

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

May 6, 2010, 9:00 A.M., Dept. of Natural Resources
Boardroom, Salt Lake City, Utah

AGENDA

Thursday, May 6, 2010

1. Approval of Agenda **ACTION**
 - Rick Woodard, Chairman
2. Approval of Minutes **ACTION**
 - Rick Woodard, Chairman
3. Old Business/Action Log **CONTINGENT**
 - Ernie Perkins, Vice-Chair
 - Release of Captured Snakes
 - Krissy Wilson, Sensitive Species Coordinator
4. DWR Update **INFORMATION**
 - Jim Karpowitz, DWR Director
5. Antlerless Addendum, Rule and Permit Recommendations for 2010 **ACTION**
 - Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator
6. Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2010 **ACTION**
 - Boyde Blackwell, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Program Manager
7. Emigration Canyon Boundary Proposal **ACTION**
 - John Fairchild, Central Region Supervisor
8. Variance Request - Mr. Claude Hamilton **ACTION**
 - Judi Tutorow, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator
9. Other Business **CONTINGENT**
 - Rick Woodard, Chairman
 - Proposed change to September RAC agenda topics
 - Proposed change to November RAC meeting dates
 - Proposed change to January Board meeting date

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act - Persons needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) for this meeting, should contact Staci Coons at 801-538-4718, giving her at least five working days notice.

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING
Summary of Motions
May 6, 2010, DNR Boardroom
Salt Lake City, Utah

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

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda as amended.

2) Approval of Minutes and Action Log Items (Action)

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Del Brady and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the March 31, 2010 Wildlife Board meeting with noted corrections.

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the recommendations concerning the relocation of nuisance snakes as presented and remove this from the Action Log.

3) Antlerless Addendum, Rule and Permit Recommendations for 2010 (Action)

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's permit recommendations on antlerless pronghorn and moose.

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

MOTION: I move that we review and consider a boundary change on the Boulder and Fish Lake Plateau units for antlerless elk

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

MOTION: I move that the season end date on the Boulder and Fish Lake Plateau units be moved to December 12, 2010.

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

MOTION: I move that we increase the Southwest Desert Unit by 25 antlerless elk permits.

The following motion was made by Del Brady, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Northeastern RAC recommendations on Diamond Mountain with 125 permits on each of the two early seasons, and 50 permits on the late season.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the antlerless elk recommendations as presented by the Division.

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

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to review the Paunsaugunt deer unit plan in early 2011 following state code.

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

MOTION: I move that we reduce the permit numbers on the Mt. Carmel Unit to 25 and the Buckskin Unit to 50

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

MOTION: I move that the boundary description on the Monroe Unit remain unchanged.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Del Brady and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the balance of the antlerless addendum and rule as presented by the Division.

4) Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2010 (Action)

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

MOTION: I move that we delete the two-doe permits on the CWMUs in the Northern Region, Unit 6.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Del Brady and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we change the Alton CWMU two-doe permits from 37 to 25.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Del Brady and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the balance of the antlerless CWMU permit recommendations as presented by the Division.

5) Emigration Canyon Boundary Proposal (Action)

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

MOTION: I move that we support the Division's recommendation on the Emigration Canyon Boundary proposal.

6) Variance Request (Action)

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

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request of Claude Hamilton to extend his Henry Mountain's cow bison permit into the 2010 season.

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING

May 6, 2010, DNR Boardroom
Salt Lake City, Utah

Board Members Present

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

RAC Chairs Present

Steve Flinders – Southern
Terry Sanslow – Southeastern
Brad Slater – Northern
John Fairchild – Central
Bob Christensen – Northeastern

Public Present

Joan Gallegos
Wade Heaton
Ken Clegg
Daniel Richins
Calvin Haskell

Division of Wildlife Resources

Staci Coons
Judi Tutorow
LuAnn Petrovich
Charlie Greenwood
Anis Aoude
Boyde Blackwell
Mark Hadley
Cindee Jensen
Alan Clark
Bill Bates
Scott White
Craig Clyde
Rick Larsen
Marty Bushman
Ron Hodson
Kevin Bunnell

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

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

Mr. Perkins asked that the Southern RAC recommendation on the Paunsaugunt deer herd objective be added to the action log and cover that under “old business/action log.”

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda as amended.

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

On p. 17, 1st paragraph, change Mr. to Ms. P. 20, 7th paragraph, change to “86% of the land owned.” P. 24, 3rd paragraph add “in 2012” to the last sentence. On the same page,

add “it could move up” after “no.” On the same page, 7th paragraph change “structure” to “unit by unit” and add “May” before “2011.”

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Del Brady and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the March 31, 2010 Wildlife Board meeting with noted corrections.

3) Old Business/Action Log (**Contingent**) Mr. Perkins said the “Release of Captured Snakes” needs to be addressed and he turned the time over to Ms. Wilson.

Krissy Wilson, Sensitive Species Coordinator presented information on “Release of Captured Snakes.” She said this is in response to a variance that came before the Board two years ago, regarding a nuisance COR and Reptile Rescue had asked for permission to be able to move rattlesnakes as part of this COR. The Board granted that variance and at that time directed the Division to come up with how far these snakes should be moved.

We gathered information on what other states do in these circumstances. They reviewed the literature and came up with this recommendation. (See Attachment #1a) The peer review literature is cited at the bottom of the recommendation. There have been many studies done in short and long distance translocation of rattlesnakes and what the results were. She went on to discuss these findings. The recommendation is to translocate nuisance snakes less than one kilometer to suitable habitat and mark the rattles with spray paint (different color each year) to identify the snake that has been translocated. If snake returns and causes additional conflict, it would be humanely euthanized following DWR Wildlife Euthanasia Policy.

Ms. Wilson went on to say the Division will begin a program to educate the public. The “Living with Venomous Reptiles” handout (See Attachment #1b) is part of this effort. Snakes are most likely seen in the spring and fall. In the spring they are breeding and congregating which makes them more vulnerable. In the fall snakes are moving from their foraging areas back to their winter hibernacula. Generally, the rest of the year there is very little detection by the public.

Mr. Fenimore asked about the 125-acre home range, is that within the 1093 yards?

Ms. Wilson said not necessarily. If you take the point of where you encounter that snake and do not take it more than a kilometer, it gives the snake the ability to circle until it finds the trail back within its home range.

Director Karpowitz asked if this will be a stipulation to the CORs of the individuals who move snakes.

Ms. Wilson said we only have one individual with a COR. Critter Control applied, but did not apply for this as part of their COR. If they move forward and want it, they would

have the same criteria. I would also like this same criteria applicable to our conservation officers, to give them guidance on how to move snakes.

Director Karpowitz asked if this stipulation to a COR is required to be approved by the Board.

Mr. Bushman said yes.

Mr. Perkins said the Division could bring back a rule change at some point through the RAC/Board system.

