

Central Region Advisory Council
Central Region Conference Center
1115 N. Main St, Springville
September 15, 2009 @ 6:30 p.m.

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda

MOTION: To accept the agenda as amended
Passed unanimously

Approval of August 4, 2009 minutes

MOTION: To accept the minutes as transcribed
Passed unanimously

Bat Management Plan

MOTION: To accept the bat management plan as presented
Passed unanimously

Falconry Guidebook & Rule R657-20

MOTION: To accept the revised falconry rule and guidebook as presented
Passed unanimously

Fishing Guidebook & Rule R657-13

MOTION: To accept fishing regulations as presented
Passed unanimously

Fishing Contests and Clinics Rule R657-58

MOTION: To adopt the rule as presented
Passed unanimously

Central Region Advisory Council
Central Region Conference Center
1115 N. Main St, Springville
September 15, 2009 @ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Micki Bailey, BLM
Matt Clark, Sportsmen
Larry Fitzgerald, Agriculture
Richard Hansen, At Large
Gary Nielson, Sportsmen, Vice Chair
Fred Oswald, Non-consumptive, Chair
Larry Velarde, Forest Service

Members Absent

John Bair, Sportsmen, excused
Byron Gunderson, At Large
George Holmes, Agriculture
Jay Price, Elected, excused
Duane Smith, Non-consumptive, excused
Allen Stevens, At Large, excused

Others Present

Rick Woodard, Wildlife Board Member

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

Add fish tournament under fishing guidebook

VOTING

Motion was made by Gary Nielson to accept the agenda as amended

Seconded by Matt Clark

Motion passed unanimously

2) **Approval of the August 4, 2009 minutes (Action)**

VOTING

Motion was made by Richard Hansen to accept the minutes as transcribed

Seconded by Micki Bailey

Motion passed unanimously

3) **Regional Update (Information)**

- **John Fairchild, Central Regional Supervisor**

Wildlife

- Any Weapon Limited Entry Bull Elk Season started Saturday
- West Desert pronghorn classification and hunt going on now
- Forest Grouse season started last Saturday
- Youth Chukar Hunt held last Saturday
- Elk Management Plan Committee working on survey

Aquatics

- Stocking June sucker in Utah Lake the next few weeks
- Busy with steam and lake surveys this month
- Strawberry River restoration (Phase II) completed
- Working through angler access issue on Provo River above the RR trestle
- Mark Grover is the new sensitive species biologist (replaced Julie Stahli)

- Utah Lake Fish Forum have identified key access locations around the lake that could be developed/maintained for angler access and some will facilitate carp removal operations
- Fall stocking of community fisheries with rainbow trout possible now that water temperatures have dropped

Habitat

- Working with BLM and private landowners on habitat restoration project for the Skull Valley/Stansbury Mtn. burn
- Strawberry Valley Sage Grouse Habitat Restoration Tour
- Watershed Restoration Initiative projects underway
- Guzzler maintenance scheduled for next couple of weeks

Conservation Outreach

- Strawberry Valley Wildlife Festival and Kokanee Viewing Day (Sept. 18-19)
- Raptor Viewing Day (Sept. 26) – Orem Overlook (Squaw Peak Road)

Law Enforcement

- Strawberry Checkpoint Updates
- South Fork bear case still under investigation
- Hollie's bear case

Fred Oswald – I think there are cases in which the public is justified in taking a bear that is threatening them but I also think there are times when they are not. I would encourage the Division to publicize those cases just as much as we publicize poachers so that people who have conflict with bears will think twice about taking one down for no real good reason.

4) **Southern Leatherside (Information)** - **Cassie Mellon, Native Aquatic Species Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Matt Clark – Is this fish facing the same problems as the June sucker at Utah Lake?

Cassie Mellon – The June sucker is unique because it is even more limited in distribution than the leatherside. Southern leatherside have a much wider range.

Matt Clark – What about predation?

Cassie Mellon – Predation is a big threat. They do coexist with cutthroat trout and those fish are predacious but less than other species.

John Fairchild – They do reproduce on their own and June suckers are not.

Cassie Mellon – There are a number of populations that are doing great.

Larry Fitzgerald – How do water levels effect the southern leatherside?

Cassie Mellon – Constant flow is important.

Larry Fitzgerald – Could the population levels be part of the natural cycle?

Cassie Mellon – Native populations do have lows and highs with drought and other conditions.

Larry Fitzgerald – What does this species contribute to the ecosystem?

Cassie Mellon – They eat insects and are food for other fish. It is part of the natural ecosystem.

Larry Fitzgerald – Would this fish be welcome in other waters such as Strawberry?

Cassie Mellon – We would not want to put them there. I think some have illegally introduced for use as bait.

Larry Fitzgerald – What areas would you want them in?

Cassie Mellon – We would want to maintain them in their native range.

Matt Clark – Is it possible to raise them in a hatchery?

Cassie Mellon – Yes, we haven't done that with southern leatherside but we are doing that with northern leatherside which is a closely related fish. That would be a last resort.

5) **Bat Management Plan (Action)**

- **Kim Hersey, Sensitive Species Biologist**

Questions from the RAC

Richard Hansen – How do you count bats?

Kim Hersey – It is pretty difficult. This summer we have been putting out nets over water so as bats fly to get a drink they get tangled in the net and we are able to take them out and collect data. We also have bat recorders that give off echo location calls and because each species has a different call we are able to use computer analysis to figure out what bats are there.

Richard Hansen – How can you stop the fungus?

Kim Hersey – What we are doing to prevent it from getting into the state is prohibiting researchers who come into Utah to do bat work from bringing items from out of state. As far as bat to bat they haven't figured that out yet.

Matt Clark – How often do you get calls about bats in home or businesses and what do you do?

Kim Hersey – This time of year we get quite a few. We have a species that migrate through the state called the Mexican free tail bat. As an agency we don't do any control work ourselves. We recommend people from pest control agencies and also give them direction on how they can do some of the work themselves. When you locate where the bats are coming out you can put something that lets the bats out like a plastic bag with one end open so the bats can get out but they can't get back in.

Matt Clark – Are the pest control companies regulated how they manage those?

Kim Hersey – Yes. They are required to have a COR to do that work and there are some stipulations in there. Also when bats are in a house in the summer they usually have young and they can't fly so we try to prevent people from excluding bats from their house at that time because it is un-needed killing of the bats and because it creates a much greater problem for the people with the house because of the decaying bats and you also have parents trying to get back to their young.

Fred Oswald – We often hear with other species when they are absent from historical habitat the Division will capture and move them into historical habitat. There is nothing in the bat plan that relocates bats.

Kim Hersey – No there isn't partially because bats can move so quickly and relocate on their own. The Mexican free tail bats migrate from Canada to Mexico. At this point in bat management we want to keep good habitat good and keep those species on the landscape.

Fred Oswald – If someone has had bats and now they don't would you move them into an area?

Kim Hersey – Some people do want to attract bats to their property and that can be done using bat houses.

Fred Oswald – Is this a multi year plan?

Kim Hersey – It is a five year plan from 2009 to 2014.

Questions from the Public

Jared Tanner – Do bat houses work?

Kim Hersey – They will only work for those species that would normally use human dwellings. There are five or six of the species in Utah that may use them. Bats are very particular about the temperature and the humidity that they need. There are good web sites that have things you can do to increase the chances of one working. Generally they say the bigger the better.

RAC Discussion

Larry Fitzgerald – With all the human activity in caves is the Division trying to educate the public about the mines and bats.

Kim Hersey – I don't think we have too much education regarding mines because you are not supposed to be there. The Forest Service has informational kiosks and signs about closures.

Larry Fitzgerald – I think it would be helpful for the Division to educate people.

Larry Velarde – Has there been consolation with Forest Service and the BLM on the management plan?

Kim Hersey – The management plan was put out to all the members of the Utah Bat Conservation Cooperative and there are members from both agencies.

Larry Velarde – One of our biologists for the Wasatch, Cache forest has some concern. He says based on what he has seen there is a lack of good solid data supporting some of the inferences made in the conservation plan.

Kim Hersey – I think I have been in contact with that individual and we are working with him.

VOTING

Motion was made by Gary Nielson to accept the bat management plan as presented

Seconded by Micki Bailey

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

6) Falconry Guidebook & Rule R657-20 (Action)

- Jimmy Parrish, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Comments from the Public

Shane Clark – I am a master falconer from Orem. I have been a falconer for 20 years. I would like to voice my support for the work that has been done. Falconers are very passionate and we want give our stamp of approval. There has been quite a lot of discussion and we appreciate the dialog that we have had with Jimmy and the Division.

Jared Tanner – Vice President of the Utah Falconers Association – First and foremost I want to thank Jimmy for all the work he has done. We have had countless hours and dialog back and forth and we have come to a nice document in my opinion. Things are moving forward really well. There have been thousands of hours on the federal level as well as the state level to get this to where it is at.

RAC Discussion

Larry Fitzgerald – I don't know these guys but I run into a lot of falconers on desert and every one of them are good people. The clean up after themselves and take care of the land. I wish other people would follow their example.

VOTING

Motion was made by Matt Clark to accept the revised falconry rule and guidebook as presented

Seconded by Gary Nielson

Fred Oswald – To clarify we are adopting a plan until 2014?

Jim Parish – It is currently on a five year revision so if we get approved in 2010 then the rule will go through 2015.

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

7) Fishing Guidebook & Rule R657-13 (Action)

- Roger Wilson, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Richard Hansen – Are all community fisheries ponds and reservoirs? Are there any streams?

Drew Cushing – No. We went away from that to a more contained user safe/friendly areas. The lower Provo River was on the list in the past mostly because it is in town but this is a totally different category.

Matt Clark – What role do the local municipalities have in these fisheries? Do they contribute financially?

Roger Wilson – In many cases yes. They contribute money to buy catfish from Arkansas. There are agreements written up. We have never insisted the cities donate money but many of them are coming forward with money. They see great benefits in these fisheries and they are more than willing to assist us in management. Part of the community fishery program is a mentoring program for youth. We get a number of volunteers that help us run these kids through a mentoring program where they teach them how to fish and about ethics and teach them how to tie a fisherman's knot. It is a great program. It is a six week long program.

Sheril Garn - Riverton City – We have a mentoring program for a number of kids each spring. We handle all the registration and we only charge what it costs. We have many volunteers, many of which are dedicated hunters, who come and teach the kids to fish. The last week we have a fish fry. It is a great program.

Fred Oswald – What are the license requirements for a community fishery?

Roger Wilson – They require the same license as any other water in the state.

Fred Oswald – At what age does someone need a license?

Roger Wilson – 12 and 13 year olds need a five dollar license and 14 and up require the adult license which is 26 dollars.

Fred Oswald – What sort of law enforcement issues do these waters present?

Scott White – Many of the problems are over limits. In the past we have had problems with people using two poles but you can now buy a two pole license that is valid at all waters in the state. We do find a few fishermen without licenses and we do issue quite a few citations for that.

Matt Clark – Are those over limits by adults or youth?

Scott White – Generally by adults.

Matt Clark – I know for example Vivian Park has a sign that says 12 and under. Is it possible to do something like that on the community waters?

Roger Wilson – As I understand it the age discrimination laws will not allow us to do that.

Matt Clark – These are designed for youth and yet the adults are causing the problems.

Roger Wilson – Adults are using these waters a lot more because of economic concerns and we did not anticipate that. Our initial thought was this would be a place that kids would be introduced to fishing and then they would expand their horizons to statewide waters.

Fred Oswald – Is another one of the management problems the fact that you have people fishing with treble hooks and barbs and they may catch catfish first and try to release them unsuccessfully? Are you finding a lot of mortality?

Sheril Garn - Riverton City – We have a lot of dead catfish around our pond. The kids love them but our adults do not.

Fred Oswald – May you have to consider no throw back?

Roger Wilson – We are encouraging throw back on bass so that would require species ID. That would be difficult. Our real effort on community waters thus far has been to minimize the regulations and make it a friendly place for kids. I think the program is working. I have heard of some mortality but I think that could be handled through public education programs.

Fred Oswald – I hope the communities support your two fish limit.

Comments from the Public

Sheril Garn - Riverton City – Our ponds are primarily a secondary water system and initially we started with fish to control the mayflies. The fishing program has been so successful. It is disappointing when the adults come fish it out and then grandpa takes Johnny fishing and they get skunked. We are very much in favor of the two fish limit.

Todd Asay - Sandy City parks – Our new park just opened. We have just started our youth program and look forward to it. We also support the two fish limit.

Emily Gilmwater – Highland City – We are also in support of this proposal.

VOTING

Motion was made by Gary Nielson to accept fishing regulations as presented

Seconded by Matt Clark

Fred Oswald – I think this is a wonderful program.

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

8) Fishing Contest Rule R657-58 (Action)

- Drew Cushing, Wildlife Biologist

Questions from RAC

Larry Fitzgerald – What is the fine for having a contaminated boat on the water?

Scott White – It is a class b misdemeanor. If they come to the water and they have not decontaminated or they will not decontaminate then we can hold their boat and not let them out on the water.

Larry Fitzgerald – Are you at all these contests?

Scott White – We are there at most of them. If we know about the competition we will have an officer there.

Drew Cushing – That is one of the effects of the changes we made a few years ago was to ensure ourselves that we could make our law enforcement and AIS folks aware that those were taking place so they could go out and interact with them. That works for the traditional tournaments but with these internet tournaments they have a loop hole.

Larry Fitzgerald – You think this will solve that?

Drew Cushing – They will find another loop hole but if we keep addressing the issues we have we will get to a better place.

Fred Oswald – Are the tournaments on streams as well as lakes?

Drew Cushing – Yes. We just had one on the Provo River which was also one of these multiple contest approaches.

Richard Hansen – What is the cost of a COR?

Drew Cushing – It is only 20 dollars. It is not cost prohibitive to get one. What we want is for them to apply and let us know what they are doing. That is the only reason for the COR. You don't get money back from a COR, what you want it is the accountability.

Questions from Public

John Fairchild – Is the self certification process redundant just to make a point with people who are looking at tournament regulations? Everyone has to have them.

Drew Cushing – It is to make sure that these guys are doing business right. They attract a lot of out of state folks. This makes them accountable.

VOTING

Motion made by Richard Hansen to adopt the rule as presented

Seconded by Micki Bailey

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

25 in attendance

Next board meeting October 1st, 2009

Next RAC meeting Thursday, November 12th, 2009 at Springville Jr. High School 165 South 700 East, Springville

NORTHEASTERN RACMEETING SUMMARY-MOTIONS PASSED
Western Park, Vernal/September 10, 2009

Rule R657-39-4(5) states: “[n]o formal decisions or recommendations may be made at any meeting unless there is a quorum present consisting of a simple majority of the membership of the council.”

Because there were only six voting council members present at the meeting, the NER RAC could not make a formal decision or recommendation.

NORTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY

Western Park, Vernal

September 10, 2009

Started at 6:30 pm; Adjourned at 8:45 pm

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kirk Woodward-Sportsmen
Mitch Hacking-Agriculture
Bob Christensen-Chair
Kevin Christopherson-NER Supervisor
Beth Hamann-Nonconsumptive
Curtis Dastrup-Agriculture
Carlos Reed-Ute Tribe

RAC MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Loran Hills-Nonconsumptive
Rod Morrison-Sportsmen
Floyd Briggs-At-Large
Ron Winterton-Elected Official
Amy Torres-At Large
Brandon McDonald-BLM

UDWR MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kim Hersey-SLO Sensitive Species Biologist
Jim Parrish-Wildlife Program Coordinator
Charlie Greenwood-NER Wildlife Pgm Mgr
Wade Paskett-SER Wildlife Biologist
Justin Shannon-SER Wildlife Biologist
Roger Wilson-SLO Wildlife Pgm Coord
Drew Cushing-SLO Warm Water Fisheries
Ron Stewart-NER Conservation Outreach
Gayle Allred-NER Office Manager
Brian Maxfield-NER Sensitive Species Bio
Roger Schneidervin-NER Aquatic Manager
Sean Davis-NER Law Enforcement

Dixie Sadlier attended from BLM to answer grazing rights questions

1, 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES - Bob Christensen

Bob Christensen: We're one person shy of a quorum, so we won't be voting or making recommendations to the Board, but we will still take comments and questions which will be read by the Wildlife Board.

Kevin Christopherson: If you have a specific comment you want to make sure gets captured in the minutes, be sure and let us know.

3. OLD BUSINESS – Bob Christensen

Summary of last Wildlife Board Meeting: All action items on the Wildlife Board, passed with the same recommendations our RAC recommended except for a few:

Fee Schedule: There was a new premium bear permit fee they wanted to include. There isn't a premium bear hunt but since they had the fee schedule agenda, they wanted to put this on there for resident and non-resident so in the event they do have a premium bear

hunt in the future, that schedule would already be in place. The fees would be \$166.00 for residents and \$465.00 for non-residents.

Cougar Guidebook: The other exception on those action items was that the cougar guidebook and rule was consistent with our RAC except for the Manti unit. They kept that one on a predator management plan.

Furbearer Guidebook and Rule: Passed. The trapper recommendations were discussed but that was not included in their motion so that was not accepted.

All the other items passed consistent with what we voted on in our RAC.

4. REGIONAL UPDATE - Kevin Christopherson

Personnel changes: We have two new officers in the region; Bryan Clyde in Roosevelt and Cody Griffith in Vernal. Pat Rainbolt who used to be working on oil and gas is now doing the impact analysis. Alex Hansen is a new biologist who will be working on oil and gas. Lowell Marthe who was the project leader at Flaming Gorge is now the wildlife biologist for Daggett County and Diamond Mountain.

Aquatics: The new fish barrier has been installed on the West Fork of the Duchesne River. We found whirling disease in there last year. Two barriers were installed to keep fish from moving upstream, and there's a pond Roger cares about called Strawberry Reservoir.

CRCT lake surveys are going on. Garn Birchell has done a lot of surveys for CRCT on Burnt Fork and is finding about 90% pure.

Boreal toad sighting: Garn Birchell found a boreal toad in the Spirit Lake area. The last sighting was in the 1940s.

Stream survey habitat improvement projects: Lake Canyon Lake stream has no canopy, no shade trees, so we've had a project going to recreate a stream where one was lost. That's a project Calvin's been working on.

Budget: The economy's bad which affects the state as well. We took a cut last year, and have been asked to cut 1-3% of our budget again this year. We're better than most because most of our money comes from license sales, but it still equates to \$100,000 to \$300,000.

Henry Mountains Research Project: The Henry Mountains has been difficult to study, so we've contracted with a group to do a research project on them. It will cost about \$450,000. Hopefully that research will translate into information we can use on the Book Cliffs.

Depredation: The elk are moving into the corn fields so there are going to be a lot of depredation tags issued this year.

Fires: There have been several fires on the Book Cliffs. From a range point of view, the Rat Hole fire was in a prescribed burn area. It burned just over 3000 acres. The Winter Ridge fire covered about 2400 acres. We would like to reseed Winter Ridge so we're working with BLM. The seed will cost us \$150,000, so we'll probably cancel some of our other projects to be able to pay for the seed. BLM will fly the seed over.

Questions:

Mitch Hacking: If you find a toad on the mountain, that's going to cause the problem of an endangered species. Why is that a good deal?

Kevin Christopherson: Typically what happens with a petition to list a species, some scientist says, "I'm not seeing as many as I used to see; I think their range is shrinking; I think they need special protection."

The problem is, no one's looked very hard and state wildlife agencies have been negligent about managing the species within their state. If someone petitions a species to be listed to Fish and Wildlife Service they have to determine if it's justified to be listed. They have to research it and find out if there's data to support it and if we have data to say there have been some seen in the Uinta Mountains.

Mitch Hacking: So they get put on a list?

Kevin Christopherson: No, that lets us know that they are there, so their range is not shrinking as much. Amphibians in general are disappearing around the world. In this case, the boreal toad range just got a lot bigger because we just found one. If it was listed, they would look at trying to protect the habitat. What the states have done recently is ask the federal government to let us develop a conservation plan.

6. BAT MANAGEMENT PLAN - Kim Hersey

See attached

Questions from RAC:

Mitch Hacking: Do you have any idea how much this program would cost? And where does the money come from?

Kim Hersey: We're able to apply for cooperative funding from the Department of Defense for \$400,000. Partnerships have given us strength to compete. That was for our bat initiative. Funding for my position is from Endangered Species Mitigation Fund (ESMF) money and that's matched with State Wildlife grant money.

Jim Parrish: Kim does more than bat work. The total budget is \$700,000 a year but that's spread out over all regions and some have other monies like prairie dog money or ferret money. Bat work is just one part of sensitive species paid under block grant.

Mitch Hacking: How much is the bat program costing?

Kim Hersey: We had special funding this year and it's just part of our regular work.

Mitch Hacking: How much would the bat conservation plan cost?

Kim Hersey: Nothing on top of what's already occurring.

Mitch Hacking: \$200,000?

Jim Parrish: \$10,000 per region probably, based on how much time each biologist spends on this.

Mitch Hacking: And you're getting money from outside sources?

Kim Hersey: We're not using any sportsmen money. We use royalties from brine shrimp for ESMF.

Jim Parrish: The Division uses matching grant block monies. This is just one component of her work plan.

Jim Parrish: We do have BOB legacy money for bat work that Field and Duway are paying us to do.

Bob Christensen: Did the development of the plan include all members of the partnership?

Kim Hersey: Yes.

Curtis Dastrup: We're concerned with degradation of riparian areas used by bats, removal of plants along the river and yet we have a plan to the effect that we're trying to get of the tamarisk?

Kim Hersey: This came up last evening. The author meant to say native "phreatophytes" and before the plan goes to the Board, we will make that clear. We don't want native, but we do want tamarisk.

