Price, George Holmes, John Bair, Calvin Crandall, Larry Velarde, Gary Nielson, Richard Hansen, Byron Gunderson**

**Opposed: none**

**Motion passed unanimously**

**Motion was made by Calvin Crandall recommending to allocate more of the antlerless elk permits on the Wasatch Mountains, West (Central Region) unit in the east Wasatch county area**

John Bair – Is there a set percentage of antlerless tags that can be mitigation permits?

Craig Clyde – By rule we can't go any higher than 20 percent of the population. The herd may be hitting more than one landowner and they may all get permits.

Ed Kent – So are you okay with the motion to allow the division to allocate most of the tags to the Wasatch county elk population.

Calvin Crandall – Yes.

George Holmes – Craig, in your opinion will that work because of all the private land in the area?

Craig Clyde – I don't believe it will because as you put more hunters there you push the elk onto private property where they can't be harvested.

Jay Price – They are getting damage too.

Calvin Crandall – Then they have to realize that they have to let some people in to hunt.

John Bair – I know a lot of landowners don't want people hunting but don't want the elk either.

**Seconded by Richard Hansen**

Gary Nielson – Does it need to be that specific?

George Holmes - Either way. Sometimes too specific is not good. You could make it more general and say to try and take care of the elk problems in Wasatch County.

Ed Kent – We could generalize and make it Wasatch county.

Calvin Crandall – Lets just make it Wasatch County.

**In Favor: all**

**Motion passed unanimously**



**Motion was made by Richard Hansen to reduce antlerless elk draw permits on the Central Mountains, Nebo unit to 115 (from 230) and close all antlerless elk hunts after the general elk hunting season in the boundary defined as from I-15 at Nephi to Nebo loop road to Santaquin Canyon road to I-15 back to Nephi.**  
**Seconded by John Bair**

Calvin Crandall – Looking at the numbers it seems you are fairly stable on the Nebo. If you cut that harvest in half you are over objective.

Craig Clyde – Which would mean we will have to kill more bulls.

Calvin Crandall – Is that part of the recommendation?

Richard Hansen – I have my own opinion about that. I hunted in '98 and it was absolutely incredible. I went out and every morning I saw 40 to 50 bulls. I went with my son in 2006 and we saw only three bulls. That's how it was. They are not there like they were in 1998.

**In Favor: Jay Price, John Bair, Larry Velarde, Gary Nielson, Richard Hansen, Byron Gunderson**

**Opposed: George Holmes, Calvin Crandall**

**Motion passed 6 to 2**

Gary Nielson – Mike, are you aware of the land swap with the Indians on the Deep Creeks a few years ago when they got all the good hunting places?

Mike Christensen – I know about that but I was out there a few years ago and watched a herd of about 120 cows and calves.

Gary Nielson – It is true that the habitat can't handle a lot of elk.

Calvin Crandall – Did I hear you say there were a lot of bulls there?

Mike Christensen – They counted 180 bulls and the herd objective is 200.

Ed Kent – I think part of the problem is it is a migratory herd.

Craig Clyde – One of the problems we have is that the elk are on in the Indian reservation when we are having the hunt to try and control the elk population.

John Bair – It seems to me that 12 elk is somewhat insignificant either way.

Ed Kent – There are 32 permits total.

John Bair – So we are still only talking about 17 or 18 elk. A coyote kill varies that much. What was your recommendation?

Mike Christensen – More. I don't know a number.

**Motion was made by John Bair to increase permits on the West Desert, Deep Creek unit to 40 draw permits**

**Seconded by Calvin Crandall**

Jay Price – Is that a problem with the division? It sounds like you admit there are more elk there.

Craig Clyde – We believe there are. We put the best information we have into the model and we rely on that to give us a trend overtime.

John Bair – We're just adding a little human error to that.

**In Favor: all**

**Motion passed unanimously**

**Motion was made by Jay Price to approve the balance of the recommendations**

**Seconded by George Holmes**

**In Favor: all**

**Motion passed unanimously**

- 5) **Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2009 (Action)**  
- **Craig Clyde, Regional Wildlife Program Manager**

**Questions from the RAC**

Calvin Crandall – For the unit in the southern region, what was their recommendation?

Craig Clyde – They wanted 12 total, six for the public and six private. And our recommendation is no permits.

John Bair – Do you know the reason for their recommendation?

Craig Clyde – I don't. I assume it is family or a public relation effort for people in town or around the unit.

John Bair – Mike and I worked on the CWMU committee. The operators don't like antlerless tags but that is part of the deal. Of all things I would be leery to not follow the division's recommendations for a CWMU after seeing the process that is involved.

Craig Clyde – Normally it is the other way around because we want to get antlerless harvest and they don't want permits because they don't make any money on them.

John Bair – I have seen the process and I would think that this would be the one time I would not adjust what the division has recommended.

**VOTING**

**Motion was made by John Bair to approve the recommendations as presented**

**Seconded by Jay Price**

**In Favor: all**

**Motion passed unanimously**

- 6) **AIS Amendment R657-60 (Action)**  
- **John Fairchild, Regional Aquatic Program Coordinator**

**Questions from the RAC**

Richard Hansen – Can you treat a water that is infected?

John Fairchild – No.

Byron Gunderson – If an invasive species is detected will that water be infected?

John Fairchild – It may or may not. It is a numbers game. They may be so widely distributed that they may not establish a population. The detection capability is very high so you are detecting something that might not, could eventually, but might not lead to the establishment of a population. Because of this it is placed in different category where we are monitoring closely but aren't justified in the huge expense of reallocating all our resources to that one water.

Byron Gunderson – How do you determine if juveniles or adults are present?

John Bair – By observation.

Ed Kent – So the veligers may be so widely dispersed that they don't get together.

John Fairchild – Or because they are an introduced species the conditions might not be suitable for establishment. You may have water quality issues that don't allow them to ...

Ed Kent – So the mood lighting might not be just right.

John Fairchild – Exactly.

John Bair – Can they survive in Utah Lake?

John Fairchild – Probably? Utah Lake is one of the highest ranking lakes for those who boat in Lake Powell.

Byron Gunderson – Are there still other mussels in Utah Lake?

John Fairchild – You are getting out of my league.

Richard Hansen – Do they do better in warm water and can they travel through a stream?

Ed Kent – Yes and they can go anywhere the water takes them.

**Motion was made by George Holmes to accept the amendment as presented  
Seconded by John Bair**

Byron Gunderson – What is your opinion on this?

John Fairchild – The recommendation is based on the assessment of risks and the economics of having to respond to a classification of a system limited to infected verses non-infected waters.

Ed Kent – Like I said, the “mood lighting” is not right.

**In Favor: all**

**Motion passed unanimously**

**Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.**

**19 in attendance**

**Next board meeting May 7<sup>th</sup> at the State Capitol Building, Senate Room 210, Salt Lake**

**Next RAC meeting May 19<sup>th</sup> at the Central Region Conference Center**

**NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY-MOTIONS PASSED**  
**Western Park, Vernal/April 28, 2009**

6.ANTLERLESS ADDENDUM, RULE AND PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2009

**MOTION:** to accept the Division recommendations as proposed  
Motion passed 4 to 2

7.ANTLERLESS CWMU PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2009

**MOTION:** to accept UDWR's recommendations on CWMU permits as presented

Passed unanimously

8.AIS AMENDMENT R657-60

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

**NORTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY**

**Western Park, Vernal**

**April 28, 2009**

**Started at 6:30 pm; Adjourned at**

**RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Beth Hamann-Nonconsumptive  
Kirk Woodward-Sportsmen  
Amy Torres-Chair  
Kevin Christopherson-NER Supervisor  
Rod Morrison-Sportsmen  
Floyd Briggs-At Large  
Ron Winterton-Elected Official  
Bob Christensen-Forest Service

**UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:**

Charlie Greenwood-NER Wildlife Pgm Mgt  
Ben Wolford-NER Law Enforcement  
Derrick Ewell-NER Wildlife Biologist  
Dax Mangus-NER Wildlife Biologist  
Gayle Allred-Office Manager  
Ron Stewart-Conservation Outreach

**EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:**

Curtis Daststrup-Agriculture  
Karl Breitenbach-At Large

**UNEXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:**

Dave Chivers-Agriculture

**Amy Torres:** I will be stepping down as RAC chair because I have changed jobs and am now working for the Forest Service. I still plan to be on the RAC but will have to fill one of the positions which will be vacant in July.

**1. REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA:**

**Amy Torres**

We need to add agenda item # 8 regarding the Aquatic Invasive Species Amendment. In this region we are pretty familiar with the quagga situation at Red Fleet. This amendment will clarify some terminology, etc. We can address it after the Antlerless CWMU permit recommendations.

We will also need to nominate a new RAC Chairperson. We can do this after Kevin Christopherson gives his regional update, before we start the regular agenda items.

**MOTION by Rod Morrison to add Agenda Item # 8 to the agenda**

Second by Ron Winterton

**Passed unanimously**

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

**MOTION by Floyd Briggs to accept the minutes and old business.**

Second by Bob Christensen

Passed unanimously

**4. REGIONAL UPDATE: Kevin Christopherson**

We received a phone call from the Wyoming side of Flaming Gorge the other day. There was a 41' boat with a live zebra mussel on it. The boat owner originally lived in Rock Springs, and was coming back from Lake of the Ozarks. He had read articles and saw signs about quagga mussels so he contacted the marina who, in turn, contacted UDWR to inspect his boat. When they found the zebra mussel, they searched every inch of the boat. Later that day, the Wyoming Director, who hasn't been very interested in the quaggs, called UDWR asking lots of questions. Sounds like all of our advertising may be doing some good.

I received a notice of "Intent to Kill" from a landowner in Duchesne County who had animals and we were not able to keep them off. Landowners have to give 72-hours notice and then they can shoot. It's a tough thing. Our depredation specialist kept herding them and got them to move off but they'd run off the hill and run back onto the property. The good news is, the landowner didn't end up shooting any. We're over-objective for elk on that unit so we need to address that issue in the future.

Free fishing day will be held the first Saturday in June, which will be June 6. There will be multiple activities around the region in every county. It's kind of a kid's day. We're going to dedicate the new moose pond project, in conjunction with the Forest Service. Last year we had a tagged fish contest and a local radio station gave away some television sets, etc. Will do pretty much the same thing again this year.

With Spring deer classifications, Charlie Greenwood says the deer in our Northeastern region look like they came through the winter in good shape. Also, the browse is looking pretty good.

**RAC Chair Nominations: Amy Torres**

In the Northeastern Region RAC meetings, the RAC Chair only votes as a tie breaker. They take the information gathered in these meetings to Salt Lake to represent NER's RAC to the Wildlife Board. The RAC Chairperson can plan on attending meetings in Salt Lake once or twice a month, occasionally requiring an overnight stay. Sometimes

the meetings start early and end late but it's pretty fun being involved on the statewide level. The Vice-Chair will be a backup in case the RAC Chair cannot attend.

**Bob Christensen nominated by Floyd Briggs**

Second by Beth Hamann

**Rod Morrison nominated by Bob Christensen**

Second by Kirk Woodward

**MOTION to cease nominations by Floyd Briggs**

Second by Ron Winterton

**Passed unanimously**

Did silent vote with the following results:

4 votes for Bob Christensen. **Bob Christensen will be the new RAC Chair**  
2 votes for Rod Morrison. **Rod Morrison will be the new RAC Vice-chair**

This will take effect on the May 14 RAC meeting.

Rod Morrison: I would like to give a big thanks to Amy for the excellent job she has done as RAC chair.

**5. LOCAL/NONCONSUMPTIVE ISSUES**

None

**6. ANTLERLESS ADDENDUM, RULE AND PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2009 - Charles Greenwood (ACTION)**

**DEER**

Four areas in the southern region have poor habitat conditions and so antlerless permits are recommended to cautiously move the population back to objective.

**ELK**

**SER**

Control permits are being recommended on Henry Mountains, North San Rafael and the new San Juan any bull unit east of us-191, Nine Mile Range Creek

On these units we are recommending that hunters who have any antlered big game permit can also purchase an antlerless elk control permit for these units at a reduced price.

## **PRONGHORN**

Parker Mountain

## **MOOSE**

Populations are about back to objective

### **Antlerless Harvest Reporting:**

New in 2009, antlerless hunters can fill out their harvest report online  
Reporting is NOT mandatory

### **Questions from Public:**

Mitch Hacking: Are these permits available over the counter? Are they in addition to other permits?

Charlie Greenwood: The depredation and landowners are not included in these permits. They are in the handout and considered in the overall management.

### **Questions from RAC:**

Rod Morrison: Why the zero elk east of Hwy 191? Is that off of the mountain at the limited entry unit?

Dax Mangus: Landowners are growing sunflowers for bio fuel and they've got a huge operation and haven't been able to keep the elk out which is why they have declared it a zero elk area.

Rod Morrison: I'm curious to know if that will affect the limited entry unit, if it went on the mountain or down low in San Juan because that's our number one unit.

Kevin Christopherson: The hope is that it will not. They're hoping to target the resident populations on the agricultural lands. I can't give the exact boundaries, but hopefully we can reduce the animals that are on the agricultural lands.

Kirk Woodward: Concerning the South Slope Yellowstone unit. Population objective is 5500. We're at 5600 and have been steady for three years yet we've increased the permit numbers by 130.

Charlie Greenwood: We're trying to maintain the population. Permit numbers are based on success last year.

Kirk Woodward: In the Book Cliffs, objective is 7500. We're at 4600 elk and we're giving 200 tags.



Charlie Greenwood: The herd is increasing with slow growth. We have depredation concerns and range problem winter concerns on Little Creek and McCook. We'd like to push them off McCook to help the deer population there.

Dax Mangus: Three hunts on north end Little Creek and McCook are to target specific areas where we have range issues. McCook is an important transition range to try to displace the elk to free up for deer. The Little Creek in roadless area, the concentrations of elk are so concentrated that needs to clear that out. Willow Creek has a resident lower country elk herd that hits resident areas. Will try to target depredation problems.

Kirk Woodward: I've been concerned about Book Cliffs because I'm concerned about the spike elk hunt already. And then we add cow hunters out there. The increased traffic is a concern to me and to the sportsmen.

Clay Hamann: One of the arguments for killing spikes is to have more cows. It seems dumb to allow a spike hunt to get more cows and then allow more cow permits.

Kirk Woodward: I haven't received positive feedback from sportsmen about the Book Cliffs spike hunt.

Charlie Greenwood: We're concerned also. We'll keep an eye on that.

Rod Morrison: Way too high number doubling on Anthro. What is the reason?

Derrick Ewell: When we flew it, the numbers are double over objective.

Kirk Woodward: There are a lot of elk that go back and forth on Tribal lands.

Bob Christensen: On Forest Service, there aren't any elk in October but they come back in November.

Rod Morrison: What does the Forest Service think about doubling these permits?

Bob Christensen: They have a population objective and they need to stay within the objective. There are this year's calves that are going to be in the population as well, that's not in the population estimate plus the hunter success; you have to take that into consideration as well.

Kevin Christopherson: most of the complaints I hear about Anthro are the quality of the bulls not the size of the herd. We're required to get down to objective.

Rod Morrison: I've heard a lot of complaints about not seeing many elk in there. Maybe by November but not during the hunt.

Charlie Greenwood: We have elk that come all the way from Strawberry to winter there. We have worked with the Central Region this year to take care of elk when they're on Strawberry this year.

Derrick Ewell: Tribe's going to have cow hunts on Avintaquin unit, hoping that will increase the harvest over there to push them onto public lands. We're having a December and January hunt to hopefully get the migrating elk.

Dax Mangus: Some other complaints deal with range concerns on the Anthro elk herd. There is late wintering on the Forest Service lands, hurting the aspen.

Kirk Woodward: They're wintering on Forest Service lands?

Bob Christensen: They're eating choke cherries in January and December. When people come up and hunt not just elk but deer as well and then they're pushed off but in November, they're back.

Charlie Greenwood: The success rate last year on Anthro antlerless elk was 35% success. Year before was 52% success, year before was 70% success. 35 is not bad. They range from 20 – 50%. The elk are figuring out where to hide.

Kirk Woodward: Were the hunts in December and January?

Dax Mangus: December. Little bit of distribution of where bulls are.

Rod Morrison: A lot of cow hunters will pound Wells Draw and they're getting the resident herd instead of the migration herd. If they have this many tags and they're going to the easier access, they'll be taking the resident herd instead of the migrating herd.

Bob Christensen: There are more permits given for just the west side - 300 permits.

Rod Morrison: So they are going to break them up?

Derrick Ewell: Yes.

Charlie Greenwood: Also, 100 permits are muzzleloader permits.

**Comments from Public: None**

**Comments from RAC:**

Bob Christensen: Regarding the Anthro suggestion, I wonder about season dates if we pushed the season into November when those elk are coming back, I wonder if they'd see a little higher success rate,

Kirk Woodward: Are you talking about limited entry bull elk?

Bob Christensen: No, the antlerless elk. Right now it's 12/5/2009-12/20/2009 and 1/1/2010-1/15/2010. The reason is I'm not sure how much success they're going to have but they'd increase the success if they move that into November somewhat. I've seen the elk come back in November. I don't know if it's resident or migrating from Avintaquin but I think you'd see a higher success rate if you do it after the limited entry bull hunt. That way you'd get people some opportunity to access the area.

Derrick Ewell: The reason I put it just in December is because the limited entry goes into November and I wanted to give them a couple week break so they're not running around the entire month. Some years you can get in there, some years you can't. If you had good weather, you could get in there.

### **RAC MOTION AND DISCUSSION:**

Amy Torres: We've had quite a few comments on Anthro and the Book Cliffs. Do I have a motion?

**MOTION by Bob Christensen to accept the Division recommendations as proposed.**  
Second by Beth Hamann

**DISCUSSION: None**

**Favor: Bob Christensen, Ron Winterton, Floyd Briggs, Beth Hamann**

**Opposed: Rod Morrison, Kirk Woodward**

**Motion passed 4 to 2**

Kirk Woodward: From the sportsmen's perspective, they want lower numbers. I understand the rationale but they would rather see less elk harvested

Clay Hamann: Especially with this unknown spike elk hunt starting.

Kirk Woodward: I don't have an answer regarding the Anthro unit, but I know the sportsmen are concerned.

Bob Christensen: The complaints that I have heard seem to be centered on the number of larger bulls.

Rod Morrison: It's definitely down on that end.

Kirk Woodward: The reason I don't bring that up is UDWR doesn't manage for inches, they manage for age objective. That's what all the sportsmen want is to kill a 380 bull

but that's a different discussion. It'd like to see the age objective increase but that's another issue. But sportsmen are nervous, especially regarding spike bull hunt coming up.

Rod Morrison: Kirk, the year you had a tag and we hit the fields, we hardly saw any cows there during the hunting season.

