

# Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

January 3, 2017, DNR Auditorium  
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

The Board Meeting will stream live at <https://youtu.be/bgSzr1vUbrA>

## AGENDA

**Tuesday, January 3, 2017**

- |  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda<br>– John Bair, Chairman   | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 2. Approval of Minutes<br>– John Bair, Chairman  | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log<br>– Kirk Woodward, Vice-Chair  | <b>CONTINGENT</b>  |
| 4. DWR Update<br>– Gregory Sheehan, DWR Director   | <b>INFORMATION</b> |
| 5. Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2017<br>- Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program Coordinator        | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 6. 2017 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments<br>- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator                   | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 7. Private Pond Rule Amendments – Rule R657- 59<br>- Randy Oplinger, Coldwater Sport Fisheries Program Coordinator | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 8. AIS Rule Amendments – Rule R657- 60<br>- Nathan Owens, Aquatic Invasive Species Program Coordinator             | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 9. R657-38 Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments<br>- Bryan Christensen, Dedicated Hunter Coordinator                   | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 10. Other Business<br>– John Bair, Chairman  | <b>CONTINGENT</b>  |

Details of the specific recommendations can be found at [www.wildlife.utah.gov](http://www.wildlife.utah.gov)

**Wildlife Board Motions**

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

**Spring 2017 - Target Date – Youth hunts on WMA's**

**MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a listing of state youth hunts, their restrictions and preclusions on WMA's and the feasibility of closing these areas during youth hunts. The findings will be presented at the next upland game meeting.**

Motion made by: Byron Bateman  
Assigned to: Jason Robinson  
Action: Under Study  
Status:  
Placed on Action Log: August 27, 2015

**Spring 2017 - Target Date – Order of the Turkey Hunts**

**MOTION: I move that we ask the division to look into the possibility of changing the order in which turkey hunts are held so that they have a greater benefit for youth hunters. Also to review the possibility of eliminating the Limited Entry Turkey draw and replacing it with over-the-counter permit sales. The findings will be presented at the next upland game meeting.**

Motion made by: Byron Bateman  
Assigned to: Jason Robinson  
Action: Under Study  
Status:  
Placed on Action Log: September 1, 2016

**Fall 2017 - Target Date – CWMU Single Permits**

**MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to look into the possibility of issuing 2 permits every other year for CWMUs that currently only have one public permit, so bonus points are an advantage.**

Motion made by: Kirk Woodward  
Assigned to: Covy Jones  
Action: Under Study  
Status:  
Placed on Action Log: December 9, 2016

# Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

December 9, 2016, DNR Auditorium 1594  
West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

**Thursday, December 9, 2016 9:00 a.m.**

- |   |                    |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda<br>– John Bair, Chairman  | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 2. Approval of Minutes<br>– John Bair, Chairman   | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log<br>– John Bair, Chairman   | <b>CONTINGENT</b>  |
| 4. DWR Update<br>– Gregory Sheehan, DWR Director  | <b>INFORMATION</b> |
| 5. Elk Unit Management Plan Revisions<br>– Justin Shannon, Big Game Coordinator                                 | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 6. Bucks, Bulls, & OIAL 2017 Season Dates, Application Timeline<br>– Justin Shannon, Big Game Coordinator       | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 7. Preference Point System Amendments<br>- Lindy Varney, Licensing Specialist                                   | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 8. NER Deer Management Plans<br>- Randall Thacker, Northeastern Region Asst. Wildlife Manager                   | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 9. CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2017<br>- Covy Jones, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 10. Landowner Association Permit Number for 2017<br>– Covy Jones, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator     | <b>ACTION</b>      |
| 11. Other Business<br>– John Bair, Chairman   | <b>CONTINGENT</b>  |

**Utah Wildlife Board Meeting**  
December 9, 2016, DNR Auditorium  
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah  
**Summary of Motions**

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

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Byron Bateman, and approved unanimously.

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

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

The following motion was made Steve Dalton, seconded by Byron Bateman, and approved unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the minutes from the, 2016 Wildlife Board Meeting as presented.**

3) Elk Unit Management Plan Revisions (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Donnie Hunter, and approved 5 in favor with Calvin Crandall opposed.

**MOTION: I move that we approve that we accept the Elk Unit Management Plan revision as presented by the Division.**

4) Bucks, Bulls, & OIAL Season Dates, Application Timeline (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Mike King, seconded by Donnie Hunter, and passed (after two amended motions) unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's proposal as presented.**

This motion was amended by Donnie Hunter and seconded by Calvin Crandall and approved 4-2 with Mike King and Kirk Woodward opposed.

**AMENDED MOTION: I move that we amend the motion to include an archery only mountain goat hunt on the North Slope/South Slope, High Uintas Central unit (season dates Aug. 19-Sept 10, 2017) and an archery only bison hunt on the Henry's Mountains unit (season dates Oct. 6-20, 2017).**

The motion was then amended a second time by Kirk Woodward and seconded by Donnie Hunter and approved unanimously.

**2<sup>nd</sup> AMENDED MOTION: I move that we exclude the OIAL 7-day archery only proposal presented by the Division.**

- 5) Preference Point System Amendments (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Kirk Woodward, seconded by Steve Dalton, and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's Preference Point System amendments as presented.**

- 6) NER Deer Management Plans (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Mike King, seconded by Kirk Woodward, and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Northeastern Deer Management Plans as presented by the Division.**

- 7) CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2017 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Kirk Woodward, seconded by Calvin Crandall, and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's proposal as presented, and request that the operator of the Deer Creek CWMU report to the CWMU Advisory Committee in one year to review all CWMU improvements, if there are additional concerns with this CWMU they will be taken to the Wildlife Board at that time.**

The following motion was made by Kirk Woodward, seconded by Calvin Crandall, and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to look into the possibility of issuing 2 permits every other year for CWMUs that currently only have one public permit, so bonus points are an advantage.**

- 8) Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Donnie Hunter, and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017 as presented by the Division.**

**Utah Wildlife Board Meeting**  
December 9, 2016, DNR Auditorium  
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah  
[http://wildlife.utah.gov/public\\_meetings/board\\_minutes/audio/09-12-16.mp3](http://wildlife.utah.gov/public_meetings/board_minutes/audio/09-12-16.mp3)

**Wildlife Board Members Present**

John Bair – Chair  
Kirk Woodward – Vice Chair  
Greg Sheehan - Exec Sec  
Calvin Crandall  
Byron Bateman  
Donnie Hunter  
Steve Dalton  
Mike King

**Division Personnel Present**

Staci Coons	Bill Bates	Anita Candelaria
Jamie Martell	Justin Shannon	Chris Wood
Martin Bushman	Covy Jones	Mike Canning
Karen Caldwell	Teresa Griffin	Justin Dolling
Judi Tutorow	Rick Olson	Phil Gray
Lindy Varney	Jessie Chase	Mike Fowlks
Greg Hansen	Kimberly Hersey	Bryan Christensen
Kevin Bunnell	Dean Mitchell	Scott White
Jason Vernon	Randy Thacker	Boyde Blackwell
Steve Newren	Kent Hersey	Kenny Johnson

**RAC Chairs Present**

Dave Black—Southern Region  
Kevin Albrecht – Southeastern  
Region  
Richard Hansen—Central Region  
John Cavitt—Northern Region  
Randy Dearth—Northeastern Region

**Public Present**

Sterling Brown – Utah Farm Bureau	Carl Hurst
Steven Yardley – Yardley Cattle Co.	Grant Foster
Troy Justensen – Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife	
Gib Yardley	
Randy Sessions	
Ben Lowder – Mule Deer Foundation	
Bill Christensen – Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation	
Paul Phillips – Strawberry Bay Outfitters	
Alma Adams	

Chairman Bair called the meeting to order and welcomed the audience.

- 1) Approval of Agenda (**Action**) **00:06:44—00:06:56 of 06:19:59**

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Byron Bateman, and approved unanimously.

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

2) Approval of Minutes (**Action**) 00:07:11—00:07:21 of 06:19:59

The following motion was made by Steve Dalton, seconded by Byron Bateman, and approved unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the minutes from the September 29, 2016 meeting as presented.**

3) Old Business/Action Log (**Contingent**) 00:13:55—00:18:07 of 06:19:59

The Board elected to skip over the action log until Kirk Woodward arrived.

Kimberly Hersey, the Avian Program Coordinator with the Division of Wildlife Resources, updated the Board about the issue of shooting Utah Prairie Dogs with lead ammunition that can then be scavenged by raptors and other predators.

4) DWR Update (**Information**) 00:07:53—00:12:57 of 06:19:59

Greg Sheehan informed the Board about the national R3 (Recruitment, Retention, and Reactivation) Program efforts. For the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, the Division has asked Dean Mitchell, who has been the Outreach Chief for the past 10 years, to lead the program in Utah. Robin Cahoon has accepted the position as the new Conservation Outreach Section Chief.

The pronghorn transplant has been postponed until later in January. The Division has been putting radio collars on mule deer throughout the state in order to monitor them.

\*Kirk Woodward joined the meeting.

5) Elk Unit Management Plan Revisions (**Action**) 00:19:56—01:42:40 of 06:19:59

Justin Shannon, the Big Game Coordinator for the Division of Wildlife Resources, presented the Elk Unit Management Plan Revisions to the Board.

**Board/RAC Questions: 00:31:04—00:34:38 of 06:19:59**

Kirk Woodward asked Justin Shannon how the private land only tags did this year, and Donnie Hunter wanted to know how the new antlerless elk hunt in the Southern Region (Cedar Mountain) went. Kevin Albrecht from the Southeastern Region asked Justin if the Division had material that they planned to distribute.

**Public Questions: 00:34:43—00:57:50 of 06:19:59**

Public questions were taken at this time.

**RAC Recommendations: 00:58:00—01:01:32 of 06:19:59**

**CRO: Motion:** To accept the Division's recommendations as presented  
**Motion Passes:** 8 to 2

**NRO, SERO:**

**Motion:** Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Elk Unit Plan Revisions as presented.  
**Motion Passes-** Unanimous

**SRO: Motion:** To accept the Elk Unit Management Plans Revision as presented.  
**Amendment To Motion:** To add stronger language in the Southern Region plans to address elk depredation on private lands upon the private landowner's request.  
**Amendment Passes:** 8:5  
**Motion Passes:** Unanimous

**NERO: Motion:** To accept the Division's recommendations as presented  
**Motion Passes:** 6 in favor with 1 abstention

**Public Comments: 01:01:39—01:33:36 of 06:19:59**

Public comments were taken at this time.

**Board Discussion: 01:33:37—01:42:40 of 06:19:59**

Chairman Bair reviewed the comments and recommendations.

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Donnie Hunter, and approved 5 in favor with Calvin Crandall opposed.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Elk Unit Management Plan revisions as presented by the Division.**

6) Bucks, Bulls, & OIAL 2017 Season Dates, Application Timeline (**Action**)  
**01:42:56—04:48:08 of 06:19:59**

Justin Shannon, the Big Game Coordinator for the Division of Wildlife Resources, presented the bucks, bulls, and OIAL season dates and application timeline for 2017.

**Board/RAC Questions: 01:55:58—01:59:59 of 06:19:59**

Steve Dalton asked for clarification on the late Boulder Mountain hunt. Donny Hunter asked about the portion of youth permits.

**Public Questions: 02:00:00—02:00:04 of 06:19:59**



Public questions were taken at this time.

**RAC Recommendations: 02:00:09—02:16:44 of 06:19:59**

**CRO: Motion:** To accept the recommendation proposed by the SFW, Utah Bowman's Association, Mule Deer Foundation and Rocky Mountain Elk Foundations to add OIAL archery hunts and extend the Division's proposal of a seven day archery only opportunity for OIAL hunts.

**Motion Passes:** unanimously

**Motion:** To keep the late season muzzleloader hunt on the Plateau Boulder/Kaiparowits

**Motion Passes:** 7 to 3

**Motion:** To remove the points and eliminate the 50% bonus hunt on management buck deer units for youth.

**Motion Fails:** 4 to 6 (Kristofer, Ron, Larry, George) (Christine, Danny, Ken, Ben, Matt, Karl)

**Motion:** Put the youth management point problem on an action item for the board to review.

**Motion Passes:** unanimously

**Motion:** To accept the remainder of the Division's proposals as presented.

**Motion Passes:** unanimously

**NRO: Motion-** Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Division's recommendations with the addition of UBA's 2017, OIAL archery hunt recommendation season dates.

**Motion Fails-** For: 5 Against: 6

**Motion-** Recommend the Wildlife Board accept UBA, OIAL archery only Sheep hunt recommendations and season dates.

**Motion Passes-** For: 9 Against :1

**Motion-** Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Division's recommendation as presented with the exception of the 7 day archery extension for OIAL Sheep and eliminate the extra Limited Entry Bull Elk hunts during the spike season

**Motion Fails-** For :3 Against: 7

**Motion-** Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Division's recommendation as presented with the exception of the 7 day archery extension for OIAL Sheep.

**Motion Passes-** For: 8 Against: 2

**Motion-** Recommend the Wildlife Board allow unsuccessful youth elk hunters to hunt during the general season elk hunt.

**Motion Passes:** Unanimous

**SRO: Motion:** To accept the Bucks, Bulls, & OIAL 2017 Season Dates, Application Timeline as presented with the exception of adding the UBA proposal (see attachment 3).

**Amendment To Motion:** To keep the muzzle loader limited entry buck deer hunt on the Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits.

**Amendment Passes:** Unanimous

**Motion Passes:** Unanimous

**SERO: Motion:** To ask the Wildlife Board, as an action log item, to direct the Division to devise a solution for Dedicated Hunters whose children draw hunting permits for a different unit

**Motion Passes:** unanimously

**Motion:** To accept the Division's proposal for the Henry Mountain management buck hunt

**Motion Passes:** 8-1

**Motion:** To leave the limited-entry Boulder/Kaiparowits muzzleloader hunt unchanged from

2016, with dates conforming to 2017

Motion Passes: **unanimously**

**Motion:** To reject the Division's proposed seven-day archery extension for OIAL hunts

**Failed for lack of a second**

**Motion:** To accept the Division's proposed seven-day archery extension for OIAL hunts

Motion Passes: 5-3

**Motion:** To accept the remaining proposed bucks, bulls and OIAL 2017 season dates and application timeline as presented

**Motion Passes:** unanimously

**NERO: Motion** to accept as presented with the exception of 6 new hunts, OIAL archery 7 day extension, Diamond Mountain boundary change and extended archery boundary change

**Motion Passes:** unanimously

**Motion:** to accept 6 new additional hunts from UBA

**Motion Passes:** Unanimously

**Motion:** to accept 7 day OIAL archery extension

Motion Passes: 5 to 1

**Motion:** to accept Diamond Mountain boundary change meeting

**Motion Passes:** unanimously

**Motion:** to accept a change on Extend archery boundary

**Motion Passes:** unanimously

**Public Comments: 02:17:17—02:34:00 of 06:19:59**

Public comments were taken at this time.

**Board Discussion: 02:34:51—04:48:08 of 06:19:59**

Chairman Bair reviewed the comments and recommendations.

The following motion was made by Mike King, seconded by Donnie Hunter, and passed (after two amended motions) unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's proposal as presented.**

The motion was amended by Donnie Hunter and seconded by Calvin Crandall and approved 4-2 with Mike King and Kirk Woodward opposed.

**AMENDED MOTION: I move that we amend the motion to include an archery only mountain goat hunt on the North Slope/South Slope, High Uintas Central Unit (season dates Aug. 19-Sept. 10, 2017) and an archery only bison hunt on the Henry's Mountains unit (season dates Oct. 6-20, 2017).**

The motion was then amended a second time by Kirk Woodward and seconded by Donnie Hunter and approved unanimously.

**2<sup>nd</sup> AMENDED MOTION: I move that we exclude the OIAL 7-day archery**

**only proposal presented by the Division.**

7) Preference Point System Amendments (**Action**) **04:50:20—05:06:50 of 06:19:59**

Lindy Varney, the Licensing Specialist for the Division of Wildlife Resources, presented the Preference Point System Amendments to the Board.

**Board/RAC Questions: 04:59:18—04:59:57 of 06:19:59**

The Board did not have any questions.

**Public Questions: 04:59:58—05:00:20 of 06:19:59**

Public questions were taken at this time.

**RAC Recommendations: 05:00:30—05:01:25 of 06:19:59**

**CRO: Motion:** To accept the Division's recommendations as presented.

**Motion Passes:** 7 to 3

**NRO, SERO, NERO:**

**Motion:** Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Preference Point System Amendments as presented.

**Motion Passes:** Unanimous

**SRO: Motion:** To accept the Preference Point System Amendment as presented.

**Motion Passes:** 11:2

**Public Comments: 05:01:40—05:01:41 of 06:19:59**

Public comments were taken at this time.

**Board Discussion: 05:01:45—05:06:50 of 06:19:59**

Chairman Bair reviewed the comments and recommendations.

The following motion was made by Kirk Woodward, seconded by Steve Dalton, and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's Preference Point System Amendment as presented.**

8) NER Deer Management Plans (**Action**) **05:07:58—05:26:45 of 06:19:59**

Randall Thacker, the Northeastern Region Assistant Wildlife Manager, presented the NER Deer Management Plans to the Board.

**Board/RAC Questions: 05:18:06—05:22:54 of 06:19:59**

Kirk Woodward asked what the percentage is between valley and mountain deer.

**Public Questions: 005:22:55—05:22:57 of 06:19:59**

Public questions were taken at this time.

**RAC Recommendations: 05:23:10—05:23:56 of 06:19:59**

**CRO, NRO, SRO, SERO:**

**Motion:** To accept the Division's recommendations as presented.

**Motion Passes:** unanimously

**NERO:**

**Motion:** To accept the Division's recommendations as presented.

**Motion Passes:** 5-1

**Public Comments: 05:24:07—05:24:27 of 06:19:59**

Public comments were taken at this time.

**Board Discussion: 05:24:31—05:26:45 of 06:19:59**

Chairman Bair reviewed the comments and recommendations.

The following motion was made by Mike King, seconded by Kirk Woodward, and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Northeastern Deer Management Plans as presented by the Division.**

- 9) CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2017 (**Action**) **05:27:09—05:56:55 of 06:19:59**

Covy Jones, the Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator for the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, presented the 2017 CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers to the Board.

**Board/RAC Questions: 05:35:01—05:40:08**

Calvin Crandall wanted to know where the Deer Creek CWMU was located, and Byron Bateman asked about the ratio that Covy used.

**Public Questions: 05:40:09—05:40:10 of 06:19:59**

Public questions were taken at this time.

**RAC Recommendations: 05:40:16—05:44:19 of 06:19:59**

**CRO, NRO, SERO, NERO:**

**CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2017**

**Motion:** To accept the Division's recommendations as presented

**Motion Passes:** unanimously

**SRO: Motion:** To accept the Division's recommendations as presented

**Motion Passes:** unanimously with one abstention

**Public Comments: 05:44:20—05:44:21**

Public comments were taken at this time.

**Board Discussion: 05:44:31—05:56:55 of 06:19:59**

Chairman Bair reviewed the comments and recommendations.

The following motion was made by Kirk Woodward, seconded by Calvin Crandall, and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's proposal as presented, and request that the operator of the Deer Creek CWMU report to the CWMU Advisory Committee in one year to review all CWMU improvements, if there are additional concerns with the CWMU they will be taken to the Wildlife Board at that time.**

The following motion was made by Kirk Woodward, seconded by Calvin Crandall, and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to look into the possibility of issuing 2 permits every other year for CWMUs that currently only have one public permit, so bonus points are an advantage.**

10) Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017 (**Action**) **05:57:07—06:06:46 of 06:19:59**

**Board/RAC Questions: 05:59:07—06:02:36 of 06:19:59**

Gregory Sheehan relayed a question the Department of Agriculture had about what was involved in re-evaluating the Panguitch Landowner Association.

**Public Questions: 06:02:37—06:02:37 of 06:19:59**

Public questions were taken at this time.

**RAC Recommendations: 06:02:38—06:04:00 of 06:19:59**

**CRO, NRO, SERO, NERO:**

**Motion-** Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017 as presented.

**Motion Passes-** Unanimous

**SRO:**

**Motion-** Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017 as presented.

**Motion Passes-** Unanimous with one abstention

**Public Comments: 06:04:01—06:04:01 of 06:19:59**

Public comments were taken at this time.

**Board Discussion: 06:04:14—06:06:46 of 06:19:59**

Chairman Bair reviewed the comments and recommendations.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Donnie Hunter, and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2017 as presented by the Division.**

11) Other Business (**Contingent**) **06:46:47—06:18:28 of 06:19:59**

The Board has received some correspondence from Mapleton City. The Mapleton City Mayor has asked if the Division can either cut the city out of the unit, or if they can charge residents a fee in order to keep the deer that are shot within town.

The next Wildlife Board Meeting will be on January 3, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. in the DNR Auditorium.

Meeting adjourned.

Summary of Motions  
December  
Regional Advisory Council Meetings

**Motion Summary**

**Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments 2017**

All Regions:

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

**Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments 2017**

CRO: MOTION: To add a mentoring program for the bear hunt  
Passed unanimously

CRO: MOTION: To accept the rest of the Division's proposal as presented  
Passed unanimously

NRO: MOTION: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept 2017 Black Bear recommendations and Rule Amendments as presented and ask the Division to look into the Book Cliffs season dates.  
Passed unanimously

SRO: MOTION: To accept the 2017 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments as presented, with the acceptance to add 5 permits to the North Manti as recommended by the Farm Bureau and add bonus points to the summer pursuit permits.  
Passed unanimously

SER: MOTION: To limit the number of hounds allowed per pursuit permit holder to eight hounds for summer seasons and 12 hounds for all other seasons, applied statewide  
Passed 6-4

MOTION: To change the fall black bear limited-entry season on the Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South unit to Aug. 12 to Sept. 25 and Oct. 28 to Nov. 16, consistent with the La Sal and San Juan units  
Passed 6-4

MOTION: To accept the remaining 2017 black bear recommendations and rule amendments as presented  
Passed 9-1

NER: MOTION: To accept the Divisions recommendation as presented  
AMENDED MOTION: Address the South Slope Diamond spring and summer hunts. Take two permits off the spring hunt and add them to the summer hunt because of access to higher elevations that can't be hunted in the spring, but it can be accessed better in the summer so they can hunt and have a good success rate.  
Motion and amendment passed unanimously

### **Private Fish Pond Rule Amendments**

CRO, NRO, SER, NER

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

SRO: MOTION: To accept the Private Pond Rule Amendments- Rule R657-59 as presented with the additional requests from the Utah Association of Aquaculture. (see attachment)  
Passed unanimously

### **AIS (Aquatic Invasive Species) Rule Amendment**

All Regions:

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

### **Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments**

CRO, NRO, SER, NER

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

SRO: MOTION: To accept the R657-38 Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments as presented.  
VOTE: Motion carried 8:4, 1 abstained

### **OTHER**

NER: MOTION to send a directive to wild life board to better understand the distribution of the sand hill crane tags and NER. And we believe the NER is not receiving the appropriate amount of tags.  
Explanation: The depredation is too harsh for the amount of birds we have here.

Boyde Blackwell: The best for them is to wait for the upland game meeting but this will serve as a heads up to the Wildlife board that we are serious about this.

Mitch Hacking, second

David Gordon: When we are talking about the permit numbers they will have an idea?

Randy Dearth: Yes.

Passed unanimously



Central Region Advisory Council  
Springville Civic Center  
110 South Main Street, Springville  
December 6, 2016 @ 6:30 p.m.

### **Motion Summary**

#### **Approval of Agenda**

MOTION: To accept the agenda as written  
Passed unanimously

#### **Approval of Minutes**

MOTION: To accept the minutes as written  
Passed unanimously

#### **Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments 2017**

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

#### **Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments 2017**

MOTION: To add a mentoring program for the bear hunt  
Passed unanimously

MOTION: To accept the rest of the Division's proposal as presented  
Passed unanimously

#### **Private Fish Pond Rule Amendments**

Motion: To accept the Division's proposal as presented  
Passed unanimously

#### **AIS (Aquatic Invasive Species) Rule Amendment**

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

#### **Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments**

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

Central Region Advisory Council  
Springville Civic Center  
110 South Main Street, Springville  
December 6, 2016 @ 6:30 p.m.

**Members Present**

Matt Clark, Sportsmen  
Larry Fitzgerald, Agriculture  
George Garcia, Forest Service  
Karl Hirst, Sportsmen  
Michael Gates, BLM  
Richard Hansen, At large, Vice Chair  
Danny Potts, Non-consumptive  
Ben Lowder, At Large  
Kristofer Marble At large  
Christine Schmitz, Non-consumptive  
Kenneth Strong, Sportsmen  
Alan White, Agriculture

**Members Absent**

Ron Camp, Sportsmen  
Jacob Steele, Native American  
Greg McPhie, Elected  
Gary Nielsen, Sportsman, Chair Supervisor

**Others Present**

Jason Vernon, CRO Reg Supervisor  
John Bair, Chairman, Wildlife Board

- 
- 1) **Approval of the Agenda and Minutes (Action)**  
- **Richard Hansen, RAC Chair**

**VOTING**

Motion was made by Ken Strong to accept the agenda as written  
Seconded by Karl Hirst  
Passed unanimously

**VOTING**

Motion was made by Karl Hirst to approve the minutes as written  
Seconded by George Garcia  
Passed unanimously

- 2) **Wildlife Chair Board Meeting Update (Information)**  
- **Richard Hansen, RAC**

None

- 3) **Regional Update (Information)**  
- **Jason Vernon, Central Regional Supervisor**

**Outreach**

\*Many ice fishing events are coming up this winter. The first will be held on December 16 at Sportsman's Warehouse in Midvale. Other events are scheduled throughout Utah County and Strawberry Reservoir. Look for the announcements via Facebook and other news releases.

**\*Sportsman's Warehouse (Midvale)**

\*December 16 @ 6:15-8:15 - Ice fishing 101

\*January 13 @ 6:15-8:15 - Advanced ice fishing techniques

\*January 27 @ 6:15-8:15 - Techniques targeted for Strawberry fish species

**\*Sportsman's Warehouse (Provo)**

\*January 11 @ 6-7:30 - Intro to ice fishing and tips and tricks

**\*Cabela's**

\*To be determined

**\*FishTech**

\*To be determined

**\*Ice Fishing Event at Strawberry Reservoir**

\*Saturday, February 4 from 8-2

\*Bald Eagle Day will be held Saturday, February 11, near the Fountain Green Fish Hatchery

Wildlife

**\*Big game capture**

\*Jan 10-15, North Slope and Wasatch moose capture. We will be capturing and GPS collaring 80 cow moose on the North Slope and Wasatch units to better understand survival cause of mortality and movement patterns. No moose will be slung back as part of this capture.

