

**Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
Electronic Meeting
Anchor Location - DNR, Soldier Hollow Conference Rm.
1594 W. North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
REVISED October 18, 2010**

AGENDA

Tuesday, October 19, 2010 - 1:00 pm

1. Approval of Agenda **ACTION**
 – Rick Woodard, Chairman

2. Board Position Letter on Federal Endangered Species Act Wolf Legislation **ACTION**
 – Rick Woodard, Chairman

3. Other Business **CONTINGENT**
 – Rick Woodard, Chairman

Board Members in attendance:
Rick Woodard – Chairman
Ernie Perkins – Vice-Chairman
Bill Fenimore
Keele Johnson
Jake Albrecht

Board Members participating by telephone:
Tom Hatch
Del Brady

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 MOTIONS
October 19, 2010, Soldier Hollow Conference Room
1594 W North Temple, Salt Lake City UT

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

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Ernie Perkins and passed unanimously.

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

- 2) Board Position Letter on Federal Endangered Species Act Wolf Legislation (**Action**)

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

MOTION: I move that we support the return of management authority for the gray wolf to the State of Utah through the letter as drafted and amended by the Division.

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

MOTION: I move that we support the letter and add our signature to it.

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING
October 19, 2010, Soldier Hollow Conference Room
1594 W North Temple, Salt Lake City UT

Board Members Present

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

Public Present

Don Peay
Tim Fehr
Bill Christensen
Randy Parker
Kirk Robinson
Bob Brister
Brett Prettyman
Allison Jones

Division of Wildlife Resources

Amy Canning
Judi Tutorow
Mike Fowlks
Cindee Jensen
Justin Dolling
Greg Sheehan
Alan Clark
Kent Hersey
Anis Aoude
Rick Larson
Masako Wright
Martin Bushman
Lacy Welch
Kevin Bunnell
Robin Thomas
Staci Coons

Chairman Woodard introduced the Wildlife Board members and welcomed the audience. He said the agenda today is to consider the Board's position on a federal endangered species, on the Wolf Act. There were four Board members present and two on the phone, Tom Hatch and Del Brady.

1) Approval of Agenda (Action)

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Ernie Perkins and passed unanimously.

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

2) Board Position Letter on Federal Endangered Species Act Wolf Legislation (Action)

Chairman Woodard said this meeting is not a regularly scheduled Board meeting and was called due to a request received from a sportsman's organization to endorse the legislation addressing the wolf issue. We felt it would be better to do this in an open

public meeting. Chairman Woodard turned the time over to Mr. Perkins for a brief history of why this meeting is needed.

Mr. Perkins said he was contacted and asked if the Board wanted to take a position on the bills moving through Congress relative to the wolves. He felt the topic was appropriate for Board consideration and discussion. This is a topic of concern to the Board and the State, so he contacted Chairman Woodard and asked if a meeting could be set up. That is why we are here today.

Chairman Woodard said our purpose is to determine whether the Board wants to give a letter of endorsement for this legislation. There are copies of the legislation available for the public. It is Senate Bill 3919. It was introduced by Mr. Hatch, Mr. Richie, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Enzi and Mr. Barrasso. The other legislation is HB 6028, introduced by Mr. Edwards of Texas. Both bills are very short and to the point. There is a copy available for anyone who would like one. Basically, the bills address the prohibition on treatment of the gray wolf as an endangered or threatened species. It removes the wolf off of the ESL and turns the management of the wolf over to the respective states. Chairman Woodard indicated he had two letters one from the Governor's Office in Wyoming, and one from the Governor's Office in Idaho.

Chairman Woodard discussed the meeting that was held about 10 days ago in Hobble Creek to discuss the topic. Congressman Matheson came to the meeting and spoke. Senator Hatch, Senate Candidate Elect Mike Lee, Senator Margaret Dayton and Senator Allan Christensen were in attendance. The meeting was attended by representatives from all the major organizations, Miles Moretti (MDF), Bill Christensen sitting in for David Allan (RMEF), Don Peay, Ryan Benson (BGF), Sterling Brown (Utah Farm Bureau), and Jack Husted, an Arizona Wildlife commissioner. The gentleman gave an update of the federal position on the bills.

