

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
Summary of Motions
May 5, 2011, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

1) Approval of Agenda (Action)

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

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

2) Approval of Minutes (Action)

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the January 4, 2011 Wildlife Board Meeting as corrected.

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the March 16, 2011 Wildlife Board Work Session as corrected.

3) Bucks, Bulls and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2011 (Action)

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the general season deer recommendations with the exception that we reduce the Northeastern region general season deer permits from 11,000 to 9,000.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed 4 to 2 with Ernie Perkins and Bill Fenimore opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the limited entry and premium limited entry deer recommendations as presented by the Division with the exception that the Book Cliffs to be reduced by 50 permits.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed 4 to 2 with Del Brady and Jake Albrecht opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the general season and limited entry season elk recommendations as presented by the Division.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Division's recommendations for "Bucks, Bulls and OIAL Permits 2011."

4) Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2011 (Action)

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's recommendations on Antlerless Permits for 2011 with the exception that doe permits in Ashley Valley be addressed through mitigation permits. Also the Division pursues a workable solution concerning the doe on the Panguitch Lake Unit consulting UDOT and applicable sportsmen's groups.

5) Big Game Rule Amendments – R657-5 (Action)

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's recommendations on the Big Game Rule Amendments R657-5 as presented.

6) Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2011 (Action)

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's recommendations as presented on Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2011.

7) Other Business (Contingent)

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded Jake Albrecht and passed 5 to 1 with Bill Fenimore opposed.

MOTION: I move that we put on the action log that the Division takes out a proposal placing two units, one from the Northern or Northeastern region and one from the Southern or Southeastern region under antler restriction.

Utah Wildlife Board Work Session

May 4-5, 2011, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

AGENDA

Wednesday, May 4, 2011, 1:00pm

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

Items of Discussion – NOTE: The Wildlife Board will not be taking action on any of the following items. This meeting is discussion only. The meeting is open to the public however no public comment will be accepted.

2. Review of Thursday Agenda Items – Alan Clark **INFORMATIONAL**
• Process for setting recommendations – Anis Aoude

3. Board Meeting Procedures Discussion **INFORMATIONAL**
– Rick Woodard, Chairman
- Should public comment be taken at board meetings?
 - When should the board vote for a new chairman and vice-chairman?
 - Should the chairman be able to vote on each motion?
 - How can items be added to the meeting agenda?
 - Should sweeping motions to wrap up an agenda topic be made or should each item be discussed individually?

4. Antler Gathering **INFORMATIONAL**
– Mike Fowls, Law Enforcement Chief

5. Cougar Plan Amendments **INFORMATIONAL**
– Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator

6. WAFWA Attendance **INFORMATIONAL**
– Rick Woodard, Chairman

7. Tri-State Attendance **INFORMATIONAL**
– Rick Woodard, Chairman

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

May 4-5, 2011, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

Thursday, May 5, 2011 – 9:00 am

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda
– Rick Woodard, Chairman | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
– Rick Woodard, Chairman | ACTION |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log
– Ernie Perkins, Vice-Chair | CONTINGENT |
| 4. DWR Update
– Jim Karpowitz, DWR Director | INFORMATION |
| 5. Bucks, Bulls and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2011
- Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 6. Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2011
- Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 7. Big Game Rule Amendments – R657-5
- Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 8. Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2011
- Randy Wood, Wildlife Program Manager | ACTION |
| 9. Other Business
– Rick Woodard | CONTINGENT |

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
May 5, 2011, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

Board Members Present

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

RAC Chairs Present

Steve Flinders – Southern
Kevin Albrecht – Southeastern
Fred Oswald – Central
Bob Christensen – Northeastern
Robert Byrnes – Northern

Public Present

Mike Welch
Byron Bateman
Don Peay
Sterling Brown
Jason Lowe
Greg Gilroy
Brad Horrocks
Jill Flygate
Ken Strong
Tye Boulter
Chris Otto

Division of Wildlife Resources

Staci Coons
Judi Tutorow
Mark Hadley
Anis Aoude
Cindee Jensen
Doug Messerly
Mike Fowlks
Kevin Christopherson
LuAnn Petrovich
Bill Bates
Charlie Greenwood
Randy Wood
Martin Bushman
Ron Hodson
Suzanne Fowlks
Teresa Bonzo
Craig Clyde
Randall Thacker
Robin Thomas
Rhianna Christopher
Brent Kasza
Brandon Davis
JD Abbott
Rory Lenorson
Teresa Griffin
Derrick Ewell
Dax Mangus
Brad Crompton
Justin Dolling
Bryan Christensen
Lacy Welch
Mike Styler

1) Approval of Agenda (Action)

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

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

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

2) Approval of Minutes (Action)

On p. 45 of the Wildlife Board minutes, 5th paragraph, line 6 change IMC to IHC, p. 53 last line change to “the Outfitter Board is only an advisory Board.”

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the January 4, 2011 Wildlife Board Meeting as corrected.

On p. 38, paragraph 9, change to “would agree.” P. 2, correct spelling on Mr. “Fenimore” on attendance list. P. 41, paragraph 10, line 2 delete “not.”

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the March 16, 2011 Wildlife Board Work Session as corrected.

3) Old Business/Action-Log (Contingent)

Ernie Perkins, Vice Chair said none of the items will be covered on this meeting. The first three items on the action log will be addressed at the June 9th meeting. On the 3rd item, the preference points for youth upland game hunts, there is a change of assignment from Dave Olsen to Justin Dolling. Finally we could have a motion today to add deer transplants to the action log. He recommends that be covered during the antlerless discussion when it came up in the RAC meeting.

4) DWR Update (Information)

Jim Karpowitz, DWR Director said replacement Board members for Chairman Woodard and Mr. Johnson are John Bair from Central region and Dr. Mike King from Price. They are awaiting confirmation by the Senate. Tom Hatch is resigning his position effective July 1, 2011. We will be finding a replacement for him right away. We intend to have that process completed by the end of the month. That Board member can come from any region except the Northern, because it already has two. We already have applicants from Central and Southeastern regions, so we will open the applications for a short time for Southern and Northeastern regions.

Ms. Coons said they are opening the announcement this morning and it will be closed at noon on May 18, 2011.

Director Karpowitz said that will be a quick turn around so if anybody is interested in that Board position, it will be filling Mr. Hatch's unexpired term for two years and then would be eligible for reappointment for six years. That Board member could potentially be with us for eight years.

Mr. Hatch said he has enjoyed his time here.

Director Karpowitz referred to the Wolf delisting as addressed in Congress. They restored the delisting process from 2009 which included Montana, Idaho, a little piece of northern Utah, north of I-84 and eastern Oregon and Washington. Wolves in that area, known as Northern Rockies DPS are now permanently delisted because of Congressional action. They cannot be relisted. That puts us right back where we were in 2009. Because of legislation in 2010, our policy will be that we will not allow the establishment of a pack of wolves in that delisted part of Utah until the rest of the state is delisted for wolves. They are having a meeting later this month, May 16-17, with the USFWS which will address what happens to wolves in the rest of the west. The meeting will include consideration for Mexican wolves and the areas that are not in a DPS in the rest of the west. Where that leaves us from now on is any wolves that kill livestock in delisted areas will be dealt with through Wildlife Services. If we see any indication that wolves are attempting to form a pack, we'll remove those wolves, according to state law that is in place. If the entire state gets delisted, our management plan will go into effect. He then asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Perkins said in two of the RACs there was mention of packs in Utah.

