

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

November 30, 2017, DNR, Boardroom
1594 W. North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

The meeting can be viewed live at
<https://youtu.be/3XljSD4UdG8>

Thursday, November 30, 2017, 9:00 am

- | | |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda
– Kirk Woodward, Chairman | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
– Kirk Woodward, Chairman | ACTION |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log
– Byron Bateman, Vice-Chair | CONTINGENT |
| 4. DWR Update
– Mike Fowlks, DWR Director | INFORMATION |
| 5. Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2018
– Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 6. R657-19 – Taking of Non-game Mammals Rule Amendment
– Jessica Van Woeart, Utah Prairie Dog Wildlife Biologist | ACTION |
| 7. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2018 Season Dates, Application Timeline
– Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator | ACTION |
| 8. R657-5 – Taking Big Game Rule Amendments
– Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator | ACTION |
| 9. R657-71 - Removal of Wild Mule Deer from Domesticated Elk Facilities
– Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator | ACTION |
| 10. Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan
– Randy Larsen, Wildlife Research Coordinator | ACTION |
| 11. Statewide Moose Management Plan
– Kent Hersey, Big Game Projects Coordinator | ACTION |
| 12. NR Deer Management Plans
– Jim Christensen, Northern Region Asst. Wildlife Manager | ACTION |
| 13. CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2018
– Mike Wardle, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator | ACTION |
| 14. Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2018
– Mike Wardle, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator | ACTION |
| 15. R657-67 – Mentor Rule Amendments
– Phil Gray, Licensing Coordinator | ACTION |
| 16. Other Business
– Kirk Woodward, Chairman | CONTINGENT |

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act - Persons needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) for this meeting, should contact Staci Coons at 801-538-4718, giving her at least five working days notice.

Wildlife Board Motions

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

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: Will be addressed during the November RAC and Board tour
Placed on Action Log: December 9, 2016

Fall 2017 - Target Date – Shed Antler Gathering

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a Division review of the shed antler gathering and provide an informational report at the upcoming November RAC.

Motion made by: Byron Bateman
Assigned to: Justin Shannon
Action: Under Study
Status: Will be addressed during the November RAC and Board tour
Placed on Action Log: April 27, 2017

Fall 2017 - Target Date – 2nd General Season Rifle Hunt

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a request to have the Division look at the possibility of a second General Season Rifle deer hunt on select units that runs 5 days during the Spike elk hunt (no weekends) and that the Zion and Pine Valley units be considered.

Motion made by: John Bair
Assigned to: Justin Shannon
Action: Under Study
Status: Will be addressed during the November RAC and Board tour
Placed on Action Log: April 27, 2017

Fall 2017 - Target Date – LE Late Season Muzzleloader hunts on GS Units

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a request to have the Division look at the possibility of Limited Entry late season muzzleloader hunts on General Season units with buck to doe ratios at or above the objectives.

Motion made by: John Bair
Assigned to: Justin Shannon
Action: Under Study
Status: Will be addressed during the November RAC and Board tour
Placed on Action Log: April 27, 2017

Fall 2017 - Target Date – Velvet- Only Buck Hunts on the Paunsaugunt

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a request to have the Division look at adding a Velvet-only buck hunt in November on the Paunsaugunt unit to address “Cactus” bucks.

Motion made by: John Bair
Assigned to: Justin Shannon
Action: Under Study
Status: Will be addressed during the November RAC and Board tour
Placed on Action Log: April 27, 2017

Fall 2017 - Target Date – Antlerless Public Hunt Ending Dates

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a request to have the Division look at ending all Antlerless public hunts by December 31.

Motion made by: Byron Bateman
Assigned to: Justin Shannon
Action: Under Study
Status: Update September 28, 2017
Placed on Action Log: April 27, 2017

Spring 2018 - Target Date – Big Game Baiting Issues

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log item a report in spring 2018 from DWR’s big game coordinator on the review of big game baiting issues.

Motion made by: Kirk Woodward
Assigned to: Justin Shannon
Action: Under Study
Status: Scheduled for the April/May 2018 RAC and Board Tour
Placed on Action Log: August 31, 2017

Fall 2018 - Target Date – Conservation Permit Program Audit

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log item a review of the conservation permit audit process that could include a rule change.

Motion made by: Karl Hirst
Assigned to: Greg Hansen/Kenny Johnson
Action: Under Study
Status: Scheduled for the May/June 2018 RAC and Board Tour
Placed on Action Log: September 28, 2017

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
September 28, 2017, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

The meeting can be viewed live at <https://youtu.be/Zb2YAO7ORBk>
REVISED September 26, 2017

AGENDA

Thursday, September 28, 2017, Board Meeting 9:00 am

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda
– Kirk Woodward, Chairman | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
– Kirk Woodward, Chairman | ACTION |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log
– Byron Bateman, Vice-Chair
– Early Rifle Deer Hunt
– LE Deer Hunts on GS units
– Velvet only deer hunts
– Mt. Goats on Deep Creeks
– Mt. Goat Transplants
– End cow elk hunts by December 31
– Shed Antler Gathering | CONTINGENT |
| 4. DWR Update
– Mike Fowlks, DWR Director | INFORMATION |
| 5. Conservation Permit Annual Report
– Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief | ACTION |
| 6. Conservation Permit Audit
– Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief | ACTION |
| 7. 2018 RAC/Board Dates
– Staci Coons, Wildlife Board Coordinator | ACTION |
| 8. Proposal to create Furbearer/Trapping Rule Working Group
– Darren DeBloois, Mammals Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 9. Other Business
– Kirk Woodward, Chairman
• Winter WAFWA | CONTINGENT |

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act - Persons needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) for this meeting, should contact Staci Coons at 801-538-4718, giving her at least five working days notice.

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
September 28, 2017, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Summary of Motions

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

The following motion was made by Steve Dalton, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda.

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

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the August 31, 2017 Wildlife Board Meeting with corrections.

3) Old Business/Action Log (**Contingent**)

7 Action Log Items were addressed:

Early Rifle Deer Hunt

Limited Entry Deer Hunts on General Season units

Velvet only deer hunts

End cow elk hunt by December 31

Shed Antler Gathering

Mt. Goats on Deep Creek

Mt. Goat Transplants

4) Conservation Permit Annual Report (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the findings of the Conservation Permit Annual Report as presented by the Division.

5) Conservation Permit Audit (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the findings of the Conservation Permit Audit as presented.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a review of the conservation permit audit process that could include a rule change.

6) 2018 RAC/Board Dates (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the 2018 RAC/Board Dates as presented by the Division.

7) Proposal to create Furbearer/Trapping Rule Working Group (**Action**)

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the proposal to create Furbearer/Trapping Rule Working Group as presented by the Division.

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
September 28, 2017, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Attendance

Wildlife Board

Kirk Woodward – Chair
Byron Bateman – Vice-Chair
Mike Fowlks – Exec Sec
Kevin Albrecht
Calvin Crandall
Donnie Hunter
Karl Hirst
Steve Dalton

Division Personnel

Mike Canning
Rick Olson
Darren DeBloois
Kent Hersey
Teresa Griffin
Covy Jones
Drew Cushing
Chris Wood
Justin Shannon
Kenny Johnson
J Shirley
Lindy Varney
Rusty Robinson
Martin Bushman
Greg Hansen
Mike Christensen
Paul Gedge
Staci Coons
Thu Vo-Wood

Public Present

Miles Moretti – MDF
Lee Howard
Melissa Whitaker
Allison Jones
Aaron Johnson
Nile Wilkey
Greg Bird
Sterling Brown – UT Farm Bureau
Troy Justensen – SFW
Kyle Witherspoon – SCI
Al Robb – UT Trappers Assoc.
Bailey Bannon

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
September 28, 2017, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
<https://youtu.be/Zb2YAO7ORBk>

- 00:00:23** Chairman Woodward called the meeting to order and welcomed the audience. Board members introduced themselves.
- 00:02:34** 1) **Approval of Agenda (Action)**
The following motion was made by Steve Dalton, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimously.
MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda as presented.
- 00:03:15** 2) **Approval of Minutes (Action)**
The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.
MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the August 31, 2017 meeting with corrections.
- 00:04:01** 3) **Old Business/Action Log (Contingent)**
Seven Action Log Items were addressed. Justin Shannon addressed the first four items. Covy Jones addressed shed antler gathering and Rusty Robinson addressed the last two items.
- 00:05:08** **Early Rifle Deer Hunt Action Log Item**
To reduce crowding and lower buck-to-doe ratios on units that are consistently over objective the Division plans to recommend early rifle deer hunts this November on nine units with season dates overlapping general season spike/any bull hunts and include a weekend.
- 00:09:40** **Limited Entry Deer Hunts on General Season Units Action Log Item**
This November DWR plans to recommend limited entry hunts on all general season units that are meeting the minimum buck-to-doe ratio objectives.
- 00:16:13** **Velvet Only Deer Hunts Action Log Item**
The DWR plans to recommend a cactus buck hunt on the Paunsaugunt unit this November. Cactus buck will be defined under R657-5. This will provide additional limited entry deer hunting opportunities and reduce cactus bucks on the unit. The proposed season dates would be early to mid-November 2018.
- 00:22:00** **End Cow Elk Hunts by December 31 Action Log Item**
Late season elk hunts serve a management purpose: population objectives, proper distribution, reduce depredation and conflicts. The

hunts also allow for more public harvest and reduce the need for removals from DWR. The Division will commit to remove or reduce late season hunts that are not fulfilling a management purpose.

00:31:41 Shed Antler Gathering Action Log Item

The severe winter conditions in 2017 led to emergency feedings and closure of shed antler gathering. The closure was to protect the mule deer population and their winter habitat.

DWR recommends continuing to allow shed antler gathering along with the Antler Gathering Ethics course certificate, and closing affected areas during severe winters to protect deer and their habitat.

00:50:58 Mountain Goat on Deep Creeks Action Log Item

A committee was formed to consider the transplanting of sheep and/or goats. They supported the transplanting of goats and drafted a unit management plan. The Division will continue to work with stakeholders, gather and compile data, and refine the plan. A field trip is planned for this fall. DWR will report to the board with options.

