

**UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING**  
April 5, 2007, 9:00 a.m.  
DNR Auditorium, 1594 West North Temple  
Salt Lake City, Utah

**AGENDA**

**Thursday, April 5, 2007**

- |     |   |                    |
|-----|---|--------------------|
| 1)  | Approval of Agenda<br>- Dr. Jim Bowns, Chairman   | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 2)  | Approval of Minutes<br>- Dr. Bowns  | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 3)  | Old Business/Action Log<br>- Dick Diamond, vice-Chair   | <b>CONTINGENT</b>  |
| 4)  | DWR Update<br>- Jim Karpowitz, DWR Director   | <b>INFORMATION</b> |
| 5)  | Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL Age Classification Objectives for 2007<br>- Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 6)  | Bucks, Bulls and Permit numbers for 2007<br>- Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator                      | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 7)  | Black-footed Ferret Management Plan<br>- Brian Maxfield, Wildlife Biologist                         | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 8)  | Puddle Valley and Snake Valley Pronghorn Unit Plans<br>- Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator           | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 9)  | CWMU Committee Term Limits<br>- Boyde Blackwell, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator          | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 10) | Other Business<br>- Dr. Bowns   | <b>CONTINGENT</b>  |

**UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MOTIONS**  
April 5, 2007, 9:00 a.m.  
DNR Auditorium, 1594 West North Temple  
Salt Lake City, Utah

**Thursday, April 5, 2007**

- 1) Approval of Agenda **ACTION**

**MOTION: I move that we accept the agenda as amended.**  
Passed unanimously

- 2) Approval of Minutes **ACTION**

**MOTION: I move that we accept the minutes of the March 7-8, 2007 Wildlife Board meeting with the noted corrections.**  
Passed unanimously

- 3) Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL Age Classification Objectives for 2007 **ACTION**

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's recommendations as presented on the Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL Age Classification Objectives for 2007.**  
Passed unanimously

- 4) Bucks, Bulls and Permit numbers for 2007 **ACTION**

**MOTION: I move that we approve 78 bison tags, with 20 hunter's choice, 20 hunter's choice, 35 cow plus three conservation tags.**  
Passed 5 to 1

**MOTION: I move that we accept the DWR's recommendation for deer permit numbers, except the Northeastern region's numbers will remain the same as last year.**  
Passed 5 to 1

**MOTION: I move that we reduce the proposed increase on the Henry Mountains in deer permit numbers from 11 to 6.**  
Passed 4 to 2

**MOTION:** I move that we leave the Monroe Mountain elk numbers the same as last year with the inclusion of the 20 management tags.

Passed unanimously

**MOTION:** I move that we accept the remainder of the Division's proposals on bucks and bulls permit numbers for 2007.

Passed unanimously

5) Black-footed Ferret Management Plan **ACTION**

**MOTION:** I move that we accept the Division's recommendations for the Black-footed Ferret Management Plan as presented.

Passed unanimously

6) Puddle Valley and Snake Valley Pronghorn Unit Plans **ACTION**

**MOTION:** I move that we approve the Division's recommendations on the Puddle Valley and Snake Valley Pronghorn Unit Plans as presented.

Passed unanimously

7) CWMU Committee Term Limits **ACTION**

**MOTION:** I move that we ask the Division to look into putting a RAC Chair on the CWMU Committee as a voting member, and also allowing the Chairman to vote in case of a tie.

Passed unanimously

**MOTION:** I move that we accept the Division's recommendation on the CWMU Committee Term Limits.

Passed unanimously

11) Other Business **CONTINGENT**

1) Variances

**MOTION:** I move that we direct the Division to look at creating a rule to set parameters and time frames relative to variances.

Passed unanimously

Wildlife Board Meeting  
April 5, 2007

2) Mule deer

**MOTION: I move that we put the issue of exploring mule deer management on the action log, to be brought back in informational form.**

Passed unanimously

**UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING**  
April 5, 2007, 9:00 a.m.  
DNR Auditorium, 1594 West North Temple  
Salt Lake City, Utah

**Board Members Present**

Chairman Jim Bowns  
Dick Diamond  
Allan Smith  
Paul Niemeyer  
Lee Howard  
Rick Woodard  
Keele Johnson  
Jim Karpowicz - Executive Sec

**RAC Chairs Present**

Del Brady - Northeastern  
Mike Small - Southern  
Ernie Perkins - Northern  
Terry Sanslow - Southeastern  
John Fairchild – Central

**Public Present**

Tony Abbott  
Todd Bingham  
Miles Moretti  
Steve Dalton  
Adus F Dorsey

**Division of Wildlife Resources**

Judi Tutorow  
Craig McLaughlin  
Justin Dolling  
Bill Bates  
Doug Messerly  
Staci Coons  
LuAnn Petrovich  
Marty Bushman  
Mark Hadley  
Boyde Blackwell  
Brian Maxfield  
Alan Clark  
Cindee Jensen  
Teresa Bonzo  
Craig Clyde

Chairman Bowns welcomed the audience and introduced the Wildlife Board members and RAC Chairs.