Director Karpowitz said we have had some indication of multiple wolves in Utah. Currently we do not know of any wolves in the delisted area. We know of a single wolf in Chalk Creek and have documented multiple wolves in the Flaming Gorge area in the past. Wolves are very mobile animals that travel long distances in a short amount of time. That situation changes daily. Idaho and Montana are going to put more pressure on wolves, issuing quite a few hunting permits this fall and that might move them around. Because of what Congress passed in recognizing the court decision in Wyoming, it legitimized their plan, so the USFWS are moving forward with delisting in Wyoming also. For the time being we will be following our policy that the Board and Division adopted in 2009 for the delisted area. The rest of the state we have no authority over wolves and they continue to be federally protected for the time being.

Chairman Woodard asked if our plan has been dealt with by USFWS.

Director Karpowitz said no. It has not been officially adopted or reviewed to his knowledge. He then went on to talk about the fatal bear attack from two years ago. In the media the last few days they have talked about the federal lawsuit concerning this incident. Because the State still has a pending court case, he asked Mr. Bushman to give a quick briefing on this issue.

Mr. Bushman said two days ago the Federal District court in Utah entered a decision from a trial that was held back in February. This was involving the US Forest Service and the mother and father of Samuel Ives, who was attacked by a bear in American Fork Canyon in 2007. It was a fatal incident. A year after the attack the Ives family filed lawsuit against the State of Utah, the DWR and the US Forest Service. Under the 11th amendment of the US Constitution, you cannot sue the state in federal court in less there is a federal issue involved. You can't sue the United States in state court, so two separate law suits were filed, one against the Forest Service in federal court and the other against the DWR in state court. These are two parallel proceedings and neither one effects the other. The decision was the resolution of the trial in the federal case. Judge Kimball awarded the family 1.9 million dollars. In that case the court was required to allocate fault to those involved, including the DWR. The judge allocated 65% of the fault to the Forest Service, 10% to the family and 25% to the DWR. That allocation of fault has no impact on the State case.

The state case has been going along and a motion to dismiss was filed on one ground under the Governmental Immunity Act. The court accepted that and dismissed the lawsuit against the state and it was then appealed to the Supreme Court, who reversed it and remanded it back to the State court. The State case has been waiting to see what happens in the federal case in order to have a better idea of where to go on it. The State case is not ready to go to trial. They still have more immunity defenses that are very substantial. The federal case has concluded trial. The 1.9 million dollar judgment could be appealed. The State case is in the preliminary stages of litigation. He asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Hatch said the cases are not combined but the judge is required to allocate fault. If the federal judge found that the DWR was responsible for 25%, could the Division go to the family and settle on that?

Mr. Bushman said legally that is not possible because under the Governmental Immunity Act, the most that can be paid is \$550,000. 25% of 3 million is about \$750,000. Considering the immunity defenses that exist, the state would not go in and settle it at the damage cap at this point. That would be a homerun for the plaintiffs.

Director Karpowitz said that was a terrible incident that occurred several years ago that saddened us all and it is finally working its way through the legal system.

He went on to say that we have three new officers here today who just graduated from the academy and were sworn in last week. We are glad to have them on board and they are all very well qualified. We are now fully staffed, for the first time in the last six years, in law enforcement. In the last six years 55 new officers have come to the Division. Walt Donaldson and Rick Larson have retired. Roger Wilson is the new Chief of Fisheries and the Wildlife Section Chief position is open currently. We will make that selection in the next few weeks.

Director Karpowitz then went on to discuss the budget. We are facing a perfect storm of budget problems, which is creating a real hardship on the agency right now. The loss of revenue from license sales, large reductions in federal aide, the division lost 1.1 million dollars in Pitman Robert's money, which is taxes on firearms and ammunition, Dingle Johnson money which is taxes on boats, motors and fishing equipment is down about \$300,000, and there are still things happening in Congress with federal budget reductions. We get a little bad news every week with further impacts on our budget. For example, the Jones' Hole fish hatchery is scheduled for closure. It provides a large number of our fish for the northeastern part of the state including Flaming Gorge reservoir. It is about a \$600,000 operation which we cannot afford to pick up if the federal government walks away from it. We have reminded the federal government that it is a mitigation hatchery and they have a mitigation responsibility. We are prepared to deal with that legally if we need to. We also lost \$300,000 in revenue that we have been getting for fish hatchery support. We will have to make this up if we are going to keep all our hatcheries running. Congress took a large chunk out of the state wildlife grant money which is used for our Sensitive Species program to help keep species from being listed. The net effect is we're down about 2 ½ million dollars in revenue plus new expenses we have to pick up with no new money. The Division is facing about a three million dollar budget cut, at least, going into FY 2012. Depending on what happens with the federal budget in FY 2012, it could be even worse. He just wants the Board to know what actions we're taking within the Division to deal with those kinds of potential increases.

Director Karpowitz said they met as a leadership team in a two day session and identified every area where they could make substantial budget cuts. It is a pretty hard hiring freeze right now and every position has to be justified before we fill it. We are going to have to be down about 25 FTEs by this time next year. They think they can handle most of those with attrition. There will be shifting of personnel around the agency and we will try to do it without a great deal of displacement of employees. The sections have stepped up and offered budget cuts. The sportsmen of the state will feel it. Fish hatchery money will go down. They are going to have to reduce some personnel. There is less money available for habitat with a lot less federal money coming in. We are going to have to go through a time of serious budget cutting and changes within the agency. A year from now we will be a smaller agency. What they do as a Board today will determine what will have to be cut. He asked they do what's best for wildlife, but realize we are an agency that subsists largely on revenue from hunting and fishing. When we make big cuts in permit numbers, we lose state money and also the accompanying federal aide. This will force us to reduce services.

Fortunately we saw this day coming and the Division has a significant surplus that we can spend with the permission from the legislature. They are going to ask the legislature to allow us to start spending down that balance, but when it is gone we will have to go to the sportsman for additional revenue and go from there. We are ahead of this and hope to soften the impact.

One more fiscal issue is we have an auditor from the legislature here today. He is auditing our conservation permit program. This is a legislative audit. He has been here

for a few weeks. This is an important part of our revenue picture in the Division. It provides between 2-3 million dollars that goes directly to enhance wildlife populations. Most of it goes for habitat, but also for transplants, research and those critical programs above our base operation. While it is a time of concern, we are optimistic that we will get through it. We've got to do something about fishing license revenue in the next few months. The price has not gone up relative to the costs. In fact, the fishing program is being subsidized by hunting revenues. We have to get those revenues back in balance. The public would like us to spend more money on habitat and predator control. We have to have revenue to accomplish this. This summer we are going to ask for more fishing revenue and more money from big game to address predator control and habitat enhancement. We will spend the next few months preparing the public and gaining their support for that.

