

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 24, 2023 4:32 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I think you should get rid of adjustable dial scopes or ones that can magnify for the use on muzzleloader. Getting rid of a scope all together is a bad idea and really limits some individuals (my poor father in law that can't see great as is). I wish people didn't shoot super long range with muzzleloaders and I feel like you can fix that to a certain extent with a low powered fixed scope.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 24, 2023 8:30 pm

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

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? Please approve this proposal. We were promised 'better' management when dividing the state into units instead of regions, and this proposal would allow the collection of real life data for different management strategies to improve opportunities.

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 25, 2023 8:02 am

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

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 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? Your own research data suggests the increase in harvest was minimal and that there wasn't support by hunters to make changes. Leave it alone the Division doesn't always know what hunters want you are literally doing the opposite of what we want. or change the general season back to November.

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? Strongly disagree

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 25, 2023 10:43 am

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

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 Strongly agree
regarding the proposed rule changes to
the Dedicated Hunter Program?

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? I would propose the 4 point better or any type of these studies occur on the southern portion of the manti at the very least. If not the whole unit.

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? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? I propose to do away with the dedicated hunter program.

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

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? Since Monroe is just a reference unit with no changes. It would be a great time to eliminate as many coyotes and lions on the unit as possible during the next four years. Then you could compare the restricted units to one that severely reduced coyote and lion populations.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? The data you presented shows that powered scopes have very little effect in harvest rates. Limited Entry hunts are very limited in the number of tags given. I think Limited Entry hunts should still be allowed to have scopes. I could support restricting General season hunts to no scopes where there are hundreds of tags given.

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? Neither agree nor disagree

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

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?

I think the report might help very little . I not opposed to the new rule . But I would strongly agree with a minimum points buck deer hunt . A 3 point or 4 point or better hunt would be great for both the division and general public . It would allow for the state to continue to make it possible to issue tags , as well as help youth in giving them better opportunities to hunt . I understand we may not have high harvest reports but the joy of the hunt would go up because we could see quality buck deer vs. our current status of seeing baby bucks and very few mature bucks.

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 agree with the buck deer point restrictions. I feel we should try for a minimum of 3 to 4 years so see if improvements are seen . So I do agree with these changes . Thank you for listening to the public and your willingness to help implement citizen recommendations.

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? Somewhat agree

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I do not feel your data on wound loss is accurate. You cannot enforce ethics. Those that would shoot unethical shots will do so with or without scopes. Hunters are less accurate with open sights and therefore have a higher risk for wound loss. Don't punish those that rely on magnification to be sure if their shot due to a few outliers that shoot further than 200 yds with or without scopes. Some individuals have waited years to have the opportunity to utilize this benefit only to have it removed just before their opportunity.

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 taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I'm glad we're going to have more information for our officials to make better decisions with.

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 think it will be great to increase opportunity for antelope which seem to be less desirable to hunters but could be a great resource for the future.

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 it's great to try some new regulations since it seems most people aren't satisfied with the hunting. That I have spoken to. I think with better technology the 3point of better regulation hopefully will work better than in the 1980s.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I think better definition of muzzle loaders and removal of scopes could help realign us with traditional use practices

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've never had a problem with how the current program functions.

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 25, 2023 4:54 pm

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

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Scoped muzzleloaders allow for more ethical shots and allow youth a more positive experience. I would rather see a limit on magnification (4x) rather than a complete ban.

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? I'm interested to see how this plays out after the study period. I would be worried that when these restrictions expire, all the big bucks will get killed when it goes back to normal hunts.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? As a "long range" muzzleloader hunter, I can support this. I would be okay taking the scope off my muzzleloader if everyone else does to. I can't deny that I have killed deer that would have gotten away if I couldn't shoot 300+ yards.

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

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

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? i think that this is a great idea and will allow for better collection of harvest data then a random poll as is presently used. i do think that the fee is a little steep, maybe a 20 dollar fee. it is expensive enough to participate in these hobbies and excessive fees will do more to drive off new and amateur hunters then any progress it will make to gather this data.

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 think that the addition of new possible transplant or augmentation sites in the plan is an acceptable and needed change.

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? This section has a lot of information that was presented, so there are a few points that I would like to bring up. First off there is a sentiment among many hunters that they were blatantly ignored the past few years with some of the restrictions that were put in place, the most obvious one being the trail cam rules. The view is that they were asked for input and when the division received their opinions and wishes, an unscientific, political rule was implemented. Visit any forum, the easiest to access is Facebook and look at the comments that are attached to posts regarding the division and you will see that the trust in the division to honestly listen to the public and not the hunting elite is gone. You are playing catch up in the eyes of most hunters today.

Kent brought up and touched on quite a few points that I think are pertinent, but I think that there is one elephant in the room that should be addressed as well. Basic wildlife management tells us that to maintain or increase a population of wildlife you remove males, and to reduce a population you remove females. We need to work harder to reduce the take of does, the data that is shown to the public is the buck to doe ratios, but what we need to focus on is deer population.

I like the idea of an antler restriction with one caveat, I think that the antler restriction should not apply to youth. There should be a rule that if the hunter is under 18, they can harvest any buck.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I think that this is a very hard subject to broach. I do not think that taking away muzzleloaders is a good idea. I think that the addition of muzzleloaders allowed more people to enter the sport and remain in the sport for longer, it certainly did for my father. I like the idea of an addition of a primitive hunt and have an idea that I think may be feasible. What if we changed the muzzleloader spike hunts that begin around nov 1st to a week or 10 day long primitive hunt and have a primitive deer hunt that coincides with it. Once that hunt is over run the muzzleloader spike hunt. This adds two more hunts, a primitive deer and a primitive spike/general any bull, and keeps the deer hunt out of the deer rut.

Another idea would be to limit scopes on muzzleloaders to 4 or 5 power. This would still allow inlines to have a scope and let older hunters and those with poorer eyesight to use a scope but would hopefully keep people from taking ridiculously long shots with their muzzleloader. I would also like to see a limit placed on centerfire hunts of 12 power. This would mean that a lot of us would have to replace scopes, I would have to swap out a few of my 3-9s on my muzzleloaders, but I would accept that a lot easier than no scopes at all.

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 think that the dedicated hunter has lost its way and needs to be brought back to its original purpose. This program was proposed as a way to help deer herds, but over the past few years I have heard more and more stories about people counting boats going to lake Powell and buying block to make artificial reefs. While I am sure that those programs helped the division, I do not remember seeing any deer out waterskiing or swimming around suspended tires. This is a program that is set up to allow a hunter to have more of an impact on the deer herds that they are hunting. If they cannot find the time to work on a project for their tag, they should not have it. They should not be allowed to buy their hours with cash or materials, they should be spending time working on a project that benefits deer. They know the requirements when they apply and they should have a plan to complete those requirements if they draw the tag.

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

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

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 agree

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

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? 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? Thank you for proposing this. I think just to get this data will help in the future to see just how many animals are being harvested. I would also recommend in the harvest report that there be an estimated age class and how many antler points on the bucks/bulls so we can see what exactly was harvested not just a general successful/not successful data point.

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? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? STRICTLY FOR BEAVER UNIT
My input along with my family and very close friends comes from hunting the Beaver unit for over a decade personally and at least double that for the rest of my group. We hunt HARD mostly after good mature bucks and simply don't kill if we don't see anything we like. We glass many Canyons, mountains, and valleys. We spread out across the northern and southern part of the unit and cover ground. What I'm trying to say is we are very well aware of the decline in deer population. There has been a consistent decrease in deer population since roughly 2014-5. The deer just simply aren't there. So to get to my point.

I agree with the proposal on the beaver unit however I would also like to see a 3 point or better to go with the shortened dates. I worry that because the dates are shortened people would tend to shoot whatever they see first because they don't have a lot of time to hunt. OR just go 3 point or better and keep the dates how they are. But honestly don't think hunting is the main problem....the deer just aren't there it'd be one thing to not see bucks but with all the country we look through we just simply don't see deer. With overcrowding of elk, over population of predators and highways the deer are really struggling.

Thank you for your time and I really hope to see things change for the better.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?	Strongly agree
Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?	Maybe 10 years ago I wouldn't agree with keeping a scope on muzzleloaders however this day in age with how impressive and efficient muzzleloaders are its basically just a single shot rifle. So I HIGHLY agree with this proposal.
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 disagree
Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?	I've never been a fan of LOA tags. The idea to have public land is to have public tags. If a landowner wants to hunt their land then they can put in for a general tag like the rest of us. My proposal would be to help the landowners give public access.
Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?	Neither agree nor disagree
Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?	Strongly disagree
Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?	SPECIFICALLY FOR KIMBERLY This is not a good idea. I am very familiar with this unit and especially this area. Sure they might have enough acorage for deer but there the parts of this private ground I can glass from the main roads are thick nasty country and simply unsuitable for game. I've very very very rarely seen any sort of wildlife in this area. Please please please do not approve this. I know many people in Richfield that strongly oppose this im not the only one. We don't need more hunts on this unit. It already struggles as is.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 25, 2023 10:21 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.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I would like to see compound bows allowed on the archery hunts for the primitive weapon hunts on the Dutton and boulder units. There is very few hunters still using recurves. I believe the tags for these proposed hunts would go way under subscribed.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Id like to see magnified scopes on muzzleloaders done away with

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 taking big game rule? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I think it's a good idea to better manage the heard in Utah.

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? Great idea

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 think as a southern Utah Hunter specifically pine valley the 4 point or better is a great idea. I think that is a much better idea than taking optics off of or down from archery and muzzleloader. Rag restrictions would be next after the 4 point of better.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? If we are to limit muzzleloaders then let's go across the board and limit archery sights and slide pins. There are far more animals wounded in the archery hunt than muzzleloader. The muzzleloader has become a very fun hunt. If too many animals are being taken lower the amount of tags. In final be fair across the board, lower the tags or do nothing. Let's be proactive and make a smart educated decision on this one. The optics on the muzzleloader aren't the problem.

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? Neither agree nor disagree

**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

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 agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? As a long term utah muzzle loader hunter i full support the no scopes proposal , you could go all the way back to sidelocks only and number 11 caps as far as im concerned or flint locks , i have to say your study showing a 3 percent increase in success with scopes over iron sights doesn't match what I've seen in the field , I suspect the success is much higher with scopes, mine has been. As far as sight impairment a 1x scope should address that . And a shorter season is fine with me also at my age 5 days of pounding the ground im done anyhow.

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 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? It is very easy to report harvest online, especially if you are given 3-4 weeks to do it.

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 disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I believe that a 4 point or better restriction will reduce the quality of deer in the Pine Valley unit. By harvesting 4 point or better you are leaving the inferior genetics to reproduce. In the Pine Valley unit I see a lot more 18" and wider 2 and 3 points than I see 4 point deer of any size. By eliminating the 4 point or better gene we will have a unit of large 2-3 point buck deer with poor genetics. I would rather see the seasons shortened than to have a 4 point or better restriction.

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

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? Strongly agree

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 9:20 am

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? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I think the Beaver needs to have a second restriction of antlers like the pine valley. Reason is because so much of the Beaver is open sage brush landscape it make the small bucks too prone to be killed in first few days. This unit could be a combo unit 5day/with antler restrictions.

Thanks for your time.

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?

Strongly disagree

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

Regarding the archery restrictions of compound bows and general rifle removal of scopes; I believe this will reduce the clean and accurate harvesting of deer and increase the likelihood of wounded animals who suffer and eventually die without the harvest of their meat.

Compound bows have more capability of putting an animal down due to their accuracy and penetration power. I am a woman who can not pull a recurve bow back with enough strength to provide a kill shot. I believe most youth and women would be in the same position. As an ethical hunter this means I will not be able to archery hunt in the unit I have grown up hunting in.

Open site hunting with my riffle also seems very risky when it comes to a clean and reduced suffering kill. I use a 3 power scope and have never shot over 150 yards. I have only injured 1 animal in 12 years but, I have cleanly harvested 5 animals on the first shot. I propose limiting scopes to no more than a 4 power. This will force hunters to actually hunt rather than snipe but still allow precise and ethical shots that will still reduce the harvest numbers and increase hunting satisfaction. Thank you

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

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? I would like to see an additional site on Mytoge on the fishlake, there used to be a pretty good herd out there.

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? Thank you for finally listening to the public on this

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly 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? The surveys should have been done decades ago.

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? Do what needs to be done to help the pronghorn herds.

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? NO ANTLERPOINTRESTRICTIONSEVER! I'm good for almost anything to help the deer herds. I absolutely hate the antler point restrictions. I'm older and it's tough for me to hike to where they are. Antler point restrictions ruin the hunt. I am 100 percent opposed to antler restrictions. All other senerios I'm good with. NO ANTLER POINT RESTRICTIONS EVER!! I rather take a season off than be limited. I adamantly dispise antler point restrictions. This is for headophiles that hunt for trophy not meat. If they want big racks fine, I like big butts. NO ANTLER RESTRICTIONS EVER!

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I don't bow or muzzleloader hunt anymore so I don't have a dog in this fight. However the best way to keep deer numbers up is limit licenses or cancel hunt seasons. It's hard enough to get deer. I rather hunt with limited tech than antler point restrictions though.

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? Dedicated hunters sacrifice a lot especially 1 harvest per every three years. Go easy on them. Along with the lifetime we are the ones truly dedicated to deer and deer preservation.

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

Strongly agree

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

Private land owners are the future of hunting make them happy and they will make you happy. Hunters on Private land need to be respectful. I like the Private land only aspect hunts.

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?

Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?

Do what needs to be done.

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?

Good program. Do what needs to be done.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 12:16 pm

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'm ok with most of these proposals. The point I am not in agreement with is no scope on rifles. I've purchased 3 rifles with expensive scopes with the understanding I could hunt with these weapons. I'm also getting older and to shoot a decent shot with open sights will be very difficult for me due to sight issues. I grew up in Escalante and like to hunt the Boulder unit where this restriction is being considered.

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? i do not think that the removal of the ability to hunt with muzzleloaders with scopes is a good idea. i think that it will result in the wounding and loss of more game and that more hunters will leave the sport.

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 12:33 pm

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? Scopes should be allowed. You would have to get extremely close to the deer in order to get a good kill shot. This will lead to more injured bucks.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 12:42 pm

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 strongly agree with everything except for no scopes on rifles. My main concern is that this will lead to more injured bucks than bucks that will be harvested. I think people will still take shots from long range with open sites and end up injuring bucks that end up being wasted when they could have made a perfectly ethical shot with a scope. But overall these changes need to be implemented, I'm in huge favor for a 4 point or better, this would be amazing!!