1) Approval of Agenda (Action)

The agenda was then reviewed. Mr. Diamond said that under “other business” he would like to discuss giving help to the Division on the matter of variances. Mr. Woodard said he would also like to discuss putting something on the action log, at that time, concerning mule deer. Director Karpowicz said they would like to discuss falconry, as an informational item, also. They also need to discuss the June Wildlife Board meeting in Vernal.

The following motion was made by Rick Woodard, seconded by Dick Diamond and passed

unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the agenda as amended.**

**2) Approval of Minutes ( Action)**

The following motion was made by Allan Smith, seconded by Rick Woodard and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the minutes of the March 7-8, 2007 Wildlife Board meeting.**

**3) Old Business/Action Log (Contingent)**

Dick Diamond went over the Action Log. (See handout) The CHA Variance request goes back to June of 2004. Mr. Hodson has since then changed positions. We need an update on this. The next item is concerning turkey depredation permits.

Mr. Bill Bates said that Mr. Mitchell has a committee working on a turkey management plan. This item is ongoing.

Mr. Diamond said the next item is on black bear pursuit tags.

Mr. Kevin Bunnell said he did present the data on this at the December meeting. They are still gathering data and this is an ongoing effort. They are looking to see if the nonresident pursuit level rises to the level where they can do something about it. It is going to take three to four years of data to come to a definite conclusion. They will be out on Memorial Day weekend checking bear hunters and filling out questionnaires on the San Juan and the La Sal units.

Mr. Diamond then asked about the calibers used in hunting. This one goes back to April 2006.

Craig McLaughlin said they are working on that and will present this information in the November 2007 meeting. This will also be combined with the Division's findings on archery tackle. Law enforcement will be taking the lead on this.

Mr. Bunnell said that letters have been sent out on the Boulder Mountain bear hunt, so this action item has been completed.

Mr. Diamond asked those involved in the action log items to update it accordingly with Staci Coons.

**4) DWR Update (Information)**

Director Karpowitz said the last Wildlife Review publication recently came out and it is the last printed edition. They are in the process of changing it to an online publication and it will be up and running at the end of April. The Division will show this to the Board at the next meeting. This will reach a lot more people and it will be a broader audience.

The new Wildlife Foundation that Bob Hasenyager is working on is a nonprofit foundation where people can donate to help with specific projects within the Division for wildlife, particularly native species. This foundation is now up and running, with bylaws. They are now organizing the new board. Mr. Hasenyager will come to a future board meeting to give an overview of the program.

On the Little Hole property, not much has changed. Mr. Bushman continues to interview witnesses. We are trying to determine the legal status of the road. It is still scheduled for auction on May 11. A minimum can be set at the auction, at the discretion of their director.

On DWR salary issues, we are now in the process of looking at inequities in the Division. The legislature gave the Division some discretionary money and we are finalizing how that might be spent to help our employees this year. All employees will get a 3½ % cost of living, plus 1½% discretionary money that will be used to address hot spots and inequities. This should help and is a step in the right direction. We will thank the legislature for this money and then go after it again next year.

WAFWA will be held in Flagstaff, Arizona this year. Since it is so close and we can drive, Director Karpowitz encouraged all the Board members to go. It is being held July 7-12. We will get a few more Division people to go also, carpooling down to help with expenses.

The Annual Awards Banquet is scheduled for April 25<sup>th</sup>. The Wildlife Board is invited. Awards will be given to Division employees for outstanding work. Outside interest groups also give awards to Division employees. We will be giving the first Kevin Conway Habitat Conservation Award that has been established. This banquet will be at the Embassy Suites Hotel at 6 p.m.

Two scholarships have been established at Utah State University for outstanding wildlife students. The Kevin Conway scholarship and a new scholarship in the name of Jesse Clark Tayon has been established. At the SFW Banquet that was held recently, they donated \$14,000 to that scholarship. RMEF and MDF have also donated.

The last issue is relative to the nomination committee for the replacement of three of the Wildlife Board members. They need two nominations for each position. They will submit these to the Governor. The selection committee will be up and running by the end of the month. Chairman Bowns, Dick Diamond and Allan Smith will be done with their terms in August 2007. It is always difficult to lose the years of experience that goes off the Board, as these members finish.

Chairman Bowns asked about when the actual end of their term is.

Ms. Coons said they would attend the August 2, 2007 board meeting and then their term would expire on the 15<sup>th</sup>.

Director Karpowitz said they are planning a retreat in August where they will invite all past Board members to attend and they will also introduce the new ones.

**5) Bucks, Bulls and OIAL Age Classification Objectives for 2007 (Action)**

Bill Bates presented this agenda item. As a Wildlife Section, they went through and prepared an elk management plan for each of the units. As part of that they incorporated the average age of elk to be harvested. Due to changes in personnel, they did not have adequate time to review all the plans. Because of this, they have delayed the review and revision of unit population objectives until 2008.

