

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

August 15-16, 2012, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

Revised Aug. 13, 2012

Wednesday, August 15, 2012 – 1:00 pm - **Canceled**

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda | Canceled | ACTION |
| 2. Board Appeal – George Simon | - Canceled | ACTION |

Thursday, August 16, 2012 – 9:00 am

- | | | |
|---|--|--------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda | | ACTION |
| – Del Brady, Chairman | | |
| 2. Approval of Minutes | | ACTION |
| – Del Brady, Chairman | | |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log | | CONTINGENT |
| – Ernie Perkins, Vice-Chair | | |
| 4. DWR Update | | INFORMATION |
| – Jim Karpowitz, DWR Director | | |
| 5. Board Variances – Time Certain 9:30 am | | ACTION |
| 6. Bobcat Harvest Recommendations | | ACTION |
| – John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator | | |
| 7. Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 | | ACTION |
| – Blair Stringham, Waterfowl/Upland Game Coordinator | | |
| 8. Pineview Reservoir Hunting Closure Proposal | | ACTION |
| – Becky Wood, Landowner | | |
| 9. Conservation Permit Allocations for 2013-2015 | | ACTION |
| – Kevin Bunnell, Wildlife Section Chief | | |
| 10. Convention Permit Audit | | ACTION |
| – Jim Karpowitz, Director - Alan Clark, Assistant Director | | |
| 11. Convention Permit Allocation | | ACTION |
| – Alan Clark, Assistant Director | | |
| 12. United Wildlife Cooperative Proposal | | ACTION |
| – Tye Boulter, UWC - Martin Bushman, Assistant General Attorney – Jim Karpowitz | | |
| 13. CWMU Advisory Committee Membership | | ACTION |
| – Scott McFarlane, Private Lands, Public Wildlife Coordinator | | |
| 14. Broadmouth CWMU request for Additional Bull Moose Permit | | ACTION |
| – Gareth Jones, CWMU Operator | | |
| 15. CRC – Recommendation – Scales and Tails | | ACTION |
| – Staci Coons, CRC Chair | | |
| 16. Request for Additional Antlerless Elk Permits | | ACTION |
| – Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator | | |
| 17. Other Business | | CONTINGENT |
| – Del Brady, Chairman | | |

**ACTION LOG
Wildlife Board Motions**

Following is a summary of Wildlife Board motions directing the Division to take action and the response to date:

Fall 2012 – Target Date – Preference Point Presentation

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to give a presentation on the preference point system relative to the new 30 unit deer plan.

Assigned to: Greg Sheehan
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: June 6, 2012

Late Fall 2012 – Target Date – Conservation Permit Program Report

MOTION: I move that the Division publish an annual report in reference to the conservation program that lists from start to finish how the permits are allocated, the percentages that are allocated, where the money goes and what projects are accomplished with that money.

Assigned to: Greg Sheehan
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: June 6, 2012

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Nine Mile Range Creek

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to report back on the Nine Mile Range Creek change to any bull relative to all issues of hunting, including trespass, harvest, and hunter satisfaction.

Assigned to: Anis Aoude
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: December 1, 2011

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Premium Limited-entry deer tags

MOTION: I move that we have placed on the action log that the Division look into a premium limited entry deer tag similar to the premium limited entry elk tag.

Assigned to: Anis Aoude
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: May 3, 2012

Summer 2014 – Target Date – Hunting Turkeys with Falcons

MOTION: I move that we put the hunting turkeys with falcons proposal on the action log for consideration when the Upland Game Guidebook comes up for review.

Assigned to: Jason Robinson
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: June 9, 2011

Summer 2014 – Target Date – Additional Benefits for Limited-Entry turkey tag holders

MOTION: I move that we have placed on the action log that the Division look into the possibility and feasibility of a limited entry turkey permit holder who is unsuccessful to turn in their limited entry tag and purchase a general season tag.

Assigned to: Jason Robinson
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: May 3, 2012

Fall 2014 – Target Date – Management Buck Tags on the Book Cliffs

MOTION: I move that the Division be asked to review the buck management tags on the Book Cliffs. People are always reporting the presence of big two and three point bucks in that area. Perhaps these permits could be given to youth. This is to be addressed during the revision of the Deer Management Plan in 2014.

Assigned to: Anis Aoude
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: December 1, 2011

On going – Target Date - Multi year guidebooks and rules

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

Assigned to: Staci Coons
Action: Under Study
Status: Wildlife Board Updated – January 12, 2012
Placed on Action Log: August 20, 2009

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
June 6, 2012, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

Wildlife Board Members Present

Del Brady – Chair
Ernie Perkins – Vice Chair
Alan Clark – Exec Sec
Jake Albrecht
Bill Fenimore
Calvin Crandall
John Bair
Mike King

RAC Chairs Present

Southern – Steve Flinders
Southeastern – Derris Jones
Central – Fred Oswald
Northeastern – Boyde Blackwell
Northern – Robert Bynes

Public Present

Tye Boulter
Troy Justensen
Harry Barber
Sterling Brown
Todd Black
Craig Black
Carson Black
Chip Dawson
Charity Stone
Chris Colton
Dale A Jones
Brent Poll
Ryan Loose

Division Personnel Present

Judi Tutorow
Staci Coons
Cindee Jensen
LuAnn Petrovich
Teresa Griffin
Kevin Bunnell
Bill Bates
Greg Sheehan
Krissy Wilson
Anis Aoude
Justin Hart
Lindy Varney
Lacy Welch
John Fairchild
Anita Candelaria
Roger Wilson
Suzette Fowlks
Dean Mitchell
Jason Robinson
Justin Shannon
Darren DeBloois
Justin Dolling
Randy Wood
Charlie Greenwood
Craig Clyde
Bruce Bonebrake
Martin Bushman
Michal Fowlks
Bryan Christensen

Chairman Brady had some car problems and is expected in a few hours. In the interim they will proceed with the agenda. Vice Chair Perkins welcomed the audience and introduced the Wildlife Board and RAC Chairs. He referenced the Southeast RAC minutes and Mr. King's response as to what the responsibilities of a Board member are. The response was very informative and appropriate. Vice Chair Perkins said he has one addition to the agenda talking about Winter WAFWA 2013 issue topics for the Commissioner's Committee.

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

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

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

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

The following motion was made by Mike King, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the May 3, 2012 Wildlife Board meeting as presented.

3) Old Business/Action Log

Vice Chair Perkins said there are no action log items coming due today and asked if anyone had any additions for the action log at this point.

Mr. Bair said they received an email from Mike Christensen from the Central region with some concerns about preference points and the current system, relative to how it affects people accruing preference points while they're still drawing their second choice. Having talked with people in the Division, he would like to put this issue on the action log for the Division to put together a presentation for the Board explaining this issue and how it works with the new unit by unit. The Division would also look at Mr. Christensen's suggestion that you cannot accrue preference points while drawing your second choice.

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to give a presentation on the preference point system relative to the new 30 unit deer plan.

Mr. Clark said on the Nine Mile Range Creek action log item it will be reported on at the November 2013 RAC/Board meetings.

Mr. Bates said they would rather wait a year to gather hunt data and push it to fall 2013.

4) DWR Update (**Information**)

Assistant Director Clark said Director Karpowitz is having some time off and he will do the update today. The drawing for bucks/bulls and OIAL permits was completed and results were posted on May 31, 2012. We did discover a problem with the Henry Mountain deer any weapon hunt, but it was before results were posted. The wrong

permit quota was sent to the contractor. All the people affected by this were contacted and have received any permits they would have had if the error had not occurred. It has been entirely corrected. They now have a revised process that will keep this from happening in the future.

Most of the general season deer permits went in the drawing, but they have 4,380 left, most are archery and muzzleloader. They will be available July 19 for muzzleloader and archery and will use a staggered process. July 31 the any weapon permits will be available.

Antlerless application period is now open and will close on June 21st. Bear issues are increasing as is typical in the spring. Coyote predator program is coming to completion. Lots of work has gone into that and information on that will be on the website soon.

Free fishing day occurred over the weekend. Community fisheries had lots of participation. Fishing is good throughout the state. Fishing sales are stable or up slightly. Comment on fishing changes for 2013 is open right now via the internet. They will probably have a few open houses also to discuss new ideas.

There is a new regional office in Vernal and it opened Monday. There are new phone numbers except for the front desk which is still the same. There will be an open house for the new office June 20, 2012. He then asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Albrecht asked if they can get a handout on the remaining tags and the number of people that applied for all of the units in the state.

Mr. Sheehan said they will get one on the remaining and the other information will be available soon. It is on the website now.

5) Board Variance Requests (**Action**)

Judi Tutorow, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator presented these request summaries. (See Board Variance Requests in the Board packet for details.) Randell Murray fractured his ankle and was only able to hunt one day. The committee is supportive of the reinstatement of his bonus points and waiving his waiting period based on the fact that the hunter only hunted one day because of his fractured ankle.

Mr. Randell then addressed the Board. He only hunted one day and it took several years to draw that tag. He has heard that variances have been granted in the past for people who have been hurt.

Mr. Bair asked if he shot at anything and how many points it took to draw the tag.

Mr. Murray said he did not shoot and did not see a bear on opening day. It took 7 points.

Mr. Bair said they have had a lot of discussion on this. Actually we will be voting on rules that pertain to this later on in the meeting today. The situation falls within the parameters we've discussed since he hunted one day and did not shoot at anything.

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we reinstate the bonus points and waive the waiting period for Randell Murray.

Ms. Tutorow then introduced Chris Flood's request. He hunted one day when he was involved in an accident and rolled his truck and was injured.

Mr. Flood said they arrived at camp for the limited entry bull elk hunt evening of September 8th and after setting up camp the next day went out in the evening. He passed out and rolled his truck that evening. He injured his shoulder and was unable to draw his bow back and had no vehicle for transportation. He had three points.

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by John Bair and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we reinstate the bonus points and waive the waiting period for Chris Flood.

Todd Black, Ben Peterson, Randy Lucas

Ms. Tutorow said this request came last week so it is relative to the 2012 Big Game drawing. Todd Black submitted the application for all three of them on the San Juan, Abajo Mtns for general season buck deer. The request is to exchange the weapon type to archery for all three hunters. Ms. Tutorow then read from the rule which addresses the process for exchanging permits. There were 365 unsuccessful applicants for this hunt with zero remaining to be sold over the counter. Through the years they've had a lot of hunters select the wrong weapon type on their application. The division has several different options to offer hunters who have done this. One is to surrender their permit and have their preference points restored. Two, they can exchange for a remaining archery permit and three, they can hunt with archery tackle during the any legal weapon if they decide to keep the permit. This is the committee's recommendation and options to help mitigate the situation.

Todd Black said he made a mistake and is not interested in hunting with a rifle or in another unit. This was a complete oversight on his part. They will just surrender the tags if a variance is not granted. Archery is a more primitive hunt that offers less success.

Vice Chair Perkins said the second choice on the drawing is on the Cache.

Mr. Black said yes, but it is for rifle. He does not want an archery tag on the Cache even if there might be one available. He feels badly about making this mistake relative to the other two hunters.

Mr. King recused himself from the vote because of professional association with Mr. Black.

Mr. Fenimore said something that might be considered is to have the applicant actually enter the weapon type, and then do it a second time.

Mr. Albrecht said when he did his application this year he made a similar mistake. He realized it a few days later and resubmitted. He does not see how we can pick and choose who can exchange a permit without setting a precedent for the future.

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by John Bair and passed unanimously with one recusal, Mike King.

MOTION: I move that we deny the variance request of Todd Black, Ben Peterson and Randy Lucas.

Mr. Bair said he feels bad about the situation, but this would set a precedence.

Mr. Black said this would really be a degrade of a weapon type and biologically it is a non issue. Perhaps in the future this might be something that could be considered.

Mr. Bair said the problem he has with this specific situation is there were 365 unsuccessful applicants for this hunt and they didn't get the hunt weapon wrong.

Vice Chair Perkins clarified that this motion is applicable to Mr. Black, Mr. Peterson and Mr. Lucas.

Garry R Bigler and Gary W Bigler

Ms. Tutorow said these two are father and son and in-laws to Edward Graves. They will call Mr. Graves on this request. He is the leader of a group of five who applied for these permits. His brother and son were refunded through the variance process. Garry and his son are both extended family and did not meet the definition of immediate family so they could not be refunded. They are nonresidents. They are requesting a refund on a general season hunt that would have to be approved as an extension that would then revert back to the refund because that hunt is no longer available, because of the switch to unit by unit. That is how they had to deal with the others.

Assistant Director Clark said the Board does not have the authority to give a refund. In effect, the Board can do that by extending the hunt that is no longer available and then they could get a refund.

Mr. Crandall asked what would happen to the tags if they are turned back in.

Ms. Tutorow said it was last year's hunt.

Mr. Bair asked if they are nonresident.

Ms. Tutorow said yes.

Mr. Perkins asked if the Board has ever approved an extension on a general season hunt.

Ms. Tutorow said they have done a few, mostly some nonresidents in situations like Hurricane Katrina.

Mr. Bair asked if they could have surrendered their permits before.

Ms. Tutorow said since he was so badly injured they didn't think about it until now. By the time they looked at the guidebook, it was too late. They could have surrendered it earlier on, but would not have received a refund.

A phone call was made to Edward W. Graves to present the request on behalf of the Bigler's.

Vice Chair Perkins greeted Mr. Graves and made him aware of the Board ready to hear his request.

Mr. Graves referred to the information he sent relative to the incident and a refund for the son-in-law and his father who live in Arizona. He reviewed the circumstances of his accident when he fell off his roof a year ago. He sustained many serious injuries that he still suffers from. Reimbursement was received for Mr. Graves and his sons permits because they are direct relatives. He has done everything he can to show that there was no attempt to hunt, since the accident occurred. He has had a lot of illness over the last eight years as a cancer survivor and was looking forward to this hunt last year. Over the last 7-8 years he has purchased hunting licenses and only gone 1-2 times, never expecting any money reimbursed. He paid for all the permits for this group looking to have a good time together. He asked if there were any questions. Needless to say he has lots of doctor bills that he continues to pay. This would really help him. If the DWR has the need to keep this money, he would like to know the reasoning. He hopes he will be able to hunt and fish in the future and put this hunt together again.

Mr. King asked if any money has been refunded.

Ms. Tutorow said three tags have been refunded, but the two non resident tags have not at \$263 each.

Mr. Bair said we would have to do an extension on these tags.

Mr. King asked if all the money is refunded or is there a handling fee.

Ms. Tutorow said there would be no handling fee on this one. There is a handling fee on limited entry but not general season.

The following motion was made by Bill Fenimore, seconded by Mike King and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve an extension for the hunt of Garry R Bigler and Gary W Bigler.

Dennis Kallash

Ms. Tutorow said Mr. Kallash is a nonresident out of Missouri who obtained a CWMU bull moose permit on the Two Bear. He hunted for two days when he was notified that his brother was in critical condition from an accident with a horse. He flew back home at that point. The operator, Kim Rolfe has given his permission for Mr. Kallash to hunt next year if it is approved. He is asking for an extension for next year. It was denied because he hunted two days before his brother's injury.

Vice Chair Perkins said this was a purchased permit since it was on a CWMU. We don't have any nonresident moose permits in the draw.

Ms. Tutorow said that's right, it was a privately purchased permit.

A phone call was made to Dennis Kallash.

Mr. Kallash explained the circumstances of his hunt. His brother was in an accident and he got the emergency call from his wife the first night of his hunt. He went home to be with his brother and didn't really think about the moose hunt or what might be done. Someone from the DWR called him and asked him about reporting his hunt and he owed them \$25. He told them he wasn't going to pay them. The caller said then he would not ever be able to hunt in Utah again. He then got a letter in the mail that said he needed to report his hunt, so he called and got more information from the DWR. The contact at the Division told him if he could prove that his brother was in the hospital they would waive the \$25. Mr. Kallash called back to see where he would send the information and that contact explained that there was a variance process available. He didn't know anything about that. At this point the process began with Mr. Kallash providing proof as to the circumstances which brought him to this appeal to the Board today.

Mr. Bair asked how many days Mr. Kallash hunted.

Mr. Kallash said he doesn't even think it was a couple. Late afternoon the first day they went out and listened to the elk bugle. On the second day they drove around to some different spots and that's when they got the call. The next day he decided to go home to his brother. He left the next day.

Mr. King asked about the partner with him who killed a moose.

Mr. Kallash said he did kill a moose the first day of hunting. They came in that afternoon and took care of that moose. He got the call that night.

Mr. Fenimore asked where the Two Bear CWMU is located.

Assistant Director Clark said it is on the Bear River drainage near the Wyoming line.

Mr. Bair said they try to be consistent and this depends on how the Board looks at one or perhaps two days of hunting. He said if Mr. Kallash arrived on evening, got settled in then received the call the next evening; he sees it as one day of hunting.

Mr. Crandall said part of the second day was spent helping his partner with the moose he killed. Is that hunting?

Mr. Kallash said he does not feel like he got to hunt.

Mr. Crandall asked if he has permission from the CWMU operator to come back and hunt.

Ms. Tutorow said yes.

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the variance request for Dennis Kallash.

Mr. Bair said to clarify, he felt Mr. Kallash had just one day of hunting.

6) Conservation Permit Rule Amendments R657-41 (**Action**)

Kevin Bunnell, Wildlife Section Chief presented this agenda item. He reviewed the program history and the regulation history. (See Powerpoint Presentation) He gave a short summary of the 2011 Legislative Audit and reviewed the program's accomplishments. Recommended rule changes were then presented. The inclusion of the table was for transparency.

Mr. Bair asked why just OIAL permits had a mechanism for reducing the number of conservation tags relative to the public tags. Perhaps to be consistent we should do that across the board.

Mr. Bunnell said they started with these tags because the number is small and we'll be able to work out any bugs with this change. This will be an easier process to work out with just the OIAL. In the future we could extend it to other permit types. He then finished the recommended changes and that concluded the presentation.

Vice Chair Perkins clarified that the Division's proposal would include explicit removal of general season deer as recommended by the Northern RAC.

Mr. Bunnell said yes and we can spell that out as such.

Vice Chair Perkins asked if there were any questions. This is a question only section. He then explained the orange comment cards relative to the public comment section of the meeting.

At this point Chairman Brady arrived. Vice Chair Perkins will finish this agenda item.

Ty Boulter of UWC asked what the projected elk tag cuts are with the age objective adjustment.

Mr. Bunnell said we have been in a steady growth mode. We are getting to the point where we are going to start to plateau and will reduce the number of tags on some units.

Mr. Boulter asked if it is accurate to say about a 10% cut in the next 3-5 years.

Mr. Aoude said our projected number of limited entry bull elk tags, given we're at objective on every unit is between 2,400 and 2,500 permits. That's about 500 permits fewer than we have now.

Mr. Boulter said if we adopt the rule as presented, that doesn't affect limited entry tags, we will see roughly a 500 permit reduction with the public, but none to the conservation permit program?

Mr. Aoude said this is over the next three years, probably once every unit comes to objective which could happen in the next 5-10 years on some units. The units that have more elk will take longer to get to objective. It will not be that steep of a decline in the next three years.

Mr. Albrecht asked, other than some of the things described in the presentation, what else can the conservation money be used for, like purchasing property.

Mr. Bunnell said the vast majority of the money goes to habitat projects, watershed restoration initiative and a lesser percentage to some research projects.

Assistant Director Clark said in the seven years Director Karpowitz has been Director, the money has never been used to purchase property. It is used for habitat in a different way. It is a very complicated state process to purchase property and most purchases never make it through that process. It is possible, but has not been done in the last seven years.

Mr. Bair asked what we get on matching funds from the federal government.

Mr. Bunnell we use this to generate seed money. Since the watershed initiative which started in about 2005, we have raised about 19 million dollars. The watershed initiative has accomplished 75 million dollars in projects during that time. We leverage this seed money through other partners to get lots of work done.

Mr. Fenimore asked if money has been used to retire grazing permits in areas where they want to put bighorn sheep, for example, with domestic sheep.

Mr. Clark said it has been used for conversions, rather than retirements. They are not done by the DWR, but between the conservation groups and the grazers.

Mr. Bair said in Central region there was a lot of discussion on the sheep program and how this might affect it if we were to take away even a few permits. How much is the budget for the sheep program?

Mr. Bunnell said in 2011, there were six Desert sheep permits, that sold for an average of \$44,000 and four Rocky Mountain sheep permits that sold for an average of \$55,000. These are high maintenance programs with the helicopter time and all.

Mr. Bair asked what type of effect it would have on the program if they took \$100,000 from the program.

Mr. Aoude said most of the money is used for flights and roughly, it would be more than half.

Mr. King asked what they pay for helicopter time.

Mr. Aoude said close to \$1000 an hour.

RAC Recommendations

Southern – Mr. Flinders said they passed the recommendation unanimously. Later in the agenda there was a lot of discussion.

Southeastern – Mr. Jones said they passed the recommendation unanimously. Mr. Bunnell's information on how the numbers are established was very helpful.

Central – Mr. Oswald said they had two motions. Karl Hirst who was the instigator of those motions wanted to be here to today but couldn't. A reading of the minutes will explain the rationale behind the motions.

MOTION: Accept that a minimum of 5% and 10% will be maintained and a table will be adopted to make it more visible to reflect maximum percentages. Rounding, in the current system, makes permits exceeds the 5% and 10% rules presently. This failed 5 to 2.

MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations for rocky mountain bighorn sheep and desert bighorn sheep and use the hard five percent limit for all other conservation species as well as the balance of the recommendations. Passed 7 to 2.

MOTION: Annual report published on the conservation permit program start to finish of how the permits are allocated including the percentage allocated, where the money goes and what projects are accomplished with that money. It passed unanimously.

Northeastern – Mr. Blackwell said the recommendation passed unanimously.

Northern – Mr. Byrnes said they had three motions.

MOTION: To exclude general deer permits from the conservation permit program and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Remove the sentences that have percent and number restrictions. Insert table for sheep and remaining species – passed 9 to 1.

MOTION: Accepted remainder – passed unanimously.

Public Comment

Tye Boulter, representing United Wildlife Cooperative said we have rules in our society that keep things in order. These tags have a market value. We were over allocated 40-50 tags this year and on the average sales price of these tags, we're looking at \$250,000 to \$300,000. There are consequences to this type of difference in the real world. Where is the recourse on this? Where is the leverage to make sure it doesn't happen in the future? Mistakes happen, but we need things in place to minimize them. In the future we need to have things in place to keep permit allocations under the 5 and 10% rule and UWC supports whatever the Division and Board come up with to do this. Sheep is a little different, but on all others, structure is mandatory. They support anything the Division puts in place to keep within the 5 and 10% .

Troy Justensen of SFW and Utah FNAWS, asks the Division to come up with a table that clarifies the limited entry, based on the rule not to exceed the 5-10% rule. Sheep would be the only exception. They would like the Division to come up with a table that would carry what we are currently issuing as far as sheep permits go. They want to carry the reduction trigger that is proposed on OIAL permits to all species. They also support that they do not include any general season tags within the conservation permit rule. Eric Christensen and Karl Hirst have put together table of percentages and they would ask the Division to come up with something similar to clarify.

Jason Hawkins representing himself said he heard several months ago that the Division had been issuing conservation tags in excess of the rule. He also heard there would be an amendment to the rule and he assumed the amendment would be to clarify the rule to make sure the caps were clear so they weren't violated. At the Central RAC he was disappointed to see that the amendment was going to actually authorize the prior conduct to allow these allocations and tags well in excess of the 5 and 10% caps. The proposal today is not clear. Caps need to be hard caps and be clearly defined. Also the OIAL proposal should go clear across to all species. If the public takes a cut on tags, the conservation tags should be cut also. Mr. Hirst's suggestion in the Central RAC would

be a very helpful proposal. He appreciates the Board and they need to keep the hard caps within the rule. The state should understand the rules and comply with them.

Miles Moretti, MDF said he remembers early meetings on the conservation program in the mid 90's in Moab. If the cap on the sheep hadn't been raised to 15% from 10%, we wouldn't have a sheep program in the Southeast at this point. They support the Division's recommendations. They support the creation of a table on the 5 and 10% to clarify if that's what the Board and Division decide to do.

Board Discussion

Vice Chair Perkins opened it to general comment with the Board.

Mr. Bair said it is notable that Utah has a program that raises more money and does more habitat work than the rest of the country. The things we are able to accomplish are remarkable. There are some house keeping issues that need to be tended to. He would like to see the trigger on OIAL tags to be reduced include all species.

Mr. Bunnell said this question has not even been an issue up to this point because we were in a steady growth phase across the board. It was when moose started coming down that we realized there were some inconsistencies there. That is bound to happen with other species over time.

Assistant Director Clark clarified that on the number of tags on a unit, once it is above 150 or 160 depending on which table the Board adopts, it doesn't do anything. The tags that were cut on the Manti had zero effect. Because almost all the units are getting above the number that generates eight maximum tags, elk are very stable. Sheep and moose are affected the most because we have very few tags and those species are very susceptible with something bad happening to them within one year. That is part of the reason we wanted to make that stipulation on OIAL species. You can put that in the rule, but it won't get used very much.

Mr. Bair said he still thinks it should be in the rule. It is the right thing to do.

Vice Chair Perkins said in addition to the comment on outstanding work we've been able to do because of the conservation program, it is also important to note this has allowed us to have the highest number of permits and opportunity for our state sportsmen that any state enjoys. These, very few permits, bring in the kind of money that allows us to severely restrict nonresident opportunity and all of that operates to the benefit of our citizens. His second thought, he is inclined to agree that all the other species in addition to the OIAL, but he believes it will be a little more difficult to do based on the timing of when we find out there may be a decrease in permits and the obligations that the organizations have already incurred. It might even be delayed to the following year because it would be too late. It still could be done.

Mr. Fenimore said with the 75 million that's been invested in habitat projects, he wishes there was a way to determine an ROI on that money to see if the money is truly being

recognized relative to the amount of money invested. Over the years we have talked about how the deer have not responded, yet there has been a lot of money aimed at the coyote program that is being started this year. There might be other ways that should be targeted that are not necessarily being recognized.

Mr. Bunnell said that can be done, but it is over long time periods. We are only five years into it. The main benefits from this investment are yet to be realized.

Vice Chair Perkins asked Mr. Thompson to comment on project feedback and what's been done over the last couple of years.

Tyler Thompson, DWR Habitat Coordinator said they do have a comprehensive monitoring program, most is directed at the actual vegetation response. They took a stab at a wildlife monitoring program without total success, so they are looking at ways to come back and look at that. It is one of the priorities, to try to look at the return on that investment and find the areas that are being successful.

Mr. Albrecht asked about the audit, was there a list of suggestions or things that needed to have attention?

Mr. Bunnell said no. The statement on the powerpoint was essentially the feedback.

Vice Chair Perkins said he developed an alternative proposal that might resolve some of the conflicts and public perceptions that have developed. This proposal would use the tables, recognize that rounding to the nearest whole permit could occur and then would impose a review of the total number of permits based on a 5 and 10% rule; then it would reduce permits if that was exceeded, rounded to the next whole permit. He distributed that to the Board yesterday, but due to some illnesses and vacation time, this has not gone through a normal discussion period smoothly. In that the 10% rule in sheep would be accorded and the 5% rule in deer would be "in rule," and also accorded as a follow on to use of the table.

In doing that Mr. Perkins asked the Division to run a set of comparison on this coming year's permits based on the numbers that were passed by the Board at our last meeting and they have done so. They ran three sets of figures, one was the hard 5% rule. One would be the proposed table and the last one would be using the table and then doing a calculation at the end with a 5 and 10% rule figure, rounding to the nearest permit. In running that table, the only thing that would change from the Division's proposal by adding that 5 and 10% for the coming year, would be one deer permit. All others would remain the same. He would like to propose that we retain the 5 and 10% as proposed to the Board members as a matter of transparency to the public. He also proposed a methodology or reduction method on the other species, relative to the OIAL species.

Assistant Director Clark said he's been involved in this program since around 1998. He reviewed some of the history and how they arrived at conservation permit numbers. Every time we go through this process, we try to tighten the rule down. We included a

table this year that shows how the numbers are calculated. The Division's intent is to have something that is absolutely clear. He's not sure that the language it adds makes it clear as of yet. We've always had a table that included rounding through the years. This was not a misreading of the rule that is always how it has been done. It can be changed. The change of reflecting all species could be done. The concern is we have catch up which occurs every three years, because every three years we use whatever the most recent year is and we don't add permits during the three years when the Board issues more permits. We see with moose that it is more volatile than it's ever been. A lot of those hunts are above that 150-160 number and it won't make any difference. We have been asked what dollar difference it makes. With sheep it is about \$110,000 less that it would generate for the conservation permit program when he applied this to last year's numbers. Not a dollar of the conservation money goes to salaries. It only goes to programs that we could not fund otherwise. We have accomplished a lot of things.

Vice Chair Perkins asked if the Division could live with the limited numbers on goat and moose.

Mr. Bunnell said on a hard 5% rule verses using the table for deer makes a difference of one tag. 40 tags using a hard 5% to 41 tags is the difference if we apply the proposed table. He went over all of the species and what the difference would be. On elk it makes a 5 tag difference. On Rocky Mountain goats it makes a difference of 2, but it's a higher percentage. On moose it is a difference of 1 tag, but a 50% increase. Pronghorn would be the biggest difference, because there are a lot of pronghorn units in the 11-20 range. With pronghorn it is a difference of 9 tags. We will implement the program with whatever rules and stipulations are placed on it and do our best to be completely forthright about it.

Chairman Brady asked about the difference in money.

Assistant Director Clark said it would be a \$110,000 reduction.

Mr. Bunnell said that's without sheep and with one tag it would become about \$200,000.

Chairman Brady said he is a strong advocate of the money that is brought in for these tags. In watching this program since 2000, we as sportsmen benefit from the sale of these tags.

Mr. Crandall asked about percent of the money that goes to the Division on the conservation permits.

Mr. Bunnell said 30% comes to Division immediately, 60% comes back on approved projects and the groups retain 10% to support their organizations. Some groups just give the 10% back to the Division. They have to run the projects by the Division for approval. 90% goes back on the ground is the bottom line.

Mr. Bair said in looking at the numbers, on the pronghorn, 9 permits would go back to the public draw, and also 1 moose permit and 2 goat permits if we went with the hard 5%. The goat and moose permits would be worth more than the 9 pronghorn permits.

Mr. Albrecht asked about an annual report.

Assistant Director Clark said we haven't done an annual report recently, but we are working to get it done soon.

Mr. King asked if that is something that could be put on the action log.

Assistant Director Clark said yes.

Mr. Bunnell said what does happen every year is an audit of the funds, tracking the money.

Mr. Bair said he would like to see the money breakdown and the projects done on the website.

Mr. Bunnell said we'll put some examples of projects and whatever reports that would be done.

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that the Division publish an annual report in reference to the conservation program that lists from start to finish how the permits are allocated, the percentages that are allocated, where the money goes and what projects are accomplished with that money.

Mr. Bunnell said there will be some time lags and some things that are still in progress when we put this report together. We will produce a report on an annual basis and at the timing that makes the most sense.

Vice Chair Perkins said they'd now consider the provision for a reduction of permits on all other species when there is a change in age objectives, or something along those lines.

Mr. Bair said even though we're above the number of permits on many of the species, he still feels that language should be in the rule. It is the right thing to do.

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that all species be included in the option mechanism for reducing the number of conservation permits if the number of public permits declines during the time period for which multi-year permits were awarded.

Mr. King asked about the timing of those decisions.

Mr. Bunnell said in a lot of cases, there would be on a one year time lag in making those adjustments considering the timing of the marketing verses the timing of when the Board approves things. It will take some additional accounting and tracking, but not anything that would preclude it being done.

Mr. Crandell said the motion gives the Division some flexibility to reduce numbers if necessary.

Mr. Bunnell said it brings some equity to it if the public is taking a reduction in tags, we should evaluate and see if it is out of proportion with conservation tags based on a recommended reduction in public tags.

Vice Chair Perkins said they'd now move onto the sheep issue.

Mr. Bair said the sheep program does rely on the conservation money. It is the perfect example of how conservation dollars turn into public opportunity. He doesn't think we should adopt anything that is going to cut sheep tags from the program. We can see the good it is doing. 1-2 sheep tags would cut a huge percentage of those tags.

Mr. King said he still remembers when the first sheep permits were sold and the benefits that came from that money.

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Mike King and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we adopt the Division's recommendation and table for sheep.

Vice Chair Perkins summarized that we are looking at three options now, a hard 5%, the Division's table, and Mr. Perkin's proposal of the Division's table with a 5% cap on the end of it.

Mr. King asked for explanation on the difference between Mr. Perkins proposal and the Division's proposal.

Mr. Bunnell said let's look at deer because that's the only place it will make any difference. What Mr. Perkin's proposal will do is after we're done, we go back to the total number of deer permits and what 5% is of that number, and is the number of conservation permits that we've issued exceed that 5% number with one caveat, with units that are over the 151, to make the calculation we bring them back to 151, so they're

not overwhelming the 5%. The difference it makes is from 41 back to 40 permits dropping the lowest valued deer tag. What the Board has to decide is it worth the added complexity. With pronghorn it doesn't make any difference using Mr. Perkin's proposal or the Division's table.

Mr. Bair said he is not opposed to the Division's proposal, but he would lean towards Mr. Perkin's proposal making it right at 5%.

The following motion was made by Del Brady, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed 5 to 1, with John Bair opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's method for calculating conservation permit numbers for all other species as presented.

Mr. King said the Division's proposal is to include the rounding factor.

Mr. Bunnell said they just apply the table as referenced.

Mr. Bair thinks that Mr. Perkin's proposal is a little better and he is not opposed to the Division's proposal.

The following motion was made by Bill Fenimore, seconded by John Bair and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Division's proposal as presented on the Conservation Permit Rule Amendments R657-41.

Lunch break.

After the lunch break Chairman Brady took over as Chair of the meeting.

7) Collection, Importation and Possession Rule Amendments R657-03 (Action)

Krissy Wilson, Aquatics Wildlife Coordinator presented this agenda item. (See Powerpoint Presentation) She defined the CIP and explained noncontrolled, controlled and prohibited species. They have spent two years on this rule to get it to this point. She then went over species not covered by this rule and definitions. Classification and specific rules for crustaceans, mollusks, fish, mammals, bird and raptors were also covered.

Mr. Fenimore asked how they differentiate between the wild geese and the others.

Mr. Bunnell said it is urban geese verses wild geese. They are trying to keep goslings being born in areas and then because of the imprint coming back to that area.

RAC Recommendations

Northern – Mr. Bynes said they had two motions. Motion: To accept as presented with the exception of R657-3-7(1)(a)-“A person is not required to obtain a COR or federal permit to kill black billed magpies, starlings or domestic pigeons, rock doves when found committing or about to commit depredation upon ornamental or shade trees etc. or when concentrated in such numbers in a manner to constitute a health hazard or nuisance provided.” The maker of the motion wanted to eliminate the cow bird because of the concern of cow birds flocking with black birds in the winter. He liked the wording that the animal needed to be found “when found committing or about to commit depredation,” rather than the new wording. Motion: To accept the remainder or the Division’s recommendation.

Northeastern – Mr. Blackwell said they passed the rule unanimously. A few RAC members asked that the Division consider creating an informational medium for the public since this is a little known rule.

Central – Mr. Fairchild said they passed the rule unanimously as presented.

Southeastern – Mr. Jones said they passed the rule unanimously as presented.

Southern – Mr. Flinders said after some discussion and clarification about the new distinction of magpies verses ravens and crows, they voted unanimously to accept as presented.

Board Discussion

Mr. Perkins asked about the Northern region motion to cut cow birds out. Mr. Parrish presented a list which cow birds were still included.

Mr. Bynes said the maker of the motion was concerned about cow birds could be taken with black birds, similar to the way crows were taken out of the rule to prevent taking ravens.

Mr. Parrish said the federal rule includes 3 blackbirds, 3 cowbirds, grackles, crows and magpies. Section 7 of the rule is whether a COR would be required to take those species. The federal depredation rule allows taking without a COR. We were proposing requiring a permit for crows but not black billed magpies, cowbirds, starlings, house sparrows and rock doves. The issue was a person taking ravens which aren’t in the depredation order, thinking they were taking crows. He sees the point on the cowbirds, but that’s why we didn’t include any blackbirds. There is some concern, particularly in the winter when they flock together with mixed species. The Division sticks with the recommendation.

Mr. King asked about the wording “is committing or is about to commit depredation.”

Mr. Bynes said that is the original wording and the same wording that is in the federal order.

Mr. Parrish said that is something we wanted removed. He asked the question at the RAC of how to determine when a bird “is about to commit” depredation. We can be more restrictive than federal rule. He is concerned about people taking birds because they believe they are “about to commit” depredation.

Chairman Brady summarized the RAC comment.

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Division’s recommendation on Collection, Importation and Possession Rule amendments R657-03 as presented.

8) Division Variance Rule Amendments R657-57 (**Action**)

Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Section Chief presented this agenda item. He handed out the requested material on leftover big game permits and general permit information on the draw. (See Attachment #1) There were 4,300 remaining deer permits that weren’t sold in the draw. More than half of those were for Boxelder or Cache county archery or muzzleloader. There were some from the Ogden Unit. There was an increase of over 12,000 people in the draw. We also had a slight reduction in deer permits this year. He went over factors that made it harder for hunters to draw out this year. Applications overall are up about 25,000, 17,000 residents and 8,000 nonresidents. We had 6,700 unique individuals apply in this draw compared to last year. The odds will be published in a couple of months. The remaining permits will go on sale in July.