\*Jan 16, Rock Canyon bighorn sheep capture. We will be capturing and collaring 10 bighorn sheep in the Rock Canyon area for disease testing and population monitoring.

\*Feb 1-7, Wasatch Area elk capture. We will be capturing and GPS collaring around 125 elk on the Wasatch and surrounding units to better understand elk migrations and movements between units. No elk will be slung back as part of this capture.

\*On each unit we will be catching 20 doe deer to assess overall condition and rate of decline of fat reserves.

\*Dec 2-4 South Manti deer capture.

\*Dec 3-4 Oquirrh-Stansbury deer capture.

\*Dec 5 North Manti deer capture.

\*Dec 6-7 Wasatch deer capture.

\*Mar 6-7 Wasatch-Manti deer capture.

\*Mar 8 Oquirrh-Stansbury deer capture.

Law Enforcement

\*Actively patrolling winter range

Habitat

\*Finishing restoration and fire rehabilitation projects

**4) Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2017**  
**- Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Matt Clark– What would it take to get the pintails limit back up to two? What kind of data will you be looking for? I know the main concern for waterfowl hunters on this whole proposal is, once you reduce the numbers, it's really hard to get the numbers back up.

Blair –We have a harvest strategy that was developed by us, the States and the Fish and Wildlife Service which lists specific population levels as to the 2- bird bag or a 1- bird bag in a closed

season. Those are pretty much set in stone right now. They are based off of long term data as well as the spring survey which we do each year. For that number to come back up to two, all that would need to happen is for the pintail population to come back up so we are above that threshold again. That will probably happen in future years just because pintail populations tend to move quite a bit based on breeding conditions and so if an area is really dry they tend to go north to where they will have better nesting conditions. This is likely what has happened with this last survey so it is all depended on what the results are from that survey.

Ben – You made a comment about youth/group applications for the swan; can you give a little background on that? Would we allow group applications for everybody else or are we just going to allow them for youth specifically?

Blair – Yes, for some reason we didn't allow youth to apply as a group for any of our drawings about 10 years ago. We have changed that with deer and have allowed youth to start applying as a group with several other species, so this is just a way for us to make all of our drawings consistent as well to allow youth to apply as a group for all of our drawings. We are just trying to move all the species through the process of doing that. Ben – Okay, thanks.

Karl – With having two openers, are we going to have all the duck hunters spread out in the state north or all of them south, or what is your guess with the two openings?

Blair – That is a good question and I think probably it just depends on where the birds are. I would imagine most people will stay for that northern opener. I imagine we will have as many people going south for the opener but I guess it's anyone's guess right now until we try it.

#### **Questions from the Public**

None

#### **Comments from the Public**

Dee Jay Bigler/SFW – We agree and are fully behind the recommendations of the department on this agenda item.

#### **RAC Discussion**

None

#### **VOTING**

Motion was made by Danny Potts to accept the Division's recommendations as presented  
Seconded by Matt Clark

Passed unanimously

#### **5) Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments -2017**

- **Rusty Robinson, Wildlife Biologist**

#### **Questions from the RAC**

Kris – I didn't see anything that showed what our sow harvest was. Can we compare it to the metrics and see what the tag increases were?

Rusty – Do you have a specific unit in mind and we can look it up?

Kris – Yes, there would be some certainly in the Central Region that we would want to take a look at. It would be good to take a look at all of them.

Rusty – What unit specifically and Riley can pull those up? Kris- Wasatch

Riley – For the Wasatch last year 44 %, but like we said some of the fall numbers are still coming back. This is a liberal unit 40-45%, it's a liberal strategy and we fall right into where we want to be. For the Nebo Unit it is 38%, which is a liberal strategy as well. We are right where we want to be there too, but we did recommend a 5 permit increase on the Nebo since we are a little lower on some of the factors.

Richard- Kris, did you want to know more about the male/female?

Rusty – Yes, that is just a sow harvest. Do you know the average age as well? I don't know if we have the average age for 16. Average age for the Nebo was 4 ½ this year and then 5 on the Wasatch.

Kris – Is the Nebo data off of the triggers and percentage?

Rusty – Right, the Nebo does have the ability to increase on both of those and is not within the triggers.

Danny – I assume that some of the issues are related to prolong drought. Could you just talk a little about that?

Rusty – I am not the bear biologist so not sure what to say other than bears are obviously very effected by weather conditions, food availability and harvest largely.

Riley – I think you're right. I think bear harvest is largely depends on weather and Friday night snow storms.

Ben - This will be our 3<sup>rd</sup> year with this new hunt structure with the summer season and allowing the ability to hunt with a rifle over bait; so it will be real interesting to see how the application distribution will be since we have made those changes.

Rusty – No, not on the top of my head. We could take a look at that for you. Ben- Sure

Richard – On the spring bear hunt it ends June 2, the summer bear hunt starts June 3. The summer bear hunters can bait 2 weeks prior so they are overlapping into the spring bear hunt season. Can spring bear hunters shoot a bear over bait?

Rusty –They are not supposed to. Correct me if I am wrong.

Richard – The reason I ask that is because I was involved in an exact situation. We put some cameras out where we knew where there were bears in this particular area. We saw the people come in and set up bait in front of our camera. What are we suppose to do? I know that's a law enforcement issue, but the spring bear hunter didn't put the bait there. It has caused problems among some hunters to tell you the truth.

Rusty - Jason, get your law enforcement guys. That is a good comment to make and I appreciate that concern.

Richard – The question is, is it legal for the spring bear hunter to kill a bear that's on bait that he didn't put out?

Law Enforcement – No, but if you have somebody that is baiting in your area they need to contact us because they are suppose to register bait stations.

Richard- Yes, we did that and got a hold of Jay and we told him the situation and he wasn't sure what we should do.

Law Enforcement – I guess we need to sit down and discuss this issue. I didn't know that this had happened.

Richard – Yes, and it will happen more often now with that 2 week overlapping.

Law Enforcement – I apologize, I was unaware of this problem. We will sit down and discuss this and get some different options.

Rusty – Aside of that have you seen an increase with the 2 week pre-season baiting, have we had many issues?

Law Enforcement – I haven't seen it being an issue.

Richard – I think it needs to be clarified especially for the spring bear hunter so that he doesn't feel like that he can get into trouble because he ends up shooting a bear that is coming into a bait station.

Rusty – That is a good comment!

### **Questions from the Public**

Dan Cockayne/Utah Houndsman – Do you have the numbers on the conflicts and the depredation bears that were taken in this region?

Rusty – Do we have these broken down in each region Riley? Riley – Yes, I do for both Nebo and Wasatch?

Riley – The number for conflict bear on the Nebo, 5 taken this year and there were 8 on the Wasatch.

Dan Cockayne – So the Wasatch is way down? Riley - Yes quite a bit down.

Chet Young – For the depredating bears, the rule used to be with the wildlife services, that the bear had to be a fresh kill, within 24 hours, and now that has changed to where they can go in front of a sheep herd in a problem area and take a bear out before it's a nuisance bear or a depredating bear. Is there a way to put that on record to where that bear is not a depredating bear because it shows that it is a depredation bear but really the bears not depredating just for the future on this going forward?

Riley – I guess that is something that maybe we could talk to wildlife services and work through. This is the purpose for the Wasatch being the liberal unit. It is in hopes of getting the hunters out to kill those bears before they become a problem so wildlife services won't have to come in and take them. The goal is to give the bear harvest to the sportsman and not to wildlife services. That is a tough question to answer but it is something I would be willing to bring up with wildlife services to see what options we have and where we could work forward with them. I think you're talking specifically on the Wasatch unit? Chet- Yes I am Riley – They work with us well. We

have a good communication, and it would be something I'd be willing to bring up and discuss. Also to see what opportunities we have and if they know of a bear to let us know before they get it and maybe we could get a sportsman on. I'm willing to go make those conversations but as far as a rule change or policy changes that is a tough question to answer at the moment.

Chet – Yes, it is more of a documentation thing because there were 8 nuisance bear took for depredation. But if 4 of them were killed in front of the sheep then that would bring that number way down as far as a depredating bear which kind of changes numbers and the reason for the harvest objective. Is there a chance that we are going to get away from this harvest objective on the Wasatch in the next go round?

Riley – We will re-evaluate that completely the next time the plan comes up. This is not something that is permanent and this is something that Dale does a fantastic job in evaluating and looking at and giving us the options. Harvest objectives came about on the Wasatch because of the number of bears being taken by depredation and the amount that we needed to trap and move or division removals which have been way down. We are down to 8. We have been as high as 20 in the last 5 years, so we hope that the plan is working, but it is something we will always re-evaluate and look at further.

Chet - I was part of the bear management plan and when it was structured, we were promised in units like the Wasatch it would never fit in the criteria of being a harvest objective. It was structured for places like the 9-mile with private land and access issues. We have looked into how the Wasatch fits those criteria.

Riley – I was definitely not part of the plan so I don't know what was promised and what wasn't. I can say that I feel like the Wasatch for the purposes that we are trying to accomplish it's a harvest objective well, will it always fit that way, will that always be the plan, I can't say that, but at the moment I personally think it was a good move and we are putting more tags into the sportsman and not into the wildlife services killing bears. We are seeing that number drop. If that continues to be the case, I think it is a successful plan. We'd all rather see a hunter harvest a bear than have it be shot off a dead sheep. There are reasons for it, I think it fits well, I don't know what was said before I got here but I do believe it's the right plan currently. Will it be the next go round? I don't know but we are always willing to sit down with you and hear the entire sportsman's concerns and what we have going forward and see what needs to be improved upon, if anything.

Chet – Ben this question is for you. Would you be against on the next go round putting the bait season back in the spring instead of the summer? Or do you think there would be too many conflicts?

Ben – Are you asking to swap the spring and the summer? Chet- I'm asking to combine it the way it was with hound and bait. Ben- concerning Richard's problem I think that is really an edge case. This is the first time I have heard of that. I can see the potential of it happening, but I really think that's an edge case. Riley, I have a follow up question for you that we're talking about the next go round. I want to figure out what that is. The bear plan is a 12 year plan but it was designed to be implemented in 3 year cycles. Is the next go round next year or 9 years?

Riley – Next year. We can re-evaluate the hunt strategy. The 12 year plan is putting it into a liberal season and kind of the side boards of that and that will not be re-evaluated on a yearly basis but we do have the opportunity to adjust the hunt strategy on a yearly basis. Honestly it was looked at this year and thought over that we all agreed that we still believe this is still the right strategy for the unit.

Ben – So I imagine next year we will possibly see some significant discussions regarding whether or not to continue the hunt structures as we have today? Do we keep the summer season? Do we keep the harvest objective on the Wasatch? I imagine those are going to be some heavily discussions next year.

Riley – Right, yes they will be discussed and re-evaluated.

Ben – Now to answer your question Chet, that is a big decision that I would want to discuss with my membership and my board. I could support it either way. Personally I have hunted both the last 2 years on the summer season with friends that have drawn tags, and I think it has been a great hunt. I think we should keep it there. I think it has been going well. This new plan has a lot of new strategies and I think the Division is using them well to accomplish the goals. I know you don't like the harvest objective on the Wasatch but it's doing what it is designed to do. We are reducing these conflicts and I think we have been successful at it. I think this will be a big discussion that we need to have next year so I can't give you a straight answer right now, but if I was to be put on the spot, I'd probably like to see that summer season stay.

Chet- Alright, I have worked with you before, I just wanted your opinion.

Brad Osguthorpe/Utah Wool Growers & Red Pine Ranches – We have some permits in the Strawberry area and we have a lot of problems with the bears up there so anything we can support to increase bear permits would be great. We killed roughly this past summer about 15 bears in that area. Yes, the bears love the sheep for some reason, don't know why, but they love the sheep. We would support anything that could be put out there to get more permits. Thank you

Jason Binder- What is our state bear population?

Riley – That data does not exist to know exact number of bears. That is really difficult, a thing we use instead is a model population based on age and harvest data and then we go back in time to determine demographics and get a minimum number, but it is relative to itself. This way we know if we are increasing or decreasing but not a total population number.

Jason - Doesn't it kind of make it hard to determine a population when we keep increasing tags every year so the harvest is always different?

Riley – That is a great question. You're asking if we're trying to hit a moving target, is that kind of what you are asking.

Jason – Yes, to me it's kind of hard to determine a bear population using numbers if every year we keep increasing tags. Last year we increased tags and also the year before and now we are looking at another 46, so obviously more bears are being killed and more bears are being turned in but how do we know we're not damaging the population?

Riley – We do that with all our species and we use those numbers to calculate what our harvest will be and it is a moving target but we can do that. What are the alternatives is what you're asking? Are you asking to stay the same for a year?

Jason – Yes, to keep the tags the same for 3 consecutive years so we can see if there are ups and downs. Do we have numbers on sow harvest on the harvest objective on the Wasatch?



Rusty – Riley, I think you gave me 44% for sow harvest. Riley – That was percentage overall. I think we're 50% 6 and 6.

Jason- So there were 12 bears killed on the harvest objective? Riley – Yes Jason – Out of 25?

Riley – Yes Jason – The last I looked there were 17 bears killed on the harvest objective when the hunt was still open.

Riley – I'm sorry you have put us on the spot. Jason – That is why I am here. Riley – We have the information but we will have to get back to you.

Jason – I have heard through the grapevine it was 12,017 out of 17. How many violations were written for wet sows?

Riley- Law Enforcement, can you speak about that? Law Enforcement – I'll have to take a look at that.

Jason – My biggest problem I have with this being close to 50% is if we are killing half of our bears our wet sows are obviously dying. Obviously someone is breaking the law and nobody is being written a ticket for it.

Riley – I don't know, we'll have to look up those numbers and see what violations have been written.

Jason – To me, if no violations are being written, that is basically poaching, correct? It's against the law to chase a sow with cubs or kill a sow with cubs. Correct?

Riley – Yes, that is a violation as far as I am aware of.

Jason- Okay, thank you.

Chet Young – On there it shows there were 8 bears killed for depredation; we just heard that there was 15 killed on the Wasatch.

Riley – That was our question as well.

Chet – Is there information not getting back to the Division or what is the process now to see where we are at? Obviously we are looking at this saying this harvest objective is working if our numbers are off 50%?

Riley – That was 15 this summer. Let's get together afterwards Brad and see if our numbers jive.

### **Comments from the Public**

Dee Jay Bigler/SFW- There has been a lot of questions asked here this evening that we are not getting answers to but SFW feels that we should support the department with their wildlife biologists and SFW recommends that we agree with the Division on their recommendations and support their findings for this bear hunt for next year.

Dan Cockayne/Utah Houndsman – We sent a letter to most of you that your emails worked and we had a couple of issues in some other regions but other than those we support the Divisions recommendations. We are a little alarmed at the wildlife services.

### RAC Discussion

Kris – Riley and Rusty can bring up the slide with the performance metrics. What I am asking for both the Wasatch and the Nebo is what the performance was for 2016 against those metrics?

Rusty – Both of those units are liberal which cause for the performance targets of adult male or 5 years old under 25% and we were 20%. Females are between 40-45%. We were at 44%.

Kris – Was that the sow number or the success rate? Riley- That was the sow number.

Rusty – So overall we were within both of those performance targets on that unit.

Kris – On the Nebo unit, was the sow harvest 48%?

Rusty- I believe it was 38 % on the female harvest. Adult male percentage harvested was 13%, so we were within target on the male and out of target on the female. This allows for adjustment of up to 20%.

Kris- Okay, my confusion has been just understanding what we actually did against the metrics and that's what I have really struggled with this particular discussion to understand. The biologists do a great job and the Division works hard, but why do we make management plans if we're not going to follow them? I feel like it is really important if we're going to make recommendations and approve recommendations and that sort of thing that we need to make sure it's staying true to the management plan. I feel like the human conflict is an important issue but I don't think we should lose sight of the metrics that we have in the plan to address those conflicts. I think this is very important. And if we need to address the plan next year, perhaps we should think about this a little bit more because the bear harvest due to human conflict has to have a boundary; we can't reduce our bear population down below a sustainable level just because there are conflicts reported. At some point the Wasatch is going to have no bears on it if we keep going too far, I think. So you're proposing no increase to the Wasatch, right?

Rusty- That is correct and that is what I want to clarify is according to the plan it would be a no permit increase but sounds like maybe your concerns are with the base line number we are already using from last year.

Kris- Perhaps, yes but it sounds like we are within the metrics but just wanted to confirm so no permit increase for the Wasatch? Rusty – Correct Kris – Was the increase for Nebo 2? Rusty – 5 permits for the Nebo.

George Garcia- I don't have an issue with the increase of 5 permits mainly because our numbers show that folks are visiting Nebo at an increased rate. The human conflicts with bear's are going to continue to increase.

Kris – That is understandable, but if we are going to continue to have wild places and wild things we have got to keep a sustainable population as well. We need to maintain plan and to adhere to that plan.

Richard- I can tell from personal experience that the Nebo's bear population is pretty healthy. I guarantee it. I will see more bear than I will deer when I go up there.

Danny - Although I kill ducks and I don't hunt bear, I really appreciate the opportunities provided. A really diverse opportunity for baiting, the use of hounds and stalking. I really think that is a healthy overall approach to dealing with these critters.

Ben - I think a mentoring hunt would be great for bear. What would it take to change that? Does it need to go to a legislature first? John, to get the ball rolling is there anything that you would need from our RAC to help further that along. I would love to see this change.

John Bair – Ben, it's a lot more likely to get talked about if there is a motion made that the chairman can bring up to the wildlife board than if it's just something we're doing right now in the minutes. If this is something you'd like to see looked at, or asked about, make a motion and have your chairman report on it that and we will have a good opportunity to discuss that and get some good answers and put it on the record.

### **VOTING**

Motion was made by Ben Lowder to add a mentoring program for the bear hunt

Seconded by Ken Strong

Passed unanimously

Motion was made by Karl Hirst to accept the rest of the Division's proposal as presented

Second by Ken Strong

Passed unanimously

- 6) **Private Pond Rule Amendments-Rule R657-59**  
- **Randy Oplinger, Coldwater Sport Fisheries Program Coordinator**

### **Questions from the RAC**

Richard- I have a little pond located on Cove Mountain by the Monroe Mountains, do I need a COR for that? It's not a stream and it doesn't have any screens because it doesn't really have any outlets because it is spring fed, snow melt, and has enough water that seeps up out of the ground. It's about 14 feet deep. Do I need a core for that?

Randy –Under the current rule you technically do, you need a COR for that. The proposed rule addresses really the exact situation that you are discussing right there. Traditionally under the current rule you never would be allowed to put fish in that pond, but under the rule that we are proposing you could receive a certificate of registration.

Richard – I have had a COR and I have bought fish and stocked the pond. They don't winter over, they all winter kill. How do you find out what species that are appropriate or be allowed in that certain area?

Randy – Are you asking as a pond owner of what's appropriate? The rule does spell it out. The online reporting tool is going to have that information as well and we are also giving that information with members of the private agriculture sector so you could contact a business or wherever you would like to purchase fish from and give them the location of your pond and they could tell you what is allowed in that area. Or you could ask the Division, we could tell you as well. Richard – Okay.

Ken Strong – In the past we have had whirling disease introduced into this state and with these changes in the rules, do we have plans that this will block any disease from coming in from the private agriculture? I just worry about disease being brought in and maybe the state isn't. We don't need it here.

Randy – That actually goes to the Department of Agriculture. They monitor basically if the private agriculture sector is importing fish within the state. There are certain requirements for

disease testing and that kind of thing. Individual private agriculture facilities area asked if they are producing fish in state, producing their own eggs, hatching them out, raising the fish , again those fish have to be disease tested and certified by the Department of Agriculture before the permit is released for stocking. Whirling disease is one of the things they are looking for in the testing.

### **Questions from the Public**

None

### **Comments from the Public**

Robert Judd/President of the Utah Aquaculture Assoc-Spring Lake Trout Farm- I am one of three that are allowed currently to grow fish and deliver them live in the state and want to thank Randy and the Division for the time they have spent with us in meetings hashing over these rules and trying to come up with plans that we felt that would be beneficial to customer and also to the growers. Overall, as we look at this rule we agree with the majority of what this rule is. But like any rule there are certain things as an industry we still struggle with and some of that is some of the things that you just brought up. When a customer calls in how can we describe to them whether or not they can or cannot have fish in a certain area? Currently in the rule it states that if you're on a natural stream channel you can't stock fish unless you meet all those requirements. We'd actually like to see and propose to this body that maybe you look at that and we actually could eliminate "that natural stream channel" altogether and actually propose that in place of that, "If a private owner has a piece of land and has water generated on that land, then he should be able to screen that and populate that body of water without a COR" that should be pretty easy. Most of our facilities are what you are describing. In order to try and protect the wildlife with the state of Utah with wild fish, if you had a piece of property and water flowed from another place into your property and out of your property, in a situation like that you would need to take that water into an off shoot into a pond and screen it and put that water back into the water and that would still allow you to have fish without a COR as long those are met. But what the Division is offering to be able to stock a stream without a COR altogether, without screens through a COR process is definitely an increase in something we haven't seen. Our proposal would be for you to look at instead of saying you can't stock a natural stream channel the reason why is that fish can only be stocked where there is water and if you define a natural stream channel where we have gone round and round trying to define it, where water flows that is where it is natural and that is where fish are going to survive. You can't put fish out on dry land and expect them to live. So this is why we are proposing that if you maybe look at or discuss it among yourselves and make a recommendation to the board that would be awesome. Overall, I want to just tell you that the rule is much simpler than what it was and overall we agree with the rule and we appreciate the work that we have been able to do with the aquatics people in the Division of Wildlife.

### **RAC Discussion**

Kris- If I understand your comments, you're asking us to consider recommending or limiting the need for a COR if water originates and terminates on somebody's land?

Robert – That is currently that would still be able to help but what we are talking about is that right now in the rule it states you cannot stock fish in a natural stream channel. Basically wherever water flows, that is a natural stream.

Kris – That is right but you are asking for an exception if water originates and terminates within boundaries of private.

Robert – Yes, that is what we are asking, and if it is a flow through situation where it flows from one place into another such as some other place through their property and out then they would need to defer that water and screen it and then be allowed to stock it.

Kris- Okay Robert- Does that make sense? Kris – Yes it does and could Randy comment on that?

Robert Judd – I think there is a misunderstanding. We aren't saying that you can't stock a pond on natural stream channels. There is a process that would need to take place to protect native species. The problem is with anybody looking at a piece of property where the water originates and terminates is the time that you're there doesn't account for high run off, high water in the spring, and what we are asking is an opportunity to go look at it and evaluate the threat downstream or potentially upstream when there might be activity. We have done that in number of cases and allowed these stockings to take place in the past and will in the future. The COR process is our way of just evaluating the risk.

Richard – My situation is that in the spring/summer the water flows into there and flows out into another area that fills up by the end of the summer. This area is completely dry and there is no outflow from our pond and there must have not been a problem because they did issue me a COR permit several years ago to do that without screens. It was all contained.

Randy –One of the other things that about this rule change is that needs to be addressed or brought up is the fact that with this change in the last 8 years, state regulation has been that we are trying to get away from COR's and trying to allow people to be able to purchase fish. (Example if you want to go buy a chicken you buy a chicken but if you want to buy a fish there are some other things that you have to go through) and we are trying to streamline that so if somebody wants to buy a fish they can buy a fish. With the new current rule or the rule that is being proposed, do we like all of the additions that they are doing? It is going to require a lot more COR's at this point. Does this make sense?

Alan White – I have a situation that's kind of like Richard's. The stream comes off a forest service land which is 100 yards through the fence before the private property. It goes into a pond that is used for irrigation which I have the water filings on and it's a small stream. I think that the water filing is for a little bit less than 1 second foot of water but the water unless it was a real run off spring flood never leaves the private property. Like you say there is always a natural course and you can see where in certain times water would run to the river but it would be a mile away and so I am just trying to get in my mind whether this is a kind of thing you would say that maybe wouldn't need a COR in this case. I agree with that, if we can do that and I am sure there is lot of smaller ponds like that because the pond is used to store the water until you have enough to irrigate and flood with. I am currently in the process of putting a pivot out of it so I can use it, but I would like to and as far as I know it never has had fish in it or stocked or anything but in my mind I would love to be able to put fish in there.

Ben – How many COR's turned down for this kind of situation?

Drew Cushing - To say that it is infrequent is an understatement. We work with the landowners and the private aquacultures through most issues whether it is putting screens in or a different species of fish. Those seem to be the 2 most common things. The reason some of these changes are being recommended is Robert kind of alluded to this; historically there have been ponds that you argue either way or try and find what a natural spring channel really is problematic because of springs and where it ends. So it's more about the threat so we are trying to get away from historic decisions and try and get to a good happy spot. Usually we work through the issues

through series of phone calls between private aquaculture, ourselves and regional managers and the land owner.

Ken Strong – So with these new proposals and complete change of what we have had in the past , does this make easier for the COR's to be put into place or handle the fish?

Drew – It does make it a lot easier to understand the rule and there were 2 and now there is 1. It simplifies the process it goes through. It allows for some stocking in places where historically they couldn't take place at all. According to the rule, what we have done is we have moved those into a situation where we would evaluate them on a case by case basis and there should be more opportunity for private stocking through this rule. I don't think anything is ever perfect, but we have worked with Robert on a variety of different rule changes and his group since 2008 and have adjusted things on a continual basis since then addressing issues as they arise as we can.

Robert Judd- As far as from the aquaculture side of things we agree there are parts of this rule that allows more people to access fish but we also believe that through the way it is written currently with “the natural stream channel”, it will require more COR's. They still have the ability to get fish, but they would have to go through the COR process before they could stock the fish.

Matt Clark – I guess I don't understand, I guess is it that big of deal to get a COR? Are you turning away people because they don't have a COR because the Divisions isn't getting them fast enough or not enough resources.

Robert – It depends on your perspective. We hear it from our customers that they want to purchase a lot of fish, 50 or so, and that is going to cost them around \$50-\$100, but to get a COR it is going to cost them \$200. For the customer they look at it cost prohibitive.

Matt – So it's a constitute issue?

Robert – Yes, because the Division charges for them to go out and inspect that facility to verify.

Matt- Yes, that makes sense. Thanks for clarifying that.

Robert – It just depends on the buyer. Some buyers spend \$200 and it is no big deal and others think it is a big deal. It's just dependant.

Richard – Who determines whether you need a COR? Is it the Agriculture Department?

Drew- If those 3 criteria's are met, sterile fish, screen pond, and not on a natural stream channel, then you can stock ponds without a COR.

