

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I support mandatory reporting.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** I fully support augmenting the current populations of antelope in the proposal. I think we should be harvesting less doe antelope across the state and moving them to areas where they can help struggling populations. I would like to see some money used to add guzzlers in some of the areas that get hit by drought consistently. There are areas that pronghorn could utilize if they had a water source.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I do not agree with antler point restrictions. What is the origin of hunting? It wasn't antlers, it was meat. I understand that people hunt for different reasons and some people want a large set of antlers. Antler point restriction only caters to the vocal minority. Most people want a tag in their pocket that is good for any buck. If a person wants to shoot a 3 point and put some meat in the freezer that should not be illegal on any General unit. There are plenty of Limited entry units where a large set of antlers can be the main focus. Until every unit in this proposal is at Carrying Capacity, we should not be stockpiling bucks. We need more does. Most of the areas listed for this trial have limited resources (feed and water). we should be focusing on increasing the resource so we can grow more does, not so we can feed more bucks for several extra years, so they get a large of antlers. If we take care of the does and grow their numbers, the bucks will take care of themselves.

I don't agree with shortened seasons. I believe that it makes people less selective. Most of the people who are going to shoot a deer are going to do so in the first few days. Right now, people can't get a deer tag every year. It may even be every 3 or 4 years between tags. I don't like the idea of a person getting to hunt 3 to 5 days every few years. It's sad that the management strategy is now to let people hunt less so that maybe they kill fewer bucks.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I strongly disagree with removing scopes completely from muzzleloaders. In addition, the majority of muzzleloader hunters disagree with removing scopes from muzzleloaders. I would prefer to leave things as they are. However, I can support and would recommend that the maximum magnification of 4x power be allowed. The division said they can support low power scopes and the 4x scope is the logical choice. 4x is a low enough magnification that it will deter long range shots but in turn allow for clean ethical shots out to 200 yards. 4x gives the consumer plenty of options in buying a scope as other low magnification scope just aren't readily available.

That being said, I think this proposal to remove scopes from muzzleloaders is a knee jerk reaction to a perceived problem rather than anything of substance. It doesn't make any sense at all to hamstring muzzleloaders all the while people are shooting out past 150yds with archery and 1000yds with a rifle. Now I know this is a small group of people that are shooting these distances. The same can be said for muzzleloaders. It is a very small group of people who are shooting muzzleloaders past 250yds. This proposal is not going to do anything to help our struggling deer herds. The DWR acknowledges that the success rate for scoped (Current) vs 1x (pre 2016) is negligible. So why do it, the majority of Muzzleloader hunters oppose going to open sights?

I have hunted with a muzzleloader for 35 years. The vast majority of my hunts have been with a muzzleloader. I even used my muzzleloader on my only Once in a lifetime permit. If you make me go to open sights, it's the end for me. I just can't get my eyes to focus on the sights and the animal all at once.

So, in conclusion, please consider a 4x scope as the Max magnification. It would be a shame to take this muzzleloader hunt opportunity away from old guys like me who can't go to go open sights.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

By not requiring an un-notched paper tag to be returned you are asking for people to game the system. It will happen. no doubt about it. Please continue to require an uncut permit to be returned.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

LOA and landowner tags should only be allowed to hunt their own private property.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

My biggest concern with CWMU's that have trade lands is that the trade lands are still designated as private property on mapping apps. The public doesn't know this property is accessible unless they do extensive research.

I disagree that any accessible public land is included in any CWMU. If the public can access it, it should remain public.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

The change in weapons won't help the deer here we need fewer tag number and if you do the point restriction it will make the quality of deer less and be just like Monroe a bunch of people will shoot first then go see later and leave them to rot we've seen this before on the Monroe I am a hunting guide on fishlake thousand lake and Boulder units I agree with the shorter season dates but that's it there's no data that shows you kill less deer with iron sight muzzel loaders or rifles you wound more deer that then go die never to be found or reported than you do with a scoped weapon I've hunted these mountains here since I was Legal age to hunt and have seen the animals decline we need fewer permit number to help them recover this year they put out 800 rife deer tags on Boulder mountain and that will drastically decrease the population when they shouldn't have added any more tags

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

There's no reason to take scopes off muzzel loaders yes I agree taking the long range muzzel loaders out where you can shoot 800+ yards but a muzzel loader that shoots 100-400 is not bad and a scope just adds that you are sure of the kill rather than wounding it

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 3:33 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Somewhat agree  
**regarding the proposed changes to the**  
**taking big game rule?**

---

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly agree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

Forcing proposed weapon changes won't do anything to affect heard health. These proposed changes are dangerous. They only restrict what we can use. This will only go down hill. Long range hunting is not the problem. It's not. Heard health is more tied to drought and predators and car collisions. Those do more damage then what these proposals are trying to fix. Why do I wait 3 years for a tag only to have 5 days to hunt with the firearm I want to hunt with? Don't change the days or the weapons. Change how we can help with drought conditions, predators, car collisions, feeding during harsh winters, adding guzzlers etc. that will make a difference in numbers.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Scopes on Muzzleloaders are great to have. It gives the hunter a better knowledge of what they are shooting at and can be beneficial with those who don't have eyesight. Even modern muzzleloaders are nothing like rifles. You get one shot. And you still have to load it from the muzzle. Most people who own paramounts and knights don't shoot more then they are capable. Most hunters know their limits. If they don't then that is on them. But don't punish everyone else because some have made poor decisions on shots they shouldn't have taken.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 10:25 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

Some of the earliest memories that I have involve hunting. I have been hunting since I can remember. Now I know I was too young to hunt when I was little. But hunting for my family is also about family time. Now I can remember hiking with my grandfather in the woods, I learned many things from that man about how to hunt. I also remember sitting and watching a field with my grandmother, she also was able to provide much needed knowledge regarding hunting, and those memories are memories I carry with me and now am teaching to my sons. Now I bring up these memories because as we well know the hunter is a dying breed. The generation that taught my parents to hunt, and encouraged our family to continue hunting is no longer with my family. The DWR knows this and that is why over the most recent years they have decreased the hunting age from 14 to 12, as well as made it possible for the youth to hunt with another hunter using the mentor program.

Now these programs were introduced to get the youth, ( which is our future)involved interested, and wanting to continue hunting. I have eager nieces and nephews that cannot wait until they are old enough to go out on the hike for the elk hunt. So the point that I am trying to make is that hunting is not just about hunting, but it is also about family, family time, and the opportunity to teach our youth how to become even better hunters than we are ourselves. Now I remember when the General Deer season went to a draw, and I will tell you that hunting deer, has never been the same. This is due to my family and I not all being able to have tags to be able to go out and hunt together. This has divided our family and therefore caused some disinterest from the younger of us in participating in hunting.

