

Central Region Advisory Council
Central Region Conference Center
1115 N. Main St, Springville
February 16, 2010 ☞ 6:30 p.m.

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda

MOTION: To approve the agenda as written
Passed unanimously

Approval of the December 15 2009 minutes

MOTION: To approve the minutes as transcribed
Passed unanimously

CIP – R657-53 Rule Amendment – Venomous Snakes

MOTION: To accept the rule for the Great Basin rattlesnake but leave the midget faded on the prohibited list
Passed unanimously

Drawing Application R657-62, Rule Amendment

MOTION: To accept the rule as presented
Passed unanimously
MOTION: To add nieces and nephews to the definition of immediate family in this and other applicable rules
Passed unanimously

Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License R657-17, Rule Amendment

MOTION: To accept the rule as presented
Passed unanimously

CWMU for Small Game and Waterfowl R657-21, 5 yr. Review

MOTION: To accept the rule as presented
Passed unanimously

Central Region Advisory Council
Central Region Conference Center
1115 N. Main St, Springville
February 16, 2010 ⌚ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Micki Bailey, BLM
Matt Clark, Sportsmen
Larry Fitzgerald, Agriculture
Byron Gunderson, At Large
Richard Hansen, At Large
Gary Nielson, Sportsmen, Vice Chair
Fred Oswald, Non-consumptive, Chair
Jay Price, Elected
Duane Smith, Non-consumptive

Members Absent

John Bair, Sportsmen
George Holmes, Agriculture
Allan Stevens, At Large
Larry Velarde, Forest Service

Others Present

Jake Albright
Rick Woodard

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

VOTING

Motion was made by Matt Clark to accept the agenda as written

Seconded by Byron Gunderson

Motion passed unanimously

2) **Approval of the December 15, 2009 summary (Action)**

VOTING

Motion was made by Gary Nielson to accept the summary notes as transcribed

Seconded by Richard Hansen

Motion passed unanimously

3) **Wildlife Board Meeting Update**

- **Fred Oswald, RAC Chair**

4) **Regional Update (Information)**

- **John Fairchild, Central Regional Supervisor**

Wildlife

- Moving turkeys from Hobble Creek where about 300 have taken up residence in someone's backyard. Plan to move 100 to the Stansbury Mtns.
- Big game recommendations have been submitted to the Salt Lake Office. Bucks, Bulls, OIAL permit numbers will be considered at the March 23rd RAC meeting and go before the Wildlife Board March 31 in the State Capitol Bldg.

Habitat

- Earlier this month, aerial seeded sagebrush and kochia on 3500 acres of deer winter range on the Ensign Ranch that was involved in the Big Pole Fire on the Stansbury Mtns.

Aquatics

- Utah Lake carp control covered by KSL in a news broadcast that aired Feb. 3rd. Check out the story online, pretty fascinating how they can seine under the ice.

Conservation Outreach

- Western Hunting and Conservation Expo this past weekend
- Bald Eagle Day earlier this month

Law Enforcement

- Fur sale in Nephi was slower than normal

5) CIP – R657-53 Rule Amendment – Venomous Snakes (Action)

- **Krissy Wilson, Native Aquatic Species Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Matt Clark – Is there a cost for a COR?

Krissy Wilson – There is a 100 dollar inspection fee and a 10 dollar application fee and the COR is 75 dollars.

Matt Clark – If local municipalities don't allow for these things it doesn't trump their laws and regulations?

Krissy Wilson – Right, for example I live in Sandy city and I looked up their rule. They have an ordinance that says you may not have a dangerous animal in your possession and they consider a venomous reptile a dangerous animal. So even if you were to try to get a permit from the Division you would not be issued one because you could not get approval from the city.

Richard Hansen – How often would the facilities be inspected?

Krissy Wilson – The way it reads right now it would be inspected prior to them receiving their animals but that is a good recommendation.

Duane Smith – I know when we had those captive at the museum our facilities were subject to an inspection anytime with or without us knowing. That is a real benefit to the protection of the animal. I think you need to have a tighter inspection rule.

Krissy Wilson – In the rule we don't have built in that we would do an annual inspection but the Division does have the ability to inspect at anytime without reason for all CORs.

Fred Oswald – Could you give us an idea about how many people do have these permits?

Krissy Wilson – Right now there are only three entities that are holding rattlesnakes. The zoo has an educational permit. The veteran's hospital has a research permit. James Dix with Reptile Rescue has an educational COR. He has venomous reptiles in his possession that he takes around for educational purposes. He trains animal control officers on how to respond when they have a venomous reptile call or other snakes.

Questions from the Public

Dave Jensen – I am from Salt Lake City. I would like to know, without an annual inspection, how you would enforce compliance of the total number of animals someone might have in their possession so they don't abuse the privilege.

Krissy Wilson – They have to provide an annual report of their activities and purchases. If they get a propagation COR they have to provide records to us. As far as annually going to check if they are doing what they are reporting that is not in this rule.

Dave Jensen – How was the total number of animals allowed determined? It seems excessive.

Krissy Wilson – The Division has been getting a lot of pressure to simplify our rules to make things consistent and easier for the public. The number currently allowed of a non-controlled species is nine. It is not a magic number.

James Dix – If people are selling snakes they usually need to have a license from the city and the animal control comes out and does an inspection. They would check to see if your amounts are in check. If you are a snake breeder the city comes out before a new license is issued. Like Krissy said I do training classes with Utah Animal Control Officers Association and I train officers how to handle venomous and remove them. I teach on drug raid seizures where drug dealers have these snakes as well as highway patrol. All the cities from Provo to Logan have said they are not going to give any permits out for people to possess these animals. They are concerned about escapees in apartments and condos and the snakes getting down in heater vents and walls and along pipes. I am a plumber from LA and have removed hundreds of snakes from drains and sewers and out of walls, even in Utah. There are a lot of things that concern me. I don't want to shoot down this rule but I am concerned about bites, escapees, people getting drunk and pulling them out at parties to show them off and people getting bit.

Comments from the Public

Collette Sutherland – I have read through the rule and it appears that there has been a very thorough job done to make sure that people who want to do this can do it safely in areas where it is permitted and where it is allowed. You can't save people from their own stupidity. If they are going to play with them drunk they are going to drive drunk too. I support this rule although I would encourage an annual or anytime inspection. I think that is appropriate. Everyone is not going to run out and do this. I think it has been very well thought out and very good safety protocols have been put in there. There are a lot of requirements for people to do this. You have to meet criteria and show responsibility.

James Dix – I am not against this but we need to make sure people are experienced. I am proof that you can do this. I live in a residential area and house venomous there and wild and dangerous animals. I have snakes the size of a pencil to 21 feet and 225 pounds and they eat 80 pounds of rabbit a month. No escapees and no violations from the city. This can be done safely in a secure room. The amounts concern me. I think nine of each species is extreme. Another thing that concerns me too is if you are going to breed them you need to make sure you can sell them. I don't know if the wildlife division knows that currently the going price for a midget faded rattlesnake is 2,500 dollars in the United States. You can't get them anywhere except out of Arizona. I have a permit for one but I haven't got one because I don't want to pay 2,500 dollars to buy one. We do need one for training. This snake is a valuable snake. If you sell it overseas you could probably get 5,000 dollars for it. This is something you might want to consider. The Great Basin price is 65 dollars. Why was the midget faded selected to be able to possess? These are some of the things I am concerned about. People that work with me who remove snakes are concerned about snakes getting loose. Animal control officers are also concerned about this. When they do pick them up what are they going to do with them? Where can they keep them? Currently I am the only person that is able to set up and hold snakes in the state of Utah. If people can't sell them I don't want to see people breeding and then having to destroy them. I do this to save animals and I don't want to see them destroyed. I love animals and I don't want to see someone benefiting from selling these snakes for 5,000 dollars and the Division gets 100 dollars to put toward protecting animals. If they are getting five grand then you could charge ten grand for the permit. I think you need to look into the value of the midget faded snake and consider that.

Dave Jensen – I want to echo what James has said. I have been an armature level herpiculturist for 40 years. In that time I have helped educate people about snakes and the critical role they play in the environment. I served for several years as the states reptile merit badge counselor and I have written informational articles about reptiles in various media for the benefit of the public. I currently possess a COR from the DWR to remove and relocate nuisance rattlers. I have two primary concerns. Number one, how was the determination made that the midget faded

rattlesnake is so numerous as to encourage their collection in quantities that could severely impact their population numbers? I have always been under the impression that midget faded are reclusive and limited in their ranges and populations and that they are not a commonly seen Utah snake. I think most enthusiast would agree. The proposal amounts to a value being placed on midget faded that could severely impact population numbers across their range. This is not an animal that is as numerous or as prolific as the Great Basin rattler and I am confused as are others by this proposal. As proof that the midget faded are considered scarce, they are valued to collectors both locally and foreign. It is valued much higher than that of a Great Basin rattler. Encouraging captive breeding of these snakes will result in the sale and shipment of these animals to out of state and overseas buyers resulting in obscene profits for those who breed them. The unintended consequence for creating a demand for midget faded will be the increase in poaching that will occur when unscrupulous individuals discover the value of these animals and start capturing wild specimens for sale further reducing their numbers in the wild. This proposal applies to Utah's least populous and most seldom seen rattler. Why not include Utah's other five rattlesnake species as well? Why include the midget faded when its numbers can't justify collection. If the DWR is encouraging captive propagation of midget faded by certified individuals then a provision should be made for a percentage of captive born offspring to be released into the wild in an effort to sustain native populations. In fact it should be a requirement. This makes a lot more sense than euthanizing excess animals as is the case now. Charging a much higher price for the propagation of midget faded to legal profiteers would make good economic sense. After all the state may as well get their cut of what is sure to become a lucrative business venture for many breeders. If a junior midget faded can fetch 2,000 dollars or more on the foreign market why would the state only charge a 100 dollar certificate fee to a breeder. Before you know it everyone and his grandmother will be breeding and selling midget faded while the DWR remains underfunded. Thank you for listening.

RAC Discussion

Krissy Wilson – Let me start with how we selected midget faded. The native aquatic biologists got together when we were looking at this rule. We have seven venomous snakes in Utah. Four of them occur in Washington county; the Hopi, the speckled, the Mojave and the sidewinder. Their distribution is so limited in just Washington County that we discounted them. The other three species we have are the Great Basin, the midget faded and the green prairie rattlesnake. The prairie rattlesnake is only found in southeastern Utah. It is probably more abundant but it does have a more restricted range. When we came up with the midget faded it was our understanding at the time that conservation officers were seeing it and it was still fairly wide distributed in its narrow range. The midget faded is only found in eastern Utah, western Colorado and southwestern Wyoming. That is the only place that it is found. At the time we made the recommendation we believed that it could withstand harvest. It may be that we made a mistake in that recommendation. At the time we made the recommendation that was the data we had to work with. It has only come to our attention since we have begun this process that the demand for this species would significantly increase in people were allowed to collect it and propagate it. Currently in the rule we indicated that we would allow 25 under propagation. Let me walk you through the process. If someone meets all the criteria they get a COR in their hands then they can go out and collect one from the wild. They bring that back and they have to report it to us then they can get one from another source if that was possible. Then that goes from collection to possession. Now if they want to propagate they have to apply for a propagation COR. We have two types of propagation CORs. One for personal use and trade but not make any money. But if they want to sell, barter or trade that in anyway benefits them they have to apply for a commercial COR. We have discussed raising the fee to 1,000 dollars but that process has to go through I think the legislature so we were not in a position at that time so we left it open in the rule that whatever the applicable fee is would apply and we would go get that changed as soon as we could.

Byron Gunderson – How is the three years of experience documented?

Krissy Wilson – In Utah there are only three ways they could have experience with venomous reptiles; either at the zoo, with James or at the veterans' hospital. We talked a lot about that because we felt very strongly that they should demonstrate that. How can they legally do that in Utah when you can't have them? We haven't come up with the process of how we would validate experience but I was not too concerned about that. I think we could get testimony from neighbors or friends. I am sure they have records. Some of these guys have CORs for propagating another species.

Randy Long – I am against this proposal for several reasons. All snakes are good climbers and they can get through small holes and escape. I own rental apartments and these animals cause problems.

RAC Discussion

Duane Smith – James, what is the underground trade in these animals? If someone has these snakes how do we know where they come from?

James Dix – We know people are poaching them. People come to Utah to get a midget faded if they want one and drive it across the border. We have to rely on people reporting others or actually getting caught importing them. This goes on all the time. You could take a snake from Utah and apply for a possession COR and take it to Arizona and get a vet certificate and bring it back to Utah legally. There are a lot things people can do if they want to. We are concerned about the amount of money people can make off these snakes. I do love our wildlife here and I put in a lot of time teaching.

