

Central Region Advisory Council
Central Region Conference Center
1115 N. Main St, Springville
April 27, 2010 @ 6:30 p.m.

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

MOTION: To accept the agenda and minutes as presented
Passed unanimously

Antlerless Addendum, Rule and Permit Recommendations for 2010

MOTION: To exclude late cow elk hunts in Sanpete County (that are designed to target depredation problems and to move elk off the highway) from early antlerless hunting opportunity (to take your cow elk while you are **rifle** hunting)
Passed 10 to 1

MOTION: To reduce permits on the Central Mountains, Nebo unit from 130 to 50 and end the late season cow hunt on that unit December 31st
Failed 6 to 5

MOTION: To accept the remainder of the antlerless recommendations as presented
Passed 8 to 3

Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2010

MOTION: To accept recommendation as presented
Passed unanimously

Emigration Canyon Boundary Proposal

MOTION: To accept the recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously

Habitat Management Plans

MOTION: Table this proposal until a public meeting can be held by the Division
Passed unanimously

Central Region Advisory Council
Central Region Conference Center
1115 N. Main St, Springville
April 27, 2010 @ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Micki Bailey, BLM
John Bair, Sportsmen
Matt Clark, Sportsmen
Larry Fitzgerald, Agriculture
Richard Hansen, At Large
George Holmes, Agriculture
Doug Jones, for Larry Velarde, Forest Service
Gary Nielson, Sportsmen, Vice Chair
Fred Oswald, Non-consumptive, Chair
Jay Price, Elected
Duane Smith, Non-consumptive
Allan Stevens, At Large

Members Absent

Byron Gunderson, At Large

-
- 1) **Approval of the Agenda and March 23, 2010 Minutes (Action)**
- Fred Oswald, RAC Chair

VOTING

Motion was made by John Bair to accept the minutes as transcribed

Seconded by Richard Hansen

Motion passed unanimously

Motion was made by Duane Smith to accept the agenda as written

Seconded by John Bair

Motion passed unanimously

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

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

Wildlife

- Completed antelope flights in the West Desert this week
- Monitoring sage-grouse leks, Strawberry and Vernon areas
- Bear dunning – new program in region (following up on one possible mortality)
- Range rides on deer winter ranges – no significant fawn losses

Habitat

- Submitted 21 habitat project proposals, totaling over 12,000 acres for inclusion in this years Watershed Restoration Initiative. We'll know how many will be funded soon.
- Habitat maintenance on our wildlife management areas is in full swing with noxious weed control our highest priority this time of year.

Aquatics

- Community Fishing Ponds getting stocked weekly
- Identifying stream sections for possible inclusion in the Walk-In-Access Program

Conservation Outreach

- Salem Fishing Event May 11 (1000 disabled kids and 1000 volunteers)
- Expect to see numerous articles pitching fishing opportunities in response to the legislation limiting stream access. The angling public has the false impression that the legislation greatly reduces fishing opportunities in the state.

Law Enforcement

- Warrants were served today on five people suspected of poaching close to 100 bucks, mostly from the Cedar Mountains in Tooele County. The investigation by Central Region law enforcement personnel has been going on for the past 1 ½ years.

4) Antlerless Addendum, Rule and Permit Recommendations for 2010 (Action) - **Craig Clyde, Central Region Wildlife Manager**

Questions from the RAC

Doug Jones – What is the objective for elk on the Vernon unit?

Craig Clyde – The elk are moving into that area and we have a hunt recommended to try to eliminate elk in that area.

Matt Clark – Why the reduction in antlerless moose permits?

Craig Clyde – It depends on the area. We have moved a lot to Colorado. In some areas it is because of disease issues. If a population is down we decrease permits. We are as far south as you can have moose and because of the warm temperatures the disease factor is high.

Allan Stevens – I know a lot of the late cow hunts are to control depredation situations. If we allow hunters to hunt during the earlier seasons we won't take the animals we want.

Craig Clyde – They still have to hunt within the boundary of the antlerless hunt. It is still the animals that migrate to those areas.

Allan Stevens – On the Manti unit you would take animals that would migrate over the mountain.

Craig Clyde – On that particular hunt some of the elk would migrate to the other side of the mountain. The hunter success if they are hunting early is about 60 percent and the late hunt success is around 90 percent. The chance of a guy buying a permit is lower and then his chances of getting an elk are lower but then he can still come back and hunt the later hunt where 80 to 90 percent of the animals are taken. It does give more opportunity and it does eliminate elk.

Richard Hansen – What kind of success do you anticipate by letting people hunt during the general deer or elk hunt.

Craig Clyde – It could go up some. We don't know how many people will choose to do that. We will be watching the numbers.

Richard Hansen – On the Nebo I don't think this is a good idea. You are going to kill too many elk.

Craig Clyde – There are not more permits. It is the same elk whether it is taken early or late.

Richard Hansen – If you increase success then you may take more elk.

Craig Clyde – It could. It may increase one percent, we don't know. It is going to be a lower number that is hunting in the first place and it is a lower success hunt.

Richard Hansen – On some units that may be okay but I don't think we should kill more elk on the Nebo.

Craig Clyde – A lot of elk do winter on private property and landowners won't let hunters on so this gives people the opportunity to take the elk.

Larry Fitzgerald – If you are at objective why are you reducing numbers?

Craig Clyde – Some units are over objective and some units we need to target animals that are causing damage. As you can see from those numbers we need to make sure we take enough animals because if we are over by one animal then we are out of compliance and we need to stay within this.

Larry Fitzgerald – But you are reducing the numbers.

Craig Clyde – We are but you can see from the total numbers that we need to take animals so we don't go over the objective.

Larry Fitzgerald – So you might be over objective.

Craig Clyde – It is also based on what was taken last year. On units that were over objective last year and we hit them hard and we removed those animals then we can have less the next year.

Larry Fitzgerald – It is confusing if you are saying you are over objective on several units.

Craig Clyde – On several units but not statewide. We have more below objective and we lower the number of permits and on units above objective, those would have more tags.

Larry Fitzgerald – Could you increase permits on units that are above objective?

Craig Clyde - When you model each unit it will tell you what the success rate is for that unit, what the winter kill is and the model tells you what you need to do to stay within objective. By putting extra tags there you are not going by your model.

Larry Fitzgerald – Is there enough spring habitat to have this many elk?

Craig Clyde – We are working to improve habitat. That can vary depending on how hard the winter is and how early the spring comes. Our range index is mainly for deer. We are setting one up for elk because the elk will take the grass.

Larry Fitzgerald - They are pushing the grass line way up.

Craig Clyde – The winter range is our main limiting factor.

Larry Fitzgerald - Elk numbers have increased dramatically in recent years. Your objective is to have 80,000 elk. My feeling is if you push it too fast too hard you will make same mistake the livestock people made. There will be too many animals and not enough habitat.

Craig Clyde – But that is subjective. Is that at 130,000 elk or 80,000 or is that at 68,000 where we are at now. What we are seeing is that we have room for elk

Richard Hansen – I think that 80,000 marker was tied to increased habitat.

Craig Clyde – And we are doing more habitat work than any other state in the west.

John Fairchild – The 80,000 figure is a goal but that can't be reached unless we can identify units where we can increase the objective over what they currently are. If we decide there are units that we could increase there is a whole process that identifies how we would go about that. It may be a number that is unattainable. At this point we don't know. I am only aware on one unit in this region that we are looking at the possibility of some increase.

Craig Clyde – There may be others throughout the state. When those do come on line the biologists will look at it and put together a committee to work on the management plan for that unit to see if it can be increased. When we look at all the units and decide if we could have more animals then we will know if that number can be reached. I can't say right now that it is unattainable.

Larry Fitzgerald – I don't know this range here. I am more familiar with the northeastern region.

Richard Hansen - Which unit are you looking at in the central region?

Craig Clyde – We would consider the Wasatch. Some people like George would jump up and scream that we can't have anymore elk. But there are areas of the Wasatch that we could increase and areas that we couldn't.

Richard Hansen – If you do that would you split the unit up?

Craig Clyde – No, the unit is already split up for antlerless permits.

Jay Price – On the west side there are no cows anymore. I hunted last year and the most I ever saw with the bulls were three cows.

Comments from the Public

Ken Strong – I have been retired for five years and I spend a lot of time in Hobbie Creek, Diamond Fork and Payson canyon and the elk have dwindled drastically in Payson canyon. If you go on the west slope between the freeway and the mountain where five years ago there were hundreds of cows in the winter there isn't any. The DWR owns a bunch of property down. I went there the day after Christmas and there wasn't even an elk track. I don't understand why we are issuing so many permits when there isn't any elk. I have covered that whole mountain and the elk numbers have dwindled drastically in the last five years. I talked to Earl Sutherland between Nephi and Levan. He said this winter he had six cows come down. Why are we killing so many elk? We don't need to kill the elk in Diamond Fork, Hobbie Creek or on Nebo, not the cows.

Craig Clyde – We flew the Central Mountains Nebo unit and it was a little bit under objective but not much. The permits that we are having on that unit are to control depredation problems. When we flew we did them so they are there. In a given year they can move around a lot. Earl Sutherland's area down there has some depredation permits. He is controlling it himself and that is why he is seeing less elk.

John Fairchild - Did the fire impact the distribution of elk?

Craig Clyde – Yes. Also last year was a wet spring and then after about June we didn't have any rain so it became really dry. Normally after a fire elk would move into an area and they didn't last year. I suspect if we have a good wet year this year the elk would move back into that area.

RAC Discussion

Richard Hansen – I agree, on the Nebo most of the elk have been taken on the west side. Most of the elk are on east side. I flew with them this year and in a three hour flight we counted zero elk on the west face from Nephi to Levan. I think most harvest takes place on west side because of the access. I would like to see the boundary split to direct hunters to east side and not take elk on the west side. I also think the hunt should end December 31st.

Allan Stevens – I have some real concerns with opening up the cow elk hunts to all the different seasons especially on certain units such as the Manti where you have late cow hunts specifically to move elk off the highway and out of the fields. If you hunted that unit for three days during any of the hunts you could get you a cow elk right off the road high in the mountains. I don't think you would be killing the same elk that would be coming down in the valley. I have real problems with the really late hunts. That hunt is just to move elk off the road and into the mountains. Those targeted hunts should not be open to hunt during any other hunt. Other units could be hunted early with other permits but I think those units should be excluded.

George Holmes – So you want to leave the ones that are targeted to move elk off the road for only that time?

Allan Stevens – Yes. The problem I have is that we are not going to kill the same elk, at least not on the Manti.

VOTING

Motion was made by Allan Stevens to exclude late cow elk hunts in Sanpete County (that are designed to target depredation problems and to move elk off the highway) from early antlerless hunting opportunity (to take your cow elk while you are rifle hunting)

Fred Oswald – Can you identify which hunts those are?

Allan Stevens – I only know of the one in Sanpete County.

George Holmes – Can you differentiate those tags, is it possible to do what he is asking.

Craig Clyde – You could. It could be in the proclamation that it is that way for all hunts except for Sanpete County and that particular hunt. That boundary goes to skyline drive and so it would have to be an elk that would be on the central region side so the chances are that you would take the right elk. There is the possibility that the elk winter on the other side. We do have 1,500 that winter on our side.

Allan Stevens – I disagree. You could kill an elk off the horseshoe and 90 percent of those elk go over the mountain. I don't think you can differentiate which elk is going to go over the top and which one is going to come down in the valley. You can tell when the hunt stops because the elk go from being in the foothills to being right down on the road the minute that hunt stops.

Craig Clyde – No one is more concerned about that than I am. I have to deal with them when they come down. The hunt was designed to keep the animals pushed back. Our biologists and technicians down there have deal with that. We are concerned about that and we are going to put together a committee to talk about other things that we can do. I think that the number they will take during the general hunt will be minimal and won't affect us that much.

Motion seconded by John Bair

John Bair – I see where Craig is coming from but I agree with Allan on this. There can be a lot of elk from the highway to the foothills and we need to maximize those late hunts to keep pressure on them. I saw a couple hit an elk on that road last year and it wasn't a pretty thing. I think the cow hunts put better pressure on the elk than the archery hunt.

In Favor: Allan Stevens, Micki Bailey, Larry Fitzgerald, Gary Nielson, Richard Hansen, Jay Price, George Holmes, Doug Jones, Matt Clark, John Bair

Opposed: Duane Smith

Motion passed 10 to 1

Motion was made by Richard Hansen to reduce permits on the Central Mountains, Nebo unit from 130 to 50 and end the late season cow hunt on that unit December 31st

Seconded by John Bair

Craig Clyde – We counted around 1,150 elk on that unit. The elk are there but as Gary mentioned they have shifted. To reduce it that much may put us over objective.

Richard Hansen – I got educated. When they count elk they count the number of bodies and they count tracks. When Dennis did that I was just flabbergasted. The other thing is that once they count that then they add 20 percent. This year they are far from objective and that is post season. We should let the herd grow. If you have too many elk you can increase the permits then. If anybody thinks that unit has the elk on it it had six years ago they don't know what they are talking about. Especially on the west side. I am really for them being able to hunt those antlerless animals during the other hunts simply because they are killing animals that are probably going to go east side anyway. You just as well kill them there than let them go onto private ground where you can't hunt them. All I am asking for it to find a way to target the animals that end up on private property anyway and let the little herds that hang on the west side build. The places they have had fires the last few years is better ground now than it has been for 100 years. There are places the grass up there is over waist high.

Doug Jones – The northwest Nebo unit goes from highway 6 to Santaquin and there are elk there.
Richard Hansen – But from Santaquin canyon south there are not. Mitigation permits should still be issued for problems on private land but let the elk come back.
George Holmes – Does the proposed number of 50 include the mitigation permits?
Richard Hansen – No.

In Favor: Allan Stevens, Gary Nielson, Richard Hansen, Duane Smith, John Bair
Opposed: Micki Bailey, Larry Fitzgerald, Jay Price, George Holmes, Matt Clark, Doug Jones
Motion failed 6 to 5

Motion was made by Jay Price to accept the remainder of the antlerless recommendations as presented

Seconded by George Holmes

In Favor: Allan Stevens, Micki Bailey, Larry Fitzgerald, Jay Price, George Holmes, Doug Jones, Matt Clark, Duane Smith

Opposed: Gary Nielson, Richard Hansen, John Bair

Motion passed 8 to 3 (because previous motion did not pass)

- 5) **Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2010 (Action)**
- **Craig Clyde, Central Region Wildlife Manager**

Questions from the RAC

Gary Nielson – Why would they want antlerless permits if they are under objective?

Craig Clyde – There are a number of reasons. They could have the permits sold out front. Maybe they have a depredation situation but they should work that out with the biologist in the area. They may want the permits for their family. They do make money on these also.

VOTING

Motion was made by John Bair to accept recommendation as presented

Seconded by Gary Nielson

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

- 6) **Emigration Canyon Boundary Proposal (Action)**
- **Scott White, Central Region Law Enforcement Lieutenant**

Questions from the RAC

Fred Oswald – We have received an email from a rifle hunter and has hunted Emigration canyon area and wanted to continue to do so. He has hunted on the north boundary that has been defined as the peak.

Comments from the Public

Steve Ostler – I was on the Emigration Canyon committee and I wanted to make sure I answered any questions that might come forth for sportsman. Since this time I have heard of several sportsmen unhappy with it and losing more hunting area. However the problem we faced with this area is a clear defined boundary that everybody could understand. The other issue is that there is a lot of this land on the map that is private land that is intermingled with city land. The other issue is with the moose. I believe south of I-80 is open for moose but closed to rifle hunting for deer and elk. As long as the moose hunters keep within that 600 foot rule they could hunt this but now it would be closed. The moose issue kind of blindsided me a little bit but I don't have a moose tag so I guess it doesn't matter.

Fred Oswald – How did you happen to get yourself put on that committee?

Steve Ostler – A lot of complaining about the boundary being closed down. I believe John Fairchild asked me to be on that committee.

Fred Oswald – Historically have you hunted in that area?

Steve Ostler – I have hunting up there along those boundaries. I have not hunting the mouth of Emigration Canyon. Historically it was closed until the changes recently.

Fred Oswald - Did you end up supporting the proposal?

Steve Ostler –I do support the proposal. There needs to be a clear defined boundary that everybody could understand. There were only two hunters that were landowners that showed up at any of the meetings and both of those hunters stated they supported because of the homes in the area. That was one of my concerns that if you are a landowner would you still be able to hunt your own land. Nobody came forward with that issue. Joan Gallegos who is the Emigration Canyon council member stated that they would provide maps for landowners as well hunters to avoid some of the conflicts in the area.

Fred Oswald – This was partly in response to you in there?

Steve Ostler – This actually gives us more area than we had before when the one mile restriction was in place.

Allan Stevens – From a law enforcement standpoint, if you are on the ridge are you out of compliance?

Scott White – That is part of the issue we have had up there for years. Someone walking the ridge or somebody discharging a firearm is the issue. Walking the ridge is not a problem. In fact even walking through some of this area is not a problem. The issue becomes discharge of a firearm within the archery only area or hunting in there. If someone is on the ridgeline and shoots to the open area there is not an issue.

Fred Oswald – Having spent a lot of time in that area I know that the ridgeline is very steep. If someone is dragging a deer up to the ridge they are in violation.

Richard Hansen - A deer could go over into the closed area once you shoot it.

Scott White – Not a problem in my mind. We have a lot of boundaries where that is the case.

Call us and we should be able to see what happened. In hunter safety classes whether it is a CWMU boundary or regional boundary issue we tell them that if you shoot a deer on an open side and then it runs onto say private property you need to call us.

VOTING

Motion was made by Duane Smith to accept the recommendations as presented

Seconded by John Bair

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

Duane Smith excused

7) Habitat Management Plans

- Mark Farmer, CRO Habitat Manager

Questions from the RAC

John Bair – On black hill I have had a lot of complaints about this one for a couple of reasons. First this would restrict access to the forest. Also we were just talking about the elk on the highway and that we want to put pressure on them yet we are restricting access there until you get down to highway 89.

Mark Farmer – One of the things we do to address that is put a combination lock on the gate and we can allow access by giving someone the combination and we could the same here if there is a

need for it. We want to keep the majority of people who don't need to be in there in the winter off the muddy roads. We could accommodate those issues.

John Bair – So if someone has a lion tag they could get in there?

Mark Farmer – We could work with them. You can't please everybody.

John Bair – What about the Cain valley road?

Mark Farmer – That will be open year round. We want to work with the county to gravel that road because it is a mess when it gets wet.

Allan Stevens – This closes a lot of areas. Have you worked with the Forest Service on this?