Mr. Bushman said we can add this to a COR or internal policy with the vote of the Board for Reptile Rescue. If they have problems with it, they could appeal it.

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the recommendations concerning the relocation of nuisance snakes as presented and remove this from the Action Log.

Mr. Perkins said we will now talk about the Southern RAC recommendation which was that the Wildlife Board put the Paunsaugunt deer population objective from 5,200 back to 6,500 on the Board's action log for 2011. He referred to state code relative to how a plan is developed and by whom. All shall manage to the plan after it is approved by the Wildlife Board. The one specific required in state code for a management plan is that it have herd objective. It also talks about how a plan gets revised. He then called on Mr. Flinders for the RAC's intent.

Mr. Hatch read from an email from Sam Carpenter to support the Southern RAC motion. "This motion was to have the population objective on the Paunsaugunt reinstated back to 6,500 by 2011 before the 2010 classification. This was to be put on the action item log for the Wildlife Board to address at the upcoming antlerless meeting agenda. First the BLM and DWR have made over 5,000 acres improvements on the Paunsaugunt from 2005 to 2008, Alton Bull Hog Project (900 acres), Millcreek project (900 acres), Buckskin Burn area (750 acres) etc. There were more than 2,000 acres to be completed in 2009 in addition to this. In speaking to Alan Bate of the Grand Staircase Escalante Monument Range Specialist, he states that they have no cuts in AUMs and that he feels the range meets standards and the cliff rose is very strong, and they are supporting two huge projects this coming year, 130,000 acre upper Kanab Creek project to start this summer, but it is still in the final stages of public comment and acceptance. There is also a 2,000 acre Coyote Kimball Valley project that was scheduled for 2009 and may be complete by now. There are three 125,000 gallon water catchments that are scheduled to be completed by October this year. We struggled and had to resort to emergency water hauling last year, due to the dry late summer and early fall precipitation patterns. This improvement will be in place and in service by 2011. Winter migration, is and has been

the opinion, of the Friends of the Paunsaugunt and many others that the unit is in acceptable condition for the 6,500 population objective, even with the DWR estimates that have been as high as 6,500 in 2006 and 6,600 in 2007, we have seen no die off to support the need to continue with the 5,200 population objective. It is felt that the Paunsaugunt Unit is in better shape now than it has been in decades. This is intended to be informational only and clarify any questions you may have in advance of the meeting.”

Mr. Hatch said this gave us some background as to why they would like to push the numbers back up.

Mr. Flinders said that covers it. The only other point to consider is the additional information on range trend from the Division. They were in the region last year and some things may have changed since then.

Director Karpowitz said another piece of information is the letter the Board received last year from the BLM refuting some of the remarks made by Alan Bate last year. There seems to be a difference of opinion within BLM on range trend.

Mr. Hatch asked if that is from within the Grand Staircase.

Teresa Bonzo, Wildlife Manager Southern region said the letter from last year from Cameron McQuiby, Grand Staircase biologist said as far as the BLM's side, they are in the final stages of this major EA and it plans for 51,000 acres to be treated over the next ten years. Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance has that one held up. These projects that Sam has identified are smaller acreage projects that were done in the last several years. With this year's precipitation, we are going to see a lot of response from grasses and forbs, but we have to have the browse component for winter range. Projects for winter range can take five years on the short end to establish browse. Gary Bezzant, Habitat Restoration Specialist, emailed Ms. Bonzo last night and said he would estimate 10-15 years until the browse is of real value. This EA that is coming up will help raise the carrying capacity for the deer herd, but we are coming out of the drought years and the last two trends studies, 2003 and 2008, are down. Only one site showed the DCI scores in the good category and the others are poor to fair or less. We need to be careful, because drought will lower the carrying capacity and if you have sustained use by deer at or above carrying capacity, you are going to have some negative impact on the range. We are on the right track and will get to the point to raise objective soon, but they would not go to 6,500 as of yet.

Mr. Hatch said he read that statement for informational purposes for the Board. It was not that he was advocating that position.

Chairman Woodard said as he read this information in the minutes, he called Ms. Bonzo and she said the committee will be formed.

Ms. Bonzo said at the start of 2011 they will form the unit wide deer committees and start looking at any changes that need to be made.

Chairman Woodard suggested putting this issue on the action log to form the committee, but not set any numbers. The area committee should meet first, then have it come back through the RACs and to the Board.

The following motion was made by Rick Woodard and died for lack of a second.

MOTION: I move that we form the Paunsaugunt Mule Deer Committee, take it back through the RACs, then to the Board early 2011.

Director Karpowitz asked when the plan is scheduled for review.

Ms. Bonzo said they are going to start the unit wide plans in 2011. It usually takes several months of meetings. We will see what we can get done for the main meeting in 2011.

Mr. Aoude said population objectives should not be set by committee, but by biologists and the science. We usually do not put committees together to determine population objectives, because the committees represent a wide variety of interests and some of them might not be the deer population itself. We have the data to tell us what populations should be and he would hate to set the example of putting a deer committee together to try to hash out this issue.

Director Karpowitz said when we change any population objective, we have to go through a process which is spelled out in state code. Certain agencies/groups must be considered and they are spelled out in state code. It involves landowners, public land agencies, the Division and some others. They have to be consulted in that process.

Mr. Aoude said the committee in place for this unit is heavily weighted towards private landownership. They have a different take on things, than what might be best for the deer herd.

Mr. Perkins said the problem with this is the use of the word committee verses the wording in state code.

Mr. Aoude said the plans are up for revision in 2011.

Director Karpowitz said what it says in code is, "in preparing the plans, the Division shall confer with federal and state land managers, private landowners, sportsmen and ranchers. There is no mention of a committee in code.

Mr. Albrecht said we could just wait for the revision in 2011.

The following motion was made by Rick Woodard, and seconded by Jake Albrecht.

MOTION: Concerning the Southern RAC's request on the Paunsaugunt, get the committee together, as outlined in state code, take their recommendation through RAC process and to the Board.

Wade Heaton said he is here representing Friends of the Paunsaugunt. First, this objective has historically always been 6,500. During the drought years of 2001-2003, it was lowered as a temporary objective. It is listed as a double objective and was always the intent to raise it when things got better. We would like to be represented at the table when this committee comes around. The herd is very healthy and the majority of the range is very healthy. We can support 6,500 deer without any negative side effects. If it takes a year and half to get there, that's where we'd like to go.

Mr. Johnson asked if he knows how many deer were on that range during the late 60's and early 70's. Back then the deer hunt was a major event with the schools letting out, hunters everywhere and huge camps everywhere. At that time we were giving three-buck tags and there were lots of deer, probably too many. The number of deer on the Paunsaugunt at that time needs to be part of this issue. The habitat has changed since then, but this needs to be considered.