Chairman Woodard then explained the comment procedure.

Tom Hatch asked for procedural clarification on what the Board will be discussing or agreeing too.

Chairman Woodard explained that after comment and questions, the Board would read the letter then they could choose to amend the letter, then adopt it or not.

Mr. Hatch cited legislative code 23-29-103 relating to wolf management and asked if the Wildlife Board could make a decision even though the state of Utah has already stated their position on the wolf issue, in that wolf management would be returned to the state. Mr. Hatch asked if we can legally go against the policy of the state of Utah. He indicated that this meeting might be redundant. The state legislature has already stated their position so why would a Wildlife Board make a separate statement?

Chairman Woodard said we would not be anything different than the policy; we are just having a formal meeting to reinforce our agreement, then sending a letter to those in Washington D.C.

Director Karpowitz said that the meeting today is to decide if the Wildlife Board wants to specifically endorse these two bills. We are all aware of what the new state law says in the Wolf Management Act and there will be copies available for review. We are looking for specific action on these two pieces of legislation and on the wording of the letter, if the Board chooses to send one.

Martin Bushman said the issue is not whether the Board is going to oppose the legislation, but whether they will specifically give their endorsement to it. This would not be inconsistent with state policy. It may be redundant, but to the extent that those putting forth this legislation have asked for the Board's support on this, it may be something the Board would wish to do. As far as saying you oppose this, it would be inconsistent with state policy.

Kirk Robinson, Western Wildlife Conservancy, said he would like to know who made the request for the Board's approval and who drafted the letter?

Mr. Perkins said the request came from Don Peay specifically to Ernie Perkins. He did not mention that, since he feels where the request came from is irrelevant. If any organization had made this request, he would have suggested that there be a meeting. The letter was drafted by the Division.

Chairman Woodard said the Board had not seen the letter until today.

Mr. Fenimore said the meeting in Hobble Creek was mentioned, was that a public meeting or a private meeting, and were members from the original wolf working group invited? Did any of those members attend? He was unable to attend the meeting.

Chairman Woodard said he received an invitation from RMEF. They sent out a blanket e-mail on the meeting to his RMEF supporters. Mr. Peay ran the meeting.

Don Peay said it was an open public meeting with over 300 in attendance. The email was sent out to 1,000 people and indicated that anyone who would like to come would be welcome.

Chairman Woodard said they would move into the comment period.

Director Karpowitz suggested that he introduce the draft letter prior to the comment period.

Chairman Woodard said that would be more appropriate. He then read the draft letter.
(See Attachment #1)

Director Karpowitz said the Board is free to accept, reject or amend the letter based on the public comment received today.

Mr. Perkins clarified that he did see this letter the end of last week when he called in from out of state and requested that a copy be sent to him. He did not forward it to the entire Board.

Public Comment

Randy Parker of the Utah Farm Bureau thanked the Board for the opportunity to discuss this important issue. Livestock agricultural in Utah represents 70% of the agriculture in the state. It is a 1.6 billion dollar farm gate sales industry, but larger than that is the impacts it has in forward and backward linkages. Food and Agriculture, according to a recent study by Utah State University contributes 15 billion dollars to the Utah economy and is the catalyst for 67,000 jobs. Utah Farm Bureau represents 30,000 member families across the state. Last week during an agriculture advisory meeting, this issue was discussed from an agriculture industry standpoint. The Agriculture Advisory Board supports this letter and has signed on it, as has the Utah Farm Bureau. The Farm Bureau supports Utah's Wolf Management Plan. We support taking the wolf off of the ESA giving the control and management of the gray wolf in Utah to the State. We participated in the Wolf Working Group and also in drafting the Wolf Management Plan. We support this plan as adopted and we would recommend to the Wildlife Board the support of this effort as well for the future of Utah agriculture and also for all of us who enjoy the countryside in the state of Utah.

Director Karpowitz said as a point of clarification, Mr. Parker referred to signing onto a letter. That is not the letter the Board is acting on, but another letter that has circulated.