They still went ahead and implemented the Wildlife Board's decision to revise age objectives on all units. The Wildlife Board approved an across the board one year increase in age class objectives on all limited entry units to start management for the remainder of the current planning period (2006-2010). While the Board will consider adjustments to individual unit age class objectives, it affirmed that the overall goal is to strive for a distribution of age class objective statewide across three levels as: No more than 6 units managed under the 6-7 year objective, no less than 4 units managed under a 4-5 year and/or 3-4 year objective and the remainder of units managed under the 5-6 year objective. He then went over the specific units in each level. (See Attachment #1)

Mr. Niemeyer said he has been approached with the suggestion that since the Boulder has so much cover and the Monroe is so open, they would like the Monroe objective to go up and the Boulder to stay where it is. This is different than the recommendation.

Teresa Bonzo said both the Boulder and the Monroe did have elk committees formed. Both asked for increases, even higher than the 6-7 age class, but since we only have so many units that can be in that highest age class, they decided to go with the Boulder and the Beaver for the higher age class.

Director Karpowitz said if the Board wants to make that change it is okay, but we cannot have more than six units on that level. When we reviewed it here in Salt Lake, we had more requests than six and because of the history on the Monroe, we felt it ought to be the one to drop out. We would have to adjust permit numbers accordingly, if the Board made the change. Chairman Bowns said a botanist from the Fish Lake National Forest asked him what the Board is going to do about the Monroe mountain elk herd and habitat? Apparently there are some resource problems on that unit.



Mr. Howard asked about numbers and if the Monroe Unit is close to reaching objective.

Director Karpowitz said first we need to decide what the objectives are going to be. The Division has made the recommendations based on the objectives. If the objectives are changed, then we have to deal with number changes.

Mr. Bates said the age objective on the Monroe is 8.2, way over. The population numbers are under objective.

### **RAC Recommendations**

Northern - Mr. Perkins said they unanimously accepted as presented by the Division.

Central - Mr. Fairchild said they unanimously accepted as presented by the Division.

Southern - Mr. Small said they accepted as presented , 9 to 1. There was some discussion about time invested in work committees by citizens, including the five-year plans, and age and population objectives.

Southeastern - Mr. Sanslow said they unanimously accepted as presented by the Division.

Northeastern - Mr. Brady said the unanimously accepted as presented by the Division.

Chairman Bowns summarized RAC recommendations. There was no public comment.

### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Smith clarified that what we are discussing here is age class objectives, not population objectives.

Mr. Johnson said that concerning the Monroe and the Boulder, he would like to increase the number of units in the upper age class to 7, and add the Monroe to it.

Director Karpowitz said the Elk Management Committee did an exhaustive review on this matter. The number 6 was a compromise for that many units in that age class. If we are going to a different number, we need to run that through the RACs again. It has had a lot of public review and scrutiny to get to this recommendation.

Mr. Diamond said we would have to change numbers, if units are changed or added.

Mr. Johnson said this might be looked at next year.

Mr. Niemeyer said we do need to look at the Boulder and Monroe Units down the road.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Dick Diamond and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's recommendations as presented on the Bucks, Bulls and OIAL Age Classification Objectives for 2007.**

6) Bucks, Bulls and Permit numbers for 2007 (Action)

Mr. Bates presented this agenda item. He went over last year's general season deer harvest, which was very good. We had a harvest of 26,000 bucks statewide with a 34% success rate. Rifle success was almost 38%. In Southeastern and Southern regions, we had over 40% success rate. Looking from 1993-2006, harvest is still lower than it was a decade ago, but it is on the up swing. Mr. Bates then reviewed the post season buck:doe ratios on general season public land units, followed by the same on private land units. Buck:doe ratio trends for 1998-2006 was discussed and also fawn production trends. Fawn production is coming up due to increased precipitation the last few years.

The Statewide Deer Management Plan was approved in 2003 and the Division was given direction to achieve a three year average post season buck:doe ratio of between 15-20 bucks per 100 does. The Northeastern and Central region reduced their permits by 1,000 each when they fell below the objective. The Northeastern now meets that objective. They are recommending that those 1,000 permits in Northeastern now be reallocated.

Mr. Bates then went over the 2007 general season deer permit recommendations. They are recommending that Northeastern region be increased by 1,000 permits, and that puts them at 14,000. The total permits recommended for the state is 96,000. He then went over the 2007 limited entry deer permit recommendations.

On the Henry Mountains, they are now using a program called Pop 2 to model deer populations. The population on the Henry Mountains from 2003 to 2006 has increased by over 40% and the increase of 11 permits coincides with that. He showed a chart that indicated an increased number of bucks on the Henry Mountains which gives opportunity to issue a few more permits.

He then moved onto the 2007 limited entry elk permit recommendations. A list of all the units and the average age of harvested bull elk was shown. All of the 28 units are above the top end of the 2005 objective. Following the unit plan review, 26 of 28 exceed the recommendation for the 2007 objective; the remaining 2 meet objective.