Mr. Heaton said there were a lot of deer in the 60's and there was a big decline in the 70's. The unit was closed to all hunting in 1980 and it was opened limited entry in 1985.

Mr. Johnson said on Deer Flat in San Juan County, in the 60's, miners counted 3,000 deer and now the count is 60. A few years back in Northern, we were not reaching objective, so we took the easy way and lowered the objective. Habitat has changed dramatically.

Mr. Bushman said this issue was not on today's agenda to be voted on. At his advice, this item will be discussed with agenda item six as an action log item.

Chairman Woodard withdrew his amended motion.

3) DWR Update (**Information**)

Jim Karpowitz, DWR Director presented this information. Last night was our annual awards banquet where we recognize the outstanding employees in the Division and several of our partners that have helped us be successful in the last year.

With Law Enforcement, in the media in the last few weeks, there were some high profile arrests, the biggest of which was the deer poaching case in Central region that involved five individuals taking upwards of ninety deer in the last few years. That was a case that our folks worked on very hard and it is a credit to our law enforcement people. It also points out the scale of the problem in some areas of the state and the opportunity that sportsmen are missing out on because of illegal activity.

Relative to funding on habitat projects, it is still down for work this year for a variety of reasons. We will have projects this year that will not get funded. With budget cuts and less revenue, we cannot do them all. On the Condor Project we are going to have real difficulty implementing it, the price tag is close to one million dollars over the next five years. Without partners stepping up to help, we will have to scale back or table it for a while.

On a more positive note, turkey season is in full swing and we are hearing great success stories. Our early season seemed very early in the snow and our over the counter season is going now. Spring fishing is going well this year. Lake Powell is the best it has ever been and there will be great fishing opportunities around the state this year. We hope people will take the opportunity to get out and enjoy the season.

Mr. Fenimore said on the projects that might not be done this year. Have the conservation organizations turned in all their money?

Director Karpowitz said yes. This is the first year we have not been able to fund everything we wanted. We will be able to fund the highest priority regional projects, but we certainly need more money in that fund.

Mr. Perkins asked if there is any chance to get any State ESMF money to do the condor project?

Director Karpowitz said they got about \$20,000, but they need partners to step up and help with this, since the price tag on it is over \$175,000 for the first year and about one million over five.

Mr. Perkins asked if Utah condors are 10-J, experimental, non-essential? If there was anything significant, could it be a base for a change in that?

Director Karpowitz said yes they are 10-J and he doubts it could be changed without a significant process. He does not anticipate this happening. This concluded the update.

4) Antlerless Addendum, Rule and Permit Recommendations for 2010 (**Action**)

Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator presented this agenda item. These recommendations are based on objectives that are in our unit and statewide management plans. As we get into more precipitation, our deer populations are going to start to recover and we will have to start harvesting antlerless deer, probably in the next five to ten years if conditions continue. Doe hunting has never been a popular thing and is something we have to do to make sure deer are not overusing their ranges.

Mr. Aoude then presented trend graphs and information on antlerless recommendations. (See Powerpoint Presentation) Fawn production trends 1998-2009, deer statewide population trends and antlerless permits were shown on a graph. Most antlerless permits deal with depredation and nuisance issues. The RACs do have some motions that are

contrary to the Division's recommendations and Mr. Aoude urged the Board to ask the regional managers for more information on those. This presentation is statewide and does not deal with unit by unit.

He then went on to elk showing graphs on elk population trends and antlerless permits. Overall elk populations are doing well and we are able to maintain most populations through antlerless harvest. For some reason elk antlerless harvest seems to be less controversial than deer. There are three units where our objective is zero elk, Henry Mountains, North San Rafael and a new, San Juan any bull unit (east of US-191) We will continue to offer antlerless elk control permits to hunters who have any antlered or OIAL big game permits. Additional elk recommendations were covered.

Doe pronghorn permits and moose permits graphs were shown and they are recommending fewer permits because we are getting toward objective on both. This concluded the presentation.

RAC Recommendations

Southern – Mr. Flinders said they had a number of motions and amended motions. There are two motions that reflect changes to the Division recommendations, one for deer to reduce Mt. Carmel numbers to 25 and Paunsaugunt Buckskin numbers to 50 (See Southern RAC motions). The other is a change for elk regarding the Southwest Desert, raise permits to 175 from 150.

Southeastern – Mr. Sanslow said they had some discussion, no public comment or questions and voted unanimously to accept the Division's recommendations.

Central – Mr. Fairchild said there was concern regarding the hunting of antlerless elk in an area where the primary problem was to address nuisance situation, rather than population on the West Manti. The motion was to not add the rifle option to take those cows on the Manti. The remainder of the Division's recommendation passed 8 to 3.

Northeastern – Mr. Christensen said there was some discussion on habitat conditions and the antlerless deer permit numbers. Mainly it was focused on the population numbers on Anthro and Diamond Mountain. MOTION: To go with the Division's recommendation with two exceptions, Diamond Mountain, take 50 permits off the late hunt and put 25 permits on each of early hunts and on the Anthro, cut the antlerless elk permits by half from 500 to 250. This passed 3 to 2 with one abstention, and the abstention was that the motion did not go far enough and he wanted more permits cut across the board. On the Anthro, the reason for the motion is there is some disagreement on what the population actually is and whether the cow elk permits would be hitting the herd too hard. They had a lot of discussion on this. On Diamond Mountain, the landowners in late hunt have experienced some damage to their property with a lot of public hunters.

Northern – Mr. Slater said discussion was primarily on the deer population in Northern region. There was one public comment via email that said the public had not been

involved in these recommendations. He had some misconceptions about the process and we let him know on the process. We encouraged him to become involved earlier on with some of the concerns that he had. They voted to accept the Division's recommendations unanimously.

Public Comment

Wade Heaton explained about Friends of the Paunsaugunt. This group was started eight years ago to make some changes and promote quality and health of the herd on the unit. They have been involved ever since and have a good relationship with the Division. They have a great biologist there and spend a lot of time with him in meetings doing classifications and such. They are a diverse group and forming the Friends of the Paunsaugunt was done to help bring them together. Relative to the comment that the private landowners might not have the deer herds best interest in mind. He disagrees and their group does have the deer herds best interest in mind. He was here asking for reductions in permits for trophy animals six months ago and they do want the best for the herd and the habitat. He already discussed their goal towards changing the objective and because of that they are against any antlerless hunts until they reach objective at 6,500. They met with the biologist and came to a compromise on some numbers on antlerless that they can live with. There are some issues there and they do kill a few does on the Alton summer range. There is a hunt on the winter range also, the Buckskin with the 50 permits. There are some depredation issues in Mt Carmel in some agricultural fields, with 25 permits recommended there. Friends of the Paunsaugunt are supporting the Southern RAC on permit recommendations.