Richard- So if I go to someone that raises fish and I want to buy fish and take them to my pond on my property what is he going to say to me?

Drew – He is going to look at the screen, is it on a natural stream channel or are you stocking the right fish? He can address most of that over the phone and I think Robert does a really great job doing that.

Robert – It's hard at times to make that decision over a phone call. That is why I proposed, if it wells up on their property, they would be able to stock it. This eliminates a lot of questions.

Richard – I can say now for me, for example, this becomes problematic now even though before I did have a COR and was able to buy the fish, this rule makes it more questionable as to whether I should go get a COR or not; or whether I need one.

Drew – It actually makes it less questionable. It actually simplifies this process for Robert and for you because we created an app that Google earth can pinpoint the location. You can expand it out and see your ponds location. This way you can see what you need, and what you can stock and then we can determine your requirements.

Richard – So this resource is going to help make that determination? Drew- That's right.

Robert – The only thing that makes it's a little harder is that natural stream channel saying that you can't stock an actual natural stream channel. Other than that the fact that if you have streams and you use the right fish that makes it much simpler for us to be able to state whether you can stock that fish.

Danny – I have a comment on a very small pond outside of Beaver. It had Sacramento Perch in it and it was on a natural stream channel. Most of the year there wasn't any water running into it and then we had a rainstorm and the water topped the dam. The Sacramento fish ended up into Minersville Reservoir, and I don't know how much we paid to remove the Sacramento Perch in Minersville Reservoir, but it was a lot of money. There are consequences sometimes that we pay even when we think we're doing all of the right things. That's why we pay these guys to go look at these ponds or at least research it on Google so they can take a look and see is their potential for trouble? The species, the drainage, and ask if the screening to the dam is secure? Is it going to go out in a thunderstorm? These are extremely important and you would agree.

Robert – What we are talking about mostly is the fish that are in the salmon family. If you bring up a perch situation, that would have had to been approved by the Division.

Alan White – Can fertile rainbow trout be stocked without a COR in any private fish pond or short term fishing event within the state? Where can you put fertile rainbow trout without having a COR?

Drew – Once again the rule is basically where you can and can't put rainbow trout. Statewide if your pond meets those 3 requirements, anywhere in the state you can stock sterile trout minus brown trout in the Virgin River area.

Alan – My question was, can you stock fertile rainbow without a COR?

Drew - As long as your pond meets those 3 requirement and you stock sterile (sterile brown, sterile brook, sterile tiger trout, sterile rainbows) you DON'T need a COR to do that. There are places on the Wasatch front down below 7,000 feet in the Colorado River drainage where you can stock fertile rainbow trout without a COR as long as you meet those 3 requirements. That is where that phone app helps Robert make that decision.

Robert – A lot of times we have heart to heart talks and sometimes we disagree but I will tell you that the proclamation looks really confusing and they are extremely hard to understand. The app on the pond will make it a much easier opportunity for people to understand. The proclamation is just a way that they are able to identify a stream that they have a situation with. Generally speaking, if you're in a valley location along the Wasatch Front, you can stock it with deployed fish. Once you get up into the mountain areas where the native fish are, this is where the Division is concerned about when you are required to use sterile fish.

Alan- Well right now I would love to make a motion of what you're saying, but don't quite know how I would word it to make it a little less stringent so you didn't have to have a COR in broader circumstances than what it is now.

Larry Fitzgerald – Dan brought up an excellent point. At some point I think the COR is to predict the native fish in other water ways. We need something to catch the fish if something like that happens in the future. There needs to be some regulation and I think they are making it a little easier for the fish industry.

### **VOTING**

Motion was made by Larry Fitzgerald to accept the Division's proposal as presented

Seconded by Danny Potts

Passed unanimously

- 7) **AIS Rule Amendments –Rule R657-60**  
- **Nathan Owens, Aquatic Invasive Species Program Coordinator**

### **Questions from the RAC**

Ken – I have a question on if we have an officer that stops the boat on the road and he puts the cable on that boat and sends the guy on his way, what stops that guy from taking some bolt cutters and cutting off that cable and go fishing?

Nathan – Good question, so just to clarify that proposed rule change we already have that authority under statute. This is mostly just to clarify within the rule. We have done this probably between 5-10 times this last year. What we end up doing is instruct the boat owner to be restricted from launching your boat for this amount of time. Once you get back to your place of residence, we will contact you or you are instructed to contact one of our conservation officers. They will come over to your place of residence and apply that seal and we will periodically check in on that boat to make sure that the boat has not been moved and the seal has not been broken during that required dry time. We are currently doing that and it has worked pretty well.

Karl – Is this just for vessels that are attached? Will this change for the weekend guy that goes down there? The boat needs to be cleaned, drained and dry for 7 days.

Nathan- Correct, this will not apply to probably 99% of the boats visiting Lake Powell. It is just another precautionary thing we can do to make sure the highest risk boats and those with the attached muscles go through the required process to make sure they are not posing an additional risk.

### **Questions from the Public**

None

### **Comments from the Public**

None

### **RAC Discussions**

None

### **VOTING**

Motion was made by Kristopher Marble to accept the Division's proposal as presented

Seconded by George Garcia

Passed unanimously



8) **Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendment R657-38**  
- **Bryan Christensen, Dedicated Hunter Coordinator**

**Questions from the RAC**

Richard – I have some emails and personal visits wondering if there was any interest from the RAC and Wildlife Board in allowing dedicated hunters to attend RAC or Wildlife Board meetings and get service hours applied.

Bryan – As dedicated hunters, we used to have a requirement to attend at least one RAC meeting and that became problematic in a number of ways. So to force a dedicated hunter to attend the meetings and participate wasn't helpful in every case. We don't have any intention of allowing dedicated hunters to participate as an audience member and earn their service credit. We feel that this program should have them actively out doing service projects. To be here as an audience member is important and I don't shun their request for that, but I would feel that to participate is an important thing as a deer hunter or a dedicated hunter regardless of earning service credit for those hours.

Richard – One of the complaints is there are limited projects in certain areas. It's hard to obtain the service hours due to that.

Bryan – I appreciated that comment, I agree in some locations in the state there will be fewer deer projects. I will use SLC for example, we don't try to grow too many deer in Salt Lake, but hit the mountains and now you are going to find more. I agree in some places in Utah it will be more challenging to find continual abundant projects where we find the dedicated hunters are most successful is if they go to our website and look at the projects a couple times a week rather than once or twice a month. Many of those projects that are close by to their residences, fill up very quick and they are only announced for a day or two, a very short period of time, so they just don't see those projects if they only look for the projects once a month or every couple of months.

Richard – Have you ever considered doing a dedicated hunter program for the general elk?

Bryan – We have discussed that at length. I have met with Justin and several of the big game biologists and have talked about a variety of ways in which that could occur. If it ever did come to be a formal program, it would be a whole separate rule, its own entity, and be ran that way. Initially I can tell you that through several discussions we feel that to make a successful program for elk we would probably either need to limit the number of people in their dramatically or we would have to change the way we arrange projects, because now we would have two competing programs for volunteer service, which would mean similar habitat types, similar projects and now competition between two different types of hunters for those same projects. We would have to be pretty creative, so one of the things that has been discussed but again no formal decisions have been made, is the potential of a different kind of hunting permit altogether that wasn't tied to service that might provide the same opportunities for those folks that are hoping for.

Richard – If you need a project, try the forest service. They are always willing to help you find a project. That's a really good place to go.

George- What about a wildlife education program? We have a wildlife module for Diamond Fork Youth Forest and kids go out there and participate in that youth forest program and a lot of

times we have decreased staff, our staff members are going down. There is going to be a point where we will have volunteers out there teaching the kids, so would that qualify?

Bryan – We entertain with every proposal for projects (independent or partner projects) with agency and what we initially do is ask a few basic questions and one is what is this doing for wildlife or wildlife habitat in Utah and what is it doing for public access to wildlife and wildlife recreation? If it answers those questions favorably then generally we can create a project out of it. We would encourage you to present the project to us for the Central Region, contacting Derek Murdock, and discuss that project option with him. We look at that criteria and if we feel like it's intended with the dedicated hunter program and its intentions, the Division of Wildlife asks does it meet our goals and mission, then yes you have a pretty good project. The details after that are deciding who is it and making sure that the right kinds of people/volunteers are paired up and recruited for that particular project.

Larry - There is a huge potential for hours and I don't know if it would qualify, but just through the desert on BLM land, there is a lot of garbage from the shooters. This would create a lot of hours for them and this could help.

Michael Gates - I agree. We need to do a better job on our end and get some projects. I will take that back to both Salt Lake and Fillmore office and rededicated ourselves to come back with some more projects.

Bryan – I can add one thing to that. I don't know about the Utah county side but I know we have some projects running for that very thing west of Utah Lake. We have done several clean ups from basically skull valley all the way down to the southern portion of Utah Lake towards Goshen. Those projects have often brought 50-60 volunteers in a day and the first time we ran a big one was last year when we took out a 120 commercial 6' bags of garbage out of one area and we went back this year and we were very happy of how little we actually brought back out. Thank you for bringing that up and BLM has been a great partner. There is definitely room for growth with trigger trash and shooting sports responsibility.

### **Questions from the Public**

Dee Jay Bigler/SFW – I have been the coordinator in this Central Region area for probably 20 years now. This will be the 11<sup>th</sup> year that I will be attending the expo and we get dedicated hunter hours for the guys that have been running the 200 permit booth. This booth is where they can draw hunts for the \$5.00 application fee. In years past, the men that have worked in that booth have gotten as many as 24 hours during the week. They would be there all week. This year Derek says we are going to drop that to a maximum of 12 hours. It's going to be awfully hard to get the guys to fill that booth. There has to be 8 guys in that booth for 10 ½ hours a day for those 4 days and once they get their 12 hours they are not going to come out of the booth. To apply for the \$5.00 permit fee, you need a state hunting license or a combo license and that is both resident and non-resident. This benefits the Division buying the licenses and then the \$5.00 application fee benefits SFW and the Mule Deer Foundation. I'd like to see you make an exception on that just for the expo because the money raised benefits the state quite a bit too.

### **Comments from the Public**

None

### **RAC Discussions**

Danny – The Division of Wildlife -Salt Lake County has utilized the dedicated hunters at the Utah Lake festival for years. It's been incredibly invaluable because we just don't have the people to take that on. This positively influences things so far from deer it's ridiculous. We are

talking about this extremely shallow lake yet, those dedicated hunters keep coming back year after year because they are having so much fun and yet they are so helpful for the June Sucker recovery program and also for the Utah Lake commission, etc. I just can't say enough good things about that and the opportunities that you guys provide.

**VOTING**

Motion was made by Kristopher Marble to accept the Division's proposal as presented  
Seconded by Larry Fitzgerald  
Passed unanimously

**Meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.**

**In attendance: 40 (12 RAC Members, 1 Board Member, 15 DWR Employees, 12 Public)**

**Next board meeting: at the DNR boardroom, Salt Lake**

**Next RAC meeting: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 @ 6:30 pm, Springville Civic Center**

**Northern Regional Advisory Council**  
December 7, 2016  
Brigham City Community Center  
Brigham City, Utah

**Draft Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting Begins: 6:00 p.m.**

**RAC Present**

John Cavitt- Chair  
Paul Chase- Forest Service  
Chad Jensen- Elected  
Matt Klar- At Large  
Mike Laughter- Sportsman  
Russ Lawrence- At Large  
Kevin McLeod- At Large  
Justin Oliver- At Large  
Matt Preston- BLM  
Kristin Purdy- Noncon  
Bryce Thurgood- At Large  
Craig VanTassell- Sportsman  
John Wall- At Large

**DWR Present**

Jodie Anderson  
Justin Dolling  
Rusty Robinson  
Blair Stringham  
Craig Schaugaard  
Nathan Owens  
Bryan Christensen  
Rich Hansen  
Ben Nadolski  
Paul Thompson  
Randy Wood  
Darren Debloois  
David Beveridge  
Paul Thompson  
Brandon Baron

**Wildlife Board**

Byron Bateman

**RAC Excused**

John Blazzard- Agric

**Agenda:**

Approval of Agenda  
Approval of November 9, 2016 Meeting Minutes  
Old Business  
Regional Update  
Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments  
2017 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments  
Private Pond Rule Amendments – Rule R657-59  
AIS Rule Amendments – Rule R657-60  
R657-38 Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments

**Item 1. Approval of Agenda**

-John Cavitt, Chair

Agenda is approved.

**Item 2. Approval of November 9, 2016 Minutes**

-John Cavitt, Chair

Minutes approved as circulated.

**Item 3. Old Business**

-John Cavitt, Chair

Wildlife Board Meeting had not occurred

**Item 4. Regional Update**

- Justin Dolling, Regional Supervisor

Wildlife Section- Deer Classifications. Trapping Turkeys in Eden, Mantua, Paradise and Bountiful. They will be moved to Book Cliffs. Radio collaring deer on Cache for deer survival study.

Law Enforcement- Shop with a cop this Saturday.

Outreach- Hardware Ranch open on Dec 10. Ice fishing clinic at Cabela's on December 10th in Farmington from 11-3.

Great Salt Lake Eco System- Waterfowl areas had a great pheasant hunt. Plenty of swans on marshes. 27 million pounds of brine shrimp eggs. Waterfowl wetland unit at Farmington Bay is close to completion.

Habitat- Recede fires.

Aquatics- Bear Lake White Fish Spawn occurring. Analyze Boreal Toad data.

**RAC Questions**

Kevin McLeod- What effect would the breach have on brine shrimping?

Justin Dolling- The railroad installed a new bridge but had earth and fill on either side. On December 1st, they opened that up. We worked with the railroad to delay that until December so that it would not have an impact on the brine shrimp production. The south arm has dropped 2/10 of a foot and the north arm has raised about 3/10 of a foot.

**Item 5. Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2017**

- Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program Coordinator

See RAC Packet

**Public Questions**

Carl Stettler- Is that rest area going to be in the same place?

Blair Stringham- No, it is in a different area.

Carl Stettler- Did not come to public mic.

Blair Stringham- It is currently going to be on the road as you come into Ogden Bay up to where unit 3 road goes to the west. It follows that road to where you come to that dike. I think it is referred to as the Bachman Unit.

Rich Hansen- It is the north Bachman unit. It is the first two impoundments as you head west down the road.

### **Public Comment**

Carl Stettler-Bear River Club- Commend the direction the younger generations are heading. The week skipped between youth day and general opener is a waste of prime duck migration. September 30th is only one day earlier of the opener that we had this season. It accounts for a 7 day loss of hunter opportunity. Reopening of the swan border to include all properties north of 4th street needs to be abolished to stop overcrowding. We are skipping that one week and it is important. Is there a reason why we dont shoot that week.

Blair Stringham- The biggest reason is that is has just been a tradition in Utah to do that.

Carl Stettler- Every one of your hunting dates now have changed. But not the general opener and waste that one good week when all kids can hunt and it is good weather. Is there a reason other than tradition?

Blair Stringham- We have never considered it because it has always been that week but we could look at it and start thinking about it.

Carl Stettler- I appreciate that, thank you.

Chad Jensen-Does the rule say there are 107 hunting days in a duck season?

Blair Stringham- Yes, for all migratory birds, they only offer 107 days.

Chad Jensen- If that day was to get moved, we would lose it on the back end in January.

Troy Justensen-Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Commend Blair and the Division on the waterfowl seasons. Support the recommendation as presented by the Division.

### **RAC Comment**

Mike Laughter- In regards to the comment about shooting that first week. If you did that, it would make the opener for over 17 a Sunday start right? Is that the reason for the week in between?

Blair Stringham- Typically, Fish and Wildlife offers two things when structuring a season. A youth day has to be a couple of weeks before the opening season. It is something we could do, we could move the seasons up. Two weeks between youth hunt and regular opener has been popular.

Mike Laughter- If you had that opening day as a youth day and started hunting, you would have to start the opener on a Sunday?

Carl – Another Saturday is skipped.

Blair Stringham- We could technically start it September 23rd and start the waterfowl hunt on September 30th.

### **Motion**

**Motion**-Matt Klar- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments 2017 as presented.

**Second**- John Wall

### **Discussion on the motion**

**Motion**- Craig VanTassel- Recommend the Wildlife Board move the General Season to start on September 30.

**Second**- Chad Jensen

## **Discussion on the Motion**

Matt Klar- How popular would that be with duck hunters?

Blair Stringham- I don't think we have ever asked duck hunters. I've heard it from a few people but no survey.

Bryce Thurgood- Is that possible. If we didn't act on that tonight, could we do that survey so next time we could decide?

Blair Stringham- I would probably recommend making it an action item and take it to the board.

Mike Laughter- The gap between the youth day and the opening day is to allow ducks to settle and provide a quality opening day for adult hunters correct?

Blair Stringham- It is largely been based upon what the public has wanted. We have done it both ways and there is a perception that it does impact the opener. Our survey data has shown that there is basically no difference. It is largely just something we have maintained because the hunters like the 2 week break in between.

**Motion Fails- For: 4 Against: 8**

## **Discussion on the Motion**

Bryce Thurgood- After we vote on the motion, we need to look at having the board look into this and do a survey.

**Motion Passes: Unanimous**

## **Item 6. 2017 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments**

- Rusty Robinson, Wildlife Biologist

**See RAC Packet**

## **RAC Questions**

Russ Lawrence- Do you have any data on how this is going? How is the success?

Rusty Robinson- It is pretty low success.

Justin Oliver- I have firsthand knowledge. It was quite surprising. I hunted the La Sal spot and stock. I was excited when I drew the tag until I saw how many guys were on the mountain. On the La Sals, when you increased by 15 permits, were they all in the spot and stock?

Rusty Robinson- There was no increase on the spot and stock. 4 of those are on the spring hunt. 5 on the summer hunt, 5 on the fall and 1 on the multi-season. Same on the San Juan.

Kevin McLeod- Predation on livestock numbers? I find it hard to believe that bears are killing a lot of cows.

Rusty Robinson- Mostly sheep.

Kevin McLeod- Sheep.

Rusty Robinson- We do have those numbers if you have a specific unit in mind.

Kristin Purdy- What is behind the one week of no dogs in the La Sals and San Juans?

Rusty Robinson- Try not to run dogs on top of other people hunting other species. It is kind of a break area. We are not having a lot of conflicts.

## **Public Comments**

Troy Justensen- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Support the Divisions recommendations on bears.

Bret Selman- Utah Wool Growers- Support your recommendations. Appreciate the hunting opportunities increased and bear numbers increased. We continue to have substantial losses from wool growers in the state.

Mitch Herzog- Utah Houndsmen Association- Support recommendations with the exception of a few concerns. Letter sent out explaining the following recommendations. Bookcliffs and Bitter Creek Fall limited entry season be changed to match the La Sal and San Juan hunt dates. Black bear production on Bookcliff Bitter creek unit appears to be lower. Conservative harvest recommendations. La Sal limited entry summer pursuit season allocation be raised to match the San Juan limited entry.

Rusty Robinson- Acknowledge mistake sent out in RAC packet regarding hunt tables. Multi-season hunts on Bookcliffs. Last date should be October 2nd.

### **RAC Comments**

Matt Klar-Can you respond to this gentleman's comment about the hunt conflict?

Rusty Robinson- A change was made awhile back. Northeast region feels strongly about that October date. They have seen a vast reduction in complaints and conflicts since moving it to those dates. To address the lack of production on cubs, I asked Clint out there if he was seeing any of that. He said den data looked good but maybe we need to get together and see if there are specific areas we are seeing losses in cub production. With restricted pursuit season, I wanted to clarify that we are proposing 4 resident and 1 non-resident on the La Sal and 13 on the San Juan. You would like those flushed across like 9 on each one or something like that?

Mitch Herzog- Just raised more.

John Cavitt- Bookcliffs season dates. You may have houndsmen not participating because of the perceived conflict that may not exist. You might want to get with them and find out.

Rusty Robinson- That might be part of it.

### **Motion**

**Motion-** Craig VanTassell- Recommend the Wildlife Board change the season dates of the Book Cliffs to match the La Sal and San Juan season dates.

Rusty Robinson- I did ask the southeast region about that. This is part of that experiment they started to do years ago. There is a hypothesis that some of the issues were bears coming into town and getting into trouble correlated with hound pursuit. Years ago they decided to flip flop those two units, La Sal and San Juan, where they give a very low number of pursuit permits and they found at that scale it was too difficult to see if there was any difference. The southeast region would like to stick with the 4 and 13 for three years in order to really take a look at that and get through all the climatic ups and downs and see if it is really having an effect.

Craig VanTassell- The change was made because the pursuit was happening when there were campers there and dogs were coming into the camps?

Rusty Robinson- That could be. It was nuisance related.

**Second-** Matt Klar

**Motion Fails: For: 3 Against: 9**

**Motion-** Bryce Thurgood- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept 2017 Black Bear recommendations and Rule Amendments as presented and ask the Division to look into the Book Cliffs season dates.

**Second-** Craig VanTassell

**Motion Passes:** Unanimous



## **Item 7. Private Pond Rule Amendments – Rule R657- 59**

- Craig Schaugaard, Fish Culture Coordinator

### **See RAC Packet**

### **RAC Questions**

Craig VanTassell- Does Smartphone work if there is not reception?

Craig Schaugaard- It wouldn't but some of the GPS might.

Justin Oliver- Generally, you can download a map and GPS will show you where it is at.

Craig Schaugaard- They might not have the connection to download.

### **Public Comment**

Troy Justensen- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Our membership is made up of a large amount of anglers and there were some concerns regarding this. Comfortable with changes made. Continue to watch over and protect fisheries. Support the Divisions recommendations on this issue.

### **RAC Comment**

Justin Oliver- I participated in buying fish for a pond we have. Started doing it for our family and it was difficult to get them. This seems like a good thing. Simplifies and still protects resources.

Craig Schaugaard- Gives more opportunity.

### **Motion**

**Motion-** Russ Lawrence-Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Private Pond Rule Amendments- Rule R657-59 as presented.

**Second-** Justin Oliver

**Motion Passes-** Unanimous

## **Item 8. AIS Rule Amendments – Rule R657- 60**

- Nathan Owens, Aquatic Invasive Species Program Coordinator

### **See RAC Packet**

### **RAC Questions**

Kevin McLeod- Significant amount of water retained. How do you feel about water you cannot drain?

Nathan Owens- The rule reads to the extent reasonable. Everything you can do without having to winterize your boat. When water is going through a block or engine, it is going to heat up to some extent. No mussels would be found in there but vellagers could. If you put a dry time on there, you are going to kill any vellagers. The risk is fairly low on our priority scale. We are mostly concerned about the gallons of water that are not fully drained. Mussels hiding in engine compartments.

Justin Oliver- Apart from being a sportsman, I spend a lot of time at Lake Powell. The checkpoints can be very frustrating. If I watched 10 boats leave the lake, 2 are stopped and washed. I hope there is something else to try and make it an easier thing. Some want to protect waterways and are more likely to stop. A lot of the crowd there are not worried about the mussels. What kind of authority do you have to quarantine a boat? Are there things going on to enforce this?

Nathan Owens- We have a law enforcement officer here that specializes in this. We have quarantined, at least a handful of boats this last year we had to tell them that their boat could not leave the garage for a certain amount of time. Any boat with attached mussels, we direct to a private business for

decontamination which is a paid service now. Some boats that have attached mussels, decontamination may take 2 individuals and up to 12-14 hours. We do not have resources to concentrate on one boat for that amount of time. We have written citations at our check stations for any residual water. This plug rule is very important. We have written probably 20-30 citations this last season for residual water leaving the area.

Justin Oliver- Watching the number of people that leave the water at one time. If we want to protect it, it is going to require a lot more law enforcement and a better plan in place. People are leaving at night just to avoid this.

Nathan Owens- I agree. We are thinking outside the box on this. We are looking at 24/7 coverage at Lake Powell this next year. This requires a great deal of funding. Speaking with a business out of Colorado to look at the potential of using dip tanks for decontamination. Would cut down decontamination time. Looking at other options and a huge challenge.

Justin Oliver-Thank you.

Bryce Thurgood- You are going to make the drain plug this year out of Lake Powell but you are wanting to do it next year and other states are wanting to do it next year. Why not start it right now and do it statewide. People are going to get confused.

Nathan Owens- We would like that. The issue is that our authority is a little bit muddy in this area when it comes to requiring it out of all boats. Even boats not coming from an infested water body. Being able to regulate the transport of quagga or zebra mussels. Other states don't have that issue because they are responsible for regulating boating overall. That may be a year down the road or so.

Chad Jensen- Besides getting the citation which would be a criminal action. If someone was to get cited for the things you mentioned, does the state consider civil penalties for those who transport mussels?

Nathan Owens- I will say yes but I can't really elaborate on that. Law enforcement officer could elaborate more.

Scott Dealbout- Have had civil penalties. Last one was about 2 years ago where they had live mussels on and tried to sneak it through. Quarantined the boat 40 or so days and assessed fines of about \$5,000 to cover costs of personnel and equipment purchased to decontaminate their boat.

Chad Jensen- You should make that more public.

Scott Dealbout- We are getting better at that. This problem is continually evolving. We have evolve the rules and laws to go with it. Increase law enforcement capacity.

## **Motion**

**Motion-** Chad Jensen- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept AIS Rule Amendments-Rule R657-60 as presented.

**Second-** John Wall

**Motion Passes-** Unanimous

## **Item 9. R657-38 Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments**

- Bryan Christensen, Dedicated Hunter Coordinator

## **See RAC Packet**

## **RAC Questions**

Matt Klar- What are you currently charging for service hours?

Bryan Christensen- Right now, we have rated each hour at \$20.

Kevin McLeod- Is it the same for resident vs. non-resident.

Bryan Christensen- Yes.

Justin Oliver- Question regarding permits as far as you declare once you have received the notice that you have drawn, you declare what permit you would like. What are the things behind not being able to declare one unit one year and not another?

Bryan Christensen- You might have to clarify the question.

Justin Oliver- Once you say you drew the dedicated hunter, you have to tell them at that time, what unit you will be hunting and that is where you will get your permit for the next 3 years.

Bryan Christensen- Right

Justin Oliver-Is there any way, with the draw system, if you have a family member that draws another one, is there any way to change it from one year to the next.

Bryan Christensen- No.

Justin Oliver- Is there a reason why that is not looked at?

Bryan Christensen- Yes, there is. That is the biggest question I get each year. It use to be possible when we hunted regionally. When we changed to a unit to unit hunting, we created a whole new system. Dedicated hunter became part of the big game drawing. Before, it was done in December so we knew well in advance where each dedicated hunter was going to be. As soon as the dedicated hunter permit is drawn, it pulls 3 permits out for the next 3 years. It sets it aside for that unit and it has to stay that way, mostly because the dedicated hunter opportunities and the quota we allow for each unit is tied to a percentage quota for the year. It get complicated if we have 100 hunting permits on one unit and that means we have 15 dedicated hunters that can be in there. If that gets filled up this year, we don't have somewhere for somebody else to switch over. Those other units are at capacity as far as what we have to issue. If you have family members you want to hunt with, don't put more than one choice on your application.

