

Form Name:
Submission Time:

April 2026 RAC Proposals Feedback
April 1, 2026 7:31 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the pronghorn recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the aquatic rule amendment recommendations? Strongly agree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

April 2026 RAC Proposals Feedback
April 2, 2026 10:18 am

Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk recommendations?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any comments about the bull elk recommendations?

I do like that Utah offer ample hunting opportunities I don't like the amount of spike permits allowed. Having been a part of a premium rifle elk hunt last year it was very frustrating to have so many people out at the same time. I feel this number should be reduced drastically.

Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the antlerless recommendations?

You claim the Nebo is 550 elk over objective (it's not, I don't care what your collar data suggests). But you are recommending nearly 1000 cow tags? That is absolutely [REDACTED]! Quit pounding them into the ground any chance you get! You did this back in 2009 and it took them nearly a decade to recover! Pull your head out of your [REDACTED] and start doing the job you're paid to do! We can certainly kill more bulls, there's plenty of those. But declaring war on this herd when the numbers YOU publish doesn't suggest that needs to be done is ridiculous!

Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the buck deer recommendations?

As a lifetime Utah hunter and after 60 years of hunting deer and elk in the state, I strongly disagree with your decision to raise any area's number of tags issued. We have a place in northeastern Utah and have spent much time there and watched the herds as we visit often from filling the meadows with hundreds of deer in early spring to no deer. This year we do see small little 20 to 25 deer numbers but those numbers used to be 80 to over 100 20 or 30 years ago. Let the herds continue to grow and increase. I drove my 87 year old father up to hunt for his tag last year and we saw 1 buck in his unit. This is typical of our experience for the last 20 years. The herds have never recovered from the over issue of permits for the last 20 or 30 years. Let the herds rebound. It is okay if hunters don't draw. Our state is over populated and utilized as it is. Then in a few years when the herds have really begun to rebuild to their former status, if you would be more conservative on your permit increases, you might be able to hold the population you build. I fear you have grown in size as a managing institution and require permit sales to be able to afford the bloated budgets you require to operate at unaccountable levels to the despair of the herds and a quality hunting experience. Management needs to be better at controlling themselves and their wants to let our herds recover.

Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any comments about the buck deer recommendations?

Proposal to Modify General Season Deer Draw and Point System
I am writing to propose a new management strategy for General Season deer units: transitioning away from the current points system over a three-year period.

Under this plan, the first year would prioritize high-point holders.

second year, would clear out mid-tier holders.

third year, would address those with the fewest points. Once the transition is complete.

the system would move to a "harvest-based" eligibility model:

Successful Harvest: Results in a mandatory three-year waiting period before applying again.

Unsuccessful Hunt: Guaranteed a tag for the following year until a harvest occurs.

The goal is to improve the age class of our herds. Currently, long wait times for tags pressure hunters to harvest the first legal buck they see. By guaranteeing a tag the following year for those who don't fill it, hunters can be more selective, allowing younger deer to reach maturity.

If we are worried about the application fee. that's easy just add \$10 tag increase.

Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species recommendations?

Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any comments about the bull elk recommendations?

I am writing to propose the reinstatement of the Multi-season General Season Any Bull elk permit. Currently, this 'hunt-all-seasons' option is only available for spike-only units, but I believe it should be extended to any bull units as well. To maintain management objectives, this could include a permit cap similar to the 4,500-limit currently placed on multi-season spike tags. This change would provide adult hunters with an opportunity similar to the youth permit, allowing them to hunt through the archery, any-legal-weapon, and muzzleloader seasons with a single tag.

Which best describes your position regarding the pronghorn recommendations?

Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless recommendations?

Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the aquatic rule amendment recommendations?

Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the buck deer recommendations?