Chairman Woodard asked on the Jones' Hole fish hatchery, when they reanalyze the fishing license, could something be factored in to keep that open under state operation?

Director Karpowitz said we want to keep it open and we don't want to let the federal government out of their agreement to provide for that hatchery. When they built the reservoir part of the deal was to replace the loss of fish habitat, they would keep the fishery running. We have sent them a letter to that effect. There are some other cuts that we are experiencing that don't have that same responsibility that we will just have to deal with.

Mr. Hatch asked how we will get more money from fisherman with decreasing the quality.

Director Karpowitz said it will be a combination of budget cutting and revenue enhancement. We will tell them that we are going to ask for more revenue, but even at that we may not be able to keep the level of services going. There is always a point with licenses where you hit buyer resistance and you may end up with less money. We have to balance where the buyer resistance is and become more efficient.

Mr. Fenimore said in terms of getting support, he attended open houses around the state and was disappointed in the turn out. The Division had gone to a lot of effort with biologists available there and displays. He went to three of the meetings and hopefully others had better attendance. Has the Division had time to assess that approach and how it worked? The other thing that concerns him with the changes and cuts coming up is what that does to the revenue. We are going to be in a situation where we are reducing opportunity which is going to hurt the Division in the long run.

Director Karpowitz said the open houses have been overwhelmingly positive. The public has appreciated the less formal way of communicating with the Division. We are going to continue that, especially relative to fishing. We have also reinstated spring range rides and will continue that through this month. We have a new brochure on mule deer to let the public know all the things that are happening right now. Our website has been revamped with a focus on mule deer. These efforts have helped with the public.

Whenever you cut permits you lose the resident fee and 10% nonresident fees, but you can potentially lose the federal aid if they fall out of the drawing. The federal aid almost approaches the cost of the permit. It can be a really big impact. They estimate that the 13,000 tag cut that we have discussed would be about a \$750,000 impact minimum on the Division and that is if nobody fell out of the draw. It is a tough thing. Mr. Sheehan prepared a spreadsheet that looks at the impact if the Division recommendation is accepted across the board with some increases and some reductions and it would be about a \$130,000 reduction in revenue this year. If the Board does not increase tags, or decreases deer tags more than recommended, that number will change dramatically. Mr. Sheehan is here to help understand what the impact will be as this is addressed.

Chairman Woodard asked what has happened with the application period and the number of dollars generated.

Director Karpowitz said our applications were up slightly this year for big game. We topped the 300,000 mark. They have stopped the exponential growth and are flattening out about there. We have lost revenue on turkey permit sales by going to over the counter, about \$200,000, even though we have provided abundant new opportunity. Mr. Sheehan can show the effects of the cuts. We can absorb some of the reduction because we have a revenue surplus, but need to be aware of it long term.

5) Bucks, Bulls and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2011 (Action)

Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator presented this agenda item. All the recommendations in our presentations are geared to getting towards objectives that are in both unit and statewide management plans that were approved by the Wildlife Board. (See Powerpoint Presentation) He went over the 2010 general season deer harvest success, harvest trends 2001-2010, fawn production trends 1998-2010, buck/doe ratio trends 1998-2010 and post season buck/doe ratios. He then went over the 2011 general season deer permit recommendations by region. Premium limited entry, limited entry management buck deer permits and limited entry deer units and permits were reviewed and recommendations were made.

Mr. Aoude then went on to present 2011 Elk permit recommendations, including general season and limited entry. There was a discussion on limited entry antler quality verses opportunity on elk. He also covered pronghorn and OIAL species permit recommendations. This concluded the presentation.

Mr. Albrecht asked what the return was on the tooth data this year.

Mr. Aoude said 80% overall. We made a greater effort this year to make sure people got their packets and felt that really helped. The return was up from 50%.

Mr. Albrecht said the deer are classified on public lands and private are exempt, and yet elk are the opposite. You include them on public and private?

Mr. Aoude said they do not do classification of elk on bull to cow ratios.

Mr. Albrecht said on your classification on tooth data, do you separate the private from the CWMU to see what the difference in age or size of the bull?

Mr. Aoude said yes, but the CWMUs are such a small proportion and they do fit within the unit, so we do include them in the average. Even if you took them out, it would not change the recommendation. There is very little difference, about 2/10's of a year higher, which is about 1/8 of the total number of teeth which adds up to no difference when you average it.

Mr. Albrecht asked if they have had any complaints on moving the draw back to a later date.

Director Karpowitz said they have had a lot of questions. This has allowed the Division people more opportunity for better and more accurate information. We have winter flight data and tooth data. We sent every applicant an email to explain why it is a month later.

Mr. Perkins said going to Mr. Albrecht's question on deer data both on and off CWMUs, he had several queries in the Northern region on deer data both on and off CWMUs with the concern that individuals thought buck/doe ratios were getting skewed on the public land unit by counting a lot of CWMU deer and using it to boost the average. The answer for Box Elder and Cache which are about 90% of the hunting opportunity in Northern region public lands, was that no deer were counted on CWMUs or classified on the Cache and the difference in buck/doe ratios on the Box Elder was one percent, 22 and 21. The lower was on the CWMUs on the Box Elder unit. There is lots of concern, but just smoke, no fire.

Mr. Johnson said looking at these graphs talking about buck/doe ratios 2008-2010 and the general season deer permit recommendations, on the reduction on southeastern, it is setting at the lowest buck/doe ratio at 14, but you only reduced it 1,000 permits. Looking at northeastern at 18 and you reduced it to 2,000 permits. He was wondering why.

Mr. Aoude said need to consider the three year average. We asked the regions to do the analysis unit by unit basis as if making recommendations for 2012. When that did that they came up with fewer permits than we are recommending to cut. We rounded it up to 1,000. The Manti drives it in southeast region and they didn't feel there needed to be that big of a cut to get to objective in the next couple years, looking at a lot of data including production data and all the other. The one unit that is low tends to have a little bit higher production. The Manti has higher production than the San Juan and the La Sals.

Director Karpowitz said a bunch of winter loss was also factored into northeastern region, where we didn't have that in the southeastern.

Mr. Aoude said we are not trying to get to 18 in one year, just up to 17 in 2011. That unit doesn't have a lot of permits, so 1,000 cut will be helpful in getting us there.

Chairman Woodard said this is the same presentation the RACs saw with no changes.

Public Questions

Sterling Brown, Utah Farm Bureau said late last year a number of DWR staff members helped with a committee to look at incentives for landowners and others to possibly increase elk numbers on public lands. What were the results of that? Is it part of some of these recommendations?