Mark Farmer – Yes and we have identified the roads and trails that are on Forest Service maps. If I showed you what is actually there I think you would be amazed and appalled. We are planning on taking out ten miles of roads and trails that were user created. I can show you some of those problems. There is a lot of activity from college students and they leave lots of things. This is a couch burning here. There are cars and all kinds of things dumped there. It will help to have this closed during winter months. The main reason these properties are here is to manage big game winter range. That is the primary reason for the property and that is what we agree to with our federal partners so we have to meet that requirement and also balance use with our constituency. Right now it is a free for all, it's like the wild west and you do whatever you want. That's got to change in order to maintain this for wildlife. There are miles and miles of single track trails.

John Bair – That is summer and spring use not winter.

Mark Farmer – Any time the roads are wet they are causing problems and a lot of that is early spring.

Jay Price – If that is access to federal land and the county has identified those roads on rs2477 you can't close those roads.

Mark Farmer – The only road that is going to left open is going to be left open is the Cain valley road. The county is planning for that road to be open year round. The other roads

Doug Jones – Under rs2477 the county has to go through a process.

Mark Farmer – Right now there is no county maintenance on this road and one of the things we want to do is have them help us maintain that and keep it open and improve it so it is a little bit better during those wet times. Right now it is about four lanes wide.

John Bair – Right now that one is probably on their class D road system and they don't get any money reimbursement from UDOT for maintenance. I don't think they even have it on a class D system. They are in the process of deciding what they want on the class D system. It was their request to keep it open and that was the only one they were concerned about. They are in the process of updating the county master plan and we timed this so we could coordinate the two plans.

Larry Fitzgerald – How are you going to close these roads and keep them closed?

Mark Farmer – Starting this July we will be using a combination of rock and fences to close the black roads on this map and leave the red road open. There will be a combination of enforcement, gates, barrier rock and signs to show which routes are open. The ones that will be decommissioned will be ripped and seeded and open routes signed. There will be seasonal closure signs as well. It is a big project that we are going to be starting on this keep fall.

Allan Stevens – I know primarily these lands were acquired for winter range but isn't one of the main goals of the DWR also to promote wildlife viewing?

Mark Farmer – I think we are doing that.

Allan Stevens – Not with the road closures.

Doug Jones – User created roads spread noxious weeds which degrade the habitat and you have less deer and elk in the long run. You have less feed for livestock which creates competition.

You would be further ahead by managing the habitat and the use because the problem is people spread noxious weeds on these user created road and we can't manage them.

Allan Stevens – I am not talking about user created roads.

Doug Jones – That is what Mark is talking about.

Allan Stevens – They are shutting down more than user created roads.

John Fairchild – Is the seasonal closure what you are worried about?

Allan Stevens – I grew up in Sanpete County and all there is to do in the winter is go look at deer. If you shut down the base roads people won't be able to. That is where people go to view animals. I would have no problem with the closure if they didn't shut down right at the Division border. If they allow the bottom roads to stay open so people can view wildlife. I have more people contact me about this than any other issue.

John Bair – On a couple of those areas I hunt lions on all year. Every two weeks I go up there and I will be the only person there.

Mark Farmer – We are trying to address this problem (picture shown).

Allan Stevens – I understand that but ...

Mark Farmer – I didn't get any of this feedback when we did all this outreach with the county. The county was all in favor of this. The Forest Service and the BLM are in favor of this. Even the single track riders are in favor of this. I didn't hear about any of this.

John Bair – That unit is the hardest lion unit in the state to draw. It takes ten points to draw and you start chopping off all their access it is going to be a nightmare.

Mark Farmer – I can accommodate them.

Doug Jones – The question I would ask is who is going to pay for the maintenance.

John Fairchild – I think he addressed the cougar hunting opportunities. That just takes coordination with those who are permitted. Allan, you are talking about something different. Wildlife viewing is something that is in our plan but it comes at a price. There are where we have absolutely no control right now. How much disturbance takes place? It is a trade off.

Allan Stevens – You could do the same thing and leave the lower roads open to allow wildlife viewing.

Mark Farmer – Twelve mile will be open because of the private homes. Six mile has the county road going through the middle of it so that will be open. Manti face you can't really get to because of the private land around it. There are only a few properties that have a seasonal closure right now. I am not sure where else would be an issue. We have to manage these properties with a mandate from our federal partners. If it gets too bad we could be in real trouble with them.

Doug Jones – Is it fair to say the number of people who use these areas has increased over time?

Mark Farmer – The roads increase every year. There are a lot more people using them.

Doug Jones – I can go back to places I went to 20 or 30 years ago and there are so many more people.

John Bair – You know the use goes down in the winter substantially from the summer. The damage you are showing is not from December or January.

Mark Farmer – I agree it is not happening then but it is happening early spring. We need to identify these roads and sign them as legal routes and reclaim the other roads to keep people where they need to be.

Allan Stevens – I would like to see more thought for access to wildlife viewing areas. The local people are concerned about that. There are a number of roads on the base that could be kept open on for example Bald Mountain and Manti Face.

Mark Farmer - Brad Bradley actually helped us with this and he knows those issues. You can't leave all the roads open. If I leave too many more open I have to factor the number of gates I need by like ten.

Doug Jones – Is there a snowmobile restriction?

Mark Farmer – Seasonal closures are to all motorized traffic.

John Fairchild - You can still view wildlife. We are not saying you can't view wildlife but you many have to hike a quarter or a half a mile.

Richard Hansen – When there are more and more restrictions from the Forest Service and the BLM and the Division you are just saying we don't want you here, keep out! You used to be able to retrieve game on an ATV, which didn't impact the resource, and now you can't.

Doug Jones – I appreciate what you are saying and you are right but the problem is there are so many more ATVs now than there were 30 years ago.

Richard Hansen – I agree with that but you need to make trails where people can go to and use. You could charge a 10 dollar access fee to be able to get downed game.

Doug Jones – What I am trying to get at is it is not the one ATV that is the problem it is everyone else that follows.

Larry Fitzgerald - If one person goes off then everyone follows. It is all over the west desert. It is a huge problem and they have trashed the areas out there.

Allan Stevens – Most of the garbage is dumped in summer.

Mark Farmer – I think with a law enforcement presence there it will help. This has gone through habitat council, RDCC, the county and all the other partners and this is the last stop. We haven't received any comments from and nothing but positive comments from the county. The saying goes you can't please everyone and if you try to you will please no one. Something to consider, we have put a lot of thought into this and we want reasonable access and still maintain our main goal of providing big game winter range.

Fred Oswald – What are we voting on?

Mark Farmer – The management plans for the 10 areas.

Fred Oswald – So once they Wildlife Board approves it is it in place?

John Fairchild – It doesn't have to go to the Wildlife Board. They can elect to see it or not. It has to go through the RAC in the region it involves and then it is the Director's decision to approve it.

Fred Oswald – So these plans are just for the central region.

Jay Price - Did the public have a chance to come to a meeting about this?

Allan Stevens – I am not aware of a meeting on this issue in the areas where these closures are going to take place.

Mark Farmer – There were county commission meetings which are public meetings.

Allan Stevens – That is a public meeting but there was no public meeting I am aware of specifically on this issue. I would strongly urge that the Division has one down there. I can tell you that from the comments I have had there is going to be a law enforcement problem making outlaws out of good guys.

George Holmes – So the county commission voted on it but did they have a public meeting for this?

Mark Farmer – Public can come to those meetings.

John Fairchild – They advertised all the county master planning meetings and all the committee meetings.

Jay Price – I would still like to see us continue this for a month and go back down there and have a public hearing where the public can give input.

Mark Farmer – We are trying to compromise here. One option is to close the properties to all access year round like they do in some parts of the state.

Richard Hansen – I don't think any of us are opposed to what you are trying to do. But I think the public input issue is important and you will get a middle ground. You do that and you will find a middle ground.

VOTING

Motion was made by Jay Price to table this proposal until a public meeting can be held by the Division

John Bair – I just want to clarify that we are not passing the plan tonight until it goes back for public input in Sanpete Valley, I think that is important.

Fred Oswald – Who are we asking to have the public meeting?

Jay Price – The Division should get together with the county commission and advertise a public meeting.

Fred Oswald – So you want the county commission to have the public meeting?

John Fairchild – We could have a meeting on our own and invite them. I don't want them to force them into a process...

Jay Price – That is fine.

Doug Jones - So you do that and the same thing happens...

John Bair – That may be the case but right now they feel like they are being force fed the deal. I think it is the right thing to do and the right result will come of it.

Allan Stevens – I have probably received close to 150 calls on this. This may have been brought up at the county commission meeting but to me it is a separate issue than the county plan.

George Holmes – I think sometimes in a county plan some things go unnoticed.

Allan Stevens – It is a big issue down there. I think the Division would be well served to do this.

Seconded by Allan Stevens

In Favor: all

Motion passed, 10 members voting (Duane Smith excused)

John Fairchild – I just want to know how complex this needs to be as far as the presentation.

Clearly there is a unit or two where the big issue is access. Do you have issues with other parts of the plan with regards to how it's being grazed, noxious weed control etc.?

Allan Stevens – I think there is some misunderstanding and that is part of the problem. I think you need to look at each unit and have a map of where the seasonal closures will be. I know it is at additional cost to the DWR but I would strongly urge you to look at improving and creating wildlife viewing areas within these areas. I was confused with some of the maps and I think some people just don't understand what is happening. I think the big issue is access.

John Fairchild – I think we need to be prepared to show and discuss what viewing opportunities would be available in the absence of being able to drive along the roads. Walking a quarter or half a mile might not be out of the question if it means we get to close off a road from winter use that can't be supported at anytime during the winter or early spring when you do have conditions that are causing resource damage. The only way to get in there would be on snowmobile and there is a balancing act that we are trying to maintain with regards to disturbance. People get on snowmobiles and all of the sudden no road is confining any of that activity. Throw on top of that antler gathering. It turns into a zoo. We're certainly prepared to show up and discuss the rationale behind the recommendation and listen to what people don't agree with as far as the recommendation. We are not at the point we are saying what do you want – we are now at the point of saying this is our recommendation, what can't you live with and let's narrow it down.

Larry Fitzgerald – Are there any restrictions now?

Mark Farmer – Just on white hill.

Larry Fitzgerald – A lot of use is probably making new trails so it is a law enforcement issue. If there is an area that is closed write some tickets.

John Fairchild – You need to have local support. You find out when a stakeholder has been left out. It is not fun to get to this point and find out that you left one out. No we show up and try to convince people that what we are doing is responsible stewardship of deer winter range and all they can see is you left me out of the process and I didn't get a chance to tell you how important wildlife viewing was so now wildlife viewing is even more important than it would have been.

John Bair – I think if you show them the same things you showed us a lot of those people would like to see those things fixed and may have some pretty good ideas of how to do it.

Allan Stevens – I think if you had a map with each WMA and what the proposed road closures are it would be helpful.

John Fairchild – We could have a map with all the current roads and the next slide would be all those roads cut out. Then where wildlife viewing can currently take place on existing roads winter long. The reason to tie in with the county is that they have jurisdiction over roads. We don't start talking about closing roads without support from the county. You might not have

known this is all mandated by state code, the process we go through. Anytime there is a change in the management of a Division owned wildlife management area we have to go back through the process of involving the county, the habitat council, the states clearing house, the state agencies that review state actions and back to the RAC. The issue that the Division is indiscriminately doing things that affect the history of use is in code and so far we have followed the law. We missed a stakeholder that now requires us to backup one step and then move forward.

Allan Stevens – I think Sanpete county is unique in that more than any other place I have been to people can ride their four wheelers from their homes up on the mountain in a matter of minutes. John Bair – They have designated roads for four wheelers.

Allan Stevens - I understand all the problems. I think the big issue is that it seems to the public that the Division has done this without public process. It is wise to do this.

John Fairchild – We will get suggestions from you on how to make sure we get an audience.

Suggestions: Local paper and radio stations.

Meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

22 in attendance

Next board meeting May 6, 2010 at the State Capitol Building, Senate Room 210, Salt Lake

Next RAC meeting May 18, 2010 at the Central Region Conference Center

Northern Regional Advisory Council

April 27, 2010

6:30 P.M.

Place: Brigham City Community Center

RAC Present

Robert Bynes –At Large
John Cavitt- Noncon.
Paul Cowley-Forest Service
Joel Ferry- Agric
James Gaskill- At Large
Shawn Groll- At Large
Jon Leonard-Sportsman
Ann Neville- Noncon.
Bret Selma- Agric
Brad Slater- Chair
Craig Van Tassell- Sportsman
John Wall- At Large

DWR Present

Jodie Anderson
Ron Hodson
Randy Wood
Darren Debloois
Kirt Enright
Clint Brunson
Scott Davis
Scott McFarlane

Wildlife Board

Ernie Perkins
Bill Fenimore

RAC Excused Absence

Michael Gates- BLM
Russ Lawrence- At Large

Meeting Begins: 6:30 p.m.

Number of Pages: 7

Introduction: Brad Slater-chair

Agenda:

Review of Agenda

Review of March 24, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Wildlife Board Meeting Update

Regional Update

Antlerless Addendum, Rule and Permit Recommendations for 2010

Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2010

Emigration Canyon Boundary Proposal

Item 1. Review and Acceptance of Agenda

Motion: Cowley- Accept the agenda as presented.

Second: Gaskill

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 2. Review and Acceptance of March 24, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Motion: Gaskill- Approve minutes as presented.

Second: Neville

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 3. Wildlife Board Update

Robert Byrnes- The Wildlife Board did not follow our motion to exclude the forest service lands in the elk management plan as far as the incentive permits. They did feel it could be addressed in the rule making and in the individual elk management unit plans. Hopefully that will get addressed when we go through that.

Gaskill- Did they explain why? Was there some rationale?

Byrnes- They felt it would be addressed in the rule that will have to be formed to allow those permits. Their feeling is that they are in favor of that incentive but there does have to be a rule generated for that to occur. It is a separate rule or program for those permits. The other item that was not on our agenda but was on the Wildlife Boards agenda was they gave the Division some direction for 2011-2013. Coming this fall, on the agenda there will be a new hunt structure as far as the season dates will be coming through the RAC process and the Wildlife Board. In the following year, unit by unit deer management will come around again as well as 3 year big game proclamation.

Gaskill- Is that in response or as a follow up to the plan they presented a few months ago for changes in the big game structure?

Byrnes- The hunt structure will be this fall.

Gaskill- Is that what this discussion was about?

Byrnes- Yes.

Cowley- There was a letter sent to Mr. Karpowitz and the chair and then distributed to all the board members encouraging leaving National Forest Lands out of that rule.

Item 4. Regional Update

Ron Hodson, Regional Supervisor

Biologists out doing sage grouse and sharptail counts. Sharptail trapping project from Box Elder County to Antelope Island.

Darren Debloois- Moved 22 sharptails to Antelope Island.

Hodson- Waterfowl Management areas are doing phragmites burning. 3 burns done so far. Aquatics are starting their field season. Event next week at Willard Bay to gill net wipers and inviting the media.

Gaskill- Are there any plans to work on the road around the south and west part of Willard Bay?

Hodson- The road has been improved on the south side. No plans to do anything with the west side road. Habitat doing general maintenance and spraying weeds. Board walk completed at the Great Salt Lake Learning Center. Dedication scheduled for May 14th at 9:00 a.m. and anyone can attend. Law enforcement getting out and doing boat patrols and sage grouse counts.

Slater- I was on the south road at Willard last week and it is a very nice road.

Hodson- When BOR worked on that road, they also put in a new fence with walk-over styles there. Some signs say no vehicle trespassing and some say no trespassing. It is just intended for no vehicle trespassing.

Gaskill- My suspicion is that will probably be taken care of by firearms.

Hodson- That is probably true.

Item 5. Antlerless Addendum, Rule and Permit Recommendations for 2010

Randy Wood, Regional Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Questions

Selman- Elk antlerless recommendations for Cache and Ogden unit. There are going to be 20 instead of 100?

Wood- Yes, there is going to be a decrease of 100. That population is about 600-650 animals and the objective is 800. These permits are trying to address depredation and allow that herd to grow.

Selman- I did not see that reflected on the CWMU part of it.

Gaskill- What is going on with the antelope herd in Box Elder?

Enright- *(could not hear comment)*

Gaskill- So those are just depredation and they are staying out of the hay fields.

Wood- All the permits were to address depredation and we don't have that problem anymore. They are staying out of the fields and are not causing problems anymore.

Gaskill- So it is not a herd population problem?

Wood- No.

Byrnes- Are we seeing any kind of solution for the Bountiful deer problem or is that something Bountiful City will have to work out with the division?

Wood- Right now we are working with Bountiful City with some options. We are looking at what direction we want to go with them. It is not going to happen overnight, it will take a while. The progress is slow and we may not see a solution any time soon.

Byrnes- On control permits for antlerless elk, are those boundaries going to stay the same?

Wood- On which?

Byrnes- The controlled tags that we had last year.

Wood- For those units that were listed.

Byrnes- That San Juan east of 191 tag last year was only good for part of the area north of 491 which was in the spike bull limited entry unit.

Wood- I am not sure on that one.

RAC Comment

VanTassell- When the cow hunt started in the Kamas area, they were usually a late hunt and I know some of the thinking that went in to that was to keep pressure on the elk to keep them up higher. My concern is if those elk are taken during the rifle hunt.

Selman- I see exactly the opposite. I see those elk wintering late high. I applaud this theory to get the hunting done and let the elk be.

Cowley- Could you tell me about tribal and mitigation permits?

Wood- There is an agreement with the tribe where they get a fixed number of antlerless elk permits that are good on any of the units in their tribal boundaries. They issue those to their tribal members. Typically, not all of those get issued and they report those to us at the end of the year. I want to say it is 50 antlerless elk permits that would be good on units 1-8.

Mitigation permits are good to address local landowner problems. They allow people to come onto their property to harvest elk but the area is really restrictive. It is a way to address unforeseen problems coming up for depredation.

Cowley- So he could basically sell those permits?

Wood- Yes, he can. He gets a voucher with the mitigation permits and he could sell that.

Gaskill- That is not just elk? Is that antelope and deer also?

Wood- Yes that is antelope, deer and elk.

Gaskill- Received an email concern but have misplaced it. Do you know what it was about?

Slater- I was going to cover that at the end of the meeting but it was concerns with the elk management plan and whether there had been public involvement.

Gaskill- Is it not an appropriate time to bring it up?

Slater- No, it is appropriate. I can cover that now.

Gaskill- I emailed him back that I would make sure it was covered and I wanted to follow through with my promise.

Slater- A member of the public was concerned that different discussions and plans had been put into place without public involvement. He wanted an answer, then and there, from one of the council members agreeing with his thoughts and feelings. I apologized that we do not do that and that we listen to all of the concerns and bring them up here, talk through them and then make our recommendations to the Wildlife Board. I felt the process had been through a very robust public process. I responded to him in that matter.