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

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Recommend removing the late muzzleloader, late season archery and any additional antlered hunt starting after November. The public is asked to avoid pressuring animals after the first of the year for shed hunting, the same could be said for added pressure to deer in November, especially bucks when they are vulnerable and attempting to breed does. These hunts are counter intuitive to the results you are seeking with these studies.

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? 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 research study? Strongly disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

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

Antler restrictions are an absolute mistake. This will destroy pine valley as a hunting unit. You will make a genetic disaster with mature 3 points. The hunting public will lose hunting opportunities, nobody but trophy hunters will apply, and in essence, this is making pine valley a trophy unit, without labeling it a trophy unit. Pine Valley is under attack by developers. Antlerless hunts destroyed eastern pine valley. Mountain lions are the real culprits to losses of mature bucks, along with private property, and deferment. You will be diverting applicants, applying for the pine valley unit, to panguitch. This will make the draw odds into a once in ten year success rate. Avoiding the disease, treating the symptoms is not going to be beneficial to the resource. Bring the mountain lion population to near zero. Protect our deer through legislative action. Make farmers and ranchers high fence their property. Deer can not read. Land owners are handed massacre permits. If the deer are used as a revenue, nothing will cure the problem. Land owners, public land managers and grazing permit holders need to work together, to build our deer and elk populations, or we will all lose in the end. Scrap the antler restrictions. The cat food bill is too high, Bring the lion population to zero.

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 love the four point or better recommendation, I've been wanting this for years. I've been hunting down here for my entire life, my dad grew up down here, our ancestors settled down here, this is where we'll be hunting forever. One problem I foresee is hunters not being able to utilize scopes to identify if a buck is 4 point or better. They'll be relying on a relative or buddy with binoculars telling them "the legal four point is the 3rd buck on the left" when the individual shooting can't identify 4 points or better in any of the deer since they are farther away. The shooter shoots what he thinks is the 4 point when he accidentally shoots the illegal smaller buck. I think specifically with the antler restrictions a scope is crucial in identifying a legal buck to harvest. I think that the scenario mentioned above will be an unintended consequence of no scopes allowed. I also firmly believe that hunters will still be taking long, 200-300 yard shots regardless and end up wounding deer because they can't make as accurate of a shot without a scope. The Boulder unit specifically, there aren't a lot of places on that mountain that you can take a 300+ yard shot anyways, I don't see having "technology" or a scope being anything but a positive and ethical thing when it comes to hunting. I would hate to see an uptick in bucks that are wounded, killed, but that go to waste because they are shot inaccurately and unethically with open sites. Please take this into consideration, I love the shortened hunting period, I love the 4 point or better rule, but the scope limit really brings up a lot of issues that I just can't get myself past. I am glad we are trying to save the deer herd down here. I love the Boulder mountain with all my heart and I'm excited to hunt this unit for the enforceable future!!

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 1:58 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?

I think the DWR receives a lot of critical feedback when it comes to their recommendations, but I know that this is being pushed by people who think they know better than our biologists on how to "save" our deer herd. It is sad that politics work this way, but it is happening now because of our social feelings when it comes to "saving" our deer herd.

I, myself, have been very ignorant and uninformed in the past towards the DWR, and I regret not fully educating myself before opening my mouth. I would like to publicly thank the division for their efforts to do their best to manage our wildlife to the best of their ability with push and shove coming from all directions. They really do have a difficult job and cannot please all of us.

We all have our own personal wants when it comes to the management of our wildlife, but I think we need to be patient and understanding about what factors really play the biggest roles in our deer herd's health and quality.

None of the proposed changes will "save" our deer herd. The changes being proposed focus on increasing the quality/number of bucks on the landscape. This is a quality change, not a "save" the deer herd change. If we really want to do things to save our deer herd, then let's try being patient, and focus on helping our does and fawns! In southern Utah we just came out of record drought, and now have seen a good moisture and fantastic feed for our deer. Look at our fawn recruitment in southern Utah this year! It is looking good and a lot of the does I have seen have a fawn or two at their side. This is the simplest biological way to "save" our deer herd. Fawn recruitment and survival, and healthy does during gestation is key to the population of our deer herd.

Predation, vehicle collisions, habitat, weather, and killing does for depredation all play bigger roles in the health of our deer herd than how we hunt our bucks. Like I mentioned earlier, it isn't really about "saving" our deer herd. It is about the quality of bucks. I don't disagree with increasing quality, I just wish we would be honest about what we are trying to accomplish when it comes to the social aspect of saving our deer herd.

STOP killing our does. this is the baby factory of our deer herd! This needs to stop immediately for the sake of any argument on saving our deer herd! The only reason we should have antlerless hunts is if we are over population, and that is not the case or we wouldn't be crying about our deer herds right now.

Please consider implementing just shortened season dates and three point or better for point restrictions. I think this will provide a good study to research the benefits on the proposed units. The restricted weapons is an extreme leap from where we are currently and it would take a lot of opportunity away from hunters that would normally like to hunt those units.

If restrictions on weapons should take place, then we should have some

common sense and let people hunt with their compound bows (it is hard enough, and not everyone shoots past 60 yards), and their inline muzzleloaders. taking the scope away on muzzleloaders and rifles will be restrictive enough. I just ask that we keep in mind the financial burden that many would face to hunt a unit that they love just because they'd have to buy a " new"(old)bow and muzzleloader.

Again, thank you for your time. I hope my comments provide some insight to possible adjustments to the proposals.

Clay Christensen

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? Get rid of late season muzzle load hunt, ban on trail cameras, no scopes on muzzle loaders, shorten the seasons a little and keep tags relatively low and the state will come back to great hunting in a few years... I have been hunting for 25 years and the last 5 have been the worst by far.. can't even find a mature deer during the rut.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Taking scopes away from muzzleloaders will help the deep populations immensely. I strongly agree with the recommendation for not allowing scopes in muzzle loaders

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Is the DWR going to Buy back everyone's scopes, at retail price! Because people have spent a lot of hard earned money to be able to Hunt efficiently with a muzzleloader, when they change the law a few years back to allow scopes on muzzleloader! Just because they can't manage wildlife, and are strictly about taking money, they are the reason we have no deer, it not a muzzle loaders scope fault! If you get rid of them, then all long range rifles need to go, no more rangefinders, no more spotting scopes, no more hunting guides. No more compound bows, with sights. The DWR has no clue on what they are doing, they are all about money, and these changes are a bunch of crap! Just keep adding more hunts that's there best solution so they can get more money!!!

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 appreciate the divisions willingness to try new ideas. The public has spoken and you guys have listened. Some people will start to get nervous and pucker-up now that all there feedback has been taken and is about to be implemented. Stay strong and good for you guys willing to make a bold move. With that said I would just like to offer a few suggestions. I believe the antler point restrictions on the Pine Valley will increase the buck to doe ratio. I do worry that after a few years the really mature bucks will take a hit and 3 point genetics will be more common. I trust your decision, but please consider moving to 3 point or better instead of 4. If you want to stick with 4 please only give it a few years and then maybe change it to 3 or remove it altogether. Please please, don't let us shoot out all the 4 point genetics. 3 point or better would allow 3 points to be harvested which many people would be glad with, but would still protect the youngest bucks., thank you so much for your time!.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 4:15 pm

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 would like to see the Beaver and Mt. Dutton go to 4 point or better and the 5 day hunt.

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 4:33 pm

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

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 Strongly agree
regarding the proposed rule changes to
the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 4:37 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

If they change anything, it should be to a fixed 4x scope. Most muzzleloader now are not capable of having iron sights put on them without major cost of a gun smith drilling on the gun to be able to mount them! It not the technology's fault that the DWR miss managed the deer herds by all the antlerless hunts, and killing hundreds of deer out of peoples fields!

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 4:47 pm

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? Why would you want to reduce selectivity? In my opinion this is just going to promote going out and harvesting smaller, less mature mule deer. I vote on the Beaver Unit make it a shortened hunt and 4 point or better on one side.

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? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? move all shortened hunting days to all southern Utah units

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I'm not a muzzleloader hunter but I would be good with a maximum of a 1 power scoop on them

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

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? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I would love to see these changes in effect. And I think that they are a great movement in the right direction. I spend and have spent countless time on thr Mt Dutton unit and hunt it regularly and it is somewhere I truly cherish. I am for the proposed changes to the rifle and muzzleloader hunts, but I must say I am in strong disagreement with the changes to archery equipment. The proposed change to "no compound bows" is not a good idea. Archery success is already extremely low and the percentage that it would drop by the no compound bow proposal would lower harvest to nearly 0% not to mention nearly no hunters would participate. I also see the issue of WAYY more animals being injured with these lack of effective weapons. Again, I can stand behind the scopes of rifles and no inline muzzles, but no compound bows does NOT seem fair or reasonable. Would love to see the changes made, just keep compound bows available. Thanks for the movement in the right direction.

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? Somewhat 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? Somewhat agree

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

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? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? On Boulder -4 point or better should be allowed and the shortened season. However, don't take peoples scopes away. That's taking it to far. For young hunters, people with disabilities, and people who are older this is making it impossible. Also stop making it so long for someone to draw a hunt. This used to be a family tradition... with or without killing a deer. The family aspect is getting taken away. It's appearing more and more like it's driven by money.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 8:23 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 proposed research study?
Do you agree with the
recommendations?

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

I have hunted all my life in Utah . I am an avid Hunter and hunt Elk and Deer every year I draw. I understand that there is a great need to work on the deer herd as every year I see less and less deer. This year I spend 13 plus days hunting the boulder unit. Some with my family as my sister drew a limited entry elk tag and I drew a deer tag. There are less deer then every before. During the elk hunt on one day while looking for elk in Deer country I counted 27 deer. 7 were yearling buck, 18 were does, and 2 were fawns. We are losing so so many fawn in my opinion to predators. On that day from a glassing knob I counted 7 coyotes. Almost everyday we heard or saw coyotes too.

I don't believe that technology restrictions and primitive hunting restrictions is the answer for a bigger deer herd. yes, it will produce bigger bucks. No question. But I don't believe it will impact the herd numbers. From data I have studied most does are getting pregnant so having bigger bucks doesn't increase numbers. It just increases buck size. We need to control predators, put in more Wildlife crossings, and stop shooting all the does if we want a bigger herd. Why in a state where we have such low deer numbers do we still kill does. Compensate farmers with landowner tags they can sell for profit, or compensate them for crop loss, or help them build a high fence but please stop shooting so many does. if we can do some of these things, then a bigger herd will also give us more and bigger bucks. Primitive hunting won't help us solve the low deer numbers. It is a selfish idea of someone who just wants to shoot bigger bucks.

The other problem in my opinion with primitive hunting is it cuts so many individuals out of hunting. I have a wife and 4 kids that love to hunt. Hunting with a scope is hard enough for anyone under the age of 18. When we ask kids or women to pull back a one string bow, shoot an old time muzzleloader, or shoot open sights we are limiting them from hunting. They will also have such low success that they will become discourage and want to quit hating all together. these restrictions will work very well for the committed male hunter who has time to practice and is between the ages of 20-55. Anyone older or younger, or women of any age, will be greatly restricted by these crazy primitive restrictions.

I understand the need to take a scope off a muzzleloader but there is no reason to go back to to the old flint-lock muzzleloaders. If you can take the scopes away that limits the hunting already.

I have hunted the boulder all my life. My whole family loves hunting. I believe the primitive restrictions will only produce bigger bucks. It will not increase herd size and will greatly impact children, women, and the elderly from hunting. This proposal is a disaster for those individuals. Please reconsider this proposal. It is a selfish proposal to only produce bigger bucks and not help the deer herd or give success to our future generations.

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

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I have hunted all my life in Utah . I am an avid Hunter and hunt Elk and Deer every year I draw. I understand that there is a great need to work on the deer herd as every year I see less and less deer. This year I spend 13 plus days hunting the boulder unit. Some with my family as my sister drew a limited entry elk tag and I drew a deer tag. There are less deer then every before. During the elk hunt on one day while looking for elk in Deer country I counted 27 deer. 7 were yearling buck, 18 were does, and 2 were fawns. We are losing so so many fawn in my opinion to predators. On that day from a glassing knob I counted 7 coyotes. Almost everyday we heard or saw coyotes too.

I don't believe that technology restrictions and primitive hunting restrictions is the answer for a bigger deer herd. yes, it will produce bigger bucks. No question. But I don't believe it will impact the herd numbers. From data I have studied most does are getting pregnant so having bigger bucks doesn't increase numbers. It just increases buck size. We need to control predators, put in more Wildlife crossings, and stop shooting all the does if we want a bigger herd. Why in a state where we have such low deer numbers do we still kill does. Compensate farmers with landowner tags they can sell for profit, or compensate them for crop loss, or help them build a high fence but please stop shooting so many does. if we can do some of these things, then a bigger herd will also give us more and bigger bucks. Primitive hunting won't help us solve the low deer numbers. It is a selfish idea of someone who just wants to shoot bigger bucks.

The other problem in my opinion with primitive hunting is it cuts so many individuals out of hunting. I have a wife and 4 kids that love to hunt. Hunting with a scope is hard enough for anyone under the age of 18. When we ask kids or women to pull back a one string bow, shoot an old time muzzleloader, or shoot open sights we are limiting them from hunting. They will also have such low success that they will become discourage and want to quit hating all together. these restrictions will work very well for the committed male hunter who has time to practice and is between the ages of 20-55. Anyone older or younger, or women of any age, will be greatly restricted by these crazy primitive restrictions.

I understand the need to take a scope off a muzzleloader but there is no reason to go back to to the old flint-lock muzzleloaders. If you can take the scopes away that limits the hunting already.

I have hunted the boulder all my life. My whole family loves hunting. I believe the primitive restrictions will only produce bigger bucks. It will not increase herd size and will greatly impact children, women, and the elderly from hunting. This proposal is a disaster for those individuals. Please reconsider this proposal. It is a selfish proposal to only produce bigger bucks and not help the deer herd or give success to our future generations.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 9:07 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?

