

**Utah Wildlife Board Meeting**  
**August 20, 2009, 9:00 A.M., Courtyard - Marriott**  
**4843 West Douglas Corrigan Way, SLC Utah**  
**AGENDA**

**Thursday, August 20, 2009**

- |  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda<br>– Rick Woodard, Chairman  | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 2. Approval of Minutes<br>– Rick Woodard   | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log<br>– Ernie Perkins, Vice-Chair  | <b>CONTINGENT</b>    |
| 4. DWR Update<br><br>– Jim Karpowitz, DWR Director   | <b>INFORMATION</b>   |
| 5. Board Appeal – Motion to Dismiss – David Edwards – 1:00 pm <b>Time Certain</b><br>Board Appeal – Motion to Dismiss – Scott Stephens – 1:00 pm <b>Time Certain</b> |                      |
| 6. Board Variance Request – David Cooper – 1:30 pm <b>Time Certain</b><br>Board Variance Request – Denny Lytle and Brynne Lytle – 2:00 pm <b>Time Certain</b>        |                      |
| 7. Proposed Fee Schedule<br>- Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Section Chief  | <b>INFORMATIONAL</b> |
| 8. Wildlife Board and RAC Rule Amendment R657-39<br>- Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Section Chief  | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 9. Error Remedy Rule Amendment R657-50<br>- Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Section Chief  | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 10. Turkey Hunting Guidebook, Rule and Permit Allocation R657-54<br>- Dave Olsen, Wildlife Program Coordinator   | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 11. Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-10<br>- Tom Aldrich, Wildlife Program Coordinator  | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 12. Cougar Guidebook and Rule R657-10<br>- Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator  | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 13. Cougar Management Plan<br>- Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator   | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 14. Furbearer Guidebook and Rule R657-11<br>- Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator   | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 15. CWMU Advisory Committee Appointee<br>- Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator  | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 16. Henry Mountains Bison Permits<br>- Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator  | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 17. Establish Total Conservation Permits for 2010-2012<br>- Alan Clark, Assistant Director   | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 18. Other Business<br>– Rick Woodard   | <b>CONTINGENT</b>    |

**UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MOTIONS**  
August 20, 2009, 9:00 a.m., Courtyard – Marriott  
4843 West Douglas Corrigan Way, SLC, Utah

- 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 approve the minutes of the June 4, 2009 Wildlife Board meeting with the noted corrections.**

- 3) Old Business/Action Log

**MOTION: We ask that the Division look toward multi year guidebooks and rules and that they present a plan on how that multi year guidebooks work as each is presented.**  
Passed unanimously

- 4) Proposed Fee Schedule (Action)

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Proposed Fee Schedule as presented by the Division.**  
Passed unanimously

- 5) Wildlife Board and RAC Rule Amendment R657-39 (Action)

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Wildlife Board and RAC Rule Amendment R657-39 as presented by the Division.**  
Passed unanimously

- 6) Error Remedy Rule Amendment R657-50 (Action)

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Error Remedy Rule Amendment R657-50 as presented by the Division.**  
Passed unanimously

- 7) Turkey Hunting Guidebook, Rule and Permit Allocation R657-54 (Action)

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Turkey Hunting Guidebook, Rule and Permit Allocation R657-54 as presented by the Division.**  
Passed unanimously

**MOTION: I move that we remove the “Turkey Depredation Permits” item from the action log and accept the Division’s response.**  
Passed unanimously

- 8) Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-10 (Action)

**MOTION; I move that we accept the Division's recommendations on the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-10.**

Passed unanimously

- 9) Cougar Guidebook and Rule R657-10 (Action)

**MOTION: I move that we change the split season opener to the first Saturday in March**

Passed 4 to 1 with Keele Johnson opposed

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Southern Region RAC recommendations and leave the Zion unit at 21 permits, the Paunsaugunt permits to stay the same but change it to a split season and make the permit correction on the Monroe unit.**

Passed 3 to 2 with Ernie Perkins and Bill Fenimore opposed

**MOTION: I move that we change all four Manti units to harvest objective and place them under a predator management plan.**

Passed 3 to 2 with Ernie Perkins and Bill Fenimore opposed

**MOTION: I move that we approve the remainder of the Cougar Guidebook and Rule R657-10 as presented by the Division.**

Passed unanimously

**MOTION: I move that we reconsider the last motion on the Manti Unit.**

Passed unanimously

**MOTION: I move that the unit be on a quota system and it be moved to a split season on all four units on the Manti.**

Passed unanimously

- 10) Board Appeal – motion to dismiss – Scott Stephens

**MOTION: I move that we dismiss the appeal of Scott Stephens for lack of jurisdiction.**

Passed unanimously

Board Appeal – motion to dismiss – David Edwards

**MOTION: I move that we dismiss the appeal of David Edwards based on Rule 657-2-19.**

Passed unanimously

11) Variance Requests

**MOTION: I move that we grant the extension of David O Cooper on his spike bull elk general any legal weapon permit to the 2010 season.**

Passed unanimously

**MOTION: I move that we move Mr. Lytle's season dates on his Henry Mountains Bison permit to December 15-22, 2009.**

Passed unanimously

12) Cougar Management Plan (Action)

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Cougar Management Plan as presented by the Division.**

Passed 4 to 1 with Keele Johnson opposed

13) Furbearer guidebook and Rule R657-11 (Action)

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Furbearer Guidebook and Rule R657-11 as presented by the Division, including the otter amendment.**

**AMENDED MOTION: I move that we accept the Furbearer Guidebook and Rule R657-11 as presented by the Division, including the river otter plan amendment, with the exception that the stakeholders be contacted prior to introductions under the divisions proposal for Section 2a of the Otter Management Plan.**

Passed 5 to 1 with Tom Hatch opposed

14) CWMU Advisory Committee Appointee (Action)

**MOTION: I move that Sterling Brown be appointed to the CWMU Advisory Committee.**

Passed unanimously

15) Establish Total Conservation Permits for 2010-2012 (Action)

**MOTION: I move that we support the conservation permits by species and permit numbers as presented by the Division.**

Passed unanimously

16) Other Business

**MOTION: I move that we appoint Jake Albrecht to be the Board's representative on the Elk Committee and Del Brady as the alternate.**

Passed unanimously

**Utah Wildlife Board Meeting**  
August 20, 2009, 9:00 a.m., Courtyard – Marriott  
4843 West Douglas Corrigan Way, SLC, Utah  
Revised August 17, 2009  
**AGENDA**

**Board Members Present**

Rick Woodard – Chair  
Ernie Perkins – Vice Chair  
Jim Karpowitz – Exec Sec  
Keele Johnson  
Tom Hatch  
Jake Albrecht  
Bill Fenimore  
Del Brady (excused)

**RAC Chairs Present**

Terry Sanslow – Southeastern  
Steve Flinders – Southern  
Robert Burns – Northern  
Fred Oswald – Central  
Bob Christensen – Northeastern

**Public Present**

Gleelyn Bateman  
Ernie Millgate  
Craig Edwards  
Bill Christensen  
Andy Beerman  
Thea Leonard  
Sterling Brown  
Jackie Fehr  
Tim Fehr  
David Woodhouse  
Steve Dalton  
Ryan Foutz  
Ken Madsen  
Desiree Ingram  
Chet Young  
Kincade Bauer

**Division of Wildlife Resources**

Judi Tutorow  
Staci Coons  
Cindee Jensen  
Tom Aldrich  
LuAnn Petrovich  
Greg Sheehan  
Kevin Bunnell  
Anis Aoude  
Anita Candelaria  
John Fairchild  
Doug Messerly  
Bill Bates  
Justin Shannon  
Kevin Christopherson  
Randall Thacker  
Rick Larsen  
Dennis Southerland  
Kent Hersey  
Randy Wood  
Sean Kelly  
Martin Bushman  
Alan Clark  
Mike Fowlks

Chairman Woodard welcomed the audience and introduced the Wildlife Board and RAC Chairs. He then reviewed the agenda.

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

Chairman Woodard said that under “other business” we need to add “select a Board appointee for the Elk Committee.”

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed unanimously.