Duane Smith – It probably doesn't matter which category they are in then from a law enforcement standpoint. It is the same nightmare no matter what.

Krissy Wilson – I think there will be people out there who don't want to follow the safety protocol that we are requiring because it is pretty strict. We are doing that to reduce the threat to public safety. There are going to be folks who break the law anyway.

Fred Oswald – Before we vote on this I would like to ask both James and Krissy how they would feel about keeping the midget faded on the prohibited list?

Krissy Wilson – I think we would be willing to consider that.

James Dix – I would feel fine with that. Some people could qualify for a permit if they need it for educational purposes but just to use it for something to gain money on I don't agree with.

Micki Bailey – What is the distribution on the midget faded again?

Krissy Wilson – Southeastern Utah, western Colorado and southwestern Wyoming.

Micki Bailey – What is the current possession rules in those other states?

Krissy Wilson – They do not allow collection. They are on their sensitive species lists. I am not trying to sound like a cop out but we were not aware of that. We had done a survey of all the states in the United States of who allows possession of venomous reptiles. The information we got back was that pretty much all of the states except of a few, Utah being one, did not allow people to hold venomous reptiles. We moved forward with looking at what species we could allow in possession. It has come to our attention since then that those two states do not allow collection of midget faded.

VOTING

Motion was made by Duane Smith to accept the rule for the Great Basin rattlesnake but leave the midget faded on the prohibited list

Seconded by Byron Gunderson

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

6) **Drawing Application R657-62, Rule Amendment (Action)**
- **Bryan Christensen, Wildlife Licensing Specialist**

Questions from the RAC

Gary Nielson – What was the reasoning for forfeiting your bonus points if you miss a couple of years putting in?

Bryan Christensen – That is a good question. It came before the board last year. They thought it would be a positive thing to keep those who are interested in continuing applying for those hunts. To clarify, we are not actually suggesting any changes to that proposal they made then and that action that they passed. We just want to make sure it is in rule.

Gary Nielson – As I recall when this came up at the RAC last year they shot it down. I was not aware that it passed.

Bryan Christensen – That did pass and has dates for starting and when it is in effect.

Larry Fitzgerald – Is there a reason why the definition of immediate family does not include nieces and nephews?

Bryan Christensen – Immediate family is a term that is used throughout code and throughout rule and is consistent with other rules we have in place.

Larry Fitzgerald – Could nieces and nephews be included in that?

Bryan Christensen – I believe it would take board action to make changes like that. We don't have any proposals to make that change now.

Larry Fitzgerald – This applies to landowner tags and depredation tags and I think it should include nieces and nephews.

Jay Price – Just to clarify, if you have points for deer and then you put in for elk for five years would you lose your points for deer?

Bryan Christensen – As long as you apply for a limited entry or a once-in-a-lifetime species you would retain points all your bonus points.

VOTING

Motion was made by Richard Hansen to accept the rule as presented

Seconded by Matt Clark

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

Motion was made by Larry Fitzgerald to add nieces and nephews to the definition of immediate family in this and other applicable rules

Seconded by Jay Price

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

7) **Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License R657-17, Rule Amendment (Action)**
- **Bryan Christensen, Wildlife Licensing Specialist**

Questions from the RAC

Gary Nielson – Will lifetime licenses ever be offered again?

Bryan Gunderson – There seems to be discussion annually but I don't know if it is going to happen. At this point it is not being proposed.

Matt Clark – How many lifetime license holders are there?

Bryan Christensen – Approximately 4,500. Not all of them hunt, some just fish.

VOTING

**Motion was made by Gary Nielson to accept the rule as presented
Seconded by Duane Smith
In Favor: All
Motion passed unanimously**

- 8) CWMU for Small Game and Waterfowl R657-21, 5yr. Review
- Bryan Christensen, Wildlife Licensing Specialist**

**Motion was made by Jay Price to approve rule as proposed
Seconded by Matt Clark
In Favor: All
Motion passed unanimously**

**Meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.
30 in attendance
Next board meeting March 4, 2010 at the DNR building, Salt Lake City
Next RAC meeting March 23, 2010 at Springville Jr. High School**

Northern Regional Advisory Council

Feb 17, 2010

6:00 P.M.

Place: Weber State University, Student Union Bldg.

RAC Present

Robert Bynes –At Large
John Cavitt- Noncon.
Paul Cowley-Forest Service
Joel Ferry- Agric
James Gaskill- At Large
Michael Gates- BLM
Russ Lawrence- At Large
Ann Neville- Noncon.
Bret Selman- Agric
Brad Slater- Elected –Chair
Craig Van Tassell- Sportsman
John Wall- At Large

DWR Present

Jodie Anderson
Ron Hodson
Krissy Wilson
Randy Wood
Paul Thompson
Sam McKay
Bryan Christensen
Justina Parsons-Bernstein
Walt Donaldson

Wildlife Board

Ernie Perkins
Bill Fenimore

RAC Excused Absence

Shawn Groll- At Large
Jon Leonard-Sportsman

RAC Absent

Meeting Begins: 6:06 p.m.

Number of Pages: 12

Introduction: Brad Slater-Chair

Agenda:

Review of Dec 16, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Review of Agenda

Wildlife Board Meeting Update

Regional Update

CIP - R657-53 Amendment-Venomous Snakes

Drawing Application R657-62-Rule Amendment

Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License R657-17, Rule Amendment

CWMU for Small Game and Waterfowl R657-21 5-yr Review

Aquatic Sensitive Species Program

Farmington Bay Nature Center Overview

Other Business

Item 1. Review and Acceptance of Dec 16, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Motion: Neville- Accept the minutes as presented.

Second: Gaskill

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 2. Review and Acceptance of Agenda

Motion: Cowley- Accept as published.

Second: Van Tassell

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 3. Wildlife Board Update

Robert Byrnes- Represented the RAC at the last board meeting. Received email on how the Wildlife Board is going to respond to our recommendations if they vote differently. Are there any questions on how the Wildlife Board is going to respond on that? Are you satisfied?

Gaskill- Yes. I appreciate the work of the RAC and Wildlife Board.

Item 4. Regional Update

Ron Hodson, Regional Supervisor

Personnel changes in the region. Masako Wright is our new Sensitive Species Biologist. Davis County Conservation Officer Brandon Baron.

Item 5. CIP - R657-53 Amendment-Venomous Snakes

Krissy Wilson, Native Aquatic Species Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

James Dicks- Reptile Rescue Services- Where are you getting your numbers to base this on?

Wilson- Our initial recommendation was two but have been required to take a look at our regulations and simplify. Currently, you are allowed to have nine non-controlled species. We wanted to follow the same protocol.

Dicks- What about the 25?

Wilson- If you have snakes that you are breeding in your possession and you have 2 that are successful, there is a good chance that you would hit that 25. We wanted to put it at a number to be reasonable with what they would probably actually be able to produce but we also want the applicant to be able to sell them that year. They cannot carry them over. We want them to be responsible breeders.

Dicks- If they can't sell them and they do have their breeding license for that, are you going to revoke that at the end of a year or two if they don't have people purchasing them? Will the animals be destroyed because they cannot go in the wild?

Wilson- You are right, they will not be able to release those animals to the wild.

Dicks- If they do not have people purchasing these snakes then are they still going to be allowed to keep breeding these?

Wilson- I would think not. That would make them in revocation of their propagation COR.

Dicks- Would the Division monitor that?

Wilson- They are required to submit annual reports. We will be closely monitoring their activities.

RAC Questions

Cavitt- Could you comment on what we know in terms of the status and abundance of both of those species?

Wilson- The Great Basin is distributed along the Great Basin. It is probably the largest species of snake that we have in the state. We believe that it is fairly abundant. When we were reviewing what species to include in this proposal, these were the two species that we recommended based on what we felt we knew at the time. We still feel that the Great Basin populations are viable enough that they can withstand some harvest. When we made the recommendation, we thought the midget faded was more abundant. Since that time, we are not quite sure that it is as abundant as we thought. It has a very narrow distribution and is rarer than the Great Basin.

Lawrence- How many COR's does the division anticipate there being annually?

Wilson- I would say if we had 5 people across the state that would meet these requirements, that would probably be the maximum that we would get. The requirements are very strict and expensive.

Gaskill- I am assuming that the violations of these rules are not a criminal violation. Is that correct?

Wilson- It is not, it is a misdemeanor.

Gaskill- Misdemeanor is criminal.

Wilson- It is a misdemeanor.

Gaskill- So what, a C or B?

Wilson- B.

Gaskill- You anticipate less than 5 of these COR's and that is in addition to the 3 that are now operating outside of the COR regulations.

Wilson- Yes.

Gaskill- So, 8 maybe?

Wilson- Maximum.

Neville- How do you tell if an animal has been collected in the wild or transported from another state?

Wilson- You have to rely on the honesty of the applicant.

Neville- It seems the denial to get a COR is very strong. Is it "one strike and you're out"? Or is there a statute of limitations?

Wilson- Part of the COR process is that the Division has the ability to deny anyone a COR if they are in violation of any of the rules. I assume that it would be a case by case basis.

Neville- But it is not in the rule itself?

Wilson- Right.

Neville- My brother is a veterinarian and I don't know if he would be able to tell the different species of snakes. Do you have accredited veterinarian that knows snakes or could they get it from any veterinarian?

Wilson- For the inspection?

Neville- Right.

Wilson- The inspection is to determine the health of the individual. It is not to determine the species. The veterinarian would have to inspect the animal to make sure it does not have any diseases.

Gates- When they collect them in the wild, where do they usually find these? What is the process for finding a rattlesnake and where are the locations?

Wilson- The folks looking to collect these snakes know where they are. If you don't know where they are, it is really not that difficult. There are so many chat lines out there that has this information available.

Gates- Are the areas generally accessible or are they in remote locations? How do folks usually get into these areas?

Wilson- Along the Wasatch Front, the Great Basin are very easy to find. Especially if you are out at night because snakes tend to go onto the road where it is warmer. Most folks will collect snakes at night when they are on the road. They are found in remote sites as well as in sites that are very easily accessible.

Cowley- Who bears the expense of the inspection?

Wilson- The initial inspection is \$100 dollars and that is paid by the applicant. In the rule it also says that the Division has the authority to conduct inspections at any time with the

presence of the applicant but there are not any scheduled annual visits after that first initial inspection.

Cowley- So there is not any annual review as far as if they have maintained their facility or anything?

Wilson- There is not. They provide an annual report of their activities but that is the extent of it. That would be a good recommendation.

Cowley- Can you let us know the value of these two snakes?

Wilson- The Great Basin is fairly widely distributed. I have heard that Great Basin's are anywhere from \$50-\$65 dollars. They are fairly common and fairly easy to get a hold of. The midget faded is about \$2500 dollars and it is because of their rarity and very narrow distribution.

Cavitt- How does one dispose of a snake once they decide they no longer want to keep that? Are they eligible to sell that to someone else in the state?

Wilson- Once they apply for their COR, their first COR is called a collection COR. Once they have that animal in their possession, then it automatically moves over to a possession COR. Once they have animals and want to start breeding, then they apply for a propagation COR. We currently have two types of propagation COR's. We have a personal use which is for breeding or trading but you are not going to receive any financial benefit from that. If you want a commercial COR, that is where you are going to benefit financially.

Cavitt- Do you know how likely is it that cities have ordinances that would prohibit venomous reptiles? Do you know of any?

Wilson- I do. I was made aware that this was city ordinance so I personally looked up Sandy because I live in Sandy and venomous reptiles are considered a dangerous animal and dangerous animals are prohibited for possession in Sandy. I have also heard that most of the cities along the Wasatch Front have this same type of ordinance in place that they would prohibit venomous reptiles. I don't know that for every single one but that is what I have heard.

Van Tassell- Is there any concern about moving the midget faded out of their normal region into other areas where they are not really indigenous to?

Wilson- When you give someone this COR; they are never to release an animal into the wild. There is no collection allowed in Washington County but that does not mean that someone who lives in Washington County couldn't get this permit and have both these species in their home because you base that on the premise that you never release these into the wild.

Slater- When you say "controlled substances", I am assuming that is the unlawful user of controlled substances?

Wilson- I think you are right.

Slater- Based on comments and emails I have received, there is a perception that there is unfettered licensing that is going to occur if this passes. That there would be hundreds or thousands of people collecting venomous snakes. I think that is a perception that exists in some realms. If I understand correctly, you are depending upon the rule and not having many applicants as well as the city and county ordinances that prohibit dangerous animals.

Wilson- That is correct. There is a very small population that is interested in holding venomous reptiles.