Mr. Aoude said the recommendations of the committee were carried forward and we still have the task of forming the unit committees that are on a local basis. We will revamp the unit plans a year from now. Today's recommendations do not reflect any of that change. They are still based on the population objectives that are in place. There is always a year lag after committees and change in population objectives.

RAC Recommendations

Southern – Mr. Flinders said most of the discussion was on general season deer, harvest rates and various weapon types. The most pointed discussion was on limited entry elk and spike elk with the increase in permits. Ultimately there was a motion to accept everything as recommended. It was then amended to leave the limited entry bull elk permits for the Fish Lake, Manti and Wasatch units the same as 2010. The amended motion carried 6 to 2 and the overall motion carried unanimously.

Southeastern – Mr. Kevin Albrecht said they were unable to fill a quorum. Several elected officials were at meetings and there was some sickness. They had good discussion. Overall they supported the DWR's recommendations.

Central – Mr. Oswald said they had 100% attendance on their RAC. We are also very pleased about Mr. Bair's appointment to the Wildlife Board. There was a motion to accept the Division's recommendations with one exception that bull elk permit numbers on Manti and Wasatch Units remain the same as previous year and it passed 7 to 5.

Northeastern – Mr. Christensen said they had lots of discussion on general season buck permit numbers as well as the increase in spike tags in the Book Cliffs. There were a number of motions made and several amendments. The final motions were as follows:
MOTION: 30% deer reduction in Northeast region to 9,000 permits and 100 less buck permits in the Book Cliffs – passed 8 to 1. Concern was expressed on not seeing very many mature bucks in the Book Cliffs and the buck population in northeast. There were also opposing opinions on cuts. MOTION: To have no spike hunt in the Book Cliffs on elk, but go with statewide 15,000 spike permits on the elk hunt. This passed 5 to 4.
MOTION: To accept the rest of the recommendations and this passed unanimously.

Northern – Mr. Byrnes said they had three motions of which two passed. MOTION: Accept the spike recommendation as presented and it passed 8 to 3. MOTION: Adopt

the remainder of the permit numbers with the exception of the spike permits and it passed 8 to 3.

Public Comment

Byron Bateman of SFW said he attended the Northeastern RAC and supported their motions for the reduction. He wanted to further that today. Some of the fawn counts are substantially below what they were estimated originally so that additional decrease in deer tags should be warranted.

Don Peay of SFW thanked the Division for presenting the data in the RAC meetings. They took the information back to their Board of Directors and there were 41 sportsmen in attendance. They supported about 95% of the Division's recommendations with a couple of issues. The first is in keeping the number of trophy elk tags on Manti, Fish Lake and Wasatch the same as last year verses the increase. If you look at the three year tag numbers from the last three years on the Beaver, Pahvant, San Juan and the Boulder, even though the tag number stayed the same, the average age dropped one year or more according to harvest data. After the hunt a lot of the hunters were fairly disappointed and the data verified the average age is coming down. There are 6,000 elk on the Wasatch Unit, 12,000 on the Manti. If the Manti is going to reach equilibrium at about 450 tags and we are recommending 600 on the Wasatch, it is not a sustainable number. What it will lead to is it becomes a crowding issue and decrease in satisfaction. The feedback from hunters says as we continue to increase number of tags, there are crowding problem and less quality of hunt. The elk go onto the CWMUs and it gives less to public. Keeping the spikes tags where they are is also an issue looking to the future of big bulls. He commented on the decrease in the demand on turkey permits. If you get too much opportunity, it is not a fun experience. In this case more is less.

Director Karpowitz said it is still way more opportunity than it was under limited entry.

Mr. Peay said there is a point of diminishing returns on all this, where more actually is less.

Greg Gilroy of Northeastern Utah Wildlife Coalition spoke to the Board. He said they started meeting as a group of various organizations and he listed them from the handout. (See Attachment #1) They did this in an effort to get a plan agreeable to everyone concerned in pursuit of these issues. On the South Slope above Vernal they have the one of the poorest buck/doe ratio at 11 per 100 in the state. That is one of the heaviest hunted areas in their region. They have also been devastated on the numbers coming from the Book Cliffs. These are the reasons they have come up with these recommendations. At an SFW banquet that was held last week they did a survey from 104 of those who were in attendance. (Included in attachment #1) This reflects the feelings of the general public in their area. He talked to Representative John Mathis, Chairman over appropriations committee for the DNR and he expressed the fact that we are really facing a struggle with the budget. He feels we need to look at the resource. Some of our management practices need to change for the future of wildlife. He asked the Board to consider their plan.

Brad Horrocks of Grazing for Wildlife addressed the effort that has been put in to the Northeast region to come up with this survey. They have been working on this recommendation for better than a year as to what the people in the Northeast region want. Many of those in the area wanted to go to 4,000 tags so they felt good about getting them to 9,000. They have put in a lot of effort. We have a drastic problem with our deer out there. On the spike only Book Cliff hunt the hunters are dissatisfied and the quality of elk and hunter opportunity has been affected by spike hunters. Fawn survival is down in the Book Cliffs, around 15%. There is low hunter satisfaction on bucks that they are harvesting and they are asking for the number of deer tags to be reduced. They would like the Board to consider 4 point or better options in the Book Cliffs. People feel that it worked in the past. They would also like them to look at the transplant of does. The white tail deer industry is doing well with transplanting. Look at what we can do to make it work for these units. He thanked the Division for their efforts. He complimented Don Peay on his efforts in the wolf wars. He hopes the people realize what he has done for the state of Utah.

Jason Lowe of United Wildlife Cooperative said they represent the hard working, everyday sportsmen and women of Utah. They have had a number of meetings and had a variety of comments. Today they recommend a 100 tag increase on the Manti and the Wasatch for elk. They are very concerned about the deer herds in Utah and the opportunity for the future hunters in the state to be able to enjoy that tradition. There is also the huge concern about the budget in the future. Is it really necessary to make the 5,000 tag decrease if we are facing these budget problems? They would recommend that we do another survey to see where people stand today, not from the 2008 survey. They recommend postponing the cut until they could get the input.

Mr. Hatch asked what poll he is talking about.

Mr. Aoude said the survey the Division did in 2008 when they redid the deer plan.

Mr. Johnson said he's never heard of their group and asked how many active paid members they have.

Mr. Lowe said it is a grass roots organization and they just started at the beginning of the year. They are at about 1,100 members and it is free to join. They have people joining every day. People are concerned about the deer hunting and its future. They would like to get some more accurate information.

Mr. Perkins asked which limited entry units he referred to and what the recommendations were. Is that 100 more tags than the Division recommended?

Mr. Lowe said it was part of the original recommendation of the Division. They want to go with the Central RAC recommendations.

Director Karpowitz said the recommended increase on the Wasatch is 94 and the Manti, 57.

Mr. Perkins said Central wanted the permits kept the same as 2010.

Mr. Lowe said they voted on altering that original recommendation. They want what the Division recommended.

Chairman Woodard said the decision to move the direction they are going in the Division is what was decided during the December board meeting.