Technology is constantly advancing it makes us better more efficient hunters. If we want primitive hunts we can hunt with rocks and spears. If a hunter wants a primitive muzzleloader hunt they can still hunt with a flint lock. Why is it that if a hunter wants to hunt with a more technologically evolved weapon that they are limited. The data in the survey showed no significant difference in success. So what is the purpose of removing scopes. We use more efficient means to hunt every year. Optics (scopes, binoculars, spotting scopes), range finders, compound bows, long range guns, ammo, etc are getting better each year. Why restrict these advances to those who want to be more efficient hunters. If you want primitive go for it but don't restrict hunters that want to be more efficient at marking better shot placement to put dinner on there table. I hope that you remove this proposal and continue to allow scopes on muzzleloaders so as a hunting community we can continue forward with technology and not backwards.

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? No need for more taxation. Just don't allow people to apply until reporting is done. It's a self correcting problem.

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? The Parker mountain herd has been desimated by farmers poaching and transplanting from that unit. It needs a lot of help.

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? We already have primitive weapons (hams) hunts. Look at that data. I'm also concerned that these studies will flood surrounding units with applicants who want to avoid the restrictions thus reducing drawing odds..

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? It is glaringly obvious that this committee was built using people with predisposed opposition to the use of technology in hunting. This bias is not a true representation of the majority of the hunting community. Technology is not the enemy. Your own study showed overwhelming opposition to changing the current status of the muzzleloader hunt and you had to dig and twist to justify the recommendation. Once again, fabricating data in order to justify a biased opposition to technology. Scopes help make shots more accurate, reducing the rate of injury whichbis the obvious ethical priority. It's as simple as that. Same with the Garmin rangefinding sight on bows. The problem the committee sees with this is that success equals a loss in revenue. Anytime the DWR mentions opportunity, it means more tags sold and a reduction in harvest success. Artificially inflating "opportunity" while simultaneously eliminating the tools used to be successful is deceptive and wrong!

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 disagree

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

When people struggle to find elk on the Fishlake but can go look into the Johnson Ranch and Grazing pasture and see thousands, its hard to feel bad in any sort of way for these landowners. They need to provide a lot more access for what they are currently reborn in tags and payouts and they need to be penalized for herding animals into their properties.

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?

Landowners should not recieve buck and bull tags. They can hunt does and cows if they want but the percentage based tag allocations are outrageously unfair to the average hunter who will never have near the opportunity.

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?

There need to be far more public tags allowed and far fewer private. This private allocation of public resources seems like it should be illegal and would be in almost all public sector situations.

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? Somewhat agree

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? Strongly 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? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Make restrictions on size state wide. 3 point or bigger on deer for adults. Absolutely heartbreaking seeing no deer because people only shoot the first deer they see due to possible not seeing another

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I very strongly agree to remove all scopes from muzzleloaders. If you can't ethically shoot 200yards, there is an issue and probably should practice more. If you must keep scopes though, going back to the 1x power scopes would be the next closest thing. But I am in support of 100% scope removal on muzzleloaders

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

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? I support any and all pronghorn augmentation in the state. I also would love to see new populations developed. Some interesting sites in my mind would be Poverty flats in Sevier County or the sand ledges.

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 think these strategies should be used with increased tags for a HAMS type hunt on any units that it makes sense, but a typical general any weapon hunt should still be held in those units, just limit tags as necessary. So, greatly limited general any weapon tags, and expanded HAMS tags.

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 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? Somewhat agree

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 10:35 am

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

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? 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 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

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Consider adding Panguitch to the control (no treatment) units. Zion's high ratio of public land could be a variable that the other units in the study do not have. I support any thing to try and get the division away from just cutting tags. That does not seem to be solving the problem and only takes opportunities away from families. Please commit to increasing opportunity if these treatments work.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Make hunting, hunting again not shooting.

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? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Benefits seem to favor the land owner over the general public.

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations? There is too much incentive for landowners to take measures that keep wildlife on their land.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?

Public land should not be included in CWMUs. Over the last several years the division has decreased buck tags overall. Why should any CWMU see an increase in buck tags when the general public has been cutting back? No to increase in buck tag allocations.

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? Strongly disagree

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

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

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 disagree

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 am for the most part in favor of the proposed changes for our southern deer units. I am in favor of antler point restrictions for the Pine Valley unit, but what needs to be addressed at the RAC meeting is lifetime license holders. If there isn't some type of regulation with lifetime license holders the Pine Valley unit will turn into a honey hole exclusively for them with the new 4 point or greater proposal. If there is not some type of regulation put in place regarding lifetime license holders on a unit with antler point restrictions I AM STRONGLY OPPOSED and this should not get approved. Please think of the Hunters that were not even alive when this program ended in 1994. Thank you.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 12:51 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 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 like the idea of limiting tech but struggle with eliminating compound bows. Seems like a great way to wound more deer. I do not like the idea of the restriction to 4 point or better. I have 4 kids and would like them to grow up hunting like I did. We are not overachieving hunters but like to get out get a rush and to eat deer meat. I like the opportunity to teach my family how to process it including start to finish with bottling, freezing and jerking it. I have killed 1 4 4-point or better buck in about 30 years of hunting. Yup, not overachieving here. This rule is going to make us be even more discouraged about the opportunity to hunt. My 15-year-old finally drew out this year if he doesn't get to pull the trigger not sure he engages to dump \$\$\$\$ into the hobby down the road. As their father, I want to be able to see them get excited and shoot a deer not just a trophy hunt. I think the point idea is going to hurt the novice hunters. It really seems that is the trend. My friends that I grew up with hunting already don't put in anymore because of the headache \$\$\$ and lack of opportunity for their kids. Next year it will cost me hundreds just to apply for my 3 eligible kids and myself and now I cannot tell my daughter sorry who may only draw once in her teens sorry all we could find was a little 2 pointer. If that is the case she will be done. The Mentor Program is great to help but when multiplied by 3 it gets expensive as well.

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? Not related to the changes, but would love to see pronghorn removed from limited entry. I have to go to other states to hunt pronghorn because I don't want to use my limited application for it here.

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? 4 point plus for hunters over 18 years age in Pine Valley. Youth should be able to harvest what they can so they can get into hunting. Shorten hunt seasons for Pine Valley as well. I would like to see the early rifle hunt either eliminated or else the late rifle hunt start a week later than it does. The late rifle has gone downhill since the early rifle hunt was introduced.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Keep scopes. If you remove them it will make more people put in for rifle only, thus making it harder to get a rifle tag.

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? As long as you make hunters take a photo or something of their unused tags. I could see a lot of people in the program harvesting a deer and not reporting it if it is based only on an online survey.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 3:41 pm

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? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Stop doe hunts, stop depredation hunts, investigate and stop poaching in the beaver unit

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?

While I agree with shooting bigger bucks the idea of taking scopes off of rifles for the hunt is a horrible idea. The area I hunt by Koosharem would be difficult to even take a shot without a scope. I hunted it this year and the average shot I took was over 400 yards because the hillsides have had the vegetation removed so the deer hang out around the tree lines. I believe you'll have a lot of smaller deer accidentally shot or even does because they can't see the deer to shoot the one they want to

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 4:33 pm

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? You know what, I retract my former statement. If you guys think 4 point or better will move the needle more than three point or better, than let's do it. I trust you guys.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 6:26 pm

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? Thank you so much for helping increase our buck quality. You guys were brave to do it. Good for you.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 6:31 pm

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

Do you have any additional comments Very good ideas!
about the research study or the
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? Love it absolutely great idea.

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 Agree overall to experiment and see what a points restriction would do. I don't know if I love the restricted weapons hunt if I were hunting Mt Dutton. Unless that is an additional hunt? The previous 4 years of tag numbers makes sense. Overall I think I like the idea of seeing where this goes.

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 eliminating scopes on muzzleloaders. I say this as someone who has used a scope on a muzzleloader. We just need to keep that distinction between a rifle and a muzzleloader hunt. I know people who have killed deer at 500 yards with a muzzleloader and that just isn't a muzzleloader hunt.

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 6:41 pm

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 6:45 pm

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

Do you have any additional comments Thank you for listening to us! Imagine me getting votes to pass
about the research study or the
recommendations?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 28, 2023 7:44 am

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?

One thing that is missing from your scientific study and recommendations is the affect that cougars play on deer herds. Until you get serious about what these big cats are doing, then all of these other proposals won't work as well. Let's get serious about reducing the number of cougars.

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, if I buy a new scope and can't use it then why would I hunt Utah. 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 for people to join the Dedicated Hunter Program. People that are complaining about the requirements are too [REDACTED] Lazy.

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

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? I like the Idea but don't like the fee.

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? Please Read...I don't like the 4 points restriction for 4 years but would agree on implementation the first 2 years as 4 points only then in 2026 change it back to any legal buck. Then in 2027 back to 4 points only, 2028 any legal buck. In this way it could be use to keep the buck to doe ratio inline plus establishing older class bucks in the deer herds in Pine Valley unit while still offering hunters opportunities.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? A Muzzleloader with a scopes makes it easier for hunters to make a clean shots and not wound a buck. Your own data says over 50% hunter don't want scopes removed and hunters are not willing to take a shots over 200 yards at a buck. I could see it if there was a big increase success but that's not the case here.

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?

The Beaver: It is a CRIME what has happened to this (what used to be) a prime UNIT. I have hunted the Beaver Unit for 70 years, yes 70 years, with my dad until I was old enough to hunt, the decline I have watched just makes me sick, no matter what the reason (I have my own theory as to what has happened) this Unit needs as much attention as the Dutton, the deer are gone, sure you might find a few small two points and I mean few, but before the hunt is over they are killed. PLEASE, at least make it a 3 or 4 point or better. It will take years to bring this Unit back if ever. In Fact its a Unit to CLOSE. And see how that helps bring the deer back. I won't live long enough to see, but good luck.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 28, 2023 5:01 pm

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? Nice work. Stick with the four point antler restriction. Don't let them talk you into going three point or better. It will not move the needle as much. I applaud you all.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 28, 2023 5:04 pm

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

Do you have any additional comments Way to be brave and go 4 point or better!
about the research study or the
recommendations?

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I strongly agree with removing scopes from muzzleloaders. I hunt muzzleloader seasons in Washington, Idaho, and Utah. I grew up hunting muzzleloader hunting in Utah. The muzzleloader that I use in Utah is basically a single shot rifle. I took an elk at 230 yards on the bookcliffs. My friend took one at 260 yards. I use a magnified scope because it is allowed. I also did an internship with the WDFW Cedar City, UT in 1997/98 when 1x scopes were allowed. There were individuals using magnified scopes. The game wardens did not enforce the rule because they said it creates a dangerous situation and people were unable to purchase 1x scopes.

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? After thorough review of the proposed changes to "Taking of Big Game" rule, I support the DWR proposal as presented. I have hunted other states that require mandatory reporting and is essential for good wildlife management.
Thanks,
Lynn Kitchen

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? After thorough review of the proposed changes to 2024 Utah Buck Deer Hunting Research Study, I support the DWR proposal as presented. I have been advocating those types of changes for several years. The knowledge we will learn from these trials will benefit wildlife and sportsmen and sportswomen far into the future. I encourage all to support the actions as well.
Thanks,
Lynn Kitchen

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I am in full support of the proposal presented by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources on Technology and hunting recommendations for 2024.
Thanks,
Lynn Kitchen

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

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? The proposal seems reasonable and well thought out. I support the proposal as presented.
Thanks,
Lynn Kitchen

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

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? My only addition to this would be to make the mineral mountains into a primitive weapons only unit it's already its own unit for general elk and now sheep it's completely different terrain with different needs than the rest of the beaver unit its no longer the same deer herd with the high fence along the freeway so why is it still part of the beaver unit? Other than that I'm extremely happy with DWR trying these things! I've been begging for them to try something different for years I'm thankful they're finally listening!

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I'd like to see this taken a step further and go to Idaho or Colorado definition of muzzloader I know people who claim to still be able to shoot 300 yards with peep sight dwr can claim whatever they want nobody wanted to hunt muzzloader 10-15 years ago when you were only accurate to 80 yards it will help grow age class bucks on units. Look at hams units like the southwest desert there's 50 people who applied for it even though there are big bulls on the unit but there were hundreds of people applying for southwest desert south even though there's not as big of bulls there why? They were able to hunt with a scope!

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? Strongly 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? Somewhat 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 strongly agree with the "4 point rule" and I am willing to have shorter seasons as well if that means more opportunity. However I do not agree with the weapon restrictions on archery, it already has the lowest success rate and I personally do not think it needs to be any more difficult than it already is.

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 agree

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 CWMU recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

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

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I wouldn't mind having an antler point restriction on Pine Valley, but I think a 4 point or better restriction is a bad idea. If you're going to have a point restriction it should be a 3 point or better.

After a few years of 4+ point restrictions I feel like there will be a significant amount of mature 2 and 3 point deer that never get killed. Those overgrown 2 and 3 point bucks will continue to breed does which will cause genetics to go downhill over time.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Ban scopes on muzzleloaders!

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I extremely disagree that there shouldn't be

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

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? No scopes on muzzleloaders and rifles will wound more deer and make less people want to hunt down in Southern Utah. Southern Utah has the best deer hunting and you guys want to mess it up, why don't you do it in Northern Utah? I'd rather have a point restriction. I can't afford to put sights on my guns. It changes the whole dynamic. That ruins the Dutton rifle deer hunt if you can't have a scope. Why don't you just reduce the tags? Or do a point restriction?

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

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? You need to change it back to a 5 day hunt.

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? This is all so dumb. Cut tags. Your experiments on these test units are bull crap. The deer population is down because of coyotes and cougar populations growing. I hunted mt Dutton this year and saw 4 coyotes and a cougar. You want to screw the average hunter because of crap management of predators in every unit of Utah. You're going to create more problems than help. You don't listen to the people and average hunters. All Units are going to be harder to draw because of this. This is robbery you want us to spend all our money and burn all our points.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? This I crap. This is going to ruin other units and no body is going to rifle and muzzleloader hunt. You're going to have more injured animals from inaccurate technology. I'd rather have a point restriction. This is going to cause a chain reaction because of terrible management. My family has hunted southern utah for generations and you are ruining the culture.

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

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 29, 2023 7:04 pm

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?