Board Discussion

Mr. Fenimore asked if when making recommendations for antlerless, is highway mortality included?

Mr. Aoude said yes, all mortality is considered.

Mr. Perkins asked if we are having problems with disease in moose.

Mr. Aoude said they are investigating some issues that might be going on with moose and he cannot say yes or no at this point. The issues are west wide, not just in Utah, one is a parasite and one is perhaps a deficiency of minerals. They just started doing some testing and have found *Elaeophora* which is a parasite in almost all they have tested so far. They want to do multiple years to make sure. That tends to affect the older animals more than younger. He hates to say there is disease when they are so early in the investigation, but there does seem to be some indication of it.

Mr. Perkins asked about the revised Division proposal on the antlerless hunts on the unit on the Manti.

Mr. Aoude said they were not going to change the recommendation, but were going to change the boundary on that hunt, so those who had an early permit could still hunt antlerless during the general season and not have different units excluded. We would deal with it with the boundary change instead of excluding units from the hunt. They do have a new boundary description for that and it stops at the Forest Service line, which means all the private land below is all that is included in the new description.

Mr. Perkins asked if that change will address everything.

Mr. Aoude said it should, because the elk are not usually down below the Forest Service line before the time we want to harvest them.

Mr. Perkins said over the past year or so, the Board has indicated interest in making a maximum number of antlerless permits available for use during all general season hunts and the Division's recommendation is that those permits only are valid for those who are also holding a buck or bull permit. What about promoting family hunting opportunity? This recommendation only goes part way toward that.

Mr. Aoude said it would cause crowding if we open it up to everyone, with almost 10,000 antlerless permits on top of almost 13,000 spike permits and so on. What our recommendation does is allow for people to go out and harvest antlerless, without increasing number of hunters on the mountain. The reason we do not want more hunts during the general season is the success rate is a lot lower on antlerless animals and it does not help us target where those populations winter. This will help us do both. If they are not successful during the general season, they still hold that permit and can hunt them on the winter range, where we were targeting them.

Mr. Hatch said from the discussion at the Southern RAC and the difference in the permits on the Mt. Carmel area, there have been depredation complaints there. Is that the primary reason for the recommended permits?

Ms. Bonzo said for the Mt. Carmel hunt, it is three fold. We have landowner complaints and deer are coming down from both sides, The Zion Unit during the fall and moving through on the Paunsaugunt. The population on both units for deer is over objective and it is a good place to centralize some harvest. Although, a few of the landowners are members of the landowner association, we do continue to get hunts. They brought up, during the RAC meeting, that sometimes the deer are not there during August and September; still they come in the fall.

Mr. Hatch said most of the deer they are complaining about are the Paunsaugunt deer that are there in the summer, yet we are proposing to hunt them in late fall, and those deer that we are going to be killing are the east Zion deer that migrate into that area later in the fall.

Ms. Bonzo said during the RAC meeting, it got blown out of proportion that this hunt was due to specific landowners. This is not the case and we do not want the blame to go onto those landowners. They are on rocky ground with the landowner's association as it

is because they would like more harvest. We do issue a few antlerless permits to the landowner's association itself to use as they see fit.

Mr. Hatch asked if they allow public access onto those lands.

Ms. Bonzo said they have to allow public access for a certain number of permits that they receive. There are some habitat concerns in that area and we are over objective on both the Zion and the Paunsaugunt, so that is a good area to focus some harvest.

Mr. Perkins asked Northeast region to respond about the Diamond and Anthro units. The RAC recommendations on Diamond were based on poaching, vandalism, there not being any late elk on the mountain and an implication that sportsmen are responsible for the vandalism. On the Anthro, we have a huge excess of elk relative to objective, why cut permits?

Mr. Greenwood said starting with Diamond Mountain which is combined with the Vernal sub-unit and we are still above objective. We have recommended the same basic hunts that we have the past few years. The claim that there are no elk on top of Diamond Mountain after November 15 is not accurate based on our counts. Our surveys occur late January, early February and we do find elk there. Concerning the vandalism by sportsmen to cabins, there are other people there that could be causing that.

Mr. Christopherson said they had an extra law enforcement effort up there. They had a few cabins broken into up there, but not necessarily sportsmen. Part of the late hunt was done to coordinate hunting with surrounding units. We responded to a request a few years ago from the Three Corners landowners where we are over objective. We have to coordinate that with Colorado and Wyoming to get to those cow elk. This ties into that and we are concerned if we do not have a late season hunt, the same time as the hunts in the surrounding areas, we will not be effective in addressing the problem.

Mr. Brady asked if it changes taking some of the permits off the late hunt and splitting them earlier.

Mr. Christopherson said it may, and will 50 hunters be enough to keep those animals spread out? Possibly, this was a compromise. We are trying to address the Three Corners problem at the same time and we do not want those animals to move off of Blue Mountain or Three Corners or wherever onto the Diamond. Is 50 hunters enough, he can't answer that. They recommended 100 and they reduced it to 50. It may work.

Mr. Fenimore asked about poaching and the Anthro unit.

Mr. Christopherson said the Anthro is not a poaching issue. We get complaints every year on quality of the hunt each year. It is not as good as it used to be. There is a lot going on there. We are way over objective on our winter counts. Sportsmen's representative are being pressured to make some changes because of the complaints of reduced quality. There have been a lot of changes with the tribal management and habitat

alterations due to oil and gas exploration. He did intend to meet with sportsmen to explain some of this, but because of the complaints they want to reduce antlerless tags. That is kind of a disconnect, but they are trying to respond to their constituents. We are way over objective. There are ideas out there that the population count in the winter is an over estimate, but that is how we determine our biology. It would be nice to know and we have talked to them about possibly helping to fund some radio collars.

Mr. Christopherson said we do not see the poaching problem on Diamond Mountain. The more eyes you have on the mountain, the less problem you have. We are not seeing this problem. There have been two fences cut and two cabins were broken into, but this happened a few years ago. It is not fair to put this on the sportsmen.

Mr. Albrecht asked if they might address the species separately to simplify the discussion.

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's permit recommendations on antlerless pronghorn and moose.

Chairman Woodard then summarized the RAC recommendations on elk.

Mr. Albrecht said at the Southern RAC there was a man there with some AUMs on the Southwest Desert and he had some concerns. Mr. Albrecht has some concerns on the boundary description. He asked if we could connect to internet in this room. He was hoping we could pull up the Division's actual boundary maps. He went on to describe the Boulder Unit with 450 cow permits and on the Fish Lake Unit there are 3 hunts in late November, early December. Hwy 24 that goes from Richfield to Loa, at approximately Koosharem Reservoir, there is a turn off that goes to Koosharem and that is the north boundary of the Boulder Unit. The old boundary used to be five miles south of Hwy 24 on the Parker Mountain, which is completely without cover, so when they cross Hwy 24, they are no longer Fish Lake elk and that is naturally where they winter. That is fine if the Boulder hunters take those elk, but this does not help the 450 tags we have on the Boulder, which is more down towards Antimony and the Boulder Units. He is okay with the Fish Lake tags if we can put it on the action log to put the boundary back to where it was. The safety issues on Hwy 24 also support doing this. Somebody is going to get killed there one of these days, whether in a car wreck or getting shot.