Mr. Parker said it is industry related. The Commissioner of Agriculture, the Chairman of the Ag Advisory Board, and Utah Farm Bureau has all signed on that letter. The letter is basically the same concept.

Don Peay said he is sorry we have to meet on this issue, but it probably the most important issue facing wildlife conservation in this generation. David Allan of the RMEF said this is probably the greatest destruction of wildlife herds, since the destruction of the bison. Wolves are growing exponentially and it is going to worse, not better. He spoke with Idaho's Governor at length yesterday and he figures the economic impact caused by the wolf is a negative 40 million dollars a year and growing. This is a bi-partisan issue. Mr. Peay was in Washington D.C. for two weeks and there are Democratic representatives from Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Arkansas, North Carolina and other states that are in support of seeing the states have the right to manage and protect their wildlife, and also the wolf. The thirteen member Midwest companion of WAFWA unanimously supports taking wolves off the ESA and allowing those states to manage the wolves. The wolf advocates have all said delist. President Obama said delist. President Bush said delist. There are 12 states looking to delist. If you cannot get wolves off the list in the states where there are tremendously negative impacts, or clearly exceeding

recovery goals, how can Utah, Oregon, Colorado or any of these other states resolve this issue, unless Congress amends the ESA.

Mr. Peay said the language proposed by the two Montana Senators has three problems. One, it only deals with Montana and Idaho. Two, it still leaves the decision to list or delist in the hands of the USFWS and the Secretary of the Interior, and those decisions can be litigated forever in the courts. It does not solve the issue for anybody. This is the biggest hoop jumping he has ever seen. It is a disgrace for our American system of governance. It is destroying our wildlife herds and the great foundation of conservation. Finally, on the Wyoming plan, it should be pointed out that the USFWS has killed 180 wolves in a predator zone using helicopters and aerial gunning, which is supposedly a taboo. It's not about the wolf or management, it is about destroying the ranching and hunting economies of the west. A friend of mine said that Wyoming Fish and Game just flew for six hours around Jackson Hole, Wyoming and did not see a moose. There used to be 1,200 moose in that area. Somebody needs to pay to restore the moose. I think I have said enough and you know what our position is. It will be nice to get back to spending our money, time and effort on protecting habitat, fencing highways and other issues. That is the position of Big Game Forever and Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife. There is a letter here signed by the Farm Bureau, the Cattlemen, Wool Growers, Utah Ag Advisory Board, Commissioner of Ag, Utah Farmer's Union, SFW, MDF, RMEF, Wild Sheep Foundation, the Division Director and the DNR supporting the congressional action. He hopes the Board will add their signature to this letter. He then asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Perkins asked if they could get some copies made of the letter.

Allison Jones of Wild Utah Project said she was one of the members of the wolf working group that wrote Utah's Wolf Management plan. Wild Utah Project is a nonprofit conservation biology research group and as such they are in many professional and scientific societies. She can agree with Mr. Peay and many wildlife professionals and conservation scientists that the gray wolf should be delisted, because by and large the recovery goal has been met. However, there is overwhelming consensus with the conservation scientists that amending an act of Congress through members of Congress who are not biologists, using no science and relying on politics and special interests to meddle and undermine an Act to specifically manage one species would set a dangerous precedence. USFWS, who has been charged with carrying out the ESA and writing the recovery plans for almost 40 years, has never asked to have the ESA amended for any reason, certainly not for the management of one species. The USFWS is not happy with Judge Malloy's decision either, because the recovery goals have been met, but they would rather see the delisting of the wolf occur under the current ESA. The good news is that is easy to do. Instead of putting all this energy into undermining the ESA and setting a dangerous precedence for the benefit or non-benefit of one species, why not just ask Wyoming to just obey the law. All they have to do is write a plan to pass muster with USWFS and the species would be delisted. It is really quite simple. One other point to make is that the American public, in many polls, has come down on the side of the ESA, literally every time it has been polled. This is a population act with the American public.