Can please include the zion with the pine valley. No mature deer on the zion just little two points. Also can we not cut tags on the late rifle hunt and add some to the early rifle. I Like all the changes make them for all the units. Or atleast the zion.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 29, 2023 10:57 pm

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

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

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 30, 2023 7:11 am

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

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Great change. Need to keep ahead of technology in the Muzzleloader world. Current muzzleloaders are basically long range rifles.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 30, 2023 7:40 am

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

a 1 power scope should be allowed for muzzle loader hunts, i have adjusted my open sights as much as possible, but still shoot to the right, i wounded a couple of bucks over the years because of this, with my 1 power scope, i am dead on.

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?

I've never commented on proposed hunting changes before. For years, those of us living near the Boulder/Kaiparowits hunting unit have just gritted our teeth and taken what the DWR has dished out, but enough is enough. Why should the residents near the Boulder/Kaiparowits unit be PUNISHED with all three restrictions at once? It's already hard enough to get our youth interested in hunting, especially when they can barely draw a tag once every three years. Now you want them to hunt with open sites, and only shoot deer that are four points or bigger? Come on! Some of us aren't trophy hunters. For my family, the deer hunt is a way to provide food for our family each year. It's also a time to spend in the outdoors with family and make great memories. You say these recommendations are based on "public feedback"? You give out tags to out of state weekend warriors who watch youtube hunting videos, get excited, then complain when they can't see massive bucks from their truck windows or side by sides on opening morning. This year we spent a total of several days hunting the Boulder/Kaiparowits unit. We had two tags, and were able to fill both of them. We saw a lot of deer, but you have to actually get out of the truck to do so. We WALKED a lot of miles, and had to pack one of the deer we harvested a long ways to get it back to the pickup. I personally saw more bucks this year on the Boulder/Kaiparowits than I have seen for a while. They weren't massive trophies, but they were bucks. There is a ton of grass up there, and plenty of water. If people want the big, trophy deer, let them put in and pay for the trophy units. You are killing hunting and family tradition, all in the name of "public feedback". Stop pandering to the high dollar, loud mouthed "sportsman" class. At the very least, make these restrictions age specific. These new restrictions are a joke. The Boulder/Kaiparowits unit has never been a trophy unit. Some of us prefer it that way.

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 have several thoughts on this

1. This should go thru the mule deer committee not on a random year
2. the long Bow is a terrible Idea, I have helped several youth get archery tags as there only method of hunting and with both of the primitive weapon units right next to each other youth i this area have no options, also most people do not have long bows you would be forcing people to buy new equipment for a test. I would support a separate long bow season but not at the expense of the normal archery hunt the success is 19% it isn't the problem
3. why are all the units in southern Utah lets pull the study off the boulder and put it on the Manti or Wasatch.
4. I think if you are going to try this the HAMS would have been a much better option, people could use there bows and muzzle loaders with out scopes and the rifle would be similar. I don't like the idea but if you feel the need to implement it the HAMS option is much better

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 agree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 30, 2023 10:50 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? I find it a little puzzling that majority public opinion put the scopes on muzzleloaders, but the committee voted to defy the majority opinion with these recommendations. 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 taking shots 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.

In my opinion the reported wounding loss data is NOT correct. Most people I know think they will get in trouble if they report an unrecovered animal - people who have been hunting their whole lives. I'm confident there is far less wounding loss with scopes on muzzleloaders.

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 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 research study? Somewhat disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

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

I am thrilled that we are seeking ways to try new things to increase deer populations overall and buck quality as well. I feel strongly that a few of these recommendations however hurt the hunter and the experience, particularly with youth that hunt these units.

First, 5 day hunts. These really didn't accomplish anything when we tried them in the past, so why would we try this again, especially if we adopt point restrictions that will decrease harvest rates/hunter success on it's own? A 5 day hunt simply congests the hunting season. I would recommend keeping the rifle and muzzleloader hunts 7-9 days. A shortened archery hunt I am supportive of.

Antler restrictions: I support this 100%, it's worth a try. I would be more in favor of a 3 point or better but I can buy into this one. One concern is what happened in the past when this was tried. I hear a lot of people talk about how folks would shoot a buck, find out it didn't meet the antler requirement, then leave it. We really need to monitor this strongly.

Restricted weapons: I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS! Why on earth would we go this route on general any-weapon hunts? This is damaging to the youth and family hunt. We are out there trying to teach our kids the basics of hunting and this is a terrible way to do so. Maybe on the muzzleloader...but keep the general any weapon (rifle) hunt as it is.

Specific to the Plateau/Boulder: This is the unit I have hunted and have done so all of my life. I feel like if this proposal passes hunters here are being punished hard. This is already a fairly low success unit if you go with an antler restriction. Why add to it restricted weapons and a 5 day hunt? It already takes an adult 4-5 years or more to draw it, so when we do now we have more of a challenge. Please do not do this to this unit.

Southwest desert: Are there enough deer and enough hunters for this to really be a good unit to include in these test studies at all?

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I don't see why we would change something that is working. Success with scopes has only increased by 3%. There are fewer tags on these hunts. I'm having trouble buying data that says wounded loss isn't an issue when reporting on such hasn't been mandatory and the response pool is light (IF this is being reported honestly at all). I strongly believe wounded loss will be a greater issue without scopes.

At the same time I hate the idea of long range muzzleloaders. If we need to make a change let's go back to 1x or at the most a 4x scope. I know this puts more on LE's. Please don't punish muzzleloader hunters and ruin a really good hunt. I feel the committee went to an extreme on this topic when they didn't have to. I am a part of and moderate several social media hunting forums and from what I see there the public is overwhelmingly in favor of keeping scopes. Please listen to us on this one!

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 disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I don't care about the 4 point or better or even shortened seasoned dates but the restricted weapon stuff on the Dutton or boulder is a no go. Traditional archery equipment is something most people do not have and will cause more wounding Archery equipment is already difficult this is not a goof idea. I do not like the no scopes on rifles as well I live in and hunt these areas and feel this is a bad idea.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I like scopes on muzzle loaders

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 proposed research study? Somewhat disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

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

I like some of what is being proposed. My preference would be reduced season dates and 3 point or better for any tag issued for anyone 18 or older. I think it should be done state wide for that 4 year period. We already know what we are dealing with so having a control group doesn't make sense to me.

I'm not opposed to scopes coming off muzzleloaders, but I think rifles should be left alone. I also think inline muzzleloaders should be allowed. I wouldn't be opposed to a straight wall cartridge early rifle hunt in leu of the normal early rifle. I think this would be a good way to reduce success when the bucks are migrating through pinch points where they are vulnerable, but still continue to offer the hunt. I think the second rifle hunt shouldn't have restrictions to weapons.

I disagree with restrictions on archery equipment. Compounds bows shouldn't ever be out of the question. I myself have invested around 20,000\$ in my weapon systems for archery, muzzleloader, and rifle to be as proficient as possible. I'm fine giving up some things but not the core of my equipment. It's not fair to the time and money I've put into it. I think the biggest issue is old men slamming 2 point bucks just to fill a tag. Then half the time they just let the meat go to waste anyways. It is a big problem.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I'm fine with scopes coming off muzzleloaders but think that inlines should be allowed. I would be okay with a straight wall rifle hunt in leu of the traditional early rifle hunt. I think the late rifle should not have weapon restrictions. I think compound bows should be left alone. I have over 20,000\$ invested in my weapons from archery, muzzleloader, and rifle along with 1000s of hours of practice. I'm fine giving some things up but not the core of my system. It's not fair to me considering the time and money I've invested.

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 disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? 4 point or better even shorter seasons might be acceptable but the restrictive weapon stuff is to far people do not have that equipment. also both units are right next to each other switch the boulder and the pine valley make it the all unit and the boulder 4 point or better so you don't have both restrictive units right next to each other. As a 77 year old this is not something that makes you want to hunt

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 agree

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? 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? This is one of the dumbest ideas you guys have ever came up with. Why do you think that taking scopes off of weapons is going to make things better? Ethical kills has to be a positive thing for all involved. You are stating that the percentage of success is higher due to the scoped weapon. What is the percentage of deer that is shot and wounded and gets away from the hunter? That is never reported I promise you. To say that the hunter will not take a long shot due to it not being with a scope is dead wrong. Shorter dates on the archery is a great idea, but it should be state wide. Compound bows are a great tool to be much more effective and efficient. You can not say that this will make people better hunters, just ruin the experience all the way around for everyone. What about the youth and effort to try to get them involved? What kid that is 17 or under will ever get the experience of a good, ethical, fun hunt? This is a terrible proposal and needs to be taken out. Besides the fact that you are going to compare the Zion unit to any other unit is crazy. I just finished up and hunted hard all 9 days of the late rifle hunt, 3 days on the early rifle, and 5 days on the muzzleloader hunt on that unit and seen zero mature bucks. We seen a bunch of little 2 points getting killed by poor hunters. That unit has a major problem. I have been on all of the southern units and the biggest problem on those units are predator's. I know lions are fair game to anyone with a hunting permit but that will never get the job done on that predator.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

This is a bad idea to take away from the hunter what you already got for them. This should be an ethics subject and not what we think a non hunter thinks. Who cares what the other states are doing? We are going to follow what a different state does? People are shooting long shots no matter what weapon is in their hand and what sights are allowed. If people want to shoot without scopes then why don't they do that? No one is forcing them. Try hitting the kill zone with an open sight muzzleloader at 200 yards and then do it with a scope of any kind. You will see this should be about ethics. Price of muzzleloader is now the reason??? What does that have to do with anything? Sounds like people are jealous and want to slap people down for their financial status.

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?

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 research study? Strongly agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

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

I've made a few comments already, I've thought a lot about this more over the past week. Why aren't predators mentioned in this? 60-100 years ago when my grandpa was out hunting, there were very high buck to doe ratios everywhere in the state. I was told stories of my grandpa seeing a group of bucks, with multiple four points and him choosing to shoot the biggest, and that was not uncommon. You could buy a tag, resident or non resident, every year. Back then cattlemen, ranchers, and sheep herders would be up on the mountain during the summer and would kill predators. The state would even pay trappers to go and kill as many predators as possible, and as a result, cattle, sheep, and deer wouldn't be killed by lions and coyotes. Now fast forward 100 years, there are not any sheep herders or ranchers up in the hills anymore. The state does not pay anyone to kill predators, and now the only predators, especially for cougars, are humans. An adult mountain lion can kill 1 deer every single week, now you cannot tell me that the deer populations doesn't get decimated by this, it has to be!! Why hasn't this been put into this test and research? Why not try 1-2 units and cut the predators by 50%? That will tell you if the deer herd is being effected over a 4 year period. I suggest, since your throwing tons of restrictions out here, that we add a better management of coyotes and cougars, I know this is a huge factor that is being left out.

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? 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? I have several concerns about this process, not as much about the proposals. For years the division has stated they are working on becoming more transparent, to present this as the division's proposal when it's clear that this is being pushed on the division by a small group of powerful people with political connections. For the division to state this is their idea, loses credibility, credibility that was fought for will be quickly lost and take years to rebuild that trust when the division states "this is our recommendation". 2nd, The mule deer committee starts in a couple months putting this in place prior that handcuffs what that committee is capable of doing, or looking at. 3rd, we have a public process that is the best in the country, for a few people to be able to use political ties/threats to circumvent the process is unacceptable.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I'm glad I'm not a decision maker on this one, as it's going to get some people upset. My opinion, we have a any weapon and separate muzzle loader season for a reason. the reason is not to have a single shot rifle season. Muzzle loader season was put in place under the principle of a limited weapon hunt. With modern technology and the use of scopes, these are not a limited weapon. I support removing scopes, or at worst allowing only 1x scopes.

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? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?	I get nervous anytime we approach losing sight that wildlife are a trust of the state, and there is no ownership simply because they are on private property. I also can appreciate that if wildlife adds value to private property owners the wildlife will be viewed as an asset and hopefully encouraged on the landscape. This is tricky, please make sure we don't go to far catering to private property that we forget wildlife is not owned by private landowners.
Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?	Somewhat agree
Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?	I get nervous anytime we approach losing sight that wildlife are a trust of the state, and there is no ownership simply because they are on private property. I also can appreciate that if wildlife adds value to private property owners the wildlife will be viewed as an asset and hopefully encouraged on the landscape. This is tricky, please make sure we don't go to far catering to private property that we forget wildlife is not owned by private landowners.
Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?	Somewhat agree
Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?	<p>DO NOT, allow elk on the Beaver CWMU, that is outside the intent of the CWMU program as outlined.</p> <p>I get nervous anytime we approach losing sight that wildlife are a trust of the state, and there is no ownership simply because they are on private property. I also can appreciate that if wildlife adds value to private property owners the wildlife will be viewed as an asset and hopefully encouraged on the landscape. This is tricky, please make sure we don't go to far catering to private property that we forget wildlife is not owned by private landowners.</p>

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 30, 2023 4:20 pm

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? Have a 3 point or better, not 4 point restriction. I enjoy hunting spikes and deer with a bow, but I'm not going to carry two bows. Keep compound bows but limit the electronic sights so you can hunt both species at the same time

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I am reaching out to in regards to the Boulder, kaiparowits unit and the proposed changes mentioned. Before I dive into some points though I want to say "thank you" for looking into this matter and wanting to make a change(s) because we do need a better more healthy deer heard on the unit...its very poor.

Over the last 20 years i have spent countless days scouting and hunting mule deer on the Boulder unit, i eat, sleep & dream about mule deer on this unit ;) I am hear to tell you that it does need some serious attention but i am not sure it needs everything stated on the new release. I love the idea of the 4 point or better and i love the idea of a 5 day hunt. I am also for removing scopes off of muzzles loaders or reducing the scope size to 1x on the muzzle loader (my current muzzle loader can shoot 500 yards accurately, that is not a muzzle loader....over the last several years i have seen several deer die to long range muzzle loaders... those big bucks should still be a live). Shortening the archery hunt to 2 weeks would also be great. Doing these things listed above would greatly help the heard and put more mature deer on our land scape. However, i think that expanding the restrictions to percussion cap muzzle loaders, recurve bows and no scopes on rifles is over the top, i do not agree with those three limitations.

Another topic that i think Utah needs to look into is to pull out all the "LE" hunts meaning that a hunter can not apply for a LE deer tag and a general deer tag. Make the hunters decide what unit they want to apply for and maybe they will have to hope for a 2nd choice draw to hunt a buck. This is how all the other western states work. Why does Utah have to be different?

I feel that youth should be able to harvest a buck of any size.