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

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

On p. 3, last motion change “hunting” to “replacing.” P. 5, last paragraph change “Chairman” to “Director.” P. 7, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, insert “through” between June and November.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the June 4, 2009 Wildlife Board meeting with the noted corrections.**

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

Ernie Perkins, Vice-Chair, presented four updates on the action log. First, on the Cache Working Group, change the Division assignment to Randy Wood. On p. 2, turkey depredation permits should be completed and covered today. On p. 4, Term limits for regional council chair and vice chairs should be completed. On p. 4, nonresident pursuit and harvest permits/premium bear permits, change the completion date to Jan 2011, which is the earliest date this can be done to actually establish the hunt.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Tom Hatch and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: We ask that the Division look toward multi year guidebooks and rules and that they present a plan on how that multi year guidebooks work as each is presented.**

4) DWR Update (**Information**)

Jim Karpowitz, DWR Director presented this information. This has been an unusual summer in having to kill a number of bears. The way we handle those is on each and every case where the public kills a bear, we investigate each case, screen it with the county attorney where the action happened, and let him make the call. Generally speaking, prosecutions are rare. This is consistent with what Colorado and Wyoming do. We have made a statement to the media that this issue is being properly handled. Utah hosted the Chronic Wasting Disease symposium and around 300 people attended. We received a lot of positive feedback on this event.

We met with Colorado and Wyoming in a tri-state meeting. Mr. Brady attended and will give a full report at an upcoming Board meeting. This is a very helpful meeting as we share information annually. We have a lot in common with those two states.

As to personnel changes, the Wildlife Section chief, Craig McLaughlin, left this month to live back east. We had five strong in house candidates for consideration. We selected Rick Larsen as our new Wildlife Section Chief. We are losing Tim Miles who has been in the hatchery system for the last 36 years. This will be a great loss to the Division. He and his predecessors have built one of the finest hatchery systems in the country. We do have capable people to step into this role. This concluded the update and he asked if there were any questions.

Chairman Woodard asked if the Wildlife Board should try to stay out of the bear situation. I had one person contact me on one of the bears that was killed in Provo Canyon. They documented that the bear was being fed and was shot going away from the cabin that day.

Director Karpowitz said since the fatal bear attack a few years back, we have had some bears killed by the public. There have been some prosecutions. In Colorado there is a law against feeding bears, but despite that, they did have a lady killed who continually fed the bears. A rule would probably not help us in this regard, but we need to make sure we are diligent in investigating all of these and evaluating on a case-by-case basis.

Chairman Woodard said we have a board appeal and a variance that are time certain for this afternoon, so we will go to the proposed fee schedule.

#### 5) Proposed Fee Schedule (**Action**)

Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Section Chief presented this item. He did an overview for changing fees and then went over the proposed fee changes. (See Powerpoint Presentation) The brine shrimp COR went from \$14,000 to \$15,000 per year per boat. This is from a graduated fee schedule that was set up a few years back. Swan and crane hunting is \$15 per permit if you draw out. A nonresident cougar and nonresident bear pursuit permit fee has been established. When the Guides and Outfitters bill was passed, it enabled us to separate out recreational pursuit and the fee went from \$30 to \$135. An additional fee that was not presented at the RACs is a resident premium bear permit at \$166 and a nonresident premium bear permit at \$475. There is presently not a proposal for a premium bear hunt, or the details of how it would be established, but it would be presented in FY 2010 at the RAC/Board meetings, and this would give some options. The fees were arrived at by looking at the deer and elk premium permits. This came from a Wildlife Board action item.

In summary, there are no other changes. Fee changes recommended by the RACs and approved by the Wildlife Board will be addressed and take effect July 2010.

Director Karpowitz asked about the bill to be run in the legislature addressing refunds. In the past we have a situation where if someone returns a license, we want to reallocate it

so people can have the opportunity to go hunting on limited entry and OIAL units. We want to be able to refund those permits.

Mr. Sheehan said we are asking the legislature to delegate some of the details of this to the Board as to how we implement the rule.

### **RAC Recommendations**

All RAC representatives said they would be open to the premium bear hunt.

#### 6) Wildlife Board and RAC Rule Amendment R657-39 (**Action**)

Mr. Sheehan presented this agenda item. The proposed additions are: The chair and vice chair shall serve for a two year term of office, the regional advisory council may re-appoint the chair and vice chair to serve a second two year term and (i) neither the chair nor the vice chair may serve more than two terms. This concluded the presentation.

Mr. Fenimore said so a vice chair could serve two, two year terms and then also be elected as a chair.

Mr. Sheehan said any combination of those twice, either a first or second term.

#### 7) Error Remedy Rule Amendment R657-50 (**Action**)

Mr. Sheehan went over the purpose of this rule. (See Powerpoint Presentation). He went over Division, third party errors and applicant errors.

Mr. Hatch asked if an applicant marked the wrong region, could they say I picked the wrong hunt, and get another chance?

Mr. Sheehan said that is not the direction they want to move into. They need to provide significant evidence, that there was really an error, not excuses like "I changed my mind," or "my brother didn't put in for that one," or that type of situation.

### **RAC Recommendation**

All RACs passed these agenda items unanimously.

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Tom Hatch and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Proposed Fee Schedule as presented by the Division.**

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed unanimously.



**MOTION: I move that we approve the Wildlife Board and RAC Rule Amendment R657-39 as presented by the Division.**

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Error Remedy Rule Amendment R657-50 as presented by the Division.**

8) Turkey Hunting Guidebook, Rule and Permit Allocation R657-54 (**Action**)

Dave Olsen, Wildlife Program Coordinator said this presentation is actually two part, one on the turkey transplant list and the other the guidebook and rule. He presented the wild turkey management objectives, which are to establish and increase statewide population, increase hunting and viewing opportunity, minimize depredations and nuisance, and simplify regulations and streamline management. (See Powerpoint Presentation)

Discussion topics centered around the 2008-09 transplant program and DWR recommendations, a review of the current management, the 2009 harvest results, hunts and the guidebook.

The sportsmen came to the Division and desired more turkey hunting opportunity. Within the discussion, we recognized that trade offs would be necessary in achieving that. The Division began to liberalize permit numbers beginning in 2005, in 2007 the committee was formed and they developed a formal approach which was approved by the Wildlife Board as a phase in toward over-the-counter (OTC) permit sales. 2009 was the second year of that phase in approach. OTC permit sales did have a trigger when we met a certain ratio of applicants. It is apparent that this would occur after the 2010 spring hunt. When the committee reviewed this, they decided hunter responses were positive enough that we felt it was time to stabilize the program, move forward and make the recommendations.

The 2010 hunts recommendations were covered in detail, including regional limited entry and statewide OTC hunts. They will maintain and monitor the program for three years. On-line application, bonus points, season dates and specific permit numbers were presented.

There were no changes in the landowner permits, and CWMU and Conservation permit recommendations were made. This concluded the presentation and Mr. Olsen asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Albrecht asked if any one area brought in a higher percentage of birds.

Mr. Olsen said it was compiled by unit and yes there was a lot of fluctuation between units. The figures on the table were statewide and on any individual unit, it could have been different.

Mr. Albrecht asked if the CWMUs are required to take permits.

Mr. Olsen said they apply for them. They are not required to take them.

Mr. Fenimore asked if a person applies for limited entry and does not draw, does it default to an OTC permit?

Mr. Olsen said, no, they would receive their bonus point, then go in and buy a permit over-the-counter.

Mr. Johnson asked about sportsmen with disabilities, in allowing them to hunt earlier, how many would there be?

Mr. Olsen said based on last year, there were 10-20 turkey permits, and it would increase over time.

Mr. Johnson went over the disabled hunters recommendation and asked if they could go the weekend before and then hunt both the other seasons, both limited entry and OTC. We are not talking a lot of hunters and there would not be much impact.

Mr. Olsen said our intent would be to get the program established and then adjust as we need to. Disabled hunters seem comfortable with the proposal.

Chairman Woodard asked if there were any questions or public comment. There was none. He received letters from SFW and the NWTf supporting the proposal.

### **RAC Recommendations**

Southern, Central and Northern RACs accepted the proposal unanimously.

Southeastern – Mr. Sanslow said they approved the presentation, requesting a yearly review in case something drastic happens.

Northeastern – Mr. Christensen said there were some questions on seasons, they were answered and the RAC passed the proposal unanimously.

### **Board Discussion**

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Turkey Hunting Guidebook, Rule and Permit Allocation R657-54 as presented by the Division.**

Mr. Fenimore said this is a remarkably successful program. It is a very well coordinated hunt and the Division deserves accolades for it.

Mr. Albrecht said he concurs with Mr. Fenimore.

Mr. Hatch said in response to the Southeast RAC's concern, the Board can always amend the rule.