The other part is the Boulder Unit with 28 days hunting. Is there a way for it to close the same day as the Fish Lake on December 12? How far out do you go on the aerial counts?

Ms. Bonzo said she does not see a problem with that end date. They count the Monroe and entire Plateau at the same time. We are over objective on both units. On the boundary, it used to go down to Dry Wash, south of Hwy 24, so we have a Fish Lake hunt with part of the Boulder and running these two hunts concurrently is the best way.

We are over objective on both units and it really was an administrative nightmare to sign along Dry Wash. This is hard for Law Enforcement, because it is not a major highway. We have tried to get more of our boundaries along major highways.

Mr. Albrecht said he understands this, but if you have 400 elk on the Boulder, the people who draw those tags are not going to go to the Boulder to hunt, they are going to go 50 yards off Hwy 24 and shoot those elk coming across.

Ms. Bonzo said they would like to keep it the same, because otherwise you will have the Fish Lake hunters just go right of Hwy 24. We will still be killing elk on both units and we are over objective on both units.

Mr. Albrecht said if we do not extend the boundary south, hunters are not going to drive over to the Boulder to hunt.

Mr. Hatch said what is happening, according to the people in Wayne and Garfield Counties, is we give permits for Fish Lake and Boulder antlerless. The guys that have tags for the Boulder are driving up Hwy 24 and shoot the Fish Lake elk from the road. This way we are not killing the Boulder cows.

Mr. Perkins asked Mr. Albrecht if his motion would be to review and consider this boundary change.

Mr. Albrecht said yes.

Mr. Perkins said he would be willing to support this and there are better forums than this meeting to do that.

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

MOTION: I move that we review and consider a boundary change on the Boulder and Fish Lake Plateau for antlerless elk.

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

MOTION: I move that the season end date on the Boulder and Fish Lake Plateau Units be December 12.

Mr. Brady said there was a reason for choosing the end dates. What were they?

Ms. Bonzo said they wanted to give more opportunity. They made it a little shorter on the Fish Lake because on December 13, we have our third hunt starting because of more tags there. On the Boulder we were giving hunters an additional week.

Mr. Albrecht said the Boulder has 28 hunting days on it. They can get the opportunity in 21 days.

Chairman Woodard said they will now consider the increase on the Southwest Desert.

Mr. Hatch said there were only two public at the RAC meeting and they were concerned about the competition with elk and livestock. They would have liked a bigger increase. There was also another issue in that the Paunsaugunt requested some antlerless cow permits for the CWMU.

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

MOTION: I move that we increase the Southwest Desert by 25 antlerless elk permits.

Ms. Bonzo said they increased trophy bull tags on that unit also this year in addition to the harvest that will occur during the spike hunt, but only 25 tags should not affect it too much.

Chairman Woodard said they would now consider the Northeast recommendation.

Mr. Christensen said on the Anthro, it has been a controversial unit with concern from sportsmen on quality and quantity. On the other side of the issue, counts are way over objective. The Forest Service has some concerns with the aspen stands. The Elk Committee talked about raising the elk population objective and was unable to come to a consensus. It has been recommended to have the elk committee get back together to talk about some of those issues. There are lots of things going on out there with oil and gas. Some of the elk have moved. Also, adjacent units are over objective and they are trying to target animals that are showing up on winter counts. On the other side of the issue is the public perception with frustration of not being able to find bulls. That perception is real and hunters are complaining, but the data seems to suggest otherwise.

Chairman Woodard said those units are border units and aren't they the Diamond Mountain?

Mr. Christensen said they are more the Avinaquin and Strawberry units. There has been some east to west movement observed during the winter. How much of that is taking place is relatively unknown as of yet.

Mr. Brady said the land managers feel there is too much pressure on the aspen. Is it taking place during the green season, and not later? Has there been talk about increasing that population?

Mr. Christensen said the use is occurring during the spring and winter. The aspen stands are struggling between drought and disease, plus the elk browsing has been inhibiting the

regeneration of those aspen stands and we are losing some of them up on Anthro. In the committee, it was suggested to raise the population objective from 700 to 1,000. The current population count is 1,450. From the Forest Service side, they are on board as long as aspen stands are protected. As the proposal went forward, the landowners around there were opposed, so consensus was not reached.

Mr. Christopherson said often what we hear when over objective, is show us you can get to objective.

Mr. Brady said the bottom line is, the unit is over objective. Some of the hunters that have complained, might be a hunter's choice complaint in that "I didn't see what I wanted to see." On the Diamond Mountain, if they are up there, we need to address it. He would still like to take some of the pressure off and would go with the RAC's recommendation.

The following motion was made by Del Brady, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Northeastern RAC recommendations on Diamond Mountain with 125 permits on each of the two early seasons, and 50 permits on the late season.

Chairman Woodard said they would discuss the Manti Unit.

Craig Clyde, Central Region Supervisor, said they wanted to be sensitive to the Board's recommendation of making the guidebook simple. They wanted to try to keep from pulling out separate little hunts and not have it just statewide. It would be a minimal amount of elk taken during that hunt where it would not affect us, and we could deal with the depredation problems with the later hunts. The RAC wanted to go the other direction and pull that hunt out separately, complicating the proclamation. So, what we decided to do is change the boundary of the hunt on the Manti, following the Forest Service line, therefore the animals would not be taken up on the mountain, because they would not even be there. They would come off the mountain onto the winter range to where the late hunters could take them at that time. We see this as a win/win situation, being sensitive to the RACs vote as well as the Board's direction. We stick with the recommendation that antlerless animals can be taken during the rifle hunt statewide.

Mr. Albrecht asked for further clarification.

Mr. Aoude said the Manti hunt was designed to take elk that are crossing the road a lot and we want to target them during the winter months. We also included a recommendation that hunters can take their antlerless elk during the general season. So the Central region wanted to make that exclusion, but the way we dealt with it was to modify the boundary, so those elk could only be harvested during the late season, because it is the only time they are there. They did not want to be excluding units in the future. It

does complicate things when just one unit is changed when there is another rule in place statewide.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the antlerless elk recommendations as presented by the Division.

Chairman Woodard said they will now talk about antlerless deer recommendations on Mt. Carmel.

Ms. Bonzo said our recommendation was 75 for Buckskin and 50 for Mt. Carmel.

Mr. Hatch said it was indicated that the biologist met with the Friends of the Paunsaugunt and they agreed on a number, then somewhere along the way the number changed.