Kirk Woodward: During the season I saw 32 bulls and I'll bet I didn't see any more cows than that.

Charlie Greenwood: Keep in mind that that there's an active elk committee that's working on the Anthro including representatives from livestock, sportsmen, county commission., Derrick Ewel from UDWR, Rod Morrison from our NER RAC.

## **7. ANTLERLESS CWMU PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2009 - Charlie Greenwood (ACTION)**

There are five CWMUs in this region. Antlerless permits are allocated based on what the buck/bull allocation is on CWMUs.

**Questions from Public: None**

**Questions from RAC: None**

**Comments from Public: None**

**Comments from RAC: None**

## **RAC MOTION AND DISCUSSION:**

**MOTION by Floyd Briggs to accept recommendations on CWMU permits as presented.**

Second by Rod Morrison

**DISCUSSION: None**

**Passed unanimously**

## **8. AIS AMENDMENT R657-60 – Kevin Christopherson (ACTION)**

See handout

This amendment covers how we define an infestation. Also, law enforcement issues need to be tightened up a bit. We really need public cooperation.

This came about because Red Fleet sent samples to five labs and got different results from all five labs.

New terms are defined, such as Veliger: the larval form of these mussels, a free swimming form.

We are also developing intermediate terms four classifications of waters they are:

- Not tested
- Inconclusive
- Detected- but never found adults
- Infested – adult forms seen which kicks in the set of rules

Electric Lake will change from Infested to Detected

We are still developing the response plans.

**Questions from Public: None**

**Questions from RAC: None**

**Comments from Public: None**

**Comments from RAC:**

Kirk Woodward: The UDWR has done a good job in informing the public and I can't think of water that I've been in over the last year that didn't have information available.

ROD MORRISON HAD TO LEAVE AND WAS EXCUSED

**RAC MOTION AND DISCUSSION:**

**MOTION by Kirk Woodward to accept as presented**

Second by Ron Winterton

**DISCUSSION: None:**

Passed unanimously

**The NER RAC SOCIAL will be held June 30, 2009 at Del Brady's house.**

**Next RAC meeting will be held May 14, 2009 at Western Park.**

**Northern Regional Advisory Council**

**April 28, 2009**

**6:30 P.M.**

**Place:** Brigham City Community Center

**RAC Present**

Darwin Bingham  
Mark Marsh  
Robert Byrnes  
Jon Leonard  
Bill Fenimore  
Ryan Foutz  
James Gaskill  
Paul Cowley  
Ann Neville  
Brad Slater

**DWR Present**

Jodie Anderson  
Randy Wood  
Clint Brunson  
Ron Hodson  
Darren Debloois  
Candace Hutchinson  
Kevin Labrum  
Scott McFarlane  
Mike Kinghorn  
Kirt Enright

**Wildlife Board**

Ernie Perkins

**RAC Absent**

Lee Shirley  
Shawn Groll  
Bret Selman

**Meeting Begins: 6:30 p.m.**

**Number of Pages: 10**

**Introduction:** Brad Slater- Chair

**Agenda:**

Review of Agenda

Review of March 25, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Regional Update

Sensitive Species Program Update

Antlerless Addendum, Rule and Permit Recommendations for 2009

Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2009

AIS Amendment R657-60

**Item 1. Review and Acceptance of Agenda**

**Motion:** Fenimore- Approve the agenda as published.

**Second:** Neville

**Motion Carries:** Unanimous

**Item 2. Review and Acceptance of March 25, 2009 Meeting Minutes**

**Motion:** Marsh- Accept the minutes as published.

**Second:** Leonard

**Motion Carries:** For: 8, Abstain: 1

**Item 3. Regional Update**

Ron Hodson, Regional Supervisor

Started a process for a management plan for Hardware Ranch. Moving sharptail grouse to Antelope Island. Hoping to move at least 30. Have radio collars on some of the birds.

Mantua spring fishing should be good this year. East Canyon catch rates are up.

The dam at Willard Bay is up. Shad and wiper numbers are up. Walleye and catfish are down but size is really good. Fishing for larger fish should be good this year.

**RAC Questions**

Neville- Where did you catch the sharptail?

Hodson- They are being captured in Cache County. Probably out of Box Elder also.

Labrum- I think that started today.

Mr. Slater asked to excuse Mr. Shirley from the meeting.

#### **Item 4. Sensitive Species Program Update**

Kevin Labrum, Sensitive Species Biologist

Wildlife watching in 2006 brought in \$1.6 million dollars into the Utah economy. Hunting brings in \$5.3 million and fishing brings in \$708 million.

3 tier approach to sensitive species. 196 species petitioned for federal listing. Programs for sensitive species including aquatics and terrestrial problems. GIS computer models to monitor species, impact analysis and positive management. Monitor species on a 3 year rotation.

Plan to restore wet meadow habitat. Evaluate impact that different projects have on species. Information to contractors to reduce impact on federal species. Long-term surveys to determine decline.

#### **RAC Questions**

Gaskill- Is there any consideration given to whether sensitive species be allowed to become extinct.

Labrum- That is a question we should throw to the public. It is our duty to take care of them or at least not allow them to go extinct.

Gaskill- Why? Extinction is just as big a part of biology as any other part.

Labrum- It is anthropogenic extinction that we do not want to have occur.

Gaskill- Do we ever say "this species needs biologically to become extinct"? Is that ever a consideration?

Labrum- I don't think we have considered that as something we should do. That is an ethical question I guess.

Gaskill- I am asking as a scientific question.

Labrum- From a biological standpoint, each species plays a role in the ecosystem.

Gaskill- But it has been going on since the beginning of time hasn't it?

Labrum- It happens naturally but the rate in which the species go extinct is pretty low.

Gaskill- Do you ever consider that? This is an economic question.

Neville- I think it is unpleasant.

Fenimore- Do we have any programs where we try to work with landowners to have better nest success?

Labrum- Adam did try and do some of that. Some of our NRCS programs can work with landowners for those issues.

Fenimore- Depending on what tier, as you go through the various data collection, if the population data continues to decline does that raise their tier status?

Labrum- It goes through a panel. Species are then approved through the Wildlife Board. Some species don't warrant being tiered.

Fenimore- Are there any proposed wind farms in Utah that would require study to see if their migration routes for sensitive species that potentially could have negative impacts?

Labrum- We would provide those wind farms with that information.

Foutz- How do you estimate one billion dollars in watchable wildlife? Where can I find that information?



Labrum- You can do a search on economic impacts of wildlife watching. Google search would show several public documents that tell about methods used. I got my information from a pamphlet that the Division has published.

Fenimore- The biggest statistical survey is done every 5 years by U.S. Fish and Wildlife. That is done nationwide.

Labrum- In South Texas, the Department of Commerce did a study on economic impact. They estimated \$125 million just from bird watching for one city.

### **Item 5. Antlerless Addendum, Rule and Permit Recommendations for 2009**

Randy Wood, Regional Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

#### **Public Questions**

Roger McDermott- Harvest reporting online. Is there a phone number that can be called for those not computer savvy?

Wood- I am not sure there is.

Hodson- We have that with our antlered online reporting system so I am sure there will be.

#### **RAC Questions**

Fenimore- Do you have any slides on Northern Utah units?

Wood- No.

Fenimore- Permit recommendations for Box Elder County. I am surprised the number is so high given the population objective is so far below where you would like it to be.

Rather than take 150 animals out of the Cache unit, is there a mitigation fund that you can help landowners?

Wood- The Box Elder increase is due to depredation problems. Habitat improvement in that area. Mitigation permit number is an estimate at this time. Trying to project looking at last year. Have not issued mitigation permits yet. Allotted amount of 500,000 annually to pay for depredation problems. No funds available to do that. Mitigation permits are issued on a localized basis.

Fenimore- Are there any stimulus monies you can apply for?

Wood- I don't know, I am not sure.

Gaskill- If I buy a general bull elk tag, can I spend \$25 bucks and shoot a cow down in San Juan or do I have to have a permit for San Juan before I can buy that \$25 dollar tag?

Wood- That is the information I have. I don't know if Ron has more on it. My assumption is that it is going to be for that unit.

Gaskill- I assumed that but then I read "any".

Hodson- I don't know the answer to that one so I am going to call someone.

Gaskill- I just got through hunting turkeys in Washington and we all have to report. If we don't report, the next time we get a license it will cost us an extra \$10 dollars.

Wood- You probably don't need 100% reporting. You can get pretty good data without 100% reporting. We are going to see what kind of data we get back. I don't know why it is not mandatory.

Gaskill- Does the website have enough memory? More data is better.

Foutz- What is the margin of error when you do deer population estimates?

Wood- I don't.

Foutz- Does anyone here know? I would like to know what we are dealing with.

Byrnes- Are the price of tags are set by the legislature?

Wood- Yes. There has to be some leeway for them to be able to do that.

Byrnes- Were the tribe tags renegotiated?

Wood- I cannot talk outside of the Northern region. The tag for the Shoshone are still the same. That is the only one I deal with.

Byrnes- Could reminders be through email?

Wood- We are doing that with upland game. That could work.

Cowley- Antlerless objective in Box Elder and having problems with depredation. If we had 20,000 animals would we expect an increase in the depredation problems. If so, is our objective too high there.

Wood- Our problems are pretty localized in the eastern part of the unit. We feel that is a good objective at this time. There will probably be an increase in depredation problems.

Foutz- Fish Lake proposal for 1,600 cow permits. 69% success rate on 570 tags issued. If we maintain that success rate, we would kill 1,142 cows which still seems very excessive.

Wood- I have not looked at Fish Lake prior to this. Typically, it depends where they are. You have to pull out recruitment to start bringing that down. Where are you on that?

Foutz- Bottom of the first elk page.

Wood- You're 500 animals over the objective.

Foutz- It's 300 actually.

Wood- 300 over the objective. They are recommending 1,600 permits. I don't know.

Foutz- That doesn't work for me.

Neville- When you are giving these out, when we don't have the cow to bull ratios, it is really hard to see why these numbers are generated.

Wood- I agree with you. These presentations were put together by Salt Lake so each RAC received the same information. I think that is a good suggestion.

Neville- I think we are going to have to make it formal because we have made the suggestion in past years and nothing has happened.

A 10 minute break was taken to have a clarification on questions from Salt Lake that were asked by the RAC members.

Hodson- Answer to question regarding elk control permits. You need to have an antlered permit good for the unit where you are hunting. Confidence limits on deer population estimates. We do not have confidence limits. Data is not tight enough to put confidence limits around this. We do have confidence limits in one unit in the state. The Cache unit confidence limit is plus or minus 1,500 head. I don't know about the rest of the units in the state. Fish Lake increase of permits over the last several years. Recommending 1,600 permits and 300 over elk population. The 1,600 permits is what is required to hold steady. It will take more than 300 permits to bring to objective. We have recommended more permits than 300 and 500 over the last 2 years which have not gone forward.

## **RAC Comment**

Foutz- Cow to bull ratio information to be included in RAC packets.

Neville- With your suggestion, could we put that into motion for the Wildlife Board?

Foutz- Yes.

## **Motion**

**Motion:** Byrnes- Accept the proposal as recommended by the division.

**Second:** Bingham

**Motion Passes:** For: 7, Against: 2

## **Motion**

**Motion:** Neville- Move to recommend to the Wildlife Board in the antlerless permits for elk, to also include data for cow to bull and cow to calf ratios.

**Second:** Gaskill

## **Discussion on the Motion**

Cowley- Are you looking for the most current year?

Neville- Right, that is the most applicable.

Cowley- Is it to request that the Wildlife Board direct the Division to provide that information or this meeting?

Neville- Yes.

Hodson- I am not arguing against the motion. But, there are a lot of factors that come in to this. Also, there is success rate for the unit with several more. Short of bringing the model for each unit, that is what it would take to give a full explanation.

Neville- I think that is fair enough. It would be nice to have access to this data online. I am willing to change the recommendation because I know it is complex. We need all of the information so that we can make a better decision.

Gaskill- I totally agree with your motion but also agree with the philosophy. I am uncomfortable voting for because I don't understand it. I don't have enough data to make what I think is an intelligent decision. I would like a lot more data.

Neville- I am willing to change the motion.

Gaskill- I don't think you need to change the motion. I think the point has been made.

Slater- Sometimes a lot of this information does come to us but in other agendas.

Bingham- You can take all of the information we have got and when the information is presented, it is all backed up. We are not paying attention. The facts have been given to us.

**Motion Passes:** Unanimous

## **Item 6. Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2009**

Randy Wood, Regional Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

### **RAC Questions**

Cowley- Can you tell us which management area this CWMU falls within?

Wood- Unit 27 Paunsaugunt. The population estimation is 50 elk and the population objective is 200. Did I hit that close.

Cowley- You did.

Marsh- What is the reasoning asking for antlerless permits?

Wood- I can't answer that directly. We are not experienced in any elk depredation problems.

Gaskill- Are you asking the RAC's to make a motion for one or the other of those recommendations? What is the situation?

Wood- We have split. The division is recommending zero antlerless permits and Alton CWMU has requested 12 permits.

Gaskill- What should our motion should include?

Slater- We are basically going to support the DWR recommendation or the request from the Alton CWMU.

Gaskill- So, we have to do something with this?

Slater- Yes.

Gaskill- That was my question.

Foutz- Recues himself due to being a CWMU operator.

Neville- Recues herself due to being a CWMU operator.

### **Motion**

**Motion:** Gaskill- Accept the DWR recommendation proposal as presented.

**Second:** Marsh

**Motion Passes:** For: 7, Recues: 2

## **Item 7. AIS Amendment R657-60**

Candace Hutchinson, AIS Biologist

See Handout

### **RAC Questions**

Gaskill- Are these codes that have been enacted or are you proposing them?

Hodson- These are not codes, it is our rule. We are proposing some changes to our rule.

Gaskill- These are proposals. Is this an action item?

Hodson- Yes.

Gaskill- You are proposing a criminal rule?

Hodson- It is our AIS rule.

Fenimore- New proposals classifying waters and identify protocols of other states. Are we doing what other states are doing?

Hutchinson- I am not sure if other states have gone to it. We are kind of a lead state in what we are doing.

Fenimore- Are secondary waters tested to make sure we are not transferring some of these from one area to another.

Hutchinson- Secondary waters are not tested.

Cowley- I am still unclear of the benefit of adding the detected presence and not saying it is infested if we are seeing the juveniles and having the PCR test verified. What benefit does that provide in adding that category?

Hutchinson- It gives us a little bit of leverage to manipulate them instead of having them completely infested and having to go through complete decontamination.

Cowley- I am still struggling to see the benefit. If we take additional measures at water that has been detected to prevent the spread, that seems like a much more clear approach than adding a category and worrying less about it.

Hutchinson- Right now it's infested. Detected has the opportunity to know it is just detected and seems more acceptable to go to that water.

Cowley- Is it a public perception?

Hutchinson- A lot of it is.

Cowley- I don't understand trying to make this change in a protection of the resource issue.

Hutchinson- Right. We do not have enough information to say "that lake is infested". Infested has that permanent connotation. If it is detected, it gives room and time for water users.

Cowley- But isn't it really infested?

Hutchinson- We don't know, that is the problem. We do not have enough information.

Cowley- We are basically saying that detected has not found the full life cycle of that species where with infested we are finding the full life cycle?

Hutchinson- Yes.

Neville- So this is giving us a little break in understanding if it really will come to the full life cycle.

Hutchinson- Yes.

Gaskill- How come we did not have this information before we got here tonight?

Hutchinson- This was given to me 2 days out of Salt Lake. It is in the works and this is the time to come public.

Gaskill- This is an action item and you are asking me to vote on something that I have never seen before and don't clearly understand. What will the crime level be? What authorization will be required for the Sherriff to pull over to decontaminate their boat?

Hutchinson- I do know the rule with the printout per specific. I saw it on the fax. There was a chance to glance through that. The misdemeanor is the same class as with any offense. It depends on the level of intent.

Gaskill- I understand those things very well, I teach them. That is why I want to know what this one is.

Slater- We did not know about this until this evening. Our packets from Salt Lake did not include any of this.

Hodson- I was not aware that the RAC did not have this. I knew you did not have it in your original packets. This is something that has developed since those packets came out. You should have had this before the meeting.

Slater- I have some of those same concerns on what level this crime is.

Hutchinson- From my understanding, the penalty for this can range up to 2,500. That is if there is clear evidence.

Bingham- This is not new. We have had this for years. This is just being presented to change some things. What are you asking for?

Cowley- Which lakes would fall under detected and which would fall under infested for the state?

Hutchinson- The detected would be Electric Lake and Red Fleet Lake. There are no infested water bodies in Utah.

Cowley- This document is incorrect then. This lists Electric Lake as infested.

Hutchinson- Electric Lake is currently under infested but that is because it was deemed that before.

Cowley- But this is the new rule we are proposing.

Hutchinson- The new rule states that Electric Lake would be removed and put to detected.

Cowley- The front page has not been crossed out, there is no definition of detected.

Hutchinson- My notes show it as marked out and changed in 60-9.

Cowley- I am looking 60-2 and it is not there under definitions. It looks like it has been rushed through.

Fenimore- Classification of waters. Intent to classify how to categorize waters. It seems surprising to add criminal charges if they do not understand if contamination was present. How will they know if they are in violation?

Hutchinson- That would be law enforcements investigation. Funding for larger stations.

Fenimore- Would those be waters that would fall under number 4?

Hutchinson- Those would fall under 3 and 4.

## **Motion**

**Motion:** Gaskill- Move to table this proposal until we have an opportunity to study it further.

**Second:** Neville

## **Discussion on the motion**

Marsh- What date was this put on our agenda? This should come up as an action item next round. Not enough public notice.

Slater- The action on the floor right now is the move to table this item. This item is coming before the RAC for recommendation. This would not preclude the Wildlife Board from taking action on this issue.

Foutz- Thanks for doing this on short notice. Don't take it personally.

Hutchinson- It's to be expected.

Cowley- I do not have problem with approving the document. We just need to make some corrections that are obvious.

**Motion Passes:** For: 7, Against: 1, Abstain: 1

Slater- Some of these things may not come through the RAC council process.

Additional information is being presented by Randy Wood in regards to CWMU.

### **RAC Questions**

Byrnes- Was Jacob's Creek the one we had a bunch of complaints on at our meeting in Ogden about trespassing?

Wood- Yes. They have been worked out.

Slater- I sat on that advisory committee CWMU as my first involvement and it worked out very well. It was a very good process.

Hodson- We will work on getting this cleared up.