Director Karpowitz said the Division's director always has the authority to close a season if necessary.

### **Wild turkey depredation**

Mr. Olsen said this is in response to an action log request from Board. They asked the Division to look into turkey depredation and determine if there was a need for a permit program. They did a review of programs of other states. Also the 2007 Turkey Committee got involved. At this point the Division went through some personnel changes in upland game and in some of the regional positions as well. Concurrently, turkey program changes began and so further action was held off to allow the program to settle. While that was going on hazing, trapping and transplanting remained the chief tools for addressing nuisance depredation.

Following the 2008 report to the Board, they asked the Division to again review depredation and some back with information for today. The regional managers and the turkey committee met on this in the spring and as they reviewed the annual call volume (30-40 calls annually, statewide) felt this does not warrant a rule or anything that formal. They proposed that we look at some internal guidelines to help be consistent in responses, prioritize a list of actions to be taken, put together a pamphlet; "living with wildlife," and devise a simple method of tracking calls and responses.

Mr. Fenimore asked if repetitive calls might be responded to, rather than others. He referred to a situation up in Cache County where turkeys were harassing school children at a bus stop. Maybe with the "living with wildlife" concept, the Division might offer a companion article to utility companies to send out in billing or other information.

Director Karpowitz said there is getting to be more interfacing with humans and wildlife. We have been looking at this, not with just turkeys.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Tom Hatch and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we remove the "Turkey Depredation Permits" item from the action log and accept Division's response.**

9) Waterfowl Guidebook and rule R657-10 (**Action**)

Tom Aldrich, Wildlife Program Coordinator, presented this agenda item. He reminded the Board that on migratory birds, the federal government ultimately has the authority in establishing the seasons. Goose/swan status is reviewed annually, unlike upland game. Mr. Aldrich went over these reviews on populations, changes from last year and over the long term. (See Powerpoint Presentation) This year there are no changes in federal frameworks. May Ponds indicate the status of the habitat. He presented the survey area

compared with last year and the long term average. There was a doubling of ponds in the prairie US and across the board, habitat production is very good.

Mr. Aldrich then went over the North American duck breeding populations and the majority of duck populations showed an overall increase with 13% over last year and 25% over the long term average.

The 2009 regulation decision on Eastern mallards, mid continent mallards, and western mallards, is liberal seasons. He then went on to present season frameworks, basic bag limit and mallard bag (M/F).

Recommendations on swan are to allow group applications for up to four hunters, implement preference points for swan drawings, reserve 15% of swan permits for youth hunters, and move the application period to September after the Board meeting. Youth day will be Sept 19, on ducks, coots, and geese. This concluded the presentation and he asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Fenimore asked what time the youth hunt starts.

Mr. Aldrich said ½ hour before sunrise.

Mr. Johnson asked about golf course geese.

Mr. Aldrich said we have implemented two things in trying to deal with them. One, is the later hunt in an effort to harvest more in late January when they leave the city. When we hit the January thaws it really works well, but some years when it is extremely cold, they do not leave the golf courses. The second thing is we are translocating birds out of the city. We have moved almost 3,000 adults and probably 4,000 young out of the city. None of the young come back and about 40% of adults return. This is the last year we are going to do the marking and moving study, then we will re-evaluate the late hunt and the translocation effort. We are making headway.

Mr. Albrecht asked if January 31<sup>st</sup> is as late as you can hunt them.

Mr. Aldrich said for Canada geese, under federal law, and if we want to hunt later than that we can ask for the outside framework dates to be extended. That is one thing we will be looking at, but presently that is where it stands.

### **RAC Recommendations**

Northern – Mr. Bynes read the motion: To accept the Division proposal as presented and commend them for their work, and recommend that they study any and all biological aspects of waterfowl. This passed unanimously. Two items that they would like to see study done on are weeds from the mud motorboats and there was a large public response opposed to access closures. At our meeting, the group that was proposing the access closures did not present their proposal.

Northeastern – Mr. Christensen said there was some discussion about the motorless groups analysis and some of their restrictions, there was no actual proposal. The Division's proposal passed unanimously

Central – Mr. Oswald said they had good discussion on the proposed guidebook and rule. Almost all comments were positive and in favor of the rule. They did have someone from the motorless folks and commented that they were interested in trying to get an increase in accessible places. The vote to accept was 9 to 1 on the Division's proposal.

Southeast – Mr. Sanslow said they approved the proposal unanimously.

Southern – Mr. Flinders said there was no public comment, and the recommendation passed unanimously.

Mr. Perkins commended the Division for the survey they did. After watching the last five years in Northern region and also looking at Central region, he perceives a continued growing of dissention on how we divide the pie. He recommends that the Division look at forming a committee to explore social distribution and how we divide the pie. Maybe they could bring some recommendations to the Board and put some of these conflicting discussions to bed for a while.

Mr. Fenimore asked if there are any advisories on ducks that should not be consumed.

Mr. Aldrich said the advisories are exactly the same as the last couple of years. There are consumption advisories on shufflers, cinnamon teal and golden eye.

Mr. Fenimore asked about wasting wildlife, if they decide to throw away any they have harvested.

Mr. Aldrich said you have to put it to beneficial use, taxidermy, train your dog, etc. You cannot just throw it in the trashcan.

The following motion was made by Bill Fenimore, seconded by Ernie Perkins and passed unanimously.

**MOTION; I move that we accept the Division's recommendations on the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-10.**

Mr. Bushman said the law states that you cannot waste wildlife. Whether the Division chooses to enforce that is up to the discretion of the Division.

Chairman Woodard asked if this is something we need to look at in the future on-contaminated game.

Mr. Bushman said this is statute and the legislature would have to change it.

Mr. Hatch said he does not feel this is a problem that we need to address. It would be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

Director Karpowitz said these are do not eat advisories. It is a limited amount as defined in EPA standard, which is very strict. We get the information to the people and they decide whether or not to eat them.

10) Cougar Guidebook and Rule R657-10 (**Action**)

Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator, presented this item. Discussion topics will include cougar management plan and objectives, review of harvest data and recommendations for 2009-2010. He showed a map of cougar habitat, which is defined by suitable prey, which in most cases is mule deer in the state of Utah. He went over harvest management criteria. (See Powerpoint Presentation)

Under the criteria to reduce the number of units managed under predator management plans, Mr. Bunnell gave a brief review on predator management plans policy (W1AG-4) This is a completely separate policy and it is not part of the cougar or deer plan. In that predator management may occur, but is not limited to several different circumstances.

1. localized areas where introductions or transplants of potentially vulnerable wildlife species has occurred or is imminent.
2. situation where prey population are unable to meet management objectives and predation plays a significant role.
3. on waterfowl management areas (not applicable to cougars)

Criteria for the consideration of a unit predator management plan:

1. When transplants are coming up in the following year.
2. When big game populations on a management unit is below 65% of management objective or below 75% for three consecutive years.
3. When big game populations are below viable levels.

Mr. Bunnell then presented graphs on cougar mortality from 1989-2009 and cougar pursuit from 1990-2009. This metric on a statewide scale tracks the trend of the population quite well and the population has stabilized in the last few years. Eco-regions, management performance for 2008-2009, phone survey summary, hunt strategy comparison over the last four years and 2009-2010 permit recommendations were presented.

Under recommended rule and procedure changes, it is proposed to divide the San Juan into two subunits, with the Abajo as a split unit, which will start limited entry and transition to harvest objective and keep the Elk Ridge straight harvest objective. Also the addition of a definition for "kitten with spots," as a cougar that has obvious spots on its sides or its back. He showed some pictures and said it is something that there will have to be some discretion on. This concluded the presentation.

Mr. Perkins asked about the Manti predator management plan. Why is it not under a predator management plan?

Mr. Bunnell said it is under predator management, but they are not applying it to cougar at this point. There is predator management on coyotes on that unit.

Justin Shannon said when they went to harvest objective there, they killed the cats very quickly and it was closed in just over a week. The percent females taken increased substantially, and the following years, the age in the animals taken decreased quite a bit. When you go harvest objective on the Manti, you really impact the population quickly because of access and the success that is possible. In talking with local biologist, they did not see a response on the deer herd.

Mr. Fenimore asked how hard it is to tell which sex the animal is.

Mr. Bunnell said they have two full pages on ways to tell in the guidebook, including head size, compared size to dogs, and several other things. The split hunt is more successful on taking less females. Not a lot of people have a lot of experience looking at cougars and it is very difficult.