Gaskill- I appreciate that and if you look into the audience, you can see here.

Slater- Maybe that is why I have been a little bit focused on the public.

Gaskill- Exactly.

Slater- I would like to mention that I think the State of Utah with Wildlife policy has a much more public involved process than any of our neighbors. The Division invests a lot of time and effort to go through that process and we are not going to make everyone happy. On the phone, I explained to him different ways that he could become involved.

Motion

Motion: Byrnes- Recommend to accept the Antlerless Addendum, Rule and Permit Recommendations for 2010.

Second: Leonard

Discussion on the Motion

Gaskill- We did not get all of the recommendations so I am assuming that even the recommendations for areas that are not covered in this presentation are covered in your motion, is that correct?

Byrnes- Yes.

Gaskill- This is a statewide thing but we only got the Northern part. Is your motion covering all areas?

Byrnes- Yes it is.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 6. Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2010

Randy Wood, Regional Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

Hodson- Did we get that date?

Wood- There was a mistake in your handout which was not in the presentation. On page 3 of 10 of the CWMU's Deseret, there is a typo on the antlerless elk season. It should read August 15th 2010 thru January 31, 2011 for the antlerless elk permits on Deseret.

Gaskill- August 10th instead of August 1st?

Wood- August 15th thru January 31st is what it should be.

Cowley- Where is the new Stillman Ranch CWMU?

Wood- Stillman Ranch runs out of Weber Canyon and barely crosses to the south side of the highway up Weber Canyon and it runs to the north. It almost connects over to the east fork of Chalk Creek. It does not quite go that far.

Slater- That is the upper Weber River above Oakley.

Wood- Yes.

Motion

Motion: Leonard- Accept the Division's recommendation as proposed.

Second: Gaskill

Selman and Neville asked to be recued from this vote

Motion Carries: Unanimous with Selman and Neville Recues.

Item 7. Emigration Canyon Boundary Proposal

Randy Wood, Regional Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

Hodson- During the bucks and bulls board meeting, there were some folks from Emigration Canyon that approached the board concerned about hunting in Emigration Canyon with high powered rifles. It caught a lot of people off guard and there was a motion made to include all of Salt Lake County east of I-15 and north of I-80 into archery only and that passed without going through any of the RAC's or anything like that. This caused a lot of problems with folks up there because there is a side of Emigration Canyon included in that got eliminated. The next meeting, the board rescinded that decision and asked our central region to get with the folks of Emigration Canyon to see if they could come up with some sort of boundary and solution. This is a result of all of that. That section of ground actually sits within the central region but it is within the northern region deer hunt. Our deer hunts do not follow our administrative boundaries.

Wood- (Shows map for antlerless only part of recommendations).

Gaskill- I think you said antlerless to begin with but meant archery.

Wood- It is all big game hunting to be archery only.

Slater- I think we are all somewhat aware of the controversy with some of the landowners and homeowners in that area. Salt Lake County proposed a discharge of firearms kind of proposal to address that housing concern. That created a conflict of hunting opportunity.

RAC Questions

Gaskill- I don't understand why we have the checkered part. All the rest of it is standard weapon restrictions right?

Wood- Yes that checkered part followed the county boundaries. It could have been left out.

Gaskill- Why did you put that in there?

Wood- The central region put it in there and I think they use this map when they visited with the towns.

Cowley- Do you know how this may affect the herds in that canyon. Are we going to see more traffic problems as we step away from a rifle hunt?

Wood- I don't know but where the restrictions are, there are a lot of houses and following the state rule of the 600 feet/200 yards. I do not foresee much of a problem with that.

Slater- I would take it then that archery might actually increase some of the opportunity to remove animals from that area that maybe would not be removed because of the discharge of a firearm kind of rule.

Wood- We will have to wait and see.

Slater- Deer mortality figures may go up or down, we don't know.

Wood- I don't know.

Gaskill- In South Weber for example, they consider a bow and arrow a weapon. So, the 600 feet does not apply in this specific area if you are using archery?

Wood- The 600 feet for a firearm applies statewide.

Gaskill- Does that apply to an archer in this scenario?

Hodson- It does not change any of that from the law that we currently have.

Gaskill- Archery is not covered in the 600 foot rule statewide, am I correct?

Davis- Discharge of a fire arm.

Slater- A weapon is defined as an object that expels an object by force.

Gaskill- They are still 600 feet away from a house in Emigration Canyon even with this new rule.

Wood- Yes, it does not change the 600 feet rule.

Motion

Motion: Gaskill- Approve the recommendations as presented.

Second: Wall

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Slater- I already explained about some things that went out a bit ago. I have responded to the gentleman and have had a couple of follow up phone calls. He had some strong feelings and felt like they had not been represented.

VanTassell- When we receive emails, what kind of guidelines do we have as far as responding to them?

Slater- We are the receivers of that information and it is our duty to come to this meeting prepared to show that information whether we agree or disagree. We may do that in verbal comments or by email. I have tried to respond to every email in a neutral fashion. As I understand, that is kind of the way we should do it.

Hodson- You are all there to represent your communities and those groups which you are here to represent. You are going to get all sorts of comments and a conversation there is completely in order. If you want to have a conversation via email to clarify things, there is nothing wrong with that. However, you should not feel obligated to answer every email that might come to you. You can take it as comment and consider it that.

Neville- I always try to acknowledge that I have received it and that we will present it to the RAC as a comment or issue.

Gaskill- In a court of law, if you are a juror, you have to hold your decision until you have heard all of the evidence. I don't always do that, sometimes I reply that I agree and sometimes I reply that I do not agree. If there is something wrong with that you better tell me because that is the way I am.

Slater- I really wanted to make sure I had an opportunity to thank you. It was one of those times when maybe I forgot how much time and effort you and the Division all puts in. I will defend my opinion that this process is good. When I look at the public input process that the Division does on a local level, I think it is phenomenal. My criticism is those who speak out against these things and don't pay attention until it is way past the time to pay attention and somehow it is our fault.

Meeting Ends: 7:30 p.m.

**NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY-MOTIONS PASSED
UBATC, Vernal/April 27, 2010**

**5.ANTLERLESS ADDENDUM, RULE AND PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
2010**

MOTION: To go with the Division's permit recommendation with a couple of changes. Cut the Anthro elk permits from 500 to 250, and cut the Diamond Mountain January late hunt from 100 to 50 elk permits. Put 25 permits on each of the two earlier hunts (same total number of permits on Diamond).

Motion passed 3 to 2 with one abstention

6.ANTLERLESS CWMU PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2010

MOTION: To approve numbers set by the DWR.

Motion passed unanimously

NORTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY
Uintah Basin Applied Technology College (UBATC), Vernal
April 27, 2010
Started at 6:30 pm; Adjourned at 7:50 pm

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Brandon McDonald-BLM
Beth Hamann-Non-Consump
Rod Morrison-Sportsmen
Kevin Christopherson-Supervisor
Bob Christensen-Chair
Kirk Woodward-Sportsmen
Floyd Briggs-At-Large
Mitch Hacking-Agriculture

UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Dax Mangus-NER Biologist
Derrick Ewell-NER Biologist
Lowell Marthe-NER Biologist
Sean Davis-NER Law Enforcement
Charlie Greenwood-NER Wildlife Mgr
Gayle Allred-NER Office Manager
Ron Stewart-NER Conservation Outreach
Randall Thacker-NER Biologist

EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

Amy Torres-At-Large
Ron Winterton-Elected Official
Loran Hills-Non-Consumptive

UNEXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

Curtis Dastrup-Agriculture
Carlos Reed-Ute Tribe

1.WELCOME, RAC INTRODUCTIONS AND RAC PROCEDURE: Bob Christensen

2.APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES: Bob Christensen

Motion by Rod Morrison to approve agenda and minutes
Second by Floyd Briggs
Passed unanimously

3.WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING UPDATE: Bob Christensen

The elk management plan was approved as presented by the NER, and the Board approved it as presented also.

The other action item was pertinent numbers. There was a lot of discussion about the bison permit numbers. Motion from NER was to accept with two exceptions: keep spike tags at 12,500, no increase; and to exempt the Anthro unit from spike hunting. The Board passed the permit numbers as presented by the Division. The reason they gave was because as far as the Anthro unit goes, they didn't feel that the amount of spikes taken during the spike hunt was really enough to decrease the bull population significantly on the Anthro unit. Four spike bulls were taken last year and they felt that that success rate wasn't going to be detrimental to the quality of the herd. The other thing brought up was elk hunter satisfaction, some of the hunters hunting the Anthro unit are looking for a larger bull and so they passed up others.

4.REGIONAL UPDATE: Kevin Christopherson

Bison release: The snow is clearing and the road is opening up on the Book Cliffs so the bison transplant is scheduled to occur on May 4. You are all invited. We will round the animals up early on the 4th and be coming through the Basin somewhere around 11:00 am and meet a Ouray to car pool.

Fishing stream access bill: We're pretty much going back to the way things were. The Legislature provided money to purchase access to stream lands. We will be hosting meetings around the state and looking for possible stream access opportunities. If you want to be involved, let me know.

Roger Schneidervin, our Regional Aquatics Manager is retiring after 25 years. We will miss him.

Genevieve Nord who works at the front counter will be transferring to the Northern Region.

5.ANTLERLESS ADDENDUM, RULE AND PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2010: Charlie Greenwood

Antlerless Deer Hunt Recommendations

For NER

North Slope North Browns Park 50

South Slope, South Browns Park 50

South Slope, Vernal/Red Fleet 40

Low elevation sites have the most sagebrush die out.

Seven of the study sites in the lower area, 57% of these are considered poor to very poor of the desired condition index.

We need to utilize antlerless deer harvest to protect forage conditions.

Antlerless Elk Hunt Recommendations

For NER:

Book Cliffs objective 7500. Estimated population 4100.

Three hunts recommended. Dropped a couple of hunts

503 Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek-McCook Ridge 30

504 Book Cliffs, Little Creek 30

506 Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek-Willow Creek 20

Nine Mile Anthro objective 700. Estimate 1450
559 Nine Mile, West Anthro 165
560 Nine Mile, West Anthro
561 Nine Mile, West Anthro

North Slope
West

South Slope
Yellowstone obj-5500 estimate 5900
Vernal/Diamond/Bonanza ob-2500 Estimate e2800

Wasatch
Currant Creek objective 1200 Estimate 1400
Avintaquin objective 1250 estimate 1400

Doe Pronghorn
882 North Slope, Lucerne Point 22 Muzzleloader only

Questions from RAC:

Rod Morrison: I'm concerned about guys who have limited entry elk tags and have all these cow hunters in there. It would be good during an open bull hunt but not during limited entry hunts.

Charlie Greenwood: We try to avoid putting the cow hunters on top of the limited entry hunts. There are no cow hunts on top of limited entry hunters.

Dax Mangus: Were you referring to the rule where a cow tag and a bull tag were obtained? Only the people who have a bull tag and a cow tag can hunt there. If they just have a cow tag, they cannot go in there during the limited entry bull hunt.

Derrick Ewell: On Nine Mile Anthro we eliminated the two unit-wide hunts and on the others, we put the season as late as possible.

Rod Morrison: Hunters I've talked with were disappointed in the numbers of antlerless elk.

Derrick Ewell: On the two latest hunts we had 50% success rates and 30% on the other unit.

Randall Thacker: That unit is double the population objective. We've got to have some hunts to lower the numbers.

Mitch Hacking: On the two late Diamond hunts, what would be your position on eliminating the plateau, the top of the mountain because of landowner concerns with cabins.

Charlie Greenwood: My concern is that it creates the top of the mountain as King's X for the elk. They'd figure that out pretty fast. We need this number of permits. We need to get the harvest to get the population down. The boundary could be redone but that is my concern. The elk will go to where they're safe.

Mitch Hacking: How much do you think it would affect it?

Charlie Greenwood: 25 to maybe 45%. I think they'll figure it out really fast, to be really safe. We are bound to manage to 2500 head and we have 2800 head.

Lowell Marthe: We were finding a lot of elk on the top of the mountain last year because of the light snowfall.

Charlie Greenwood: I recognize your concerns and we've talked about it year after year. I'm just not sure how we're going to get the harvest.

Floyd Briggs: On your sagebrush, some of those pictures I thought it looked better in 2005 than in 2000 because of the grass.

Charlie Greenwood: When the grasses come in; it's harder for the browse to get established.

Floyd Briggs: I've heard studies with the sheep gong away and not taking it down, do the deer feed on the young sage brush?

Charlie Greenwood: They feed on all of it but if they hammer that little stuff that's just starting to come in, they can hurt it.

Floyd Briggs: On Goslin Three-Corners, I have a concern that during the season resident elk are being counted but they move.

Charlie Greenwood: Hunters have to work to get those elk out.

Floyd Briggs: I went there with a hunter last year and there were a few tracks but that was all.

Charlie Greenwood: There's some real country they could hide in. Hopefully we'll fly it next winter and we'll have more up to date information.

Floyd Briggs: A couple years ago, there were big herds but not last year.

Charlie Greenwood: They're smart. Sometimes, they go into Colorado, but that's why we're having the Browns Park hunt, so they can't hide.

Floyd Briggs: I'm concerned with those numbers.

Lowell Marthe: Last year was such a light snow year you couldn't count as well. But we're over objective.

Floyd Briggs: I'll just stake the experts' opinion.

Questions from Public:

None

Comments from Public:

Gale Rasmussen: We work with Charlie. He does a good job. On our Diamond Mountain cow hunts, from watching it and being up there a number of years, we have some problems. The late hunt that goes until the end of January, by the 15th of November, all our cows are off of Diamond Mountain. We have vandalism. If there's some way to take the late hunt and cut the 100 down and put them in the first hunts. They poach our big bucks, there's no law enforcement up there during that time. They've broken into cabins in the past. If there's some way we could decrease the number on that late hunt, we'd sure appreciate it.

Kevin Christopherson: If we can, we'll help you with the law enforcement. If we need to get more people we can get with the county or even get more of our people up there.

Gale Rasmussen: We hired some people last year but we can only afford so much.

Comments and Discussion from RAC:

Kirk Woodward: I understand the vandalism problem and poaching problem, but how do we know those are cow elk hunters?

Gale Rasmussen: We're not saying its cow hunters but when you put that many people up there at that time with no one up there, it's pretty difficult to supervise it and have any control. I leave my gates down and they still cut my fences.

Mitch Hacking: I don't know how people get around up there in January. With snow drifts, fences do get cut. We've got nothing against the elk, but it has to do with how hard it is to get around and cut fences.

Kirk Woodward: How come this late a hunt on Diamond, because we don't have migratory elk there?

Charlie Greenwood: We're trying to keep the seasons we have on Three-Corners. Otherwise the elk will move from there over. There are elk on Diamond that need to be

harvested and we're above-objective. We used to put out hunts for three months with 30 guys and they'd procrastinate to the end of the hunt or wait till it's too late. Now we give a group a two-week time period, then they're done and another group comes in.

Mitch Hacking: As a landowner, I'd like to make a motion to change the boundary during the January hunt to exclude the upper boundary on the Diamond Mountain unit.

No second.

Motion dies.

MOTION by Rod Morrison motion to go with Division's permits with a couple of changes:

Cut the Anthro from 500 to 250 and

Cut the Diamond Mountain January late hunt elk permits from 100 to 50. (Put 25 permits on each of the two earlier hunts).

Gale Rasmussen: Are you going to put the other 50 on the other two hunts?

Rod Morrison: Yes. 25 permits on each of the two earlier hunts.

Kevin Christopherson: The Wildlife Board is going to have a hard time with the recommendation because by our, approved plan, when you're over-objective we have to get the numbers down, and you're asking them to break the rules.

Bob Christensen: If you do make that motion and it carries, we need to provide the Board with a reason why we want them to do that.

Rod Morrison: Poaching and problems on Diamond and Anthro is a poor hunt. I don't believe the population numbers.

Second by Kirk Woodward

Favor: Rod Morrison, Kirk Woodward, Mitch Hacking

Opposed: Brandon McDonald, Beth Haman

Abstained: Floyd Briggs

Motions passed 3 to 2 with one abstention.

Kirk Woodward: I think it's a statement from the sportsman's group which is what we hear overwhelmingly. Consensus from sportsmen is that Anthro does not have quality animals. If that herd objective is 700 and there's 1500 in a count the answer for us would be to make a recommendation to increase the herd objective. So the elk group on Anthro, is that something you guys have talked about?

Derrick Ewell: Yes. Committee was formed and DWR would take the recommendation of the committee if they could agree on increasing the objective so DWR has to go with current recommendation. Many ranchers and cattle ranchers were extremely opposed to raising the objective.

Kevin Christopherson: This comes up every year. Let's get together and discuss this outside of the RAC. Maybe we could come up with another idea. I'm not optimistic we'll convince the farmers and ranchers to raise the objective. Also, they're cat calling about trophy bulls, but this hunt is for cows. We're double the objective so by law we have to manage to it. We're kind of at an impasse.

Charlie Greenwood: We're working with the CRO also to get more harvest toward Strawberry.

Randall Thacker: Most of those animals will impact the Avintaquin unit. We know some come from Strawberry, just a handful. So the assumption that most of the animals are from Strawberry is not true, although some do. We've radio collared them. We are trying to target everything in the migration pathway. We're trying to harvest them the whole way through. One thing we can request is that CRO; they had a high harvest last year so they recommended a lower harvest; we can recommend that they keep their harvest high and try to kill them before they get there.

Kevin Christopherson: You've heard Derrick talking about the late hunts to deal with that.

Derrick Ewell: It's a wintering population that we have to go off, but if you look at Anthro, Avintaquin and CRO's, all of them are over objective, so even if they're coming from Wasatch, they've got to be eliminated. Somewhere those elk have got to be harvested if we're going to get objective.

Randall Thacker: The Forest Service has real concerns about the aspen stand whether it can sustain any more of the level of elk use.

Bob Christensen: That is a concern with the aspen stands. They're struggling. I think they would be in on somewhat of an increase as long as the aspens were protected.

Kevin Christopherson: We changed the age objective on it, did we not?

Randall Thacker: No, it did not.

Kirk Woodward: I've got another question about numbers. The Association on Diamond said earlier that if the age objective went up; they were willing to agree to a few more elk up there. Does that still stand?

Gale Rasmussen: I don't know. We'd have to sit down as an association and see if the ranchers are willing to do that.

Mitch Hacking: Are there any set numbers as far as with the age objective?

Charlie Greenwood: I can tell you the Division would have to look really hard at that because deer winter range is a concern. Elk cause depredation problems. We would work with the landowners but we've not made that recommendation in the past.