**Meeting Ends 8:50 p.m.**

**MOTIONS MATRIX**  
**SOUTHEAST REGIONAL WILDLIFE ADVISORY COUNCIL**  
**JOHN WESLEY POWELL MUSEUM IN GREEN RIVER**  
**April 28, 2009**

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

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

**PASSED:** unanimously

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**MOTION:** to approve the minutes of the March 18 meeting as written

**PASSED:** unanimously

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**MOTION:** to approve Terry Sanslow as the new RAC chairman

**PASSED:** unanimously

**ANTLERLESS ADDENDUM, RULE AND PERMITS FOR 2009**

**MOTION:** to accept the 2009 Antlerless Addendum as presented

**PASSED:** with a majority vote. Opposing votes were cast by James Gilson and Wayne Hoskisson

**ANTLERLESS CWMU PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2008**

**MOTION:** to approve Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2009 as presented

**PASSED** unanimously

**AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES INTERDICTION RULE R657-60**

**MOTION:** to approve Aquatic Invasive Species interdiction rule as presented

**PASSED** unanimously



**SOUTHEAST REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY**

**John Wesley Powell Museum in Green River**

**April 28, 2009**

**Commenced at 6:30 p.m. Adjourned at 9 p.m.**

**RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Albrecht, Kevin	U.S. Forest Service
Bates, Bill	Regional Supervisor
Byrnes, Verd	At Large
Gilson, James	Sportsmen
Hatch, Jordan	Agriculture
Hoskisson, Wayne	Environmental
Maldonado, Walt	Sportsmen
Riddle, Pam	BLM
Sanslow, Terry	At Large

**EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:**

Sitterud, Drew	Elected Official
Kamala, Laura	Environmental

**UNEXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:**

Adams, Bruce	At Large
Bayles, Lyle	At Large
Lewis, Kurt	Agriculture

**UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

**DWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:**

Bates, Bill  
Crompton, Brad  
Stettler, Brent  
Shannon, Justin

**PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE 2**

## **CONDUCTING THE MEETING**

-by James Gilson and Terry Sanslow

### **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**Questions from the RAC:**

**Questions from the Audience:**

**Comments from the Audience:**

**Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

James Gilson invited the RAC to nominate a new chairman as his replacement.

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

**SECOND by** Walt Maldonado

**PASSED** unanimously

### **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**Questions from the RAC:**

**Questions from the Audience:**

**Comments from the Audience:**

**Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

**MOTION by** Verd Byrnes to approve the minutes of the March 19 meeting as written.

**SECOND by** Terry Sanslow

**PASSED** unanimously

### **OLD BUSINESS**

By James Gilson

**Questions from the RAC:**

**Questions from the Audience:**

**Comments from the Audience:**

**Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

James Gilson asked the RAC to select a new chairman as his replacement. James pointed out that Terry Sanslow had been a faithful and effective vice chairman and that he would serve the RAC well.

**MOTION by** Walt Maldonado to elect Terry Sanslow as the new chairman

**SECOND by** Verd Byrnes

**PASSED:** unanimously

### **REGIONAL UPDATE**

By Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor

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

Terry Sanslow asked about last winter's deer mortality.

Brad Crompton answered that despite a relatively mild winter, the deer herd suffered a larger than expected winter kill.

James Gilson asked about the upcoming deer study.

Bill Bates reported that the Division planned to collar does, followed by collaring of fawns in order to identify causes of mortality and proceed with a sightability study.

Brad Crompton added that a hundred does would be targeted. We could then find where fawns had been dropped so that we could collar them. Brad also cited a study on the Uncompahgre in Colorado that may dovetail into our study.

Brad and Jordan compared tooth replacement of domestic sheep and deer for age assessment.

#### **Questions from the Audience:**

#### **Comments from the Audience:**

#### **Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

Walt Maldonado reported that he had launched a boat at Hite last Thursday and had not seen either a quagga mussel attendant or forms to fill out.

Dan Keller replied that personnel and forms would be present in May.

Walt suggested that a box for forms be permanently installed.

**MOTION by** N/A

**SECOND by**

**PASSED:**

### **ANTLERLESS PROCLAMATION AND PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2009**

-By Brad Crompton, Acting Regional Wildlife Program Manager

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

James Gilson, Jordan Hatch, and Kevin Albrecht engaged in a discussion about four units in the southern region (Paunsagunt, Zion, Panquitch and Pine Valley), where significant numbers of antlerless permits had been recommended.

RAC members discussed the new management strategy in the southeast region, regarding units with a zero population objective. These included the San Rafael North, Henry Mountains, and east San Juan units. Brad explained the antlerless control permit proposal.

RAC members asked for further clarification, concerning situations where an antlered animal had been harvested. Would the control permit remain valid? Bill called SLC for clarification and answered that the control permit did in fact remain valid.

Jordan expressed concern that the elk herd on the Manti had increased by 600, whereas elk permits had been cut by 175. Brad responded that we were slowly moving toward the goal of 12,000 elk on the unit.

Pam Riddle asked why the number of antlerless permits in the northern region was so large. Brad replied that the permits were intended to address local depredation problems.

James asked about the causes for the state's deer herd problems.

Jordan reminded the RAC of the poor range condition and its inability to sustain greater numbers of deer.

The question was raised about overlap of deer and elk winter range use. Brad said the separation of deer and elk was variable. They typically separated, except when conditions prevented that from happening.

Pam asked Brad if the deer herd would rebound, if elk numbers dropped.

Brad said they wouldn't. Deer habits and habitat preferences were different.

### **Questions from the Audience:**

### **Comments from the Audience:**

### **Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

Walt Maldonado related the concern his constituents had about the increase of antlerless elk tags on the Fish Lake/Thousand Lakes unit. He cited the over-harvest that had occurred several years back.

Kevin Albrecht complimented biologists in the southeast region for sub-dividing elk units to more evenly distribute hunter pressure.

James Gilson raised objections about Anis Aoude's presentation last month, when he incorrectly identified the state's deer herd as 300,000. The table indicates the population to be 273,000.

James challenged the Division's failure to seriously strive to reach deer population objectives.

James pointed out that some units were at 50% of their population objective.

Kevin Albrecht raised the issue of poor range conditions and the problems associated with increasing the deer herd.

Jordan added that this spring's scanty vegetation growth would become next winter's forage and that there might be tough times ahead.

James Gilson protested the wording in the introduction of this month's packet that understated the status of Utah's deer herds. The term, "slightly" was entirely misleading in describing the state's deer population downturn.

Jordan Hatch observed that one of the problems with the declining deer herd lay in the growth of the elk herd. When one increases, the other falls. If we want to achieve the elk herd objective, we will have to sacrifice the deer herd.

James Gilson aired his frustration over the deer herd. He accused the Division of "sugar-coating" the deer situation.

Wayne Hoskisson concurred with James' assessment about the information in the tables and how the highlights were a representation of the data.

Walt Maldonado recommended that Anis Aoude frankly tell the RAC how much the state's deer herds departed from their population objective. Walt complained that the RAC had often squabbled over the "scraps", while ignoring the big picture.

Bill Bates asked for the RAC's opinion about combining the big game and antlerless RAC meetings. Members expressed concern about the time factor, member fatigue and inability to spend enough time on each.

**MOTION by** Kevin Albrecht to approve the Antlerless Addendum as presented.  
**SECOND by** Walt Maldonado

**QUESTION ON THE MOTION:** James Gilson protested the number of antlerless permits recommended for units in the southern region, namely the Paunsagunt, Panquitch, Pine Valley, and Zion. He asked Kevin to amend his motion to approve the addendum as presented with the exclusion of permit recommendations for the above named units. After discussion by RAC members, James' recommendation failed to gain the support of a "second" and the original motion stood.

**PASSED** by a majority vote. Opposing the motion were James Gilson and Wayne Hoskisson.

### **CWMU ANTLERLESS PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2009**

-By Brad Crompton, Acting Regional Wildlife Program Manager

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

Jordan asked Brad questions about the permit split on the Alton CWMU.

Terry inquired about CWMU disagreements in this region.

Brad indicated that there had been no disagreements in this region.

Terry asked how many CWMUs there were in this region.

Brad answered 15.

Verd Byrnes questioned the elk objective on the Spring Creek-Dodge CWMU.

Brad replied that it was a sensitive issue.

James asked why there was an increase in permits for the East Scofield CWMU.

Brad answered that the general season elk hunt pushed a great number of elk onto this CWMU, and the operators had been concerned about forage over use.

#### **Questions from the Audience:**

#### **Comments from the Audience:**

#### **Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

**MOTION by** James Gilson to approve CWMU permit recommendations as presented.

**SECOND by** Verd Byrnes

**PASSED** unanimously

### **AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES INTERDICTION RULE R657-60**

By Dan Keller, AIS biologist

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

Walt Maldonado asked if it were possible to kill quagga mussels.

Dan Keller answered that it was. Rotenone in high concentrations would kill them, but it would also kill all other aquatic species. Dan pointed out that potassium chloride kills them, but the cost is prohibitive.

Jordan asked about the ramifications of the mussel's presence in Electric Lake in light of agriculture and power plant needs downstream. Dan noted that a lot of information was available

on the Division's website for those concerned about the situation. He also noted that we were cooperating with Pacificorps on mussel interdiction.

Pam Riddle asked if the larval or adult stage was most vulnerable, and if Electric Lake should be treated right now.

Dan replied that the larval form was easier to treat, but that we are unsure if adults were responsible for the presence of the larval form or they had been introduced by a boat.

Jordan Hatch asked if the Division had adequate personnel to deal with this issue.

Dan answered that the Division would be gearing up this summer with more personnel and mobile washers.

Jordan asked about waste water disposal. Dan said that we were exploring a system to recycle the waste water.

Jordan spoke about the dangers of mussel presence at Electric Lake. If fishermen became disappointed with fishing at Electric Lake, they would go to Scofield and move the mussels with them.

Dan stated that education was crucial to prevent this kind of movement.

Jordan asked how much a boater would have to pay for the washing.

Dan said that a private vendor at Lake Powell was charging for the service, but that boat washing was free elsewhere in the state.

Walt asked Dan if there would be personnel at the "Friendship Cruise" at Lake Powell.

Dan answered in the affirmative.

Walt expressed the need to educate river users as well.

Dan said they were lower risk users, but conceded they needed to be educated as well.

Walt said that Kentucky biologists discovered that clear water lakes had less of a problem than productive waters. Dan acknowledged that fact and added that mussels can eat themselves "out of house and home" and could suffer a die-off in the absence of sufficient food.

James asked what a killing water temperature is.

Dan answered 140 degrees.

James remarked that the lower part of a boat's motor holds water that may hold mussels for a subsequent use.

Dan acknowledged this, and replied that his personnel had been telling people to drain the water there.

Walt asked if ballast tubes and jet skis needed to be drained. Dan said they needed to be.

**Questions from the Audience:**

**Comments from the Audience:**

**Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

**MOTION by** Walt Maldonado to accept the Aquatic Invasive Species interdiction plan as presented.

**SECOND by** Pam Riddle

**PASSED** unanimously

**ADJOURNMENT**

Terry Sanslow adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting  
Beaver High School  
Beaver, UT  
April 28, 2009  
6:30 p.m.**

**REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA**

**MOTION: To accept minutes and agenda as submitted.**

**VOTE: Unanimous**

**ANTLERLESS ADDENDUM, RULE AND PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2009**

**MOTION (Deer): To accept the antlerless deer permit recommendations as presented with the exception that there are no permits given on the Paunsagaunt and that the permit numbers are cut by 50% on the Pine Valley, Zion, and Panguitch units.**

**VOTE (Deer): 5 in favor, 4 against. Motion carries.**

**MOTION (Elk): To accept the elk permit recommendations as presented.**

**AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION: To reduce the Fishlake cow permits to 800 total.**

**VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION: 3 in favor 6 against. Motion fails.**

**VOTE ON THE ORIGINAL MOTION (Elk): 6 in favor 3 against. Motion carries.**

**MOTION (Pronghorn, Bison, Moose): To accept the remaining permit recommendations as presented.**

**VOTE (Pronghorn, Bison, Moose): Unanimous**

**ANTLERLESS CWMU PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2009**

**MOTION: To accept the Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2009 as presented with the exception that we give the Alton CWMU 12 cow permits.**

**VOTE: 8 in favor, 1 against. Motion carries**

**AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES**

**MOTION: To accept the Aquatic Invasive Species as presented.**

**VOTE: Unanimous**

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting  
 Beaver High School  
 Beaver, UT  
 April 28, 2009  
 6:30 p.m.**

<b>RAC Members Present</b>	<b>DWR Personnel Present</b>	<b>Wildlife Board Present</b>	<b>RAC Members Not Present</b>
Chairman Jake Albrecht Paul Briggs Sam Carpenter Steve Flinders Cordell Pearson Jack Hill Gary Hallows Clair Woodbury Steve Dalton James Edwards	Douglas Messerly Natalie Brewster Teresa Bonzo Lynn Chamberlain Jim Lamb Jason Nicholes Dustin Schaible Sean Kelly Richard Hepworth Brent Farnsworth Kody Jones	Paul Neimeyer Tom Hatch	Dell LeFevre Rex Stanworth

Jake Albrecht called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

Jake Albrecht: The following procedures will be followed; we will have questions from the RAC and then questions from the public. And then we'll have comments from the public, which is three minutes per individual, five minutes per organized group. Then we'll have comments from the RAC, then we'll have a RAC motion, discussion and a vote. On the comments we have some little orange, we'll use the back of these tonight for our comment cards. Put your name on there, what you would like to discuss and then turn that in to one of the DWR officers if you would.



## **Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)**

Jake Albrecht: Okay, our agenda tonight is to review and accept the RAC meeting agenda and minutes. Under the invasive species, that is an action item, which is kind of down towards the bottom. It's not informational. That will be an action item. So do we have a motion to approve tonight's agenda? Jack Hill.

Jack Hill: I would move for the acceptance of the agenda as written.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have a second? Second by Cordell. All in favor, aye. Any against? Motion carries.

**Jack Hill made the motion to accept the agenda as written. Cordell Pearson seconded. Unanimous**

Jake Albrecht: Do we have a motion on the minutes? Jack.

Jack Hill: I would move that we acceptance of the minutes as mailed, as written and mailed.

Jake Albrecht: Motion by Jack. Second by Mr. Briggs. All in favor? Any against? Are you okay with that Natalie?

**Jack Hill made the motion to accept the minutes as presented. Paul Briggs seconded. Unanimous**

Jake Albrecht: Our next item is the Wildlife Board Update. Before I get started I need to go back. I need to introduce the RAC members and we'll start on our left with Jack Hill and come this way.

Jack Hill: Jack Hill, from Cedar City.

Paul Briggs: Paul Briggs, representing BLM.

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

Douglas Messerly: I'm Doug Messerly Regional Supervisor with the Division of Wildlife. My staff and myself act as executive secretary to this committee.

Gary Hallows: Gary Hallows, agriculture.

Clair Woodbury: Clair Woodbury from Hurricane. I represent the public at-large.

Steve Flinders: Steve Flinders from here in Beaver, Fish Lake and Dixie National Forest.

Sam Carpenter: Sam Carpenter from Kanab. I represent sportsman.

Natalie Brewster: Jake, who seconded Jack's motion to accept the agenda?

Jack Albrecht: Cordell Pearson.

Natalie Brewster: Thank you.

### **Wildlife Board Update:**

Jake Albrecht: Okay, our Wildlife Board update from last month:

- On the Paunsagaunt unit to accept the deer permits as presented, except for a 10 percent cut across the board on the Paunsagaunt. That also passed at the Wildlife Board.
- The DWR's elk permit numbers as proposed with exception to leave the Monroe unit the same as it was last year that also passed at the Wildlife Board.
- To accept the pronghorn permit numbers. That passed.
- On the bison permit numbers, our motion was to accept Option 2, regarding bison permit numbers. That also passed at the Wildlife Board.
- And then the remainder of the recommendations as presented, the once in a lifetime, was passed with no changes.

Jake Albrecht: Unless anybody's got any questions on those. Okay we'll go to Regional Update from Doug.

### **Regional Update:**

Douglas Messerly: Thank you Mr. Chairman. A little housekeeping item first. All the comment cards, we failed to bring the actual comment cards with us. We put some out on the table for those that may want to fill one out later. We have three of them up here now. We need you to write your names on these so we know who made the comment and who to call to the microphone to speak. So if you would please write your name, the topic you want to address on here and we'll get you up here. I think we can figure it out from what we have.

- Draw results will be posted tomorrow. Many people have already had credit cards charged. Confirmation e-mails are being sent out. There will be a lot of excited people and we'll let the scouting begin.
- The ice is off at Panguitch Lake. Fishing should start picking up really soon. We did have a minor winterkill at Panguitch Lake, which we haven't full evaluated at this point. I'm told it isn't major and fishing should still be good. There are a few complaints about people seeing dead fish around the edge of the lake and it is from a winterkill.
- I had the pleasure last week of attending a dedication ceremony for a fishing peer at Quail Creek reservoir that was installed by State Parks employees. It was a joint project between the Division of Wildlife and State Parks. The Habitat Council actually funded that project.
- There are a lot of new faces around the office as spring work begins.

Douglas Messerly: If there are any questions of any activities or any items that they would like to have information on I would entertain those. Other than that Mr. Chairman that's my presentation.

Jake Albrecht: Do you have any questions or comments? Okay, our first agenda item in Antlerless Addendum Rules and Permit Recommendations. This is an action item. Teresa.

**Antlerless Addendum, Rule and Permit Recommendations for 2009 (action) 7:31 to 29:26 of 3:07:31**

**-Teresa Bonzo, Wildlife Program Manager**

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

**Questions from the RAC:**

Sam Carpenter: Hi Teresa, good job. One of the things I noticed on showing your charts up there, on the habitat on the Paunsagaunt, I didn't see where the habitat was anything but poor on those.

Teresa Bonzo: Well we didn't go back too many years. So it wasn't fair. . . .

Sam Carpenter: These are the Jim Davis studies, right? That we're talking about. So what year did we change the population objective, was it '05 we changed that? '04? When was it that we change it?

Teresa Bonzo: I think it was 2005.

Sam Carpenter: And what was the justification? Why did we do that? What was the reason we changed it from 6500?

Teresa Bonzo: Because when they use these DPI scores. So they go and look at the range trends and see if the desirable components index, they measure that and . . . The main point, especially with browse, the deer use, if they continue, if it's continually hit hard and continually degraded it's going to have a harder time coming back. It can cause permanent damage. And I know we got a lot of great projects out on the Paunsagaunt. There's been a lot of discussion that the habitat's great, the habitat's horrible, you know coming from different agencies and people. Um, we're putting in a lot of money. The Forest Service, the BLM, the Grand Staircase all have great big EA's and are planning a lot of habitat projects but the thing with the browse habitat projects, for them to establish. . . they're not quite as easy. Of course you all understand when we do most habitat projects we want to make sure we don't have livestock grazing for at least a couple of years on there. Well I don't think it's fair for us to maintain high levels of wildlife that are going to be grazing, especially on browse, which isn't going to be two years to respond. With browse coming in when you do a project it's going to be five to ten years down the road before you're seeing the results of these projects. So we want to ensure that these projects that we put so much time and money into are of value and contribute so we can carry a higher population level.