Mr. Perkins asked about the start date on the split units harvest objective season, February 15-March 1. He perceives that there is a dividing the pie question of who might benefit or who might not?

Mr. Bunnell said some of the guides are recommending later start dates, and also some of the houndsmen. It will be less time on good snow. It does seem to be a social issue and we wanted to take suggestions from public. He would have thought the guides would oppose this. I am not quite sure how to interpret the input we have received.

Mr. Perkins asked if there was a broad amount of dissemination of the information on this proposal for the various groups.

Mr. Bunnell said those in the groups could probably answer that better. It has been out there for quite a while, but if someone was not involved in the clubs, maybe they did not know. If the Board decides to go that way, the Board needs to know that logistically it would be easier to do it the last Saturday in February, or the first sat in March. We end limited entry on a Sunday and then reopen on the following Saturday.

Mr. Albrecht wanted to know why the reduction on the Monroe Unit.

Shawn Kelly said there was no change in their recommendation from last year.

Mr. Bunnell said the recommendation is the same it must be a misprint and it will be corrected.

Mr. Albrecht said the Beaver and Monroe are side-by-side and similar. There is a reduction of three on the Beaver.

Mr. Kelly said the Beaver Unit came off predator management and we did reduce harvest there.

Dave Woodhouse asked when the Manti unit was taken out of predator management and how many years was it in.

Bill Bates said about five years and it was under predator management for 3-4 before that. We were trying to focus the harvest on the southeast Manti.

Mr. Bunnell said despite reducing the cougar density, we saw very little response from the deer herd. This shows that the cougars were not the problem.

Mr. Woodhouse said in 2005 the deer herd was at 32,700 and it has dramatically dropped in the last three years. Could the cougars have had any impact on that unit?

Mr. Bunnell said there is some confusion, but the issue is that actual metrics that are going into the model have changed very little.

Mr. Bates said what has happened the last two years is we have had significant winterkill, 25% of fawns with poor winter conditions.

Mr. Woodhouse said he has been to all the other meetings on bucks and bulls, and deer management plan and winterkill was never brought up at these meetings. We brought that up and it was brushed under the carpet. We are getting the run around.

Mr. Bates said he would have to go back at the minutes. Brad Crompton has mentioned that is the case. We have discussed winterkill as a region. If you have questions, just get with us and we will answer anything we can.

### **Public Comment**

Chet Young, Utah Federation of Houndsmen, said they would like to remove as many harvest objective units as possible. They are against Manti harvest objective and support the first Saturday of March for the split units.

Ernie Millgate, representing himself, said he gets lots of calls from houndsmen throughout the state. After the Southeast RAC when they recommended predator management on that unit, he talked to some guides. They were actually against it. They are more biologically minded than you would think. They also guide big game hunts on these units and do not feel the lions are affecting the big game. Lions are being depleted in the state and the big game herds are not coming back. He is glad to see that the cougars are not taking all the blame anymore, coyotes are a real problem as well. He supports the Division's recommendations and the March start date. There has been significant snowfall right at the beginning of March and the houndsmen go out in large numbers. There have been some problems on the mountain. We are trying to patrol our own ranks and take care of these problems. He would like to see this hunt pushed back.

Dave Woodhouse, SFW said they recommend the Board go with the recommendations from the Southeast RAC and that the whole of the Manti go predator management plan. We are not just targeting the cougars, but also the bear and the cougars. The deer herd objective for 2005-2008 is plummeting, down to 54%. The west side of Manti has never been in predator management. We need to go to split season and reduce the predator numbers. The deer numbers are going down and we need to do everything possible. This



unit has been under 75% for three years and the triggers say the whole of the Manti needs to be put into a predator management plan. We will be back with similar recommendations on the bear management plan, and also on coyotes.

Craig Edwards, Federation of Houndsmen, said cougar have been under attack for a long time. The Division gives good sound biological recommendations. He supports the recommendations, including the split on the Manti. Cougar are not necessarily the problem with the deer herds.

### **RAC Recommendations**

Southeastern – Mr. Sanslow said there were lots of discussion and comments. They had three motions that were passed. (See Southeastern RAC meeting minutes): Leave San Juan/Abajo unit as is: passed with 1 opposed. To make all four Manti units harvest objective and place all four Manti units under a predator management plan – passed with 2 opposed, and last to approve guidebook and rule – passed unanimously.

Central – Mr. Oswald said there were five recommendations made from the houndsmen group that were different from what the Division proposed. There was not any interest in looking at those recommendations separately. There was a motion to accept the Division's recommendations as presented and it passed unanimously.

Northeastern – Mr. Christensen said most of the discussion was with moving the date to March 1 with the split season. The motion was to accept the Division's proposal with moving the split season date to March 1 and that passed unanimously.

Northern – Mr. Bynes said there was a proposal during public comment by Big Game hounds association to have a pursuit only in Northern region and lower harvest in the rest of the state. That was to address their perception of a greatly reduced cougar population. They also had a comment proposing for pursuit only. The RAC voted unanimously to accept the Division's proposal.

Southern – Mr. Flinders said there was extensive discussion from the public and amongst the RAC members. Two motions: MOTION: to accept rule as presented with the exception that split units would start March 1 statewide, make the statewide conservation tag to hunt all open units year round. Sportsman's permit year round all open units. Zion unit permits stay the same at 21 permits and Paunsagunt permits stay the same but make a split unit. – passed unanimously. MOTION: That all the conservation tags can hunt year round in the region – passed with 2 opposed.

Chairman Woodard said we cannot deal with the conservation tags at this time, or the sportsman permit. They would have to come back at a later date.

Mr. Clark said the change the Southern RAC is requesting would require a rule amendment. It would have to come back through another round of RACs.

Mr. Sanslow said on the motion on the Manti sub units, it was based on below 50% of objective on the deer herd.

Chairman Woodard summarized the RAC and public comments.

Mr. Hatch said in response to the Division, if all the predator management triggers have been hit on the Manti, why aren't we there?

Mr. Bunnell said that when the triggers are hit, we look at going to predator management. The predator management plan on the Manti is focused on coyotes and the cougar are not the reason for the deer herd situation. That is our opinion.

Mr. Albrecht said on the Central Mtns. Manti, is it because of mis-information put into the model?

Mr. Bunnell said there are two things that contribute to the numbers, altering the model and the winterkill two years ago.

### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Albrecht asked what it does to opportunity moving the split start date.

Mr. Bunnell said it will give the hunters with the limited entry tag a little longer and makes it so the harvest objective season on the units is shorter.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed with one opposed, Keele Johnson, 4 to 1.

**MOTION: I move that we change the split season opener to the first Saturday in March.**

Mr. Perkins said he has some reservations from a process standpoint. He did not see anything on this prior to the RAC meetings. He is not opposed to it, but has a feeling that the guy who does not have really good hounds and has been waiting for years to draw a limited entry tag, could use the extra time and would feel disadvantaged.

Mr. Bunnell said with this motion, limited entry would get more time. Currently he starts the end of November and goes to the first week in February, then it is closed for 5-6 days, then we open it for harvest objective. In the current proposal limited entry would not close until the end of February and he would get more time. The general season on the unit is reduced by a couple of weeks.

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Tom Hatch and passed 3 to 2, with Ernie Perkins and Bill Fenimore opposed.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Southern Region RAC recommendations and leave the Zion unit at 21, Paunsaugunt permits stay the same, but change it to a split season and make the permit correction on the Monroe unit.**

Mr. Perkins said when a unit comes out of a predator management plan, it drops the number of permits, so we have multiple Board policies that define the circumstances. We also have large groups that try to decide when to go with various hunt strategies. We also have motions coming from RACs that violate the Board policies that are already set. All three changes in opportunity of harvest objective to split, and split to limited entry are being posed in favor of increased opportunity and increased access for everybody verses things that were developed over the last ten years. Maintaining the number of permits and not reacting to changes in predator management plans violates Board policy. For that reason, I will vote against the motion.

Mr. Johnson said the San Juan/Abajo deer herds are not doing all right and they should not come out of predator management. Some of the logic of the discussion today has bothered me relative to objectives. Lions eat deer, period, that is their number one prey. Lions do affect the deer herds. I also have some real questions about limited entry and its use as a management tool. It seems like there is a group that is looking to take care of itself with limited entry. I do not have a big problem with the split season.