He then went on to present the variance rule amendments. (See Powerpoint Presentation) He went over the history of variances at the DWR and the basis for changes to the rule. When variance relief will be given, variance types, preference point restoration, bonus point restoration and/or waiting period waiver, season extensions, groups and limitations on Board authority were covered.

Mr. Perkins asked for some examples of substantially precluded first day hunt.

Mr. Sheehan responded to the hypothetical situations presented by Mr. Perkins. We have a lot of situations where people are hurt on day one, because they’re not in good physical shape, not familiar with their equipment or whatever. The Board has heard many requests from people who just got one day of hunting. Giving them day one will hopefully help satisfy a lot of these situations.

Mr. Bair said no matter what we do, there’s always a judgment call to be made.

Mr. Sheehan said hopefully the variance committee can address some of those situations. We are trying to get these away from the Board as much as possible. There are always judgment calls and that’s why the slide “No Guarantees.”

Mr. Bair said on tags are eligible for bonus point restoration and waiting period waiver, when it went through the RACs he was surprised to still see OIAL in that category and not in the category that qualified for season extension. He feels that OIAL hunts should be eligible for season extension.

Mr. Albrecht said he agrees with that.

Chairman Brady asked if that wasn't part of what the work meeting suggested.

Mr. Bair said it was.

Mr. Sheehan said they re-listened to it and Director Karpowitz said they'd make the RACs aware of it as a consideration of the Board.

Ms. Coons said she went back and listened to the work meeting and Director Karpowitz said we'd take it to the RACs for input as to whether they should be moved or not.

Chairman Brady asked if there were any questions and there were none.

RAC Recommendations

Southern – Mr. Flinders said one public said they shouldn't extend even one day. The RAC unanimously passed the Division's proposal as the presented.

Southeastern – Mr. Jones said their RAC passed the recommendation unanimously as presented.

Central – Mr. Fairchild said they wanted the season extension for OIAL.

Northeastern – Mr. Blackwell said they had some discussion. It passed 5 to 1 however they had one RAC member that wanted to see an amendment added to the season extension for limited entry, CWMUs and OIAL. That is why this individual voted against the motion.

Northern – Mr. Bynes said they passed the rule as presented with exception of OIAL big game to have a choice of bonus point restoration or a season extension. The definition of substantially precluded would mean three day hunting for OIAL and one for other hunts. Part of the discussion was the maker of the motion felt if you drew OIAL it would allow you a little more time in the field before you'd be precluded.

Public Comment

Troy Justensen, SFW said they support the Division's recommendation with the exception of the OIAL being available for season extension. Unfortunate things happen and we need to allow them to experience a OIAL hunt.

Board Discussion

Mr. Perkins said in all cases if somebody is eligible for a season extension by category, can they also be eligible for their choice of bonus point and waiting period being waived. For instance in a case where somebody has a severely broken leg and they might need 15 months for recovery, they may not want to have an extension, but restoration of bonus points and waive waiting period.

Mr. Sheehan said we didn't write into the rule that you could have your points back because there aren't any on there now that have any points to get back. That could be a motion and that's what Northern region addressed. We had no need to add that on, but if you move OIAL over, then they could be offered the choice of one or the other without further recourse.

Mr. King asked what the ramifications of moving OIAL into the other category. Why did they keep it there?

Mr. Sheehan said there are pros and cons. In this category it looked fairly consistent. Some of the limited entry permits such as the Henry's deer tag or San Juan bull elk tag might be as much of a OIAL opportunity as some other hunts. We have looked at it both ways. They are comfortable with whatever the Board prefers.

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by John Bair and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Division Variance rule Amendments R657-57 with the exception that we move the Once-in-a-Lifetime to be allowed to have a season extension, or the option to retain their bonus points and waive the waiting period.

9) Deer Management Plans (Action)

Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Manager presented this agenda item. All the unit plans expired and were revised. They did however ask the Northeast and Southeast regions to do a more comprehensive revision because they did have the most up to date range trend data. From this date on we have asked each region to redo their plans as they get the most up to date data. From now on they will revise the plans on a five year rotation with the most recent range trend information. The 2012 Deer plan revisions and content were presented. These deer plans contain boundary descriptions, land ownership and also population objectives, both long term and short term, buck to doe ratios, and habitat objectives. He said this is a summary presentation. There were no changes in either short or long term objectives this time for general season deer from the 2006 plans. The buck to doe ratios comply with the 30 unit plan that was just passed. This concluded the presentation.

Mr. Albrecht asked if each region comes up with a plan of its own.

Mr. Aoude said each individual unit has a habitat section of what was done and what needs to be done in the future.

Mr. Albrecht asked if these plans are on the website available to the public.

Mr. Aoude said yes. The unit plans will be published there once they are approved.

RAC Recommendations

All of the RACs passed the Division's recommendation unanimously.

Public Comment

Miles Moretti, MDF said they support the Division's deer management plans. The decline of mule deer is a trend across the west. He is asking the state wildlife agencies to make mule deer a high priority. Utah is making them a high priority and need to continue to do this. Also keep the plans up to date and increase efforts to reach out to the public. He hopes Utah's example will continue to lead in these efforts.

Chairman Brady asked if he sees something different in other states that we could do.

Mr. Moretti said one place that mule deer are doing well is in the eastern part of the range in the Sierra Peak Conservation reserve program, out in the plains. That is the only positive place he sees for mule deer around the west. Everybody is struggling and its all habitat, predator and water issues. He does see a bright spot with highways and underpasses, etc. that are being funded by the highway departments. They are seeing thousands of deer make crossings under these highways that weren't happening before. Continue to partner with agriculture and work on habitat. Cutting buck numbers does not help deer herds, it only cuts opportunity.

Chairman Brady summarized the RAC recommendations.

The following motion was made by Mike King, seconded by Ernie Perkins and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's Deer Management Plans as presented.

10) Elk Management Plans (Action)

Mr. Aoude presented this agenda item. We passed our statewide plan a couple years ago. All elk units needed revision. Committees were only formed on units where we intended to raise population objectives, although there were some units where we didn't intend to raise objectives, but still had committees. He presented a list of Units that had

committees. (See Powerpoint Presentation) The Division recommends a total statewide increase in elk population objective of 2,140. They recommend a reduction of 35 animals on the Paunsaugunt. That unit does not winter a lot of elk, but there is a section of the unit where elk may be moving mule deer, thus the reduction. He went on to present a summary of recommended changes and the rationale behind it. This concluded the presentation.

Mr. Perkins said the recommendation to move those two units to any bull went through the committees, is that right?

Mr. Aoude said yes.

Chairman Brady clarified that the objective that is being set, in some cases duplicates what we have on the ground.

Mr. Aoude said yes. We targeted some units that are constantly above objective knowing that it would be easier to raise objectives there since we can carry that amount of elk in those units.

Chairman Brady asked which units that would be.

Mr. Aoude said Chalk Creek, Kamas, Avinaquin, Fillmore and the Fish Lake is about there now. Every unit there that is on this list has had more elk on them in the past.

Chairman Brady asked if there were any questions.

Sterling Brown with Utah Farm Bureau has four questions. First regarding the analysis, to what extent is that information distributed to the RACs, Board and public.

Mr. Aoude said all of these were done through a committee process and it was explained there to a great extent. It varied from RAC to RAC depending on how many questions were asked. There was a lot of detail as each region manager presented the plans for their units. Today is just a summary.

Mr. Brown asked regarding the elk proposed numbers relative to livestock AUMs. During the local working groups to what extent was the recent and long term history of livestock AUMs discussed and incorporated into the final recommendation to the RACs and Board?

Mr. Aoude said at every committee meeting that was discussed to a large extent. That is our main limiting factor to increasing elk.

Mr. Brown asked if that part of the analysis got to the RACs.

Mr. Aoude said again it depends on the individual RAC. We cannot present every single detail that occurs in the committee. That is why we have committees that come up with these recommendations.

Mr. Brown asked to what extent was depredation considered. What percent of the landowners were made whole on loss?

Mr. Aoude said he doesn't have that information on hand, but they had to prorate last year. It was about 89% of what was coming through. Those below \$1000 got 100%. Because of the need to prorate last year, there were additional funds put into the budget this year through the legislature and the Division.

Mack Morrell asked what the response was to the increase by the Forest Service and/or the BLM. Were they positive or negative?

Mr. Aoude said he wouldn't venture to say across the board, but mostly positive.

Mr. Morrell asked which were negative.

Mr. Aoude said he wouldn't say any of them were negative.

Troy Justensen asked what role, if any does the Division plan in the allocation of AUMs for livestock holders on public lands.

Mr. Aoude said none whatsoever.

RAC Recommendations

Southeastern – Mr. Jones said they voted to accept 4 to 3 as presented. The motion was made and seconded by the two federal representatives on the RAC.

Southern – Mr. Flinders said they spent a lot of time on this item. They had two motions. The Fish Lake/Plateau was separated because of the amount of public comment. Motion: To table the increase of 800 elk to do a more thorough analysis of AUMs available, respective grazing and sportsmen's needs. It failed 5 to 6. After more discussion a motion to accept everything as presented passed 6 to 5. To narrow the focus more, there was no discussion on increase on Fillmore/Pahvant of 175. The discussion and controversy was around the Plateau.

Northern, Northeastern and Central passed the recommendations unanimously as presented.

Public Comment

Harry Barber, Bureau of Land Management Field Officer and is here to represent the Color Country District. He is the Southern RAC member who represents the BLM. He

is here to clarify their position at the RAC meeting. There was a communication break down. Information he should have received much prior to his meeting only came to him several minutes before the meeting started. The information was that the Richfield field office had problems with the 800 head elk increase. He didn't have time to speak with all those involved. The bottom line was because of communication breakdown, it appeared that their representative on the committee, Larry Greenwood, didn't fully explain his feelings about the 800 increase to his supervisor. He talked to Mr. Greenwood last night about this issue. From his notes, "figures show that an increase of 600 elk would be okay as long as there was an increase for livestock also. This gets us into that AUM question. Mr. Barber proposes that in the future, particularly in regards to this 800 head increase, the BLM, DWR and permittees work much closer on the ground in terms of data collection, in looking at areas where they see the beneficial increase in forage and that a determination is made on an annual basis on whether or not that forage is going to be there. The BLM is pro wildlife, but have other constituents as well to look after. If the forage is there, we're good, but it needs to be determined ahead and if it's not there, there needs to be a temporary decrease in numbers, whether in antlerless permits or some other avenue. We feel more collaboration would benefit all.

Mr. Perkins asked if he could confirm Wayne Whetsel's letter which says that BLM does not support the increase above 4,800. Is this the position of Mr. Barber's office, Greenwood's office and the BLM?

Mr. Barber said he found out about that letter yesterday afternoon as part of the communication issues they are having. He should be the official spokes person for the BLM in terms of that area. That letter was not reviewed by the district manager. He called Mr. Barber and asked if he's seen the letter and he had not. Mr. Barber asks that the Board discount that letter, but strive to put in place this effort of collaboration.

Mr. Perkins asked what their position is.

Mr. Barber said they support the committee's recommendation with the caveat that more collaboration is done between the groups and some determination annually on how it will drive the elk numbers.

Mr. Perkins said the BLM is invited every year to participate with the range trend analysis. Is that the type of collaboration that he is looking for?

Mr. Barber said that's a good step but more needs to be done with the AUM numbers. They might need to get more site specific on data collection.

Troy Justensen, SFW said they support the Division's recommendations based on what was said in the committee meetings. The DWR's recommendation was that forage is there and adequate for increase. The same recommendation came from the Forest Service and the BLM. The question is if the biologists had the right to voice this, but they are being somewhat overridden by the federal agency. They are not against livestock and believe there is enough forage to increase wildlife and the cattlemen receive

their AUMs also. They have spent a lot of money in that area with over 220,000 acres treated in the Fish Lake and several million dollars of conservation permit money has been there. It benefits not only wildlife, but livestock also. They support the Division's recommendation.

Stanton Gleave is a rancher down in Southern Utah. He runs sheep on Mt. Dutton and cattle on Monroe Mountain. He is president of the Monroe Mountain Grazing Association. If they increase the herd of elk on the Fish Lake, they'll get a bunch of them on Monroe Mountain. It is ridiculous saying you're increasing one unit or the other and that whole herd of elk pays no attention to boundaries. At the present time they are getting a lot of damage on private property all through Grass Valley and the Sevier River Valley. The Division admitted that they are not able to pay for the damages that have been done presently and the ranchers he is representing say there should be no more elk until they can pay for present damages.

Mr. Gleave said they are friendly with wildlife. It is no mystery about the problem with deer, its cougar. How can you raise deer and protect cougars? You can't. Southern Utah is deer country, not elk country. Deer have been mismanaged for 40 years. Sheep herds have disappeared out of that country also. The same with cattle and in his lifetime he has never been increased one AUM, but has been cut 100s of them. If the elk go from zero up into the 1000s something is wrong. Ranchers have not come to the Division and that's how it happened. He referred to an incident with a landowner shooting elk on his property and he had every right to do so. We've got to control these elk and they are not native to the country. If the Division has any power to do anything, this is what he believes should be done. They are opposed to any increase.

Stan Wood, a permittee from Wayne County based out of Lymon said everything reaches a point of saturation. In his childhood and up to 1977 there were not elk in that area. They moved them off in '77 and now they have elk in their feed lot. They farm the Horse Valley Ranch and in the drought of 2001 they found out if you bail small bales of alfalfa you better get them hauled the next day or the elk would come in and destroy it all. An increase in the elk numbers is going to concentrate in the valley. They have 12 big bulls that winter in their feed lot every winter. 9,600 AUMs is an 800 head increase. That is the equivalent of approximately 2,150 head of cattle increased on the Fish Lake. In the EA done on Boulder Mountain before they planted the elk it said if the elk numbers get above 250 head it could affect the deer population. He was a county commissioner for 4 years and represented Wayne County on the Six County Association of Government. They have a meeting every month with representatives from that area. Supervisor Rowley said we may need to decrease livestock numbers because of utilization standards. Mr. Wood responded that if livestock were to be reduced, elk and wildlife must be reduced also. At the ensuing Natural Resource meeting they had Dr. Bowns give a crash course on range science. Every commission chairman in the Six County Association drafted and signed a letter stating their opposition to the increase in the numbers due to possible resource management. Supervisor Rowley is against this increase. An increase in wildlife AUMs and nothing in the livestock is discrimination.

Mr. Crandall asked where and when was the environmental assessment over the 250 head of elk.

Mr. Wood said it was Boulder Mountain in the early 70's.

Mack Morrell said when they had the elk committees, the Southern RAC assigned a RAC member to each committee. He was assigned to the Fish Lake/Plateau. There was a negative vote from Forest Service. They spent two long evenings discussing this. The Fish Lake is managed by Curtis Robins and Jason Cling. The presentation was made and eventually it came to a vote. Mr. Cling said in his discussion with Mr. Robins, the Fish Lake could not sustain an increase in elk. He was 3rd to last to vote of 15. If he'd been earlier in the voting order, Mr. Morrell is sure the vote would have been different. The elk are there and probably more. Sight ability is 80%, but some studies say it is 40-50%. There are problems with elk in the fields because there is not enough winter habitat, too many elk or a combination of both. If the Board votes to increase elk on the Fish Lake/Plateau they are going against the Forest Service recommendation. Who knows the land better than the Forest Service? The letter from Alan Rowley and the Forest Supervisors from Dixie says the aspen and riparian areas are problems on the Fish Lake. No money has been spent to improve them. They also recommended keeping the numbers in check with antlerless permits. The Division recommended no increase on permits on Fish Lake and with recruitments they will be over objective. This is going to create a boom bust cycle on the Fish Lake which has been its history.

Verland King is a member of the Dark Valley Grazers Association and also a doctor of Veterinary medicine. He feels the studies should be done before the objective is raised. The range trend study for DWR is for deer habitat, not elk. Mr. Aoude says 850 elk are all ready there and the land can handle it. That is out of order. SFW says they've spent a lot of money down there so there should be more elk, but right now Boulder Mountain has two fires on it, Monroe has one which will affect habitat. The money that is available should be used to counteract a drought or these fires that will affect winter range. He has private land in Grass Valley and for the deer and elk to water they have to come across his property to drink at Otter Creek, which is fine most of the time, but the elk come in and eat the new green grass in the spring. There are a lot of things that go into habitat and the way animals use it.

Mr. King went on to say that Charles Kay from Utah State has documented aspen problems and a lot is due to elk herds. They run cattle on Boulder Mountain on the Dark Valley allotment. They fence the riparian areas so the cattle can't damage them. They still get grazed heavily from the elk, not the cattle. From studies on the Fish Lake herd of elk, it is actually the same herd that runs on the Dutton, Monroe and Boulder. If the Fish Lake herd is increased you increase all of it. There are habitat problems that need to be addressed before that number is raised.

Sterling Brown with Utah Farm Bureau said there is conflict between livestock and wildlife and there's a rich history for this. The DWR establishes wildlife numbers and BLM and Forest Service establish livestock numbers. We keep passing the buck and it's

beyond everyone's control to address the core problem. Farm Bureau is asking the Board today to compromise enough to incorporate the needs of livestock. Regarding the analysis, it is unfortunate that livestock AUMs and their history is not part of the presentation to the RACs and Board. It gets tucked away in the local working groups. We are in the business of habitat. He read from the Utah State Code Title 4 – "managing for wildlife is of highest priority at the same time managing for highest possible level for livestock." Public policy in Utah clearly says managing for livestock is of highest priority. Has this incorporated into the system? The compensation earlier this year, he was told 81 cents on dollar for depredation payments. Today it was 89 cents, but landowners were not made whole. The Division is in debt and has not paid their obligations. He knows the legislature appropriates money for those payments, but still here we are asking for an increase in elk numbers when the state could not pay full costs last year. There is more money, but is it enough and has it been considered in the planning? Has the Division gone before the state planning coordinator for input on the proposals before us today?

Chairman Brady read in an email comment from Rick Woodard (Attachment #2)

5 minute break

Board Discussion

Chairman Brady then summarized RAC and public comment.

Mr. Fenimore asked Assistant Director Clark in view of today's meeting and what has been discussed, does he feel the elk management plans have been adequately addressed or does it need further review.

Assistant Director Clark said we have followed the process with additional work that has been done. There have been discussions about raising elk numbers in different parts of the State for years. Unfortunately there will always be those who feel like they've won or lost. The Division will continue to work on making habitat better and work with all those who are using the natural resources and contributing to the big picture. He asked for input from Mr. Aoude and Mr. Bunnell and if anything has come up today that would change the Division's recommendation.

Mr. Aoude said no. In addition, before they went forward with these unit plans they formed a different committee to look at incentivizing that increase to make it more equitable for the ranchers. They came up with some ideas that were incorporated, but unfortunately a lot of those were overshadowed by the total number. They are working on the ground to try to improve distribution. There will be future habitat and water treatments. That's why the plans were delayed for a year in an effort to put some of those things in place. Yes, they are adding 2,140 elk to the objective, which are really already on the ground, but we are also doing habitat and distribute them better through water distribution and things like that, which are in these plans.

Mr. Crandall asked about the GIP funding annually?

Mr. Brown said years ago when it started, there was initial seed money for administrative overhead to get the program going, then 1.4 million dollars. This last year it was reduced to 1.2 million on the ground money, plus some money for overhead.

Mr. Crandall said in the GIP the 1.2 or 1.4 million is a cost share. The rancher still has to come up with 25-50%. Actual dollars on the ground is actually more, pushing 2 million annually in funding for range improvements. He then asked Mr. Morrell about the elk on the Fish Lake, Dutton and Boulder running together.

Mr. Morrell said they do tend to run together depending on where the pressure is. The elk on those units are interchangeable. Some cow elk were collared a few years ago and they went to the various units. As landowners we are not in the business of wintering wildlife. We farm and ranch to raise hay to winter our livestock, not wildlife. Some compensation is not nearly enough.

Mr. Crandall asked about those elk on those three units. Is that summer, winter or what?

Mr. Morrell said both, sometimes year round, depending on the snow level. They were going to count all four units, but because of lack of snow they just counted Fish Lake. There were tracks going across I-70 that they didn't count. Out on Parker Mountain there are 400-500 elk around Cedar Peak, Dry Wash and the Buttes that are never covered. At Southern RAC they said we were at objective at 4,800, but then the DWR says with the increase it will include elk that are already on the ground. Where is the credibility with the DWR? We've seen it with the antelope and bison in the past. Ranchers want integrity and credibility from the Division.

Mr. Bair clarified that this is not comment period.

Mr. Perkins asked Mr. Brown what percentage of the GIP gets used on public lands where we then partner with the feds and bring in most dollars for cost sharing, greatly increasing the benefits.

Mr. Brown said he doesn't know. Bill Hopkins would have an answer.

Mr. Perkins said we need to get as much from that program as possible, like we have on the watershed program. We are spending significant amounts of watershed money on private lands too, and even getting some federal matching on that.

Chairman Brady asked for a report on the Forest Service position.

Mr. Flinders said as a RAC representative for the Forest Service he spends a lot of time talking to Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Rowley who are biologists. They made sure that these committees were attended by District Rangers for the most part so you didn't have a biologist saying one thing and a range specialist saying another, because often they are on

different ends of the spectrum. It is almost impossible for Mr. Rowley to write a comment letter to summarize what went on in the committee meetings to articulate the Forest Service position. It really went through the mouths of the representatives on those committees. He read an email from Alan Rowley. (See Attachment #3)

The forest service is clearly caught in the middle of balancing resources, but is staying resource based. It is saying it will support the decisions made by the Board and support the people in the committees and what they said. So Jason Cling can say as a District Ranger that he doesn't see the room for elk right now, but we weren't there and have to defer to what went on there.

Assistant Director Clark said he had a long discussion with Alan Rowley yesterday. The last point he made is the letter that he sent along with the other four supervisors was in response to recommendations on how many cow elk and antlerless deer permits to be issued based on previous objectives. He said we should manage to objective, but now we're talking about what the objective should be. No one should be quoting the letter from a few weeks ago relative to the discussion now. We are now in a different discussion.

Chairman Brady asked Mr. Bushman to respond to the discussion.

Mr. Bushman said there was comment that this plan should have gone through the State Planning Coordinator's Office. Many of our plans do go through the Resource Development Coordinating Committee and the planning office. Deer and elk management plans are not required to go through this office. He read from code. "in preparing plans the Division shall confer with federal and state land managers, private landowners, sportsmen and ranchers. Each management plan shall establish a target herd size and consider some of these factors. Consider available information on a unit's carrying capacity and ownership, and seek to balance relevant multiple uses for the range." That is the legal process the code sets out to create these plans.

Mr. Bushman said the other comment related to Statutory Declaration in agriculture's code – Title 24 chapter 23 which states "the legislature defines and declares that it is important to the economy of the State of Utah to maintain agricultural production at the highest possible level and at the same time to promote, to protect and preserve the wildlife resources of the State. This was a declaration made by the legislature in 1979. 16 years later when the legislature created the Wildlife Board, it gave the Board some directives on its responsibilities in establishing policy with the management of wildlife. He went on to cover those responsibilities. This discussion is doing exactly these responsibilities, considering the issues and then the next directive is "to seek to balance the habitats of wildlife with the social and economic activities of man." The agriculture code and wildlife code can be reconciled, but you couldn't interpret "highest extent possible" to mean livestock to the exclusion of everything else. The Board must determine what the fair balance is.

Chairman Brady asked Mr. Justensen about what SFW has done in Southern region.

Mr. Justensen said we need to look at the group of organizations and what they do. Mr. Clark would be able to speak better to the conservation money that has been raised for wildlife. As groups, we are just the tool that generates this money. It really comes from sportsmen. There has been 12 million dollars and over 220,000 acres have been invested in the Fish Lake area to improve habitat, as quoted from director Karpowitz two Board meetings ago.

Chairman Brady asked if the majority of the money from conservation organizations goes to Southern region.

Mr. Thompson said about half the conservation permit money goes to Southern region.

Mr. Crandall asked about Fillmore/Oakcreek South going to any bull, why?

Mr. Aoude said it is not a great elk habitat and has been a fairly poor limited entry unit. Success rates and satisfaction on that unit has been low. It fits better as general season any bull unit.

Mr. Crandall asked what the boundaries are.

Mr. Aoude explained where the location is on these units. Fillmore/Oakcreek North and south is everything west of highway 15. The South goes down to Cover Fort. He continued discussion on the Fillmore/Pahvant units.

Ms. Griffin said another reason for the any bull on the Fillmore/Oakcreek South, west of I-15 they have future plans to do a high fence from Cove Fort north which will slow the movement off the Pahvant onto the Oakcreek side making the unit that is already poor even worse. So it will fit better in any bull elk rather than limited entry.

Mr. Bair said this has been a hot issue in Southern region and Ms. Griffin should be commended on the way she's handled things relative to the elk. Mr. Flinders should also be commended for the RAC meetings and information.

Chairman Brady agreed.

Mr. King asked how many elk tags are in the CWMU program.

Mr. Blackwell said he doesn't know the exact number. There are about 11 CWMUs and a high percentage of them have elk permits.

Mr. Aoude said there are four CWMUs on the Fish Lake that have a good proportion of the summer range, with probably around 50 permits there.

Mr. Fenimore said he has heard that mule deer are our most valuable resource in Utah. With marginal habitat for elk and putting them in places they have not been historically, is this increase of objective helping or hindering the deer?

Mr. Aoude said the areas they have recommended for elk are arid areas or areas that are not suitable for elk. The areas we are recommending more elk are historically areas where we've had more elk and been trying to keep them down. It is good elk habitat, high country and aspen. Having said that people do want mule deer, but there is also a large constituency who want to see more elk. We are trying to strike a balance.

Mr. King asked about the overall economic impact in carrying deer to elk.

Mr. Aoude said he can't say really how much it generates to local governments. To us, most of our deer are general season deer with a low tag price. For elk we can have both limited entry and general season. It is a resource that is fairly constant, where mule deer tend to fluctuate a lot. It is a more stable resource. They are about equal right now as far as income goes with 33,000 elk permits versus 87,000 deer permits. We have only 70,000 elk versus 300,000 deer. Elk are more predictable in their survival. It is a balance.

Mr. Albrecht thanked Mr. Barber for attending today. He brings a lot to our RAC meetings. According to Commissioner Wood, over on the Thousand Lakes side up over I-70, it is a lot drier than on the Koosharem side. Those guys have some valid concerns about wintering elk, in Lyman and Forsythe and up through that country. But with that being said, if you go over on the Koosharem side towards Lost Creek and that area, it is totally different. We have some CWMUs on that side and all those feed the majority of the elk during the summer months. Johnson Ranch does not feed livestock now. That CWMU has gone strictly to an elk ranch. Vance Mumford has the majority of the Fish Lake now and does a very good job. He does not think he would recommend an increase in elk if he can't feed them. This will not fix the Wayne County problem unless the Division goes in and figure out some different ways of hunting cow elk. Those elk on that side need to be pushed back onto the Sevier County side. There are some other things that need to be implemented down the road whether this passes today or not. Mr. Morrell is right that the Fish Lake, Pahvant, Boulder and the Dutton should be counted all together. The Southern region is working toward that.

Mr. Albrecht said he went into the Fish Lake National Forest and got their AUMs from 1943-2010. In 1943 there were 224,000 AUMs, 1971 there were 145,000, 1979 there were 137,000. From 1985-2009 it ranges from 126-137. It hasn't changed much since 1985. That says that the money that is being put on the ground is working. If we are going to continue to do this, he doesn't see any negative AUMs coming down the road, but if we don't work together everybody will lose.

Mr. Perkins said both the BLM and Farm Bureau asked for consideration of some agricultural data by the committees. They also asked for some additional review and improved range trend and conditions information. Those are reasonable requests, but it isn't up to the DWR to provide that information. The Farm Bureau and the Department of Ag should be providing that information to their representatives and to the Division right up front. He'd be very supportive of additional information on range compared to

elk. We have done millions of dollars and 100s of acres of improvement benefiting livestock and elk. These benefits are realized by elk and cows and down the road we hope forage will be increased for deer and perhaps sheep, if we ever get that industry back up.

He has to kick back a bit on the depredation funding comment. He stood with Farm Bureau a few years back and testified in multiple committees for the need for increased depredation funding. There was an obvious need. The real driver in securing that funding needs to come from the Department of Ag, Farm Bureau, Cattlemen's Association, etc. The DWR can support it, but these other organizations need to spearhead it. There might need to be a reserve account. The Division just dispenses the money.

Mr. Bair said as he listens it's like listening to both sides of his heritage argue back and forth, livestock raisers and big game hunters. It is very difficult. Having said that, he doesn't believe that any recommendation the Board makes today on elk numbers is going to affect AUMs. He has seen AUMs taken from ranchers and grazers for years and they never get them back. He appreciates everybody being here today. He doesn't believe that Mr. Aoude would bring out any proposal that is detrimental to mule deer. The Division would not recommend an increase in elk numbers if they hadn't looked at all the angles and the future ramifications.

Mr. Crandall reviewed the AUM history that Mr. Albrecht outlined.

Mr. Albrecht said sheep have gone down and cattle have picked up some of it.

Mr. Crandall said there were 15,000 head of elk in the 1976 and now we're between 68,000 and 75,000 head of elk. That is almost five times as many elk in the last 30 years, but the livestock AUMs have gone backwards. Livestock AUMs have taken a big hit and they need to be considered. We should increase the elk when the livestock AUMs come back. If we have too many elk, let's take them out. If there's too many livestock out there, you have two weeks to reduce them. 89 cents on the dollar is just what's reported. A lot of ranchers just repair the depredation problems and never report it. There is a lot of habitat restoration that the livestock men do not report. Ranchers haul water and that frees up water for the wildlife. He cannot go for an increase in elk numbers. He would approve the plan, but not the numbers.

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed 4 to 2 with Calvin Crandall and Bill Fenimore opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's recommendation as presented on the Elk Management Plan.

Mr. Crandall made an amended motion before the vote was taken. He doesn't know how much of the management plan is numbers and how much is other issues.

Mr. Aoude said there is a lot in the plan that is not numbers, so basically he's saying to leave the numbers where they were.

Mr. Crandall supports the rest of the plan, with keeping the numbers the same as they were.

The following amended motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Bill Fenimore and failed 4 to 2 with Calvin Crandall and Bill Fenimore in favor.

AMENDED MOTION: I move that we keep the current permit numbers on all elk management plans.

Mr. King said we really haven't heard any discussion except the Fish Lake and Southern region.

Mr. Perkins said he cannot support the amended motion because it would put us at an impasse throughout the State on multiple topics forever. He sympathizes with the ranching community on their problems with working AUMs, including the Forest Service and BLM. He doesn't want to hold the sportsmen, citizens and wildlife of Utah hostage to that problem. He is not willing to create a congressional impasse where nothing gets done, because we have highly divided groups.

Mr. King asked when the next opportunity is to revise these plans.

Mr. Aoude said they are always five year plans, but there is always the option to look at them at any interval.

Mr. King said his hesitation is concerned that they are all lumped together. He doesn't know that each unit has the same problem as the Fish Lake Unit has.

Mr. Fenimore said he is supportive of Mr. Crandall's motion because he doesn't look at this as a stalemate issue. He looks at Desert Land and Livestock. They brought hunters and ranchers together in Rich County and created a CWMU that had wonderful success in a collaborative way. He is concerned about the numbers of the increase and what potentially it might bring. He would like to sit on the numbers and study it a bit more before we move forward.

At this point the amended motion and the original motion were voted on.

Assistant Director Clark said relative to the integrity of the Division, he wants to assure everyone that is ultimately what we are about. We present what numbers we gather rather they're embarrassing to us or not. We'll show you the numbers and take interested parties along. He thinks that what Mr. Aoude was trying to say in his comment is that wildlife aren't livestock and it takes a while to get things down under objective or to get things to grow back. There are many variables. We never intentionally build a population above objective to force something.

Mr. Perkins said a lot of this revolves around the condition of the range. The suggestion that the Division, the BLM, Forest Service and Sportsmen's organizations get better information together, in agreement on range conditions is a huge progression from where we're at. He would encourage that. That data would be hugely valuable in going forward with requests for changes in AUMs, depredation funding, etc.

Mr. Crandall said there has been a lot of cooperative effort between the Division, the federal agencies and those who use those agencies. The ranchers are at a disadvantage because they do not have groups of range biologists to support their needs. They are fiercely independent. He commended those ranchers who are here today to voice their concerns. Don't give up. Continue to participate.

Mr. Morrell said what they're concerned about is the winter range, not the summer range.

Mr. Albrecht said that's why he said the Division needs to redo how we hunt cow elk and that will take care of part of that problem.

11) Ferron Creek Introduction (**Action**)

Justin Hart, Aquatic Program Manager from Southeast region presented a Colorado River cutthroat trout restoration project they have in their part of the state. Anytime a state conservation species is reintroduced, it requires a process. It starts locally for approval, then to the county governments, the RDCC process, then the RAC and Wildlife Board. He went over the drainage location, activities to date, future plans and a summary. (See Powerpoint Presentation) We would like support for the reintroduction of Colorado River cutthroat trout into the Ferron Creek Drainage for sport fishing and conservation goals would be met. This concluded the presentation.

Mr. Crandall asked if irrigation will be limited because of any needs of the fish.

Mr. Hart said in order to keep this fish from being listed, restoration protects rights of anglers and fishery, including the water source. It is a benefit to all of us. This is a proactive way to protect everyone involved with the use of this water.

Mr. Crandall asked about a water quality issue relative to grazing.

Mr. Hart said that is not a problem. It is the same thing. People think since we're putting in a sensitive species, are they going to limit us? This is not the case. We're protecting rights long term. If the species became endangered then there might be limiting situations.

Mr. Perkins asked in how many places around the state are we reintroducing Colorado cutthroat.

Mr. Hart said in dozens of different drainages. We are in a working group with Colorado, Wyoming and Utah. There are wonderful, numerous projects going on.

Mr. Crandall asked what the possibility is that they will be listed, if you don't do the reintroductions. Is it a sensitive species?

Mr. Hart said it is a sensitive species. This conservation group we have with the three states gives us a lot of political power to fight those listings.

Mr. King asked if they are going to treat it again next week.

Mr. Hart said yes. Generally they like to do rotenone treatments twice to ensure the success of the projects.

RAC Recommendations

Southeastern – Mr. Jones said they voted to support the Division's recommendations unanimously.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's recommendation on the Ferron Creek Introduction as presented.

12) Hunting Closure Proposal – Northern Region (Action)

Justin Dolling introduced the Poll's request. Brent Poll came to the regional office four months ago and expressed a desire to close their property to rifle deer hunting. Our law enforcement section went out, reviewed the lay out of the property, and had a lot of discussions, plus a follow up with the Poll family. At this point the Polls still wanted to pursue this closure. They laid out the process to follow. It has gone through the RAC and Mr. Poll is here to present. Their proposal has changed a little bit in that the original was to just close their property to rifle deer hunting. They would now like to close within a mile of Hill Air Force Base all rifle deer hunting, just during the general season.

Brent Poll then addressed the Board. He has always been a hunter and deer were never seen around Hill Air Force Base years ago. Last fall he saw 70 head in a one acre field that they have. Later in the fall there are some big bucks that come down. Presently the population has exploded and there is no location where you can safely shoot a high-powered rifle in that area. This is a safety issue. The Davis County Commissioners thought they had this taken care of, but they do not have the authority to make laws over this area. They recommended that Mr. Poll come to the Division to have hunting restricted in this area. In South Weber around Hill Air Force Base there is no safe place to hunt with a high-powered rifle. We need to take care of the deer population, but we have archery and muzzleloader to take care of it. He is asking to correct this oversight by

outlawing hunting with a rifle within a one mile radius of Hill Air Force Base. The days of rifle hunting in that part of the state is over.

Mr. Bair asked if it is a total closure or just with a rifle.

Mr. Poll said hunting with just a rifle.

Mr. King asked if there are statutes in place around the municipal airports and other airports that have a similar restriction.

Mr. Perkins said he has been fairly close to airports while hunting.

Mr. Poll said that municipalities limit the firing of firearms in their borders all the time, but this unincorporated area has been overlooked.

Mr. King asked if the Air Force has any safety policies regarding this.

Mr. Perkins said the Air Force discharges a lot of weapons on Hill Air Force Base. He believes there are a variety of rules in place in municipalities that surround Hill Air Force Base and a number of them do allow hunting of some kind.

Mr. King asked if there is hunting going on there, but is it hunting or poaching?

Mr. Poll said last year, the second to the last day of deer hunting when there were some rifle shots that came down the valley. People thought it was their family. It was probably off their ground, but they weren't doing the shooting. A lot of people go to the Davis County landfill and see these big deer. It is a simple matter for them to come in and jump over a few fences to hunt during the season and poach when it's not. They've had quite a bit of both. This area is hard to access. Sheriff's Office and Division have been good to try to police the area, but it is hard to get to. By the time they get there the poachers are gone.

Chairman Brady asked if it would close more than just their land.

Mr. Poll said it would close more than just their land. Their land is where the cover is and it draws more hunters and poachers.

Mr. Perkins said it is all private land. It would be either the landowner hunting on his own land or trespass poachers.

Mr. Bair asked how the Wildlife Board restricting hunting would do more than the landowners just posting their property.

Mr. Poll said the land is posted. There is not a safe place on this land to shoot. If they leave the impression that it's okay to shoot there, they're still going to be there when the population of big deer is there. There is not a safe place there to shoot. You cannot defend that in terms of safety alone.