Justin Oliver- contemplated drawing from dedicated hunter. Feel like the unit I have a tag for the next 2 years is not where I want to be. I think it is a downside to it in some ways.

Bryan Christensen- One of the reasons we have looked at this withdraw option. More options now than before.

Craig VanTassell- Since the hunting went from regions to units, has dedicated hunter numbers gone up or down?

Bryan Christensen- Regionally, it went down. We are now gaining. There is anticipation we will increase next year by quite a bit.

Craig VanTassell- In the latest elk management plan, they do have an option for dedicated hunter. One of the hurdles is probably that the Division cannot provide service hours or cannot manage service hours required. Would you rather have the service hours or the money?

Bryan Christensen- We would rather have the service. If we started a brand new program for dedicated hunter elk, there is concern we may not be able to provide the number of quality projects with two groups competing for the same projects.

John Cavitt- What percentage of dedicated hunter actually buy out their hours?

Bryan Christensen- I think it is about 15-18% of the hours. This was last year which was higher than any other year. Before that, it was about 8-10%.

## **Motion**

**Motion**-Kevin McLeod- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R657-38 Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments as presented with the exception to have non-residents service hour fees doubled.

**Second**- John Wall

## **Discussion on the Motion**

Justin Oliver- I would not like that.

Kevin McLeod- It becomes a money thing again where someone can just buy the right to be in that program. The service hours are more important and beneficial to the process than the money. There

ought to be a difference in the purchase of those hours by a non-resident vs. resident. A resident should get some consideration.

Bryan Christensen- Non-residents are paying over \$1,000 for a COR and a resident pays \$195. They are already being hit pretty good just to join. We would be happy to look at your request. It may boil down to more of an auditing standpoint for value. A service hour is rated by the type of service it is.

Justin Oliver- Are there many non-resident?

Bryan Christensen- I don't have an actual number for you today. There are a few dozen for sure. Maybe 30 or 40? Some plan their projects for the week before the hunt.

Kevin McLeod- I would agree that a service hour is equal to a service hour but sitting in your easy chair in Arizona with a big bank account, they should pay more for their service hours if they are going to buy them.

Bryce Thurgood- I think paying \$1,000 for a COR is enough. Plus, they are paying for deer tags every year.

Bryan Christensen- The deer tag is free after that.

Bryce Thurgood- I still think \$1,000 vs. what we pay is more than enough compensation.

Kevin McLeod- You guys are getting soft.

John Cavitt- Non-residents still have to go through the training course online.

Bryan Christensen- Right, all requirements are identical.

**Motion Fails- For: 1 Against:11**

**Motion-** Justin Oliver- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R657-38 Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments as presented.

**Second-** Matt Klar

**Motion Passes-** Unanimous

**Motion to adjourn**

**Meeting Ends- 7:57 p.m.**

**SOUTHERN REGION RAC MEETING  
Sevier School District Office, Training Lab  
Richfield, UT  
December 13, 2016 5:00 p.m.**

**1. REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA**

**MOTION:** To accept the minutes and agenda as written.

**VOTE:** Unanimous.

**2. Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments**

**MOTION:** To accept the Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendment as presented.

**VOTE:** Unanimous

**3. 2017 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments**

**MOTION:** To accept the 2017 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments as presented, with the acceptance to add 5 permits to the North Manti as recommended by the Farm Bureau and add bonus points to the summer pursuit permits.

**VOTE:** Unanimous

**4. Private Pond Rule Amendments- Rule R657-59**

**MOTION:** To accept the Private Pond Rule Amendments- Rule R657-59 as presented with the additional requests from the Utah Association of Aquaculture. (see attachment)

**VOTE:** Unanimous

**5. AIS Rule Amendments- Rule R657-60**

**MOTION:** To accept the AIS Rule Amendments- Rule R657-60 as presented.

**VOTE:** Unanimous

**6. R657-38 Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments**

**MOTION:** To accept the R657-38 Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments as presented.

**VOTE:** Motion carried 8:4, 1 abstained.

<b>RAC Members Present</b>	<b>DWR Personnel Present</b>	<b>Wildlife Board Present</b>	<b>RAC Members Not Present</b>
Mack Morrell Craig Laub Gene Boardman Mike Worthen Nick Jorgensen Dale Bagley Harry Barber Brian Johnson Layne Torgerson Sean Kelly	Mindi Cox Natalie Brewster-Wilson Teresa Griffin Phil Tuttle Matt Bartley Kevin Bunnell Jim Lamb Darren DeBloois Stan Beckstrom Bryan Christensen Randy Oplinger Blair Stringham Scott Dalebout Nathan Owen Lynn Zubeck Dave Smedley Vance Mumford Gabe Patterson Seth Decker	Donny Hunter	Dave Black Rusty Aiken Wade Heaton Brayden Richmond

Mike Worthen called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. There were approximately 3 interested parties in attendance in addition to RAC members, members of the Wildlife Board, and Division employees. Dave Black introduced himself and asked RAC members to introduce themselves. Mike Worthen explained RAC meeting procedures.

**Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)**

**Dale Bagley made the motion to accept the agenda and minutes as presented. Nick Jorgenson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

**Wildlife Board Update and Regional Update:  
-Kevin Bunnell, Southern Regional Supervisor**

Kevin Bunnell: Okay, the Wildlife Board was just last Friday, so we are almost back to back here with the Board Meeting. If you remember the last, the main things on our last RAC were the Elk Management Plans and then the season dates for Bucks, Bulls and Once in a Lifetime and then also the procedures on how we run our drawings. The Board passed the Elk Management Plans as presented by the Division which is also the recommendation that came out of our RAC, the Southern RAC. On the Bucks, Bulls, and Once in a Lifetime season dates, and application time, that was passed with a couple of amendments. The first, if you remember there was a proposal from Yuba to add some archery hunts at the end of our

Once in a Lifetime seasons. And then there was a proposal from the Division to just add 7 days on the end of each of those hunts and, rather than having a specific archery only hunt. The Board decided instead of taking the whole Yuba proposal they just took 2 units. The, a goat hunt on the North slope, of the Uintah's and then a bison hunt on the Henry Mountains. So, there will be archery only, Once in a Lifetime hunts on those 2 units, as kind of a test run, and then they decided not to have the 7 day extensions with the Divisions proposal so that is the way that went. They also did accept the recommendation from our RAC to keep the Boulder Mountain on the late general season buck hunt. I guess kind of a limited entry buck hunt but those limited muzzleloader hunts that are in the first part of November. On the preference points that was passed as presented, as was the Northeastern Region Deer Management Plan, and the CWMU and Landowner Association recommendations were accepted as presented. There was a fairly long discussion about the Deer Creek, CWMU, if you remember when Colby presented that he talked about how that had been a CWMU, that in the past we had had some issues with, in terms of how the public hunters were being treated. They went away for a year, they were applying to come back. The Board put a requirement on that CWMU that after this year they will report back to the CWMU Advisory Committee and then to the Board with the option of their COR being suspended if they are not meeting the expectation in the, in terms of the way the public hunters are being treated on that CWMU. If, I'm glad to try to answer any questions but that's the way the Board meeting went down.

Unknown: Why did they not approve the 7-day extension?

Kevin Bunnell: If you remember there was the Division's proposal for a 7-day extension and there was the Yuba proposal to do just limited entry hunts and it was kind of an either/or thing instead of both and so they did part, they didn't take the whole Yuba proposal but they decided to go that route but limit it to 2, 2 hunts rather than I think there was 4 that was being proposed by Yuba. Any other questions?

Mike Worthen: Do you just want to give the regional update then?

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah as far as the regional update it seems like it wasn't too long ago that we met so I'll be quite brief.

Unknown: At the Wildlife Board did they pass that extra language that was recommended at the Southern RAC on the elimination of (inaudible)?

Kevin: That was reviewed and looked at, in terms of the, we looked at the language that was in the Statewide plan which is kind of the over-arching and felt like the language that was in there already covered that, that there was already adequate language to, it was talked about and decided that the language that was existing would cover the recommendation. Thanks for bringing that up John, I had forgotten about that. In terms of a regional update probably the main thing for everybody to be aware of is the antelope trap that was scheduled to, for the end of this week has been postponed. Right now we are tentatively looking at January 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>. We did some flights over the area where the 2 traps are and the pronghorn just aren't in the area yet. There hasn't been enough weather to congregate them and move them down towards where the traps are and so, that is a huge undertaking both in terms of the expense of our employees and also the expense of having a helicopter capture company in the area and so we've, in hopes of getting additional weather and helping us be effective when we run that trap and remove the number of animals we need to, we've chosen to postpone that for now. Teresa or Jim anything you want to add to that? I think we had less than a hundred within 10 miles of the 2 traps when we flew so that wasn't gonna get it done. The other bit of news, Dustin Shibely, who was the, our biologist on the

Panguitch Lake and Zion Units, has accepted a position with the BLM in Cedar City and so we have a vacant biologist position open right now and are working through the process of filling that vacancy. Other than that, we had our regional Christmas Party that you guys were all invited to and I think Rusty was the only one who showed up and you guys, you know your loss. We had a good time and enjoyed that opportunity. Are there any questions for me in terms of things that are going on in the region that I can answer? All right, Mike?

Mike Worthen: Okay thank you, let's move on to the recommendation section. We'll first have up Blair Stringham to present the Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments in 2017.

**Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments 2017 (action)**

**-Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program Coordinator**

(see attachment 1)

**Questions from the RAC:**

Mike Worthen: K thank you, any questions from the RAC? Okay go ahead Dale.

Dale Bagley: Where you've got 2 season openers do you anticipate crowding problems, I mean are you going to have a shift of hunters from the North going South and South, North, I mean do you anticipate that creating any problems?

Blair Stringham: Um we currently do have some hunters that come down to the Southern part of the State for the general opener so it's likely there will be a few more hunters coming down but honestly I guess it would just be speculation now, I guess we'll run it the first year and kind of see what happens.

Dale Bagley: One other question, how do you, I mean you got a bag limit of one pin-tail, I'm not really a duck hunter, I mean how do you differentiate a different breed of duck? I mean you got a flock of ducks coming in?

Blair Stringham: It can become a challenge for sure especially early in the year, that's one thing that waterfowl hunters and our hunting regulations have always relied on is just hunter's ability to identify their birds and so, but we do have quite a few species that allows for 2, one will be a little more tricky for some guys and they'll just have to be a little more careful next year.

Mike Worthen: Any other questions from the RAC? Questions from the audience? Seeing none then we will entertain comments from the RAC. Go ahead Layne.

Layne Torgensen: I just have one comment, I have received several emails and phone calls from local guys here in Sevier County that are definitely in, you know they are, liking the idea of having the split season, it gives them a little longer because of lot of them are just like Blair said, you know, we're not seeing the migration down here that we have in past years, earlier in the season so everybody is in favor of what you proposed.

Mike Worthen: Any other comments from the RAC? Any comments from the public. Seeing none we will entertain a motion.



**Questions from the Public:**

None

**Comments from the Public:**

None

**RAC discussion and vote:**

**Layne Torgerson made the motion to accept the Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments 2017 as presented Brian Johnson seconded. Motion carried unanimously**

Mike Worthen: The next item of business is the 2017 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments by Rusty Robinson.

Kevin Bunnell: Let me correct the agenda there just a minute. I should have announced this with the regional updates. Darren DeBloois has just accepted, and when I say just, like Thursday of last week or Wednesday or last week, a promotion as the new Mammals Coordinator and so he is jumping right into the fire and starting on a RAC tour within his first week of being on the job. So, thank you Darren.

**2017 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments (action)**

**-Darrin DeBloois, Wildlife Biologist  
(see attachment 1)**

**Questions from the RAC:**

Mike Worthen: Thank you for your report. Do we have any questions from the RAC? Yes, go ahead Craig.

Craig Laub: I was just wondering how come you was, well I got 2 questions, one, how come on the Beaver you went down 2? I was up there this summer and saw my first bear up there. I mean in the flesh not just the sign. And then my other question was back on the first page there, why, your conflict there on 14 was so high, compared to your average has been pretty even across there and then 14 it jumped way high.

Daren DeBloois: Yeah I don't know if I can answer that. If you look at the numbers they are not big numbers so a little change looks like a big old bump. But I'm not entirely sure and then Teresa can probably answer on the Beaver.

Dave Smedley: So, we went down because we're managing (inaudible) strategy and the, that's 40 to 45% female harvest and the three-year average is 53% so the female harvest had been increasing so we bumped a few down to try to help with that to stay within the management goal there.

Craig Laub: So, your conflict is a not a problem there huh?

Dave Smedley: No this year actually hasn't been as bad, we had minor conflicts. The conflicts have increased over the last several years but this year has been pretty good. So,

Mike Worthen: Any other questions? Go ahead Nick.

Nick Torgerson: Back on your first page where you are talking about harvest and evaluation, or no down one more from that, it's on the depredation news, (inaudible) do you track separately those that you have to kill versus those that you move?

Daren DeBlois: I'm sure that do but I don't know that I can give you those numbers. These are all mortality so these are the ones that are taken.

Kevin Bunnell: But we do have a data base where we keep track of all our nuisance bear responses Nick.

Darin DeBlois: And I can look that up for you Nick if you want to,

Nick Jorgensen: I'm just curious how many what the ratio is moved versus killed.

Darin DeBlois: Okay. Let me make a note.

Mike Worthen: Any other questions

Nick Jorgensen: One more question on that same issue. What do you use to determine whether you move it or kill it?

Darin DeBlois: We have a nuisance bear response policy and we, when we respond to problem bears we categorize those bears based on aggressiveness, overall damage, that kind of thing and so really what it boils down to is do we feel comfortable that that bear can be moved and then not be becoming an issue somewhere else. And so, and I can get you that detailed sort of hierarchy of how we classify those bears Nick if you want but we do have a policy that we follow every time we respond to a bear.

Mike Worthen: Anything else from the RAC? Go ahead Brian.

Brian Johnson: Does anybody know how many bears that were actually taken on the Panguitch/Zion hunt this year? Just wondering what that number is. I've got friends that are sheep farmers that just got hammered this year.

Darin DeBlois: She is looking it up and do you mean harvested on the seasons or just overall?

Brian Johnson: Just sheep that just got absolutely hammered this year up on the Panguitch and Zion. Just wondered how successful they were if the numbers have gone up since we lengthened the summer season.

Darin DeBlois: Right.

Unknown: 2.

Brian Johnson: 2?

Unknown: 2 bear harvested.

Teresa Griffin: We killed a bear, I don't know if Wildlife Services killed one of those on the Panguitch side but if that's accurate, 7. I'm pretty sure.

Brian Johnson: 7, (inaudible) this year? How many of those were Wildlife Services?

Teresa Griffin: Those were sport (inaudible).

Mike Worthen: The two was Wildlife Services were sports harvests? Any other questions from the RAC? Questions from the public?

Brian Johnson: The harvest, not the harvest, excuse me, the pursuit seasons, do those have preference points? If you are putting in for those?

Darin DeBloois: Good question, I don't know the answer to that, do you know Kevin?

Kevin Bunnell: I'm not sure Brian but if they do it would be bonus points instead of preference points if they did because its limited entry I believe but let me find out for sure.

Brian Johnson: I just have a buddy that is like I can't draw.

Kevin Bunnell: They would have either, I don't know if we have anything that's a draw that doesn't have either a bonus point or a preference point associated with it but I'll get an answer for you.

Darin DeBloois: I'll let you know tonight, I'll check, I've got it here.

Mike Worthen: Do we have anymore questions from the RAC? Questions from the public?

### **Questions from the Public:**

None

Mike Worthen: Okay, then let's have comments from the public and if you have comments please come up to the mic over here. Bryce Pilling. And please state your name for the record.

### **Comments from the Public:**

Bryce Billings: Bryce Billings, Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife, thank you Mr.Chairman, thank you Darin. We support the proposal as presented, thank you.

Mike Worthen: John Keeler.

John Keeler: John Keeler, Utah Farm Bureau. We had multiple individuals on the Northern San Pete area that sheep producers that had huge problems with bear this year. Couple of producers had their herd split on the East and West side of the valley, were being hit, at the same time, losing 30 to 40 head of sheep and so we feel like there is a problem up in that area. We see that there is a recommendation for 5 increase on the Nebo side but we feel like there needs to be 5 increase on the Manti North.

Mike Worthen: Okay thank you John. Let's go ahead and have comments from the RAC.

### **Comments from the RAC:**

Mack Morrell: This fall when everybody had trail cameras out on the Boulder looking for bull elk, they said they didn't see any bull elk, all they saw was bears and cougars. And your population, you know, is I guess the same on the Boulder but yet they've had more, more either that or they had a lot more trail cameras, one or the other, so, I don't know, how do you get your population for bears?

Darin DeBlois: It is based on a couple of things. One is we look at the age of harvest and if we have enough bears in that unit that are harvested we can back our way into an estimate for population. That a lot of times where we have small number of permits we gotta look at a larger scale. And then we also look at our denning data so we are looking for birth places and we have cubs in the den and we can make an estimate for number of bears or how the, it's actually a growth rate, how is the population growing over time.

Mike Worthen: Okay, do we have another?

Kevin Bunnell: Jim would you please come down and just speak to nuisance and depredation problems on the Boulder? What did we experience this last summer?

Jim Lamb: This summer was one of the quietest summers we've had in many years on the Boulders for depredation and nuisance both. We do have a tremendous population of bear there. We do see bears on cameras by the loads. I have people who bait and put cameras on bait, that are waiting for that one big giant bear and so the 7 other bears that come to the bait that they don't shoot, they don't even try. So, I have a great population of bears on the Boulder and the permit numbers that we've recommended reflect that. And if we have bear get in sheep we call Kevin, he takes care of it, or cattle for that matter, he is really good to come and help us. Any other questions?

Mike Worthen: Thank you, go ahead Craig.

Craig Laub: I'm just gonna comment on the Boulders, when I was over there elk hunting there was, I didn't see him or have a run-in with him but they said there was a bear there that was kind of not very shy. He would stand up and snap at em and stuff so, I wondered if he was a moved bear if he would be in that way, but I don't know but, they, others run into him but I didn't.

Jim Lamb: I don't think we have moved anything to the Boulders, we've got plenty of bears there, so. And typically we'll mark em, if they've got ear tags. It would have a collar.

Mike Worthen: Any other comments?

Unknown: Here is a question, where do you move most of your bears to?

Jim Lamb: Do you want to speak for the region Teresa?

Teresa Griffin: We typically don't move very many bears. Often times they'll fall in the category that if

we're going to take action, if they are a public nuisance, often we do euthanize those. If they do come in contact with livestock, Wildlife Services take care of those ones. But, if there is a bear that we move, we've moved a few over the years on top of the Boulder. We moved one this last year, it was getting into trouble in Marysvale, and they will be collared and marked if we move them.

Dale Bagley: Rumor has it the Marysville one came back, is that a rumor or not?

Teresa Griffin: You know two or three years ago we had a Marysville one that we moved from (inaudible) Canyon on top of the mountain, within a month, she was back at the same, I think she was at the Fireman's Park up there, if they do that twice,

Unknown: Can you talk about the recent one?

Teresa Griffin: Yeah the recent one, we had one there, apparently, the rumors the other day, that turned out to be a deer. Yeah it, Vance looked into that one.

Mike Worthen: Thanks Teresa. Go ahead Brian.

Brian Johnson: Do we have any success, harvest success on this summer hunt, cause I know we've done it 2 years now, I was wondering if we had any averages or what their kill percentages are on that?

Darrin DeBlois: It tends to be a lower success hunt. Is there a particular unit you wanted to, you were wondering about?

Brian Johnson: (Inaudible) a lot, Elk Ridge, San Juan Elk Ridge, there is 15,

Darrin DeBlois: What unit number is that Teresa, Elk Ridge? 14? San Juan, that's the whole unit right, 14? Looks like success on the summer, actually on that unit was about 60%. Looks like last year and the year before 100 but that's, how many permits is that? Like 3 and 6 permits so.

Mike Worthen: Any other comments from the RAC? Okay let's see if we have a motion. Okay the recommendation is from the Farm Bureau to increase five permits on the North Manti and I think that's about all the recommendations we had.

#### **RAC discussion and vote:**

**Craig Laub made the motion to accept the 2017 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments as presented, with the acceptance to add 5 permits to the North Manti as recommended by the Farm Bureau and add bonus points to the summer pursuit. Dale Bagley seconded. Motion carried unanimously**

#### **Private Pond Rule Amendments- Rule R657-59 (action)**

**-Randy Oplinger, Coldwater Sport Fisheries Program Coordinator**  
(see attachment 1)

#### **Questions from the RAC:**

Mike: K, thank you Randy. Do we have any comments from the RAC or any questions from the RAC? Okay, seeing none do we have any questions from the public? Comments from the public, 2 comment cards, Jesse Burrell.

### **Questions from the Public:**

None

### **Comments from the Public:**

Jesse Burrell: Jesse Burrell, I'm with Gunnison Valley High School. We have a little fish system in our school we've been doing for years, a couple recirculating tanks we raise trout in and it was brought to my attention that they were making some adjustments to this that might require us to have a COR or might require us to pay a fee for that. We've never paid a fee to the State for operating that. We'd like to keep it that way and the idea of not having a COR would which I think is how it is right now is, is desirable due to the paperwork. It's a small part of my program but the kids benefit from it and so I 'd like to see either a requirement not for me to have a COR or you know the 5-year thing is definitely better than a 1 year thing though so those are my comments.

Mike Worthen: Do we have any comments from the Division on that issue?

Randy Oplinger: Yeah just for your information the proposed rule has no changes whatsoever on institutional aquaculture.

Jesse Burrell: So, I would still have a 1 year COR?

Randy Oplinger: I could look into that for you? We may have made that a 5 year COR for you but otherwise the rules have not changed, we basically duplicated the language for institutional aquaculture in the proposed rules.

Mike Worthen: Okay, we have a comment from Robert Judd.

Robert Judd: Thank you chair, my name is Robert Judd, I'm with the Utah Aquaculture Association. I'm also a spring lake trout farm. There are 3 of us currently left in the state that sell fish live so you are dealing with a pretty small industry at this point. We are just trying to change some things to keep afloat and stay alive. We just want to first off tell the Division thank you for the time that they have spent working with us. Randy knows we've been in meetings many a day throughout this entire year trying to meet with them and go over these rule change and for the most part the rule changes are what we want to see happen. But just like any rule sometimes there are things that you don't necessarily always agree with and we would like two propose two amendments or changes to the rules as it is being presented right now. The first amendment is the institutional aquaculture which is what Jesse just commented on. Under the rule currently if you have a COR, or if you have a pond, and you meet the 3, would you mind going back to the little diagram there Randy, and you meet the 3 requirements then you don't need a COR in order to stock the fish. Under the proposed rule they are leaving the institutional aquaculture the same which means that they have to have a COR even if they meet all those 3 requirements. And so what we want to see happen is that, that just go away, the institutional aquaculture, and then it just falls under the rule like everybody else. If they meet those requirements, they should be able to stock without a COR without having to tax

our school systems more than they are currently being taxed. And that would be the change there. Just to eliminate the institutional aquaculture and let it fall right in with the rest of the rule. The second change that we would like to propose and see happen is if you look up here on the proposed rules, number 1 it says, the pond owner if he meets these criteria does not need a COR. On the first one it says it's not located on a natural stream channel. The problem with that is in order to put fish, fish are where there is water, water is where there natural stream channel is. So basically under that it states that you can't stock fish anywhere that water runs. And that's basically what its stating. And so what we are proposing is that instead of trying to define where we cannot stock fish, we would like to propose you, you look at the opportunity to define where you can stock a fish. What we would like to see proposed is eliminate number 1 and in that, in the place of that put if it is on private land and the water originates on that private land, and they meet those other 2 criteria then they should be able to stock those fish. If, it doesn't originate on their land, then it falls under the other side and you would still need a COR. The benefit of this is that somebody who wants to stock fish, has the ability to call up and we can explain to them what the requirement is. Currently right now if you called me up, say Mr. Chair you called me up and wanted to fish, I would have to ask you if its on a natural stream channel. Well that's based on your definition and my definition of what is a natural stream channel. And your definition might be different than my definition which might be totally different than what the Division's definition is. And so we feel like by doing this it would simplify and make it much easier and if you wanted to call up and ask me can you stock fish, I can basically ask you does the water originate on your property, do you screen it, and if you do, if we meet the sterility requirements then you should be able to stock fish. And that's what we're proposing.

Mike Worthen: K, thank you.

Kevin Bunnell: Make sure I'm capturing this so I can help these guys. So, your 2 recommendations just to remove the language for institutional and just make them fall under the same?

Robert Judd: Fall under the rule, just like everybody else.

Kevin Bunnell: And then, for, for altering this part, if the water originates on private land, on the same, on the same private land that the pond is on, and its screened, on the downstream side, then remove the requirement?

Robert Judd: As long as it originates on private land and you meet the other 2 criteria then it should be just fine.

Kevin Bunnell: The same private land that the pond is on, if the water originates there and its screened. I just want to make sure I am capturing this so I can walk through this.

Mike Worthen: Okay, thank you. Do we have any comments from the RAC? Go ahead Brian.

Brian Johnson: I just have a question, that proposal, how does that affect you? I don't understand, is it because it's better?

Unknown: I think this benefits me because I wouldn't have to do a COR.

Brian Johnson: That's what I thought. I just wanted to make sure I was understanding what he was saying.

Mike Worthen: Okay any other comments?

Dale Bagley: I was just wondering what Randy's thoughts are on changing that #1 to the water originating on private land, does that make a difference to you or the Division?

Randy Oplinger: You know where it makes a difference, I see the point Robert is making, first off, and this whole natural stream channel issue is a very difficult issue. I'm not a lawyer but we've got lawyers in Salt Lake who we spent a lot of time sitting down with as we were developing this rule and the fact of the matter is we couldn't come up with a very nice legal definition to a natural stream channel that goes to a Supreme Court issues and things like that. What we're really asking for in this rule, with the Division of Wildlife, is we're just concerned about fish escaping ponds and what potential effect that could have on native fish in those areas. And what we're asking for is just the opportunity to evaluate individual ponds to assess that risk and you know honestly in our dealings with pond owners in the Division of Wildlife, we seldom turn down a COR for a stocking request and we try to bend over backwards to really work with the pond owner and try to address whatever concerns are in place, so you know, we feel as a Division that we need to have that in place just to protect our fish and we just need to evaluate it on a case by case basis.