Curtis Dastrup: You wanted to catalog all the fresh water sources. Isn't that quite a pretty big project? Are you down to livestock ponds?

Kim Hersey: We've done efforts through habitat to bring together sources of information that's already out there. We don't have plans to record every water, but as people are out

there and see water sources, they can hit their GPS and let us know if there are resources for bats.

Curtis Dastrup: Some objectives seem like pretty massive undertakings to be done on a shoestring economy.

Kim Hersey: That's the challenge of the job.

Questions from Public:

None

Comments from Public:

J.R. Kirkaldie (Forest Service in Roosevelt): The presentation was informative. We try to incorporate the wishes of the state in the work that we do. Your plan affects a lot of items and the Forest Service has to manage all those resources. On my district I have oil and gas development, timber harvest, livestock grazing, caving, habitat vegetative manipulation, bark beetle control and pesticide use. In your actions under oil and gas mining, you've got toxic ponds covered with wire netting or made in accessible. I talked with my specialists on that and concluded that's something we could maybe add to our projects. Regarding livestock grazing, we're already doing vegetative manipulation. We burn a lot of that.

While this plan is general enough that we can try to call you and ask you to describe to me so we can incorporate that, you've touched on so many areas that it needs to be sent to the Forest Service with a complete review that we could come up with complete ideas. I would be very interested in having more input and a longer time period of input and specialists to input. We're trying to incorporate them as much as possible and meet your wishes, but from what I've got here I don't have all the information I need right now to make this useful from a Forest Service standpoint.

Kim Hersey: It's intended to be a living document, to include more as we get more information. There have been recommendations from the Forest Service management to fill in holes and we will be working on that before it goes to the Board.

J.R. Kirtland: It's a new thing. I don't recall a bat management plan ever before in my career.

Kim Hersey: This is Version 1.0 and we hope to have more in the future. Since we have holes in our knowledge, we will include more information as we know more. As we get more information, it will be more useful.

Comments from RAC:

Mitch Hacking: We run cattle every day and take care of our riparian lands. "Livestock grazing is detrimental to wildlife...?"

Kim Hersey: The other RAC had that comment as well. We are going to amend that to read “Inappropriate grazing.”

Mitch Hacking: We have more problems to riparian from four-wheelers.

7. FALCONRY GUIDEBOOK AND RULE – Jim Parrish

See attachment

Questions from RAC:

Mitch Hacking: On depredation of livestock, what if you have an area where you have a healthy population of eagles and they are working on sage chickens. Is there any way you could open that up and get some of the birds?

Jim Parrish: The livestock depredation is a new one, but as I understand, if goldens are taking livestock, then they will go in and do some control. For other things, they would probably do some control now if they’re taking sage grouse. The only livestock depredation areas defined are in Wyoming. There are none designated in Utah.

Mitch Hacking: Can the sage grouse be taken?

Jim Parrish: The number one prey item for golden eagles is jackrabbits. They’ll take other things too but their number one is jackrabbits. We have an individual who’s been doing golden eagle surveys for several years for us now. He’s had footballs and basketballs show up but the number one prey item has been jackrabbits.

Mitch Hacking: We’ve talked to the Fish and Game about reducing golden eagles but they can’t. Maybe if they could go the falconry route they could reduce them a little bit.

Jim Parrish: Goldens are a hard bird to work with, especially since they have to hunt with them. I’d call Wildlife Services and see what they can do.

Mitch Hacking: Are there many falconers who have golden eagles?

Jim Parrish: Only 2 out of 200.

Questions from Public:

None

Comments from Public:

Mark Holmes (Utah Falconers Club): We’re happy with this new guide book. It’s a lot better for us in a lot of ways than the past regulations. It’s more regulated than any other species. We want to express our appreciation for the work Jim Parrish has done with our

club and officers. We'd also like to go on record expressing our appreciation for efforts of Dave Olsen.

Comments from RAC:

Carlos Reed: We had a couple Falconry members come on to reservation land last year and were attempting to take pheasants. These rules and regulations don't apply on the reservation so before they hunt on the Tribe, they need to contact us to let them know special permits they may have to have on the reservation.

Jim Parrish: The new rule says they must abide by all state and territorial rules and obtain permission, so the current rule includes Tribal lands and permission. That includes municipal ordinances they have to comply with, which has always been true but hasn't been stated.

Mark Holmes: We really value our relationship with the Ute Tribe. We had a National Conference in 1995 and worked with the Tribe. That was a great boon for us and a wonderful thing. We want to maintain that relationship. If somebody was hunting on Tribal lands without a permit, I hope they were ticketed. We'll send that out in our newsletter.

Kirk Woodward: I think we could go on record from the Sportsman's point of view as saying this is something we would approve.

8a. FISHING GUIDEBOOK AND RULE – Roger Wilson

Recommended Changes to the 2010 Fishing Rule and Guide. We'll have two items to cover. I will cover the Guidebook and Rule. The Fishing Contests and Clinics section will be presented by Drew Cushing. It's in packet but didn't make the agenda. See handout.

NERO Tiger Muskie Waters:

Bullock Reservoir in Uintah County

Cottonwood Reservoir in Uintah County

The statewide tiger muskies limit applies. We would remove specific water references.

Sheep Creek, Daggett County, August 15 through 6 am on the last Saturday of November.

8b. RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO R657-58 FISHING CONTESTS AND CLINICS

-Drew Cushing

See handout

Lack of accountability from internet-based fishing contests
Unfair competition with legitimate fishing contest sponsors for resources
Unfair competition with general anglers for resources
Cumulative cash and prizes attracts professional anglers who fish multiple states

Questions from RAC:

None

Questions from Public:

None

Comments from Public:

Sharon Weyland: Some boaters think the “Diver down” flag means wakeless speed. Sometimes they are aiming for divers. Boaters need to know that there are underwater divers. There needs to be more information in the boating guidebook.

Roger Wilson: We’ve had that discussion. That’s our plan. We’re not in charge of the content that goes in the boating informational guide but we are pushing for that and hope that’s in there.

Comments from RAC:

None

10. BISON RECOMMENDATIONS –Justin Shannon (SER Wildlife Manager)

(See Handout)

- Counted 407 adults during bison flight
- 35 animals over expected count (90% sightability)
- The Henry Mountains Bison Committee met and came up with the following options:

Option 1 – Transplant

Translocate 40 bison to the Book Cliffs

Pros:

- Reach population objectives (Henries – 310/275) Book Cliffs – 50/450
- Less hunting pressure (151 permits issued)
- Less impacts on bison

Cons:

- 1 Permittee and Landowner opposes the transplant
- We may be limited on release sites on the Book Cliffs in winter (Steer, Winter, or Moon Ridge)

Option 2 – Increase Permits

Increase permits by 39

Pros:

-Reach population objective of 275

Cons:

-increased hunting pressure

-Possibly lower hunter success and satisfaction

-Increased stress on the bison

-Safety issues

-Notify hunters of OIAL hunt on short notice

-January's weather condition are variable, not sure of access opportunities

Conclusion

The bison committee and the UDWR support Option 1; although there is some opposition in the Book Cliffs. If the Wildlife Board approves Option 1, but logistically we cannot see it through, we will resort to Option 2 if time permits.

We view a transplant as a win-win for both the Henry Mountains and the Book Cliffs bison herds.

Questions from RAC:

Mitch Hacking: The transplant is more expensive isn't it? Who pays for that?

Justin Shannon: SFW. It's about \$850 an animal, so that's \$34,000

Mitch Hacking: Why is the concern about pressure so important on this Henry Mountain bison hunt?

Justin Shannon: It's a once-in-a-lifetime hunt, and there's also that expectation of waiting so many years and wanting a quality hunt. There is also a safety issue.

Bob Christensen: In the past Board meeting, was there was concern expressed for overcrowding of the Henry Mountains hunt?

Justin Shannon: Yes, we had many complaints on that last year. We don't want to put more than 30 hunters on each of those hunts.

Kirk Woodward: I was on the Henry Mountains the year it went from three-point or better and there is a crowding issue. This is not changing our management plan in the Book Cliffs, right?

Justin Shannon: Let me speak to that. That's already written and that's passed and approved.

Kirk Woodward: We want to get to 450 animals, right?

Kevin Christopherson: The plan called for 45 to be put in last year with a total of 450. We didn't know these animals were going to be available, so that's why we have to run this through the RAC.

Kirk Woodward: But we're under objective so this is a way to bring it closer to what we're already approved.

Mitch Hacking: But we're going to put them in a different area.

Kevin Christopherson: We'll put them in the same area in Winter Ridge if we can. It depends on weather conditions.

Justin Shannon: I'll be the first to admit this seems like a rushed process, but if we count more bison than what we think are there, we have to address it. It's not our intention to rush this through but we either have to move them or transfer them.

Kenny Labrum: If you do go with increased bison, what will you do?

Justin Shannon: Hold a later hunt. If a hunter kills a female there's bound to be a very large fetus.

Brad Horrocks: When do they have a plan to hunt the Book Cliffs?

Kevin Christopherson: Modelers are predicting seven to ten years to get it up to a huntable numbers. What this would do is get us to that population objective sooner.

Brad Horrocks: How many bison are out there now?

Charlie Greenwood: Between 45 and 50. There are some Tribal bison.

Brad Horrocks: It would cut the time in half. Sounds like a win-win situation.

Justin Shannon: From a population standpoint it would be helpful.

Gordon Vandyke: Where are you going to release them if you can't get to Winter Ridge?

Charlie Greenwood: We would have to get to Steer Ridge, Winter Ridge or Moon Ridge. That's one of our concerns is we may not be even able to get there. There are possible conflicts in other areas with permittees. The plan mentions we will work with permittees. We're committed to the plan to do that. To follow the plan we need to address those concerns.

Kirk Woodward: On the herd that has been released out there, there's been quite a significant movement of that herd already and we know there's been quite a significant movement by the animals from the Tribe. Does it really matter where we release?

Charlie Greenwood: Yes it does. Because we need to work with the landowners and permittees. There hasn't been that much movement. The Bogart Canyon is in Steer Gulch and on the Tribe. A couple animals did go back to Tribal capture sight. The Steer Ridge and Moon Ridge herd have pretty much stayed in that area. The two groups met up but then kind of split back up to the original release areas.

Kenny Labrum (Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife): Our recommendation would be to continue with the transplant. We had input meetings and would like to see the public hunt those animals as soon as possible.

Comments from RAC:

Curtis Dastrup: Before you put buffalo out there, there were already buffalo out there. Are they still there?

Charlie Greenwood: Just a few.

Curtis Dastrup: Are there more than ten?

Charlie Greenwood: I don't know but there is a small number.

Kevin Christopherson: We saw one at Willow Creek this summer and it wasn't one of ours.

Kirk Woodward: Comment from sportsmen in general. They have undoubtedly said that they're anxious to develop a herd as quickly as possible and this is a step in the right direction.

Kevin Christopherson: (Clarification) The 40 is what we need to meet objective down there. We may not get 40; we may not be able to move 40, depending on conditions. Also, Alameda, who's represented here, has raised concerns to water development and we're certainly committed to working with them because it's a concern for wildlife as well. Whether this gets approved or not, Mother Nature's going to have a lot to say about how many animals get moved.

Letter from BLM Field Station: In Support of the Committee's recommendations. In Support of Option 1.

Kirk Woodward: I would like to go on the record that I would make a motion to support this if we could.

**Meeting adjourned at 8:45.
No RAC meeting in October.**

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY-MOTIONS PASSED
Western Park, Vernal/September 29, 2009

5. HENRY MOUNTAINS BISON OPTIONS

MOTION: to go with Option 1 with a side note that we work closely with BLM and landowners on any concerns that they might have.

Motion Passed 7 to 2

NORTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY

Western Park, Vernal

September 29, 2009

Started at 6:30 pm; Adjourned at 8:15 pm

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Floyd Briggs-At-Large
Bob Christensen-RAC Chair
Mitch Hacking-Agriculture
Beth Hamann-Nonconsumptive
Loran Hills-Nonconsumptive
Brandon McDonald-BLM
Rod Morrison-Sportsmen
Amy Torres-At Large
Ron Winterton-Elected Official
Kirk Woodward-Sportsmen
Kevin Christopherson-NER Supervisor

RAC MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Curtis Dastrup-Agriculture

UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Miles Hanberg-NER Habitat Manager
Dax Mangus-NER Wildlife Biologist
Clint Sampson-NER Law Enforcement
Justin Shannon-SER Wildlife Biologist
Wade Paskett-SER Wildlife Biologist
Charlie Greenwood-NER Wildlife Mgr
Ron Stewart-NER Conservation Outr
Gayle Allred-NER Office Manager

WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS:

Del Brady

1. REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA: Bob Christensen

MOTION by Amy Torres to accept the agenda.

Second by Beth Hamann

Passed unanimously

2. REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES: Bob Christensen

To be reviewed next time because RAC members did not have a chance to review them yet.

3. OLD BUSINESS

Update of elk committee meetings.

Kirk Woodward: The committee has produced a survey that will sample random elk hunters in the state. It is being made available now. We don't want to hand it out at the RAC because we don't want it to influence the sampling. The overall tone of the elk committee is a good one. Once we get the public input back from the survey, the direction will be come fairly clear as to the direction we will want to go with the elk.

4. REGIONAL UPDATE: Kevin

We appreciate the RAC committee members coming to this special meeting. There are two reasons for this meeting: *First*, through the State process there's an opportunity for local governments to comment on UDWR projects like transplants, called the RDCC. The last time we met, their comment period was still open. Now I have this letter of documentation from the RDCC stating none of the local governments have commented. *Second*, the last time we didn't have a quorum, and it's not fair to ask the Board to move on something without a quorum to vote.

New RAC Member: Brandon McDonald is our new BLM representative, and this is a BLM issue so we're glad to have you here.

Handouts from RAC training: I have extra handouts and would encourage you to pick them up if you want some information regarding wildlife and wildlife management. It will help RAC members understand the management and how the RAC process works.

Seep Ridge Road: has been controversial. The County has a proposal to pave and realign it out into the Book Cliffs. We have had concerns from a wildlife point of view because it goes through deer summer and winter range. They went through the environmental impact process and didn't answer our concerns on the impact to wildlife. To avoid a deadlock, the County asked to meet with us. We've worked out a compromise and Monday, the County signed an agreement. They've agreed to put in the culvert passages we identified which are the most expensive. In addition, the County will also fund a research project to find out where deer mortality is highest and put in fences, if needed. We think we can protect the deer herd and let the County move forward with their plan. Our Director should be signing that today.

Mule Deer Committee Meeting (Rod Morrison): There will be a mule deer committee meeting tomorrow night in SLC, Kirk Woodward and Rod Morrison will attend. It will probably be the last meeting.

Bob Christensen: Reminder: there are comment cards on the back table. Please be sure to fill one out and get it to me. Also, we'll be talking about the bison transfer. As far as the bison plan goes, we won't be discussing the plan, just the transfer.

5. HENRY MOUNTAINS BISON OPTIONS – Justin Shannon, Wildlife Biologist SERO

Slide Show

- Counted 407 adults during bison flight. This was a major surprise. Our bison population model showed we should have been much closer to objective. This resulted in a new study, the most expensive study commissioned, to determine and test a new model.
- 35 animals over expected count (90% sightability)
- The Henry Mountains Bison Committee met and came up with the following options:

Option 1 – Transplant

Translocate 40 bison to the Book Cliffs

Pros:

-Reach population objectives

Henrys – from 310 to 275

Book Cliffs – from 50 to 450

-Less hunting pressure

(151 permits already issued) This would bring the number of permits to 190, which is almost 70% of the 275 adult objective in the plan.

-Less impacts on bison

Cons:

-Logistically, we may be limited on release sites on the Book Cliffs in winter- (Steer, Winter, or Moon Ridge)

Dax asked SITLA if they were going to have any road access into the area because of oil and gas activity, and they said there would be access.

Option 2 – Increase Permits

-Increase permits by 39

Add hunters to hunts already established

Change Hunt dates by adding a late season hunt in January

Pros:

Reach population objective of 275

Cons:

-Increased stress/hunting pressure on bison

-Possibly lower hunter success and satisfaction

-Safety issues (crowding)

-Notify hunters of OIAL hunt on short notice

-Fetus size – cows will be carrying a large fetus and from past experience with other hunts, we know many hunters and the public will have a hard time accepting this loss.

-Environmental conditions

Conclusion

-The Bison Committee and the DWR support Option 1

If the Wildlife Board approves Option 1, but logistically we cannot see it through, we will resort to Option 2 if time permits (part of Option 1)

-We view a transplant as a win-win for both the Henry Mountains and the Book Cliffs bison herds

Questions from RAC:

Beth Hamann: The last time you thought you may not have money to move them. Has it been allotted?

Justin Shannon: Sportsmen dollars will be used for this transplant. The money's not a problem. It's \$850 per animal for a total of about \$34,000.

Mitch Hacking: Is it fair to say a pro would be increased revenue and hunter opportunity?

Justin Shannon: It could be. Pros and cons are from the Division's perspective. It's sixes though. There might be too much opportunity. We would have increased revenue but overcrowding.

Mitch Hacking: We have increased permits for Diamond Mountain. The reason is increased revenue and opportunity.

Justin Shannon: There are a lot of effects, but we could have increased revenue.

Mitch Hacking: Hunter congestion is a problem. Is this 30 head going to happen every year?

Justin Shannon: This was unexpected to have bison over-objective. We don't want it to be every year. We'd like to be at population objective every year.

Kevin Christopherson: We were surprised at being over-objective and we committed to a research project to look at that and make better predictions in the future. It will cost around \$500,000.

Mitch Hacking: Better to be over objective rather than under

Kevin Christopherson: We want to keep it at objective.

Mitch Hacking: What about splitting the difference and hunting 15 and transporting 15?

Justin Shannon: Again I think it goes back to the quality of the hunt. Kirk Woodward told us at the last meeting about crowding. We want them to have a quality hunt. Hunter satisfaction is important to us.

Kirk Woodward: About the hunter that says it's a hard tag to draw, if we get to objective in the Book Cliffs sooner, the tags will be drawn sooner and make a better odds of drawing.

Brandon McDonald: If you were to move forward with the preferred strategy, what would happen if you were not able to make it in, in the winter?

Dax Mangus: They'll be plowing roads to access oil and gas activities. If we had to though, we could probably get helicopter access and snowmobiles. I'm pretty confident we can get them where we want to.

Justin Shannon: If we can put a man on the moon, we can put a bison on Moon Ridge.

Kirk Woodward: We have a commitment for the monies, if we have to put a patrol to plow the roads for a day and it costs \$1000, that's not a huge commitment.

Amy Torres: I would like to hear from Farm Bureau before I ask questions, if that's all right.

Bob Christensen: Let's finish the RAC questions first

Rod Morrison: How many animals do you need before you have a hunt?

Charlie Greenwood: Enough mature bulls in the herd to offer a harvest. We'll have to monitor how the herd progresses. Hopefully within five years, something like that.

Rod Morrison: So we're quite a ways away without this transplant.

Kirk Woodward: This doubles our herd.

Dax Mangus: The relocated bulls have all been yearlings, so they're young now. Hunters would want to harvest a mature bull. In another four years, we'll be able to offer possibilities. It would be better for antlerless opportunities however.

Questions from the Public:

Brad Horrocks: What about putting any on the east side? Why only on the west side?

Dax Mangus: The Book Cliffs Management Plan calls for 450 bison throughout the Little Creek and Bitter Creek subunits. One of the reasons we've put them on the west side is because DWR holds some grazing allotments and have concentrated a lot of habitat work and wildlife on the west side.

Charlie Greenwood: Plus there were concerns on east side by a landowner who also has permits to graze BLM, concerns about water and forage.

Brad Horrocks: What projects have we done out there for water for the buffalo?

Miles Hanberg: We have covered about 54,000 acres. Have done 6-10 projects a year, mostly on the west side to help bison and livestock.

Comments from Public:

Dusty Carpenter: (Note: In Dusty's introduction about herself, she gave listeners the impression she was an official representative from the Vernal Field Office of the BLM. This created some considerable confusion as to her role during this meeting among some members of the RAC and public. While she works as a range con for the Book Cliffs and is getting to know the area well, she did not represent the BLM in any official capacity. Brandon McDonald was present to represent the BLM.)

I'm Dusty Carpenter, the Range Con for the BLM in the Book Cliffs. I have concerns about the bison plan and the grazing allotments, regarding this year's resource commissions (?). There has been spring work on Kelly Spring and Rock Springs. However, a lot of springs are going dry [east side].

I've moved permittees off pastures and some areas have big riparian issues. What is in the bison plan when the snow melts? We've [BLM] been given direction to hold off for two years.

I haven't been included in any coordination and communication. I happened to hear about it by accident while talking with a rancher. He was concerned about water on the east side, and Mc Cook Ridge being a release site. [Note: McCook Ridge was one of several sites throughout the Book Cliffs discussed in the original brainstorming. It was removed from consideration when water issues were raised prior to the first RAC meeting.]

AUMs don't just appear out of nowhere. Just because we pull horses off, does not mean AUMs are available. Winter Ridge is in bad shape this year so that's definitely an area that is not conducive for a release site.

Don Peay (Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife): A lot of you are new to the RAC. We appreciate you serving. We have about 600 members in the Uintah Basin and 8000 members statewide. We've been involved in the Book Cliffs from the get go [Book Cliffs Initiative and later management meetings]. We have worked closely with the BLM, DWR and landowners and we are proud of our good relationships. We've put our money where our mouth is and tackled some big issues.