Ms. Bonzo said she meets with all the biologists and they go over all the recommendations. At that point they give her their numbers for the deer hunt. Within about a ten-day period, some of them revise them and send them in on another form, usually a boundary change, or a new hunt. Those new numbers did not get into the RAC packet that was sent out. Dustin Schaible said he was fine with the original recommendations at 75 and 50. He sent out an email to the group of what went on with this recommendation.

Mr. Hatch said so he did not really agree on those numbers.

Ms. Bonzo said he might have forgotten the numbers he had given her originally, then went and had those discussions with the Friends of the Paunsaugunt. Somewhere along the way there were some gaps in the communication. He went back to them all and told them the numbers we are going with. It is a difference of 50 permits total from the Friends of the Paunsaugunt. We have also asked them to recognize that is not a harvest of 50 does, it is 50 permits.

Mr. Albrecht asked about Panguitch Lake / Panguitch Valley Unit. What is the boundary description on this?

Ms. Bonzo said along the eastern edge of the Panguitch Unit, up against the hills, surrounding the town of Panguitch. We do have a lot of deer coming in and causing depredation problems.

Mr. Hatch said the boundary goes from the BLM boundary to the Forest Service boundary.

Ms. Bonzo said it is a two-fold hunt that will help address some depredation issues in the area and the Panguitch Unit is over objective.

Mr. Albrecht asked about winter loss on the Panguitch Lake, as well as the Monroe.

Ms. Bonzo said they rode the east side of the Panguitch Unit and found quite a few deer in fences with a fair amount of winter loss. For the Southern region, it is heavier than normal winter loss. She would not go as far as to call it significant. We lose 25% of the fawns on a normal winter and this was a heavier loss. They have collar studies going on the Monroe and the Pine Valley. They did the range survey on the west side of the Panguitch Unit along the I-15 corridor and found similar results as the east side.

Mr. Albrecht asked about the spring rides in Southern region and are they open to those interested in going?

Ms. Bonzo said absolutely and she has asked the biologists to get some arranged. They lost their Fillmore biologist recently as he is going to work for the Forest Service. Vance Mumford and Jim Lamb have been asked to get some range rides going with the public invited. We will let you know for this year.

Mr. Albrecht asked about a boundary change that was recommended last year on the Sevier that included part of Glenwood, but it was never approved by the Board. Still the boundary change went into effect. Has that been taken care of?

Ms. Bonzo said Mr. Mumford has recommended the same change for this year.

Mr. Albrecht said the recommend is to go back to Saul's Meadow. He would like a description on that before the vote. The problem we have there is the same as the one on the Fish Lake.

Ms. Bonzo said the reason for that is we have some severe depredation problems in the Sevier Valley. On that unit last year we issued 120 mitigation tags. Instead of issuing all the tags to the private landowners, we can use the public to put some pressure onto some of the population coming down into the valley and living year round. The season dates on that is the month of September, in an effort to address the resident deer and not the Monroe Mountain deer, which should not be moving down yet. I will get the boundary for you.

Chairman Woodard asked if we could put this off on the boundary to "other business" and we will not vote on it until later. This is in an effort to keep the meeting going.

Mr. Fenimore asked if deer were found in agency fence or private fence? Are there any types of fencing that are more animal friendly?

Ms. Bonzo said they were mostly forest fences. There are some fences that are more animal friendly. Some of these fences were good, but with the high snows there were still some accidental mortalities.

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

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to review the Paunsaugunt deer unit plan in early 2011 following state code.

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

MOTION: I move that we reduce the permits on the Mt. Carmel Unit to 25 and Buckskin Unit numbers to 50.

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

MOTION: I move that the boundary description on the Monroe Unit remain unchanged.

Ms. Bonzo said it will make it easier for the Division and give the opportunity to the public to harvest some of those deer as we recommended, but otherwise we will just have to issue additional permits and try to address them through mitigation permits and vouchers.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Del Brady and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the balance of the Antlerless Addendum and Rule as presented by the Division.

5) Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2010 (**Action**)

Boyde Blackwell, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Program Manager presented this agenda item. (See Powerpoint Presentation) The antlerless permit allocation is determined by the allocation that they receive in the bucks/bulls process. There were 44 CWMUs that had the 90/10, therefore there are 44 CWMUs that have zero private permits and 100% of their permits will go to the public. We are in the second year of the three-year management plan where most permits were approved last year. Today he will recommend for permits that were not approved or not in the addendum for last year. As an overview, we have 129 two-doe permits, 1,041 for elk, 93 for pronghorn and seven moose for the public permits, which brings us to 1,270 permits for the public, 264 permits for the private CWMUs. He then went over some of the specific recommendations for the regions.

Mr. Hatch asked what the population objective is on the Paunsaugunt elk.

Ms. Bonzo said the objective is 200 and the population this year is estimated at 100. It is increasing, but we are still below objective. They are not recommending any public hunts.

Mr. Hatch said that objective is a winter count. The problem is we have migration from Dutton and Panguitch Lake and we have a summer population of at least 400 elk that migrate off. The problem is we are over objective during the summer and then under in the winter. Would you respond to the request of the Alton CWMU? They draw a lot of elk there because of their habitat work.

Ms. Bonzo said until there are enough elk to draw some public permits, we will stay consistent and not recommend any CWMU permits. We recognize that it is a variable unit. They do not like to winter there, but we do our counts in the winter. We have thought about all sorts of ways to do other counts and assess different populations. We are sensitive to habitat damage and when we are over objective, we want to have some antlerless removal.

Mr. Hatch said Alton CWMU did request six public and six private.

Ms. Bonzo said yes, for the CWMU, but until we go through the process and offer a proclamation hunt to the public that they can put in for the Paunsaugunt as a whole, the CWMUs follow the public hunt.

Mr. Albrecht asked if the Division has ever counted elk during the summer.

Ms. Bonzo said they do their classification and the biologist spends a lot of time doing this. We do have some classification to get calf production information. Still, all of our numbers are based off winter counts and we model those on the years we do not fly.

Mr. Albrecht asked, based on their models, are there a considerable amount of elk in there?

Ms. Bonzo said she does not have those classifications, but could look them up. We certainly have more than 100 that he classified, because he got into a couple of good pockets.

Mr. Albrecht asked if she would look that up.

Ms. Bonzo said yes.

Mr. Perkins asked if Mr. Blackwell would restate what he said on the two-doe permits up in Northern region.

Mr. Blackwell said they went to a three-year process and within that we have the number of permits that the CWMU should get annually. Last year they made a request not to receive two-year doe permits and they were granted that request. Therefore, as you move down the column, year-by-year, they have those two-doe permits on there and they were entered. There was a request, which has to be in writing and when Mr. Blackwell entered the information, he entered what was on their management plan. We made a request that there be some communication, there was a let down, and things were not discussed properly with the CWMUs. We do not have public antlerless doe hunts on those units and in staying with their management plan, we made that presentation. Because they are under objective, there are no public doe permits there, but we do realize we are going to start having some permits in there.