Now I guess I am saying all of this in hopes of catching the attention of the DWR on the problem that is ongoing. I want to point out that over this last week I had the opportunity to spend time with and attempt to help my Mother fill her deer tag which took her 4 years to draw. As I am riding around in the truck with her on the dirt roads, it is sad to say she had to point out to me that due to our states current management plans of the Deer in Utah; I will need to pay for my sons to experience hunting out of state in order to hopefully hold their interest in hunting. As I sat in the back of the truck and thought about this, I came to the realization that my own mother who is now in her 50s likely will only experience maybe 5-6 more deer hunts in her life time given the current ridiculous average drawing period of 3-4 years for General Buck Deer Any Legal Weapon. I then think of my children who I only have with me for 18-20 years, they are unable to hunt until the age of 12 then I put the 3-4 year drawing average into the equation and I will maybe be lucky enough to enjoy 2 hunts with my children before they are grown. Maybe 3 if they are lucky enough to draw a youth hunt which is also not guaranteed.

If I take into account my own hunting and being able to take my children with me I may have 1-2 hunts with them while they are young (ages 3-8) for me to be able to involve them. Now we all know how challenging it can be to hunt with a 3 year old, so that is not realistic.



I feel it is ridiculous for me as a hunter to have to pay more money to hunt out of my own state in order to allow my children to be able to hunt and keep their interest in hunting. Which in doing so benefits the State of Utah.

So now the DWR proposes more restrictions on deer hunting, on units that I hunt. I have to say that I disagree. I would make the regulation in Pine Valley any point count of 3 or higher on one side.

I disagree with limiting the number of days to hunt to 5. This is a terrible proposal, this does not allow people enough time to be able to hunt, track, and find an animal. With how busy today's world is, it is nearly impossible to do any scouting and so in my opinion the first couple of the days of the hunt unless you are lucky are often used to find the herd/animal to be able to potentially harvest a deer. You will also be putting more of a time crunch on people and towards the end of it in my opinion they will be more prompt to fill their tags which will ultimately result in them harvesting younger deer as the younger bucks are more often seen.

I strongly hope that we as hunters and sportsman are able to come up with a solution that is less restrictive for an already restrictive hunt. I also hope that this message will hit home with someone on the board that the current draw system is not working and needs to be addressed for the betterment of our youth, and the future of hunting.

Thank you for your time in reading this.

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 26, 2023 2:11 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** We already know this works. Look at other states studies. Cut the amount of tags given.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Finally your listening. Eliminate optics on muzzleloaders!

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 26, 2023 8:11 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Please make the southeastern until manly the manti follow the same recommendation for season length and just keep trying to help the deer head thanks

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** We have such advanced bow hunting equipment compared to 10 years ago that it definitely needs some sort of restoration maby even a shorter season

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

---

After watching the video here a few things that bothered me

1. your survey size of 2500 people and a response size of 650 people is a very small percentage of the hunting public. But what the hunting public did respond with is that they wanted to keep scopes. The question needed to be asked, what range do rifle hunters feel comfortable at shooting. I believe that you would see similar results.
2. Changing the rules just to match what other states are doing is following, just to follow.
3. All the data shows an increase of harvest of 2.6% since the regulations changed that allowed scopes of all powers. by removing scopes completely the harvest rate will go down and the rate of woundings/not recovered animals will go up and then people will shoot another animal, and that will result in less animals overall. REMOVING SCOPES WILL HAVE A NEGATIVE EFFECT ON THE OVERALL NUMBERS.
4. If this proposal is approved then you will see a lot of muzzleloader hunters change back over to the any legal weapon hunts and this will make point creep worse.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

In the video it states that a goal is to maintain hunting traditions. I have invested a significant amount of money into muzzle loaders and equipment for myself and my children to hunt together. This recommendation would render all that a waste and destroy our hunting tradition. I understand the reply would be that I could take that and hunt in the any legal weapon hunt. There is a reason I spent money on muzzle loaders and not on rifles. I wanted to avoid the any legal weapon hunt. Putting my muzzle loader with those carrying rifles would leave me at a significant disadvantage. Additionally, I don't feel comfortable on the any legal weapon hunt and would not hunt it do to past experiences on that hunt. I can't afford to replace or change all my weapons. Where does our family tradition go? Just stories now about when we used to hunt. The reasons given in the video for taking this opportunity seem flawed and seeking for the answer this committee wanted. The survey results of your constituents should carry the most weight of the reasoning I saw in the video, and those surveys clearly opposed this conclusion. The reasons for this conclusion? Because other states are doing it, how is that a valid reason? No reason was given as to why the other states are seeing better results were given, in fact the opposite seemed to be true, that other states are seeing similar results! Why then make a change and alienate tens of thousands of hunters? A reason was given for trying to keep shots inside of 200 yards. Open sites will not help with this, individuals who believe they can hit a deer at longer distances will still take those shots. We will see an increase in unharvested and wounded animals as people take less accurate shots at all distances. The high end equipment getting cheaper is no reason to switch as well. I have friends who have invested in the high end equipment that can shoot out to longer distances. After several years of hunting with that high end equipment there kill distances are no different than mine. Just having the ability to shoot further hasn't changed their harvest distance. Again, the reasoning for making this change appears to be decided on well before any discussion as the reasons given for the change don't hold water.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Data is key. Punishments and \$50 seem harsh for 1st year trial run.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** I do not understand enough of the details to have an educated opinion.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Data is key and I thought that taking a unit and subdividing into trial areas for different type of management should have been done years ago. If this was done 5 years ago we would have data now. It is about time. I have been told that they haven't worked in the past and so no need to implement now. I love the collar studies being done by Biologist Hinton and BYU.

Before restricting weapons where is the data showing improved technology has increased success harvest rates. Everyone says that technology increases harvest rate and on the surface the argument makes sense but I have yet to see a harvest success rate study showing the increase.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Leave it alone!!! As your study shows more than half the muzzy hunters don't want changes and another 20% neutral. With out science and data the changes are only being made based on a committees opinions. DWR management should be science and data driven. Your own data and science shows 2.5% harvest increase and so by your own data there is not a scientific value reason to make the changes. In fact the rifle hunt had almost the exact same increase in harvest over the same time period. The recommended changes are based on a committee and none of the committees recommendations refer to science, almost every recommendation is an opinion of a person that is on the committee. It looks like the committee went in with an agenda and have their minds made up.

1- Multiple Muzzy definitions, the DWR creates these definitions with addition of HAMS, and special weapons hunts just like the definition for unit boundaries are all different and can be confusing, different multiple season dates can be confusing, this argument makes no sense. If the definitions are confusing you create the definitions, simplify them and make them easier to understand, don't add more restrictions and confusion.

2-As a fellow law enforcement officer I will tell you that if the DWR officer if I cannot look at an optic and see a variable power ring on the small ocular eyepiece of the scope as they are talking to a subject then you need to hire different people. Identifying a variable power optic is as easy as looking to see if a hunter is wearing blaze orange. Looking at variable power optic is easier than looking at a hunting license and easier than seeing if the gun is capped and loaded or not. As a law enforcement officer this argument about officer safety is ridiculous and a offensive to your DWR officers intelligence.

3-The old saying from your mom of if your friends jumped off a cliff would you follow and jump? this is the argument for other states not allowing technology so Utah shouldn't allow it. Because everyone is doing it is a silly argument.