Mr. Bair said so safety is your main concern. He asked Mr. Dolling for input.

Mr. Dolling said the Division is always concerned about safety, thus the Hunter Safety Program. There are areas within the properties where there is a hillside that could be fired into safely, but also areas where a shot could go clear over Hill Air Force Base and into Layton. The safety issue exists, but there are places where you could safely discharge a firearm.

Mr. Perkins asked about the 600 foot safety zone from habitations. Are there places in this area that comply with state code?

Mr. Dolling said you'd have to really study it, but yes probably some core areas adjacent to Hill.

Mr. Poll said he agrees, but they have exhausted that and there are not roads and boundaries to limit this.

Chairman Brady said this is his opinion. We have private property where nobody should be shooting unless they have trespass authorization and now we have a hunting problem where they want to stop shooting high powered rifles on the property which may or may not accomplish what they want to do. He asked Mr. Bushman for a legal explanation. Mr. Poll has posted his property against trespass, but it's not working.

Mr. Bushman said posting prevents anyone from coming onto property and it is a Class B misdemeanor if they do. Trespass can be a very effective law. By state law you have to be 600 feet from any structure. This is a difficult situation because it is similar to many other areas around the state where we have cabins and mountain communities. The only law out there is 600 feet, about 5 miles out. Even if you're out on the face above South Weber a round can still end up in the valley. We do have communities that come to the Division to restrict hunting after getting input from their constituents. Today is different in that we have a private landowner asking for a mile radius around Hill Air Force Base to be closed. Mr. Bushman would be more comfortable if the county came to the Division with this request. We can't close it to the discharge of firearms, but just restrict the hunting regulations.

Mr. Bair asked about the mile around his property. What does that entail?

Mr. Poll said when he says a mile around the property, there are two landowners that are affected on the northeast corner of the Base, that aren't controlled by other statutes. This just happens to be the corner where all the deer are. He is just trying to find something that would be easy to legislate.

Mr. Perkins said but there are multiple other landowners all around the Base, all the way through South Weber and Riverdale.

Mr. Poll said there is not a property in that whole location which isn't within 600 feet of a house or road.

Mr. Perkins said there is no prohibition shooting within 600 feet of a road, but there is one against shooting across a road. Every landowner is allowed to shoot on his own property within 600 feet of his own house. If you prohibit hunting he can't hunt on his own property.

Mr. Bushman said he would be limited to archery and muzzleloader.

Mr. Fenimore asked if Mr. Barlow is in favor of this request.

Mr. Poll said yes.

Chairman Brady asked Mr. Dolling for the Division's position.

Mr. Dolling said they recommend rejecting this proposal. They are not sure that all the potentially affected landowners have been notified of this proposal. Landowners currently have all the protection to go out and properly post their property and we are willing to help enforce trespass in this area. They are afraid that this would be a difficult law to enforce. It would have to be spelled out in the proclamation and rule. Closing the one mile zone around the Air Force Base during the hunting season still does not keep anybody from discharging a high powered rifle as long as they're within the limits set by code. This also has potential to create a dangerous precedent. There is also the issue of excessive requests as land changes hands. If the Division were to recommend acceptance, there's the potential that it could affect tens of thousands of acres around the state.

There are some suggestions that the Division would like to offer to help the Polls with this problem. They would like to go out and provide some advice on how to properly post the property, how to post it in a way so the Division can go in and enforce it. They would also offer to provide increased patrol during the general deer hunt. They have officers who live in the area who are willing to be available on call when there are problems. That's their recommendation.

RAC Recommendation

Northern - Mr. Byrnes said their RAC rejected this proposal unanimously. Many of the council members thought that closing an area without involving all the landowners, especially a large area, would set a tricky precedent there. There is the ability for the landowner to post their private property also and control access.

Mr. Perkins asked Mr. Fowlks about the code classification for criminal trespass. What's the difference between closing this area to hunting and the protection under trespass?

Mr. Fowlks said trespass is Class B Misdemeanor. If you created a closure it could either be a Class B under unlawful taking or a felony under wanton discussion if they do it knowingly and intentionally and a trophy deer.

Mr. Perkins said so these penalties are already in place.

Mr. Fowlks said there is also unlawful taking while trespassing. So if they kill an animal, they can seize the animal, demand restitution and the Class B penalty.

Mr. Perkins asked Mr. Dolling if the area is posted.

Mr. Dolling said there are some "no trespassing" signs up, but he hasn't been around the entire parameter. There are scattered roads and they would like the opportunity to go out with the Polls, help post it and then regulate the area.

Mr. Perkins said he went out to this property a while back when this came up and did not see posting. He would like to see the Division assist the Polls in an effort to help this situation. He is reluctant to support hunting closure when we don't have the other measures in place that are required under state law. He would be in favor of the measures the Division is suggesting.

Mr. King asked what the level of hunting is in this area now.

Mr. Dolling said the general impression is there is not a lot of deer hunting that occurs.

Mr. Poll said it is very limited.

Mr. Perkins said there is some because we have had cases come to the Board where there has been illegal take in the South Weber area.

Mr. King asked if there is legal hunting also.

Mr. Poll said he doesn't think so, not in the last 20 years.

Mr. Bushman said there is another law in place in that area and that is suspension. If you are taking wildlife in trespass you can be suspended for that which is a serious sanction. Maybe there are just a couple of people engaged in this activity and if we could catch them once, it may make the point.

Board Discussion

Chairman Brady summarized the issue.

Mr. Bair said if we take no action, things would remain status quo.

Chairman Brady said they need a motion.

Mr. Perkins said he has been out to the property and is not prepared to go there until we've taken the previous measure of adequate and reasonable posting and the assistance that the Division is proposing. He does not like setting this type of precedence statewide and putting additional restrictions over state code that already exists until we see that we clearly need to do so.

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

MOTION: I move that we deny the request for closure by Brent Poll.

Mr. Fenimore appreciates Mr. Poll coming to the Board and supports the Division in going out to help with posting and enforcement.

Mr. Perkins said Haven Barlow's property needs some help from the Division also.

13) South Jordan Hunting in city Limits Proposal (**Action**)

John Fairchild introduced this proposal. Ms. Stone and Mr. Dawson have been very patient here today in waiting to present their proposal. The process has been gone through and the RAC reviewed this proposal almost a year ago. At that point they weren't convinced that there weren't areas available to hunt, so the request went back to the city, requesting maps. They said they couldn't support a closure until there was more information. There was some misunderstanding on some ordinance language, but it was corrected. They will go over that also.

Charity Stone, Staff Attorney for South Jordan City addressed the Board. He thanked Mr. Fairchild for working with them. We went to the RAC over a year ago. They did not do a final vote, but it is not required, just the recommendation from Mr. Fairchild, so they are here today. She displayed a map showing the location of South Jordan and gave some history. In the last 15 years the population in South Jordan has doubled. With the projections based on development, we anticipate the population doubling again in the next 20-25 years. The basic proposal (See Board Packet) is to allow specialized hunts that will help with control of wildlife populations. There is presently no area within the city limits where hunting is allowed. Certain restrictions are already in place regarding hunting. She then presented county and city regulations. Hunting restricted by private property owner preference on the west side of the city was shown. They have letters from these landowners supporting their "no hunting" request. With all of the restrictions on hunting the entirety of the city would prohibit hunting. She referenced the Utah Administrative rule that supports their request. Utah Code 23-1-14 (3)(b) denotes the process to request closure for safety concerns.

Mr. Bair asked if you can't hunt there anywhere, what the request is.

Mr. Fairchild asked for clarification as to why we would support this, then gave an example. We can draw a distinction between a city that is completely surrounded by other cities or up against public lands. We can wrestle with this, but there may be places where hunting just doesn't make any sense. We ought to recognize that.

Mr. Bair said he understands, but as he looks at the map, it seems we're just putting laws on top of laws.

Mr. Fairchild said if somebody does decide to go hunting, the cost is much greater and we're more involved, because it now is closed to hunting.

Mr. Bair said it is a cleaner way to do it if the Board approves this.

Mr. Fairchild said it's different because we don't have the trespass law to fall back on. It puts our officers in a better position to cooperate with a city that has looked to do a closure like this, getting support from our agency.

Assistant Director Clark said the difference between this proposal and the last agenda item is it is a municipality that has brought this to us as opposed to a private landowner, and they have done all the work.

Ms. Stone said the Board's vote today gives them the authority to do the hunting closure.

Mr. Fairchild said in the rule under areas with special restrictions, this one gets added.

Chairman Brady asked if the surrounding cities are in this same category. Have they done something like this?

Ms. Stone said she doesn't want to name them specifically but there are other cities that may or may not have hunting ordinances on the books, which may or may not be legal. She believes other cities have done it, but she is not aware that they have followed through the process that is required in state code.

Mr. Bushman said in response to the question have we ever done this before, the answer is not nearly often enough. South Jordan has come today and followed the process. Not all cities do.

Mr. King asked what if South Jordan City votes no even if we approve it.

Ms. Stone said in the admin rules that explain the process, it says the closure becomes effectively currently with the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Perkins said to reconfirm, all private property owners realize that there will be no hunting on their own property.

Ms. Stone said there is only one private property owner and they are on board. Everything else is commercially owned.

Mr. Perkins said he wants some assurance that this is really a public safety issue and not an anti-hunting issue. Why is it wrong and dangerous for public safety for someone to hunt with a bow? Anti-hunting includes sling shots, bow and arrow, and pellet guns. If it's a public safety issue then he is in support.

Ms. Stone said South Jordan has traditionally had a lot of hunters, especially before the development. There are people who do archery in their own yards which is why we decided to come through this process to talk about the hunting, instead of trying to target the archery or any other sort of recreational activities that the home owners currently do on their own land in a controlled environment. What the city is worried about is the trail system, open spaces and other land within the city where animals might be present where someone might pull out their bow and a jogger might come down the trail. They do have a safety concern and they could address it other ways. They have already run an ordinance for air guns and other similar guns, which did not fall under our firearms law, due to safety concerns; however we wanted to be transparent in what we are trying to do as well as trying to balance uses for people on their own property.

Mr. Fairchild said Mr. Perkins first concern is anti-hunting. The fact that hunting will still be an option that the Wildlife Board will have to control deer numbers speaks to that pretty well.

Mr. Perkins said he would be more comfortable if they had restrictions on archery and such other things, unsupervised situations.

Ms. Stone said there's a big difference with regulating hunting verses regulating archery in other areas is obviously a moving target and where the practice is occurring. There was discussion initially about other ways they could approach this because as they started this process they found out how involved it is. It is not really going to address our need. They drafted their original ordinance back in 2010, so it's been a long process with lots of discussion of other ways they could handle this.

Mr. Bair said they want to achieve their public safety concerns without limiting people's ability to practice archery in the field or in their yard.

Ms. Stone said what they are trying to address is lone individuals who want to take their bow out on the trails and kill a deer. It came up and their officers were not sure how to cite them.

Mr. Bair said it is against his nature to make hunting illegal.

Ms. Stone said this is part of the Board's role.

Mr. Perkins said similar with Syracuse, there was an area that was a slam dunk as far as making a decision for closure. This is a little grayer for him also.

Chairman Brady asked to see the slide that illustrates the ordinance.

Ms. Stone said the only change from what is in the packet is the unlined portion. That language was suggested to us in order to permit the type of special hunts to control the populations.

Mr. King said as you've gone through this process, what kind of public input have you received and what is the general feeling about the closure from those who have traditionally hunted there and the general public that may not hunt?

Ms. Stone said most people are surprised that hunting is allowed at all whenever it comes up. They held a public hearing when they started this process several years ago in order to get permission to start the process. No one commented at this meeting. They heard some stronger feelings when they were with Mr. Fairchild and their meeting. That was the first time anyone had expressed anything but surprise that there might be any hunting in South Jordan.

The discussion continued around various circumstances and opinions on this request, including similar circumstances that have occurred around the state.

Assistant Director Clark said there was a lot of thought put into this proposal and it preserves the management option to have special hunts to deal with urban deer.

Ms. Stone said as a resolution as Mr. Fairchild supports that will be beneficial for our city and still permit hunting if necessary.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by John Bair and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the South Jordan No-Hunting in City Limits Proposal.

14) Other Business (**Contingent**)

Mr. Perkins talked about Winter WAFWA which is January 13, 2013. He is requesting input for topics to be discussed there from the Board members. The commissioners in Hawaii will figure out which three topics they want to have considered. If there are any inputs on the topics Mr. Perkins has come up with he'd be glad to hear them over the next few days so they can make the deadline for submission.

Mr. Crandall asked if the Board would consider leaving only the Fish Lake at zero and leaving the rest as the Division recommended.

Chairman Brady said 800 animals on the Fish Lake are what the vote was about. 800 animals are for a return on investment for the sportsmen.

Mr. Crandall said that is also 9600 AUMs, 2,100 livestock cows.

Mr. Perkins said he doesn't know if he'd change his vote, but he'd vote to reconsider, affording opportunity for a separate vote.

Mr. King asked if we can do that, given this point in the meeting.

Mr. Perkins said he believes the answer is yes.

Mr. Crandall said that would be his request.

Assistant Director Clark said there were many individuals on both sides of the issue who were present and they left after the vote was taken. There will be a severe back lash if they do this.

Mr. King said that is his concern also. There is no public here at all.

Mr. Bair said if he thought it would affect the AUMs on that unit, he would look at splitting the difference with the grazers. He doesn't think the grazers' fight is with the Wildlife Board but with the Forest Service.

Mr. King wonders if they can't use some of this as ammunition in their behalf if there is data that the Division has that could support them.

Mr. Crandall asked the Board to think about it, but if it won't change the vote we won't act on it.

Mr. Perkins said he is open to discussion.

Mr. Crandall said he agrees that it would be bad to do that now, since everyone has left the meeting.

Mr. Bushman said the comment was made that it is not fair that the BLM would authorize more AUMs for elk and not livestock grazing. In reality the BLM and Forest Service do not authorize AUMs. They can intervene in our authority only when we have so many animals that it is damaging the land or interfering with other multiple uses. Short of that, it is the State that manages the wildlife. It is a hard thing, because grazing AUMs are being driven largely by politics.

Mr. Crandall said his suggestion is for that group of ranchers to go back to the BLM and Forest Service and let them know that they are giving to some groups and not others, and they're not being fair.

The meeting was adjourned.

July/August Regional Advisory Council Meetings
Summary Of Motions

1. BOBCAT HARVEST RECOMMENDATIONS

SRO, SERO, NERO, CRO, NRO

MOTION: To accept the Bobcat Harvest Recommendations as presented by the Division.

VOTE: Unanimous

2 WATERFOWL GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-09

SRO

MOTION: To accept the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 as presented by the Division with the added proposal that the Division look into additional opportunities for expanding hunting of Sandhill crane and Tundra swans to more parts of the state.

VOTE: Unanimous

SERO, NERO, CRO, NRO

MOTION: To accept the Waterfowl Guidebook Rule 657-09 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

3. OTHER MOTIONS

SERO

Recommendation for Wildlife Board consideration concerning cougar guidebook

MOTION: That GPS locations be made mandatory for all lion kills.

VOTE: Unanimous

NRO, CRO

Great Salt Lake Waterfowl Management Area Management Plan

Motion: Recommend the Director of Wildlife Resources adopt the Great Salt Lake Waterfowl Management Area Management Plan.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

NRO

Pineview Reservoir Hunting Closure Proposal

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board not adopt the Hunting Closure Proposal.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Beaver High School
Beaver, UT
July 31, 2012
7:00 p.m.**

1. REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

MOTION: To accept minutes and agenda as written.

VOTE: Unanimous.

2. BOBCAT HARVEST RECOMMENDATIONS

MOTION: To accept the Bobcat Harvest Recommendations as presented by the Division.

VOTE: Unanimous

3. WATERFOWL GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-09

MOTION: To accept the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 as presented by the Division with the added proposal that the Division look into additional opportunities for expanding hunting of Sandhill crane and Tundra swans to more parts of the state.

VOTE: Unanimous

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
 Beaver High School
 Beaver, UT
 July 31, 2012
 7:00 p.m.**

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Dale Bagley Dave Black Harry Barber Sam Carpenter Chairman Steve Flinders Mack Morrell Cordell Pearson Mike Staheli Layne Torgerson Clair Woodbury Mike Worthen	Bruce Bonebrake Stephanie Rainey Teresa Griffin Blair Stringham John Shivik Riley Peck Lynn Chamberlain Jim Lamb Heather Grossman Lynn Zubeck Zed Broadhead	Jake Albrecht	Rusty Aiken Brian Johnson

Steve Flinders called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. There were approximately 16 interested parties in attendance in addition to RAC members, members of the Wildlife Board, and Division employees. Steve Flinders introduced himself and asked RAC members to introduce themselves. Steve Flinders explained RAC meeting procedures.

Steve Flinders: I represent the Fishlake and Dixie National Forests. I want to recognize Jake Albrecht from the Wildlife Board in the audience. And let's introduce the RAC starting on my right tonight, Mack.

Mack Morrell: Mack Morrell, Bicknell, representing agriculture.

Cordell Pearson: Cordell Pearson, Circleville, representing at-large.

Mike Staheli: Mike Staheli, Delta, at-large.

Dave Black: Dave Black, St. George, representing at-large.

Dale Bagley: Dale Bagley from Marysvale, representing an elected official.

Bruce Bonebrake: Bruce Bonebrake, regional supervisor, Division of Wildlife.

Layne Torgerson: Layne Torgerson, sportsman's representative from Richfield.

Sam Carpenter: Sam Carpenter, sportsman's representative, Kanab.

Clair Woodbury: I'm Clair Woodbury from Hurricane. I represent the public at-large.

Mike Worthen: Mike Worthen from Cedar City, public at-large.

Harry Barber: Harry Barber, I represent the BLM. I work out of the Kanab field office where I'm the manager there.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)

Steve Flinders: Thank you. As far as the order of the meeting tonight we'll first have presentations by the Division of Wildlife. I ask you to be patient and respectful and let them get through the presentation. We'll then proceed on to questions from the RAC and then questions from the public, and then comments from the public. Fill out a comment card if there's an agenda item that you'd like to speak to. We'd love to hear from you. That's what we're all here for. Then we'll proceed to comments from the RAC and motions and voting. With that I have one switching of the order on the agenda, if everybody's got one in front of them. Because of audio visual needs down here and what information's on which machine we'd like to switch waterfowl with predator control. So we'll go bobcat harvest, then predator control, and then waterfowl. So 5,7,6, if no one objects. We need a motion and we'll approve this agenda. So moved by Mike. Second by Mack. Those in favor? It's unanimous.

Mike Worthen made a motion to accept the minutes from last month's meeting as presented. Mack Morrell seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Steve Flinders: I've got a comment card here about the Cougar Guidebook and Rule, which is often on this meeting. We don't have it on the agenda tonight. But we're here to take public comment and so I think what I'd like to do is sir if you want to stick around we'll do this under other business and we'll get it into the minutes and then we'll make sure the Wildlife Board hears about it. Yeah, I think it's one of the multi-year proclamations. You know it, maybe it shouldn't be multi-year proclamation. Maybe it should be something addressed every year. We'll let the powers that be decide. Appreciate you being here.

Wildlife Board Update: -Steve Flinders, Chairman

Steve Flinders: With that let me talk about the Wildlife Board meeting. It seems like it was a long time

ago back in that hot dry month we had of June. One thing I wanted to let the RAC and folks know about that Board meeting, there's an action log item, sometimes we ask for items to be added to the action log. This one may be of interest; a motion that they asked the Division to give a presentation on the preference point system relative to the new thirty deer unit plan. So how would this preference system look like across the thirty deer units? You know usually there's a discussion about how many people have points and how they are scattered, whether that needs to be readdressed. Moving on to the substance of stuff that we discussed here and was contentious; the deer management plan was passed as presented, after a fair amount of discussion. After lots of discussion, and I want to recognize Mack Morrell for traveling to the meeting, as well as several other folks from the southern region, we spent a lot of time talking about the Wildlife Board debated the elk management plan. And it was a vote in the end of 4 to 2 that passed as was presented by the Division. There were actually other motions that didn't carry but that's what passed 4 to 2. So it was controversial, not necessarily contentious but thorough discussion. I think that's all. Anybody have any questions about the Wildlife Board meeting? Mack, again, thanks for being there and supporting the RAC and the Fishlake management plan process. I don't know how you felt about the meeting up there. They were ringing their hands. I'll turn it over to Bruce, regional update.

Steve Flinders: I will turn it over to Bruce.

Regional Update:

-Bruce Bonebrake, Acting Regional Supervisor

Bruce Bonebrake: Okay, I don't have too much to report. We have had a one personnel change. We now have a new regional fisheries manager, Richard Hepworth has accepted that position and he's in place and up and going. We'd like to welcome you to the region. I don't know how many of you here remember his dad, Dale Hepworth, but I worked with him for many years, so it's kind of a continuation. And we have a new biologist out of Fillmore and Beaver area, Riley Peck. Riley could you stand up and just so everybody could see who you are. Riley's a new employee down here. He's worked for the Division for . . . how many years Riley? Four or five, okay. And so we're happy to have him down here. I'm sure he's going to do us a good job. Other things in the region, we will be conducting interviews in two weeks for the regional habitat manager position. We've got some really strong candidates for that so I feel like we're going to, we'll end up with somebody very good in that position. And we'll be conducting those on the 15th. And lastly, I'd like to report I found out just today, and I talked about this I think last time, about US-89 the highway project down there. A federal grant has come in for a million and a half dollars to add on to that project. So I think I reported last time that we would probably be doing that more (unintelligible). It will still be somewhat that way but we've probably got about ¾ of the money needed for that. So that project, hopefully, they'll be starting to let the contract sometime this winter and they should be able to make a big push and get the majority of that done pretty quickly. So pretty happy about that. The Grand Staircase Escalante is the one that put in for the grant and got the money. And that's about it.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Bruce, any questions? Seeing none let's move on. Come to the mic.

Lee Tracy: Lee Tracy, United Wildlife Cooperative. Could you give us an update on the Navajo Lake dike project and also what's happening with that proposed transplant of the deer on the Panguitch Lake front, or the Parowan Front unit?

Bruce Bonebrake: Okay um, since there is nobody from fisheries here I'll answer the one on Navajo Lake and then I'll defer the other one to our wildlife manager, Teresa Griffin. As far as Navajo Lake that's moving along about as fast as you could expect. They're waiting for it to dry up as much as they need to do the core samples to find out how sturdy the dike is and what exactly we need to do. I think we're all kind of suspecting that we're going to need to replace that dike eventually but the procedure right now is to try to repair the hole that's in the dike. We have enough money, I think with what we've collected so far, to probably do that repair. We don't have enough to replace the dike but we're working on that on several fronts. Hopefully, I mean the goal there is to completely replace that dike. The problem is that dike gets inundated with water from time to time and anybody that knows anything about dams and dam repair, that's not a good thing for a dike. You get all kinds of piping. And that dike's actually, I mean it was put in shortly the turn of the century. It's been there a long time, it's held up pretty well. We have repaired it, though I can't remember exactly, it's like four or six times, something like that. What's that? Turn of the century. So anyway I'm pretty happy with the way I'm seeing that go. We've got a lot of partners on that. Those counties, Kane County and Iron County have come in as partners. Kane County actually came up with \$50,000.00 dollars towards the repair. So I feel pretty confident we'll probably get that repaired about as quickly as possible, which probably means about a year and a half, something like that. And the complete replacement of that dike would take several years but we're trying to move in that direction. So does that answer your question on Navajo? Okay, Teresa could you, would you address where we're at with that.

Teresa Griffin: Yeah, we just got a proposal from BYU kind of outlining what we're going to do. They're overseeing the study. Each deer will be collared. I think we will probably break it into two groups, maybe fifty in the winter and fifty in the spring. Each one does have to have a live CWD test conducted but it won't be too complicated. So it will probably happen about mid December, the first fifty taken off the Parowan Front where you've toured before, the north end of the Parowan Front. And our new biologist Riley is looking at areas to put them on probably the north end of Pahvant up near Holden. So we'll keep you informed, I'm sure the volunteer help. It will be net gun capture.

Lee Tracy: We want to be part of the volunteers

Teresa Griffin: Absolutely, we will need people to help us. We'll be hauling a lot of horse trailers up there and a lot of animal handling. So we'll keep in touch

Steve Flinders: Thanks Teresa. Let's get into this agenda then. Agenda item number 5, Bobcat Harvest Recommendations. Welcome John.

Bobcat Harvest Recommendations (action) 12:18 to 15:22 of 1:02:07

-John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator

(See attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: Thank you, questions from the RAC? Sam.

Sam Carpenter: I probably should know this but uh, when you put this the .42, .65 and these different numbers, how do you correlate that to numbers? Is that something to do with the population or age? What do those numbers mean?

John Shivik: Let me see if I can find, is that right, is that what we are looking at? So just these target ranges? So for, this is the proportion of kittens and yearlings, that's out of the harvest take.

Steve Flinders: That's a percentage, essentially.

John Shivik: That's a percentage, sorry, proportion, yeah. Uh huh. Yeah, I guess I should say proportion females. Yeah, sorry.

Steve Flinders: Yeah, there is a big lengthy management plan behind that that describes all that. Any other questions? Good question Sam.

Questions from the public:

Steve Flinders: Questions from the public?

None

Comments from the public:

Steve Flinders: I don't have any comment cards for furbearer.

None

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Steve Flinders: So, it's ours to deal with, no changes essentially. Layne.

Layne Torgerson: I make a motion that we accept the bobcat recommendations as presented by the Division.

Steve Flinders: Motioned by Lane, seconded by Sam. Any discussion? Let's vote, those in favor? Any against? Unanimous.

Layne Torgerson made the motion to accept the Bobcat Harvest Recommendations as presented. Sam Carpenter seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Steve Flinders: So let's move on into agenda item 7, a Predator Control Program. This is informational so we won't be looking for a motion, voting, but you're welcome to ask questions. Go ahead John.

Predator Control Program (informational)

-John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator

(See attachment 2)

So I put this together fairly quickly today. We realized this program has been a real whirlwind tour of trying to get something pretty big up and running. So I wanted to put together kind of the basics of what

we've got going and what we've got started up so at least you guys and anybody interested in the public can see where we're going with this. So it's not too complicated but there are some different aspects of it that are kind of interesting. Predator control incentive program, just to give a little background and history in terms of what we're doing with predators inhabiting this state, this graph shows last years numbers in terms of what we spent for predator control in Utah relative to some of the other neighboring states. As you can see historically we've already been more than all the four neighboring states combined. What's going to happen this year is that's going to go off the graph, so we're going to go up to 1.1 million relative to what we've been doing before. So it's a really aggressive removal or predator control program relative to some of the other states. Okay so they get some context. And what happened here last year, two bills came up to the legislature: predator control funding by Senator Hinkins, in essence that's the one that puts the \$5.00 fee on big game hunting licenses with the purpose of removing predatory animals, and the mule deer protection act by Senator Okerlund which requires the Division to reduce coyote populations for the benefit of mule deer. And it does this by authorizing the DWR to contract with members of the target to remove coyotes from places where they can impact mule deer. Pretty specific. What we're doing with the funds, predator control funding all that's going to go over to Wildlife Services. We're going to contract with those guys to hit the high elevation sensitive areas, which we have done in the past, that's where most of the funds went before. And then the mule deer protection act is going to fund our public contracts that we're getting up and running right now. The way the law is designed, the mule deer protection act actually has two tiers, of a general predator control program and a targeted predator control program. Now in the general predator control program this is designed to have contracts for coyote removal from people, the general public. This is going to get up and running, it's actually already started now, aspects of it have started now. This is the part that most people are thinking about, the \$50.00 per coyote thing that's got all the press right now. The other half of it, and this is kind of interesting, is the targeted predator control program. And this one allows us to, or it instructs us actually, to target specific areas and specific places using preferred vendors. And what we mean by preferred vendors are specific members of the public. So hiring people to go out and do the work rather than just take any coyote from anywhere. So the biology on it, so we have made some recommendation and we're trying to get the message to the public as good as we can that it's called mule deer protection act, it's about deer, it's not about just removing coyotes, it's about trying to help the deer herd as best we can. We try to remind people of that. So what we're doing is we're trying to recommend locations for removal and targeting places where the removals might have the best benefit. Obviously deer fawning grounds, those elevations are going to do more benefit than a coyote from a lot of parts of the west desert, or Nebraska, or Kansas for that matter. So we want to keep people focused on places that are going to help Utah. And then we're also asking people to time their removals for the best times of the year where it has the most chance of impacting coyote populations. And the most efficient removal is going to be after the coyote's social groups have formed. When they've got their territory stable. That means they're going to be there when fawns hit the ground and it's also the time before the coyotes, the pups have been produced. You'd want to remove two or one versus six, six pups. So we're trying to get people thinking that way. Okay, we've put together the map of general locations, you can download this from the web, but the pink areas are areas where our deer herds are most problematic. We're trying to focus people on those places. And in order to participate in the program we try to keep this really simple but at the same time make it so it's really accountable and we know what we're doing with all these funds, it's quite a bit of money. What we have people do is register first. They have to take an informal test and agree to the requirements. And basically the test just shows you the map and where you should go. It talks about the seasons. It talks about the biology. It's ten questions just to get people so they know everything they need to know in order to get reimbursed for the coyotes. Get that all up front. They have to turn in some information, their address,

social security number, because this is taxable income. We'll have to send 10-99's and all that kind of stuff out too. It's kind of a big deal so we have to follow the state's purchasing rules in order to make this all happen. So in terms of requesting compensation, then people would have to come in with their scalp, with the ears on it or a pelt with the jaw. What I'd really encourage people to do is if they're going to come in I'd like to have them do it December or January. We'd like to do it the right time of year and also take the pelt that they can still sell, and sell their pelt and collect the \$50.00 from the state as well. So it would be really be nice if we could get people to maximize the use of this resource. And they have to come with the lower jaw that we can use; we want to get some population information on the coyotes. We also want to get some tissue on these guys too because I'm going to put together a data base of genetics, and the hope is to identify regions what coyotes have come from. What I'd really like to be able to do is make sure we can document what's a genetic Utah coyote versus one from Kansas or wherever else in the state, and again try to help people be a little more honest about this, because if they're cheating it's not going to help Utah deer at all. It's going to be important for them to go only to posted locations. They can't just go into any Division office, or just show up in my office, or show up to law enforcement personnel and then they'll get their \$50.00 per coyote. Again, recommending submitting in December. You can collect coyotes right now. It started July 1st that's when everything went into effect. They'll need to hold clean scalps and everything until we're ready to do it, and locations and times will be updated on the web at our predators website that we have set up. So that's all up and running and good to go right now. And it's been a little frustrating for folks because hey this law hit the books, why is it taking so long? One is it's a new big statewide program; no one has ever done anything like this before. \$500,000.00 to thousands of people, there's a lot of potential for cheating or a fraud and that kind of thing so we have to be on top of it. We have to follow our state purchasing rules. And also we're trying to set up our locations such that nobody has to travel, people from Southern Utah, we're not going to have to travel up to Logan or someplace like that, we're going to try to set it up so no one has to travel more than an hour to turn in their coyotes. And we're trying to do this without hiring any additional people, or very few additional FTEs in order to meet the guts of the program, the \$500,000.00 all would just go towards reimbursements versus inflating what we're doing. So it's been complicated. But we should be going here in a couple of weeks. The targeted predator control program is going to start the fall of 2013, remember this is the other half of the law. People will need a track record, so one of the other reasons we're collecting information from people as they turn animals in, they will then have a track record. Folks that are really good at doing this that gather good information that are able to turn in good stuff and good forms, we can put them on a list of approved vendors and then we can go back to them and give them private contracts to hunt in places where we might have missed. One of the things we are collecting are GPS locations, I'm going to gloss over that, we want a GPS or a good solid location from each coyote. And one of the reasons for that is so we can see which places we're hitting, which places we're missing, and if there's those doughnut holes in the middle then that's what we use this program for to fill in those places where the general public is missing. So it's a pretty well thought out and put together control program. Finally a lot of questions about is this going to work, is this not going to work, what should we be thinking about? The fact is the science sometimes predator removal works, sometimes it doesn't. We're giving this one the college try. We're putting a lot of effort and time into this and we've been publicizing this and getting as many people as we can. So far to this day 2,970 people have signed up for the program. So we're going to have somewhere on the order of 3,000 people starting right now. One of the things that we have to remember is it's not just coyotes that are impacting deer, there's habitat, there's weather, there's a lot of other factors that are important as well, so you can't just expect just one thing to do everything. If you want to remove all the coyotes in the state, we're trying to manage people's expectations, it's pretty unlikely we're going to remove 70% of coyotes for several years in a row and remove coyotes from the state, that's not going to happen. But

they can impact coyotes in smaller populations, in smaller areas. We hope that the populations are reduced and our fawn survival will be increased. We're on the edge of our seat watching to see how this works out. And again, we're going to use the location, the age of coyotes, population data in order to evaluate the program and see if this is worth the, you know, the \$500,000.00 a year, is it really helping stuff out? So we're gathering the information on it. And that was kind of the run down for you guys.

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: Any questions for John? Sam.

Sam Carpenter: The registration test that you referred to, is that web based?

John Shivik: It's web based, yes sir.

Sam Carpenter: Okay.

Steve Flinders: Harry.

Harry Barber: How do you envision in terms of the locations, for example somebody from Kanab, are you looking at relatively close to these smaller cities? They might have to travel to Cedar City or something like that?

John Shivik: Right, exactly, and that has been the struggle. So what we are working with all the managers and everybody right now; each region is setting up their plan to figure out how best to do it, you know to spread out. Southern region is a tough one because this is big down here. So Teresa is working on trying to do, what are you up to like 8 different locations? And it won't be every . . . The thing is, the trick is they won't be 8 hours a day, every day at 8 locations. It's going to be one place for half a day, another place for half a day, and another place for half a day. So people could either travel a way or they can wait and turn it in on a day. But we'll get that posted so people can plan ahead. And we're trying to get that up and running as soon as we can right now. That's the plan.

Steve Flinders: Another question.

Sam Carpenter: What kind of participation are we getting on this so far?

John Shivik: We've got almost 3,000 people signed up so far.

Sam Carpenter: And we haven't done anything on the coyotes yet as far as having them turn in? When is it we start doing that?

John Shivik: No, we, our target is September 1st to start having our locations up and running. If we can get something before that we'll try. But we've got a lot of software. The process is someone will show up to the designated location. They have a little form that says that I've taken the test, or whatever, I've registered, and another form that has coyote date, location, and their name at the top. Then we process that form, we run through the software, it says 6 coyotes, \$300.00, puts their information through the web, and then we hand them a receipt and then they get a check mailed to them. So that's what's kind of

leading us towards, we've got people can collect coyotes now but we're not going to be ready until September. And I think what you're going to see in September, at first, the flood gates open and a bunch of people show up and then we'll adjust dates, times and locations depending on where most people are turning coyotes in to. So this will evolve still a little bit.

Sam Carpenter: Okay and what about coyotes that are not taken in specified areas of the counties, and I believe it is through Wool Growers, or Cattleman, they have bounties. Is that still going to be active during this period of time as well?

John Shivik: Some of the counties are still doing it, some of them aren't. So it's up to the counties. That's the Department of Agriculture. That money goes through them then it goes to the counties. And a lot of them have said, why are we, the state's doing this \$50.00, they were doing \$20.00 I think. So most of them have said, there's really no need and they dropped out of it. But I don't know what the count is on how many are doing it and how many aren't.

Mike Worthen: I think that a lot of the counties we encouraged to use the money that they had in their budgets to push into predator control with Wildlife Services during their budget year. And I don't know how many did that or not.

John Shivik: Right, thanks Mike.

Steve Flinders: Other questions? Questions from the public?

Questions from the public:

None

Comments from the public:

None

Comments from RAC:

Steve Flinders: Again, it's an informational item. I appreciate John putting that on. With a lot of discussion and questions I hope as RAC members you can disseminate better information now after having that. Thanks a lot John; it was excellent.

Steve Flinders: Waterfowl. You're up Blair.

Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 (action) 31:15 to 38:38 of 1:02:07

-Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Coordinator

(See attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Thanks Blair. Any questions from the RAC?

Questions from the RAC:

None

Questions from the public:

Steve Flinders: Questions from the public?

None

Comments from the public:

Steve Flinders: I've got one comment card from Paul Niemeyer. Sure, just for you.

Paul Niemeyer: How many trumpeters do they kill in the state in a year do you think? What do your records show on that?

Blair Stringham: In order to actually have our swan season the Fish and Wildlife Service requires that we monitor the take of trumpeter swans; and so in a given year, it usually ranges between anywhere from zero up to about five. I think the highest we have ever had was there were seven trumpeters actually taken. And that was in a year when we had done our release earlier in the year and so there were more trumpeters in the area. But on a given year it's probably maybe three or four.

Paul Niemeyer: Are the trumpeters doing pretty good nation wide?

Blair Stringham: They are, they continue to increase. They become kind of a focal species for the pacific flyway and so we've done a lot more monitoring and assessing their populations and they continue to increase, not to the point where you could actually harvest them or have a season. But they are doing fairly well. And it's not really much of a concern, if we did harvest a lot of trumpeters it would be and that's why we have some of those triggers in place to actually close the swan season if we do harvest too many of those.

Paul Niemeyer: I guess where I am coming from on this, we use to could hunt swans in this end of the state. And then they came out and said, well there's a bigger chance of killing the trumpeter in this end of the state. And then they shut it down and the only place you can hunt them in a few of those areas up north. But I guess I would like to recommend that we look at reinstating some swan tags down here. Maybe you could limit it so many to this Southern Utah or in the zone. Is it still zone one and two now?