Thanks for your time,
Reggie Parsons

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 30, 2023 4:54 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?

Thank you for taking my comments. As an avid and lifetime hunter in the state of Utah here are my concerns about the proposed rule changes.

1. Primitive Weapon proposal: It's going to be extremely difficult for youth and older adults to use a primitive weapon. You are only benefiting experienced hunters in my opinion. My daughter who is 13 had a hard enough time finding the deer in her scope this past hunt. Having no scope with open sights will only frustrate her more. I'm worried about the future generation of hunters using "primitive weapons" as they will become frustrated with the lack of success they most likely will have.
2. The proposed changes will only increase the quality of bucks and not do anything to the quantity of deer. If we want to increase our deer size we need to start looking at does and fawns, not bucks. As we know, one buck will breed many does.
3. Antler Restriction: I would suggest three point or better instead of four point or better. Many three point bucks are labeled as "bad genes". I know Utah has a few "management hunts" to thin out three points on some of their premier units. Wouldn't we want this across all units? I would like this change to say "at least one side has to have three points".
4. Per a number of articles published by BYU on mule deer trends in Utah, the biggest threat to mule deer in Utah is predators and the proposed changes do nothing to solve them. I know the division has done some recent changes regarding mountain lion hunts and increased the bounty on coyotes in recent years and I appreciate that but we aren't doing enough, in my opinion, to control predators.

-According to collaring data completed in Utah done by BYU the biggest threat to fawns and does are coyotes and mountain lions. According to 2020/21 data, fawns (throughout Utah) had a 39.91% survival rate (from 6 months old - 18 months old) with coyotes being the largest reason for fawn mortality. In those same studies, we learn adult females mortality during this same time frame was from mountain lions which was followed closely by coyotes. Lions and coyotes together were by far the biggest reason for mortality among does and fawns. Fences, malnutrition, pregnancy complications, disease, and hunter harvest were other causes but definitely down the list for mortality in both fawns and does.

If we are looking at increasing the deer herds and getting them up to "objective levels" the proposals presented only increase the quality of the bucks, they are not aiming at increasing the number of deer.

In order to successfully increase our deer herds, I propose the following three changes.

1. Control predators. What if we increased the bounty for coyotes? I know the state increased the bounty a few years ago but maybe \$100 bounty would be more of an incentive for people to hunt them. If you factor fuel, time, etc. \$50 doesn't get you very far (especially with recent inflation levels).

In addition to increasing the bounty, why aren't we hiring more government trappers to help control predators? We don't have enough trappers to control them. I believe this would help significantly.

2. More wildlife crossings for migration. Too many deer are getting killed

on Utah highways. According to the same BYU studies on collared deer as mentioned above, number three on the list for doe/fawn mortality was roadkill. KSL recently had an article that stated 10,000 deer are getting killed on Utah highways per year. We need more highway crossings throughout Utah. This would also be safer for the general public.

3. Doe tags. Why are we still giving out doe tags when our deer numbers are struggling ? This makes absolutely zero sense. Instead of giving landowners doe tags, let's compensate them for their crop loss and/or give them unit wide tags that they can sell for compensation.

I appreciate your willingness to accept public feedback regarding this topic and for the Division's ongoing efforts to make our wildlife thrive in Utah. I believe these three points suggested will increase our deer herd throughout Utah. Making the division's proposed changes will only produce higher quality bucks and do absolutely nothing to our struggling deer quantities. We need to make predator management the top priority in getting our deer herds back. Thank you for your time,

Devin Albrecht

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 30, 2023 5:09 pm

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 proposed rule changes to
the Dedicated Hunter Program?

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 have lived in southern utah my entire life and hunting has always been a great experience most of my life. The last several years the hunting has been terrible. I feel like the little bucks get slaughtered and never have a chance to be a nice buck. The genetics are here on the pine valley unit and if managed better will be one of the top units in the state. I hope the four point better law gets passed. I wish muzzle loader scopes were banned and the season for the rifle hunt is shortened to five day. I dont mind the two rifle hunts. I think the late muzzle loader should be banned or only have a few tags max
Hopefully there changes coming because the unit is nothing compared to what it once was and what it potentially could be.

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 lived in southern utah my entire life and hunting has always been a great experience most of my life. The last several years the hunting has been terrible. I feel like the little bucks get slaughtered and never have a chance to be a nice buck. The genetics are here on the pine valley unit and if managed better will be one of the top units in the state. I hope the four point better law gets passed. I wish muzzle loader scopes were banned and the season for the rifle hunt is shortened to five day. I dont mind the two rifle hunts. I think the late muzzle loader should be banned or only have a few tags max
Hopefully there changes coming because the unit is nothing compared to what it once was and what it potentially could be.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

This is a great idea and I think will greatly help the deer herd getting rid of scopes on muzzle loaders. I know guys shooting up to 800 yards with muzzle loaders. Usually wounding the animal

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 30, 2023 5:42 pm

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? Took 5 yrs to get a general pine valley reg. rifle tag. Hunted 8 of 9 days did not see one mature buck.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 30, 2023 5:42 pm

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Take the scopes away been hunting Utah muzzleloader for 20 year . With a scope I fill it take the hunt away Every body can shoot a rifle . I like to hunt not shoot.

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 love this proposed study. I feel like it will give us a good directive on how to manage our deer herd in the future. With technology that has made taking animals easier as the years go on our animals don't have the same chance to survive a hunt like they did many years ago. I love the opportunity to chase big mule deer even if it is harder to take one. I think the direction with this study will help our deer herds out. We're too lethal with all of our technologies.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I love that we are addressing technology as we get more lethal with the new technologies. Our animals do not have the same chance to survive a hunt like they did many years ago. Please limit our technologies.

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 30, 2023 7:07 pm

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I've been muzzleloader hunt for some time and I know some not so perfect shoots. But with a scope the shoot may be further out at times but a lot more accurate and no loose of deer from a bad shoot. The scopes need to stay or high power like over 6x can go. I hope these get read muzzleloader hunter. Thanks

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

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

Boulder Shorter seasons no problem. Antler restriction will result in more 2 and 3 point bucks as Boulder has genetics in the herd that a lot of mature bucks are only 2 or 3 points. Plus younger hunters really do not care how large a buck they harvest its just if they see success . We have hunted Boulder for over 30 years and watched my kids, cousins, friends and now grand kids get their start in hunting. Deer populations in that area have dropped but we have noticed an increase in elk ,coyotes, bears and cougars. Also more hunters driving the roads instead of walking killing a lot of bucks on the roadside. Compound bows help for an old guy like me but changing to traditional is a expense for a lot of famlies and might drop the amount hunters including future hunters. Scopes on muzzle loaders no big deal but again going to a traditional flintlock is more expense and caters to just a few hunters. Not sure how much longer this oldv guy might keep hunting but some of these ideas may of helprd me decide.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 1, 2023 3:15 am

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

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

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

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

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Mandatory harvest reporting is fine, but it shouldn't just to disallow those who did not report from participating in next year's big game draw. Just have them pay a fee.

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

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Seems like the goal is reduce the harvest, which I don't agree with. But also you are going to encourage wound loss. The better technology makes the weapons more accurate, why take that away? Using Muzzleloaders without scopes and just compound bows means people will take shots that they have no business taking. Not everyone is the calm, patient hunter who wants to get a close, ethical kill. Maybe they don't all punch their tags, but you will see those populations reduced because no will report a wounded animal that couldn't harvest and likely dies later.

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 1, 2023 9:32 am

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 1, 2023 9:36 am

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

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?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 1, 2023 12:06 pm

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 think with the technology we have to allow for harvest reporting it is a no brainer

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 like the fact that the division is willing to try some different management practices but there looks to be a few holes in some of these studies that could sabotage them.

1) in these study areas, I don't feel like you can still manage to a buck/doe ratio in regards to increasing or decreasing permits based off of buck/doe classifications taken in the winter by DWR. I have seen big swings from one year to another in these classifications. An average over a few years can give a better idea if the deer didn't move into those locations where the classifications are taking place or if deer moved early and are loaded up in those areas another year. Seeing's how this is a 4 year study I would like to see these permit numbers stay the same or have a bigger ceiling to increasing permits, like around 30/100 buck/doe ratio.

2) The four point or better rule I am not a huge fan of but am still willing to take part and see if it will make for a better experience hunting. The issue I have with this rule is there are a decent population of older, mature bucks that only have 3 points max on one side. These mature bucks should be target bucks for harvesting and yet they are illegal. I know in antler pts can change from year to year and some years they can have a fourth point but I would still like to see something like a spread credit in this four point only area such as "four point or better or bucks with antler spread 22" or outside there ears. Basically something to allow the harvest of mature 2x3's or 3x3's. Or possibly establish that that there is a time length for units to be enrolled in four point or better and rotate out every four years so to be able to harvest any stockpiled mature bucks that grow four pts.

3) I like the primitive weapon hunting category but I don't think there will be enough bow hunters that hunt with a long bow or recurve to sell these tags. Really I would rather see some sort of sight pin restriction on current compound bows to these test areas instead of limiting the archery to 5% of bowhunters and having unsold tags every year. I think it would be fine to have some sort of late November archery hunt that only allowed for primitive bows but not the entire arch season for a unit.

4) I am having a hard time wrapping my head around the Boulder that has all three test studies implemented on it. If you are trying to find out which ones work and which ones don't how are we going to determine the outcome if all three are active?

5) Another potential pitfall could come with the divisions ridiculously low population objectives/carrying capacities for deer. In these test units if the buck/doe ratio increases to the point of putting the population over objective I would assume we would have a situation like elk management and doe tags will be issued and shoot ourselves in the foot by killing off our baby producers. I feel like this would be a tactic for the DWR to point at the test management for buck harvest not working when really it is should point to a management practice/philosophy the division has used for years to "maintain objective levels" because they are handcuffed and cant take

more bucks. Which leads me to my next point.

6) These test study areas are a good thing, but in reality if the division didn't rely so heavily on fat content studies to determine if there is enough suitable habitat and more on the amount of unused habitat within the unit we could actually raise the carrying capacity in almost every single unit to the level it should be at to have the amount of deer that absolutely existed 15-30 years ago. I know with roads, cities growing, and other factors have impacted the practicality of maintaining those numbers, but population models have changed over the years used to assess the population and I have hunted and lived in southern Utah all my life and I know what my eyes tell me and I have seen these populations shrink by no less than 30-40% in my lifetime and the deer habitat that was utilized during those years has no way shrunk by the same amount. It has maybe shrunk by 5%.

Bottom line if the deer population and carrying capacities were straitened out and increased most likely you wouldn't need to throw all these test areas out there to keep selling the same amount of tags.

7) Stop killing does. It is hard enough to get them through a year with highways, fences, mountain lions, Coyotes, etc, and issuing doe tags to kill even more of them when every unit is has been chronically under carrying capacity for at least 10+ years is absurd. I know the division took steps in recent years to reduce the number of doe tags issued and I commend them for that, but I have seen this time and time again and the division will start ramping them up again as soon as they have a low fat content study regardless of the amount of available forage on the landscape.

8) One last point is on the four point or better is how many four points does the DWR actually feel like they have in the Boulder and Pine Valley? Can they issue that amount of tags for bucks that aren't even on the unit?

Thank you

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

1) On the muzzleloader hunt and removing keeping or removing scopes. It was said there wasn't much support in changing to another any legal weapon or single shot rifle hunt. News flash, with scopes on muzzleloaders it is a single shot rifle hunt....

My answer is that if there isn't that big of a difference in harvest with and without scopes then take them off and put it back to a unique hunt with a limited range weapon. If people love hunting with their muzzleloader and want to use a scope then go back to letting them use that equipment during the any legal weapon hunt. The problem is those individuals that cry that they cant see through open sights and want to use a scope and love hunting with muzzleloaders only want to hunt with them when it gives them advantage and hunting with other hunters that carry scoped rifles doesn't fit their narrative. Make it no scopes, not even 1 power and put it back to a limited range hunt where a 150 yard shot is a tough shot. Another thing is what should've been said is "most people aren't comfortable admitting they take long shots with muzzleloaders". They still take the long shots and if the deer doesn't drop half the hunters out there most likely don't follow up on the shot. On top of that, in my experience muzzleloaders do not create the same type of wound channel as rifles or archery equipment, especially at longer ranges (150 yds+) which makes increasingly difficult to follow a blood trail and examine your impact.

2) Make the HAMS definition the standard muzzleloader definition and have a primitive weapon muzzleloader definition for primitive weapon hunts.

DO NOT allow visual impairment loopholes! This opens up individuals to fudge information. If they want to hunt with muzzleloaders and use scopes, hunt the rifle hunt with your muzzleloaders. I have just seen too many people take advantage of these loopholes.

I am in support for restricting weapons so as to limit effective range as we have gotten more and more efficient. I still feel like we need both.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 1, 2023 12:39 pm

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 really like the idea of 4 point or better I think that would save a lot of bucks help them get more age to them I'd like to see that statewide, I don't like the idea of handicapping hunters where it's going to be almost impossible to have an enjoyable hunt. If you don't want that many bucks killed we shouldn't be giving the number of tags I think with these restrictions it will give people a chance to wound allot of deer before they harvest one. I do appreciate that the state is recognizing the deer issue and are trying to fix things. Hopefully we can reduce tags and still be able to enjoy inline muzzleloaders and rifle scopes.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 1, 2023 1:54 pm

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 would like to know how the "partial" on the refund of money and pts will be outlined but overall I like that this would happen on such drastic changes to units

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?

I do not agree with any of these proposals. As a hunter, I want longer season dates, no point restrictions, and I want to be able to use my rifle and scope. Every year it gets harder, more complicated, and more expensive to hunt. I am about ready to just give it up. This year we did not draw on anything in Utah. It was hard, but it made me realize that the thing I missed the most, was spending time with my kids. So we did other things together including spending our time and money in Wyoming coyote hunting. Point restrictions are hard because you can not always count the points. And why sound eye guards not count? Shorter seasons are also not good for people who already have a hard time finding days that they are able to hunt. And if you want primitive weapon hunts, then make them a separate hunt all together. I think we need to purchase more land to hunt on. Do more predator control. And just try to simplify things. If I am a resident, I want to be able to hunt in my own state every year, have a chance at a buck, and not need a couple college degrees on how to figure out how to apply and follow all the new rules and regulations. Like I say, I guess I am just frustrated with it all and about ready to just quit hunting. Just not as easy and fun as it use to be. I do understand that you guys have a hard job and with our growing population it is hard to please everyone.