If the state of Utah comes down on the side against the ESA, they will be in conflict with mainstream America. This has not stopped our legislature from coming down on certain sides of issues against the mainstream of America, but she would ask the DWR, many who are biologists, to help the Board and our State understand that going about this in the wrong way will ultimately not benefit the gray wolf or any wildlife.

Ms. Jones said she has one point about the letter as written as it seems to have a conflicting sentence in it which is "In 2010 the legislature passed SB-36 which prevents full implementation of the Utah Wolf Management Plan until wolves are removed from protection of the ESA statewide." This sentence will need to be edited to reflect the truth, in that SB-36 in fact supplants and overrides the Wolf Management Plan in one significant regard in that once the wolf is delisted in that part of Utah, SB-36 calls for no packs to be established. If they are known to be there, in that recovery zone in Utah, they need to be taken out, shot on sight or hauled from the area. The Utah management plan allows for two mating pairs to exist as long as they do not get into trouble. So, this sentence as written is simply not accurate. She would ask that it be corrected. She is sure Mr. Bunnell can speak to how those two points conflict with each other. This concluded her remarks.

Mr. Johnson asked who it was that set up the ESA.

Ms. Jones said that would be Congress.

Mr. Johnson said he sat on the Utah legislature for eight years and he found the main thing the legislature does is to fine tune existing law. Congress set up the ESA and they have every right to go in and adjust that, especially when it is being abused. The wolves in the world are not endangered. There are tens of thousands of them in Canada and Alaska. The last thing they are is endangered. Groups have abused that act. It will set dangerous precedence, and you will see more if they are continued to be abused. The original amount was 300 wolves, ten packs. That didn't happen and the next thing we know we were in court.

Ms. Jones said that did not happen because Wyoming would not pass a plan that would pass muster with the USFWS. That has nothing to do how many wolves are in the Northern Rockies. That is a different issue.

Mr. Johnson asked how the black bear are doing in Wyoming. The black bear and the cougar are doing fine in all the western states. They are not seen as being endangered and the states are managing them perfectly, why are we in the courts with the wolves, especially when the groups that said all they wanted, and that is what was done. Everything that Ms. Jones said, he disagrees with, because Congress has every right in the world to change that act. Because of this, you are seeing a dangerous precedence in your eyes, but you are going to see Congress starting to address ESA in many places where they think it has been abused.

Chairman Woodard said we can take this debate later and we need to move forward with today's meeting.

Mr. Fenimore said as he understood SB-36, if the wolf is delisted, it would require the Division to eliminate any wolf it found in Utah as opposed to the Wolf Management Plan that the Division developed, which would allow up to two packs and provide various management policies for that. He wants to understand this.

Director Karpowitz said in SB-36, in 23-29-201, Section 2, it says the Division shall manage wolves to prevent the establishment of a viable pack in all areas of the state where the wolf is not listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA until the wolf is completely delisted under the Act and removed from federal control in the entire state. In other words, if these two pieces of legislation pass, the Wolf Management Plan will go into effect which does allow for the establishment of two packs of wolves in the state. SB-36 allows for zero in the delisted areas. He does not see the conflict in the letter that was pointed out. I think it is correct as stated and consistent with SB-36.

Chairman Woodard said we can go back and adjust or change that if necessary, after we have heard from everybody.

Kirk Robinson of Western Wildlife Conservancy said he disagrees with Mr. Johnson. He thinks he knows how Mr. Johnson is going to vote and he disagrees with his judgment on the points he made. I do think wolves are an endangered species in the United States and if you read the ESA, they merit protection. The question is whether or not to support either of these bills. I know why the DWR would like to support them. It would give them management authority over wolves throughout the state, whereas if Wyoming were to work on their plan and produce one the FWS would accept, that would only lead to delisting in the Northern Rockies existing population segment, which includes only a portion of Utah. Wolves may move into the remaining 90 % of Utah from the north or the south, and Utah would not have authority to manage them. This brings the case of the Mexican gray wolf that was at last count, 51 individuals. There is going to be a new management plan for the Mexican gray wolf and unless you can pass this legislation you won't have management over gray wolves for quite a long time.