My comments are specifically targeted to the Cedar/Stansbury unit. I understand that under the management plan, no real changes will be made until at least 2030. I hope after this plan expires, that the unit is split up. The Cedar Mountains and Stansbury Mountains are completely different units, with different populations of deer. There is very little mingling of deer between the two units as a whole, aside from very few deer that come off Dugway and go onto private property in the southern end of Skull Valley. In talking with Jason Robinson, there is next to no data that actually comes off Cedar deer, and instead all of the data piggy backs off data from the Stansburys. I think that's a catastrophically wrong way to view Cedar deer. I threw out a number of 250-300 total deer on the Cedars, and was actually agreed with that the number is probably accurate. That's on a mountain range that's a little over 40 miles long and 8-9 miles wide. I grew up hunting the range, and have a ton of experience with it when deer numbers were significantly better. I honestly worry about the strategy of allowing hunters to decide where to hunt by experience, rather than putting a set number of tags for the Cedars and a set number for the Stansbury. The entire unit is listed as having 5100 deer, and that data is 100% driven by numbers on the Stansbury and no actual counts of deer on the Cedars. Realistically, at 18 bucks per 100 does, there are maybe 54 buck deer currently on the Cedars. People who don't know the unit aren't going to harvest bucks off of it. It's currently taking 3 points to guarantee a rifle tag on the unit, 4 points to guarantee a dedicated hunter tag, 2 points on muzzy, and 1 point on archery (Even when the Cedar deer numbers were decent, I've had a grand total of ONE opportunity to harvest with archery equipment.) Even knowing the unit, it isn't worth burning those amount of points to hunt it. I feel like a better strategy would be to put the two mountain ranges into different units, either putting the Cedars on their own, reconfiguring back to the West Desert West boundaries (that worked!) or creating a new unit combining the Cedars, Lakeside and Grassy mountains, all of which are low density units the exact same as the Cedars.

Which best describes your position regarding the pronghorn recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the pronghorn recommendations?

I can speak to my experiences on the West Desert Riverbed unit. Numbers are down. Way, way down. The size of Pronghorn bucks I see out there are down. A 14" buck is an absolute giant on the unit, and 10" bucks are the majority of herd bucks. The range has trended downward since the 2-3 year old standard has been put into place.

Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the antlerless recommendations?

Deer: We have zero reason to harvest any doe deer anywhere in the state of Utah. If there are concerns about populations around urban or agricultural areas, non-lethal methods of conflict resolution such as high fencing should be utilized.

Elk: We're hunting elk WAY too late into the year, every single year. Big game hunting should be concluded by December 31st state wide. The private lands only cow hunts should be valid during general elk hunt dates, and with the same harvest method as the hunts open on surrounding public lands. If you actually had pressure on elk that go onto private lands during the hunts, they'd get pushed back onto public and increase harvest for both sides.

Pronghorn: Cut the Vernal/Ouray valley hunt. I had the tag last year. There was literally one huntable herd of Pronghorn out there. I got lucky enough to intercept them coming off private onto BLM. I fail to see how 25 pronghorn are detrimental to any of the agricultural areas around there.

Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the buck deer recommendations? I am a very active hunter and spend a significant amount of time in the mountains. I hunt both deer and elk and am also a houndsman. As such, I am sensitive to the number of all these species in the state. When we experienced the big winter two years ago, Wyoming significantly decreased the number of tags for its wildlife while Utah saw an increase. It has long been rumored amongst hunters, that the state of Utah is only interested in the money aspect and not the management of the wildlife. I would love to see the collective responses of hunters in relation to their post-hunt surveys to see the satisfaction of the hunting in Utah. I have long been a supporter of this feedback and feel that if the state is truly interested in the opinion of hunters and the management of wildlife, these reviews should be strongly considered as much as the biologist's surveys. I am more than happy to discuss this topic further in person or via phone.

Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species recommendations? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk recommendations? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the pronghorn recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any comments about the CWMU recommendations? It would be helpful if the previous year's information in the memorandum was provided to see a comparison of increased or decreased numbers.

Which best describes your position regarding the aquatic rule amendment recommendations?

Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species recommendations?

Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any comments about the once-in-a-lifetime species recommendations?

I would like to suggest that the members consider the following: If a hunter is past the age of 85 and can still physically hunt big game, and has a minimum of 25 points accumulated for the Once in a Lifetime Bull Moose Hunt. that a permit be awarded. I am 88 years old, love to hunt and fish, but I recognize my years are limited. My fear is that I will either die or be otherwise physically unable to hunt in the not too distant future. Special consideration for the few of us in this category would be very appreciated and in my opinion justified. Thank you for your consideration.

Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer recommendations?

Strongly agree

Do you have any comments about the buck deer recommendations?

Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species recommendations?

Strongly agree

Do you have any comments about the once-in-a-lifetime species recommendations?