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? Applicable to the Boulder--- unit I agree that Archery and Muzzleloaders should have tech restriction BUT I think scopes should be allowed on rifles. Additionally long shots are generally required in the Parker Mt. regions on the Boulder unit. Scopes on rifles will continue to allow longer humane kills.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I agree that Archery and Muzzleloaders should have these propose restriction BUT I think scopes should be allowed on rifles especially for youth, elderly and novice hunters.

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? 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? 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

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 technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I am somewhat confused, when you compare us to other states, one I don't Really care what other states are doing this is Utah this is where I hunt, next you compare scopes but not sabots, bullet type or concealed ignition systems if your going to compare compare all not pick and choose. A lot of our muzzloading rifles don't have sights nor anyway to install them, we purchased these muzzloaders while legal in Utah! We will now have to invest in new equipment!!!! Another concern you touched on that I disagree with is the wounding of animals, I believe scopes allow for a lot more accurate shot placement. I am in the field a lot and since unlimited scope power was allowed I hear a lot less, oh I hit one but we couldn't find it. I am ok in stopping technology progression at this point but don't take what has already been accepted and authorized! If your going to take scopes to make it unique then take away in lines, primer ignition, sabots and cams and sights on archery equipment! I think this proposal is wrong a lot of sportsman have invested there hard earned money on there muzzloading equipment that will become illegal to use during the muzzloading season. Harvests do not seem to be a concerning factor for the change but less than half the survey doesn't want scopes! They don't have to use scope if they don't want to but don't infringe on my desire to use what now is legal. If you want to stop future technology I'm for that but again don't take from us what has become acceptable to this date!!
Thank you

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I have always muzzle loader hunted it is my favorite hunt I have kept up with technology and sold my older muzzleloaders. Now you want to take away my muzzleloader and I will have to buy another one with metal sights, this is wrong. Stop future technology if you will but let's not go backwards. If people don't want scopes on there muzzleloaders they don't have to have them but don't tell me I can't. I believe there are a lot less wounded animals with scopes than without, because you know they will still take that 200 yard shot even though the sight covers the whole animal. Even long range muzzleloader bullets still have low ballistic coefficients and bullets have there limited effectiveness but scopes will minimize the crippling. This is not another any weapon hunt you still have to load from the barrel then prime your ignition system, then there is moister that effects the powder the slight-hang fire that still makes muzzleloader hunting unique. You compare us to other states but you really aren't comparing apples to oranges Colorado has to have an exposed ignition Idaho doesn't allow sabots are you going to go back to that also after I have bought another legal at the time muzzleloader! Leave it alone it's not broken by your own surveys don't try to fix what's not broken! Stop future technology yes you have my support like not allowing range finder scopes, inferred scopes, but again let's not go backwards after being allowed to have scopes as long as we have! Even limiting the power of a scope will increase the cripple rate in my opinion. All I hear in todays comments is how archery hunters are shooting 100 yards plus, but I don't see you taking away there sights and cams. As an elk hunter if you take our scopes then let us hunt before the rifle hunters, and with the archery hunters. Muzzleloader hunters always gets the tail end of the planning, leave the hunt the way it is, you don't have to change it, not sure why you think you do!!!

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Leave our hunt alone, your surveys are not showing any benefits to changing it. Also if I heard you right on the video the majority although slight is in favor of scopes! Taking scopes doesn't put us in line to other states in the west, and who cares what other states are doing. They have the lottery, they smoke marijuana for pleasure, we don't! They can't shoot sabots but we can. I love the muzzle hunt, at this point in my life you will be taking that away because I can't afford to go buy new equipment. If hunters don't want scopes on there muzzleloader they don't have to put them on. Scopes are not increasing success enough to justify the rule change. I don't understand why we are wasting so much time and energy trying to change what has been working according to your survey. Why isn't the majority ruling? It is still a muzzleloader not a single shot rifle!!!

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

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

I and my wife have Dedicated deer tags on the Boulder/Kaiparowits unit and have not harvested a deer in the past 2 seasons. I can agree with limiting technology on the archery and muzzleloader hunts to keep it primitive. I strongly disagree with removing scopes from rifles. Especially when you want a 4-point or better restriction. The fastest way I identify how many points a deer has is with my rifle scope. This unit also has a Strong 3-point gene with many mature bucks that will only ever be a 3-point. Also with limiting technology between me and my wife we do not own a bow, muzzleloader, or rifle that will fit your criteria of a legal weapon. How do you expect us to afford all new equipment to hunt any of the 3 seasons that we can hunt as dedicated hunters? I don't own any rifle that I can just remove the scope and go hunt. How many open sights rifles do you see on the shelves? The largest majority of rifles sold today are scope only rifles. Bare minimum I would have to buy 2 open sights rifles for me and my wife to be able to go out and at least enjoy the shortened rifle season. I do not know what you expect us to do. Please think this over before making such a drastic change to an area that I love to hunt.

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

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?

I have hunted the Boulder unit for almost 50 years. I have seen the best and the worst of the management of the deer herd on this unit. My family has been in the ranching business in Wayne County for over a hundred years. It is my opinion that you cannot increase your herd by adding more bulls or bucks to the herd, we have to address the problem of saving the fawn crop to increase the numbers. I remember the times when the doe/fawn ratio was close to 100 fawns/100 does. You cannot expect to increase the numbers with the amount of fawn loss we have to predators on not just the Boulder, but all the units in the proposed study. We have also tried the point restrictions and the 5 day hunts in the past, it made no impact on the overall herd numbers. If I remember correctly the illegal kill was out of control with the 3 point or better hunts in the 80's. I also do not agree with eliminating scopes on muzzleloader, I would recommend going with a fixed 4 power scope to reduce the number of wounded and lost animals. I also do not understand the weapon restriction theory of eliminating scopes during the any weapon hunt. It seems to me that again we would have the problem of wounded and lost animals. I served 8 years on the Southern RAC and we never heard of such drastic changes proposed without it going through the appropriate channels. I sincerely hope that changes are not in haste just to get a short term fix, there needs to be decisions made that will effect the resource far into the future. Thanks, Layne Torgerson Richfield, Utah

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 2, 2023 8:46 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 3, 2023 9:27 am

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? Good change. The more data the better.

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? We have hunted deer on the Parker regularly for the last 20 years and that doe you did several years ago was a tragedy! Please, no more doe hunts ever. It is hard to find an antelope on the Parker where there used to be thousands.

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?

The way it is written, I strongly oppose this proposal. I grew up hunting the Boulder and am currently in year two of the dedicated hunter program on the Boulder (went on my first hunt in 1998). Those were great times with lots of deer. It was common to see 35-50 bucks a day. I would love more than anyone to see it returned to its former glory! However, I don't think that any of these proposals will do anything to increase the deer herd.

You listed the reasons right in the video.

First, antler restrictions have been tried all over Utah and surrounding states. They don't work and only add stress to the hunter and preserve bad genetics. From the video "Didn't result in increases in mature bucks."

Second, shorter season dates. From the video, "Didn't reduce success or harvest" and only reduced the average time hunted from 3.5 to 3 days. However, those three days will no doubt see an increase in hunter crowding because of the reduced dates. The only upside may be the reduced stress on the animals?

Third, restricted weapons, I agree that technology on weapons has gone way too far. Muzzleloaders should not be capable of 500-yard shots and no one should shoot 1,000 yards with a rifle. However, these restrictions seem way too drastic. Most hunters would need to buy 3 new weapons to continue hunting (myself included). Leave the archery equipment alone. It is hard enough. Take the scopes off muzzleloaders but allow inlines. Leave scopes on rifles but remove variable scopes. A fixed 4-power scope is enough.

In conclusion, if we want to see the deer herds rebound, we need to focus on the does. Cutting tags and restricting hunters doesn't do anything to improve deer numbers. I don't care if I see a buck; I just want to have the opportunity to hunt.

Almost 29% of our general season deer tags have been cut in just the last five years alone. Nearly 70% fewer tags than we had in the early 80s and the deer numbers continue to decline. I get it, people are calling for tag cuts, but you're the biologists, you understand that bucks don't give birth to other bucks so tag numbers don't matter that much.

These southern units don't suffer from the same issues that they do in the north. The habitat looks good (yes, the drought was tough), but there is no shortage of winter range.

Let's end ALL doe hunting. It makes me sick to see my neighbors in Wayne County shooting does with depredation tags when there isn't any deer on the mountain (Thousand Lake unit is in dismal shape). Can't we reimburse them some other way? Or have all these expo tag/special interest group funds go into building deer fences around farms and highways?

I would also love to see increased predator control, starting with bear

permits on the Fishlake Thousand Lake. There are more bears than deer on Thousand Lake right now. I had that bear tag this summer and had 14 different bears hitting my bait! I wish we could bring back coyote baiting as well. We are seeing more and more coyotes in areas that just didn't have any 25-30 years ago.

Sorry, I rambled on. I'm very passionate about deer hunting and would love to see it improve so I can get my kids involved and excited. Thanks for being willing to try new things! I just don't like the way this is written but will adapt if required. I have one more year as a dedicated hunter so I'm stuck with these rules if you pass them.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I agree. The long shots are unethical. though I was surprised by the data. Scopes only improved success rates by 2.5%. Is there a way to ban high-functioning muzzleloaders rather than taking scopes? Maybe take away the bolt action muzzleloaders that require rifle primers and special powder.

Just a thought.

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

Strongly agree

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

As a dedicated hunter. I like the changes. Thanks

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 3, 2023 12:29 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?

While I agree with collecting data that could potentially help the DWR better manage our deer herds, I disagree with some of the proposed changes. The southwest desert is a very remote unit with very limited resources within reasonable distance. Because of this, planning to hunt this unit requires extra preparation and provisioning. Most hunters I know save their vacation all year for hunting season. What if a severe storm system moves through the unit lasting 2-3 days? Your hunt/vacation could be ruined. The extra effort I have to put into hunting this unit, and the risk that I might only get 1-2 days of huntable conditions would deter me from applying for this unit. Is the study accurate if nobody wants to hunt the unit? The second proposal I disagree with is the weapon restrictions. Many hunters have invested thousands of dollars in archery equipment, inline muzzleloaders, and optics to be more efficient and ethical in the harvesting of big game. Arguments can be made both ways, but I feel more animals will be wounded with the weapon restrictions. If what I believe to be a small percentage of hunters desire a restricted/primitive hunt, take time off of the archery hunt and make it a separate season. Lastly, I feel there is a better way for the division to manage the deer populations. I feel the the hunting units should be broken down into mountain ranges (where applicable). I live in a unit that incorporates two significant ranges. One of the ranges has limited access and a significant portion of private lands. The other range is fairly accessible and primarily public land. When population and buck to doe calculations are made they are for the unit, not the individual mountain range. This skews the numbers and results in one range with a high concentration of hunters and being overhunted and the other with not much impact from hunting at all. Breaking the units down into ranges (where applicable) would give biologists and the division a better way to manage hunter density, buck/doe ratios, and better control how many animals are being harvested from a given area. This will also provide the division a better platform for analysis and result in more accurate data that is truly applicable to the impacts that hunting has on a specific herd. Better data = better management, better management = healthier herds and happier hunters. It seems the only thing you will learn from this study is success rates for shortened and restricted hunts. Can't harvest reporting give you success rates and age class of deer taken? It doesn't matter how you harvest an animal or the time it takes to harvest it, once the animal is removed it stays removed. Reduce the number of tags if needed. The proposals have been done before, you have the data and know what to expect. Make harvest reporting mandatory, and you will have more data in one year than was collected in the last several.

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 have hunted the Plateau area of the Plateau Boulder Kapoworitz unit for more than 55 years. I will try to hunt this unit under any circumstances. Shortened season dates, all in favor. Antler restriction concerns. The genetics have changed over the last decade. Many bucks are developing only 2 points to aside, regardless of age. These genetics will be preserved and more prevalent. Weapon restrictions are harsh. First concern is that accuracy will be reduced and wounding animals may increase. Proposal would require obtaining possibly 3 new weapons. An expensive proposition. Observation for this year, based on hunting general elk hunt. The herd in this area is doing well. One evening we observed around 60 deer, from the road. Including one group of 7 bucks and another 3. Individual and pairs of young bucks. Range vegetation is as good as it gets. Plenty water, grasses, and browse. thanks, blaine.lutz@gmail.com

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 4, 2023 8:50 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?

I like the changes. New technology on muzzle loaders is not a primitive weapon like they should.
Archery hunters have 30 days to wound animals and cause numbers to decrease. Man has been hunting for thousands of years and has minimal impact. We had great numbers after the settlers got control of the predators they are still the biggest problem killing calfs fawns bucks bulls cow's and does. They have no management. We can't manage numbers with predators taking everything in their path.

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? I agree with the changes with the exception on one thing. Youth 18 and younger should have the chance to shoot ANY buck on the 4 point or better units! This will allow the kids that have waited years to draw have greater success while also weeding out some of those two and three points that never get to the 4 point level. It sucks that when they are excited to draw a tag that they have to wait several years, then when they get a tag you tell them 4 point or better extremely decreasing their success. This proposal I suggest would be the best for all of us, giving them lots of chances and getting them hooked all while providing a type of Management hunt for those units all at the same time.

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

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? 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 research study? Strongly disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

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

I disagree with a 5-day deer hunt unless its implemented statewide and includes ALL weapons. I also disagree with weapon restrictions simply due to the fact that hunters can shoot to 300 yards with a scope or open sights or a peep sight. The last deer I shot with a scoped muzzleloader was 138 yards, the last deer I shot with open sights was 168 yards. I'm confident I could shoot a deer or elk to 300 yards with open sights. Fact is I'd buy a peep sight muzzleloader to hunt Utah and other states with weapon restrictions and stretch my shooting to 600 yards. These proposed restrictions don't solve anything. Just adding more wounded deer.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Weapon restrictions will only result in more wounded deer. DWR has no tracking or mandatory reporting, how would DWR know the success or failure of your proposals? Fact is I can shoot to 300 yards with an open sight muzzleloader. My last deer with open sights was 168 yards, my last deer with a scope was 138 yards. I'm much more accurate with a scope but can shoot to 300 yards either way. I'd go to a peep sight and shoot to 300-maybe even out to 500 yards. Removing scopes and 209 primers is nonsense and ridiculous, it will solve nothing.