Sam Carpenter: Okay and on these studies that Mr. Davis did, did we see anything other than (unintelligible) that was causing the range before? I mean do you have any evidence of anything like over grazing; any evidence that there really were too many deer and that was a problem with the destruction of habitat? Or was it drought and (unintelligible) that could have done this?

Teresa Bonzo: Drought is going to be a part of it. But I think that they show (unintelligible) on them

too. They measure a bunch of different things. I don't know exactly. Dustin if you want to address this at all?

Dustin Schaible: I guess there are a lot of factors. It's not just an indication of deer use (unintelligible) or why we measure those things. All the factors that limit habitat are I guess factored into the (unintelligible) Does that answer your question?

Sam Carpenter: That's good enough. Thank you. One other thing, on the dates on some of these doe hunts. I see you're doing that in December. Some of the target dates you've got set on those. What happens to those fawns when you orphan them in December? Toughest four months of their life.

Teresa Bonzo: Well we start shooting fawns in August.

Sam Carpenter: Shooting fawns?

Teresa Bonzo: Or shooting does in August. So they can be orphaned as early as August 1<sup>st</sup>.

Sam Carpenter: Right, but you got a bunch of tags here that are in December, hundreds of tags that are, you're going to be taking the does in December. When you orphan those fawns in December, the toughest, you know, three or four months of their life is going through the winter. When you pull away what happens to those fawns? Do they have . . . I mean their chances of survival are going to really go down.

Teresa Bonzo: Well they are going to be a lot better in December than they are in August. We also put that date, it's so hard scheduling all these, and making sure we don't have any conflicts with a premium limited entry buck tag. And then we do have to have a little gap in there. This year we've got the complication; we've got the management buck hunt as well. And then sometime we've got to have a little window in there so that we can get our post season deer classification which is the most important piece of data that we gather. So we've got to have a little window in there that we gather that data as well.

Sam Carpenter: Okay I've been reading lots of other studies from other states, Nevada is one and Colorado is one. And what they're claiming is that even when you do your classifications, and you do usually do them in November, that you lose roughly 40 percent of the fawns during that next period. So when we get our doe to fawn ratios, according to their data that they presented we still lose an awful lot of the fawns after that.

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah and I think it kind of depends on where it is. Of course in harsher conditions, more northern, when they've got harsh winters, they're going to lose a lot of fawns. But we also factor that into our modeling that accounts for the over winter fawn loss.

Dustin Schaible: Sam I would like to add we've got empirical evidence that fawn survivorship is very similar to buck survivorship, which is about 75 percent. It's a lot higher on the Paunsagaunt than it is in those (unintelligible) areas. You've read those studies.

Sam Carpenter: Right.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any other questions from the RAC? Steve Dalton.

Steve Dalton: Yes I'm wondering, we hear from you people all the time how difficult it is to come up with a population on the deer herds. So what are you using for criteria to establish these populations you've arrived at?

Teresa Bonzo: Well right now we have switched over the last several years to a different modeling system that we're getting better and better at. In the packet it shows all of our population objectives. I guess one way to explain it is we've got our harvest data that we get back every year that shows how many bucks we are harvesting from a population. We also look at how many, our post-season buck to doe ration, so we know how many bucks we have after the hunts have occurred. In many cases we have increasing buck harvest and our buck to doe ration is maintaining; and in some cases it's increasing. So for us to be able to continually harvest and sustain that level, that level of bucks and still have that many bucks left over we've got to have a base population of so big to be able to keep sustaining and harvesting a certain age class of deer. Every year that we put more data into our model it fine-tunes it even more and more. And that's why, in some of the populations it jumps a little bit from year to year on the same units. But each year it just kind of, it does fine-tune it a little bit more so we gain more confidence in our units.

Steve Dalton: Okay thank you. I think I understand. You don't have a whole lot of confidence right now or you do?

Teresa Bonzo: I do. I am getting a lot more confidence. And then we're also, in the next few years around the state we're going to try to do some studies with collars so we can get some better ideas of over-winter mortality. And it will help fine-tune the modeling even more. It's tough because when you go out and you . . . you've gone on our flights with us . . . it's easy to count elk and count pronghorns. Deer are frustrating, there's so much that goes into it. But I'm feeling pretty good about our model.

Steve Dalton: So essentially what you're doing is just extrapolating the numbers from the leftover bucks that are still in the herd after the hunt and then the hunter success rate.

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah and in addition our production that we see. All the data that we gather.

Steve Dalton: Okay thank you

Jake Albrecht: Teresa I've got a question on the last frame that you had on the deer.

Teresa Bonzo: (Unintelligible).

Jake Albrecht: Okay, my question here is; is if Pine Valley is a thirteen thousand four hundred population, why would you only kill four hundred there and you go back to the Paunsagaunt and they're at fifty two hundred and you're going to kill five hundred over . . .

Teresa Bonzo: Well and that's three consecutive years, the Pine Valley is five consecutive years. So if we took that one down to three consecutive . . . That one's just thrown in there.

Jake Albrecht: But my question is look how many more deer you have to (unintelligible) every year but

you're killing less animals on that unit (unintelligible) smaller ones.

Teresa Bonzo: On the Pine Valley but it's sustained over a longer period of time. So it's five years versus three years. So we're condensing it on the Paunsagaunt. If we did it on the Paunsagaunt for five years it might be, say three hundred and fifty. I haven't figured out that extrapolation.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, on the Monroe, what's the new boundary on the deer?

Teresa Bonzo: For the valley deer hunt?

Jake Albrecht: Uh huh.

Teresa Bonzo: Just, do you want to talk about what changes for the valley deer?

Jim Lamb: The new change for this year will be instead of coming along the power lines (unintelligible) pond and then jumping across the Black Knolls Road to Sigurd, we'll come along those power lines until we hit Salt Meadow. And then we'll go up around on the Salt Meadow road so that we can incorporate some harvest in and around those fields in Glenwood, which have always been outside of the boundary. So that new boundary in the Sevier Valley is to try and incorporate some help for those depredation problems in Glenwood itself.

Jake Albrecht: So is that where your mitigation problems have been, in Glenwood? Are you trying to pick up on . . .

Jim Lamb: Well we are including Glenwood into the rest of the valley. Now we have problems in the fields in Glenwood, just like we do in the rest of the Sevier Valley. And I don't know why in years past that's not been included. But I had some requests this year to look into that and so we came up with a new boundary there and we'll see how that goes.

Jake Albrecht: Okay well, you're up there, do you know what the population on the Fillmore unit is as far as cows to bulls, or what's happening there?

Jim Lamb: Don't know. Sean will answer that.

Sean Kelly: The question was bull to cow ration in Fillmore, and for elk, is that correct?

Jake Albrecht: Yeah.

Sean Kelly: We're probably, it's . . . We often underestimate bulls quite a bit in our flight data. Our flight data had about one to three, one to four. The actual number is probably closer to one to two. (Unintelligible).

Jake Albrecht: Hey, a couple questions on the Fishlake. What was our, what did we use for sightability then?

Teresa Bonzo: 80%

Jake Albrecht: You used 80, okay. My question on another on the Fishlake, Jim, on those three hunts that we're going to have for those cows, is there a way that we could make subunits out of those so that all those people aren't on the (unintelligible) or Forsyth unit? You know, where it's easy access and good long range shooting and you never know what you hit until you finally find one. I guess what I'm saying is there a way that we can make like the Gooseberry a subunit or the Rocks or some of those?

Jim Lamb: Yes there certainly are ways we can do that. They are very complicated and it creates a lot of confusion for the hunters. And it creates a lot of work for law enforcement. But that's something that we can do. Yes we can do that.

Jake Albrecht: I talked to a friend of mine that said they've done that on, I think it was on the Manti, where they've had a lot of pressure on different areas so they made sub-units because they have so many cows to shoot. I was just wondering if that's something that would work there or not.

Jim Lamb: Well my feeling is if we distribute pressure across the unit then we'll also distribute elk across the unit, instead of teaching the elk to avoid one area and campout in another area, which causes problems for us; especially when some of the problems that we would cause would be on those private lands on the north side of the unit. If we make them more safe havens than they are right now by surrounding them with some areas that hunters can't hunt on I'm afraid that we'll have even more issues with those private lands.

Jake Albrecht: Thank you. Any other questions from the RAC?

Paul Briggs: Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

Jake Albrecht: Go ahead.

Paul Briggs: I'm just curious on the herds that transition or migrate out of Utah into Arizona. I'd like to hear some more from the Division folks on how the neighboring states do their antlerless control and how the coordination's done.

Dustin Schaible: I can't speak specifically how they do it in 12-A but in, or excuse me 12-B, which is right immediately adjacent to the Paunsagaunt. There is currently no antlerless tags over there. But they've got anywhere, ranging for the last five years, from one hundred fifty to seven hundred permits on 12-A, on specific winter range, which has had problems. And they allocate all of those to youth. They call them junior only hunts.

Paul Briggs: Is that just Paunsagaunt deer or is that (unintelligible) as well?

Dustin Schaible: That wouldn't include Paunsagaunt deer. That's on the unit closest to Zion.

Jake Albrecht: Clair, you had a question?

Clair Woodbury: Teresa I have a question on the Zion unit. It said fifty tags on the northwest part of that unit. What would that be?

Teresa Bonzo: The northwest, Jason do you want to explain the northwest boundary?

Jason Nicholes: The northwest boundary is basically starting in Cedar City going up Cedar City Canyon, up the main canyon, Highway 14, up to Right Hand Canyon, 7000 foot level, south and east down towards Zion National Park, Kolob Fingers, and then back along the park boundary to the freeway.

Clair Woodbury: So it's the Kanarra Fields?

Jason Nicholes: Yeah the Kannaraville area.

Clair Woodbury: Okay.

Jake Albrecht: Is that all the questions from the RAC.

Clair Woodbury: I have one I'm almost done.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, go ahead Clair.

Clair Woodbury: Teresa you also made mention on the browsing on the range and the impact that the deer can have. Do these not respond, these plants, I mean browse, to grazing? You said there's a lot of damage done?

Teresa Bonzo: There can be if it's continually grazed, over grazed.

Clair Woodbury: I'm an orchardist, about one hundred fruit trees. I know that the harder I prune my trees up the more growth they put out. And I just wondered if it's different out on the range.

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah you get to irrigate your orchard as well. I mean these plants when they have the continuous stress of being grazed down more then they should . . . So grazing is absolutely healthy for these plants. But when it serves too much it can permanently damage the plants. And then it can stunt them so that then it takes longer for them to respond. Or it can basically kill them.

Clair Woodbury: Basically it depends on the range (unintelligible).

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah that as well. And how hard the grazing does occur. And just to make a point also that the browse is, when we do those treatments it's a long time before we're seeing the rewards of those . . .

Clair Woodbury: Yeah with small trees you have to (unintelligible) but with established trees I find that the harder I prune the more growth they put out. And we know that's where the best forage is for those animals too. So I just had a question on it. Thank you very much.

Jake Albrecht: Cordell, do you have a question?

Cordell Pearson: Yeah, just one quick one. Do we have any idea what mortality rate with the calves when their mothers are shot in November, December and January? Do we have any clue what percent are going to make it?



Teresa Bonzo: I am not exactly sure. A lot of them are going to make it. But you also need to take into account that most of the, many of the cows are pregnant and so of course those calves don't make it.

Cordell Pearson: Jake are we holding this to deer right now or are we doing elk? What are we doing?

Jake Albrecht: No, we're asking questions of the whole presentation.

Cordell Pearson: Okay.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any other questions?

James Edwards: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, on the Fillmore unit on the three hundred twenty-five deer permits, we're back to deer now, is that in a special area or is that over the whole thing?

Teresa Bonzo: No those are special areas. We have the, we've got the McCormick hunt there, where they're causing some serious problems. And we've also got the one out to Garrison. No, that's in the southwest desert. It's the Delta/Sevier River one. The Delta/Sevier River hunt is one hundred two-doe permits. And the McCormick one is 52-doe permits. And note that they're all depredation issues.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions? Clair.

Clair Woodbury: On the Fishlake and Monroe elk, I noticed the Monroe was quite a bit under count and the Fishlake was quite a bit over count. Is there some crossover there that might cause that?

Teresa Bonzo: Well some crossovers for sure that we noticed, the Plateau Fishlake was 5700, the Boulder we counted, or our population estimate is 1525. And Monroe 1058.

Clair Woodbury: I was just wondered is there a crossover there that might inflate those numbers?

Teresa Bonzo: For sure there's some Boulder that go back and forth.

Clair Woodbury: I mean Monroe. Monroe/ Boulder.

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah, Boulder ones go over to Monroe. We flew sage grouse two weeks ago and there was some that had moved off of the Boulder and were going up on the east slope there of Monroe. And I'm sure there is movement from the Fishlake. And I think also, if there's a lot of hunting pressure on one unit they'll shift back and forth on the (unintelligible).

Clair Woodbury: But we'll do these counts in the spring though right? Long after the hunts?

Teresa Bonzo: We do the elk counts, we do those every three years, January and February. That's the best time when they're herded up, and when we have best snow conditions. This year it was the end of February.

Clair Woodbury: And one question now that . . . The Boulder, 1500 is the target and we counted 1500. But we have over 500 cow tags on that.

Teresa Bonzo: Okay we have 2 different seasons. We've got a bunch of elk out in the Circle Cliff area . . .

Clair Woodbury: So it's a depredation (unintelligible).

Teresa Bonzo: It's not really a depredation but they are hitting some new habitat treatments. And it's not the prime area that we want them right now so we've got to hunt them. How many? It's on the back page of your . . . If I could find it (unintelligible).

Clair Woodbury: I'm just going off these numbers on the packet (unintelligible).

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah. And then we also have two different hunt seasons on the Boulder Salt Gulch. This is the one that affects Dell. Where is Dell tonight? But we've got two hunt seasons there. So we've got two on the Circle Cliffs, two on Salt Gulch, on the Boulder and then we have one unit wide on the Boulder.

Clair Woodbury: A total of 505, is what I'm saying. I was just wondering, a third of the herd is up for shooting on that (unintelligible). I was wondering if that was . . .

Teresa Bonzo: I have 445.

Clair Woodbury: There's 60 mitigation.

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah, and 60 mitigation. That is just our estimate of kind of based on past years of what we issued to the landowners for suffering depredation.

Clair Woodbury: My question was if there's 1500 elk on the unit but 500, and that's right at target, but yet we're putting out 500 cow tags on, 505. So that just seems a little high to me.

Teresa Bonzo: Well and the success on those have been 30 percent. So just remember the number of permits isn't the harvest. It never is. Very rarely we have 100 percent success.

Clair Woodbury: So that is a low harvest unit then.

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah.

Clair Woodbury: Okay, thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Sam Carpenter.

Sam Carpenter: One more time Teresa. What year did we change models?

Teresa Bonzo: I think it was 2006.

Sam Carpenter: Wasn't it '05?

Teresa Bonzo: No it wasn't in '05. When I started this job in 2006 we were right in the switch over,

because Nile Sorenson taught me the old school way. And then that year we had lessons on it as well. I don't think it was even incorporated into the models of 2006, at least, in the southern region.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. I've been trying to learn some more about your modeling and try to figure out, you know, and this term keeps coming up, spatial interpolation. Is that a familiar term with you?

Teresa Bonzo: Well say it again, special what?

Sam Carpenter: Spatial interpolation. And what it is, it's, you go do your classifications, do your counts, and then you take like terrain and you put that number of deer and all the other places because you cannot cover . . . I know on the Paunsagaunt you've got what, five million acres out there to cover? And as you go down and do your classification and come up with your numbers, the term that they use in there that, that factors that in to get a total population had to do with a term called spatial interpolation. And that defined the different terrains that were similar to where they were doing the counting and actually putting numbers to accommodate, you know, the entire area. Is that a part of it or do you know?

Teresa Bonzo: Well I guess. I mean we go . . . I, if I'm understanding you correctly, Doug might want to chip in here, but we go to all sorts of different areas on the Paunsagaunt . . . I know that you've gone out with us, and get counts in different areas so we have a sample size that's representative of the entire unit. Doug.

Douglas Messerly: The way I've heard that term pronounced is spatial interpolation. And what it boils down to is the estimated density based on a habitat type, and then you interpolate the population level by extrapolating how much of that particular habitat type there is. So you establish a density and then you . . . Yeah you must have been reading some studies from other states or something Sam because we don't use that.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, any other questions? If not we're going to go to questions from the public.

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

**Jake Albrecht: Do we have any questions from the public? Please come up to the mic and just state your name and then the question.**

Nolan Gardner: On the Pine Valley, Doug, whereabouts do you plan on killing the does? And is it 200 total?

Natalie Brewster: What's your name?

Nolan Gardner: Nolan Gardner. Sorry.

Teresa Bonzo: Where are we killing the . . .

Nolan Gardner: On the Pine Valley.

Teresa Bonzo: Do you know the boundary of the Enterprise hunt that they had last year? One hundred there and then fifty on the Bumblebee Area, near Cedar City. So it's off of Vandenberg Road. That's our one hundred fifty recommended for the Pine Valley unit. Just those two. No unit wide. Just those two hunts.

Nolan Gardner: Okay, thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions? Paul.

Paul Neimeyer: Paul Neimeyer. I was just wondering if they are still using these pellet transects like we used to use, on these deer. That they used to estimate these populations.

Teresa Bonzo: No

Jake Albrecht: Come up to the mic there Tom.

Tom Hatch: Tom Hatch. I was just wondering on the range transit, where you show, I think most of them were fair to poor, or very poor, are those taking unit wide or only in these areas that you're proposing the harvest? Am I making sense?

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah. Not in the areas that we're proposing harvest. They're kind of spread out and we've got them in different levels. We've got like high potential groups. We have high potential growth areas, mid and (unintelligible).

Tom Hatch: Don't use those big words on me either.

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah, I know. But uh, we have them spread out so that they're in different areas that are hopefully spread out and representative of the entire unit. So we've got some in decadent sagebrush (unintelligible). But they're not in just the areas, they're long-term sites. So every year we might add a site or two to a unit so we can learn more about a different area. But they are not what are dictating these, the area specific.

Tom Hatch: But theoretically you could have some areas in a unit that are on upward trend or a good to very good condition and some that are on a poor condition.

Teresa Bonzo: And they could have averaged them out and find where they average . . .

Tom Hatch: So were the slides indicative of an average?

Teresa Bonzo: Yes they are.

Jake Albrecht: Did you get all that?