I would like to address the once in a lifetime species and the 50% of permits that go to the general public instead of the highest bonus point recipients I've been putting in for 27 years. I have Parkinson's and I will be 66 years old this year. I have a friend that is the same age and he has 28 bonus points this year. he has Parkinson's and. He's still waiting to draw but every year I see a person with one bonus point or two bonus points or seven bonus points draw for moose and it frustrates me. I am sure the same thing is happening to all the once in a lifetime hunts I think all limited entry hunts are just fine but the once in a lifetime should be changed to only the highest bonus point recipients obtain a permit. every year I hear of people giving away their permits because they're unable to hunt because of disabilities or age related disabilities. I would appreciate your reconsideration on this matter. Thank you very much for your time..

Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the buck deer recommendations? I am having a hard time believing the information you are presenting. If you say we have to kill every lion because the deer numbers are doing so bad, then I don't think we should be raising the number of deer tags given. It seems hypocritical.

Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the bull elk recommendations? It's hard to get excited to go hunt the unit I live in which is the nebo. My brother had the tag last year and we worked our butts off to find the biggest bull we could. And didn't find anything of the caliber he would have liked to kill. Having hope that there is something bigger out there is what drives us to go farther and harder. But when there isn't anything bigger it is hard to justify applying for elk.

Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless recommendations? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the buck deer recommendations?

There is less and less big deer on all of the limited entry units. There is usually a handful of 200 inch deer on the limited entry units. They are usually dead on the archery hunt. And what is left over is killed on the muzzleloader hunt. Leaving smaller deer for the rifle hunter which is the most successful and they will kill something because they have a special tag that took 25 years to draw. I believe the general deer system is not in a good place but leave that to opportunity and leave the limited entry units limited (cut tags) so at least when you draw a limited entry tag you get to hunt something big

Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the buck deer recommendations? You guys are definitely not following data. Why on earth would you increase the hunting permits after you pulled too much out last year. You pulled too many deer out last year and now are killing off Puma in those same units instead of lowering permits. Blaming puma instead of your incompetence. Do you never want to see 3 point buck again? Those areas are going to spin out in disease without predators. Why would you increase the permits unless your greedy for permit money? It is the worst idea. The DWR needs to be state ran, not permit funded. You guys have taken too many mule deer etc. Forever. They just had a major die off from disease, and deep snow for 2 years. No adjustments from you guys at all other then lets just kill the puma for your own complete incompetence. You guys are not listening to science and you are Utah's national shame. Pretending to pay attention to data while not even looking at your own dats. You over hunted in 6 districts so your exterminating puma like backwards blind money hungry fools. And now you want to over hunt more? Shame on you. Greedy.

Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the once-in-a-lifetime species recommendations? Why are you increasing any hunts when you over harvest and have been doing so for years? Greed.

Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the bull elk recommendations? Isn't this in the same district your wiping out puma? Or is it the unit next door. So your increasing hunting to bring in more money while wiping out puma before or after? Shame on the lack of science and more about greed.

Which best describes your position regarding the pronghorn recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the pronghorn recommendations? Your doing this right after wiping out Puma so you could harvest more. Shame on you. No numbers should be going up on any species to get more money. You are taking out predators which have nothing to do with science. Other states have already done your study and the herds got sick because the predators weren't there to take the sick out. You shouldn't be increasing any numbers anywhere. We went from too much snow and disease to drought.

Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the antlerless recommendations? Listen those herds are tiny close to the metro area. You completely decimated the herd in mountain dell. The females having babies are small and I didn't see any prints for 2 years til just barely. You don't need to increase the anger less hunt when your not even doing a good job regulating harvests. I know the economy sucks but don't increase the harvest. Poachers are getting worse with the economy. Don't do it. Don't be greedy.

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the CWMU recommendations? Listen the herds are decreasing over time. Everyone's favorite hunt is close to habitations. That makes no sense to have a hunt for females when the herds have been decimated already. That makes you look greedy and no matter how you taint the science you still look the greedy fool. So what you guys are saying is there should be no wildlife at all near people? Maybe just maybe people should drive slower and pay better attention to side road movements. We can't sterilize safety for drivers. They only drive more wreck less speeding down canyons. In Alaska people do not speed at all, not even a little. Because there are lots of animals and people will drive slower if we see them more.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

April 2026 RAC Proposals Feedback
April 14, 2026 11:08 am

Form Name:
Submission Time:

April 2026 RAC Proposals Feedback
April 15, 2026 12:56 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer recommendations? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species recommendations? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the bull elk recommendations? Raise age objective on Nebo. Do not increase tags. We're finally starting to see elk again up there in public areas that are accessible. Leave it alone!