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

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Limited vision CORs for scopes need to be limited to 1x magnification only.

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 4, 2023 3:17 pm

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

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

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

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 disagree

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

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 4, 2023 11:23 pm

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 like the way we are ways to keep hunting available to many people

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? line 1 B i) on limiting archery to two weeks could be changed to using the last two weeks in August for traditional 1 string bows only.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

After watching the presentation an under 3 percent increase in the number of animals taken while using a scope versus not using a scope isn't justification to eliminate scope all together from limited entry/general deer and elk hunts! You can guarantee you will have more injured and lost animals with the elimination of scopes. The hunt is hard enough as is this change will likely make harvest even lower than that already exists! This counter point is probably what the division wants anyway as they would rather sell more tags and harvest less mature animals while increasing hunt opportunity given Utah's robust population growth since 2019. This change is very unfair and in addition you are penalizing a lot of individuals who went out and spent a lot of money to purchase an effective an ethical muzzleloader to make an ethical and efficient shot. Long story short reduce the number of tags allocated for each species if the division is worried about harvesting all the trophy deer and elk don't penalize the hunters that have spent years accumulating points for that once in a lifetime opportunity to harvest a mature deer or elk. This technology reduction is totally wrong.
Thank-You

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 would love to see the 4-point antler restriction be temporarily adopted in the Pine Valley Unit for the next 4 years. I feel that this will give the young bucks a chance to grow to maturity. I don't think that this should be a long term solution to our deer herd problems. I feel that now would be a great time to implement it temporarily with the high number of fawns that we have on the landscape now. I would also really like to see wildlife fencing and crossing on Highway 18. I drive from Enterprise to St. George for work and I see lots of deer killed. I feel that this would help increase the population of our deer heard and increase the safety of motorists.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I would love to see scopes on muzzleloaders go away. I feel the the technology has advanced way too much, and would rather see the hunt become more difficult.

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 almost everything you are trying, to better the quality of hunting in Utah. My one concern is, being an archer on the boulder kaparowit unit, is the restrictions of compound bows and only mature bucks. That makes an already low success hunt, and turns it into a nearly impossible hunt. If you could make all the other changes and leave compound bow I would be happy to be apart of your study. I'm afraid if you take away compound bow I will put in for a different unit which will have a negative affect on your study. Thank you for your hard work.

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? Thanks for the opportunity to comment. There are several things that need to be carefully scrutinized in this proposal and I trust that the Southern RAC will give it due vetting, I want address the four year average permit proposal to be used for the next four years on the study units. The past four years have seen a reduction of 30% in permits due to drought and the Wildlife Board's refusal to increase tags last year. This proposal would extend that hard cut for another four years regardless of deer numbers or buck to doe ratios, resulting in a considerable loss of public hunter opportunity, In the past, and in the deer plan, permit numbers are discussed and set after the counts have been conducted and buck to doe ratios and winter survival have been established. This should be considered in the spring. This study would likely increase bigger bucks, but the loss of opportunity for the public hunter would be considerable.

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? Take the (purchasing hours) out of the program. As long as you allow hours to be bought, you are SELLING PRIVILEGE!!!

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 strongly agree with removing scopes off of muzzleloaders. I'm also recommending moving the GS muzzleloader elk hunt to the general season muzzleloader deer hunt. The least successful weapon should always be before the rifle.

Then we have the first season rifle elk hunt then a week break. Then put the second season rifle Elk hunt in line with the general season rifle deer hunt.

no hunts in November other then the late season muzzleloader deer hunt.

Let's give these animals a little more time to recover before winter hits.

Thanks for all your hard work this was by far the best GS elk hunt I have ever had love the split season.

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 agree let's try something new.. I have read everything on APR Restrictions. I know if it's ran for a long time it can hurt quality and the health of the deer herd. I suggest an order to balance out APR. We allow youth hunters to shoot 2 points or bigger. That is something that hasn't been tried on APR restrictions I think you will find it be more of a balance and might just work.

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 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 agree. We definitely need to try something new.
I have read everything on APR. there is more cons then pros about it. It just seems there isn't a balance on this.
So I have a proposal! Allow the youth to shoot two point or better which is only 20% of the tags. This is something that has never been tried and I feel light it would be more balanced. Just a thought.
Thank you

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? There is one thing that I don't agree on? That the GS Muzzleloader Elk hunt is the very last hunt.
If we remove them I feel like the GS Muzzleloader Elk hunt should be moved up during the GS Muzzleloader deer hunt.

Then have the first rifle GS Elk and the second rifle GS Elk and then the GS rifle Deer hunt. The only hunts that would be running in November is the late season muzzleloader hunt and the extended archery areas.

I know a lot of people really enjoyed the split seasons on GS any weapon elk it was a lot more fun.
Thanks

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 6, 2023 3:55 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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 6, 2023 4:25 pm

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 generally like the proposed research study, but I think it might create some big shifts in the application patterns for a bunch of hunters. Some units like Pine Valley and Boulder/Kaiparowits may become highly desirable in a couple years if the age class of bucks improves and some units may become relatively undesirable if the hunts are shorter.

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? This is a great idea and am looking forward to the information that comes out of this study.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I do not agree with the proposal for scopes to be eliminated from muzzleloaders. Utah has said eliminating scopes only increases successful hunts by 6%, if that is the case why not leave them on muzzleloaders and let the hunters decide how they want to pursue game. Utah has also made the point that they are limiting scopes due to Utah being one of two states that allows it? My question is why other states laws should impact me as a resident. Many hunters have spent substantial financial investments on their scopes for muzzleloaders just to have Utah back track on the law. I do not agree with this proposal.

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? In my view the dedicated hunter program has and is taking opportunity away from hunters that want to hunt archery or muzzle loader and gives the opportunity to hunters that would generally put in for any legal weapon. Service hours are great things for the dwr to ask for and many outdoorsmen are willing to help whether they get an extra hunting opportunity or not. If money is what the dwr is after by giving applicants the ability to buy their hours, and increase of a couple dollars per tag sold would and could offset the revenue.

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? Making things too complicated. We know this will turn into an excuse to issue more tags when harvest is lower.

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? These weapon restrictions are going to ruin hunter experience. Claiming to want more people to get into hunting and not going to let them use a scope????? That is insanity. And using recurve bow only??? Taking scopes off of muzzel loaders and rifles won't necessarily reduce harvest. It will increase wounded deer though. Since powered scopes were introduced to muzzel loaders in the mid 2010's success rates have only increased ever so slightly around 2% I would argue that wounded / lost deer has declined in that same time frame. Focus on the issues at hand. HIGHWAY MORTALITY and HABITAT . Yes that includes wild horse /cattle/sheep overgrazing. Highway mortality is the main focus. Every doe mortality results in a large amount of future deer off the landscape. There should be deer fences and crossings all over the state ! Instead of our dnr out wasting time and money trying to catch a shed hunter hiking in February how about they do something useful and build fence or build more guzzlers or plant more bitterbrush. There should also never be a doe hunt allowed in the state of Utah ever again. The only thing I think worth testing is the 4 point or better restriction. Stop changing the rules every single year it's getting so old! Everyone feels like they are getting trampled on and that the wildlife board doesn't listen to real hunters.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Absolutely disagree with getting rid of scopes on muzzel loader hunts. Success rates have barely changed since introduction of powered scopes. (Less than 5%) that will not change your deer population. It will increase wounded/lost deer

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Please don't limit the harvest to 4 point or better. We worked for years to have a place to gather as a family to hunt, fish and enjoy the Boulder mountain with family. I hate to see Boulder unit controlled by a few people with power and influence.

Suggestions.

- You could make the Kaiparowits it own unit with four point or better.
 - You could sell lifetime tags to those over 65, and allow a harvest every three years.
 - limit those with current life time tags to harvest two of three years.
 - Do away with the archery hunt on the Boulder unit, as we see the dead animals on the rifle hunt!
-

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

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

I live and hunt in the Pine Valley unit and the hunting experience has been negatively impacted over the last 3-4 years. It is crowded and despite your instance that deer populations are robust, I don't think you know what you are talking about in the Pine Valley area when it comes to populations. I don't have to depend on a study to tell me that we don't have near the numbers here that we used to. This could be blamed on many items like drought, or too many tags (which there are). I also think there was some kind of disease that killed off a huge number of deer, because there are 2 whole years of generations of deer missing based on my hunts this year. I can already tell you that your decision to implement a 4 point or higher requirement here is only going to ruin the experience for the Youth, who we are trying desperately to keep interested. My own 15 year old son said he would quit hunting if he could only harvest a 4 point, because the chances of being successful fell dramatically, which I totally understand is your desire. If you do anything, please don't make the youth adhere to the 4 point or better requirement. I don't care if you make the adults adhere to it, but please don't ruin the experience for our younger hunters as this most certainly will. Also, why aren't any Northern Utah / Wasatch Front / Back areas being impacted by this? Are you afraid to implement them there for fear of the number of hunters there? Is it a money issue?

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I don't know a single muzzleloader hunter that supports these restrictions on muzzleloaders, especially the units where you are going to restrict inline muzzleloaders. This will result in an exponential increase in wounded animals. It seems to me that you'll take the ability to be accurate out of the equation. Hunters are not going to stop taking long shots and you are increasing the instances when someone will make an ethical decision on when to pull the trigger. I think these are ridiculous and I don't think you really care what the public thinks about it. I do not support these changes.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 7, 2023 3:58 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 Southern 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 technology
recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

To the Southern 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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 7, 2023 4:10 pm

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 fully support harvest reporting. This allows biologists to better track how many and the quality of animals being harvested in each unit. Should have been implemented a long time ago.

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 am strongly opposed to implementing five day hunts and four point or better antler restrictions. First on the proposal to shorten hunts. How soon we forget. The Utah DWR already did this study. Back in around 2003-2004 the UDWR shortened the rifle hunt to 5 days. Their study found that there were no fewer bucks killed on the five day hunts than a nine day hunt. I am a lifetime license holder who has hunted the Southwest Desert unit for the past 36 straight years. My personal observations on this unit have shown that many people pass up smaller bucks the first part of the hunt knowing they have a second weekend to hunt. Many of them end up not taking a deer early, then not seeing one later so they don't harvest. On the years of the 5 day hunt many 2-points were killed the first weekend because everyone knew they didn't have more time. This year on the unit I was able to harvest a nice mature buck. This is the first deer I have taken since 2017 because I don't shoot immature bucks. This year I saw more deer, more bucks and more mature bucks than I have seen in several years. This unit is coming back and I hate to see it ruined again by a pointless research study that has already been proven ineffective and will most likely increase the number of smaller bucks harvested. Five day hunts do not dramatically change the number of harvested bucks period. Furthermore, I plan my vacation time for the rifle deer hunt. My favorite part of the hunt is the last five days when most of the hunters have gone home and the pressure is greatly reduced. It allows me to hunt with minimal conflicts and pressure from tons of other hunters. Reducing this unit to a five day hunt will increase pressure during those five days and take away what I enjoy most about it. At 56 years old I don't want to be forced to go learn a new unit to get the hunting experience I enjoy on this hunt.

On the topic of four point or better. This is also another ill advised proposal. This has been tested before and I have read many studies about it. I also have an ecology degree and have studied population dynamics and genetics. This strategy results in harvesting of all desirable mature 4 point or better bucks leaving the less desirable 3 points to do the breeding. Case in point are the Henry Mountains and Paunsaugunt. Ask yourself why the DWR has implemented management buck hunts on these units. It is because over time the undesirable mature 3x3 bucks that do not get killed end up doing the breeding. This genetic trait gets passed on and soon you have a large population of undesirable bucks. Management hunts are then implemented to reduce the number of undesirable mature bucks giving the preferred bucks better chances to do the breeding. On a general season unit this is exactly what will happen and over time there will be very few bucks that you are trying to produce.

Lastly, I heard through the grapevine that this proposal did not in fact come from the DWR but from a small group of individuals led by a couple prominent politicians. We need to stop politicizing our wildlife and make decisions based on sound biological science. I urge you to look at the science and past studies and please vote "NO" on this proposal. Don't take our deer herds a step in the wrong direction and back several years. The

populations and quality are improving with the work the biologists are doing. They know wildlife management better than a handful of politicians.

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? Yes please. Online surveys for every tag. Other states do this and it should help gather data and reduce the costs to collect the information.

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? We have tried all the strategies already. Just wondering why we need to keep trying them over and over. I spoke with the biologist recently about this and they are not recommending this proposal. Sounds politically motivated from somewhere else. I personally hated the shorted seasons. Hunting is about family and friends. Only having 5 days to hunt and one single weekend for rifle and muzzle loader reduces the time family and friends can spend hunting together. The 2003 to 2008 timeframe was not a great hunting experience for our family. All the research I have read about antler restrictions shows harm to herds not help. I would love to see it implemented in my unit for trophy reasons, but I feel that is a selfish motivation and not backed by research. Also 4 point or better would increase the 3 point genetic for the areas. If doing the antler restrictions I would suggest a mature buck restriction such as 22 in wide and or 3 point or better instead. I also feel the scope restrictions for rifles and muzzle loaders are likely to increase wounding of animals. I do not at all understand the compound bow restriction. Try the studies in Northern Utah for a change. Living in southwestern Utah this blocks off almost all the units close by. I hunt Southwest Desert but have hunted Pine Valley and Beaver Units too.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Don't like the scope restrictions on muzzle loaders. I feel this will increase wounding of animals. But I don't hunt much with a muzzleloader.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 7, 2023 7:07 pm

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?

I hunt the south west dessert unit all the time. I enjoy being able to have 2 weekends to hunt. I am the mother of 3 sons who works for a living, this proposal would only allow me to hunt for a couple days maximum. This proposal would ruin a family tradition.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 7, 2023 7:32 pm

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? I hunt in the southwest desert unit, I work week days, so transitioning this to a five day hunt will only allow me to hunt two days. I love this unit and have friends with property on this unit. I don't want to have to hunt a different unit due to the shortening of the hunt.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 7, 2023 7:55 pm

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?

I travel a long distance to hunt this area a 5 day hunt would not be worth the travel distance. Hunted this area for several years I don't feel that a shorter hunt would help the deer herd.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 7, 2023 8:31 pm

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? As a new hunter in Utah I want the opportunity to take my vacation time and spend more time scouting the area and hunting. A 9 day hunt would be a much better option compared to a limited 5 day hunt or be forced to choose another unit to hunt.