Wildlife is pretty smart. It'll figure out where the range, where the good food is and where the water is. We are willing to help by providing the funding to make sure this transplant happens. Cow tags are for one year, we want long-term dividends - year after year. We'd rather have a long-term view than a short-term view. We have a great opportunity to have another free-ranging bison herd in the United States.

We have invested a lot of time and money in the Henrys working with the BLM, Division and cattlemen. That's why cattlemen support it on the Henrys. We put our money where our mouth is and help solve problems.

In the future, you'll probably talk about conservation permits and expo permits. A lot of agencies around the country are cutting back. In Utah, we have been very fortunate that the Expo has been successful. That's why we can spend money prudently and wisely, we have the significant resources to help solve problems.

Gordon Tattersall: Riverton, Utah. I support the hunters and the sportsmen. I was one of 13,000 sportsmen who applied for a limited entry permit, and was fortunate enough to get a Book Cliffs deer tag. It was a wonderful experience. I was able to see over 100 bucks a day plus herds of elk. I think the Division, as well as sportsmen's groups have done a fantastic job.

A few years back I drew a Henry Mountain bison tag. You have close to 20,000 applicants who are looking at the new Book Cliffs for bison. And you'd have close to 20,000 individuals who would support a transplant. A lot of hunters and sportsmen feel the Book Cliffs is their land as well as everybody else's and would like to see the plan go forward.

Clay Hamann: 20 years ago, people in the Uintah Basin had a great idea called the Book Cliffs Initiative. I wasn't along with it the first year. Later, I became part of it and helped start raising money for it. We wanted a place to start growing wildlife and the Book Cliffs is a great place for wildlife. The oilfield does take its toll but there is still some room for wildlife.

We wanted to enhance deer and elk, we reintroduced turkey and helped grouse. We brought Colorado River cutthroat trout back into the streams. So many things, just to make it a beautiful healthy ecosystem that's whole, which is such a rare thing today. Buffalo is part of that vision.

I think 40 more buffalo to the Book Cliffs is entirely reasonable. It only brings the population up to about 18% of the objective. We've only got about 30% of the elk. We've gone slowly, been careful and have not abused the range. Transplanting 40 bison to the Book Cliffs is not irresponsible. I think it's a wise move and I fully support it.

Mitch Hacking (RAC member): Why doesn't the BLM representative [referring to Dusty] agree?

Clay Hamann: Truthfully, I don't know, but it's my understanding, considering all of the time I spent on the RAC and as the RAC Chairman, that you are entirely out-of-order.

Kevin Christophersen: Mitch, the BLM representative is sitting next to you on the RAC. Having another member of the BLM in the audience is confusing.

Bob Christensen: Clay and Kevin are correct. We will hear from the BLM representative and clear some of this up after the public comment period.

Ryan Thornock (Utah Farm Bureau): We [claiming to unanimously represent 25000 farming and ranching families] oppose the transfer primarily because we think it's premature. In the future it may make sense. We think the coordination with BLM has been minimal. Dusty, the range con has concerns with water. Animals will find water, and it may be on private landowners' land. Bison will go anywhere they want to go.

Another group that is opposed is all three county commissions. They have written three(?) letters to Mike Styler [DNR Director] in opposition to the transplant.

The Ute tribe is against it. The Ute tribe has 450 buffalo. When the Book Cliffs reaches its objective, there could easily be 1000 animals. If they were to combine and concentrate in one drainage, it would cause considerable damage to the resource.

This is a year of financial crisis in the state. Taking away potential permits is a loss of funds. Private funds are being used for these resources, but that's not necessarily a wash on this issue.

The management of the numbers is not that simple. The Henry Mountains over-population problem could be duplicated in the Book Cliffs.

We recommend Option 2. Two permits each could be given to 39 hunters. With better management and coordination it could be a good thing as long as livestock owners and BLM are met with.

Brad Horrocks (Sportsman and livestock permittee): I love the Book Cliffs. I'd love to see the opportunity for buffalo to be out there. I think we can work through this. It's easy to do a lot of talk. You hear a permittee approach Wildlife Resources for funding for water problems but it doesn't happen. That is a concern, Wildlife always tells you they don't have money for that kind of thing. People spend a lot of money for water (livestock men). Landowners get permits, that's great and why we work with Wildlife. It's easy to talk about projects but not to get funds. I think we need to make sure that the permittees and the landowners are being worked with. It's easy to say, "Yeah, we'll do it." It's another thing to get it done. There needs to be something to say we are going to handle these water issues. I don't know what has been spent on water projects. We haven't been able to get these funds to help us on Diamond Mountain and the water sources support the wildlife as much as they do the livestock. I'm in favor of the buffalo being there, but let's put something in writing to help these guys with water.

Lee Howard: I work with the Bighorn Sheep Foundation. We started out with a few bighorns, which we transplanted, and we've kept on transplanting, and it has grown from a few to around 5,500. You can almost see the 5000 additional hunters or opportunities in the state. Bison can be the same, a transplant will create opportunities.

I was noticing the number of cow tags that we have. We have a lot of cow tags. That's one of the reasons we're trying to get rid of the numbers. 90% of them [hunters] want a big bull but they'll be willing to settle for a cow just to get a tag. Some may want the meat. We all have some concerns but the sportsmen have created 32,000 acres of habitat out there in the area so they're doing a lot for wildlife. The Cattlemen's association is also benefitting from the habitat restoration. So I'm for doing the transplants when we can.

Bob Christensen: That finishes the public comments. Now for a clarification: Brandon, is there a BLM position on Dusty's comment?

Brandon McDonald: I'm not disagreeing with Dusty. She's out there more than I am. But, talking with many of the ranchers and other BLM employees throughout the Uintah Basin, I've not heard them having any water issues. In fact, I've heard better things this year. Ron Trogstad [retired BLM employee, who worked in the Book Cliffs, now working as a field project leader for the Division] has been out there working on

repairing and installing guzzlers. The guzzlers are filling up. I've not heard of any water problems in that area. I'm not disagreeing with Dusty. Maybe it's dryer out there where she works but as far as what I've seen, it's been a pretty good water year.

Kevin Christopherson Correction: The County opposition letter statement is not true [referring to a statement from Ryan Thornock (Utah Farm Bureau). I have the letter that says no concerns are raised, dated the 22nd of September.

Dax Mangus: Burt DeLambert, who's the permittee on the west side, won't be able to make it. He understands we want to put all 40 bison on his land. He said that's okay but he'd like to continue to work with the Division on water and habitat projects. I expressed to Burt the Division's committed to working with him. He wanted me to express that comment to the RAC.

Floyd Briggs: Have you pulled the cattle off early in this area?

Dusty Carpenter: No, my comments were mostly on an earlier proposed release site, on Monument Ridge and McCook. It's just a concern. And I'm wondering if there's a larger plan for water development because right now water is trucked by both permittees.

Floyd Briggs: Is there a management plan for the co-existence of both livestock and buffalo?

Charlie Greenwood: The bison plan states that we work with the landowners and land agencies over situations of concern for habitat: for water, for feed. We're committed to that in the bison plan.

Dax Mangus: In the plan it says in drought years, if landowners have to cut numbers, we will cut back bison numbers as well.

Ryan Thornock: The Uintah County Commission is unanimously opposed. When I talked to them they said they met with Styler and told him they were against it, but maybe they agreed not to publicly oppose it.

Kevin Christopherson: I actually talked with them last week. They were not opposed then. They were given the chance to make official comments through the RDCC, they declined to comment.

Gordon Tattersall: (speaking without RAC Chair permission) A lot of times when you're in tree stands, you're over water holes. In Moon Ridge, there was water flowing in every single area. The deer are doing fantastic, the elk are doing fantastic. It's difficult finding a place where animals are having a difficult time getting to water.

Don Peay: (recognized by RAC Chair) A couple of points, the BLM office in Hanksville and Richfield wrote letters of support for the transplant, as well as the Henry Mountains Working Group.

Regarding the earlier comment about talking and not doing, the reason they signed off on it is because we put our money where our mouth is. It's not talk, it's action.

A third point ought to be brought up. The sportsmen and the Division have bought and paid millions of dollars in assets in the Book Cliffs. The desire of the 20,000 people [hunters] that Gordon talked about support wildlife. There's a lot of grass that was bought for wildlife. I can't understand how the grass disappeared. If there wasn't enough grass, the bison plan should never have been approved for 50, let alone 450. It's disappointing to the sportsmen that we have to drastically reduce the herd in the Henries but we have to follow the plan. This Book Cliffs herd should follow its plan also. If the plan is exceeded we work hard to bring the numbers down. If the numbers are down, we should work just as hard to bring the numbers up.

Miles Hanberg (Habitat Manger for UDWR): We plan to be aggressive in the Book Cliffs enhancing 6,000 to 8,000 acres of habitat each year. Maybe Dusty got left out when I spoke with her supervisor, but we plan to work on habitat whether bison are there or not.

Amy Torres: It is my understanding that the bison management plan was a complete plan. It was approved by the RACs and the Board, so I do not think it is premature to put bison out there.

There was a statement that the Tribe was not in agreement with us. Carlos Reed was here when the bison management plan was being proposed and was fully in support of it. I cannot see how that has changed.

The other part is that BLM has been involved in the plan since its inception and the RMP also supports bison into the Book Cliffs. It's also my understanding that the AUMs come from lands the UDWR holds. They are not come from ranchers unwilling to give them up. It [forage allotment for bison] comes from AUMs that the DWR has. I don't see that there is a real issue here, this is all just part of the plan, to reach objective.

Kevin Christopherson: We lease some SITLA lands and sportsmen groups hold some AUMs from the lands we purchased.

Amy Torres: None of the livestock or ranchers have to give them up. Although I don't care which option is being taken, I don't think anything's changed, nothing is premature. It's just part of the plan.

Mitch Hacking: I don't have problems as far as the buffalo transplant. My concern is with the habitat. I work with range cons every day on AUMs. They look at the range and tell us what the range will support. I have a concern because the range con wants to hold off, if they've turned the cattle back. I also have a concern with why she had to find out through the grapevine.

Brandon McDonald: I need to apologize for the BLM. With Amy leaving the BLM, there's been a large gap in who was going to fill the RAC position. As the BLM representative, Amy did a good job of emailing people and getting information out. but

until this meeting, no one filled the position. Now that I'm in there, there should be a good information flow again.

Mitch Hacking: We have to work with range cons and we have to take care of the range because we have sportsmen and BLM and ranchers all looking on. Is the range ready for these 40 head? (out-of-order again in addressing his question to Dusty rather than Brandon or the RAC Chair.)

Dusty Carpenter: I don't represent the BLM. I do stay 100 nights a year in the Book Cliffs and I'm on horseback all the time in the Book Cliffs. The Book Cliff range on state lands is managed by SITLA. If the bison stay on State lands, then BLM cannot speak to it. My concern is water. We have dry lands all over the Book Cliffs. There is no perennial water on the two areas marked for transplant. Water management is paramount on the Book Cliffs.

Mitch Hacking: When you have no water it's not healthy for the animals. They get sick. You can have all the grass in the world but if you don't have water, it's not healthy.

Amy Torres: If conditions are as bad out there as it seems then the bison plan has a fatal flaw if the objective is for 450. The Division also has its range specialists. Dax, how do you think the transplant area looks?

Dax Mangus: It is a dry year but there are a lot of drainages in the roadless area that have running water. There is no authorized livestock grazing. Originally we had considered putting bison on the east side. After talking with Dusty and her concerns, we changed to putting bison on the west side. I really don't think 40 bison is going to be the straw that breaks the camel's back. We're not going to be at 450 bison next year. We'll keep working on habitat and the resources. I don't see that this is going to cause a major problem.

Loran Hills: To get some historical context, when was the bison plan made and how long before the Board approved the plan?

Kevin Christopherson: The management plan was passed last year. It has been in the works for 20 years. We lease from SITLA 6000 AUMs on their lands for wildlife. If we weren't leasing those AUM's, some permittee would have put out 6000 cattle. This is not a new issue, we've thought about this for 20 years. People have worked hard to address the issues.

Mitch Hacking: Are there still wild horses out there? with a management plan?

Brandon McDonald: Dusty is the best source to answer that question. She is the wild horse person for the BLM.

Mitch Hacking: What kind of impact do wild horses have on the management plan?

Dusty Carpenter: There are wild horses in the area, mostly from Burt DeLambert who had a horse permit but many became feral horses. There are also feral Tribal horses and likely some that other people brought out and let loose. These horses are not in herd management unit. The BLM plans to zero them out next summer. After the BLM takes care of these, and declares them to be zeroed out, then horse management will become the responsibility of the County through their animal control program.

Mitch Hacking: So they shouldn't even be an issue.

Dusty Carpenter: If horses remain on Winter Ridge, it will be a County issue. BLM will do a forage inventory after the horses are removed. As stray and feral horses come into the area, the County will be responsible. On July 13 next fiscal year, we have a contract with a helicopter to remove them.

Amy Torres: It is an issue as a lot of horses are there now. Horses are a complex issue, getting them zeroed out will have to a lot to do with how many horses are now there and how many are in the BLM's holding facilities. Until they're no longer managed under the BLM, they're the BLM's responsibility.

Kirk Woodward: As a sportsman representative, I want to say that this meeting is not to revisit the management plan for the Book Cliffs bison. The management plan has been 20 years in the making, It can be adjusted as management needs change but our job today is just to allow movement towards something that's already been decided in a management plan.

Regarding the Farm Bureau claim of having 25,000 members and families unanimously opposed this, that's probably not true. They are not unanimously opposed to this, only the leadership. If we wanted to use numbers, the sportsmen have much larger numbers that do support it.

The other comments you made about the Book Cliffs turning into a Henry Mountain management scenario [reference to statement of poor management because unit is over population objective] , the Book Cliffs is not the Henry's, they are much different. for example the Book Cliffs are not even close in size to the Henries. It's a much bigger area. It's probably not going to turn out to be the same.

You mentioned it's premature [statement from Farm Bureau representative]. It's been 20 years in the making. So again, as a RAC, we don't need to readdress the management plan. We need to allow or disallow movement toward the population objective in the management plan.

MOTION by Rod Morrison to go with Option 1 with a side note that we work closely with BLM and landowners on any concerns that they might have.

Amy Torres: With Option 2 as a backup?

Justin Shannon: That's already in the plan.

Second by Kirk Woodward

Favor: Floyd Briggs, Beth Hamann, Loran Hills, Brandon McDonald, Rod Morrison, Amy Torres, Kirk Woodward

Opposed: Ron Winterton, Mitch Hacking

Motion passed 7 to 2

COMMENT: Curtis Dastrup was excused but wanted it mentioned that he was in favor of Option 1, the bison transplant.

Comments from Ron Winterton: My personal observation on the east side is that the water is in short supply. I personally know some of the livestock people down there are hauling water in. I'm not opposed to them [bison] being there, but I know for a fact they are hauling water to the sheep out there. The water is there because of the livestock guys are paying to have it there.

Comments from Mitch Hacking: 1st. I was nominated by Farm Bureau so I have to represent them. 2nd I'm having a hard time with the analysis by the range con, Maybe hold off on the 30 head, use Option 2. I understand Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife are willing to pay for it, but hold off until water developments are developed further. I'm not convinced the range is ready.

Kevin Christopherson: I would like to add some clarification. It's not easy to move bison. If the Board approves this, there's a possibility that it might not happen or only some of it. What position is the RAC thinking if there might have to be a split of hunting some of them and moving some of them?

Mitch Hacking: These 40 head are just a booster, right? It's just a concern about the dryness of the area.

Kevin Christopherson: That's why we decided not to release them in the areas she talked about. We hadn't heard that concern before but when we did, just prior to last time, we changed the release site.

Beth Hamann: We prefer you move all 40, if not, we'll have to go with part of Option 2 and allow a Henry Mountain hunt for the remainder.

Beth's statement echoed by the other RAC members.

Meeting adjourned 8:00 pm.

Northern Regional Advisory Council

Sept 16, 2009

6:00 P.M.

Place: Brigham City Community Center

<u>RAC Present</u>	<u>DWR Present</u>	<u>Wildlife Board</u>
Robert Byrnes –At Large	Jodie Anderson	Ernie Perkins
John Cavitt-Noncon.	Randy Wood	
Paul Cowley-Forest Service	Ron Hodson	
Joel Ferry-Agric	Roger Wilson	
James Gaskill- At Large	Kim Hersey	
Shawn Groll- At Large	Drew Cushing	
Russ Lawrence- At Large	Scott Walker	
Jon Leonard-Sportsman	Phil Douglass	
Ann Neville-Noncon.	Chris Penne	
Brad Slater- Elected (Chair)	Jim Parrish	
Craig Van Tassell- Sportsman	Pam Kramer	
John Wall- At Large	Craig Schuagaard	

RAC Absent

Bret Selman-Agric.

Meeting Begins: 6:00 p.m.

Number of Pages: 12

Introduction: Brad Slater

Agenda:

Review of Agenda
Review of Aug 5, 2009 Meeting Minutes
Old Business
Regional Update
Bat Management Plan
Falconry Guide Book & Rule 657-20
Fishing Guide Book & Rule 657- 13
Fishing Contest and Clinics Rule 657-58
Habitat Management Plans

Item 1. Review and Acceptance of Agenda

Motion: Byrnes-Accept the agenda with the change.

Second: Cowley

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 2. Review and Acceptance of Aug 5, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Motion: Byrnes- Amendment to Meeting Minutes to include Brad Slater, Shawn Groll and Ann Neville were excused from the last meeting.

Second: Leonard

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 3. Old Business

None

Item 4. Regional Update

Ron Hodson, Regional Supervisor

Back Country Lake surveys in the Uinta's. Weber River surveys for Blueheaded sucker and also for brown trout. 2,500 tiger muskie stocked into Pineview this week. Law enforcement has an action plan written to combat growing fish violations. New officer in Summit County. Fewer bear incidents this year than in the past few years. We just finished a goat census on the North Slope. Do not have the numbers for that yet. New front desk staff member. State Fair going on right now.

Gaskill- Appreciated the youth chukar hunt assistance from the division.

Cowley- What were the major violations up on the Logan that you are running into?

Hodson- I am not sure what they were.

Item 5. Bat Management Plan

Kim Hersey, Sensitive Species Biologist

See Handout

RAC Questions

Neville- The plan shows no way of measuring whether or not the plan will be implemented. Is the division going to following up on that?

Hersey- Currently we have nothing written into the plan. We need to come up with something to track our progress.

Cavitt- Very impressed with leadership the state has taken on getting back conservation as a priority. Concerned about the number of action items that are vague or general.

Mosquito abatement is a major concern of mine for other species as well. Is there a way that those kinds of things can be more specific as far as how the DWR relates with mosquito abatement crews? Is there any dialogue that occurs now?

Hersey- For mosquito abatement specifically, I do not have an idea of how much occurs.

RAC Comments

Gaskill- I sit on the habitat council and I do not remember seeing bats as a problem on any of the other projects. How serious are we on this bat issue? We are not going to see the same problem as we do with quagga mussels.

Hersey- Bats are usually a little way down people's lists when they are considering things. We all have different priorities but all should be considered. This plan is trying to state that bats will be considered sometimes. Hopefully, white nose will raise to that level. It has had media attention lately.

Gaskill- I am not saying bad things about the plan, I actually like it. I like who wrote it, I had to look up 2 words in the dictionary which is pretty rare.

Hersey- The primary author on it was George Oliver. If you have ever talked to him, you have to look up a lot of words.

Cowley- I really think this is great to see the division move forward on some of the non-game species, bats in particular. My concern with some of the language in there is we make statements like you and I have talked and we really need to be sure that is science based and as we make action statements, we need to pull that one step further and say "what does that mean"? I understand we still need to do exploration on the science side to determine that but to make broad statements is a concern. We just need to look at the wording and make sure the science is there to stand behind and strengthen the position.

Lawrence- I have a lot of people ask how to get or make a bat house. The hyperlink that is provided in the bat house plans, I have tried on two different occasions weeks apart and I can't get that link to work. I was able to Google it and found it. Maybe the hyperlink is broken.

Hersey- Ok.

Motion

Motion: Cowley- Approve the plan as presented with the following recommendations: Problem statements science based, the action statements more measurable and an annual report compiled reflecting the accomplishments under the plan.

Second: Gaskill

Discussion on the Motion

Neville- Is that motion going to help with metrics, making sure the plan is implemented? We have no way of knowing if this plan will be implemented because there is no accountability.

Cowley- Ann, how would you add that in?

Neville- I don't know.

Slater- May I suggest that we treat this as a separate motion. So, if we could act on this motion.

Cowley- It kind of feels like you are adding something to a plan you just got through approving if you do it that way.

Neville- It can just be a recommendation, I like the plan.

Cavitt- Can you read back the motion?

Anderson- Can I offer a friendly amendment to the motion that we insert after more specific action items identified and then follow along with the rest. That gets at what I was concerned about.

Cowley- My perception is what Ann is looking at is how do we monitor implementation of the plan once there? So whether that becomes like a yearly report that the conservation team would put together as far as actions that were taken during that year to meet the objectives of the plan. I think we are looking for an annual report. It allows individual agencies to show where they implemented the plan for the year. Something that shows cooperation or movement forward. It would be appropriate to provide that feedback as far as a yearly report from individual agencies.

Neville- I like it.

Gaskill- Is there such a plan? Is that included and we somehow missed it?

Hersey- I think it is an excellent recommendation but it is currently not included in the plan.

Slater- This is as good as we've got right now. There is concern at the division level to do some of these things that have been mentioned?

Hersey- Yes.

Slater- This is where we are going and this is how we will tell where we are at. Will that come back through this process?

Hersey- I don't think it would be reported here yearly. I think it would just be a report that would be produced and available to interested parties.