Kirk Woodward: What kind of crossover is there with deer and elk? Some range looks better for elk and you've mentioned there is competition between them.

Charlie Greenwood: In heavy winters when they have to come down, they hit the browse because the grass is under the snow while the deer are hitting the browse and so that's mainly when we see that competition.

Kirk Woodward: You also mentioned that with McCook Ridge, but McCook, after the big burn, there's a lot of forage there.

Charlie Greenwood: Yes, but they come down on the Two Waters country where the deer range is.

Dax Mangus: We'll harvest a handful of elk on that, depending on the success rate, maybe 40% rate. More than anything, those hunts are more to influence elk distribution, more so than trying to control the number. That McCook ridge is an important piece of habitat in the winter for deer.

6.ANTLERLESS CWMU PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2010: Charlie Greenwood

NER No Changes

Questions from the RAC:

Rod Morrison: Sand Wash Sink Draw went away?

Randall Thacker: Yes. He's withdrawn that completely.

Rod Morrison: So you have to have a Wasatch hunt to hunt that?

Randall Thacker: Yes. We only bought half of that. We'll be working on them on some mitigation vouchers on the east side to keep some harvest there which will push them back to the west on public land and keep them away from where they're causing damage.

Kirk Woodward: What's happened with the moose numbers? 12 listed that aren't there now.

Charlie Greenwood: We're looking into possible disease issues with moose. We've found it in this region and the northern region. Another thing, they're checking is for selenium deficiencies. There are some studies and work going on to try and figure out what's going on with moose but we are seeing some reductions.

Kirk Woodward: That's a little nerve racking with the whole western United States. The moose population is considerably decreased in Jackson Hole area.

Randall Thacker: On our last moose trend counts, we came out within two head difference between two years ago and this year on the South Slope.

Kevin Christopherson: The Northern region had a hard winter last year.

Mitch Hacking: Have you got any habitat projects?

Charlie Greenwood: We have a lot of lop and scatter projects with Diamond Landowner Association's help. There's been some inter-seeding on Red Fleet area enclosure by BLM and Division. Donkey Flat, same thing.

Mitch Hacking: That Donkey Flat took about three years. It was slow, but then it finally took off.

Charlie Greenwood: The Kosha is coming on really good.

Dax Mangus: From last year to this year there's a big difference and the sagebrush is coming along in some areas more than others.

Beth Hamann: I went on that range ride and it was fun to see the sagebrush on private land where sagebrush is dead, and other areas on Division land where it has been reseeded. It's small but it's coming back and is looking good. You guys should try those range rides. They're wonderful.

Questions from Public:

None

Comments from Public:

None

Comments from RAC and discussion:

MOTION by Floyd Bartlett to approve numbers set by the DWR.

Second by Beth Hamann

Passed unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 7:50 pm

Next meeting: May 13, 2010

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Cedar City Middle School
Cedar City, UT
April 27, 2010
6:30 p.m.**

1. REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

MOTION: To accept minutes and agenda as written.

VOTE: Unanimous.

2. ANTLERLESS ADDENDUM, RULE & PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2010

MOTION (MOOSE): To accept the Antlerless Moose permit recommendations as presented.

VOTE (MOOSE): Unanimous

MOTION (PRONGHORN): To accept the Antlerless Pronghorn recommendations as presented.

VOTE (PRONGHORN): Unanimous

MOTION (DEER): To accept the Division's antlerless deer recommendations with the exception of the [Paunsaugunt] Mt. Carmel permit numbers be reduced to 25 permits and [Paunsaugunt] Buckskin permit numbers be reduced to 50 permits.

VOTE (DEER): 5 in favor 3 opposed

MOTION (ELK): To accept the elk recommendations as presented by the Division with the exception of the Fishlake unit being lowered from 1200 to 600 permits.

AMENDED MOTION: To also increase permits on the Southwest Desert from 150 to 175

AMENDED MOTION: To leave the Fishlake elk permits at 1200

FINAL MOTION: To accept the elk recommendations as presented by the Division with the exception that Southwest Desert unit permits increase from 150 to 175.

VOTE (ELK): 5 in favor, 3 opposed to the motion to leave the Fishlake elk permits at 1200.

VOTE (ELK): 6 in favor, 2 opposed to the motion to increase the Southwest Desert

elk permits from 150 to 175.

3. ANTLERLESS CWMU PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2010

MOTION: To accept the DWR proposal as recommended with the exception that we allow Alton CWMU 12 antlerless elk permits and change from 37 two-doe permits to 25 two-doe permits.

VOTE: 7 in favor, 1 opposed

MOTION: To accept the remainder of the Antlerless recommendations as presented [control permits and hunting antlerless during rifle season].

VOTE: Unanimous

MOTION: That the wildlife board put the Paunsaugunt deer population objective from 5200 back to 6500 on the action log for 2011.

VOTE: Unanimous

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Cedar City Middle School
Cedar City, UT
April 27, 2010
6:30 p.m.**

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Rex Stanworth Dale Bagley Cordell Pearson Dell LeFevre Clair Woodbury Paul Briggs Sam Carpenter Mack Morrell Steve Dalton	Douglas Messerly Natalie Brewster Teresa Bonzo Jim Lamb Jason Nicholes Sean Kelly Dustin Schaible Vance Mumford Lynn Chamberlain Josh Carver Heather Grossman	Jake Albrecht Tom Hatch	Steve Flinders-Excused Layne Torgerson-Excused

Cordell Pearson called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. There were approximately 8 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.

Cordell Pearson: Hey if we can have your attention and get you to sit down please; we're going to start. It is 6:35. My name is Cordell Pearson and I'll be chairing the meeting tonight. We'd like to recognize our two distinguished guests here from the state game board, Mr. Tom Hatch and Mr. Jake Albrecht. Very distinguished. Okay, we'll introduce the RAC board members now. We'll start to my left.

Clair Woodbury: I'm Clair Woodbury from Hurricane. I'm an at-large member.

Rex Stanworth: Rex Stanworth from Delta. I represent at-large.

Dale Bagley: Dale Bagley from Marysvale and I represent an elected official.

Paul Briggs: Paul Briggs, I represent BLM.

Douglas Messerly: I'm Doug Messerly, Regional Supervisor for the Division of Wildlife Resources. Myself and my staff act as executive secretary to this committee.

Sam Carpenter: Sam Carpenter, I represent sportsman. I'm from Kanab.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, as you can see we only have six members present at this time. We won't do any of the action items until we have a quorum here. But this is the way that the order, the meeting, will be ran. We will have a presentation from DWR. And then we'll have questions from the RAC and then questions from the public. Anybody from the public that wants to comment, you'll have to fill out a comment card and give it to one of the officers; they'll bring it up to us. And usually what we do, we don't have a lot of people here tonight, but it's three minutes for individuals and five minutes for a group. We will then hear, after we hear the comments from the public we will then hear comments from the RAC. Then we'll have a motion and vote. Okay if I could I'd like to have approval of the minutes from the last meeting. Okay.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)

Rex Stanworth: I'll make the motion we accept the meeting minutes from last time.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, do we have a second? Okay, Dale Bagley seconded the motion. All in favor raise your right hand. Any opposed?

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept agenda and minutes as presented. Dell LeFevre seconded. Unanimous

Cordell Pearson: Okay, seeing as how I wasn't to the Wildlife Board meeting, if I could I'd ask Doug to tell us what happened there. Evidently Doug wasn't there either. Maybe we could have one of the gentleman from the Wildlife Board tell us what happened at the meeting.

Wildlife Board Update: -Cordell Pearson, Chairman

Tom Hatch: (Inaudible not on the mic).

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we'll proceed with Doug with the regional update.

Regional Update: -Douglas Messerly, Regional Supervisor

Douglas Messerly: Thank you Mr. Chairman. That's how I recall the Wildlife Board meeting also. All the permit numbers that passed this committee, as recommended by the Division, also passed the Wildlife Board, with the exception of the bison discussion that we just talked about.

- Big game drawing results are coming out. Many people are aware by virtue of the fact that their credit cards have been charged and some e-mails have been

sent out also to applicants to notify them of their success status.

- The antlerless application period which is our next big application period follows this meeting and the meeting of the Wildlife Board next week, next Thursday. All of the regions are meeting at this same time. This is the one meeting that we do on the same night each year; so each of the five regions are meeting as we speak. When we're through at this meeting I'll contact the Salt Lake office and let them know the results verbally and then we'll e-mail them tomorrow with the summary of the motions from this meeting. It's a pretty quick turnaround for us. As a result Teresa Bonzo will be presenting tonight and the Salt Lake staff will be available in Salt Lake if there are questions that we need to ask. So I can dial those up if there are questions that we need to contact Salt Lake on. I'd like to kind of bunch those up.
- Fishing is coming on pretty good as I understand it. Lake Powell is outstanding this spring, particularly for large largemouth bass. Wayne said to tell everybody to come down and catch some largemouth bass. The next month or so should be really, really good for that. Also, our other lakes and streams are looking good. Primarily the lower elevation reservoirs have already been gill netted this spring so that we can sample and see what the results are. Good news is that Minersville seems to be back. So the fish are looking good there. Not a lot of pressure at this point. It kind of lost its reputation but the aquatics biologists are telling me that it's a good time to get back to Minersville so if anybody's interested in that. We expect good fishing this year. A lot of controversy swirling around House Bill 141, the stream access bill that was passed by the legislature. The Division already has some information on our website about that. In addition to that we're complying more information. Simple fact is that there are lots and lots of streams and rivers that are available for fishing in Utah still. The impact, even on private lands, I think will be less significant than some people are predicting. Although it is an important issue to both landowners and fisherman, the Division's doing what we can to help facilitate a better understanding of what the law that passed is. In addition to that we'll participate, as asked by the legislature, the task force that was ordered by the legislature to further study this issue. So you can look for more information on that. But it looks like we have a quorum.

Douglas Messerly: With that Mr. Chairman, unless there's any questions. One other thing, in light of tonight's topic, winter loss . . . we've had our field biologists out for the last couple of months filing weekly reports on what they're finding and we have found some significant issues that we need to address, particularly on Panguitch Lake unit. That's a unit that by our calculations is over objective. The antlerless permits that remain recommended on that unit are to address habitat issues. Another area of concern is the Monroe Mountain. Fortunately we have a deer collar study that I think we've mentioned briefly here in the past. One of the two units that we selected to study is the Monroe unit so we'll have some good data on that over the next few years. It's difficult to tell anything with one data point but the process essentially is that we've collared animals on each unit, both adults and fawns, and we'll study their survival over time. The collars change their tone when the animal dies. And then we frequently fly those with aircraft and go out on the ground and see if we can recover the collar and determine the cause of death on the animals. So that will be exciting for us to have that information.

The other unit that we've done that on is the Pine Valley unit. Hopefully we can get some good information about both adult survival and fawn survival on our deer units. Unless there's any other questions Mr. Chairman that's my presentation.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thanks Doug. As you've seen Mac Morrell, so we do have a quorum now right? So we can proceed. Okay, one other thing, there's not a whole lot of people here tonight but I think we need to say this anyway. When the presentation is being presented please be quiet. You'll have your chance when you come up to ask a question, or you can come up and comment. Okay? So I guess we'll just go on to the Antlerless Addendum Rule and Permit Recommendations for 2010. And Teresa will be doing that.

Antlerless Addendum, Rule & Permit Recommendations for 2010 (action) 11:52 to 31:10 of 2:35:26

- Teresa Bonzo, Regional Wildlife Program Manager

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you very much. Could we have the other members of the RAC board that came in. Okay, Steve Dalton is with us now. You might introduce yourself Steve if you want.

Steve Dalton: My name is Steve Dalton. I'm from Teasdale. Late, again.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any questions from the RAC? Yes Sir, go ahead.

Questions from the RAC:

Rex Stanworth: Teresa on the Paunsagaunt and on the Panguitch Lake, are those, apparently those are a lot of mitigation permits, and, but they're late hunts. So is it winter damage or is it harvest summer damage? On deer on the . . . because the hunts are like December 8th through December 19th, and the other one's 11-24 through 12-2. So I'm just wondering is that winter damage or is that summer damage in the fields?

Teresa Bonzo: Well on the Paunsagaunt we are having some summer damage, especially on that southwest Paunsagaunt area. Not down on the Buckskin. The Buckskin is more habitat issues and the lack of water, lack of resources down there. The Buckskin one is not for a depredation issue. But the Southwest one we do have summer issues there. A lot of those numbers are in the landowner's association but we still are issuing a hand full of permits, mitigation permits to those guys. As far as Panguitch Lake, we don't issue a ton of mitigation permits on that unit either. But around the Panguitch Valley, that's a summer problem, where they're coming down into the valley. And we're getting increasing pressure to reduce the numbers that are in those hay fields around there.

Rex Stanworth: Is the reason that you're shooting, you're shooting deer that could be coming off the mountain down there where the problem deer are so you may not be killing problem deer. So that I guess was my concern, is if it's depredation problems in the summer time I'm just wondering why we don't shoot them in the summer time and get rid of the problem deer instead of waiting until December when we got mountain deer that are coming down and they're innocent bystanders. I guess that's my point.

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah and I see your point there. But we are still trying on those four units, the

Paunsagaunt, Panguitch Lake, Zion and Pine Valley . . . Although we do want to concentrate our efforts where we're having the most problems, for those units were also trying to do a little bit of overall population control. So those are some of the combined efforts. We want to put the pressure where it makes the most sense. But some of the timing we may have to issue some more mitigation permits earlier in the season.

Rex Stanworth: Are the landowners in those areas are they willing to allow hunters to come in and hunt those problem deer in the summer?

Teresa Bonzo: If they got mitigation vouchers they can always give those to people and allow them to come on. I don't know about each individual landowner. Some people love to have people come on. Some people want to keep them all as family permits and remove them all themselves. So it fluctuates.

Mack Morrell: What's the success rate on the antelope on the Plateau Valley area?

Teresa Bonzo: It will take me just a half a sec. Jim, do you know right off the top of your head? We had 24 percent harvest on the Valley area.

Mack Morrell: One other issue on the deer. I know that Jim can attest to this. The problem that we have in Dry Valley and south of Lyman, and basically in the valley of all the does coming in, actually in September, October and November. You got your population objective is way below but we still have a problem of deer coming in the fields, a lot.

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah absolutely. And on those issues we try to address those more with mitigation permits for the landowners. For the Plateau unit, say for the Boulder last year, we issued 171 permits. It looks like only about 64 people actually hunted with 37 percent success. So for those summer issues on the farms where the deer population is still below objective we would rather issue those as mitigation permits to the landowners, and they can go as the free permits or as vouchers. So if you do want to give them to public to have them do it you can or you can have family do it, either way.

Dell LeFevre: Where is your antlerless boundary on the Fish Lake, on the south, for cow elk?

Teresa Bonzo: Highway 24 to 72.

Dell LeFevre: What would it take to change that? All you do is run them across the road and they come to Boulder.

Teresa Bonzo: And then we've got 500 and some odd permits on the Boulder as well, 580, I think, permits on the Boulder.

Dell LeFevre: Buy why don't you change that boundary out to Row Lake where they can have a chance to kill them elk before they get to us?

Jim Lamb: Years ago the boundary ran across the middle of the Parker, passed Parker Lake, across through the (Unintelligible) down Dry Wash. And we hunted those Fish Lake elk all the way to that boundary. When the boundaries across the entire state were changed to the current boundaries that we have now, we were encouraged to have those boundaries on those major roads. And so to address those

elk out on the Fish Lake some, but we just have to hunt them on both sides of that road. So we've got Boulder permits there and we've got Fish Lake permits there. This last November up in that area we had a hunt that had 80 percent success. And part of the reason was because those elk kept going back and forth and didn't know quite where to run to hide.

Cordell Pearson: Any more questions? Go ahead Steve.

Steve Dalton: I have a question on the depredation, the mitigation doe permits. I guess all of these permits have to be hunted during the summer months, not in the fall of the year, is that correct?

Teresa Bonzo: For the ones that, the depredation and mitigation ones that we issue to the landowners. We need to get those done before the end of September, typically, so that we are targeting specifically those deer that are there during the summer, the deer that are doing the damage that are on the hay fields at the time when the hay is growing. These antlerless hunts that we are recommending for the public they can be kind of spread all over the place to address other issues, whether they're some habitat issues or overall population issues. Does that kind of answer your question?

Steve Dalton: Yeah I think so. I think that's part of what Mac was trying to get at is this, part of the problem we're having, especially in the haystacks is October problems, November problems. And you've got a whole herd of deer there and no permits and nobody hazing them out of there. And they're in the stacks and . . . anyway.

Cordell Pearson: Go ahead.

Sam Carpenter: Teresa, what were the hunt dates for that Mt. Caramel hunt again, the one on the Paunsagaunt? I looked on here and I couldn't really find it.

Teresa Bonzo: That is Nov 24- Dec 2.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. Now didn't you say that's to address some problems during the summer months?

Teresa Bonzo: Well we have deer in there but that's also one of the population controls because the Paunsagaunt is over objective.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. And this again is because we're getting complaints from landowners? Now my understanding is landowners have signed agreements to get these buck permits. And part of their agreement was not to be complaining about depredation issues. We went through this on the Johnson Canyon hunt. Isn't that true?

Teresa Bonzo: Yes, if they are enrolled in the landowner's association. Regardless, we still do have members of the landowner's association that are complaining. And there are some people that aren't enrolled in the program. We kind of took that stand that if the public . . . like take the Southwest Desert for example, if the public is receiving a great deal of, if they're receiving antlerless permits then the landowner's association would be eligible. Last year I believe we issue a handful of antlerless elk permits to the Southwest Desert as we did, I think the Panguitch Lake Landowners Association. So if the public is getting them, you know, we'd like to spread out, there's no reason when we're trying to get rid of a few deer not to give them some.

Sam Carpenter: Ok and also isn't it true that you got the Zion does down there at the same time? That's where they migrate to during that time of year.

Teresa Bonzo: From the Zion?

Sam Carpenter: Right.

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah, that's likely. And we're trying to reduce population on the Zion as well. We've got another hunt that, the Mt Caramel one it's just right across the highway and it's at the same time so it's kind of addressing the same area.

Sam Carpenter: All right, and what are the boundaries on the one on the Paunsagaunt side? Do you know?

Teresa Bonzo: Jason, or Dustin do you want to speak to the boundaries?

Dustin Schaible: It's the Glendale Bench Road, east out of Kanab Creek and then down Kanab Creek back up 89.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. Okay, tell me this, if you have a unit that's 499 deer over it's objective, how many deer tags would you issue if you were 400 over? Do you have a formula for that? How do you go about determining?