Board Discussion

Chairman Woodard summarized the RAC recommendations and public recommendations. He asked that limited entry elk tags be discussed first.

Mr. Johnson said concerning the last presentation. He has been going over the old annual reports back to 1935. He recommends that everyone look at these. He would like these reports to be put on the website. In the 1960's there were 2,800 deer harvested on the Elk Ridge and it has gone to 38 tags given presently. That's why we're looking to cut tags. He will admit that there were too many deer on Elk Ridge and it needed a drastic reduction, but now we're at 38.

Director Karpowitz said their biologists have to make recommendations according to the plans the Board approves. The Board is charged with weighing that with public sentiment and the social, economic and biological values, taking it all into consideration. Please don't forget the plan that you've approved. The elk plan has not gone two years without change and when it was developed there was a lot of give and take in the committee that developed that plan relative to age objective on some units, providing more opportunity and additional spike hunting. That was brought to the Board as a package. Now it appears that we like some parts and not other parts of the plan. He encouraged the Board to follow the plan and there are lots of ways to arrive there. We need to be moving toward the objective on elk. The same with the deer plan and yet there is discussion on doing things differently. Let's follow the plan that the Board approved. There was a lot of give and take in the committee who developed this and a lot of public input. People supported this as a package and not a piece at a time.

Chairman Woodard said let's go to limited entry elk tags and he reviewed the recommendations from Central and Southern RACs.

Mr. Johnson said he has had some concern on the Manti with people in Emery country concerned about what they are seeing on the quality. He thinks we've hit the tipping point on some of these units and need to back off. One long term thing on the Manti is do they need to raise the age limit on there and on the Wasatch one more time. We are over on the age classification on the charts and according to that we should be giving more tags. If the public is bothered, raise the age classification.

Mr. Perkins said if the rest of the Board concurs, at some point economics will enter in this discussion and the resource is undoubtedly the first priority for all of us. He is more concerned over the last few years on deer than on elk. He wants to look at the deer issues first.

Mr. Brady said he doesn't have a problem with the plan. What the Northeastern Wildlife Coalition is saying is we have to take care of the resource and it will come back. The permits we lose today will come back with the resource in the future. The Vernal Unit is the real problem. You could say why not close it, but that change burdens other units. He is in favor of what the group in Northeast has come up with. It is a significant option, especially with the handout at the SFW banquet. He supports that the tags be cut to 9,000, as recommended by the Northeast RAC. It is their backyard and they know what needs to occur. These recommendations were made before we knew the situation with the fawns. In the Book Cliffs the fawns were way down.

Mr. Perkins said in many of the recommendations made today he doesn't see any real compelling new evidence that has occurred since we approved the plan, or that we have a biological problem that needs to be addressed that wasn't known previously. In this case he does see some reasoning to this. The Vernal Unit is down to the lowest buck/doe ratio of any in the state. The Basin has had two hard back to back winters. Of all the proposals today, there is more biological and social merit on this reduction than others.

Mr. Albrecht asked Mr. Brady to explain the fawn reduction section of the handout.

Mr. Brady went over the map that is in the handout from Northeastern Wildlife Coalition. These were Division counts that were done the third week of April. He got these counts from one of the biologists. He extrapolated that to see what percent the fawns were of the herd. As he recalls the fawns represented 18% of the total animals counted over the six sites. When you see those types of counts, the fawns are down. He has heard similar reports as to Current Creek.

Director Karpowitz said that is not 18 fawns per 100 does, that is 18 fawns per 100 adults and there are 37 bucks. That is a number we don't normally use.

Mr. Brady said he equates that because if he was a rancher it would be a question of how many calves you need to keep the herd growing.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the general season deer recommendations with the exception that we reduce the Northeastern region general season deer permits from 11,000 to 9,000.

Chairman Woodard said we have the balance of the deer recommendations, looking to the Book Cliffs recommendation from the Northeastern RAC. It was only addressed there.

Mr. Brady said the people that live out there would like to see that reduced because of the quality of the deer in the area.

Mr. Albrecht asked if the buck/doe ratios there aren't within where they should be.

Mr. Aoude said yes. The three year average is above objective. The last few years it's been right in there at 32 bucks per 100 does. We should be able to maintain that level of harvest.

Mr. Perkins said in the Northeastern RAC minutes people were concerned with the quality of hunt, but there has not been other significant change. Mr. Perkins then asked Mr. Aoude for the hunt satisfaction and other data that might explain the Book Cliffs issue. Mr. Aoude was asked to present the data. This makes the situation understandable.

Mr. Aoude said this is what the last three years have looked like on the Book Cliffs limited entry unit for deer, including harvest success rate, satisfaction indices, antler measurement and ages compared to all other limited entry units in the state (See Attachment #2) Often people equate one bad year of hunting with the population decline. There are a lot of things that affect antler growth like drought reflecting that year's weather condition. There wasn't a lot of change as far as satisfaction and antler measurement from previous years. They are still harvesting the same kind of deer as in past years. The harvest age has gone up a little. He does not think this unit requires a 100 permit cut and there is nothing saying we need to cut 25% of the permits on that unit. Our recommendation is to leave it status quo.

Mr. Perkins said three years ago we were sitting with a buck/doe ratio similar to the Henry's and the Paunsaugunt.

Mr. Aoude said we were at 45 three years ago and it was even higher the year prior. We are issuing more permits and when this happens you have people with different expectations every year to see more deer. This is our largest limited entry unit in the state with an 86% success rates on rifle hunt and 82% on archery. One year of limited antler growth should not drive us to cut the permits. The bucks are out there and will mature another year. There is low fawn production, but that won't be in the harvest for 4-5 years, because we are shooting 4-5 year olds. We track these units with buck/doe ratios because it shows the number of bucks out there.

Chairman Woodard asked if there aren't a high percentage of weird antler animals and big three points, could that be driving it.

Mr. Aoude said there may be a little higher proportion there because they did have antler point restrictions for so long on those units, it may have driven it in that direction. He can't really speak to that, but the biologist could. There is no shortage of bucks. He has heard from several hunters that they looked over several bucks before harvesting a buck.

Mr. Fenimore said he is sensitive to trying to stay with the plan. He appreciates receiving the details. He would hope that the Board would not be moved by surveys taken from a banquet. He would hope that the Board not be moved one way or the other by anecdotal information.

Mr. Brady said the individuals at that SFW banquet were not a bunch of dummies. The people there put up their money year after year to support wildlife. Some of the highest paid individuals in the state were there. They had comments to say and they put up more money in one year than anybody in this room does in five years. Those were not just a bunch of hap hazard cowboys. He is not sure if he can biologically justify cutting the 100 tags, other than we are below objective out there and bucks don't grow the herd, but the individuals want to see the herd come up. As a young boy he can remember what the Book Cliffs was. You can still go and see a bunch of bucks out there, but there are a bunch of junk deer. It has been suggested that we have a youth hunt and make sure they get rid of those management bucks. Nonetheless, that is what the Northeast RAC voted for.