Mike Worthen: Anything else Brian? Anything else from any of the other members of the RAC?

Robert Judd: Can I comment on that

Mike Worthen: Well, we're through that but go ahead.

Robert Judd: So, I appreciate what Randy said. Most of the ponds that we end of stocking are ponds that are on land wholly owned by somebody, they have a small spring or something that wells up on their property, they dam it off, they screen it and we stock those fish. 85 to 90% of that water is never going to be a water that has any concern as far as native fish species. And one of the other things that I forgot to mention on the proposal is we would like to add a 4<sup>th</sup> line in there, where it would actually say if the water is being managed by the Division then they would have to have, still get a COR, does that make sense? So, if it's a private land, and that water generates on their land, but it is being managed by the Division for native species, then we would want them to get a COR.

Mike Worthen: You would want the Division to get the COR?

Robert Judd: No, the pond owner.

Kevin Bunnell: So if I understand, so if you had a native fish, even if it originated on the landowner's property, but if we had I don't know, (inaudible) chubs upstream in the springhead above the pond, that we were, that we were managing for, in that instance, even though it originated on the private land owners property that the pond is on, they would still require a COR, is that right?

Robert Judd: Correct because the Division has notified them they are managing that land and that water for that purpose, yeah.

Mike Worthen: Any other comments from the RAC? Okay go ahead John.

John Keeler: John Keeler, Utah Farm Bureau, we would like to support the Utah Aquaculture Association



recommendations on this issue. We've been involved in the private industry issues for many, many years and we've watched just the decline continuing to happen and we feel like these recommendations are reasonable. We do appreciate the Division and their willingness to sit down and work on these problems that we have but these are important issues to the few that we have left and we want to maintain this industry and we feel like they are reasonable recommendations and that they should be accepted, thank you.

Mike Worthen: Okay, thank you John. Okay, before we go into any of the comments regarding what was just said, see none?

Kevin Bunnell: Okay, so, with the comments we have, we have the issue with Gunnison Valley High School not to require a COR or a fee for institutional aquaculture. And then from the Utah Aquaculture Association, really 3 points, well 2 points. One just to get rid of language that is directed at institutional aquaculture and make them follow the same rules as everyone else which would mean that if they meet the 3 requirements, is not located on a natural stream channel, its screened and the fish species are permitted in the area, then there is not a COR requirement for institutions, same as just make them follow the same rules as everyone else. The second one when in relation to stocking on private ponds, if the water originates on the same private land that the pond is located, and the pond is screened, then you remove the requirement for a COR except if the Division is managing the water above the pond for a conservation species. Did I capture that? And then in that case they would require a COR. The comment on the other side for the Division is that we would like to retain the ability to evaluate those on a case by case basis and then the Farm Bureau supports the recommendations from the Utah Aquaculture Association.

Mike Worthen: Okay, from that do we have a motion?

#### **RAC discussion and vote:**

**Dale Bagley made the motion to accept the Private Pond Rule Amendments- Rule R657-59 as presented with the acceptance to remove the language for institutional aquaculture. Brian Johnson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Mike Worthen: Okay, next up is Nathan Owens to present the AIS Rule Amendments on Rule 657-60.

#### **AIS Rule Amendments- Rule R657-60 (action)**

**-Nathan Owens, Aquatic Invasive Species Program Coordinator**

(see attachment 1)

#### **Questions from the RAC:**

Mike Worthen: Thank you. Do we have any questions from the RAC? Dale?

Dale Bagley: How do you track a boat that's been basically under quarantine but returned to the owner? How do you track that boat to make sure it doesn't go to another body of water and get launched?

Nathan Owen: Great question. The way we've handled that this last season is we have our conservation officers periodically call that individual, stop by their place of residence, just to ensure that the seal that we apply attaching the boat to the trailer is still intact. So, we haven't had any issues with that so far.

Mike Worthen: Okay, any other comments? Okay comments from the public, or questions from the public? We have a comment card that says that the SFW supports the recommendations by the Division on aquatic mussel. Any comments from the RAC? Seeing none do we have? Gene,

**Questions from the Public:**

None

**Comments from the Public:**

Gene Boardman: Really it's a question. I know you want to protect all of Utah's waters but is there a, is that quagga mussel, can it survive in higher colder lakes?

Nathan Owen: Good question. We commonly get that question. The answer is yes. The quagga mussel is currently thriving in the Great Lakes where it gets a lot colder than anything we see here. Elevation does not seem to be an issue. They are pretty hearty (inaudible) oxygen does not even seem to be an issue so really the only thing that is a limiting factor is the calcium level in the water.

Unknown: How did we get rid of them out of Electric Lake?

Nathan Owen: We did not get rid of them. They were probably never there. There are a couple of possibilities with that. It could have potentially been a contaminated sample that we collected. It could also have been we detected the larvae form of the mussels but they did not settle out to within that 12 to 18 inches to where they can successfully reproduce and so they basically just died off. We don't know for sure.

Mike Worthen: Do we have a motion?

**RAC discussion and vote:**

**Layne Torgerson made the motion to accept the AIS Rule Amendments- Rule R657-60 as presented Mack Morrell seconded. Motion carried unanimously**

**R657-38 Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments (action)**

**-Bryan Christensen, Dedicated Hunter Coordinator**

(see attachment 1)

**Questions from the RAC:**

Mike Worthen: K, thank you Bryan, do we have any questions from the RAC? Any questions from the public? Do we have any comments from the public? Then we will take comments from the RAC. Okay, Gene, go ahead.

**Questions from the Public:**

None

## **Comments from the Public:**

None

## **RAC discussion and vote:**

Gene Boardman: Okay, this purchasing points, don't you think that's just a lot like buying hunting privilege?

Bryan Christensen: Do you want my opinion of it or the Divisions opinion of it Gene?

Gene Boardman: I want anybody's opinion of it. I want somebody that, I don't think it's defensible.

Bryan Christensen: Are you asking me if I feel it's appropriate?

Gene Boardman: If you got a defense for it I'll listen to it but, but, purchasing hunting privilege is, it's kind of goes against everything that our general, fair play in this hunting goes with.

Bryan Christensen: Are you talking about purchasing the service hours?

Gene Boardman: Purchasing service hours, I equate it to purchasing hunting privileges.

Bryan Christensen: Okay, so I will respond with one thing if you want more, just tell me more. The main thing I think with this is that every sportsman has initially the same price. If you apply for the COR and you draw it, as a resident your price is the same for every resident. The price of the COR fee which is \$195.00. That gets you 3 years. The hunting privilege is an exchange. You can go do those service hours and it will cost you your time and every sportsman can do that. There are some sportsmen that either don't have that flexibility or have other life situations where it is simpler for them to purchase the hours. Now whether you agree with that or not, every sportsman from the beginning, has the same initial cost and its 32 hours of service, which is time. And \$195.00. So, if they choose to purchase their hours, it costs them a whole lot more than the rest of us that perform the service.

Mike Worthen: Those funds are used to help the program, is that right?

Bryan Christensen: That's a good point to add. When service hours are purchased they go into an account that the Division can use. And that account can be used for a variety of things but its money that goes directly to the Division of Wildlife.

Mike Worthen: Does it go, so you have the flexibility to do anything with that money but it has to be in the Division but it just doesn't go for habitat improvements projects or anything that?

Bryan Christensen: No, the purchased hours don't. They are put into what's called a restricted fund. It's a fund that's used at the discretion of the Directors Office. Generally I can tell you that it goes towards administering the program, and the staff and Division personnel, wages, things like that so it goes straight to the Division.

Mike Worthen: Okay, do you have anything else Gene?

Gene Boardman: Yes I do. The, the brunt of this program is, is big game, the licenses come from the big game which is what, what, what why people join the dedicated hunter program. But, the efforts, what, what percent of all these hours and so forth go back to big game and what goes to other things?

Bryan Christensen: I like that question and if it was up to me, I would love to see eventually that every single project had to do with deer. What I have found in the last few years as I have been working, you know in this program, is that there are more than 1 type of project that benefit deer. So, there are those habitat projects that are specifically organized to benefit directly, benefit deer. But then there are other projects like sage grouse projects, habitat projects there. Well they happen to live in the same place and they happen to use a lot of the same plants, the same forest, the same sources of water, the land, if the land is bad, neither of those species can live so what I find, what I found is, many projects that benefit one species benefit deer as well. We do some stream restoration projects, if the water quality is good, big game have support for their water. Is it possible to entirely make all of our projects for the dedicated hunter program big game and deer related? I think could be in certain ways but we would probably see a big reduction of the number of available projects. Our goal in the dedicated hunter program is to help hunters interact with wildlife recreation, wildlife habitat, become stewards, and often that means becoming stewards of all things wildlife. Deer habitat projects also have certain time frames that they can only be done. We can't do a lot right now. And so sometimes during the winter, the months when we're not doing habitat projects, it benefits to sportsmen to offer other things to get them involved with the Division with the landscape with other agencies and become partners and stewards in other ways. So, I hope that helps, and gives you a reason why we do diversify our projects, we feel they do have a reach to the Division and if we are supporting the Division in those ways that ultimately benefits wildlife.

Mike Worthen: Thank you. Do we have any other comments from the RAC? Seeing none then we will entertain a motion.

**Brian Johnson made the motion to accept the R657-38 Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments as presented. Sean Kelly seconded. Motion carried 8:4, 1 abstained. Passed.**

**Other Business:**

None

**Meeting adjourned at 6:49 p.m.**

**Southeast Regional Advisory Council  
John Wesley Powell Museum  
1765 E. Main  
Green River, Utah  
December 14, 2016**

*Motion Summary*

**Approval of today's Agenda and Minutes**

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

**Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2017**

**MOTION: To accept the waterfowl recommendations and rule amendments as presented  
Passed unanimously**

**2017 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments**

**MOTION: To eliminate the two restricted black bear summer pursuit seasons on the La Sal unit  
Failed for lack of a second**

**MOTION: To limit the number of hounds allowed per pursuit permit holder to eight hounds for all seasons, applied statewide  
Failed for lack of a second**

**MOTION: To limit the number of hounds allowed per pursuit permit holder to 12 hounds for all seasons except summer seasons, applied statewide  
Passed 6-4**

**MOTION: To change the fall black bear limited-entry season on the Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South unit to Aug. 12 to Sept. 25 and Oct. 28 to Nov. 16, consistent with the La Sal and San Juan units  
Passed 6-4**

**MOTION: To accept the remaining 2017 black bear recommendations and rule amendments as presented  
Passed 9-1**

**Private Pond Rule Amendments – Rule R657-59**

**MOTION: To accept the private pond rule amendments as presented  
Passed unanimously**

**AIS Rule Amendments – Rule R657-60**

**MOTION: To accept the AIS rule amendments as presented  
Passed unanimously**

**Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments – Rule R657-38**

**MOTION: To accept the dedicated hunter rule amendments as presented  
Passed unanimously**

**Southeast Region Advisory Council  
John Wesley Powell Museum  
1765 E. Main  
Green River, Utah**

**December 14, 2016 @ 6:30 p.m.**

***Members Present***

***Members Absent***

---

**Kevin Albrecht, Chairman, USFS**

**Sue Bellagamba, Non-consumptive**

**Keith Brady, Elected Official**

**Blair Eastman, Agriculture**

**Trisha Hedin, Sportsperson**

**Todd Huntington, At-large & Vice Chair**

**Karl Ivory, BLM**

**Kent Johnson, At-large**

**Derris Jones, Sportsmen**

**Darrel Mecham, Sportsmen**

**Christine Micoz, At-large**

**Charlie Tracy, Agriculture**

**Gerrish Willis, Non-consumptive**

**Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor**

**Others Present**

**Dr. Mike King**

**Public in attendance: 5**

---

**1) Welcome, RAC introductions and RAC Procedure**

**-Kevin Albrecht, Chairman**

**Kevin Albrecht:** Alright, with that we will go ahead and get started. We like to welcome everybody to the Southeastern Region RAC. Looks like we have an awesome turnout from our RAC so kudos for everyone for making the time to come, sure appreciate it. Also like to thank the audience, thank the public for making the time to come. So a couple things on RAC procedure: We will have a presentation from the division. They will present in this microphone, and then we will go to, first, questions from the RAC and then we will go to questions from the audience. If you will come up to this microphone in the front and state your name and then we will go to comments from the public. If you have a comment in the back there is a comment card, if you will fill it out and bring it up here to Chris and then we will call you up by name and then we will go to comments from the RAC.

2) **Approval of the Agenda and minutes**  
**-Kevin Albrecht, Chairman**

**Kevin Albrecht:** Everyone had a chance to look at the agenda? Okay. We're ready for a motion on that. Motion by Charlie Tracy to approve the agenda. Seconded by Keith Brady. How about the minutes. Everyone had a chance to look at those? All in favor of the agenda? Unanimous. How about the minutes? Motion by Kent Johnson to accept the minutes, seconded by Gerrish Willis. All in favor? Unanimous.

**VOTING**

**Motion was made by Charlie Tracy to approve this meeting's agenda**  
**Seconded by Keith Brady**  
**Motion passed unanimously**

**Motion was made by Kent Johnson to accept the minutes of the Nov. 16, 2016, meeting as printed**  
**Seconded by Gerrish Willis**  
**Motion passed unanimously**

3) **Wildlife Board Meeting Update**  
**-by Kevin Albrecht, Chairman**

**Kevin Albrecht:** So we just had a wildlife board meeting and I'll do my best. It was quite a long meeting. There was a lot of discussion and I'll do my best to give you an update and if you have any questions please just bring those up. First, Greg Sheehan gave some updates. He talked about a translocation out on Parker Mountain for pronghorn but due to weather that was postponed. He talked about a mule deer study that is, they are collaring and studying the mule deer on several units. One of those I know is on the Manti, the South Manti where we have had a lot of discussion with those deer so that's been ongoing. I think it's going on in several places in the state. They also gave a lead poisoning update that came from the action log that came from our region and so after going through the action log the division spent a lot of time looking at that at this time they decided not to put it in rule so they left it the way it is. They did apparently take our comments and they looked at that and decided to leave it the way we have it. Chris reminds me, the prairie dogs, their rules will be updated. So they talked about possibly putting it in that rule and a lot of their discussion was just for the prairie dogs and I remember when we had our discussion it wasn't just for prairie dogs, it was as a whole. But they talked about that they will look at it further come that time.

They talked about the youth bonus point. There was a gentleman that came and addressed us. So with that, that's already, some of our discussion has taken place. With the dedicated hunter there already is a lower price for the youth and we will allow them with that. And then on the youth bonus point, Lindy went in quite a bit of detail on that and she will be glad to do that for us when she comes back. She is very knowledgeable



with that, and after listening to her, a lot of our discussion was maybe a little bit ignorant. We didn't know all the ins and outs of that so she would be glad to talk to us more.

I'll jump right in with the motions from the Wildlife Board. They had a motion to accept the elk management plan they had quite a bit of discussion with this. They had a the Farm Bureau and quite a few cattlemen and livestock and so they were talking specific areas, not so much for our region, but Panquitch Lake, Southwest Desert, and there is a lot of discussion. That motion passed, four approved with two opposed. The elk management plan was five in favor, one opposed and then on the bucks, bulls and once-in-a-lifetime there was a lot of discussion just like we had here. There was a lot of discussion with the UBA proposal. There was an amended motion that was to include the archery-only mountain goat hunt on the North Slope/South Slope and that would include the high Uintahs in the Central Unit and also an archery-only bison hunt on the Henrys and so those were pulled out. They didn't include the whole proposal with the sheep and everything that came here it was only the bison and the mountain goat. After much discussion that is kind of what they went to and the season is October 6<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup>. That actually came, it was amended by the Divisions recommendation to accommodate some of the hunts. So it was actually shortened up a little bit to meet some of their needs. And then the dates on the mountain goat were August 19<sup>th</sup> to September 10<sup>th</sup>. That was approved unanimously. And then they had an amended motion to exclude the once-in-a-life time seven-day archery proposal by the Division, and that passed. They had a motion on the preference points that came through and that also passed. That's basically the gist of mostly of our discussion from our RAC. Is there any questions? Okay, with that, we will have a regional update.

4) **Regional Update**  
**-Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor**

**Chris Wood:** Good evening. Thanks for coming tonight. December is a busy time of year but hopefully you're enjoying your holiday parties and family time but I appreciate you taking time out tonight to come to our RAC meeting. Things are slowing down just a little bit for most the sections, except for the Wildlife Section. They are still running around like crazy all over the state doing flights and surveys, but I'll touch on that in a few minutes. The Aquatics Section, I'll give an update for that. Ice fishing has begun on several reservoirs including Scofield, Huntington, and Cleveland. I mentioned last time the results of our Scofield survey have come in. We have identified a team that can work together to write a management plan that will go through the RAC and the board process. That meeting the first meeting will be held in January for that management team. Our maintenance guys are working with our aquatics team to build a pond at Fuller Bottom. There is a spring there, we have created a really nice area for the water to come up and create a nice wetland for the property there. Fuller Bottom is a Wildlife Management Area on the upper San Rafael that we own and is for sportsmen and recreationists.

Our habitat section is also finishing up there habitat projects. They just finished a lop-and-scatter near Blanding. They are flying a second flight of seed, sage brush seed on top of a bull hog project near the Sagers area on the South Book Cliffs, and then they are planning on doing a projects on the Henry Mountains, another lop-and-scatter, in early

Spring. Lop-and-scatter refers to pinyon and juniper encroachment areas where they have chainsaw crews that cut down the smaller pinyon and juniper trees and cut off the branches and scatter it on the range.

**Kent Johnson:** Question on that Sagers is that both sides of Thomas Canyon on those benches you're doing or just the east side north Sagers?

**Chris Wood:** I'm not sure, do you know Morgan, have you been out there? Just the east side. Yeah. Law enforcement has been busy as well. We have a vacant sergeant position that closes today so hopefully by the time we talk to you next we will have a new sergeant that will cover the north part of the state, or the region. We will be doing winter range patrols this month and then through March, and, of course, we are running other patrols and looking at other cases that have come up that involve trappers, cow hunts, and upland game and waterfowl. So our guys are out there working and checking hunters and responding to calls. And then the UCOA is the Utah Conservation Officers Association. This is the second year now that our conservation officers have been able to grow beards. They usually have to be cleans shaven with the exception of a trim, conservative-looking mustache. So it is something our officers like to grow facial hair, so in the month of November and December they are allowed to buy a beard card and that money goes towards a charity gift fund, and UCOA matches the officers donation and statewide we have collected \$3,300. So you see our COs that are sporting facial hair, it is going to a good cause and we're helping bring Christmas to some low income families.

We had a Mule Deer Watch at our Nash Wash WMA on November 19<sup>th</sup>. We had a really good turnout. The deer were down low on the winter range and there was some nice trophy-size bucks and a good number of bucks as well with does also, but it was a good turnout and a good event. We are currently reviewing community fisheries MOUs and agreements and Walk-In Access contracts. And then coming up this winter we have two different clinics planned. One is an ice fishing clinic that will be held at our Price office on January 13<sup>th</sup>. Teach people the basics of ice fishing any tricks that our guys have. We usually have a really good turnout. The following day on the 14<sup>th</sup> we will go out to a reservoir and put that fishing knowledge, the knowledge you learned at the fishing clinic to use and help people and coach them along and help them have a successful day on the ice. We don't know which reservoir we will go to on the 14<sup>th</sup>. Hopefully Huntington North will be frozen over enough to go there and then on February 3<sup>rd</sup> our Price office will have a coyote hunting clinic.

Our wildlife guys have been busy. They have been in the chopper, they have been both captures for mule deer and collaring them as part of a statewide effort to understand migratory patterns of mule deer. A lot of times we know where they are in the summer time. We know where they are during the hunts and during the winter but we don't necessarily understand their migration patterns and where they are moving to and from and how far they are moving and so statewide I think you will see in upcoming years a big effort on our part as an agency to continue to put more collars on deer and understand their patterns better. And we will probably do that with a lot of species other than mule deer as well. We have been doing big horn sheep surveys. We just finished up Rattlesnake and the Nine Mile units. You know specific questions Guy is here in the back but I just talked to him before the meeting numbers are a little down, probably down about 20 percent, but they still are seeing some good age class diversity, including some lambs. But numbers are down about 20 percent. And then this month they will continue

to do deer classifications and then January they have a busy month as well doing captures for deer and big horn sheep on the Henrys, elk on the Manti, and then some turkeys. With that I will try to answer any questions if not I have some smart guys behind me that can help.

**Derris Jones:** The pond at Fuller Bottom is it a brood rearing for a sensitive species or community fisheries or what is the purpose of the pond?

**Chris Wood:** The original intent was to do a brood rearing for one of the sensitive fish, however in the last few months we came across an opportunity there is a pond that PacifiCorp owns, I believe, that we have been able to use and treat with rotenone and use that as a brood rearing for the blue head I believe. Is that right Justin? Round-tail chub, sorry, yeah. And it could be in the future too, but at this point we have that need filled by that opportunity that we took advantage of this fall.

**Derris Jones:** So is it going to be a fishery at Fuller Bottom or just a wetland

**Chris Wood:** Right now it is just going to be a wetland pond. Alright, thank you.

5) **Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments- 2017**  
**-Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program Coordinator**

**Questions from the RAC**

No questions from the RAC

**Questions from the Public**

No questions from the public

**Comments from the Public**

No comments from the public

**RAC Discussion**

**Kent Johnson:** I like the proposal to add a youth day and also to change things around, change the season in the south a little bit. I have heard quite a bit of feedback from guys that hunt waterfowl in the southern region, not many birds down here earlier on. I think that's a good idea and the Division is recognizing that in the southern part of the state.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Thank you. Just a reminder, make sure you pull your mic close.

**Charlie Tracy:** I make a motion that we accept everything presented.

**Darrell Mecham:** I second it.

**Kevin Albrecht:** We've got a motion by Charlie Tracy, seconded by Darrell Mecham, for item No. 5, Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule and Amendments. All in favor? Unanimous.

**VOTING**

**Motion made by Charlie Tracy to approve item No. 5, Waterfowl Recommendations**

**Rule and Amendments**  
**Seconded by Darrell Mecham**  
**Motion passed unanimously**

**6) 2017 Black Bear Recommendations and Rule Amendments**  
**-Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator**

**Questions from the RAC**

**Kevin Albrecht:** Thank you. Questions from the RAC?

**Darrel Mecham:** Yeah, could you give me the specifics on your depredation issues on the La Sals?

**Darren DeBloois:** I'm going to let Guy or one of the biologists answer that question.

**Guy Wallace:** Actually, on the La Sals, we didn't have many depredation issues on there. We had a few that were reported up on Taylor Flat but I don't think any bears or, there may have only been one bear removed in that case. So most of the issues that we had were on the Southeast Manti and that's where we had a little higher removal from wildlife services than we usually have and so that is why we recommended more permits on the southeast Manti.

**Darrel Mecham:** I'm talking about the La Sals. I mean you're increasing them there due to the depredation issues?

**Guy Wallace:** No, that's primarily fitting within those parameters that Darren talked about.

**Darrel Mecham:** Well he was talking about the depredation issues here and raising the number of tags on the La Sals.

**Guy Wallace:** No.

**Darrel Mecham:** Did I misunderstand him?

**Guy Wallace:** Right, you misunderstood. The reason for that is like he explained, with each of those, the La Sals is in the moderate category and our female harvest is lower than 30 percent and our percent males older than five years is higher than 35 percent, so it is out in both parameters, and with that the guidelines call to adjust 20 to 40 percent and so that is what we are doing. But actually we are not quite adjusting within that, we are actually only adjusting about 15 percent on both those units. One of the reasons why we felt like a 20 percent increase was quite a bit, we had a really high male harvest on both the San Juan and the La Sal units and which doesn't happen every year and so we just want to be a little conservative about how much we increase, so we didn't quite go to 20 percent on those two units. So that's why the increases are on both the La Sal and San Juan units is because of those parameters.

**Derris Jones:** Okay, do you have the exact percent of female harvest and the exact percent of males over five for the La Sals? Will you give those to us?

**Guy Wallace:** I do have it yeah. Sure. I believe this data is three-year data. And I can look at last year's as well. Let's see for three years for La Sals, adult males were 45.5 and percent females was 23.6 for the La Sals. For the San Juan, we were at 65 percent adult males and 12 percent females.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Any other questions?

**Gerrish Willis:** I've got a couple, so I am trying to get up to speed on bear management. So bear with me. Kevin, I think this might be a good question for you. Why do people who want to bait have to get a permit from the BLM and not the Forest Service to put in bait stations?

**Kevin Albrecht:** Yeah so that just changed this last year. And I don't know the exact reason. I know it's above me but the Division working with the Forest Service at a regional office level. That was now given to the Division so for them to get a permit they have to do that with the Division office and they approve those locations.

**Gerrish Willis:** I went through the bear booklet that the hunters all get and it described areas closed to baiting as being designated wilderness areas, heavily used drainages or recreation areas and critical watersheds. So are the La Sals open to baiting?

**Guy Wallace:** Yes, for the summer bait season. Yes they are.

**Gerrish Willis:** Why wouldn't the La Sals be excluded, especially the heavily used recreation areas, from baiting? I don't understand why a criteria that you have doesn't fit the La Sals.

**Guy Wallace:** I don't understand your question. We are baiting, we do have a summer bait season on the La Sals.

**Gerrish Willis:** I understand that, but the La Sals are a heavily used recreation area so it seems like it's inconsistent to be baiting where you have got those recreators all summer long.

**Kevin Albrecht:** So I can speak a little bit to that. There is a distance within those trails and campgrounds and those type of things of where that is not allowed and I believe that has been carried over with the Division, they carried that over just like the Forest Service did before. I don't know their exact distance but there is a distance within those campgrounds and recreation trails so that that's mitigated.

**Gerrish Willis:** Okay.

**Guy Wallace:** I guess I can add to that. All of our units have high recreation in the summer. So the La Sals is not unique in that aspect.

**Gerrish Willis:** So what is a high-use recreation area? What is that different than all these other areas that are highly used for recreation?

**Todd Huntington:** It's what Kevin just said it's a campground or a trail, so we have to be a certain distance away from that. That's all they are talking about. You can't put a bait station in the middle of a campground. That's what they are talking about when they are saying a high-use recreation. Just because the mountain is heavily used doesn't exclude the entire mountain range. We are narrowing that down I think a lot more specifically. Is that correct?

**Gerrish Willis:** And then in the bear management plan, at the end of it, it has a bunch of objectives, and one of the objectives is to document impacts to other resource users from summer bear pursuit activities and implement actions to reduce impacts if warranted. Does the Division have any desire or anything in the plans to actually document those impacts?