Mr. Perkins said if they had requested no doe permits this year, the Division would have agreed to it.

Mr. Blackwell said not knowing exactly what is happening out there, he would not want to answer that question. In discussion this morning with the regional wildlife manager and biologist, there are approximately 600 deer in those fields out there and we do have anywhere from \$10,000-\$20,000 in damage claims annually that do come in. There again, we are below objective and would have no concern at this point if we decided to go with a CWMU request.

RAC Recommendations

Northern – Mr. Slater said they accepted the Division's proposal as presented.

Northeastern – Mr. Christensen said there was some discussion about some individual CWMUs and the moose population, but they accepted the proposal unanimously.

Central – Mr. Fairchild said they accepted the proposal unanimously

Southeastern – Mr. Sanslow said they accepted the proposal unanimously

Southern – Mr. Flinders said they went with Alton's CWMU's request for 12 antlerless elk permits for the second year in a row. They also went with 37 two-doe permits to 25 two-doe permits for the Alton CWMU.

Public Comment

Ken Clegg, of the Chalk Creek Chapter Utah Foundation of Quality Resource Management, as their President and he is also the Executive Director of the CWMU Association. He thanked Mr. Blackwell for everything and they are very happy with the three-year plan. With the Chalk Creek Chapter, their support to the Division regarding antlerless harvest and transplanting elk, we have been working hard to make sure the antlerless recommendations and harvest on the Chalk Creek Unit are up to par. They support the mitigation for the removal nuisance deer and are supportive of the habitat and

all aspects of that. He has worked as a biologist on the private side for about 15 years. During the last three years, we have had one moderate winter, so if we go back to the 2007 numbers, it is apparent that they are down about 25% on the deer in that unit. Their experience has shown that in the past, on the 15-year data set, usually there is a blip after a bad winter and get some additional deer. It seems like that has slowed down and we have not had quite as much of a jump on the deer populations. As a result, we should be careful and reconsider the doe hunts and they propose that they do not have any this year.

He also apologized, as the President of the Chalk Creek Chapter Foundation; he should have held those public meetings so their members could have had opportunity to voice their concern about that. It did not happen and by the time he got the information that we would be asked to take does, it was too late. We did not communicate with the Division. We come with hat in hand and request that those doe hunts not happen this year. We have made lots of progress with landowner relations in the last 20 years relative to taking the harvest. Thank you to the Division.

Chairman Woodard had comment cards for Daniel Richins and Calvin Haskell, and they said Mr. Clegg spoke for them.

Wade Heaton of the Alton CWMU and Friends of the Paunsaugunt said he supports the requested increase for 12 antlerless elk permits. The Southern RAC has approved their request for these permits for the last two years. We are a premium deer unit and we want to have the ability to keep the elk herd in check. They want to meet with the elk committee this summer as the management plans are discussed and revise them and see if they can get some mechanisms in there to help us keep track of the elk herd. That is from the Friends of the Paunsaugunt side.

The issue of having a wintering objective on the Paunsaugunt is useless. He sat on the elk committee when they made recommendations several years ago. The objectives they sent back were 175 wintering elk and 275 summering elk. Elk do not stay on the Paunsaugunt in the winter, therefore it is very hard to do any management using a winter number. The problems are in the summer with 400-500 elk and that is where damage occurs.

With regard to the 12 permits for antlerless. They realize that it is hard for the Division to approve antlerless tags, when there are no antlerless hunts on the unit. Years ago they had some cow hunts and that was eliminated with managing toward objective, but the need did not go away. They need a mechanism to keep elk out of areas that have recently been reseeded. 12 permits do not make any difference biologically.

Chairman Woodard asked if these permits were given, would they be timed when the elk were there and do the good they are looking for.

Mr. Heaton said yes. With the CWMU antlerless season, we have got a large window. We like to do the hunt in October when they are there. Also, half of the 12 would go to the public.

Mr. Johnson said what they want to do is harass those elk and move them out of there.

Board Discussion

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Jake Albrecht and failed 4 to 2, Tom Hatch and Jake Albrecht in favor.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Alton CWMU request for six public and six private antlerless elk permits.

Mr. Perkins spoke against the motion for several reasons. First, we are obligated by state code to manage to plans. I have no problem and will fully follow a change on Paunsaugunt management plans, if those are achieved. But this continual jumping from one change to another is not appropriate. If we are going to deviate from the plan here, there are another ten thousand microsystems in the state that could come in for deviation. Also, twelve permits is not going to solve a three month summer problem without a lot of additional harassment if we are going to protect new plantings throughout the winter months on the Alton CWMU. Change the plan first and come back next year to look at permit change requests that keep coming back year after year.

Mr. Johnson said he is concerned where we are only half way to objective and considering going in and taking cows out. If there is another way to move those elk, he would lean toward that.

Mr. Perkins asked for Northern region's input on the two-doe permits.

Randy Wood said last year they asked for no antlerless permits. This year there was a failure on the part of the Division to get with the CWMUs and talk about doe permits. Chalk Creek has asked to stay with no antlerless permits this year. The objective is at 10,500 and we are at about 8,100. We do not have any general antlerless permits there. We do want to start into the mode to having antlerless permits as we approach objective. We are having some depredation problems. The Division has no problem if the Board decides to remove the two-doe permits for one year. It is a total of 140 permits with 72 doe permits out through there.

Chairman Woodard asked if any of these permits would target some of the depredation issues.

Mr. Wood said yes on some of the CWMUs down lower. We are going to handle those this year with mitigation permits too.

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

MOTION: I move that we delete the two-doe permits on the CWMUs in the Northern Region, Unit 6.

Mr. Blackwell asked for clarification, not the whole region, just Unit 6.

Mr. Albrecht asked how the three year CWMU plans are presented.

Mr. Blackwell said they are presented in the RACs, then if they want to make a change they have to be submitted by August 6th, or when we do antlerless by April, so we can go through and make the requested changes to the management plans concerning permit numbers. This has to be done in writing, by rule. The Division approves it and makes the recommendation to the Wildlife Board.

Mr. Albrecht said if he is an operator, can changes be made within the three year period?

Mr. Blackwell said they can make changes, but they must be in writing. They try to keep an open line of communication according to what is going on. We look at this annually in between the three-year process.

Mr. Fenimore said on Deseret Unit 4, the elk antlerless hunt dates were printed wrong and we changed it during the Northern RAC meeting. It should read 8-15 to 1-31.

Chairman Woodard asked about the 37 to 25 two-doe permits. Does that need to be addressed?

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Del Brady and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we change the Alton CWMU two-doe permits from 37 to 25.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Del Brady and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the balance of the Antlerless CWMU permit recommendations as presented by the Division.