Mr. Johnson said he thought it would be helpful to have the 2004 data included. He is still nervous that we may have dropped the age objective too much on some of the units. We will

just have to watch and see what happens.

Mr. Bates went on to say that the management bull elk permits are intended to reduce bull:cow ratios through removal of smaller antlered bulls. These permits will be on four units: San Juan; Monroe; SW Desert; and Fillmore Pahvant. On the archery hunt there will be 10 permits on the San Juan which is 15% additional permits. The remainder are concurrent with the late season including 20 on the Monroe, 34 on SW Desert and 15 of the Fillmore, Pahvant. The Southern region is trying to be a little more aggressive on the SW Desert to see what difference this approach might make.

In summary, the limited entry age objectives were lowered slightly in 2005-2010 as per the Statewide Elk Management Plan. The LE age objectives increased one year across the board per the Wildlife board in 2006. On the 2006 harvests, 26 of 28 Units exceeded age objectives; 2 Units met objective and they are recommending a 19% increase, including the management tags. We hope that moves us toward objective on some of these units.

Mr. Bates then covered the 2007 Pronghorn permit recommendations. We see a slight reduction in permit numbers, due to the Boulder/Parker Mountain area. That herd is being moved towards objective with the transplants we have been doing and with the permit recommendations for antlerless. On the OIAL permit recommendations, an increase of 13 permits for moose, an increase of 3 permits on Desert bighorn, an increase of 3 permits on Rocky Mountain bighorn, and an increase of 11 permits on Rocky Mountain goat are proposed. The recommendation for bison on Antelope Island is the same. At this point, if the management plan on bison passes, we are going to recommend that any increases in population be delayed in order to allow vegetation from habitat projects to become established.

On the Henry Mountain bison, based on last year's harvest of 22 animals, we are now slightly below objective. For this next year, in order to come into the 275 objective, we are recommending a total of 76 permits. 73 of those will be issued to the public, one statewide, one sportsman's permit and one area conservation permit. This concluded the presentation.

### **RAC Recommendations**

Northeastern - Mr. Brady said they voted to accept as presented, with exception of the 1,000 tag increase on deer permits. It passed 6 to 2.

Southern - Mr. Small said they broke their vote down by species with six motions that passed. (See Southern RAC Motions) They had a lot of discussion on the bison permits. There was also a lot of discussion on Monroe and Boulder elk units.

Southeastern - Mr. Sanslow said they had lots of discussion on the Henry Mountains bison, including AUMs and varying numbers of bison. They had three motions that passed. (See

Southeastern RAC Motions) Since the Division's recommendation has been altered on bison, it is in line with what their RAC recommended.

Central - Mr. Fairchild said they dealt with the bison permit numbers separately from the other recommendations. MOTION: 59 permits, with 53 on Henry's and 6 on Antelope Island. Passed 4 to 3. The motion to accept the remainder of the Division's recommendations passed unanimously.

Northern - Mr. Hodson said they voted to accept the Division's recommendations unanimously.

### **Public Comment**

Tony Abbott of the MDF said if we increase and work on the bison herd on the Henry's, we need to make sure it is not affecting the mule deer herd. The deer population is increasing there and in turn bringing more opportunity. We have a couple of tags on that unit that brought \$125,000 this year. We need to be careful as the bison herd expands. This is a premier unit in the country for mule deer.

Mr. Johnson asked about a deer transplant onto the Henry Mountains that took place several years ago. What has happened on this mountain range to bring the mule deer back?

Director Karpowitz said we did a deer transplant on the Henry's, taking them off the San Juan. For a while it looked pretty good, but after a few years, all the radio-collared deer were dead.

Mr. Hodson said they radio collared or marked every deer that was transplanted. The following spring we saw a lot of those deer. The next fall the percentage dropped way off and the next spring it dropped off again. After that, we did not see any of those deer. The transplanted deer did not persist in the population.

Director Karpowitz said that people think the Henry Mountains deer herd has recovered, because they are seeing lots of bucks. The herd is still way below the population objective. The unit still needs moisture and improved habitat to get where it needs to be. It has the appearance that it is a lot better than it really is.

Chairman Bowns said when John Kimball was Director of the DWR, there was some concern about harvesting does on the Beaver Unit. There was a project to take deer off that unit and move them to Indian Peak. It was essentially a disaster. Within a few years they all disappeared. There is not a lot of success transplanting deer.

### **Public Comment**

Steve Dalton is the Manager of the Sandy Ranch, down by the Boulder and Henry Mountains.

He is also on the Southern RAC. The ranch has been greatly impacted by bison through the years. He asked that the Board follow the Southern and Southeastern RAC recommendations. They came up with a compromise at the Southern RAC meeting, increasing what the Division recommended, but a reduction on what the Henry Mountain Grazing Association recommended. There has been a lot of contention through the years between the DWR and the livestock operators. Mr. Dalton has gone on a lot of the helicopter counts. They seem to manage the herd with a boom and bust strategy, and it is not biologically sound. They had low counts in 2004 and 2005. In 2006, we suddenly have a high count. They do not want that herd to increase. There are 125 more bison from 2005-2006. To keep the herd as is, they counted 86 calves last year using 95% sightability and with 5% mortality, that should put permit numbers at 86. It is beyond Mr. Dalton how the DWR can use a 95% sightability to come up with a population model and consequently, it has created contention between the Division and the livestock operators. 86 permits should be issued.