00:53:40 Mountain Goat Transplants Action Log Item

After evaluating the viability of proposed areas and considering the social issues, habitat availability, and ability for populations to establish on their own, DWR created a list of potential transplant sites and areas where goats could establish naturally. Some transplant sites may require changes to statewide plan.

01:00:20 4) DWR Update (Informational)

Mike Fowlks talked about the AFWA Conference, the NRCC tour – Brian Head fire, the Pacific Flyway, staff changes, hunting season, and furbearer.

01:05:20 5) Conservation Permit Annual Report (Action)

Justin Shannon presented the annual report.

01:13:12 Board Questions

The board asked about documentation for funds used, 5% rule, limitations of projects without funds.

01:16:28 Public Questions

Public questions were taken at this time.

01:21:14 Board Discussion

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the findings of the Conservation Permit Annual Report as presented by the Division.

01:22:05 **6) Conservation Permit Audit (Action)**

Kenny Johnson presented the audit.

Byron Bateman expressed concern about the discrepancies presented in the audit. Karl Hirst pushed the issue on documentation of funds.

01:43:40 **Board Questions**

The board continued to express and address concerns about discrepancies and documentation.

01:50:20 **Public Comments**

Public comments were accepted at this time.

01:57:18 **Board Discussion**

The board expressed concern about the discrepancies presented in the audit. Karl Hirst pushed the issue on documentation of funds.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the findings of the Conservation Permit Audit as presented.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log a review of the Conservation Permit Audit process that could include a rule change.

02:04:36 **7) 2018 RAC/Board Dates (Action)**

Staci Coons presented the 2018 RAC/Board dates.

02:05:54 **Board Questions/Discussion**

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the RAC/Board Dates as presented by the Division.

02:06:40 **8) Proposal to create Furbearer/Trapping Rule Working Group (Action)**

Darren DeBloois presented the working group proposal.

02:07:42 **Public Comments**

Public comments were accepted at this time.

02:10:14 **Board Discussion**

The board mentioned many people expressed concerns about this issue. They discussed details of the working group.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Donnie

Hunter and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the proposal to create Furbearer/Trapping Rule Working Group as presented by the Division.

02:15:24 9) Other Business (Contingent)

The Board discussed the upcoming winter WAFWA in San Diego, CA and decided that Byron Bateman should attend. The conference runs January 3-8, 2018.

02:21:05 Meeting adjourned.

DRAFT

**Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Summary of Motions**

Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2018

NRO Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments as presented with the exception of delaying the start of the scaup season to align with the last 86-days of the season.
Motion Passes- Unanimous

CRO, SRO, SERO, NERO

Motion – To accept the Division’s recommendations as presented.
Motion Passes – Unanimous

R657-19 – Taking of Non-game Mammals Rule Amendment

NRO, CRO, SERO, NERO

Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R-657-19 Taking of Non-game Mammals Rule Amendment as presented.
Motion Passes- Unanimous

SRO Motion – To accept the Division’s recommendations as presented.
Motion Passes – 10 in favor with 1 abstention

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2018 Season Dates, Application Timeline

NRO Motion- Accept the proposal to have the Bighorn Sheep hunt on the Oak Creek unit with dates from Sept 9th to Sept 30th
Motion Passes-Unanimous

Motion-Accept the proposal to have new archery only OIAL hunt on the Newfoundland and Zion units for Bighorn Sheep with season dates Newfoundland, Dec 11 to Dec 31 and the Zion, Nov 11 to Dec 1.
Motion Passes- Unanimous

Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the elk multi-season proposal as presented.
Motion Passes- For:10 Against:2

Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the early deer season hunt as presented.
Motion Passes- Unanimous

Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the late season Limited Entry muzzleloader deer hunt on general season units as presented.
Motion Passes-For: 7 Against:5

Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the balance of the items presented.
Motion Passes- Unanimous

- CRO Motion** – To follow the current mule deer management plan in accordance to the limited entry muzzleloader tags and not accept the recommendation presented by the Division to implement the late season muzzleloader hunt.
Motion Passes – 8 to 2
- Motion** – To add the Oak Creek Unit as a new Bighorn Sheep hunt and to add archery only hunts to the Newfoundland Mountain and Zion Units Bighorn Sheep hunts.
Motion Passes – Unanimous
- Motion** – To accept the remainder of the Division’s recommendations as presented.
Motion Passes - Unanimous
- SRO Motion** – To recommend to approve the early rifle hunt.
Motion Passes – 8 to 3
- Motion** – To recommend to approve the cactus buck hunt on the Paunsaugunt and the 9-day hunt being held on the last 9 days of October, with the caveat that it could be an 8 –day hunt if the first of the 9 days falls on a Sunday.
Motion Passes – Unanimous
- Motion** – To recommend to approve the Oak Creek sheep hunt.
Motion Passes – 10 to 1
- Motion** – To recommend to approve additional archery hunts to the Newfoundland and Zion Sheep units.
Motion Passes – 10 to 1
- Motion** – To recommend to approve multi-season elk hunts with the exception of the cost changing from 150.00 to 100.00.
Motion Passes – 8 to 3
- Motion** – To recommend to approve that muzzleloader hunters can shoot a cow or bull like the archery hunters on over objective units.
Motion Passes – 8 to 3
- Motion** – To accept the remainder of the Division’s recommendations as presented.
Motion Passes - Unanimous
- SERO Motion** – To remove the Nine Mile Unit from the Book Cliffs/Wild Horse Bench bison hunt.
Motion Passes – 6 to 4
- Motion** – To create an action log item for the Wildlife Board to look into a long-term solution for buffalo leaving current units where they’re supposed to be, particularly those leaving the Ute Indian Reservation
Motion Passes – Unanimous
- Motion** – To recommend to the Wildlife Board that the boundary units of the South Manti be changed to include the portion of the Nine Mile Unit from the Price River south to Interstate 70.
Motion Passes – Unanimous
- Motion** – To add the bighorn sheep once-in-a-lifetime archery hunts and the Oak Creek bighorn sheep hunt.
Motion Passes – Unanimous
- Motion** – To add a South Book Cliffs late-season limited-entry primitive weapon hunt
Motion Passes – Unanimous
- Motion** – To accept the remaining Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2018 Season Dates, Application Timeline as presented.
Motion Passes – 8 to 2

NERO Motion – To accept multi season elk hunts as presented by the Division.

Motion Passes – 5 to 2

Motion – To not accept the limited entry late muzzleloader deer hunt.

Motion Passes – 5 to 2

Motion – To accept early season rifle deer hunt as presented by the Division.

Motion Passes – Unanimous

Motion – To accept SFW proposal to the Division for Oak Creek California Bighorn Sheep hunt.

Motion Passes – 6 to 1

Motion – To accept SFW proposal to the Division for the Newfoundland California Bighorn Sheep hunt.

Motion Passes – 6 to 1

Motion – To accept SFW proposal to the Division for the Zion Desert Bighorn Sheep hunt.

Motion Passes – Unanimous

Motion – To ask the Wildlife Board to take a look and discuss season date change for archery deer hunt during the rut.

Motion Passes – 6 to 1

Motion – To accept the remainder of the presentation from the Division.

Motion Passes – Unanimous

R657-5 – Taking Big Game Rule Amendments

NRO Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Taking Big Game Rule Amendments as presented.

Motion Passes- Unanimous

CRO Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Taking Big Game Rule Amendments as presented.

Motion Passes- 10 to 1

SRO Motion- To accept as presented with the exception that the definition of a cactus buck be changed to 50% or more coverage to antlers, and remove the 1 power scope limitations on the crossbows when a COR has been issued, and to remove the restriction of hunter orange on premium limited entry units.

Motion Passes- 10 to 1

SERO Motion- To accept the Taking Big Game Rule Amendments as presented, except to leave the minimum draw weight unchanged.

Motion Passes- 9 to 1

NERO Motion- To accept the Taking Big Game Rule Amendments as presented, except to maintain the 40lb draw weight on archery equipment.

Motion Passes- 5 to 2

R657-71 - Removal of Wild Mule Deer from Domesticated Elk Facilities

NRO, CRO, SRO, SERO, NERO

Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R657-71 Removal of Wild Mule Deer from Domesticated Elk Facilities as presented.

Motion Passes- Unanimous.

Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan

NRO, CRO, SERO

Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan as presented

Motion Passes- Unanimous

SRO Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan as presented

Motion Passes- 10 in favor with 1 abstention

NERO Motion- To accept as presented from the Division with an amendment to review or reword the livestock and pronghorn conflict of the plan.

Motion Passes- 6 to 1

Statewide Moose Management Plan

NRO, CRO, SRO, SERO

Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Statewide Moose Management Plan as presented.

Motion Passes- Unanimous

NERO Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Statewide Moose Management Plan as presented, with an amendment to make a slight language addition regarding pink eye and that it occurs naturally as well as due to any irritant to the eye.

Motion Passes- Unanimous

NR Deer Management Plans

ALL REGIONS

Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board Accept the NR Deer Management Plans as presented.

Motion Passes- Unanimous

CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2018

NRO Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2018 in addition to the proposed changes on Jacob's Creek CWMU and Woodruff Creek CWMU's. On Jacob's Creek CWMU change moose permit numbers for 2018 to - 2 public 2 private and for 2019 to - 1 public and 2 private. On Woodruff Creek CWMU change deer permits from 25 private and 3 public to 18 private and 2 public.

Motion Passes- Unanimous

CRO, SERO, NERO

Motion – To accept the Division's recommendations as presented.

Motion Passes – Unanimous

SRO Motion – To accept the Division's recommendations as presented.

Motion Passes – 9 in favor and 1 abstention

Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2018

NRO, CRO

Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2018 as presented.

Motion Passes- Unanimous

SRO Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2018 as presented.

Motion Passes- 9 in favor and 1 abstention

SERO Motion- To accept the Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2018 as presented, except to leave the Book Cliffs Landowner Association Permits unchanged.