Mr. Hatch said he takes exception to hap hazard cowboys. They are just as intelligent as someone who makes a lot of money.

Mr. Brady said sometimes they are and he doesn't want that inference from this point either.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed 4 to 2 with Ernie Perkins and Bill Fenimore opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the limited entry and premium limited entry deer recommendations as presented by the Division with the exception that the Book Cliffs to be reduced by 50 permits.

Mr. Perkins said we are seeing a lot in this meeting specifically, of "not in my backyard syndrome." It is common throughout our society as seen up north with the Legacy Highway. Every one of these recommendations for change that we are going to hear is something like, "we need to do this statewide, but not in my backyard."

Mr. Fenimore said his remark wasn't to disparage that Northeastern group, but it is a very focused group in terms of their goals and so forth. He gave a fishing analogy comparing vested bass fishermen to the little kid with the cane pole. There are more folks out there than just one group.

Mr. Johnson said relative to the SFW banquet, they had over 300 people at their banquet. He asked for a show of hands how many got a deer in the last season and about 10 people raised their hands.

Mr. Brady said cutting spike tags is what the coalition wanted to do. They are looking to cut spike tags because of the crowding. The spike hunting is 16-18% success.

Mr. Albrecht said we are staying below what our herd objective is to take care of our spike hunt, which maxes out at 20%. We're at 18% now and if we take those tags off that unit, we'll just put the pressure somewhere else. If we are going to do something different, it has to be different statewide.

Director Karpowitz asked the biologist if they have the number of how many hunters hunted the Book Cliffs and how many bulls the spike hunters took.

Dax Mangus, biologist in the Book Cliffs said in 2009 from the harvest surveys they had 471 hunters hunt (all weapon types) and they harvested 116 spikes. In 2010 it was 452 hunters and they harvested 160 spikes. Season dates do not overlap, although there is a slight overlap during the archery with archery spike hunters and archery limited entry elk hunters during the overlap. It is the same with any limited entry unit spike hunt in the state.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed 4 to 2 with Del Brady and Jake Albrecht opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the general season and limited entry season elk recommendations as presented by the Division.

Mr. Johnson said on the spike only, biologically it is a good way to manage, taking out the poor genetics. The branch antlered yearlings survive. The opposite has happened in deer. We have hit the deer so hard that the breeding has been done by the little spike bucks with poor genetics over a long period of time. We should look at different hunting dates on the elk spike hunts to take care of crowding.

Mr. Hatch said he feels we have a thriving elk population in the state. Mule deer are much more sensitive in their management. There is a debate out there on whether we should be managing for quality or opportunity. As a Board we have addressed this and the Division is moving in that direction.

Mr. Brady said he opposed because he wants to support the coalition, but he is with the Board on the issue biologically.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Division's recommendations for "Bucks, Bulls and OIAL Permits 2011."

6) Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2011 (Action)

Mr. Aoude presented this agenda item. He went over the fawn production trends 1998-2009 and statewide deer pop trends and compared antlerless permits. All but 150 permits recommended are geared toward depredation issues or other issues of that nature. There are 150 permits that are for the Parowan Unit to deal with some specific habitat damage in that area. Those are the only permits issued to deal with population reduction.

Moving onto elk, we are above the statewide objective overall. The elk herds are all doing well and he went over population trends compared to antlerless permits. The increase in permits is to get back to objective as soon as possible, from 9,803 last year to 12,174 this year. They also recommend offering antlerless elk control permits to hunters who have any antlered or OIAL big game permit on the following units: 3 units where the objective is 0 elk -Henry Mountains, North San Rafael and San Juan. We have three units where access issues make it impossible to harvest enough antlerless elk to control the population, Nine Mile Range Creek, East Canyon and Chalk Creek units. He then went over doe pronghorn with a slight increase in permits. The majority of those are on the Cache North Rich Unit where they are over objective. Almost 400 permits are there. The majority of the doe pronghorn permits used to come from the Plateau, but two winters ago, the winter mortality was very high. There is a 50 permit hunt there that deals with cropland damage. No permits were recommended for cow moose. We have seen stabilization or even a slight decline in our moose populations.

Mr. Albrecht asked what the population on Parker Mountain antelope is.

Ms. Bonzo said they flew it two months ago. Jim Lamb has been monitoring it closely. It is estimated at 1,100 now and the population objective is 1500.

Mr. Fenimore asked if it would make sense with pronghorn if they are easy enough to capture, to move those up in Rich down to the unit that had a lot of winter mortality in the past.

Mr. Aoude said it would, but the Parker Mountain population will probably rebound a lot quicker, most likely within the next couple of years barring winter mortality. The only place that it makes sense to move pronghorn are in areas where they're at such low numbers that they couldn't rebound on their own. We only move animals to give an area a boost when they are trying to overcome a bad event. That is not the case here. Pronghorn have the ability to produce twins and triplets when conditions are good and they'll bounce back. They are looking at the Cache North Rich area in the future if we have some sites we may want to transplant from. There is extensive crop damage in that area so they don't want to wait another year.

Mr. Brady asked about the 100 doe permits in Ashley Valley. He has given the Board members a copy of that map. His suggestion is that we try to focus on the deer that are a problem. If we have deer in Ashley Valley which is the farmland right around Vernal, into Jensen, Dry Fork and Deep Creek, the map should identify those areas.

Mr. Aoude said he talked to Mr. Mangus about that and he thinks it would be more useful to do away with that hunt and deal with it through mitigation permits. Just because, as Mr. Brady mentioned, if you restrict the hunt it is mostly people's backyards and access becomes almost harder to do.

Mr. Brady said he is glad to hear that.

Chairman Woodard asked if the Division is changing their recommendation on that and would you need a motion to back that up.

Mr. Aoude said yes.

Mr. Albrecht said a year ago at this meeting the Board asked the Division to look at boundary change on the Boulder and the Fish Lake. What process did that go through?

Ms. Bonzo said this summer she spoke with all of their law enforcement officers at a crew meeting. They looked at maps and considered it. In years before they did have the boundary further south. It does pose a lot of law enforcement issues, so for that reason they would like it to be on Highway 24, keeping it where it is.

Mr. Albrecht asked how we will kill the Boulder elk off if we have that boundary where it is.

Ms. Bonzo said we are still killing Boulder elk.

Mr. Albrecht said they definitely are, when they come off the Monroe.

Ms. Bonzo said they could be Mt. Dutton elk also.

Mr. Albrecht said clear to Koosharem Reservoir with the boundary. He won't support that hunt anymore if they can't get a decent boundary change on it.

Mr. Flinders said when they are counted in the winter, if they're on the Boulder side of the road they are Boulder elk, whether they came from the Fish Lake or wherever. It is a winter target population. That is where they migrate to.

Mr. Albrecht said when they count the Fish Lake they count it on to the Boulder, so they are not Boulder elk.

Mr. Flinders said it follows the highway boundaries.