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? I see no problem with 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? Parker mtn. Used to be the best antelope hunt in the state. Now you can travel the whole unit and you are lucky if you see half a dozen.

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 strongly disagree with the Boulder mtn restrictions. A hunter saves up to get a good compound bow. Practices to become proficient. Sells his old recurve. Now is forced to purchase a recurve and throw away his expensive equipment. The no scope for muzzleloaders is another bad idea. Using a scope makes a hunter capable of making a better shot killing the animal. You'll have a lot of wounded animals that get shot and go off and die with a hunter using open sights. Also again a lot of money invested by the hunter he or she can no longer use.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I have hunted for over 57 years. The best improvement was to allow variable power scopes. You can actually see if an animal at 200 yds. Has the legal amount of points. You can make a more accurate shot. A lot more wounded animals that run off and die with poor shot placement with open sights. As I get older, it's harder to see with open sights. A 1 power scope is useless. Muzzleloading will always be unique because you only have one shot and you have to reload it through the muzzle. The scope just lets you see better.

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?

No

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?

Confusing

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

1. Scopes on muzzleloaders help ensure target identification and aid in shot placement and ethical kills
 2. Why just muzzleloaders? Why is there not a proposal to remove scopes from rifles or multi pin and dialable sights from bows? Muzzleloader technology has advanced but also has for rifles and bows.
 3. Success rate from the DWR increased 2.6% going from unscoped to scoped. How would unscoping muzzleloaders affect the percentage of wounded animals not recovered? Remember only the aiming device is changing. How many hunters will have a muzzleloader capable of taking a big game animal with a scope that they cannot with open sights and will ALL hunters not take these shots
 4. what percentage of people who applied for muzzleloader tags last year will apply again next year if scopes are removed 60%? 40? Nobody knows. How many will jump to the already bloated any legal weapon general and limited entry points pool?
 5. Before modern scoped muzzleloaders the general season dates for elk was September and for deer it was November. If we remove scopes should we go back to those dates?
 6. Modern muzzleloaders are good in some cases very good, however contrary to popular belief they fall way short of most modern rifles. I own what I would consider to be in the top 5% or at least 10% of Utah legal muzzleloaders. I have spent a lot of money and countless hours of practice, load development, gathering data. My muzzleloader with the best bullets and ignition system I can find has less than half of the ballistic coefficient of most modern hunting bullets and is 400-500 FPS slower. I enjoy muzzleloader shooting/hunting and I know my limits but to say they are the equivalent of a rifle is untrue.
-

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? Glad they are finally going to do mandatory reporting.

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 disagree strongly with doing a 4 point or better hunt on Pine Valley. If you remember we tried to propose a 3rd tier B/D ratio for Pine Valley about 5 years ago which would have been 20-25 instead of 18-20 and the RACs and Board thought it would bring to much pressure to one unit if you manage it for better quality then any other unit in the state. Well thats exactly what you are doing here. My kids that are just getting old enough to hunt will have a hard time drawing a rifle tag once as youth if this is done. Currently it takes 3 years right now to draw a early rifle tag and 6 years to draw the late rifle for a youth on Pine Valley. Ive also hunted Pine Valley my whole life and you will have a major 3 point problem if you restrict hunting to only 4 point or better. Very oppose to this idea. I could maybe get behind a 3 point or better restriction although history shows that doesn't work better. But like the old saying goes if we doing learn from history, history is bound to repeat itself.

- Restricting the entire unit on Boulder and Dutton to restrictive weapons is very radical. To alienate 98% of hunters to that type of weapon restriction is ridiculous. Its hard enough to get youth involve with how hard it is to draw tags currently. Youth wont have a chance to hunt either of those units as a youth if you add these restrictive weapons. Currently youth can draw archery and muzzleloader almost every year. It takes 5 years currenly to draw a rifle tag and that will only go up with the restrictive weapons. This will completely elimanate kids from being able to hunt with a bow. There is no way that a youth will be able to pull a recurve bow back that has a pounds to be considered legal.

-Life time license holders should have to draw these units just the same as anyone else. If you are going to cap tag numbers an essentially manage them for limited entry quality animals lifetime license holders should have to draw them just like anyone else. Currently there are around 3500 Lifetime tag given out. That many people could take every tag on any one of these units if they wanted to. Pine valley already has over 500 of those lifetime tags there. You better expect that unit to only get hit harder if you do a 4 point or better and not restrict lifetime tags to a draw as well.

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 going to open sight muzzleloaders. I've hunted muzzy for the last 5 years and I believe that it should go back to an open sights mostly due to it being early enough to target buck when they are still in there more vulnerable summer time patterns. Its the first gun hunt and we don't need to be shooting deer at 400 plus yards with muzzys.

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? I disagree with this rule. If you are going to restrict DH that have drawn a 3 year tag with an expectation then you need to restrict the lifetime license holders to a draw.

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? I think that the division shouldn't shorten the dates on the hunt. All that will accomplish is the deer being ran ragged and the small young bucks to be shot first. And in my opinion I think that the hunt should be extended for another week instead of shortening it. The hunters will then be more willing to take their time and not rush all over the mountains or fields trying to find any buck but will hopefully find older mature bucks that can be harvested

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 8, 2023 8:59 am

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I agree with the recommendation to eliminate muzzleloader scopes. Modern muzzleloaders are basically one shot rifles and can effectively shoot 400+ yards. If people are wanting to shoot long distances then apply for rifle hunts. The muzzleloader hunt should be open sights only.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I strongly disagree with this decision. This will make hunter hunt the whole time instead of the weekends.

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

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? Neither agree nor disagree

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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 8, 2023 9:38 am

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

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I appreciate the fact that we are trying to do something to help our deer herds, but some of the things talked about in this study are honestly more of control issues rather than management issues. The State honestly wants more control, bottom line!

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 8, 2023 11:31 am

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?

I own farmland in the Deseret area SW unit. I have 30-40 deer on my farms all summer that do a lot of damage but I put up with them because I get a landowner tag for my Grandkids every year except for this year. Somebody decided to give landowner appreciation tags for 100 acres and overloaded the allocation. Then a draw. Please go back to 640 acres min. There are a lot of mad farmers here that are talking about making DWR remove the wildlife on their farms. Tony Anderson 435-979-0234

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 Biologist already know the best practices for managing the herd. Why are we trying to change something that is not based in science and is just trying to appease certain people or politicians? Lets use the knowledge we know that is based in good science and improve habitat by creating more water sources to utilize habitat that is not being used, limit vehicle animal collisions by creating more fencing and corridor crossings, and lower or eliminate doe tags for land owners and general public. A quick look into the science of point restrictions shows that it is not a very effective management strategy.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Why ban scopes from muzzleloaders if the data states there is not a significant change one way or another? Lets keep it the same instead of always trying to change things all the time. We need to concentrate on habitat that is proven to help the deer herds more than anything else.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 8, 2023 4:22 pm

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

The use of scopes on rifles for hunting significantly aids in accuracy and precision, which has contributed to more humane and successful hunts. Scopes allow for better target acquisition, especially over longer distances, enhancing the hunter's ability to ensure a clean and ethical shot. Removing scopes could potentially decrease accuracy and increase the possibility of wounding animals without a clean kill.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 8, 2023 4:26 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

The use of scopes on rifles for hunting significantly aids in accuracy and precision, which has contributed to more humane and successful hunts. Scopes allow for better target acquisition, especially over longer distances, enhancing the hunter's ability to ensure a clean and ethical shot. Removing scopes could potentially decrease accuracy and increase the possibility of wounding animals without a clean kill.

I feel that if the decision to remove scopes from rifles goes through, it should be effective on all units in the State and not just single out Mount Dutton.

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? Something need to be done to stop the long range shooters. A 1x scope is about as good as nothing, I have tried them and they don't help you shoot.

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? I don't like the dedicated hunter program because it produces more hunter in the field for every hunt/
Dedicated Hunter should have to work all their hours and not purchase them.

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 would like to express my appreciation for the Utah Department of Wildlife Resources (DWR) and the commendable efforts they have made over the past 15 years to improve wildlife management in our state. The dedication and commitment of the DWR team have not gone unnoticed, and I am grateful for their ongoing work in this important field.

I have recently become aware of a proposed research study by the DWR, and while I fully support the organization's mission and goals, I would like to offer some feedback and concerns regarding this particular research endeavor. It is essential to maintain a constructive dialogue and ensure that research initiatives align with the best interests of wildlife and the hunting community.

My concern stems from reports and studies conducted elsewhere that have already examined similar approaches to wildlife management, resulting in negative outcomes. These include wounded animals, unrecovered kills, and lower levels of hunter satisfaction all without achieving the objectives of the changes. Given these past results, I believe it is crucial for the DWR to reconsider the proposed study's potential impact on our local wildlife and hunting community.

I understand that research is essential for progress, and I appreciate the DWR's commitment to continuous improvement. However, I respectfully urge the DWR to thoroughly review the existing data and studies in this area before proceeding with this research. It is crucial to avoid duplicating efforts that have already demonstrated adverse consequences.

I genuinely hope that the DWR will consider these concerns seriously and engage in further discussion with stakeholders to ensure that any research undertaken is in the best interest of wildlife conservation and the hunting community. Together, we can continue to build on the progress that has been achieved over the last 15 years.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and for your dedication to preserving Utah's wildlife and promoting responsible hunting practices.

Sincerely,

David Dodds

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I am writing to express my support for the use of open sights or limiting the power of scopes to 1x on muzzleloaders. Recent advances in muzzleloader technology have undoubtedly made them increasingly effective, closing the gap between muzzleloaders and traditional rifles. While I appreciate these innovations, I believe it is crucial to maintain a level of fairness and sporting challenge in hunting practices.

The recent developments in muzzleloaders have brought about remarkable improvements in accuracy, range, and overall performance. These advancements have allowed muzzleloaders to approach the effectiveness of modern rifles in some cases. However, it is essential to strike a balance between technological progress and preserving the fundamental principles of fair and ethical hunting.

By supporting open sights or limiting the power of scopes to 1x on muzzleloaders, we can promote a more traditional and challenging hunting experience. This approach encourages hunters to rely on their marksmanship skills and proximity to the game, rather than relying solely on advanced optics and long-distance shooting capabilities. It adds an element of skill and sportsmanship to the hunt, aligning with the core values of ethical hunting.

Furthermore, such regulations can help maintain a level playing field among hunters, ensuring that the advantage provided by technology does not overshadow the importance of hunting ethics and conservation. It encourages hunters to get closer to their prey, increasing the chances of a clean and humane kill while reducing the risk of unrecovered animals.

In conclusion, while I appreciate the progress made in muzzleloader technology, I believe that supporting open sights or limiting the power of scopes to 1x is a step in the right direction to maintain the integrity of hunting as a sport. It ensures that hunters continue to engage in fair and challenging pursuits while respecting the wildlife and the environment. I hope you will consider these points when evaluating regulations related to muzzleloader use.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and for your dedication to responsible hunting practices.

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 taking big game rule? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Don't let the politics of Utah to determine what the DNR does with the wildlife. Just because that is what they want. You have done this study in the past and it was not good. If you want to do anything than cut back on the number of tags you give out.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Don't let the politics of Utah to determine what the DNR does with the wildlife. Just because that is what they want. You have done this study in the past and it was not good. If you want to do anything than cut back on the number of tags you give out.

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? Don't let the politics of Utah to determine what the DNR does with the wildlife. Just because that is what they want. You have done this study in the past and it was not good. If you want to do anything than cut back on the number of tags you give out.

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Don't let the politics of Utah to determine what the DNR does with the wildlife. Just because that is what they want. You have done this study in the past and it was not good. If you want to do anything than cut back on the number of tags you give out.

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? Not into dedicated hunter program

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

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

If you're going to do this then give it to everybody who owns mnt land not just those who have money and buy up all the land before everyone else. Give to one not the other is not fair.

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?

If you're going to do this then give it to everybody who owns mnt land not just those who have money and buy up all the land before everyone else. Give to one not the other is not fair.

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? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? The only problem I have with this is starting the archery hunt September 1. If it's only going to be 2 weeks on these units, it should start the same as all other archery hunts. I don't know if we need to go as far as single string bows and traditional muzzleloaders but we might as well try something new

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

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? The long range muzzleloader technology has gone too far to continue to use scopes. It's supposed to be a more primitive weapon, not a single shot rifle

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? Quality amendment to the R657-5 & -42. The understanding is clear that you can either report online or via phone but there should be a direct link either with the hunter's permit on the mobile app &/or the link printed on the physical tag as well. There are many Midwestern states who utilize the e-tag idea which I think could make this process much simpler or easy to use by being able to submit the filed tag through the UT DWR mobile app to track all successful harvests and a link there in the mobile app to get to the report to complete it if the hunter did not fill their tag.

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?

For the most part, I think that this plan has been thought out and through very well and very scientifically driven. Overall, I think that it is a good plan. But I think that where this lacks the most is the lack of consideration of the ecological issues and predator issues across the state and these affected units. We only hunt deer for 3 months out of the year and time is already very limited due to current season dates. Yes, the pressure on deer during those times is heavy, but predators and mother nature do not abide by our season dates, antler point restrictions, weapon restrictions, etc.. Mother nature and predators have no rules. I think that more effort needs to be put into habitat restoration and management to help remedy the damage caused by the years of drought and recent harsh winter and to help better control and manage predator populatuons who hunt year-round. Secondly, I think that due to this, you will see a large influx of applicants leaving the affected units come application season because of these changes and probably because they are not aware at this point of these proposed changes, if these changes go through. That, and if these changes are just sprung on the unknowing population, they will likely not be very enthusiastic about them and not apply for a unit because of that and could potentially be a skewed data set because there will not be the "normal" amount of permit holders hunting in these units. I think that the permit number hold is a good plan and a good way to help reduce variable in the study. The introduction of this study I think overall is a good idea. Yes the points were made early in the slides that these ideas have been tried before and other states have had success and no success using such methods but for Utah this has not been tried since the unit-by-unit management idea which is a valid reason for again trying these ideas and using different units to try different methods. But just because other states have data to support these methods does not mean any of these methods will work. Habitat and predator management should be at the top of these lists, in that order. The best way for a population to grow is healthy doe on the ground with plenty of good feed and water to grow deer.

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 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