Gaskill- It would seem appropriate to have a second motion because I don't know that we would incorporate it into one motion and tell them to change the plan and then vote against it. If we vote for it and then in another motion say this is what we would really like you to do, it seems like we are accomplishing what we want to do that way.

Cowley- The other way we could handle that would be as part of some of the edits that we have talked about needing to be made that we add in there an action item or request that the division add in an action item to provide an annual monitoring report as far as what occurred through the cooperative.

Gaskill- So you want to add that to your motion?

Cowley- I see a panic on Kim's face.

Slater- What if there are not resources available or funding secured to do that.

Cowley- That is the concern that I have. Then your plan is not being implemented anyway.

Gaskill- But there are things going on.

Hersey- There are.

Cowley- Lets handle it is a separate item. It could either be included with the update of the plan as discussed or it could be handled as a separate item through an action item at the cooperative group level.

Neville- The only reason I do not want to leave it at the cooperative group level is because I feel like the division needs some accountability for it.

Cavitt- It is a point that I think could flow into this motion easy because if we add some specifics to some of these action items in the plan, for example, will there be monthly meetings with mosquito abatement or yearly meetings? How are we going to encourage mosquito abatement to use different forms of pest management? If we could be more specific in those action items, I think that would solve my issue.

Restatement of the Motion

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 6. Falconry Guide Book & Rule 657-20

Jim Parrish, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Question

Byrnes- How do you determine the qualifications of a non-resident who is declined for a capture permit?

Parrish- They will have to show their COR from the state they are from. They will have to give us whatever class they are in their home state.

Byrnes- Do all the other states follow a similar classification system and they require COR's as we do?

Parrish- I don't know if they call them COR's but you have to be licensed in each state.

Cowley- How specific are your COR's as far as location of the bird where they hope to capture it?

Parrish- We don't.

Cowley- So it is open, anywhere in the state?

Parrish- They have to abide by trespass laws and private property rights. National parks and state parks do not allow take and that is all in the trespass law. Other than that it is falconer's choice.

Cavett- Could you explain the rationale for relaxing the banding requirement or do you know?

Parrish- My understanding is that the service determined that is not needed. None of the other species are showing declining patterns. There is a lot of additional reporting to maintain that information. Everything in our database does hinge on the band number but we can still number the birds. We will have to come up with some sort of alphanumeric numbering system to keep our database in sync with what we have already been doing.

Cowley- Who has access to the information provided on 3-186-A?

Parrish- We will, the falconers will and Fish and Wildlife Services. It is an electronic form they will fill out, that goes immediately into the database. There is limited access to the database.

Parrish- Would the Forest Service want access to the database?

Cowley- That would be really helpful. We have had a couple of nests where people either stake trees to get to the nest site, ripped down nests or leave ropes hanging off of nest trees where they have accessed it to pull birds out of the trees which is illegal. It would be nice to help educate those who have done those types of things.

Parrish- I am sure your law enforcement gets involved with this and then let us know of those activities as well.

Cowley- Right, and we have this last year. We have had two different situations where things of that nature have occurred.

Parrish- You can call us anytime to access the database. We are going to limit it to individual access.

Cowley- That is reasonable.

Public Comment

Todd Ballantyne- Utah Falconers Association- Appreciate divisions work efforts and cooperation to help implement the new federal regulations.

Motion

Motion: Gaskill- Approve as presented.

Second: Neville

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 7. Fishing Guidebook & Rule R657-13

Roger Wilson, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Questions

Van Tassell- On Rockport, Echo or Jordanelle, have you ever considered limiting the amount of bass and maybe letting an angler take a larger than 22 inch bass?

Wilson- That is a good question. We have been working on that for a few years. Now, you are talking about bass not perch right?

Van Tassell- Yes, just bass.

Wilson- We are going to work into bass standardization next year. We have a number of bass regulations across the state that are not the same but have the same intent. We have had some requests for that. Categorization with a trophy limit and then a general statewide limit. We want to make it easier for anglers to figure it out. Does that answer your question?

Van Tassell- Yes.

Neville- On Holmes Creek Reservoir, did you determine that it is more of a state fishery from the fishing pressure or the amount of fish or both?

Wilson- It is really both. It does not really fit the community standard water and access is kind of limited.

Cushing- It is managed as cooperation between Holmes Creek irrigation and the Division of Wildlife. It fits more with the statewide limit than it does the community fisheries limit. We do not have a cooperative agreement with Layton City for that yet.

Gaskill- Have we made any progress on bird predation?

Wilson- We are going to initiate discussions. Jimmy will be involved in those discussions. Nothing specific yet.

Gaskill- Do you think those weekly plants were successful?

Wilson- Do you want to address that Chris?

Penne- In the waters not affected by cormorants, the fishing was fantastic. On the issues that were affected by the cormorants, you could not tell that we had been stocking any more frequently than before.

Gaskill- I go to that stocking website occasionally and one thing that jumps out to me every time is that we put more fish in Strawberry than the whole rest of the state. I am wondering if there is any possibility to take some of those Strawberry fish and put them in community ponds.

Wilson- Actually, if you look at pounds per acre, Strawberry is well down the list.

Gaskill- For the size of the lake.

Wilson- Yes, and Strawberry does get a lot of pounds lately because we are moving them to a larger rainbow trout and actually into larger cutthroat trout to get survival. If you look at numbers or even pounds per acre, Strawberry is well down the list.

Gaskill- Are you going to put some things together that help these kids so they can recognize the large mouth?

Wilson- We are looking at that right now. As a matter of fact, Chris has already begun that effort to get some signs together for regulation and species ID. The voluntary catch and release program worked marginally well at Strawberry in the mid 90's. We had an aggressive effort to talk about that and it was well accepted.

Gaskill- I just want to make sure those kids know the difference. Last question, I want to know when they are going to open 21st street pond?

Wilson- If this was voted on and accepted, it would open January 1st.

Lawrence- I am happy to see 21st street pond open. My concern is the trace amounts of PCB possible in some of those fish. You mentioned working with the health department but wouldn't it solve the issue by making it catch and release for right now?

Wilson- We talked about that and actually went through a process with one of the waters in the state and I think the Division of Wildlife would rather remove ourselves from that. We want to cooperate but we are not in the business to regulate consumption. We are in the business to regulate harvest. If there is an elevated level that the Department of Health is concerned about, there needs to be an advisory.

Byrnes- Have you taken additional samples on Beaver Creek for the greenback cutthroat trout identification?

Wilson- We did not take additional samples but we did go through an extended effort over the summer to try and characterize why the population has remained isolated for all these years. The first step this year was to determine why that population has remained pure and is not connected. Next step is where do we go from here and what is our restoration program and how do we illicit public support?

Byrnes- But you didn't take any additional samples?

Wilson- No. We did meet with the Colorado Division of Wildlife to talk about management of the fish. The species is not threatened in Utah and the greenback team and Colorado River team feel like the greenback is a lineage, not a separate species. That is probably where this is going to go in the future.

Lawrence- I have taken my daughter over to Glassman's pond a couple of times. It has been discouraging as there are limited spaces to fish and those spaces have been dominated by adults. I think the emphasis is to get the kids to fish. I'm sure this has come up before on other ponds. How do you address that and work with the cities?

Wilson- This actually came up in a couple other RAC meetings. With the economy and aging of our populous, we are seeing a lot of older people fishing these waters as destination waters. Our initial plan was to establish these for youth fishing opportunity. It has really evolved into something else. We have looked a little bit at the idea of restricting fishing to youth. Our lawyer tells us that is against the law. We have laws that prohibit age discrimination. We just need to encourage adults taking kids fishing with them.

Van Tassell- Question regarding standardizing yellow perch limit to 50. The perch seem to have a lot of highs and lows, what was your thinking behind that?

Wilson- I did not go into a lot of detail on that. We have had the 50 perch limit at Pineview for a long time.

Schuagaard- Six years.

Wilson- Pineview is a pretty stable perch population and perch can take a lot of pressure. We feel like maybe we can flatten that fluctuating cycle by taking some more perch. We really think it will help with that whole cycle.

Public Comment

Dale Searcy- Manage Meadow Creek Pond in Roy. I have worked very closely with the Division with our pond and would like to thank them. We are on our fifth year and it has been very successful. We do have a new class of people that we did not have 5 years ago which is our seniors. They are enjoying the community ponds. Leaving this for all

anglers is a wonderful thing. I have been a major supporter and big lobbyist for the reduction of limit of fish in community ponds. Encourage working on something to help with cormorant problem. Support 2 daily fish limit.

RAC Comments

Groll- Suggestion of 4 fish limit with exception of July 31st- October on Little Creek Reservoir instead of putting three different dates.

Motion

Motion: Cowley- Accept recommendations as presented.

Second: Wall

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Slater- Has 21st street pond gone through a name change?

Wilson- Yes.

Item 8. Fishing Contests and Clinics Rule 657-58

Drew Cushing, Urban Fisheries Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Questions

Gaskill- Are the online contests going to be tough to monitor?

Cushing- It is not easy now, it is impossible now. All we can do is improve on what we have. We have to make sure that if they do take place and they don't go through this, that they only do it one time. There is a stipulation the rule already that if they don't follow the rules then they cannot hold a tournament anymore.

Gaskill- So there will not be any fines because how are you going to fine them?

Cushing- When they show up. We have a number of different avenues to track those.

Gaskill- I am in favor of it.

Motion

Motion: Gaskill- Approve the recommendations as proposed.

Second: Byrnes

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 9. Habitat Management Plans

Scott Walker, Regional Habitat Manager

See Handout

RAC Questions

Cavitt- Could you talk a little bit about the predator management on some of the water fowl management areas. Is there any coordinated effort to work on that between all the different sites and if there is any structure or plan to deal with the issues there?

Walker- I am not the best person to answer that question. I know there is active predator management on the waterfowl management areas.

Cavitt- The reason I ask is that we do a lot of nesting surveys at public shooting grounds and nesting ducks up there are very low. I know that in some of the management areas, it is fairly high. Is there any method that could be used to boost that activity?

Walker- The nesting activity?

Cavitt- No, the predator management.

Walker- I am not going to be able to answer that.

Hodson- I can maybe answer that a little bit. Are you asking if it is standardized from area to area? The answer to that is no. It depends a lot upon the manager, the resources that each manager has and the time they are able to put into it. It really does depend on resources more than anything.

Kramer- On some of the WMA's, they have trappers come in typically for muskrat and for beaver but also take coyotes, skunks and foxes as well. We can get you that information if you want.

Cavitt- I just think it is a major problem and if there is some way we could help secure additional resources, it is something I would like to help do.

Kramer- Secure what kind of resources?

Cavitt- To increase or help in that regard.

Gaskill- I am wondering how you are going to keep rainbows and other trout out of middle fork?

Walker- What they have done in the past when we have gone into an area like that if they want to secure that is to put in a fish barrier.

Gaskill- Is that going to happen?

Walker- It is something they are looking at and it looks like Pam has a comment.

Kramer- There is an irrigation aversion that is on middle fork. Last time I spoke with the aquatic section, there is a fish barrier and treat everything upstream of that. There may be another barrier they want to put up further as well.

Gaskill- How is the phragmites eradication program doing and is there any hope for any kind of cooperation from the lands outside the WMA's where you cannot burn? Val Bachman goes and burns inside his area.

Walker- I understand that frustration. That happens anytime you have a fence with two neighbors.

Gaskill- These are supposedly neighbors under the same government entity.

Walker- Sometimes we get along, sometimes we don't. The project is actually going quite well. They are being pretty proactive about it with success.

Gaskill- Is there any possibility of anything other than walk-in access to the rainbow unit, particularly the lower rainbow unit at harrow crane?

Kramer- Val Bachman is not here. He would be the one to know what his specific intentions are for that unit.

Gaskill- Is sediment project still on hold?

Walker- It is still waiting. Can I go back to your last question?

Gaskill- Sure.

Walker- Would you like to suggest something about that walk-in access issue on the rainbow unit to incorporate to this?

Gaskill- Is Val over this?

Walker- He is but if you have some comments you would like to suggest that we address in the plan, then now is the time to present those comments.

Gaskill- That is a really remote unit. It turns out the Division bought that area of ground west of Marsholders. It turns out that Marsholders gun club that they do not have to pay taxes on because no one can get to it unless they walk 9 miles down the railroad. I think it is something we need to look at.

Leonard- I don't know when the last time you were out there but there has been a road down there to the west from the earlier parking lot that allows access.

Gaskill- There is? Does it go through Marsholders?

Leonard- It does not go through Marsholders, it goes down the old railroad grade.

Gaskill- You can drive down the old railroad grade?

Leonard- That's right. It is a constant source of irritation for us.

Gaskill- But as long as it belongs to the state.

Leonard- Because they walk onto Marsholders.

Gaskill- Sure, it has always been a source of irritation.

Slater- There was an answer for your phragmites question but you began before we could get the person acknowledged so if you would like to go back to that.

Hodson- We have had discussions if we can take this project bigger out onto private lands and out onto the rest of the sovereign lands. Right now, we are stretched to the limit to get things done on our areas. We have put together a mini proposal in case one of the national congressmen asks if we have someplace we would like to spend some money.

Gaskill- Stimulus money.

Hodson- We are ready to hand that to them. We would love to do that but are stretched as far as we can to work on what we've got. Finding a day to burn is difficult. This fall we are letting people know that there may be some burning on Farmington bay during the waterfowl hunt.

Gaskill- Great. You do not have any plans to do anything with the west Bear River?

Walker- Given the situation, we don't spend a lot of time out there.

Gaskill- It may be worth a chat to the Bear River refuge people to let some water out. That has historically been a good waterfowl area.

Walker- We will address that.

RAC COMMENTS

Cowley- We really support where the division is headed with both the front here above Brigham City and also the middle fork of the Ogden Wildlife management area.

Slater- Will treatment of middle fork include the private lands above Browns Park?

Walker- The treatment on middle fork?

Slater- On the middle fork of the Ogden. Yes, there is some beaver ponds and things that are on Sunridge Estates.

Walker- Currently that is something that the aquatic section is looking at doing. No specifics have been set forth.

Lawrence- They have been all over that country touring and trying to get as much information as they could. They are definitely working on it.

Ferry- I have been working with the division on the phragmites and there has been some waterfowlers that have helped out as well. Could the division do a public campaign to get some help?

Walker- They have tried but there is an issue of training and manpower to manage the volunteers.

Ferry- Some days there are machines sitting idle because there are not enough people.

Walker- We will take that back and present that.

Ferry- Just some way to get those who want to help the opportunity.

Walker- I appreciate that.

Neville- Down on the south end of the lake, we had these cooperative weed management areas that we share equipment, herbicide and people. We have been relatively successful as far as getting a coordinated effort. I don't know if there is one this far up north but it would be wise to possibly look in to that.

Walker- There is and we will.

Neville- Is there one?

Kramer- There is for the Weber/Morgan area but there is not one I am aware of for the Box Elder area. Some of the equipment is so specialized that not everyone is going to need a big caterpillar going through a marsh spraying.

Neville- But it might help with burning and a bunch of other things if you could get everyone in the same room.

Motion

Motion: Gaskill- Accept the management plan as presented.

Second: Ferry

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Meeting Ends: 9:05 p.m.

MOTIONS MATRIX
SOUTHEAST REGIONAL WILDLIFE ADVISORY COUNCIL
JOHN WESLEY POWELL MUSEUM IN GREEN RIVER
September 9, 2009

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

MOTION: by Travis Pehrson to approve the agenda as amended.

SECOND: by Charlie Tracy

PASSED: unanimously

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

MOTION: by Walt Maldonado to approve the minutes of the July 29 meeting as written.

SECOND: by Travis Pehrson

PASSED: unanimously

BAT MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION: by Derris Jones to approve the bat management plan, except that wording modifications be made to indicate what aspects of forest management are detrimental, and specifically what aspects of grazing are detrimental, and that the effects of phreatophyte control be clarified.

SECOND: Charlie Tracy

PASSED: unanimously

FALCONRY GUIDEBOOK & RULE R657-20

MOTION: by Derris Jones to accept the falconry rule after the Attorney General's office has had a chance to look at the reference to public lands and decides if the reference should remain in the guidebook.

SECOND: Jeff Horrocks

PASSED: unanimously

FISHING GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-13

MOTION: by Todd Huntington to accept the fisheries guidebook and rule R657-13 as presented with the following recommendations, Huntington Creek, Right Fork remain "FLY ONLY", and Carbon County Community fishing pond be removed from the list of Community Waters.

SECOND: Walt Maldonado

PASSED: unanimously

BISON RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION: by Blair Eastman to accept Option 1.

SECOND: by Travis Pehrson

PASSED: unanimously

MOTION: by Blair Eastman to recommend that a bison management plan be considered for the West Tavaputs Plateau.

SECOND: by Derris Jones

PASSED: unanimously

SOUTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY

John Wesley Powell Museum in Green River

September 9, 2009

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

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bates, Bill	Regional Supervisor
Eastman, Blair	Agriculture
Horrocks, Jeff	Elected Official
Hoskisson, Wayne	Environmental
Huntington, Todd	At-large
Jones, Derris	Sportsmen
Maldonado, Walt	Sportsmen
Micoz, Christine	At-large
Pehrson, Travis	Sportsmen
Sanslow, Terry	Chairman
Tracy, Charlie	Agriculture

EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

Albrecht, Kevin	U.S. Forest Service
Kamala, Laura	Environmental
Riddle, Pam	BLM

UNEXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

None

DWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Birdsey, Paul
Cushing, Drew
Donaldson, Walt
Hart, Justin
Hersey, Kim
Parrish, Jim
Paskett, Wade
Stettler, Brent
Wilson, Roger
Wright, Tony

PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE 3

CONDUCTING THE MEETING

-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

Terry welcomed the audience and introduced RAC members.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Terry Sanslow recommended that bison recommendations be placed in the last position on the agenda. Terry also suggested that R657-58, concerning fishing contests and clinics, follow R657-13, which governs the taking of fish and crayfish.

MOTION by Travis Pehrson to approve the amended agenda as recommended by the chairman.

SECOND by Charlie Tracy

PASSED unanimously

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Walt Maldonado to approve the minutes of the 7-29-09 meeting as written.

SECOND by Travis Pehrson

PASSED unanimously

OLD BUSINESS

-By Terry Sanslow

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Terry Sanslow reviewed the action of the last Wildlife Board meeting. He indicated that a premium bear permit fee schedule had been approved in the event that a premium bear hunt is implemented. The Board voted consistent with this RAC's motions, except that they approved

DWR's recommendation for the San Juan unit; and changed the four Manti units to a split season of limited entry and harvest objective.

With respect to the Board's decision about the Manti units, Bill Bates added that there was a concern about over-running the Manti unit with cougar hunters, if it were opened to harvest objective first. The split season would better distribute hunter pressure, while allowing for the same cougar harvest.

Charlie Tracy asked why the Board chose to over-ride this RAC's recommendation for the San Juan unit. Terry Sanslow explained that the DWR recommendation carried more weight than our motion.

MOTION: N/A

SECOND:

PASSED:

REGIONAL UPDATE

-By Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor

Questions, Comments and Discussion from the RAC:

Derris Jones asked about the role the leatherside chub played in the region. Later in the meeting, Walt Donaldson responded that a leatherside chub management plan was currently underway.

These chubs were native to the Bonneville Basin and have been found in the Fremont River, Dirty Devil and Quitchupah drainages. At this time, it is unknown what level of protection and recovery efforts might be in store for this species.

Travis Pehrson asked about the opportunity for input on bear management.

Bill Bates said that there would be a lot of opportunity for providing input and added that there had been a lot of complaints in the San Juan Mountains this past year with regard to bears and bear hunters. We will be making bear recommendations in December.

Walt Maldonado asked what unit the elk on the west side of the Green River belonged to. Bill Bates answered that they belonged to the Range Creek unit.

Blair Eastman emphasized the need for more bear control on the Range Creek unit.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

MOTION: N/A

SECOND:

PASSED:

BAT MANAGEMENT PLAN

-By Kim Hersey, Sensitive Species Biologist

Questions from the RAC:

Terry Sanslow asked if the bat fungus was the result of high humidity.

Kim Hersey answered that there is so little known about the fungus at this point that she couldn't give an answer to that question, although higher humidity usually promotes fungus growth.

Derris Jones asked what type of forest types and growth was preferred by bats.

Kim Hersey replied that forest bats require dead snags with loose bark.

Walt Maldonado asked about the disturbance to bats caused by traffic, when roosting occurred under a bridge, specifically under the San Rafael River Bridge.

Tony Wright answered that for the most part the impact was negligible.

Chris Micoz asked if there were plans to educate the public about bats to counter the negative public image of bats.

Kim Hersey answered that public education varied by region, but that she did one or two workshops a year. It's something she would like to do more of.

Travis Pehrson asked why there were so many bats around buildings. Did that represent a lack of natural habitat?

Kim answered that some species had adapted well to buildings. In other cases, our cutting down of roost trees had reduced natural bat habitat.

Charlie Tracy asked if habitat degradation was more of a local or widespread issue.

Kim replied that the habitat issue followed the same trend experienced by other species of wildlife and that we were trying to slow the loss of habitat. We don't know if populations are growing or diminishing for a lot of species and that's something we are trying to figure out.

Derris Jones asked if native riparian vegetation was better than tamarisk for bats.

Kim answered that a cottonwood gallery was certainly better than tamarisk.

Charlie Tracy asked about the frequency of mine closures and how that might relate to habitat destruction for bats.

Kim answered that a huge number of old mines were being closed off.

Jeff Horrocks asked if the Division of Oil, Gas and Mining was taking steps to mitigate against bat habitat loss.

Kim answered that DOGM had bat biologists that evaluate bat occupancy and erect alternate roost sites, when mine closures occur.