Still, this is the wrong way to go about it. Wyoming should cowboy up and stop acting like babies. Less than 1% of total livestock losses in the northern Rockies are due to wolves. I'm not saying they are not a problem but there are a lot of other species that are a problem too. Livestock growers, especially sheep men should be concerned about the effect that wolves have on coyotes. Within 2-3 years on the northern range in Yellowstone, the coyote population was dropped by 50% and they take a lot more sheep than wolves. If Mr. Peay would like to set up a debate, he would be happy to accommodate him, even in front of his home crowd.

Back to the issue, it would set a dangerous precedent to amend the ESA this way for just one species without solid science. To carve out one species, because certain special interests don't want it protected is not good, just because the nimrods and the ranchers

don't want it. There is a huge amount of ecological ignorance all through those two camps. They do not read the literature and if they do, they rarely understand it. For example, the reason the moose is missing from western Wyoming was studied by Joel and Kim Berger for ten years, two premier conservation biologists. Their conclusion was that wolves have almost nothing to do with it. It is a nutritional problem. There were too many moose for too long. There is the same problem on the northern range in Yellowstone. I don't think you are going to succeed in this. I don't think the American public will put up with this exception, to serve special interests in the west.

Bob Brister of the Utah Environmental Congress addressed the Board. They are a non-profit environmental public lands conservation group. We oppose legislation to remove the wolf from ESA protection. They would like to see wolves return to Utah and live in the Uintahs and on the east Tavaputts Plateau where they believe there is good wildlife habitat for them. He has personally collected over 700 hand written post cards sent to Senator Salazar over the past several months in support of wolves returning to Utah. There is great a great deal of public support for the return of wolves to Utah, outside of the interest of hunting and ranching. He urged the Board to listen to the rest of Utah and not just to those few special interests. Wolves are native to Utah. We have places where they can live here again. They were here first and deserve to come back.

Bill Christensen, the Utah Regional Director for the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation and a member of the wolf working group addressed the Board. Their official statement is that wolves need to be delisted and managed by states. There was mention earlier of using biology. From their experience with the RMEF, doing over 400 projects in Utah impacting almost a million acres, the best biologists in the state are with the DWR. We trust them to take care of this wolf issue. Two of the groups that spoke, that are pro wolf joined the lawsuit, fighting the delisting of wolves.

Ms. Jones asked who those groups are.

Mr. Christensen said Defenders of Wildlife and the two groups here today.

Ms. Jones said that is not correct.

Mr. Christensen apologized for that comment. He knows the Defenders of Wildlife was and when we had the wolf committee meeting, I asked the representative from Defenders of Wildlife what was going to happen when we reached our reintroduction goals for wolves. He said then we will support delisting. Mr. Christensen was lied to as a member of that committee. In 2002, we reached the reintroduction goal. We are 300 to 500 % above the breeding goals that were set by the FWS, talk about ecological ignorance. Wolves have a place in large tracts of wilderness with very little impact from mankind. We don't even have that in Utah. Now in those areas of Idaho and Montana, where there are huge wilderness areas, one herd in Montana and two in Wyoming are losing elk at such a rate that they are not having calves quick enough to keep the herd going. We are losing complete herds of elk. If we don't support HB-6028 and SB-3919, unchecked wolves in the west will become the scourge of the new west. Every wildlife species is

managed and if the ESA is not allowed for scientific, biological management with public input, they will become an unmanaged and uncontrolled population of predators that have no place. Our members have raised over 25 million dollars in Utah since 1987 to improve habitat for elk, deer and other wildlife, including wolves, but when wolves are not managed like other species, then we have a problem. Please support this letter. This is the only way to turn management over to the biologists and scientists who are best qualified to do this.

Kirk Robinson asked if the Board is aware that in the Bugle Magazine, elk counts for Idaho, Montana and Wyoming in 1995 compared to 2009 show a 16% increase from the time wolves have been introduced.