Motion Passes- 8 to 1

NERO Motion- To accept the Diamond Mountain Landowner Association variance to allow each landowner or groups of landowners to manage who they allow on their individual land areas.

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Motion- To accept an additional Elk tag to Three Corners Landowner Association

Motion Passes- 4 -3

Motion- To amend the Book Cliffs Landowner Association to increase elk permits from three to six

Motion Passes- 4 to 3

Motion- To put a committee together to look at the Bison issue in Nine Mile

Motion Passes- 6 to 1

R657-67 – Mentor Rule Amendments

NRO Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R657-67- Mentor Rule Amendments as presented.

Motion Passes- Unanimous

CRO Motion- To have the youth surrender permit if they have multiple tags of same species.

Motion Passes – 9 to 2

Motion- To accept the remainder of the Division's recommendations as presented.

Motion Passes- Unanimous

SRO Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R657-67- Mentor Rule Amendments as presented.

Motion Passes- 9 to 1

SERO Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R657-67- Mentor Rule Amendments as presented.

Motion Passes- 8 to 1

NERO Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R657-67- Mentor Rule Amendments as presented with the exception that youth be limited to one antlered animal per species.

Motion Passes- 5 to 1

Northern Regional Advisory Council
November 8, 2017
Academy Conference Center
Brigham City, Utah

Draft Meeting Minutes

Meeting Begins: 6:00 p.m.

RAC Present

John Blazzard- Agric
Paul Chase- Forest Service
David Earl- Agric
Christopher Hoagstrom- Noncon.
Randy Hutchison- At Large
Chad Jensen- Elected
Aaron Johnson- Sportsman
Matt Klar- At Large
Mike Laughter- Sportsman
Justin Oliver- At Large
Kristin Purdy- Noncon.
Bryce Thurgood- At Large
Mellissa Wood for Matt Preston-BLM

DWR Present

Jodie Anderson
Nicaela Haig
Justin Dolling
Phil Douglass
Blair Stringham
Randy Wood
Covy Jones
Kent Hersey
Jim Christensen
Dave Rich
Chad Wilson
Randy Larsen
Martin Bushman
Eric Anderson
Krystal Tucker
David Beveridge
Scott Walker
Ben Nadolski
Mike Wardle
Phil Gray
Brandon Baron
Justin Shannon

Wildlife Board

Byron Bateman

RAC Excused

Kevin McLeod- At Large
Darren Parry-Shoshone Nation

Agenda:

Approval of Agenda
Approval of July 26, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Wildlife Board Meeting Update
Regional Update
Approval of July 26, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2018
R657-19 – Taking of Non-game Mammals Rule Amendment
Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2018 Season Dates, Application Timeline
R657-5 – Taking Big Game Rule Amendments
R657-71 - Removal of Wild Mule Deer from Domesticated Elk Facilities
Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan
Statewide Moose Management Plan
NR Deer Management Plans
CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2018
Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2018
R657-67 – Mentor Rule Amendments

Item 1. Approval of Agenda

-Bryce Thurgood, Chair

Agenda Approved

Item 2. Approval of July 26, 2017 Minutes

-Bryce Thurgood, Chair

Minutes approved as circulated.

Item 3. Wildlife Board Meeting Update

- Bryce Thurgood, Chair and Justin Dolling, Regional Supervisor

Bryce Thurgood- Hunter Education Rule Amendment-Passed Unanimously. Fur Bearer Rule-failed. Chairman broke the tie.

Byron Bateman- It passed.

Bryce Thurgood- Sorry, the information I have is not correct. Furbearer and bobcat recommendations passed unanimously. Beaver management plan passed unanimously. cougar recommendation and rules passed unanimously with allocation of permits on the southwest Manti by 4, for a total of 12. On the southeast Manti by 2 for a total of 18. Expo audit passed unanimously. Expo permit allocation passed unanimously.

Justin Dolling- Wildlife Board has an Action Log item where they charge the division with going out and doing research and coming back with a recommendation.

Action Log Items:

Early Rifle Deer Hunt- Division recommendation to present an early rifle deer hunt at this meeting.

Limited entry deer hunt on general season units- Recommending to have limited entry on general season units.

Velvet only deer hunts- Associated with the Paunsaugunt unit. The division concluded that we will recommending a velvet only deer hunt.

Ending cow elk hunts earlier in the year- Ending December 31st rather than the end of January. The division will commit to remove or reduce late season hunts that are not fulfilling management purposes.

Shed antler gathering- Exploring and making recommendation whether to change how we collect sheds in Utah. After review, their recommendation is to stay the course as is and look at possibly site specific closures during harsh winters.

Mountain goat on deep creek- Division says there is a committee formed to consider transplanting mountain goats and this committee supports the transplanting the goats for the deep creek. Possibly plan a field trip to go out and look at the deep creek.

Mountain goat transplants- The board wants the division to look at the possibility of transplanting mountain goats in several locations throughout the state. The division went back and evaluated that and the division is proposing consideration of some of these areas and will also evaluate social issues, habitat availability and the ability for populations to establish naturally on their own. In the end, the division will create a potential list of transplant sites for mountain goats and those sites will be included in our new mountain goat management plan which is June 30, 2018. Shortly thereafter, the division will go back and look at updating that plan and including that list within that plan.

Action Items:

Conservation permit annual report- Presented conservation permit annual report and the board recommended to accept that report as presented. The conservation permit audit caused some concern. there were some discrepancies on the audit which turned up a couple of issues. One is that there is not timely submission on the conservation organizations part when it comes to the direct return money to the division. The division worked with those individuals and feel like the issue was resolved. There was also some discussion by the board about trying to be more transparent on the way we account for expenditures of funds. Currently, when we commit the funds but do not show when balances are zeroed out. In the end, the board accepted the findings of the conservation audit. It did show there was some issues and as a result of

those issues, the board wanted to add an action log review of the conservation permit audit process that could possibly include a rule change. The division will be working on that to see if there is a better way to account for when funds are committed to projects and when they are actually spent out.

2018 RAC and Board proposed dates and that was approved as presented.

Changes for furbearer rule affecting private property created concern with private landowners. The division is going to establish a furbearer trapping rule working group. The board agreed and approved that needs to be done to sort out differences.

Item 4. Regional Update

- Justin Dolling Regional Supervisor

Pheasant Hunt Opener- Working with several conservation groups to release over 10,000 pheasants this year. The releases will occur periodically throughout the season. This year, it will be a 30 day season statewide. That includes all lands statewide, not just public land.

Mule Deer Foundation planted over 1,500 shrubs on Middle Fork WMA.

Wildlife Biologists doing post season deer classifications.

Item 5. Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2018

- Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program Coordinator

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Kristin Purdy- What kind of crop damage are Sandhill Cranes causing in Uintah County that makes us want to extend the season to keep the birds moving.

Blair Stringham- It is different than what we see here in the northern part of the state. They don't have a lot of breeding cranes there. Their damage comes with silage corn. There is also some damage to some of the alfa alfa fields. It is not substantial damage but enough that it is causing concerns.

Bryce Thurgood- Extending swan border to the north. Can you follow up on that?

Blair Stringham- Having a 3 year average above population objective is what is holding us up. This last survey found that population is up again. We have exceeded that 3 year average. At this point, it is a matter of working with the Fish and Wildlife Service to make changes.

Bryce Thurgood- You guys are actively working on pushing that.

Blair Stringham- Yes, we are definitely interested in making some of those changes.

Public Comment

Jeff Bringhurst- Ask that the scaup season dates are moved to the end of the season in the northern region. Delay start by 20 days. The chairman for Ducks Unlimited of Utah has asked me to let you know that he supports that and would also like to see if we can delay start to the 26th of October and run through the end of the season.

Darin Noorda- Utah Waterfowl Association- Request late start in Scaup season to October 26th. Bring in consistency with southern zone. Surrounding states have delayed starts. Sample poll showed 204 favored to delayed start and 10 were against. Scaup are late migrators. Would like to start season when they show up. Waterfowlers try to identify and know what they are shooting.

Kevin Noorda- Support the delay of Scaup season.

RAC Comments

Mike Laughter- Can Blair give us his thoughts on the late season.

Blair Stringham- Survey data. Flexibility in terms of when birds are going to be here. There is a 45 day window when they are here. The reason we come up with our recommendation is because we see more harvest in the early part of the season. We feel like we have more illegal harvest on that front end than the tail end. It is largely a social issue of when guys want to hunt. We would be supportive of either/or.

Bryce Thurgood- I have had waterfowler's tell me they prefer the later season.

Motion

Motion- Mike Laughter- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments as presented with the exception to delay the start of the scaup season to the last 86-days of the season.

Second- Aaron Johnson

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Item 6. R657-19 – Taking of Non-game Mammals Rule Amendment

- Martin Bushman- Assistant Attorney General

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Matt Klar- I'm assuming it is safe to assume you are not appealing this ruling?

Martin Bushman- We are trying to. This case is not unique. There are five other federal circuits that looked at this issue. Does the federal government have authority, under the commerce clause, to regulate species that occur in a single state and have no commercial value. All of those circuits ruled that there was sufficient nexus to commerce, they all found different ways of getting there. In commerce, you can link anything to it nowadays. All of them were petitioned and supreme court denied all of them. It is being petitioned.

Motion

Motion- Matt Klar- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R-657-19 Taking of Non-game Mammals Rule Amendment as presented.

Second- Justin Oliver

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Item 7. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2018 Season Dates, Application Timeline

- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator

See RAC Packet

Public Questions

Ryan Yearsley- Would dedicated hunters get to hunt both rifle hunts?

Covy Jones- Yes, we looked into that. There is nothing in the rule that would preclude them from hunting that. This is not on every unit but they can still only harvest 2 deer every 3 years.

Ryan Yearsley- Why don't you run the elk hunt like the dedicated hunter hunt where you can only harvest 2 every 3 years.

Covy Jones- It is an annual thing. That is one of the main differences. We appreciate all the help we get from dedicated hunters but that program takes a lot of administration. We decided to attack this one a little differently.