4-Most people are not comfortable shooting over 200 yards. People are lying to you on the survey. With the proper equipment most muzzy hunters I know and hunt with are comfortable out to 300+. Open sights 200 yard max is realistic and accurate but I think the survey needed to specify optics and I truly believe that 300+ would be more accurate result from the survey.

5- Maintaining the primitive nature of the hunt. YES A VALID POINT FINALLY. I agree with this one but if you want primitive go all out and no in-line no sabots, round ball of lead only. Lets go primitive!!!!

6-Accurate guns and equipment are becoming more affordable. Isn't this exactly what you want? More hunter participation and opportunity should be your goal, not the opposite of restricting people from hunting. This argument actually is an argument for more technology not less. Many hunters will be angry because they bought muzzleloaders that were optic specific and they are not open sight capable without going to a gun smith and having work done on the gun. The added cost of switching will be a finical burden for many.

7- Need to get ahead of technology advancements? I am not sure what advancements you are looking at? powders, ignition sources, range-finding optics? Why not list them and ban them specifically (like you did for rifle rangefinding scopes) instead of attacking only optics on muzzy?

8- What is acceptable. I think this last one is key. If you want primitive hunt no problem go back to complete primitive, or leave current. But trying to go back to a halfway point I think causes more issues. I would love to see a primitive muzzy hunt again and get rid of all the inline, sabots, and long range bullets and go back to cap and ball. I think sitting on the fence will cause more issues, go one way or the other.

As you can see I am passionate about the muzzy hunts and I have been hunting them for 30+ years and all of my kids love the opportunity it provides, including the use of technology. Using technology on the muzzy hunts have allowed my kids much more opportunity to hunt, wound less animals and get outdoors and if they put in the work harvest an animal.

I think the recommended restrictions will reduce their opportunities, increase wounded animals and eventually possible reduce their desire to hunt.

As you can see I am passionate about this topic and I appreciate having the opportunity to voice my concerns.



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** I like the clarification.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 26, 2023 12:45 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly agree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

After watching the video and seeing the statistics the data showed that participants were split down the middle on if they wanted change. I find it interesting that the data also showed no change in harvest success. Why then do we need to remove scopes from muzzleloaders? Technology is constantly evolving and becoming more affordable. If we want a primitive hunt we should go back to spears and rocks. Rangefinders, compound bows, optics (scope's, binoculars, spotting scopes), and long range guns are way better now than they were years ago. These technologies have allowed us to become better and more efficient hunters. Why are we limiting advancements? If someone would like a primitive muzzleloader hunt they are entitled to get out the flint lock and give it there best shot. Why is it that someone who wants to hunt with a more accurate weapon is limited? It saddens me to be out hiking and see wounded animals or animals that were not recovered due to poor shot placement. Many times this could have been avoided with use of better equipment. I hope that this proposal is revoked and that generations to come are able to use better technology if they choose to become more efficient hunters.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** think this will be good you could add a management hunt in the future For the youth but you need to no the Rule does not state no inline muzzleloader it just says cap must be Visible

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I have muzzleloader hunted for Over 30 years and this needs to happen

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** The use of magnified optics was put in place after a general election vote by the residents. Residents voted to allow this and to change it, it should require a general election vote.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I support increasing buck to doe ratios and overall buck age class by any means necessary. Please keep the study for a minimum of 4 years to see improvements

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** the increase in fees for hours is already going to drop dedicated enrollment. proposing additional data in return while threatening to revoke points seems counter intuitive.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 27, 2023 12:52 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I am strongly in favor of removing scopes from muzzleloaders. I have powder hunted for over 20 years and would like to see it back the way it was before people were shooting animals at 500 yards with a muzzleloader. If hunters insist on using a scoped gun, there is an any legal weapon hunt they can use it on. Thanks

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

If it only changes the odds by 3% and the hunting pressure is the least of all the seasons (I do dedicated Hunter so I see all the different hunts and pressures) you should be able to still use a scope on a muzzleloader. You are making it harder and harder to harvest an animal for the average hunter. Now you are going to have more wounded deer with open sights.

This goes back to the trail camera thing if you are rich and own property you can use a trail camera but if you are just an average joe that uses public land no camera's. You want to sell more tags and have a lower success rate and say it is what hunters want. I have hunted every year for over 30 years and do not like what I am seeing. If you make these changes I will be giving up on hunting. I will pick up a camera just take photos and you won't get any more money from me for tags or application fees. I have been trying to get my kids into the sport but it will die with me if I am not doing it with them. There goes your future generations also.



Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 27, 2023 3:46 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I strongly disagree with removing scopes from muzzleloaders. I am opposed to long range muzzleloaders which uses brass cartridges that hold a primer. The run of the mill inline muzzleloaders that us 209 shotgun primers is ok.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 27, 2023 4:58 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** They need to hunt when everyone else hunts. And dates. And they have to apply with everyone else

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Nice to have stats public

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Scopes on muzzleloader is my favorite way to hunt and the reason my family hunts in Utah. Removing Scopes from muzzleloader, I do not believe, has any benefit.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?** It would be nice to reduce the amount of land required to get landowner permits. Previously living in Missouri, we would get a landowner permit for each 75 acres owned. 640 acres is excessive. I have about 100 acres but the deer and Elk eat approximately 10,000 or more of my crop each year and I get no compensation for this.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 28, 2023 10:10 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** It would be nice to know the number and size of bucks taken on private property versus public property.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 28, 2023 10:23 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Somewhat agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I agree with all changes except the weapons restrictions of the compound bows and muzzleloader. Why would I need to buy new equipment when bows and muzzleloader are generally harder hunts as it is. With Longbows and flintlocks people are less experienced and could lead to more errant shots and wounded animals. As with rifle, taking away scopes will only add more errors. I believe if it's just point restrictions and shorter season dates that majority of hunters will still hunt those units but will Not with the weapons restrictions

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I like the shorter hunting days  
I like the weapon restrictions.  
I don't like that 1 unit will be the sacrificial lamb.  
I believe there needs to be more units across the state to implement these changes, not just the Boulder unit.  
Please choose 4-8 more units to restrict throughout the state.  
That will give better data than just 1 unit.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

The division should be making it harder to join the Dedicated Hunter Program. People that are complaining about the requirements are too ██████ Lazy.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** The argument that technology only increased success by 3percent is hollow. Should not be a big hardship to reduce success by that same 3percent. Currently the season is merely a single shot rifle season and not in the spirit of a muzzleloader season.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I am all for the changes. I love the no scopes on muzzle loaders combined with the 4 point or better on one side. A max of 3x powered scopes on rifles would be nice to see as well. This will increase herd numbers as well as quality and eventually give more opportunity to the public when herd numbers begin to rise. These regulations need to be implemented on the Central Mountain Manti, 9 Mile, La Sal, and the Abajo units if not state wide.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I like the idea of no scopes on muzzle loaders. I think just as many deer get wounded by taking long range shots with muzzle loaders and rifles than they would at a closer range with no scopes. I think rifles should be limited to a 3 powered scope as well. This will require hunters to get closer and give the deer a chance to survive.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** CWMU's need to be required to follow the same season dates as the rest of the world. The fact that an animal can survive the hunts all year on public land and then move to a CWMU to rut and be killed is not helping the herd numbers and is really hurting quality on some units. If there is no game on the CWMU's during the regular season dates then let the land owners improve there habitat on there land.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I have long been an advocate of using scopes on muzzleloader. The data you collected shows that it makes little difference in the harvest number. Over half of the hunters surveyed want to keep the rule as it is presently. Regarding the rules in surrounding states; who cares what their rules are. In fact, when looking at all states, not just the west, more states allow scopes than do not. What this proposal boils down to is a philosophical argument by a minority of advocates. If this change is implemented it will very likely end my big game hunting experience, something I have greatly enjoyed for the last 60 years.