**Guy Wallace:** We have gone through kind of an evolution with our restricted pursuit where we have carved out those dates to reduce conflicts. With that, what we have had our officers do and also the federal agencies when they have had conflicts, to document those conflicts so we can get a feel for where those are occurring and at what rate and have they changed with the changes that we have made with those seasons. And so we

are trying to monitor that along with the changes that we have made to those seasons.

**Gerrish Willis:** Well I just have a comment. You know I am from Moab and I don't spend a lot of time down on the Abajos, but I do spend a lot of time up in the La Sals and I know a lot of people that do. And it just seems like during the pursuit season there are these guys charging up and down the roads chasing their dogs and everything and it really has an impact on the pleasure people get recreating because there are so many of them and the pursuit season lasts for so long. So I think it would be good for the Division to rethink that and maybe put some restrictions on the length of the pursuit season or so that they are not pursuing up there at all because there are a lot of people that are heavily impacted by hounding, particularly during the pursuit.

**Guy Wallace:** We have tried to address those concerns and some of those issues that have happened and one of the things I can say is right now we are right in the middle of an experimental design with our restricted pursuit where we only have five permits on the La Sals for restricted pursuit and we have had that for the last two years and that is our recommendation for this year so that will be three years and we have 15 on the San Juan for restricted pursuit during the summer season restricted pursuit.

**Trisha Hedin:** If it is only five permits can you have five different teams of dogs out there on that one permit or is it limited? I mean I know that is getting into muddy water, but do you see what I am saying?

**Guy Wallace:** Yeah there is some restrictions regarding that.

**Gerrish Willis:** One thing I have noticed, Guy, is that there seem to be a lot of people from out of state that come over to the La Sals with their dogs, particularly Colorado because the citizens of Colorado force the wildlife folks there to get rid of pursuit altogether so they come to the La Sals because it is close by and I don't understand why you don't send them to Idaho instead and get rid of the out-of-state pursuit hunters. That would take care of a big part of the problem.

**Kevin Albrecht:** That used to be a big problem and working with the Division. So now that is a draw. Can you speak to that because that should have eliminated that quite a bit.

**Guy Wallace:** And probably the confusing part of this is we are talking about the summer pursuit which is they can pursue outside that during the fall and spring as well. But when we have had the issues that we have had with campers or recreationist was during that pursuit season and those are the areas where we have restricted and changed some of the season dates to avoid the high-use dates. Things like that. And restrict the permits. And that is why we got a limited number of permits for those seasons there.

**Kevin Albrecht:** But the Spring and Fall is still limited to when they draw, if they have a draw permit, so that is based off the drawing, drawing a permit.

**Guy Wallace:** Fall and Spring is an open permit.

**Gerrish Willis:** I would recommend getting rid of the summer restricted pursuit to avoid conflicts with other people that are out recreating.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Any other questions from the RAC?

**Kent Johnson:** Yeah, I have one question, one of them was this is addressed in an email from the houndsmen but I was curious about it myself. Why is the season dates different on the Book Cliffs than it is on the other units?

**Darren DeBloois:** This is a similar issue. What they have decided to do there is rather than have pursuit happening on top of limited-entry opportunities they pushed that season back so that those guys are pursuing during the general spike hunt and just them trying to

manage the people on the mountain.

**Kent Johnson:** Okay.

**Darren DeBloois:** They felt like if you drew a permit and you burnt your bonus points they would let you have the mountain to yourself and then...

**Kent Johnson:** That's kind of what I thought it was but that doesn't make a lot of sense because you're doing the bear hunt on top of the limited entry draw bull hunt on the La Sal Mountains.

**Darren DeBloois:** Yeah. And it may just be a difference between regions. That is why that region did it. Whether you guys did it, you know that is up to you guys to decide that. That makes sense, but that is why.

**Trisha Hedin:** I think this is in the same thread but it says for the La Sals and the San Juan unit that you are not allowed dogs from September 16<sup>th</sup> through the 25<sup>th</sup> and I would assume this is because of limited-entry bull rifle, but archery hunters can have dogs running. So we are giving rifle hunters one more advantage. I guess that was a comment; that wasn't a question. Sorry.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Any other questions.

**Gerrish Willis:** I've got another comment.

**Kevin Albrecht:** We are still to questions.

### **Questions from the Public**

**Kevin Albrecht:** With that we will go to questions from the public. Please come up to the microphone and state your name.

**Pam Hackley:** Hi my name is Pam Hackley, I live in castle valley, and the La Sals are in my back yard so that is partly why I am here today. But I just want to clarify when you are talking about this gap in the pursuit hunt in particular just clarifying we have talked about hunters for rifle hunting for bull elk, but are you talking about also other users that are up there whether it would be hikers or you know recreational vehicle users, bird watchers or whatever the heck it is, picnickers, or are you only talking about the hunting public?

**Darren DeBloois:** I would say in general we want to try to take all user groups into account, but obviously you have a limited amount of time and trying to get everything in there. And so we try to take those things into account and make the best management decisions we can and then we have a public process to kind of weed through that, too.

**Kevin Albrecht:** One question with that, Guy, can you go through those numbers of the summer? I think there is some confusion on the summer pursuit permits. The restricted ones because those are restricted during the summer when it is the highest recreation. I think there is some confusion when how many are allowed during that time.

**Guy Wallace:** On the La Sals, currently we have five permits for each of the two seasons. And then on the San Juan, we have 20.

**Todd Huntington:** You mean 15?

**Guy Wallace:** Yeah, you are right, sorry. It used to be 20 total and so we split it up, you are correct it is five on the La Sals and 15 on the San Juan.

**Kevin Albrecht:** And that was for the purpose to limit it with the amount of recreation during the summer, is that correct?

**Guy Wallace:** Yeah it's kind of a two-part deal. I mean a lot of that we have had we have

implemented to address issues that we have had, but part of that is also we are trying to look at if some of our bear movements that we are seeing particularly during the summer time are influenced by pursuit. That is why we are having differential in permits, and then after this third year we are going to flip that and monitor it for another three years to see if there is any difference. And you know one of the things that drives this a lot of times is weather conditions or forage conditions for the bears so we have to have it for a long enough period of time to hopefully try and catch a year that would lead to a problem and see what the effects of those different permit, restricted permit levels are or if there is one at all.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Other questions from the public?

### **Comments from the Public**

**Kevin Albrecht:** We will go to comments. Chris wants me to mention that there are also some comments that were e-mailed that may not have come to our inbox but come to the Division so those are in front of you as well so you can take that into consideration. We will go to comment card from Pam Hackley, and she will be followed by Bryce Pilling. And if you have comments please bring them up here to Chris.

**Pam Hackley:** Hello again, thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment Mr. Chair and members of the committee. I will be brief. I am asking for the Division of Wildlife to suspend baiting and hounding in the La Sal and the San Juan units of the Southeast Region. My first reason for that is I, over the years, have had, I grew up in a hunting family, I hunted in Montana when I lived there. I have not hunted in Utah, I am not against hunting; I am in favor of the public trust doctrine and how we manage our natural resources and wildlife. But I can't in rationalizing or in my heart understand that baiting and hounding are fair chase as far as trying to harvest black bear.

And my secondary reasons, as I said, the La Sals are my back yard and I spend an awful lot of time hiking up there and recreating in all kinds of ways—skiing, bird watching, primarily backpacking, that is my favorite thing up there with my family with my grandkids. And I have encounters times when I have known that wildlife have been displaced by hounds coming through. I couldn't tell you what season it is or what or you know what they are doing I just know that that's what is going on. I have had experiences that I have reported to BLM and SITLA of hunting camps in Castle Valley that were illegal and very poorly maintained. And I know that's, I'm not trying to put a black eye on the entire hounding population out there, but over the years I haven't had positive experiences with hounding in particular. That said, I know that it says in the bear plans that you are planning to re-evaluate the management strategies, objectives and management strategies that were in place in 2011 and you are going to re-evaluate them in 2017, and I'd be really interested in being a part of that process and would like to hear more from folks out there on the ground. Thank you.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Thank you. Bryce Pilling followed by Robert Judd.

**Bryce Pilling:** Bryce Pilling for Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife. Thank you Mr. Chair, RAC members, Darren. We would just like to say that we support the plan as presented. Thank you.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Cody Webster and that is the last comment card.

**Cody Webster:** Cody Webster just representing myself. To speak kind of to the



opposition to hounding, we have seen quite a bit of examples of where hounding was taken away that it really increases the conflict with just the bear general population conflict. But my main comment would be I just would like kind of a conservative approach at any jumps we take at the Book Cliffs. I have seen kind of a decrease in the amount of bears I have been able to find, both in hunting specifically for bears as well as general big game out there spending the entire fall on the mountain just not seeing the numbers and I don't think that is a big, it's not attributed to the hunting because that pretty well remained the same that it has been for several years so there is something else that is going on there that needs to be looked at and addressed.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Thanks Cody, Guy Webster.

**Guy Webster:** Guy Webster, representing Utah Houndsmen Association. You all probably received two emails; tried to get two of them to you on recommendations. With the Division with a couple different things, the Book Cliffs fall limited-entry we have requested that them season dates match the La Sals and the San Juan, the same elk opportunities are on the San Juan and the La Sals. The San Juan is just as much of a trophy area for rifle elk hunting as what the Book Cliffs is. Echo Cody is somebody who has hunted the Book Cliffs for the last 30 years, got a pretty good pulse on what the population is and it is a little bit scary. We are not seeing the cub recruitment the denning has been down the past couple years. This past year has been a little bit better but there is something going on so we appreciate the Northeastern Region saying let's not get crazy and increase tags on that.

Back to the La Sal, I understand that it is in a study but we want to make sure that in that point in time that study is done the tag allocation does come back up to match what the San Juan is. I'll kind of talk to you a couple things. Yeah, Colorado has shut down hounding, but Colorado also had their animal damage control take hundreds of bear out of the Grand Junction Valley this year. Bears need to be managed. Hounds are a good way of keeping them bears afraid of humans, away from campgrounds, away from, from the populated areas. You take that away you're going to have them bears being taken by somebody who is not a sportsman, somebody who is getting paid, and that bear is just going to waste. I know that some people are a little bit upset with the hunting in the fall and I have run into some of them and I hope and I try to preach it but I've helped more than one elk hunter go and harvest an exceptional animal. Because if you really know a true houndsman—there probably isn't any sportsman that spends more time in the field than what a houndsman does—and if you go and approach them and ask if they have seen a good bull, 90 percent of them are going to tell you right where it's at and do what they can to help. There is always a bad person in every group, but I just ask to support the houndsmen. We go back we have a lot of history, the Houndsmen Association, we are definitely in support of the bears and want to make sure that we have a stable population and a sport that is being monitored and taken care of in a positive aspect to the community and those other land eaters out there. Thank you.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Are there any other comments? You spoke Bryce? Umm

**Guy Webster:** Can I throw one other comment as myself real quick? Let's get back to kind of a pet peeve of mine is the Book Cliffs road-less area. That was taken away from us years ago, long before you guys were on the RAC. But I sat here one year and was told we had a conflict up there with people on Memorial Day weekend. That was a problem had a few guys up their pups got in with some other recreationalists, so I contacted every

single houndsman I knew that hunted that area was up there Memorial Day weekend, said, “Do ourselves a favor,” again houndsmen self-policing themselves, told them, “do not go there Memorial Day weekend due to the conflict because we are apt to have a problem with that going away if we don’t.” So low and behold come to the next years RAC meeting, walk in and our mammals coordinator says guess what. I was up there on Memorial Day weekend on the Book Cliffs and did not see as single hound up there so obviously you guys don’t have that as an important area to hunt hounds and it went away. I just ask for myself I know of a few other people that would probably enjoy to be able to get back in there and also being a user of the Book Cliffs and the road-less and having bears come into camps it is a big problem in there. Maybe we would reduce that a little bit by getting the fear of bears back from humans instead of not having any reason to be fearful of coming into a camp and raiding coolers.

### **RAC Discussion**

**Kevin Albrecht:** I will just start with a question for Guy, can you talk about what the harvest is with baiting, what the average harvest is with hounds and then what it is with neither the use of neither one of those, just spot-and-stalk?

**Guy Wallace:** I don’t know if I have that or if I have it in my head either.

**Darren DeBloois:** So this is for 2016, and we have additional harvest data if you want to look at it. But that will be for each individual unit you can see the percentages there by hunt and those are percent permits filled. So if a person had a permit and they didn’t hunt they just stayed home or if they went and were unsuccessful, we don’t know for sure. But typically most people have permits hunt, so this is probably pretty close.

**Kevin Albrecht:** So can you point out which of those are spot-and-stalk only?

**Guy Wallace:** Spot-and-stalk would be the San Juan and the La Sals, and I think there are some spot-and-stalk permits on Nine Mile.

**Kevin Albrecht:** On which of the seasons?

**Guy Wallace:** The spot and stock on the La Sal and the San Juan has its own season. It is in October.

**Darren DeBloois:** And maybe it’s not on here, and if it’s not I apologize. We have got Spring, Summer, Fall. I don’t know if they are combining those or if there is only one Fall season. Guy, you’ll have to answer.

**Guy Wallace:** It probably is combined. I don’t have the exact numbers but, Dustin do you know what the numbers are on the—on our bait season we only had five permits last year and I think most of those harvested four of five, or three of five. The question was he wanted to know about bait season as well. On the spot-and-stalk on the La Sals and the San Juan our hunter success is usually less than 15 percent, its usually about 12 percent. Five out of 50 permits, five or six animals on the spot and stock, 40 percent on bait.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Alright, I’ll open it up to comments.

**Trisha Hedin:** So I want to say, Guy, I’m not opposed to dogs, hounds. I guess I’m opposed to if the Division is going to pick out a user group to make special during those limited entry bull hunts, why is it rifle hunters? My comment is I think probably if we are going to do that, which I don’t think we should, should probably be archery hunter’s limited-entry bull. To pull out that user group and say well you’re special you have the highest capacity weaponry to kill a bull but we are going to give you that one more

advantage. So I guess my recommendation would be to dump that all together. Just let them run the whole time. But that is just my opinion. Is that bad? So I am not opposed to hounds I just think why give rifle hunters one more advantage. And I am a rifle hunter also I guess I just have a hard time giving all these, we are starting to pit hunters against hunters and this happened during the last meeting, too, and I don't think it's good.

And the other thing is this is from both you Guy and Utah Houndsmen, I would recommend to push those seasons in the Books to the same as the La Sals and the San Juan unit. That spike hunt, which I have mentioned before, is now a hot mess. There is a ton of spike hunters up there. So I think those conflicts are just going to keep escalating. So I would go with that recommendation and I would seriously look at, and I know you know bear populations in the Books, and so I would highly recommend we listen to looking at those harvest numbers in the Books.

**Derris Jones:** Guy, what is the reason between the different season dates between the Book Cliffs and the La Sals and the Abajos?

**Darren DeBloois:** Yeah. The Northeastern Region is trying to figure out when the best time to have those guys afield is, and what they have decided is to have them hunt the same time as the general-season elk hunters to try to avoid those limited entry hunts for guys who have burnt bonus points. But that is why.

**Derris Jones:** So the Book Cliffs has a later closing or later season?

**Darren DeBloois:** Yeah, I think it's October 2<sup>nd</sup> through November 16<sup>th</sup>. In fact, I probably ought to point out I think there is a typo in your packet I think says the 3<sup>rd</sup>. It should say the 2<sup>nd</sup>, October 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Trisha Hedin:** So yeag I mean anybody who is in the Books during this last season spike hunt, I mean, the population up there at least in just my estimate is probably quadrupled. When they put that Seep Ridge road in it is a disaster, so at least that's my opinion.

**Kevin Albrecht:** You are talking about hunting.

**Trisha Hedin:** General season spike, yeah.

**Kent Johnson:** I agree, the idea was probably made it was okay when that was a cruddy road like the roads we got from this end to get up there. But now you can go 70 miles per hour all the way to the gas plant. That's just increased the impact of the use up there across the board and so it might be something. Could we entertain that as a separate part of the motion?

**Kevin Albrecht:** Yeah when we get to ready for motion, let's talk about those separate things and let's do that as separate motions.

**Guy Wallace:** Our season dates, the biggest conflicts we had during those fall seasons was during that early limited-entry bull. People that are with maximum points that are drawing bull permits and out there upset and they were quite, there were some that were pretty volatile, fist fight type stuff. Guys threatening each other over ruining an elk hunt. Things like that. So originally we had carved out that part of the season for bear hunting during that period of time, but then last year, I believe it was last year, we changed it to where they just can't use hounds during that limited-entry, early limited-entry bull hunt. They can still hunt but they can't use hounds during that nine-day whatever the length of that bull hunt

**Kevin Albrecht:** So to understand that so that is on the La Sal and the San Juan?

**Guy Wallace:** Correct.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Could we, we could make that recommendation to be the same on the

Book Cliffs Right?

**Guy Wallace:** We could do that.

**Trisha Hedin:** But it doesn't mitigate the issues with the spike hunt.

**Kent Johnson:** It uniforms everything out. I think that's what the houndsmen want.

**Kevin Albrecht:** It would be the same on all units.

**Darrel Meham:** Everybody knows I don't ever have much to say on this but Kent is wrong, you can drive 90 miles per hour. You're way off, bud. And when I start on this rant I feel for the DWR because the La Sals are unique. Moab is exploding. They are building 148 homes right now and over 100 a year. It is becoming urban. The mountain is getting used. We don't slow down anymore. We are up there all winter. You have Yurch, you have cross country skiing, you have people everywhere. So I don't know if your bear conflicts are ever going to go down because of the amount of people on the mountain. They are there all the time and they are there and there are just some things that I'll roll into and bear in mind I'm a houndsman, too. I've got it, Colorado closed their hound hunt they killed almost 400 bear in Grand Valley this year in agriculture. DWR killed them. Wasn't sportsmen, they killed all those bear and they have serious conflict and you know some of the issues I've got to go with him and people I hear in Moab I think you are going to have to address is 42 dogs on a bear. I sit and listen to that. You know guys talking about we had 42 dogs on this bear you should have seen it. Come on. That gives us a black eye, everybody I don't care who you are. And you sit there and watch somebody gather up 30-some dogs one day and I'm like, that's, that's not hunting. That is disgusting. And I don't know you are going to have to entertain the conflicts. I don't know how you're going to do it. I really don't and maybe you're going to have to look at going back and giving the bear hunt back to the July 1<sup>st</sup> and have the hounds on there Spring then pull them off the mountain. Then they aren't there. Gives the hunters time to hunt when the bear are out and things are going on. I don't know and the road-less, caught my first bear in road-less 1981, Fish Creek Sheep Canyon. Caught the majority of my bear in the little creek and when it went to no hounds I was not happy but you know I guess that is life. It's where you go, but big, big changes in Moab. It is becoming urban and it is getting used and I don't really know where you are going to go. I don't.

**Gerrish Willis:** So Kevin is now the appropriate time to make a sub-motion?

**Kevin Albrecht:** You would be fine if you would like to make a motion.

**Gerrish Willis:** So what I would like to see is the two summer pursuit hunts in the La Sals taken out all together to avoid the conflicts that Darrell is talking about.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Okay so I am going to get specific. So you are talking just for the La Sal but the two different summer seasons?

**Gerrish Willis:** Yep, I think that is a step in the right direction. I think over time you are going to see an increase in population around the Abajos and have similar types of conflicts, but the conflicts with the non-hunters, non-houndsmen in the La Sals is really serious, and I think this is a way to, if houndsmen really want to keep hunting with hounds, they are going to have to recognize it is important to keep the other recreationist happy.

**Kevin Albrecht:** I'll re-state the motions. You got a motion by Gerrish Willis to eliminate the two summer pursuit seasons in the La Sals, do we have a 2<sup>nd</sup>? Motion fails, lack of second.

**Derris Jones:** Can I ask a question from the Division and maybe the Forest Service?

How many actual formal complaints, people actually calling and complaining about houndsmen on the La Sals, have we received this last year?

**Kevin Albrecht:** I'll take a stab at it first. We just recently had our annual meeting where we meet with the Division and that is one of the things we go over every year is what that is. Here a lot of these summer pursuit seasons come out of because of those conflicts that we have. About 4 years ago we had a tremendous amount but there wasn't a draw, there wasn't a limit and at that time, I know you are talking about the out-of-state tags that you see, at that time they were from all over the country. We had them from Georgia, we had them from North Carolina, and a lot of times they were here for two or three months. At that time it was a tremendous amount of conflict. But since they have gone to the draw and it is limited to five or so those numbers have really gone down. And so I know our district ranger, Mike Diem, spoke to the Division about that and they still had, he said, a limited number but it had really gone down since they put that summer season with a draw limiting the numbers.

**Charlie Tracy:** Is there a way we can get specific numbers?

**Derris Jones:** We need to start quantifying things so that we can—

**Guy Wallace:** We have been trying to do that between the Forest Service and our officers that are out working during those periods of time. I don't have the numbers with me but Kevin has stated it correctly is that the number of complaints that we have had has gone way down with the changes that we have implemented in the seasons and the restricted number of permits. It was, I mean, we had a pretty good volume of complaints prior to changing those seasons to get out of the fourth and 24<sup>th</sup> of July and plus restricting the numbers and they have gone down significantly. I can get the numbers and report them to you at another meeting but I don't have them right now.

**Charlie Tracy:** I would like to make one comment on this pursuit thing. You know when they did that over in Colorado and took that away the bears just went crazy population wise and production agriculture is taking that in the teeth big time. I mean even where I used to lease up there they have to hire one guy just to ride the ponds just to make sure to run the bears off because as the water gets low those steers get into the water and they will tag team on those steers and bring them down. They have figured that out. You kill those three and within a week three more come in and establish themselves as kind of the pond, if you will, and they do the same thing. I mean it is just devastating thing over there. And the thing of it is the bears are dying. They are going to get killed. It's just your, somebody else is doing it and its you know and then also the damage, it's just a great tool to keep those numbers down and it would just be devastating if we didn't allow baiting or hounds to do that because right here in Green River, the problems they have with bears on their melon patches and things like that and just around Monticello, we can't keep the bears out of the backyard and they hear a dog barking and they take off. It keeps them scared, kind of keeps them off.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Just hearing you speak, I'll address a couple of those things just from my personal opinion but to add to that, Guy talked about the low success rate on the spot-and-stalk only. The number of permits you would have to give to be able to increase is outrageous. Within this RAC we have seen so many times there is only a certain number of hunters you can have in the field and have success to where it goes the opposite direction. When you get that many in the field it just becomes too many and I think it is going to do the same. There just is a limited number of, a limited resource and our

population not just in Moab but in Utah is increasing as we increase those hunters to get that success the conflict is going to be one way or another.

**Charlie Tracy:** Well we are kind of getting and the other thing about it we start going down that slope of restricting certain entities completely that is a bad slope, anybody's liable to get restricted. I mean in Colorado it has happen a lot on the Grande Mesa they closed it down no motorized vehicles. They shut a lot of those roads down, where do they come? They came to us. We are traffic for four-wheelers has just quadrupled. I mean you can't ride, you can't push cows down a road without meeting half a dozen things or those machines in a mile. I mean they are just zoom, zoom, zoom, all day long. So it is just something we have got to learn to live with and get along with each other because we all use the land. Use that areas, whatever they are. And yeah there's going to be some wrecks once in a while I think. That is unavoidable but they, anyway.

**Kent Johnson:** I would like to speak to that a little bit. The comment and just what I have learned talking to wildlife biologists over the years and what I have learned from reading studies and stuff. The idea with managing any game population is we target specific animals in that population to manage the level. And with bears ideally you want to take adult males in order to keep a healthy population going and coursing with hounds or using bait are the two best ways to be specific about the animal you take. You can evaluate the animal and be very selective about the one you take so I think it is a good idea and a lot of the, I guess, the opposition to baiting is probably based in emotion because it sounds a lot like it's unfair but I have talked to a lot of people that have done it and I have read and called guides and stuff thinking about, you know, in North country Alaska or Canada you know going after griz someday myself but they say you know baiting is not a sure thing. It is far from a sure thing.

Years ago I use to trap and use bait to trap with and it is not a sure thing it's like a 20-30 percent success at best. And I don't expect that bear baiting is much better. And another comment I want to make about the Division's proposal to restricting and cutting up the summer pursuit season on the La Sals I think you know they are doing a good job there in trying to mitigate the conflicts with other recreation users and still allow the opportunity to train hounds and hunt up there where there is a large bear population and the ability to do it. And I think we ought to go with the Division's recommendations on that and see how that works out and let the Division and the Forest Service gather their data on conflict, you know, after we have had a few years of doing this as opposed to wide open and people from all over the country coming in and flooding the mountain. I could see where that I would agree with you that's just you know it would get bothersome and like Darrell said probably just a black eye for the houndsmen too makes them look bad and it, you know, there are bad actors in every group as far as the filthy camp sites. I've ran across them with people that are mountain bikers and people that are hikers and people that are hunters and horsemen and whatever else. There are bad actors in every group. That is just something that just has to be addressed, something that catches individuals and not target a specific group and it's these guys doing it because there are bad people in every group.

**Gerrish Willis:** So I have noticed the same influx of razors and ATVs and quad runners and all kinds of things and I think the word is out and I think we get to think, not the Grande Mesa road closure so much as the Utah travel counsel and in Moab the travel counsel there is really, really effective at selling Moab to all user groups. But I feel your

pain. I got the same one.

**Charlie Tracy:** I mean I use it too that way but I mean it's just that's what we have to deal with. We can kick and scream all we want but they have just as much right to be there as I do.

**Trisha Hedin:** Well and I mean it is great that we are looking at ourselves as a user group and looking at what we can do to mitigate it and maybe Kevin since you are with the Forest Service. You know the Forest Service needs to do what they can do in one place that I see with Moab is shuttle how many shuttles can you run to Burrow Pass a day? You know you can limit some other user groups I mean I think I don't even know how many shuttles run to Burrow Pass a day. Fifty? I have sat on that road running with cross country kids and I have had 50 shuttles pass. I mean it is just out of control so it's like user groups do need to limit themselves if you do have that ability, so we are limiting ourselves so but I you know.

**Kevin Albrecht:** You know the comment with that is good in that those special use permits that we have. That is one of the things that we monitor and can be limited. I don't have those numbers because I work on the North zone but I can get those numbers and I think it's a good comment, I will give that. I know that one of the things that is specifically limited down there is the number of guides and outfitters and special use permits and so that falls under one of those special use permits. But I'll get those numbers.