Mr. Albrecht said you can issue 600 permits on the Boulder every year and most guys aren't going to drive there. They'll drive to the Garkane substation.

Public Comment

Jason Lowe of United Wildlife Cooperative said they are recommending the board be cautious with the Wasatch cow tags perhaps spreading them out over three years with that number of cow tags.

Chairman Woodard said they are spread out by hunts.

Byron Bateman, SFW said Southern region voted to do a transplant of does from the Cottonwood area out to the Southwest Desert. They have been talking to Randy Larsen at BYU and trying to work on a study for this issue so they could do some more capture and relocation. With the agriculture problem, it would be easy to capture and transplant does. There are a lot of mule deer transplanted in Texas with a good success rate. He said there have been some studies done. There was a Master's thesis that was put out from Sul Ross University in Alpine, Texas where they did a mule deer transplant and relocation. The success rate ran from 57%-83%. SFW would like to get some money behind this and get started by 2012 in the winter. The third trimester is probably the best time to move the does. They want the DWR to get a proposal and make it a three year study, so we can get some real data behind us. They would commit funds for three years, doing it as a Master's thesis, collaring many of the deer moved.

Mr. Albrecht asked if Mr. Bateman has a cost estimate on the study.

Mr. Bateman said \$50,000-\$75,000 per year, especially if they do it on a hard release. We could have them relocated within 3-4 hours. They have a lot of people interested in volunteering to help defray the cost. They have also had some private people talk about helping defray some of the costs. They can transplant deer where our populations are really low and help jump start them. This is something we haven't done in the past. Mule deer are our number one priority and anything we can do for a minimal cost, we should do.

Don Peay of SFW said he would like to address the 5-10 year plan. He and Director Karpowitz attended a seminar in October 2008 with the hunting industry. That was just when Wall Street crashed. In that conference they said the future of conservation is more state and federal tax money. He told them they weren't very good businessmen, because in the future there will be a lot less federal and state tax money to support conservation. That problem hasn't even started to set off the chain reaction that will occur from the federal agency budgets to the habitat matching funds. We are looking at a 15 trillion dollar problem in the federal government. There is a billion dollar problem in the state budgets. Where are the future revenues going to come from? Now we need to look at return on investment and what it has been, 70 million dollars and 600,000 acres of habitat restored. What is the return on investment to that? To date, zero. There has been an arrest to the decline in deer population, no increase in cattle or elk populations. As the

Board sits here and makes decisions, the only way for Division to have more revenue in the future is to say there is enough new grass for 250,000 new animals on our public lands. There has been a lot of money invested in habitat and the only way to grow revenue is to grow these base herds of elk and deer. Some of the growth is going to have different ways to distribute that increase. It is a complex issue. There have to be some hard committees set up with landowners, sportsmen and different groups or the revenue picture of this agency is not very good. People won't pay more for less, only for more and better. SFW has fought harder to get the Division more resources and tools to get more wildlife than anybody. We have to get some return on the habitat investment or it won't be sustainable.

Greg Gilroy, Northeast Utah Wildlife Coalition said they are in favor of the transplant. There is help out there available and our sportsmen will help out. He agrees with Mr. Peay's comment also. Our resource is our main concern. They agree with the Division looking at the South Slope Ashley Creek, Deep Creek situation on the deer and doing away with the doe hunt, dealing with it with depredation permits. He thanked the Board for their efforts.

RAC Recommendations

Northern – Mr. Byrnes said they approved the Division's recommendations unanimously.

Northeastern – Mr. Christensen said there was concern about Ashley Valley and whether the problem deer are being harvested or not. They passed the Division's recommendations 6 to 4. He said there is some consideration on maybe changing the boundary map or going to mitigation permits, their RAC would probably go with this suggestion.

Central – Mr. Oswald said they passed the recommendations 11 to 1.

Southeastern – Mr. Albrecht said they had no quorum. The RAC members present were comfortable with the Division's recommendation. There was also discussion on the Manti elk herd and the fact that the antlerless harvest goes very well as it is broken up into around 11 units. They complemented the Division on managing such a large herd with minimal effects.

Southern – Mr. Flinders said they had some controversy in their meeting. Nearly half of the public wanted to speak to the 150 deer tags on the Panguitch Lake unit/Parowan Front. Their motion was to accept the antlerless deer recommendations, but asked the Board, as an action item, to ask the Division to look at transplanting deer and using BYU as a formal study so in ten years when this comes up again we can look back on whether it worked or not. The motion passed unanimously and the remainder passed unanimously also.

Board Discussion

Mr. Fenimore asked Director Karpowitz about moving deer and the likelihood of success.

Director Karpowitz said this was discussed somewhat yesterday. He was involved in as was Ron Hodson in the last deer transplant the Division did where they moved deer from the San Juan unit to the Henry Mountain unit. He also talked to Jim Guyman who did five deer transplants during his career, all six transplants failed, although they were not monitored with today's technology. They didn't have radio collars on all those deer, so the information is not as solid as we'd like. He does not know of any transplant of mule deer that has been successful in the west. The only time you would consider a transplant is where you have no deer and you are trying to start a new unit or you have a very low deer population where adding 50-100 deer might significantly change that population. To move deer to a herd of 1000s of deer, it will have no effect. Having said that, if the sportsmen want to fund it and not short our other habitat programs, we can do it. It is very time intensive and the \$100,000 would be a minimal cost. The first year's expenses would be more than \$100,000 with all those radio collars.

Chairman Woodard asked if this moves forward as a transplant, would it qualify as a predator management, like we do with the bighorns up on Timp where we give it a fair shake.

Director Karpowitz said no, it won't automatically qualify, you could do that and make sure you move them to an area that has a PMP on it, but you are moving primarily adult deer. Predators don't have much effect on adult does. They die from all sorts of things, not just predators. The Division would agree to study it one more time, but it must be funded and done from the outside.

Mr. Perkins said he contacted Dr. Randy Larson from BYU to get some education for this discussion, not knowing that Mr. Bateman had started working with him. Mr. Perkins is in favor of doing the study since in the past the studies haven't had enough scientific rigors to them, nor enough people with skin in the game that the topic has been concluded and buried. His conclusion with Dr. Larson is trying to do it this year is too soon. In order to design the study properly including the decisions on which deer we are trying to move and where we want to move them. The parameters of the study need to be established before we move deer. Ask the questions and determine the direction. He is in favor of the study and he talked to the presenter in the Southern region and he was talking about sportsmen paying for it and they were already lined up to do so. Also they weren't talking conservation permit dollars. That is important because we are already ripping a lot of money out of the habitat work that in his mind is the most important long term thing we need to do in the state in order to have good deer herds in the future. He is in support of the transplant with two provisions, we do not start this year, get adequate funding and get the sportsmen involved.

Director Karpowitz said there is probably time to get it done this year, especially if you tell a university the funding is there. They'll have a study proposal ready.

Mr. Perkins said he is more interested in getting it done right. He is not sure Panguitch Lake is the right place for the transplant either. Locations for taking from and moving need to be relevant to what we are trying to prove in the study.