Derris Jones asked if old uranium mines and radon gas was detrimental to bats.

Tony Wright indicated that DOGM's view was that bat use of uranium mines was more detrimental to the bat population than closure of uranium mine openings.

Blair Eastman asked for examples of how livestock grazing might impact bats.

Kim mentioned degradation of riparian areas.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Derris Jones questioned the comment in the plan which indicated that, "Forest management is detrimental to bats." The statement was misleading. Forest management is beneficial. If aspects of forest management are detrimental, then those specific detrimental aspects need to be changed. The verbiage needs to be reworked to specify which aspects of forest management are detrimental rather than making a blanket statement.

Charlie Tracy took issue with the notion that livestock grazing was detrimental to bats. He runs a lot of livestock and sees a lot of bats. The cows draw a lot of insects, which provide food. Stock ponds also provide water and habitat for insects.

Bill Bates commented that this was another case where the language needs to be more specific.

Derris Jones commented that phreatophyte control might be a short-term benefit, but couldn't benefit bats in the long-term.

Wayne Hoskisson added that the term probably indicated tamarisk domination of riverbanks.

MOTION: by Derris Jones to approve the plan, except that wording modifications be made to indicate what aspects of forest management are detrimental, specifically what

aspects of grazing are detrimental, and that phreatophyte control and its effects be clarified.

SECOND: Charlie Tracy
PASSED: unanimously

FALCONRY GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-20

-By Jim Parrish, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Travis Pehrson asked about the minimum age for falconers.

Jim Parrish indicated that 14 was the minimum age for an apprentice.

Derris asked which birds on the sensitive species list might be used for falconry.

Jim Parrish answered that ferruginous hawks and goshawks would be the only birds that would be used for falconry.

Bill Bates asked which sensitive species the federal government would permit for taking by falconers.

Jim Parrish answered that there was no listed species in Utah. The only way that the take of sensitive species might be applicable was where a falconer brought in an exotic falcon that fell under this category.

Bill Bates asked about a spotted owl as an example.

Jim Parrish indicated that the USFWS would not give a permit for the spotted owl.

Travis Pehrson asked if a golden eagle could be transported to Utah and used for falconry purposes under the livestock depredation clause for this species.

Jim Parrish answered that a falconer could work with a state where depredation occurred and import a golden eagle into Utah, if the falconer adhered to all Department of Agriculture regulations.

Derris Jones asked how we could enforce the use of a bird for falconry purposes, rather than using them as pets.

Jim Parrish indicated there would be an annual report that would have to be completed to assure that the bird was used for the sport of falconry.

Charlie Tracy asked what kind of prey was being hunted by falconers.

Jim Parrish responded that sage grouse, ducks, rabbits were the most common quarry.

Charlie Tracy asked about the possibility for prairie dog control.

Jim Parrish didn't think falcons or falconry could be effective for that purpose.

Derris Jones asked if falconers had been cooperative with the Division in putting the plan together.

Jim Parrish answered that there were a few contentious times, but that compromises were made and the falconers are on-board with us.

Travis Pehrson asked if an apprentice could actually capture a bird.

Jim answered that apprentices must be sponsored by an experienced falconer, who is encouraged to work closely with the apprentice to teach him the correct way to capture and handle his bird.

Travis Pehrson asked if a bird could be purchased.

Jim answered that a captive bird could be purchased.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Derris Jones questioned what jurisdiction the DWR had in requiring a special use permit for falconry events on public land.

Jim Parrish said he would check on that, because we shouldn't have that kind of jurisdiction or wording in the plan. Jim said he would talk to Marty Bushman about that issue.

MOTION: by Derris Jones to accept the falconry rule after the Attorney General's office has had a chance to look at the reference to public lands and decides if it should be in the rule.

SECOND: Jeff Horrocks

PASSED: unanimously

FISHING GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-13

-By Roger Wilson, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Travis Pehrson asked if the size of the water body was considered to determine the type of fishing contest or tournament.

Drew Cushing answered that consideration would be taken into account during the permitting process.

Todd Huntington asked about the change in regulations for the right fork of Huntington Creek. The new wording includes the use of lures, whereas it had always been "fly only."

Roger Wilson indicated that the change had been made to standardize regulations around the state.

Todd's preference was that the regulation of "fly only" be left intact.

Charlie Tracy asked if the DWR considered the use of private hatcheries to supply fish.

Roger Wilson said that this had been discussed on multiple occasions. Disease and money issues are the primary concerns. Roger said that the DWR would rather avoid that approach.

Travis Pehrson questioned that a reduction in the daily limit at community fishing waters could result in reduced license sales.

Roger Wilson answered that we hope it doesn't. Our intention is to extend good fishing for more people over a longer period of time.

Travis Pehrson suggested that some people may consider it a waste of time, if they can only take home two fish.

Drew Cushing replied that anglers had been surveyed about the reduced limit and that the public was very accepting of this change. The consensus was that if a fisherman could take home a few fish, then they would be satisfied.

Derris Jones asked if we could exclude bluegills from the two-fish limit. Fisheries management would be benefitted by allowing anglers to take as many bluegills as possible.

Roger Wilson said that the two fish limit concept was simple. A lot of kids don't know one fish from another. The easier the better at community waters.

Derris Jones expressed concern that kids would release the bluegills because they were small, and we may be teaching the young angler to high-grade.

Travis Pehrson asked if bass eat bluegill. The answer was in the affirmative. He asked if bass will stunt and was told that they would.

Derris Jones asked if the Carbon County fishery would be finished this year.

Justin Hart said it would not. The pond design is inadequate to prevent failure in the event of a catastrophic flood. Because of its structural challenges, it is unknown if and when the pond will be completed.

Travis Pehrson asked if all hatcheries were being used.

Roger Wilson said that Springville has problems with whirling disease issues as well as a source of good water. Springville is now off-line in terms of trout production.

Travis Pehrson asked if fish license sales are up or down from the preceding year.

Walt Donaldson said it's been about the same.

Walt Maldonado asked about the timeframe for getting a COR for a fish tournament.

The reply was 30 days.

Derris Jones noted that the greenback cutthroat had been left off the list of cutthroat species.

Roger Wilson suggested the greenback trout was a lineage, rather than a species.

Derris wondered if we should just lump all cutthroat trout into one species in our listing for cold water fish. Roger agreed to look at that.

Walt Maldonado, in behalf of the Utah Bass Federation, congratulated the DWR aquatics section for coming to their meetings and keeping them informed of changes. The bass federation has a great rapport with the DWR.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

DWR sport fish biologist, Justin Hart, congratulated Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife on their \$5,000 donation toward the purchase of tiger muskies for Joes Valley Reservoir. Walt Donaldson was presented with a \$5,000 check.

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Todd Huntington to accept the fisheries guidebook as presented, except that the right fork of Huntington Creek remain "fly only."

SECOND by Walt Maldonado

PASSED unanimously

BISON RECOMMENDATIONS

-By Justin Shannon, Regional Wildlife Program Manager

Questions from the RAC:

Jeff Horrocks asked about the cost of the transplant.

Justin Shannon replied that it is about \$850 per animal, including helicopter costs.

Todd Huntington asked why harvest of the extra bison couldn't be spread out through the existing hunts, rather than making a new hunt in January.

Justin replied that hunter over-crowding would diminish the quality of the experience for the other hunters.

Bill Bates added that permit holders often bring many family members to help them with the hunt, which expands the number of people on the unit.

Derris Jones asked about the one person, who objected to the transplant.

Bill Bates answered that the one person had suffered from a fire, and their biggest concern was getting water to their livestock. We have offered to do some water projects to address his concerns.

Todd Huntington questioned the reduced number of permits between this and last year, and questioned whether hunter pressure was found to be unacceptable.

Blair Eastman asked about the number of Ute tribal bison. He said he sees bison all over the place. He expressed concern about where the bison would go, and if they would cross the Green River and over-run private ranches. Range Creek, Horse Bench and Rock Creek already have bison. What is the DWR going to do with these bison. Blair Eastman expressed concern that

adding additional bison would add to the problems of private land owners. Once the bison leave the reservation, the Ute Tribe won't take responsibility for them.

Bill Bates contended that we would not be pushing more bison west across the Green River, because of the distance from the release site. We have radio collars on some of them and can determine where they are going.

Blair Eastman questioned the hunter pressure issue on the Henry Mountains. He compared the bison hunt with the elk hunt.

Justin Shannon said the difference was in hunter expectations, because a bison hunt is a once-in-a-lifetime hunt.

Bill Bates said that if we increase hunting pressure too much, we will move the bison off the Henry Mountains and somewhere else where they are not wanted.

Blair Eastman urged consideration of harvesting the additional bison, rather than moving them from the Henry's.

Charlie Tracy questioned the ability of hunters to harvest bison in January, when roads are inaccessible.

Derris Jones brought up the issue of killing cow bison in January and causing a public outcry, because of the size of the fetus, which cow bison carry. Derris also spoke against adding more permits onto existing hunts, because of the outcry from OIAL permit holders.

Terry Sanslow asked how the extra 39 bison hunters would be drawn.

Justin Shannon indicated that there would be another 39 selected from the list of applicants.

Blair Eastman asked if there were some sort of contingency to deal with bison that moved from the Book Cliffs. Blair asked Bill where the bison came from last year.

Bill Bates said we received 15 from the tribe and 31 from the Henrys. The majority of the transplanted bison moved over to Went Ridge and Steer Ridge. Only two went back to the Ute tribal ground. The majority are further east on BLM ground.

Charlie Tracy asked if our options are to kill them or transplant them.

Justin Shannon answered in the affirmative.

Charlie asked about the risk of killing bison in the transplant.

Justin said that last year one bison died.

Blair Eastman expressed concern again about how the wandering bison will be dealt with.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Shayne Thompson of the SFW read a statement supporting the concept of transplanting more bison to the Henry Mountains, rather than issuing more permits to existing hunts.

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Bill Bates assured the RAC that if the translocation is approved, we have enough time to secure the contracts and pull off the project this year.

The RAC discussed the pros and cons of issuing more bison permits to reach the population objective vs. the option of transplanting excess animals.

Terry Sanslow, at the end of the discussion, provided the RAC with a summary of its options.

MOTION by Blair Eastman to accept Option 1.

SECOND by Travis Pehrson

PASSED unanimously

MOTION by Blair Eastman to consider development of a bison management plan for the West Tavaputs Plateau.

SECOND by Derris Jones

PASSED unanimously

Terry Sanslow adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

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

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

MOTION: by Walt Maldonado to approve the agenda as amended.
SECOND: by Derris Jones
PASSED: unanimously

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

MOTION: by Jeff Horrocks to approve the minutes of the July 29 meeting as amended.
SECOND: by Derris Jones
PASSED: unanimously

BISON RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION: by Blair Eastman to accept DWR's recommendations with the recommendation to include specifics on a plan to address bison that leave the area and address water and range improvements for livestock interests.
SECOND: by Wayne Hoskisson
PASSED by a majority vote. One member, Charlie Tracy, opposed the motion.

MOTION: by Derris Jones to form a West Tavaputs bison management committee with the objective that a bison management plan be written.
SECOND: by Chris Micoz
PASSED unanimously

SOUTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY
John Wesley Powell Museum in Green River
September 28, 2009
Commence at 6:30 p.m. Adjourn at 8 p.m.

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Albrecht, Kevin	U.S. Forest Service
Bates, Bill	Regional Supervisor
Eastman, Blair	Agriculture
Horrocks, Jeff	Elected Official
Hoskisson, Wayne	Environmental
Jones, Derris	Sportsmen
Maldonado, Walt	Sportsmen
Micoz, Christine	At-large
Riddle, Pam	BLM
Sanslow, Terry	Chairman
Tracy, Charlie	Agriculture

EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

Huntington, Todd	At-large
Kamala, Laura	Environmental
Pehrson, Travis	Sportsmen

UNEXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

None

DWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Bates, Bill
Shannon, Justin
Stettler, Brent

PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE 5

CONDUCTING THE MEETING

-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Walt Maldonado to approve the agenda.

SECOND by Derris Jones

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 Jeff Horrocks to approve the minutes of the 9-9-09 as amended.

SECOND by Derris Jones

PASSED unanimously

OLD BUSINESS

-By Terry Sanslow

Chairman Terry Sanslow indicated that the statewide archery committee met and decided to leave the statewide deer archery hunt the way it was prior to this year. It was discovered that if archers were tied to a specific region for the first two weeks of the hunt, the hunting pressure in the southern region actually increased.

Kevin Albrecht provided an update on the statewide elk committee. The committee met twice to put together questions to learn what the public wants the DWR to do to manage Utah's elk herds. The committee will meet again in six weeks after the survey results have been returned. Bull and cow elk hunters will be randomly surveyed. They will consist of those, who have hunted in the past five years. The committee hopes to sample at least a thousand persons, representing archers, muzzleloaders and rifle hunters.

Bill Bates reported that the Wildlife Section was finishing its recommendations for next year's Bucks and Bulls Guidebook and would be sending those recommendations to SLC tomorrow. As a preface to the discussion tonight, Bill Bates explained that bison recommendations had been left off the agenda, which resulted in protests that the results weren't valid. Jim Karpowitz agreed that there was substance to the complaints, and for that reason, both the northeast and southeast regions were asked to repeat their discussion of bison recommendations at this expedited meeting.

BISON RECOMMENDATIONS

-By Justin Shannon, Regional Wildlife Program Manager

Prior to the discussion of bison recommendations by the RAC, Bill Bates indicated that the DWR had already taken the transplant proposal to the Governor's Resource Development Coordinating Council (RDCC). RDCC did not receive any comments from the public.

Questions and Comments from the RAC:

Derris Jones asked if the bison committee was statewide in scope or limited to the Book Cliffs. Justin Shannon replied that it was limited to the Book Cliffs.

Walt Maldonado asked if the single party opposed to the bison transplant had finally conceded to the transplant. Justin Shannon replied that the party didn't speak up when the plan was presented at the northeastern region RAC. The northeastern region's biologists had done a lot of work to address this one party's concerns, which probably accounted for the lack of opposition to the plan when it was presented at the northeastern RAC.

Blair asked about this party's major concerns. Bill Bates answered that water availability and forage destruction following the fire were his primary concerns.

Derris Jones asked if the population objective of 450 bison on the Book Cliffs included the Ute Tribe's herd. Justin Shannon replied that it did not. Derris asked what the Ute Tribe's population objective was. Bill Bates answered that he thought it was also around 450. Bill noted that the tribe's contribution of bison to last year's initial transplant had returned to the Ute tribal ground. Derris Jones commented that the *Wildlife Professional* journal had just published an article on the minimum number of animals needed for genetic viability. Derris asked if the 1,000 animal minimum was considered, when determining the population objective. Justin Shannon said that the 1,000 animal minimum was not explicitly part of the objective, but that the population objective for both the Ute Tribe and State of Utah herds closely approached that number when considered together. Bill Bates referred to his attendance at the National Wildlife Society meeting and the issue of genetic viability was addressed. Previously, 400 individuals were considered the minimum number. Bill indicated, however, that there was another way to achieve genetic viability, and that is to introduce five bulls every five years from other sources, which would accomplish the same objective.

Blair Eastman offered his opinion that the Ute Tribe had far more than 400 animals on their tribal ground.

Walt Maldonado asked if there were a Ute tribal member on the statewide bison committee. Bill Bates emphasized the need for the Ute Tribe to work hand-in-hand with the DWR in order to keep their herd in check.

Derris Jones asked about the status of bison that leave Ute tribal property, and whether they automatically become property of the State of Utah. Bill Bates answered that the bison did become the property of the State of Utah.

Blair Eastman raised the issue of bison that wandered from the Book Cliffs or Ute tribal land.

Walt Maldonado asked if the target area for the proposed transplant would occur more easterly than the previous year. Justin Shannon answered that the northeastern region would like to see them on Moon Ridge and Steer Ridge, depending on road access.

Blair Eastman asked about the possibility that the bison would return to the Henry Mountains. Justin Shannon suggested that the probability was very small, considering the desert that would

have to be crossed. If a few animals were to return, the DWR would address that situation on a case by case basis.

Bill Bates interjected that last year the DWR was prepared to mobilize helicopters to herd two wandering bison back onto the top of the Book Cliffs after they had wandered down Hay Canyon. Just before the drive, it was discovered that the bison had returned to the top of the divide. The plan was not to allow them to establish themselves on the south slope.

Walt Maldonado asked if the same strategy applied to bison that tried to cross the river.

Bill Bates indicated that such contingencies needed to be addressed by a West Tavaputs bison committee.

Blair Eastman emphasized the need to address problems such as this, when the RAC passed Option 1, which authorized the transplant. Blair asserted that bison had already dispersed from the original transplant location, so the need for a contingency plan was imperative.

Chris Micoz asked for clarification on the timeframe for Option 2, if that were selected. She said it wouldn't be fair to notify hunters at the last minute about a hunt they had waited a lifetime to prepare for. Justin Shannon replied that these hunters would have the opportunity to turn down the hunt without loss of bonus points, if they felt rushed.

Terry Sanslow asked where the money for transplants came from. Bill Bates answered that funding came from the sale of permits and conservation permits, and that no tax payer money would be spent on the transplant.

Terry Sanslow asked about the water issue associated with the transplant. Bill Bates replied that the SFW planned to fund water development projects to address this concern.

Derris Jones asked about the DWR's plans to improve the reliability of its aerial counts. Bill Bates spoke of a new study by a USU PhD student to improve sightability indices. The PhD student would use GPS collars and satellite telemetry in connection with aerial surveys.

Chris Micoz asked about SFW's commitment to develop water resources, and if details had been fleshed out. Justin Shannon replied that the SFW and ranchers were working together to achieve a solution, although details haven't been worked out at this time.

Kevin Albrecht noted that the Henry Mountains bison committee had been effective in working out a variety of solutions for habitat improvement and water development there. On the Henry Mountains, the SFW did follow through with their commitments and did put a lot of money on the ground.

Blair Eastman asked if there was a single opponent to the plan or several. The answer came back that there was only one individual.

Walt Maldonado questioned the apparent flip flop of Uintah County commissioners during the first transplant. Bill Bates interjected that the DWR could not have come this without the approval of the Uintah County commission.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Ryan Thornock of the Utah Farm Bureau expressed concern about the proposed translocation of bison. He had visited with Uintah County commissioners. All three are unanimously opposed to the transplant. They had also been opposed to the first transplant and had written letters to the DWR and the DNR stating their opposition. Mr. Thornock stated that the Vernal BLM office was also opposed to the transplant. The Vernal BLM office allegedly cited resource overuse such as water. Mr. Thornock expressed his opinion that the state budget is anticipating a large deficit during the next fiscal year. He thinks that spending a thousand dollars per animal for the transplant would be an unwise use of our state's financial resources. Mr. Thornock's preferred alternative would be to add more permits to existing hunts, which would bring more money to the state. He asserted that bison are hard on rangeland and will wreak havoc on riparian areas. He stated that the transplant was at best premature. Right now, the population on the Henry's is over-objective. Who can say that the same thing won't happen on the Book Cliffs? One alternative

would be to give current bison permittees two permits. Permittees could be required to pay for the extra permit, which would provide more revenue to the state, and would eliminate the need for an extra season.

Sue Fivecoat, the assistant office manager of the BLM Hanksville-Richfield office, stated that her office had been involved in the transplant discussion and that the Hanksville-Richfield BLM office supports the DWR Option 1 set forth by the state bison committee.

Kevin Albrecht asked Sue if there had been any discussion between the Hanksville and Vernal offices. Sue answered that there had not been any discussion.

Bill Bates added that the DWR had not received any communication from the Vernal office either.

Cory Vetere complained that if bison encroached upon his grazing allotment, he wouldn't have any options to deal with the problem.

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Wayne Hoskisson summarized the history of bison in North America and Utah; and emphasized the importance of bison remaining part of America's landscape, and that we should consider restoring them to places where we can.

Kevin Albrecht cited his observations that bison are efficient resource managers and are different than livestock. They don't over-utilize a rangeland like domestic livestock.

Pam Riddle indicated that even with the proposed transplant we are still so far below the Book Cliffs population objective, and that the extra animals shouldn't make much difference.

Jeff Horrocks commented that he would be concerned that a late season hunt would draw public criticism, because of the advanced development of bison fetuses that would be killed along with harvested cows.

Charlie Tracy expressed his reservations about the transplant, based on past experience with the DWR and its assertion that elk wouldn't move east of Highway 191 in San Juan County. The elk did move indeed. As a result, Charlie questions the DWR's assurances that the bison will stay around the release area. Charlie questions whether the DWR will be successful in herding them back to the release area if the bison stray. Charlie fears that there will be bison everywhere and that their numbers and movements will not be easily managed. He also expressed concern that if a non-Ute hunter shot a bison on tribal land, trouble might ensue. Charlie questioned the need to have bison in so many locations.

Bill Bates responded to one of Charlie's concerns about the Ute Tribe being upset, if one of their bison were killed. Bill indicated that the Ute Tribe showed no concern about what we did with those bison that wandered off the reservation and onto the Range Creek unit. The same has been true with bighorn sheep that cross back and forth.

Kevin Albrecht took issue with the allegation that the DWR wasn't responsive to animals moving out of a unit or allowing a herd to expand beyond its population objective. He pointed out that the DWR had been quick to rectify the bison over-objective on the Henry Mountains. Kevin expressed his belief that trying to fit in an extra hunt would be a bad idea. The bison would scatter far and wide and hunter success would drop significantly.

Blair Eastman proposed that we leave alone for a year, until a concrete plan has been worked out. Bill Bates responded that that was an option.

Chris Micoz suggested that we could sell or transplant bison to other states. Bill Bates replied that this idea was in the works. There has been a problem with classification of bison as wildlife and/or livestock and that efforts were underway to allow interstate transfers of bison.