Randy Parker of the Farm Bureau said he would like to clarify what Mr. Robinson said about livestock. Mr. Robinson talks about special interest groups. Everybody in this room and across America is a special interest, because we all eat. We are looking to maintain the food security of our country. Everyone should be interested. The gentleman didn't give you the total story of the 1% of livestock. When they talk about the ones that were documented as killed by wolves, they figure there are between 8 and 10 other sheep or cattle that have been lost, that they cannot document. You are talking about an 80-90% reduction in those numbers. The second part of this is, when wolves are in the environment, from a wildlife stand point and a livestock standpoint, the animals don't conceive, you lose lambing and calving numbers, and they do not put on weight. So, you are losing 100% of the stock that is out there on the mountain, that these animals are involved with. The gentleman was disingenuous when he shared that with the Wildlife Board.

Chairman Woodard said that is all the public comment. This is a very sensitive issue with strong feelings on both sides of it. The purpose here today is to review this letter.

Director Karpowitz said he wants to make sure Mr. Brady and Mr. Hatch can see the letter and comment on it. It is on your e-mail at Utah.gov. Do you both have access to email where you can look at it while we are speaking?

A 10 minute break was taken to get a copy of this letter to these two Board members.

Chairman Woodard said the Board members on the phone have received and reviewed the letter. They both confirmed this. The question today is we need to decide on this draft letter that the Division has prepared for us. He would feel more comfortable, before we tackle this, if we could hear from Mr. Bushman. Does he have any input on this letter, or anything he feels he would like to change?

Mr. Bushman said there was one matter brought to his attention which is a very good point. In the last sentence of the first paragraph where it states specifically the Board supports S.B 3919 and H.R. 6028 now making its way through the United States Congress. Those bills can change in either direction, so it may be better to write that sentence in a way that would envision change. What he would suggest is to rewrite that

sentence to say specifically the Board supports S.B 3919 and H.B. 6028 to the extent that they return management authority over gray wolves entirely to the state of Utah, throughout the state. That is the essence of what this issue is about.

Tom Hatch said he wonders if it would be just as well to say the Board supports S.B 3919 and H.B. 6028 as originally drafted and now making their way through the United States Congress.

Chairman Woodard asked if he would concur that they say “and returning management authority to the state.”

Mr. Hatch said we say that later on in the letter so that would be fine.

Chairman Woodard asked if there are any other questions for Mr. Bushman. There were none. He asked how the Board wants to handle this. Do they want to go through it paragraph by paragraph?

Mr. Hatch said he would like to make a point to make a change on. In paragraph 3, the last sentence where it says “we strongly believe that wolves in Utah should be managed. . .” I think we should add that “we concur with the Utah State Legislature that wolves should be managed by the DWR under the guidance of the Utah Wolf Management Plan.” That does two things, one that we believe the state should do this, but also shows our entire legislative body has come to that conclusion.

Mr. Fenimore said, regarding that same sentence, he suggests that we add “we strongly believe and request that wolves be managed . . .” The point he wants to emphasize is the Division conducted a very exhaustive process involving the public and all stakeholders. We had a Utah Wolf Management Plan that went over a two-year period, under the Division’s guidance. Testimony was taken from all sorts of individuals both in and out of the state. One of things he learned in that process is there was no neutral zone. Everyone is either for or against. Using that plan is a very strong point and he would make that suggestion.

Chairman Woodard said with those two changes on paragraph 3, it would read.

Mr. Hatch stated it with the changes. Starting after “ESA statewide,” “We concur with the legislature and request that wolves in Utah should be managed in by the UDWR under the guidance of the Utah Wolf Management Plan.”

Director Karpowitz said while we are on that paragraph there is a typo. It is S.B.36, instead of H.B., on the very first line.

Mr. Fenimore said he would like to address this letter to a specific person, rather than to whom it may concern.

Director Karpowitz said it could be addressed to the Utah Congressional Delegation. It could be to Congress at Large, or the Utah Congressional Delegation, since it only applies to Utah.

Chairman Woodard asked if any other Board members would like any other points changed or reworded.

Mr. Albrecht said he would like to make a statement

Mr. Brady said he has no other changes.

Mr. Hatch said those changes took care of his concerns

Chairman Woodard said the letter stands except for the changes to paragraph 3 and paragraph 1. To the last sentence of paragraph 1, add “to the extent of the return of management authority to the state of Utah,” right after 6028. It will be addressed to the Utah Congressional Delegation.