Eli Gourdin- Extended archery boundaries and extensions. Most of the extended archery stuff is done by a lot of dedicated hunters and we are only allowed to take 2 deer every 3 years which is great. A lot of the extended archery areas are for urban deer population control, correct?

Covy Jones- That is correct.

Eli Gourdin- If a lot of the dedicated hunters are participating in that, wouldn't it make sense to allow dedicated hunters to take a doe in those extended archery areas on their odd year?

Covy Jones- That is definitely something we could look in to. It is not a decision we would make here tonight.

Eli Gourdin- It would increase opportunity and also put them out there more. If we are expanding the archery areas to control urban deer populations, that would be one way to do it. If the dedicated hunters are the only ones hunting extended archery areas, we are not helping control the population at all.

Covy Jones- It makes a lot of sense. Administratively, we would have to take it back and see how it would work.

Shane Tingey- Early rifle season. If the state is willing to look at this and flirt with the idea of putting in another deer season, why have we done away with the buck bull tags in some areas. I know there is a general harvest report we are after. It seems that would be the perfect time to go about that.

Covy Jones- The buck bull combination permits? I don't know.

Shane Tingey- Just a thought.

Covy Jones- This gets the same thing on these areas and if you want to hunt buck bull combination, you could pick one of these areas and do that. It makes a lot of sense.

RAC Questions

Aaron Johnson- On the early deer season that you are proposing, it is a 5 day season but the later season is 8-9 days. Why is it shorter? Why is it only 5 days on the earlier season?

Covy Jones- Trying to fit everything in. Overlapping 5 days gives guys a chance to do both.

Aaron Johnson- Disabled hunter season. You shortened the extension for disabled hunters?

Covy Jones- Yes, it looks like that might have been shortened about 7 years ago. This year we did not make any changes to that.

Bryce Thurgood- It is something we can look at in the future if we need to.

Mellissa Wood- I heard that last night in the central region meeting, that you proposed a new hunt on the Newfoundland's? Is that correct?

Covy Jones- No, the division did not propose that but we will probably hear that proposal tonight. It is something we could support.

Mellissa Wood- I will wait until that time.

Randy Hutchison- I have had several comments come in to me on the late season, which we are over limit on deer in some of those units. Why are those extra tags not being given out on the general hunt?

Covy Jones- The reasons for this hunt is that we run two systems in Utah. We have tried to increase permits on a lot of these units but were met with opposition. In the southern region, where one of these hunts were occurring, we had individuals saying they did not want to increase permits because they love the late season hunts. The majority of public like these hunts.

Justin Oliver- There is 60,000 general rifle tags this year?

Covy Jones- Approximately.

Justin Oliver- With these numbers, is there a quota for early or late? Do they choose, or how is that divided?

Covy Jones- We have not determined that yet. We are going to have to split those up in some way. In some cases, it is splitting up hunters to reduce pressure. In a lot of cases, it will be adding permits to manage buck to doe ratios. It is unit specific.

Justin Oliver- We are doing this to spread out the hunts so we are not overcrowded but will possibly add some tags?

Covy Jones- We could possibly add permits.

Bryce Thurgood- But we won't know until April.

Covy Jones- Right, we will bring those recommendations forward in the spring.

Justin Oliver- Late muzzleloader tags. Are those new tags being created or will they be taken from one spot or another?

Covy Jones- We will continue to manage general season units as we have based on buck to doe ratios. It is not intended to deduct permits from general season to meet those permits. They will be in very limited amounts.

Justin Oliver- That was my next question.

Covy Jones- Very small percentages, as they are currently being applied.

John Blizzard- How are you going to determine the percentage. You said it would be really small, what process do you use to come up with those numbers?

Covy Jones- We said at least 5 so that we can offer 1 for out of state hunters. We have never set a max on it. We have looked at no more than 1% of the total unit permits. That is not in any plan. The plan does state that they need to be in limited numbers. Something that is not a significant amount of permits.

Kristin Purdy- Opportunity vs. quality of the hunt. Specifically, if the limited entry hunts are offered on general season units, in truth it limits the opportunity of next year's general seasons hunter. It may limit opportunity next year on that same unit.

Covy Jones- At the percentages we have given these tags, it would not change buck doe ratios. I don't believe that it would affect general season opportunity that way. I understand what you are saying. Harvest rates are higher and there would be a few more harvested there. It is not an equal rate of return and I think that is why hunters are willing to use their limited entry points on these hunts.

Kristin Purdy- My husband and son hunt the Ogden unit. As the herd has recovered and the number of deer have returned to something respectable, they are just barely starting to see bucks again and they are general season hunters. Finally, they had a shot this year and it was not a good one for either one of them but if it gets back to them that I voted that limited entry hunters could have a chance on their unit. I just think we are robbing Peter to pay Paul with this proposal offering general season opportunity to a limited entry hunter.

Covy Jones- I appreciate and understand that perspective. I hope you can understand that what we are trying to accomplish is to provide opportunity in both. Again, we have both systems and it is important to try and legitimize both systems.

Bryce Thurgood- What was the success rate on the general deer hunt and what is the success rate on these limited entry muzzleloader hunts?

Covy Jones- Do you want to look at general season with archery, muzzleloader and rifle? That will be different than if you compare the same weapon types.

Bryce Thurgood- I would say rifle and muzzleloader.

Covy Jones- 44% for rifle and muzzleloader and for these permits. the statewide average, I will ask Kent for.

Kent Hersey- 82 %.

Covy Jones- That is overall limited entry muzzleloader. That is not just season permits. I believe these were about 60% success. So 44% vs. about 60% success.

Public Comment

Lee Tracy- If I don't make a statement about an issue, I support it. I do support the early season any weapon hunts but I would like to see more extended archery hunts and areas to help address the reasons for the early season any weapon hunts. I do not support mixing those limited entry hunts on general units. It is contrary to the mule deer plan. I was on the committee that drafted that plan and we had a struggle with this item. It is the difference in success rates. You are cutting general hunters out of the mix. If you want late muzzleloader hunts, make them a general hunt and just call the muzzleloader hunt a split hunt.

Kelvin Judd- Support the multi-season elk hunt. North slope of Uintah's. I hunt there my whole life. Right now you have the elk/deer combination during the general elk hunt. There are unique dynamics there. That hunt was created because those deer migrated to Wyoming before general deer hunt. We are losing opportunity to a different state. I would like to do away with the elk/deer combination which is in October. I would not recommend the late muzzleloader hunt on that unit. The dynamics of that unit, there is a very small portion low enough in elevation to support deer during the rut. I recommend doing the limited entry hunt for deer on that general unit during the any bull hunt. You are going to have people out there with rifles anyway. Give rifle hunters an opportunity to harvest a mature buck.

Troy Justensen- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Papers passed out to RAC members. Support recommendations for bucks, bulls and OIAL with two exceptions. Success with bison and mountain goat hunt. Asking to approve hunting big horn sheep on the limited entry with archery only. Units are the Zion and Newfoundland's. It passed the central RAC last night. Would like to ask to open up the Oak Creek to sheep hunting. It would be a standard rifle hunt.

Bryce Thurgood- Will you address those Zion and Newfoundland archery hunts. Also, the Oak Creek sheep.

Covy Jones- I will address Oak Creek sheep first. After we sent RAC packet out but before this meeting, we were able to fly the Oak Creek unit. We realized that we have a sustainable population there. We can support a hunt on that unit. As far as the OIAL archery hunts go, we did get a hold of the hunters who have those permits for this year. The hunters who hunted mountain goats, 0% success. They were not super happy. If our goal is to decrease success rates, we did it. The hunters who hunted bison were extremely excited and a lot of positive comments. We got a hold of 9 out of the 10 that participated and we know that 3 did not harvest and 6 did. We either have 60 or 70% success. The two proposed hunts, Newfoundland's and Zion, this is something we could support. We would ask to let us propose these and have these 4 hunts for archery and OIAL and let it ride for 3 years. Then, we can look back and see if it is doing what it was designed to do. It did not impact draw outs. If success rates are lower, it could allow for more opportunity on the back end. Let's have a few years to look at it and look back to see if it is accomplishing what we want it to.

Bryce Thurgood- My good friend, 78 years old, shot a buffalo with his bow on the Henry's. He loved every moment of it.

Covy Jones- That's great..

Aaron Johnson- Where would the tags come from?

Covy Jones- We determine permit numbers by success rate. We will probably start slow and see what success rates are and adjust. To say that we would take them out or add to, we have not had those discussions yet.

Bryce Thurgood- Every year, you are adding to those units because populations are going through the roof. You are not taking away but taking additional permits.

Covy Jones- We picked those two units because populations are doing well.

Mellissa Wood- Is there currently a hunt on the Newfoundland's?

Covy Jones- Yes.

Mellissa Wood- What is the number?

Kent Hersey- Two hunts.

Covy Jones- That is the northern region hunt. Jim, that was yours right? Would you like to answer that?

Jim Christensen- There are currently 2 hunts on the Newfoundland's, early and late hunt. I do not have the hunt number on them. They have been going for about 10-12 years now.

Bryce Thurgood- Approximately 6-8 permits.

Jim Christensen- Yes, 10 total. There is usually one conservation permit. We try and split them equally between the early and late hunt.

RAC Comments

Mellissa Wood- The BLM manages a lot of land in this area. We have something we want to make the RAC aware of. I do not think our office is opposed to this but we have an operator that has applied several times for a grazing permit for sheep in the area. He currently does hold a state of Utah grazing permit for cattle. He is trying really hard to get a sheep permit from the BLM. We are at the point of just addressing his application to us. We haven't yet responded and he is not very happy about that. I am a little worried that this population could be jeopardized in some way if those were allowed to go through. We tried back in 2000 to retire grazing on that area when the sheep were introduced out there and the State of Utah opposed it. It would be an unfortunate thing if something happened out to the population. Just wanted to make the RAC aware of that.