Mr. Perkins said it is easy to get into a predator management plan and hard to get out. Northern region had been under one for around six years. They had hunted the lions down to almost nothing and the deer herd kind of stabilized. It is still below 65% and has been there since 1993. If we had continued predator management plans on the Cache, there probably would not be a cougar left and the deer herd would still not have come back. The Division has the right take on this issue. They have the numbers of what the impact of the cats has to be and what the impact of the cats needs to be and what the response of the herd needs to be to the predator management plan. That is solid science and we need to support that. He would like to see lots more coyotes taken on the Manti, but putting the cougar back in the plan is not what we need to do.

Mr. Johnson said he does not blame the cougar 100% for the deer herd problems. We have lots of other issues, but the lion is also a factor. If a deer herd is down, we need to address all issues. The lions are not a threatened species and we need to keep them under control. The Manti herd is in trouble.

Mr. Hatch said during our training yesterday we were told that exponentially if a doe is killed by a cougar, it effects the long term population.

Director Karpowitz said we do need to do the right thing for the deer herds and do everything we can, but we need to make sure it is the right thing that will have the most impact. I did a fawn mortality study over three years, collaring them, and coyotes are a much greater problem, than lions. If you do not have the habitat, it will not matter how many lions are taken in bringing back a deer herd automatically. Habitat is first and foremost, then focus on the predators that are actually causing the problem. I have been a proponent of accelerated cougar harvest over the years and we have done this a lot, to the point where we are hearing from houndsmen that we need to slow down a little. The change that has been recommended is the same as last year, but the motion is to go back to where we were. I am all for doing all we can to help the deer herd, but let's be sure we are doing the right thing.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded Jake Albrecht and passed 3 to 2, with Ernie Perkins and Bill Fenimore against.

**MOTION: I move that we change all four Manti units to harvest objective and place them under a predator management plan.**

Mr. Fenimore said what he heard at the training was that a cougar that kills a deer can have an impact, but in some of these particular cases, there were other factors such as winterkill or coyotes that had a greater impact.

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Ernie Perkins and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the remainder of the Cougar Guidebook and Rule R657-10 as presented by the Division.**

Lunch Discussion

Director Karpowitz said we have talked a lot about how to deal with e-mail. Ms. Coons has established a universal account on the state's system called WildlifeBoard@utah.gov and we are looking to post that on the internet rather than the Board's individual e-mail addresses, and saying that if you have comment for the Board, send it to this address. Then each of the Board members would have a utah.gov e-mail account and these comments could be accessed. Comments to the entire Board would go to the Wildlife Board address and questions to just one Board member would go to their e-mail.

Chairman Woodard said this would do away with the issue of our personal e-mails being pulled and having to store them. They continued to discuss this issue and they were in favor of it. It would be a great advantage to keep these e-mails separate from personal e-mail. They also discussed compensation for personal computer use and cell phone use. The Board members are eligible for business cards and laptops. The website was explained for use of wildlife business and messages. The Division is also looking to put monitors and computer hook ups in the Board meeting rooms.

Director Karpowitz said in conversations with Commissioners and Directors in other states, before every Board meeting they have an executive work session. In some states they can do it closed door, but ours would have to be open to the public, noticed with an agenda. It would not be open to public comment. We might not need to do that every meeting, but for those with large agendas and complicated issues, it would be helpful. It would mean more of a commitment in travel and have a half-day before the meeting where the Board could informally discuss the Board meeting issues. Perhaps we could start an executive session at 2 pm the day before. It would be available to the public, but there would be no public comment or action. We could try the first of these work sessions before the big game meeting.

The Board discussed this idea and decided to pursue it.

Director Karpowitz asked Mr. Bushman if we could invite a Division person in to make a presentation, or answer questions at a work meeting.

Mr. Bushman said yes. You would have to do minutes and record it also.

Director Karpowitz said the Board is eligible for cell phone compensation, but it is difficult to track. The state will provide them with a cell phone, or they could submit the charges.

Mr. Johnson said that with Verizon, if you are using your phone for government use, you can get 18% off on your plan. You have to apply for this. I think AT&T does this also.

Director Karpowitz said the department rule on cell phones is you can use it for personal use, as long as it does not increase the total cost of the bill. That is what it is for employees. This gets kind of complicated too.

Ms. Coons said she will provide the Board with the state contact at Verizon. As far as she knows, Verizon is the only one who offers this.

Director Karpowitz said if they decide they want a separate state phone, they should let the Division know.

End of lunch break

Chairman Woodard said they are going to reconsider the last motion on the Manti predator management plan.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we reconsider the last motion on the Manti Unit.**

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that the unit be on a quota system and it be moved to a split season on all four units on the Manti.**

11) Board Appeal – motion to dismiss – Scott Stephens – 1:00 pm time certain  
Tape was changed

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Ernie Perkins and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we dismiss the appeal of Scott Stephens for lack of jurisdiction.**

Board Appeal – motion to dismiss – David Edwards – 1:00 pm time certain

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we dismiss the appeal of David Edwards based on Rule 657-2-19.**

12) Variance Requests (**Action**)

Board Variance Request – David Cooper – 1:30 pm Time Certain

Mr. Cooper, from New Orleans, presently living in Sandy, Utah, presented his case. He does not want a refund, he would like to be able to use his license next year. He could not use it last year, because he had to go to Galveston to help his family. He went down to help with the devastation caused by Katrina. It came through September 13 and they left here on September 28 to help out. Because of this, he was unable to use his elk tag. The Division told him about the appeal process.

Judi Tutorow, Licensing Coordinator, presented the Division's position on this extension. It was denied by the committee, because the Division has no authority to extend the tag. They directed him to the Board.

The following motion was made by Bill Fenimore, seconded by Tom Hatch and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we grant the extension of David O. Cooper on his spike bull elk tag, general any legal weapon to the 2010 season.**

Denny Lytle Variance Request

Ms. Tutorow said Denny and his daughter, Brynne both drew Henry Mountain OIAL bison permits this year, with different season dates. He would like to extend to next year or have his season date changed to match his daughters. (12/15-22, 2009)

Mr. Lytle presented his request to have his permit moved to match her permit season dates. He does not want an extension on his permit. They would like to be able to hunt together and have this positive experience for his family.

Mr. Johnson asked if moving the dates on this season back is a problem.

Mr. Bushman said the Board has broad authority on this issue.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Tom Hatch and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we move Mr. Lytle's permit dates on his Henry Mountains Bison permit to December 15-22, 2009.**

Mr. Hatch said he is acquainted with Mr. Lytle.

13) Cougar Management Plan (**Action**)

Kevin Bunnell presented this agenda item. He listed the participants on the Cougar Advisory Group, (See Powerpoint Presentation) and went over the plan goal which is to maintain a healthy cougar population within existing occupied habitat while considering human safety, economic concerns and other wildlife species through 2021. Having worked with several of these advisory groups, this one worked better than any he has ever been associated with. The group as a whole, even though everyone did not get exactly what they wanted, does support the plan unanimously.

Mr. Bunnell then went over objectives, strategies and management systems. Outreach and education, cougar population management, managing cougar population under predator management plans, managing chronic cougar depredation and cougar research were covered during the presentation.

In summary, we have the longest standing cougar study in the West. We are just getting to the point after 15 years where we can answer some of the questions that are relevant to management. We need to maintain the applied research momentum. We want to continue to manage populations at temporal (3 yrs) and geographic scales (eco regions) that are appropriate for cougars. We look to use management systems for cougar population and predator management. We also look to resolve chronic depredation and be proactive in our outreach. This concluded the presentation.

Chairman Woodard said he and Mr. Perkins took turns attending these committee meetings. This committee ran very smoothly and cooperatively, very little conflict.

Mr. Fenimore asked when females start breeding.

Mr. Bunnell said three years old.

Mr. Fenimore asked if on the cougar tracking methods, is the technique similar to the bears where they use scent stations and hair samples.

Mr. Bunnell said it is similar because it is using a mark recapture and we are using DNA to try to identify animals, but instead of the animals giving the DNA, we will actively collect it through a biopsy dart. We would require houndsmen to tree the cougars. Washington and Montana have perfected this technique and we are looking to try it.

Director Karpowitz asked if the motions made thus far today are consistent with this plan.

Mr. Bunnell said yes. The Manti issue either under predator management or not, the split season applies, it just depends on where you set the quota on how aggressive or unaggressive you go.

Mr. Albrecht asked how they come up with animals treed per day.