Mr. Albrecht said he has listened to the comments and made notes throughout the meeting, but personally I agree with the comments from one person. It’s too bad we have to meet like this to help change the ESA. It should have been taken care of years ago. As far as he is concerned, no wolves in Utah are fine with him. He supports both the bills, S.B. 3919 and H.B. 6028. I hope we can get something done with them

Mr. Johnson said as he watched this wolf debate go for a number of years, you see very polarized sides and it is becoming more that way. Part of my frustration is with the groups that continue to push to have these species listed. Mr. Robinson honestly understands how people in the state of Utah feel about these things. He represents his constituency well and also understands that we have hunting and wildlife management in our state. I’m really disappointed with these groups keeping it in there, because he thinks they have shot themselves in the foot, big time. They have awakened a sleeping giant and we are seeing that with this action in Congress. There is room for wolves in certain places. I watched a pack of 14 wolves awhile back and they are a magnificent animal, but they have their place. Utah has room for a few packs of wolves, in their place. They cannot be around certain livestock, especially domestic sheep. They just want to kill them. I think there are places for them. Now, because these groups have pulled them in, they have scared everybody to the point where we are going to change the ESA. Congress does have the right to do that. The process has been abused and something slowly would have happened if it wasn’t at this point. Cougar and black bear are managed well in this state. They do take a lot of wildlife, but we are not asking that they remove them. Because of what has happened with this process, what could have been very peaceful is not going to happen, because it is polarized now. The groups pulled it into court and if they had left it alone, over the years as people got used to it and saw where wolves fit into the ecosystem and where they didn’t, they may have been quite pleased with what happened, but I don’t think they are going to be pleased now. I’m very

bothered by that. I think what they dreamed of doing they destroyed. They will have lots of opposition now. The wolves I observed were in Alaska.

Mr. Perkins said he has a couple of thoughts. As we make a decision to support or not to support these bills, his consideration of it is that we supporting the bills would be consistent with our wolf management plan that went through a solid public process some years ago. It would be consistent with the current and previous Governor, to the Department of the Interior and FWS, and it would be consistent with the legislative action SB 36. I do understand and appreciate comments from Allison Jones and Kirk Robinson, that wolves should have been relisted from a biological perspective, and they do require some protection, but he feels the state plan provides the protection in this state. I am also a pragmatist and if I was working on my own, I might have approached the legislative action in Congress a little bit differently. In my opinion, supporting these bills is the best option that will provide us a clear direction and opportunity to manage wolves properly in the state of Utah.

Chairman Woodard asked if Mr. Brady or Mr. Hatch had any comments at this time. Neither of them did.

Director Karpowitz reiterated how the letter reads now. The last sentence of the first paragraph now reads, "Specifically, the Board supports S.B. 3919 and H.B. 6028 now making their way through the United States Congress to the extent that they return management authority to the state of Utah." The third paragraph, change H.B. 36 to S.B. 36 and the last sentence now reads, "We concur with the Utah Legislature and request that wolves in Utah be managed by the UDWR under the guidance of the Utah Wolf Management Plan."

Chairman Woodard said the letter will be addressed to the Utah Congressional Delegation.

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

MOTION: I move that we support the return of management authority for the gray wolf to the State of Utah through the letter as drafted and amended by the Division.

Director Karpowitz re-read the letter with the corrections.

Chairman Woodard said the second issue they have today is they were asked to sign on a letter provided by Don Peay, also addressed to the Congressional Delegation. (See Attachment #2) He asked the Board to please take a quick second to review it.

The letter was reviewed by all Board members present. Mr. Hatch and Mr. Brady also had a copy of the letter.

Chairman Woodard said the question here lies in that it is signed by 12 different groups, including the Director of the Division Director Styler of the DNR. Would you like me to add the Wildlife Board's signature in support of this?

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

MOTION: I move that we support the letter and add our signature to it.

Chairman Woodard said there is nothing else on the agenda.

The meeting was adjourned.

Approved