Public Question

Sam Sepula- Wondering why you are allowing collection of the midget faded rattlesnake. If their numbers are uncertain, why risk seriously impacting a species that already may be low in numbers and that we know little about? The fact that they sell for \$2500 dollars may raise the potential for abuse of the system. Why even include this species based on what we have learned tonight?

Wilson- When we started this process, we sat down with all of the native aquatic biologists across the state and evaluated what we thought the species were that could stand some harvest. These were the two species that we came up with. Since that time, we have had a chance to obtain more information so we are not exactly sure that we made the right decision. It has been good for us to go through this process and get public input to pass on. The fact that we made this recommendation does not mean that is the way it has to be. It will be up to the RAC's and the Wildlife Board to determine.

Sam Sepula- How do other states with this species handle this in their area?

Wilson- We compiled all the information of all the states across the United States. Almost all states allow collection of venomous reptiles. Utah is one of the few that does not. We were under the assumption that it was allowed in Colorado and Wyoming. Since that time, I specifically asked my counterparts in those two states what their specific rules are. Colorado and Wyoming do not allow the collection of midget faded.

Public Input

James Dicks- Reptile Rescue Services- If you are breeding these snakes and have a license to and decide to send them overseas and you have someone who has importation/exportation where they can do that, this can be a real benefit to that person who is selling these snakes. They could make a lot of money and the Division is getting \$100 dollars.

Wilson- Yes.

James Dicks- That might need to be reconsidered. I am concerned that you guys are not getting your share to help save the animals.

Dave Jensen- Concerned about harvest of midget faded. Potential for exploitation as a commercial commodity. How does the DWR intend to certify and inspect the premises of everyone who chooses to register themselves as legal keepers of rattlesnakes? My understanding is that it is so prevalent now and that is what prompted this proposal. Is it prevalent?

Wilson- We have been told of quite a few people who have rattlesnakes illegally in their home. We hear of these cases all of the time where people are holding them illegally. We are trying to make it so people cannot say that we do not allow it and if they follow the criteria that we have, then we are giving them the avenue to hold these species. I think these people that are holding them illegally don't care. They are not going to go through the effort to get their home or facility safe. We are not changing the punishment if they get caught. Some folks will break the law no matter what we do but some folks will go through the process.

Jensen- Because a rattlesnake is not a pet in the same way that a harmless snake is a pet, if a pet rattlesnake escapes from a suburban area, the person responsible is probably not going to announce that fact by submitting himself to legal consequences of his actions. This makes it dangerous for his neighbors. Applicants should be considered based on their need to own

rattlesnakes not solely on their desire. Additional criteria should be considered for an applicant. The number is too excessive.

James Dicks- Reptile Rescue Services- Comment regarding a gentleman with a rattlesnake in a seven eleven. This gentleman was drunk and had a rattlesnake wrapped around his arm and it bit him. He has been cited twice. Both times he was fined and let go. This is an example of someone being careless with snakes.

RAC Input

Neville- It is confusing that you have a five page rule for potentially 8 groups or people.

Wilson- There are a lot of laws that are passed for a minority of people. This is not uncommon.

Cowley- I am struggling why I would want my neighbor to have this many snakes in their home with kids around and the concerns. I'm sure the breeders that are doing it for the right reasons will be careful. Did you ever do any searches on the internet to see if there were any illegal's up for sale from Utah?

Wilson- We see them all of the time. We are always looking for illegal animals being sold. It is probably a weekly occurrence.

Slater- There is a segment of our community who may use different kinds of animals to protect treasures or maybe controlled substances.

Neville- Would legalizing the possession of rattlesnakes somehow lure the line of understanding of the public and potentially even some employees on understanding what is legal and what is not. Right now, it is pretty cut and dry. Do you have an education process for your officers?

Wilson- I am not exactly sure what your question is?

Neville- Now there is a law in place that says if you have anything venomous, it is illegal. If you allow it, will there be some confusion and people wondering if they have a COR?

Wilson- I would think that those who want to hold venomous reptiles in their possession, they are aware of the rules in other states and in Utah. A lot of times, they don't really care.

Neville- I was thinking about whistleblowers more than anything. If this passes, will people not understand?

Wilson- I don't know. I would think that if they have a COR, they are going to have a special room that is dedicated to holding these reptiles. It will have special doors, special locks and be posted that there are venomous reptiles inside. To me, that would be easy for someone to know.

Motion

Motion: Gaskill- Accept the recommendations of the DWR, include the word unlawful in front of controlled substances, and recommend the Division have a more aggressive educational program.

Second: Selman

Discussion on the Motion

Cavitt- I am really uncomfortable with the fact that we have so little information on the midget faded and I am not sure I can support a motion like that.

Gaskill- I think that we are talking about five snakes.

Cavitt- I am not sure and I don't think that we can say that. The potential for propagation and distribution of these kinds of snakes are appropriate given the fact that we do not know what their current status is. The snakes may be an important part of the gene pool in one area.

Selman- I don't think I would have gone to science class at Bear River Junior High if it was not for the rattlesnake there? He was there for over 15 years and I think if somebody wants to have a rattlesnake and there is a way for them to have it legally, I think this is a good thing.

Cowley- I think there ought to be annual inspections of these facilities and verify if these reports are accurate. I am really struggling with the proposal. I think there should be an exception for a lower number that can be held.

Slater- Variance approval process exists now with the Wildlife Board. Here is one thing this rule does is maybe shift that to the Division. Are COR's indefinite?

Wilson- No, they are renewed annually. Once they have them in their possession, they provide an annual report.

Slater- Is there an expiration date or renewal date?

Wilson- They would be in violation and lose their COR if they did not provide their annual report.

Slater- A COR could be issued with Division discretion based upon future information that develops as maybe generated on whether the distribution has decreased or the population has decreased of a specific animal?

Wilson- Yes.

Cavitt- I think it sets a bad precedence to establish a rule that would allow for the collection and keeping of an organism that we do not currently understand the population status. I would be more comfortable with a motion that would allow for Great Basin rattlesnakes to be kept and then have the Division look at the current status of the midget faded and come back and add them in if they are in fact more abundant than what we know.

Van Tassell- Concerned with the exploitation of the midget faded. Maybe it should be excluded until further studied. DWR needs to get more of the profit from it.

Lawrence- I agree with John and Craig on everything they said.

Neville- Me too.

Motion Fails: For: 3, Against: 8

Motion

Cowley- Remove the Midget Faded Rattle Snake from the rule.

Second: Neville

Discussion on the Motion

Cavitt- I am concerned about the comment regarding the numbers listed in the rule.

Cowley- The proposal is to merely remove the midget faded at this point.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Motion

Motion: Cavitt- Reduce the number of adults from 9 to 3 adults with a total of 25 in possession including progeny.

Cowley- Would that be 3 of each sex?

James Dicks- Reptile Rescue Service- 3 would include one male and two females. I would consider that the overall limit.

Cowley- In the number of brood, we are told that it would typically be 2-12. It would then be realistic to have 24.

Dicks- It is usually 6-12 and breed every other year but in captivity would breed yearly.

Cowley- Would be reasonable?

Dicks- Yes, and if they could not sell them then there is no purpose of breeding and destroying them every year.

Second: Lawrence

Discussion on the Motion

Van Tassell- If progeny are not sold or given away after a period of time, can the COR be revoked? Is that included in the law or should it be?

Wilson- In the rule right now, it states that they must dispose of the progeny within one year. If they do not, they would be in violation of their COR.

Van Tassell- What is disposed?

Wilson- They have to sell them, euthanize or kill them.

Gates- Having dealt with the wild horse in the BLM, those folks do not want to euthanize horses. You are probably going to run into the same thing. Most likely, they will be turned out on public land. I know that is prohibited, at least I think it is. Still, that is going to happen.

Wilson- We could put something in there that said they could notify the Division and we could take care of them. Then, we would have to dispose of those animals.

Ferry- Being in agriculture and having an understanding about the cost it takes to bring a facility up to speed, I am concerned about limiting it to just 3 breeding snakes and the financial aspect of it. For a person to maintain a facility, I am concerned about limiting it may not make it feasible to do that.

Slater- So you are speaking against the motion?

Ferry- Right. I think reducing it down that far leaves a lot of uncertainty. If a person is going to invest in that, we want to make sure they are going to maintain and keep it up to the way it is suppose to be.

Cavitt- This current rule is not for commercial propagation. This is more for hobby.

Wilson- No, it could be commercial propagation.

Cavitt- Would they need a separate COR?

Wilson- It is a different COR but it is still covered under this rule. It would depend on the purpose for why the person got into this. For most, it is a hobby. There are some who make a living on breeding and selling snakes.

Cowley- Could a person who is doing it commercially be issued a COR to hold more? If this rule was passed, would they be limited to 3 also?

Wilson- They would be limited to what is outlined in the rule.

Slater- Our recommendation would not include midget faded.

Motion Carries: For: 7, Against: 4

Cowley- Is there any requirement by the Division, where there will be a limited number of COR's issued, to then relay that information to the local government so they are aware of what some of the folks are walking into. Also, so they can verify that they are meeting local regulations?

Wilson- Prior to them receiving the COR, they have to demonstrate to us that they have meet the rules that would be applicable for their county or city. They should also have it posted that there are venomous reptiles inside.

Slater- It almost requires that you have a permit from the local government before you can even proceed right?

Wilson- Right, if it is required by the local entity.

Cowley- Do you think the Division would be willing to take that on as far as if someone is not able to dispose of their individuals. This would also increase the cost of dealing with these.

Wilson- The Division could do it. I don't think anyone would relish that job.

Slater- Most animal control functions usually require relinquishment or abandonment.

Cowley- Would the local animal control facilities be set up to handle this type of thing?

Slater- No. It depends on where you are and who you are.

Cowley- I hope the Division would at least consider that as far as being set up to be a receiver of unwanted Great Basin Rattlesnakes. I would like that to be considered as part of the rule before it gets to the board.

Motion

Motion: Cowley- Move the Division would consider being set up to be a receiver of unwanted Great Basin Rattle Snakes before it gets to the board.

Walt Donaldson- Aquatics Chief DWR- On relinquishment or disposition of animals, we can do it but would not relish it. The reality is that we do not have the budget or location to control it. You can encourage us but we do not have the capability. I am just being honest.

Motion Withdrawn

Item 6. Drawing Application R657-62, Rule Amendment

Bryan Christensen, Wildlife Licensing Specialist

See Handout

Motion

Motion: Byrnes- Recommend approval of Rule R657-62 as presented.

Second: Neville

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 7. Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License R657-17 Rule Amendment

Bryan Christensen, Wildlife Licensing Specialist

See Handout

RAC Questions

Gaskill- You are not taking away opportunities to communicate. In other words, they can still call you or write you a letter and all those things.

Christensen- Yes, in essence they can. This should enhance our ability to reach them easier and quicker.

Motion

Motion: Gaskill- Recommend approval of Rule R657-17 as presented.

Second: Cowley

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 8. CWMU for Small Game and Waterfowl R657-21, 5-yr Review

Bryan Christensen, Wildlife Licensing Specialist

See Handout

Motion

Motion: Lawrence- Move to approve Rule R657-21 as presented.

Second: Van Tassell

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 9. Aquatic Sensitive Species Program

Sam McKay, Regional Aquatic Biologist

Sam McKay presented on Native Aquatic Management projects that are taking place within the Northern Region.

The Goal of the UDWR Northern Region is to secure, protect and expand sensitive aquatic species to ensure their continued existence and preclude the need from populations becoming federally threatened or endangered.

Item 10. Farmington Bay Nature Center Overview

Justina Parsons-Bernstein, Director of the Great Salt Lake Nature Center

Justina Parsons-Bernstein presented on some of the Nonconsumptive uses at Farmington Bay WMA and highlighted on the new additions to the Great Salt Lake Nature Center.

Meeting Ends: 8:40 p.m.

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY-MOTIONS PASSED
Vernal Uintah Basin Applied Technology Center/February 11, 2010

5. CIP-R657-53 RULE AMENDMENT – VENOMOUS SNAKES

REVISED MOTION: to accept as presented, but to add the “Tribe” to Section 37-2, page 9.

Passed unanimously

Carlos Reed would like the UDWR to give this presentation to the Tribe.