Blair Stringham: It's not, it's just a statewide season.

Paul Niemeyer: But I mean is the State, you know we had the zone one and two; I don't know what they even call it now. You know like your duck season ends different, or you goose hunt ends up there a week earlier before it does here. I think they call it zone one and zone two. But anyway, I'd like to see them look at reinstating some swan hunting opportunity down here. And then the other thing is we're starting to get more sandhill cranes down here all the time. I counted over 400 in one day last year. And I'd like to see them, and I know this is going to have to go through the Pacific flyaway council but still we need to, if you're ever going to get anything we've got to start here at the RAC and work through and try and . . . best case scenario it would be probably next year to even do anything. But these cranes are on the increase. You're seeing more that are raised here and plus the ones that are migrating through. And

the crane hunt would probably be better down here later than it is up there. Up there they're doing it in about September. When we really see them down here is about from the middle of October to about the middle of November. There were some I know that wintered, I think they wintered, I saw them the last of January at Piute. But you know I would like to see, it seems kind of unfair that we always have to go up north. Sometimes I think the whole state of Utah thinks they end at Provo. But I would like to see some opportunity for the people down here. You know these cranes, you know, I'm sure nation wide they've got to be on the increase from everything I can see, you know, clear into Canada and in uh, you know all the Prairie Potholes and the (Unintelligible) Forest and all that. But I would like to see, you know, some recommendations for some seasons to be able to hunt both of those species somewhere besides just up there. Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Paul. Follow up Blair, what is the process for expanding that Tundra Swan hunt or?

Blair Stringham: Yeah, both of those are both species covered under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. And so in order to change the seasons, and a lot of the actual areas or dates that you can hunt you have to go through the federal agency to do that. And so for our swan, we have a pretty tight contract with the Fish and Wildlife Service to only hunt in the Great Salt Lake area. It's something that could be looked at in the future if that's something that you guys wanted to pursue. You know it could possibly be, we would have to negotiate with the Fish and Wildlife Service and allow them to actually give us permission to do that. Um, as far as the cranes, that's also a possibility. Right now we do it in the highest populations of cranes we have in the state; so those four counties in Northern Utah. We have started looking at cranes more in Southern Utah trying to get a feel for what the population numbers are and so that's something we're continuing monitoring and could definitely be a possibility in the future as well. The Fish and Wildlife Service does give us a certain allotment of cranes though that we can harvest every year. And so if we were to open up a season down here you would be pulling permits from other parts of the state: tell them we harvest that certain number of cranes, so . . .

Steve Flinders: Great, thanks. RAC discussion? That concludes public comment.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Steve Flinders: Further discussion by the RAC? Mack.

Mack Morrell: Did you say on the Sandhill Cranes they're a maximum number of permits so you say you'd have to move some from the north down to the south to use it?

Blair Stringham: Yeah the Fish and Wildlife Service only allows us to harvest a certain number of cranes. And so like for instance with this year we could only shoot 127 total cranes. And so if we were to open up a season down here it would have to adjust permits accordingly so that we didn't harvest more than that 126. And so in order to do that you'd probably have to take permits from, like the Box Elder County hunt, or the Cache hunt, or the Rich hunt or something like that. But it's also in proportion to our cranes populations and surveys that we do every year in September. And so depending on how those populations fluctuate, I mean some years we could have more permits and so it, you know just depending where the cranes are at is where we'd like to hunt them. So . . .

Mack Morrell: How do you get more permits?

Blair Stringham: It's basically just in proportion to how many cranes you actually have in your state during the survey period. And so if our number of cranes were to increase we would be given a larger allotment of cranes that we could harvest.

Mack Morrell: When do you count the cranes for Southern Utah? I think we have plenty.

Blair Stringham: Yeah, they are specified dates that the Fish and Wildlife Service gives us every year and they are September, usually 10th through the 15th. And so that's when we conduct our survey and so depending on when the cranes actually move through down here, if it's later in the year then we're probably not counting as many of those cranes. And they may be cranes that are moving from Northern Utah down or you know, it's hard to say.

Mack Morrell: What about the cranes that stay year round?

Blair Stringham: Um, we have done some surveys in the past. And so if they were here year round we would be detecting them. I know Vance Mumford did some surveys last year around Richfield and counted some. I couldn't tell you how many for sure. If there's areas in the state where we're starting to see more and more cranes we'll probably start to do more and more surveys in there to try to get a better idea of how many cranes we have statewide.

Mack Morrell: You better come down to Bicknell Bottoms, there's some year round. All you've got to do is plant your grain in your field then they show up.

Blair Stringham: Yeah.

Steve Flinders: Mike.

Mike Worthen: Is the number of permits tied to, or are there permits for depredation on crops? I know some states do that like Idaho.

Blair Stringham: Yeah, and again, it's something that goes through the Fish and Wildlife Service. In the past we haven't really done much of that. We've issued cracker shells, or propane cannons, and things like that to try to deter cranes from feeding in fields like that. We haven't ever done any kind of lethal removal like that for cranes.

Steve Flinders: More discussion? Anybody ready to make a motion? We can certainly ask the Wildlife Board to put it on the action log. Go ahead Cordell. Sam.

Sam Carpenter: I move that we accept the DWR proposal on the waterfowl recommendations but I would like to add to the action log or whatever we need to do to get Paul's concerns addressed. I'm not exactly sure how to word that Paul on what you want on there. I know it had to do with the swans . . .

Steve Flinders: Just look for additional opportunities with swans and crane's in Southern Utah.

Sam Carpenter: That sounds great, what Steve said.

Steve Flinders: Second on that motion? Seconded by Clair. So you want to read something back Stephanie so we know what we're voting on? Yeah for cranes, Sandhill Cranes and swans, Tundra Swans. Discussion on the motion? Let's take a vote. Those in favor? Any against? That looked unanimous. Thank you.

Sam Carpenter made the motion to accept the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 as presented with the added proposal that the Division look into additional opportunities for expanding hunting of Sandhill crane and Tundra swans to more parts of the state. Clair Woodbury seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Other Business

-Steve Flinders, Chairman

Steve Flinders: Moving on to other business. Dan, do you want to talk to us about changes you would like to see in the cougar guidebook.

Dan Cockayne: (Attachment 3) I would, I appreciate the opportunity. My name is Dan Cockayne. I'm a houndsman and also the lion coordinator for the Utah Houndsman Association. We realize that cougars aren't on the agenda. They're listed on the DWR website as the guidebook changes for this RAC and so that's why we wanted to be here for sure. But cougars are kind of a unique species. I've been in the woods all my life and I've never seen one except with my hounds. And so they are hard to count, it's hard to know how many there are and where they're at. There is science, and I know this managing cougars in North America is part of the management plan. So as the lion coordinator I've traveled all over this state pretty much end-to-end, side-to-side in the past four or five months talking to houndsman because they're very concerned about the lion populations, mostly the harvest of females. The records are showing that the female harvest is increasing and the age is decreasing. So basically we're killing the young females, which is, can devastate a population. The target for harvesting, or for adjusting the tags is between 17 and 20 percent harvest on females. In 2011 we harvested 39 percent females. In 2012 we harvested 34 percent females. And then if you also take into consideration, I emailed most of you, or tried to, this and I've got a copy and I'll leave it so that everyone gets one, but a study recently in Montrose Colorado they had three collared females that were taken, it was legal to kill a collared female, they orphaned eight kittens. And they were all euthanized and their collars taken off because they weren't old enough to survive. So if you take the numbers of the females that we've harvested in the last two years of our three year plan and even if you consider half that many kittens are going to be orphaned and die we're taking females at the rate of about 50 percent, females and kittens. And we're alarmed. The houndsman, some of them 30, 40 years of experience in the field, everywhere I go are saying there's no lions. We can't find lions. These aren't amateurs. These are men that have been riding their mules, running the roads. They're just dwindling. I think we've targeted lions as a predator for the deer and with very few results and we need to look at the lions before we take them all. The other unique thing about the lions is they're not only hunted they're also, the opportunity for a non-consumptive tag to just go pursue the lion; and if there's no lions that's not happening. That's a lot of dollars. Typically for me I buy a rifle, a couple boxes of shells, I take a couple tanks of gas and go hunt a deer a couple weeks a year. My hounds I feed them day after day after day, I buy gas, I travel, I train them. I bought coyote dogs because there's coyotes everywhere. And it's tougher and tougher to find a lion. And based on the science and the experience of the houndsman we feel like we're at a serious critical point and so we would like to see things done to protect the females. Whether it's lower the tags, which we'd love to see,

and revert the harvest objective to a male only. We could still have the numbers but preserve that base to take care of the population. A couple of other things that we would like to see and that could be done when we adjust the guidebook for the dates and stuff this year, there's a voluntary cougar orientation course for to identify, it's excellent materials and hardly anyone is using it, we'd like to see that mandatory for any permit holder, anyone guiding a permit holder, any outfitter that's outfitting a permit holder, that that course is mandatory. We do it on almost every other species and it doesn't, it doesn't cost anything to do that. We'd like to also, and I've met with John and talked to him about updating that and putting more of an emphasis and helping the hunters understand how we effect the population by taking a female. If we take a male cougar another male will move into that area and take care of the breeding. If we take a female, she averages 12 kittens in her lifetime that survive. If half of those are females by the third generation killing that one lion is taking over 2,000 cougars. It's a huge impact to take those females. We'd also like to see the split moved up to April 1st, so it's not a . . . What we find is in the spring is the ideal time to take a cougar so you wait 8 to 10 years to get a limited entry tag and then right when all the good storms are hitting and the good conditions to take a lion it switches to limited entry and a lot of females are taken. If those guys who have waited all that time to take a trophy animal have a little more time their odds of taking a mature male increases by doing that. The other target for, or the other trigger for adjusting the numbers are the pursuit numbers. Right now we do a random survey on pursuit holders. We'd like to see that mandatory for everyone who holds a pursuit tag to take that. It's five minutes on the computer. I took it this year. The information collected is really good and it just makes for better science and better management doing that. There's a study on the Oquirrh and a study on the Monroe. On the Oquirrh a collared cougar is not legal to take. On the Monroe a collared cougar is legal to take. So we're taking our hunters dollars, our taxpayer dollars and paying these guys to go track these cougars, tranquilize them, collar them and then we're killing them. We're not studying anything; we're just killing them. I think Clint Meacham told us that four or five of the females that he collared were taken this year. It doesn't make any sense to not protect those collared cougars. So we'd like to see that statewide; a collared cougar is off limits. And then finally we would like to see it mandatory that all the kill sites are GPS and that information is recorded. There's um, there was just recently a case down here over by Moab, I believe, where they were taking, I believe they were actually killing cougars in Colorado and tagging them with Utah tags, but regardless because during the limited entry season and the harvest objective season there's also, they coincide and so there are a lot of incidents where a cougar is taken off of a limited entry area depriving that guy who has a tag for there and tagged with a harvest objective tag on another one. It would be a law enforcement tool and it would be a good tool for the biology so we know exactly where these cougars are being taken. All of the last five of those things could be adjusted in the guidebook without changing anything with the management plan. They're just little housekeeping things that will save some females. And we feel, and I feel personally that we need to take care of those females. We're killing too many of them. Three years may be too long, I don't know. That's all I have.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Dan. Follow up question for John Shivik. Remind us John of the process or the timing that we're in with the Cougar Proclamation. I think what Dan was talking about, I pulled out my copy of the 2012 Wildlife RAC Board schedule off of the Internet and it shows a place holder there for Cougar Guidebook and Rule in this meeting where it's traditionally been done. We're at the first year of a 3-year proclamation, right?

John Shivik: No, we are at the 2nd year of the 3- year proclamation on cougars. And the placeholder is just that. So when they put together the schedule they put in what's traditionally there and then use it just as a placeholder. And then what actually happens is, you know, it's the agenda that we put together. So

it's the 2nd year. And this is actually, I mean it's great that Dan's here. We've been communicating; we have visited at the offices and things to address some of his ideas. He's got some actually pretty relevant and good ideas and things I think that we'll talk about. And this is, I mean it's a little early but what I'm hoping to do is I'll keep working with the houndsman, we'll put stuff together so by the time we're actually hitting cougars again this time next year I think they'll have kind of a nice package of stuff to throw out, to present, and stuff that we can work with them on too. So I'm actually looking forward to this process.

Steve Flinders: So hypothetically if the harvest this year were way out of the performance targets. . .

John Shivik: Right, next year we would do some; yeah we would do the adjustments.

Steve Flinders: But you wouldn't change it midstream?

John Shivik: We haven't really hit any kind of a threshold to make us change midstream. And again, the 3-year recommendation, the reason for that, as you know in any given year you've got, oh especially with these cougars, a late snow versus an early snow, they're the same kind of thing, it really impacts how many of these animals are taken. So any one-year isn't the population. It really helps us to have a 3-year block so we can be pretty reliable about the information that we have so we can make informed decisions going forward versus kind of chasing our tails. So that's why it was set up that way. It's a good process; and there's no plan right now to do any kind of an emergency thing with the cougars.

Steve Flinders: Thank you. Question, Layne.

Layne Torgerson: John, if I remember right, when we, on this, when we changed the cougar management plan we went to the regions or to the bigger zones.

John Shivik: Right.

Layne Torgerson: Aren't there triggers in place so that if that harvest of females gets to a certain point, boom, we cut it off? I'm trying to remember. I thought that was . . .

John Shivik: Um, yeah I've got the plan here. I mean it's more about . . . and I'm just looking at the numbers from this year in terms of, you know, we're not hitting our female quotas even. Um, the split units didn't get up to what the quotas were, or the sub-quotas were for females and things. I, the plan's more, it's probably a little more aggressive the other way around in terms of leaving harvest objectives open than . . .um, and keeping the split units open for quotas than shutting it down on emergency (unintelligible).

Layne Torgerson: That's the word I was looking for. If I remember right there was some wording in there about a female sub-quota on these harvest objective units.

John Shivik: Yeah, that's what would do it, yeah. I'm sorry. No, I'm sorry. There is language in there that would initially shut those things down with these female sub-quotas. But we didn't hit those things for most of the units.

Steve Flinders: Good discussion. Other questions? Sorry to put you on the spot John.

John Shivik: That's okay. I'm thoroughly unprepared.

Steve Flinders: Yeah, you got it all in a folder. Anything else? This is just informational. Dan, appreciate you coming and we'll, we've got a capture of that in our minutes and we'll see what goes on with other RACs and take it up at the Board meeting. Anyone have any other business? Motion to adjourn?

Layne Torgerson: I make a motion we adjourn.

Steve Flinders: So moved. Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 8:03 pm.

To: Wildlife Board and RAC members
RE: Cougar Guidebook & Rules Meetings

Please consider the following issues as you address the 2012/2013 Cougar Guidebook at the upcoming RAC and Board meetings.

1. While I realize that we are only in the second year of a three year plan I believe that we are over harvesting female cougars statewide, the harvest on female cougars for the past two years exceeds the Management Plan target by a substantial amount. Over the past 4 months I have personally spoken to over 100 Houndsmen statewide and have been alarmed at their response about low cougar numbers in their areas. Sanpete county houndsmen have seen a dramatic decrease in the number of cougars, but statewide I have been told by many hunters who have been pursuing cougars with hounds for 10, 15, and as much as 30 years that they have never seen the population drop this low, and most feel that it is a result of over harvesting females. As I am sure you are aware from reading the publication Managing Cougars in North America an increase in the harvest of adult female cougars is a typical sign of a declining cougar population. (Chapter 5, page 112) The other result of harvesting female cougars is the orphaning and subsequent death of dependant kittens. A recent study in Montrose, Colorado where it is legal to take a collared cougar found that the taking of three collared female cougars resulted in the orphaning and death of eight kittens. I feel the female harvest quota needs to be drastically reduced and then the harvest objective units revert to a male only harvest to fill the remaining harvest numbers.
2. The “ Voluntary Cougar Orientation Course” needs to be made mandatory for all permit holders, guides and outfitters. The course also needs to be modified to include more information on the impact killing a female cougar has on the population. If an average female cougar has 12 surviving kittens in a lifetime and half of them are female kittens in just three generations the taking of that one female cougar on average will result in the loss of 2058 cougars, whereas the taking of an adult male cougar only results in the loss of one cougar as another male can take his place in the breeding cycle. I feel this course should be made available in a video presentation.
3. The split Limited Entry / Harvest Objective date should be moved to April 1st to allow those who have waited a substantial number of years to draw a tag two more weeks to harvest a trophy. I find that many of the females taken by limited entry hunters are taken as a last resort because the season is ending for limited entry hunting and the competition for a trophy animal becomes much greater when the unit switches to Harvest Objective. The additional time would allow for the taking of a mature male cougar.
4. The random pursuit survey should be mandatory for all pursuit holders in order to assure more accurate information as the cougars treed per day is a trigger number for setting harvest quotas.

5. Many sportsman and tax payer dollars are being wasted on the Monroe cougar study because it is legal to take a collared cougar. It should be illegal to take a collared cougar on this study area as it is on the Oquirrh cougar study. Killing a study animal is a waste of time and ultimately tax payer dollars.
6. The location of every cougar harvest should be recorded and reported with GPS coordinates. This would create a tool for law enforcement and also valuable information for biologist in the study of cougar densities. I believe that too many cougars are being harvested on one unit and reported on another unit. Because limited entry and harvest objective seasons occur at the same time.

Five of these actions can be implemented in the 2012-2013 guide book with out altering the 3 year management plan. I also feel that harvest rates are exceeding recruitment and that an emergency action should be taken and female harvest quotas reduced drastically

Thank you for your consideration in these matters

Respectfully

Dan Cockayne
Taylorsville, Utah
801-420-1547
danc@sandlinc.com

**Southeast Region Advisory Council
Grand Center
182 N. 500 W.
Moab, Utah
Aug. 1, 2012 @ 6:30 p.m.**

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

**MOTION: To accept the agenda and minutes as written
Passed unanimously**

Bobcat Harvest Recommendations

**MOTION: To accept the bobcat harvest recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously**

Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09

**MOTION: To accept the Waterfowl Guidebook Rule 657-09 as presented.
Passed unanimously**

Recommendation for Wildlife Board consideration concerning cougar guidebook

**MOTION: That the Wildlife Board considers incorporating a mandatory GPS location on harvested cougars prior to the next proclamation cycle.
Passed unanimously**

**Southeast Region Advisory Council
Grand Center
182 N. 500 W.
Moab, Utah
Aug. 1, 2012 @ 6:30 p.m.**

Members Present

Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor
Sue Bellagamba, Environmental

Wayne Hoskisson, Environmental

Derris Jones, Chairman

Darrel Mecham, Sportsmen
Christine Micoz, At Large

Pam Riddle, BLM
Charlie Tracy, Agriculture

Members Absent

Kevin Albrecht, USFS
Seth Allred, At Large

Blair Eastman, Agriculture

Jeff Horrocks, Elected Official
Todd Huntington, At Large

Kenneth Maryboy, Navajo Rep.

Travis Pehrson, Sportsmen

Others Present

-
- 1) **Welcome, RAC introductions and RAC Procedure**
-Derris Jones, Chairman

- 2) **Approval of the Agenda and Minutes (Action)**
-Derris Jones, Chairman

VOTING

Motion was made by Wayne Hoskisson to accept the agenda and minutes as written

Seconded by Charlie Tracy

Motion passed unanimously

- 3) **Wildlife Board Meeting Update**
-by Derris Jones, Chairman

Note; A malfunction in the sound system prevented the recording of the Wildlife Board update. The problem was resolved by the time John Shivik made an informational presentation on predator control. The following was salvaged:

Derris Jones-There was quite a bit of discussion on the Conservation Permit Rule. There was a lot of concern that not only limited entry but once in a lifetime permits gets adjusted on an annual basis and limited entry didn't on the number of conservation permits. The Wildlife Board felt pretty strong that most limited entry units have over a 150 permits anyway, and it maxes out at 8 permits, but they did request that limited entry be looked at on an annual basis for the conservation permit.

Questions from the RAC

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

- 4) **Regional Update (Informational)**
-Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor

Questions from the RAC

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

- Predator Control Program (Informational)**
-John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

- 5) **Bobcat Harvest Recommendations (Action)**
-John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Pam Riddle-Once we fall into line, what will the permits be raised to?

John Shivik-The baseline is six per individual.

Charlie Tracy-Explain what the set days mean. Is that how many days the traps are out?

John Shivik -Yeah, so one trapper might set a hundred traps for one day and that's a hundred set days, so we get an average set days per trapper and that's an interesting metric, because we have some trappers that have been working an area they know very well. Other ones...One of the biggest correlatives is how much the fur prices were last year. So if you get a big fur price last year, a bunch of people want to start trapping and they come in and their set days are terrible. They don't know what they are doing as much, so it really skews that number. So it's one of those things you have to consider. That's why there are four different factors and there's not any one that drives our recommendations completely, so it's smart that way.

Derris Jones-John, do you feel that the increased coyote removal is going to benefit bobcats? Is there a lot of overlap in habitat and competition?

John Shivik -What tends to happen...it's called meso-predator relief where you remove some animals such as foxes, raccoons, etc. and they will really kick up high when you remove a lot of coyotes. It depends on how many people harvest bobcats and are out shooting coyotes at the same time and there are a lot of really complicating factors there. The other thing is the rabbit population. The rabbits are doing well here too, aren't they? Throughout most of the state, they've been on a down and now they are coming up, so even though coyotes may be removed, the bobcats might be doing well on other things, so my best guess is that we will have to see. I don't expect a monster jump in bobcats, but I don't see...anything can happen, but it's not going to be bad for them.

Pam Riddle-I have one more thing. It has to do with coyotes. So if the fawn levels increase, we continue coyote control, if we don't see an increase in fawns, how many years...do we have a plan for that?...how long to continue the program?... if it doesn't give a response. What kind of a response are we looking for?

John Shivik -There are a variety of things mixed in now in terms of units that we are worried about and predator management plans and the whole coyote program. So the coyote program, the way it's set up, it's really relative to those laws, instructing us to work with the public to remove coyotes. So I think what's going to happen is this first year, we will see where the public is removing them. Then we will see what our fawn to doe ratios look like, if there are already areas being treated by Wildlife Services, they are under a predator management plan, and that whole process takes several years in a row. You look at the numbers and you look at the range conditions and if they don't match up, then you put things into gear as far as looking at some of these other predators to see what the problems are...either they are coyotes or cougars, depending on what the population is or what's being hit, so relative to the plan, I don't really have a strong answer for that until we see what happens, relative to the predator incentive program. I don't have a really good answer until we see what the public...what comes about from public interactions there.

Questions from the Public

Jerry Swasey-Some studies they have done with coyote populations in Wyoming...once they control big sections of ranches there, they control the coyotes down to where they are tolerable, the bobcats rebound almost hand in hand as one trades places with the other. So I think we will see an increase in the cat population, because they are both competing with the same rabbit, so if we diminish the coyotes, we will see the bobcats come up. Is that correct? I think with the rabbit population having been down the last 2-3 years and now we will see more rabbits increase... the amount of predators that we see will increase as Mother Nature takes care of things, I suppose. I think the Utah Trapper's Association would probably endorse that.

Mike King-I'm just curious what the overall bobcat harvest was for the state last year?

John Shivik -I think...I should have that number in front of me, but it's in that 300-500 range.

Mike King-So it's 10% or less than the permits that are allocated?

John Shivik -Right. Yeah. Let me check.

Bill Bates-I was thinking it was about a thousand.

John Shivik -I want to strike that. I want to double check the numbers.

Comments from the Public

Dan Cockayne-Lion Coordinator of the Utah Houndsmen Association. I appreciate the chance to have a minute. I also appreciate John watching over these critters. He's a good guy and we appreciate him. I emailed everyone a copy of this stuff and I hope you got it. If not, I brought more copies. From my work with the UHA, I've traveled around the state, talking to houndsmen and statewide there is a huge concern about lion populations, and the female harvest, and we realize that we are in the second year of a two year plan, but we also think there are some things the Wildlife Board could do to take some steps to keep us out of big trouble. These numbers aren't really 100%, but in 2011 we killed 39% females. In 2012, we killed around 34%. The management plan calls for...a trigger at 20% females, so we're way above that, and then if we also consider...down in Montrose they had a collared cougar study. They killed three females with collars and orphaned 8 kittens and they were all euthanized to get their collars back, so if on the average these females that we are killing, just had a half kitten apiece, you know we are killing 50% females, and we think that's way out of line. I've talked with houndsmen who have been out in the field 30 years and they tell me they have never seen a lion population this low and I understand that we've picked on them a long time and it hasn't changed much with the deer. The thing to consider with the houndsmen is that...we may not be a huge group, but we have quite a financial impact in what we do. When I hunt deer, I buy a box of bullets and orange vest, a tank of gas or two and go out a scout, but that's about it. As a houndsman, I spent more money buying gas last bear season than in my own community. It's a year round thing. We are feeding our dogs. We are doing all that, so when we hurt the houndsmen to the point that they aren't around any more; we create a bunch of things. The other thing that we are concerned about is the science says when the percent of females harvested goes up and the age goes down, it's a sure sign of a declining lion population. We are absolutely seeing that. If you kill a male, another moves in and takes its place. If you kill a female lion and you take on an average of cubs in her lifetime, she's going to have 12 kittens that survive. If half of those are female, in three generations, you've killed 2,000 lions. So killing females has a huge impact, which brings me to the things we feel like that we can do even though we pretty much all agree that the Wildlife Board isn't going to open the plan and change the quotas, we feel the female harvest quota is too high, we'd rather see a low female quota and then have those harvest objective units turn to male only. It can be done. It's been done in a lot of states. And we can still harvest lions and have the opportunity to hunt but we don't need to kill all the girls. Some things we think are important that the DWR has put together...the DWR has put together an excellent cougar orientation program and it's voluntary. It's about the only species that it is voluntary. We'd like to see it made mandatory. If you have a lion tag, you have to take the course. If you are a guide, and you are guiding a lion hunter, you have to take the course. If you are an outfitter, you have to take the course. We'd also like to see that updated so that all hunters understand the impact of taking that female. When they are taking that 40 lb. female, they are just killing something because they have a tag. We'd like to change that. We'd also like to see the split that...a lot of the units are limited entry then they split to a harvest objective and any one can come in. We would like to see that moved to the first of April. Typically March is a very good month to hunt cougars. We have lots of storms and lots of opportunity and what's happening is that it's becoming a competition, so as the clock ticks, you are going to have all these other hunters come in and then you settle

for a young girl and that's hurting the population. We'd like to see those dates moved. The other trigger for adjusting quotas is cougars treed per day and that's for the hunters that are just pursuing. It's another unique thing. We buy a non-consumptive tag. We spend our dollars to get nothing except maybe a picture, we hope. And that's part of what triggers adjusting those quotas. Right now we do a random survey of 25% of the permit holders. We would like to see that mandatory for everybody. If you have a permit, take the five minutes to do it, so we can do it with good science. We have a cougar study on the Monroe where we are paying a houndsman to go out and tranquilize a cat and put a collar on it and then its fair game to kill it. Clint Meacham was at one of our meetings and he said that hunters killed 40% of the lions he has collared. We aren't studying these animals if we are killing them. The study on the Oqirrrhs, you can't kill a collared cat and we'd like to see that statewide. If we are going to spend our money to study them, then let's not kill them. The last thing that we would recommend is that we everyone be required to GPS the location of their kill. There was a case in your country about lions being killed in Colorado and tagged with Utah tags. The way that limited entry and harvest objective is, it's so easy to kill a lion in one canyon and claim it on another canyon tag and we would like to see that changed. It's a law enforcement tool. It's also a biology tool, so the biologist can see where these lions are killed and where they are taken from. I've been in the woods all my life and never seen a cougar without my dogs. They are just elusive and it's hard to know how many we have. If you talk to the houndsmen like I have, we don't have nearly as many as we used to, so we think that they have been picked on way too much and we need to quit killing a few females. Derris Jones-When is the cougar RAC?

Bill Bates-It's not going to be this year, is it?

John Shivik -We are on the second year of a three year cougar cycle, so the next round we will be talking about cougars. We are already working with Dan and he's been great and has been coming to these, and bringing some of these issues out, so we will work with him, and I think we will have a really good set of recommendations for cougars, but there's nothing to talk about now.

Dan Cockanyne-But didn't you change the bear program? (He did not come to the microphone, but spoke from the audience. His challenges to John were masked by other talking and John's rebuttal.)

John Shivik -Bear just started a new (?)...the cougar one...we are in the second year...this is confusing and I'm learning this as well, so the cougar is on a 3-year plan. Last year they did change some stuff in it. But as you can see, that causes a lot of confusion and it undercuts the whole purpose for having a 3-year plan, and one of the purposes of having a 3-year plan is so you can have good enough information on any given year, it's a late snow, it's an early snow, harvest has really been impacted by all sorts of yearly things, and it makes a lot of sense to me to follow the three year recommendations so you have a good data set, so you are making a good recommendation for what's going on and visa versa. As of right now, relative to cougars, it wasn't on the agenda and we're getting to the point of not following the 3-year plan.

Dan Cockanyne-But you are requiring GPS locations for coyotes.

Bill Bates-I was just going to say, regardless of whether we have brought it up or not, I think the RAC is still able to make recommendations.

Dan Cockanyne-The fact is having the GPS locations, you would know where each lion was killed. That's a tool that benefits these guys a whole lot.

John Shivik -I agree. There are some of the things they have come up with that are wonderful things that will be incorporated. You can make recommendations on whatever now. I'm only prepared...I will be prepared to get cougars up and running the next time around. Cougars are on the plate the next time around, so I fully expect some of these things to be discussed and incorporated into our recommendations and incorporated into some of your thoughts. This public process is great. The good thing about having this come up now

is that and our having these discussions is that on the day of recommendations, I'm not playing catch up. What I'm hoping is that come next year, we are doing this and this because of this and this and because of this input and this input. I will be up to speed rather than playing catch up. It's going to be a good process that way, and I will have three years of data, so I'll be able to make really strong recommendations about what the cougar population is doing. One problem with GPS is that we will get complaints from the public that they can't afford a GPS. It goes visa versa and that's why we look to your guidance to figure how to work this out and get that to the Wildlife Board so they can sort that out. Bill Bates-A valuable thing might be is if you feel strongly about that, you can make a motion tonight for John to consider that for next year, and it will be voiced at the Wildlife Board and it will be something on your plate to look at. It's worth bringing up. Charlie Tracy-How hard is it to falsify a GPS location?

Bill Bates-Not very hard.

Wayne Hoskisson-It's as easy as writing down on a piece of paper.

Dan Cockanyne-If you go to the GPS location and there's no evidence of kill, that's the whole basis of it.

Bill Bates-That would be the implication. Since cougars must be checked in within 48 hours, it gives us a chance to use the GPS location as a law enforcement tool. So, the officer could say, okay, you have this GPS location, let's go take a look at it...especially if he suspects somebody. That's probably the only time it would be used, if he suspects somebody is not hunting in the right area, so you go out and look and then it becomes a law enforcement tool at that point.

John Shivik -Can I answer the question with regard to bobcat numbers? I got embarrassed by not having the numbers right off, so I want to set the record straight on that. Some of the confusion was that for last year non-trap harvest was 156, but the total trap harvest was 846. Our average throughout the years was more like 1500 for the trap harvest and 260 for the non-trap harvest, so that's the numbers you are talking about.

Derris Jones-Regardless of what we end up doing later on this cougar stuff, Dan, I hope you come back when they do open up the same items again, but we will see what happens tonight from the RAC. Is there any other public comment from the RAC for bobcat?

RAC Discussion

Pam Riddle-I have a question on the cougars. Is there a mechanism to prevent from shooting collared cats? It seems kind of ridiculous to shoot a collared animal if you are trying to collect data.

John Shivik -In the Oquirrh study those animals aren't hunting, but the other side of it is if you are trying to monitor populations that are being hunted, you need to monitor a hunted population, so there are arguments for seeing what the impacts are for seeing what is taken and what is not taken.

Bill Bates-So the purpose of the study might be to look at what proportion of the collared animals are taken by hunters, so you may want to leave that open.

John Shivik -There's a variety of demographic and population studies and we need to know what kills cougars and you got to mark them first and then you know what proportion is due to hunting take and what proportion is due to road kill and what proportion is due to some other factors.

Pam Riddle-So that falls into the plan?

John Shivik -Yes. Right into the reason for the study. That needs to happen.

Bill Bates-I guess that's an expensive part of the research.

Christine Micoz-I have a question for Dan. Your concern with so many females being taken, are the majority of lions that are hunted taken with hounds, and if so, isn't there a level of responsibility placed on the houndsman and the hunter to not harvest the females.

Dan Cockanyne-Absolutely and that is why I have driven all over the state tirelessly trying to educate the hunters not to take the females. We've been doing that since I was elected to the Board in April. I've gone to some community almost every week and have met with the houndsmen, because there is. Part of the problem is that outfitters and guides making a living, killing these animals and they are making \$4,500 to bring a hunter to a cat and kill it. Christine Micoz-It just seems there's a level of responsibility on the houndsmen themselves to maybe educate the hunter previous to the hunt that they don't want to take the females and that would alleviate some of the over-harvest of the females.

Dan Cockanyne-Absolutely and we are doing all we can...we are encouraging them to take that voluntary...because it's hard to identify a female. It's hard to identify a female if she has a dependent kitten, because they are dependent up to six months old. We just think there are some things to help us.

Bill Bates-It would probably be good to clarify some of Dan's comments on the percent females in the harvest and the performance targets. When he was talking about 39% females in the harvest, he was talking about total females, which would include adult females and juveniles, but the performance target is based on high, medium or low level of harvest and ranges from 17% to 25% adult females, so there's a difference. Typically with cougar biology we are looking at trying to have less than 40% total females in the harvest, so just to clarify it.

Derris Jones-Tell us what you think, Wayne.

Wayne Hoskisson-My own preference would be to oppose bobcat hunting, but if I was going to propose something, I would indeed propose a decrease by one in permits this year.

Darrel Mecham-Right now it's three. The proposal would reduce it to two.

Charlie Tracy-Doesn't that just encourage another person to get more tags. I mean it's not really reducing the number of tags, is it?

Wayne Hoskisson-It may not change very much, because if you look at the number of bobcats that were killed, and the number of permits that were issued, it's pretty small. It's not a high success hunting or trapping proposal.

Derris Jones-Is there a cap on it, John?

John Shivik -On the total number of tags...it's 4,600.

Derris Jones-So if they reduced tags by one, just more bobcat trappers could possibly fill in and harvest the same number of cats, theoretically?

Darrel Mecham-Generally, what you see happen is instead of having the dad get two tags, they will have the mom get two tags, and someone else gets two tags. I know what you are trying to do, but it's an easy thing to get around.

Charlie Tracy-It's probably better to leave it at three and allow the serious trapper to take the cats. He will do a better job than...well, I don't know.

Derris Jones-We've got a motion on the floor. I guess we need a second if we are going to continue with that motion.

Wayne Hoskisson-My own sense is that we decrease it, because that's what the plan says you should be doing. It may or may not affect things, but if you don't do something, nothing is going to be effective. Might as well do it, I'd say. That's what the plan suggests.

Derris Jones-John, for clarification, didn't we review the bobcat so that we could go to three last year or this year...I can't remember which one it was, but we had to change something to allow it to decrease by one.

John Shivik -Yeah, again, this is before my time, but I'm still learning fast. I mean the way the plan is set up...and I read this to clarify it...to maintain baseline management strategy if less than two variables are outside of the historic range or return to baseline, if less than two variables are outside of the historic range for two consecutive years. So you can consider that if less than two variables are outside of the range and that's what we have right now, less than two outside the range, this is what they fixed last year, it would pop you right back to the six, right, so what that additional language did was really good because it

added incrementally, saying if everything was going in the right direction, which means that your management looks like it's working, stay the course, don't jump and say that we've saved everything. So now we go to our second consecutive year and see if things are still on course and then that's when it jumps back up to six again. So as of now, the way the plan would state exactly what we recommended. But in the old days, before the last alteration to it, it would have jumped way up to six again.

Wayne Hoskisson-Isn't this a judgment call about whether those movements are really adequate or really represent movement? We only have two years of statistics and it's not good enough and they are not big enough for me to say that those are moving in the right direction.

John Shivik-Yeah, I'm kind of ...I've got this that's been approved and I just can't say this sucks and throw it out.

Pam Riddle-Isn't the point that last year we were at three and rather than jumping back up, we are going to stay at three for another year to see if the trend continues where we are at, rather than make any changes? So if we change it to two, we might also not be able to determine what's happening out there. So if we stay at three, we will have some consistency for a couple of years.

VOTING

Motion was made by Wayne Hoskisson to reduce the number of bobcat tags by one to two per person.

Seconded by Sue Bellagamba

Motion failed. Except for Wayne Hoskisson, all members opposed the motion. 5 to 1

VOTING

Motion was made by Charlie Tracy to accept the bobcat harvest recommendations as presented.

Seconded by Christine Micoz

Motion passed with one opposing vote cast by Wayne Hoskisson. 5 to 1.

6)

Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 (Action)

-Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Wayne Hoskisson to accept the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 as presented.

Seconded by Charlie Tracy

Motion passed unanimously

Cougar Discussion

Derris Jones-I skipped over the cougar discussion. Does the RAC want to do anything by way of a motion to the Wildlife Board?

VOTING

Motion was made by Darrel Mecham that the Wildlife Board consider incorporating a mandatory GPS location on harvested cougars prior to the next proclamation cycle.