Walt Maldonado complimented the Henry Mountains bison committee on the job they did, and added that a Book Cliffs bison committee would face even more obstacles, due to the geographic size, number of livestock permittees and partnership with the Ute Tribe. The Ute Tribe must be an integral part of the committee as well as all livestock stake holders. Walt indicated that he has heard of other's concern that the Ute Tribe won't actively participate in herd management and control.

Bill Bates reminded the RAC that the RMP has already conceded forage for 450 bison and that there are not as many grazing permittees as one might think. A number of grazing permits were purchased as a result of the Book Cliffs initiative efforts.

Derris Jones asked about the dividing line for the management boundary. Bill answered that the Book Cliffs divide was the management boundary.

Ryan Thornock (from the audience) interjected that no AUMs were specifically allocated for bison. The AUMs were allocated to wildlife.

Bill Bates said that it was his understanding that bison were addressed in the RMP as part of the wildlife AUM allocation.

Wayne Hoskisson added that many other species had not been specifically taken into account, such as lagomorphs, rodents and insects in the BLM's calculation of forage allocation. Wayne said we run into problems when RMP allocations fail to take all consumers into account.

Kevin Albrecht said that considering the small number of bison to be moved, over-utilization of forage wouldn't be an immediate problem.

Blair Eastman expressed concern that the SFW may address current water problems, but what about those problems that arise years down the road.

Justin Shannon answered that the DWR will step in to address those types of issues, even if the SFW fails to do so years later. Justin suggested that these concerns were probably unfounded, since the SFW is very excited about bison and the Book Cliffs herd.

Bill Bates added that the purpose of the Book Cliffs bison committee will be to work together to see that all these contingencies are addressed and managed.

Blair Eastman inquired about the feasibility of creating a 10-year agreement on the water.

Bill Bates indicated that the UPCD process was already in place to deal with contingencies of that nature.

Blair Eastman then initiated a series of draft motions in support of Option #1, but would take into account problems encountered by private landowners and grazing lessees in the event that bison wandered from the release site.

Bill Bates rephrased Blair's first motion with the following wording: "Accept Option 1 which would include specifics to deal with bison that leave the plan area and address the concern of livestock growers in the area."

Derris Jones expressed concern that we needed more specificity about livestock concerns.

Blair Eastman then identified water and range improvements as the details he was concerned about.

Bill Bates then rephrased the motion with the following wording: "Accept Option 1 that includes specifics of a plan to deal with bison that leave the plan area and address water and range improvements."

Blair Eastman added that he wanted a provision added that a West Tavaputs bison committee be put in place.

Blair Eastman then changed his initial motion to state that the RAC accept Option 1 to include specifics on the plan to address bison that leave the plan area and address water and range improvements and livestock interests.

Wayne Hoskisson suggested that two separate motions be implemented. The first option would approve Option 1. The second motion would identify the problems that need to be dealt with as they happen in the future. If The Wildlife Board approves Option 1, then the balance of the motion we set forth may never happen.

Derris Jones reminded the RAC that we are an advisory council and that the Board isn't bound to do anything that we suggest.

Terry Sanslow noted that if Option 1 did not occur, then the RAC automatically defaulted to Option 2, calling for the harvest of surplus bison on the Henry Mountains.

Blair Eastman then reworded his motion to accept the Division's recommendation as written. He suggested that if Option 1 does not occur, then the RAC move to default to Option 2 with the recommendation that the plan address bison that leave the plan area and address water and range improvements and livestock interests.

Terry Sanslow then reworded the motion, as stated below:

MOTION by Blair Eastman to accept DWR's recommendation, which is Option 1 with the recommendation to include specifics on a plan to address bison that leave the plan area and address water and range improvements for livestock interests.

SECOND by Wayne Hoskisson

PASSED by a majority vote. One member, Charlie Tracy, opposed the motion.

Terry Sanslow suggested that a motion be made to address bison which move west across the Green River.

Blair Eastman asked if another motion were still needed to cover that potential. His intent was to protect all livestock permittees outside the plan area, and assure them that wandering bison would be removed.

Derris Jones pointed out a difference of opinion within the RAC about how to handle the bison that wandered west of the plan area, and for that reason Derris suggested that a committee be organized to hash out those details.

MOTION by Derris Jones to form a West Tavaputs bison management committee with the objective that a bison management plan be written.

SECOND by Chris Micoz

PASSED unanimously

DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION:

Blair Eastman inquired how such a committee would be put together.

Bill Bates indicated that the number of members would have to be considered—large enough to represent special interests and yet small enough to accomplish its goals. Bill suggested that 10-12 people might be assembled from a variety of interests, representing sportsmen, livestock permittees, and federal and state agencies and the DWR.

Terry Sanslow stated that for this type of motion, the Wildlife Board would enter the motion on its action log with a directive to the DWR that someone be appointed to organize the committee.

Bill Bates added that the district biologist might make recommendations to the Directors' office for potential candidates.

Terry Sanslow adjourned the meeting at 8 p.m.

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Beaver High School
Beaver, UT
September 8, 2009
7:00 p.m.**

1. REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

MOTION: To accept minutes and agenda as written.

VOTE: Unanimous.

2. UTAH BAT CONSERVATION PLAN

MOTION: To accept the Utah Bat Conservation Plan as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

3. FALCONRY GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-20

MOTION: To accept the Falconry Guidebook and Rule R657-20 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

4. FISHING GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-13 and FISHING CONTEST RULE R657-58

MOTION: To accept Rule R657-13 and Rule R657-58 as presented

VOTE: Unanimous.

**5. WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA HABITAT MANAGEMENT PLAN
BICKNELL BOTTOMS WMA**

MOTION: To accept the Bicknell Bottoms WMA Habitat Management Plan as presented.

VOTE: 7:1

**6. WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA HABITAT MANAGEMENT PLAN
KINGSTON CANYON WMA**

MOTION: To accept the Kingston Canyon WMA Management Plan as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

**7. WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA HABITAT MANAGEMENT PLAN
MONROE WMA**

MOTION: To accept the Monroe WMA Management Plan as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

**8. WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA HABITAT MANAGEMENT PLAN
PANGUITCH CREEK WMA**

MOTION: To accept the Panguitch Creek WMA Management Plan as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

**9. WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA HABITAT MANAGEMENT PLAN
REDMOND WMA**

MOTION: To accept the Redmond WMA Management Plan as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

**10. WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA HABITAT MANAGEMENT PLAN
TOPAZ SLOUGH WMA**

MOTION: To accept the Topaz Slough WMA Management Plan as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
 Beaver High School
 Beaver, UT
 September 8, 2009
 7:00 p.m.**

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Chairman Steve Flinders Rex Stanworth Paul Briggs Steve Dalton Cordell Pearson Layne Torgerson Dell LeFevre Mack Morrell Sam Carpenter Clair Woodbury	Douglas Messerly Giani Julander Stephanie Rainey Mike Ottenbacher Mike Hadley Richard Hepworth Drew Cushing Walt Donaldson Roger Wilson Jim Lamb Lynn Chamberlain Josh Carver Bruce Bonebrake Rhett Boswell Cassie Mellon Kim Hersey Jimmy Parrish Lynn Zubeck	Paul Neimeyer Jake Albrecht	

Steve Flinders called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. There were approximately 13 interested parties in attendance in addition to RAC members, members of the Wildlife Board, and Division employees. Steve Flinders introduced himself and asked RAC members to introduce themselves. Steve Flinders explained RAC meeting procedures.

Mac Morrell: Mac Morrell, Bicknell, for agriculture.

Steve Flinders: And I thought I saw Rex Stanworth here, somewhere. We'll give him a few minutes to come in. I want to talk a little bit about the meeting order tonight; I see some members of the public here. We're going to have a presentation from the Division of Wildlife. We ask you to please be respectful and let them get through that presentation. I'll then ask for questions from the RAC. Then I'll ask for questions from the public; and I'd like those to be questions. We'll then take clarifications from the Division. Then we'll move on to comments from the public. I need you to fill out a comment card. Somebody hold up a comment card from the Division. They are some out on the table. Fill one out; get them up here to us. Give them to one of the Division of Wildlife folks or set them up on the desk here. We'll allow three minutes for public comments, five minutes if you're a member of a bona

fide group. We'll then take comments from the RAC, and then move into motions and voting. Unless anybody has any questions up here I'm ready for an acceptance of the agenda and past meeting minutes

Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)

Steve Flinders: A motion by Cordell.

Sam Carpenter: Seconded.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Sam. All in favor? Any against? It is unanimous.

Cordell Pearson made the motion to accept the agenda and minutes as written. Sam Carpenter seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Wildlife Board Update.

Wildlife Board Update:

-Steve Flinders, Chairman

- We met in Salt Lake. We have a pretty good training session the day previous.
- The Wildlife Board acted as follows: They accepted everything that went on in our RAC meeting, save a couple of items. We talked about amending conservation permits relative to cougars. The feedback that I got is that's going to require an amendment to the conservation permit rule. They took it under consideration. So we might keep that in mind for the next time we see that conservation permit rule. It was a much bigger issue than they wanted to deal with at that time.
- They followed our motion on the Paunsagaunt, the level of permits, the split season; same on the Zion.
- They struggled with the furbearer rule, much the same we did, with how to liberalize things as far as trapping coyotes goes, and left it as presented by the Division.

Steve Flinders: Rex, do you want to give us a quick and dirty update on the first meeting of the elk committee?

Rex Stanworth: I'd be happy to do that. We met last Wednesday in Salt Lake at the Division office. Jake was there. We've also got a meeting scheduled for the 14th, which is next Monday. The purpose of the meeting, and really what they're trying to do is they're trying to come up with a survey that can go out to the elk hunters who have applied for an elk permit or who have drawn an elk permit. It's a fairly lengthy survey. Right now this one shows 54 questions. Back in 2001 they did one and there were some interesting things that came out of that. They believe that they need to do another one so that a new management plan can be put into place. So the first two meetings, last week and the upcoming week, is to develop the survey. And then once the survey is developed it will go out to the hunters. And then after the hunters have filled those out and been brought back then the committee will sit down and digest the kind of information that was presented in those surveys. A couple of things, which is really kind of where I thought it would go, is that we have those factions who want to have nothing but big bulls, an

opportunity for a big bull, and then you've got those who want to have an opportunity to maybe several times in a lifetime to draw a bull permit and definitely trying to keep elk being able to hunt by a family. So right now we have spike and we have general season any bull permits on certain areas. The proposal has kind of been thrown around again, which was done on the first one, to do away with the spike hunt. And they threw out the idea to do away with the general season hunt. And then take all of those elk permits and have them simply 100 percent by limited entry. That means that the last family hunt would be gone. And so that's one of those things which I drug my feet on last time, and I had the support of the RAC that we kept the spike hunt there; and I'd ask for your opinion tonight. One of the other things that was thrown out, and this was put out by a nonresident hunter, he believes that we should stop hunting spikes and have it only limited entry with no general season, but he says if that doesn't happen then one of the other ideas that's been thrown out today was the idea that as an elk hunter you would get a chance to either put in for the big game draw, or you could buy a hunt, or you could buy a general bull hunt, but you couldn't do two at the same time. And that way they're saying that we would take a large number of people out of the running for the draw, because there's a lot of people that say well geeze I want to hunt with my son, I want to hunt with my family, I definitely want a spike bull. I personally think there would be a revolt if we did that. The other concern is that the Division came right to the point of telling us we need to have a neutral position. If you take permits away from us in this hand then in this hand you've got to shove back the revenue that was lost because we're at a point where we have no more money to deal on, we're on that strict of a budget. So it's got to be neutral position. And so I wrote back today to the gentleman and said, tell me how this is going to be neutral, how you're going to come up with the cash. I guess at this point in time I'd just like to have a little feel from the Board, is number one: How do you feel? Do you believe that a spike hunt should stay and exist as it is now? How many would want that? Would you raise your hand so I could see how many? Okay. So it looks like that's about unanimous. What's your thoughts in regards to the idea of only being able to put in for one permit, either a limited entry, a spike, or a general season? Right now you could put in for two. You could buy a spike or general season or you could put in for a big bull. How many would like to limit it to just one opportunity for an elk? Anybody in favor of that plan of limiting it to where you can only put in for one elk? Okay, then I'd take it that the majority would like to see it to where you can put in for a big bull and you can also buy either a spike, if you're unsuccessful there you can either buy a spike or a general season bull tag. Okay. One other issue, and I'd like to get, I know that Sam's got comments on this but if anybody else has I'd like to know about it. I had one of the mule deer committee members that wrote to me and he told me, he says you put up a good fight last time. He says, one of the things I'd like to have some discussion about is that while the Division hasn't come out and said that there's an impact elk versus deer, as a committee we believe there is. And we would like to see on some of our premium hunts having the elk eliminated or make it a general season area so that it would diminish the elk rather than have them have such a hard impact on the deer. So has anybody got any comments in regards to that? Sam.

Steve Flinders: You know if you do Sam, why don't we follow up in an email to Rex and we can hash some of this stuff out later.

Sam Carpenter: Okay.

Steve Flinders: There's a lot, there's a lot. And I think the feedback is good to go both directions and appreciate to hear what's going on.

Rex Stanworth: Yeah, I'd really appreciate any emails you want to send me on your thoughts as to the

way things are going and give me some guidance.

Steve Flinders: Sounds great. How about a regional update Doug?

(Clair Woodbury arrived during Wildlife Board update.)

Regional Update:

-Douglas Messerly, Regional Supervisor

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I have a few issues to address here in no particular order.

- Heather Perry who was our volunteer services coordinator, our dedicated hunter coordinator for the region recently moved with her husband to take a new job in Colorado. Blaine Cox has been selected to replace Heather. Blaine has previously been working in our Utah Prairie Dog Program and is an excellent people person. We expect great things out of Blaine in the dedicated hunter program. And fortunately we received word today that we've got some more budget to hire some more people to accommodate the projects etc, that are going to come as a result of the increase in the number of hours that people are required to work in order to participate in that program. Blaine will be working with the agencies and with the public to do good things with his dedicated hunter volunteer hours that we have.
- Spike tags are sold out for this year. The over the counter general season spike tags are gone. We do still have general season any bull permits. Opportunities are fairly limited within the Southern Region, and that would be the Zion and the Pine Valley. So there are still some opportunities left to buy those tags but the spike tags did sell out again this year.
- Some information has been floating around out there about Navajo Lake. Navajo Lake is located east of Cedar City, adjacent to Highway 14. Navajo Lake is an interesting lake in that it's located in some high lava dome activity areas. That whole mountain is essentially a lava rock. There are some big sinkholes adjacent to the lake. In the 30's the civilian conservation corps. built a dike across the east end of the lake to keep the water from running out those sink holes. During this past winter and spring that dike breached, it was washed out. It's difficult to keep a dike intact when it's inundated regularly, and that dike is. When the lake gets full it goes clear over the top of that dike. But it's lasted since the 1930's and we are making as much headway as we can to repair that dike and get it back into place. It was put in place specifically to maintain a fishery in that lake over the winter in order to keep enough water depth to maintain a fishery. And the dike exists under a special use permit from the National Forest Service, and the Division of Wildlife actually holds that permit; so it's our responsibility to fix that dike and we're moving towards doing that. It's going to be a very expensive repair but we're committed to doing whatever we can to get that done. We recommended to the directors office that we double the fishing limits at Navajo Lake for the remainder of this summer in an effort to utilize some of those fish that are in there. We anticipate a winterkill and we'd like to get the public to get as much use as they can out of those fish before that occurs. We

- expect word back on that soon and I think it's being viewed upon favorably.
- We had some poaching cased make the press recently, one specifically in Hurricane, that went as far as the LA Times, Lynn Chamberlain pointed out to me. He wrote it. It's a sad commentary on what some people are willing to do. It is that time of year and I'd just like to urge everyone to keep that in mind; to report suspicious activity and help us help you protect your wildlife. Anything you can do along those lines is greatly appreciated. You can contact the help stop poaching hotline or any of the officers or division personnel that you know, including myself, don't hesitate to call me.
 - I was proud to see the turnout that we had at the RAC training last month in Salt Lake. I appreciate you guys coming and participating in that training. Hopefully we can put some of that information that we learned there to use, here tonight and in future meetings.
 - I would like to remind you that these recordings, these audio recordings of these RAC meetings are now put on the Internet. Last month's meeting of the Southern Region RAC is there. You can go listen to it again if you'd like to. This recording will be posted on the Internet also. If you go to the Division of Wildlife website and the RAC and Board information page you can find your way to those recordings.

Douglas Messerly: Unless there's any questions Mr. Chairman that's my presentation.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Doug. Before we move on, since the introduction and roll call we might want the record to show we have a full complement of RAC with Clair and Rex joining us up here. Let's move on to the first informational item on the agenda, Conservation Agreement and Strategy of Southern Leatherside. Is Cassie here? We can't wait.

Conservation Agreement and Strategy Southern Leatherside (informational)

15:47 to 23:23 of 2:44:30

-Cassie Mellon, Native Aquatics Species Biologist

(See attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Thank you. Any questions from the RAC? Go ahead Rex.

Questions from the RAC:

Rex Stanworth: I guess one of the statements you made in regards to keeping water in the streams, if the water rights are owned by private individuals how will you keep that water in the stream?

Cassie Mellon: In some cases we have been able to purchase water rights; either through the Division or through one of the partner agencies. So through whatever, legal.

Rex Stanworth: So you're thinking if need be you would purchase the water to keep the water going down the waterbed.

Cassie Mellon: If that's an option and feasible in that case.

Rex Stanworth: how far north are you talking about? Where would you say the furthest point south is for this Leatherside? And how far north does it go? Do we go to Richfield or are we south of that?

Cassie Mellon: The farthest south is probably either the east fork of the Sevier or in Upper Sevier. And I don't have those maps on here. Would be the farthest south. And the farthest north is in the Provo river; a couple tributaries to the Provo river, not the main river.

Rex Stanworth: But on the Sevier river, how far north would that, does it go to Richfield or is everything above Richfield?

Cassie Mellon: The populations are spotty in the Sevier River, both above and below Richfield. So there are some both above and below.

Rex Stanworth: Okay.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions? I've got one. Is the next step in the Beaver River then to reintroduce Leathersides?

Cassie Mellon: I don't know. Surveys were done there probably within the last 10 years and they weren't found. I couldn't tell you what reasons they weren't. They are no longer there though. So any reintroductions it would have to depend on why they aren't there any more and if that issue has been addressed.

Steve Flinders: If that threat's gone.

Cassie Mellon: And I can't tell you the specifics there.

Steve Flinders: Thanks. Any questions from the public?

Questions from the public:

None.

Steve Flinders: We don't have any comment cards so, and we don't have to make a motion. So thank you. Very good and good conservation strategy.

Comments from the public:

None.

Comments from the RAC:

None.

Steve Flinders: Let's move on to Kim Hersey and the Bat Conservation Plan.

Utah Bat Conservation Plan (action) 26:40 to 36:54 of 2:44:30
-Kim Hersey, Sensitive Species Biologist

(See attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Any questions from the RAC? Rex.

Questions from the RAC:

Rex Stanworth: From what I gathered, if there are any cave closures then is there a permit required? I realize if it's on like BLM or Forest Service they're probably astute to it. But if it's a private mining claim is there a requirement for somebody to go say to them we're going to close this cave, we're going to blow it closed, or is there something there would prohibit that?

Kim Hersey: There isn't. You know none of the species are protected under threatened endangered status so there is nothing that would prevent a private landowner; just hopefully work with them to do anything before that would happen.

Rex Stanworth: It looks like to me the one thing that would save bats is if there was a great PR program telling everybody that they're not a vampire bat that's going to suck them dry. So it looks like a PR program is one way you're going to save bats because if there's a bat that comes close to my wife I'm telling you she's got the broom. When you were saying there needs to be protection of the surface water, do bats actually water as they fly?

Kim Hersey: Exactly. Pretty much every bat out there needs to swoop down and drink.

Rex Stanworth: The other question I was going to ask you're BLM and Forest Service rep., on caving, if someone wants to go caving . . . I know west of Delta there are several caves out there where people have gone caving . . . Do you require any permits to go caving?

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Paul.

Paul Briggs: Yeah Rex. I know certain caves that do require permits to go in and they're monitored. And those permits are limited during certain times of the year for the bat activity. I don't know the specifics but if you want to contact the Fillmore BLM office I'm sure their recreation and wildlife folks could tell you more.

Rex Stanworth: But you're saying they are designed to where the bats are protected as much as possible.

Paul Briggs: Yeah, to a degree and just overall the protection and maintenance of the caves. You know, reduce vandalism to the resource itself. There are a lot of organizations out there that just go caving for the sake of caving. We want to try to maintain that recreational resource as well as the others.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions? Questions from the public?

Questions from the public:

Steve Flinders: Yes Sir. Come to the mic and give us your name and ask your question.

Dave Imlay: My name is Dave Imlay of Hurricane city. If you find a dead bat, which I did last week in my yard, what do I do with that bat? Another questions is: as I'm swimming in my pool, just in the evening as the bats are out, they are swooping the pool which freaks my wife out, but if a bat has rabies is there any danger?

Kim Hersey: First off I just want to predicate anything, the Division of Wildlife doesn't give health advice, so if you ever have any sort of fear of contact with a bat contact the health department. As far as finding a dead bat, you know things die all the time. As long as you don't think there's been any exposure you can throw it away. As far as swooping down at the pool, again, as long as you don't think there's been any type of exposure but the second you have any fear, you know . . .

Steve Flinders: I don't have any comment cards.

Comments from the public:

None.

Steve Flinders: Any comment from the RAC? Layne's got a question.