Mr. Bunnell said based on phone survey and they are looking to get this information online. We have to be sure the results are comparable, so for a few years we will be doing both.

Mr. Albrecht asked how consistent or truthful are these results.

Mr. Bunnell said there are certainly some biases, but they are consistent. It is precise, if not accurate. The change of whether it goes up or down is accurate, but the actual number is irrelevant, since we look at the population trend.

Mr. Albrecht asked on the chronic depredation issue with public land, how do you treat an area where a farmer has public lands, but is unable to use it because of a chronic cougar problem?

Mr. Bunnell said the problem on private land is we are not getting the sport harvest and that contributes to the chronic depredation problem. If we have an issue on public land, we can address it through sport harvest, reducing densities.

Sterling Brown, Utah Farm Bureau asked how many head of livestock do cougar bring down through the course of a year. Which regions of the state are hit hardest, more specifically, which units?

Mr. Bunnell, said in general, the cougar depredation is down over the last ten years. I could get more specific data, but I would have to look it up. There are hot spots in each region as the animals are moving through the country, intersecting livestock through travel corridors.

Mr. Hatch asked about depredation being down over the last ten years and that is an indication that populations are down. Couldn't that also be an indication that livestock numbers are down. In the last ten years, sheep numbers have plummeted in our state. With less sheep being raised, we will not have the depredation issues.

Mr. Bunnell said in talking with Mike Bodenchuk from Wildlife Services, he believes strongly that during the few years in the 1990's that we killed 500-600 cougars, livestock depredation went down. In that short period of time, livestock numbers did not change, but depredation did.

### **Public Comment**

Ernie Millgate, representing himself said he was on the Cougar Management Committee. He feels we have some of the foremost authorities on cougars here in Utah and it was very impressive seeing how this all came together. Working with the various groups was a good experience. Everyone agreed on this management plan and it will benefit the population. He fully supports the plan as it will solve a lot of fluctuations with the ups and downs and balance with other species.

Chet Young, Federation of Houndsmen said they support the Division's proposed cougar management plan.



Kirk Robinson of Western Wildlife Conservancy said he was a member of the first Cougar Advisory Committee and has been active on this issue for 20 years. During that time, he has represented the nonconsumptive faction of the community and attended many RAC and Board meetings. He is not opposed to hunting all animals, and has hunted deer in the past. This is somewhat of a paradox. He is not totally convinced that we have ever needed to hunt cougars. He commended that latest and best science that was used on this cougar committee. There are a lot of people out there that support the non-consumptive point of view. All things considered, as a management system that involves hunting, this is a good one. It makes use of the latest research on cougars. He likes the fact that the plan is only visited every three years, allowing for more data to be collected. This system will allow the cougar population to remain more stable and healthy, and hopefully there will be less negative public reaction to the management in general.

Dave Woodhouse, SFW said Byron Bateman who is their president was on the committee. They support the plan and in the long run this will really help us out with cougars.

### **RAC Recommendations**

Central – Mr. Oswald commended Mr. Bunnell and the committee for what they did. They supported it unanimously.

Southeast – Mr. Sanslow said they had some discussion and ultimately made a motion to accept the plan as presented and it passed with one opposing vote.

Northeast – Mr. Christensen said they had positive discussion on the plan and it passed unanimously.

Southern – Mr. Flinders said they had a good discussion and it passed unanimously.

Northern – Mr Bynes said they passed the recommendations unanimously.

### **Board Discussion**

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson and it died for lack of a second.

**MOTION:** I move that we approve cougar management plan, and under strategies “use limited entry, split season or harvest objective.”

Mr. Bunnell said he does not feel it is a good idea, because units that are not under predator management plans, they are trying to protect the females in those units. Fewer females are taken during the split season and too many are taken under harvest objective.

Mr. Hatch commended the Division and the committee for their work on this plan, especially on the twelve-year plan and the system.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed 4 to 1, with Keele Johnson opposed.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Cougar Management Plan as presented by the Division.**

Mr. Fenimore also commended the Division and committee. He encouraged the Division to keep in touch with the public and look at varying systems to get survey data. This way they can continuously gather information from those who are participating in these programs.

14) Furbearer guidebook and Rule R657-11 (**Action**)

Kevin Bunnell presented this agenda item. He reviewed the bobcat management plan with the goal to maintain a healthy bobcat population within existing suitable habitat and provide quality recreational opportunities for bobcat harvest while considering the social aspects of bobcat harvest. He then went on to discuss bobcat harvest, population objective and the 2009-2010 recommendations. (See Powerpoint Presentation)

Tag numbers and season length will be adjusted plus or minus when the performance targets are outside their normal range. The Division recommends a one-tag reduction from five to four and a one-week delay in the season opening from 11/18 to 11/25.

The Furbearer rule change is to add the middle section of the Provo River (between Jordanelle and Deer Creek reservoirs) to the list of areas with trapping restrictions to protect river otters. Otters will be released into this section of the Provo River beginning this fall. The furbearer rule will undergo a revision in 2010.

The Northern river otter plan amendments (UTA requests) objective B to expand distribution and they will meet with the Trappers Association and any other interested organizations prior to otter reintroductions. Objective D is to reduce incidental trapping and use the least restrictive regulations to provide protection.

Some issues that will be coming up are a beaver management plan to be presented at the December RAC/Board meetings, otter management plan revision (winter), opportunity to trap otters and triggers to end trapping restrictions after otters are established. This concluded the presentation.

Mr. Fenimore asked that on objective B to meet with UTA, might be changed to be more general, such as UTA and any other interested parties.

Mr. Bunnell said that would be fine.

Mr. Johnson asked if we have introduced otters into most appropriate drainages in the state.

Mr. Bunnell said no. We have otters in the Green River drainage, the Colorado, in the San Juan River and have been establishing them in the Escalante River. That is the extent of our reintroductions at this point.

Mr. Johnson asked about transplants from the Green River.

Mr. Bunnell said they have been using them from the Green River down to the Escalante. They have been getting them from Idaho to put them into the Provo River, with about 15-20 annually to get the population going.

Mr. Johnson asked what the impact of bobcats is on fawns.

Director Karpowitz said bobcats do eat fawns. Most of that would occur in late winter when fawns are in a weakened condition. Compared to coyotes, that is quite minimal and they usually key in on rabbits and porcupines.

### **Public Comment**

Ken Madsen, of the Utah Trappers Association said their recommendations kind of got blown up in the RACs. They asked for too much and looked to negotiate. They support the plan, but would like to see some liberalization in the 48-hour trap check on coyote trapping. It is difficult to run a significant trap line for coyotes, since most of them are not where people live. Four of the five RACs addressed this issue. If we cannot address it today, hopefully we can look at it in the future. Perhaps a COR could be available for those wanting to trap coyote. The Division would be able to monitor the trapper through the COR.

Chairman Woodard asked if a 72 or 96-hour trap check would work for them.

Mr. Madsen said 96 hour would make a significant difference.

Kirk Robinson said he is opposed to the change on a trap check on the basis of humane treatment. Being caught in a trap for that length of time would be inhumane. The longer an animal is in a trap the more he suffers. He compared the coyote to a dog, and that would be similar to a dog being trapped. On ethical grounds he opposes this.

Kevin Muhler represents the Utah Environmental Congress. He missed the comment period on cougar and passed out three sets of comments with a scientific article related to some of the issues on the plan. They strongly oppose the proposal to extend the trapping time period. He strongly opposes this based on it being inhumane. These are modern times and we should be looking toward being a progressive society. There needs to be a formal integration with the Forest Service on the cougar plan. Their concerns with spending millions of dollars trying to repair undulate grazing patterns and the cougar management plan does tie into that.

### **RAC Recommendations**

Northeast – Mr. Christensen said they had some serious discussion on the furbearer proposal centered around the UTA proposal. They oscillated back and forth between UTA, law enforcement and the humane side of it. MOTION: To accept as presented and it passed 5 to 1. MOTION: The UTA's proposal, may be looked at as an action item and this passed unanimously.

Southeast – Mr. Sanslow said there were considerable questions and comments, because of cruelty and time period that animals could be in a trap, and also law enforcement issues. There are quite a few trappers that are not even doing their 48-hour trap check. Extending the time period is ridiculous. They accepted the furbearer recommendation as presented with one opposing vote.

Southern – Mr. Flinders said they had a motion to exempt the coyote from the furbearer proclamation and it failed 5 to 4. There was lots of discussion and the recommendation passed 6 to 3.