Douglas Messerly: Tom I think I understand your question and maybe I can add just a little. The DCI that we showed you, desirable component index, are an indication of range conditions across the unit. Unfortunately we can't sample everywhere, obviously, and we have to pick some sites. So we try to make a projection of general conditions across the unit. And it should be used very generally and

broadly, and that's why the categories are very general and broad. When we choose to have, when we reach population objective based on our estimates and we need to remove animals our first choice is to remove depredating animals or habitat problem causing animals. And then our second choice is to remove the unit-wide, depending on the number of animals that we need to remove. So when you see these focused hunts that we have, they are directed at places that generally the land management agency and or private landowners would agree that there are too many deer, that's either habitat or depredation reasons. And we try to stuff as many permits as we can into those areas to reasonably assist with that problem but at the same time not overdue it on those localized populations. But when it comes time to harvest big numbers because the population objective has been exceeded our strategy is to spread that harvest across the unit so that we don't focus on any particular and it becomes a general population reduction. So on those units we see unit-wide permits we're well up over objective that we've kind of filled up our options in terms of localized hunts. If that helps.

Jake Albrecht: Okay one follow-up question in the comments to what Doug just made. A year ago we had some doe permits, I think they were in Johnson Canyon and they were depredating. So has that problem been taken care of then?

Douglas Messerly: If you recall the controversy was that we called that hunt to address some depredation issues, as I just explained. Unfortunately the deer didn't show up, so, and so we didn't have the depredation problem. What we ended up doing was extending that hunt, if you recall, and taking those deer in the same area so we didn't have to do another boundary, but we did it later in the year when the deer were there. And so a good example of a place where what I just explained failed because we tried to do a population reduction by taking problem animals first but they must have read it in the proclamation is all I can figure. In any event we have done away with that particular strategy on the Paunsagaunt this year.

Todd Abelhouzen: I'm Todd Abelhouzen from St. George. Two questions. Is, it possible that the 350,000 population statewide is um, could be moved up to 500,000 and what would it take? And my second question is, is there a way that we, together with the Division, we sportsman groups, publicly involved organizations, could educate landowners, people that have moved to small town to get away from the big city and then oh my goodness these deer are bothering my garden? Uh, maybe an educational process. So two questions, a population increase, what would have to happen? And then number two: what are we doing and what could we be doing to help in desensitizing people from these very, very evil animals that keep eating their gardens?

Teresa Bonzo: All right, to raise the population objective they would have to go back to the statewide plan. They would have to reconvene, the statewide deer committee, and they would have to go throughout the state and find, identify units that could handle more deer. It could probably be raised. I don't know that it could be raised as high as 500,000. But one thing that we'd have to do to get there, it's going to be a long-term because we've got to make sure that they've got ample habitat to sustain that level of deer. Your second part, the garden is, of course we've got some people that complain about the gardens but that's not really the biggest problem. It's the agricultural depredation. So it's guys that haven't moved here from California that have them in their gardens. It's guys that have been here since the beginning of statehood. The guys that are raised in Utah that the deer are depredating their agricultural crops and that would be a change in the law. The code dictates how we handle our depredation and we're mandated to do something. Or they can give us their 72-hour notice. We count, we pay, we issue mitigation permits.

Todd Abelhouzen: But education . . . Because I find them really good to work with, Gary and a lot of the guys that are ranchers, as long as they're being treated fair (unintelligible).

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah and education helps for sure. But also when they are losing money out of their pocket, when it's taking a toll on their crops, it's law that we compensate them somehow.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, Don.

Don Peay: Don Peay. Steve Flinders, I'm going to ask you to pull up a subdirectory in your brain. You manage the Manti elk herd. And when it hit 12,000 elk, think of the maximum number of cow tags issued. I don't think it was ever over 1600 elk.

Steve Flinders: That's about exactly what it was.

Don Peay: For 12,000 it was about 1,600.

Steve Flinders: Plus, probably plus some, a little bit of public draw tags, plus some depredation and CWMU tags..

Don Peay: Okay. All right. Thank you.

Braden Richman: Braden Richman. Just a question, and maybe you answered this but if you could tell me again, how often are the objective number evaluated? How long do they stay the same? And when we evaluate them to increase or decrease?

Teresa Bonzo: It's annually. Every year. The population objectives? Or the estimates?

Braden Richman: Population objectives. The objectives.

Teresa Bonzo: We do that typically every five years. Some of the plans are on a seven-year rotation. But it's when we go back to the plans which, I'm not sure if you know, we have to form committees. It's about a year (unintelligible) process to get all the interested parties and then we evaluate whether we can (unintelligible) population. For elk we just did those, finished them at the end of 2007. They were just approved last year, only for two years, because they would still like some increases. Deer plans I believe are up for revision in 2011.

Braden Richman: Okay. So I guess maybe a two-part question tied to that. I just spent the last couple of hours going out and looking at some of the habitat restoration we've done here and as I understand we have some of the most aggressive habitat restoration anywhere in our area in Utah. So with the five year plan, and we have, as I understand it, I'm not sure of the acronym, the place that we evaluate on the growth. . .The C . . . what you call the CPI?

Teresa Bonzo: The DCI.

Braden Richman: The DCI. So if we are using old DCIs with all the new habitat restoration how is that incorporated into this five-year plan? Are we evaluating all the new habitat we're creating with these old

PCIs?

Teresa Bonzo: Well what we'd do is probably add a new site. We've got sites that stay the same every year. But if we did a range improvement project here we may put a new site here so we can start to follow this one for the next fifty years. But we'll have less data on that one. But we will incorporate some of those new projects into it. And we do, we have an incredible habitat restoration biologist that's just going gung-ho. And he sent me e-mail this morning and his goal is to make more habitat for our wildlife. But to just use caution that we're doing so much but we have to let it establish before we start hitting it so hard.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any other questions? Okay, we'll go to comments from the public. We'll go as they came in.

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

Jake Albrecht: The first one, and once again for reminder, you have three minutes if you're an individual, five minutes if you're representing a group. The first one is David Verosco.

David Verosco: Hi, my name's David Verosco. I represent the Friends of the Paunsagaunt Committee. And it's my recommendation for the Paunsagaunt doe hunts this year that we have zero tags issued. My reasons are plenty deep and there are plenty of them. But the number one reason I believe that is because I don't believe the herd numbers that we have based on an extended amount of time annually in the field. I would say easily over one hundred days, a third of the year. Not just weekend warrior type of stuff. Out there hitting it in the summer range, hunting season and fall, and in the winter range. I have progressively seen less and less deer, especially during the last five years overall. And that's just not bucks, it's not older age class bucks, it's the overall deer population. I don't know if the transects that we're using of Jim Davis's, I believe them to be extremely accurate. I don't know if something shouldn't be done to add more transects in different areas since those are fifty years old. If we could add more and possibly look into maybe seeing what those turn up so we can raise that population objective. That's the main reason. The second reason is you know months ago we fought like crazy to get those trophy permit number cut because we didn't believe that, same essence, didn't believe that there were that many deer. If we allow this many doe tags to happen we just counterweighted what we got accomplished last week. And all of you guys that voted unanimously that we needed to cut those trophy tags, I would hate to see all that hard works that we did getting those trophy tags cut done away with by issuing these doe tags and bringing our buck to doe ration back into where it was before we cut those tags. But that is the two main reasons that I'd like to voice tonight. So, thank you.

Jake Albrecht: John Keeler.

John Keeler: John Keeler with the Utah Farm Bureau. We would like to support the DWR in their recommendations on the elk numbers. These elk unit committees were assembled two years ago and I served on all but the Paunsagaunt. And in all those except the Beaver there was recommendation made for no increases. And the reason that uh, almost in every case that is was like that was because of the habitat. And it's been mentioned here tonight that it takes several years for these projects to become established. It's been pointed out in those deer range, and it's the same with a lot of the elk range, that they are not in optimum condition. The drought is continuing in the south. The snow pack is below in many areas. The long range precipitation trends doesn't look that good. They look like they're below

normal. Letters have gone out in many of the forest districts to permittees letting them know that there will probably be some reductions made in livestock grazing. And because of these factors we feel like these numbers, these elk numbers need to be kept at reasonable amounts. And so that's why we're supporting the antlerless recommendations. I also have a letter here that I'll pass out. I'm one short so you guys need to (unintelligible) get it. But starting on a collaborative group on the Tushers that took a look at two grazing allotments, the Pine Creek on the Sulpherdale side, and the Ten Mile on the Junction side. This group spent two years looking at the range conditions and browsing was brought up. And this letter basically addresses that concern of the browsing and asks that there be no increases in that Beaver unit at this time. And I'll pass these letters out. But we do support the recommendations by the DWR.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks John. Uh, Mac Morrell.

Mac Morrell: I'm Mac Morrell and I represent Dark Valley graze association, the Parker Mountain graze association, the Wayne County Farm Bureau. And we would like to, thanks to Jim Lamb for bringing some credibility back into the DWR on the numbers on the antelope and elk, and for getting together the working group, particularly on the antelope. We've received on the Dark Valley allotment a ten percent decrease in time for grazing this year because of the drought. And I think another issue that we have is that we're on the free rotation grazing system. Once we move from one unit to the other and we get summer range or whatever and the other unit we leave greens up that's where the wildlife are found. So in essence uh, we're not getting the complete grazing rotation that we should have for the livestock, you know, the, to the general effectiveness of that. Uh, so we, well we would support the recommendation of DWR on the elk numbers on the Fishlake, Thousand Lake and also on the Plateau, and also the antelope. And I know that we're taking lots of antelope off but we have one more year to get that population objective down to 1,500. And I think what we need to do is continually work at it instead of the boom and bust like we've raised the elk numbers on the, particularly the Fishlake area from 570 to 1,600, and on the doe antelope, Plateau, we've raised . . . well let's see last year, I can't get it here . . . Well anyway we're up quite a bit, which is good because what you've got to take into consideration is recruitment each year that comes into that. If you take the does, antelope having twins or whatever . . . I know that they say there's a 70 percent survival or whatever, and the same with the elk. You just have to continually take some off constantly because of recruitment to get down to the population objective. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Max. Don Peay.

Don Pay: Don Peay with the Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife. There will be a bunch of different chapters but Mr. (unintelligible) return the phone call after the meeting. Uh, just a couple of comments, I mean it's important to try to live with the management plans; that's what they're there for. But I think there's two main points, one on the deer, with all the habitat projects, I mean we just spent a few hours driving around Beaver and there's plants out there just dying for something to come and eat them. I mean there's, there's no tracks, there's no manure. Just a couple of us farm boys know there's nothing out there and there's been thousands of acres treated that something needs to be eating the grass and the browse. And so as all this habitat work's being done I think there needs to be a serious effort, fairly soon, to look at these deer population objectives. So that's on the deer. There's some places deer population objectives can be raised and I think that's what turned the Paunsagaunt. I've spent a lot of time working with the ranchers, the BLM, the biologists, you know, that's issue number one. On issue number two, for the deer in the hay fields and stuff, totally support those. You know the Pine Valley, I know the sportsman down there just feel like that deer herd is nowhere near 13,400. Now the last



question on elk, we support the Division's numbers on everything but the Fishlake. And Steve it makes absolutely no sense that the Manti herd is a 12,000 head of elk herd, and about the maximum tags ever issued on that was about 1,600 plus some depredation. So now you've got a herd that Teresa just said several times, it's 5,700, when all the data that we seen it was 5,100, which is slightly over.

Teresa Bonzo: You've got to add in um, that's incorrect. It's 5,700.

Don Peay: Anyway, that number seems quite high when you compare it to how many tags were issued to keep the Manti at objective. So I'm not going to offer a number but that numbers seems . . . you know if you compare 12,000 elk to 5,000 elk that's a lot of cow tags. And the Fishlake herd has the number objective for quite a few years. There was a, I'm not going to go into that now, I don't know why (unintelligible) so thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Don. Wade Heaton.

Wade Heaton: I just want to talk a little bit, I just want to talk a little about the Paunsagaunt antlerless permits. We all know the reason the DWR is recommending these antlerless tags is because according to the numbers we're over objective. They're not evil and want to see a lot of does killed. That's not the point. I mean they're mandated by state law, as Teresa said, to issue these permits. Three years ago as Sam brought up, 2005, they lowered the objective. The objective had been 6,500 deer on the Paunsagaunt for many years. And because we had that drought in 2002 they went ahead and lowered the objective, temporarily, to a 5,200 number. And which is probably wise. What I have seen on the CWMU, and I'm speaking mainly on the summer ground, we've seen a nice steady slow increase of permit, or I mean of total population numbers up there. And so I think we're seeing some rebound. But I personally just don't see us at the number that the DWR's got listed as 6,000. Irrelevant in reality because the reason they lowered it is because of the habitat. You know we felt like that drought really had hurt our habitat, which it did. And we've had some descent moisture down there on a lot of those areas in the last few years and I feel like our habitat is pretty good. We've talked to a lot of the state biologists, or a lot of the government biologists, and they share the same feelings, you know, pretty optimistic, pretty positive about where the habitat's at right now. Mr. Davis's study, and while it's been pounded, and it's great information, no question, while it's been touted as one of the best studies that goes across the west in these states, I just don't think there's nine transect sites that are decades old on the lower Paunsagaunt, on the winter range. And I just don't feel like his data that came off those nine sites is a good representation of the winter range, the habitat on the winter range, I just, I really don't. Twenty of the twenty guys that spend over one hundred days on the Paunsagaunt each year feel the same way, you know, that we just don't feel like our habitat's that poor. And if that's the case, which I believe it is, I really think it's time to change that temporary objective. And I know that's not going to happen tonight but it needs to be revisited in a management plan; change it back up to 6,500. And if we're back at 6,500 then we'll all agree we really don't need a lot of antlerless doe tags on the Paunsagaunt. Anyway, I just feel that we're not there yet. We need to hold off a few more years. I mean at some point we are going to have to have doe hunts. I mean we all understand that. If the herd stays healthy and our weather stays good we're going to have to have doe hunts. I just don't think we're there just yet. Thanks.

Jake Albrecht: Jeremy Chamberlain.

Jeremy Chamberlain: I'm Jeremy Chamberlain representing the Paunsagaunt Landowners Association.

And uh, I want to reiterate what Wade just said. But I think we do need to revisit the population objective, get it up to where it has been established in the past. We, some of the other biologists with the BLM, the Grand Staircase National Monument, things like that, don't think that the habitat is as poor as the Division thinks it is. They haven't restricted the cattleman in any way on the range down there so far. And so that indicates to me that the range is in pretty decent condition and it should sustain a deer herd of what we have. One other thing that I think we also need to understand, and Don hit this, is all the money and effort, not only by sportsman's groups and things like that, but landowners improving their own habitat for the deer. There's a lot of effort, a lot of money, a lot of time. And it seems like if we go ahead and kill the number of does that we're talking about we're taking two steps backwards. When in essence in maybe a year, because we have had some projects that are already established, and will continue to get better and better if we can maintain right now until these other habitat improvements and water improvements get established I think we'll be at a better carrying capacity. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Jeffery.

Jeffery Albrecht: My name's Jeff Albrecht. I am here with Friends of the Paunsagaunt regarding the deer. I don't want to beat a dead deer here but I'll reiterate what they just said. I don't believe that the numbers are quite where they say they are as well. If there are 6,000 deer on the Paunsagaunt then I believe we ought to move that number up to 6,500 or the objective. I don't feel like this should be the only, as far as reaching the population of the deer herd should be the reason why we should kill all these does. It's managed as a premium deer unit. It needs to be looked into what exactly is this going to do to our future bucks, not only to all these numbers we have but I think some more extensive research needs to go into it. I understand the count on the deer isn't exact. We don't even know the percentage of accuracy of the data we have here. I'd like to see us look at it a few more years and if it continues to grow if we're 20-30 percent above that objective for a continued amount of time then maybe at that point we start a big doe hunt I guess. As far as the elk numbers, I can represent a sportsman I guess. Hard to say what we can, how we can control all those numbers of cows just by, or the numbers of elk just by hunting the cows one year. We saw what we did on the Fishlake a couple of years ago. I don't know, I think we should go limited for a few years not just jump up to 1,000, 1,000 permits, but maybe start at a lower number and work our way up as it continues to grow.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Jeff. Adam Bronson.

Adam Bronson: Appreciate the opportunity to be here. Steve, nice to see you again (unintelligible). You know Teresa said something that I guess maybe describes why I'm probably here tonight and that's you know this topic of killing does. And this era we're in now it's a very sensitive issue, and I guess that's why I'm here tonight. And I, I'll be the first to admit these people behind me have a tough job and I've been in their shoes. And modeling deer populations are very tough. Unlike elk populations where we get an opportunity ground truth our counts, every three years and fly them in a helicopter and have trend data and fly generally the same canyons and the same pass and flights, we get to recalibrate our models. So we don't really get to do that with deer. There are very striking differences in the way we can classify deer with any degree of certainty or confidence. I recognize that. But I guess that drives the point home that I'd really like to talk about tonight and the fact of possibly the credibility of the model. A ten to fifteen percent overestimation of deer herds for ten to fifteen years it can grossly overestimate what we actually have on the ground. And we don't have a way to ground truth that. Specifically regarding the Paunsagaunt unit, having been someone that had that unit in my jurisdiction at one time,

has a lot of very unique factors. It's a premium limited entry unit. You can't model a cross section of buck harvest like we can on regular general season units and get an idea of what's available, equals, what people are bring home at a bag check station, migration to Arizona, extremely high highway mortality on that unit, probably more so than a lot of other units in Southern Utah. You know we've had biologist turnover and that just takes some time. I mean everybody that's new has an opportunity to get a feel for things, do the best they can, but it takes time. So I think there's a lot of reasons that I think that this unit has a very unique guidelines when trying to model the deer population there. I too feel that I think we've overestimated that deer herd. I've been on a lot of the range transects in that unit with Jim Davis, personally on one of the rounds there. While I do feel some are representative I think there probably could be more. But I think one question that could be asked, I guess, is that if we are at 6,000 deer is that in relation to historical numbers, it's not far from the, you know the last few years 6,500 and 6,600 deer, not far from the highest deer numbers that we've had there in the last ten to twenty years. And I think that's a hard, that's what we're saying is a hard fact to accept, that we have that many deer now in historical context. One point I wanted to make was that when we had 65 and 6,600 deer the last two years we didn't have doe recommendations on the Paunsagaunt. This year, 2008, I suspect because of lower productivity we dropped the estimate to 6,000 and now we have doe tags. We drop, you know, by ten percent in one year and now we're having the doe tags. Maybe we need to see if that drops or where it's going before we recommend that. A couple of points I want to make, and I know I'm about out of time, was that the beeper? Two more minutes? Um, is I think what Dave had mentioned, increasing doe tags, 275 or whatever it is, 200 on the Paunsagaunt is only going to compound the problems that we have there with our buck doe ratios. (Unintelligible) buck counts there trying to re-instill that as a true premium limited entry unit, that's going to really hurt us because we're going to be forced to issue more either trophy buck tags, management buck tags. We're going to go in the opposite direction. We got two mechanisms they're working against each other. One thing that I find, I guess, maybe hard to accept . . . I realize that the statewide deer herd dropping to 275,000 roughly is probably largely due in part to the fact that the Northern regions have suffered winter loss. But also I guess I find it maybe harder to accept that we have four units all right down here next to each other that are apparently, on paper, or on computer, bursting at the seams. And I think that's hard to accept. And that if the model suggests, like that we should issue, that we're 1,500 deer over objective and we should, you know in Panguitch, or we're over objective on the Paunsagaunt and we should issue 500 doe tags for the next three years, or 1,000 doe tags over the next three years. Why don't we do it? And I guess I would suggest that I think there's probably a lack of confidence amongst even the DWR in this model. Otherwise just like the elk, like we've heard tonight, we're mandated to manage to objective. And if we were 1,500 over objective on Panguitch Lake for elk I'm sure we wouldn't have a token cow hunt on that unit. Anyway that's just to draw the parallels. And I realize there's a lot more emotion with cattlemen and all that with elk than there is with deer, but if we're that high over why aren't we doing it? And uh, third point I want to make in closing is to recommend some of these permit numbers at 10,000, at 9,500 on the Zion, 6,000 on the Paunsagaunt, you have to be willing to accept that some of these units are at their highest levels they've been in ten and some case twenty years, since the winter of '92-'93. And that's the question I need answered, do we feel that they are? And I would answer no.