RAC discussion and vote:

Layne Torgerson: Is there anybody that governs or oversees the pest control industry as far as eradicating bats? I mean are there any regulations that govern that?

Kim Hersey: I have a COR, a certificate of registration to do bat work in the state, well first of all you are supposed to have a COR to do bat work in the state. And I'm not sure of exactly what the requirements are at this time. There was some work by one of my colleagues to make sure that they passed an exam and knew the basic ways to get bats out of houses without harming the bats or the people.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Kim.

Kim Hersey: Thank you. Any other comments? Good presentation.

Douglas Messerly: Just one quick comment. I'd suggest any time you're removing dead animals from your yard or other place that they need to be moved from that you always wear gloves, use a shovel etc. West Nile virus and potential exposure to rabies with bats is something you need to be cognizant of. Any time you're moving dead animals it's a good idea to protect yourself.

Steve Flinders: I was going to add I'm excited to use the new keys in the back of that plan and some of those habitat descriptions. I'm ready for a motion guys. Go ahead.

Layne Torgerson: I move we accept the bat management plan as presented.

Steve Flinders: Move by Layne.

Cordell Pearson: Second.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Paul? All in favor? Any opposed? It's unanimous.

Layne Torgerson made the motion to accept the Utah Bat Conservation Plan as presented. Cordell Pearson seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Let's move on to the Falconry Guidebook and Rule, Jimmy Parrish.

**Falconry Guidebook and Rule R657-20 (action) 43:10 to 1:01:41 of 2:44:30
-Jimmy Parrish, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

(See attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Thanks Jimmy. Any questions from the RAC?

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: I've got a gee whiz question. How many peregrines and or goshawks are taken from the wild? Do you have a guess?

Jimmy Parrish: Right now we allow seventeen total permits. One nonresident and the remainder are resident permits for peregrines. For goshawks, last year I think we had like half a dozen or so that were taken; so not uh, about a third.

Steve Flinders: Interesting. Yeah, Paul.

Paul Briggs: In your earlier slide you showed that the hunter numbers or the falconer numbers permitted by region; are they allowed to hunt in only that region?

Jimmy Parrish: No they can hunt anywhere they want. It's just that's where they reside and that's how many we have in each region.

Paul Briggs: That's just distribution of hunter, falconer.

Jimmy Parrish: Right, right. Yeah they hunt all over. They even go out of state and hunt.

Steve Flinders: Questions from the public?

Questions from the public:

None.

Steve Flinders: We'll get to comments. How about right now Todd?

Comments from the public:

Steve Flinders: One comment card.

Todd Ballantyne: I'm Todd Ballantyne. I reside up in Davis County, in the Kaysville area, and I made the trek down here primarily just to support Jim and the effort that we've been working on for the past year. We really have appreciated the opportunity that the Division has extended to us, and Jim's been a great example and person to work with through this whole process. And we just wanted to express that and to support the recommendation to you to approve this request for these regulations to become active for us. Thank you. If you have any questions I'd be happy to . . .

Steve Flinders: Thanks Todd. It looks like a lot of work you guys have done. Any other comments? Any comments from the RAC?

RAC discussion and vote:

Steve Flinders: I guess I'm ready for a motion.

Rex Stanworth: I'll make a motion that we accept Rule R657-20 as presented.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Rex.

Paul Briggs: I'll second.

Steve Flinders: We've got several seconds. I saw Paul. All in favor? Any opposed? It looks like that's unanimous.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept the Falconry Guidebook and Rule R657-20 as presented. Paul Briggs seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Thank you.

Jimmy Parrish: Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Let's move on to fishing, Roger.

**Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 (action) 1:04:34 to 1:20:55 of 2:44:30
-Roger Wilson, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

Roger Wilson: And Mr. Chairman, Drew will present on the fishing tournament after I get done. Would you like that now or would you like to do that separately? I assume it's a separate voting issue.

Steve Flinders: On tournament fishing?

Roger Wilson: Yeah, it's basically some proposed changes to the fishing tournament rule. Would you like him to present that now?

Steve Flinders: I don't see it on the agenda unless it's part of the rule.

Roger Wilson: Yeah, it's kind of part of this presentation. We have materials delivered in the packet but it's not listed as a separate agenda item.

Steve Flinders: So it's part of R657-13?

Roger Wilson: It's a different rule; it's R-58.

Steve Flinders: I'd just as soon let him follow you up.

Roger Wilson: Okay. All right.

**Fishing Contest Rule R657-58 (action) 1:21:49 to 1:27:16 of 2:44:30
-Drew Cushing, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

(See attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Thanks Drew. I'm a little bit confused because R657-58 on your title slide is not on the agenda and it's not on the agenda sent down by Salt Lake. So we'll muddle through and take questions from the RAC and the public and comments from those who might have been aware that this was coming up tonight. But you might check that for future meetings.

Drew Cushing: We will.

Steve Flinders: It's not on Stacie's agenda.

Steve Flinders: Any questions from the RAC? Go ahead Rex.

Questions from the RAC:

Rex Stanworth: Who wants to be first Roger, you or Drew? Oh okay. Lots of questions about Kolob. As I remembered when we had our meeting the committee was there, everybody thought there was an agreement and then at the last moment one of the members said, well I can't go with this, I can't go with it any longer. And my understanding was I thought they were going to reconvene that committee and try to unify a proposal and then bring it back to us.

Roger Wilson: Do you want to address that Richard? I think the committee decided that they felt like they had a vote and they had a consensus and they wanted to continue. I'll let Richard address that.

Richard Hepworth: I'll have to stand on my tiptoes. Yeah, at that meeting at that time we did feel like we had a consensus, or we had all six members of the committee that were in agreement. What we did find out that we didn't, we had five of the six that were in agreement with this. And at that time we discussed reconvening. We felt like that we probably wouldn't have made any more progress on that so we went with the majority ruling on that with the five of the six agreed with this proposal.

Rex Stanworth: Okay. Roger and your counterpart is welcome to stand there. In this relationship with Kolob, you know the guys that want to keep it as a fly fishing Mecca, trying to keep that standard there,

they're indicating that we're letting them down because we've taken one of only two waters where they felt like they had a true opportunity to fly fish, turn them back and come back and catch them the next time around. And then they're maintaining that we're allowing the family fish, the children to fish with bait coming in and taking that potential water away. I guess what you're saying is we're going to have this as a three year plan. We're going to monitor it basically yearly, and if we see a problem come about with this then at that point in time it's going to come back, you guys are going to make a decision, we're going to come back and say okay this doesn't work. Is that what I'm understanding?

Roger Wilson: Yeah. And that came from the committee. You know they wanted to evaluate this in three years. You know I think it's pretty clear that you can have quality opportunities to fish without gear restriction, without bait restrictions. You know this in many ways is a social issue. And we need to really see what the implications are with the lake itself. I mean the three years aren't going to change anybody's mind about bait versus artificials. You know the team felt that most of the interest in using artificials was during the spring and fall so they will still have that opportunity. And it will take a fairly aggressive effort on our part to sign this, to promote this through an outreach program to make people aware of this changing situation. To my knowledge we've never had a regulation like this that changes seasonally from bait to artificials. So it's something we're really going to outreach on.

Rex Stanworth: Now as far as the youth fishing, did we determine an age, what is a youth? Who gets to allow to fish with bait? Can anybody? I was under the impression it was just youth.

Roger Wilson: It's everybody during those warm summer months. I don't have the dates right in front of me but I believe it's the last Saturday in May or something like that. Richard, what was it?

Richard Hepworth: Yeah, it's basically Memorial Day through Labor Day.

Rex Stanworth: Okay. So anybody can fish with bait, it's not just youth it's family fishery.

Richard Hepworth: Yes. We opened it up to bait, no age restrictions at all with that.

Rex Stanworth: Okay, and that was recommended by the group, by the committee?

Richard Hepworth: Yeah. Five of the six committee members agreed to that.

Rex Stanworth: Okay. I did get the letter from the mayor of Hurricane and it sounds like he's very supportive of the way you're going.

Richard Hepworth: He was a member of that committee as well.

Rex Stanworth: Okay. All right. The other question, I guess this is for Drew: On the fishing contest, the tagged fishing contests. . . Remember the last time you came down we had that discussion . . . The tagged fish or the fish that are in that water that somehow you're going to . . . Are these fish that are tagged from prior contests, how are you going to catch the fish to tag them?

Drew Cushing: What's been happening, this has been going on for a year now and we've had a number of these contests and they were tagged at the hatchery.

Rex Stanworth: Okay.

Drew Cushing: And then stocked.

Rex Stanworth: I gotcha.

Drew Cushing: And so they went really well, the contests did.

Rex Stanworth: Okay. And I know one of the questions I had before for you was the cost of putting these contest on to the Division. There's no discussion that I saw in here about any cost for putting this on.

Drew Cushing: You mean the cost of the COR?

Rex Stanworth: Yeah.

Drew Cushing: Yeah, it was \$150.00 and what we did is this last winter when we sent all of our fee adjustments through, it went through then, and it's now \$25. And so the fee went down which was one of the, we had kind of a verbal agreement with the tournament anglers, because the \$150.00 per tournament is really ungodly for them to pay.

Rex Stanworth: I see.

Drew Cushing: And so what we did is made sure that that was reduced and encourage some of these to take place.

Rex Stanworth: And then I like the idea that you're going to inspect the boats. One of the questions I had about the mussel problem, are you seeing any of that going into the livewells? I mean are the livewells part of the inspection?

Drew Cushing: Every part of the boat is part of the inspection.

Rex Stanworth: Okay, so it is.

Drew Cushing: And most of, well livewells are a good place that, you know your water pump, I mean there's all; you can't imagine the places these things can hide.

Rex Stanworth: Right. Okay. On the waters like, I don't believe Strawberry is on the list, but Scofield which does have a slot limit, these tournament people would be required the same as an angler, if they catch a fish in the slot limit they have to turn it loose and that's why you've made it just rainbow trout only, is that right?

Drew Cushing: Yes Sir.

Rex Stanworth: Okay, because that was a big question I thought. In Flaming Gorge the burbot, if an angler catches those they're required to dispose of them, I'm assuming the tournament people are the same thing?

Drew Cushing: Yes Sir.

Rex Stanworth: Okay. And let's see . . . I think that was all the questions I had there. Thanks.

Drew Cushing: You're welcome.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions from the RAC? Go ahead Sam.

Sam Carpenter: How do we handle Lake Powell on these fishing tournaments? I'm out there quite a bit and I see an awful lot of these bass fishermen sponsored by businesses there in Page. It seems like there's an awful lot of people and big money in that. How do we handle that where we have a state line kind of verging in the middle of the lake?

Drew Cushing: We handle all the tournaments on Lake Powell. They go through this process. We see all the COR requests. They go through the Southern Region and my office and we review them and either give them a thumbs up or thumbs down.

Steve Flinders: Anything else? Any questions from the public? Questions only right now. I've got a number of comment cards. Oh, one more question from Steve.

Steve Dalton: Yes. I have a question; if we're going to fish Kolob with bait and then you've got a slot limit there as well, what's the survivability with a bait caught bigger fish that has to be released?

Roger Wilson: Well you know we looked at this extensively at Strawberry and you know there are, there are costs, you lose fish. But what we found there was that there was enough survival of those fish to meet our management objectives. And see that's what we're relying on. We will have mortalities. We will have bait mortalities. If you release a bait hooked fish, one that's deeply hooked without cutting the line and try to disengorged the hook, 60 percent of those fish will die. That's very clear in studies. If you cut the line you reduce that by half, so 30 percent. But you know you still have to apply that to the number of fish you release. You can legally keep fish at Kolob. And you know there will be some fish losses and people will have to release fish that are in the slot that they know are going to die. Those are issues that we have. But again, we get enough fish survive to meet our objectives.

Steve Dalton: Will the public be advised to do that, cut the line as opposed to trying to get the hook out?

Richard Hepworth: Yeah. One of the big portions of this management plan was an outreach or a public education portion of that. So if this regulation goes into effect then there will be extra outreach and public education efforts to address that exact issue, and other issues.

Questions from the public:

None.

Steve Flinders: All right. Let's move on to public comment. I've got Neil Glauser, followed by Corey Cram.

Comments from the public:

Neil Glauser, Southern Utah Anglers: My name is Neil Glauser and I've been asked to represent Southern Utah Anglers. Southern Utah anglers are against bait fishing regulations for Kolob reservoir. There's been much conversation in regards to kids not having an opportunity to fish Kolob since it does not allow bait fishing. When this proposed regulation came about it was, this new reg was actually brought about from the local citizenry to bait fish and then when they could see that they might be losing the battle they started using that the kids weren't able to fish. And that in order for kids to fish that you had to have bait fishing at Kolob. Southern Utah Anglers have been pro kid fishing since we were formed fifteen years ago. And the first thing that we did was have a kids' fishing derby, which was very successful, and we've had it on an annual basis. Another thing that the Southern Utah Anglers have done is we were at the forefront of putting together the urban fishery in St. George and pushing that forward. There are many other reservoirs in Washington County that kids can fish. Kolob is a special fishery, only one of two fisheries in Utah with artificial fly and lure regulations. There's also been some talk of using Kolob as a Cutthroat brood stock source, and it would be nice to keep it artificial fly and lure if they are able to do that. Southern Utah Anglers wishes Kolob Reservoir regulations to stay as they now stand. That's all I have. Do you have any questions?

Steve Flinders: Thank you. Corey Cram followed by Steve Cox.

Corey Cram Washington County Water Conservancy District: Hi, my name's Corey Cram. I work for the water conservancy district. We own and operate Kolob Reservoir, and I was also a member on the advisory council there. I also work very actively in my job with endangered fish recovery on the Virgin River so I rub shoulders with a lot of folks with the Division; and appreciate working with them. I guess I just wanted to let you know that we're really proud of this plan that we came up with and want to tell you that . . . I enjoyed the process we went through; we had a very objective process. We sat down and at the very start we had four objectives. And we recognized that Kolob is a special place; it's a very productive water and it's a unique place in that it's pretty much self-sustaining. We don't see a lot of fish stocked there, in fact it's been doing well enough that the fish that have been stocked there historically have been now going to some of the urban fisheries in Washington County. And that's proved a very valuable asset to our community, both in having Kolob self-sustaining and also supporting those local ponds there. So that was our first objective, is to maintain that self-sustaining fishery because that was important to everybody. Secondly, there's golden shiner in there and we want to keep those under control. Thirdly, our third objective was to increase both, maintain and increase both the catch and the harvest rate. You know people are frustrated that they're not able to take anything home. People are having a bad experience. It's just losing a lot of users there. And then from the very start our fourth objective was to increase our family participation, and make that a bigger part of what's taking place there. And we went through a nice process of looking at these objectives and looking at the different management approaches, looking at different tools and how we could implement those objectives and get to where we want to be. And this wasn't something where our Division staff led us down a path or directed us, we had good discussions, and really came up with these on our own. And that's why I felt so good about this whole plan that we have and felt like, you know, I think you get a pretty strong feeling that this is something that's really strongly supported by the community, by the people. And you heard the word earlier, compromise; that this was intended to be something that could work for everybody. And we tried to put some safeguards in place to where if there are problems, you know, this will be reevaluated and there's a fall back position. And to me it seems like it's really a zero risk

proposition. And I guess that we recognize that there's a, that Kolob is special, that there's a desire to keep that self-sustaining fishery and we're thinking that we have met that objective. In working with our Division staff, you know they're kind of the experts that we have here. I'm a water expert not a fish expert. And they're telling us that, like you heard earlier, that there's some mortality association with bait fishing. But according to them they believe that what we have in place can sustain the fishery, can control the shiner and make a better catch rate, harvest rate, and better family experience. I guess I would reiterate that I think that we have a nice seasonality to this. It's a little different twist that's never been implemented anywhere else. But I think it's a really neat compromise that satisfies the seasonal use that both the fly fisherman, special use fisherman, and also the bait fisherman get a look at the time of the year when people are out there when they want to be there, and I think this meets everybody's objectives and not a big conflict. And I just reiterate that we've got these triggers in place. If we do see problems we can fall back and we haven't lost anything. Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Corey. Steve Cox. And one last one, Sheldon Schmit.

Steve Cox, Kolob Property Owners: I'm Steve Cox. I represent the petition and the property owners on Kolob. Sorry, like I said, Mayor Hirschi could not make it tonight. He really wanted to be here but he had Utah City League up in Salt Lake so he could not make it. So that is what the letter is for. I do have one rebuttal with the fly fisherman group. When I did come to this board in the very beginning last fall, family and kids were the number one reason I came here for this change. There was no compromise during the time that we met as a committee. At Kolob Days I presented the proposal to the citizens that were there at Kolob Days. It was greatly appreciated. It had a round of applause. Everybody there thought it was great. Still at this time there are still no kids on the lake. Fishing is still slow during these times, yes in the spring and the fall it does come up, but that's when the family and the kids are not there. It's, the lake to me it seems to have become more of a party lake now. People are not fishing; they're just going up to party. Families are not using the lake anymore. There has been a lot of people contact me wanting to know what was going on. Whether they could still sign the petition or not, or whatever they could do. I told them the petition was great, it did its job. Could have had hundreds of e-mails sent to all of you but I feel like your time is short, your free time is short, and should be spent with your family or the times that things that you do enjoy. We feel that the petition, petitioners, that the committee has come up with a great proposal. It seems that the committee has come up with a plan that includes all anglers. As in the past it's been for a select few. In the beginning the petitioners came in for a general fishing rules. But we gave some so all anglers would have their times to be on the lake. We appreciate the Division of Wildlife for their time. Special thanks to Richard Hepworth for all his time. And also the Kolob Committee, for the time and consideration they have given to all anglers that fish Kolob. Thanks again for your time and let's make Kolob a family fishery once again. Thank you.

(See attachment 2, letter from Mayor Hirschi of Hurricane)

Steve Flinders: Thank you. Go ahead Rex ask him a question.

Rex Stanworth: Can you tell me who was on the committee one more time? I think there were what, six members?

Steve Flinders: Richard probably wants to answer that.

Richard Hepworth: I hope I don't forget anybody. Steve Cox was on it, Clair Woodbury from the RAC

was on it, Todd Abelhouzen from Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife, Mayor Hirschi from Hurricane City, Corey Cram who talked to you a minute ago from Washington County, and Greg Anderson with Southern Utah Anglers Association. Those were the six. Did you get that?

Rex Stanworth: I got most of them. Richard, a couple of the comments that came through the mass of letters I got from the folks on Kolob, they asked the question, why were not the blue fish or the blue ribbon . . .

Richard Hepworth: Blue Ribbon Advisory Council?

Rex Stanworth: Yeah right, there you go. There were a couple of fishing groups that they felt like maybe should have been asked to be at those meetings. I realize the bigger the group the harder it is to come to a consensus.

Richard Hepworth: Right. We considered the Blue Ribbon Advisory Council but at that time there wasn't a representative for the Southern Region. There is now a representative on there but at the time there wasn't. But we tried to make it as balanced and as fair as we could.

Rex Stanworth: I guess one other last question as long as you're at the microphone, what's your take as far as family and kids on the lake versus those that are on artificial lures, it looks like the family folks have the shortest time. Are you thinking that you're going to see fifty people fishing there? Do you think it will be two hundred people fishing with bait?

Richard Hepworth: What we looked at with the dates, you're going to say shortest time, we did that basically when school was out for the summer. That's how those dates kind of come about. As far as numbers go, you know that varies a lot depending on day of the week, things like that. But you know you could see up to a hundred to a hundred and fifty fisherman during a Saturday afternoon or a holiday weekend. You know that would probably be a pretty high numbers there at Kolob.

Rex Stanworth: And Steve, what you mentioned is right now there's not much participation by the family or the kids there at the present time.

Steve Cox: No there's not. It's really, really low. I mean like I said, I'm up there almost every weekend and by the lake all the time. And you look at the lake you might see one or two boats, one or two float-tubers, but very few people on the banks fishing. And no, and very few kids, very few.

Rex Stanworth: Awesome.

Steve Flinders: Thanks guys. Let's finish with public comment. Is Sheldon here?

Sheldon Schmit: My name is Sheldon Schmit. I'm from St. George, Utah. Previously in Park City and I used to go into high country fly-fishing up there. And I'm here to request that you leave Kolob Reservoir regulation the way it is now and keep it in place. The reason being it is the only Blue Ribbon Fishery we have in Southern Utah. You can use bait, you can use artificial flies, you can use lures, M-80s or just about anything you want in any other lake and stream in Utah. This is the only one we have in Southern Utah. And to say it's not a family fishery is wrong. There's plenty of families that go up there and it's not known as a party lake. I've talked to many people, I was not born and raised in St.

George, but I've talked to a lot of people that were and it was known as a party lake when it was used for bait. Once it changed over to artificial flies and lures only that changed and it cleaned up. We're catching big fish out of Kolob Reservoir right now. I pulled out an eight to ten pound Cutthroat last year out of there. There's a lot of big fish in there. There's a lot of people creating a lot of revenue from out of state that they know that there's big fish in Kolob Reservoir and they're coming into Kolob to fish that. Now if you're going to have a slot limit and there's a problem because there's too many fish in there change the slot limit for us, we'll be more than happy to take some of those fish out of there. As far as the Mayor of Hurricane endorsing this over to bait I wonder why? He has a cabin up there, that's why. Now if that lake was as big as Otter Creek, or Strawberry Reservoir, and I've fished all of those, I wouldn't have a problem with using bait up there. It's not. It's a very, if any of you have been up there you know it's a small body of water. We want to keep it a Blue Ribbon Fishery. There's no reason why the kids or families can't use lures or can't use flies. And if you're going to change it to bait do it in a way that the education is out there so people know that they have to cut that line. We counted over two hundred dead fish on the surface of Panguitch last summer because people don't know how to handle a fish that falls in the slot. We need more education and so far we're not getting that. I know these guys have said that they were going to educate, well they should have started a long time ago because the word's not getting out how to release fish. We want to keep Kolob Reservoir a Blue Ribbon Fishery. It's a great fishery. Please leave it the way it is. And if you want us to take more out we will do that, change the slot for us. Thank you very much.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Sheldon.