Which best describes your position regarding the pronghorn recommendations? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the buck deer recommendations? I struggle to understand the rationale behind combining units together when there is no biological reason to have them combined. If all the data is coming from the Stansbury Mountains, why are we combining it with the Cedars? More deer move between the Stansbury and Oquirrh than the Stansbury and Cedars, yet those two mountain ranges were split. Fix the issue. Split the unit down farther. Let the people who want to hunt a low deer density hunt it without waiting for the premium that the Stansbury creates.

Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the once-in-a-lifetime species recommendations? It's time to end archery only permits. Out of the 8 different hunts offered for OIL, only the Beaver Mountain Goat hunt actually had harvest rates that were lower than expected harvest rates for ALW tags. Close the loophole. Any legal weapon means ANY legal weapon. If archers want to hunt with archery gear, let them. But don't give them an advantage in the point game.

Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any comments about the bull elk recommendations? The huge increase on the Nebo should be leveled out and increased far more gradually. I get you guys did flights. How many of those bulls were wintering on Nebo from the Manti? There's definitely animals that cross back and fourth. Fix the mistake of taking away multi season any bull permits. It was never proposed by the elk committee.

Which best describes your position regarding the pronghorn recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any comments about the pronghorn recommendations? Increase the age objectives for pronghorn. 2-3 year olds are laughable. These are all limited entry permits. This is the equivalent of applying for a limited entry permit, and hunting a spike elk or two point buck.

Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless recommendations?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any comments about the antlerless recommendations?

Private lands hunts for cow elk should have to coincide with other dates for elk hunts happening on surrounding public lands. The idea should be to provide equal opportunity for both public land and private land hunters. Get the elk moving during the hunts rather than sitting on private.

Cow moose harvest should go to zero in the state until every single unit is over objective. Start moving moose to areas that are under objective. Moose are moved all the time, and the backlog on bull permits is the worst in the state.

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any comments about the CWMU recommendations?

Why are we letting Deseret cut cow permits, when the area is still over objective? Keep the pressure up on those cows. They hunt cows after all their other hunts are over, so pressure making other hunts harder is negligible.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

April 2026 RAC Proposals Feedback
April 16, 2026 5:07 pm

**Which best describes your
position regarding the buck deer
recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any comments about the buck deer recommendations? These comments regard WRI-7707 and the elimination of cougars from 6 units:

16 April 2026

Resources Advisory Council

Division of Wildlife Resources

RE: Cedar City RAC meeting comments on WRI-7707

To whom it may concern,

I live in Boulder, Utah adjacent to Boulder Unit 25, one of your WRI-7707 cougar "study" areas. I oppose this project for the following reasons:

Firstly, traps and snares are dangerous and non-selective.

By-catch (killing or maiming) of other non-targeted animals (including deer) is a serious problem. Back when traps were being set by local trappers to catch coyotes in our neighborhood, our dog was twice caught in leg-hold traps. Many dog-owners in Boulder have had their pets caught in traps. Snares are much more deadly and inhumane (Proulx, 2025) and are not welcome in our community. Tourists, the main source of income for our community, and their pets visiting our area will be even more vulnerable.

Secondly, extermination of cougars should not be the unstated goal of the WRI-7707 "study". Your cursory WRI project description appears to support only efforts to eliminate cougars from your study areas; it relies on ongoing deer population studies to then determine the influence of "top-down" predation. I cannot see how your 2-3 DWR/USDA trappers involved in the WRI-7707 project could properly monitor traps and snares in the huge area covered by your 6 study units. The project is too large in scope and should include dedicated wildlife biologist(s) to observe and record the project's impacts. Furthermore, I doubt that ranchers would appreciate these depredation experts being diverted from their present duties of protecting livestock.

Top-down management by the Utah legislature, who have little understanding of wildlife biology and management, is probably worse for wildlife ecology than top-down predation by cougars. 2020 HB-125 demands intensive predator control without consideration of other factors in deer population decline, such as harsh winters and sprawling urban development. 2023 HB-469 is a free-for-all slaughter of cougars (a protected species), not proper wildlife management. Both policies should be amended, so the qualified biologists at the Division of Wildlife Resources can do their jobs without such kibitzing.