Teresa Bonzo: You know with doe tags we try to be as conservative as we can. We're also hoping, as I know Friends of the Paunsagaunt are, that at one time the habitat trends are going to turn around and we can raise that objective back up 20 percent so we can have a higher objective. I don't know if Dustin if you want to speak to this, but we're trying to take it as conservative as possible. We don't want to get there in one year. And we also recognize that the deer, you can take out a lot of harvest and put a lot of pressure on elk and they seem to rebound, they do really fine. But we like to be a little more gentle with the deer and not just completely pound them. That's why we're issuing; we'd like to recommend 75 permits down on the Buckskin and only 50 on the Southwest hunt.

Sam Carpenter: Remind me again why we went to 5,200 on the Paunsagaunt from 6,500. Why did we do that?

Teresa Bonzo: The population objective that we have?

Sam Carpenter: Yeah we went from 6,500 in '03 to 5,200.

Teresa Bonzo: We took a 20 percent reduction; it's been probably five to ten years ago they reduced that.

Sam Carpenter: It had to do with the drought. We had about four years there that we had a really serious drought problem. Isn't that the reason that we lowered that?

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah, and based on the range trend, the long-term range trend studies that we have done.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. And going over the minutes from last year, this same meeting, we just discussed for a lengthy period, and even a recommendation was made by Mr. Woodbury to get this objective changed back up to 6,500. We've done thousands and thousands of acres of habitat work and we wanted to try to get that done. We were told at that meeting that over the next couple of months we would address that at the RACs and get that changed. Can you tell me why we didn't do that?

Teresa Bonzo: You know we'll have to put it into the management plan. This year we're doing the elk management plan. Next year we'll do all the unit wide deer management plans. At that time we can certainly make that recommendation to raise it back up to 6,200. Dustin and I have talked to the people in Salt Lake, to the big game coordinator, to our chief, and discussed these issues; as well as had countless meetings with our range trend. A lot of these habitat projects, yes a lot of work has been done and some of them are looking spectacular but we've also got the shortage of water that you are so familiar with. Of all the people, you know how scarce the water is. And we're working on that as well. When we address some of these basic needs that the deer have I don't think any of us have problems with raising the objective back up. But just because you do a habitat project this year doesn't mean that you're going to have, especially the browse species, sometimes you get the grasses back in but it take a while for the browse species. I spent a bit of time out there last summer and those projects are looking great and they are improving. And I'll be the first one to be absolutely thrilled when we can raise that objective back up and I hope that we can work that in to our next deer management plan; but we also base it on the range trend. We've actually discussed with the range trend group to come out and do some surveys and read the trend, not just every five years. Because you know how hard that is; if it catches us on a bad year it always show that we're declining. So Dustin, he'd like to look at some different areas more often, even like on a yearly basis. So there's a lot of things we're working on but it certainly doesn't happen over night.

Sam Carpenter: Right, and I understand. And most of these projects the BLM did were back in '06, '07 and '08, so they have had time and (unintelligible).

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah, browse usually takes 10 years to be established well enough to be utilized by deer. So we're absolutely getting there and it's looking great. We've moving in that direction.

Sam Carpenter: Ok so is it on the record that we will discuss this objective sometime this year on the RAC and see if we can change this?

Teresa Bonzo: Not this year. That would be when we redo the deer unit wide plan, next January the elk plans will go through and next year we'll be working, we'll form unit wide deer working groups and work to move towards this goal.

Sam Carpenter: Ok and you're basing this all on the DCI study? Because we lowered it prior to that study.

Teresa Bonzo: I thought it was the DCI that . . .

Sam Carpenter: No. It was prior to the one that Jim Davis came out with. Was that '08 when he came out with that one.

Teresa Bonzo: I was in a meeting in St. George in probably 2002 when we discussed lowering them by 20 percent, so that's been a while ago. I certainly wasn't in big game at that time but that's when we did discuss lowering poor units with poor range trends by 20 percent.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, that's all I have.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, go ahead Mac.

Mack Morrell: On the Henry Mountains on the elk; population objective is zero and your estimate is 20, and you're only going to have 8 antlerless permits. How are we ever going to get down to the population objective if we don't issue more permits?

Teresa Bonzo: Um, those are just the permits, let me grab my notes. Remember the slide about the control permits? Anybody that has a deer tag or a bison tag in that area can also pay \$25.00, go out there and it's not just once in a lifetime. . . . Those are the control permits. So what we're trying to do is maximize the number of people that could go out there and hunt antlerless elk. For \$25.00 all they have to have is an antlered or a once in a lifetime permit and they can for \$25.00 buy an elk tag.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any more questions from the RAC? Go ahead.

Clair Woodbury: Teresa do you have on the elk on the Fish Lake Plateau, do you have how many bulls were killed off of that unit last year, spike and limited entry?

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah, it will take me a minute to find it.

Clair Woodbury: And how many branched-antlered on that limited entry?

Teresa Bonzo: We killed on the any weapon, on the Fish Lake we killed 78. On the muzzleloader we killed 19. Archery, we killed 12. There were 4 killed on premium. And then we've got CWMU in addition. And I can go through those if you want. Those were 48.

Clair Woodbury: So there were over 400 bulls got killed on that unit. The reason I'm asking, going on your figures here we had almost 1,300 cows killed counting the CWMU and the mitigation. And how many bulls were there, five hundred, four hundred and something?

Teresa Bonzo: I didn't add them up.

Clair Woodbury: About 400. If I do that math that comes close to 1,700 elk that we killed there and we started last year with 5,100. 57, that was counting the unborn calves; because I strongly questioned you on the 57.

Teresa Bonzo: Well we counted 5,100.

Clair Woodbury: I think the actual count was just under 48 on that fly over., just a few. And then with the adjustments it was up to 51. Well it was up to 51, the 57 came with the unborn calves because I strenuously questioned the (unintelligible) on that.

Vance Mumford: (Inaudible, off the mic).

Cordell Pearson: Hold on just a minute. If you would, if you say something would you please step up to the mic so we get it on the records.

Clair Woodbury: Anyway we started with 5,100 elk, we killed 1,700 and magically we end up with 5,200 this year. I'm not getting the math here.

Teresa Bonzo: All right, we can sit down later and we can go through all the numbers. I'll show you where.. .

Clair Woodbury: No let's . . . no I'm just going off your numbers here. We killed 1,800 off of 51,000 and that's 33?

Teresa Bonzo: Well if we had 5,700, let's say that . . .

Clair Woodbury: That's with the unborn calves.

Teresa Bonzo: No.

Clair Woodbury: Yeah.

Teresa Bonzo: No, that's with sightability.

Clair Woodbury: No, that's . . . it was 51.

Teresa Bonzo: Because we, we . . .

Clair Woodbury: It was 51. I've got your numbers right here.

Teresa Bonzo: Okay, well I don't know that this is the forum to go into this much detail.

Clair Woodbury: Well no, we're recommending 1,200 more cows this year and we're starting with 3,300 and you've got listed the population 5,200 and I'm just questioning how we ended up with 1,900 more elk after we've got the numbers on what we shot last year.

Cordell Pearson: Teresa, I think that Doug would like to comment on that.

Teresa Bonzo: We counted . . . Okay, go ahead Doug.

Douglas Messerly: The issue of modeling and our calculations is a frequent topic of discussion at this RAC meeting each year. And I'm not sure how best to address that except to say that we use the best models we can get our hands on. We go over and over them for days. We calculate how many calves or fawns or whatever is going to be added in each year. And the basic fact Clair is if you've got 5,700 animals on the mountain, or let's say 5,000 animals on the mountain, somewhere between three and four thousand of them are cows that are going to have calves. And if you add that up each year how many do you have to remove in order to just stay even? And that's a real basic calculation. And I wish it were

that simple. I've seen modeling done on a napkin at a RAC meeting in this same sort of discussion. And all I can tell you or offer to you is that these guys go through a lot of training and we use extensive models and we're very concerned too. We certainly wouldn't want to make a big mistake here. But when you're trying to manage 5,000 animals or 6,000 animals and keep them at objective you got to remove a lot of them each year because there are a lot of calves born each year. And if you're further going to reduce the population you got to remove some more and sometimes it's a pretty scary number; and we understand that. But we work hard to try and get it right.

Clair Woodbury: Thanks Doug. I appreciate that. What I'm trying to stop here is another kill like we had ten to eleven years ago where we took the numbers right down to 1,300. That's the unit I cut my teeth on hunting for most of my adult life.

Douglas Messerly: Trust me

Clair Woodbury: No, I'm not going to trust anybody with these numbers right here.

Douglas Messerly: No, no, trust me when I say this, I want to avoid that more than you do.

Clair Woodbury: Good. Good because I'm going to do my best to not let that happen again. And I'm just going on your numbers. 5,100 elk we started with last year. That was on the survey, on the count. That was the actual aerial count. We killed 1,800. That brings it down to 3,300, even adding the calves that were born I don't see we're anywhere near that 5,200 that we've got listed this year. Then we're going to kill another 1,200 this year and I'm just not seeing it. Anyway that's all.

Teresa Bonzo: And I certainly appreciate it. Yeah, we just go off the 5,706 is what we started with. We add in our calf crop that will occur, you know, this past July.

Clair Woodbury: And I have a severe problem with adding unborn calves too. Let's get that from the record again for this year.

Teresa Bonzo: And another issue ten years ago, those were those control permits that were obviously so effective.

Clair Woodbury: I know what they were; I was talked into one.

Teresa Bonzo: So yeah, I don't want to ever have to live through that in my career also.

Clair Woodbury: That's all Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, one more question from the RAC.

Sam Carpenter: I just noticed in this handout that it differs from the one that I received in the package and the one I printed off the Internet after they made some corrections, and that was on this 2-10 CWMU recommendations were 37. And I looked at this handout that I got from you tonight and it says 75.

Teresa Bonzo: Those are to the side and then it says 37 two-doe.

Sam Carpenter: And then it says 37 two-doe. What is that?

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah, uh they're two doe permits and we'll cover that in the CWMU presentation. I found errors and I mentioned this earlier that Rex had caught some errors and I caught some other errors that are in this handout so I redid it. It's not the same as what was on the Internet but this is accurate. The Alton CWMU has the three-year plan where this year they will receive 37 two-doe.

Sam Carpenter: Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: I just have one question for you. How many CWMU permits is there on the Fish Lake? Yeah, for antlerless elk.

Teresa Bonzo: 230. No? No that is deer, I'm so sorry. 32. No I'm sorry, 52. No it's 52, it's in the handout.

Cordell Pearson: Ok thank you. We'll now have questions from the public. When you go up to the mic please state your name.

Questions from the public:

None

Cordell Pearson: No questions from the public. We'll proceed and we'll take comments from the public.

Comments from the public:

Cordell Pearson: And the first one will be Mr. Heaton.

Wade Heaton: Wade Heaton, I'm representing the Alton CWMU tonight. Just a couple of quick things I want to get just by way of background information. Sam's brought it up a little bit and talked about it, as well as Teresa. I got elected from the Friends of the Paunsagaunt to present this proposal. So this is actually Friends of the Paunsagaunt's proposal. We've met with Dustin several times over the last month and a half discussion these antlerless permits with regard to the deer for the Paunsagaunt. Friends of the Paunsagaunt we've made it very clear from the very beginning that we, we're not in favor of antlerless hunts at this time; and I'll get into the reasons why in just a minute. But we met with Dustin and like usual he did awesome. Um, we into the wee hours of the morning and he didn't even mind. But we uh, kind of came to a compromise and felt like, you know what, these are some numbers we can live with. And what we kind of left the table with was 50 doe tags for the Buckskin and 25 for this Mt Caramel hunt. Somewhere between that meeting and Salt Lake those numbers got increased a little bit. Um, but uh, we actually want to go back to those numbers and so I'm making that proposal from Friends of the Paunsagaunt. Instead of 75 for the Buckskin we propose 50. Instead of 50 for Mt. Caramel we propose 25. And now let me get into the reasons why just a little bit; Sam alluded to this already. When we went through those really bad droughts at the beginning of, well in '01, '02, '03, the DWR, and wisely so, did an emergency reduction for that population objective. It was at 6,500, they dropped it to 5,200. It was kind of a moot point, we didn't really have any antlerless hunts anyway,

Mother Nature kind of took care of the problem. We had such poor production and such mortality loss that the population actually dropped far below that 52 objective anyway; so it all kind of worked out great. But, we've kind of turned the corner on that drought and we've had some really good years; especially these last three. And uh, we feel like we're to the point where we can go back to that 6,500, and that is our soul purpose in reasoning for making this proposal that we did. You know we want to compromise and we want to work, if it has to be 75 doe tags, great. But we certainly don't want any more than we have to have. We feel like the unit can . . . there's probably at a higher carrying capacity now and it's been a long time; especially due to the fact that, Sam mentioned, the habitat projects. There's been more habitat work done in the last five years than there's been in the preceding twenty-five. I just got an e-mail the other day that the issue that Teresa brought up, we've had some terrific water issues out there on the winter range. They just proposed, actually just passed, approved, passed, there were no protests, we'll have some new guzzlers on the Buckskin. They've already, or according to the e-mail, already started work on them. So hopefully we'll have those for this fall. Anyway, hopefully to alleviate some of that, get some more dispersal. We've got some great habitat out there, that's the bottom line. And we feel like we can have a few more deer on the Pauns without affecting that. We take some issues with a little bit of those range trend studies, very narrow, very select; and we feel like it's not a real accurate representation of what's truly out there. Um, anyway, so that's our recommendation. We'd like to have 50 tags on the Buckskin and 25 on the Mt. Caramel. Thanks.

Rex Stanworth: Wade, what is your take on some of the landowners who are protesting those deer? I mean is that a serious thing?

Wade Heaton: Um, I guess if I don't mention who it is I can say whatever I want. There are some issues. There are some issues. Some of the landowners are very vocal. They cause Teresa and Dustin a lot of headache. I am personally not opposed to this hunt, that Mt. Caramel hunt. To be very honest there's not a lot of damage that goes on in the summer time. It's a chronic complaining situation. And the bottom line is if this will help, great. Do we want to lose a lot of deer due to a few complainers? No. We're willing to compromise a little but we don't want to give up our whole herd just because of a few guys. There's not a lot of damage in the summer. And by the time all the deer do show up they're done with production, as far as their hay fields and crops.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you Wade. Next Jeremy Chamberlain.

Jeremy Chamberlain: Wade always makes me go after him and I have to adjust the mic every time. I am Jeremy Chamberlain, also with the Friends of Paunsagaunt. And Rex, just to address a little bit more of that I actually live there in the valley where this Mt. Caramel and the Zion hunt will be taking place. Not only has the BLM been doing a lot of stuff on the Paunsagaunt they've actually just cleared and reseeded, uh, I'm going to say between 3 and 5,000 acres on that Zion unit that, you know, we mentioned or it has been mentioned that a lot of those deer come off of the Zion unit and come down into those lower fields by the river there. We don't want to kill a lot of deer. You know I don't think the Fish and Game want that either but they do want to curb the complaining and things like that. And it's from a very few select people and they are, as far as my knowledge goes, they are enrolled in the landowners association and they do get money from that. So, you know I hate to say, you know, they get their cake and eat it to but they do. If we're going to have this many doe tags they're going to get the money and then also we're going to lose a resource. And so going back to it, you know they've improved a lot of land there. The 50 Zion tags and the 50 Mt. Caramel tags I think would be too many in that small of an area. You know at that later date most of those deer are going to be in those hay fields

and they're going to be shooting the deer that are all congregated there. They're not disbursed that late in the year. But anyway, I also support Wade's recommendation in that we have 50 and the 25. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Yes, go ahead.

Rex Stanworth: So Jeremy just one question: do you think that the landowners, or do you think the majority of the people would support the 6,500 number for an objective?

Jeremy Chamberlain: Are you asking the landowner, the landowners or the people?

Rex Stanworth: People, let's say people.

Jeremy Chamberlain: In that area, absolutely. Yes.

Rex Stanworth: So if we make a recommendation to Salt Lake that we would like to see the objective go to 6,500 you're going to be here to defend us when it comes time if anybody comes up and starts shooting bullets at the RAC members, right?

Jeremy Chamberlain: Yep, I would.

Rex Stanworth: Okay, all right.

Jeremy Chamberlain: I'd hope I'd get a flack jacket from the Fish and Game though.

Rex Stanworth: All right, that's all I wanted to know.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you. Next will be Jake from Dixie National Forest.

Jake Schoppe: I feel like I'm amongst a lot of friends here tonight but I'm glad I'm not behind the table with you guys again. So I left you a letter and I got to be the messenger tonight. The two units that are over objective, I've talked quite a bit with Dustin about this, are that Johns Valley pronghorn unit and the Mt. Dutton elk unit. And I don't know if you want me to read the letter or if you want to read it but I'd like for everybody to hear it.

Cordell Pearson: Yeah, why don't you go ahead and read it Jake.

Jake Schoppe: All right I'll just read it and then I won't get in trouble. Dixie National Forest is providing this letter as comment to the proposed 2010 antlerless recommendations. There are two unit recommendations that the Dixie National Forest would like to provide comment on; the Mt. Dutton elk herd unit and the Mt. Dutton/Paunsagaunt Johns Valley pronghorn unit. In each case both elk and pronghorn currently exceed the plan population objectives. Based on our review of the proposals it appears that the proposed numbers for harvest are not designed to bring these pronghorn and elk units into objective. Following discussions with local UDWR biologists the Forest has learned that the proposed harvest are not designed to bring these units into immediate compliance but will be accomplished over a three year period. This approach seems to be a different management approach than what the Forest has seen in the past. Because of that we suggest that if the plan is to decrease the

herd size over a three year period that UDWR count these herds on an annual basis rather than every two or three year basis. This will not only help determine hunter success but will provide a basis for monitoring immigration. If herd counts are not practiced on a more frequent basis herd numbers could far exceed plan objectives before managers can ever access its population goals are being obtained. The Forest supports bringing current numbers into compliance with herd management plans and encourages the Division to consider season changes as a complement to other changes that have been proposed within the Mt. Dutton herd unit. And that's all in the letter. So in general I guess what that gets to is primarily on Mt. Dutton elk, you know, we're looking at a population objective of 1,500 head and we're looking at being 500 over. In talking with Dustin he didn't feel like he can put that many people in the woods all at once on top of each other. So I think what you're seeing is your support to follow that up over a three-year period but we definitely want to see it get to objective. And I guess I'll leave it at that. And there's bumper stickers on the back table that say Mt. Dutton elk taste better than Fish Lake elk. So, that's all I have. Any questions?

Cordell Pearson: Anybody have any questions? Thank you very much. Okay next will be Gibb Yardley.