Unknown: Oh, I've got a petition here. This is just (unintelligible) couldn't show up. We had 416 signatures. That's the one I brought, so . . .

Steve Flinders: And your position is against the Division's recommended changes. All right. To review, we're looking for a motion on R657-13 and R657-58. We probably do them separately.

Layne Torgerson: Mr. Chairman.

Steve Flinders: Yeah, Layne.

RAC discussion and vote:

Layne Torgerson: I have one question that's come up in several of the comments here. Several of the people have said that Kolob is the only Blue Water restricted water that we have in Southern Utah. And I'm going to put this to one of these guys, isn't Manning Meadow and Barney Lake both artificial lure or fly only?

Richard Hepworth: Yes. So is Minersville Reservoir.

Unknown: Can I rebut that?

Steve Flinders: Well, we're specifically looking for questions to things we're mulling over. And we realize the Blue Ribbon Fisheries are subject to some discussion but we're talking about specific waters that have the same form of regulation as Kolob Reservoir. Do you have ones to add to that list?

Unknown: No, he says we have Minersville. But he knows as well as I do we've lost Minersville.

Steve Flinders: We need you on the mic sir. Minersville's not artificial fly and lure?

Sheldon Schmit: Well yeah by word, and by what you have on the regulation. Why what you have on the regulations it is, but you're not catching anything up there anymore because the fish are all stressed out. They use it for irrigation, which I totally understand, that's what it was built for. And so now they're catching fish about fifteen to eighteen inches long and about that big around.

Steve Flinders: But it's not related to a change towards a regulation like Kolob is.

Sheldon Schmit: No, no, no, no. I'm just rebutting his statement that we have Minersville. We have it on the books but we've lost it.

Steve Flinders: Sure.

Unknown: Thank you.

Steve Dalton: What is required for a Blue Ribbon Fishery? That's my question. I'm directing it to whoever can answer.

Steve Flinders: Roger probably could.

Roger Wilson: Well we're kind of talking about two different things. Blue Ribbon Fisheries, one of the aspects of their appointment as a Blue Ribbon Fishery is substantial capability to produce a fishery, it's also waters that can sustain pressure, it's waters that may be suitable for special regs. There is a formal list of Blue Ribbon waters that's, I don't think I have them on my fingertips in the Southern Region. But it's a formal designation by the Blue Ribbon Committee. Now there are other waters that we have special regs on that aren't necessarily Blue Ribbon so we're kind of talking about two different things here. Sure, Paul.

Paul Briggs: You gentleman talked earlier about some trigger points that would institute a revision or a review prior to the three years we were talking about in the plan, can you tell us what those are?

Richard Hepworth: Yeah, right now we listed four triggers in this management plan. The first one deals with the golden shiner population. If the population of those shiners exceed a certain point then it puts some triggers in place, such as possibly changing the type of fish that are in there, maybe adding additional like tiger trout that are a better predator. Another one is if our gill net catch rates drop below a certain level; it indicates we either need to maybe stock a few more fish or the regulations need to be changed. If angler catch rates decline below a certain level; that also dictates some of these triggers. And if angler harvest rates drop below a certain point. So those are the four main triggers in there. Does that answer your question?

Steve Flinders: Comments Rex?

Rex Stanworth: I guess there's a couple of alternatives here that we could throw out, whether they're acceptable or not I have no idea. But a couple of ideas would be: one, we could shorten a little bit the

time, instead of saying on the third Saturday in May, you could say as of June 1st and through August 31st you could fish with bait if you so desire. You've shortened that down by a short time and quite honestly based on Southern Utah that's about when kids are out of school and mom and dad can make their way up towards the hill. Second thing is that I guess you hate the thoughts of losing an opportunity with such a great water, but I guess one of the thoughts is that we've talked about the importance of the kids fishing, making it just a kids fishery with bait. You know? Fifteen, sixteen or fourteen, wherever you want to have it, can fish with bait during that period of time. Are those anything that was discussed by the group? Is that even anything that's plausible?

Richard Hepworth: Yeah, the first one with the dates like you were talking about; there's some issues with the legal wording and these laws that have to do with the dates we started and ended on. Instead of using an actual day, like May 1st, June 1st, we needed to use like a Saturday. The other issue with youth that was discussed quite a bit, there was some concerns and issues with that one being that if you pick an age such as fourteen, law enforcement goes up to a child and asks that child to prove how old he is, is pretty difficult. Most fourteen, fifteen year-olds don't have any form of identification that states their age. And there are some issues with legality issues with age discrimination doing an age specific rule like that. So they were discussed, to answer your question.

Steve Flinders: Anybody want to venture a motion on just Kolob itself? Or fishing in general? Clair's got a comment.

Clair Woodbury: I just wanted to wait until everybody had a chance ask questions and give their opinions. I was asked by this board last fall to, by this committee to be on this Kolob Advisory Committee. And went in there with a little trepidation. And we had some very diverse groups of conservationist, fishing groups, mayor, landowners, and Corey Cram from the Washington County Water Conservancy who actually owns the waters; and thought we might see some fireworks. But I was very impressed with what quality of men that was there. Very willing to listen, to discuss the different views. I listened all winter long and was amazed at some of the thoughts and the ideas that came out. And I do want to complement Richard Hepworth for doing a fantastic job of managing those meetings and coming each time prepared to show which ideas we had and to put them actually in a proposal form. And I think that we came up with a great proposal. Not going to satisfy everyone one hundred percent. But still answers all of the main issues. We're still, number one going to protect that water and the fish in it, and the sizes though this slot limit has been proven at Panguitch and at Strawberry that this works. And in fact I think that Richard was mentioning a national award received for the management of Strawberry and the success that we've had there. And for those that haven't been to Kolob, it's a beautiful high mountain, large lake for Washington County. The only pristine high mountain lake down there; and as Mr. Cox was mentioning almost unused anymore. I grew up fishing that lake. I remember the great crowds, the cycles of chubs back to fish, and Rotenone. And when it went to the artificials only I thought man this is a great idea, this will work. But as it evolved I could see there was just no use anymore. I'm an artificial fisherman. I get in my float tube and I love to go out. But even I've quit fishing that lake. My friends don't go with me because they don't fish like I do. And I thought this was just a great compromise on letting everyone use this great facility and still protect the fish. With that said I would like to make the motion that we accept the Division's proposal on R657-13 and R657-58 as presented to us.

Sam Carpenter: Second.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Sam. All in favor? Okay, and those against? Unanimous.

Clair Woodbury made the motion to accept R657-13 and R657-58 as presented. Sam Carpenter seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Let's take a 10 minute break and we'll jump into those wildlife management area plans.

(Dell LeFevre left during break)

Steve Flinders: We're missing Doug but let's get started with agenda item number 5, Bicknell Bottoms WMA. You must be Rhett. I think that mic's off.

Wildlife Management Area Habitat Management Plan Bicknell Bottoms WMA (action)
-Rhett Boswell, Habitat Biologist 2:16:16 to 2:19:00 of 2:44:30

(See attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Any questions from the RAC on Bicknell Bottoms? Let's take these individually and just move through them one by one. I don't know, I'm not seeing a great deal of publics here. But I don't have any comment cards. Anybody have any questions?

Questions from the RAC:

Mack Morrell: Yeah I do.

Steve Flinders: Great. Mack.

Mack Morrell: Since I'm from Bicknell I'm pretty familiar with Bicknell bottoms. To me as a fishery that has went down hill since I was a kid because it's been over run with cattails and the water's backing up and all it is is a swamp. In fact the nitrogen load that the DK and catfish and grasses, the big tall grasses and all, going down the Fremont is a problem, Fremont River. You know so we're concerned about that because I'm a member of the Fremont Conservation, Water Conservancy group; and that's a problem. So how do you plan on addressing that?

Rhett Boswell: We had a fisheries or our area biologist here, anything you can help us with there Lynn? Our wetland manager might be able to address that.

Lynn Zubeck: Hello, my name's Lynn Zubeck. I do manage Bicknell Bottoms. I guess your question comes from the fact that during the flood years there was quite a channel cut through Bicknell Bottoms. And that over time that has filled back in with emergent vegetation and that is something that we're striving to protect and we want to keep there; the biggest reason is for nesting waterfowl. So I understand the way you see it that maybe you're worried. . . . Are you most worried about what that contributes to the water?

Mack Morrell: That's correct. The nitrogen load going down stream is a problem for people down stream.

Lynn Zubeck: Well a nitrogen load, you know, the cattails and the wetland absorb nitrogen very quickly. And so your nitrogen that's put into that water through fertilizers, manure, that type of thing is absorbed very quickly through a wetland. And so my view is that place has got to be helping that water.

Mack Morrell: Well from the information that we have it's not. And you're talking about the flood years, but as a twelve year old kid I could ride my horse down there and I could fish way down stream and right now you can't do that, because all that is is spread out.

Lynn Zubeck: Yes, yes sir it's . . .

Mack Morrell: There's no, there's no streambed in there whatsoever anymore.

Lynn Zubeck: Well I don't know what it used to be. But I can tell you that we have done some electro fishing in there and there's some tremendous fish.

Mack Morrell: Upstream yeah. But you know where the main road, one of the main roads to it is access is straight south of Bicknell.

Lynn Zubeck: Okay.

Mack Morrell: Okay. And you can only drive, right now so far down it and you can't drive the last quarter mile because there's no road.

Lynn Zubeck: Yes Sir.

Mack Morrell: Because I own property right there.

Lynn Zubeck: Yeah. Most of our fishing access comes below the Eagan Fish Hatchery, and you know down through there. And we have done some bank improvements. We put some nice stiles up there to try to get the fish some protection from the sun. And you know really by doing what we're doing there we're just trying to help that whole system out. And letting the vegetation grow up along the banks is important for that stream in keeping it cool and allowing those fish some protection. The way we've done that is to eliminate the grazing as best we can. And it's an ongoing problem there. We keep working on it every year. So, you know we're managing it for wildlife. Since I've been managing Bicknell it's come many miles as far as looking at it from a wildlife perspective; from being bare dirt to crops. It was overgrazed, and we've all see that, what that does to it.

Mack Morrell: I doubt there being much overgrazing. But I think that the management is destroying grazing on private land from the swamp that's coming upstream.

Lynn Zubeck: Um, I don't know how to answer that.

Mack Morrell: In fact you can't even maintain a fence down there. stream.

Lynn Zubeck: Well it's a lot of work, it really is. And you know if it weren't for Jim Lamb keeping a

diligent effort on it it would be very hard. And we work on that fence every year, every year. We've done a lot of good there.

Mack Morrell: I've got some private landowners down there that says there's been no work on the fence. In fact the only thing they have to do, they try to put up electric fence and that's it.

Lynn Zubeck: There's been . . . Yeah, I can guarantee you we've done a lot of work on that fence.

Mack Morrell: Uh, which part of Bicknell Bottoms? The one directly, the road coming south out of Bicknell down there or on the other side of the Eagan Hatchery?

Lynn Zubeck: We did a lot of work north, or west of the Eagan Hatchery. And we've done it down through the entire bottoms to the uh, north side, and we'll keep at it. You know we only have . . .

Mack Morrell: Well I haven't seen any. So anyway . . .

Lynn Zubeck: Okay.

Rex Stanworth: I was just going to mention Mack, Lynn lives over in Delta and he's done a tremendous job with the Clear Lake Wildlife Refuge and I would say to you that find out when Lynn's coming your direction and take a few minutes and load up with him and let him give you a tour and let him show you what they've done. Because he's interested in getting your comments, guarantee ya. And if you've got a question or concern there's the man that will fix it.

Mack Morrell: Yeah, I'd like to know when he's coming down and I can get some of the landowners together and we'll go down and look at it.

Rex Stanworth: Well he's the man. He'll do you a great job of listening to your concerns.

Mack Morrell: There's no questions of waterfowl down there, in fact the problem we have is there's a lot of people coming down on hunting season for ducks and geese and have no respect for private property. (Unintelligible) or nothing.

Lynn Zubeck: Yeah, I completely understand.

Mack Morrell: In fact it's posted, and part of it's posted and it's completely ignored.

Lynn Zubeck: Well you know that's a law enforcement issue and something that when you have a problem you need to get a hold of us and let us try. We're just trying to do the best we can with it. And it is a wonderful place.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Mack, Lynn.

Questions from the Public:

None.

Comments from the public:

None.

RAC discussion and vote:

Steve Flinders: Looking for a motion on this management plan guys.

Rex Stanworth: I make the motion.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Rex. Seconded by Cordell. All in favor? Any against? One against.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept the Bicknell Bottoms Habitat Management Plan as presented. Cordell Pearson seconded. Motion passed 7 in favor, 1 opposed. Mack Morrell opposed.

Steve Flinders: Also let the records show that we've lost Dell LeFevre for the evening. All right Rhett, next one.

**Wildlife Management Area Habitat Management Plan Kingston Canyon WMA (action)
-Rhett Boswell, Habitat Biologist 2:27:15 to 2:28:30 of 2:44:30**

(See attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Any questions from the RAC? Sure, Clair.

Questions from the RAC:

Clair Woodbury: In both of these proposals I see you're proposing a lot of work. Who's doing this work? Is it just you? Is there a couple of ya?

Rhett Boswell: No, it's the whole Division does work on WMAs, I mean we, dedicated hunters, and dedicated sportsman. We have our aquatic section does a lot of this work. Our Blue Ribbon Fisheries biologist has done a lot of the structures in this actual WMA.

Clair Woodbury: All right, thanks.

Rex Stanworth: I'd just comment that I've been through that several times and that is a beautiful area. I mean it's something that sportsman, the Division; the state of Utah ought to be tickled with. It's just an absolutely gorgeous little spot.

Questions from the public:

None.

Comments from the public:

None.

RAC discussion and vote:

Rex Stanworth: I'll make a motion to accept the Kingston Canyon WMA plan.

Steve Flinders: Second? Cordell, again. All in favor? And against? Unanimous.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept the Kingston Canyon Habitat Management plan as presented, Cordell Pearson seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Monroe.

**Wildlife Management Area Habitat Management Plan Monroe WMA (action)
-Rhett Boswell, Habitat Biologist 2:29:49 to 2:31:09 of 2:44:30**

(See attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: I have a question. What's the main, I assume it's a small wetland?

Rhett Boswell: Monroe was purchased for big game winter range habitat. Both those parcels fall within the map of the crucial winter range. Yes Sir?

Steve Flinders: They border public land. Go ahead Steve.

Steve Dalton: All of these WMAs, these are all private land holdings that the Division has?

Rhett Boswell: Not all of these but we own these wildlife management areas, the Monroe, yes.

Steve Dalton: And the Bicknell Bottoms as well?

Rhett Boswell: And the Bicknell Bottoms.

Steve Dalton: Thank you.

Rhett Boswell: Your welcome.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions?

Questions from the public:

None.

Comments from the public:

None.

RAC discussion and vote:

Steve Flinders: Ready for discussion and vote?

Rex Stanworth: I'll make a motion to accept the Monroe WMA Management Wildlife Management Plan.

Steve Flinders: Clair seconds that. All in favor? And against? It's unanimous.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept the Monroe Habitat Management Plan as presented. Clair Woodbury seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Panguitch Creek, or creek here in Panguitch.

**Wildlife Management Area Habitat Management Plan Panguitch Creek WMA (action)
-Rhett Boswell, Habitat Biologist 2:32:29 to 2:34:37 of 2:44:30**

(See attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Steve.

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Dalton: Is this entire WMA, is this all private land Division owned or do you have BLM or what?

Rhett Boswell: This is all, this plan relates to the Division property, yes.

Steve Dalton: So you're not managing any other surrounding property is not included in this WMA, only the private the Division owns.

Rhett Boswell: Right. But we work closely with federal agencies next to us in habitat projects in the area.

Steve Dalton: Okay, but no private land holdings surrounding it?

Rhett Boswell: There is a private land. I can show you on the map actually. That parcel there with the red road and Panguitch Creek running just kind of north of that main square, that's a piece of private there, yeah.

Steve Dalton: Okay so the management decisions that we make here are affecting these private landowners as well or not?

Rhett Boswell: This plan is specific for our property.

Steve Dalton: Just for the Division property.

Rhett Boswell: Right.

Steve Dalton: Okay.

Paul Briggs: Rhett, can I add to that a little bit from the BLM perspective?

Rhett Boswell: Sure.

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Paul.

Paul Briggs: We've been working with Forest Service, the BLM and a lot of the private landowners in there in that valley for years. And this piece of property that the Division controls right there on the river is the connection point, if you will, for some areas where we've got project work, vegetation treatments for big game winter range, sage grouse habitat enhancement, those type of things and hazardous fuel reduction that go all the way from Three and Five Mile Creeks on the Forest Service land and across through this property into that chaining you saw on Rhett's slide, back all the way around South Canyon back out to Highway 98 on BLM and into Sage Hen Hollow. So it's a huge piece of land that we've got a lot invested in out there. And this piece of property is the corner stone of that if you will. Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions?

Clair Woodbury: Now will this piece also be fenced around there or is that just?

Rhett Boswell: This piece has been fenced completely.

Clair Woodbury: This has been fenced also, okay.

Rhett Boswell: Yes.

Clair Woodbury: And that private landowner is he working with us on this, part of it, or just giving us a go-ahead type deal?

Rhett Boswell: We, the private landowner we've talked with he has some, he grazes cattle that trail up through the bottom. And we've spoke with him to say where the best places to put gates in the bottom are, to let the cattle trail through.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions?

Questions from the public:

None.

Comments from the public:

None.

RAC discussion and vote:

Steve Flinders: Discussion and vote. Go ahead Clair.

Clair Woodbury: What's the number of this one?

Steve Flinders: Panguitch Creek, number eight.

Clair Woodbury: I make the motion we accept the Panguitch Creek Management Plan as presented by Rhett.

Layne Torgerson: I'll second.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Layne. All in favor? Any against? It looks unanimous.

Clair Woodbury made the motion to accept the Panguitch Creek Habitat Management Plan as presented. Layne Torgerson seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Redmond.

**Wildlife Management Area Habitat Management Plan Redmond WMA (action)
-Rhett Boswell, Habitat Biologist 2:38:04 to 2:39 of 2:44:30**

(See attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Any questions on Redmond? Go ahead Layne.

Questions from the RAC:

Layne Torgerson: I drive by Redmond every day on my way to work. I just want for the RAC to know that this is an outstanding wildlife management area. I mean there's, they've done a really good job. I just have one question, there's a bunch of gated pipe in that one field, do you irrigate that? I mean does the Division irrigate some of that ground?

Rhett Boswell: We have in the past, if I remember right. We haven't?

Lynn Zubeck: We don't have the water to irrigate.

Rhett Boswell: That must be a neighboring parcel huh?

Layne Torgerson: No there's some gated pipe in that one section right by the road. I was just wondering if we . . . I know that there was, I don't remember, some kind of a grain planted there a few years ago; but it's been a while.

Lynn Zubeck: Once again Lynn Zubeck. We try to do a bit of irrigation there but the only water we have available is the effluent from the fields above it now. When the property was purchased we did not

maintain that water right to put water through all that irrigated pipe; so basically that hay field is just there from when it was established before and we're just trying to do what we can with it.

Rex Stanworth: Are you stockpiling that pipe (unintelligible)?

Lynn Zubeck: Yes that's correct.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Rex, you caught him.

Questions from the Public:

None.

Comments from the public:

None.

RAC discussion and vote:

Steve Flinders: Discussion and vote, Redmond. Layne's making one.

Layne Torgerson: I move we accept the Redmond Wildlife Management Area Plan.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Layne, seconded by Rex. All in favor? It looks unanimous.

Layne Torgerson made motion to accept the Redmond Habitat Management Plan as presented. Rex Stanworth seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Last one, Topaz.

**Wildlife Management Area Habitat Management Plan Topaz Slough WMA (action)
-Rhett Boswell, Habitat Biologist 2:41:37 to 2:42:59 of 2:44:30**

(See attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Clair.

Questions from the RAC:

Clair Woodbury: A couple of these management plans you've mentioned non-lethal public access. Does that mean you discourage hunters in there? Do you want to use it for a nursery or?

Rhett Boswell: Non-lethal?

Clair Woodbury: Non-harmful, maybe that was the word.

Rhett Boswell: It's non-motorized public access.

Clair Woodbury: Okay.

Steve Flinders: Things that don't harm nesting birds.

Clair Woodbury: I'll be quite.

Steve Flinders: No, it's a sly term. Any other questions?

Questions from the Public:

None.

Comments from the public:

None.

RAC discussion and vote:

Rex Stanworth: I'll make a motion to approve the Topaz Slough WMA Plan.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Rex, seconded by Steve Dalton. All in favor? It looks unanimous.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept the Topaz Slough WMA Management Plan as presented. Steve Dalton seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Rhett.

Rhett Boswell: Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Mission accomplished.

Other Business (contingent)

-Steve Flinders, Chairman

Steve Flinders: I don't have any other business for tonight. Anybody else? 5:00, November 3rd, Richfield High School. 5:00 p.m. because it's a bucks and bulls and you know how those meetings can go. Looking for a motion to adjourn. Steve Dalton, seconded by Mack. Thanks everybody. All in favor? It is unanimous.

Steve Dalton made the motion to adjourn. Mack Morrell seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 pm.