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I have hunted elk in Colorado 3 times with a muzzleloader rifle w/o scope. I harvested one that I tagged and two that I wounded that I didn't find. Marksmen don't make their long shots with 2x scopes. My family and friends have hunted muzzleloader deer on the Blues not counting this year for 13 consecutive years. We haven't filled up any year but there is not a hunter that hunts w/o a scope. What is the percentage of rifle hunters that hunt w/o a scope. How many would you have hunt if they had to use a powder horn and open sights? I got the impression from your study that power of scope didn't make a difference in how clear they saw their target. If you limit muzzleloader from having scopes why don't you limit rifles from having scopes and see what red flags show up. Presently there is a better chance of drawing a tag on good areas when there are multiple weapon seasons.

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 30, 2023 10:51 am

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I'm all for the mandatory harvest reporting. The data probably won't change, but the public confidence will.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I really like the idea of trying some new hunting strategies. A major concern I have is the lifetime license holders grabbing a huge majority of the tags in the 4pt or better units. Pine Valley already has about 500, and I think it will more than double. I think there should be some sort of cap, similar to the Dedicated Hunter Program, around 15% or so.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

So, the technology committee recommended to restrict the use of range-finding bow sights that cost \$800-\$1,000. A small percentage of hunters were using these and were affected by the change. On the rifle end of things, riflescopes that do similar things were restricted. The Burris Eliminator (\$1,500+) and the Swarovski DS (\$4,000+) are the only two mainstream scopes that do that. Again, very few people were affected by this change, with the vast majority of hunters using regular scopes with a turret/dial system. Almost EVERY muzzleloader hunter in the state will be affected by this proposal, and per the DWR's own survey data, there's "Not a lot of support for change". Also, no majority was in favor of the muzzleloader sight restrictions, the majority was in favor of the status quo - their words! So who is really pushing for this? If someone is looking for a "unique experience", what is stopping them from using iron sights right now? It doesn't make sense to me to make such a drastic change, without majority support.

The survey says that "Most people aren't comfortable harvesting animals beyond 200 yards" That's because most people are still in the 200-300 range, and I know a LOT of people with long-range muzzleloaders capable of shooting a long way. People like to be accurate and ethically harvest animals! Was that not even part of the conversation? Do we purposefully want to reduce people's accuracy and effective ability to cleanly and quickly harvest animals? I don't think it's a good idea to go backwards there.

Here's the big issue I have and I would like the RAC and Board to discuss:

The technology committee recommends that we restrict the optics that allow muzzleloaders to shoot similar distances to rifles. What are we doing to restrict the optics and sights on archery equipment that allow them to shoot more than 100 yards, crossing into muzzleloader territory? Shooting those extreme distances with a bow is far less accurate, predictable and ethical than some shooting 500 yards with these new muzzleloaders. And people ARE doing shooting those extremely long-range bow shots, because their sights allow for it! If you surveyed the general hunting public, a HUGE majority would say that people should not be shooting 100 yards (or more) with their bows. If we are going to restrict these optics on weapons, let's do it equitably and fairly. Let's not pretend like archery hunters are exempt from their weapons pushing the limits of an effective and ethical range. No preferential treatment.

I respectfully request the RAC's and Wildlife Board seriously discuss and vote on restricting archery sights to a maximum of 5 fixed pins and NO SLIDING or ADJUSTABLE SIGHTS. And only then I will be in favor of the proposed muzzleloader restrictions.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Mandatory harvest reporting is needed.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I've been muzzleloader hunting in Utah since 2003. Your muzzleloader proposal is completely off the mark regarding technology. Why did you limit the conversation only to scopes? Scopes only enable long distance muzzleloader shooting. The weapons and ignition types are the driver, and this was completely ignored. Why? There are 3 types of muzzleloaders, traditional, modern, and ultra modern. Define traditional as side locks of any type, modern as inlines with musket or 209 primers, and ultra modern as small caliber large magnum rifle primer ignition. If you want to keep the hunt more traditional, eliminate ultra modern LRMPs and anything under .45 caliber. Enforce 45 minimum for pronghorn, deer and 50 minimum for elk with modern inline bullet/sabot minimum weights. Then no one can shoot >200 yards due to weapon limit regardless of scope power. The survey results speak for themselves. It doesn't matter what other states are doing; if everyone was to jump in a lake would you do it just because they were? Think for yourselves and stay unique. I would really like to see a) keeping a minimum of 1X scopes legal, and/or b) eliminate ultra modern muzzleloader ignition types and bore/bullet sizes instead. This is a much more common sense proposal than eliminating scopes altogether.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Neither agree nor disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** If/when you conduct these research studies, please - for the love of all that is good and holy - FOLLOW THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF YOUR BIOLOGISTS when they analyze the data collected.

One huge reason why the hunting public has so little faith in the DWR is the fact that, at board meetings, the board will routinely disregard biologist recommendations and enact their own biases into statewide hunting policy (see here: the elimination of Multi-season Any Bull Elk hunts).

How is it acceptable that, at board meetings, the committee votes on things that aren't even on the agenda, let alone haven't even been released for public feedback?

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** If optics on a muzzleloader only increase success rates by 3%, then why are we even having this discussion?

Those who draw HAMS hunts are responsible for reading the regulations just like everyone else. If the goal is to make the rule consistent for all muzzleloader hunts, then instead allow HAMS hunts to utilize optics - not the other way around.

When the DNR proposes these rule changes, please ask yourselves, "is this policy change motivated by, and in accordance with, the recommendations of our biologists?" If the answer is no - then it shouldn't even be a topic of discussion.

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Great idea

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** What about people with disabilities ? They won't have a chance to kill. It's hard enough for them already. If you go to a 5 day hunt then everyone will hunt the same days causing crowds. Nothing wrong with scopes on muzzleloaders and rifles. You already screwed it up

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Leave stuff alone you just make it worse

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Going to iron sights on muzzleloaders I feel is a mistake. I feel the wounded rate will increase. With people trying to deal with open sights. Please consider limiting the scopes to 1 power which will help keep the wounded rate lower while limiting the range of muzzleloaders. Why do we care what other states are doing? Don't pick and Choose. We're the only state that has rifle elk hunt's during the rut???? There's no need to take muzzle loaders back to open sights. The increase in success rates with scopes is minimal. But I agree something needs to be done with the long range muzzle loaders. So limit scopes to 1 power.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** This is a long overdue change. A+

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** I mostly agree with this proposal, but one area I am not in favor of is Antelope Island, I feel they need to get a handle on the very over abundant coyote population before putting more animals out there.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I commend the DWR for this out of the box thinking, and am willing to see how these proposals shake out.