Seconded by Pam Riddle

Motion passed unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Public in attendance 4

The next Wildlife Board meeting will take place on August 16th at the DNR Salt Lake office Boardroom at 1594 West North Temple at 9 a.m.

The next southeast regional RAC meeting will take place on September 19 at 6:30 p.m. at the Castle Dale County Building at 75 E. Main in Castle Dale. Second floor in Canyon Room.

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY – MOTIONS PASSED
Wildlife Resources NER Office, Vernal/August 2, 2012

5. BOBCAT HARVEST RECOMMENDATIONS-John Shivik

MOTION to accept as presented

Motion passed unanimously

6. WATERFOWL GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-09-Blair Stringham

MOTION accept as presented

Motion passed unanimously

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY
Wildlife Resources NER Office, Vernal
August 2, 2012

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Floyd Briggs, RAC Chair
Rod Morrison, Sportsmen
Ron Winterton, Elected Official
Bob Christensen, Forest Service
Mitch Hacking, Agriculture
Wayne McAllister, At Large
Beth Hamann, Non-Consumptive
Carrie Mair, At Large
Kirk Woodward, Sportsmen
Andrea Merrell, Non-Consumptive

UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Dan Barnhurst, NER C.O. Sergeant
Randy Scheetz, NER Conservation Officer
Lowell Marthe, NER Wildlife Biologist
Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Coordinator
John Shivik, SLO Mammals Coordinator
Ron Stewart, NER Conservation Outreach
Gayle Allred, NER Office Manager
Boyde Blackwell, NER Regional Supervisor

1. WELCOME, RAC INSTRUCTIONS AND RAC PROCEDURE: Floyd Briggs

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES: Floyd Briggs

3. WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING UPDATE: Boyde Blackwell

The Wildlife Board went with NER's recommendations.

4. REGIONAL UPDATE

Aquatics:

There will be a Sheep Creek rotenone treatment and will be removing fish from the Sheep Creek drainage September 10-14. If you want to participate and help, Trina needs 80 people to help work on that.

White River had a large fish kill due to ash runoff from a major Book Cliffs rain following the fire. We will start planning restoration work on Evacuation Creek for

the burn. It wasn't a bad burn for wildlife, but the ash draining into the water can be bad for aquatics.

Conservation Outreach:

As waters are smaller, fish are condensed and fishing has been good. Need volunteers for Last Resort Ranch built too high. He has given us permission to move the strands to a better spacing for wildlife (about a five-mile section) August 10 and 11. If you're interested or know of people who are interested let us know, or Kyle Kettle at 435-219-1830.

Law Enforcement:

Busy with court cases from last year. We recently had a deer that tested positive for plague. The law enforcement officer who picked it up tested positive for plague also. He's been on antibiotics and is fine. We need to get the word out to folks, if you see a suspicious animal, don't touch it. We had a "Bear Aware" float on 4th of July put on by the law enforcement folks.

Habitat:

Started Middle Crouse Creek restoration work. There were fish that survived which had been put in last year. They are also starting their season of restoration in chaining, harrow, bull hogs, lop and scatter projects. 800-acre bull hog treatment. There are six new guzzlers going in and four more planned for the Book Cliffs. Six guzzler tanks in Bonanza and Book Cliffs areas are planned.

5. BOBCAT HARVEST RECOMMENDATIONS – John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator

Questions from RAC:

Carrie Mair: What is set days per trapper?

John Shivik: How many average days a trapper has his traps set before he gets a bobcat.

Questions from Audience:

None

Comments from Audience:

Dan Cockayne: I wanted to make a comment regarding cougars.

Floyd Briggs: It's not listed on the agenda so we could accept it in "Other Business."

Comments from RAC:

Beth MOTION to accept as presented

Second: Kirk Woodward

Motion passed unanimously.

6. WATERFOWL GUIDEBOOK AND RULE – Blair Stringham

Recommend Liberal season 107 days with a 7-bird basic bag limit except on pintail, canvasback and scaup.

Season dates: (See handout)

Questions from RAC:

Carrie Mair: All the abbreviations on the slides can be hazy when you go so fast. I would prefer full print out of words instead of abbreviations.

Questions from Audience:

None

Comments from Audience:

None

Comments from RAC:

MOTION by Kirk Woodward to approve as presented

Second: Beth Hamann

Motion passed unanimously

7. OTHER BUSINESS (COUGAR) - Dan Cockayne and Dennis Ingram

Dan Cockayne (hounds man): I am the lion coordinator of the Utah Hounds man Association. I've never seen cougars without my hounds there. You don't see them without the hounds. We've talked to hounds men and they feel the lion population is the lowest they've ever seen. There is way too much competition.

The trigger that adjusts the tags is the adult female harvest and cougars treed per day. In 2011 we killed about 39% females. In 2012, looks like it will be 34%. We've killed almost 50% of females or kittens. We're trying to educate the hounds man why it's so important not to kill the females.

We would like to see a voluntary cougar orientation course (this also identifies if she has dependent kittens). This course should be made mandatory for the hunter, the guide and the outfitter. The course also needs to be modified to include more information on the impact killing a female cougar has on the population.

The split date should be extended two weeks. Currently, if the limited entry quotas aren't filled they go to open season, so near the end of their limited entry season, hunters harvest a female so they get one.

The voluntary random pursuit survey should be mandatory for all pursuit holders in order to assure more accurate information as the cougars treed per day is a trigger number for setting harvest quotas.

Don't take collared cougars. It should be illegal to take a collared cougar on the Monroe cougar study area, like it is on the Oquirrh cougar study area. Killing a study animal is a waste of time and tax payer dollars.

We need a GPS location of the harvest because there are limited-entry areas open at the same time as the harvest objective unit. A lot are being taken on one unit and reported on another unit.

Carrie Mair: How many hounds men were questioned about mandatory surveys?

Dan Cockayne: I've personally met with over 100 hounds men. Only a handful had taken the orientation course.

Carrie Mair: I appreciate you representing the resource. I would like to see the Board recommend the cougar orientation course.

Dennis Ingram: (hounds man) I would like to see the South Slope Yellowstone pushed back to year-round harvest objective unit instead of a split unit. So much of the area is Tribal ground. The cougars move a lot and are not accessible. The accessibility for a trophy hunt is not very good on this unit. I am a strong proponent of letting people hunt using harvest numbers. There's no reason to allow people to have a tag when it's not a trophy unit and I don't want to see two to three people own the mountain. The deer herds are not back enough to have a limited entry cougar hunt. I will send something to the Board. I don't care about the number of tags, but I do not like the idea of a limited hunt because they are calling it a trophy hunt. I am looking for more opportunity. I spend a lot of money on hounds, tracking units, shocking collars, electronics, dog food, not to mention gas, etc.

Bob Christensen: What is the harvest objective starting and ending date? There is a season on it.

John Shivik: 11/16/2011 to 11/11/2012. The harvest objective is the whole year. The splits are limited entry then turn into a harvest objective.

Bob Christensen: With the proposals made, even with a mandatory survey, there could be people who don't like that and that's the whole reason for this RAC process, to get information out.

Floyd Briggs: I'm sure this will come around and we'll deal when it's an agenda item.

Carrie Mair: We might put on the web site how to get your information on the RAC agenda.

Boyde Blackwell: Staci Coons has put many things on the agenda, or you can talk to your RAC chairman.

Kirk Woodward: I don't know if I've ever heard of anybody being able to call Staci and get something put on the RAC agenda. We've discussed this a dozen times, when somebody has a point that we might want to push forward, but it wasn't an item on the agenda so we couldn't do anything about it and we at least want to comment to the Wildlife Board. But the Wildlife Board doesn't have it on their agenda either so it doesn't get moved on.

Boyde Blackwell: The Board does give the mandate to address a specific item within a one year time frame if it likes the proposal.

Kirk Woodward: So I could make a motion that we push that onto the Board to let them consider it for an action log to the Division?

John Shivik: If a topic comes up that people want to discuss, they need to get it to you guys before 24 hours before the meeting, it's published, and then the general public has the ability to comment on it. So you call up before the meeting to make it an agenda item. With the coyote presentation, the RAC contacted Staci and she put it on the agenda published.

Bob Christensen: Would it have any bearing if it's regional related vs. statewide?

Floyd Briggs: That was too short of notice to be on the agenda. It's a two-action item meeting agenda.

Boyde Blackwell: We discuss hunting strategies and hunts and unit boundaries and those kinds of items in November, and permits in April. We can't take action on a hunt boundary, etc. in April after we've already discussed them because we wouldn't have taken any public input.

Kirk Woodward: But if we wanted to discuss it, and called Floyd in advance, and had that put on the agenda as a discussion item we could at least make recommendations.

Boyde Blackwell: At the Wildlife Board meeting, during the round when the Wildlife Board asks all the RACs to make recommendations, Floyd can say our recommendation was unanimous for this, we had a discussion for this and that. They ask every RAC what the motions and recommendations are, which bring up discussion items.

8. OTHER BUSINESS (COYOTES) – John Shivik (informational only)

The Utah Legislature passed two predator-related bills in 2012 and we have a mandate to implement them.

The first bill, Predator Control Funding (Senate Bill 87), adds a \$5 fee to all Utah big game hunting permits. The money will fund a program to control populations of predatory animals that endanger the health of Utah's non-predatory wildlife.

The second bill, Mule Deer Protection Act (Senate Bill 245), allocates general funding to the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (\$500,000) and the Utah Department of Agriculture and Food (\$250,000). The legislation directs our agencies to work together, and with other government entities, to administer

programs that reduce and control coyote populations, particularly in areas where predation of mule deer occurs.

Carrie Mair: Does the Division stand behind this program?

John Shivik: We've got the laws implemented, direction made, and we're giving it the best shot we can, but we're going to begin to see next year if it will work.

Carrie Mair: If we don't hit the 70% mark, it could send them back into a reproductive cycle, is that true?

John Shivik: There will always be high coyotes unless you remove them at super high levels.

Carrie Mair: Regarding regulations, if you start turning in coyotes from other regions, will that help the deer population in Utah?

John Shivik: No.

Carrie Mair: If we do this and there is no help to the deer populations will it continue or will it go away?

John Shivik: There should be a lot of self-policing and not cheat the system so we are effective.

Carrie Mair: What does the biology say?

Floyd Briggs: You could add some language in there on sage grouse because on my summer ground we have strutting grounds with coyotes circling it. In our area where there is a predominant sheep population the sage chickens are suffering.

John Shivik: We've worked with the upland guys and we've added some species like rabbits to see how they do in areas, and we want to overlay that information.

The science is, sometimes yes, sometimes no. I want to get information to answer questions.

Ron Winterton: The old-timers come in and want the county to pay the bounty and we don't do it. I think it's going to make a big difference.

Mick Hacking: When money comes in, other groups try to match it on coyote control, so it'll keep the other groups strong and keep it going. It's not just going to be the mule deer that benefit from the reduction of coyotes.

Boyde Blackwell: One of the things we need to consider and focus is what John said. We're collecting other data and we don't know that it's for sure going to work. That's why we're measuring fawn survival and collecting data on sage grouse, and we'll be able to measure those populations at the same time. In three years if we don't see a benefit then we can say we tried this and it does not work. No other states have tried it. We're on the cutting edge.

Carrie Mair: It's still politically driven. It could increase coyote populations if it's not done right. We're trusting in the public and that could be a gamble.

Andrea Merrell: In 2013 they'll have targeted contractors to harvest and concentrate in those areas.

Meeting adjourned 8:00 pm.

Next meeting: September 20, 2012

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Public Library
45 S Main Street, Springville
August 7, 2012 @ 6:30 p.m.

Motion Summary

Approval of Minutes

MOTION: To accept the minutes as written
Passed unanimously

Approval of Agenda

MOTION: To approve the agenda as amended
Passed unanimously

Bobcat Harvest Recommendations

MOTION: To accept the recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously

Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09

MOTION: To accept the Division's proposal
Passed unanimously

Great Salt Lake Waterfowl Management Area Management Plan

MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Public Library
45 S Main Street, Springville
August 7, 2012 @ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Larry Fitzgerald, Agriculture
Michael Gates, BLM
Richard Hansen, At large
Karl Hirst, Sportsmen
Kristofer Marble, At large
Gary Nielson, Sportsmen, Vice Chair
Fred Oswald, Non-consumptive, Chair

Members Absent

Matt Clark, Sportsmen
Timothy Fehr, At large
Sarah Flinders, Forest Service
George Holmes, Agriculture
Jay Price, Elected
Duane Smith, Non-consumptive

Others Present

Alan Clark, Division of Wildlife Assistant Director
John Bair, Wildlife Board member

-
- 1) **Approval of the Minutes (Action)**
- Fred Oswald, RAC Chair

VOTING

Motion was made by Gary Nielsen to accept the minutes as written

Seconded by Larry Fitzgerald

Motion passed unanimously

- 2) **Approval of Agenda (Action)**
- Fred Oswald, RAC Chair

Addition of presentation by John Shivik regarding the predator program
Addition of public comments regarding cougar

VOTING

Motion was made by Richard Hansen to accept the agenda as amended

Seconded by Larry Fitzgerald

Motion passed unanimously

- 2) **Wildlife Board Meeting Update (Information)**
- Fred Oswald, RAC Chair

- 3) **Regional Update (Information)**
- John Fairchild, Central Regional Supervisor

Wildlife

- Elk and pronghorn classification taking place now
- Coyote check-in program to begin September 1
- Aerial survey of Rocky Mountain Goats to take place this week
- Still receiving wolf sighting reports from Diamond Fork Canyon, latest one from Fifth Water (August 1)

Habitat

- Working with private landowners and state and federal agencies on the following fire rehabilitation projects in the region:
 - Wood Hollow (north and east of Fountain Green)
 - Ophir Canyon
 - Dump Fire (Saratoga Springs)
 - Dallas Canyon (Cedar Mtns.)
- Habitat restoration projects planned for this fall (may get postponed):
 - Manti Face Lop and Scatter
 - Dairy Fork Habitat Improvement Phase 2 (bullhog treatment)
 - 12-Mile Habitat Improvement Project (shrub planting/oak spray)
 - North Hollow WMA and Sorenson C.E. Habitat Improvement
 - Maple Canyon WMA Habitat Improvement (bullhog treatment)

Aquatics

- Low flows resulting in isolated fish kills
- Finished Phase III of the Strawberry River Restoration Project
- Sanpitch River fish kill fairly complete on brown trout, native speckled dace and leatherside chub numbers reduced to 10% of previous numbers
- Sticking with bass regulations at Utah Lake (6 and only one over 12")

Conservation Outreach

- Responding to concerns about dead ducks at local ponds (botulism)
- Taking "Bear Aware" campaign to Boy Scout camps
- Bat event at Hogle Zoo successful
- Promoting new predator control program

Law Enforcement

- Officers participated with Juab County Sheriff and DEA to shut down a marijuana grow east of Levan
 - 5100 plants seized
 - One of two individuals arrested
 - Significant environmental impacts and public safety issue

4) Bobcat Harvest Recommendations (Action) - **John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Fred Oswald – Is the 197 on your slide the target?

John Shivik – It is the target for the set days per bobcat which we get by surveying trappers. We call them and ask them how many days they put their traps out and how many traps they put out and then you can calculate the number of trap days per trapper. If we called one person and he had 100 traps that he set one night that would be 100 set days.

Fred Oswald – Is that one of the performance targets?

John Shivik – Yes.

Fred Oswald – If that is one of the four variables and it is so out of line even though it is moving toward target why wouldn't that be of concern?

John Shivik – I have looked at the set days per bobcat quite a bit and that measure is probably one of the less precise. It is good because it gives us an idea of how many people are afield and how much effort they are putting into it but it is heavily influenced by such things as pelt price and how many newer people are in trapping. There tends to be a core group of trappers that are very familiar with the areas and the cats and trapping methods and they will always consistently pull in more or less the same number of animals. I have played around with the data a little bit and the one thing that really influences the most what happens with set days is what the previous years pelt price is. If the pelt price was high last year then we have a bunch of people trying it out this year and the newer people aren't as efficient and so it's not that the bobcats are down necessarily. It may be that we have a lot of people that aren't as good of trappers. That can really mess up the set days per bobcat calculation. That is why it's not the only thing we look at.

Fred Oswald - Thank you

Gary Nielsen – A few years ago when we adjusted the cat tag numbers down I think it was Kevin who was doing it then and he said they had trapped too many large males and he said that was one of the triggers. Because that was so high the number of tags was reduced and we have since got one tag back. Is the population still low?

John Shivik – The way the plan is now it is difficult to figure out numbers exactly. My guess is cats are doing pretty well. The animals they prey on are coming back. Based on we kept our management the same and it is getting better the populations are probably improving for the cats.

Gary Nielsen – I know that one year cats were worth a lot so people were letting the small ones go.

Questions from the Public

Jason Adamson – I have a question about your set days. Last year the winter was very long and I think the set days number would have been higher.

John Shivik – Those are excellent points. A couple things, these are not arbitrary things I came up with last year, these are according to the plan which is approved through the RAC and Board process. This is what I have to follow in terms of managing this species. Some of the other comments have to do with any given year and frankly this is why I see some benefit in some of the other animals moving to three year plans because any one year the weather or pelt prices can really skew the one year data. There has been something nice about this plan in that they amended the plan last year to add that you look at the year before to see if you are going in the right direction. We are incorporating better multiple years and having better information. The process isn't perfect but it's based on good science.

Chet Young – Last year the way the management plan was set up the tag numbers had to fluctuate by two or three and this was changed last year so they could change one tag number a year.

John Shivik – The big change last year was to add the language that you would keep the number of tags consistent with the previous year. The first strategy would be to maintain the base line management if two variables are outside of the historic range. The base line is six tags per individual and a season length from the third Wednesday in November to the second Sunday in February and no cap on the number of tags sold. We got here by adjusting that through time.

Jack Young – I just remember big changes in the past and now there are smaller changes but they added the cap so that is a reduction in permits.

? – Are we managing bobcats because of the demand for pelts or because they are a predator. A few years ago I read a study about antelope fawn mortality in the Delta area. The conclusion was that bobcats were a major influence on fawn mortality.

John Shivik – The goal statement for the plan is to maintain healthy bobcat populations within existing suitable habitat and provide quality recreational opportunities for bobcat harvest while considering the social aspects of bobcat harvest.

Comments from the Public

Chet Young – I support the Division’s proposal.

VOTING

Motion was made by Kristofer Marble to accept the recommendations as presented

Seconded by Gary Nielsen

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

5) **Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 (Action)**

- **Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Kristofer Marble – What kind of conflicts did you have that prompted the 600 foot buffer.

Blair Stringham – On the causeway we had several high profile waterfowl species out there last year. We don’t get many sea ducks and last year we had a pair of harlequins that were spotted out there which are a high profile species for birders. Unfortunately they are also a trophy species in Utah because we don’t get many of them. We had

Randy Berger meet with the interest groups; the birding community, the hunters as well as the state park personnel and based upon his meetings they came to a consensus that a buffer along that causeway would be the safest thing to do.

Kristofer Marble – Do you know what sportsman organizations were represented in that?

Blair Stringham – I don’t remember but I think the Utah Waterfowl Association was one of them.

Karl Hirst – It seems like if you have good conditions for ducks all the ducks would go up. Can you talk about pintails that are going down and scaup going up?

Blair Stringham – A lot of it depends on the areas these birds are nesting in. If we have a lot of water in the prairie pothole region in particular that is a really high priority area for pintails so when water numbers are down pintails are down. Pintails have become a concern because a lot of their habitat is diminished particularly in California where we have really large populations of pintails in the pacific flyway. A lot of the agriculture has been converted into urban areas and the result is their population being down. They have been on the increase overall so we are hoping if we continue to have some wet years those populations will build. Scaup tend to nest farther north in the Boreal forest regions of Canada and Alaska so those species have done really well with the reduced bag limits as well as overall conditions improving.

VOTING

Motion was made by Kristofer Marble to accept the Division’s proposal

Seconded by Richard Hansen

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

6) **Great Salt Lake Waterfowl Management Area Management Plan (Action)**
- **Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Kristofer Marble – Looking through the plan I noticed there are no specific goals as to the number of acres or some number set in regards to the phragmite control. Do you know why there are not some specific goals in the plan?

Blair Stringham – We tried to put as many in as we knew we had control over. For instance with the phragmite program there are some years we can go out and spray quite a bit but does require follow up burns. Some years we are not able to burn because of weather conditions or getting permits and such. We left that out because it may be something that is unattainable and there is some variability there that we don't have much control over. For the most part we tried to put in measurable goals and a time period in which we could accomplish that in.

Kristofer Marble – Do you know how much treatment needs to be done to make an impact on the phragmites or is that something that is unknown?

Blair Stringham – There haven't been too many studies on that. Phragmites can fill in a large area in one year. What we found is the less we have the better. The more areas we can try to eradicate it or open up will provide opportunities for waterfowl to utilize so our goal is to try to treat as much as we possibly can each year.

Fred Oswald – A large part of that area is private clubs and is there a reason that there wasn't any mention of possible partnerships or coordination with the private clubs with regard to the goals and objectives of the plan?

Blair Stringham – As far as the plan is concerned we tried to focus specifically on the WMAs around the Great Salt Lake. Aside from the plan we do have quite a bit of close contact with the club managers and they actually have a little more leeway as far as things they can do and we have worked with them to try to train them on how we have been doing phragmite removal. The reason we did leave them out of the plan is we tried to focus on the areas we have ultimate control over which are our waterfowl management areas.

VOTING

**Motion was made by Gary Nielsen to accept the Division's recommendations as presented
Seconded by Kristofer Marble**

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

Fred Oswald – I would suggest that it might be something you might want to reconsider in terms of just mentioning the private clubs in the plan for two reasons; one to show that there is a shared responsibility for the ecosystem up there on both the public and private and two if they are mentioned they might feel like they really are full partners in dealing with all of the problems and goals that are going on. I would make that recommendation.

7) **Other Business**
- **Fred Oswald, RAC Chair**

Cougar

Fred Oswald – There may have been some miscommunication or misunderstanding on behalf of this being an action item tonight. The cougar plan is a three year plan and is up for renewal next year so this is not an action item and we will not be taking action on your comments tonight. We do want to hear from you because you are here.

Jason Adamson – Sanpete County Houndsmen – In Sanpete County on the southwest Manti our cats are in major trouble due to this plan. They have lumped all of these units into one harvest objective unit. We are not a sheep unit. On the sheep units here they used to kill 40 cats in a three month season on Timp. Now we kill two in a year-round season. Two on one unit and six on the other. On west Nebo it's the same thing. They can't fill the quota, those cats are gone. Now the Manti units have a quota. The Manti unit was over killed this year by ten cats over the quota. The quota was eight cats they killed 18 this year. Two years ago they went six over. The southwest Manti unit has been wiped out and to put these units together is ridiculous. On the Monroe unit Clint Mecham has 20 collard cats and half way through the season eight of them had been killed. I don't know about you but if half way through the season they killed half your deer I think you would be upset. These cats are in trouble. I enjoy them, all of us do. I want to be able to take my kids and show them a cat. There are very few left down there. It's not uncommon to travel 70 miles to find one lion to chase. And that is with good houndsmen who know what they are doing. A lot of guys want to tell you there are cats behind every tree but I would be willing to bet they can't tell you the difference between a cat and a coyote. Our cat populations are in trouble and I am asking for your help. This needs to be shut down. The units need to be divided and we need to go back to a limited entry unit on the Manti. It is has been slaughtered. These mountains here are rugged and tough. They are not an easy place to hunt. They are a nightmare to turn a pack of hounds loose on compared to the Manti. We have 24 on the Nebo and have only killed 11 of them. Everything that is left over comes down to the Manti. You have 12 on the Wasatch Timp and only two have been killed. We used to go 40 there in a month and the season would shut down. Those cats are gone. On Wasatch Cascade the quota is 12 and they have killed six. That is a year-round season. Those quotas are coming to the Manti and I need that stopped. We all do. We want to have some cats to hunt somewhere. I am a deer hunter and I love to hunt deer. But I can guarantee that the cats are not your problem. The cat populations are the lowest I have seen them in 30 years. I can understand wanting to bring the deer herds back. I want to bring them back as bad as anybody. The quota on the Manti was eight cats this year and last year and five the year before. The year it was five they killed 11. Last year they killed eight when we didn't have the quotas from the other units combined. It stopped where it should have. This year the quota was eight and they killed 18. There are nine cats that aren't accounted for. There were 94 cats killed total but the numbers I got from John show 85. I don't know where those other nine came off of. One thing we would like to do as houndsmen, I heard you talking about problems with bears in campgrounds. Our hound club has gotten together and we would like to recommend to you guys that will come into these campgrounds and get it done and get these bears out. It won't cost you anything. There will be several guys that will be on call 24/7 and if you get a bear in a campground we will run it out. We have been doing it on the scout camp above Mount Pleasant. We want to help. There are a lot of houndsmen out there that can't get it done and cannot

catch a bear but a lot of them can and we will recommend the best ones for you. We do need your help with these cats.

Robert Olsen – I just want to back what Jason is saying – I live in Fairview and our lion population is in trouble. I don't know if there is an emergency closure that could be done but something needs to be done. I don't understand how it got away from us. I don't understand the logic of filling tags from Alpine in my backyard. The lions aren't traveling that far. That is bad management. We need help, our lions are hurting.

Tammara Mohr – I agree with Bob and Jason. I too live in Fairview in the southwest Manti unit and we love to chase our cats down there. When it comes to predators I can see that nobody really cares when it comes right down to it. Before I moved here I didn't either. I am from California, not something I really want to say in here. I love to hunt deer and chase cats with my hounds but they are in trouble. Last year we chased three cats. That is a mama and two babies. And we had a tom that came in and out. I remember seeing 60 pound cats that were turned in that still had spots. They were tagged as a tom. I don't know about you but I think there is a problem there and we really need help. We are asking for your help. I know you can't do anything for a year but recommendations from a lot of people, especially RAC members, go pretty deep and that is what I am asking for.

Jason Walker – First of all I would like to say I really appreciate the Division of Wildlife for the freedom to pursue cougars on about any unit and the pursuit season is very liberal. There are a lot of states that don't have that privilege. I started to hunt with my father in the late 80s and I continue to pursue cougars still and I really enjoy it. I do 90 percent of my hunting off horseback or hiking so I'm in the back country pursuing these cougars and over the years I have seen a steady decline. We had quite a few lions in the late 80's and mid 90's and I have watched them decline ever since. Now we are giving out twice the amount of lion tags as we used to. I love to hunt deer also and I haven't seen them come back and that seems like the reason everyone is after cougars. I would support Dan and am against any increase in lion permits.

Chet Young – I appreciate you taking the time to listen to us tonight. Three years ago at the Wildlife Board meeting when the Manti units were switched over to a split unit Justin Shannon was the biologist at the time and he recommended to the Board not to do it because they already did a study on those four units and had proved that the coyotes were the problem not the lions. Right after he made that statement Director Karpowitz made the statement that we need to do the right thing for the deer but let's make sure we are doing the right thing. You can go to the Board minutes. So now these units are combined with the Wasatch units which are sheep units and the Nebo unit also. I added the numbers together and for the Nebo west face, the cascade and Timp there are 48 tags allowed. There could be 48 lions killed on those units. The three year average is 17.32 cats. So we are setting the numbers at 48 when realistically they should be down around 17 or 18. That is the amount of cats available and what has been getting harvested. That leaves 30.68 tags to get filled off these Manti units and it is devastating them. On the one unit the quota was eight and they killed 18 lions off it. The fear is if we wait for three years for this to come back to discussion those units will be no better than the Timp unit which is a sheep unit that they are only killing two lions a year off of. The average for

three years on that unit is 3.66 lions. Yet the quota is at 12 and that is transferring down to the other units. I am here asking and I appreciate you listening. I know what you have said but I would like some discussion on this to get the tag numbers set at a realistic number. This was a three year trial but we need to start with the right numbers. I appreciate your time.

Dan Cockayne – Lion coordinator for the Houndsmen Association – I appreciate your time and the opportunity to address you. I want to say that I appreciate John. We are glad to have him looking after these critters. He cares about them and has been a big help to us. I emailed a copy of my stuff. I want to say lions are unique. I have been in the woods all my life and I have never seen one except with my hounds. We can't count them and it is really hard to tell how many there are but there are some things that we can tell. In the publication, Managing Cougars in North American it says one of the signs of a declining cougar population is an increase in the harvest of adult females and we are seeing that drastically. I have been all over the state the last four months talking to houndsmen and what I have heard all over the state is they have never seen the lion population so low and that really concerns us. The trigger to adjust tags is 17 to 20 percent females in the harvest. In 2011 we killed 39 percent females and in 2012 with the numbers so far it looks like 34 percent. And Sanpete County is over 40. We are really concerned about that. What we have targeted in our meetings with the houndsmen is education. We need to stop killing the females. We can kill a tom and another tom will move into the area. If we kill a female and she averages 12 surviving kittens in her lifetime and the average is six females by three generations taking that one female out of the population has removed over 2,000 lions out of the population. Taking the females is hurting the lion population. In Colorado they are currently doing a study. They had three adult female lions that were collard and it was legal to kill a collard lion. One was taken and it orphaned eight kittens that had euthanized because they were too young to survive on their own. We realize that it is a three year plan but we are asking for an emergency change in the Sanpete county area. It can be done for the sheep or the deer. We can raise the numbers but we can't hit the quotas. We need to lower the female quotas. There are things that can be done. The guidebook has to be adjusted to get the dates lined up as always and we feel like there are things that can be done that don't change the plan that can help preserve the females. One is the Division has an excellent cougar orientation online and that is a volunteer course. Almost all other species have a mandatory orientation course. We are asking that the orientation course be mandatory for cougar. One of the other things we are asking is that we move the split up to April 1st. Right now it is March 1st. March is a really good time to hunt lions because we consistently get storms and by moving that up we think that will help save some females because the guy with the limited entry tag doesn't have to rush out at the end of February and take a female to fill his tag. The other trigger to adjust tags is a pursuit survey, how many lions treed per day. Right now we do a random survey of about 25 percent of the hunters and it's voluntary. We would like to it required if you have a pursuit tag to fill out the survey. I was selected this year and it took me five minutes on the computer and it provides a lot of good information. The cats that are wearing the collars on the Monroe are free game. You heard Jason say we are spending our money to study these cats and put collars on them and then we are shooting them. It doesn't make any sense to me to kill them. If we want to study a dead cat we are killing 400 a year we have a pile of them we could study. We feel like we should preserve those collard animals. Lastly we would like to see every

kill be reported with a GPS location. I know down around Moab they just finished a case where they were killing lions in Colorado and tagging them with Utah tags. Because hunters can hold a harvest objective tags but pursue anywhere in the state there are a lot of cats that are being killed on a limited entry unit but being reported as killed on a harvest objective unit. We think that GPS information would be valuable to biologist as well as law enforcement. That is what we are about. We are putting all of our efforts as a club into educating hunters and especially our new hunters. There was an atmosphere that they were our competition and what we are trying to convince the houndsmen is that these hunters are our future and we need to take them under our wing and help educate them. We need your help with that. We feel like it is time for and emergency adjustment on some numbers on the Sanpete unit. Thank you.

Questions from the RAC

Fred Oswald – Thank you to all of you who took the time and effort of coming here tonight and let us know how you are feeling about that. There are a couple of things I would note with regard to who might be listening to you. We do have a Board member here tonight and I'm sure John has been listening and he is aware of your concerns. In addition to that the minutes of this meeting are sent to all the board members and I know by experience that all the board members read all of the minutes that are sent to them. In terms of you being here tonight I think it's worthwhile for you to express your concerns. While it is not an action item and we will not be taking any action on what you have told us tonight you can be assured that the Wildlife Board will read the minutes and they will know that you were here and expressed your concerns. I think John will take back to the Wildlife Board what you have said tonight. Again we appreciate you being here. We have heard your concerns with regard to cougars and that concern will be relayed to the Wildlife Board. That is the body that will need to take action if any action is taken before a year from now when the plan is up.

Coyote Predator Program

- **John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Kristofer Marble – Where are the check-in locations published?

John Shivik – That will be online soon. People will need to login over the next couple of weeks. We are working with the regions on locations. What you will probably see is in some regions you will have three different sites and one site will be every Monday, one will be Tuesday, one Wednesday. We will publish it and see how many people show up in September and then adjust that schedule from there.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30

30 in attendance

Next board meeting August 16, 2012 9 a.m. at the DNR boardroom, Salt Lake

Next RAC meeting September 11, 2012 6:30 p.m. at the Springville Public Library

Northern Regional Advisory Council Meeting Motions
Wednesday Aug 8, 2011
Brigham City Community Center

Review and Acceptance of May 16, 2012 Minutes

Motion: Approve the minutes as amended

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Bobcat Harvest Recommendations

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Bobcat Harvest Recommendations.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09

Motion: - Recommend the Wildlife Board adopt the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Great Salt Lake Waterfowl Management Area Management Plan

Motion: Recommend the Director of Wildlife Resources adopt the Great Salt Lake Waterfowl Management Area Management Plan.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Pineview Reservoir Hunting Closure Proposal

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board not adopt the Hunting Closure Proposal.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Northern Regional Advisory Council

Aug 8, 2012

6:00 P.M.

Place: Brigham City Community Center

<u>RAC Present</u>	<u>DWR Present</u>	<u>Wildlife Board</u>
John Blazzard- Agric	Jodie Anderson	Ernie Perkins
Robert Byrnes- Chair	Justin Dolling	Bill Fenimore
Paul Cowley- Forest Service	John Shivik	
Joel Ferry- Agric	Blair Stringham	
James Gaskill- At Large	Mitch Lane	
R. Jefre Hicks- At Large	Rich Hansen	
Russ Lawrence- At Large	Jason Jones	
Jon Leonard- Sportsman	Dustin Mitchell	
Bruce Sillitoe- BLM	Randy Berger	
Bryce Thurgood- At Large	Chad Cranney	
Craig Van Tassell- Sportsman	Darren Debloois	
John Wall- At Large	Scott Davis	
	Corrie Wallace	

RAC Excused

John Cavitt- Noncon.

Ann Neville- Noncon.

RAC Absent

G. Lynn Nelson- Elected

Meeting Begins: 6:00p.m.

Number of Pages: 14

Introduction: Robert Byrnes-Chair

Agenda:

Review of Agenda and May 16, 2012 Meeting Minutes
Wildlife Board Meeting Update
Regional Update
Bobcat Harvest Recommendations
Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09
Great Salt Lake Waterfowl Management Area Management Plan
Pineview Reservoir Hunting Closure Proposal
Coyote Predator Program
Cougar Guidebook & Rules Consideration of Issues

Item 1. Welcome and Introductions

Introduction of RAC Members

Item 2. Review and Acceptance of Agenda and May 16, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Motion

Motion- Blazzard- Adopt the amended agenda.

Second- VanTassell

Motion Carries- Unanimous

Motion

Motion- Gaskill- Approve the minutes as amended.

Second- Lawrence

Motion Carries- Unanimous

Item 3. Wildlife Board Update

Emailed info to RAC Members.

Item 4. Regional Update

-Justin Dolling, Regional Supervisor

In the middle of a drought. Conditions aren't as bad as other parts of the state. Have had small fires in the region. Habitat section has been meeting with BLM to get rehab areas burnt. Rehab project on Rock Creek on Hardware Ranch.

Aquatics- Keeping an eye on the conservation pools. Plans to treat right hand fork of the Logan River. Part of the Bonneville Cutthroat recovery effort. 2 day project.

Wildlife- Launched coyote control program. John Shivik will talk about that a little later this evening. Droughts have increased big game depredation especially in west Box Elder and Rich

County. Starting on Mule Deer Unit Management Plans. Biologists are reporting fair number of bucks this year.

Outreach Section- Dedicated Hunter participation has declined. 1700 signed up and right now we are 57% below the peak we had 4 years ago.

Law Enforcement- Successful quagga mussel road block at Echo last weekend. Continue with Big Game Winter Range patrols looking for illegal activities. Primarily the poaching of mule deer.

Item 5. Bobcat Harvest Recommendations

- John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

Becky Wood- I have only seen one bobcat in my entire life. I'm curious if you have an estimate of how many bobcats are really out there?

John Shivik- That is a very common question. A lot of the species we manage are bears or cougars or bobcats and things that are rare for people to see. We don't have a good estimate of exactly how many there are. I try to get away from that. That is why we use these proxy numbers. We don't know exactly what the population is but the numbers we are looking at, it is probably stable to rising a little bit. I cannot tell you exactly how many there are.

RAC Questions

John Wall- On your surveys, does that include guys that bought a furbearers license or is that just trappers.

John Shivik- It is the furbearer licenses.

Robert Byrnes- On your variable for kittens and yearlings, that is the proportion in the harvest? Is that correct?

John Shivik- Yes.

Robert Byrnes- As that number goes up, does that tell us where we are having good reproduction. What does that variable tell us as it changes?

John Shivik- If you have a lower number, you are harvesting less and would want to back away from the permits because you want to see a higher proportion which would indicate you have got a growing population. That would be the interpretation. As you get more of those, there is more in the population. If you have more of the lower age groups, that is an indicator that your population is growing. If you have fewer, it is an indication that it is not growing. Each are good indicators of effort and health of population but any one of them is not perfect and that is why we take all 4 of them together.

Robert Byrnes- That is why we really like the newer plan.

Paul Cowley- How many animals were harvested last year?

John Shivik- 846 trapped, 156 non-trapped.

Paul Cowley- Thank you.

John Blazzard- The non-trapped would be houndsmen?

John Shivik- Non-trapped would be houndsmen, shooters shooting any other take like that.