6 .DRAWING APPLICATION R657-62, RULE AMENDMENT

MOTION: to accept changes as presented

Passed unanimously

7. LIFETIME HUNTING AND FISHING LICENSE R657-17, RULE AMENDMENT

MOTION by Amy Torres to accept as presented

Passed unanimously

8. CWMU FOR SMALL GAME AND WATERFOWL R657-21, 5-YR REVIEW

MOTION by Amy Torres to accept as presented

Passed unanimously

NORTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY
Vernal UBATC, February 11, 2010
Started at 6:30 pm; Adjourned at 7:35 pm

+

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Carlos Reed-Native American
Loran Hills-Nonconsumptive
Floyd Briggs-At Large
Kirk Woodward-Sportsmen
Rod Harrison-Elected Official
Bob Christensen-RAC Chair
Kevin Christopherson-NER Supervisor
Amy Torres-At Large
Beth Hamann-Nonconsumptive

UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Krissy Wilson-Native Aquatic Species Coor.
Bryan Christensen-Wildlife Licensing Spec.
Gayle Allred-NER Office Mgr
Ron Stewart-NER Conservation Outreach
Trina Hedrick-NER T & E Biologist

RAC MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Rod Morrison-Sportsmen
Mitch Hacking-Agriculture
Curtis Dastrup-Agriculture

WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS:

Del Brady

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

MOTION by Amy Torres: to approve agenda

Second by Rod Harrison
Passed unanimously

MOTION by Amy Torres: to approve minutes

Second by Rod Harrison
Passed unanimously

3. WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING UPDATE

The Wildlife Board put the eight dog limit in effect for both bear summer pursuit seasons on the Book Cliffs, LaSal and San Juan units. There will be no dog limits in either the fall or spring pursuit seasons. There will be no dog limits during the limited entry hunts, but the Book Cliffs hunt will be spot and stalk only, no use of dogs or bait.

ADDITION TO TONIGHT'S AGENDA:

Update for elk committee meeting by Kirk Woodward

The Elk Committee has been really productive. We're really close to having a final draft of the statewide elk plan to present at the March RAC meeting. There are several suggested changes to plan right now. For example, we're talking about proposing an increase in the average age of elk on Diamond Mountain, the Book Cliffs and the Roadless Book Cliffs. Also, we're trying to take the elk herd from 65,000 to 80,000. A

survey census given to elk hunters throughout the state shows people are generally happy with the way the elk hunt is. There are concerns about the wait to draw, and opportunity vs. quality. The plan presented will be a good compromise between all of those things.

Questions from the RAC:

Floyd Briggs: Did you consider the age objective on Goslin Mountain?

Kirk Woodward: Yes. Goslin is a hard unit to manage because it's in cooperation with Colorado and Wyoming, so we can't make changes as easily. It will fall into a class that will move to a half a year older in elk age.

4. REGIONAL UPDATE – Kevin Christopherson

The Book Cliffs bison release was snowed out. There were eight-foot drifts in the road. We spent \$5,000 trying to get the road open and by the following day, they were drifted over even more. The bison are at Antelope Island and are still okay. All of them are yearlings but one. Once the weather calms down, we will try it again.

Hunt structure split season. It has been presented a couple of times to the RACs in the past and will be presented next month as an informational item. I'm wondering if people are getting the message. Is the word getting out as to the significance of the proposed changes? Talk to your constituents if you would and see if they understand. I want to make sure this doesn't surprise people. Maybe people are fine with it, but I want to make sure the word is getting out.

PILT. We pay these payments in lieu of taxes for UDWR properties we own. We are careful to acquire lands valuable to wildlife. The payments are higher than green belt payments. We have a lot of UDWR lands in this region.

Bighorn sheep reintroduction was planned for Daggett County. Montana had some disease outbreaks so we didn't take their sheep. They're aggressively killing sick animals to prevent the spread of disease.

There were also two outbreaks in Washington sheep. They killed 85 sheep there.

We've noticed some sick sheep on Daggett County on Goslin Mountain. Our biologists have identified six ill sheep. They were shot and samples were sent to the lab. We'll find out if there's a problem. We're concerned and being cautious. It's typical for new populations of sheep to explode and it seems like everything's great and then it crashes before it finally stabilizes. We hope that's what it is. We should know in about two weeks.

Legislative Update:

House Bill 31 passed which allows the Wildlife Board to refund licenses in certain

instances.

Livestock Damage Compensation for Wolves passed in de-listed areas, so it doesn't affect our region.

The Wanton Destruction law died in committee.

The Streambed access bills are changing daily.

Rep. Christensen passed amendment to delist wolves statewide in Utah. Supported by DWR.

2010 RAC SCHEDULE-Bob Christensen:

I'm passing out the new, revised 2010 RAC schedule, which includes the March 22 date change for our region.

5. CIP – R657-53 RULE AMENDMENT – VENOMOUS SNAKES -Krissy Wilson

Proposal:

Change classification from prohibited to controlled.

Number of Rattlesnakes an Applicant may possess:

- Nine Great Basin rattlesnakes
- Nine midget faded rattlesnakes
- One from the wild per species per year
- Three total per species from the wild
- Twenty five progeny (babies) in possession at any time

Questions from RAC:

Floyd Briggs: How many young does a snake usually have?

Krissy Wilson: 2-12 per year. The reason we put 25 is that was a recommendation from the herp society. A responsible breeder has a buyer for each of their progeny. We want them to be able to propagate 25, sell them within the year either through euthanasia or selling them or giving them away.

Floyd Briggs: Do they generally have their young the same time every year?

Krissy Wilson: Yes.

Carlos Reed: You're going to make sure the owner of the property is aware. Will there be warning signs in and about the property as well so the general public will know? How would you cover the liability on that, is that covered by household insurance if that gets

out and bites somebody?

Krissy Wilson: In the rule, we require that the room that's housing the snakes has to have signage on that door, not in their front yard or front door. Second, as far as liability, in this rule it says there's no liability to the state. As far as the person, I don't know who would make them but I would assume they could cover that under their homeowners insurance. We could not enforce that.

Carlos Reed: I was talking to the business committee on this proposal. They didn't like it. Our customs are different from you folks. It's not generally accepted. We believe the spirit should be allowed to roam freely. Nobody can go back on the state and we're seeing the law put into place by being accepted by RAC and the Wildlife Board. The concern was if on the exterior boundary of reservation we have members and non-members, will our people be notified other than the warning on the door. Could we get a list of the snake handlers so we can make our people aware? They were concerned about the liabilities and actions of the loose snake.

Krissy Wilson: I would suggest you recommend that to this RAC and they would pass that onto the Wildlife Board.

Kevin Christopherson: Feel free to modify our proposals.

Krissy Wilson: That's why we're here is to get recommendations on how we could make it better.

Loran Hills: Who asked for this change? I have a lot of concerns about the enforcement to make sure their facilities are safe, etc.

Krissy Wilson: We have had some interest from the Utah herp association. They all have varying interests. There has been expressed interest for rattlesnakes. We've had a couple people approach the Division to create a regulation to allow them to hold them as reptiles. We know that there are a lot of people who hold animals illegally. We want a way to protect the public the best we can. Things have to be in place before they get a COR, to inspect facility and criteria. As far as enforcement after, that's a concern to be able to follow-through.

Amy Torres: Why would you need a limit on snakes?

Krissy Wilson: The reason we came up with nine is that we've been getting a lot of pressure to simplify our rules. Right now, the number of prohibited snakes allowed is zero. Nine is the number of non-controlled snakes allowed under the current rule so it was a number we thought would be consistent. 25 progeny are allowed as far as propagation. In this rule, if you have a species in your possession and you have propagation, the adults belong to the state, the progeny belong to you. If you have king snakes or gopher snakes, these are the species they are right now propagating. We put the limit of 25, given that if they have two matings that were successful, they could hit that

goal, between what they can produce and what they can market. As far as venomous snakes go, we felt the great-basin and the midget-faded could withstand harvest, the others we felt could not, so these are the only two venomous snakes we are proposing.

Questions from Public:

None

Comments from Public:

None

Comments and discussion from RAC:

Carlos Reed: A proposal from the Ute Tribe and reservation is that if this proposal goes through, we be furnished... Because of our traditions and our culture, we don't feel this is right. However, I would feel much safer if we would put into the proposal that we would get a copy of who was raising the snakes, not just a sign on the door. Members of the Tribe are not in favor of this, but you folks live with who you live and we live with who we live.

Kirk Woodward: If I wanted to get a copy of a COR for a fish pond, that's public stuff. I don't think that's a problem. This is public information already.

Kevin Christopherson: That is true. Is there any talk of posting this on the website so it could be easily viewed?

Krissy Wilson: It is not currently. Some of the discussion was that the applicant gets permission from his neighbors but the attorney general didn't feel that was something we could impose.

Kevin Christopherson: If a city can pass an ordinance against this, does the Tribe have jurisdiction to prohibit this? We would respect the Tribe's position much like a city.

Carlos Reed: We haven't presented this to the attorney yet so I'll submit it to our attorney and see what he says.

Kevin Christopherson: You may be within your legal rights to disallow this.

Krissy Wilson: Sandy City does not allow dangerous animals to be held within city limits, so I would assume the Tribe would have the same authority.

Kevin Christopherson: If that's the case, then this rule would cover you and we wouldn't issue the COR's. I'll check with Marty Bushman to make sure we are all ok with this.

Carlos Reed: I would like the UDWR to give this presentation to the Tribe.

MOTION by Floyd Briggs to approve as presented.

Second by Brandon McDonald

Favor: Beth Hamann, Rod Harrison, Amy Torres, Floyd Briggs, Kirk Woodward

Opposed: Loran Hills, Carlos Reed

The Division will get with Tribe on whether they can prohibit this rule.

Kevin Christopherson: Often what we do when we hear proposals in the RAC is we adjust it before it goes to the Wildlife Board. Maybe we can add verbiage including approval by Tribe.

REVISED MOTION by Amy Torres to accept as presented, but to add the “Tribe” to Section 37-2, page 9.

Second by Carlos Reed

Passed unanimously

6. DRAWING APPLICATION R657-62, RULE AMENDMENT - Bryan Christensen

Kirk Woodward: Why are we taking out the names Merriams and Rio Grande?

Bryan Christensen: There's no designation as far as turkeys go whether you can take a Merriam or a Rio Grande. As far as application procedures go, you're applying for a wild turkey permit. You may be in an area that has Rio Grande, you may be in an area that has Merriams. The permit allows you to get one wild turkey.

Kirk Woodward: The Wildlife Board rule from 2008 said, if you do not apply for a bonus point. Is that species specific? If a guy has five mule deer points and then decides to apply for elk for the next 15 years, does he lose all his deer points?

Bryan Christensen: If I have those deer points and I want to go after bison, by applying for a once-in-a-lifetime or a limited entry, you're going to secure all of your bonus points. Don't misunderstand that, by applying for a *general season* point doesn't secure your limited entry.

Bob Christensen: In the order of the drawing, is there any reason why once-in-a-lifetime is drawn *after* the limited entry deer and elk?

Bryan Christensen: At one time, it was in the proclamation that the species that had the most applications was drawn first. Then they decided to have a specific draw order, and they listed deer limited-entry first. The reason I do not know, but it does require someone to think about what they want. If they think they're going to draw their deer, they may want to reconsider before they put in for bison.

Questions from Public:

J.C. Brewer: By applying for one limited entry every third year, we retain all of our bonus points for all species for which we have bonus points?

Bryan Christensen: Yes. If you go three complete years without applying for anything, you lose all your points.

Comments from Public:

None

Comments from RAC:

Carlos Reed: I think it's a good idea putting "turkey" in there instead of specific turkeys. We changed our proclamation just read turkeys also. A lot of our folks don't do a lot of turkey hunting and we don't know what we've got, so it's good just to get a wild turkey.

MOTION by Loran Hills to accept changes as presented

Second Amy Torres

Passed unanimously

7. LIFETIME HUNTING AND FISHING LICENSE R657-17, RULE AMENDMENT-Bryan Christensen

5-year mandatory review. Housekeeping to eliminate verbiage regarding paper applications

Questions from RAC:

None

Questions from Public:

None

Comments from Public:

None

Comments from RAC:

MOTION by Amy Torres to accept as presented

Second by Rod Harrison

Passed unanimously

8. CWMU FOR SMALL GAME AND WATERFORL R657-21, 5-YR REVIEW-

Bryan Christensen

Questions from RAC:

Loran Hills: So you don't have any CWMU for small game but if you did this would apply?

Bryan Christensen: We currently use Walk-in access programs but it will be nice if we do have one in the future.

MOTION by Amy Torres to accept as presented

Second by Kirk Woodward

Passed unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm.

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Hurricane High School
Hurricane, UT
February 9, 2010
7:00 p.m.**

1. REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

MOTION: To accept minutes and agenda as written.

VOTE: Unanimous.

2. CIP – R657-53 RULE AMENDMENT – VENOMOUS SNAKES

MOTION: To accept as presented

VOTE: Unanimous

3. DRAWING APPLICATION R657-62, RULE AMENDMENT

MOTION: To accept as presented with one change of putting definitions of the points in the document.