A couple of issues that I am not a fan of, for the restrictive weapons hunts, I feel the archery restrictions are vastly over kill. Archery is already a very low success rate that I feel moving to long bow tech is to far. To me a fair restrictive hunt for archery would be to limit hunters to a 3 or 5 pin NON SLIDING site. to me this would help to reign in the archery equipment and lower success some. As I said its already very low compared to rifle and even muzzleloader.

I also feel that the muzzleloader restriction is to much, I feel that removing scopes as your have with rifles would be a fair take for that weapon type.

To me you went too far with your restrictive weapons definitions, I was ok with-it last year as a proposal, but only because I thought it would be used to add and additional hunt rather than completely replacing a hunt especially something as big as a whole general season unit.

One other issue, the proposed archery season is to start the first weekend in September, I feel you should keep the original start date in August as one of the draws to the archery hunt is hunting velvet bucks, if you move the hunt to September the velvet is not as pristine as it is getting ready to be rubbed off.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

This is a very disingenuous proposal, all of the feedback shows that the majority of hunters, and especially muzzleloader hunters do not support this change.

This is not a biological issue, the success rate did not see a significant jump, I see no reason to change the current rules. Hunting with a muzzleloader even one of the new ones is not even remotely close to the same as hunting with a rifle.

The DWR, or the Tech committee never did give a good valid reason that they feel this rule needs to change. I fully reject this proposal and I hope that you on the WB will as well.

KEEP SCOPES ON MUZZLOADERS.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

I agree with most of this, the only thing I do not like is them automatically adding a year to the program if the hunter draws a LE tag.

I personally had this happen to me as I drew a LE deer tag on the second year of my Dedicated hunters enrollment last year, this allowed me to be extra selective this year as I was able to hunt for a bigger buck this year knowing that if I did not kill one I could extend my dedicated to next year. But in the chance I did find a buck I wanted this year (which I did) I would still be able to use last year (the year I drew LE) as my no kill year. This allows me to now put in for a general hunt next year and either build a point or draw a tag.

Ultimately if you do this you will essentially be taking away a year of eligibility from the people that draw a LE tag while in the system. We all want as many years as possible to hunt, this rule would take a year away from someone depending on how it is implemented.

Everything else looked good.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

It does not say in this video, but in the new rules that passed last year, the people buying a voucher would have access to the entire LOA per the rule. I am wondering if that rule would still be in effect for Option 2 of the LOA rules?

Something to think about.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

I feel the public hunters do not get enough of the tags, should be 20% go to the public.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** On one hand, the video says it only increased success 2.6% and that the division wants people to have success during the muzzleloader hunt but yet they're taking away one of the options to be successful. I can understand if they want to limit or do away with it for adult hunters but this is one of the tools I have used to get my children interested in muzzleloading, and if you take the scopes away, I feel our youth will be less likely to muzzleloader hunt. I feel it's a bad idea I would be in favor of limiting the power of scopes but not to do away with them completely! Thanks

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 8:47 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Dear Sirs and Madams,

I am writing in response to the proposed restrictions for optics on muzzleloaders. I did watch the video in its entirety, and I have some thoughts and concerns. I have hunted in Utah for over 40 years. I have used muzzleloader rifles throughout that entire period. I own and have used traditional TC rifles (cap and ball) as well as more modern in-line rifles. According to the data presented in the video, adding scopes to muzzleloaders insignificantly increases the harvest ratio, does not increase the wound ratio, does not increase the distance of the hunter taking a comfortable shot and therefore really has no scientific data to show that removing them entirely would have any significant effect except to appease a small fraction of people who are traditionalists or just don't like them or to match what other states are doing.

I would propose leaving the regulations as they are unless:

- 1) The scientific data shows an overwhelming advantage in harvest numbers.
- 2) The data shows an unacceptable increase in the number of wounded animals.
- 3) Biologists need to slow the buck harvest to increase buck-to-doe ratios or to help a specific area herd to recover. Make it a useful tool, like they are doing in our southern regions, not a blanket regulation.

As far as technology is concerned, I think it would be easy to argue that all methods have significantly increased over time, especially in the last 30 years. For example:

- 1) Compound bows have gone from 50-60% let off to 90% enabling longer hold periods.
- 2) Newer materials have shortened bows with higher speeds and less vibration.
- 3) Optics, specifically range finders, have dramatically improved accuracy and range.
- 4) The increase in the speed of compound bows allows greater arrow choices.
- 5) Rifles have also benefited from optic technology.
- 6) Rifle bullet technology has made effective shooting ranges more than double.

I respect that trying to effectively manage the states game animals is a daunting task and there are a lot of voices to be heard. However, I believe taking scopes away from muzzleloaders is the wrong choice and an ineffective rule with no real benefit for the wildlife at this point in time.

Sincerely,  
Robert M

---



Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 8:54 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the proposed changes to the**  
**taking big game rule?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments** Please leave scopes on muzzleloaders  
**about the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

In this case, the DWR is being awfully selective and disingenuous in using "alignment" with other western states as a reason to disallow scopes. To the point, no other Western state allows rifle hunting of bull elk during the height of the rut; most other states hold their muzzleloader deer hunts in November, not September, and so on. If there is truly a minimal difference in hunter success as stated in the Proposal, then allowing scopes should allow for fewer wounded and lost animals. This proposal smacks of an effort to appease complaints from rifle hunters versus a biological or management driven change.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

I worry about unethical hunters taking advantage of the changes to essentially false report and harvest every year. Unless there is a corresponding change in the rules to allow 3 harvests in three years, I think there will be abuse of the new reporting/tracking system.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** No

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** No

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Scopes on muzzleloader does not change a muzzleloader. It helps us to see what we are shooting at. If you place the scope restriction, there will be unwanted shots on doe and fawns. Especially since we are use to some sort of scope. Deer move around they do not stay in place. So if someone is looking through binoculars an tell themselves "ok, shoot the one on the right". Between the transition of binocular to muzzleloader. The deer could shuffle around and the hunter could lose sight of his/her target an accidentally shoot a doe, fawn or yearling. Muzzleloader needs to be left alone. We can not shoot 300 to 600 yards whoever concluded this is shooting at paper on a bench rest with a table rest. What you need to focus on is ohv trails especially in southern Utah. There is a ohv trail in every ravine, mountain top, valley and opening. It's ridiculous how many trails there is. I believe we need to control ohv trails during hunts and basically force people to stay on main roads and trails. People will learn how to hunt and stop pointing fingers at muzzleloaders.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** No

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

No

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?**

No

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

No

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree finally we will have actual data on the number of animals harvested and wounded per unit and weapon type. NO more guessing and averaging numbers.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I think this is a great idea. I am glad to see the DWR wanting to try some things sportsmen have been asking them to try for years. I would like to see this study expanded and maybe even include central and northern units to compare to the southern unit studies. I would like to see the season date restriction statewide. We are very good at harvesting animals with the technology we have now days. We don't need to be hunting and pressuring the animals as long as we do now.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I really don't feel like the scopes on muzzleloaders is having a negative affect on the deer numbers. I would be fine with going back to 1x scopes to help curve the technology. If we do go back to open sights or peep only I really think the DWR should look at restricting the new adjustable MOA peep sights example( Gunwerks Revic EXO). These adjustable peeps are the next step in open sight muzzleloader technology for shooting long range and should be restricted now with these proposed changes.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

First, I do not support having different rules for different areas. It is already way too confusing and this will make it exponentially worse. Many people are not following the rules now and most of the time it is not intentional, the rules are just too complicated. Also, some of these recommendations are needed on all units and some should not be implemented on any unit. It is not logical to wait until 2029 to implement statewide.