John Blazzard- Do you see any advantage to having a certain number of the tags allocated to houndsmen rather than first come, first serve trappers? I hear a lot of houndsmen complaining to me that the trappers are taking all the bobcats and they don't get a chance to chase them. They don't ever kill the babies, just the big ones.

John Shivik- I will take note of that. I talk with the houndsmen quite a bit but have not heard that in particular. It is like a lot of our other issues where we have to figure out amongst the groups how to share the mountain. I would be resistant to allotting certain numbers to certain groups. If it became a huge issue, we may approach it differently. I think we are handling it pretty well the way it is now.

Public Comment

Stan Bassett- Utah Trappers Association- Support the recommendations that have been presented tonight.

Chet Young- Utah Houndsmen Association- Supports the division's proposal on bobcats.

Robert Byrnes- Where are we at in our cycle on this? Have we had this for 2 years now?

John Shivik- This current plan started from 2007-2016. The recommendations come out every year for bobcat.

Robert Byrnes- We adopted this management plan that long ago?

John Shivik- I think you discussed it last year, an amendment last year to add that language that said if things are stable then to keep consistent with the previous year.

James Gaskill- Refreshing to be sticking to the plan.

Motion

Motion-Gaskill- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the bobcat harvest recommendations.

Second- Cowley

Motion Carries-Unanimous

Item 6. Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09

- Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Questions

Robert Byrnes- On the Antelope Island Causeway buffer, have you defined where it starts? Is it the center line of the road or the edge of the pavement?

Blair Stringham- We have defined it as the edge of the pavement. 600 feet from the edge of the pavement north and south.

James Gaskill- Maybe I heard incorrectly but I thought you said it closes 30 minutes after sunset? Is that correct?

Blair Stringham- Yes.

James Gaskill- That is a big change from the past.

Blair Stringham- Is that not similar to what we have done in the past?

James Gaskill- It has always been sunset. I thought that was a federal regulation.

Blair Stringham- You are correct.

R. Jefre Hicks- Scop harvest. Big increase this year from what it was before. When you listed it on your page, there was an asterisk by it, is there something more we need to know about that?

Blair Stringham- It is just the change from last year to this year.

R. Jefre Hicks- Do you know the percentage of increase? Is it a huge increase in nesting?

Blair Stringham- It is based on the models that are formulated by the fish and wildlife service. They have specific criteria in that plan that if the population reaches a certain level then we can become more liberal with our harvest and season. The way that is set up is that the most restrictive would be a bag of 2 and 86 day season. The next step up would be 86 and a bag of 3. After that, it would be 107 day season and a bag of 7. As far as Utah is concerned, Scop make up a small portion.

Bryce Thurgood- On the pintails, is most other states around or in the flyaway at the 2 pintail bag limit or are we higher?

Blair Stringham- 2 is the maximum that the fish and wildlife service will allow us to take. We are hanging right there until they allow us to take more.

Bryce Thurgood- Dropping it from 2 to 1. Obviously you are worried about levels keep going down right?

Blair Stringham- We are recommending 2 this year. It is really based upon another model the fish and wildlife service has and how many they will allow us to harvest. With the population being down, it is still not a level that they are concerned that we would overharvest. That is why they have allowed us to have the 107 day season and the bag of 2 again this year.

Bryce Thurgood- I thought it was the only one below the long term average.

Blair Stringham- It is below the long term average. It is not significantly below it just depends on the year for pintails. They are up and down. They are down below their long term average but not at a place where we feel like we need to reduce that bag further than 2.

James Gaskill- Could you talk a little bit about our local conditions. Could you tell us how it is looking and if there is any botulism or anything like that going on?

Blair Stringham- If you compare it to last year, it is probably night and day. Last year we had huge amounts of water and a lot of snowpack. This year is the complete opposite and dry. A lot of our water is shrinking. We are able to manage that within our waterfowl management areas and so we can maintain, for the most part, our water levels. Overall, the Great Salt Lake is drying up pretty fast right now. As far as botulism, we have not seen many outbreaks yet on the Great Salt Lake. We do expect some because there always is some every year. It is just a matter of how long the conditions persist. If it maintains to a really high temperature as well as the water levels being low, that water level temperature increases, bacteria produces a toxin which causes botulism. We are monitoring that and have seen some outbreaks in ponds in the Great Salt Lake area but nothing yet in the Great Salt Lake. I imagine there will be some before things cool down.

James Gaskill- Thank you.

Joel Ferry- Thank you for all the work you have been doing. On the swan population, I have heard that it has been growing and is quite large. Is there any talk of increasing those permits at all? Do you know population numbers for swans and what kind of situation we are in there?

Blair Stringham- I don't have the number here with me.

Joel Ferry- I have heard that they are eating themselves out of house and home on their nesting grounds. Have you seen that?

Blair Stringham- Swans have not really been the same as snow geese. Swans are increasing but are not to a point we are increasing permits yet. It may be a possibility in the future.

Joel Ferry- You don't know what our fly away populations are?

Blair Stringham- I don't, sorry about that.

Joel Ferry- Just interested in knowing, thank you.

Public Comment

Carl Ingwell- Utah Birders- Support the guidelines proposed tonight. Most notably the rule change of the 600 foot buffer along the causeway.

RAC Comment

R. Jefre Hicks- 600 foot buffer zone turned out to be an ok thing for everybody including the hunters and the birders. Thanks to DWR and everyone who worked on this to make a compromise.

Motion

Motion- Cowley- Recommend the Wildlife Board adopt the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09.

Second- Wall

Motion Carries-Unanimous

Item 7. Great Salt Lake Waterfowl Management Area Management Plan

- Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Questions

James Gaskill- Do we have any data to support the widely held notion that youth hunts really do help recruit hunters? I am not bad mouthing youth hunts but I am wondering. Do we really have any data to back it up and say that we have more young hunters into the system because we let them hunt 2 weeks before the season started?

Blair Stringham- We don't have any real specific data indicating that. We can look at our hunter numbers. Overall, support for that program seems to be really high. Every year, you hear lots of stories of youth who have had amazing experiences on that youth hunt. It is something we continue to support even though we do not have any direct data to support it.

James Gaskill- I am not saying I don't support it, I do support it. I would like to see some data or something that would back it up because if we are just letting them hunt with their dads 2 weeks early, that is ok. I have another question about rest areas. This is something that has been on my mind for 30 or so years. Is there any thought to expanding rest areas outside of WMA's?

Blair Stringham- We have not really thought much about that. Largely because the Great Salt Lake itself is a huge rest area. It is not something we have really ever considered.

James Gaskill- That may be so but there is very little of the waterfowl use areas that isn't easily accessible to airboats and mud boats now days. It is my experience that whenever you drive your airboat through an area, the ducks are not able to rest very well. It is something I have thought about for a long time. Rest areas are probably the least thought about thing in the whole management process. I was devastated when they opened the rest area in Ogden Bay, for example. It is a question I think you ought to look at which is not a question, it is a statement.

John Blazzard- Curious as to what the long term waterfowl hunter numbers are? Are they increasing dramatically or going down?

Blair Stringham- It really depends on the year. It fluctuates and periods when we have really good duck numbers and lots of water, hunter numbers go up. Overall, I think in general, there has been a general decline in the hunting public. It is something that we want to maintain as many hunters as possible.

Public Comment

Jeff Richards- Utah Waterfowl Association- Would like to thank Justin Dolling. Very thorough and thought out. In support of this plan.

RAC Comments

R. Jefre Hicks- Mimic what Jeff Richards said. It is a pretty good guideline for keeping things on track in the waterfowl world.

Joel Ferry- As a waterfowler myself, it is neat to see this plan as a guideline so we have some direction we can head towards. In this overall plan, I think the utilization of conservation easements would be a good management tool on this habitat management section in addition to land acquisitions and working with adjacent landowners.

Motion

Motion- R. Jefre Hicks- Recommend the Director of the Division of Wildlife Resources to adopt the Great Salt Lake Waterfowl Management Area Management Plan.

Second-Ferry

Discussion on the Motion

Justin Dolling- Would like to provide some clarification with these management plans. They typically do not go through our Wildlife Board. They go directly to our director.

Robert Byrnes- The director will approve it or adopt it as your management plan. Is that correct?

Justin Dolling- Yes.

Motion Carries- Unanimous

Item 8. Pineview Reservoir Hunting Closure Proposal

- Becky Wood, Landowner

See Handout

Mitch Lane, Sergeant- The Division agrees whole heartedly with the value of Pineview and the wildlife that use it. I certainly sympathize with Becky. However, the Division does not support this proposal. Utah code 76-10-508 prohibits the discharge of any firearms within 600 feet of any buildings as well as other places. In this case, that would address Becky's concerns there. That covers that concern. There are areas at Pineview where hunting can occur safely and legally. I have either worked in Weber County or supervised for the past 16 years. To my recollection, we have not ever had any other complaints of hunting. It is a small group of hunters. We feel it is a short duration. Most of this hunting activity that occurs at Pineview is late season waterfowl hunting. There is no biological reason hunting should be closed at Pineview. The division is a little concerned with what closing an area like this could do as far as setting a precedent for other requests and proposals. I can assure Becky and all the residents in Huntsville, that the division of wildlife will respond to and handle complaints of violations. We work very closely with both the Weber County Sheriff's department and law enforcement up there.

RAC Questions

John Wall- Does Huntsville City have any firearm restrictions of any kind for the city?

Becky Wood- I don't think it is legal to discharge a firearm within city limits. As far as I know.

R. Jefre Hicks- She brought up the topic of skeet shooting. It seems to me that is almost a littering issue. Is that legal on the shores of Pineview Dam?

Mitch Lane- If that were prohibited, it would be by a forest service regulation. The area we are talking about is owned by the BOR and administered by the forest service. That would be a forest service regulation. I am not aware of a regulation that would prohibit that. Certainly, littering could be occurring. Even though the shooting of trap or skeet would be allowed, littering would not be.

Robert Byrnes- I'm sure you can inform us on the ability of the Wildlife Board to control the discharge of firearms which is outside of their purvey. Could you just state what you know as far as being law enforcement?

Mitch Lane- As to what the Wildlife Board can do?

Robert Byrnes- They cannot restrict the discharge of firearms.

Mitch Lane- That's correct.

Robert Byrnes- Except in hunting right? Skeet shooting is outside of their jurisdiction.

Mitch Lane- Yes.

Joel Ferry- As an officer, wouldn't this be more appropriately addressed with the forest service than in this body? Would they own the land?

Mitch Lane- Yes, it very well may be. We have been in communications, as well as Becky, with the forest service and they are aware of her concerns. I have visited the area with one representative from the forest service.

Joel Ferry- Okay.

Paul Cowley- I know Ms. Wood contacted me and we visited about this subject. That has been passed to our district ranger who has been meeting with the division. We are looking at some signage there that we could better inform folks about some of those concerns. At this point, when they had a meeting scheduled, that was the same time we had a fire break up in Logan and that meeting was cancelled. That needs to be rescheduled.

James Gaskill- Maybe we ought to boil it down to what this committee can do and what we can't do.

Robert Byrnes- We could make a recommendation to the Wildlife Board for a hunting closure. Or, we can make a recommendation to the Wildlife Board opposing a closure. It is an action item. When we get to that point, we will have to have a motion.

James Gaskill- We can't do anything with the noise restriction? We can't do anything with a shooting restriction?

Robert Byrnes- Correct.

Public Comment

Scott Anderson- I live in Bountiful and we have a rifle range on the northeast side of us. There is Farmington Bay 4 miles away and I can hear shooting from either of those.

Becky Wood- In the Huntsville river bottoms, there is signage posted by the forest service. It is just a small area. On the south side of the trail is a sign describing types of wildlife and birds to look for in the area. The very last paragraph of the sign says "don't make any loud or sudden noises if you want to maximize your viewing of the wildlife in this area." A loud and sudden noise is a description of a gunshot.

Jeff Adams- I live between Corinne and Brigham and hear gun shots. I feel this would be a negative trend to start.

Kevin Noorda- Oppose the closure of Pineview Reservoir.

Becky Wood- The Winters Grove nature trail is a designated nature trail. To me that says you go there to view nature. There are three signs along that trail calling it Winters Grove nature trail. The sign at the end says "be quiet when you come here so you can view nature". These are forest service signs.

RAC Comment

R. Jefre Hicks- I am in agreement with the DWR's position on this. I think it sets a dangerous precedent to areas that are legally open to hunting. Especially based on the proximity to houses that it is still legal. I would hesitate to go along with any proposal that would close legally open lands based on the discharge of firearms.

Bryce Thurgood- I hate to feel like we are teaming up on you. Banning gunshots for disturbing wildlife means we are going to have to ban people that drive around Pineview, boats in Pineview, cars or airplanes that fly over Pineview. You are going to hear deer hunting 5 miles up any hill around all of Huntsville. The cars are a lot louder on the freeway than the shotguns. I hope we totally avoid ever going down this road and not even give it a consideration.

Paul Cowley- Want to thank you for taking the time to come and express your opinion and voice that to us this evening. I think it is really commendable that you took the time to come and try to address an issue vs. letting it just fester and struggle with it. We are trying to work with the division to find out how we best balance out some of these needs.

Robert Byrnes- We respect private property rights and the property rights of land management agencies in Utah. Currently, you don't have a recommendation in favor of this from the agency that basically controls this property. We can't do anything about people just discharging weapons that are not engaged in hunting. It is outside of the capacity we are granted by the legislature. They hold that very tightly in their hand as far as shooting that is not involved in hunting. I'm glad that you came out and made your presentation and became involved in the process. We need more people to be involved in the process of managing wildlife in Utah.

Motion

Motion- Gaskill- Recommend the Wildlife Board not adopt the Hunting Closure Proposal.
Second- Van Tassell

Discussion on the Motion

Bruce Sillitoe- I am inclined to withdraw from this particular issue because it appears to be very direct at forest service lands.

James Gaskill- That is certainly something you can do. I think that what we can do, however, is we can recommend that there be a hunting closure or recommend that there not be a hunting closure. Forest Service can do what they want to do regardless of what we do. You are welcome to excuse yourself from the discussion but I don't think at this point we have encouraged the Forest Service to do anything. We can only deal with strictly hunting and not with land use in any other way.

Bruce Sillitoe- Thank you, that actually helps out a lot. We are recommending maintaining the management of wildlife as the DWR has done in the past.

Robert Byrnes- Are you still going to want to recues yourself.

Bruce Sillitoe- I will go ahead and vote.

Motion Carries- Unanimous

Robert Byrnes- Thank you Becky for coming out. You will still be on the Wildlife Boards agenda.

Other Business

Item 9. Coyote Predator Control Program

- John Shivik, Mammals Coordinator

Informational Only

RAC Questions

R. Jefre Hicks- To monitor this, I assume it will take more man hours and possibly some more employees. The DWR will have to foot that bill or will that be money allocated by the legislature?

John Shivik- It is a mix. We try to keep that \$500,000 for the intent of contracts with the general public. We are not hiring gobs of people to do this. This is why it has been a little bit more difficult. Logistically, what you are going to see is not some full time person sitting at an empty desk all day. It is set up in each region to try and different days open. We will use people, resources and time and juggle them around.

R. Jefre Hicks- Are there any closed areas? I guess this is the bounty program right?

John Shivik- It is more or an incentive program.

R. Jefre Hicks- Call is what you will.

John Shivik- Everybody has to follow the furbearer guidebook. In terms of where you can go and what you can do, you have to follow all of the ordinances and standard type rules. You don't get any right to go on tribal lands or parks or anything like that.

R. Jefre Hicks- Oquirrh land is targeted to mule deer, right? So, you pay people to hit them in targeted areas. Are those public or private lands? Are we paying people to clean out coyotes out of someone's private property? Just need some clarification.

John Shivik- It is a really unique situation for the division because we don't manage coyotes. It is not one of our species. We don't manage the lands, per say, that way either. We are trying to get people to focus on the areas where mule deer, especially fawning grounds and areas where deer populations can be impacted by coyote predation is how the law is written. We don't make any differentiation between private or public land although we have had some people call checking with the walk in access program to ask if they can put coyote on their list for reasons to let people on private land. That has happened but we are just saying this is about protecting mule deer.

John Wall- I think coyote control is a good thing but I think that high of a bounty will bring misinformation. People are going to come from out of states and I don't know how you can track that. A coyote has no boundary, especially in the winter.

John Shivik- We are just following what we are instructed to do. People are already complaining about locations and things. WE have to balance keeping people honest and helping deer against putting up road blocks for people. I think we have come up with a good thing in between where people have to set their location and sign a paper saying they removed coyotes from these locations. If they are willing to put their name to a piece of paper, that is the best we can do.

James Gaskill- Tell me about the budget for this. The \$5 dollar additional fee is suppose to fund this entire program or is that just going to fund the bounty and the hiring of the agents and you are expected, in house, fund the rest of it?

John Shivik- The \$5 dollar fee is what is going to end up with Wildlife Services. The \$500,000 that is going to fund this program is general fund money.

James Gaskill- The legislature appropriated half a million dollars for the entire program or just for the bounty program.

John Shivik- For the incentive program. It is not pure bounty because we are recommending and focusing in specific areas. We are trying to make it for the benefit of mule deer as much as possible. That is \$500,000 dollars of general fund. We are trying to follow the spirit of it and not just hire a bunch of people. I have been working with supervisors to make this happen without hiring. Most of that \$500,000 will go right back into actual work and reimbursements.

James Gaskill- I would be very upset if you take a fishery biologist off his job to run this program, or any other biologist, or even law enforcement. It seems to me that if the legislature

wants to kill coyotes, they ought to give you enough money to do it and not just enough money to pay the bounty.

John Shivik- I acknowledge what you are saying and from the way we formed this program, it is a lot to do very quickly and we are balancing competing interests. We've got a really clear mandate in terms of this legislation. We are trying to gather the information needed to assess it and see if it is working.

James Gaskill- I understand that and applaud that. I am pleased with this presentation, just not necessarily pleased with the whole program.

Justin Dolling- We have a part time person involved in the depredation nuisance program so we took that part time position and then matched it with the money that is coming out of the two bills to form a full time position. Essentially, it is going to help our region from the standpoint that we will be able to carve the region in half and have two full time people dealing with depredation and nuisance as well as coyote check in type procedures. Not all the money that comes from the 2 bills will go to bounty. There is an education component. There is a personnel component and then there is a bounty component.

James Gaskill- That helps but my statement was simply that if they mandate something for you to do, the legislature ought to pay for it. It's not like you have pockets of money hidden you can pull out when you want to.

Robert Byrnes- Especially for your contractors, are you checking that they are eligible to possess a firearm? Just like you do when you buy a hunting license.

John Shivik- The way it is currently set up, if someone turns in a coyote they could hit it with a car. We are reimbursing for those who turn in coyotes. With traps and the furbearer regulations, you have to have an ID number fixed to that trap. There is a fee there with giving people those. As far as other stuff, it is going to have to be up to local ordinances. Currently, it is not set up in the registration to check for that.

Robert Byrnes- A felon could possess a gun illegally, go out and kill coyotes and come to you to get money.

John Shivik- That is something I think we will look into.

Robert Byrnes- Think about it.

John Shivik- Thank you.

Bryce Thurgood- Let's give the felons a break and let them shoot coyotes. Nothing else, but let's let them shoot coyotes.

R. Jeffrey Hicks- It appears as if we are somewhat stuck with this now. Obviously this had to go through a subcommittee and the legislature. What was the DWR's position on these two bills that spend all this tax money?

John Shivik- This was passed. These are our orders and it is what we are going to do.

R. Jeffrey Hicks- Was anyone there representing the DWR on the subcommittee that recommended this go to a full vote? If so, was it a favorable recommendation for this?

John Shivik- You are now at levels above me.

Justin Dolling- I don't know the answer to that question. There were two bills that went through the process and passed. I heard our director say that he got a text saying the bills are dead. Two minutes later, he got a text saying they passed. I don't have a lot of detail in the level of involvement we had in crafting those bills or even commenting on those bills.

R. Jeffrey Hicks- I just wanted to know how the DWR was involved in crafting or what say they had in it?

John Wall- As far as I can remember, I took the test online and there is something in there that requires you to the same circumstances if you are buying a hunting license. You have to answer yes or no saying you are legally able to do that.

John Blazzard- I was involved in the law getting passed to the legislature. We were trying to funnel money into Wildlife Services which the \$5 dollar thing did. If Wildlife Services can take care of more coyotes out of a helicopter or an airplane in a day than you can trap in a lifetime. The farm bureau and a lot of ranches and livestock folk were pushing hard for this thing too. I'm sure we were thinking a whole lot more of the livestock than the deer. Hopefully, it will help us all.

Item 10. Cougar Guidebook & Rules Consideration of Issues

Chet Young- Utah Houndsmen Association

Informational Only.

Chet Young- RAC members given a list. Amendments made to the cougar management program. Numbers are not adding up. Would like to ask the division to look at the numbers. Would like to see the voluntary cougar orientation course be mandatory. Random pursuit survey should be mandatory. On the Monroe, we would like to see it illegal to harvest a collared female. Would like GPS coordinates on location of all cougars harvested.

RAC Questions

John Blazzard- How often would you like the pursuit permits to report?

Chet Young- Yearly. Right now, it is a random survey.

John Blazzard- It seems to me the division ought to generate that because there are a lot of houndsmen that would forget to do those kinds of things. It would be easy to forget unless it was mailed to you.

Chet Young- I don't know the full circumstances of how to set it up.

James Gaskill- The division does a phone survey is that correct? Statistically, it is valid as far as the mathematicians are concerned. All this would do is be additional. It seems to me that if we have a statistically valid survey, there is not much more to be gained from that survey. I don't mind filling out surveys myself but there would certainly be an additional cost to do that. You would have to implement a cost if they didn't do it. Is that going to make it an efficient mandatory survey? I'm not saying it's not a good idea, I'm just wondering if you have considered all of the ramifications?

Joel Ferry- Don't they do a survey on the swans every year if you draw? If you don't fill it out, you are left out for two years. You cannot apply for two years. Every tag holder on swans has to do it.

James Gaskill- I have been in other states where they have done it with turkeys and all kinds of things. I'm not sure it is cost effective.

Chet Young- This stems back from 4 years ago. I did a survey that somewhat replicated the divisions survey and asked everybody at our bank to fill it out. The numbers were so far off, it was comparing apples to oranges. I'm not saying which one is right and which one is wrong. I just feel if there is a way to get better numbers, it would be nice.

James Gaskill- I appreciate your passion for your sport and that you have taken the time to come up with these recommendations. I really do think that it is a valuable contribution.

Joel Ferry- When the cougar thing came up, there were some changes made from the previous year when we opted this long term plan. I made the comment that if we are bringing this up, something is not right within that management plan if we are having to change, adjust and modify it. It has been 3 months since we have looked at cougars are you are already wanting to make changes to it. I don't know why this was not brought up 3 months ago. Personally, I am disinclined to make any changes because we had the opportunity to evaluate it then and here we are now. What if something changes in the next 6 months, do you want to come back and do it again?

Chet Young- This is the same complaint today as what I had when this was originally made.

Joel Ferry- The houndsmen bring the concerns that they are overharvesting in certain areas. We get the information from the DWR that we go off of.

Chet Young- To clarify, when I was talking numbers, I was not asking for any changes be made to the management plan itself. I was asking if we are offering 12 tags on a unit. The average amount of cats over a 3 year cycle at 3.66 cats. I was asking for maybe an evaluation at the division's discretion and say we might be a little bit out so that after we go through the 3 year cycle, our numbers are in line. Obviously, this new plan is a learning process. If there is something that can better the process without taking away is all I am asking for. No change to the plan.

R. Jefre Hicks- If people had to turn in their GPS coordinates every time they harvested an animal, would that really help? Would that give you some good data that you do not have now?

John Shivik- This process has been ongoing in terms of communication of the houndsmen. The GPS and training, are a lot of good ideas. What these guys are proposed through all 5 RACS now, I think GPS could be really useful. This is a good time for us to talk because this next round, a year from now, I will be making new recommendations and I think we will have some good input from the houndsmen and you might see some of these ideas in the next round of recommendations. There are pros and cons to all of these things. It will just take some time to work out the cost of GPS locations and full surveys.

Meeting Ends: 8:28 p.m.

VARIANCE REQUEST FOR THE WILDLIFE BOARD

AUGUST 16 2012

Permit Holder: BRAD MILLER

Type of Hunting Permit: 2012 LE Bear, Central Mtns, Manti North #7003

Season Date: 04/07-06/03, 2012

Received Variance Request: 06/04/2012

Received Permit: 06/04/2012

Variance Request: Brad Miller accessed the hunt unit beginning April 7th and began placing and managing bait sites. On May 26th he was diagnosed with a pulmonary emboli and was not able to complete his hunt. He is requesting a hunt extension for 2013 or to have his points reinstated and his waiting waived .

Variance Committee Authority: The Division's authority to grant a variance is limited to persons that are completely precluded from participating in the activity authorized by a wildlife document, or substantially impaired from filing a timely application because of:

- Personal illness or injury
- The death or significant injury or illness of an immediate family member; or
- Mobilization or deployment under orders of the United States Armed forces, a public health organization, or public safety organization in the interest of national defense of a national emergency

Variance Committee Review : The Variance committee reviewed Brad Miller's request on July 31, 2012. His request was denied because it falls outside the authority granted to the committee.

Variance Committee Recommendation:

The committee would recommend to deny this request based on the fact the hunter did have opportunity to hunt and was on the unit during the specified season.

Wildlife Board Approval/Denial: _____

Date Letter mailed: _____

Comments: _____

May 31, 2012

Division of Wildlife Resources
Attn: Licensing
1594 West North Temple, Suite 2110
PO Box 146301
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-6301

To Whom It May Concern:

I am submitting a variance request for the bear tag that I received for 2012. I realize the norm is to return a tag or request a variance prior to the starting date of the hunt, however, this did not work out that way and I would like you to consider the following:

- While the hunt began on April 7 and I was in the field placing and managing bait sites, there were no bears that came in and I did not even have a bow with me during these weekly bait runs and never sat in a tree stand due to my bait going untouched (with the exception of some overweight squirrels and diabetic chipmunks that love donuts now). I was told by many fellow hunters to be patient and the bears would come and probably start hitting baits near the end of May.
- My thoughts were to hunt the entire final week of the hunt and see if I could improve my bait sites or find a better site to hunt. Before this could happen, on Saturday, May 26 I went to the ER and was diagnosed with an pulmonary emboli due to pain and shortness of breath, thus ending any chance of getting back down to finish my hunt.
- I sent my son and son-in-law down to pull cards from the cameras on Friday, May 31 and received word that the bears had started hitting the bait on the same day I went to the ER...go figure! I had a glimmer of hope that if I walked in really slow and carefully climbed the tree stand I could probably make this work. This hope was immediately dashed by my wife and by the fact that I could not draw my bow due to the pain.
- I don't remember how many bonus points I had but I do remember when I received the call that someone was surrendering their permit and I was the next one on the list. I would really like to get another chance to harvest a bear in Utah. I have, as always, enjoyed being outdoors even if there were no bears hitting the bait but I have been looking forward to getting a bear for quite some time now.
- On my application I have checked both boxes for season extension and for Bonus or Preference Point awards leaving the decision in your hands in the event that my request is accepted.

Thank you for your time and consideration,



Brad Miller



GARY R. HERBERT
Governor

GREGORY S. BELL
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Wildlife Resources

JAMES F. KARPOWITZ
Division Director

MEMORANDUM

Date: August 7, 2012
To: Utah Wildlife Board Members
From: Justin Dolling, Northern Region Supervisor
SUBJECT: DWR Position on Proposed Hunting Closure at Pineview Reservoir

The Division does not support this proposal for the following reasons:

- Utah Code (76-10-508) defines where a firearm cannot be discharged (demonstrates safety has been addressed in state code).
 - from an automobile
 - from, upon or across any highway
 - at any road signs placed on the highway of the state
 - at any communications equipment
 - at railroad equipment
 - within Utah State Parks
 - within 600 feet of a dwelling, building and structure containing livestock without written permission from the landowner
- There are areas at Pineview where hunting, specifically waterfowl hunting, can occur legally and safely (i.e. more than 600 feet from any dwellings or buildings).
- The Division has not received any prior complaints or any reports of hunting-related incidents.
- The time frame during which most waterfowl hunting occurs at Pineview is relatively short, usually late in the season, after the reservoir and other waters have frozen over, and at a time when other users are at a minimum.
- There is no biological reason to close Pineview to hunting.
- Closing public property to hunting could create a precedent and invite others to make similar requests. Then, all the difficulties and problems



Page 2

August 9, 2012

Subject: Pineview Hunting Proposal

associated with a single closure will be compounded many fold across the state.

- If the Division is to embark on closing hunting in all areas of the state that are in proximity to human habitation (homes, cabins, buildings, businesses, highways, campgrounds, etc.), tens of thousands of acres will be closed that will need to be described in rule or guidebook to inform the public.

The Division will commit to help resolve this citizen's issue by:

- Increasing patrol efforts at Pineview Reservoir during hunting season and responding as quickly as possible when notified of a violation or of a situation where the safety of persons or property has been compromised.



GARY R. HERBERT
Governor

GREGORY S. BELL
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Wildlife Resources

JAMES F. KARPOWITZ
Division Director

MEMORANDUM

Date: August 7, 2012
To: Utah Wildlife Board Members
From: Kevin Bunnell, Wildlife Section Chief
SUBJECT: Recommended 2013-2015 Conservation Permit Allocation

The Division is recommending the allocation of conservation permits for 2013-2015 in accordance with the Conservation and Sportsman Permit Rule (R657-41). The tables below detail the permit recommendations for each species. In summary the Division is recommending a 56 permit decrease in the number of big game permits and an overall decrease of 45 permits.

Specific recommendations include eliminating deer and elk permits on the Fillmore, Oak Creek unit in response to a fire that burned close to 90% of the available habitat on the unit and restructuring the way Desert Bighorn Sheep units are combined for issuing conservation permits.



Deer Conservation Permits for 2013-2015						
Hunt Name	2012 Permit Total	2012 Permit Breakout				Rec For 2013- 15
		Draw	Conservation	Landowner	Tribe	
Henry Mountains	50	48	2	0	0	2
Paunsaugunt	161	135	8	18	0	8
Book Cliffs	674	541	7	26	100	8
Cache, Crawford Mountain	20	18	1	0	1	1
Fillmore, Oak Creek	43	40	3	0	0	0
LaSal , Dolores Triangle	20	19	1	0	0	1
San Juan, Elk Ridge	56	51	3	2	0	3
South Slope, Diamond Mountain	124	74	6	44	0	6
West Desert, Vernon	267	224	8	35	0	8
Statewide	1		1			1
Total	1416	1150	40	125	101	38

Proposal

Elk Conservation Permits for 2013-2015						
Hunt Name	2012 Permit Total	2012 Permit Breakout				Rec For 2013- 15
		Draw	Conservation	Landowner	Tribe	
Beaver	44	40	4	0	0	2
Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek-South	174	130	7	10	27	8
Book Cliffs, Little Creek (roadless)	61	57	4	0	0	3
Cache, Meadowville	60	56	1	0	3	3
Cache, North	97	88	4	0	5	5
Cache, South	140	129	5	0	6	7
Central Mountains, Manti	414	406	8	0	0	8
Central Mountains, Nebo	107	100	7	0	0	5
Fillmore, Oak Creek South	48	40	3	5	0	0
Fillmore, Pahvant	84	71	6	7	0	4
La Sal, La Sal Mountains	99	95	4	0	0	5
Monroe	45	35	6	4	0	2
Mt. Dutton	118	110	8	0	0	6
Nine Mile Anthro	28	21	1	0	6	1
North Slope, Three Corners	45	36	2	5	2	2
Oquirrh-Stansbury	39	37	2	0	0	2
Panguitch Lake	100	85	5	10	0	5
Paunsaugunt	60	56	2	2	0	3
Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits	90	85	5	0	0	4
Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	188	180	8	0	0	8
San Juan	86	75	5	6	0	4
South Slope, Diamond Mountain	97	52	5	40	0	5
Southwest Desert	141	133	5	3	0	7
Wasatch Mountains	741	652	7	0	82	8
West Desert, Deep Creek	40	36	3	1	0	2
Satewide	1		1			1
Total	3147	2805	118	93	131	110

Pronghorn Conservation Permits for 2013-2015						
Hunt Name	2012 Permit Total	2012 Permit Breakout				Rec For 2013- 15
		Draw	Conservation	Landowner	Tribe	
Beaver	20	19	1	0	0	1
Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek	13	8	1	1	3	1
Book Cliffs, South (Cisco)	29	25	2	2	0	1
Box Elder, Pilot Mountain	9	8	1	0	0	0
Box Elder, Promontory	8	7	1	0	0	0
Cache, North Rich	100	92	3	0	5	5
Fillmore, Black Rock Desert	11	11	0	0	0	1
Morgan-South Rich	13	12	0	0	1	1
Mt. Dutton/Paunsaugunt	53	44	3	6	0	3
Nine Mile, Anthro	29	23	1	0	5	1
North Slope, W Daggett-Three Corners	31	28	2	0	1	2
Pine Valley	27	25	2	0	0	1
Plateau	103	96	7	0	0	5
San Rafael, Desert	8	7	1	0	0	0
San Rafael, North	46	43	3	0	0	2
South Slope, Bonanza-Diamond Mtn.	27	22	2	0	3	1
SW Desert	92	88	4	0	0	5
West Desert, Riverbed	34	32	2	0	0	2
West Desert, Rush Valley	14	13	1	0	0	1
West Desert, Snake Valley	18	16	2	0	0	1
Statewide	1		1			1
Total	686	619	40	9	18	35

Moose Conservation Permits for 2013-2015					
Hunt Name	2012 Permit Total	2012 Permit Breakout			Rec For 2013- 15
		Draw	Conservation	Tribe	
Cache	8	6	2	0	0
Chalk Creek	2	2	0	0	0
East Canyon	5	5	0	0	0
East Canyon, Morgan-Summit	4	4	0	0	0
Kamas	2	2	0	0	0
Morgan/So. Rich	2	2	0	0	0
North Slope, Summit	9	7	2	0	0
North Slope, West Daggett-Three Corners	6	6	0	0	0
Ogden	7	6	1	0	0
South Slope, Vernal/Diamond Mountain	4	3	0	1	0
South Slope, Yellowstone	5	4	0	1	0
Wasatch Mountains	35	29	2	4	2
Statewide	1		1		1
Total	90	76	8	6	3

Proposal

Mtn Goat Conservation Permits for 2013-2015					
Hunt Name	2012 Permit Total	2012 Permit Breakout			Rec For 2013- 15
		Draw	Conservation	Tribe	
Beaver (early)	12	11	1	0	1
Beaver (late)	12	11	1	0	1
Beaver (Female Goat Only)	25	25	0	0	1
No. Slope/So. Slope, High Uintas Central	13	11	0	2	1
No. Slope/So. Slope, High Uintas West	25	20	1	4	1
Ogden, Willard Peak (early)	15	14	1	0	1
Ogden, Willard Peak (late)	15	15	0	0	1
Ogden, Willard Peak (Female Goat Only)	32	31	1	0	2
Wasatch Mountains, Lone Peak	5	4	1	0	0
Statewide	1		1		1
Total	155	142	7	6	10

Proposal

Bison Conservation Permits for 2013-2015					
Hunt Name	2012 Permit Total	2012 Permit Breakout			Rec For 2013- 15
		Draw	Conservation	Tribe	
Book Cliffs, Agency Draw, Hunter's Choice	5	4	0	1	0
Henry Mountains, Cow Only	15	14	1	0	1
Henry Mountains, Hunter's Choice (Early)	22	21	1	0	1
Henry Mountains, Hunter's Choice (Late)	22	21	1	0	1
Statewide	1		1		1
Total	65	60	4	1	4

Proposal

RMBHS Conservation Permits for 2013-2015				
Hunt Name	2012 Permit Total	2012 Permit Breakout		Rec For 2013-15
		Draw	Conservation	
Book Cliffs, South (Rattlesnake)	7	6	1	1
Box Elder, Newfoundland Mountain	6	5	1	1
Nine Mile, Range Creek (Bighorn Mtn)	16	15	1	2
North Slope, Three Corners (Bare Mtn)	3	3	0	
North Slope, West Daggett (Sheep Creek)	3	3	0	
Stansbury	2	2	0	
Statewide	1		1	1
Total	38	34	4	5

Proposal

DBHS Conservation Permits for 2013-2015				
Hunt Name	2012 Permit Total	2012 Permit Breakout		Rec For 2013- 15
		Draw	Conservation	
Henry Mountains	2	2	0	
San Rafael, Dirty Devil	3	2	1	
Henry - Dirty Devil (Comb)	5	4	1	1
Kaiparowits, Escalante	5	4	1	
Kaiparowits, East	4	3	1	
Kaiparowits, West	3	3	0	
Kaiparowits, (All Comb)	12	10	2	1
La Sal, Potash	3	3	0	
San Juan, Lockhart	2	2	0	
San Juan, South	2	2	0	
San Juan - LaSal (Comb)	7	7	0	1
San Rafael, North	3	2	1	
San Rafael, South	8	7	1	
San Rafael, (No - So Comb)	11	9	2	1
Pine Valley, Virgin River	2	2	0	
Zion	9	9	0	
Zion - Pine Valley, (Comb)	11	11	0	1
Statewide	1		1	1
Total	47	41	6	6

Proposal

Turkey Conservation Permits for 2013-2015				
Hunt Name	2012 Permit Total	2012 Permit Breakout		Rec For 2013-15
		Draw	Conservation	
Northern Region	407	400	7	8
Central Region	508	500	8	8
Northeastern Region	258	250	8	8
Southeastern Region	258	250	8	8
Southern Region	1107	1100	7	8
Statewide	1		1	1
Total	2539	2500	39	41

Proposal

Cougar Conservation Permits for 2013-2015					
Cougar Management Area	2012 Permit Total*	2012 Permit Breakout			Rec For 2013-15
		Draw	Conservation	Tribe	
Book Cliffs	18	14	1	3	1
Cache	40	38	2		2
Monroe	97	93	4		5
Oquirrh - Stansbury	32	31	1		2
Pine Valley	32	30	2		2
San Juan	11	10	1		1
Uintas	32	25	1	6	2
Wasatch - Manti	98	94	4		5
Statewide	1		1		1
Total	361	335	17	9	21

* Includes LE and Split unit totals

Proposal

Bear Conservation Permits for 2013-2015							
Hunt Name	2012 Permit Total*	2012 Permit Breakout					Rec For 2013- 15
		Spring	Fall	Premium	Conservation	Tribe	
Beaver	16	10	6		0		1
Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South	40	24	6	3	2	5	2
Central Mtns, Manti-North	28	19	5	3	1		1
Central Mtns, Manti-South	16	4	9	2	1		1
Central Mtns, Nebo	21	14	4	2	1		1
Chalk Creek/Kamas/North Slope	13	5	6	1	1		1
Fillmore, Pahvant	3	1	1		1		0
La Sal	47	35	5	5	2		2
Nine Mile	45	25	15		2	3	2
North Slope, Daggett-Three Cor	11	6	4	1	0		1
Panguitch Lake/Zion	16	8	5	2	1		1
Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits	40	23	12	4	1		2
San Juan	47	35	5	5	2		2
South Slope, Bonanza/Diamond	32	19	7	3	1	2	1
South Slope, Yellowstone	22	10	5	2	1	4	1
Wasatch Mtns, Avintaquin/Curra	11		9		0	2	1
Wasatch Mtns, West (bear)	51	35	10	5	1		3
Statewide	1				1		1
Total	408	273	114	38	19	16	24

* Includes LE and Split unit totals

Summary		
Species	2012 Conservation Permit	Recommended 2013-15 Conservation Permits
Deer	40	38
Elk (Bulls)	118	110
Pronghorn	40	35
Moose	8	3
Mtn Goat	7	10
Bison	4	4
RMBHS	4	5
DBHS	6	6
Turkey	39	41
Cougar	17	21
Bear	19	24
Antlerless Elk	20	0
GS Deer**	20	0
Total	342	297
		Difference
		-45

**Originally allocated for 2012, but revoked because of implementation of the unit x unit hunt structure



GARY R. HERBERT
Governor

GREG BELL
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Wildlife Resources

JAMES F. KARPOWITZ
Division Director

August 3, 2012

Jim Karpowitz, Director, Division of Wildlife Resources
Del Brady, Chairman, Utah Wildlife Board
Ernie Perkins, Vice Chairman, Utah Wildlife Board
Utah Wildlife Board Members

RE: 2012 Convention Permit Internal Audit – Rule R657-55

Dear Director Karpowitz and Wildlife Board Members,

In accordance with Rule R657-55, an audit of the Convention Permit series program has been conducted. This audit is attached for your review and the results will be presented at the Utah Wildlife Board Meeting on August 16, 2012.