John Blazzard- I know there is a lot of controversy about domestic sheep vs. big horn sheep. From a livestock industry standpoint, there is no science that says domestic sheep are killing off big horn sheep. I would like to see some science put into this thing rather than a bunch of emotion if that is going to happen.

Bryce Thurgood- I think they have been studying this for a long time, correct Covy? Sheep foundation has been buying permits.

Covy Jones- There is a lot of research that goes into this. It is not our intent or goal to put anyone out of business.

Working with producers and forming collaborations.

Kristin Purdy- You brought up that the proposal to offer limited entry hunts on general season units is in opposition to the mule deer plan. Is that correct?

Covy Jones- Currently, this is allowed for in the plan. We are doing it on 15 units. It is allowed for in the plan on units that are managed for 18-20 bucks per 100 doe and are exceeding those objectives.

Kristin Purdy- The contrary part is contrary to the units managed at a lower buck to doe ratio than 18-20.

Covy Jones- At 15-17. the other change would be units that are currently meeting, not exceeding that objective. It is the board that hears these plans and passes these plans.

Kristin Purdy- My concern is the committees we assemble with stakeholders to create these plans, they do some hard work. There is a great deal of controversy and conflict. Stakeholder organizations come up with these plans and there is a lot of compromising. When we make a significant proposal that is not necessarily in agreement with the plan then we are undermining what the stakeholders have done. It undermines our process of bringing together these committees to create the management plan on each of our species. Mule deer is a pretty popular one. The portions of it are in opposition to the plan and it undermines the committee process.

Justin Oliver- If we put the elk committee and mule deer committees together and they come up with these plans. I am not familiar with how much public input there is. This process today, gives opportunity to the public to put in their two cents. We also have the RAC as well as our Wildlife Board. So, if we were to stick with the Wildlife Board, would that not eliminate the process of public input, RAC meetings and Wildlife Boards? I feel like all together it works well. The mule deer committee and elk committee has a difficult job but there is also room for more input. I think we have to be able to adapt to what we are finding through experience. There is an opportunity to stray from that if there is evidence showing it is possible.

Bryce Thurgood- The mule deer committee comes up with the plan, submits it before the RACs and at that time we comment and vote on it. We have done what she is saying. They have come up with a plan and we have commented on it and decided to adopt it at that time. It has gone through the process.

Aaron Johnson- If we were to implement this limited entry muzzleloader hunt that occurs after the rifle season and there was some detrimental effects, are we going to revisit that on a yearly basis? Or, do you want it to go 3 years?

Covy Jones- These recommendations would be annual. The way these were proposed, if you drop below criteria for the units, we would recommend cutting those hunts.

Aaron Johnson- A few years ago we allowed people to put magnifying on muzzleloaders. Now, we have scopes and muzzleloaders that are shooting 200-300 yards. Weapon systems are so much better. There could be some overharvest. I appreciate the fact that if there was, this would be pulled away. I have a lot of feedback emails from outdoorsman for and against. It comes down to a decision, if we are 50/50, which way we go.

Covy Jones- These are a lot of good points. In retrospect, we should have called the committee back together and proposed an amendment to the plan in conjunction looking back on things. Again, I think the point has been made. This is also a public process and full disclosure we presented as it was. We are not trying to sneak anything through. We are trying to be completely honest and forthright.

Mike Laughter- With the limited number of tags, it is impossible for overharvest because you are already over objective. If you are only allowing 1-2 permits in an area, if it is 100% success rate, it is unlikely there would be any over harvest correct?

Covy Jones- That is a fair assumption.

Mike Laughter- If you determine, if in that unit, they are exceeding buck to doe ratios and they qualify for these permits at 100% success rate, it cannot be detrimental or can it?

Covy Jones- These permits will be at such a low number, it won't be.

Mike Laughter- That's the clarification I needed.

Bryce Thurgood- If you have 20 permits, at 70-80% harvest, you are taking away from permits.

Mike Laughter- Is it 20 permits or 2 or 3?

Bryce Thurgood- It will be at least 10.

Covy Jones- It will be at least 5 but currently we have 165 of these statewide.

Bryce Thurgood- On how many units?

Covy Jones- 15 units. At 100% success, we are talking 165 deer on a population of over 350,000.

Mike Laughter- It is the personal connection on your own unit right?

Covy Jones- Sure.

Mike Laughter- That is what I hear and feel too. You don't want them taking more deer off your unit because that is your opportunity to hunt.

Bryce Thurgood- We are going to chunk this out. We are not going to do it all together. It will probably be 5 different motions. They deserve their own. We will do elk multi-season, deer split season on rifle, deer late muzzleloader, Oak Creek sheep and then a Zion's and Newfoundland's archery.

Aaron Johnson- Disabled hunters. Received email regarding the decrease time for disabled hunters from 30 days to 10. They were cited because there was some conflicts. Is there any wiggle room to increase days? It does take people to go with them. If I draw that limited entry elk or moose tag, I can walk all over the mountain. This guy in a wheelchair has to hunt from a row and to give him a few more days, I don't see how that would be a conflict with other hunters.

Covy Jones- I can understand that. That is probably bigger than a lot of this. That is something we can definitely take back and discuss.

Aaron Johnson- I would like to take that back and look at it.

Bryce Thurgood- That would be a motion we could make after the recommendation that the Wildlife Board look into it, extending the season on that.

John Blazzard- A few years ago, we were worrying about trying to build the deer herd. Now, we have got a magnanimous deer herd. I want to make sure we have the mechanism in place, with the old system, you could increase or decrease the number of tags on a yearly basis based on counts. I hope this does not take away from the opportunity. We need to be careful when we start coming up with numbers for these new hunts we are proposing.

Bryce Thurgood- Let's starting chunking away at the easier ones first.

Motion

Motion-Aaron Johnson- Accept the proposal to have the Big Horn Sheep hunt on the Oak Creek unit with dates from Sept 9 to Sept 30th.

Second- Matt Klar

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Motion-Aaron Johnson- Accept the proposal to have new archery only OIAL hunt on the New Foundland and Zion units for Big Horn Sheep with season dates New Foundland Dec 11 to Dec 31 and the Zion Nov 11 to Dec 1.

Mellissa Wood- Can we clarify that this is OIAL.

Second-Matt Klar

Motion Passes-Unanimous

Covy Jones- They will be deducted from the quotas in the plan.

John Blazzard- Will that be treated as a limited entry hunt? As far as bonus points?

Covy Jones- They will be sold over the counter. There will be 15,000 for spike. When you go in to buy a permit, you can still buy for archery, muzzleloader or any weapon. Or, you could just have another choice which is, I want to hunt all seasons. There is a price difference. That permit would come out of the 15,000 for spike and 15,000 for any bull that are set aside.

Bryce Thurgood- How many are there going to be?

Covy Jones- It will just be deducted from the quota. When you come in and buy the permit, up to 15,000.

Aaron Johnson- Potentially everybody or potentially no body if they decide right?

Covy Jones- Yes.

Justin Oliver- How many archery, rifle and muzzleloader tags do we have in the state?

Covy Jones- Currently, there are 15,000 spike permits statewide and 15,000 any bull permits. However, when you go and purchase an archery permit, that permit is not deducted from the quota. An archery permit, you are allowed to hunt either unit. This proposal is to allow an individual to go in and hunt all three seasons, either on a spike or any bull unit. That is a permit they could purchase and it would be deducted from the quota.

Justin Oliver- The muzzleloader tag, is that considered any bull?

Covy Jones- It sorts itself out because everyone could come in and say they want a muzzleloader any bull permit and sell up to 15,000 but then you wouldn't sell any rifle permits. We sell out of both every September.

John Blazzard- Once they are sold out, the whole game stops right?

Covy Jones- Once they are sold out, they are sold out. Hopefully, you will buy earlier next year.

Justin Oliver- Potentially, if one guy comes in and purchases an any bull or both for all three seasons, someone is losing opportunity. He is getting three permits for himself.

Covy Jones- It's not three permits, it's still one. It would count as one.

Justin Oliver- We are putting a lot more people on the mountain.

Bryce Thurgood- How many archery hunters did you have last year?

Kent Hersey- 12,000

Covy Jones- That is in addition to 30,000 elk hunters. That is 42,000. You could see a reduction in pressure because archery hunters possibly could not buy an archery permit which is not deducted from the quota and they would buy one of these permits that allows them to hunt all three seasons.

Bryce Thurgood- You could have 20,000 archery hunters also?

Covy Jones-As the rule currently stands, we could.

John Blazzard- Does the muzzleloader hunt pull from that 15,000?

Covy Jones- Yes, all hunts pull from that 15,000 and so would this proposed hunt.

John Blazzard- If any archery hunter decides he wants to buy an all three hunt, that will cut down on the number that are available to the guy that always just buys a muzzleloader tag?

Mike Laughter- Anybody that chooses this would be deducted from those 15,000. But it could be the same guy.

Covy Jones- True.

Mike Laughter- But it is not the guy on the back end if it is the archery guy that decides he wants to muzzleloader hunt. He is the same guy that is buying a tag last year right?

Matt Klar- These permits are first come first serve right? They are stacking 15,000 it does not matter which one you pick. When they are gone, they are gone.

Bryce Thurgood- You are going to have more archery hunters and muzzleloader hunters. We are trying to decrease crowding and we are going to increase crowding. Received emails and 70% are not in favor of this. They want to keep it the way it is.

Justin Oliver- Seems contradictory to what we are doing with rifle deer hunt. Giving 2 seasons to distribute hunters better in the field and this feels like we are doing the opposite.

Covy Jones- We issue almost 90,000 deer tags. We are talking 30,000 elk tags statewide. The Manti itself has 8,800 deer tags on one unit. The perception of crowding is sometimes more the reality than actual crowding.

Bryce Thurgood- The northern region basically only have a handful of spots to do bull. The areas are not as big as the Manti.

Aaron Johnson- I see it as it is similar to dedicated hunter. You would get to hunt all three years. I think it increases opportunity. There is always the potential of a few more bodies on the mountain but potentially less crowded. We are keeping tag numbers the same and expect similar success rate. I like it.