Your challenge is to understand the entire ecosystem to optimize your goal of maximizing deer populations. Drought-related issues, wildfires, whacky winters, loss of habitat due to urbanization, climate change & desertification, increased use of OHVs & other outdoor recreation impacts, water shortages, invasive species, contagious diseases, and other "bottom-up"

factors are essential considerations in making comprehensive wildlife management decisions.

Please use the \$450,000 in funds donated for WRI-7707 to conduct a smaller more focused study to reduce cougar predation on specific deer herds in areas where "top-down" deer population losses are most extreme. Rather than using a "shotgun" approach with traps & snares, use a "sharpshooter" approach where houndsmen and their dogs remove specific cougars that have been proven to prey too heavily on adult female deer. Use the money to pay houndsmen for their participation and discontinue use of traps & snares. Fund wildlife biologists to carefully monitor predators and prey (not just cougars and deer but also other affected species) in a proper scientific study to determine if cougar are actually to blame. Make sure that you have comparable monitoring in control areas having similar population dynamics.

If the deer population responds in a positive manner, then you can consider expanding the project in the future. If the study doesn't produce the desired results, then at least you will have minimized unnecessary damage to cougar populations and the human communities that share their habitats.

Living in Boulder, our ranch provides essential winter range habitat for dozens of mule deer. Although we would like to remain your allies as DWR attempts to enhance wildlife populations in the Boulder Unit, we do not support the WRI-7707 project with its present shotgun approach to predator removal. In closing, I hope that HB-125 and HB-469 are amended, so the DWR can refocus their wildlife management decisions to most benefit the entire ecosystem. More specifically, I hope that DWR chooses the "sharpshooter" approach in your WRI-7707 study of the influence of cougar predation on our deer herds and that your published results are meaningful.

Respectfully,

Dr. Keith Watts

Boulder, Utah

Form Name:
Submission Time:

April 2026 RAC Proposals Feedback
April 19, 2026 1:35 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any comments about the buck deer recommendations?

Dear Wildlife Board Members,

I am writing on behalf of the Oak Creek Landowner Association. Our association currently represents 27 landowners and 34,964 acres of private land enrolled in the Landowner Association program within the Oak Creek / Fillmore Limited Entry unit (Unit 21C).

We appreciate the opportunity to provide input on the proposed 2026 buck deer permit numbers for our unit. According to the current DWR recommendations, the public limited-entry permits would increase to 67 in 2026). This represents a significant jump from the 30 public permits that were in place when the unit boundaries were expanded in 2016 to include private lands - more than a 100% increase over the past 10 years.

Oak Creek is widely regarded as a trophy unit. By continuing to increase the number of public tags every year, we are putting more and more pressure on the top end mature bucks. These high-quality animals are being harvested at a high rate each season. In addition, many younger bucks are also being killed before they have the chance to reach maturity and their full potential.

We respectfully ask the wildlife board to hold off on increasing tags for 2026. Additionally, when the mule deer plan is up for review next year, we request that the Oak Creek unit be placed in premium status. Under premium status, the buck-to-doe ratio objective would be raised to 40-45 bucks per 100 does (as it is for the Henry Mountains and Paunsaugunt units). This would allow the Division greater flexibility to manage the herd without having to increase public tags every year and could potentially lead to a reduction in tags in the future.

We value the partnership between private landowners and the Division of Wildlife Resources and remain committed to responsible wildlife management. We would welcome any dialogue or additional data that could help address these concerns.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Andy Monroe

President

Oak Creek Landowner Association

Phone: 435-231-5210

Email: andy@rubysinn.com

Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any comments about the buck deer recommendations?

Good morning, Board members.

I am here to propose transitioning from our current General Season (GS) buck deer point system to a three-year guaranteed tag cycle. This shift would ensure that every hunter in our system has a guaranteed opportunity to hunt right from the start.

With roughly 100,000 applicants, we can streamline the process by dividing the pool into thirds. Under this plan, every hunter is guaranteed a tag within a three-year period. To balance hunter satisfaction with effective herd management, I propose the following:

Success-Based Eligibility: If a hunter does not harvest a deer, they remain eligible to receive a tag again the following years.

Mandatory Waiting Period: Once a hunter successfully harvests a buck, they would then enter a mandatory three-year waiting period before their next tag.

Weapon & Season Commitment: Hunters will select their preferred weapon or season and stick with that choice until they harvest. Once a harvest occurs, they will have the option to apply for a different weapon or season for their next cycle.