Gibb Yardley: I'm Gibb Yardley from Beaver, Utah. I run my cattle on the Southwest Desert, on Blue Mountain and Burnt Knoll allotments and in the summertime we summer on the Panguitch Lake units, up on the top of the mountain, right under east of Cedar Breaks. We like to see deer and we like to see elk but we also like to be able to run the numbers of cattle that we need to run to make a living on. And the problem is with these elk that they get there before this grass is started, keep the grass back a lot in the spring so it doesn't have a chance to grow as much when the cattle get there. We want to stay in the cattle business as much as (unintelligible) and be able to hunt it but we've got to try to live together and that's what we want to do. But we cannot keep raising the upper limits on all these herd units and that's what's been happening for the last 15 years. Because we worked hard to get an upper limit set on these different herd units and every time we turn around they're raising the numbers. Now it was my understanding a couple of years ago that on the Panguitch Lake unit that there was only supposed to be about 800 elk up there. And uh, I, I haven't been here for a couple of years and uh, they've got the upper limit here now to 1,100 and I know that we didn't approve of that at the last meeting I was to. And there's 872 and I don't think it ought to go above that. And I think we ought to take a few of these cow elk off and bring that down, because I think the upper limit is too high for what those ranges will carry. So I'd like to recommend that they take 100 of those cow elk off the Panguitch Lake unit. Now out on the Southwest Desert, before I get into that I want to say that, how often do they count these herds? Is it every year or how often?

Douglas Messerly: Every three years.

Gibb Yardley: Every three years? Well is that often enough? Hadn't they ought to be counted every year? How can you estimate it from one year to the next and for three years?

Douglas Messerly: How that works Mr. Yardley is that we count these units on a three year rotation, primarily because it's very expensive. We do it in a helicopter and it costs between \$650 and \$750 dollars an hour. And you know how big that country is and it takes it several days to fly the Southwest Desert. And there's not an endless supply of money to do that. We do our best to count all the animals when we do do that and then we keep close track of production on the in between years. And with modeling, and what that takes into account is production, the number of calves that they have, we take a

good sample size so that we get an estimate of the number of calves that are born every year, and we all that to the existing population. And then we factor in the harvest that we accomplish through the hunts, the very hunts that we're recommending tonight, to control those population size. And this antlerless recommendation process is primarily how we do that. And so what we do is we make our best guess based on what we see in the field with regard to production as to how many calves hit the ground based on the number that we got from the last count and we project that forward right on through the third year when we count again and we see how close we are. If we need to make adjustments to that based on what we predicted versus what we observed then we do. And we've actually gotten pretty good at it on those units where there's not a lot of immigration and out migration to those units. And units like the Southwest Desert we can predict pretty well.

Gibb Yardley: Well it's hard for me to believe that we get very accurate counts on these animals, just counting them every three years. And I think there's a lot of animals missed in a lot of these counts, in various places, because I've talked to some people that have been on those counts and they said that they missed quite a few. Now who goes on those counts? Is there any livestock people that go on them?

Douglas Messerly: Who did go this year Jason? We invite

Jason Nicholes: The guy didn't show up and (inaudible not on mic).

Douglas Messerly: We invite a livestockmen every year. Sophia Hall has flown many times. And Mr. Yardley I'd like to extend an invitation to you to fly with us the next time we do on the Southwest Desert.

Gibb Yardley: Well what about Panguitch Lake?

Douglas Messerly: Sure.

Gibb Yardley: Well if those things are safe so I can stay in the air all the time and we land on the ground well I might try it. I'd kind of like to go with ya. You never had one crash yet have ya?

Douglas Messerly: Well actually we have doing wildlife work.

Gibb Yardley: You have, oh.

Douglas Messerly: And it's actually the most likely way for somebody who works in the wildlife business to lose their life in the course of their work. However, we fly with the safest pilots we can find because I think a lot of these folks. And I'd think a lot of you too so we'd get a safe pilot to take you in.

Gibb Yardley: Well I can see you've got to do that to count them, it's all you can do. And there's risk involved in everything we do in life so. . .

Douglas Messerly: Yep. But you're welcome to go. And as you know there's a lot of livestockmen on the Panguitch Lake and also on the Southwest Desert but we try to give everybody their turn that wants to go. So don't come back but others really like it and we have to shoo them away. So we're sorry we missed your turn a couple a times it sounds like but we'll get you on the next one if you'd like.

Gibb Yardley: Okay. Well we'll give it some serious consideration because I want to see some accurate counts on these animals.

Douglas Messerly: Fair enough.

Gibb Yardley: Now uh, on this Southwest Desert the objective plan is 975 head. I, and then they said the count estimated 1,150. And they had that same about and in 2008 they recommended 300 and last year 200, and now this year 150. I'll tell ya, I been in the ranching business all my life raising cattle, those cows have a lot of heifer calves and you've got to keep selling a bunch off if you keep your numbers where they're supposed to be. And we've got to take some of these cow elk off to keep these numbers down because they increase mighty fast. And it's the same with these cattle. We have to see a bunch of heifers and you have to take a bunch of these cow elk off to keep these herds in line. We've got to all do what we can. I love grass. I love a good range. I don't want my cattle starving. If they don't have enough to eat we don't put them up there. And that's been my philosophy and you can ask anybody that I've got permits with. This year I could only put 2/3 of my cattle out on the winter range out there. My neighbors, the Winches out there in Wah Wah, they had to ship all their cattle to Nevada to winter. The drought was terrible out there. They didn't have anything for those cattle. Of course it wasn't all the elk and that, a lot of it and a big share of it was them wild horses that's eating us out of house and home. Now they took a lot of them off and that seems like a never-ending problem out there and there doesn't seem to be any answers to it because there's so much public sympathy for those things that really have no value. And it's nice to have a few but it's not nice to have them eat you out of house and home. And that's just what's been happening on a lot of them ranges. We've got to protect the resource and protect the ranges. And when we have these droughts like we had last year it was bad out there. We need to take off a few more of these cow elk. We don't have the problem with the deer but it's these, these elk. And uh, I just don't think that we ought to, I think we ought to take 300 off out there on that West Desert. I really do, of cow elk. And I noticed that uh, on the deer population at Panguitch Lake, uh, there was 8,500, that's the objective. But there was 10,500 and you're only recommending 175 be taken off, now why's that? If the objective is 8,500 and you've got 2,000 more how come we're only taking off 175? That don't make sense. Why don't we try to follow the objective?

Douglas Messerly: Well you're probably familiar with the kind of winter we had on that unit Gibb. As was stated earlier by Teresa, our range work just in the last couple of weeks has shown us that we had a very significant loss of fawns on the Panguitch Lake unit, particularly in the Panguitch area and Three Mile Creek, but also on this Parowan front side. So we're real conservative. . . .

Gibb Yardley: Was that because of the drought?

Douglas Messerly: No it's because of the heavy snows this winter.

Gibb Yardley: Oh this year. Yeah.

Douglas Messerly: Yeah, this winter. So we lost a bunch of fawns is what we think and we're a little, not a little, we're conservative in this case. Managing deer is different than managing elk. My friend Jeff Grandison used to say the only thing that kills an elk is a bullet. But deer are not that way and so we have to be, we have to be careful managing our deer. And so we're being conservative so we can kind of see what happened with our winter loss this year on the Panguitch. But you're absolutely right in pointing out that we're over objective on that unit and we'd like to manage to that objective in order to

protect the habitat, but we're worried about the winter loss. That's the answer to your question.

Gibb Yardley: Well I can see that. But uh, you take if you've got 2,000 more elk or deer than what your objective is it seems like to me you should have a bigger hunt than that. I can't believe that that many fawns would die. But maybe they would now, I don't know. It has been a heavy snow year, thank goodness for that it's going to break the drought. We need some of them pretty regular. But uh, and we had an awful dry summer on that mountain last year. But uh, I think that ought to be at least double to compensate when you've got 2,000 more than what the objective is. That isn't even a drop in the bucket unless; it doesn't seem like to me, so I think you ought to take that into serious consideration.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, Gibb if you can wrap it up a little bit. You've had your time.

Gibb Yardley: Okay. Well let's work together but let's keep these upper unit numbers where they're supposed to be and the objective number in where they're supposed to be and not increase them by 100's of head and thousands. So, uh, I appreciate the opportunity of talking here and I hope that you'll remember those things. Uh, . . .and I can't understand, and it seems like to me that we ought to take a few cow elk off the Panguitch Lake unit. But that's my recommendation.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you. We have one more card here from Steven Yardley.

Steven Yardley: Hi my name is Steven Yardley and I'm from Beaver, Utah as well. That was my dad addressing you. And he covered pretty much everything I was uh, was wondering about. I just wanted to thank everyone on the RAC. I know you guys put in a lot of long drives, a lot of long hours and make a big sacrifice. Thank everyone that's working for the DWR as well. I know that, especially like Teresa taking the head of the bullet, being the messenger, delivering the messages ain't always the easiest thing to do and there's a lot of controversy on both sides in these instances. I would uh, on the helicopters, I was wondering like on the lower deserts, I know up in the high mountains and that it wouldn't be a possibility, but on the lower deserts some of those like ultra light planes might be a lot better, uh, I guess fiscally uh, measurable, a cheaper way to fly I guess is what I'm trying to say, uh, than a helicopter. Maybe the safety is a little bit of an issue. And prop planes also. And just, if there's every anyone, if on the Panguitch Lake or on down on the Southwest Desert, if there's ever a rancher that can't go we'd like to have our names in there so we could go because we would like to see a rancher be on there. And uh, and then just quick, and my dad kind of brushed over this, but on the Southwest Desert the objective is 975. The past two years they've let 200 and 300, in 2007 they had 200 off, 2008 300 off. Estimated was 1,150 in 2008. For 2009 it's the same number but yet they're only letting out half the tags and it seems to me that they need to be letting out one and a half, about 450 if they're going to get down to their objective. So we have some reseeds out there and we never even put cows on them and the elk eat the hell out of em. And that you guys all know how fragile that desert winter range is and the habitat doesn't come back like it does on these high mountain country. If the habitat gets beaten up in one year and we have a drought it can affect that for 10 to 20 years. So just recommend increasing that, thanks.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you. I'm going to have Doug comment a little bit on why we don't use ultra light airplanes.

Douglas Messerly: Interestingly enough attempted to do that in the mid '90's. I was actually a pilot of one of those powered parachutes and have logged about 75 hours in one. And the time we fly elk is in January when we have good snow cover: sometimes we go into February. And I am here to tell you it is

no fun to fly those when it is below zero. It is very cold. And the other thing is it is hard to take the ranchers with us in them. And you just can't cover the country. The truth is they fly about 27 miles an hour top speed. And the jet helicopters that we're using now cover a lot more ground in a lot shorter time. It would take us way to long to count them with the lighter aircraft and that's why we don't do it.

Steven Yardley: What about with the just little prop planes? (Inaudible, not in the mic).

Douglas Messerly: You really need, the difference between counting with a fixed wing and a helicopter is very significant when you're trying to actually count animals. Because you have to keep your speed way up in a fixed wing aircraft in order to stay aloft. It's really difficult to turn and it's actually probably a lot more dangerous under the circumstances.

Cordell Pearson: Okay. Seeing there are no more comment cards from the public we'll now have comments from the RAC.

RAC discussion and vote:

Cordell Pearson: Okay, go ahead.

Paul Briggs: First of all I would like to say to the Yardley's, Gibb I remember working with you on those permit and what you say is absolutely true, you take pretty good care of your permits and I always appreciated that about ya. I liked working with you on those. From the BLM perspective on the antlerless recommendations, BLM is in support of the Division's recommendations on all of the Southern Region antlerless as proposed. I also have a letter here from the Cedar Field office I'd like to read into the record. It says, Dear Regional Advisory Council members. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on antlerless recommendations to the RAC. Pronghorn, we support the recommendations for Southwest Desert, Milford Flat, and the Pine Valley units. Elk, we support UDWR's recommendations for the Southwest Desert, Beaver, Panguitch Lake, Zion and Pine Valley units. We intend to increase our monitoring efforts in the Southwest Desert unit in the coming year to gather data that could address concerns about elk over utilization of forage. We removed approximately 700 head of horses in 2009 from the Southwest Desert unit due to drought and rangeland health conditions. Deer, we support UDWR's antlerless recommendation for the Pine Valley, East Bumblebee and Enterprise units, the Panguitch Lake, Parowan Front, Summit, Paragonah hunts and the Zion, Northwest Zion hunt. BLM is continuing our efforts to improve crucial deer winter ranges in these areas. As you know development and highways restrict the amount of available habitat and large numbers of deer are concentrated on the public land winter ranges. We look forward to continuing cooperative efforts with our partners in habitat restoration. It is signed Elizabeth Bergheart, the acting Cedar City Field Office Manger.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you. Are there any more comments from the RAC? Go ahead Mack.

Mack Morrell: Paul what did you say the elk loss was on the Southwest Desert, on your letter? Or did you say anything about elk?

Paul Briggs: It didn't say elk (inaudible, not on mic).

Mack Morrell: I was just going to say the Yardley's have a probably a legitimate grip because if you,

right now the population estimate is 1,150 and if you're only taking 150 off and that doesn't include the recruitment coming in . . . so. And the same with Dutton, you've got an objective of 1,500 and it's 2,000 and you're only taking 5 off and still the recruitment isn't counted in that. So . . . you know I think maybe we ought to take more off those two units. Come down to the objective. Because if Southwest Desert never has been objective for the last, elk at objective for the last four years.

Paul Briggs: Well Mack the way the BLM follows these recommendations or adds to these recommendations is on the recommendations that I receive from our biologists. And they reviewed these antlerless recommendations and felt that when you consider the other hunts and the depredation permits and all those things in conjunction with these antlerless permits that they were pretty close to getting them to objective. So I'm just forwarding the recommendation from those biologists.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, go ahead.

Clair Woodbury: One more thing we've done on that Southwest Desert is increase the bull kill, open it up last year to the spike hunt and then a couple of years before that to the management hunts. What we found out there is a high percentage of bulls to cows and we're trying to reduce the numbers on the bull side more than the cow side I think.

Cordell Pearson: Go ahead.

Dale Bagley: I just had a comment on the Greenwich, 20 permits on that. That opens the same day as the spike hunt. By that point in time most of the damage is done in that area anyway. So you could probably cover the same objective with the spike hunt in that area unless you can start that hunt a couple of weeks earlier. But then I know what the problem is there, you start running into overlapping on your limited entry hunts and we wouldn't want to do that. But anyway, the spike hunt pretty much pressured those out of there in that area.

Cordell Pearson: Go ahead.

Clair Woodbury: Yeah I would like to, I probably didn't leave any doubt on how I feel on the Fish Lake cow hunt. And Teresa I apologize if I rough you up a little too much on that. Uh, I've talked to Teresa at the bucks and bulls meeting last month and she was under the impression maybe there would be about 600 cow tags put on that. And I felt that was about right and I hope that we could reduce it to that 600 rather than almost 1,300.

Cordell Pearson: Go ahead.

Sam Carpenter: Something Wade brought up. We got together, Friends of the Paunsagaunt got together. We've been meeting with Dustin, and I hope there's no repercussion on Dustin because he came and met with us, we discussed in length, we don't really want any does taken off the Paunsagaunt. We do understand depredation issues and we do understand habitat issues. One of the things that really came of that meeting was we wanted to be able to come to these RAC meetings and be able to streamline in to where we don't have to sit and argue back and forth over permits, and this is one of the reasons that we're agreeing to a certain number of permits to be issued on the Paunsagaunt. And that number, as Wade brought up, was 50 at the Buckskin and 25 on Mt. Caramel. With that in mind we talk about the habitat issue on there and population objectives. We really truly feel that unit can handle these

additional animals. It's just like I was saying before when I was questioning Teresa, we covered this last year, we were told we would be addressing it last year. I never did get an answer on why it wasn't but that's fine. We would like to reinitiate that and make sure that it at least gets on as an action item as something that we can look into. I can tell you from '05 to '08 out on the monument itself that they have done over 5,000 acres of habitat work out there. From '08 to present there's at least another 3,000 that has been done. And we have nearly 100,000 proposed to start. I mean it is just massive projects out there. And we all understand the importance of habitat but we certainly would like to get this objective moved up to where it was prior to that drought. So uh, I can tell you that we truly care about these units. We don't want to do anything to damage it. We understand that DWR is doing their best in their recommendation and their modeling. Another thing that Dustin met with us about was the modeling and discussion that with us. So uh, with that in mind we'd hope to try to get that addressed and somehow get this on record to address that population objective. And I don't think we're ready for any kind of motions yet. I'm sure there's still more discussion to come so I'll just leave it at that.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you. Okay.

Paul Briggs: Mack I think I'm a little bit slow but I think I just clued into what you were saying about that letter from Cedar Field Office and what that referenced to the elk utilization studies, is on the Southwest Desert. Is what Cedar Field Office is trying to say is they're going to do some more intensive utilization studies on those areas so that next year, hopefully, we'll have better information to put into these recommendations on targeting more specifically those areas where we're going to take off antlerless elk.

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman.

Cordell Pearson: Yes Sir, go ahead.

Rex Stanworth: What I'd like to see us do is, shall we start on pronghorn and moose, go to that, make a decision on what we're going to do, make a motion and pass that. Then go to elk and then go to deer. Because I think if we try to do everything at one time there's just too much to put in to make a motion. So I would propose that we start with the one that had the least amount of comment, and that was the pronghorn and moose, discuss that, somebody make a motion, we approve it and then move to the next one. It may speed us up a little bit.

Cordell Pearson: Ok we can do that. We will start with the moose. But first I want to see if there's any more comments on the elk or the deer. And I just have a couple of comments; one is on Mt. Dutton, you know that's in my back yard. That has been a terrible hunt, forever, ever since they started issuing cow tags. I mean it don't matter if you're in a vehicle, if you're walking, if you're riding a horse. When you have a late hunt up there in January, and I know that Tom has seen the same thing, you can see 300 head of elk up there but there's no way to get to them because your horse is in snow clear to his belly. I think one thing that's really going to help that hunt this year is people being able to shoot a cow elk during the deer hunt with a rifle. You know where it's never been before, it's been bow and arrow. And I think next year when you take a long look again at the Dutton, because I think that our success on the Dutton over all is like what, 19 percent on antlerless hunts? Uh, that's what I've heard. I'm sorry, couldn't hear ya. Okay, 27 percent. I think we'll see a lot better percentage kill on that. One other comment that I have is and we've kind of hashed this over a bunch, is the Marysville on the Beaver hunt. And I know extending boundaries is a pain in you know what, but we did extend but we extended it in the wrong

way. We extended that hunt clear to Circleville which really don't help at all where we have the problem with is in Marysville, down in Bullion. And I don't know if there's any way that we can extend that to go up the mountain further or what we can do, but I think it's something that we need to look at.