**Gerrish Willis:** Part of what Trisha is talking about is just not just mountain bikers but all the people that go up into the La Sals. And there's really there's no way the Forest Service is going to be able to control that. You can maybe control the number of special use permittees you have hauling bikers but what is going to happen this is you are going to have individual cars so instead of having 16 people in a van you're going to have 16 cars or you know carrying the same number of people. It's just there is no solution to it. But I think I know my motion didn't pass but I think you all really need to look at this pursuit hunt in the La Sals in the summer time because it's you know you are trying to avoid impacting a certain type of hunter from another type of hunter you know trying to protect their recreational experience going out on the hunt there is a whole lot more people in the La Sals that aren't hunters and aren't hunting than all the permits that you all sell. That is just an observation.

**Kevin Albrecht:** I can appreciate your comments, Gerrish. I think this is probably my last year on the RAC and one of the things that I probably learned is when you go to a zero policy or something that eliminates generally the RAC really backs off. But if you go to you know backing off numbers or a reduction, generally people will talk but anyways.

**Gerrish Willis:** I can appreciate that but if you notice I did not say no pursuit at all. I did not say no hounding at all. I said cut back the numbers a little bit by getting rid of those two summer pursuit seasons. Maybe I should have said half of one or three days of one. I don't know what the right number is.

**Kevin Albrecht:** So we have had a lot of discussion, especially on recreation. But I'll kind of steer us back in and maybe to get you thinking about some motions.

**Derris Jones:** One last comment before we head that direction. With the study you have got going between the San Juan and the La Sals as far as five permits on the La Sals and 15 permits on the San Juan and going to flip flop them, what we are talking about is

going to triple the problem on the La Sals in the future. What year are you thinking of flip flopping those permits?

**Guy Wallace:** It'll be 2018.

**Derris Jones:** So this year after this next one.

**Guy Wallace:** Yeah, cause these recommendations are for 2017. And then it'll be the year after that.

**Derris Jones:** Good thing we are all going to be gone next year. I would strongly recommend the Division incorporate the complaint program into the study you are doing so that you can kind of give you some idea of what the complaint problem is with five permits vs what the problem is going to be with 15 permits so maybe you know about where to put it at the end of the study.

**Guy Wallace:** And since we have started this, like I said, this is the second year we have done this started this. We have but this last year there were so few complaints, you know, it was very minimal number of complaints. And you know every year is different like I said before and we may come into a bad year where food conditions are tough and we may see whole different circumstance go on. But yeah that is a good comment and I agree and that's what we are hoping to do by changing that and hopefully having it during a long enough duration so that we can catch that and not all just be dependent on annual conditions.

**Derris Jones:** Although if we are measuring complaints from recreation users I can't imagine it being much different based on bear food availability unless they start eating recreationists.

**Guy Wallace:** Well we have had more complaints in campgrounds during bad years.

**Keith Brady:** I was going to say I have some questions regarding some of the comments that have come up. One of them comes from Cody where he says on the Book Cliffs he hasn't been seeing the bears. It was mentioned the growth population of the bears was about 4 percent and it looks like it is slowing but we have an increase of tags overall and I was just wondering why that is. Do you want the growth at 4 percent? Do you want it greater than that? And you said there is indication that it is slowing so why is there more tags?

**Darren DeBloois:** Right so those estimates are based on a statewide picture, and primarily on our denning information. And so but then when we get to the tag issuing level we are talking about unit by unit and so it will depend what is going on on a particular unit, how those permits shake out. So overall, we have a growing bear population and we see an increase, but you will have to look at each of your individual units to see and I think quite a few of those are in this region right? And that is all based on those three management regimes that I have pointed out in the plan.

**Keith Brady:** Like Trisha said we need to maybe look at the Book Cliffs according to people that are on the ground seeing, not seeing the numbers that maybe are being reported.

**Darren DeBloois:** The Book Cliffs stayed the same. Our denning data my understanding is they did see cubs in the dens. They are comfortable there is still some growth going on. With the bears they have collared there. They are cautious and obviously we manage to the plan and we are concerned if we feel like there are issues so we are responsive to that. The other thing to bear in mind is that we issue we are managing based on a three-year average as well. So we will look at that. Hope that helps.



**Keith Brady:** I guess the second comment I have is when Darrell mentioned like 30 dogs hounding one bear is there a this is my ignorance on hounding but is there a restriction on the amount of hounds that can be used in pursuit? Should there be? Because 30 does seem excessive but I was thinking more like five but again that is my ignorance I don't know how many.

**Kevin Albrecht:** The summer is eight.

**Keith Brady:** That seems a little ridiculous.

**Darrell Mecham:** That is training time. That is hound hell week.

**Keith Brady:** That's training time, that's what that is?

**Gerrish Willis:** Kevin, I would like to make another motion based on that information that there be a limit put on all pursuit hunts of a magic number—three dogs, two dogs, one dog, seven dogs.

**Keith Brady:** Is there any way we can hear from the houndsman about the restriction of dogs during pursuit season?

**Kevin Albrecht:** Well real quick while we, we have a motion on the table, I think one of the things is I know the Division, when you start separating between mountain ranges and different numbers it is really confusing so if you are going to make a motion I would recommend it be consistent across the board. I don't know that is what you are looking for but if not I know it makes it very extremely difficult for law enforcement to enforce when one mountain is different than another.

**Gerrish Willis:** I was just saying statewide.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Will you restate your motion?

**Gerrish Willis:** So my motion would be that the number of dogs allowed per permit be consistent in all the pursuit hunts.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Okay and what is that number?

**Gerrish Willis:** Well I think it's eight, eight in the summer.

**Kevin Albrecht:** And you would make that for all seasons?

**Gerrish Willis:** Yes.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Are there any questions on the motion?

**Darrell Mecham:** I'd like to just cause I'm conservative when it comes to this so you really should look at me, maybe bring Guy up who does a lot of hunting with a lot of people and maybe he can give you an idea of numbers because I know I will be lower than the average person.

**Keith Brady:** I was going to suggest that too with his motion I am not opposed to it but I would like to hear from the houndsmen on what they think the restriction should be

**Darrell Mecham:** Exactly, I'd rather have more of an average than what I do cause I use less.

**Guy Webster:** Do you want me to come up? I'll try to address it. This is going to be a two-part thing. When you restrict the summer permits that's why they went to eight because what you have done you have caused a problem. When you restrict it down to a certain number of people one person will draw a tag. Then he is going to try and have seven of his buddies try and run their dog or two dogs with that tag, so in essence, limiting your summer pursuit tags on the La Sals didn't do shit. I mean if you just want to be blunt it didn't accomplish what they wanted to do. That is why they have limited it to eight dogs to try to minimize that. The problem you have got is it's law enforcement nightmare. You may have one guy that turns loose dogs and another guy who turns loose

dogs and they end up on the same bear same canyon. They may you may end up having more dogs. There are definitely some groups that decide they are going to dump every dog they have. It is unfortunate, it is a black eye, and me as the Houndsmen Association, I address that with our members constantly. Granted there are a lot of people out there with hounds that aren't a part of the association and don't really care. But they are also the ones out poaching elk, poaching deer and doing a lot of other things. So putting a number on it I'm a little bit questionable about that. You know, trying to train dogs, raise pups, you may turn loose a dozen dogs but you may only end up with 4 dogs at the tree. Not uncommon whatsoever because not every dog is going to make it. And the ledges especially here on the Book Cliffs. This last year we have been running 12 dogs but half of them dogs aren't making it they are young dogs, but you also come in and you end up with dogs poisoned you end up with dogs trapped I mean Darrell had three out of his four hounds caught in snares this week. Was very fortunate he didn't lose three out of his four hounds this week. I have lost dogs, I have lost several to poison and you can go from a good strong pack to nothing overnight and stuff. So I am going to say a dozen. That may sound like a bunch but in reality it's not and if you try to restrict less than that you're not going to get compliance. And so you know I am real hesitant to try and say a number because I speak on my own and stuff but not the others but as a group, I just mentioned to my son, there's definitely going an email as soon as I walk out of here saying with what you are bringing up on the La Sals, you guys had better start watching what they are going to do or they are going to lose it. And that has been a drum I have been beating for a long time. And stuff but that is part of what you are doing with limited entry and restricting the permits and it is unfortunate repercussion of what has happened.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Thanks Guy. So we had comment so we have got a motion on the table. Are you good with your motion. Do you have that?

**Gerrish Willis:** Can we restate it?

**Trisha Hedin:** Yeah restate it.

**Gerrish Willis:** So the motion would be to limit the number of hounds per permit and pursuit hunts state wide to in all hunts to 8.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Do we have a second on the motion? Motion fails due to lack of a second.

**Trisha Hedin:** I'll restate that same motion but I am going to go with a dozen.

**Kevin Albrecht:** We've got a motion by Trisha to have all seasons with a limit of 12 dogs per permit statewide for all seasons.

**Todd Huntington:** Including the summer that's now eight?

**Trisha Hedin:** Excluding the summer. I'll exclude the summer and leave that at eight.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Leave it at eight and the others would be 12.

**Trisha Hedin:** Because there's obviously a reason they put that in there.

**Chris Micoz:** I'll second that.

## **VOTING**

**Motion was made by Gerrish Willis to eliminate the two restricted black bear summer pursuit seasons on the La Sal unit**

**Motion failed for lack of a second**

**Motion was made by Gerrish Willis to limit the number of hounds allowed per**

**pursuit permit holder to eight hounds for all seasons, applied statewide.**

**Motion failed for lack of a second**

**Motion made by Trisha Hedin to limit the number of hounds allowed per pursuit permit holder to 12 hounds for all seasons except summer seasons, which will remain at eight, applied statewide**

**Seconded by Chris Micoz**

**Motion passed with four opposed (Darrell Mecham, Charlie Tracy, Todd Huntington, Carl Ivory)**

**Motion was made by Charlie Tracy to change the fall black bear limited-entry season on the Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South unit to Aug. 12 to Sept. 25 and Oct. 28 to Nov. 16, consistent with the La Sal and San Juan units**

**Seconded by Kent Johnson**

**Motion passed with four opposed (Gerrish Willis, Carl Ivory, Todd Huntington, Chris Micoz)**

**Motion was made by Charlie Tracy to accept the remaining 2017 black bear recommendations and rule amendments as presented**

**Seconded by Darrel Mecham**

**Motion passed with one opposed (Gerrish Willis)**

**7) Private Pond Rule Amendments- R657-59**

**-Randy Oplinger, Coldwater Sport Fisheries Program Coordinator**

**Questions from the RAC**

**Kevin Albrecht:** Questions from the RAC?

**Kent Johnson:** Yeah I have a question on this registration that the industry asked for a lifetime COR but the Division wants them to re-apply. Why not just go to a five-year review on it rather than go through the application procedure all over again?

**Randy Oplinger:** You know that is more or less what we are going for. I think the first time a pond owner applies for a certificate of registration there is a bit of a process behind it. We have to look at the pond, look at screens, if it is located on natural stream channels stuff like that, more or less after that after that five-year period when it lapses, it is more of a paperwork thing, they just have to file the paperwork and we will quickly review it and then reissue it. You know it may not be a lifetime thing because again there might be changes in the landscape or scientific knowledge that might make us want to not re-issue that COR but from the pond owner perspective that second application isn't more than filling out their name address phone number on a piece of paper and submitting it back to the Division.

**Gerrish Willis:** I have a question, too. When they introduce sterile fish is it 100 percent guaranteed that every single fish is sterile, I mean how effective is the sterilization process?

**Randy Oplinger:** To be honest with you on that, it is a very effective process but it is not

100 percent. You know, typically a business or the Division of Wildlife we go through the same thing you know we are producing thousands and thousands of fish and we are testing a subsample of those fish and very often we are saying 99 or 100 percent of those fish are sterile, but again, that is a subsample of those fish and if you are stocking thousands and thousands of fish at that rate, odds are there are a few fish that didn't get sterilized in the process that it takes to sterilize them. It is very effective but it is not perfect is the answer.

**Charlie Tracy:** So if you've got a pond that is fed by a well or irrigation ditch and you stock it, you don't know, you still don't—I guess what is a natural waterway? I mean, okay how do I say that? You take water out of a natural waterway like an irrigation ditch, fill your pond, but it doesn't really have an outlet, you don't have to have a COR there right? Am I understanding that correctly?

**Randy Oplinger:** Probably not in that situation. Again you know unfortunately the definition of a natural stream channel is way beyond us. It's actually more of a Supreme Court kind of issue and it is something that is being heavily debated but you know a lot of it is kind of judgement. You know if it is obvious that it is not a natural stream channel and we don't have to worry about fish potentially escaping into a public waterway then you know we are going to treat that as not being a natural stream channel.

**Charlie Tracy:** Are you going to build the screens or are we, does the pond owner have to?

**Randy Oplinger:** That is the responsibility of the pond owner. One thing that the Division does is you know it's not our goal to turn people down for these CORs we want people to have the opportunity to stock fish on their private properties if they want to have fish. And there is a lot of innovative ways to screen a pond and we definitely work with pond owners to come up with something that is inexpensive and reasonable. You know you might see some of our fish screening projects on huge rivers that are very elaborate and cost hundreds of thousands of dollars you know we are not asking pond owners we are asking for very simple steps to prevent fish from escaping.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Is that all the questions from the RAC?

### **Questions from the Public**

**No questions from the Public**

### **Comments from the Public**

**Robert Judd:** My name is Robert Judd. I am with the Utah Aquaculture Association. I am actually their president at the moment. First off I would just like to say that we would like to thank the Division of Wildlife for working with us and trying to reduce some of the redundancy with the rule and to try and streamline some of the requirements for the rule. We have been working with them for well over a year just on this rule alone trying to get where we are at at this point so we do support the majority of this rule. However, with any rule there are certain aspects that we have some issues with and umm I would just like to address a couple of those.

The first one is at the end of the rule it talks about institutional aquaculture which is basically your school systems so in order for a school to, say, buy some fish, they first

are required by the Division to get a certificate of registration before they can purchase a fish. What we are recommending is that rule or that section of the rule be eliminated and that they fall into the rule like everybody else if they meet those certain requirements then they should be allowed to stock their fish without a COR. And Randy if I could, can you pull up that flow chart again. The second one. That one right there. Okay so that is our first proposal that we amend that so we eliminate that so we aren't taxing our school systems more than we already are. I mean we have a hard time funding our school system anyway.

The second one that we would like to propose if you would look up here on the rule, it says you cannot stock on a natural stream channel and the issue that we have is everybody trying to decide what is or isn't a stream channel. For example for the gentleman that just asked if his pond was a stream channel, well if I have somebody that calls me and I am trying to define whether it is a stream channel or not, it is dependent on your definition, and my definition, and the Division's definition and we could all three have different definitions of what that is a stream channel or not. What we would like to propose is that you eliminate No. 1 that says not located on a natural stream channel and what we would like to propose is that you actually define where you can stock fish. And our proposal is that you if the water originates on private property, so No. 1, eliminate that and say if the water originates on private property, has the screens on the inlet outlet, and the fish are the desired fish, then you should be able to stock those fish without a COR. If those three things are not met, then it would go to the other criteria. We have also added one more criteria, No. 4, which would be that that water that originates on that private land is not currently being managed by the Division for native species or restoration in some way. And that is our proposed rule amendments to the rule but overall as a whole we do agree with the rule and we would just like to see those few changes looked at.

**Kevin Albrecht:** Okay thank you. Any other comments from the public? Yeah, please state your name again.

**Pam Hackley:** Thank you Mr. Chair, my name is Pam Hackley. I am just sitting here, I did not prepare to have a comment on here but one thought that did occur to me to maybe get around the idea of trying to define what a natural stream channel is, and I understand that because I am a retired wetland specialist, would be to put into the mix of the decision making as to what potential waters are going where that water in this private pond could go and whether it would have a potential impact for disease or you know fish that you didn't want going into a particular waterway. So you are getting out of the whole idea of looking at what is a natural stream channel, you are looking at where the target you are trying to avoid a problem. Thanks.

### **RAC Discussion**

**Kevin Albrecht:** Comments from the RAC?

**Kent Johnson:** I have one comment in that the gentleman referred to the water originating on private property that would be a bad idea cause that would restrict you to using a well. Most irrigation water doesn't originate on the private property. You have shares to use the water but it originates someplace else, comes out of a river a creek or whatever. In the case of the Wasatch Front most of it comes out of Strawberry Reservoir.

**Kevin Albrecht:** So I think the answer is that if it does that you still have an opportunity you just have to have a COR but if it originates on you then you don't. Is that right?

**Robert Jud:** It actually is that if the water is diverted from a natural stream channel to, say, like an irrigation pond that you then irrigate out of that would still fall under this side of the rule and you would still be able to stock, it would just be that if it doesn't meet the screening requirements that sort of thing. Okay? And as far as a spring, most of the people we stock fish to probably 80 to 90 percent of where we stock fish are somebody who has land they have a small spring they want to be able to put fish on that water before it moves off their property and that is what we are asking for. It is not to eliminate people from the opportunities to have diverted water and still stock into a pond. We said originating water so that way we are not trying to define what one person classifies as a spring or one person classifies as a stream. If it originates on your land then you should be able to use it.

**Derris Jones:** Being as I don't know anything about aquaculture could maybe Randy give us a reason why the Division didn't go along with the aquacultures' recommendations?

**Randy Oplinger:** Yeah, first I will address the natural stream channel issue. I see the point that they are making on water originating on a private landowner's property. The only issue is that water terminates somewhere and because that water ends up terminating somewhere it terminates into a natural stream of some sort and we have to be considerate of what is going down stream and possible escapement of those fish into our natural waterways so you know you would expect under that proposal half the problem because the water is originating on their property so there maybe isn't managed fisheries or many fisheries concerns upstream of that pond but there still is a downstream portion that we need to be worried about. Again you know really from the Division's perspective, we are just asking for the opportunity to evaluate these ponds. We don't want to turn people down we want people to have the opportunity to stock fish but we need to evaluate on a case by case basis and work with pond owners to be sure there aren't going to be any issues with native fish with the stocking of those fish.

**Kevin Albrecht:** So with your proposal, they just have to go through that process and it has to be looked at but it doesn't mean this proposal is saying they can't it just has to go through the COR process.

**Randy Oplinger:** That is absolutely right. We are not saying they can't have fish whatsoever we are just asking for the opportunity to review it and send it through the COR process.

**Derris Jones:** What about the school issue he brought up?

**Randy Oplinger:** The school issue it makes complete sense what he is saying. The only issue is really, and this is outside of the Division of Wildlife authority, but really it pertains to disease testing which is the Department of Agriculture and more or less in order for an institutional aquaculture facility to actually stock their fish they would have to go through the same disease testing requirements as any other aquaculture facility in the state. And that would be probably pretty problematic for institutional aquaculture because they are raising very small numbers of fish and we have to sacrifice fish for that disease testing so you would be sacrificing probably the majority of the fish they are raising to actually perform that disease testing and stalk them. So really under the current rules and what we are proposing is just having certificate of registrations so we can

document the existence of the aquaculture facilities so these institutional aquaculture facilities uhh just really from the perspective so we know who is raising fish and that kind of thing in the state.

**Charlie Tracy:** So you wouldn't hold them to those disease requirements is that what you are saying?

**Randy Oplinger:** They are still held to the disease requirements. In most cases they are probably not going to stock their fish in the end what they are really looking for is, again, this is schools they are looking for the opportunity to raise the fish for the education perspective of you know teaching animal husbandry to students and less the stocking end of things and the disease requirements don't pertain unless they stock the fish in the end.

**Charlie Tracy:** If they take them out of there and they go somewhere else is what you are saying?

**Randy Oplinger:** Yeah, if they have to go somewhere else that is when the disease testing requirements really kick in, but if they are just going to keep them in the classroom, rear them, show kids how to raise fish let them naturally die in the classroom or whatever you know that gets around the disease testing requirements. But again, we do request a certificate of registration just so we know what facilities are present and a lot of that is just if fish are showing up in the wild that don't belong in the wild we can have an idea of where they're coming from if a classroom did perhaps stock them when they weren't supposed to stock them.

**Gerrish Willis:** I've got a question for you. So how about, what would happen if the pond was located on a natural stream channel and did not have screens on both inlet and outlet and they requested a certificate. As a condition of the certificate, would you make them put screens on potentially?

**Randy Oplinger:** Potentially not, this is where we are kind of looking at a situational kind of thing. If it's really located in a situation where we have absolutely no native fish concerns within the watershed we may look at that and decide that that could be a place they could stock with a certificate of registration, even on the natural stream channel even without screens on the inlet and outlet structure.

**Robert Jud:** Can I address his question? So on the institutional aquaculture the thing with the institutional aquaculture you are only asking for the COR or the right to be able to have the fish. Whether they stock the fish or all that, that can all be done in what they call a fish health policy rule, a board where they can determine whether they can or can't stock those fish out. All we are saying is why tax the school system just to be able to purchase the fish and that what we are trying to get at. And as far as on the screening or the natural stream channel the issue that we run into is that I don't know how to define a natural stream channel, other people don't know how to define a stream channel, we are just trying to make it easy for somebody who calls up and asks, "Can I buy fish?" we can tell them if you meet these requirements you can buy those fish. If you don't meet those three, those four requirements then yes check with the Division, let them come out and inspect your facility. All we are asking for is an easier way for somebody to identify whether they need to contact the Division or not.

## **VOTING**

**A motion was made by Derris Jones to accept item No. 7, private pond rule amendments, as presented.**

**Seconded by Gerrish Willis.**

**Motion passed unanimously (Trisha Hedin had left the meeting prior to vote, and Gerrish Willis left after the vote on item No. 7).**

**8) AIS Rule Amendments- R657-60**

**-Jordon Detlor, Aquatic Invasive Species Biologist**

**Questions from the RAC**

No questions from the RAC

**Questions from the Public**

No questions from the public

**Comments from the Public**

No comments from the public

**RAC discussion**

**Motion made by Charlie Tracy item No. 8, AIS rule amendments, as presented.**

**Seconded by Carl Ivory.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**9) R657-38 Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments**

**-Bryan Christensen, Dedicated Hunter Coordinator**

**Questions from the RAC**

**Todd Huntington:** Brian can you refresh my memory on the how the service hour requirements work for each year and to get the different permits? So for example, in the first year how many hours do I need to do before I can get a permit, second etc.?

**Bryan Christensen:** Right, so the first year we actually don't require any hours to be done to get your first permit. We do require the educational course which is the conservation ethics and essentially the hunting license portion to apply. So that is all you have to do the beauty of that you draw, you find out in May or June and then you are hoping to go hunting in August so you don't have to scramble to get those hours done. So zero hours first year. A minimum of 16 by the time you want your second permit or the second year and then the full 32 before we can print your 3<sup>rd</sup> year permit.

**Chris Micoz:** How much is it for them to purchase their hours?

**Bryan Christensen:** We have set that at a \$20 per hour.

**Chris Micoz:** And does that money go back into the projects that the dedicated hunters do?

**Bryan Christensen:** Not directly. We receive donations and those donations do go



directly into projects typically, but the money we receive for purchased hours directly goes to the Division's restricted fund which generally can be used for any purpose the Director's Office prescribes. But I can tell you that there are six of us that run this program and it does cover much of the wages for personnel to run the program and other things. So it goes to the Division for Division purposes.

**Todd Huntington:** Bryan another question I just thought of. On somebody that has umm they obtain their tag with no hours and they harvest a deer, they do 16 hours get their second tag, harvest another deer. What is the mechanism to make sure or force them to get those other 16 hours done?

**Bryan Christensen:** Right, that is a good question. If they disappear after getting those two deer and only 16 hours they will find out. We will notify them they still have an obligation to complete and then if they ignore that and they try to apply for anything, can be a turkey, bear, cougar, big game, there is a big thing that comes up on their screen that says you need to call the Division. It doesn't let them until they clear that.

**Kevin Albrecht:** It used to be that the dedicated hunters had to attend a RAC meeting and I know that they took that away. But I am curious, is there any discussion to allowing dedicated hunters to get hours for RAC attendance for that hour or two hours?

**Bryan Christensen:** That has been brought up Kevin, and we have considered it, we consider all suggestions that come. We are not in favor of it for attending the RAC for a couple of reasons. One we do feel that dedicated hunters ought to be the ones that are vocal and present and part of their role as dedicated hunters being involved as stewards with conservation projects is being here as well. So that should just be innate. You know it should be part of what they do. Maybe moreover than that we would hate to do what I call stacking the deck. If we offer dedicated hunters credit to be here, you may have participation that isn't necessarily isn't the best kind of participation. It is rewarded to be here but the input you get might not be the kind of input you want. So it especially if it is for waterfowl RAC meeting you know these are deer hunters, do you want a whole bunch of deer hunters at a waterfowl meeting? Maybe, but maybe not, depending on what they have to say.

**Kevin Albrecht:** I think that those are great comments. The reason I brought it up is the RAC is an eight-year term and a lot of times there is quite a process to learn all of the things to be an effective RAC member and be able to understand those rules and the reason I bring that up is you are right in that dedicated hunters are deer hunters and they are one specific pool, but would should be a nice to be able to inform our public of all those processes not just deer but waterfowl and all those things so that is why I ask you that question.