Covy Jones- We don't know until we try it. We are always trying to add opportunity.

Bryce Thurgood- If success goes up, tags will go down.

Covy Jones- There are safeguards in the plan that would address that if success rates increased above 20%.

Justin Oliver- I do applaud the division.

Mike Laughter- The only ones not coming from the quota are archery only right?

Covy Jones- Correct.

Mike Laughter- You had 12,000 last year, a lot of those guys are archery guys that will not buy multi-season. It may not impact it like we think.

Justin Oliver- How did it do in the central RAC?

Covy Jones- It passed.

John Blazzard- I think it would be interesting if we could find out the actual numbers of tags purchased vs. last year or the last 5 years after this first go around if it is approved.

Bryce Thurgood- I'm sure they would bring that before us next year at the same time. Probably would not have too much results or success, maybe a little bit.

Motion-Matt Klar- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the elk multi-season proposal as presented.

Second- Aaron Johnson

Motion Passes- For 10 Against: 2

Justin Oliver- I would like to represent some of the people who sent the emails. I could go either way.

Paul Chase- We keep adding more hunts in October, which we support but that is when we do most of our burns. We have a chance of impacting hunts. Want to make sure people are aware we are continuing to do habitat projects.

Covy Jones- We have been talking about how we work through that and putting something in the application guide.

Paul Chase- That would be great.

Matt Klar- This is splitting the number of hunters, not adding hunters correct?

Covy Jones- I think it depends. I don't want to commit to not adding permits. Where we are above what we agreed to manage, this would allow for addition of permits.

Randy Hutchison- That would be true whether the hunt is split or not correct?

Covy Jones- It would be and it is.

Motion-Matt Klar- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the early deer season hunt as presented.

Second -Justin Oliver

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Paul Chase- Forest Service would like to have a way to notify people that are applying for it that our gates start to close in November. We want to make sure they understand that vehicle access will be limited during this hunt.

Bryce Thurgood- Is that something we put on the application too?

Covy Jones- We could look at adding that in the application guidebook.

Motion

Motion-Mike Laughter- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the late season Limited Entry muzzleloader general season units as presented.

Second- Aaron Johnson

Discussion on the Motion

Aaron Johnson- I think the division has really studied this. I would like to see it run and if it is a success. If not, we can take it away next year.

Justin Oliver- Point creep is great and will help that. It is giving opportunity to other things.

Bryce Thurgood- In the future, it would be nice to give merit to the mule deer committee. We did study and pass it. I don't want to make a repeat of doing this. It takes away from what they did. If we adopt a three year plan, we should stick to the plan.

Mike Laughter- Isn't this just another tool in the plan. If it's not a late muzzleloader hunt, isn't it just increasing tags on units that are over objective anyway.

Bryce Thurgood- It didn't fall under the plan that you voted on correct?

Mike Laughter- Right.

Bryce Thurgood- We could give out more tags to the general season. I'm not opposed, I just don't like the process we are using.

Kristin Purdy- You brought up that the mule deer plan is a 3 year plan right?

Covy Jones- No. 5 year.

Kristin Purdy- I understand that there is a process by which we glean during the life of the plan. What needs to be changed next time. I feel this undermines the plan and the process. I am wondering what the urgency is on this particular one?

Why not offer this to the committee process when it is time?

Motion Passes-For: 7 Against:5

Kristin Purdy- The proposal undermines the mule deer plan and redistributes opportunity away from general season hunters.

Chad Jensen- I would agree with Kristin. It takes away from general hunter opportunity. It is a plan that is in place and it has not played out yet.

John Blazzard- I agree with what Kristin said. Also, it is my personal opinion, if it is limited entry muzzleloader hunt, it should be specified to limited entry hunting units.

Bryce Thurgood- The current limited entry units?

John Blazzard- Yes.

Matt Klar- I have been on these committees and they are not fun to be on. If we are just going to ignore them, what is the point. I would be less likely to be on one in the future. My main objection is the process this was brought forth.

David Earl- Would like to just play out the plan.

Motion

Motion-Matt Klar- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the balance of the items presented.

Second- Aaron Johnson

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Item 8. R657-5 – Taking Big Game Rule Amendments

- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Randy Hutchison- I asked you a little about kinetic energy on bow hunting. With recurve at 30 pounds, will that generate enough energy.

Covy Jones- I think that technology in recurves has not improved over the years. If a 30 or 40 pound recurve is 40 pounds at 28 inches, at 29 inches it is a different weight. At 30 inches it is a different weight. Some of it goes back on the hunter to use a weapon that is lethal and legitimate. If you are out there hunting with a bow that you know won't do the job, I think it's important to step up and get the right equipment. If you can't draw a recurve to the full potential of what that bow needs to do to harvest the animal, that is back on the hunter. Regulating recurves is tough.

Motion

Motion- Justin Oliver- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Taking Big Game Rule Amendments as presented.

Second- Chad Jensen

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Item 9. R657-71 - Removal of Wild Mule Deer from Domesticated Elk Facilities

- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Mike Laughter- Are there penalties for non-compliance? If they fall under the Department of Agriculture and they are not governed by the Division of Wildlife and you find out that they shot a deer that was not delivered to you, what happens next? What kind of penalties should we expect? You cannot feed deer or transplant deer within the 30 mile quarantine.

Covy Jones- I am not completely familiar with their rule. Any wildlife violation would be handled by us according to how we handle poaching or other wildlife violations. Currently, The Department of Agriculture has the resources to better inspect and manage this program. We check everything before we issue these COR's.

Mike Laughter- In the case I am referring to, sportsmen paid the price. We were not allowed to move deer out of Centerville because it fell out of the 30 mile quarantine. We almost were not allowed to feed deer that fell within that 30 mile quarantine. Were there ever any repercussions that came from that particular case? How would that be handled?

Covy Jones- That is a difficult one for me to answer. Luckily, we have Marty Bushman here.

Martin Bushman- I didn't hear the beginning of the question if you could repeat.

Mike Laughter- Given the fact that elk ranches high fence are governed by the Department of Agriculture working in conjunction with The Division of Wildlife to remove deer that are inside the fence, I wanted to know what kind of penalty there would be for non-compliance? I reference this based on the recent case that had a CWD and it affected a 30 mile radius and sportsman.

Martin Bushman- Let me restate this to make sure I understand correctly. Basically, if one of these operators for domestic elk facility has a COR to take a deer in his facility, if he does not report to us, what is the penalty?

Mike Laughter- Sure.

Martin Bushman- Potentially, unlawful take. He is killing wildlife which says you cannot take protected wildlife in code unless authorized. If the take was somehow outside the authorization of the COR, then it would be an unlawful take. If it was a trophy animal, it could be a felony.

Mike Laughter- What if it was CWD?

Martin Bushman- With what was CWD?

Mike Laughter- If it contributed to the spread of CWD or caused the quarantine?

Martin Bushman- The deer inside the facility caused CWD?

Mike Laughter- The deer leaving the facility maybe not tested carrying CWD.

Martin Bushman- You are talking about live release?

Mike Laughter- No, just the transmission of CWD.

Martin Bushman- From a dead animal? There is not going to be a criminal penalty for that but civil exposure possibly. If it causes damages to others. Our rule is going to say if you are going to take an animal inside the facility, you have to notify the division and they will take custody of the animal. If they move the animal without notifying us, it is at least a misdemeanor. I don't know that the CWD is going to enter into the equation on a criminal violation. We don't have laws that address that.

Paul Chase- How often do deer make it inside these facilities. Are we concerned about elk getting out?

Covy Jones- The elk seem to stay in better than the deer stay out. They build high fences and look hard to clear wildlife out before stretching wire but that doesn't always happen. We go out in June and inspect these facilities and at that point, we would feel comfortable getting rid of the deer in there. If it becomes a problem that is an annual problem, then we would have to look at it differently and find out what the real problem is.

Matt Klar- Did you say how many of these facilities we have currently?

Covy Jones- I don't have the number right now. We have a list and I can get you the information.

Randy Wood- Big game rule states It is illegal to hunt except for domesticated elk.

Motion

Motion-Matt Klar-Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R657-71 Removal of Wild Mule Deer from Domesticated Elk Facilities as presented.

Second- Chad Jensen

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Kent Hersey-35

Item 10. Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan

- Randy Larsen, Wildlife Research Coordinator

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Randy Hutchison- As I was reading through the information about how critical the water is, your objective listed without commitment to regular maintenance benefit from water development is short lived. What is planned?

Randy Larsen- The water development issue is a tough issue in the sense that we have multiple agencies that have built these over the years. It is relatively easy to build them. It is a lot harder to plan for maintenance. Right now, we have habitat biologists in each region in charge of maintenance for the water. Some are owned and managed by the state and others by federal agencies. There is additional work that needs to be done and we are committed to getting there but it is a big challenge.

Randy Hutchison- It appears it is a known issue. Is there an organized plan to correct it?

Randy Larsen- I am relatively new to this.

Melissa Wood- As a federal agency, I can kind of answer that question. No, not to my knowledge. In the past, there was agreements between the DWR and BLM about maintenance of guzzlers and funding provided from the government to maintain.

Randy Larsen- Some states, like Nevada, have more guzzlers than we do by double. They have dedicated teams who are part of installation and maintenance crews. The way we have chosen to approach this is by each region that would have a habitat biologist that would be in charge of water developments plus a bunch of other things. This is something we need to discuss more. Anyone else have a better answer?

Mike Wardle- Southern Region habitat section oversees that. They have a person that is dedicated completely to maintenance of the guzzlers. Some of those are ones we have put in and some from BLM.

Randy Larsen- We have been working on a database and we have a good set of information about ones that belong to DWR. They have been put in by multiple agencies.

Scott Walker- Habitat manager for northern region. We have had an agreement to work together with BLM and have a crew that goes out with different kinds of guzzlers. We do make an effort to go out and visit each every year, particularly the big game guzzlers. Even though they are on BLM, we will visit them or work with them. We have a program to maintain guzzlers in the northern region.