Jake Albrecht: Todd Abelhouzen.

Todd Abelhouzen: I think Don just said be nice when I walked up. So the first thing I'm going to do is tell Jack what a great job he's done on this RAC. And I appreciate his bouncing and his humor and a lot of the topics that get a little heated and so forth. Takes one to know one. The second thing I want to address is the Farm Bureau. And we just heard a comment from Adam about two mechanism working

against each other that should be working together to solve a problem with the decreasing of buck tags and now the decreasing of does, is going to increase the buck to doe ratio. I think that the Farm Bureau and the Sportsman have missed the boat with working together. I think we have an opportunity here to really look at with the real problem is. And the real problem is that you guys are under a lot of pressure, I'm talking Farm Bureau and the members of Farm Bureau, which I am a member. You're under a lot of pressure from the Federal government to decrease the grazing on federal land. You're under a lot of pressure by people that don't live in the west that are mandating to you that you're not taking care of the land, which you've done a reasonable if not great job in many aspects of stewardship over the land. And I think that if we don't start working together we're going to find ourselves without mechanisms. I'm representing a group that is not selling deer tags. And no offense to the Paunsagaunt landowners and no offense to the CWMU, and no offense to the guys that work at Huntin' Fool that all make a living off of selling tags on the Paunsagaunt. I'm raising young men and young women in Southern Utah and I don't see any other better way to do it than to raise them out there in the wilderness and out there in the forest hunting deer with their dad's, and their aunts and uncles, and grandparents. And my position is if we don't make a stand and try to grow our deer herd we're going to lose track of our opportunity to be the silent majority. There's a lot of points that I wrote down, I'm not even going to address them, but one of the things that is . . . Is it Randy Perkins, Gary, that is with the Farm Bureau? One of the points. . . . Randy Parker, excuse me. One of the comments Randy made, and I'm on the committee for the state for healthy grazing and rangelands with Gary and Don and a few other people, but one of the comments he made at one of our last meetings was that deer do not have an effect on grazing. Deer have an effect on farming. And elk, and bison, and even pronghorn, have a much greater effect on grazing. But I think deer get thrown under the bus a little bit because when the ranchers get pulled off of the public land and the deer are on the private land eating their very valuable alfalfa I think the deer get blamed for a lot of the political and the social economic issues that you guys are being pressed against. So my whole point is that I think we need to find a way to work together. I think we've done a good job with that. I think that there are some issues on the elk management committee; in fact I know there were some issues. As far as I'm concerned that committee failed in their responsibilities and I think we've learned from that with some of our other committees. I also feel like the management objective needs to be increased. And the reason I feel that, and I know there's some people that are, that I probably represent that aren't going to be happy about it, but if they're not able to grow deer on the Wasatch Front, which they claim they're not, for a whole bunch of reasons, winter conditions, encroachment on winter range, highways, CWMUs, ski resorts, whatever, obviously we are able to grow deer in the Southern region. And so if we have to grow more deer and enhance, give out more tags to increase the opportunity for youth, and for families, and for even quality like we have on the Paunsagaunt, on the Alton CWMU, on the Henrys, that we need to increase more deer in the Southern region then you guys as a Southern Region RAC have the opportunity to do that. They can't do that in Logan, or in some of these other areas. So I appreciate your time. And again, Jack, I meant what I said. We appreciate your efforts. I know it takes a lot to serve on these committees and you get thrown a lot of darts because you're up here trying to vote the right way and I appreciate everything that all of you guys do. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Todd. Our next one is Alan Rowley. And I've actually got two cards, are they the same items? Okay.

Alan Rowley: So, Alan Rowley with the Fishlake National Forest and Dixie National Forest. We sent a letter to Chairman Albrecht earlier and I just want to cover a few highlights. The two national forests are in support of the Division's recommendations for both deer and elk. The support's based on the

Division's projected numbers and meeting the agreed upon management objectives. We further support the idea of maximizing recreation opportunities while we still meet the agreed upon objectives. That's all I have. Thanks for your time this afternoon.

Jake Albrecht: Thank you. Braden Richman.

Braden Richman: Thanks. Braden Richman representing the Beaver SFW committee. We feel, probably resay a lot of what's been said here tonight. I understand there's a lot of obstacle to play here. I understand there's a lot of things for the Division to look at and recognize that. I also understand the importance of depredation. I guess what we question is unit wide hunts and our objectives. We really feel that our objectives are a little low so we could raise those; it's been stated earlier. Another things as we were out looking tonight, one thing we'd like to propose, the Beaver unit is currently 3,000 animals out of objective. We'll take 2,100 does and move them to Beaver if you'd let us. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Gary Syret:

Gary Syret: Gary Suret, SFW, Garfield/Kane chapter, and Friends of Paunsagaunt as well. First of all I'd just like to start off by commending Dustin, he's our biologist down on the Paunsagaunt, and the BLM, you're from Kanab aren't ya, or from that office? Cedar, oh okay. The working relationship we have on the Paunsagaunt is excellent. We've had the opportunity to meet together several times. And the projects that are being proposed, that are going on are tremendous. One of the issues we've had there is water. There's six projects, and I'm sure they could tell you more about this. In the works right now, two of those have already been funded if the EA gets done, which we're hoping they do. We feel like the range conditions are better, and Wade stated this, that several other agencies have told us they're positive on the way it's going. Along with the unit population objectives, we feel like they could be higher. But as well of that we feel like there is no damage other than maybe around a few isolated waterholes and that is in the process of being rectified right now, hopefully sooner than later. So our recommendation is zero on the Paunsagaunt right now, except for if there's places where there's issues or problems and then we support those to be taken out. We're not for unit-wide doe hunts. If there is an area that is being hurt let's take them out of there. I recognize some of the problems that they brought up but we do feel like that's a much better way to take care of the problems. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Gary. Nolan Gardner.

Nolan Gardner: Thank you. Nolan Gardner, St. George. First of all I'd like to say I've been to quite a few RACs but I've never sit here and listened to so many honest and, and I've never heard so many good comments in all the years I've been to these. And I think everybody here really, really cares and you can tell whether they're on one side or the other. But I think it's great. I think you guys, if you could listen to these guys because these are the guys that really care what's going on as far as the sportsman are concerned in the southern region. I concur with Friends of the Paunsagaunt and Todd, a lot of it, but I just think we need to be really careful with we start looking at these numbers and killing off all these does, and these projected kills like 400 for 5 years on the Pine Valley, that better never happen. But we're just barely getting where we . . . Doug smiles, but I'm up here halfway civil. But anyway, I'm here too because I love the deer herd. And I just don't want to see us go backwards. You know we fought and fought and tried to get us some deer worth shooting. You guys took the five-day hunt away from us, kicked us in the guts. And I think that, I still want to see that survey when you say that you kill as many deer on the five-day as you do the nine-day but nobody told me yet how many deer

was, how many buck to doe ratio there was on the nine-day hunts when they took the survey. So I don't know how you can come up with that end ratio. But anyway, that's another meeting. I just want to say let's be really careful. And then also with the Fishlake I'd hate to see us go back to that slaughter we did a few years ago. I think that gave everybody a black eye and it will be a big mistake to do it that drastic. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, that concludes our comment cards, all of them. Some of those we held over that had CWMU written on it and we'll have those for the next agenda item. Okay, we are to comments from the RAC.

### **Comments from the RAC (deer):**

Jake Albrecht: I don't know how you guys want to handle it but what I was wondering is if we, is if we go to similar to what we did last month, let's go to comments from the deer and go through those and then make a motion on it. And then go follow with elk, pronghorn and any other remainder. So let's hear comments from the RAC on deer. Gary Hallows.

Gary Hallows: I just got back from a tour in, I knew this was going to be a hot item so I went on a tour down there and went to Wade's place and toured that unit down there the last two weeks in that area. And that's one of the few places in the world that those guys fenced the town and all the farms away from the deer. They've made a great effort there, I think, to control all the problems and all the yard problems. I talked to a lot of those cowboys down there and most of those people are involved with what's going on there. I think in that particular case we really need to listen to those recommendations because they've done a great job down there taking care of their own problems. And it shows. We toured that whole country and that fence goes forever. It looks like a prison. Anyway, and they fenced all of those problems at their expense. And I think we need to probably listen to them. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Mr. Briggs.

Paul Briggs: I'd like to take just a minute and clear up maybe a little confusion. There's been some information come out that some of the folks in BLM, particularly in the monument have been in opposition to the Division's recommendations and I've e-mailed ya, I want to read into the record from Richard Madrill who's the acting chief of resources in the Grand Staircase National Monument. The e-mail says: Paul, I wanted to clarify the information given by one of the monument's range specialists to one of the RAC members. While it is correct that rangeland health information shows the Buckskin in okay condition that's not the only information we work from. We also need to use water availability, precept data and information about treatments going on to restore habitat. We are currently doing extensive habitat treatments to improve browse and floras. Also, working with DWR on water developments across the top of Buckskin. This will take a few years to complete and return to full production. It would be the monument's recommendation that antlerless permits be issued to coincide with these projects while they are being completed. And I would like to continue that with stating it is BLM's recommendation and concurrence with the DWR recommendations for the antlerless permits as proposed from the managers in the area.

Jake Albrecht: Are you done Mr. Briggs? Could we have a copy of that for the (unintelligible) also? Comments? Sam.

Sam Carpenter: This is a tough one. I know just how much emotion and how much time we have spent as a group to try to come up with an imaginative plan for the Paunsagaunt. And I am one of the people that met with the biologists from the district office there, BLM, the one Harry Barber manages. And I met with the biologists from the Grand Staircase. And I certainly don't want to contradict anything that were just brought up but I can tell you that they were very encouraged with habitat and the numbers of deer that are there at present. They told me that in no unsaid times that their range standards are met, that they are happy with the fact that they have not had to cut the AMUs and they don't plan on doing any. They also gave me an extensive list of the projects that have already been completed on the Buckskin Mountain and the Paunsagaunt itself; there are over 5,000 acres that are already completed, some of them back as far as '06 that are actually in use now. And one of those is 1,400 acres up on the Buckskin. Did very well, a lot of deer in it this year. And I don't want to get into any kind of mud slinging but I would like to make a recommendation right now that we convene our Paunsagaunt committee and see what we can do about making a recommendation, and I ask for the Board's support in this as far as allowing us to do this, to try to bring our objective back up to 6,500. I don't know what it takes, I'm not been involved in anything like that. But I definitely would like to see that addressed as soon as we can to try to bring that recommendation back where it belongs. And the fact that they're saying that we have 6,000 deer on there now and these other agencies are okay with it, I won't go in any more than that, tells me that I think the unit can handle the 6,500 deer. One of the things that is a big issue that Mr. Briggs brought up is the water issue. And we have an awful lot on the board to try to do to improve that. And another thing that, just for information, is they're also trying to do some fencing to fence the highway mortality problem that we've been experiencing. So that said, and just all of the really good testimony I think we've heard tonight, I look at the numbers and I go back to when we switched models in '05 and '06. I mean we, the Paunsagaunt just from switching that model grew almost 30 percent, 28 percent just on a model switch here. And I agree with what Mr. Bronson said, that I really think that could use some fine-tuning. That said, I'll also agree with some of these guys that spend time in the field because I spend at least 100 days in the field on the Paunsagaunt every year. I have for on onset of when that was a limited entry hunt. I had a tag the first year. I got into photography because of what I was seeing. And I've been interested and on there to the point that I have even done my own counts. And I definitely think that we've got a little bit of an error in the numbers that the DWR presents and what I've seen over the years. That said, if we're ready I'd like to make a motion on this. Is there any more comments?

Jake Albrecht: Go ahead, you got the floor. Jack Hill.

Jack Hill: I have had the privilege of hunting what's known as the Zion unit for a lot of years. And I can tell you that last years was one of the best years I've seen on that mountain; a lot of nice deer, a lot of does, and a lot of young animals. So there's, that herd on that mountain is growing. I'm impressed with the conservative attitude that the Division's taken towards the recommendations regarding antlerless tags. I am not as objective in my look at those numbers, I guess, because I think the Division has used a lot of good science in order to put it all together. So I am totally in favor of their recommendations. I think that there are a lot of different agenda items that we have to address when we look at the Paunsagaunt. And it's been that way ever since I've been familiar with what it was all about. So I can understand why you feel strongly about it. And I empathize with you. But I think the issue of antlerless tags for those indicated units is a good idea. And I think in the long run I think all those units will be in better shape as a result of it. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Jack. Sam. Steve, you got a comment?

Steve Flinders: Just real brief Jake because I struggle the same, a little bit of what Jack and Paul have said. The Forest Service cooperates with the Division in terms of collecting that range trend data, in the way of funding, and in personnel at times in different locations, facilities. It's a lot of stock in those data. And the word I haven't heard used much tonight, what we're trying to get at with those range trend data are carrying capacity for deer, on a most critical year, in the most critical area. And it's not an exact science and you know the exact numbers of deer, we ought to be conservative with where we harvest them and how we harvest them. And look closely at what competing uses there are in those winter ranges. And obviously those trends aren't good. And I struggle with, there are a lot of passionate people here and I've heard a lot of good comments, and heard a lot of interest. And I see where the funding base is for some of the projects that we work on. And those in the long term are probably what make a difference. To follow up to would be nice to have some pellet group data that goes back 20 or 30 years or to see what the trend of deer use has been on those areas. Not that it matters what, put the trend where it is, but it's nice to use along with the model to see what the use has been. But we have such variable winters in Utah it's tough to do pellet group data on light winters compared to heavy.

Jake Albrecht: Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: I've been sitting here listening to everybody and I haven't, I've heard the Paunsagaunt brought up 50 times or whatever, heard Pine Valley brought up. I've never heard anything said about Panguitch Lake or Zion. You did Zion, I agree. But you know it's kind of funny to me that just the hot areas get all the publicity. I don't know if the Panguitch Lake, you know, if there's that many deer and we need to kill that many deer off Panguitch Lake. I grew up here, was born and raised here and I can remember when we used to have a whole lot of deer, like thousands more than we got now. I mean some of you young guys have never, you think you got deer herds now; you've never seen deer herds. When you go by Junction you count 4,000 deer. Now you go up there and count 20. So I think we need to take a look at this whole thing, you know. Not just two areas. I mean if this is bad, I understand that there's lots of need on the Paunsagaunt because of numerous reasons, okay, and it is a premium area, I agree with that. But that's the only two that I've heard battled out here is the Paunsagaunt and Pine Valley and one comment on Zion. So I guess those are the only two areas we need to worry about and the rest of them are okay. I mean that's what I've heard tonight from this group. And I mean is it just that you have a special reason for this? You know? I mean if we're going to look at bringing deer back t this state you need to do it in every area not just two. So I think that's something that we need to look at down the road.

Jake Albrecht: Go ahead.

James Edwards: I kind of agree with what's been said here. I'm looking at these estimates that we have, we've got 273,000 is our estimate right now for the deer in the state. And that's what it was back in 1993 when we cut out and went to everything as limited entry. It was 273,000 and that's all we've got left now. In my opinion I don't think we should be killing any does anywhere unless they're depredation.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks, any other comments? We were close to a motion until we went for the north end.



Sam Carpenter: I'll still go for it.

Jake Albrecht: Are you ready Sam?

Sam Carpenter: I'll try this. And one thing Cordell, on my comments from some of the land management agencies, they were pertaining to the Zion. I'm sorry I didn't make that more clear. Also, we discussed that in our meetings on the Paunsagaunt, we talked about that unit. And we kind of actually adopt that as our home unit, so to speak on the Zion. And there again when we addressed the models and the numbers we were pertaining to all four of these units that are asking for doe hunts, not just the Paunsagaunt and the Pine Valley. And we're sorry there's not more representation on those since they're open areas. But we feel strongly that the numbers are, like I said, a little high. Nobody knows, sightability and counting errors, it's not a science. You can't just go out and do accurate counts. Also, one of the things that was just brought up by Steve is the elk and these other species are hearty and you can knock them down and they come right back. But with deer it's a problem. Once you get the deer numbers down and if you don't think so look at our trend for the state. We're 34 percent below objective right now. And we're on a downward trend and it's continuing to happen. So just to you know, kind of let Cordell know that there is concern on these other areas and that it isn't just passion about a couple of key areas, especially with the people in Southern Utah. So, in this recommendation if we're ready, it's tough to do this and come up with something that doesn't just sound like too much or that we're asking for too much as opposed to we do want to cooperate with DWR, we do want to see things handled. We do want to see that habitat do well. And not just on the Paunsagaunt but on the Zion. And of course Panguitch Lake and those too, we just don't have a lot of information or people in the area down there that have met with us and passed information on that we can viably bring to you here and challenge. But as far as a recommendation uh, I'm willing to . . . and this is on deer, is this correct? Is to accept the department's recommendations with the exception, and I base this on the different range data that we've got, the sightability factors, the model, and all over, all the stuff that we discussed tonight, that we don't take any does on the Paunsagaunt and that we, if need be, and we do have some problems, we multiplied mitigation tags on that unit by ten fold this year. We had 5 last year, we have 50 this year. And we also have tags on the CWMU, we will be taking does off of that unit. And as far as the Panguitch Lake, Zion, and the Pine Valley units, I would like to see those tags cut in half and not have that December hunt on Pine Valley where we will be orphaning all these does, or all these fawns by taking them right during the toughest times. And with those exceptions I'd like to accept the rest of the proposal as presented.