I support 4-point or better on all deer units in Utah with an exception for youth 12-16 years old that should be able to harvest any size buck. This does multiple things including: increases number of mature deer, doesn't deprive youth of being able to have reasonable success and continue hunting in the future, and provides a way to cull out those deer with bad genetics that may never be a 4-point.

I absolutely do not support the shorter season proposals for any unit. Hunting is my passion and I cherish every day spent in the field. Your own data shows that shorter seasons do not significantly impact totals days hunted or harvest. It only increases hunter crowding and takes away from time in the field of those that are passionate. Please do not shorten seasons.

The weapon restriction proposals are ridiculous. We may as well go back to using spears and atlatls. These restrictions will significantly reduce hunter satisfaction, instantly make peoples equipment obsolete and force them to make significant expenditures to purchase new equipment, and result in much less ethical shots being taken and more wounded game. It simply is impossible to hunt more ethically with a long bow, re-curve, or non-inline muzzel loader when compared to modern technology.

Also, please divide the Manti unit into a north and south unit split on the most logical boundary of Highway 31. The unit is simply too big to manage as one unit. Populations and trends are not the same across that large of a unit and there is no way to control hunter crowding. Please consider this comment even though it is mostly unrelated to the current proposal.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I do not support this recommendation at all. I fully believe this will result in less ethical shots being taken and much more wounded and unrecovered game.

People do not shoot more than 200 yards generally with a muzzleloader because of the gun, not because of the optics. Muzzleloaders have no doubt improved, but are still far from being on par with a modern rifle. The fact that they are single shot, the diameter of projectile, worse accuracy, pain to clean and tune, etc. all lead to them being significantly different and less efficient than modern rifles.

Many of us need scopes due to our eyesight. I would hardly call most people with vision problems impaired since it impacts almost every single person as they age. It is very difficult to focus on open sights as you age as well as seeing clearly at all ranges. I don't think the visual impairment is meant to mean just older people. Seems very hard to enforce.

Will the RACS, Wildlife Board, or Division be buying back our now obsolete equipment? I worked very hard to obtain my equipment and will not be able to afford to replace it to meet the new restrictions. My muzzleloader didn't come with open sights or even drilled for open sights. It will place a very unfair burden to retrofit or replace equipment and result in expensive equipment with no reasonable market to get our hard earned money back.

Please do not implement this proposal.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

I find it very hard to believe the public has requested to have their hunting rights removed from them if they do not fill out a survey. Maybe if you offered to give the public \$5 off next years application fee instead of threatening a fine and hunting rights removed you would have better results. This is a government over reach and absolutely absurd. What happened to the days when we would receive phone calls from the dnr about our season? I gladly shared this information because I was asked in a respectful manner. Now the dnr is going to eliminate the need for those jobs and pass the responsibility solely onto the hunter. If the harvest information is that important to the dnr why will you not pay for it? I am strongly against this outrageous proposal. If this proposal is to pass my harvest surveys will be some of the most useful information the dnr has ever seen. The old saying "you get what you pay for " will hold true. Do not pass this proposal!



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** This is the best way to get real data quickly and efficiently. Great plan!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I strongly support the antler restriction study and the shortened season. Not so much the weapon restrictions.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** These surveys that impact every muzzleloader hunter in the state should have been sent to every hunter. I have completed every survey that has ever been sent out to me and I'm honest with them. If most answered were 50/50 the survey should have been sent out again to way more people who will actually complete the survey and provide real data to the board. This restriction impacts lots of hunters who have spent big \$\$\$ on equipment that will be useless after this restriction. Not to mention the money that will have to be spent now buying new muzzleloaders that have open sights or paying a gunsmith to drill and tap high \$ muskets for open sights. 2.6% harvest increase since allowing scopes is an incredibly low number and tells me that technology is ok and has not negatively impacted deer and wlk herds. We still have one shot then have to reload just like a traditional musket. I'd much rather make that one shot count. Imagine a young hunter with buck fever trying to shoot a deer at 200 yards with open sights vs with a magnified scope. Much quicker and cleaner kill with the scope and less chance of wounding the animal. I strongly disagree with this proposal. I would support a magnification restriction (9 power or something) and a primer restriction to traditional caps and 209 primers (eliminating the rifle primer use). I agree that the muzzleloader hunt should be different from alw hunts but why feed us cake and brownies for almost a decade and then out of nowhere start forcing us to eat slop.

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the proposed rule changes to**  
**the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I support removing scopes from the muzzleloader hunt. It has become too similar to the any legal weapon hunt. A good progression exists between the three weapon choices (bow, muzzleloader, rifle) when there aren't scopes on muzzleloader. I believe that the negative comments will come from people who primarily want a less crowded any legal weapon hunt. Most comments against this proposal will be from people who want to use a scopes weapon to be able to hunt more easily but who want to hunt during a season less popular than the any legal weapon season. This is not proper justification and the traditional peep sight muzzleloader hunt should be implemented once again. I support the recommendation to disallow scopes on muzzleloader. I believe that most true muzzleloader hunts will also support the change.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

What a bunch of Fools! 2 1/2%? Leave it the freak alone. You're so worried about killing more animals, take it back to 3 hunts!! Archery, muzzleloader, and rifle. Not 35 different freakin hunts! From August to January you have so many different [REDACTED] hunts, the animals don't have a chance! 3 hunts, muzzleloader scopes okay due to only 2 1/2% more success. You change the laws so often, a person can't keep up with them! You always say it's what the people want. Ive never been surveyed on any change of laws or proposals. You put these stupid comment questions up, but it doesn't matter, because the RAC'S, and division already have their minds made up. You go to a RAC meeting and your opinion means nothing. You have somebody like Kevin Albrecht and the Outfitter Associations giving their opinions, and that's the way it goes. The actual Sportsman paying the money to fund the division, has no say. No different the U.S. Government. Do as we say, not what you want. I've been an avid outdoorsman in Utah for over 50 years, and have seen many changes in that time. Make up your [REDACTED] minds!!! Oh yeah, and just because other states do something with laws, doesn't mean Utah has to. Listen to some of their advice on permit numbers, not necessarily their technology input.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 5, 2023 8:39 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**      Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**      I think we should keep low power scopes for general muzzle loader and limited entry hunts, if scopes are removed hunts should last longer

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 6, 2023 12:15 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** We need to keep scopes in muzzleloaders. What about the people buying long range muzzleloader? No since of having one of you can't have a scope on it.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 6, 2023 3:57 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I am writing mostly about scopes on muzzleloaders. There is only a 2.6% increase in hunter harvest with using scopes versus not using scopes and I suspect that there is less wounding loss when using scopes. I can't see a biological reason to disallow the use of scopes on muzzleloaders. Voting to not allow scopes on muzzleloaders won't increase our big game herds at all.