Todd Bingham, Utah Farm Bureau said this is a very sensitive issue in the state. They would encourage the Board to look at the higher permit number in this case. Increasing the number of permits might help with some of the collateral damage. There is a lot of contention between the cattlemen and wildlife, across the state, specifically in the Southern and Southeastern regions. We need to control the bison herd where it is.

Mr. Howard asked if there is any other information on deer transplants.

Mr. Moretti said transplants are not successful and the literature supports this.

Mr. Small said he knows about one transplant first hand. The deer were caught right by state Route 20 and I-15 around 1990 and transferred to Mt. Turnbull on the Arizona strip. Again, the deer did not survive.

### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Smith suggested addressing the bison numbers first.

Chairman Bowns summarized the RAC recommendations on bison.

Mr. Bates said the Division said the recommendation is 66 resident and 7 nonresident on the Henry's for a total of 73, plus 3 conservation permits, totaling 76. There are 6 total permits proposed on Antelope Island, so all together, it is 79. On hunter choice, we have, first hunt, 19 permits, second hunt 19 permits hunter choice, third hunt 35 permits, cow only and the 3 conservation permits. The total on the Henry's is 76.

Chairman Bowns asked Mr. Bates to address recommendations on "if there is a new management plan."

Mr. Bates said not to address the recommendation according to, "if a new management plan is approved," because the Division was going to recommend that we have fewer permits if the plan was approved. Now the committee is going to recommend that we do not ask for an increase in population for several years. Regardless, the Division is recommending that we meet the 275 population objective for next year.

Mr. Fairchild said the Central RAC recommended 53 Henry Mountain permits. 56 would include drawing permits.

Mr. Johnson asked why the Central RAC was so low.

Director Karpowitz said they felt that the 77 was too high.

Chairman Bowns said the recommendations are as follows: Central - 56, Southeastern - 86, Southern - 82. Northern and Northeastern went with the Division.

The following motion was made by Allan Smith, seconded by Keele Johnson and failed with Allan Smith and Keele Johnson in favor, and Rick Woodard, Dick Diamond, Lee Howard and Paul Niemeyer opposed.

**MOTION: I move that we approve 82 bison tags for the Henry Mountains.**

Mr. Niemeyer asked what the breakdown on that number is and does that include the 3 draw permits.

Mr. Smith said that includes the 3 draw permits.

Director Karpowitz said the Division's recommendation was 76, this would be an increase of 6 permits.

Mr. Howard said that is too high at this point.

The following motion was made by Paul Niemeyer, seconded by Lee Howard and passed 5 to 1 with one opposed, Dick Diamond.

**MOTION: I move that we approve 78 bison tags, with 20 hunter's choice, 20 hunter's choice, 35 cow plus three conservation tags.**

Mr. Diamond said two permits is obviously not a biological issue. He asked if making this motion and giving two additional tags is important enough to not go with the Division's

recommendations until we redo the plans.

Mr. Niemeyer said it is a biological issue in the livestock committee's mind.

Mr. Diamond said it is an opportunity issue.

Mr. Smith said by increasing the numbers by two we are accommodating the MDR's concerns.

Mr. Howard said the Division is working with a total of 325 on the management plan for the next five years. This is only for one year. He is counting on the Division to come back with a equitable management plan in the future. The Division and sportsmen's groups have put money into habitat on that unit. We will go with this for one year and see how the management plan and operators are doing next year.

Mr. Woodard said with the dollars that have been put into habitat, the DWR and the operators need to work together. Everyone benefits from the habitat work.

Chairman Bowns summarized the RAC recommendations on deer permits.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, and was seconded by Dick Diamond.

**MOTION:** I move that we accept the Division's recommendation on deer permit numbers.

Mr. Smith said he would like to discuss numbers, particularly on the Northeastern region, including buck:doe ratios. Those in Northeastern region have not seen numbers come up to the top end of the 15-20 bucks.

Mr. Woodard said when we are managing to the 15-20 range, we need to not recommend an increase until we are at least at 17.

Mr. Johnson withdrew his motion.

Mr. Smith said he made his discussion and he agrees with the Northeastern RAC recommendation.

The following motion was made by Allan Smith, seconded by Lee Howard and passed 5 to 1 with Dick Diamond opposed.

**MOTION:** I move that we accept the DWR's recommendation for deer permit numbers, except the Northeastern region's numbers will remain the

**same as last year.**

Mr. Diamond asked what the success rate was last year on Northeastern when there were 1,300 tags instead of 1,400.

Mr. Bates said 32% total success rate and 36% on rifle, 30.7% on muzzleloader and 20% on archery.

Chairman Bowns said we need to address the deer numbers on the Henry's and consider Southeastern's recommendation to decrease the number by 5-6 permits, instead of 11.