Melissa Wood- Where will this funding come from for maintenance on these extra guzzlers?

Randy Larsen- Scott, if you want to answer that, you can.

Scott Walker- Which extra guzzlers?

Melissa Wood- In this plan talking about reintroductions into new areas that water is a limiting factor and guzzlers or wells might be put in to facilitate those reintroductions. From an agency that has guzzlers and trying to manage that workload with the division, we are already strapped and don't get as much done as we probably should or would want to every year.

Scott Walker- If we put in the guzzler, we would take the responsibility to maintain that. We would work with federal agencies or land agency that we would put the guzzler on.

Randy Larsen- In the plan, we are calling out the science that highlights water as an important habitat component. We have conservation groups that do a great job. We probably do need more coordination between federal and state agency in that way.

Justin Oliver- By changing from buck to doe to age difference, how many permits do you foresee increasing in different units or in total throughout the state?

Randy Larsen- When this data was collected, the average age of harvested animals in 2008 and 2009 was 3.7 years. They are close to 4 years of age. We are proposing to shift to somewhere between 2 and 3. Based on how we collectively manage multiple species in this state with age ranges, we are likely to end up in practice on the higher end of that. Closer to a 3 year average. We are potentially going to shift the age down, maybe close to a year. Last year, we gave out about 760 buck pronghorn permits. Age based management only applies to bucks. Maybe somewhere close to 100 permits but that would all be subject to crowding issues and unit recommendations, etc.

Justin Oliver- The state of Utah in total, as far as habitat, do we feel like we could grow our antelope with what we have right now without doing anything or is there room for more?

Randy Larsen- There is room for more. Some populations are doing really well and others like the northwestern half of the state where we have been in long term declines. We feel like there is room to grow and in other areas there is maybe excess animals that can be harvested or use as transplants.

Motion

Motion- Justin Oliver- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan as presented.

Second- Mike Laughter

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Item 11. Statewide Moose Management Plan

- Kent Hersey, Big Game Projects Coordinator

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Kristin Purdy- What is the size of the states population of moose?

Kent Hersey- Generally, we are around 2,600 counted moose. Sight ability of moose is pretty tricky. We don't have a great handle on that. It is very expensive to get that data.

Kristin Purdy- Is that through aerial surveys?

Kent Hersey- Yes, helicopter surveys. Utah State work models that take data. 2,500 or so counts. There is more than what we have here. It seems like we are in the upswing of the cycle. We hope not to reach a peak and crash again.

John Blazzard- The plan says you want to increase the population but you also want to keep it from crashing by killing excess numbers. Is that the only way you figure you can keep this population from crashing is to keep the population steady at a lower level?

Kent Hersey- Yes, if we let them get too high, we will have a mortality event. It seems to be related to when we have some droughts followed by hard winters. It seems like that is when we lose many of our animals. We are exploring exact mechanisms why, in the southern part, ticks might be playing a role. We don't fully understand but we do know that when we hit certain levels, a decline follows.

John Blazzard- How do you determine, as far as habitat, that moose population was over populated? I have never really seen any degregation of the range by moose.

Kent Hersey- It is more difficult than other species. Wyoming is looking at the use of willow habitats trying to predict that. Through some research, we have been looking at body condition and the amount of fat for winter. We can also use historic count data. We can base it on assuming the habitat has not changed that much.

Motion

Motion- Chad Jensen- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Statewide Moose Management Plan as presented.

Second-Mike Laughter

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Item 12. NR Deer Management Plans

- Jim Christensen, Northern Region Asst. Wildlife Manager

See RAC Packet

Public Questions

Lee Tracy- Because you have so much private property up here, there is a program, the walk-in access program. In the past, there has been some substantial walk-in access areas. Is that growing or have you worked more on that? Or is that dropping off like it is down south?

Jim Christensen- We do have a walk-in access biologist. We do have several walk-in access across the region. Every year, she is working on getting new areas and maintaining the areas we do have.

Justin Richins- You mentioned you have the undergrowth, different grasses and WMA units. I am wondering how or if you have tried to address that through grazing?

Jim Christensen- On the majority of our WMA's, we do have grazing. I would have to defer to Scott again on specific types of livestock and grazing and impacts to vegetation there.

Justin Richins- I do see you grazing on them but my observation is I am wondering if you have considered adding more grazing of a different type to remove those grasses.

Jim Christensen- That is something we can discuss with our habitat section and move forward accordingly with that.

RAC Questions

Mike Laughter- At the end, you said you are going to increase buck harvest on unit 3? Can you clarify that for me? Is that on private land?

Jim Christensen- Where they are over objective, in order to come back down to objective. With that, we haven't got this year's data yet. When we combine that with the previous 2 years data, that will determine what level of increases. It may be a handful of tags. After this past winter, we decreased tags on unit 3, along with unit 1 and 2 because we were not sure of the impacts to the buck numbers. We will look into the 3 year average.

Mike Laughter- So that is not set in stone. It is contingent on your counts?

Jim Christensen- Yes, on that 3 year average.

Justin Oliver-On the private lands units of Cache, Kamas and East Canyon, we see we are quite a bit over objective. It is obvious it is because of all the private lands and not nearly the hunting pressure. You mentioned talking with land owners. Basically, it would be CWMU operators. Is there an effort to try and increase those numbers of deer they are taking? I understand they have a business to run and they are trying to keep their trophy animals in there. There are so many animals that stay and never leave that private land.

Jim Christensen- We coordinate with our CWMU's and keep contact with them. The challenge with CWMU's is we can give as many permits as we can but a certain number of those, mainly 90%, come in the form of vouchers and they can choose to redeem or not redeem those vouchers. Only 10% of those permits would go to the public. We are relying on the landowners for access. They see greater financial return on larger quality bucks.

Justin Oliver- I believe the CWMU is a beneficial program. I was just wondering if when the time comes, we look at those numbers instead of 10%. If they are not going to use all of their vouchers, why are we not letting a few more state hunters go in there who are not shooting the prize animals.

Jim Christensen- Again, that is one of those challenges where it is a delicate game we play with them. As soon as it is not an incentive for them, it will be the mule deer that suffer.

John Blazzard- Do you have any idea how many of those vouchers are unclaimed or unsold?

Jim Christensen- I don't.

John Blazzard- The way I look at it, I figured they would redeem all of them.

Jim Christensen- When I was in the Box Elder unit, there were several CWMU's where they would not redeem any of the vouchers or they would only do one or two per year. The minimum amount of total permits has been 10. They would only have their one state hunter and then one or two private hunters. Adding to that, it is a yearly thing. If they are seeing higher quality bucks, they will redeem more vouchers that year and fewer on years they are not seeing quite what they would like.

John Blazzard- Basically, it is based on marketing?

Jim Christensen- Right.

John Blazzard- Rather than managing the animals.

Bryce Thurgood- If the CWMU's are not taking the number they have, the unit is still getting managed on a unit wide basis. The public land tends to suffer because that is where you target more.

Jim Christensen- We will try and classify more deer on those public lands units where that is our main mechanism for deciding permit numbers for the general public through deer classifications. We still have to go across a unit. A unit like Chalk Creek, we are seeing more buck to doe ratios due to landowner tolerance and how those landowners want to see those deer on their property.

Motion

Motion-John Blazzard- Recommend the Wildlife Board Accept the NR Deer Management Plans as presented.

Second- Mike Laughter

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Item 13. CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2018

- Mike Wardle, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Mellissa Wood- How closely do you work with CWMU managers on increases or decreases.

Mike Wardle- Very closely. The rule states it is a consensus between DWR and CWMU operator.

Public Comment

Justin Richins-Jacob's Creek CWMU- I have talked to my biologist about coming here and asking for a bump in moose numbers. On that particular unit, in 2005 and 2006, we had more bulls than we had ever seen. In 2007, we lost moose everywhere. We kept our moose numbers down to the minimum until this year. Our observation over the last 2 years, we have had as many as 19 observable bull moose. It makes no sense to not bump up our bull moose harvest for the next 2 years for public and private.

Bryce Thurgood- What are you currently and what are you proposing?

Justin Richins- We are scheduled currently for 1 public and 1 private. Next year would be 1 private. We are asking for 2 public and 2 private this year and next year do 2 private and 1 public.

Mike Wardle- Keep in mind, when he says this year, its 2018 right?

Justin Richins-2018 would be 2 and 2. 2019 would be 2 and 1.

Bryce Thurgood- We probably want to have a comment from the biologist over that.

Eric Anderson- Biologist over the CWMU. Was there a question?

Bryce Thurgood- Can you support this or comment on it?

Eric Anderson- As Justin mentioned, these populations tend to go up and down. It seems like in some of these areas and CWMU's I cover, the moose have declined a little bit. In his area, the moose have increased. He is responsible for that and feels like we can support that.

Justin Oliver- Is Jacobs Creek is on the backside of the Wasatch?

Justin Richins- Correct. We did have about 6-8 cows on the unit. We noticed that we were pulling in bulls from the Morgan area which no one can harvest. They are coming through the end of the rut looking for cows. We have maintained 100% harvest.

RAC Comment

Mike Laughter- Defer to division on this. With their support or their thumbs up, I would say we can vote on it.

Bryce Thurgood- Letter from CWMU operator, Brian Foutz.

Mike Wardle- This request came after the RAC packet had been sent out.

Bryce Thurgood- Woodruff Creek CWMU requesting deer permit numbers be reduced in 2018. Overall population down 60-70%. Manage for 4-6 year class deer. Current harvest is 60% and 100% harvest for state permits. Currently has 25 CWMU deer tags and 3 state tags. Requesting 18 CWMU tags and 2 state tags.

Mike Wardle- That is something we can support.

Bryce Thurgood- He called me and said his hunter satisfaction is important. He wants them to have a successful hunt.

Mike Laughter- If this is something we are going to vote on, we will break them up right?

Bryce Thurgood- For the two changes.

Justin Oliver- Do we have the ability to grant this here tonight?