I am over 70 years old, and it is almost impossible to focus both the front sight and the rear sight on a muzzleloader for me and most people near my age. A scope really helps me make a better and more ethical shot on an animal, especially in low-light conditions. We hunt spike elk with muzzleloaders and it is hard to keep track of a legal spike and a spike with extra points that isn't legal when both are moving around in a herd and changing places. A scope really helps.

I was at the Wildlife Board meeting clear back when they had the two-board system when they made the 1 power scope rule for muzzleloaders. There was an older gentleman by the name of Jerry Mason on the Board who really liked to hunt with a muzzleloader, but he couldn't see very well so he wanted to be able to use a scope. He didn't think that he had enough support for a law to be able to use scopes so he made a motion to use 1 power scopes and it passed. He didn't realize that a 1 power scope makes things look farther away than they really are, and the crosshairs are so thick that they almost cover up a whole target at a hundred yards and it was really hard to even sight one in. This is why hunters pushed to be able to use regular rifle scopes.

I don't like the idea of people shooting animals with muzzleloaders at the yardage they claim. The trouble is that you can't legislate common sense, morals, or ethics. I never shoot at anything over 200 yards and almost never over a hundred yards. I don't have one of those new long-range muzzleloaders and don't plan on buying one. Basically, most muzzleloader bullets have very poor trajectory so the only way that you can hit anything at the ranges they claim is to have a scope with a lot of magnification that you can dial up for yardage. If you shoot a scope that doesn't have an adjustment for yardage, you are just guessing where you hold your crosshairs when you shoot. At the ranges, some of them claim to shoot a muzzleloader that would drop between 10 and 15 feet. That would be really hard to guess the holdover with a fixed low-power scope.

I would hate to see you vote to disallow scopes on muzzleloaders but if you think that you want to make a change, I suggest that you change the rule to say "Only fixed 4 power scopes or less are allowed on muzzleloaders". That would really cut out all this really long-range shooting but would still allow a decent short-range rifle that more follows the spirit of muzzleloader hunting. Scopes have been used on muzzleloaders clear back in the Flintlock days. People of my age have plenty of issues with hunting as they get older but please don't make it harder than it already is for us.



I was the southern region RAC chairman for several years before I was appointed to the Utah Wildlife Board. I have been active in all kinds of wildlife conservation groups for over 50 years. Every year sportsmen were complaining about low buck numbers. Throughout all these years I have been around when the legislature passed buck-only hunting when we have gone through antler point restrictions, shortened seasons, cutting permit numbers and all kinds of measuring ideas like bucks per 100 does and age classes and the list goes on. All the while our deer herds just keep dwindling and as part of it we just keep seeing fewer bucks and for sure older bucks.

Basically, for the last 50 years we have had our focus in the wrong place, we have been worrying about bucks because we like to hunt them. The real thing that we should have been focusing on is fawn rates instead of bucks. For a deer herd just to maintain we need about 65 per hundred does postseason. In the past some deer units would have over 100 fawns per hundred does postseason. Now we have units with less than 40 fawns per hundred does postseason. If we want bucks they have to be born and allowed to survive to maturity and be able and reproduce. Large mature bucks are always a small portion of a deer herd so when you have low herd numbers you can't expect to have many large bucks whether we hunt them or not.

Now we are under 90,000 deer hunters hunting buck only and the deer are declining. In the banner years in the 60's and 70's, we had almost 3 times that many hunters and we were hunting either sex, and we still had a lot of deer. I don't agree with all this modern technology and don't want to make light of it, but the answer to having more and larger bucks to hunt is fawn survival. All these hunt-change strategies that have been tried over the years to create better buck hunting have failed. Sportsmen have been complaining and bickering forth with each other and the DWR for years and have accomplished really very little. We are so far below any reasonable threshold on some of our deer units that it would take almost some major intervention to ever bring them back. If we do ever get the deer herd back to some reasonable level there will be enough good bucks for all of us to share without all these changes.

I have been where you are sitting now, and I really appreciate all the time and commitment that you have for Utah's wildlife.

Paul Niemeyer

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

This proposal goes against what the majority of muzzleloader hunters want. I strongly disagree with this recommendation, as well as most of the hunters that I know. It would be nice if the DWR would listen to the surveys that were collected and not waste time with such a nonsensical recommendation. I have been hunting with a scoped muzzleloader with my teenage children. This helps them correctly identify the game that they wish to harvest and make ethical kills. By taking scopes away from muzzleloaders I know that my children's ability to make successful and ethical harvest will be greatly impacted. If the goal is to lower confidence and increase wounding mortality this is probable a great proposal. I personally would rather make clean kills and be able to retrieve my game. For a organization that is trying to recruit and encourage youth hunters to continue to hunt, this proposal seems counter productive.

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I am strongly opposed to the proposed change which would eliminate the use of a variable power scope on a muzzleloader during the muzzleloader only hunt. I have several reasons why I am opposed to this change.

1) The number one reason why I believe this is not a good idea is I believe there will be more wounded animals that are not recovered when using iron sights only. It is more difficult for a hunter to use iron sights at distances of 100 yards and beyond. Hunters tend to overestimate their abilities.

2) If a scope is allowed to be used on a muzzleloader during the any legal weapon hunt, then it should be allowed to be used during the muzzleloader only hunt. This is an inconsistent policy and makes no sense.

3) Older hunters have deteriorating vision issues and many of us must wear eyeglasses. Being able to focus on a front site AND a distant animal in low light is a difficult proposition.

4) I am sure that many hunters, like myself, made a considerable investment when they purchased a variable power scope. Now, it appears we are about to be told that we can no longer use this same gear that we have used for the past several seasons. This would constitute an unequal application of the proposed regulation.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I Hunted for years with an open sight Muzzleloader, with the addition of a scope, muzzleloader hunting has become more crowded and it's a fact that more people are taking game. With this positive change, I would like to see the deer and elk seasons swapped-- Elk muzzleloader Season in September and muzzleloader deer in November the way it was back before scopes were allowed. Additionally, no more multi-season tags for elk, all it has done is crowd an already crowded hunt.

I feel like muzzleloader hunters are getting a bad rap, with today's technologies, bow hunters are shooting deer at 100 yards and with long range guns shooting 1000 plus yards, a Deer or an Elk really has no chance and it's not hunting in my book. One piece of technology that allows this to happen is a range finder. You really want to make things fair chase eliminate the use of rangefinders on any hunt.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 7, 2023 3:59 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Somewhat disagree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

To the Southeastern Utah RAC Representative,

My name is Scott B. Christensen. I have hunted in Utah all but one year of my eligible life. I started hunting at 14 and I'm 60 now. I just learned of several changes that will be discussed in your next RAC meeting. Many of which I disagree with.