I believe this system will achieve two critical objectives:

1. **Consistent Opportunity:** It provides hunters with a predictable and reliable schedule for when they will be in the field.

2. **Improved Buck Quality:** By removing the "now or never" pressure of the current draw, hunters are more likely to pass on younger bucks, knowing they will have a opportunity for another tag the following year, allowing more of the population to reach maturity.

Thank you for your time and for your dedicated work in managing our wildlife resources.

Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any comments about the bull elk recommendations?

Good morning, Board members.
Thank you for your ongoing commitment to managing our state's wildlife resources. I am writing to formally propose the reinstatement of the Any Bull Multi-Season tag.

Last year, several General Season any-bull early rifle tags went unsold. Reintroducing the multi-season option would be an excellent way to ensure these tags are fully utilized. I suggest implementing a permit cap modeled after the current Spike Multi-Season program; since this framework is already successful for spike units, applying it to Any Bull units would maintain consistency while expanding opportunity for hunters.
Thanks for all you do.

Which best describes your position regarding the pronghorn recommendations?

Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless recommendations?

Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the aquatic rule amendment recommendations?

Strongly agree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

April 2026 RAC Proposals Feedback
April 22, 2026 9:44 am

Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any comments about the buck deer recommendations?

I appreciate your consideration of my comment and in short I believe that to adequately maintain and adjust the mule deer hunting permits, the WRI 7707 predator management study must be halted and HB 496 must be amended or state rules must be adjusted to ensure that cougar hunting and trapping is done in a permitted and most ethical manner.

By definition the Wildlife Board was created to "establish the policies best designed to accomplish the purposes and fulfill the intent of all laws pertaining to wildlife and the preservation, protection, conservation, perpetuation, introduction, and management of wildlife."

I think that the recent green lighting and enactment of WEI 7707 predator management study conflicts with the goals and policies of this board.

Relevant to this agenda, I am concerned with WRI 7707 and its impact on permitted buck deer hunting and big game hunting. The predator management study project summary states "Despite additional tools and flexibility to predator hunters, predator harvest rates have not increased and more intensive management is needed to reduce predator densities and monitor deer population response." However the changes to HB 496 and the lack of yearly public access to the study data directly impact this statement and the tracking of this "issue". Per DWR representatives, study kills including number and location will not be publicly released until the 3-yr study is complete (and one can assume that the study results will not be ready until year 4). This study will have negative impacts on the mule deer permitting program. While there is "assumed" ethics associated with agency and contracted trappers, the lack of transparency and verification of ethical and legal hunting practices within the study is concerning. Additionally the designation of mountain lions as furbearers as a result of the previous HB 496 changes is concerning for mountain lions, hunters, and mule deer. While furbearer laws apply, the lack of a mountain lion specific permit remains concerning. Safety and ethical considerations and requirements prior to the changing of HB 496 were well assessed and valuable to the safety and ethicality of trappers, hunters and recreationalist. Additionally there is a financial disincentive to not address and correct for the changes in HB 496.

Seemingly dog restrictions have been removed with this change. The monetary benefit lost by this change is a notable hit to the department: " For the 2021-22 cougar season, 128 limited-entry permits and 2,340 harvest-objective permits were sold. Limited-entry permits included 126 unit-specific limited-entry permits, one statewide conservation permit, and one statewide sportsman's permit. 1,053 spot-and-stalk permits were sold for the 2021 spot-and-stalk season (July 1 to December 31) and 14

cougars were harvested during that period (6 cougars during the 2021-22 season) with this method. Overall, hunters harvested 467 cougars during the 2021-22 hunting seasons." In 2022 it cost \$58 for each referenced permit (and just under \$300 for nonresident) + application fees. Assuming only in-state permitting that is over 143k lost to the HB 496 bill not including the application fees. Increased traps create increased risk for other hunters and their hunting dogs, as well as hikers (but that is possibly out of scope). I don't think the science cited is accurate to the goals presented. The 7707 study cites conflicting sources and then conflates them as two symbiotic results. Stating that young and adult female mule deer are the key to population survival. And since mountain lions prey on both they are somehow the key to manipulating deer population despite citing coyotes as a greater impact on juveniles. The study also utilizes predation citations that include ecosystems with wolves and mountain lions, and cannot be equally considered to Utah's ecosystems. This pinning of mountain lions as the population undulation solution, is a reach and could negatively impact upcoming permit seasons.