Natalie Brewster: Sam, can you repeat the last part? No, just about . . . You made the motion to accept the recommendations that with the exception that we don't take any does on the Paunsagaunt . . .

Sam Carpenter: Right.

Natalie Brewster: And that the Pine Valley . . .

Sam Carpenter: We trim the other three units back by 50 percent and not, and those cuts would be the December hunt on the Pine Valley, that would be half. Is there a reason that we need to have that late? I mean the availability of those deer are there in the first of October as well, right?

Jake Albrecht: Okay, if I got your motion right there was no does to be killed on the Paunsagaunt.

Teresa Bonzo: There's not a December Pine Valley hunt.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, it says, okay the Panguitch Lake, Parowan front, 12-2 to 12-31. I'm sorry.

Teresa Bonzo: Panguitch Lake one there's not a December.

Sam Carpenter: Instead of the . . .

Teresa Bonzo: Pine Valley. The Pine Valley are the two depredation ones. The Panguitch has the unit wide one and the two I-15 Parowan front.

Sam Carpenter: Have we got this?

Jake Albrecht: Okay, I'm going to go over it and see if we got it. No animals be killed on the Paunsagaunt. And then we were going to cut the numbers in half on the Zion and the Pine Valley?

Sam Carpenter: Zion, Pine Valley, and Panguitch.

Jake Albrecht: So the remaining three.

Sam Carpenter: The remaining three.

Natalie Brewster: And that you wanted no December hunt on the Panguitch Lake.

Sam Carpenter: Right. That would be the, I think it was the uh, yeah, the Panguitch Lake. But whichever one it was half the tags and it was a December hunt. I mean you're actually going to be taking like five does in one shot there if their fawns are orphaned and they're pregnant.

Jake Albrecht: Sam? On that date would you like to propose a different date or a minimum date?

Sam Carpenter: That would be half of the tags and that would be what (unintelligible).

Jake Albrecht: So that late one would go . . .

Gary Hollows: Sam will you explain to this old farmer how a doe that's got a fawn following it in December is tougher on it than one following it younger in the summer?

Jake Albrecht: Okay, let's get back to the motion.

Gary Hallows: That's part of the motion. If you want my vote you got to explain it.

Sam Carpenter: See and what I've read about it and that's just that that's kind of the toughest time for them due to the fact that it's the heart of the winter, they're orphaned, they've never been there before, this is all new to them. And it just gives them a reduced chance to get through the winter.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, do we have a second on the motion? Okay, we have a second by Cordell. So now we'll go to discussion.

Jake Albrecht: Jack Hill.

Jack Hill: What do you base the reduction on? I mean is there any scientific evidence to base that fifty percent reduction?

Sam Carpenter: Well I tried to explain that in the numbers, the models that were presented, a couple of other individuals that were up here.

Jack Hill: Well they did not bring any scientific evidence or logic for it.

Sam Carpenter: Well, okay Jack I won't try to answer that for ya I know better.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any other comments?

Paul Briggs: I have one, on the Panguitch Lake unit particularly, and the Paunsagaunt, I know many people have brought this up already tonight, there's been an awful lot of investment, not only in money but in time and resources put into those areas and there will continue to be in the foreseeable future, from at least my agency, and hopefully from the DWR and the other partners, the sportsman's groups here as well. I'd just like to reiterate that there's a few things out there when you're doing these types of habitat improvements even if they're outside of our control, timing, amount of precipitation, some of those things are very difficult to deal with and it is somewhat of a risky investment at best. There are a couple of things that are definitely within our control, two of those things are big game numbers and livestock use on those projects. Where those projects are taking place I know at least everything that my shop is involved with that we're putting financial contributions into we do have grazing nonuse agreements in place. We're asking the livestock people to stay off those projects for a minimum of two growing seasons. Being a multiple use agency I think it's only fair that we would put the same implementation or restriction on the wildlife where possible and practical, and where it's supported by science.

Jake Albrecht: Clair, do you have a comment? We already have one, unless you'd like to amend it.

Clair Woodbury: Mr. Chairman, I move that we amend the motion to also include a vote from this RAC to immediately re-look at the target number on the Paunsagaunt to be moved from 52 to 6,500. I know it's not in the 5-year plan yet but we vote to that they immediately reassess that number.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, my recommendation on that is even though we haven't got a second on that is to let us vote on the current one and then make a motion at that time that we ask the Wildlife Board to look at that. Are you okay with that?

Clair Woodbury: I will remove my amendment right now.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, back to comments from the original motion then. Seeing none we'll call for a vote. All those in favor please raise your right hand, and keep them up. We have 5. All those against? Motion carries.

**Sam Carpenter made the motion to accept the DWR's recommendations with the exception that**

**we don't take any doe's on the Paunsagaunt and that the other 3 units Zion, Pine Valley and Panguitch be trimmed back 50%, and that there isn't a Panguitch Lake December hunt. Cordell Pearson seconded.**

**5 in favor 4 against Steve Flinders, Jack Hill, Paul Briggs and Gary Hallows. Motion carries**

Teresa Bonzo: Can I just get a little clarification? So that's just on the four units, 50 percent reduction on the four units, not all of them, right?

Sam Carpenter: This is Paunsagaunt, Panguitch Lake, Zion and Pine Valley.

Teresa Bonzo: So the Paunsagaunt is zero.

Sam Carpenter: Right.

Teresa Bonzo: The other three . . .

Sam Carpenter: Are 50 percent.

Teresa Bonzo: But the Fillmore, Monroe, Southwest Desert, those are full.

Sam Carpenter: No those (unintelligible).

Teresa Bonzo: Okay. Those other ones are half.

Sam Carpenter: Right, that's exact (unintelligible).

Jake Albrecht: Yeah, one second. Young lady.

Natalie Brewster: I need the names of the three who were opposed.

Jake Albrecht: The three were opposed....

Natalie Brewster: I know Steve Finders.

Jake Albrecht: Was Jack Hill, Mr. Briggs, Gary Hallows, Steve Flinders.

Natalie Brewster: Oh, there was four?

Jake Albrecht: Should be five, four. Okay, we've got one additional question or comment that we need confirmed on this from Doug.

Douglas Messerly: So Sam I just want to clarify what the motion meant in terms of detail because it's detail we're going to have to deal with. Um, your 50 percent reduction includes the removal of deer from the Enterprise area, correct? And it also . . .

Sam Carpenter: Is that part of the Pine Valley, is that what you're talking about?

Douglas Messerly: It is, yes.

Sam Carpenter: Right.

Douglas Messerly: What we regularly receive requests from the city council and the mayor's office to do those hunts and we'll just tell them that there was a 50 percent reduction.

Sam Carpenter: Okay.

Douglas Messerly: In addition to that the other 50 permits were a depredation hunt in the Vandenberg area and the motion of this committee is to reduce that by 50 percent also?

Sam Carpenter: Correct.

Douglas Messerly: Okay. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Paul do you have a comment? Come up to the mic. Thanks Paul.

Paul Neimeyer: On the motion to do away with the late hunt, that's the 50 percent we're going to take off of that, that's your proposal?

Sam Carpenter: Yes it is. Yes.

Paul Neimeyer: Okay.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, Clair go ahead and go to your motion.

Clair Woodbury: Mr. Chairman I move that we ask the DWR and all parties concerned to revisit the target number of deer on the Paunsagaunt to see if that number can be moved from 52 back to 65, where it was originally before we had that emergency drop in numbers.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we have a motion. Do we have a second then?

Cordell Pearson: I'll second.

Jake Albrecht: Mr. Neimeyer, what's that word I'm looking for that we always put the items on, action log? That's where you'd like that put?

Clair Woodbury: Yes.

Jake Albrecht: To study to look at that, okay. Do we have any other discussion then?

Clair Woodbury: Mr. Chairman can you restate the motion?

Jake Albrecht: That we ask the Wildlife Board to put on their action log in looking into increasing the numbers on the Paunsagaunt from where they are not at 52,000 up to 65,000. Any other discussion?

Douglas Messerly: If I'm not mistaken the Paunsagaunt deer unit management plan is currently is draft form, is that correct Teresa? The committee met, the committee that you were involved in Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Right.

Douglas Messerly: Where do you guys hit the objective at on that committee?

Sam Carpenter: You gave us the objectives, told us what it was.

Douglas Messerly: Okay. That plan, that draft plan that that committee developed has not been approved by the Wildlife Board yet. Hasn't been approved by this committee yet. And in fact I think it will be presented in the next few RAC meetings, here. So if that moves towards the motion at all, I think it's an important piece of information is that management plan will actually be coming here based on the recommendation of that committee that you served on in the next couple of months.

Clair Woodbury: Okay, in that case do I need to withdraw that motion then if it's already being addressed?

Jake Albrecht: Sam, are you okay with withdrawing your second?

Sam Carpenter: That isn't something . . . I don't think we addressed the objective as far as raising it or lowering it.

Douglas Messerly: (Unintelligible) population objective is set is in that.

Clair Woodbury: Okay, so are you saying it can be amended at the time that we bring this to an action item on this committee for the RAC?

Jake Albrecht: He's stating that when they bring those recommendations in to us within the next couple of months you can either approve them at what they are or ask them to raise them to a different level.

Sam Carpenter: And that's fine, we'd like to do that.

Jake Albrecht: So are you okay with withdrawing your second?

Sam Carpenter: I'm okay, yes.

Clair Woodbury: Mr. Chairman since that idea's already going to be addressed I withdraw that motion

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Moving on then. Our next item is elk numbers. Just looking at my notes the only comments we heard were the questions on the Fishlake whether we were killing too many at one site.

#### **Comments from the RAC (elk):**

Jake Albrecht: I'm just going to make a comment. If you look at the numbers back about three years ago, when it ways zero and then the next year it said 500 and I think the next year was 500 or something

like that. I guess I get to take part of the blame because probably that first year it said zero I should have probably left those 300 alone and then we wouldn't be killing 1,600. I never thought the Fishlake would come back the way it did over a period of seven or eight years. Just goes to prove it's a good elk unit. I've got some concerns to whether the numbers are too high or we're hunting again really late in the year on that unit. I also flew a lot of the unit and those numbers are there. We need to do what we need to do to get it back to objective as quick as possible without creating a bigger mess sometime down the road.

Steve Flinders: Jake.

Jake Albrecht: Steve.

Steve Flinders: I'd like to follow-up on a comment that Don made earlier and add a little explanation. I think the biggest difference is probably maintenance versus catch-up. And there's another unit in here that I'm familiar with, the section in the Wasatch Mountains that the Central Regions portions which is from Current Creek west to the Heber Valley, and they're playing catch-up up there on a herd that ought to be 2,600 head and there's 1,100 tags to try to get back. And I think that's, (unintelligible) Fishlake apparently with the 5,700 numbers that Teresa gave us tonight. But it's a lot of tags.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any other comments?

Sam Carpenter: I would like, is it possible for me to have Wade come up here and explain to you the problem they're having on their CWMU with elk?

Jake Albrecht: CWMU is the next agenda item.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, and that's when that comes up?

Jake Albrecht: Yes.

Sam Carpenter: All right.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, so we're up to cow elk permits. Steve have you got a comment? Go ahead.

Steve Dalton: I want to make a comment on this Fishlake cow herd we got out there. There's another factor to be considered and that's the Parker antelope herd as well. Those elk come fight off of the Fishlake and go right there on the Parker and impact that unit out there where the antelope are already impacting it. And we got two issues there that, that really, those two populations are, have been out of control in the past and it looks like they're about to get out of control again. The Parker antelope already are. If we don't, if we don't take a sizable number of elk off of there. . . I don't know, about the only thing left to do is kick the livestock people off there. And that just uh, one problem's adding to the other. It push, you know initially those Parker antelope they were, the agreement was just on BLM land and the state lands, didn't even include the Forest Service. And now the antelope have been pushed over onto the forest. The hunters are probably killing more antelope on the forestland than they are on the BLM now. Anyways that elk herd is definitely impacting the range resource out there as well as the antelope being there year round. So it's kind of a little different situation than you had on some of these other herds.

Jake Albrecht: Gary Hallows.

Gary Hallows: I guess I'd just like to ask some of these folks what they would recommend so that we don't have to have the blue light special. If we don't take a certain amount now how are we going to deal with it next year if it shows up way big? We ought to discuss it a little.

Jake Albrecht: Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: I think that we all know there needs to be some cows killed off the Fishlake. But I think most of us in here kind of went through what happened last time we played this stupid game. And I think that you need to do it a little bit more conservative. I don't know exactly what that number is, where it's a thousand, or what are we. . . . I mean that's a 1,000 more elk, 1,100 more elk that we're killing this year than we did last year. You know? I think somewhere that figure, and I don't know (unintelligible) and I know the problem on the Parker. You know? I know it exists. But I just don't want to see another slaughter. Because I understand and I wrote everybody on this RAC board a letter when that happened before when you came up with that \$20.00 piece of junk, with the spike tag. You know, because you don't have a clue how many elk are up there. You know? I spend a lot of time on the Fishlake and the Parker. So I don't know what the magical number is and I agree with Gary, we need to discuss this, we need to find out what it is. We definitely know there needs to be some cows killed up there. That is not a problem. I think that maybe what we need to do is maybe make it 1,100 elk. That's cutting it by 400 tags. Or make it 1,000 this year. Take a look at it next year. If our numbers are still going crazy then we can take 1,500 you know. But the thing that don't come into perspective with this cow elk hunt, it's different than an antlerless deer hunt. There ain't anybody that's been out there in the field knows that when them elk come off of the slopes over there on the other side, there's one canyon there that we went up, 20 dead cows. Guys had shot into a herd, so 100 elk, there was 20 dead cows there and not one person walked over that ridge to see if they'd hit anything. A lot of our hunters out there, and I don't know maybe we need to educate them, they shoot, they don't fall then they just shoot another one. And so I don't think, and that's what happened last time that we had this big hurrah on the Fishlake. I think that was one of the biggest problems, okay, is the wounded elk. Okay, not the ones that were actually killed and people tagged. So I think this is a serious matter. And I don't think that we need to just jump into this thing. I think we need to spend some time on it. Whatever, we all know that there's got to be some cows killed there. I just don't want to see what happened last time.

Jake Albrecht: Teresa, did you say that the count was around 4,000 cows?

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah, the actual number of counted cows was 4,000. Your paper is, we've looked at them and they're incorrect. The actual number of animals counted was 4,500 (unintelligible) Jim? And so sightability is 5,800. So keep those numbers in mind. So 4,100 antlerless animals were seen.

Jake Albrecht: So if you have a 50 percent of 4 is 2, so you got 1,000 recruitment coming back in?

Teresa Bonzo: Well yeah, if you have 2,000 of those antlerless that have calves. You've got a lot coming down.

Jake Albrecht: Right.



Teresa Bonzo: And then also just remember 1,600 permits does not equal 1,600 killed.

Jake Albrecht: When I did the math on last years I got like 70 percent kill on the Fishlake. That's different than what you had. But that's neither here nor there because we all know that we're not going to kill all . . .

Teresa Bonzo: Harvest on the Fishlake was 58 percent success.

Gary Hallows: Yeah but your math tells you that 50 percent calf crop you're going to be having to kill 2,000 next year.

Jake Albrecht: Yeah, and I'm going to bring that up Cordell. The next time they fly and do a count is three years on that unit. Okay, so we have some discussion on the right side that say we need to go ahead and do it and then we have a little discussion here that we need to be a little bit careful. So uh, Clair.

Clair Woodbury: Yeah just doing the numbers Teresa, I have a little bit of concern also with that high of a kill. Just looking at the Fishlake, the Boulder, the Monroe, there's a lot of crossover over those highways. Just doing the math add those three units together we're still 450 below objective with a total of 2,200 cow tags for those units. Over, almost 25 percent of the herd is listed as cow tags and that's not counting the bull kills we'll have. So I agree that there are areas that we do need to have some cow tags. I just think, like especially the Fishlake that seems very excessive, especially where the Monroe just across the highway is almost half of objective, just barely over half. I just say let's go careful with those numbers and maybe drop those some.

Jake Albrecht: Sam. Steve.

Steve Dalton: I don't really think those other units should be combined in this discussion at all. The elk you're trying to take off the Boulder need to be taken off the Boulder. It's just right at objective that those elk are trying to remove need to be removed. So those shouldn't be added into this equation or discussion at all.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. We've had a lot of discussion about removal of the animals from the forest or in the different areas so somebody needs to come up with some type of number or else go with what's on the paper.

Paul Briggs: Mr. Chairman, I'd make a motion that we accept the DWR elk recommendations as written.

Steve Flinders: I'll second that.

Jack Hill: Second.

Jake Albrecht: Okay we have a motion by Mr. Briggs to accept the DWR's recommendations as presented. We have two seconds by Steve Flinders and Jack Hill. Do we have any other discussion? Seeing none I'll call for a vote. All those in favor please . . . Do you have a comment?

Clair Woodbury: Yes. I move that we amend that motion to drop the Fishlake tags from 1,600 to 800.

Cordell Pearson: I second it.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we have a motion that was to accept the DWR's as presented. And then we had an amendment to the motion, which is to cut the Fishlake unit from 1,600 to 800, which was seconded by Cordell. And we will act on that motion first.

Jack Hill: The amendment to the motion?

Jake Albrecht: Correct. So all those in favor to the amendment, which is, cutting the Fishlake from 1,600 to 800 please raise your right hand and keep it in the air. We have three (3). All those against? Motion fails.

**Clair Woodbury made the motion to amend that motion to cut the Fishlake unit permits from 1,600 to 800. Cordell Pearson seconded. 3 in favor 6 against\* Steve Flinders, Steve Dalton, Jack Hill, Paul Briggs James Edwards, Cordell Pearson. Motion fails**

Jake Albrecht: Okay, so we're back to our original motion, which is to accept the DWR's recommendations as presented. All those in favor please raise your right hand and keep them in the air. We have six (6). All those against? Six (6) three (3), motion carries.

**Paul Briggs made the motion to accept as presented. Steve Flinders and Jack Hill seconded. 6 in favor 3 against Sam Carpenter, Clair Woodbury, and Cordell Pearson. Motion carries**

**Jake Albrecht: Did you get all that young lady?**

**Natalie Brewster: I sure hope so. Can you tell me who was against? Sam Carpenter, Cordell Pearson, Clair Woodbury.**

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Our next item is pronghorns, or if you want to just make a motion to approve the remainder of the antlerless permits.