VOTE: Unanimous

4. LIFETIME HUNTING AND FISHING LICENSE R657-17, RULE AMENDMENT

MOTION: To accept as presented

VOTE: Unanimous

5. CWMU FOR SMALL GAME AND WATERFOWL R657-21, 5-YR REVIEW

MOTION: To accept as presented

VOTE: Unanimous

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Hurricane High School
Hurricane, UT
February 9, 2010
7:00 p.m.**

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Rex Stanworth Dale Bagley Layne Torgerson Cordell Pearson Chairman Steve Flinders Dell LeFevre Clair Woodbury Mack Morrell Paul Briggs	Douglas Messerly Giani Julander Blaine Cox Stephanie Rainey Bryan Christensen Krissy Wilson Ann McLuckie Chris Schulze Kevin Wheeler Pam Wheeler		Steve Dalton (excused) Sam Carpenter (excused)

Steve Flinders called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. There were approximately 2 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.

Steve Flinders: Let's get started. I want to welcome everybody out to the RAC meeting tonight. I'm going to be brief, looking at the amount of public we have here. Please update this contact sheet that's coming down guys, if you would. I don't see any Wildlife Board members here. I am Steve Flinders, the RAC Chair. Let's start on my left and have the RAC members introduce themselves so we can get on record who's here tonight.

Mack Morrell: Mac Morrell, Bicknell, agriculture.

Clair Woodbury: Clair Woodbury of Hurricane, general public.

Dell LeFevre: Dell LeFevre from Boulder, agriculture.

Douglas Messerly: I'm Doug Messerly, Regional Supervisor with the Utah Division of Wildlife from the Southern Region, Cedar City. My staff and myself act as executive secretary to this committee but we don't vote.

Cordell Pearson: I'm Cordell Pearson from Circleville. I'm an at-large representative.

Layne Torgerson: Layne Torgerson from Richfield. I'm the sportsman's representative.

Dale Bagley: Dale Bagley from Junction. I'm an elected official representative.

Rex Stanworth: Rex Stanworth from Delta; and I represent at-large.

Steve Flinders: I'm going to skip the meeting order. Everybody in here knows how that works. Let's jump right into agenda item two, which is review and acceptance of the agenda and the minutes.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)

Steve Flinders: Any discussion? I'd entertain a motion.

Rex Stanworth: I move that we accept the minutes and the agenda.

Steve Flinders: Move by Rex.

Dell LeFevre: I'll second it.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Dell LeFevre. All in favor? Any against? Okay, that passes unanimous.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept the agenda and minutes as presented. Dell LeFevre seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Doug would you give. . . . oh I guess I had better do a Wildlife Board update.

Wildlife Board Update: -Steve Flinders, Chairman

- January 6th was a Wildlife Board meeting. If you guys recall our December meeting, most of the discussion and controversy surrounded bears. Based on Steve Dalton's motion we were looking for five days longer, as I recall, on all Southern Region units. Amongst some other sizes with pack size, all these things were discussed at length and in the end what the Board passed was much like what we passed in terms of limiting pack size for pursuit but not for those who have tags. Save the portion where there's five more days of hunting in the Southern Region. I talked to RAC member Dalton about it at length and probably in the future if we want to pursue something like that we

should articulate more carefully why we want to do it and on which units we want to do it. I might make sense to do it on particular units where there's nuisance or depredation problems or the most focus. But the Wildlife Board didn't see that it made sense to do it region wide. And that's their justification for not passing it.

Steve Flinders: Doug, how about a regional update?

Regional Update:

-Douglas Messerly, Regional Supervisor

- This is our non-consumptive meeting. Just a couple of things I'd like to point out: the Southern Region RAC has had two vacancies in it for a non-consumptive representative now for some time. And it's not for lack of trying to recruit someone to do that. And I'd just like to advise the RAC and whatever members of the public that are here tonight that we are looking for representation from the non-consumptive community on this committee; and this meeting would be the meeting where most of those issues are discussed at length. But in any event we are still looking for representation from that community.
- A couple of public events that we've had recently that turned out quite well - - Lynn Chamberlain is our lead on the winter bird festival that's held here in St. George. That was held not this past weekend but the weekend previous. And it is my understanding that they had 2,700 participants in that festival. And it's turned into quite a production. There's a lot of people in a lot of agencies and entities that put a lot of work into that. But it's turned out to be quite a neat public event that's centered around wildlife. And I thought I'd report that our agency has been involved in that and we're quite pleased with the fact that people are appreciating wildlife in that way.
- In addition to that, this past Saturday was bald eagle day in the Southern Region. That was held out by Rush Lake, in Iron County, just north of Cedar City. Lynn reported that 40 people showed up for bald eagle day. And that's a pretty respectable number for this time of year, particularly in light of the weather. And good news to report, the eagles showed up too. So they got to see some eagles; and that was another successful event.
- We're currently in the big game application period. And those of you that haven't but intend to apply, I'd recommend you get it done soon, although we have some time remaining in order to get that done. Do it while it's fresh on your mind and you won't forget.
- The dedicated hunter application period recently closed, in January. I would like to report that we had 1,600 less applicants than we had available slots. So the dedicated hunter program is now down to 8,400 participants; down from the 10,000 that it was the year previous. And the reason for that is that less people applied for the slots that were opened up by people who were exiting the system because it was their third year. And there are no plans at this point to offer those 1,600 undersubscribed certificates of registration. I asked the staff in Salt Lake to review that and see what affect that had on the Southern

Region, in particular. I received an e-mail a few minutes ago that said that the decrease appears to be pretty even statewide. So all the regions shrunk by about 16 percent in terms of the number of people that are participating in the program. So the Southern Region didn't gain or lose any more than any other region in terms of the number of people that will be volunteering. So it will be interesting to see what happens next year and how this all evens out; but it appears the supply is somewhere in the neighborhood of demand at this point for the dedicated hunter program.

- We've flown three elk units this winter; and I don't have the specific numbers at my fingertips, but I know which ones were above or below objective. The ones that we've flown are the Southwest Desert, which we found to be significantly but not a great number over objective. Our efforts there in reducing that population are working. I think that after the coming years antlerless elk harvest we'll be at our objective on that unit, which is 950 animals. The Panguitch Lake unit, surprisingly, was below objective, pretty significantly. I've heard numbers bantered around about 71 percent; we're 71 percent of objective which means we're down 300 elk, 300 to 400 elk from our objective of, I believe its 1,150. So we'll probably not be having any antlerless elk harvest on the Panguitch Lake in the coming years as a result of that. However, we found significantly more elk on the Dutton than we'd like to have. We're over objective there. Some people are suggesting that there's a relationship between the Panguitch Lake being under objective and the Dutton being over objective, but those dang elk just won't stay where they're supposed to when we're counting them. But we'll make recommendations accordingly with the counts that we found. The Paunsagaunt was also counted this year. The Paunsagaunt has a fairly low winter count objective, which we didn't reach this year. However, we did find more elk than we have previously on those counts; so we are having some elk that are finding a place to winter on the Paunsagaunt.
- We're in the process now of developing recommendation for the upcoming buck and bull hunts, and also thinking about antlerless recommendations at the same time. In addition to that the hunt structure that's been proposed for 2011 is a big topic of discussion around the Division and amongst our constituent groups. And I would urge you, if you're not familiar with what that proposal is, to get on our website and review what it is. We've talked about it a couple of times here in this committee and we'll continue to talk about it some more, I'm sure.

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

Steve Flinders: Thanks Doug. Let the record show that Paul Briggs of the BLM has joined the RAC. And let's move on to agenda item number 5, the CIP rule. Welcome Krissy.

CIP – R657-53 Rule Amendment – Venomous Snakes (action) 10:23 to 21:14 of 56:19
-Krissy Wilson , Native Aquatic Species Coordinator
(See Attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Thanks Krissy. We've got some public folks here now. Let me explain the procedures here. We're going to first take questions from the RAC, any questions from the public. If we have some comment cards, if anybody wants to comment, we'll then take comments from the public. Three minutes for individuals, five minutes for a group. And then we'll move up here and discuss things and go through with voting, if that makes sense. So, any questions from RAC members for Krissy?

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Rex.

Dell LeFevre: Don't we have the little sidewinders? I've been told all my life that Escalante Desert, (unintelligible) they're sidewinders.

Krissy Wilson: We do. But they are not, we're not allowing collection of those individuals.

Dell LeFevre: Oh, okay.

Krissy Wilson: But that's actually a nickname. That sidewinder nickname for the . . . okay.

Steve Flinders: Now Rex.

Rex Stanworth: I guess a couple of questions. I realize that they're going to require from the city or possibly the county a conditional use permit or some sort of a permit to house those. Is it the local entity's responsibility to make those folks notify neighbors? I guess my question is, is if I'm living next to a person that's got snakes, even though they are locked and nobody can get in except that person that's been trained, every time you say they can't somebody will. And usually it's a kid who knows where dad keeps that and he wants to show his best friend what's in the basement. It seems like to me that some sort of a notification of the neighbors, an approval from the neighbor. I know that you get into sensitive things about that but I saw what happened in Springville when they didn't notify neighbors. And even though there was something that was given then it was taken back and that guy that had the snake farm, if you will, lost a horrendous amount of money. I'd rather see them catch that up front rather than later. Then the other thing, once they receive this is they required to have any special insurance? Is there any liability requirement for that snake collector?

Krissy Wilson: As far as the insurance, it's not something that we are requiring or I don't know that we can require. But I do know of several folks that have checked into that. It would be covered under a special addendum to their homeowners insurance. And it is available. And I understand it is very expensive. But as far as, I don't know that, I don't know if that's, that might be a legal question that I don't know that I can answer. But I know we did discuss that. We have discussed that that. We've also discussed notifying neighbors. And we, we just didn't know if that was something that we could do within the jurisdiction of the Division, that they require notification of all of their neighbors. Now it might be that the county or the city can require that.

Rex Stanworth: I guess one of the things that I'd be a little concerned about, any time an entity is responsible for the inspection of and the approval of they have taken it upon themselves some pretty hefty liability and so I'm assuming that the Division would not, would also have that liability on them. It seems to me that at some point, whether it's at the local entity position or whether it's at the state

division, it looks like to me there would need to be some sort of requirement for liability for the protection of those who may live around that area.

Krissy Wilson: I agree.

Steve Flinders: Clair.

Clair Woodbury: Yeah Krissy I can't say that I've ever heard of any snake collectors around me. I was just wondering how prevalent this is. Obviously there must be quite a few to have a COR requirement. Do I have neighbors that are collecting snakes and I don't know it? How many CORs do we do in our state?

Krissy Wilson: We currently only have two folks that currently are holding rattlesnakes. And they have, one has obtained that through a various process and he also has an educational permit. And he takes these snakes, given that the Wildlife Board gave him the approval to do that, he takes the snakes around and does education at schools. But he also goes around to the animal control facilities and he trains a lot of those officers on how to respond to handling snakes when they have to. So that's one person. The other permit is the Veterans Hospital. And they have probably, I don't know, three to five hundred snakes in their possession where they are studying venom. But as of right now no one holds a legal permit to hold a rattlesnake other than those two.

Clair Woodbury: If there's no interest why are we doing this then? Why are we requiring a COR?

Krissy Wilson: There is an interest. There is an interest. We, we're fairly confident that many people are holding them illegally. And there is a very, very small percentage but there is a very interested section of the public that is very interested in holding snakes of all kind, and rattlesnakes.

Clair Woodbury: So this is happening; they're just not following the requirements for that.

Krissy Wilson: Right.

Clair Woodbury: Okay.

Steve Flinders: Do you have a question Rex?

Rex Stanworth: In regards to the educational, just looking here on page 12 - - - it says that a person may not use or display snakes for exhibition, demonstration, educational purposes or whatever. Is there another line that I'm missing that says they can get a special permit to show those and educate people with those?

Krissy Wilson: This rule we are talking about right now is for personal use. If someone wants to get an educational or a science permit then they can for research or for education they can apply for that. They, there's very strict requirements for that, obviously. They have to prove that they are not for profit or that they are university academia that has valid reasons for the research. But once they meet that criteria then they can apply for a prohibited species that, when rattlesnakes were prohibited, they could then apply for that if they met that criteria for research or for education. But for personal use, for personal use it means in your home, your personal use. You don't take them any place unless you're

trading, bartering or selling.

Steve Flinders: Any questions here Mac?

Mack Morrell: How does someone prove they've got the three years experience?

Krissy Wilson: Well it didn't say venomous, it just said snakes. So we have a lot of folks that they've had permits for snakes. We have folks right now that have permits for king snakes, for milk snakes, that we know have gopher snakes. We have a lot of breeding that goes on with wandering garter snakes. So those folks that have valid permits, they have documentation that they have been handling snakes for X number of years depending on how long they've had their valid CORs.