Mr. Bates said they issued 32 permits in 2006.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded Allan Smith and passed 4 to 2, with Dick Diamond and Rick Woodard opposed.

**MOTION: I move that we reduce the proposed increase on the Henry Mountains in deer permit numbers from 11 to 6.**

Mr. Diamond asked the Division for their reasoning on their recommendation.

Mr. Bates said the Division stands by their recommendation. He said the model population on the Henry's shows it is going up. The reason we did not count up in the 50's is because we counted right after the rifle hunt. Some of the bucks were not coming out like they might later in the rut. We had to beat the snow in doing our count. There are plenty of bucks. We have had a 40% increase in population, 11 more permits is nothing for that herd at this point. Four of the five RACs went along with the Division's recommendation on this.

Mr. Niemeyer asked if the quality of the bucks is as good as it was 3-4 years ago.

Mr. Bates said we had an average age of 5.3 and a 31" spread this last year, it is a great herd. Mr. Diamond said when we are talking this small of difference, we should look to the Division's expertise. They have researched this all year and are planning for the future. The individuals on the RACs do not bring the same amount of expertise to be able to say, with a biological position to back it up, that we need six more tags. The Division knows what is happening on that unit. Why not 11 more opportunities?

Mr. Howard said the RAC is a public comment tool. We could go six for one year and look at it later. We need to maintain this as a premium unit.

Mr. Johnson said these numbers are not really important. If we err, he would prefer it to be on the side of less permits issued.



Mr. Smith said he is looking to represent Southeastern's recommendation.

Chairman Bowns said we need to look at the sheep portion of the bucks, bulls and OIAL permit numbers. The Southern RAC accepted the recommendation, except the 6 permits on the Kaiparowitz/Escalante.

Ms. Bonzo said they changed their recommendation from 8 to 6. That corresponds with the RAC.

Chairman Bowns said the only issue with elk is leaving the Monroe Mountain numbers the same as last year.

Mr. Niemeyer said the people in Southern are worried about the late hunt, and killing the old bulls with broken antlers. They are worried about the unit, because it is so open. They want to go with the same numbers as last year, until we see what the management hunt does.

The following motion was made by Paul Niemeyer, seconded Rick Woodard and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we leave the Monroe Mountain elk numbers the same as last year with the inclusion of the 20 management tags.**

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Paul Niemeyer and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Division's proposals on bucks and bulls permit numbers for 2007.**

#### **7) Black-footed Ferret Management Plan (Action)**

Brian Maxfield, Wildlife Biologist, presented the Northeastern Utah black-footed ferret management plan update to the Board. He gave some background history on ferrets. They are a member of the Mustelidae family which includes badger, otter, skunk, weasel, and wolverine. They are quite small, usually around 1.5-2.5 pounds; 19-24 inches in length. 90% of their diet is prairie dogs and they rely on them for their habitat. If we do not have prairie dogs, we do not have ferrets.

Mr. Maxfield went on to discuss the black-footed ferret relative to their distribution and locations, legal status and listing, management actions that have been taken since 1996, and population size and distribution. (See Attachment #2) Each year they do spotlight surveys,

disease sampling, research, and habitat monitoring. This includes annual monitoring Coyote Basin and the Snake John areas through the use of prairie dog transects.

Ferrets were first found in Utah in 1949. In 2006, the minimum population was 25 ferrets, including 10 wild born ferrets caught for the first time. The others were captive release ferrets. They are located in the Coyote Basin subcomplex and Snake John reef subcomplex.

When they did the yearly prairie dog transecting in 2006, they counted 30,248 prairie dogs which reflects a 39.6 ferret rating in Coyote Basin and 41,451 that reflects a 54.3 ferret rating in Snake John Reef. He then discussed predation as a critical component on ferrets. These include coyotes, badger, Great Horned owl, Golden Eagle and others.

Public and biological management issues were discussed. Public issues surround energy development, grazing management, hunting/shooting, off road vehicle usage, and local public support. Biological issues include genetics, plague, captive releases, PMZ size, predators, allocation process, and intensive surveys. Plague is the biggest problem with black-footed ferrets nationwide. Plague comes in and wipes out prairie dogs, thus the ferrets are wiped out also.

Mr. Maxfield then went over the management objectives and strategies in detail. (See attachment #2) This included protecting and managing habitat while ensuring continuation of current land uses, and the associated strategies. Also monitoring and enhancing black-footed ferret habitat within the East Green management area, reducing affects of diseases on black-footed ferrets and their primary prey species, reducing the affects of inbreeding in ferret populations in the EGMA and continuing coordination and cooperation between agencies in Colorado and Utah were discussed.

Products within the management plan that are done every year include monitoring/survey data with ferret survey, prairie dog data, disease data, and release data. These data are turned in to the FSWS annually. This is a five-year plan that is being proposed. A five year final report will be also be presented.

Chairman Bowns asked about getting anything to grow in that area, relative to rehabilitation.