### **Questions from the Public**

No questions from the public

### **Comments from the Public**

No comments from the public

### **RAC discussion**

No comments from the RAC

**VOTING**

**Motion made by Kent Johnson to accept item No. 9, dedicated hunter rule amendments, as presented.**

**Seconded by Chris Micoz**

**Motion passed unanimously**

**Adjournment**

**The meeting adjourned at 9:24 p.m.**

**The next Wildlife Board meeting will take place on Jan. 3, 2017, at 9 a.m. in the DNR Board Room, 1594 W. North Temple, Salt Lake City.**

**The next SER RAC meeting will take place on April 5, 2017, at 6:30 p.m. at the John Wesley Powell Museum in Green River.**

**NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY OF MOTIONS**  
**Utah Wildlife Resources Office, 318 N Vernal Avenue, Vernal**  
**December 15, 2016**

**UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:**

Ben Williams, NER Habitat Biologist  
Tory Mathis, NER Habitat Restoration Bio  
Pat Rainbolt, NER Assistant Habitat Manager  
Miles Hanberg, NER Habitat Manager  
Bryan Clyde, NER Sergeant  
Tonya Kieffer, NER Outreach Manager  
Marcia Keddy, NER Support Svc Coordinator  
Rori Shafer, NER Office Manager  
Dax Mangus, NER Wildlife Biologist  
Trina Hedrick, NER Aquatics Manager  
Randall Thacker, NER Wildlife Biologist  
Clint Sampson, NER Wildlife Biologist  
Rich Gibbs, NER Aquatics Biologist  
Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program Coordinator  
Nathan Owens, Aquatic Invasive Species Program Coordinator  
Bryan Christensen, Dedicated Hunter Coordinator  
Randy Oplinger, Coldwater Sport Fisheries Program Coordinator  
Darin Debloois, Wildlife Biologist

**NER RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Brett Prevedel, Public At-Large  
Melissa Wardle, Non-consumptive  
Mitch Hacking, Agriculture  
Andrea Merrell, Non-consumptive  
Randy Dearth, NER RAC Chair  
Joe Arnold, Public At-Large  
David Gordon, BLM  
Joe Batty, Agriculture  
Dan Abeyta, Forest Service

**NER RAC MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

Daniel Davis, Sportsmen  
Jerry Jorgensen, Elected Official

- **WELCOME, RAC INTRODUCTION** – Randy Dearth  
Welcome all those attending and introduced members of the RAC. Went over the RAC process and how it will run.
- **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Randy Dearth

**MOTION** to approve minutes

Brett Prevedel  
David Gordon, second  
Passed Unanimously

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA** – Randy Dearth

**MOTION** to approve agenda

Joe Batty

Melissa Wardle, second

Passed Unanimously

- **WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING UPDATE – Randy Dearth**

Director Sheehan mentioned that prairie dog hunting is a concern with using lead bullets and there was discussion requiring the hunters to pick up the carcass but because of the plague that was not a good idea. As of now nothing has been decided. With the Elk unit plan revisions, cattlemen had concerns with wildlife and the amount of feed that is available for both livestock and Wildlife. That was passed as the Division presented. BBOIL season dates and timelines were proposed but the proposal for the 7 day archery extension was taken out and not passed. UBA wanted 6 additional hunts and got 2 that passed. The goat hunt on North Slope, South Slope and Uintah. And a Bison hunt on the Henrys passed as part of that topic. Archery only. The preference point system amendments proposal passed as presented. NER deer unit management plans passed as presented by the Division. CWMU plan passed as long as operators in deer creek area come and prove to the Division that public hunters are happy and satisfied. LO association numbers passed as presented unanimously.

- **REGIONAL UPDATE – Boyde Blackwell**

A lot of you have heard about the awesome habitat section. I've asked them tonight to come and give a presentation on what we have done in the last year.

Introduction of Miles Hanberg and the habitat staff.

Miles Hanberg: Review of what the habitat section does with a brief overview

The first is improvement of habitat. The second is that we own a fair amount of land that we manage. And the third is a fair amount of impact analysis. We have completed 150,000 acres through partnerships of federal and private land managers, a lot of that is completed through or WRI program. We also are part of the fire rehab projects. Like the Taylor mountain rehab. This was to do something to sustain wildlife in future. Guzzler work, we have 195 in this region for big game. We have developed 30 this year which is about 40,000 gallons of water. In this region we have 27 Wildlife Management Areas. That's about 168,798 acres. It is scattered from the Fruitland area to the Colorado line. The largest WMA is Tabby Mountain. With 46,000 acres, which is a big piece of property we manage. Tabby Mountain was acquired thru mitigation projects. We are recently working with Oil and gas developments, especially with the large transmission lines that come thru the area. Highways are always an

issue. We are working with UDOT in the area west of Duchesne and more wildlife mitigation to help with accidents. Introduction to habitat staff for slide show.

Tory Mathis  
Pat Rainbolt  
Ben Williams

Tory Mathis  
See slideshow

Introduction to Watershed Restoration Initiative website. [Wri.utah.gov](http://Wri.utah.gov)

Pat Rainbolt  
See slideshow

Jesse McKee: Is there certain specs on fencing? On the pipe and cable is there spacing done for elk and is there barbless wire? Is there break points or barbless wire?

Pat Rainbolt: There has been research done on wildlife friendly designs, 42 inch smooth wire on top and bottom of a lot of our fencing. We have hundreds of miles so when we improve we go with the design. There are also 6" to 8" spacing so legs don't get caught up in it. We do a lot of projects in house but our larger projects are contracted out.

Jesse McKee: In the future we could help out and do it more cost efficient especially with our cows being out there this is something we could assist with in that.

Ben Williams  
See slide show

Boyde Blackwell: That's my habitat section, I'm really proud of that group and they do a lot of hard work. I really appreciate what they do.

- **WATERFOWL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RULE AMENDMENTS – 2017**  
Blair Stringham

See slide show

**Questions from the RAC:**

Mitch Hacking: Have you noticed that we had any inclinations that cranes are effecting geese hunting or migration?

Blair Stringham: We really haven't seen any impact. Really the change is the increase in number of cranes here.

Mitch Hacking: We used to have pretty good goose hunts but now the geese won't come in.

Blair Stringham: We are not aware of any documented problems.

Mitch Hacking: They are so thick in there and so heavy the geese have quit us. There is a lot of concern by the green river. We used to have a few hundred and now thousands.

Blair Stringham: There is a concern in the Basin but we have put measures forward to haze them.

Mitch Hacking: How many years does it take to draw a crane tag?

Blair Stringham: Two to three years. One of the challenges out here is finding areas to hunt. You could leave your info and we could refer people to you.

Joe Batty: How many crane tags in this area? Does this area have a specified amount or is there just a number for the whole state?

Blair Stringham: Ya, the number changes each year but it's based upon a three year count. Depending on the population we get a certain number of permits. We distribute those through four areas in the state that is where we are seeing problems.

Joe Batty: So the last 5 years are the tags more or less in the Basin?

Blair Stringham: It's been about the same. A lot of the crane population is raised in the northern part of the state. Here we don't see a lot raised but they stop here when moving south. We have to structure permits according to need.

Joe Batty: We do have a number here during spring time and they will eat the Certificate of Registration seed right out of the rows. I don't know how those numbers are structured but I would really like to see more tags in this area.

Joe Arnold: The pintail numbers, what do you attribute that to?

Blair Stringham: They tend to move around a lot in the breeding areas. It could be a survey related issue but that population has not responded to habitat conditions like other populations.

Joe batty: According to the rule on the swan. Division shall issue no more permits than authorized by USFW Service each year. There's not the same rule for the Sand hill crane language.

Blair Stringham: The swan permits come from a lawsuit. We can only issue 2000 permits. The cranes are based on the three year average based on the population. That number fluctuates each year with the intent keeping around 17,000 to 21,000 cranes.

Dan Abeyta arrived

Joe Batty: So is that monitored by flyway and not regionally?

Blair Stringham: Yes, It's done through the flyway process. I try to get as much feedback from the state. And give our input for Utah to meet our needs. Eight states have to work with a management plan.

Mitch Hacking: I hear other states get more permits than we do, is that true?

Blair Stringham: Allocation is based on breeding and habitat. We get 12 percent of the allocation because we don't have a lot that are breeding here or wintering here. We are a staging area state.

Mitch Hacking: You've got a cap on permits and other states are getting them all.

Blair Stringham: Ya, but it's based on the fact they have the cranes longer than we do. Wyoming has them from April to September. We see them in October. Most are gone in November but they are staying here longer.

Mitch Hacking: They are not getting hunted and they are getting domesticated.

Blair Stringham: It's really just a recent development maybe last 5 yrs that we have seen more and more.

**Questions by the Public:**

John Snow: Cranes are still here in full number. I have estimates for myself and another farmer's losses for last year and last spring. See attached written document

**Comments by the Public:**

None

**Comments by the RAC:**

Brett Prevedel: Do the other areas throughout the state have concerns about depredation or is it just here?

Blair Stringham: Primarily in Cache county but it does occur in all areas.

Randy Dearth: What would happen if the RAC made a motion to have the division look more into this in detail for tags here? Seems like we do have a pretty good issue here. Is that something that would help us?

Blair Stringham: Yes it would depend specifically what you were asking for. We could look at different measures for depredation permits. Upland game will be where to do that recommendation.

Mitch Hacking: Could we get a few landowners together and would you be the man to meet with, and Boyde. We could get together and have a meeting with these folks. A good way to get the process started so they know we are serious about this.

Randy Dearth: I think he is right lets save motion for upland game RAC meeting.

**MOTION** to accept the Divisions recommendations as presented

David Gordon

Andrea Merrell, second

Passed unanimously

- **2017 BLACK BEAR RECOMMENDATIONS AND RULE AMMENDMENTS**

Darin Debloois

See handout

**Questions from the RAC:**



Brett Prevedel: Do you have the harvest data for Book Cliffs? Where in liberal?

Randall Thacker: The roadless is light and the regular Book Cliffs is moderate.

Clint Sampson: We can go thru hunt structure. Spring hound hunt we give out most permits. We harvested 15 bores and 2 females. Overall it's 59% success rate which was the highest success of the 4 hunts. Summer hunt was 9 permits, harvested 1 bore and 1 sow which were a 22% success rate on that hunt. Early fall archery only issued 7 permits and no bears harvested which was surprising for that time of year. Late fall hounds only 1 sow no bores for 17 percent success rate. Add all up total percent success was 25%.

Mitch Hacking: What was the bait hunt success rate in June?

Clint Sampson: 22%

Mitch Hacking: The concern I have is I'm familiar with South Slope Diamond and in April with higher country you can't get to in June. A normal year you can get to upper country. Is there a reason why the tags are allocated that way?

Clint Sampson: Yes, I want a certain amount of bears taken so we look at which one has the higher success rate and look at whose killing bears.

Mitch Hacking: So these are all pretty much harvest objective then.

Clint Sampson: We put these numbers together with a plan not all harvest object. We give out a limited number of tags.

Mitch Hacking: None of the higher country can be hunted because they can't get up there. You give more to hounds men because of the higher success rate. The bait starts in June.

Randy Dearth: It's more towards objective of harvest, the amount of bears you'd like to see and the distribution of how you would like to see them killed. That's why you are giving them the way they are.

Dax Mangus: You are talking about the Vernal Diamond. Success rates are different unit to unit. It's a social decision. We have decide what is an acceptable harvest based on our management plan. Across the South Slope access is limited during the early parts of the year.

Boyde Blackwell: They have bait and early hunts when access is very limited to protect sows with cubs. Bait hunts give archers more opportunity to be more selective so they do limit the permits at that time of year for protection.

Dan Abeyta: The 4% growth that was state wide? It looks like there was a slide. Is that over the last 5 years?

Darin Debloois: That is based on our denning activities and we have been doing that for the last 8 years across the state. We have to pool the data and it may vary depending on the unit year to year.

Dan Abeyta: Is that on a 12 year management plan? And is it reviewed every 3 yrs?

Darin Debloois: Yes and it is up for review next year to evaluate targets.

Randy Dearth: Utah hounds men association, you have probably seen their proposal letter what would you like to see with them moving the date of the Book Cliff in line with the LaSal date, what do you think of that?

Darin Debloois: The Southeast Region actually changed those dates last night. The reason dates are the way they are is this is a people management strategy. You're going to have a lot of people on the mountain in a small area at once. The region wants to avoid putting hounds men on top of Limited Entry hunters who burnt bonus points and some once in a life time elk hunters.

Randy Dearth: What are the complications with the impacts on the proposal?

Clint Sampson: In the past we have had several complaints. Big game hunters, deer and elk, that are sitting at water holes and drainages and here came a pack of hounds and blew the animals away. On elk hunting, if you hunt hard and maybe have one or two chances at a trophy elk and if one of those chances was taken away it creates conflict so we came up with the archery only hunt for bear to spread the wealth. We spread the tags out and give hounds man a good solid time to hunt. We took this as a challenge to make things better and listen to public that way.

Brett Prevedel: What do they do in San Juan and do they just allow it?

Clint Sampson: They just allow it. They moved that date to Oct 2 which allows them to hunt before the spike hunt. Which is a whole week.

Darin Debloois: In the SE they tried to move that hunt and go earlier. They put this thru the RAC process. But it is a bit of an adjustment with no hounds.

David Gordon: SE changed dates? What are the dates?

Darin Debloois: It's the same as San Juan, August 19 to Sep 25 and then again the 28 to the 16. That is the only RAC that has made a recommendation.

Randy Dearth: Houndsmen Association wanted to move the pursuit tags to the same numbers as the la al and San Juan. Are they the same and what is the impact there?

Darin Debloois: The tag distribution is conducting an experiment. There are concerns with all the bears they are pushing in lower areas and in town so they are adjusting pressure to protect movements and next year they will flip that to see if they can detect a change.

Randy Dearth: La Sal is light and San Juan is heavy.

Brett Prevedel: Summer pursuit season, what impact does that have on bears. I've heard that the dogs are hard on cubs and you have a loss because of that.

Clint Sampson: That question might be geared more toward law enforcement.

Brett Prevedel: There's no way to know I guess.

Clint Sampson: Hopefully the houndsmen look at the tracks and are aware enough before they start the pursuit.

**Questions from the public:**

JC Brewer: I don't understand the number of tags being sold and the numbers of bears taken.

Darin Debloois: As you increase activity in the field the success rates decrease but this is preliminary data and the observation is correct and seems to be decreasing.

Randall Thacker: Talking last year's trend. We set this new plan and increase opportunity and hunts. So that hunters are more interested and care more but hunts are less effective not all the late season bear data is included and may come up next year.

Ken Long: I am a hound's man and my main concern is the decline in bear population in Book Cliffs. It's going down. Are you counting all the bears killed through depredation hunts or just harvest?

Darin Debloois: Most of the increase is in Southeast and Northeast Region.

Randall Thacker: Some of that was 2014 and 2015. We did have a bad cycle in problem bears, not just the watermelon patches increased; it was all the way across the region and state.

Ken Long: The livestock depredation last year was a bad year. How many is being turned in for Bear kills?

Darin Debloois: Wildlife Service takes (shows the slide on that info). It increased not in one specific unit but increased thru out the state.

Ken Long: Bears are very low and I only came across two bears.

Darin Debloois: We do have collard bears, I asked about cub data and it had good production but we are keeping an eye on things we are within the parameter plan based on the three year average info.

Dax Mangus: We appreciate Mr. Long. Our habitat section has cameras and we are seeing sows with cubs. We have not seen anything in the data to indicate a decline in bear population. Our recommendations again are being conservative. So we are leaving things the way they are and we do appreciate the input. We are trying to stay in compliance. We need to look at all the tools and we need to look at all species.

Randy Dearth: I know we are not recommending increasing tags but what did we do on tags last year?

Dax Mangus: Same as last year and an increase the year before.

Jesse McKee: Did they do anything on the depredation program where a family member can get a tag?

Darin Debloois: You have to identify it to be a bear. Wildlife Services can verify that. It doesn't have to be family member it can be anyone they designate and it's up to region to decide

Randy Dearth: They can't sell that tag right?

Darin Debloois: They can't sell that tag and they cannot keep the bear. The intent is to handle a specific problem and to address it.

Jesse McKee: Did we give numbers on bear kills on cattle on our place?

Randall Thacker: You need to contact Wildlife Services.

Boyde Blackwell: Danny will pass that info back to us and then there is damage payment for loss of livestock from bear and cougar.

Jesse McKee: Does that work well, are they able to identify.

Boyde Blackwell: You have to get them before they get to slippery, in a decent amount of time. The kill I mean. They do a good job of identifying and figure it out unless it's really old.

**Comments from the RAC:**

Daniel Davis: See attached email

**Comments from the public:**

JC Brewer: I'm not a bear hunter I hunt deer and elk I am pressing to control predators. I want to challenge the theory of what I am hearing about the Book Cliffs, This is not what I see, I have trail cameras and I am finding dozens of bears in my pictures. My bear pictures are increasing. They hunt cougars all winter and bear all summers the problem is with hounds making noise and dust. I support the decision of the division on the recommendations.

Ken Long: I can understand on elk how someone feels. Do you know how many points it takes to draw a bear tag? It's not us it's them. They run over the tracks and it's not just hounds man causing problems its hunters too.

Randy Dearth: The concern I am seeing is during the Limited Entry hunts. Then we added the spike hunts and now a bear hunts.

Jesse McKee: On this bear stuff I lean more towards anti bear for the deer. Every one being out there. I'm seeing bears. The more bear we kill the better the deer. On the bear numbers I haven't noticed a decline.

Brett Prevedel: On the science. Every question they have asked they throw up a number and the science is there I disagree that there is no science behind it.

Discussion

Mitch Hacking: I'm not going to support this action but this is not the time to make an amendment. The thing to do is get with everyone to vote. I am against it because of SS Diamond numbers. We need to get with Dax and Clint and work out the issues.

Joe Batty: So how would you handle next year's hunts if you don't make an amendment?

Mitch Hacking: I will make an amendment.

Melissa Wardle: There is no change from last year so this won't do anything.

Randy Dearth: Unless he wants to raise the tags.

Joe Arnold: What is he proposing? It is not numbers but allocation?

Mitch Hacking: The country is too high and then June comes and bears come out. It will take a year to get the process done.

**MOTION** to accept the Divisions recommendation as presented

Joe Batty

David Gordon, Second

**AMENDMENT made by** Mitch Hacking

Address the South Slope Diamond spring and summer hunts. Take two off the spring hunt and add them to the summer hunt because of access to higher elevations that can't be hunted in the spring, but it can be accessed better in the summer so they can hunt and have a good success rate.

Mitch Hacking: If people are taking test the sows and cubs will be all right. Plus there will be less depredation problems and the sportsman can hunt the bears.

Andrea Merrell, second the amendment made by Mitch Hacking.

Joe Arnold: Can the biologist go over hunt info on Diamond Mountain?

Dax Mangus: We have only had the June hunt there for two years, the first year was 100 percent success last year was 50%. The spring hunt was 43% and the year before was 31 percent success. If we move them we may harvest an extra bear and could have an impact further down the road. I don't know if two tags are going to collapse the bear population but over time it might have an effect.

Mitch Hacking: This isn't just Diamond but Vernal as well.

Joe Arnold: Do you have a fair amount of depredation?

Mitch Hacking: We have a lot of bears on Diamond and you can't get up there in April.

Joe Arnold: The summer hunt is more successful.

Motion and amendment passed unanimously

- **PRIVATE POND RULE AND AMENDMENTS – RULE R657-59** - Randy Oplinger  
See slide show

**Questions from the RAC:**

Brett Prevedel: If a pond is filled with a well they are exempt because there is no inlet or outlet correct?

Randy Oplinger: Correct.

Melissa Wardle: Is someone doing inspections?

Randy Oplinger: Yes, if all criteria are met then they go ahead, if not we will come out and do an inspection.

Mitch Hacking; Is Blue herring a big issue?

Randy Oplinger: Only if it is really shallow but the pond owner can do things to make it less susceptible.

**Questions from the public:**

None

### **Comments from the public:**

Robert Judd: I would like to address the natural stream channel and propose amendments (see handout)

Randy Dearth: The proposal on private property, they can do it as long as they can get a Certificate of Registration?

Joe Arnold: A natural stream channel, what defines that? Does it have to flow water one time in 10 years?

Drew Cushing: Right now we are working on a definition with a Utah Representative. We don't want to negatively impact private aquiculture but we do want to protect native species. If it's too liberal and passes, potentially a fisherman can access private waters.

Joe Arnold: Doesn't the access say it has to be wet?

Drew Cushing: Right now it's up in the air.

Dan Abeyta: What about a diversion?

Drew Cushing: That is legal.

Joe Arnold: Can this go through without a definition?

Drew Cushing: Yes, the definition either way. This is to assess the threat for native species up above or down below.

Richie Anderson: Why does it take 45 days?

Randy Oplinger: It doesn't generally take 45 days the lag time is on paperwork processing trying to streamline that to make that happen.

Trina Hedrick: If I get a phone call I will make every effort to get out within the week so I will help the individual in less than two weeks. When it gets sent in that person in licensing basically pulls from the front and it's a matter of when it comes in. And how many are in front of it, plus it's not just private pond Certificate of Registration's there are other Certificate of Registration's.



Randy Dearth: So it's more than just the regional office here, it goes to the Salt Lake Office?

Trina Hedrick: There is a lot more than just that and that position was vacant for four months.

Randy Dearth: So we will do it in 45 day or within 45 days?

Randy Oplinger: Within 45 days, it's not going to take 45 days.

Andrea Merrell: Help me understand why this going to create more Certificate of Registration's. It's the same three criteria. So again I don't see why?

Randy Oplinger: There is a subtle difference.

Andrea Merrell: So this is giving them an opportunity, the way it is now they get nothing. With the change they could stock it if they go through the Certificate of Registration process.

Robert Judd: The problem comes down to the natural stream channel.

Andrea Merrell: They are looking at it on a case by case process and make the land owner aware of the problems, isn't this an improvement. It will be in rule but provide clarity

Robert Judd: This will delay people from getting fish.

Andrea Merrell: This should be an education process, you are aware of your current clients but looking toward the future and letting your buyers know of the process.

Robert Judd: Technically with this rule I can't have a fish farm.

Joe Arnold: Other states what are their definitions as growers? Is every state in the west the same?

Randy Oplinger: Every state in the west presents it the same but we are a little more lenient. Every other state requires and inspection.

Brett Prevedel: Example of water that originates from a spring, if the water did not leave the pond they would not need a Certificate of Registration.

Randy Oplinger: Yes, that would be an example.

Joe Batty: So doesn't leave, means never leave?

Randy Oplinger: So it evaporates and never leaves with an outlet.

Joe Arnold: What about the school institutional thing do they need a Certificate of Registration?

Randy Oplinger: There are more than just schools this also includes prisons and universities for research studies, but the Department of Agriculture mandates this. The Division documenting where we have fish.

Randy Dearth: We have a couple different things out there do we want to do something with the schools, education type stuff. Do we want to modify it to what Mr. Judd originated?

**MOTION** to accept the Divisions recommendations as presented  
Mitch Hacking  
Joe Arnold, second

Mitch Hacking: How many other RAC boards responded to this?

Randy Oplinger: been thru 4 RAC's 3 accepted the Divisions recommendations and the Southern Region went with Mr. Judd's recommendations

Passed unanimously

- **• AIS RULE AMENDMENTS – RULE R657-60 - Richard Gibbs**  
See slide show

Randy Dearth: What is the dry time?

Richard Gibbs: 30 days in the winter and in the spring and fall its 18 days. Once everything is drained, and in the summer 7 days.

Randy Dearth: Does Colorado have any right now?

Richard Gibbs: No.

Randy Dearth: You put this little tag on there, next time they stop this has to be checked?

Richard Gibbs: They are seals and each state has a different color. Right now we have blue and orange. Blue is fully decontaminated and orange is it has been inspected. The owner can remove it as long as they wait.

Joe Arnold: How do you track that?

Rich Gibbs: We do have a way to track that but its tuff. We have tablets to enter the info in and it's like a balance check to make sure this is correct.

### **Questions from the RAC:**

Dan Abeyta: What are plug and other devices?

Richard Gibbs: Anything that contains water that can be drained needs to be removed when transporting. Other states are doing this or moving towards doing this.

Dan Abeyta: Lake Powell, did it go straight to infested? Or was it detected prior.

Nathan Owens: National Parks Service did detect it prior in 2012 and then verified in 2013 and started seeing adult mussels.

Dan Abeyta: Deer Creek is currently suspect. It has to test negative for how many years?

Nathan Owen: 3 years

Joe Batty: Places have been detected like Red Fleet but nothing happened why did that not take place?

Nathan Owens: A few possibilities when first detected, we can't tell if they are alive or dead so they show up but are not living. Cross contamination from labs and maybe they where there alive but they are very fragile as they grow. They settle out as adults but they are so far apart they can't reproduce.

### **Comments by the RAC:**

**MOTION** to accept the Divisions proposal

Joe Batty  
David Gordon, second

Passed unanimously

- **R657-38 DEDICATED HUNTER RULE AMENDMENT** – Bryan Christensen  
See slide

**Questions by the RAC:**

Randy Dearth: What is the cost per hour? If they want to buy hours?

Bryan Christensen: 20 dollars per hour.

Randy Dearth: Is there only so many DH allowed?

Bryan Christensen: In the rule technically up to 15 percent of each unit's quota right now we have 8000.

Randy Dearth: Do we hit that number? 15%?

Bryan Christensen: No, the most we have had is 10,000, it's going up but we've never hit the 15%.

Mitch Hacking: How many DH do we have in NE Region?

Bryan Christensen: There are fewer here, this area is the lowest in quantity by residents. This area is less than any other region.

Mitch Hacking: For projects I know a couple places that fencing is causing trouble for deer. Do you clean up fencing for things like this?

Bryan Christensen: Projects are all wildlife related we ask a couple questions like what is this going to do for wildlife, for habitat and public access to the resources. Does this enhance recreation? We partner with BLM, Forest Service and cities with wildlife oriented projects. You name it we have done it. Even on private if it benefits wildlife we will do it. We encourage folks to come up with projects.

Dan Abeyta: The example you used on military, they have already done hours do the hours go with the extension?

Bryan Christensen: Yes, they go with them. They just pick up where they left off. It's like having a fourth year.

Joe Arnold: Are they guaranteed tags and are they Region specific. Do they get the tag for the NE region because it's better odds? Do people put in for different units?

Bryan Christensen: It's very similar to the general season application. As far as availability we filled 10 units out of 29. It's unit specific.

Randy Dearth: When they go to draw what order is the process?

Bryan Christensen: Lifetime first then DH and then the youth.

Randy Dearth: The odds are better if you're a DH.

Bryan Christensen: In most cases yes. In 2/3 of the units you apply you draw.

### **Questions:**

Tonya Kieffer: Please explain when is going to take effect.

Bryan Christensen: In Mid late February potentially this can go into effect. We can apply this anyone that wants withdraw. It won't help anyone who is going to withdraw before they apply. The ones that it will benefit are those that didn't want the unit that they drew.

**MOTION** to accept the Divisions recommendations presented

David Gordon

Brett Prevedel, second

Passed unanimously

Boyde Blackwell: I really appreciate and the state really appreciates all you do.

Joe Batty: Can we send a directive to the wildlife board to better understand the distribution of the sand hill cranes tags and how that works and let them know in this Region we feel we are not getting the appropriate number of tags.

Randy Dearth: The upland bird one is in May.

Joe Batty: But we would like them to know about it in May, so if we start the process now I think they would have a better understanding.

Randy Dearth: How would you want to word that?

Joe Batty makes a motion:

**MOTION** to send a directive to wild life board to better understand the distribution of the sand hill crane tags and NER. And we believe the NER is not receiving the appropriate amount of tags.

Explanation: The depredation is too harsh for the amount of birds we have here.

Boyde Blackwell: The best for them is to wait for the upland game meeting but this will serve as a heads up to the Wildlife board that we are serious about this.

Mitch Hacking, second

David Gordon: When we are talking about the permit numbers they will have an idea?

Randy Dearth: Yes.

Randy Dearth: See attached document from Ken Long.

Passed unanimously

**MOTION** to adjourn

David Gordon

Joe Batty, second

Passed unanimously