Central – Mr. Oswald said they had a tie of 5 to 5 on the recommendation, because they voted without the 48-hour amendment. The Chair broke the tie in favor of the plan as presented by the Division.

Northern – Mr. Bynes said they were opposed to the removal of the 48 hour trap check and it failed 2 to 7. There were several opinions expressed in favor of trapping coyotes and the humaneness and incidental trapping of protected species, if the trap check was extended. MOTION: To accept the Division's proposal with the exception of section 2A and it passed 8 to 1. The maker of the motion has since communicated to the Chair that he wanted to just change section 2A, so it deleted the specific consultation with UTA on the otter reintroductions. It would be better to meet with all interested parties. That was the intent.

## **Board Discussion**

Chairman Woodard summarized the RAC recommendations and public comment.

Mr. Albrecht asked Mr. Bunnell to talk about trapping coyote and bobcats.

Mr. Bunnell said coyote are not part of the trapping, but we do control trapping in general because of the potential of taking protected wildlife. They have worked with the trappers on the 48-hour trap check over the last few years. Some of the concessions we have made is snares are a 96 hour trap check since it is lethal. Also we made it legal to group trap as long as they have a note stating the situation.

Mr. Hatch asked what constitutes checking a trap.

Mr. Bunnell said making sure that trap is empty, which can be done through binoculars or any other means.

Mike Fowlks said the traps can be checked from a long distance and many trappers use a site indicator.

Mr. Hatch asked what the regulations are in the surrounding states as far as trap check times.

Mr. Fowlks said it is pretty consistent region wide, but Nevada's is longer.

Mr. Bunnell said it varies. In Colorado leg hold traps are illegal. Nevada is 96 hours. It ranges from 48-96 hours. We determined ours from rule in the European Union that pelts could not be sold outside the limits of the 48-hour trap check. There are two issues on extending the time, one it is inhumane and the taking of unprotected wildlife.

Mr. Hatch asked how many citations were given during the last trapping season.

Mr. Fowlks said he did not know for the most recent season, but there were 38 tickets given the year before for failure to check, statewide. There were probably as many warnings for the same violation.

Mr. Albrecht asked if the 750 members are paid members of the Trappers Association.

Ken Madsen said they are all paid members. They do have family memberships, so some of those are probably not active trappers.

Director Karpowitz said we got together with the UTA and came up with some reasonable ideas to help with their issue, kill sets and team trapping. There is no reason why we cannot continue discussions with the trappers to continue to look at new ideas. The Division is willing to explore other options.

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, and was seconded by Bill Fenimore.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Furbearer Guidebook and Rule R657-11 as presented by the Division, including the otter amendment.**

The following amended motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed 5 to 1, with Tom Hatch opposed.

**AMENDED MOTION: I move that we accept the Furbearer Guidebook and Rule R657-11 as presented by the Division, including the river otter plan amendment, with the exception that the stakeholders be contacted prior to introductions under the Division's proposal for Section 2a of the Otter Management Plan.**

15) CWMU Advisory Committee Appointee (**Action**)

Mr. Bunnell said Sterling Brown is replacing Todd Bingham on the CWMU Advisory Committee for the next two years. That is the recommendation.

Mr. Perkins said he has worked with Mr. Brown on several committees and he is an outstanding recommendation.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that Sterling Brown be appointed to the CWMU Advisory Committee.**

Chairman Woodard said the Henry Mountains Bison has been taken off as an action item and will be presented as information only.

16) Henry Mountains Bison Permits (**Information**)

Justin Shannon presented this agenda item. He said they met with the Henry Mountain Bison committee and had very good discussion. They flew the area recently and it is about 35 bison over objective. We grouped together as a committee to explore avenues on how to get to the population objective. This includes 90% sight ability and the population objective is 275.

The first option would be to move 40 bison from the Henry's to the Book Cliffs this coming January and February. They looked to get support from the Uintah County commissioner, the Farm Bureau and the Cattleman's Association. This would have to go through RDCC and the local RACs. They also need to develop a capture plan. Another option would be to remove 35 bison and in order to do that, they would issue 39 permits. Nine of the permits they would issue in the late December hunt and they recommend extending the season an extra two weeks. This would give two weekends to hunt, since there would be a lot of them on the mountain. Another option is to hunt them from January 7-January 24. It would be hunter's choice and they would issue 30 permits for those.

Mr. Fenimore asked if there was a preference with the committee on how to eliminate the bison.

Mr. Shannon said they were in favor of moving them, because we already have 154 permits issued for this year and if we get close to 200 hunters on the mountain it will disrupt the bison and also concerns of hunter's success and low hunter satisfaction.

Mr. Fenimore said he would be inclined to move them also to establish the new herd.

Mr. Shannon said the committee strongly supports a study for sight ability. We are in the process of seeking funding for this and the committee is writing letters to Congressman Matheson, Senator Bennett and sportsmen's groups. It is an eclectic group that we are trying to seek money from. Utah State is heavily involved in trying to raise money.

Director Karpowitz said in legislative session one year ago, Senator Stole got us \$66,000 to do a sight ability study. Utah State is keeping that money, but determined that it would cost a lot more money. They are looking for other funding sources and it will cost \$500,000 to do it right.

Mr. Shannon said that GPS collars cost \$3500 each and when you are buying 60 of those, it goes very quickly.

### **Public Comment**

Steve Dalton, with the Bison Planning Committee met with the DWR and came up with some recommendations. They had consensus on these recommendations and he complimented the Board and Division in accomplishing it. The entire committee was adamant on getting the sight ability study in place. The 60 collars are mandatory. Once they get this going on the Henry's, they might look to put it into place on the Book Cliffs. He gave the Board a letter from Byron Bateman, that he had requested to be part of the minutes for this meeting. We are all in favor of the transplant, as opposed to hunting. The transplant has certain advantages for the bison herd and younger, smaller animals will be taken out of the herd, instead of the big bulls that would be taken in a hunt.

Mr. Hatch said the Division did a flight and they are 35 bison over objective. I assume that is anticipating what the harvest will be this fall on past history.

Mr. Shannon said yes, that was including 90% sight ability. We issued 151 permits and realized that is not going to get us to the population objective of 275.

Mr. Hatch asked what it cost to transplant the 31 bison last year.

Director Karpowitz said about \$1000 a head with direct capture cost and personnel time.

Mr. Albrecht asked if there is a way the Division could separate four or five bulls for auction to help raise the money.

Director Karpowitz said that is a possibility. We will go after every private source we can and hopefully get what we need.

### 17) Establish Total Conservation Permits for 2010-2012 (**Action**)

Alan Clark, Assistant Director presented this item. They are not recommending any changes to the rule. (See handout – Attachment #1) The Board will approve the allocation of permits at the December Wildlife Board meeting. They have met with the groups and how we are going to allocate them this year. They were all in agreement. One conservation group would have liked to see us amend the rule and go back to the old system, but if we amended the rule, we would not have any permits for this year. The way the Division comes up with the permits is outlined in rule. It is based on the number of listed permits that are in the drawing. We use that as the basis and there are percentages laid out. In summary, the detailed tables are in the back of the handout. During 2007-2009, 353 total permits and for 2010-2012, 342 total permits. The main reason is turkey permits go down because of the change made today. We handle turkey permits just like antlerless elk on a region wide basis. The maximum you could have is eight for any particular hunt area, for a species plus one statewide.

Mr. Perkins asked why we are adding 20 general season buck deer.

Mr. Clark said the groups requested them. In exchange they reduced the antlerless elk permits by 20 and added the general season buck deer.

Mr. Perkins asked if the rule ties us to limited entry.

Mr. Clark said no, we can add those under the rule.

Mr. Hatch said there has been a decrease in the total, but there has been a decrease in the less desirable permits and some pretty major increases in the more desirable permits.

Mr. Clark said the permit numbers are based just on formula. There cannot be more than eight per unit. On October 12, we will distribute permits at the Salt Lake Office and it takes two to three hours. The groups are much more cooperative at this point. He is asking the Board to approve the list of permits and the total number. Once this is in place, there will not be any changes for three years. The hunt expo permits do not come out of these. They will be presented at the next Board meeting.

Mr. Perkins asked if the general season buck deer permit, is it valid anywhere in the region.

Mr. Clark said it is the hunt area that is open to general season.

Mr. Hatch said we have eight units for elk, deer and antelope that we are giving the maximum number of permits.