First I would like to say I recognize there are problems with our Deer population. This year has been miserable for the rifle deer hunt. Two days of hunting and I saw three deer. A doe and her 2 yearlings. I hunted many areas and covered many miles. I also sat down with DWR officers that were stationed near Scipio. At the time I sat down with them they hadn't had anyone stop in and only one person call them. Last winter was terrible and the area must have had severe winter kill. Lets just say I won't be applying for a tag in that area for some time.

I'm also worried about CWD and welcome testing so long as it leads to ways of controlling it or eliminating it. Testing to just track it or to just say we know it's there is worthless and a waste of the money I contribute to DWR. I further recommend more information to the public about eating animals that test positive for it. IE: Its safety and possible harms it may pose. I think it needs to be shared on more media than your website.

Now to the proposed changes.

Muzzleloader - Only open sites.

Scopes help hunters make better and more humane shots/kills. With open sites you'll have more people making poor shots that could lead to more wounded animals and less ethical hunting. Scopes also help hunters make better identification of species and sex. Scopes do not change the effectiveness of the muzzleloader itself, it's killing capabilities, or it's range.

Sometimes when I hunt CWMU's I like to use a muzzleloader for the challenge and skill it provides. After all I get only one shot 99% of the time before it scampers off.

Muzzleloader - Inline Muzzleloader (Using 209 primers) restriction from Muzzleloader season

I'm stymied about the need to break this grouping up. A muzzleloader is a muzzleloader. Inline with a 209 primer doesn't increase the distance my muzzleloader shots. I still must load it from the muzzle. I still usually only get one shot per animal. Having a primer cap where someone can see it doesn't help, improve, or change the effectiveness of a muzzleloader. Both shoot primer sparks into the powder charge forcing one round ball, maxi ball or sabot out the end of the barrel. Forcing all inline or 209 primer muzzleloader people into the regular rifle hunt puts them at a disadvantage to modern-day rifle hunters. They aren't even the same class of hunting styles.

Concerning both of these above issues I'm asking you to oppose them.

They are counter productive and appear to be more to hassle certain hunters rather than keep things fair among hunters.

Concerning the memorandum about 2024 CWMU and LOA permit recommendations. There is a chart showing the number of private and public tags. Above it, the paragraph above says it shows the recommended tag numbers of, "...bucks, bulls and turkeys." However the chart doesn't show turkey tag numbers. I don't know if this is an oversight error or purposeful omission. I would like to have known the numbers.

I should also note that my wife, daughter and son all have licenses and agree with my thoughts on this matter. We love hunting in Utah and want changes to make sense and not be used to discriminate or as a political tool, such as the muzzleloader changes appear to be.

Happy hunting

Scott Christensen  
967 West Fremont Ave  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84104  
ID # 6489548

**Which best describes your position  
regarding the technology  
recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---



**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

To the Southeastern Utah RAC Representative,

My name is Scott B. Christensen. I have hunted in Utah all but one year of my eligible life. I started hunting at 14 and I'm 60 now. I just learned of several changes that will be discussed in your next RAC meeting. Many of which I disagree with.

First I would like to say I recognize there are problems with our Deer population. This year has been miserable for the rifle deer hunt. Two days of hunting and I saw three deer. A doe and her 2 yearlings. I hunted many area's and covered many miles. I also sat down with DWR officers that were stationed near Scipio. At the time I sat down with them they hadn't had anyone stop in and only one person call them. Last winter was terrible and the area must have had severe winter kill. Lets just say I won't be applying for a tag in that area for some time.

I'm also worried about CWD and welcome testing so long as it leads to ways of controlling it or eliminating it. Testing to just track it or to just say we know it's there is worthless and a waste of the money I contribute to DWR. I further recommend more information to the public about eating animals that test positive for it. IE: Its safety and possible harms it may pose. I think it needs to be shared on more media than your website.

Now to the proposed changes.

Muzzleloader - Only open sites.

Scopes help hunters make better and more humane shots/kills. With open sites you'll have more people making poor shots that could lead to more wounded animals and less ethical hunting. Scopes also help hunters make better identification of species and sex. Scopes do not change the effectiveness of the muzzleloader itself, it's killing capabilities, or it's range.

Sometimes when I hunt CWMU's I like to use a muzzleloader for the challenge and skill it provides. After all I get only one shot 99% of the time before it scampers off.

Muzzleloader - Inline Muzzleloader (Using 209 primers) restriction from Muzzleloader season

I'm stymied about the need to break this grouping up. A muzzleloader is a muzzleloader. Inline with a 209 primer doesn't increase the distance my muzzleloader shots. I still must load it from the muzzle. I still usually only get one shot per animal. Having a primer cap where someone can see it doesn't help, improve, or change the effectiveness of a muzzleloader. Both shoot primer sparks into the powder charge forcing one round ball, maxi ball or sabot out the end of the barrel. Forcing all inline or 209 primer muzzleloader people into the regular rifle hunt puts them at a disadvantage to modern-day rifle hunters. They aren't even the same class of hunting styles.

Concerning both of these above issues I'm asking you to oppose them.

They are counter productive and appear to be more to hassle certain hunters rather than keep things fair among hunters.

Concerning the memorandum about 2024 CWMU and LOA permit recommendations. There is a chart showing the number of private and public tags. Above it, the paragraph above says it shows the recommended tag numbers of, "...bucks, bulls and turkeys." However the chart doesn't show turkey tag numbers. I don't know if this is an oversight error or purposeful omission. I would like to have known the numbers.

I should also note that my wife, daughter and son all have licenses and agree with my thoughts on this matter. We love hunting in Utah and want changes to make sense and not be used to discriminate or as a political tool, such as the muzzleloader changes appear to be.

Happy hunting

Scott Christensen  
967 West Fremont Ave  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84104  
ID # 6489548

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I know this has been a headache for you guys. I totally support this, this will give you and all of us hard numbers on what is really being harvested.  
Thank you.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I have read all the pro's and con's on APR. It seems like in order for this to work correctly we need a balance. I think we have the tools to keep it balanced.  
Allow youth to harvest 2 point or better. I feel that will give it a good balance especially with youth only getting 20% of the tags.  
  
I would strongly recommend, We do it to South slope vernal - south slope Yellowstone - north slope. That compiles three units all tied into each other, These are big units I think your study will be a lot better.  
But I wouldn't mind if we just do it state wide as well.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Look I totally agree with removing scopes off of Muzzleloaders. I have rifle hunted for years, and I always hear rifle hunters shooting early before it's time and always after shooting hours is over. I would of never thought in a million years I would have this happen with Muzzy hunter. We have gave them the tools to shoot earlier and later. Ever since the multi season tag got introduced. This is when I started noticing it they are taken further shots. I'm one of those guys that have stretched it to the limits. you take scopes away and you have to close the distance. I am very supportive on removing scopes off of Muzzleloaders.

On a side note. I strongly think the GS Muzzleloader Elk hunt should be moved to the Muzzleloader Deer hunt there has been a lot of people wanting this. if you remove scopes I think this would be a good compromise. Thank you

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?**

Strongly agree

---