It is clear to me that this 7707 study would be better suited to tracking mule deer in Utah versus removing one predator and ignoring the long-term impacts and the ecosystem as a whole. If mountain lion impact is the aim of this study, then mountain lions should be studied, alive, for their impact. If they can be trapped and killed they can be trapped and tracked.

The study calls for the extermination of all mountain lions in the selected areas. This is neither practical nor scientifically reasonable. It does not account for ethical hunting practices limiting age and sex. It does not account for the range of mountain lions and impact to nonstop areas. It does not align with DWR's mission to maintain and protect wildlife. The seasonal hunting timeframe removal both in this study and as a result of HB 496 is unethical and inhumane

Clark TJ, Hebblewhite M. Predator control may not increase ungulate populations in the future: A formal meta-analysis. *J Appl Ecol.*2021;58:812-824. (<https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13810>) Already evaluated this and found no benefit. There are too many factors, removing mountain lions does not remove coyotes or starvation, or wasting disease.

Even if this study is successful, the land has a capacity and based on the permitting program, these areas are at capacity.

Decreasing predation will only increase the need for resources the land cannot provide, weakening the whole herd. An increase in herd numbers does not increase the availability of food and therefore the availability of mule deer permits. An increase in herd numbers increases the transfer and likelihood of disease spread. By the time the herd is beyond capacity it will create a population crash, this is basic ecology and this study should be halted and reevaluated in light of the DWR's intention to at least

maintain the permitted hunting numbers. If the retort is that mountain lion predator removal will not lead to that level of increase- then I ask again if the study is a good use of resources, time, risk to other recreational users, and risk to the mountain lion population.

In relation to the study and this agenda, without the mule deer permitted hunting rates remaining stagnant in this 3 year study period, I do not believe that the study results can be verified. Which makes me believe that this study is a misalignment of funds and division resources while decreasing recreational safety and wildlife maintenance.

To summarize, I am asking this board to halt and reevaluate the impacts of WRI 7707 (which btw states that there are no negative water impacts but messing with the ecosystem messes with water) before allowing the study to continue, if at all, as it will surely directly impact the permitting numbers of mule deer available. Additionally WRI 7707 and its impacts were not considered in this year's mule deer evaluations, without those impacts I do not believe the permitting number proposed can be accurate. I also ask the board to evaluate and discuss the need for mountain lion specific permitting and hunting allowance to prevent their regional or state-wide extinction, to ensure ethically and scientifically sound hunting practices

Form Name:
Submission Time:

April 2026 RAC Proposals Feedback
April 22, 2026 4:34 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any comments about the buck deer recommendations? I like the new management plan and I support the permit recommendations. Please pass as presented. We should hunt the deer when they're available.

Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the once-in-a-lifetime species recommendations? I really don't like how the nonresident once in a lifetime tags are being allocated. Offering a high percentage of a unit's tags to nonresidents has a significant impact on the odds of the residents who apply for the unit. For example - 7 of 15 tags for the Little Creek bison hunt going to nonresidents has a big impact. I think we should be allocating a true 10% and spreading them amongst units as evenly as possible.

Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any comments about the bull elk recommendations? I would support more late archery elk permits being added as was recommended by the northern RAC.

Which best describes your position regarding the pronghorn recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any comments about the antlerless recommendations? I don't understand why we are hunting cow moose on the Wasatch unit. I support the doe deer hunts that are proposed - I know some people don't like the idea of hunting does, but the hunts are very targeted and address problem deer that don't benefit the public anyway.

Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the buck deer recommendations?

The overall outlook here on deer population management in Utah seems to be prioritizing management for sport hunters more than striking the balance for nature's healthy benefit (the chief shareholder). The extra deer tags for the year of 2026 do not reflect what the deer tags for 2028 will be. Currently the DNR and BYU are looking to conduct a culling disguised as a "study" of Mountain Lion population within the state of Utah. This is directly prioritizing more tourism for sports hunting permits over the well-being of our deer and elk populations. Mountain lions are already decreasing in number across the western United States due to human barrier construction, extreme habitat disruption, industrial encroachment, and farming. Mountain lions are the only predator species we have evidence for removing CWD from the environment why would we choose to kill them for sport? Is the money really that more important? I believe Utahns demand that the DNR wildlife management Department Chair and Mike Wardle halt WRI7707 and should be working to amend HB125 and HB469. It is lazy of the DNR to not try and create a more balanced approach to predator management than these bills.