Mr. Clark said that is true and to get the maximum number it has to have at least 160 tags going to the public, in order to trigger the 5%. Groups need to apply for permits by September 1<sup>st</sup> and all they do, as far as multi year groups go is they want to be in that process. The groups that are asking for single year permits have to identify which permits they want to get. We will determine that by September 10. If any of the Board members are interested in the draft for permits, they are welcome on October 12 at the Salt Lake office. It takes about 3½ hours to distribute the permits. This process has worked very well. The Division is asking the Board to approve the permits listed on the handout.

### **Public Comment**

Ryan Foutz, representing Utah FNAWS, said there are great benefits for wildlife that come through these permits. He has had the opportunity to talk to hunters that are not in the groups, but once they understand the benefits that come to all hunters through this program, they welcome these benefits. For example, there are now seven sheep permits available, thanks to this program. This program allows us to address issues and opportunities that they couldn't otherwise. They support the Division's recommendations.

Miles Moretti, CEO for Mule Deer Foundation, said there is some controversy in selling these permits, but when you explain to people where the money is going, they are much more supportive. We auction tags in 13 different states in the MDF and the other states



ask how our organizations are getting the amount of money they do for their conservation permits. I tell them it is because of the great habitat work and watershed program that is being done. A lot of the matched dollars that are coming come from the conservation groups and the conservation permit program. He supports the Division's recommendations.

Chairman Woodard read a written comment from Bill Christensen of RMEF that said they support the Division's recommendations.

The following motion was made Tom Hatch, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we support the conservation permits by species and permit numbers as presented by the Division.**

Chairman Woodard said this is an informational only item. We had a meeting with the Wildlife Section and the Director, telling them what we would like them to explore. They have delved into it a little more and come with this information today. We appreciate their efforts.

18) Other Business (**contingent**)  
Season options and lengths discussion

Anis Aoude presented this information and explained why a change might be proposed. The Wildlife Board asked the Division to come up with a viable option to try to reduce crowding and provide a variation of opportunities. There is a high demand for a limited number permits; especially elk permits nearest the rut. There are crowding concerns in some regions and the new legislative change allows us to be more flexible with our general season. Hopefully this option will minimize current overlap of general and limited entry seasons, i.e. general archery deer and limited entry elk.

Mr. Aoude then went through some of the major overall changes in this proposed hunt structure. The seasons will start on a calendar date instead of a set day of the week, i.e. archery season starts on August 21 every year unless that happens to be a Sunday. General deer and elk seasons will run concurrently and will be divided into early and late seasons. Most general season hunts will happen in the month of October.

He then went through general season deer and elk changes. There will be no change to the general archery deer and elk seasons and no change to the youth any weapon elk season. They look to combine general any weapon deer and elk seasons and split the combined general any weapon season into two distinct seasons (early and late October). They will combine the muzzleloader deer and elk general season and a second muzzleloader any bull season will be offered early to mid November. He then showed an October 2011 calendar that reflects the seasons with the combined deer and elk.

Mr. Fenimore asked about setting the dates to include two weekends.

Mr. Aoude said most people like to have a hunt start on the same calendar date, rather than a day of the week.

Mr. Fenimore said those are folks who like to hunt in the rut?

Mr. Aoude said even people who do not. Those who are trying to plan vacation well in advance like to know the season starts on the 21<sup>st</sup>. The reason we have it as nine days is on most years it will get two weekends. It will move. If they wanted to hunt two weekends, they would pick the late hunt.

Mr. Fenimore asked if they would buy two separate licenses.

Mr. Aoude said yes, so they could hunt deer early, elk late, opposite, or both together. It gives people a lot more choices for hunting.

Mr. Johnson asked when we combine the two hunts, how does that compare as far as hunter harvest. When they had two licenses did they harvest less animals.

Mr. Aoude said he does not think success rate changed very much. He will have to look it up. Satisfactory rates were high and they liked hunting them at the same time.

Mr. Perkins said we are talking bucks and bulls, but another option would be to put as many antlerless elk that you do not need for depredation in late December to January and put those permits in also. Now a hunter could potentially hold a deer, a buck and an antlerless elk tag. Hunter satisfaction in this case should go way up, even though the harvest rate might drop.

Chairman Woodard said a family can all put in, possibly draw and have multiple tags. Is law enforcement comfortable with this?

Mr. Aoude said he did run the initial version by them and did not get a lot of response. Some were concerned about party hunting. At some point the waterfowl opener might be the same time as the late hunt opener and there might not be enough law enforcement to cover both.

Director Karpowitz said the livestock community should like this. By combining deer and elk hunters at the same time, it reduces pressure. Archery and muzzleloader are going to like it. The overall pressure should stabilize for livestock operators and the hunters like it.

Mr. Albrecht asked about Dedicated Hunters.

Mr. Aoude said they can still hunt all seasons, because they will only harvest two deer out of three years anyway, whether they hunt every season or not. They could hunt early and late rifle.

Mr. Albrecht asked what the crowding would be.

Mr. Aoude said splitting the hunt in half should reduce the crowding.

He then went over the limited entry deer hunting changes. There is no change to the archery limited entry season. Any weapon limited entry deer will occur at the same time as the general season. Any weapon deer seasons would be (early or late October; not both, depending on where the unit is). Muzzleloader limited entry deer will occur at the same time as the general muzzleloader deer season. It will still look a lot like the general season.

The limited entry elk hunting changes would include limited entry archery with overlap slightly with general season archery. Limited entry muzzleloader season will start right after the archery season. Four days after the limited entry muzzleloader season starts, the limited entry rifle season will start and both will run concurrently into early October. Limited entry any weapon late will overlap the late muzzleloader any-bull general season (early November). Everybody gets to hunt in the rut. This is a way to allow everybody to do that.

Director Karpowitz said that is where there might be some complaints, because muzzleloader hunters are a little ahead of rifle hunters in the rut. It has the advantage of making the rifle hunt a little tougher, which would mean more opportunity.

Mr. Aoude said that was part of what Mr. Perkins and Mr. Woodard suggested that maybe we do not want the rifle right in the heart of the rut. We could not take them totally out of the rut, because a lot of people have been putting in for a long time.

Mr. Hatch wonders about the impacts of the limited entry rifle on the limited entry muzzleloader. They will be out there in the hills at least two days before the hunt.

Mr. Aoude said that on average hunters are hunting three days on the limited entry units. We have looked at many different ideas. There are many different things that we could do and none of this is set in stone.

There were no changes recommended to pronghorn seasons.

On the OIAL species changes moose season is the only OIAL species that we recommend changing. The new hunter orange law removes some of the restrictions that kept us from overlapping the moose season. Before we had a moose season that would start and then stop while we had the muzzleloader hunt, then start up again. Now the moose season will run from late September to mid October continuously.

Mr. Aoude said in summary this option will minimize the conflict of overlapping hunts. Although we propose some changes, we still maintain the traditional general deer and elk seasons, so those that are tied to them can hunt them during that time. All limited entry weapon types can hunt near the rut. It minimizes crowding by splitting the general seasons into two hunts. This is a good starting point for discussion, and one of many options. To come up with more than one option really muddies the water. There are so many variations on the scheme.

Director Karpowitz said we have messed around with seasons for a long time and this is the most creative thing he has ever seen. Getting the law changed was a real key to it. He sees a lot of positives that can come from this. The negative would be that it is change from the well established tradition and it might really bother some people. If we take the time to present it to the various groups and RACs, he thinks people will really like it. It addresses a variety of issues across the board. Our guys who have worked on this really need to be complimented. It is an exciting new approach.

Chairman Woodard said he thinks it looks really good also.

Mr. Johnson said he thinks it is ready to be put out to the sportsmen's groups and the public. Let them consider it. They need to know that this is not the finished deal. The more involved they are, they more accepting they are of new ideas.

Mr. Aoude said he threw it out to the archers and they really liked it. They did not really mind the overlapping time. He said they could put it out there online and look for feedback.

Mr. Perkins said we need a few more slides that list benefits now and potential benefits. He said he has already run this by eight guys. At first they tense up, but when you finish talking about some of the potential benefits they want to hear more.

### **Elk Committee**

Chairman Woodard said the Wildlife Board representative for the Elk Committee is Jake Albrecht and the alternate is Del Brady. Mr. Niemeyer and I talked about this and these are our recommendations.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Ernie Perkins and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we appoint Jake Albrecht to be the Board's representative on the Elk Committee and Del Brady as the alternate.**

The meeting was then adjourned.