Mr. Hatch said the real problem was created when the interstate system was established with the interruption in the migration. The deer have come out of South Creek down to the freeway, and migrating south down to the Parowan Front. There is no question there is habitat damage on that front, because the deer can't go on west like they have done historically. The real solution long term is to try to figure out how to get those deer under or over the freeway where they have historically gone in the winter. That will be an expensive project, but there is plenty of habitat just on the other side.

Mr. Perkins asked if a short term solution would be to use volunteers and move those 100 deer to the other side.

Mr. Hatch said it might be the cheap way.

Director Karpowitz said maybe we should talk to UDOT before we invest in this study, and ask if we gave them that kind of money, what kind of a bypass structure they could put in. They have successfully done some retrofits on existing highways. If someone offered that kind of money they might come up with the rest of it to get it done.

Mr. Albrecht said they should set up a committee and come up with some long term solutions with a definite return. They should look at what the study is about, talk to the university and talk to UDOT before we go ahead.

Director Karpowitz said we could ask the university for a request for proposal on what a study would be and in the meantime we are talking with UDOT daily, but getting together to talk specifically about a place for adjustment there by Beaver to see if we can't get the deer under that highway.

Mr. Hatch said there is an overpass there, but he is not sure it works.

Director Karpowitz said the overpass doesn't work very well, but the new underpasses are working better. We might need to look at other locations also.

Mr. Albrecht said if we are going to spend \$100,000 a year would it be better to do it on something with a big question mark, or put the money into habitat. These problems are all over the state and there is no easy solution.

Mr. Perkins said we could put this on the action log.

Mr. Albrecht said he would like to see a small committee put together to talk with the university.

Director Karpowitz said we can talk to the university and also meet with UDOT down in that region to talk specifically about some retrofit.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's recommendations on Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2011 with the exception of doe permits in Ashley Valley be addressed through mitigation permits. Also the Division pursues a workable solution concerning the doe on the Panguitch Lake Unit consulting UDOT and applicable sportsmen's groups.

Mr. Johnson said he has some questions about Southeast region on these doe hunts. He would like the biologist to go through each doe hunt in that region and justify them. This was not asked in the RAC meeting.

Brad Crompton said he doesn't know of any doe hunts in Southeast region.

Mr. Johnson said there is one in San Juan for 50 permits.

Mr. Crompton said yes east of the highway there in the Montezuma Canyon area where we are trying to remove a depredating population.

Mr. Johnson said he can understand the antlerless elk, but has a hard time understanding it on the deer.

Mr. Crompton said those 50 permits were from a year ago and that hunt has been removed. There were some concerns on that hunt with the population down in the area. The studies they did out there were showing that the deer were doing quite a lot of damage, as well as the elk.

Mr. Johnson said they were doing damage on sunflowers, but most of the people quit raising sunflowers.

Mr. Crompton said that problem took care of itself and we are not hunting the does.

Mr. Brady asked for clarification on the Ashley Valley, in that we are leaving that up to the DWR to either make a more concise map or go to the mitigation permits.

Mr. Hatch said his motion was to go to mitigation permits, rather than antlerless permits.

Mr. Albrecht said he opposed the motion simply because of the boundary change that he spoke to earlier.

Chairman Woodard said the motion included the balance of the recommendations also.

7) Big Game Rule Amendments – R657-5 (Action)

Mr. Aoude presented this agenda item. (See Powerpoint Presentation) He said this is a slight modification to the big game rule. They are recommending changes to some of the firearm restrictions to align with state statute. They recommend lowering bullet weight requirement on muzzleloaders for deer and pronghorn. They recommend removing the temporary game preserve section from the rule for limited entry big game hunts. They recommend allowing the possession of a handgun in a vehicle in accordance with state statute while spotlighting. They recommend allowing archery and muzzleloader hunters to carry a handgun in the field, lowering the bullet weight restrictions for muzzleloader from .50 caliber to .45 for hunting deer and pronghorn and including language that clarifies that laser range finding scopes are legal.

Mr. Albrecht asked about the handgun in camp.

Mr. Aoude said they could already have it in camp, but can now have it in the field.

RAC Recommendations

All RACs voted unanimously to accept the Division's recommendations, except Southeastern where they didn't have a quorum, but they were in agreement with the recommendation.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's recommendations on the Big Game Rule Amendments R657-5 as presented.

Mr. Johnson said in reference to making the Board meetings go faster, this last agenda item might be an example of one that is not controversial and we wouldn't have to go through every RAC response, only if they had a specific question or comment.

8) Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2011 (Action)

Randy Wood, Wildlife Program Manager presented this agenda item. He did a CWMU antlerless permit overview. He explained the buck/bull permit options along with the split options. He went over the changes and recommendations for 2011. (See Powerpoint Presentation)

Mr. Hatch asked if we cut the public permits on moose to zero.

Mr. Wood said they did on the public draw, but there are 15 antlerless moose permits all being given on the CWMUs.

He then went over the CWMUs by region including several new CWMUs. The Division approached the Chalk Creek CWMUs and asked them if it would be okay to eliminate antlerless deer permits. They all agreed to it. He continued to go over the new CWMUs and the recommendations and changes.

Mr. Albrecht asked if the gentleman was in Northern or Northeastern a few years back that had a problem with our 3 or 5 day hunt. Did he ever come back to be a CWMU?

Mr. Perkins said he did not.

RAC Recommendation

Northern – Mr. Byrnes said they voted 9 with 2 (recused) in favor of the Division's recommendations.

Northeastern, Central and Southern voted unanimously in favor of the Division's recommendations.

Southeastern – Mr. Albrecht said there was no vote, but they were comfortable with the Division's recommendations.

Mr. Perkins asked about Jacob's Creek in the RAC packet and in the presentation said 3 public permits, but is the correct figure 5?

Mr. Wood said it increased from 2 to 5 last year and this year there is no change.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's recommendations as presented on Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2011.

Chairman Woodard said over the years things have come up on moving boundaries. The Division has made quite an extensive boundary change in our new packets for the next RAC tour starting next week. Instead of changing a lot of boundaries at the Board meeting, he would recommend we look at those boundaries. If you have a concern on them, get with the Division quickly.

9) Other Business (Contingent)

Mr. Hatch said he will only be here one more month and would like to see as we move to our new unit by unit management in the state; we try some antler restriction management in a few units on a trial basis. He would like to send this out for public comment.

Director Karpowitz said that would have to be discussed in the November RACs/December Board meeting for the 2012 guidebooks. It would have to be a proposal at that time. He hoped that subject had been put to rest.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded Jake Albrecht and passed 5 to 1 with Bill Fenimore opposed.

MOTION: I move that we put on the action log that the Division takes out a proposal placing two units, one from Northern or Northeastern region and one from Southern or Southeastern region under antler restriction.

Mr. Perkins said he doesn't think the Northern region would want one because it would be the Cache or Box Elder and that is half the hunting opportunity.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Approved