If you have any questions please contact me at 801-538-7437.

Sincerely,

Gregory Sheehan
Administrative Services Chief
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources



Internal Audit of the 2012 Convention Permit Program

Dated August 3, 2012

Background

In accordance with R657-55, an audit of the convention permit program has been conducted. The Division of Wildlife Resources (Division) assists with license sales and drawing related issues at the convention and therefore is not completely independent of the convention process. Nevertheless the audit was designed by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources to provide appropriate information as required by Administrative Rule. The report focuses on verifying that the drawing processes used were proper, secure, and fairly administered for the vouchers/permits that were issued. Additionally, we reviewed data regarding number of applicants, success rates and other efforts related to the drawing procedures and issuance of the permits.

Overview

The contract for the wildlife convention permits was awarded to the Mule Deer Foundation in 2010. The award was for a five year contract period that runs from 2012 through 2016. This report covers 2012, but does include some comparative data from the initial convention contract period of 2007 through 2011.

This report refers to the contract and event as the "Convention", but the Mule Deer Foundation and the co-sponsor, Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife, refer to this event as the "Hunt Expo."

Findings and Recommendations

This audit was performed by the Division of Wildlife Resources to provide information to the Utah Wildlife Board in order to help make an assessment of program compliance and other general information about the 2012 convention. The Division has closely monitored the processes of data collection and input, securing of personal and confidential data provided, and performance of the actual computer drawing. Additionally, the Division has performed eligibility checks of successful applicants, and alternates that may have been assigned a permit. Applicants that did not have a valid hunting permit at the time of application for the permits are removed from consideration for permits.

Information gathered herein is intended to assist the Division and the Wildlife Board as they ensure contract compliance and allocate permits for the 2013 convention.

Review of handling of sensitive data

The division considers the handling of personal data and information a top priority. Because the contractor conducting the draw is allowed to access DWR data for populating the hunt applications we have required adherence to protocols that will safeguard that data.

The contractor has two process components regarding sensitive and confidential data from the applicants. For these purposes sensitive and confidential data is defined as social security number, drivers license information, height, weight, gender, hair/eye color.

First, is the handling of sensitive information given by applicants at the convention to apply for the drawing. This is done on a paper form completed by the applicant. Once completed and submitted these forms are cross-shredded on site. No paper applications are retained by the contractor.

Second, is the handling of electronic data that is used in the electronic application process. Sensitive data is used by the application for customer lookups into the Division database. This data transmission is through a secure socket layer using 128 bit encryption. Once the customer information is retrieved no sensitive information is stored on the contractor database.

No compliance issues were identified by the Division.

Review of the drawing process

Division of Wildlife personnel review the draw process by carefully examining the protocol used by GraySky Technologies, the drawing contractor selected by the Mule Deer Foundation to conduct the convention permit drawing. The Division is represented by Greg Evans and Kirk Poulsen of the Utah Department of Technology Services, who reviewed the following:

- 1) The process of the draw is reviewed for its soundness.
- 2) The database structure is reviewed to make sure that a customer can't flood a certain hunt by making multiple entries for that hunt.
- 3) A review of the code is conducted to make sure that there is no chance that a seeded record could exist in the database prior to the assignment of random numbers. This is done to ensure that the result table is empty and no records can be inserted independently of the drawing code. This ensures that a record with an abnormally low random number isn't placed in the table thereby guaranteeing a permit to that record.
- 4) The code is reviewed to ensure that all records are treated equally in the process that assigns random numbers to the entries. Care is given to make sure that when the random numbers are being assigned no records are identified to get a number assigned to them other than a random number which is generated by the system. Prior to this

draw the Division requested a change in the handling of duplicate random numbers. Although the likelihood of two people being assigned the same random number is extremely remote it was felt that if duplications occurred it was best to add one to the second duplicate number rather than reassign a new random number, thereby maintaining as closely as possible that party's position in the draw.

- 5) The code is then reviewed for inserts that may occur after the drawing to make sure that a winning record is not placed in the result table after the assignment of random numbers takes place.

Conducting the Draw

The actual drawing is conducted at Division of Wildlife Resources Offices in Salt Lake City. Attendees that are present at the drawing are required to sign a login sheet as shown on Attachment 2. The public is invited to attend the drawing and at least one individual who was unassociated with the Division or contractors did attend. The draw is then conducted by GraySky Technologies whereupon the following occurs:

- 1) A passphrase (Snow Goose) was given to the GraySky representative by a member of the public that was written into the code and displayed on the result page to ensure the code reviewed by the Division was the actual code used during the draw.
- 2) The draw was then run assigning random numbers to applicants hunt choice entries and then sorted in descending order.
- 3) The results of the draw were printed and immediately given to a Division representative to ensure that there are no edits to the results table.
- 4) This list was then given to the Division Law Enforcement and Licensing sections to validate eligibility before any results are posted.
- 5) Any applicants selected through the draw that receive multiple permits for the same species are contacted by the Division and ask to select their preferred hunt choice. The unused permits are issued to alternates.

Notes

In any truly random drawing there always seems to be a few "lucky" individuals. Statistically when randomness is discussed it is always possible to view the final result and pick out certain trends, especially with few historical data sets to observe. The key to these trends is that they cannot be predicted prior to the event or drawing. This is the very essence of randomness. Random is not an assurance that an event will be spread evenly across a population, or distributed equally among participants. There were not any abnormalities observed in the 2012 drawing, whether random or otherwise.

Draw Related Information

The Division reviewed data from the convention regarding application numbers and success rates of the convention. Applicant numbers verified that at least 10,000 individuals

attended the convention as was established as a basis for applying for the permit series. The reported number of attendees at the 2012 convention was approximately over 26,000 with more than 13,000 being formally registered for activities.

Applicant data for years 2007-2012 is as follows:

Year(s)	Applicants	Applications	Gross Revenue @ \$5 per App	Average Applications Per Applicant
Average 2007 - 2011	10,211	175,160	879,461	17.34
2012	13,388	207,870	\$ 1,039,350	15.53

Resident versus Nonresident Success

Data was reviewed comparing the number of resident applicants versus the nonresident applicants. The detailed data is shown below, but to summarize, in the 2012 application period 86.15% of the applications for the 200 permit series were residents and 89% of the permits drawn were awarded to residents. The numbers are similar for the cumulative six years of the convention with 83.4% residents applying and 84.8% of successful applicants being residents. Because only 75% of the 200 permits were originally transferred from the resident drawing hunts that are conducted by the division, the residents noticed a slight advantage over non-residents of about 10% had the permits been issued in the traditional DWR big game draw.

Historical Comparison of Convention Permit Applications and Success Rates

	Average 2007-2011	2012
Total number of resident applications	145,945	179,077
Total number of nonresident applications	29,215	28,793
Total applications	175,160	209,882
Percent of resident applications	83.40%	86.15%
Percent of nonresident applications	16.60%	13.85%
	100.00%	100.00%
Number of total permits issued to residents	170	178
Number of total permits issued to nonresidents	30	22
Total Permits Issued	200	200
Percent of permits to residents	84.80%	89.00%
Percent of permits to nonresidents	15.20%	11.00%
	100.00%	100.00%

Other data related to draw success by hunt number and numbers of permits issued by species are attached to this report.

Applicant Demographics by State

Data was also provided by GraySky to show the distribution of applicants by the applicants home states. That data is as follows:

State	Applicants
Utah	12,370
Idaho	212
Wyoming	188
Colorado	131
California	104
Nevada	102
Montana	45
Washington	40
Arizona	37
Oregon	26
New Mexico	23
Texas	22
Arkansas	17
Pennsylvania	7
North Dakota	6
Wisconsin	5
Non-USA	5
Indiana	5

continued

Florida	5
South Dakota	4
Ohio	4
Missouri	4
Minnesota	4
Nebraska	3
Georgia	3
Tennessee	2
South Carolina	2
Michigan	2
Kansas	2
Iowa	2
Oklahoma	1
Mississippi	1
Maine	1
Louisiana	1
Kentucky	1
Illinois	1
Total	13,388

License Sales

The Division requires that anyone applying for a permit at the Hunt Expo must have a valid hunting or combination license at the time of application. To ensure this compliance the programming will not allow an applicant to apply without a valid license in the system. During the Hunt Expo there were 925 licenses sold at the Salt Palace generating total revenue to the Division of \$37,023. Additional sales of licenses would have been made during the four months prior to the Hunt Expo on the Division license sales site in order for

people to pre-apply in advance. Those numbers cannot be stratified from our database but likely were several thousand licenses.

Conclusions

This audit was limited in scope primarily to processes surrounding the handling of applications and data. We believe that with the procedures set in place by the MDF, SFW, and GraySky, that the data was properly secured at the convention, and the drawing was conducted in a proper, fair, and consistent manner.

The Division will perform an internal audit of the 2013 convention and will provide a report including any findings to the Utah Wildlife Board.

We would like to thank the Mule Deer Foundation and Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife for their time, prompt response and their willingness to provide the information requested for the preparation of the audit. Their information was clearly presented and very much appreciated. If there are questions regarding this report, please contact me at 801-538-7437.



Gregory Sheehan
Administrative Services Chief
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources

CC: James F. Karpowitz, Director
Utah Wildlife Board Members
Miles Moretti, Mule Deer Foundation
Byron Bateman, Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife

ATCH:

1. Current Convention Rule R647-55
2. Attendance log at the computer drawing for permits
3. Convention Permit Application form – Paper
4. Specific permits issued and application success rates by hunt

Attachment 1

R657. Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources.

R657-55. Wildlife Convention Permits.

R657-55-1. Purpose and Authority.

(1) Under the authority of Sections 23-14-18 and 23-14-19 of the Utah Code, this rule provides the standards and requirements for issuing wildlife convention permits.

(2) Wildlife convention permits are authorized by the Wildlife Board and issued by the division to a qualified conservation organization for purposes of generating revenue to fund wildlife conservation activities and attracting a regional or national wildlife convention to Utah.

(3) The selected conservation organization will conduct a random drawing at a convention held in Utah to distribute the opportunity to receive wildlife convention permits.

(4) This rule is intended as authorization to issue one series of wildlife convention permits per year beginning in 2012 through 2016 to one qualified conservation organization.

R657-55-2. Definitions.

(1) Terms used in this rule are defined in Section 23-13-2.

(2) In addition:

(a) "Conservation organization" means a nonprofit chartered institution, corporation, foundation, or association founded for the purpose of promoting wildlife conservation.

(b) "Special nonresident convention permit" means one wildlife convention permit for each once-in-a-lifetime species that is only available to a nonresident hunter legally eligible to hunt in Utah.

(c) "Wildlife Convention" means a multi-day event held within the state of Utah that is sponsored by multiple wildlife conservation organizations as their national or regional convention or event that is open to the general public and designed to draw nationwide attendance of more than 10,000 individuals. The wildlife convention may include wildlife conservation fund raising activities, outdoor exhibits, retail marketing of outdoor products and services, public awareness programs, and other similar activities.

(d) "Wildlife Convention Audit" means an annual review by the division of the conservation organization's processes used to handle applications for convention permits and conduct the drawing, and the protocols associated with collecting and using client data.

(e) "Wildlife Convention Permit" means a permit which:

(i) is authorized by the Wildlife Board to be issued to successful applicants through a drawing or random selection process conducted at a Utah wildlife convention; and

(ii) allows the permittee to hunt for the designated species on the designated unit during the respective season for each species as authorized by the Wildlife Board.

(f) "Wildlife Convention Permit series" means a single package of permits to be determined by the Wildlife Board for:

(i) deer;

(ii) elk;

(iii) pronghorn;

- (iv) moose;
- (v) bison;
- (vi) rocky mountain goat;
- (vii) desert bighorn sheep;
- (viii) rocky mountain bighorn sheep;
- (ix) wild turkey;
- (x) cougar; or
- (xi) black bear.

(g) "Secured Opportunity" means the opportunity to participate in a specified hunt that is secured by an eligible applicant through the drawing process.

(h) "Successful Applicant" means an individual selected to receive a wildlife convention permit through the drawing process.

R657-55-3. Wildlife Convention Permit Allocation.

(1) The Wildlife Board may allocate wildlife convention permits by May 1 of the year preceding the wildlife convention.

(2) Wildlife convention permits shall be issued as a single series to one conservation organization.

(3) The number of wildlife convention permits authorized by the Wildlife Board shall be based on:

(a) the species population trend, size, and distribution to protect the long-term health of the population;

(b) the hunting and viewing opportunity for the general public, both short and long term; and

(c) a percentage of the permits available to nonresidents in the annual big game drawings matched by a proportionate number of resident permits.

(4) Wildlife convention permits, including special nonresident convention permits, shall not exceed 200 total permits.

(5) Wildlife convention permits designated for the convention each year shall be deducted from the number of public drawing permits.

R657-55-4. Obtaining Authority to Distribute Wildlife Convention Permit Series.

(1) The wildlife convention permit series is issued for a period of five years as provided in Section R657-55-1(4).

(2) The wildlife convention permit series is available to eligible conservation organizations for distribution through a drawing or other random selection process held at a wildlife convention in Utah open to the public.

(3) Conservation organizations may apply for the wildlife convention permit series by sending an application to the division between August 1 and September 1, 2010.

(4) Each application must include:

(a) the name, address and telephone number of the conservation organization;

(b) a description of the conservation organization's mission statement;

(c) the name of the president or other individual responsible for the administrative operations of the conservation organization; and

(d) a detailed business plan describing how the wildlife convention will take

place and how the wildlife convention permit drawing procedures will be carried out.

(5) An incomplete or incorrect application may be rejected.

(6) The division shall recommend to the Wildlife Board which conservation organization may receive the wildlife convention permit series based on:

(a) the business plan for the convention and drawing procedures contained in the application; and

(b) the conservation organization's, including its constituent entities, ability, including past performance in marketing conservation permits under Rule R657-41, to effectively plan and complete the wildlife convention.

(7) The Wildlife Board shall make the final assignment of the wildlife convention permit series based on the:

(a) division's recommendation;

(b) applicant conservation organization's commitment to use convention permit handling fee revenue to benefit protected wildlife in Utah;

(c) historical contribution of the applicant conservation organization, including its constituent entities, to the conservation of wildlife in Utah; and

(d) previous performance of the applicant conservation organization, including its constituent entities.

(8) The conservation organization receiving the wildlife convention permit series must:

(a) require each wildlife convention permit applicant to verify they possess a current Utah hunting or combination license before allowing them to apply for a convention permit;

(b) select successful applicants for the wildlife convention permits by drawing or other random selection process in accordance with law, provisions of this rule, proclamation, and order of the Wildlife Board;

(c) allow applicants to apply for the wildlife convention permits without purchasing admission to the wildlife convention;

(d) notify the division of the successful applicant of each wildlife convention permit within 10 days of the applicant's selection;

(e) maintain records demonstrating that the drawing was conducted fairly; and

(f) submit to an annual wildlife convention audit by a division-appointed auditor.

(9) The division shall issue the appropriate wildlife convention permit to the designated successful applicant after:

(a) completion of the random selection process;

(b) verification of the recipient being found eligible for the permit; and

(c) payment of the appropriate permit fee is received by the division.

(10) The division and the conservation organization receiving the wildlife convention permit series shall enter into a contract, including the provisions outlined in this rule.

(11) If the conservation organization awarded the wildlife convention permit series withdraws before the end of the 5 year period, any remaining co-participants with the conservation organization may be given an opportunity to assume the contract and to distribute the convention permit series consistent with the contract and this rule for the remaining years left in the 5 year period, provided:

(a) The original contracted conservation organization submits a certified letter to the division identifying that it will no longer be participating in the convention.

(b) The partner or successor conservation organization files an application with the division as provided in subsection 4 for the remaining period.

(c) The successor conservation organization submits its application request at least 60 days prior to the next scheduled convention so that the wildlife board can evaluate the request under the criteria in this section.

(d) The Wildlife Board authorizes the successor conservation organization to assume the contract and complete the balance of the 5 year convention permit period.

(12) The division may suspend or terminate the conservation organization's authority to distribute wildlife convention permits at any time during the five year award term for:

(a) violating any of the requirements set forth in this rule or the contract; or

(b) failing to bring or organize a wildlife convention in Utah, as described in the business plan under R657-55-4(4)(d), in any given year.

R657-55-5. Hunter Application Procedures.

(1) Any hunter legally eligible to hunt in Utah may apply for a wildlife convention permit except that only a nonresident of Utah may apply for a special nonresident convention permit.

(2) Any handling fee assessed by the conservation organization to process applications shall not exceed \$5 per application submitted at the convention.

(3)(a) Except as provided in Subsection (3)(b), applicants must validate their application in person at the wildlife convention to be eligible to participate in the random drawing process, for wildlife convention permits, and no person may submit an application in behalf of another.

(b) An applicant that is a member of the United States Armed Forces and unable to attend the wildlife convention as a result of being deployed or mobilized in the interest of national defense or a national emergency is not required to validate their application in person; provided convention administrators are furnished a copy of the written deployment or mobilization orders and the orders identify:

(i) the branch of the United States Armed forces from which the applicant is deployed or mobilized;

(ii) the location where the applicant is deployed or mobilized;

(iii) the date the applicant is required to report to duty; and

(iv) the nature and length of the applicant's deployment or mobilization.

(c) The conservation organization shall maintain a record, including copies of military orders, of all applicants that are not required to validate their applications in person pursuant to Subsection (3)(b), and submit to a Division audit of these records as part of its annual audit under R657-55-4(8)(f).

(4) Applicants may apply for each individual hunt for which they are eligible.

(5) Applicants may apply only once for each hunt, regardless of the number of permits for that hunt.

(6) Applicants must submit an application for each desired hunt.

(7) Applicants must possess a current Utah hunting or combination license in order to apply for a permit.

(8) The conservation organization shall advertise, accept, and process applications for wildlife convention permits and conduct the drawing in compliance with this rule and all other applicable laws.

R657-55-6. Drawing Procedures.

(1) A random drawing or selection process must be conducted for each wildlife convention permit.

(2) No preference or bonus points shall be awarded in the drawings.

(3) Waiting periods do not apply, except any person who obtains a wildlife convention permit for a once-in-a-lifetime species is subject to the once-in-a-lifetime restrictions applicable to obtaining a subsequent permit for the same species through a division application and drawing process, as provided in Rule R657-5 and the proclamation of the Wildlife Board for taking big game.

(4) No predetermined quotas or restrictions shall be imposed in the application or selection process for wildlife convention permits between resident and nonresident applicants, except that special nonresident convention permits may only be awarded to a nonresident of Utah.

(5) Drawings will be conducted within five days of the close of the convention.

(6) Applicants do not have to be present at the drawing to be awarded a wildlife convention permit.

(7) The conservation organization shall identify all eligible alternates for each wildlife convention permit and provide the division with a finalized list. This list will be maintained by the conservation organization until all permits are issued.

(8) The division shall contact successful applicants by phone or mail, and the conservation organization shall post the name of all successful applicants on a designated website.

R657-55-7. Issuance of Permits.

(1) The division shall provide a wildlife convention permit to the successful applicant as designated by the conservation organization.

(2) The division must provide a wildlife convention permit to each successful applicant, except as otherwise provided in this rule.

(3) The division shall provide each successful applicant a letter indicating the permit secured in the drawing, the appropriate fee owed the division, and the date the fee is due.

(4) Successful applicants must provide the permit fee payment in full to the division and will be issued the designated wildlife convention permit upon receipt of the appropriate permit fee and providing proof they possess a current Utah hunting or combination license.

(5) Residents will pay resident permit fees and nonresidents will pay nonresident permit fees.

(6) Applicants are eligible to obtain only one permit per species, except as provided in Rule R657-5, but no restrictions apply on obtaining permits for multiple species.

(7) In an applicant is selected for more than one convention permit for the same species, the Division will contact the applicant to determine which permit the applicant

selects.

(a) The applicant must select the permit of choice within five days of receiving notification.

(b) If the Division is unable to contact the applicant within 5 days, the Division will issue to the applicant the permit with the most difficult drawings odds based on drawing results from the Division's Big Game drawing for the preceding year.

(c) Permits not issued to the applicant will go to the next person on the alternate drawing list for that permit.

(8) Any successful applicant who fails to satisfy the following requirements will be ineligible to receive the wildlife convention permit and the next drawing alternate for that permit will be selected.

(a) The applicant fails to return the appropriate permit fee in full by the date provided in Subsection (3) or

(b) The applicant did not possess a valid Utah hunting or combination license at the time the convention permit application was submitted and the permit received.

R657-55-8. Surrender or Transfer of Wildlife Convention Permits.

(1)(a) If a person selected to receive a wildlife convention permit is also successful in obtaining a Utah limited entry permit for the same species in the same year or obtaining a general permit for a male animal of the same species in the same year, that person cannot possess both permits and must select the permit of choice.

(b) In the event the secured opportunity is willingly surrendered before the permit is issued, the next eligible applicant on the alternate drawing list will be selected to receive the secured opportunity.

(c) In the event the wildlife convention permit is surrendered, the next eligible applicant on the alternate drawing list for that permit will be selected to receive the permit, and the permit fee may be refunded, as provided in Sections 23-19-38, 23-19-38.2, and R657-42-5.

(2) A person selected by a conservation organization to receive a wildlife convention permit, may not sell or transfer the permit, or any rights thereunder to another person in accordance with Section 23-19-1.

(3) If a person is successful in obtaining a wildlife convention permit but is legally ineligible to hunt in Utah the next eligible applicant on the alternate drawing list for that permit will be selected to receive the permit.

R657-55-9. Using a Wildlife Convention Permit.

(1) A wildlife convention permit allows the recipient to:

(a) take only the species for which the permit is issued;

(b) take only the species and sex printed on the permit; and

(c) take the species only in the area and during the season specified on the permit.

(2) The recipient of a wildlife convention permit is subject to all of the provisions of Title 23, Wildlife Resources Code, and the rules and proclamations of the Wildlife Board for taking and pursuing wildlife.

KEY: wildlife, wildlife permits

Date of Enactment or Last Substantive Change: February 7, 2011

Notice of Continuation: March 26, 2010

Authorizing, and Implemented or Interpreted Law: 23-14-18; 23-14-19

Attachment 2



On Tuesday February 15th 2012 the electronic random drawing for the 200 convention permits will take place at the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources located at 1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah. These permits were awarded to the Western Hunting & Conservation Expo by the Utah Wildlife Board.

The following are witnesses of the drawing and were present during the entire process. Once the winners have been drawn all names will be given to Mike Fowlks, Chief of Law Enforcement for the DWR. The names will be checked for any compact violations and will be deemed eligible by the DWR and notified by mail.

Start Time 11:30 am.

End Time 11:51 am.

Print Name	Signature	Date
<u>Ryan Foutz</u>	<u>Ryan Foutz</u>	<u>2-15-12</u>
<u>Jenny [Signature]</u>	<u>Lindy Varney</u>	<u>2-15-12</u>
<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>Gregory Sheehan</u>	<u>2/15/2012</u>
<u>Bill Phifer</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>2/15/2012</u>
<u>Kenneth Johnson</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>2-15-12</u>
<u>Eric Tychsen</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>2/15/2012</u>
<u>Greg Evans</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>2/15/2012</u>
<u>Kirk Paulsen</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>2/15/2012</u>
<u>CINDIE JENSEN</u>	<u>CINDIE JENSEN</u>	<u>02/15/2012</u>
<u>Michael Styler</u>	<u>Michael Styler</u>	<u>2-15-2012</u>



Page 2 cont.

Name

Signature

Date

ROBERT GRAY
Suzette Fowlts
Alan Clark
~~Mils Morett~~

[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]

2/15/12
2/15/12
2/15/12
2-15-12

Attachment 3

ALL APPLICANTS must have a valid Utah Hunting License at the time of application in order for the application to be valid.

Application for 200 Permits Drawing

As the person who prepared this application, I declare under the penalty of perjury that to the best of my knowledge the information provided in this application is true and correct, and that the applicant under all prevailing laws and statutes to apply for and possess this license/permit or tag if drawn as defined in Utah Code 23-13-2.

Yes, I would like to purchase a license along with this application.

- Utah HUNTING License
 Utah COMBINATION License

Hunter Ed. # _____ [for those born after 12/31/1985]

Hunting License Fees: Resident \$26, Resident Youth (13 and under) \$11
 Non-Resident Any Age \$65
 Combination Fishing/Hunting: Resident (12+) \$30, Non-Resident (12+) \$80

Applicant's Signature: _____
 I have read the foregoing statement and agree with its terms. I have also read and understand the regulations in the rules pertaining to this application.

Customer ID: _____ (found on your Utah hunting license) Date of Birth: ____/____/____ (MM/DD/YEAR)
 (You can skip to the Hunt Selection portion if you have completed the Customer ID and DOB.)

SS#: _____ (Your SS# is not required but will be used to expedite the hunt application process.)

First Name: _____ Middle Initial: _____ Last Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Email Address: _____ Daytime Phone: (____) _____

Spend \$100 in application fees and receive 3 chances to win prizes valued at over \$25,000. Spend \$150 in application fees and receive 6 chances. Spend \$200 in application fees and receive 10 chances. No applicant can receive more than 10 chances.

PLEASE SELECT FROM THE FOLLOWING PRE-SET PACKAGES A THROUGH K. OR, CUSTOMIZE YOUR OWN PERMIT SELECTIONS.

Hunt Packages	SPECIES	DETAILS	FEE
<input type="checkbox"/> Package A, Residents	All Species	All Bucks, All Bulls, All Moose, Bison, Rocky Mtn. Goat, Desert Bighorn,	\$490
<input type="checkbox"/> Package A, Non-Utah Residents		Rocky Mtn. Bighorn, Antelope, Cougar, Bear, and Turkey Units.	\$515
<input type="checkbox"/> Package B, Residents	Select Species	All Bucks, All Bulls, All Moose, Bison, Goat, Desert Bighorn, and Rocky Mtn. Bighorn	\$345
<input type="checkbox"/> Package B, Non-Utah Residents			\$370
<input type="checkbox"/> Package C	All Elk		\$220
<input type="checkbox"/> Package D	All Archery Elk		\$60
<input type="checkbox"/> Package E	All Muzzleloader Elk		\$25
<input type="checkbox"/> Package F	All Rifle Elk		\$135
<input type="checkbox"/> Package G	All Deer		\$70
<input type="checkbox"/> Package H	All Archery Deer		\$15
<input type="checkbox"/> Package I	All Muzzleloader Deer		\$20
<input type="checkbox"/> Package J	All Rifle Deer		\$35
<input type="checkbox"/> Pkg K, Residents	Once-in-a-Lifetime Hunts	All Moose, Bison, Desert Bighorn, and Rocky Mtn. Bighorn, and Mtn. Goat,	\$55
<input type="checkbox"/> Pkg K, Non-Utah Residents			\$80

NON-RESIDENTS! THE 5 HUNTS LISTED BELOW ARE AVAILABLE TO NON-RESIDENTS OF UTAH ONLY.

Non-Residents of Utah Only — Put an "X" in the box on the left of any and all hunt selections you choose to apply for.

X	SPECIES	HUNT / UNIT	FEE	X	SPECIES	HUNT / UNIT	FEE
<input type="checkbox"/>	Once-in-a-lifetime Utah Bull Moose	North Slope, West Daggett/Three Corners	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Once-in-a-lifetime UT Rocky Mtn. Bighorn Sheep	Box Elder, Newfoundland Mtns.	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Once-in-a-lifetime Utah Bison	Henry Mountains - Hunters Choice (late)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Once-in-a-lifetime UT Rocky Mtn. Goat	No. Slope/So. Slope, High Uintahs West	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Once-in-a-lifetime UT Desert Bighorn Sheep	San Rafael, Dirty Devil	\$5				

ALL APPLICANTS Customized Selections — Put an "X" in the box on the left of any and all hunt selections you choose to apply for.

X	SPECIES	WEAPON	HUNT / UNIT	FEE	X	SPECIES	WEAPON	HUNT / UNIT	FEE
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buck Deer	Any Weapon	Book Cliffs	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	S.W. Desert (late)	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buck Deer	Archery	Book Cliffs	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Archery	San Juan	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buck Deer	Muzzleloader	Book Cliffs	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	San Juan (early)	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buck Deer	Muzzleloader	Cache, Crawford Mountain	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Archery	South Slope, Diamond Mountain	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buck Deer	Any Weapon	Cache, Crawford Mountain	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	South Slope, Diamond Mountain (early)	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buck Deer	Premium Any Weapon	Fillmore, Oak Creek	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	West Desert, Deep Creek	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buck Deer	Premium Any Weapon	Henry Mountains	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Wasatch Mountains (early)	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buck Deer	Premium Archery	Paunsaugant	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Archery	Wasatch Mountains	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buck Deer	Premium Muzzleloader	Paunsaugant	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Muzzleloader	Wasatch Mountains	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buck Deer	Any Weapon	San Juan, Elk Ridge	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pronghorn	Any Weapon	Book Cliffs, South (Clisco)	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buck Deer	Any Weapon	South Slope, Diamond Mtn	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pronghorn	Any Weapon	Cache, North Rich	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buck Deer	Any Weapon	West Desert, Vernon	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pronghorn	Any Weapon	Mt Dutton/Paunsaugant	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buck Deer	Archery	West Desert, Vernon	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pronghorn	Any Weapon	Plateau	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buck Deer	Muzzleloader	West Desert, Vernon	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pronghorn	Archery	Plateau	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Beaver (early)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pronghorn	Muzzleloader	Plateau	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek, South (late)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pronghorn	Any Weapon	Pine Valley	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek, South (early)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pronghorn	Any Weapon	North Slope, W. Daggett-Three Corners	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Muzzleloader	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek, South	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pronghorn	Any Weapon	San Rafael, North	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Archery	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek, South	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pronghorn	Any Weapon	South Slope, Bonanza-Diamond Mountain	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Book Cliffs, Little Creek (roadless)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pronghorn	Any Weapon	West Desert, Riverbed	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Cache, South (early)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pronghorn	Any Weapon	SW Desert	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Cache, North (early)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Moose		Ogden	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Central Mountains, Manti (early)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Moose		North Slope, Summit	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Central Mountains, Manti (late)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Moose		Wasatch Mountains	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Archery	Central Mountains, Manti	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Moose		Cache	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Muzzleloader	Central Mountains, Manti	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bison		Henry Mountains, Hunter's Choice (early)	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Muzzleloader	Central Mountains, Nebo	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Black Bear		Wasatch Mtns West (Spring)	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Archery	Central Mountains, Nebo	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Black Bear		La Sal, La Sal Mountains-Dolores Triangle (Spring)	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Central Mountains, Nebo (early)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Black Bear		Nine Mine, Anthro-Range Creek (Spring)	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Archery	Fillmore, Pahvant	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Black Bear		Bookcliffs (Spring)	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Fillmore, Pahvant (late)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Black Bear		San Juan (Spring)	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Fillmore, Pahvant (early)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cougar		Beaver	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	La Sal, La Sal Mountains (early)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cougar		Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Archery	Monroe	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cougar		Ogden	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Monroe (early)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cougar		Plateau-Boulder	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Mt Dutton (late)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cougar		Cache	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Mt Dutton (early)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cougar		Central Mountains, Northeast Manti	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Muzzleloader	Mt Dutton	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cougar		Central Mountains, Nebo-West Face	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Archery	Mt Dutton	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cougar		San Rafael, South	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	North Slope, Three Corners	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Desert Bighorn Sheep		Book Cliffs, South (Rattlesnake)	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Panguitch Lake (late)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rocky Mtn Bighorn Sheep		Stansbury Mountains	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Archery	Panguitch Lake	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rocky Mtn Goat		Ogden-Willard Peak (Female Only)	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Panguitch Lake (early)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rocky Mtn Goat		Beaver	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Archery	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rocky Mtn Goat		No. Slope/So. Slope, High Uintahs Central	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits (early)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Turkey		Northern Region	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lakes (early)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Turkey		Northeast Region	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lakes (late)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Turkey		Central Region	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Archery	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lakes	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Turkey		Southern Region	\$5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bull Elk	Any Weapon	S.W. Desert (early)	\$5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Turkey		Southeast Region	\$5

WHCE is not responsible for incomplete, missing, or illegible information on this paper application. TOTAL Amount Due: \$ _____

NOTES:

Attachment 4

2012 Draw Permit Statistics

Applicant by Area Statistics						
Species	Location	Type	Weapon	Applicants	Units Avail.	Odds 1 in:
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	6530	9	726
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	Limited Entry	Archery	2788	4	697
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	Limited Entry	Muzzleloader	3198	4	800
Buck Deer	Cache, Crawford Mountain	Limited Entry	Muzzleloader	2027	1	2027
Buck Deer	Fillmore, Oak Creek	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	2764	1	2764
Buck Deer	Henry Mountains	Premium Limited Entry	Premium Any Weapon	8646	2	4323
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Limited Entry	Premium Any Weapon	6271	4	1568
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Limited Entry	Premium Archery	2604	2	1302
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Limited Entry	Premium Muzzleloader	3200	2	1600
Buck Deer	San Juan, Elk Ridge	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	3867	1	3867
Buck Deer	South Slope, Diamond Mtn.	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	2876	2	1438
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	4392	3	1464
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Limited Entry	Archery	1710	2	855
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Limited Entry	Muzzleloader	2224	2	1112
Bull Elk	Beaver	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (early)	2997	1	2997
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek - South	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (late)	2221	1	2221
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek - South	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (early)	3557	2	1779
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek - South	Limited Entry	Muzzleloader	1829	1	1829
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek - South	Limited Entry	Archery	1663	2	832
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Little Creek (roadless)	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	2276	2	1138
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (early)	2036	1	2036
Bull Elk	Cache, North	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (early)	1734	1	1734
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (early)	3862	5	772
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (late)	2238	3	746
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Limited Entry	Archery	1792	4	448
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Limited Entry	Muzzleloader	1838	3	613
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Nebo	Limited Entry	Muzzleloader	1322	3	441
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Nebo	Limited Entry	Archery	1175	2	588
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Nebo	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (early)	2086	3	695
Bull Elk	Fillmore, Pahvant	Limited Entry	Archery	2067	1	2067
Bull Elk	Fillmore, Pahvant	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (late)	2874	2	1437
Bull Elk	Fillmore, Pahvant	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (early)	4454	1	4454
Bull Elk	La Sal, La Sal Mountains	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (early)	2053	1	2053
Bull Elk	Monroe	Limited Entry	Archery	1864	1	1864
Bull Elk	Monroe	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (early)	4030	2	2015
Bull Elk	Mt. Dutton	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (late)	2031	2	1016
Bull Elk	Mt. Dutton	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (early)	2898	2	1449
Bull Elk	Mt. Dutton	Limited Entry	Muzzleloader	1505	1	1505
Bull Elk	Mt. Dutton	Limited Entry	Archery	1386	2	693
Bull Elk	North Slope, Three Corners	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	1895	1	1895
Bull Elk	Panguitch Lake	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (late)	1430	1	1430
Bull Elk	Panguitch Lake	Limited Entry	Archery	1156	1	1156
Bull Elk	Panguitch Lake	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (early)	2004	2	1002
Bull Elk	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits	Limited Entry	Archery	1370	1	1370
Bull Elk	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (early)	2484	2	1242
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (early)	2482	2	1241
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (late)	1685	1	1685
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Limited Entry	Archery	1296	2	648
Bull Elk	S.W. Desert	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (early)	2442	1	2442
Bull Elk	S.W. Desert	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (late)	1777	1	1777
Bull Elk	San Juan	Limited Entry	Archery	2208	1	2208
Bull Elk	San Juan	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (early)	4629	2	2315
Bull Elk	South Slope, Diamond Mountain	Limited Entry	Archery	1089	1	1089
Bull Elk	South Slope, Diamond Mountain	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (early)	2000	2	1000
Bull Elk	West Desert, Deep Creek	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	1788	1	1788
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mountains	Limited Entry	Any Weapon (early)	4997	6	833
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mountains	Limited Entry	Archery	2270	4	568
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mountains	Limited Entry	Muzzleloader	2389	3	796
Pronghorn	Book Cliffs, South (Cisco)	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	611	1	611
Pronghorn	Cache, North Rich	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	767	2	384
Pronghorn	Mt. Dutton/Paunsaugunt	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	474	1	474
Pronghorn	Plateau	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	969	6	162
Pronghorn	Plateau	Limited Entry	Archery	233	1	233
Pronghorn	Plateau	Limited Entry	Muzzleloader	194	1	194
Pronghorn	Pine Valley	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	309	1	309
Pronghorn	North Slope, W Daggett-Three Corners	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	593	1	593
Pronghorn	San Rafael, North	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	775	2	388
Pronghorn	South Slope, Bonanza-Diamond Mtn.	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	592	1	592
Pronghorn	West Desert, Riverbed	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	909	1	909
Pronghorn	SW Desert	Limited Entry	Any Weapon	729	1	729
Bull Moose	Ogden	Once in a Lifetime		2910	2	1455
Bull Moose	North Slope, Summit	Once in a Lifetime		3156	1	3156
Bull Moose Non-Resident Only	North Slope, West Daggett/Three Corners	Once in a Lifetime		715	1	715
Bull Moose	Wasatch Mountains	Once in a Lifetime		4010	1	4010
Bull Moose	Cache	Once in a Lifetime		2605	1	2605
Bison	Henry Mountains - Hunters Choice (early)	Once in a Lifetime		4482	1	4482
Bison Non-Resident Only	Henry Mountains - Hunters Choice (late)	Once in a Lifetime		668	1	668
Black Bear	Wasatch Mtns West (Spring)	Limited Entry		700	1	700
Black Bear	La Sal, La Sal Mountains-Dolores Triangle (Spring)	Limited Entry		571	1	571
Black Bear	Nine Mine, Anthro-Range Creek (Spring)	Limited Entry		369	1	369

Black Bear	Bookcliffs (Spring)	Limited Entry	847	1	847
Black Bear	San Juan (Spring)	Limited Entry	689	1	689
Cougar	Beaver	Limited Entry	281	1	281
Cougar	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek	Limited Entry	414	1	414
Cougar	Ogden	Limited Entry	267	1	267
Cougar	Plateau-Boulder	Limited Entry	201	1	201
Cougar	Cache	Limited Entry	270	1	270
Cougar	Central Mountains, Northeast Manti	Limited Entry	324	1	324
Cougar	Central Mountains, Nebo-West Face	Limited Entry	231	1	231
Desert Bighorn Sheep Non-Resident Only	San Rafael, Dirty Devil	Once in a Lifetime	789	1	789
Desert Bighorn Sheep	San Rafael, South	Once in a Lifetime	4456	1	4456
Rocky Mtn. Bighorn Sheep Non-Resident	Box Eider, Newfoundland Mtn.	Once in a Lifetime	772	1	772
Rocky Mtn. Bighorn Sheep	Book Cliffs, South (Rattlesnake)	Once in a Lifetime	4489	1	4489
Rocky Mtn. Bighorn Sheep	Stansbury	Once in a Lifetime	3809	1	3809
Rocky Mtn. Goat	Ogden, Willard Peak (Female Goat Only)	Once in a Lifetime	2019	1	2019
Rocky Mtn. Goat	Beaver (early)	Once in a Lifetime	3112	1	3112
Rocky Mtn. Goat Non-Resident Only	No. Slope/So. Slope, High Uintahs West	Once in a Lifetime	655	1	655
Rocky Mtn. Goat	No. Slope/So. Slope, High Uintahs Central	Once in a Lifetime	2744	1	2744
Turkey	Northern Region	Public Lands	403	6	67
Turkey	Northeast Region	Public Lands	320	6	53
Turkey	Central Region	Public Lands	551	6	92
Turkey	Southern Region	Public Lands	371	6	62
Turkey	Southeast Region	Public Lands	239	5	48

2013 Convention Permits by Species and Residency

8/9/2012

		TOTAL PERMITS		
		Res	NonRes	Total
Grand Total		145	55	200

Species	Area	Condition	PERMITS		
			Res	NonRes	Total
Bison	Henry Mountains	Hunters Choice Early	1	0	1
Bison	Henry Mountains	Hunters Choice Late	0	1	1
Bison	Henry Mountains	Cow Only	1	0	1
TOTAL			2	1	3

Species	Area	Condition	PERMITS		
			Res	NonRes	Total
Black Bear	Wasatch Mtns West	Spring	1	1	2
Black Bear	La Sal, La Sal Mountains-Dolores Triangle	Spring	1	1	2
Black Bear	Nine Mine, Anthro-Range Creek	Spring	1	0	1
Black Bear	Bookcliffs	Spring	1	0	1
Black Bear	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowitz	Spring	1	0	1
Black Bear	Nine Mile	Fall	1	0	1
Black Bear	S. Slope, Bonanza/Diamond Mtn.	Spring	1	0	1
Black Bear	Central Mountains, Manti North	Spring	1	0	1
Black Bear	San Juan	Spring	1	1	2
TOTAL			9	3	12

Species	Area	Condition	PERMITS		
			Res	NonRes	Total
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	Any Weapon	7	3	10
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	Archery	3	1	4
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	Muzzleloader	3	1	4
Buck Deer	Henry Mountains	Premium Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Deer	Henry Mountains	Management Buck	1	1	2
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Any Weapon	2	1	3
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Archery	1	1	2
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Premium Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	Management Buck	1	0	1
Buck Deer	San Juan, Elk Ridge	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Deer	South Slope, Diamond Mtn.	Any Weapon	1	1	2
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Any Weapon	4	1	5
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Archery	1	1	2
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	Muzzleloader	1	1	2
TOTAL			28	12	40

Species	Area	Condition	PERMITS		
			Res	NonRes	Total
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek-South	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek, South	Any Weapon (early)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek, South	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Little Creek (roadless)	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Any Weapon (early)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, North	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Any Weapon (early)	4	2	6
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Any Weapon (late)	2	1	3
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Archery	2	2	4
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Manti	Muzzleloader	1	1	2

Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Nebo	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Central Mountains, Nebo	Any Weapon	1	1	2
Bull Elk	La Sal, La Sal Mountains	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Mt. Dutton	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Mt. Dutton	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Mt. Dutton	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Panguitch Lake	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Any Weapon (early)	2	1	3
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Archery	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake-Thousand Lake	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Bull Elk	S.W. Desert	Any Weapon (early)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	S.W. Desert	Any Weapon (late)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	S.W. Desert	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	San Juan	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mountains	Any Weapon (early)	6	4	10
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mountains	Archery	5	3	8
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mountains	Muzzleloader	3	2	5
TOTAL			48	22	70

Species	Area	Condition	PERMITS		
			Res	NonRes	Total
Bull Moose	Wasatch Mountains		1	1	2
TOTAL			1	1	2

Species	Area	Condition	PERMITS		
			Res	NonRes	Total
Cougar	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek		1	0	1
Cougar	Ogden		1	0	1
Cougar	Plateau-Boulder		1	0	1
Cougar	Cache		1	0	1
Cougar	Central Mountain, Nebo		1	1	1
Cougar	Central Mountains, Northwest Manti		1	1	2
Cougar	Central Mountains, Nebo-West Face		1	1	2
Cougar	Pine Valley		1	0	1
Cougar	Mt. Dutton		0	1	1
TOTAL			8	4	11

Species	Area	Condition	PERMITS		
			Res	NonRes	Total
Desert Bighorn Sheep	Zion		0	1	1
Desert Bighorn Sheep	San Rafael, South		1	0	1
TOTAL			1	1	2

Species	Area	Condition	PERMITS		
			Res	NonRes	Total
Pronghorn	Cache, North Rich	Any Weapon	2	1	3
Pronghorn	Mt. Dutton/Paunsaugunt	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Pronghorn	Plateau	Archery	1	0	1
Pronghorn	Plateau	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Pronghorn	Plateau	Any Weapon	1	1	2
Pronghorn	San Rafael, North	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Pronghorn	West Desert, Riverbed	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Pronghorn	SW Desert	Any Weapon	2	1	3
TOTAL			10	3	13

Species	Area	Condition	PERMITS		
			Res	NonRes	Total

Rocky Mtn. Bighorn Sheep	Box Elder, Newfoundland Mtn.		1	0	1
Rocky Mtn. Bighorn Sheep	Nine Mile, Range Creek		0	1	1
TOTAL			1	1	2

Species	Area	Condition	PERMITS		
			Res	NonRes	Total
Rocky Mtn. Goat	Ogden, Willard Peak (Female Goat Only)		0	1	1
Rocky Mtn. Goat	Beaver (early)		1	0	1
Rocky Mtn. Goat	No. Slope/So. Slope, High Uintahs West		1	0	1
Rocky Mtn. Goat	Ogden, Willard Peak (late)		0	1	1
TOTAL			2	2	4

Species	Area	Condition	PERMITS		
			Res	NonRes	Total
Turkey	Northern Region		7	1	8
Turkey	Northeast Region		7	1	8
Turkey	Central Region		7	1	8
Turkey	Southern Region		7	1	8
Turkey	Southeast Region		7	1	8
TOTAL			35	5	40

Notes:

The following proposal
is being presented by
Tye Boulter with the
United Wildlife
Cooperative.

R657. Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources.

R657-55. Wildlife Convention Permits.

R657-55-1. Purpose and Authority.

(1) Under the authority of Sections 23-14-18 and 23-14-19 of the Utah Code, this rule provides the standards and requirements for issuing wildlife convention permits.

(2) Wildlife convention permits are authorized by the Wildlife Board and issued by the division to a qualified conservation organization for purposes of generating revenue to fund wildlife conservation activities and attracting a regional or national wildlife convention to Utah.

(3) The selected conservation organization will conduct a random drawing at a convention held in Utah to distribute the opportunity to receive wildlife convention permits.

(4) This rule is intended as authorization to issue one series of wildlife convention permits per year beginning in 2012 through 2016 to one qualified conservation organization.

R657-55-2. Definitions.

(1) Terms used in this rule are defined in Section 23-13-2.

(2) In addition:

(a) "Conservation organization" means a nonprofit chartered institution, corporation, foundation, or association founded for the purpose of promoting wildlife conservation.

(b) "Special nonresident convention permit" means one wildlife convention permit for each once-in-a-lifetime species that is only available to a nonresident hunter legally eligible to hunt in Utah.

(c) "Wildlife Convention" means a multi-day event held within the state of Utah that is sponsored by multiple wildlife conservation organizations as their national or regional convention or event that is open to the general public and designed to draw nationwide attendance of more than 10,000 individuals. The wildlife convention may include wildlife conservation fund raising activities, outdoor exhibits, retail marketing of outdoor products and services, public awareness programs, and other similar activities.

(d) "Wildlife Convention Audit" means an annual review by the division of the project expenditures and convention permit accounts, and the conservation organization's processes used to handle applications for convention permits and conduct the drawing, and the protocols associated with collecting and using client data.

(e) "Wildlife Convention Permit" means a permit which:

(i) is authorized by the Wildlife Board to be issued to successful applicants through a drawing or random selection process conducted at a Utah wildlife convention; and

(ii) allows the permittee to hunt for the designated species on the designated unit during the respective season for each species as authorized by the Wildlife Board.

(f) "Wildlife Convention Permit series" means a single package of permits to be determined by the Wildlife Board for:

(i) deer;

(ii) elk;

(iii) pronghorn;

(iv) moose;

(v) bison;

(vi) rocky mountain goat;

(vii) desert bighorn sheep;

(viii) rocky mountain bighorn sheep;

(ix) wild turkey;

(x) cougar; or

(xi) black bear.

(g) "Secured Opportunity" means the opportunity to participate in a specified hunt that is secured by an eligible applicant through the drawing process.

(h) "Successful Applicant" means an individual selected to receive a wildlife convention permit through the drawing process.

R657-55-3. Wildlife Convention Permit Allocation.

(1) The Wildlife Board may allocate wildlife convention permits by May 1 of the year preceding the wildlife convention.

(2) Wildlife convention permits shall be issued as a single series to one conservation organization.

(3) The number of wildlife convention permits authorized by the Wildlife Board shall be based on:

(a) the species population trend, size, and distribution to protect the long-term health of the population;

(b) the hunting and viewing opportunity for the general public, both short and long term; and

(c) a percentage of the permits available to nonresidents in the annual big game drawings matched by a proportionate number of resident permits.

(4) Wildlife convention permits, including special nonresident convention permits, shall not exceed 200 total permits.

(5) Wildlife convention permits designated for the convention each year shall be deducted from the number of public drawing permits.

R657-55-4. Obtaining Authority to Distribute Wildlife Convention Permit Series.

(1) The wildlife convention permit series is issued for a period of five years as provided in Section R657-55-1(4).

(2) The wildlife convention permit series is available to eligible conservation organizations for distribution through a drawing or other random selection process held at a wildlife convention in Utah open to the public.

(3) Conservation organizations may apply for the wildlife convention permit series by sending an application to the division between August 1 and September 1, 2010.

(4) Each application must include:

(a) the name, address and telephone number of the conservation organization;

(b) a description of the conservation organization's mission statement;

(c) the name of the president or other individual responsible for the administrative operations of the conservation organization; and

(d) a detailed business plan describing how the wildlife convention will take place and how the wildlife convention permit drawing procedures will be carried out.

(5) An incomplete or incorrect application may be rejected.

(6) The division shall recommend to the Wildlife Board which conservation organization may receive the wildlife convention permit series based on:

(a) the business plan for the convention and drawing procedures contained in the application; and

(b) the conservation organization's, including its constituent entities, ability, including past performance in marketing conservation permits under Rule R657-41, to effectively plan and complete the wildlife convention.

(7) The Wildlife Board shall make the final assignment of the wildlife convention permit series based on the:

(a) division's recommendation;

(b) applicant conservation organization's commitment to use convention permit handling fee revenue to benefit protected wildlife in Utah;

(c) historical contribution of the applicant conservation organization, including its constituent entities, to the conservation of wildlife in Utah; and

(d) previous performance of the applicant conservation organization, including its constituent entities.

(8) The conservation organization receiving the wildlife convention permit series must:

(a) require each wildlife convention permit applicant to verify they possess a current Utah hunting or combination license before allowing them to apply for a convention permit;

(b) select successful applicants for the wildlife convention permits by drawing or other random selection process in accordance with law, provisions of this rule, proclamation, and order of the Wildlife Board;

(c) allow applicants to apply for the wildlife convention permits without purchasing admission to the wildlife convention;

(d) notify the division of the successful applicant of each wildlife convention permit within 10 days of the applicant's selection;

(e) maintain records demonstrating that the drawing was conducted fairly; and

(f) submit to an annual wildlife convention audit by a division-appointed auditor.

(9) The division shall issue the appropriate wildlife convention permit to the designated successful applicant after:

(a) completion of the random selection process;

(b) verification of the recipient being found eligible for the permit; and

(c) payment of the appropriate permit fee is received by the division.

(10) The division and the conservation organization receiving the wildlife convention permit series shall enter into a contract, including the provisions outlined in this rule.

(11) If the conservation organization awarded the wildlife convention permit series withdraws before the end of the 5 year period, any remaining co-participants with the conservation organization may be given an opportunity to assume the contract and to distribute the convention permit series consistent with the contract and this rule for the remaining years left in the 5 year period, provided:

(a) The original contracted conservation organization submits a certified letter to the division identifying that it will no longer be participating in the convention.

(b) The partner or successor conservation organization files an application with the division as provided in subsection 4 for the remaining period.

(c) The successor conservation organization submits its application request at least 60 days prior to the next scheduled convention so that the wildlife board can evaluate the request under the criteria in this section.

(d) The Wildlife Board authorizes the successor conservation organization to assume the contract and complete the balance of the 5 year convention permit period.

(12) The division may suspend or terminate the conservation organization's authority to distribute wildlife convention permits at any time during the five year award term for:

(a) violating any of the requirements set forth in this rule or the contract; or

(b) failing to bring or organize a wildlife convention in Utah, as described in the business plan under R657-55-4(4)(d), in any given year.

R657-55-5. Hunter Application Procedures.

(1) Any hunter legally eligible to hunt in Utah may apply for a wildlife convention permit except that only a nonresident of Utah may apply for a special nonresident convention permit.

(2) Any handling fee assessed by the conservation organization to process applications shall not exceed \$5 per application submitted at the convention.

(3)(a) Except as provided in Subsection (3)(b), applicants must validate their application in person at the wildlife convention to be eligible to participate in the random drawing process, for wildlife convention permits, and no person may submit an application in behalf of another.

(b) An applicant that is a member of the United States Armed Forces and unable to attend the wildlife convention as a result of being deployed or mobilized in the interest of national defense or a national emergency is not required to validate their application in person; provided convention administrators are furnished a copy of the written deployment or mobilization orders and the orders identify:

(i) the branch of the United States Armed forces from which the applicant is deployed or mobilized;

(ii) the location where the applicant is deployed or mobilized;

(iii) the date the applicant is required to report to duty; and

(iv) the nature and length of the applicant's deployment or mobilization.

(c) The conservation organization shall maintain a record, including copies of military orders, of all applicants that are not required to validate their applications in person pursuant to Subsection (3)(b), and submit to a ~~D~~ivision audit of these records as part of its annual audit under R657-55-4(8)(f).

(4) Applicants may apply for each individual hunt for which they are eligible.

(5) Applicants may apply only once for each hunt, regardless of the number of permits for that hunt.

(6) Applicants must submit an application for each desired hunt.

(7) Applicants must possess a current Utah hunting or combination license in order to apply for a permit.

(8) The conservation organization shall advertise, accept, and process applications for wildlife convention permits and conduct the drawing in compliance with this rule and all other applicable laws.

R657-55-6. Convention Permit Funds and Reporting.

(1) Within 30 days of the last day of the wildlife convention, the conservation organization must submit to the division:

(a) a final report on the distribution of permits;

(b) the total number of applications for each permit;

(c) the total funds raised through the handling fees assessed by the conservation organization to process applications;

(d) the funds due to the division; and

(e) a report on the status of each project funded in whole or in part with retained convention permit revenue.

(2) Permits shall not be issued until the permit fees are paid to the division.

(3) (a) Conservation organizations shall remit to the division by September 1 of each year 30% of the total revenue generated through the handling fees assessed by the conservation organization to process applications.

(b) The permit revenue payable to the division under Subsection (3) (a), excluding accrued interest, is the property of the division and may not be used by conservation organizations for projects or any other purpose.

(c) The permit revenue must be placed in a federally insured account promptly upon receipt and remain in the account until remitted to the division on or before September 1 of each year.

(d) The permit revenue payable to the division under this subsection shall not be used by the conservation organization as collateral or commingled in the same account with the organization's operation and administration funds, so that the separate identity of the permit revenue is not lost.

(e) Failure to remit 30% of the total permit revenue to the division by the September 1 deadline may result in criminal prosecution under Title 76, Chapter 6, Part 4 of the Utah Code, and may further disqualify the conservation organization from obtaining any future convention permits.

(4) A conservation organization may retain 70% of the revenue generated through the handling fees assessed by the conservation organization as follows:

(a) 10% of the revenue may be withheld and used by the conservation organization for administrative expenses.

(b) 60% of the revenue may be retained and used by the conservation organization only for eligible projects as provided in subsections (i) through (ix).

(i) eligible projects include habitat improvement, habitat acquisition, transplants, targeted education efforts and other projects providing a substantial benefit to species of wildlife for which convention permits are issued.

(ii) retained revenue shall not be committed to or expended on any eligible project without first obtaining the division director's written concurrence.

(iii) retained revenue shall not be used on any project that does not provide a substantial and direct benefit to convention permit species located in Utah.

(iv) cash donations to the Wildlife Habitat Account created under Section 23-19-43, Division Species Enhancement Funds, or the Conservation Permit Fund shall be considered an eligible project and do not require the division director's approval, provided the donation is made with instructions that it be used for species of wildlife for which convention permits are issued.

(v) retained revenue shall not be used on any project that is inconsistent with division policy, including feeding programs, depredation management, or predator control.

(vi) retained revenue under this subsection must be placed in a federally insured account. All interest revenue earned thereon may be retained and used by the conservation organization for administrative expenses.

(vii) retained revenue shall not be used by the conservation organization as collateral or commingled in the same account with the organization's operation and administration funds, so that the separate identity of the retained revenue is not lost.

(viii) retained revenue must be completely expended on or committed to approved eligible projects by September 1, two years following the year in which the relevant convention permits are awarded to the conservation organization by the Wildlife Board. Failure to commit or expend the retained revenue by the September 1 deadline will disqualify the conservation organization from obtaining any future convention permits until the unspent retained revenue is committed to an approved eligible project.

(ix) all records and receipts for projects under this subsection must be retained by the conservation organization for a period not less than five years, and shall be produced to the division for inspection upon request.

(5)(a) Conservation organizations accepting permits shall be subject to annual audits on project expenditures and convention permit accounts.

(b) The division shall perform annual audits on project expenditures and convention permit accounts.

R657-55-~~67~~. Drawing Procedures.

(1) A random drawing or selection process must be conducted for each wildlife convention permit.

(2) No preference or bonus points shall be awarded in the drawings.

(3) Waiting periods do not apply, except any person who obtains a wildlife convention permit for a once-in-a-lifetime species is subject to the once-in-a-lifetime restrictions applicable to obtaining a subsequent permit for the same species through a division application and drawing process, as provided in Rule R657-5 and the proclamation of the Wildlife Board for taking big game.

(4) No predetermined quotas or restrictions shall be imposed in the application or selection process for wildlife convention permits between resident and nonresident applicants, except that special nonresident convention permits may only be awarded to a nonresident of Utah.

(5) Drawings will be conducted within five days of the close of the convention.

(6) Applicants do not have to be present at the drawing to be awarded a wildlife convention permit.

(7) The conservation organization shall identify all eligible alternates for each wildlife convention permit and provide the division with a finalized list. This list will be maintained by the conservation organization until all permits are issued.

(8) The division shall contact successful applicants by phone or mail, and the conservation organization shall post the name of all successful applicants on a designated website.

R657-55-~~78~~. Issuance of Permits.

(1) The division shall provide a wildlife convention permit to the successful applicant as designated by the conservation organization.

(2) The division must provide a wildlife convention permit to each successful applicant, except as otherwise provided in this rule.

(3) The division shall provide each successful applicant a letter indicating the permit secured in the drawing, the appropriate fee owed the division, and the date the fee is due.

(4) Successful applicants must provide the permit fee payment in full to the division and will be issued the designated wildlife convention permit upon receipt of the appropriate permit fee and providing proof they possess a current Utah hunting or combination license.

(5) Residents will pay resident permit fees and nonresidents will pay nonresident permit fees.

(6) Applicants are eligible to obtain only one permit per species, except as provided in Rule R657-5, but no restrictions apply on obtaining permits for multiple species.

(7) In an applicant is selected for more than one convention permit for the same species, the ~~D~~division will contact the applicant to determine which permit the applicant selects.

(a) The applicant must select the permit of choice within five days of receiving notification.

(b) If the ~~D~~division is unable to contact the applicant within 5 days, the ~~D~~division will issue to the applicant the permit with the most difficult drawings odds based on drawing results from the ~~D~~division's Big Game drawing for the preceding year.

(c) Permits not issued to the applicant will go to the next person on the alternate drawing list for that permit.

(8) Any successful applicant who fails to satisfy the following requirements will be ineligible to receive the wildlife convention permit and the next drawing alternate for that permit will be selected.

(a) The applicant fails to return the appropriate permit fee in full by the date provided in Subsection (3) or

(b) The applicant did not possess a valid Utah hunting or combination license at the time the convention permit application was submitted and the permit received.

~~R657-55-89~~. Surrender or Transfer of Wildlife Convention Permits.

(1)(a) If a person selected to receive a wildlife convention permit is also successful in obtaining a Utah limited entry permit for the same species in the same year or obtaining a general permit for a male animal of the same species in the same year, that person cannot possess both permits and must select the permit of choice.

(b) In the event the secured opportunity is willingly surrendered before the permit is issued, the next eligible

applicant on the alternate drawing list will be selected to receive the secured opportunity.

(c) In the event the wildlife convention permit is surrendered, the next eligible applicant on the alternate drawing list for that permit will be selected to receive the permit, and the permit fee may be refunded, as provided in Sections 23-19-38, 23-19-38.2, and R657-42-5.

(2) A person selected by a conservation organization to receive a wildlife convention permit, may not sell or transfer the permit, or any rights thereunder to another person in accordance with Section 23-19-1.

(3) If a person is successful in obtaining a wildlife convention permit but is legally ineligible to hunt in Utah the next eligible applicant on the alternate drawing list for that permit will be selected to receive the permit.

R657-55-910. Using a Wildlife Convention Permit.

(1) A wildlife convention permit allows the recipient to:

- (a) take only the species for which the permit is issued;
- (b) take only the species and sex printed on the permit;

and

(c) take the species only in the area and during the season specified on the permit.

(2) The recipient of a wildlife convention permit is subject to all of the provisions of Title 23, Wildlife Resources Code, and the rules and proclamations of the Wildlife Board for taking and pursuing wildlife.

R657-55-11. Failure to Comply.

Any conservation organization administratively or criminally found in violation of this rule or the Wildlife Resources Code may be suspended from participation in the convention permit program and required to surrender all wildlife convention permits.



GARY R. HERBERT
Governor

GREGORY S. BELL
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Wildlife Resources

JAMES F. KARPOWITZ
Division Director

August 9, 2012

Del Brady
Chairman of the Utah Wildlife Board

Dear Del:

I would like to nominate the following individuals to fill the identified vacancies in the table below for our CWMU Advisory Committee. All vacancies on the committee were created when their term limits were completed.

New Committee Member	Committee Member Replaced	Representing	Term Limit
Wade Heaton	Dan Jorgensen	CWMU's	4 year
Gary Nielson	Fred Oswald	RAC's	4 year

Sincerely,

James F. Karpowitz

James F. Karpowitz
Director



Broadmouth CWMU Request for Additional Bull Moose Permit – to be presented by Garet Jones

Broadmouth CWMU is one of the oldest CWMU's in the state of Utah. We have worked with the Division of Wildlife Resources for close to twenty years.

Last July when sitting down with our state biologist Darren DeBloois we had talked about adjusting the number of moose tags. He had mentioned that the state may be able to drop a tag if we dropped a tag. I mentioned to him that it would be preferable to drop the tags later on in the three year cycle. He said that he would check and get back to me. I never heard from him so I proceeded with what we had last talked about. We sold the two tags like we have for many years and did not find out until a month ago that one of the tags had been taken away.

Our CWMU works on a very low margin of profit. Reimbursing the hunter his hunt money as well as the negative reviews this would produce for our hunting company would be devastating to us. In today's world of online communication and networking it is so easy for one unhappy person to do untold amounts of damage to a company's reputation in a matter of seconds. It is so close to the hunting season the hunter without a doubt has made airline preparations, as well as time off work, and has looked forward to this hunt for many months. He will be, as one could imagine, very disappointed and mad.

With the tag allotment as is we are looking at a 55% private to 45% public split. With the addition of one tag to private we could get the split to the exactly desired 60% private to 40% public. The detailed split looks like this: first year (2,2), second year (2,1), and the last year (2,1). This is the same amount of animals we have harvested for many years and feel that it is a sustainable number of moose for our CWMU. If you look at our average age of moose killed we are very good, if not one of the best, for harvesting mature animals.

We regret needing to make these changes so late. It seems like the only solution to a misunderstanding. Thank you for your consideration.



GARY R. HERBERT
Governor

GREGORY S. BELL
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Wildlife Resources

JAMES F. KARPOWITZ
Division Director

MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 26, 2012
TO: Utah Wildlife Board
FROM: Staci Coons, Chair -Certification Review Committee

RE: Variance Request from M. Shane Richins (Scales and Tails Utah) for the possession and exhibit of one Morelet's Crocodile for commercial and educational purposes.

The Certification Review Committee met July 16, 2012, to discuss the above-mentioned variance request to Rule R657-53, for the possession and exhibit of one Morelet's Crocodile for commercial and educational purposes.

In attendance were: M. Shane Richins (Scales and Tails Utah); Anis Aoude for Kevin Bunnell, Wildlife Section Chief; Roger Wilson, Aquatic Section Chief; Kenny Johnson for Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Chief; Mike Fowlks, Law Enforcement Chief; Felicia Alvarez for Robert Rolfs, Department of Health; Bruce King, Department of Agriculture; Drew Cushings, Aquatic Warmwater Coordinator; Suzanne McMullin, COR Specialist and Staci Coons, Administrative Rules Coordinator.

ANALYSIS

The committee evaluated the merits of the request based on the criteria established by the Wildlife Board in R657-53-11. Based upon the criteria established by the Wildlife Board, the analyses and recommendations of the committee are as follows:

1. **The health, welfare, and safety of the public** - The committee expressed no concerns over health, welfare, and safety of the public.
2. **The health, welfare, safety and genetic integrity of wildlife, domestic livestock, poultry and other animals** - The committee had no significant concerns with impacts on wildlife or domestic animals.
3. **The ecological and environmental impacts** - The committee had no concerns with ecological or environmental impacts.
4. **The suitability of the facilities** - The committee had no significant concerns with the suitability of facilities used to house the crocodile.
5. **Experience of the applicant for the proposed activity** - The committee had no concerns regarding the experience of the applicant for the proposed activity. The committee was impressed with the level of care provided to all the animals in their possession and the educational component that the applicant provides.



6. **The ecological and environmental impacts on other states** - The committee had no significant concerns with impacts of this request on other states.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee, after careful evaluation, recommends that the request be approved and that the following stipulations be made part of the Certificate of Registration:

1. The committee recommends approval for M. Shane Richins (Scales and Tails Utah) to possess and exhibit one Morelet's Crocodile with the stipulation that a written protocol for handling the crocodile at birthday parties be presented to the Division.
2. The committee recommends that the Morelet's Crocodile be obtained from a certified disease-free source.
3. The committee recommends that the Morelet's Crocodile is not to be handled by the general public and that the educational program Mr. Richins' offers will include information as to why crocodiles do not make good pets.
4. The committee recommends that the Morelet's Crocodile is used for educational purposes only and will not be used for propagation.
5. The committee recommends that the Certificate of Registration issued to Mr. Richins is not transferable and cannot be sold with his business.
6. The committee requires that Mr. Richins obtain a certificate of veterinary inspection from the Department of Agriculture for the importation of the Morelet's Crocodile and that all city, county and insurance needs continue to be current.
7. The committee recommends that Mr. Richins provide a written contingency plan for rotating animals out of his program when they become too large to handle to the Division.

cc: Certification Review Committee Members
M. Shane Richins

Scales and Tails Utah

Request for Morelet's Crocodile

Crocodylus moreletii

(801) 577-7182

3584 S. 1950 W.

West Valley, UT

84119

Request for permission to obtain and keep a Morelet's crocodile, *Crocodylus moreletii*

Since we already have permission for American alligators I thought they would be a good choice to compare the Morelet's crocodile's merits and drawbacks to.

1. Morelet's crocodiles do not get as big as alligators. This is an advantage to us because it makes it easier for us to house it long term. We already get yearly experience building safe enclosures when we do our out of state training. We have been and expect to continue to be very effective at building the enclosures for our alligators. This should prove similar but at a smaller scale.
2. Morelet's crocodiles are less cold tolerant than alligators. If an alligator can't survive a Utah winter in the wild then a Morelet's has even less chance. This eliminates the risk of this animal becoming potentially invasive.
3. Diversifying our crocodilians will give us greater ability to expand our educational programs within this amazing group. It will also give us a better chance at competing for bigger events against out of state companies, in the long term.
4. Our cleaning procedures would be the same as for our alligators. When young and in a smaller enclosure we do a complete water change between once and twice a week depending on need. At least twice a month we do a thorough scrub of the enclosure using a bleach solution. When it gets bigger we will add filtration and reduce the water changes but keep the bleachings.
5. As a general rule crocodiles have a more aggressive temperament than alligators. Morelet's crocodiles tend to be on the milder side as crocodiles go. Individuals will vary in temperament. We view this to be the most significant difference in keeping the two.
 - a. Because of the proactive training policies we have in place, all of our current employees have worked with a morelet's crocodile.
 - b. Four of us have worked with adult crocodiles of much more aggressive species extensively.
 - c. We will be implementing a separate in house certification process for any employee to be allowed to handle the morelet's which will require passing the alligator certification then allowing time for experience with the smaller alligator for sufficient time to gain the next level of experience. This certification would require yearly recertification to account for the animal's growth.
6. We currently plan to obtain the animal from Danny Conner of Danny Conner's reptile adventures, where we go every year for our crocodile training (training that is not required for our C.O.R. but which we feel benefits our company anyway).

In House Alligator Certification

Small alligator:

1. Employee must want to learn the alligators
 - a. Employees will never be punished for not wanting to work the alligators or changing their minds about being willing to work the alligators.
2. Employee may not work alligators outside of the shop or by themselves for at least three months after hire. (this gives us a chance for more in depth evaluation of the employee and to give them adequate training)
3. During the three months the employee will work the small alligator while under the supervision of senior employees who are alligator certified.
4. When the three months is up all employees who are currently alligator certified have a meeting to approve or extend training or deny permission for the new employee to handle the small alligator.
 - a. Approval to handle the alligator must be unanimous.

Large alligator:

1. Employee must show interest in progressing to the larger alligator.
2. An additional month, minimum, is required before approval can be granted.
3. During this month the employee gains experience with the bigger alligator under the supervision of senior employees who are certified to work the big alligator.
4. All employees must again meet to approve, extend training, or deny permission to work with the larger alligator.
 - a. Again, approval must be unanimous.

Proposed Morelet's crocodile:

1. While still small enough the requirements will be the same as for the small alligator. At this size the handling will be very much like handling the alligator.
2. As size and aggression dictate its status will change to mirror the large alligator.
3. Eventually we will require an additional month of training specifically with the crocodile.
4. Again, all employees currently crocodile certified will have to meet to approve, deny, or extend training.
5. The first employees to be approved will have to go through training in Texas under Danny Conner and be approved by Danny and myself. These employees will then be in a position to approve subsequent employees.

Alligator cleaning procedures

These are different for each gator as their enclosures are different

Small Alligator

We do a complete water change whenever the water is visibly dirty. This ends up being once and sometimes twice per week.

At least twice a month we wipe out the aquarium and the cage furniture with bleach.

Bigger Alligator

This enclosure is much bigger so we run a filter on it to lengthen the time between water changes.

The filter media is changed every few days when it gets dirty enough to decrease effectiveness. The media is then bleached.

We do a complete water change every couple of weeks

Because of the longer time between water changes we wipe this enclosure down with bleach each time we do a water change.

I, Delyle Billings, landlord to property 3588 S. 1950 W. #13,
West Valley City, UT 84119, where Scales & Tails Utah currently resides, give my
permission for said company to obtain and house a Morelet's Crocodile at this
location.

Delyle Billings
Signed

6-11-12
Date



Scales and Tails Inc.
Attn: Mr. Richens
3588 S. 1950 West Ste.13
West Valley City, Ut. 84119

May 18, 2012

Mr. Shane Richens,

West Valley Animal Services has reviewed your request to obtain an additional large reptile for your business. We have approved your request for a Morelet's Crocodile upon the following conditions.

- (A) You will need to contact Utah Division of Wildlife Services and obtain a state permit specific to that animal.
- (B) All employees must be certified in safe handling of said animal per the information your company provided to us.
- (C) This approval allows your company to have only one Morelet's Crocodile in your possession at any time.

Once you have acquired the permit from Division of Wildlife Services please send a copy for our records to the following address:

West Valley City Animal Services
4522 W. 3500 South
West Valley City, Ut. 84120
Attn: Nathan Beckstead

Respectfully,

Nathan Beckstead
Field Supervisor
West Valley City Taylorsville
Animal Services

Cc: Kelly Davis