Mack Morrell: But if I wanted to get a snake how would I prove I've got three years experience?

Krissy Wilson: Well you could show me your COR, or you could maybe . . . In the state of Utah there's a group that's called the Utah Herpetological Association. And this is a group of these folks that are very interested in collecting and holding snakes. And so if you maybe were to document that you were a member of that group then it would just, it would just depend upon what type of experience you had and how you could document that. If you were doing it illegally in your home I don't think we could accept that. Is that what you're asking me? I don't think that would be valid experience.

Steve Flinders: Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: Yeah, what happens to the babies after they have them the first year? Can they sell those?

Krissy Wilson: Yes.

Cordell Pearson: They can sell them?

Krissy Wilson: Yes.

Cordell Pearson: Then so what is the process there? Do they have to go through you people to sell them or can they just sell them to anybody they want?

Krissy Wilson: No. Part of what we're doing in this rule is that . . . let me step back just a little bit. Normally when, when someone takes an animal from the wild and they have a COR to possess it, that animal still belongs to the state of Utah. They just have a permit to hold that, to possess it. But when they propagate, when they breed in captivity that progeny becomes the real property of that person, the applicant. It does not belong to the state anymore. That progeny belongs as real property to the applicant. But normally under our normal process that progeny does not count towards their possession because it's their property. All we're concerned about is the Division's property. So we made the exception that instead of it being unlimited we thought we needed to have some type of control of how many progeny they have and that's why we came up with 25, because we felt like generally a female she will have two to twelve young depending on many factors. But we felt like 25 was about the most that a responsible applicant could probably make plans to sell within one year. We were concerned about just ongoing propagation where you ended up with increasing numbers of individuals. So that's why we put

it at 25, because that way it puts the burden on this owner to make sure that they have a market to sell and to get rid of these snakes rather than just have a bunch on hand they can't get rid of. What we also require is at the end of the year they have to euthanize those snakes. They can't carry them over. They have to find, so that mean they have to be responsible to find a market for those individuals.

Steve Flinders: And they have to sell them to people who have CORs with the state, or those people have to go get CORs with the state, right?

Krissy Wilson: They can sell them out of state where some of those requirements don't exist.

Steve Flinders: Yeah. Another question Rex?

Rex Stanworth: Pertaining to that, to those other permits that they would require, the educational permits and you mentioned a couple of others... is there any value including at least some sort of a dialog here, something in this particular thing that says and if you want to do an educational thing you would have to apply for this and see such and such document. I guess what I'm thinking is that if somebody read through this they could say, well gee I can't get this. Maybe they would know enough that they have to come to you for an educational permit but I wouldn't. I was just wondering if there's any value of adding that something in there that just says . . . you know an asterisk underneath that educational thing that just says see section 22 in whatever it is so that they can see it, because I didn't see anything in here for that.

Krissy Wilson: Okay, I'm thinking it's in there but let me look for it. So I don't know if this is exactly the answer to your question, but on page 2, under the definition of number 10, it describes what educational use is. It means the possession and use of an amphibian or reptile for conducting educational activities concerning wildlife and wildlife related activities. And then if we go to personal use, which is number 19, there that describes what you may do when you have this individual for your personal use. No connection to . . . So let me back up and give you a little bit more information. When they apply for a COR, once they've collected the individuals then they automatically move into what's called a possession COR. Now if they want to propagate they have to apply for propagation COR. So this will be a commercial propagation COR. So all of this is, it's just kind of a stepwise fashion process that they have to follow. So a commercial COR may have, may cost them one thousand dollars, because Midget Faded rattlesnakes, we have heard, I don't know this first hand but we've heard that you can sell a Midget Faded rattlesnake for \$2,500 dollars. So we anticipate that some of the folks that are going to do this intend to make money off of this. They intend to propagate and sell these individuals. So did I answer your question okay? Okay.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions from the RAC?

Questions from the public:

Steve Flinders: Any questions from the public? Questions for Krissy?

None

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

Comments from the public:

None

Krissy Wilson: So did you gentlemen receive the emails that had come to me that we forwarded so you could see what those comments were from the public?

Steve Flinders: Yeah, did those folks . . .

Krissy Wilson: Did Staci send those out?

Steve Flinders: Those folks that had email addresses may have seen some of those.

Krissy Wilson: Okay.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Krissy.

Krissy Wilson: Your welcome.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Steve Flinders: It's up for us to comment and entertain a motion. No comment cards. You're free to comment and make a motion.

Cordell Pearson: I'll make a motion. I make a motion that we accept DNR's proposal as presented.

Layne Torgerson: Second.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Layne. Motion by Cordell. All in favor? Any against? That is unanimous. Thanks Krissy.

Cordell Pearson made the motion to accept R657-53 as presented. Layne Torgerson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Let's move on to agenda item number 6, Drawing Application, R657-62. You must be Brian.

Drawing Application R657-62, Rule Amendment (action) 36:21 to 39:55 of 56:19
- Bryan Christensen, Wildlife Licensing Specialist
(See Attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Great. Any questions from the RAC for Brian?

Questions from the RAC:

None

Steve Flinders: Questions from the public?

Questions from the public:

None

Steve Flinders: No comment cards.

Comments from the public:

None

Steve Flinders: It's ours to deal with.

RAC discussion and vote:

Rex Stanworth: Brian let me just, I don't have one question. I was glad to see somebody could finally sit down and explain to me bonus and preference and that. And I know that the definition is contained within the document but I was curious as to why it wasn't put in the definitions of those three, or those three definitions.

Bryan Christensen: I'm not sure I entirely understand your question.

Rex Stanworth: Well I'm sorry I'm not too clear. I guess in the definitions you've gone through and you've asked, you've put a whole bunch of things there that tells you what an immediate family is, application, this that and the other. And it seemed to me that it would have been prudent to put three small things in there for bonus, preference and loyalty; and just a few words of what it was for. And then when you went from the definitions you could go back to the main portion of it and understand what it was talking about. Because I'm sitting here thinking, well gee . . . they're talking about loyalty points . . . as I read it it kind of came through, but I'm just thinking to myself why wouldn't it be put in the definitions right up front exactly what those three things are.

Bryan Christensen: Okay, as far as bonus points relating to limited entry and once in a lifetime.

Rex Stanworth: Right. Yeah, just a couple of lines there or a couple of words would designate exactly what those are. So if somebody says well explain to me what the difference is; all you've got to do is go to the definition and there it is.

Bryan Christensen: Sure, sure. I don't know. And I don't know that I have a real definitive answer for you on that one, as far as why it's not included in definition, definition form. I guess in the past as the system was created it may have just been acknowledged generally that bonus points were this and preference points were for that. But I don't see any conflict in creating definition if the council and the public desire it.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Bryan. Good comment Rex. Do you want to capture that in a motion?

Rex Stanworth: I would make a motion that we accept the Drawing Application 657-62, with one change of putting the definition of the points in the definitions section of the document.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Rex, seconded by Dell. Did you get that motion okay? All those in favor? Any against? Thank you.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept R657-62 with one change of putting definitions of the points in the document. Dale Bagley seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Steve Flinders: All right Bryan, let's do the next one.

Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License R657-17, Rule Amendment (action) 43:10 to 44:47 of 56:19 - Bryan Christensen, Wildlife Licensing Specialist (See Attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Thank you. Any questions from the RAC for Bryan?

Questions from the RAC:

Clair Woodbury: This is just a curiosity question Bryan. How many lifetime license holders do we still have in this state?

Bryan Christensen: Currently, I don't have an exact number but I have a couple of number for you, one of them is approximate, and it's around 4,500. I know there are some lifetime license holders that are in essence inactive, they just have them, and they don't use them. Some of them are just fisherman, or fisherwomen, if the case may be, and don't necessarily apply or receive their deer tags as part of that lifetime license. I did look at last year's deer report, as far as lifetime licenses reporting and it was about 3,900 that filled out a questionnaire. I don't know how many of those accepted deer permits last year and how many didn't. But about 3,900 were involved in responding to their lifetime license questionnaire.

Steve Flinders: Good question. Rex.

Rex Stanworth: I have one curiosity questions as well. I am a lifetime license holder. And I guess the question I would ask, has the Division looked at opening that up at any time? Has there been any discussion in regards to that? Because I know that there are people that are leaving hunting and I'm just wondering if that would tie some of our youth to the hunting programs.

Bryan Christensen: It's a very good question. I know there has been brief discussion about if it's merited to open it back up. Occasionally we get phone calls come in from the public asking if it will be opened again. At this time the proposal we have before you does not open that license for sale again, or for the public again. And that's just this part of our current proposal.

Steve Flinders: Other questions? Get another one Clair. Well we'll get to it. Any other questions? Any questions from the public?

Questions from the public:

None

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

Comments from the public:

None

Steve Flinders: Give us your comment.

RAC discussion and vote:

Clair Woodbury: I would propose that our southern RAC place that on the action log to look into reopening the lifetime license process. Is that, is that . . .

Steve Flinders: You can make that in the form of a motion. One comment I can add to that, and Doug maybe you ought to speak up better. But it seems like every time we talk about a new strategy for dispensing deer hunting permits in the state lifetime license holders are perceived as a encumbrance to that because what did they buy into ten years ago or twenty years ago when they could buy that versus what are we offering today; and just some potential stumbling blocks. But it would be something pretty attractive depending on how you marketed it.

Doug Messerly: And I guess that's what I would add to this discussion. The answer to the question has it been talked about, absolutely it's been talked about a lot. If you remember or are familiar with what the original notion was . . . the original notion was that the money that was gathered from selling lifetime licenses was put into a trust fund that can never be spent. And at the time this happened it was the mid 1980's and interest rates were 10 to 15 percent. So for every \$500.00 dollars somebody invested in a lifetime license the return was 50 to 60 bucks. Today the return is about \$15.00 dollars, on \$500.00 dollars. So suffice to say the cost would go up, if the idea was is that the investment is in a permanent trust fund that then funds the activities of the Division of Wildlife, it needs to pay, is what it needs to do if we're going to do a new one. In essence we entered into a contract with more than 4,000 people for \$500.00 for the rest of their lives. And you know people that have those licenses guard them jealously as they should. You know it was a big investment at that time for them to buy those licenses. The other question that comes into play is something that Steve alluded to, and that's what are you entitled to with a lifetime license? When you propose this are you proposing a lifetime license with all the benefits and considerations in the lifetime licenses that we're familiar with or with some sort of different lifetime license? Does this, the lifetime license that's being proposed, guarantee you a deer tag in the area that you want to hunt in for the rest of your life? If so it will be a very valuable commodity under the circumstances. And although it's true that we're trying to recruit hunters, you know the simple fact is, is that in the Southern Region we know this more than just about anywhere else in the state, you can only get a deer tag once out of every three years unless you're in one of these programs like lifetime license program or dedicated hunter programs. So if we were to increase the number of people that were entitled ahead of time it would actually decrease your opportunity for those people who aren't in this program to be able to do it. So they have a lot of considerations when it comes to lifetime licenses. You know lifetime fishing licenses have been proposed for example. At today's interest rates what would it

require, what sort of investment would be required up front in order for the Division to receive the same revenue that they do from a person who buys one annually? Somebody that's a mathematician can figure that better than I can but it's not going to be cheap. In any event there's a lot of considerations. So when it comes to lifetime licenses and it's something that has been talked about a lot. And I think if you stay with the original notion that these are people that are willing to invest a significant amount of money in perpetuity in a trust fund and the interest from that money would be used to fund activities to perpetuate the species that are hunted or fished it's a great idea.

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Clair.

Clair Woodbury: Thanks Doug that answered my question a lot. And reflecting on it as a representative of the general public I can see how that can make the rich person much more able to get a Southern Region tag and I would probably not be able to support that. So anyway you answered my question, thank you very much.

Steve Flinders: Good discussion. Thanks Clair. Anybody else want to discuss this further? Or we'll entertain a motion. Go ahead Rex.

Rex Stanworth: Well I just think that Clair's idea of at least addressing or looking at different avenues. It seems like the Division and all of us have a tunnel vision. It would be nice to look out of the box and come up with some creative thing. I mean sportsmen seem to be more willing to spend money than those people that love, that don't hunt or fish, that kind of go against what we're thinking. And it seems to me that we may want to look at something. It may not be a hunting license but it may be waterfowl or upland game. You know it could be something that we could look out of the box and suggest. So I guess from that standpoint I would not be opposed to having it as a future discussion where we could talk about opportunities or costs. Just a thought.

Steve Flinders: Okay. Anybody want to formulate a motion for this agenda item 7? No discussion.

Clair Woodbury: I will Steve.