That's all I have to say. Oh, one other thing . . . I do have something else to say. On the Fish Lake, I agree 100 percent. I think we need to take a long look at those cow tags and the cows that we're going to kill on that unit because I don't want to see it go back to what we did when we had the \$20.00 spike and cow tag, and I think that's exactly where we're going. There was a lot of elk killed on the Fish Lake last year, I know, I was there. Okay, any more comments?

Clair Woodbury: Yeah, I just had one question addressing Sam's concern on the Paunsagaunt. And maybe Doug can answer this; did we do an emergency reduction on that limit from 6,500 to 5,200? And if we did do we need to wait for a year to address that or can we do it this year?

Douglas Messerly: What happen was in 2003 we had a real bad summer, if you remember. And at that time that was the time when we did the annual revision, or I'm sorry, the five-year revision of the deer management plans. They come up every five-years, just like the elk plans do. And those are the unit management plans. And they, those unit management plans follow the year after the statewide management plan. So it just so happened that extremely bad year happened to be the year that we were revising our deer unit management plans and the concern was great, if you remember, about sage brush die off and about total loss of winter ranges in some cases. There were some pretty dire predictions. They turned out not to be true, thankfully. And a lot of that issue has been recovered, and frankly that was a driving force behind our habitat initiative that has created hundreds of thousands of acres of winter range improvement. But the short answer to your question is it was done then. The last time around that we did those, I believe it would be 2008 now, the objectives were not raised. Again, there was discussion about it, however, the desirable component index, which is an index that we've developed to gauge not only the range condition but probably more importantly the trend on the range, whether it's getting better or worse, indications weren't that there had been a lot of significant recovery during that time period. Now the next time around for those deer plans will be as soon as we get done with the elk unit management plans that are coming around. I would propose that that would be the time to have the discussion with regard to deer unit plan objectives. I've seen it happen where we've changed individual unit plan objectives in midstream on a management plan. But if you recall the last time we put the Paunsagaunt unit deer management plan together we convened a committee. We went to a lot of effort to get that put together. And I don't know how appropriate it would be to make a recommendation at this point to change that based on the information that's been provided here. What we're here tonight to do is make annual antlerless recommendations. If we're going to, we'd have come better prepared to talk about a unit objective adjustment because, you know, the question was asked would the people be in favor of raising the objective on the Paunsagaunt? Yeah, these people too. But we have the responsibility to manage the habitat and there are concerns on both the winter and the summer range on the Paunsagaunt that need to be addressed. We have a responsibility to address them because we can raise the objective forever and never harvest a doe if you want, but somebody has got to look out for the range. And that's what objectives are all about in the case of deer, is about range condition. So I hope that helps answer the question. I am not sure that how it fits to make a recommendation today to raise the objective on a unit management plan.

Clair Woodbury: My question was just something maybe we could address this year. But if it came about as a regular time then you answered my question.

Sam Carpenter: Can I add to that? Clair, myself and Wade and Jeremy were all a part of that committee that Doug's referring to. And our recommendation throughout that whole thing was get this objective back up. We've just never heard anything from the objectives that were passed on after that committee was rescinded.

Cordell Pearson: Ok thank you. Any more comments from the RAC? If not let's start with the antlerless moose, and I'd ascertain a motion.

Rex Stanworth: I make a motion we accept the Division's recommendation on antlerless moose permits.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, a motion has been made that we uh, that's the DWR, right?

Rex Stanworth: Uh huh.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, do we have a second? Okay, seconded.

Natalie Brewster: Who seconded it?

Cordell Pearson: Paul. Okay. We will now have a vote. All in favor raise their right hand. Okay, motion carries.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept the Division's recommendations on antlerless moose permits as proposed. Paul Briggs seconded. Unanimous. Motion carries.

Cordell Pearson: Next we'll go to the antlerless pronghorn.

Mack Morrell: I'd like to make a motion we accept the DWR's recommendation on the antlerless pronghorn hunts.

Dale Bagley: I'll second that motion.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, a motion has been made by Mack, seconded by Dale. All in favor raise their right hand. Any opposed? Motion carries.

Mack Morrell made the motion to accept the DWR antlerless pronghorn recommendations as presented. Dale seconded. Unanimous

Cordell Pearson: All right, next we will go to the deer and we would ascertain a motion on deer.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, I would like to recommend or make a motion that we accept the department's recommendation on the deer with the exception of the Paunsagaunt Buckskin 50 tags and the Mt. Carmel unit 25 tags. Okay, we have a motion and a second. All in favor raise their right hand. Okay, against raise their right hand. Okay, two against I guess, three against. Then what did we have for it, four? Hold up your hands again that's for the motion. Okay, five to three, motion carries.

Sam Carpenter made the motion to accept the Division's antlerless deer recommendations with

the exception of the Mt. Carmel permit numbers be reduced to 25 permits and Buckskin permit numbers be reduced to 50 permits. 5 for 3 opposed (Paul, Mack, & Dell). Motion carries.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we'll now go to the antlerless elk. I'll ascertain a motion. Go ahead.

Clair Woodbury: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we accept the antlerless elk as proposed by the DWR with the exception of the Fish Lake Plateau, instead of the 1,284 we go to 600 on permits on that unit.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, Clair made the motion that we accept the DWR's proposal except for the Fish Lake where we would go to 600 instead of 1,200. Do I have a second on that motion?

Unknown: I'll second it.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, the motion has been seconded. Do you want a discussion on a motion?

Rex Stanworth: I would like to suggest that we give some consideration to Mr. Yardley on the Southwest Desert. I hunted that last year, there is a lot of elk there. I'm thinking that we maybe look at changing that from the 150 to maybe 175 antlerless.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, would you like to make an amendment to the original motion?

Rex Stanworth: Yes, I would like to make an amendment to the original motion that we change the Southwest Desert to 175 antlerless permits.

Rex Stanworth made amendment to the original motion that we change the antlerless permits on the Southwest Desert from 150 to 175. Sam Carpenter seconded.

Cordell Pearson: Okay there is another motion and a second. We have to vote on the amendment first. Okay, all in favor of the amendment by Rex please . . . Okay do we need some more discussion on that?

Natalie Brewster: Rex, you wanted to amend the original motion at what?

Rex Stanworth: That we change the antlerless permits on the Southwest Desert to 175 instead of 150.

Natalie Brewster: And Sam seconded the amendment? Is that right?

Cordell Pearson: Any discussion on the amendment? Paul, go ahead.

Paul Briggs: I'd just like to maybe remind the committee and caution us that I know for a lot of folks these antlerless permits are somewhat of a bitter pill. But when we talk about cutting the recommendations of the Division and the scientists that are responsible for managing these units in half, if we're not absolutely sure and basing those decisions on sound data then that pill in the next few years becomes increasingly more bitter to swallow. If you get to a situation where instead of taking 1,200 elk off of there in a single year you're looking at taking 15 or maybe 3,000 off of there in a single year, that get's us back into the situation on the Fish Lake that I think you guys are talking about. And I just like to put that out there for consideration.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any further discussion on the amendment? Seeing none we will now take a vote, right? On the amendment to raise the Southwest Desert. What we are voting now is the amendment to the original motion. Okay, all in favor raise their right hand. Any opposed? Okay, motion carries.

Vote on Rex Stanworth's amendment: Unanimous. Motion carries

Clair made the motion to accept the Division's recommendation as presented for antlerless elk with the exception of the Fishlake, that permit numbers be reduced to 600 from 1200 permits. Sam seconded.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, do we have any discussion on the original motion? Mack go ahead.

Mack Morrell: I'd like to amend that motion and leave it as such, the 1,200 on the Fish Lake.

Dell LeFevre: I'll second that amendment.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, an amendment to the motion has been made by Mack Morrell and seconded by Dell LeFevre that we keep the same tags on the Fish Lake 1,200. Any discussion? No discussion? I guess we have to vote on that amendment. Okay, all in favor raise their right hand. Five right? Any opposed? Three. Okay motion, the amendment carries.

Mack Morrell made the motion to amend the motion concerning antlerless elk recommendations that we keep the same number of 1200 permits on the Fishlake unit. Seconded by Dell LeFevre. 5 for 3 opposed (Sam, Rex, Clair). Motion carries.

Rex Stanworth: I'll make a motion that we accept the antlerless elk permits as recommended by the Division with the exception of the Southwest Desert which we would increase to 175.

Dell LeFevre: I'll second that motion.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we have a motion by Rex and a second by Dell that we accept the DWR's recommendation, except for the Southwest Desert and we move that up to 175. Okay, all in favor raise your hand. Six for. Okay, all against? Two against. Motion carries.

Rex made the motion to accept the antlerless elk permits as proposed with the exception of the Southwest Desert to 175 permits. Dell seconded. 6 for 2 opposed (Clair and Sam). Motion carries

Cordell Pearson: You guys need to take a little break here and go to the bathroom or anything or should we continue? We have CWMU. Okay, we're going to take a five-minute break.

Cordell Pearson: We'll have Teresa do the CWMU.

Mack Morrell: Hey Cordell, can I make just one little comment?

Cordell Pearson: You bet, go ahead.

Mack Morrell: Regarding the Fish Lake and the Plateau/ Boulder elk; Highway 24 has been a division line and the elk goes like this and the hunters on one side get some, and get on this side they'll be shooting Fish Lake elk or whatever. I'd make a recommendation that they move that division line out to Dry Wash, which is a definite landmark for the Boulder and the Fish Lakes. So the Fish Lake elk people can go across 24 and kill Fish Lake elk, and they won't disturb the Plateau/ Boulder elk because they're on the other way.

Unknown: We want them to play (inaudible).

Mack Morrell: I know they will because the Plateau/Boulder elk doesn't come this way, they go the other way. Okay, just a comment.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, I don't know if you was in here or not Mack, they discussed that and I think there was like 500 elk tags this year on the Boulder, is that correct? 580 tags. I know that used to be the boundary on that hunt, was Dry Wash.

Mack Morrell: But most of them Boulder hunters is easy to just kill a Fish Lake elk because they go right on Highway 24, the elk is south of that, they wait till daylight, the elk come across, they shoot them on the south side, so it's Fish Lake elk they're really shooting and not Boulder elk. Do you see what I'm saying? Yeah, so if you move the boundary line to Dry Wash it's easy that way. You can, then the Boulder elk, the Boulder elk hunters will be killing Boulder elk and not Fish Lake elk.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, I understand exactly what you're saying, I know. We'll have a little comment here from Doug.

Douglas Messerly: It's a shell game is what it is. The basic premise is that we count them in January. So although they're Fish Lake elk all summer when they cross Highway 24 we count them as Boulder elk. And so for us, we can do it either way, what we'll have to do if we choose to make that boundary change now is recalculate the number of permits that we issue on that hunt and take some away from the Boulder hunt. But the result will be the same. I believe that's what we're trying to accomplish. And so what we need to do is harvest elk on both sides of that road and I think we've made a recommendation that will do that. And it's easy for the hunters to know which unit they're on and they figure it out in pretty short order, you know, to apply for one of those permits that they can hunt on the Boulder side if that's their preference. And I think they've probably got that figured out at this point especially after last year. So to change it on them now would be confusing again I think for everyone. You know I would ask that we stay with the recommendation that was already approved by this committee.

Cordell Pearson: Okay. Go ahead, Teresa.

**Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2010 (action) 2:05:28 to 2:09:51 of 2:35:26
- Teresa Bonzo, Regional Wildlife Program Manager**

Cordell Pearson: Okay. Thank you. Any questions from the RAC?

Questions from the RAC:

None

Cordell Pearson: No questions. Questions from the public?

Questions from the public:

None

Cordell Pearson: No questions. Comments from the public.

Comments from the public:

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we have two; first one will be Jeremy Chamberlain.

Jeremy Chamberlain: This might be putting the cart before the horse but I just want to, Wade's going to come up here and hash it out again that he'll get some elk tags. One of the reasons why we keep coming back and asking for elk tags, and maybe I can get some backup from some of these guys, but a lot of the elk are moving off the top of the Paunsagaunt, like up around Tropic Reservoir, Robinson, and they're dropping off the Pinks and they're coming down in and sitting in that Sink Valley in the Alton area and going down and wintering down in some of that wintering area where the deer are. And so there is one, the reason why I'm here, I'm coming from the Friends of the Paunsagaunt side of it. There's getting to be more and more elk down on that lower Pauns stuff. And it is the objective . . . when we go and fly they fly in the wintertime and there's no elk on the Paunsagaunt in the wintertime. And so I think that's one of the reasons why they don't issue any cow tags is because of the, you know, the low numbers when the count occurs. And anyway, there's a lot of elk down around Alton and I think it would be nice to have a few cow tags to take care of some of the population that is critical to the deer habitat in that area.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you. You got to go first this time, do you remember that instead of following Wade. Okay, we'll now hear from Wade.

Wade Heaton: As if I didn't feel bad enough before taking up your quality time, Teresa makes me feel worse. I hate to be back to you again, I really do. And I hope most of you got an e-mail kind of describing what I was trying to do. I made a mistake last year. You guys were kind enough after all these years of begging to go ahead and approve our request of these 12 tags. And I just naturally assumed the Wildlife Board was going to go ahead and rubberstamp that and let it go, and obviously they didn't. And so I ended up not getting any tags last year so I'm back begging again. I promise I won't make that same mistake. I'm going to the Wildlife Board and hopefully, hopefully we'll have a little more success this time. Anyway, let me just back up and give ya a little bit big picture. The DWR is accurate in their request, or their recommendation of zero permits because there are no antlerless elk hunts on the Paunsagaunt. The reason of that is because we're under objective according to the winter objective. Now there's a lot of things wrong with having a wintering objective on the Paunsagaunt, I'll

just go through a few; mainly they all leave. That's kind of the bulk of it. I've been, these guys are great and had me fly along with them and we could fly the entire month of February and would never find enough elk to meet the objective. It's never going to happen. And that's why I'm always on these guys. And we really hope to get this changed. Having a wintering objective on the Paunsagaunt is kind of a moot point. It's not accomplishing anything. They're not there in the winter. They're there in the summer and that's when they do the damage. And there are lots of reasons why we don't manage them in the summer, and especially count them, but I'd like to submit, we're a creative bunch and we can come up with something. A summering number on the Paunsagaunt is the only one that matters. I was on the last elk committee. Our objective currently is 175 winter, 275 summer, but the only one that matters is the winter and we're always going to be under 175. So, that's why the Division's recommended zero. But it doesn't negate the fact that we need some permits on that Paunsagaunt. We are over our 275. We are quite a bit over our 275. Just the numbers and just the preliminary counts we did this summer, I think the number's probably closer to 4 or 450. We're a premium deer unit and uh, we don't want a lot of elk on there. And although 400 doesn't sound like a lot it's about twice as much as most of us would like. We're not going for a no-elk unit. We're okay with having a few. But let's set a wintering, or a summering objective, sorry, and then let's stick to it. The purpose of what I'm trying to do here, biologically we're killing 12, that isn't going to make one bit of difference on a summering count. Our purpose is this, the CWMU given the fact that it's private land has done primarily the bulk of all the habitat projects on the Paunsagaunt, summer range has been done on the CWMU because it's private. We don't have to go through the loopholes with the Federal ground. Because of that we all know that's where the elk go is new habitat projects. All we are looking for with these 12 is just means to defend our habitat projects. Defend our investments. Like I said, 12 isn't going to make any difference. But elk are dumb, you shoot at them a few times and they run off and don't come back for a week or two. That is all we're looking for. So if you would please be kind enough again to give me this 12 and I will take it to the Wildlife Board and hopefully we can get somewhere and help these private property owners out just a little bit. Thanks.

Cordell Pearson: Just a minute. Can I have one too? Go ahead.

Rex Stanworth: Wade you're making me nervous because I sat on that elk committee and your good friend down here that forgot to shave today is the guy that kept telling me the Friends of the Paunsagaunt do not want elk. So I'm going to give you a friendly hint, when you're around this group you want to tell them we do not want elk because your friendly SFW people are coming to the south and that's where the 68 to 80,000 head are coming is to the south. So lose that word, we don't want to eliminate the elk. You want to eliminate the elk because if you don't kind of control that you're going to get more elk there than you ever believed you could want.

Wade Heaton: I hear you loud and clear, I really do. And maybe that's the approach we ought to do with, start out with zero and compromise somewhere in the middle. But we definitely don't want any more.

Cordell Pearson: I have a couple of questions for you. How many tags did you ask for last year?

Wade Heaton: The same, 12.

Cordell Pearson: 12. Okay and when would you want to have this hunt if you did get the tags, seeing there's no elk there during the wintertime?

Wade Heaton: CWMU antlerless hunts, we can start August 15th, and I believe the hunt actually goes to the end of the year, December 31st. So we usually will hunt our bulls in September and then hunt these cows in October. We've had the cow tags in the past, and that's always what we've done. It's just been the last three years we haven't had any.

Cordell Pearson: Okay. Anybody else got any questions? Go ahead.

Sam Carpenter: Wade, not to compromise anything you've said so far, but you did indeed say you flew with them this year. How many elk did you guys count?

Wade Heaton: We counted 84, 85.

Sam Carpenter: 85. And were they down in the deer wintering areas or did they stay up higher?

Wade Heaton: Um, we counted a few in the traditional wintering areas where there's always a few dozen, and those are the ones we always count. I flew with them the previous flight as well. But this year there was a group down in the lower, lower range where we typically never seen elk before.

Sam Carpenter: Right. And you have flown with them before?

Wade Heaton: Yeah.

Sam Carpenter: And you would agree that we are getting increasing numbers moving down into winter range.

Wade Heaton: No doubt.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Anybody else got any questions for Wade?

Dell LeFevre: Give me his elk and then put another ten with them.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, go ahead Paul. I'm ready for any comments from the RAC. Anybody have any comments? Go ahead Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Wade you can sit down. But this is concerning some of your business so if you want to stay up there and comment you can. In all the meetings that we had in discussing the antlerless permits with Dustin and at Friends of the Paunsagaunt, it was never understood in our discussion and our voting that this 37 permits that we were presented as was going to be the recommendation was a two for one, and actually 75 permits. I received phone calls throughout the day today on this protesting the fact that this is indeed 75 instead of the 37 permits we discussed. So in saying that I'm going to have to stand up for the other people on the board that we did not understand that we were going to be taking this many does up there and would ask Wade if he is okay with reducing that to 25 permits. Is that any heartache for the CWMU to drop that number down on those two for one permits? It would be a total of 50 up there instead of 75.