Mr. Maxfield said it will not be done on a large scale until research has been done. We have talked about doing some tests to see what might survive out there. We do have some areas that have good native vegetation that is growing and still present. We would like to try to mimic that.

Mr. Johnson asked if ferrets are coming back nationwide.

Mr. Maxfield said many are doing quite well. Canata Basin in South Dakota had around 300 ferrets. They have other sites coming online on Indian reservations that are doing very well also.

The estimate this year was 850 wild ferrets out on the ground. Wyoming has a site doing very well, similar to Utah. They are getting to the point to look for additional sites to release more ferrets.

Mr. Johnson asked about the Snake John site, why aren't they putting more ferrets there?

Mr. Maxfield said they have no management plan for that area. The original plan only pertained to the other area. We do our surveys up there, but we would like to actively manage them also. We need to have our work group make sure we do not have any problems with companies in the area, the BLM or other government agencies.

Kevin Bunnell said the Division and the BLM work on management plans. They go in parallel together in order to release ferrets in the Snake John complex.

Mr. Maxfield said they should be able to get clearance and release ferrets there the next go around.

Mr. Smith asked about the 10-J status for Daggett County.

Mr. Maxfield said they have less than 1,000 acres in Daggett County for ferrets and need a substantially bigger area, 10-15 thousand acres. We have no plans to release in Daggett County. The FWS does not make it difficult to get a 10-J status, it is actually environmental groups that oppose this non-essential way of doing things. We have been told that any 10-J proposal for ferrets will be fought by them. It would be difficult and expensive.

### **RAC Recommendations**

Northeastern - Mr. Brady said they voted to accept the Division's recommendation as presented.

The following motion was made by Allan Smith, seconded by Paul Niemeyer and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's recommendations for the Black-footed Ferret Management Plan as presented.**

#### 7) Puddle Valley and Snake Valley Pronghorn Unit Plans (Action)

Bill Bates presented this proposal for Puddle Valley Unit 1B. Its current population estimate is fewer than 50 pronghorn and its latest peak numbers in 1996 was 188 pronghorn. They are looking to raise the objective to 300, with a buck:doe ratio of 25 bucks per 100 does. We would like to have a population supplement of 50 animals, coming off Parker Mountain.

Mr. Bates then discussed Snake Valley Unit 19. Currently there are fewer than 400 pronghorn and latest peak numbers were 958 in 1999. They would like to establish a population objective of 900 animals with a buck:doe ratio of 25 bucks per 100 doe. A supplemental population transplant of 150 is also planned. These transplants will take place this winter.

Chairman Bowns asked where these units are.

Craig Clyde said Snake Valley is out toward Ibapa and the Deep Creek Mountain Range. Puddle Valley is north of I-80 and west of the GSL.

### **RAC Recommendations**

Central - Mr. Fairchild said they voted unanimously to approve the plan and transplant.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Rick Woodard and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Division's recommendations on the Puddle Valley and Snake Valley Pronghorn Unit Plans as presented.**

### **8) CWMU Committee Term Limits (Action)**

Craig McLaughlin presented this issue in which they are asking the Board to approve the term limits for this committee. The terms are two or four year terms and they are staggered at this point. The terms will be four years in the future. The Board has already approved the list of names of those individuals on the CWMU Committee.

Mr. Diamond said the Board approved having a RAC member on that committee, but they were a non-voting member. Mr. Diamond would like them to have voting status.

Mr. Smith said there is a limit on the number of voting members.

Mr. Diamond said that at one time we had three RAC chairs on that committee and it was very helpful.

Mr. Hodson said the rule states specifically, who is to be on that committee. We had that set up and the Board added a RAC Chair for purposes of review. He was not added as a permanent member.

Mr. Diamond said he is okay with that, but why did we do that?

Mr. Clark said when we had three RAC Chairs on the committee, we did not have a rule that

allowed that committee to really function. All the committee members were not in place. We have now put the committee formally in place.

Mr. Diamond asked what the rationale was for not having a RAC member on it. He feels the committee is flawed in that one area.

Mr. Clark said we couldn't add a RAC Chair member officially now, because it would be in violation of the rule.

Mr. Hodson said the rule is coming up for review and this could be changed at the May RAC meetings.

The following motion was made by Dick Diamond, seconded by Paul Niemeyer and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to look into putting a RAC Chair on the CWMU Committee as a voting member, and also allowing the Chairman to vote in case of a tie.**

The following motion was made by Allan Smith, seconded by Lee Howard and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's recommendation on the CWMU Committee Term Limits.**

9) Other Business (Contingent)

Chairman Bowns said we need to discuss the following items: a) falconry, b) the June Wildlife Board meeting in Vernal, c) variances, d) mule deer and e) CHA question.

1) Falconry

Alan Clark said we did not receive approval from the Fish and Wildlife Service to take falcons this year, so we did not do the application period. They say we will get the approval, so we need to extend the application period. The Division wanted to run this by the Board and make sure there is no problem. We have a history of litigation with the falconers. If we do not take the applications, we could end up in court.