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Clair.

Clair Woodbury: I would make a motion that we accept R657-17 as proposed to us.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Rex. Motion by Clair. Any discussion or clarification of the motion? We'll take a vote. All those in favor? Any against? Unanimous.

Clair Woodbury made the motion to accept R657-17 as presented. Rex Stanworth seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Steve Flinders: All right Bryan; let's do it, Small Game and Waterfowl.

**CWMU for Small Game and Waterfowl R657-21, 5-yr Review (action) 53:29 to 54:38 of 56:19
- Bryan Christensen, Wildlife Licensing Specialist
(See Attachment 1)**

Questions from the RAC:

Rex Stanworth: Move approval of the proposal, 657-21.

Steve Flinders: Yeah, do we have any, I think this qualifies as house cleaning, house keeping, until he said that we don't even have any small game CWMUs. So, no questions? No comments? Now give the said motion.

Questions from the public:

None

Comments from the public:

None

RAC discussion and vote:

Rex Stanworth: I move approval of item number 657-21 as presented.

Steve Flinders: Moved my Rex, seconded by Cordell. Sorry Layne. Two guys (unintelligible) it sounded like (unintelligible). That's seconded by Layne. Any discussion? All for? Any against? That's unanimous.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept R657-21 as presented. Layne Torgerson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Other Business

-Steve Flinders, Chairman

Steve Flinders: I don't have any other business. I appreciate your dedication and it sounds like it's raining outside.

Rex Stanworth: It does. Just to remind everybody it is the Snow Goose Festival in Delta this month.

Steve Flinders: Can we bring our shotguns?

Rex Stanworth: When you come to view the geese don't bring your shotguns. It's about 10 days after that Doug allows us to shoot them.

Steve Flinders: Motion to adjourn?

Dell LeFevre made the motion to adjourn. Mack Morrell seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Southeast Region Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main, Green River
February 10, 2010 ☞ 6:30 p.m.

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda

MOTION: To accept the agenda as written
Passed unanimously

Approval of December 9, 2009 minutes

MOTION: To accept the minutes as written
Passed unanimously

CIP-R657-53 Rule Amendment-Venomous Snakes

MOTION: To accept the CIP-R657-53-Rule Amendment-Venomous Snakes as presented
Passed with one opposing vote

Drawing Application R657-62, Rule Amendment

MOTION: To accept the Drawing Application R657-62 Rule Amendment as presented
Passed unanimously

Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License R657-17, Rule Amendment

MOTION: To accept the Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License R657-17 Rule Amendment as presented.
Passed unanimously

CWMU for Small Game and Waterfowl R657-21. 5-yr review

MOTION: To accept the CWMU for Small Game and Waterfowl R657-21, 5-yr review as presented.
Passed unanimously

Southeast Region Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main, Green River
February 10, 2010 ⌚ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Members Absent

Kevin Albrecht, USFS
Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor

Blair Eastman, Agriculture

Jeff Horrocks, Elected Official
Wayne Hoskisson, Non-consumptive
Todd Huntington, At Large
Derris Jones, Sportsmen
Laura Kamala, Non-Consumptive
Walt Maldonado, Sportsmen
Kenneth Maryboy, Navajo Rep.

Christine Micoz, At Large

Travis Pehrson, Sportsmen
Pam Riddle, BLM
Terry Sanslow, Chairman
Charlie Tracy, Agriculture

Others Present

Keele Johnson

- 1) **Approval of the Agenda (Action)**
-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

VOTING

Motion was made by Jeff Horrocks to accept the agenda as written
Seconded by Travis Pehrson
Motion passed unanimously

- 2) **Approval of the December 9, 2009 minutes (Action)**
-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

VOTING

Motion was made by Walt Maldonado to approve the minutes of the December 9, 2009 meeting as written.
Seconded by Laura Kamala
Motion passed unanimously

- 3) **Wildlife Board Meeting Update (Information)**
-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

Terry Sanslow-The motion to adopt the eight dog pack limit for summer pursuit statewide on all units passed. The motion to adopt the division recommendation for pursuit was approved. There will be no split season on the San Juan unit. Our motion dealing with the Book Cliffs roadless area was not passed. The Board's initial decision to designate a boundary of archery hunting in Emigration Canyon was rescinded, due to the issues which emerged, revolving around which region the hunting area encompassed--northern or central region.

Bill Bates- John Fairchild has been appointed to head up a committee to resolve this issue. The division hopes to have something in place this year.

Terry asked if Kevin Albrecht had any information on the statewide elk committee.

Kevin Albrecht-We've had seven meetings. A memo will be forthcoming about the plan we have developed, based on the survey that was sent out statewide to see what hunters wanted. The structure is pretty similar to what we have now. We have tried to address funding for fencing and other structures to reduce highway mortality. Once the plan is finalized, we will forward the plan onto the RACs.

4) Regional Update (Information)

-Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor

Bill Bates-The governor directed us to take a 3% budget cut this year and the legislature changed that to 4%. As a result, all employees took a one day furlough. The Division of State Forestry and Fire was also cut by 2 million dollars. We don't expect any more cuts this fiscal year. In the next fiscal year, we are looking at another 5% budget cut, coming from the general fund. In the last three years, we've had a 22% cut in general fund appropriation. Programs such as aquatic invasive species, sensitive species, conservation outreach and other programs are expected to suffer. The director has been committed to maintaining the sensitive species program to keep species from being listed under the Endangered Species Act, so we're doing the best we can.

Derris Jones-Did the Board give its reasons for changing our recommendations on the bear hunt in the Book Cliffs roadless area?

Terry Sanslow-There really wasn't much discussion on that. Keele Johnson sided with our recommendation, but the USFS influenced the Board to adopt the DWR recommendation.

Kevin Albrecht-The USFS said that unless there was a lot of evidence to the contrary, they wanted to go with the DWR proposal.

Terry Sanslow-When the minutes come out, I will be sending you a copy, so you can see what the discussion was on that.

Kevin Albrecht-One comment was made that in the upcoming year, the bear management plan would be up for a five year review, and other changes would be made.

Bill Bates-We caught 40 animals with our bison transplant in two days time. The fisheries section is mostly doing reports and work plans. Law enforcement has been working on bobcat cases and new elk cases. Outreach has been busy with watchable wildlife events.

Terry Sanslow-How's the turkey feeding going on in San Juan County?

Guy Wallace-We received feed from the NWTF and SFW and put it in the areas where turkeys occur. They have had little to eat due to the deep snow. The turkeys have been going into town and eating from bird feeders, so we have placed feeding stations on the edge of town, trying to keep them out of town. They have preferred hay bales over corn.

Hopefully we will keep enough turkeys for a base population. We have already lost track of a lot of birds, or they have moved to lower areas. Our numbers are probably a third from what we had counted earlier.

Kevin Albrecht-Do the deer need to be fed?

Guy Wallace-No, I don't think so. The snow levels on the north side are nearly normal. The problems we have are on the south side.

Bill Bates-We now have a new web page and the application period for the big game drawing is in progress. Antler gatherers need to take the online test and carry the certificate with them. The certificate is statewide and must be retaken each year. Bear denning is coming up. We only have cubs in a den in the Book Cliffs and anyone interested in coming is welcome, but needs to be ready for a long strenuous hike.

Terry Sanslow-Has there been a release date on the bison yet?

Bill Bates-That's dependent on the snow. It could be 6-8 weeks. They almost lost a D-8 cat out there and had trouble getting out there with snow mobiles. The bison need something to eat too. They are happy to keep them at Antelope Island, until we are ready to move them. Parks and Recreation are feeding them hay.

Terry Sanslow-The last report on quagga mussels is that all Utah waters are clear.

5) CIP-R657—53 Rule Amendment-Venomous Snakes (Action)
-Krissy Wilson, Native Aquatics Species Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Derris Jones-You say they can't keep progeny longer than one year? Are they allowed to release them into the wild?

Krissy Wilson-They can't keep progeny longer than one year and can't release them back into the wild. People who breed snakes tell us that the progeny are sold long before a year. There are a lot of buyers waiting.

Derris Jones-Are there disease issues? Is that why they can't be released into the wild?

Krissy Wilson-Right. We don't want to contaminate the native gene pool either.

Walt Maldonado-Why? It seems like a worst case scenario is bound to happen at some time. Are the owners responsible if someone is bit?

Krissy Wilson-Homeowner insurance for venomous snakes is available. As far as why, people want to have venomous reptiles. For us, it is a way for us to have some control and to implement strict safety protocols to minimize those safety risks.

Wayne Hoskisson-How many people are we actually talking about?

Krissy Wilson-It's a very small but vocal number.

Wayne Hoskisson-Is it a hundred or a thousand people?

Krissy Wilson-I think we would only have ten people who could meet the requirements of this rule. The rules are very strict and very expensive to meet the restrictions.

Walt Maldonado-What's the penalty for breaking the law?

Krissy Wilson-I can't answer that. If someone came to us and said they wanted to come clean, we would work with them to help them come into compliance.

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

Terry Sanslow-I received and forwarded you five letters about this issue. Four were against this amendment and one was in favor.

Derris Jones-There are very few species that the division allows the public to keep. Is the pressure great enough to warrant the permitting of venomous snakes? What about someone who wants to raise mule deer or bobcats? Are we opening the door?

Bill Bates-I haven't heard the discussion you are describing, but this rule is in line with surrounding states.

Krissy Wilson-Actually, this rule is much stricter than other surrounding states.

Wayne Hoskisson-Will we have any information on ill effects?

Krissy Wilson-Permit holders have to turn in an annual report. I will be reviewing annual reports, and will take a lot of interest in how many they have in their possession, who they sell them to, and what they are propagating.

Travis Pehrson-What about a situation where they have too many snakes or progeny for their permit? Will they have to euthanize them?

Krissy Wilson-The division does have the ability to inspect the facilities at any time. However, these snakes are so valuable that I don't think they will have that problem. I've heard that a midget faded rattler can go for \$2,500. Even common garter snakes are easily sold.

Travis Pehrson-I hate to see Utah allowing people to have them.

Walt Maldonado-I still don't understand why people would want them. The rules are stringent enough to minimize the risk to others.

Bill Bates-One of our sensitive species biologists was bit three times by a rattle snake.

Wayne Hoskisson-It would seem reasonable to provide persons, applying for a COR, with a brochure on how to do this correctly.

Krissy Wilson-We have put together a booklet that lists all of the safety precautions that are in the rule. The brochure is much more clear and exhaustive than what's in the rule.

Charlie Tracy-I wonder how many people realize that they need a permit to keep reptiles?

Krissy Wilson-There is a portion that doesn't. Some don't realize they need a fishing license. Most species in the state are controlled or protected. Very few can be indiscriminately killed. The public is becoming more and more educated about that.

Derris Jones-Has there been much problem with those who keep non-venomous reptiles or their progeny?

Krissy Wilson-Most collectors want the colorful milk snakes and king snakes. There is a market for that. Some people even propagate gopher snakes. Non-venomous snakes are not restricted in terms of the number of progeny a collector may have. We are only allowing a total of three prairie or midget-faded rattlesnakes to be harvested from the wild in any one year.

VOTING

Motion was made by Walt Maldonado to accept the rule amendment as presented.

Seconded by Wayne Hoskisson

Motion passed with a majority vote. An opposing vote was cast by Travis Pehrson.

6) Drawing Application R657-62, Rule Amendment (Action)

-Bryan Christensen, Wildlife Licensing Specialist

Questions from the RAC

Derris Jones-What's the reason for getting rid of bonus points after three years of inactivity?

Bryan Christensen-It's an effort to eliminate those people who are no longer interested or are out of the system. This doesn't relate to preference points. The inactivity must be for a three year period.

Derris Jones-Does the elimination occur for a specific species?

Bryan Christensen-Let me restate the proposal in an example. If you miss three application periods for limited entry or OIAL application for any species, then your bonus points are wiped out. If you apply for a pronghorn hunt, that application will preserve your bison points.

Terry Sanslow-A safety measure is that the division will try to contact the person to find out why they have become inactive and will advise them of the loss. Some are deceased.
Derris Jones-The language may need to be clarified to clearly define the terms for the loss of bonus points.

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Wayne Hoskisson to accept the rule amendment as written.

Seconded by Travis Pehrson

Motion passed unanimously

- 7) Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License R657-17, Rule Amendment (Action)
-Bryan Christensen, Wildlife Licensing Specialist

Questions from the RAC

Walt Maldonado-I received letters from a few lifetime license holders, saying that the lifetime questionnaire had no place to indicate that they were a dedicated hunter. Has that been fixed?

Bryan Christensen-The application program is written to know if they are in the dedicated hunter program or not. However this year, the application database made a few errors in identifying lifetime license holders and dedicated hunters. This has been fixed.