**Comments from the RAC (pronghorn, bison, moose)**

None

Steve Flinders: I'll make that motion Mr. Chairman.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we have a motion by Steve Flinders to accept the remainder of the antlerless permits, and a second by Jack Hill. All in favor right hand. Any against? Motion is unanimous.

**Steve Flinders made the motion to accept as presented. Jack Hill seconded. Unanimous**

Jake Albrecht: Our next agenda item is Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations. This is an action item. Teresa.

**Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2009 (action) 2:30:00 to 2:33:23 of 3:07:31**  
**-Teresa Bonzo, Wildlife Program Manager**

**Jake Albrecht: Okay, questions from the RAC. Sam.**

**Questions from the RAC:**

Jake Albrecht: I've got a question. Do these CWMU people apply or do they have to take so many if the animals are there?

Teresa Bonzo: When we are recommending them to the public, say for instance the Booby Hole on the Fishlake, we have a lot of permits on the Fishlake so the CWMU needs to take their portion of the antlerless permits. So we do ask them to take them. Usually they're receptive. When we do not issue them for removal or population control for those public hunts we don't think that there's any reason that we should issue them to the CWMUs.

Jake Albrecht: So if I used the same Booby Hole example, if he doesn't take those what happens?

Teresa Bonzo: It's a Cooperative Wildlife Management Unit and we certainly encourage them to, he will have to take, the ones that go to the public, absolutely, those are draw hunts and they will. And if he refuses to use his private ones you know it's not very good. He needs to use to help do his part on his land to help manage the population.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, on this particular unit on the Alton unit, where we count it in the fall or any other time of the year, is there a time of the year where we could use mitigation tags or things like that to help the problem there?

Teresa Bonzo: If there is a problem, you know we can address it with, we can have Dustin go out and see what the problem is. If they've got a lot of say, depredating animals, most of the fields there are fenced off so hopefully they aren't getting into the high fence. If there is a great number, you know, there is a possibility of mitigation tags but typically not. When we're not issuing them to the public we're not going to issue them to, you know, for mitigation or to the CWMU. Plus, the amount of damage that he's receiving from these elk would have to be in excess of what he is receiving from his permits from the CWMU and I don't think that elk are causing that much damage.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any other questions? Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: Does the CWMU permits come off of the 1,600 like on the Fishlake or are they (unintelligible).

Teresa Bonzo: That's in addition to.

Cordell Pearson: That's in addition to? Well how many CWMU permits are there on the Fishlake?

Teresa Bonzo: You know I don't have that number. On the Fishlake we've got the Booby Hole, we've got Johnson Mountain Ranch . . . Is Grazing Pasture on, or is that on the Manti? And (unintelligible).

Cordell Pearson: So how many total elk do you think . . .

Teresa Bonzo: He thinks an additional 60.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions from the RAC? Do we have any questions from the public? Mr. Neimeyer.

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

Paul Neimeier: Paul Neimeyer. On the Old Woman CWMU there's question about is that managed on the Manti or managed on the Fishlake? Where does that come from?

Jim Lamb: It's an interesting situation. I am the biologist in charge of it out of the Southern region but it's managed off the numbers associated with the Manti unit, Paul. So whenever I make recommendations for the Old Woman I have to get in contact with the biologist on the Manti side and then make recommendations that reflect the conditions on the Manti side not on the Fishlake. Does that answer your question?

Paul Neimeyer: Well kind of. But the landowner is very confusing. The landowner, you know that CWMU is really in the other region.

Teresa Bonzo: It depends if we're talking management or hunt numbers. We manage that hunt.

Jim Lamb: Do you want to talk about this Doug? I mean this has been something that's been going on for a couple of years. He has a better idea.

Jake Albrecht: I'd like to get an answer for Paul, as well as the rest of us now that you've got us intrigued.

Douglas Messerly: I'm not sure what the issue is. But let me state my understanding of the situation. The Old Woman CWMU occurs north of I-70 therefore it's in the Manti unit. And so, but it's still within the administrative boundaries of the Southern Region. Okay? It also happens to occur within the deer hunt boundary of the Southeastern or the Central Region, I forget which, but anyway the one to the north. Southeast. So it gets confusing to people because if you're hunting deer on the Old Woman you're hunting in the Southeastern Region. If you're hunting elk on the Old Woman you're hunting in the Southern Region on the Manti unit. So the management scheme that's used is the same management scheme that's used on the Manti unit consistent with the Manti plan, just like the Fishlake CWMUs are managed consistent with the Fishlake plan. So does that clear it up?

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any other questions from the public? Okay, if not we'll go to our comment cards, supposedly as they came in. Jeremy Chamberlain.

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

Jake Albrecht: You're peachy?

Jeremy Chamberlain: I'm peachy.

Jake Albrecht: Uh, David Verosco.

David Verosco: David Verosco, representing the Friends of the Paunsagaunt. I support the 12 tags for the Alton CWMU, the cow tags for this year. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Gary Syret. Has he left? There you are pal.

Gary Syret: I'd just like to say we support the Heaton's so (unintelligible) getting 10 tags. They've done as much work as anybody in Southern Utah to better their land. And as it's been brought up here elk are really easy to get back. I know we're under objective on the Paunsagaunt but he needs a couple of years, he feels, to get the things he's done to really go and then come . . . And we feel like if you, you know if we quit harvesting the elk they'll be right back just like that, unlike the deer. So we just, SFW on that unit supports his antlerless tags.

Jake Albrecht: You had a comment card didn't you Wade? I thought I . . . Yeah, come on up. I know I seen it.

Wade Heaton: Doug just knows I'm long winder. Now I will try and be brief. I have a hard time with that. Again, I'm back just like last year. Two reasons, one we're requesting what we get. We're requesting our 12 tags. The primary reason is we've done a lot of habitat improvements, cleared a lot of ground, there's been a lot of PJ encroachment on the southern end of our unit, and basically (unintelligible) thousands of acres on that southern end, in cooperation some with the BLM (unintelligible). And as you all know when you get a little green grass coming in and those elk come in and can be pretty destructive if they've got some numbers. We've got about 50 or 60 elk that hang in that area that just move from one reseed to the next and they're just causing trouble. And we just need the ability, we're not trying to kill them all off we're only asking for 12 tags. We just need the ability to move these elk out of these different reseeds and just move them around, I mean let them utilize everything that's there instead of just camp out on one 250 acre reseed. And they are causing some trouble. The second thing I wanted to address is the DWR's recommended deer tags, um, and the reason is this: I sat on the Paunsagaunt elk committee two years ago. Our summer range objective is 275 elk; our winter range objective is 175 elk. For reasons that I can't quite wrap my mind around yet, the only number we use to determine our population objective is the wintering number. There has never been 175 elk on the Paunsagaunt during the winter, probably from the beginning of time. They just all leave. It's a dynamic that's part of the unit that the majority of the elk leave. And I've flown, you know I've been on those flights when we do it in January and February so we can get good sightability, and the most I've ever seen is 50 or 60. And that's typical of what we see in the winter. And so the problem is, I hope you can see, is that our wintering objective is irrelevant. When we have our trouble is in the summer. And we have far more than 275 elk, but it doesn't matter because we don't use that number. And so that's why we were far under objective according to the Division, and the flights, and the winter range objective. So I don't blame the Division for recommending zero. That's why there are no cow hunts on the Paunsagaunt. But if we could figure out a way, and I understand it's a struggle, sightability and all the other factors that come in, if we could figure out a way to count on the Paunsagaunt in the summer

and then use our summering objective I think that's the only way we're going to manage that herd. We're a premium deer unit. We're not a premium elk unit. They've always taken a back seat and we've always tried to keep that number low. But if we could use that summering objective it would give us something that we could actually work them (unintelligible).

Jake Albrecht: Question while you're right there. On these reseeds that you've done, have you notified the Division about the problem or have they come out and tried to move them around for you?

Wade Heaton: Um, a little. I mean we've worked real close with them, and Dustin, and Hal before him, we've worked real close with them. It's my understanding; it's been tradition within CWMU programs they don't issue mitigation permits, for the reasons that Teresa brought up. And so that's why we really haven't pursued that avenue. We've tried to just go with it and just actually have a hunt. And uh, we're at 75/25 split, so 6 of those tags will go into a public draw, 6 would stay with the CWMU and we could use those, you know in the most effective.

Jake Albrecht: So what time of year would the hunt be?

Wade Heaton: We would do it, I mean the season runs August 15<sup>th</sup> to January 31<sup>st</sup>, I believe Doug. It's a long season. And we usually just try to hunt during the month of October, sometime in there. These elk will start leaving, they definitely shift their pattern in November and if we have any kind of snow by December they're out of there. And so we have to do them sometime in October but we really want to get into the bow hunts and cause a lot of grief there.

Jake Albrecht: Do those elk come in first sign of spring or early summer?

Wade Heaton: They do, yes Sir. They do. They'll come in this time of year and stay pretty much all summer. They do shift their patterns throughout the summer but they'll hang in that general area.

Jake Albrecht: Have you guys got any other questions of Wade while we've got him front and center? Okay, that's all of our comment cards so we'll go to comments from the RAC. Okay, go ahead Sam.

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

Sam Carpenter: The only comment that I would make is I am familiar with the projects and the work the CWMU has done. And it really is viable deer range. And I do feel like they're deserving these and if we'll ready I'll make a motion.

Jake Albrecht: I don't feel we're quite ready but we will be in just a second.

Sam Carpenter: Okay.

Jake Albrecht: I've got a question on the legality. If there's no permits issued to the public can this RAC . . . If there's no antlerless deer tags on a draw unit on the Paunsagaunt can we as a RAC give them to a CWMU for . . .?

Douglas Messerly: The answer to your question is no. This RAC can't authorize permits for any CWMU; the Wildlife Board does that. Can the Wildlife Board authorize permits that are different than

the Division's recommendations? Absolutely. So you can make the recommendations to the Wildlife Board and they issue permits when we did not (unintelligible) we recommended that no permits be issued. But there's nothing that says, nothing in the law that says that they can't have permits if there's no public permits; if that's your question. And we make recommendations consistent with the public permits as an issue of fairness to the public.

Jake Albrecht: And you did answer my question Doug, thanks. Okay, any other comments? Sam we're back to you.

Steve Flinders: Jake, I'd just say I think archers, public archery hunters can hunt outside of the CWMU can't they? Either sex, spike only? (Unintelligible) gave him a tool to manage elk on the CWMU and anything he shoots and disturbs it may push so that the public may benefit. The public gets half the tags. Isn't it a spike only area now?

Paul Neimeyer: If they've got a CWMU tag they can't go hunt something, they can't go hunt the public with a CWMU tag.

Steve Flinders: No I just said that the general public with an archery tag, it's good for either sex outside of the CWMU.

Teresa Bonzo: If it's below 75 percent of the population. I believe it's listed in the proclamation that it is not one of those . . . .

Steve Flinders: So it's not open.

Teresa Bonzo: It is not one of those that you can take a cow to place a (unintelligible), unfortunately. That (unintelligible) update came too late, but it is not one that you can choose to take a cow.

Steve Flinders: So it's spike only. You'll have to push spikes on the public. Well I can make a motion that he gets his tags. I make a motion to approve the request.

Jake Albrecht: Steve Flinders, did you just make a motion that we approve his request?

Steve Flinders: Yes I did.

Jack Hill: I second it.

Jake Albrecht: And to follow up with that are you going to approve the rest of the CWMU recommendations?

Steve Flinders: Sure.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we have a motion by Steve Flinders that we accept the DWR's recommendations with the exception that on the Alton that we give them their request for 12 cow permits. Am I correct with that?

Steve Flinders: You're correct.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, do we have a second?

Jack Hill: Yes.

Jake Albrecht: A second by Mr. Jack Hill. He hasn't got very many of them left. Okay, do we have any other discussion? All in favor please raise your right hand and keep them up. All against? Cordell. Okay, motion carries.

**Steve Flinders made the motion to accept as presented with the exception that we give the Alton CWMU 12 cow permits. Jack Hill seconded. 8 in favor 1 against Cordell Pearson. Motion carries**

Jake Albrecht: Okay, our next item of business is Aquatic Invasive Species. This is an action item. It says informational only but this is an action item. Richard Hepworth.

**Aquatic Invasive Species (Action) 2:51:48 to 2:58:00 of 3:07:31  
-Richard Hepworth, Aquatics Assistant Program Manager**

Jake Albrecht: Well I think this is very important that we keep it inside the State of Utah and other states as much as possible. But you know we went through all of this a year ago and I think a lot of these guys have already asked a lot of their questions. So unless anybody's got any comments or questions I would ask for a motion to approve on this particular item.

**Questions from the RAC:**

None

**Questions from the Public:**

None

**Comments from the Public:**

None

**Comments from the RAC:**

None

Jack Hill: I would so move Mr. Chairman.

Jake Albrecht: A motion by Jack and a second by Clair. All in favor? All in favor please raise your hand. Unanimous.

**Jack Hill made the motion to accept as presented. Sam Carpenter seconded. Unanimous**

Jake Albrecht: Okay, before we adjourn we've got a little housekeeping we need to take care of.



And it's going to go back to our motion earlier in the night on the does. The Division has got some questions on, has everybody got a copy of the 2009 antlerless deer numbers and dates? Got em? Okay, when we cut the numbers in half that were on the board earlier tonight, how do you want the Division to cut the numbers as far as dates? For example we'll start with the Panguitch Lake. The Panguitch Lake unit wide had 100 tags on it. And then the Panguitch Lake Summit had 75, and the Panguitch Lake Parowan had 200, which is 375 so we've got to cut that number in half. In looking at that the most of those are over on the Summit- Paragonah and the Parowan front. So that one there would be my recommendation, is we do away with the Panguitch Lake unit-wide hunt and do the other two. Am I correct? Would that be better? You still have to cut some numbers on those but you've have two hunts.

Douglas Messerly: Well just give us numbers because that's what we need, what this RAC, we just need clarification on what the committee wants us to half the numbers and dates with regard to those (unintelligible).

Jake Albrecht: Jack.

Jack Hill: Are these specified as a code or are they broken out?

Jake Albrecht: Say that again.

Jack Hill: They're the 375 total permits and we're going to reduce that by 50 percent.

Jake Albrecht: Right.

Jack Hill: Are there subcategories in the 375?

Jake Albrecht: Three of them.

Jack Hill: Well just cut each one of them 50 percent.

Jake Albrecht: That's what we need to know is how the RAC wants to do it.

Jack Hill: Okay, I would make that motion.

Sam Carpenter: Can I clarify the proposal I made? I did say the late hunt and there was a reason for that. And I see that does add up to more than half of that unit. That would be 175 versus 200. So I guess, have you found it what we're looking at here? So in this case I would just like to say that we just eliminate that late hunt on that unit and leave the other two as they stand, and that is the Panguitch Lake unit, that's a total of it looks like 375 deer and we would eliminate the December hunt.

Teresa Bonzo: So it would be down to 175.

Sam Carpenter: Right.

Jack Hill: Well wait a minute, that's more than 50 percent.

Sam Carpenter: Right. Well we can split 12 and a half tags.

Jack Hill: You already made a vote that said it would be 50 percent only.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, then let's make it 50 percent only. If that's . . . I did not realize we had the discrepancy.

Jake Albrecht: The way I remember your motion is you actually did away with the 12-31.

Sam Carpenter: Right, but I thought that was half. I thought that would be half and that would be the half that would come off of that unit. That was the way it was proposed.

?????: Could I ask Teresa a question on that late hunt?

Jake Albrecht: Sure.

?????: I know 200 sounds like a lot on that. Is there a reason, I know that is down on their winter range, along the freeway. Is there a lot of problems with cars hitting them? Is there a problem with too many for the range right in that particular area?

Teresa Bonzo: There is a lot for the range to handle there. It is a very limited winter range and there's a lot of animals.

?????: That's the ones you see along the freeway when you're traveling in the winter?

Teresa Bonzo: Absolutely.

?????: Is there a car wreck problem with those?

Teresa Bonzo: There is some.

?????: That's fenced along that but they're off of the freeway?

Teresa Bonzo: There is some.

Jim Lamb: I was just going to say we have high road mortality, high depredation, a lot of things damaged.

Jake Albrecht: For what (unintelligible) intended those, with the amount of deer plus the depredation. It looks to me like the Panguitch Lake hunt you need to stay on the other side of the mountain. But whether the dates stay the same I don't know.

?????: I say we dump it on Paul and Tom and let them figure it out. Sorry Paul.

Jake Albrecht: We owe the Division some clarification here.

Sam Carpenter: Let me ask a question, what if we just would half all of those hunts and just make it a 50 percent as proposed instead of trying to confuse it with the late hunt and uh . . .

Jake Albrecht: And leave your 12-31 in there?

Sam Carpenter: Excuse me?

Jake Albrecht: And leave the 12.

Sam Carpenter: Yes. Half of the tags. Half of the 75, half of the 100. Just do the 50 percent like it was proposed.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, so if we just half everything and leave the dates the way they are, you're good with that?

Sam Carpenter: I'm good with that.

Jake Albrecht: Is everybody else good with that?

Teresa Bonzo: The late hunt is half?

Sam Carpenter: Yeah, half, half the tags.

Teresa Bonzo: Okay, okay.

Sam Carpenter: Do we need to make a motion or do anything?

Jake Albrecht: Is everybody good with that? All right.

Paul Neimeyer: (Unintelligible) change the motion. Because I asked for clarification, Sam are you getting rid of that late hunt? And you said, yes.

Sam Carpenter: I thought I did. I thought that was half of that unit.

Paul Neimeyer: Right. I think you need to remake that motion that it's actually for clarification, it actually cuts everything in half or we leave the dates alone.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, so if we make a motion of clarification that the dates are good on the doe hunts that we cut in half but we just cut the permit numbers in half, something like that.

Sam Carpenter: Perfect.

Jake Albrecht: Go for it.

Sam Carpenter: Do I need to make it?

Jake Albrecht: Yeah.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, I make the motion we accept the proposal, the DWR put out there, with the

exception of cutting the Panguitch Lake, Zion and Pine Valley doe hunts by 50 percent or in half, and no doe tags on the Paunsagaunt.

Jake Albrecht: And no changes on the dates.

Sam Carpenter: No changes on dates.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. And a second by Clair. All in favor? Any against? Motion carries.

**Sam Carpenter made the motion to accept the as presented with the exception that there are no doe permits given on the Paunsagaunt and that the doe permit numbers are cut by 50% on the Pine Valley, Zion, and Panguitch units.**

**8 in favor, 1 against Jack Hill**

**Other Business**

**-Jake Albrecht, Chairman**

- **Other business I don't have any.**

**Jake Albrecht: Our next meeting is May 12, 2009, 7:00 PM at the Fillmore High School. And I think it is Fishing, right?**

**Jack Hill: I would mover for adjournment.**

**Meeting adjourned 9:40 pm**