Mr. Smith asked what season we are looking at.

Mr. Clark said May 5-12 and then May 14-30. We only allow 10 peregrine falcons to be taken. He asked if there were any objections to this extension and there were none.

2) June Wildlife Board meeting

Director Karpowitz said the June 7, 2007 board meeting will be in Vernal. They will work in some type of river trip. They are asking the Board to meet in Salt Lake on the morning of June 6, travel to Vernal, get there by noon, fish down the Green River, have dinner at Little Hole, stay in Dutch John or Vernal, then have the Board meeting the next day in Vernal. They thought they could work an air tour into this, but it still needs to be worked out. We will be back to Salt Lake late on the 7<sup>th</sup>. The Board members discussed various options on arrival times and meeting the group.

3) Variances

Dick Diamond said his intent was to have a discussion relative to time lines on variances. Everything else we do in society, surrounding these types of situations, has a deadline. Our variance process needs some type of time line, so we do not have old variances surfacing. He asked Director Karpowitz and Mr. Bushman to discuss this issue. What is a reasonable amount of time?

Director Karpowitz said he thinks this is a good idea. We have all noticed that over the past few years, we are getting an increase in variances. We are seeing them from many years past and all kinds of situations. A rule would weed out a lot of these requests. When our people are approached, they would have a definite answer. We think we could put together a draft rule for the Board to review. It would help the Board and the public.

Mr. Bushman said the variances started years back. The first one we dealt with was a OIAL and we extended the season. We looked at it as a stop gap measure. Since then it has broadened, because we have not had any guidelines. We need to set some parameters, and time frames. This would put some finality on these situations. We need to make sure a rule would grant the Board these measures.

Ms. Tutorow said she totally agrees with Mr. Bushman.

The following motion was made by Dick Diamond, seconded by Rick Woodard and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we direct the Division to look at creating a rule to set parameters and time frames relative to variances.**

4) Mule deer

Mr. Woodard said he would like to put this issue on the action log, if the Board deems it appropriate. Ever since he has been involved with the DWR, as a RAC Chair or on the Board, we keep hearing about how unhappy the public is about mule deer. Perhaps, the Division could bring something to the Board this fall, before the informational meeting. The Division could bring ramifications, pros and cons on the way we manage mule deer, and the effect of such on licenses that could be issued. If nothing more, we could become better educated on how we manage mule deer and what we could do to try and improve it. We need to consider all options on trying to improve our mule deer situation. With public sentiment as it is, we probably cannot go to unit-by-unit management.

Director Karpowitz asked Mr. McLaughlin when the Statewide Mule Deer Management plan is up for review.

Mr. McLaughlin said September 2008.

Director Karpowitz said we will be looking closely at this before this review. This will happen over the next year. We actually did something very similar to this in the early 80's. We took it to the public and told them, here are the different ways we can manage deer. We can do limited entry by unit, limited entry by region, three point or better, and others options. We had a whole list including the pros and cons. We can generate that sort of thing again. The real key to this is the revision to the deer plan. We have had regional management for a long time and things change. We are on course to do that.

Mr. Woodard said he would like it brought back on a light agenda afternoon before it is taken to the public. We need an informational meeting ahead of time.

Mr. Johnson said this could occur at a retreat.

Director Karpowitz said we could add it on a meeting, or add a day to a board meeting. This could be made an action item that some time before November, this informational meeting could take place.

Mr. Howard said he remembers back when we had 50 plus units for deer management. He thinks public sentiment has changed to where we could bring back managing deer in smaller units. People want to see the management work. We could create more units for deer only.

Director Karpowitz said we could look at all options.

The following motion was made by Rick Woodard, seconded by Lee Howard and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we put the issue of exploring mule deer management on**

**the action log, to be brought back in informational form.**

5) CHA Question

Ron Hodson addressed the action log item on the CHA variance request, concerning the year round CHA program. We held a meeting with all the regional managers and biologists and discussed this thoroughly. There was not any sentiment for wanting to expand the year round CHA program. We currently have three CHAs in the state that are year round. We have not wanted to have these. The current rule works pretty well, along with some guidelines. He then read from rule, "The Board may authorize a variance to the dates provided that game birds to not nest in the area and there are no other detrimental effects to other species of wildlife." "Hunting activities during the spring and summer have the potential to impact many species of wildlife. A thorough review of those species of wildlife that might be using CHA land should be conducted. We should specifically be looking for any sensitive species in the areas, is there any breeding, nesting or brooding game or nongame birds using the area. Are there any mammals using the area to breed or raise young? Are there any potential disease transmission problems? Are there any other impacts, either perceived or real? These should be brought out before any year round request would be granted." We have not had many requests for year round CHAs, so we do not see any reason to change this. If we do it might encourage more CHAs going year round.

Mr. Diamond asked if there are any problems with the three that are year round.

Mr. Hodson said no.

Mr. Diamond said we should drop this off the action log, since they do not believe there is any reason to alter the rule at this point.

The meeting was then adjourned.