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Derris Jones to approve the rule amendment as presented.

Seconded by Kevin Albrecht

Motion passed unanimously

- 8) CWMU for Small Game and Waterfowl R657-21, 5-yr Review (Action)
-Bryan Christensen, Wildlife Licensing Specialist

Questions from the RAC

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Kevin Albrecht to accept the rule as presented.

Seconded by Jeff Horrocks

Motion passed unanimously

9) Wildlife 101 (Informational)

- Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor;
- Justin Shannon, Regional Wildlife Program Manager;
- Guy Wallace, Wildlife Biologist;
- Brad Crompton, Wildlife Biologist.

Bill Bates-I've heard comments from RAC members that they didn't understand all the different acronyms. A CWMU is a cooperative wildlife management unit. A CFMU is a cooperative fisheries management unit. There is a bill in the legislature to create those. A CHU is a cooperative hunting unit for upland game. A WMU is a wildlife management unit. A WMA is a wildlife management area. An HMP is a habitat management plan. We know what the USFS and BLM are. The NPS is the National Park Service. The NRCS is the Natural Resource Conservation Service. An RMP is a Resource Management Plan. A FP is a forest plan. NEPA is the National Environmental Policy Act. An EA is an environmental assessment. A BA is a biological assessment. An EIS is an Environmental Impact Statement. A CX or CE is a categorical exclusion. AIS is aquatic invasive species. An RP is a recovery plan for endangered species. A WMP is a watershed management plan. An MSY is maximum sustained yield. CC is carrying capacity. Lambda is intrinsic rate of population growth. OSY is optimum sustained yield.

Bill Bates-We have five different facets to consider when making wildlife management decisions—biological, technical, legal, financial, and social/political. When all facets aren't considered, then we run into trouble. A lot of time, groups or individuals come before the RAC with proposals when they haven't considered all of these facets. What I hope you would do is turn to those who understand all the facets and ask what effect that group's or individual's proposal would have.

Justin Shannon-Justin introduced the subjects to be discussed. Guy Wallace will give a presentation on how we collect certain data and how that is incorporated into our decisions. Brad Crompton would be following Guy with a discussion on why we harvest bucks instead of does and what drives population growth. Hopefully, by the time we are done, you will have a greater appreciation for wildlife management. We have a whole year to think about all of the various management goals and strategies and how everything will be impacted, whereas the public or special interest groups may not give their proposals such scrutiny.

Guy Wallace-I'm going to talk about big game censusing. I look forward to doing this, because of the number of times I have been verbally abused about the numbers we come up with that have been supposedly fabricated. We do two types of censuses. The first is the aerial survey, which is a population census. We use fixed wing aircraft for open habitat species such as pronghorn. We also use helicopters for other species that live in tough terrain and forests. The other census involves ground counts. With ground counts, we look primarily at herd composition. We try to break out the doe/fawn ratios and production and also the buck: doe ratios. With ground counts you can get a good sample size. These are used for deer, elk and pronghorn. Counts are easier from the ground than the air, because of the movement of the aircraft. With ground counts, we focus on areas of high animal concentration. In the case of elk, we count in July after the calves have been born and the herds have re-grouped. With deer counts, we primarily use winter ranges, because the deer

congregate, once they have come off the mountain. We try to get representative samples from the entire unit. We try to do consistent sampling every year. We try to hit the same areas and during the same period of time, so that the information can be compared from year to year to establish trend information. For deer, it's good to get buck: doe ratios while the bucks are in the rut. We try to make counts just before dark or just after daylight. Another guideline is that for most units, we try to classify at least 200 does as a minimum. We try not to duplicate counts in the same area, unless poor counting conditions exist. We avoid counting during storms, full moons and on weekends when more people are out. We try to maintain the same observers. With fawn production, we compare numbers from one year to the next. If our counts are around 45 fawns per hundred does, our population is breaking even. If we are above that, the herd is increasing. If below that number, the herd is in decline. Sometimes, a count during a certain year is bad, and that's why trend information is important. Another important point to make is the effect precipitation has on the herd. There's better fawn production and survival during wet years than dry years. At times during aerial surveys, we take photos to be able to classify and count the animals more precisely.

Brad Crompton-After collecting all this data, we then have to break it down and analyze it. We use certain pieces of data for certain recommendations. As far as buck counts, we use that information for buck: doe ratios to regulate our buck harvest for the next year. On general season units, we manage for a range of 15-25 bucks per 100 does. If the ratios are above that, we try to improve hunting opportunity with longer seasons or by raising the cap. If the ratio falls below that, then we shorten the seasons or reducing the number of permits. With limited entry units, we limit the number of hunters there. On these units, we manage for a range of 25-35 bucks per 100 does. The premium limited entry units have an even higher standard with minimum age classes. Our recommendations are intended to reach our management targets. Elk have different management targets. We manage the mature bull elk units by the age of bulls harvested. Some are managed for 3-4 year olds or 5-6 or 7-8 year olds. Our recommendations are simply a reflection of harvest summaries. If the harvest of the previous year showed a decline in age, then we decrease permits the following year. With antlerless elk, we look at the total population and herd objective. We manipulate the population with the number of cow tags issued. If there are areas that are over-utilized by elk, we use hunters to thin the herd in those areas to give the range a break from elk over-use. As far as counting deer, we count fawns in June and later in the fall to calculate fawn production and survival. From August to October, we harvest the deer and collect data as deer come through check stations. At check stations, we get buck age composition, antler size and deer health condition. We classify deer post-season and again in January for a total population estimate. We use a population model to help us with that. We also include natural mortality to assist in estimation of population size. We attribute a lot of natural mortality to winter kill, but mortality occurs throughout the year. In springtime, we spend a lot of time on the ground, looking at the winter range and for winter-killed deer. Two primary factors that determine population growth are adult doe fawn survival. Bucks and bulls contribute very little to the population. When we fly for elk, we typically use an 80% sightability adjustment to account for the elk we don't see. Bull elk are harder to see, because they stay by themselves and stay in more remote locations. In general we calculate a 90% annual survival for elk.

Brad Crompton led the RAC through a population model for elk on the Central Mountains-Manti unit, showing how harvest, natural mortality, calf production and survival, population size and age advancement of bulls all contribute to the DWR's recommendations for both antlered and antlerless hunts. Brad concluded his presentation by saying that population models are not used to determine the numbers of buck or bull tags issued. Population models are used for the antlerless recommendations and to estimate population

size. Buck or bull harvest doesn't have a lot to do with population size or growth. The females and offspring control population growth or decline.

The biggest factor in our populations is how many fawns and calves we put on the ground and their annual survival. Doe survival from one year to the next plays an enormous role in population size. Weather and habitat are primary factors in herd size.

Justin Shannon-The more we understand something, the more we appreciate it. I hope that by these presentations, we have provided you with a better understanding of how we make the recommendations we do and what drives game populations. Cutting buck or bull tags to increase a population isn't a good way to go. It's the does and cows that drive population levels. The biologists put a lot of time and thought into making these recommendations. There is a lot of effort being put into what we propose. It's been my observation that the public gets the opportunity to come in and question our recommendations, but often times people come in with recommendations that aren't so well analyzed. Some are spur-of-the-moment ideas. We invite you to ask the biologists how these recommendations would impact management. The biologists should be given the opportunity to put in their two cents before motions are made. Please don't be afraid to ask us if you don't understand something.

Questions and comments from the RAC

Derris Jones-Do buck: doe ratios tell you the quality of the unit? If you drop below 15 bucks per 100 does, will that affect fawn production?

Brad Crompton-No. The buck: doe ratio is a balance between providing hunting opportunity without letting the bucks die of old age or having so few in the herd that does aren't being bred.

Guy Wallace-Some units with high buck: doe ratios have low fawn productions, and at other times, units with low numbers of bucks have high fawn production. We've had units with as low as five bucks per 100 does with as many as 85 fawns per 100 does, so we obviously have enough bucks on the units in our region.

Derris Jones-Can you tell us more about the collaring study and its duration and extent?

Brad Crompton-Across the state, the goal is to collar 600 does. There are two units per region that will be studied. In this region, we will study Elk Ridge and the Abajo units. A portion of the northeast Manti unit will be observed to evaluate population changes as a result of deer fencing projects. On each unit, we have collared 30 does and 30 female fawns, primarily to look at annual survival

Derris Jones-Will collaring of the female fawns replace the spring classification?

Brad Crompton-It won't replace spring classification, but will help validate the classifications.

Derris Jones-Does 30 collared fawns provide better data than 300 classified fawns?

Brad Crompton-The spring classification does have its hiccups. You can count an area in fall and return then in spring and count dramatically different numbers of deer. In spring classifications, you don't know what your doe survival is. The collars should help with that.

Derris Jones-Is the long range plan to switch units after you get the data you need from the ones you are studying now?

Brad Crompton-I don't know. That would be nice.

Derris Jones-What level of adult survival do you plug into the models?

Brad Crompton-The rule of thumb is 80% natural survival. A study on the Avintaquin unit affirmed that. It found the survival to range between 78-83%.

Guy Wallace-Studies in Colorado show that the condition of does going into the winter has a big effect on fawn production the next spring.

Bill Bates-That's one reason we are focusing on summer range habitat improvement, because we are finding that the summer condition of does is really important.

Laura Kamala-Do you have a sense of the number of CWD deer on the Manti-LaSal unit?

Justin Shannon-The occurrence is very low. It's less than 1%.

Bill Bates-On the LaSal's it's about 2%. Whether it's increasing or not, we don't know. We know of other states with units that range from 10-30 %.

Guy Wallace-We did find an elk this year with CWD.

Walt Maldonado-We should as much as possible try to educate the public on the effects of habitat and fawn production rather than focus on buck: doe ratios. Fawn production and why they are not reaching adulthood is a key factor in the deer population growth. Habitat improvement and protection is an on-going concern.

Guy Wallace-I'm amazed at the number of people who show up at the bucks and bulls meetings, but are absent when we discuss the antlerless addendum.

Bill Bates-I think we do a poor job, telling the public of our efforts to improve habitat and about our work to control predators in critical fawning areas.

Travis Pehrson-What's the biggest obstacle as far as accomplishing habitat projects? Federal agencies?

Bill Bates-Wilderness Study Areas an issue in some areas, because you have to go through the federal planning process to approve projects there. I think we are doing great work.

Kevin Albrecht-What's been happening in Utah in recent years has just been incredible. The impediment has been with federal agencies, trying to catch up with the NEPA process, but our wheels are starting to turn.

Walt Maldonado-The division should broadcast their successes more to counter balance the negative. Toot your horn when you have a success.

Terry Sanslow-I've been talking to sportsmen organization leaders and have asked them that when they have proposals, they need to get those proposals to us at least a week ahead of the meeting to give us time to digest the material.

Bill Bates-I have even suggested that they get with the regional biologists well ahead of the meeting.

Terry Sanslow-Sometimes we become entrenched in the social aspects of a recommendation and lose sight of the biological aspects. That's why giving us the information ahead of time will give us the opportunity to make better decisions.

Wayne Hoskisson-The DWR has some of the best range transects in the state and they read them on a regular basis, which the federal agencies haven't had the ability to do. It is interesting to see how range transect data corresponds with game population fluctuations.

Bill Bates-It would be good to have our habitat personnel come in and talk about some of those things.

Derris Jones-I suggest that you coordinate habitat with wildlife and show historic deer populations and sagebrush trends. You would see a remarkable correlation.

Keele Johnson-I like seeing discussions like this. I'd like to comment on a few things here. One of them is habitat. Utah is the absolute envy of the West. Other states aren't even coming close. They do maybe 1/10 the habitat work we are doing. They ask how we are doing it. It's a combination of the public working with state and federal agencies, and leveraging their money and going after it. When we have wild fires, we fly seed on. I think it's the same kind of spirit you have here in the RAC meeting, involving the public. Other states don't do this. Our public is very involved. In Alaska, they have a board meeting once or twice a year. As a board, we have been talking about habitat and predator control and weather effects on our game populations. We are also concerned about road mortality of deer. We harvest about 22,000 deer in the fall. It looks like we are killing about 20,000 on our highways. The difference is that 70% of the animals killed on the roads are does or fawns. Highways and trains are having a tremendous effect on our deer herds. We are encouraging the DOT to build fences and over or underpasses. Habitat projects, bounties on coyotes, and prevention of road mortalities will have a significant impact on our big game populations.

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

Meeting adjourned at 9 p.m.

13 in attendance

Next RAC meeting Wednesday, March 17, 2010 at the John Wesley Powell Museum, 1765 E. Main in Green River.

Next Wildlife Board Meeting, March 3-4, 2010