6) Emigration Canyon Boundary Proposal (**Action**)

Chairman Woodard thanked Mr. Fairchild and the amount of in depth work he went to in bringing all the parties together on this issue.

Scott White, Lieutenant at Central Region presented this agenda item. (See map in RAC packet) He expressed appreciate to Joan Gallegos and all the other members they had on their committee. Our task was to come up with an Emigration Canyon archery only hunt boundary. We had several meetings, looking at the map with the residents and listening

to their concerns. In agreement, this is the boundary they came up with. The boundary begins at the Emigration Canyon road in Salt Lake City, go southeast along the Emigration Township boundary to Little Mountain, east along the Emigration Township boundary following the Little Mountain Ridge, continuing east and north to the Emigration Canyon summit road, north along the National Forest Service in Salt Lake City Corporation property boundaries to the Kilian Canyon trail head. At that trail head there is a bike trail going north to the Emigration Township boundary just below Lookout Peak, which then follows back south and west along the boundary back down to the Emigration Canyon road. Again, the special hunting restriction in the area is only archery equipment may be used to take big game deer, elk or moose within the archery only boundary. This concluded the presentation.

RAC Recommendations

Northern and Central RACs passed this recommendation unanimously.

Public Comment

Joan Gallegos, said they are in support of the recommendation.

Mr. Fenimore said that archery only requires 600 feet or more away from any dwelling, the same as rifle.

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

MOTION: I move that we support the Division's recommendation on the Emigration Canyon Boundary proposal.

7) Variance Request – Mr. Claude Hamilton (**Action**)

Judi Tutorow introduced Mr. Hamilton to present his request. This request went through the variance committee and was denied, based on the fact that he had an opportunity to hunt for three days.

Claude Hamilton said he hunted three days on this bison permit, came home and then was involved in an accident that put him in the hospital for the next two weeks, therefore missing the remainder of his hunt. He would like to request an extension of his hunt to next year. He missed three days that he was going back to hunt and would like to finish his hunt.

Chairman Woodard asked what the time frame of hunting days was.

Mr. Hamilton said he hunted opening day plus two more days, Saturday, Sunday and Monday. He also had an x-ray available for the Board.

Mr. Albrecht said for verification, he was there December 5 and there was a snow storm on December 6.

Director Karpowitz asked if this same hunt is available for this year.

Mr. Bates said yes.

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

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request of Claude Hamilton to extend his Henry Mountain's cow bison permit into the 2010 season.

8) Other Business (**Contingent**)

Rick Woodard, Chairman turned the time over to Staci Coons, RAC/Board Coordinator.

a. Proposed change to September RAC agenda topics

Director Karpowitz talked about the reasons for this change. They decided they would take the season change structure out in September, but when they looked at it, it would have put all the RAC meetings during archery season, which would have brought a lot of objections from hunters, especially since archery season is changing so drastically. What they would like to do is leave it in November, which still leaves plenty of time to get it in place for 2011, then we would have to move three RAC meetings to get it out of muzzleloader elk season. This is such a big change we need to do it when we are not in the middle of a hunting season, so the public has a chance to come and comment.

Ms. Coons said we would like to move the hunt structure proposal from September to November, with Northern and Central on the 9th and 10th and then Southern, Southeastern and Northeastern on the 16th, 17th, 18th, 2010. It would come to the Board on December 2nd.

Director Karpowitz said it would still have two RAC meetings at the tail end of muzzleloader elk season. We do not have much room to move them elsewhere and get this done in November.

Ms. Coons said fishing is the agenda topic for the September 30 Wildlife Board meeting and the 29th would be cancelled. We need to make sure we have a quorum at the September 30, 2010 meeting.

Chairman Woodard said he and Mr. Johnson will not be at that meeting.

b. Proposed change to November RAC meeting dates

c. Proposed change to January Board meeting date

Ms. Coons said the Board meeting in January is scheduled for the 6th and those who are going to Winter WAFWA will need to have flown out before that, so we would like to move the meeting to January 4th.

Director Karpowitz said at the December 2 meeting the Board will decide whether to go with the new season structure and that should still give us time to deal with Dedicated Hunter applications and the application period, since it will be a little later.

Ms. Coons said it will be later, but we will also have the Dedicated Hunter proposal at that same meeting.

Chairman Woodard said this will be a very full meeting and maybe it should start at 8 a.m.

Director Karpowitz said the only thing that will be done on December 2 is season structure, Dedicated Hunter with a minor modification, CWMUs and Conservation Permits. It should not be too bad.

d. Informational – Boardroom

Director Karpowitz led a discussion on the remodeling of the Boardroom.

Chairman Woodard asked if there was anything else.

Mr. Sanslow said they asked Mr. Bates to share some of the habitat projects with their RAC. They did a great job and they appreciate those who helped accomplish this. We will be getting habitat updates any time we have the time on our agendas.

Mr. Fenimore said there was an update on the Great Salt Lake Nature Center that was very well done by Justina Parsons. Perhaps she could do this at our nonconsumptive meeting or sooner if practical. I would love to have the Board see this presentation.

Mr. Perkins said when we get a chance, how about that Wildlife 101 presentation, perhaps at a work session.

Mr. Brady asked about water rights on the WMAs, particularly down on Hwy 89, Manti and Fairview. Repeatedly he noticed that the water rights were not designated. Are there water rights there that the DWR should have, that they do not have.

Director Karpowitz said a few years ago they hired Eric Anderson to look at the water rights of the Division. He came to us from water rights and has done a good job at looking at our files and making sure they are where they should be. He has made a lot of progress and he is going to keep working on it. We are giving more attention to this than ever before.

Mr. Fenimore asked if he looked into the Locomotive Springs issue.

Director Karpowitz said this is two separate issues and Mr. Anderson is aware of both of those. The Locomotive Springs issue and the water rights coming out of the Bear River Bird Refuge.

Mr. Hatch asked if there is a statutory provision for water for wildlife.

Director Karpowitz said the Division could own water rights. He said he could get Mr. Anderson to come in and brief the Board on Division water rights.

Mr. Bushman said the state engineer has held that when the DWR holds water rights, it can hold them exclusively for wildlife propagation and that is the beneficial use of water. It has never been challenged. We are one of just a few entities that can hold an in stream flow water right, so it has been long recognized. All of our water rights along the Great Salt Lake are waterfowl propagation. Most of our water rights in our WMAs were originally livestock when we acquired the property. We are in the process of changing the use over to primarily wildlife propagation.

Chairman Woodard asked if anything has happened on the bear case.

Mr. Bushman said oral argument was held a month ago on the Samuel Ives case in the Supreme Court. Court heard the argument and has made no ruling as of yet. The legal arguments on behalf of the state went well and were based on our Government Immunity Act.

The meeting was then adjourned.