Wade Heaton: Just a quick history on this and the reason why there's not a split recommendation. The CWMU did make application for the 75. Because of this new plan of the three-year CWMU applications, the biologists and I, Dustin sat down two and a half years ago, because these were done so far in advance, it was almost three years ago. I'm under mandate by the CWMU statute to take my fair share of antlerless harvest. They just don't want the CWMUs running off and not doing their part. So the number we came up with was 225, that was my fair share over a three year period of time. Last year we had 25 two-doe tags. This year it was 37 two-doe tags and next year I believe it's 50 two-doe tags. And that was to meet my fair share. Now uh, what Sam brought up is a good point. It turns out I'm doing the lions share of the antlerless harvest now not my fair share. And so while I did make application for this I would be perfectly fine if the RAC wanted to amend that, or at least change what we applied for. And the reason being is this, the majority of the people on the Friends of the Paunsagaunt, and Sam and myself, definitely agree that we've got to be really careful about the antlerless harvest on there. And the numbers on the lower, the winter range hunts, have been dropped to the point where I am taking the lion's share of the antlerless harvest. So if that wanted to be changed that's entirely up to you guys.

Sam Carpenter: So you don't have any heartache if I change that recommendation?

Wade Heaton: No Sir.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any more comments from the RAC? If not we'll ascertain a motion.

RAC discussion and vote:

Sam Carpenter: Try to make it short and sweet and to the point. I'd like to make a motion that we accept the proposal as presented with the exception of allowing Wade and the CWMU 12 elk permits and reducing the two to one permits to 25 from 37.

Dell LeFevre: I'll second that.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we have a motion by Sam. We had a second by Dell. Everybody know what the motion was? Would you read that motion back please?

Natalie Brewster: (Inaudible, not in the mic).

Cordell Pearson: Okay, everybody understands the motion? Okay, we'll now have a vote. All in favor raise your right hand.

Clair Woodbury: (Inaudible) discussion?

Cordell Pearson: You certainly may.

Discussion:

Clair Woodbury: You know I sympathize with Sam and Wade on these cow elk tags but Teresa has a great point; if we're not going to offer any to the public how can we justify this? I would say that if we have 400 elk on there in the summer then maybe we need to start having some public hunts to justify . . .

I just can't see justifying only the CWMU tags.

Sam Carpenter: Can I comment on that just a little bit?

Cordell Pearson: Yes Sir, you may.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, in our meetings Clair we have discussed this and with the new elk plan we're supposed to be getting together here very soon to make recommendations on the Paunsagaunt and that will address all this problem. We just haven't had that opportunity until now to do that.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any more discussion on the motion? Seeing none all in favor raise your hand. Okay. All opposed. Okay, motion carries.

Sam Carpenter made the motion to accept the DWR proposal as recommended with the exception that we allow Alton CWMU 12 antlerless elk permits and change from 37 2 doe to 25 2 does. Dell seconded. 7 for 1 opposed (Paul) Motion carries

Cordell Pearson: Okay, that's all I think we have on the agenda except for other business.

Rex Stanworth: I've got some other business.

Cordell Pearson: Hold on just a minute Doug's going to take the mic for some unfinished business.

Douglas Messerly: Mr. Chairman it occurred to me on the break that although we address the permit numbers on each species in the antlerless addendum that there wasn't a vote on the remainder of the regulation changes such as allowing people to take antlerless elk during the rifle hunt, etc. So I would suggest that the committee might want to consider a motion to accept the rest of the antlerless addendum besides permit numbers and the changes that were proposed in the packet and in the presentation.

Rex Stanworth: I make a motion that we accept all additional addendums to the antlerless permit numbers for this year.

Sam Carpenter: Second.

Cordell Pearson: Okay it's been moved and seconded. The motion was made by Rex, and who seconded it? And Sam seconded it. Restate the motion Rex.

Rex Stanworth: We want to accept any of the other addendums to the antlerless elk numbers pertaining to the rest of the proclamation.

Natalie Brewster: Do you want me to read what I have?

Cordell Pearson: Yes, please.

Natalie Brewster: (Inaudible, not in the mic).

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any discussion on the motion? No discussion. We'll ascertain a vote. All in favor raise your hand. Any opposed? Okay, motion carries.

Rex made the motion to accept any of other addendums pertaining to the rest of the proclamation as presented. Sam Carpenter seconded. Unanimous

Other Business

-Cordell Pearson, Chairman

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any other business. Sam, I know you had something, go ahead.

Sam Carpenter: Yeah, I would like to make a motion that something go to the board, that we get something in progress on getting this population objective on the Paunsagaunt back reinstated to 6,500 from the 5,200 that we currently have as an objective.

Rex Stanworth: You can put it on the action log.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, that's not legal.

Sam Carpenter: How about we put that on the action log? Can we straighten it out that way?

Douglas Messerly: You can make a recommendation to the Board that they put it . . .

Sam Carpenter: That the Board put this population objective on the Paunsagaunt back to 6,500 on their action log.

Cordell Pearson: Do I have a second on that motion?

Rex Stanworth: I'll second.

Cordell Pearson: Who seconded it? Okay, Rex seconded it. Discussion?

Douglas Messerly: I would like a little further clarification on exactly when you would like this to happen and if you're willing to wait until we revise the rest of the deer unit management plans. Please keep in mind that we've got the elk unit management plans coming up real soon and we're going to have our hands full. So probably just a little clarification on your recommendation to the Wildlife Board as to a time frame.

Sam Carpenter: The sooner the better, 2011.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any further discussion? Is that going to be a part of your motion Sam, a date?

Sam Carpenter: If that's what we need to do, yes it is.

Cordell Pearson: Would you restate the motion please?

Natalie Brewster: Sam Carpenter made the motion that the Wildlife Board put the Paunsagaunt deer

population objective from 5,200 back to 6,500 on the action log. Rex seconded it.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, he wants to put a date in there of 2011. Rex will you still second that motion? Okay.

Natalie Brewster: I have action log of 2011.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any more discussion on that? Okay we'll take a vote. All in favor raise your hand. It looks like everybody's for it except for Dell. Are you voting for it? Okay, unanimous.

Sam Carpenter made the motion that the wildlife board put the Paunsagaunt deer population objective from 5200 back to 6500 on the action log for 2011. Rex Stanworth seconded.

**Vote:
Unanimous**

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any other business?

Rex Stanworth: Yes, I have just one piece I want to make sure (unintelligible).

Cordell Pearson: Okay Rex, go ahead.

Rex Stanworth: You may not know but Sean Kelly, the biologist from up in Fillmore, he's jumping ship. He saw the sign that says Uncle Sam wants you. So Sean's leaving us to go work for the Forest Service. I just want it to be known that Sean's done a phenomenal job. A great, great person. Really helped us a lot up on that end, especially with people. And Sean I want you to know how much we appreciate you. He's going to stay in Fillmore for a little while because he can't acclimate and do Forest Service and more at the same time, so he's going to acclimate a little bit. So we've got him there for a little bit but he won't be getting a paycheck from the Division. The bigger check will come from the Federal government. Anyway, so thanks Sean. I just want everybody to know he's leaving and he's been great.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you. Any other business? Just a minute. We got one comment from Mr. Yardley. Yes Sir, go ahead.

Gibb Yardley: (Inaudible, not in the mic).

Douglas Messerly: In fact Mr. Yardley we do send notices to all the papers. We have a whole network of contacts with the newspapers across the state. A gentleman by the name of Mark Hadley out of Salt Lake does those. And he sends announcements out regarding these meetings to all the newspapers. Unfortunately, we cannot control whether they print them or not. And it's been our experience that the methods that we're using now to advertise these have been pretty effective for us. I recognize that there are people that don't access the Internet and I'm pretty sensitive to that. But I'm afraid that without mailing each and every one of them a postcard it's going to be difficult to really get them noticed up. And unfortunately you know, public interest in waning, as you can see. I'm glad that you came tonight. Typically it takes someone with a real interest to make the effort to come. But the public is becoming less interested but I don't think it's as much a matter of them not receiving notice as them not, for whatever reason, being willing to come here and make the effort to be heard. But we appreciate it very

much when you do. And I'll commit to doing whatever we can to get people to come.

Gibb Yardley: (Inaudible, not in the mic)

Douglas Messerly: Talk to your paper and ask them if they'll print notices of these meetings when they get them on our new releases and you can help us there.

Cordell Pearson: No not yet. Hold on just a minute. Mr. Hatch has something he wants to say.

Tom Hatch: (Inaudible, not in the mic)

Cordell Pearson: Okay, I think that somebody had a motion here that we adjourn but I think he . . .

Unknown: Cordell, I'll make a motion that we adjourn.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, do we have a second on that? Okay. Thank you guys for everything. Do we need to vote on it? I don't think we need to vote, everybody left.

Meeting adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

**Southeast Region Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main, Green River
April 27, 2010 @ 6:30 p.m.**

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda

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

Approval of March 17, 2010 minutes

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

Antlerless Addendum, Rule and Permit Recommendations for 2010

**MOTION: To accept the Antlerless Addendum as presented
Passed unanimously**

Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2010

**MOTION: To accept Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2010 as
presented
Passed unanimously**

**Southeast Region Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main, Green River
April 27, 2010 @ 6:30 p.m.**

Members Present

**Kevin Albrecht, USFS
Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor**

**Todd Huntington, At Large
Derris Jones, Sportsmen**

Walt Maldonado, Sportsmen

**Christine Micoz, At Large
Travis Pehrson, Sportsmen
Pam Riddle, BLM
Terry Sanslow, Chairman
Charlie Tracy, Agriculture**

Members Absent

**Blair Eastman, Agriculture
Jeff Horrocks, Elected Official
Wayne Hoskisson, Non-consumptive**

Laura Kamala, Non-Consumptive

Kenneth Maryboy, Navajo Rep.

Others Present

Keele Johnson

-
- 1) **Welcome, RAC introductions and RAC Procedure**
-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

Terry Sanslow –Let’s get started. We have a request from Brent. We need to really speak into the microphones, and make sure that Brent can hear.

Brent Stettler-We are going to try to have one of our office personnel, Jennifer, transcribe the minutes, and it would be really helpful if she could hear who is speaking, so we are asking everyone to speak into the microphones.

Terry Sanslow-We will do our best, Brent. I would like to welcome the division and RAC members. I am Terry Sanslow, RAC chair, Bill Bates, Kevin Albrecht, Derris Jones, Chris Micoz, Pam Riddle, and Todd Huntington. We have three or four that have been excused tonight. We all know that Walt is not on the RAC anymore. He took a job with the division as the Dedicated Hunter coordinator, and we interviewed Darrell Meacham tonight to fill that position. He was the only one who applied for it, and I am pretty sure that we are going to put Darrell on the RAC.

Bill Bates-We will now talk to the Directors office

Terry Sanslow-Is there anything on the agenda that we need to change, or is everybody good with it?

- 2) Approval of the Agenda (Action)
-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

VOTING

Motion was made by Kevin Albrecht to accept the agenda as written
Seconded by Charlie Tracy
Motion passed unanimously

- 3) Approval of the March 17 10, 2010 minutes (Action)
-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

VOTING

Motion was made by Todd Huntington to approve the minutes of the March 17, 2010 meeting as written.
Seconded by Charlie Tracy
Motion passed unanimously

- 4) Wildlife Board Meeting Update
-Kevin Albrecht, Vice Chair

Kevin Albrecht-Well, I had the opportunity to take our comments to the Wildlife Board. There was a lot of discussion on things. The statewide elk management plan passed, as presented by the DWR. There was a lot of discussion on the bison plan. The comments that we heard at our meeting were much the same, but it passed as presented by the DWR.

Questions from the RAC

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

- 5) Regional Update
-Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor

Bill Bates-The Aquatics Section has been attending the American Fisheries Society meeting. They have been finishing reports and preparing for the spring field season. The Conservation Outreach Section has held two sage-grouse watches since the last RAC meeting. On the Wasatch Front, there has been a Rocky Mountain Goat watch in Little Cottonwood Canyon. The Habitat Section is beginning lop and scatter treatment of three areas in Carbon and Emery counties, using dedicated hunter volunteers. The Wildlife Section has begun spring deer classifications and will begin its spring range rides. The bison captured from the Henry Mountains in January will be released on the Book Cliffs as soon as snow depth and road conditions permit.

Questions from the RAC

Terry Sanslow-I read something about crayfish.

Bill Bates-Yes.

Terry Sanslow-Are there any in this area? Or do we not know yet?

Bill Bates-I don't think anything has been documented. I think that they are in Colorado. There's a chance that they might come, but I don't think that we actually have any documentation in Utah.

Kevin Albrecht-There have been some news releases about the Ferron Canyon project on cutthroats. I have had a few phone calls about the plan. One of the comments that I hear a lot is, "Before that happens, can we catch as many fish as we want?"

Bill Bates-That is a good question. Typically we either relax or eliminate the limits. Several years ago when we treated Scofield we did that. We will look into that this time as well. Thanks.

Derris Jones-Will there be a barrier above Millsite Reservoir?

Bill Bates-Most likely. Kenny has a pit tag reader above Millsite, tracking movement of Round-tail Chubs. The barrier will have to allow the chubs to move as far as they need to.

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

- 6) Approval of the Antlerless Addendum, Rule and Permits for 2010 (Action)
-Justin Shannon, Regional Wildlife Program Manager

Questions from the RAC

Charlie Tracy-You mentioned that if you have a tag in one of those four units, where you want to target the antlerless harvest, (for example the San Juan unit), you can shoot a bull or a cow, but you can also pick up a \$25 permit and be able to shoot an additional cow.

Justin Shannon-Yes, I think in the proclamation, correct me if I am wrong, Bill, you can't have two Antlerless permits, and so, yes, if you want, the way it works is you have your given tag, then you can pick up an additional one for \$25.

Bill Bates- You can only have two elk permits.

Justin Shannon – Is it two total?

Derris Jones- Two total. One has to be a cow.

Charlie Tracy-Is there any discussion about opening the north side of the highway, where the San Juan unit was, to allow a bull hunt?

Justin Shannon-That's been bouncing around, but it hasn't been seriously considered by the DWR. We are still weighing the pros and the cons, but we are leaning more towards a limited entry hunt in that area.

Charlie Tracy-Are there more bulls or cow left there?

Justin Shannon-Regarding depredation?

Charlie Tracy-Yes.

Justin Shannon-The situation poses an interesting problem for us there. You know some of those bulls don't go back to the mountain, so they're residents. As an agency, it would look bad for us to go harvest these animals ourselves and so that's why we went with "any bull" south of the highway to try to kill some of those resident bulls; and then north, where the damage payments aren't nearly as bad.

Bill Bates-Justin has also increased the number of CWMU bull permits.

Justin Shannon-Right. We doubled those last year, so there will be additional bull harvest on those elk.

Charlie Tracy-Will they harvest them?

Justin Shannon-That a fair question. This is the first year we have done it. If we don't, then we will have to work something out. We'll have to address it. That goes without saying, but I think it's a first step.

Bill Bates-There's an incentive for them too. They agreed to take part of the proceeds from the increase in bull permits, and use that toward depredation payments.

Charlie Tracy-Will the cow tags go above and beyond the permit numbers allotted?

Justin Shannon-Yes. Thanks for the clarification. What's in the packet and what we will recommend is above that indicated.

Derris Jones- Is this similar to what they did on Fish Lake a few years back? Is there a chance that having a blue light special is going to shift deer hunting pressure to the Range Creek unit, because of the opportunity to harvest an elk with a deer?

Justin Shannon- That's a question that I don't know. Brad, do you have any thoughts on that?

Brad Crompton-There wasn't evidence of that last year. The number of days on the Nine Mile unit were the same.

Derris Jones- How many blue light special tags were issued?

Brad Crompton-I don't know how many hunters really ended up buying a tag, but we ended up killing 14 cows or so, which was significantly more than the last time we tried it, just based on our other cow hunts during that year; 10 % success at best, 100 to 150 tags. You don't know whether they were going to hunt deer at Nine Mile anyway or not.

Derris Jones-Are you noticing an increase in deer hunting pressure since this opportunity was available?

Brad Crompton-No, but there are a lot of other variables going on, so it's tough to identify that. As far as the data, I just started to enter harvest data. It was the same number that has always been.

Derris Jones-Is this offered to any available CWMU hunter, or just non-CWMU hunters?

Brad Crompton-Non-CWMU hunters. It's a problem. The RAC may want to make a motion on that.

Terry Sanslow-Are we reaching our goal on moose, or are we backing off more on that?

Justin Shannon-Most of the problem is in the northern region obviously. I think getting a lot of them moved to Colorado and then getting the population back in check is the reason for reduced cow numbers there.

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Pam Riddle to accept the Antlerless Addendum as presented.

Seconded by Charlie Tracy

Motion passed unanimously

7) Approval of Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations for 2010

-Justin Shannon, Regional Wildlife Program Manager

Questions from the RAC

Charlie Tracy-Why did the Alton CWMU request a change in permits?

Justin Shannon-To be honest, I don't know. I tried to get a hold of Boyd Blackwell and it went straight to his voice mail.

Kevin Albrecht-Over all, how was the public access on CWMUs?

Justin Shannon-Last year, I only heard of one problem in all the CWMU's in the region. So based on that, I assume access was pretty good. I think it is going fairly well.

Bill Bates-(Gets Boyd Blackwell on the phone) Charlie has a question for you. On the Alton CWMU, why did you request the 12 antlerless elk permits?

Boyd Blackwell-(on the phone)-Because they feel like there's elk on them during the first part of the year and that's why they felt there was an opportunity to take them. It should be noted that we do not have a public hunt on that unit because the population is under-protected. Therefore no permits were recommended.

Terry Sanslow- Does that answer your question? Any more questions from the RAC? Questions from the audience? Comments from the audience?

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Derris Jones to accept the Antlerless CWMU Permit Recommendations as presented.

Seconded by Chris Micoz

Motion passed unanimously

8) Habitat projects in the Southeastern Region

-Daniel Eddington, Assistant Regional Habitat Program Manager

Questions from the RAC

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

Kevin Albrecht-Regarding the lop and scatter projects, there were quite a few complaints from livestock permittees about the number of elk in this area. As Daniel mentioned, a lot of browse was high-lined and unavailable. We are working in partnership with the DWR on the livestock issue. The livestock committee has been involved as well. The DWR did a tremendous job by calling some late season hunts, and distributing the elk throughout the area. There has been a lot of discussion as to what we can do as a land management agency to try to distribute animal use and make browse available. Based on the comments, we developed the 5,700 acre project, and now we are moving forward. The collaboration among all parties on that project was very good.

**Meeting adjourned at 8 p.m.
2 public in attendance**

The next Wildlife Board meeting will take place on May 6 at 9 a.m. at the DNR Board Room at 1594 W. North Temple, SLC

The next southeast regional RAC meeting will take place on May 12 at 6:30 p.m. at the John Wesley Powell Museum in Green River