Mike Wardle- It would be the Wildlife Board that grants it.

John Blazzard- My concern is we are hearing a two minute blip of why this needs to happen. With biologist working with the operators, I don't see how we can make that decision here when they are the ones on the ground seeing it.

Mike Wardle- These requests have come in a little late. They probably would have been included in our recommendations as well. He didn't feel like this was a huge problem until fall hunting. That is why you are seeing it presented this way rather than coming from us.

Bryce Thurgood- He is jumping ahead because, just like Jim said, the populations are going to be down this year. He is just trying to jump ahead of the curb.

Justin Oliver- If the animals are there and there is an opportunity and the biologist agrees. I think the legwork has been done.

Bryce Thurgood- It still has to go to the Wildlife Board.

Motion

Motion- Mike Laughter - Recommend the Wildlife Board accept CWMU Management Plans and Permit Number for 2018 in addition to the Jacob's Creek CWMU and Woodruff Creek CWMU changes as follows. Jacob's Creek CWMU moose for 2018- 2 public 2 private, 2019- 1 public and 2 private. Woodruff Creek change 25 to 3 split to 18 to 2 for buck deer.

Second-Justin Oliver

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Item 14. Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2018

- Mike Wardle, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

John Blazzard- What kind of criteria are for your recommendation of numbers?

Mike Wardle- We look at the unit wide percentage of private land that offers habitat for the species. Then, we compare that to how much private land that is considered habitat for that species is within the landowner association. Say that you have 20,000 acres within a unit that is considered mule deer habitat. There is 2,000 acres within the landowner association that is considered habitat. So, 2,000 acres is 10% of 20,000 acres. So, 10% of permits for that unit would go to LOA.

John Blazzard- You said they were able to hunt the whole unit rather than just their own private grounds?

Mike Wardle- Yes.

John Blazzard- Is their own private ground open to public hunters?

Mike Wardle- In the rule, it says they are suppose to allow access to public hunters. A limited number.

Justin Oliver- Suppose to?

Mike Wardle- We don't really have a way of checking up on that yet. That is something we are looking in to.

Justin Oliver- I didn't know the difference if I can force my way in there, I didn't do that. We were denied multiple times and it was a landowner tag. I was curious how that was enforced?

Mike Wardle- I am new to this position. That is something we have been asked to look at and something we are considering.

Covy Jones- When we sent out renewal applications for that, we asked them to send a list of public hunters they allowed onto the association to hunt. Did you have a private landowner tag you purchased?

Justin Oliver- It was a landowners tag purchased through a wildlife banquet. It was meant for landowner association who donated to this group. You had multiple owners and a lot of them would not let you on.

Covy Jones- Yes to both. They have to allow an equivalent numbers of public hunters through the public draw on private land to hunt. Also, any voucher that is sold and redeemed, those lands are open to all of those vouchers. Both private land that participates in the landowner association and the public land which is in rule. In the future, call us and we will take care of that.

Mellissa Wood- Do you take into account the habitat quality when you are deciding on these numbers? Or is it strictly acreage?

Mike Wardle- For each unit, we have habitat maps. That is where we are getting our numbers from.

Mellissa Wood- Presence or absence of habitat?

Mike Wardle- Yes.

Mellissa Wood- Ok.

RAC Comment

Mellissa Wood- I feel like it is not a good reward for some of these landowners if they have better quality habitat on their lands, to just be given permits based on the land acreage they are offering. It does not seem like a very good incentive to have good habitat and manage those plans in a healthy way. I don't know if that is anything we can change. It is in the rule that is how you do it?

Mike Wardle- It is in the rule.

Bryce Thurgood- I think it is a good incentive because if they get the Pavant landowners elk association, those tags are worth \$30,000 dollars apiece. I think that is good incentive to want and try to do it.

Covy Jones- We have had a lot of discussions and our concern is that any time we can be fair, firm and consistent we end up better. Being objective is best. Our biologists live in these communities. When you start to rate habitat, everyone's habitat is a 10. Mapping habitat is a more fair, firm and consistent objective on how to do that.

Mellissa Wood- Thanks, that's helpful.

Motion

Motion- Aaron Johnson- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2018 as presented.

Second- Mellissa Wood

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Item15. R657-67 – Mentor Rule Amendments

- Phil Gray, Licensing Coordinator

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Justin Oliver- Do you foresee issues with someone putting their tag up for sale?

Phil Gray- The rule as it exists now, it is unlawful to do that. In the application process, if it is not an immediate family member, they will have to sign for parental permission. The parent will have to sign to say someone can take their kid out and they are not paying to do so. The mentor will have to sign something similar saying they are not getting compensation.

Public Comment

Lee Tracy- Without going too much into detail, when this program first came out, I agreed with it with the exception that the OIAL and limited entry tags not be included in the program. That did not go over very well. I think these changes have worn me out that this is opening a can of worms. It allows and promotes somewhat various kinds of loopholes and abuses. I realize that the mentor is not to be compensated, but does that include third parties that may want to pay the mentor and the youth for the rights to the hunt. It also opens up opportunities for mentors to utilize that information in a business type way or for PR purposes. I think as it is written, I am referring to including the OIAL and limited entry tags, I oppose these changes.

RAC Comment

Mellissa Wood- Can we have the division respond to that comment from the public?

Phil Gray- I will respond to the OIAL and limited entry opportunities. We have had 16 OIAL permits shared in 4 years. I would disagree that it is opening a can of worms. If people are willing to share that opportunity with the youth, why not let them. As far as the comment of capitalizing on it, it is already illegal. I have not heard of an incident where it has happened. All we can do is make it illegal and if they do get caught or we find out about it, we will pursue it.

Bryce Thurgood- I personally think it is an awesome idea. If I drew a OIAL out of state and was to get lucky and draw a OIAL in Utah, I would give that tag to one of my kids.

Chad Jensen- If I draw a OIAL tag and give it up to one of my kids, as a parent, It is my prerogative to give it to my kid. I don't foresee tags being sold. 90% of what goes on does not get charged or arrested. We have to have some trust and faith in sportsman that they will do the right thing.

Motion

Motion-Chad Jensen-Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R657-67- Mentor Rule Amendments as presented.

Second-Justin Oliver

Motion Passes- Unanimous.

Motion to adjourn

Meeting Ends- 10:36p.m.

**SOUTHERN REGION RAC MEETING
Cedar Middle School, Cedar City, UT
November 14, 2017 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 & RULE AMENDMENTS- 2018

MOTION: Mike Worthen made the motion to accept the Waterfowl Recommendations & Rule Amendments-2018 as presented Tammy Pearson seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

3. R657-19- TAKING OF NON-GAME MAMMALS RULE AMENDMENT

MOTION: Craig Laub made the motion to accept the R657-19- Taking of Non-game Mammals Rule Amendment as presented Tammy Pearson seconded. Motion carried

VOTE: 10 and 1 abstention unanimous

4. BUCKS, BULLS, AND OIAL 2018 SEASON DATES, APPLICATION TIMELINE

Brayden Richmond made the recommendation for early riffle hunt **Wade Heaton** seconded 8:3 motion carries

Cactus buck hunt on the Paunsaugunt and the 9-day hunt being held on the last 9 days of October, with the Caveat that it could be and 8-day hunt if first of the 9 days is a Sunday. Rusty Aiken made the motion to for later season hunt **Brian Johnson** seconded. Unanimous

Late muzzle loader hunt Riley Robert made the motion to approve as purposed. **Rusty Aiken** seconded 5: 6 fails

Brian Johnson: made the motion to add the late muzzle loader hunt for units that managed 18-20 bucks **Rusty Aiken** Seconds 5:6 fails

Oak Creek sheep hunt Brian Johnson made the motion that we have a hunt **Riley Robert** seconded 10:1 carries

Adding additional archery hunts to Newfoundland and Zion Sheep units Rusty Aiken make the motion **Brayden Richmond** seconded 10:1 carries

Multi-season elk hunts Braydon Richmond make the motion as presented with the exception of the cost from 150 to 100 seconded **Brian Johnson** 8:3 carries

Brian Johnson: motions that muzzle loader hunters can shoot cow/bull like archery on over objective units Mike Worthen seconded 7:4 carries

Wade Heaton motion to approve the rest as presented Brayden Richmond seconded. Unanimous

5. R657-5- TAKING BIG GAME RULE AMENDMENTS

MOTION: Brain Johnson motion: to accept as presented with the exception that the definition of a cactus buck should be 50% or more coverage to antlers, and remove the 1 power scope limitations on the crossbows when a COR has been issued, and to remove the restriction of hunter orange on premium limited entry units.

VOTE: 10:1 passes

6. R657-71- REMOVAL OF WILD MULE DEER FROM DOMESTIATED ELK FACILITIES

MOTION: Craig Laub made the motion to accept the R657-71- Removal of Wild Mule Deer from Domesticated Elk Facilities as presented Rusty Aiken seconded. Motion carried

VOTE: Unanimous

7. STATEWIDE PRONGHORN MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION: Tammy Pearson made the motion to accept the Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan for 2017 as presented Verland King seconded.

VOTE: 10:0 1 Abstention

8. STATEWIDE MOOSE MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION: Riley Robert made the motion to accept the Statewide Moose Management Plan for 2017 as presented Wade Heaton seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

9. NR DEER MANAGEMENT PLANS

MOTION: Braydon Richmond made the motion to accept the NR Deer Management Plans for 2017 as presented Wade Heaton seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

10. CWMU MANAGEMENT PLANS AND PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2018

MOTION: Rusty Aiken made the motion to accept the CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2018 for 2017 as presented Riley Robert seconded. Motion carried

VOTE: 9:0 1 Abstention

11. LANDOWNER ASSOCIATION PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2018

MOTION: Tammy Pearson made the motion to accept the Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2018 as presented Verland King seconded. Motion carried

VOTE: 9:0 1 Abstention

12. R657-67 MENTOR RULE AMENDMENTS

MOTION: Brian Johnson made the motion to accept R657-67- Mentor Rule Amendments as presented Tammy Pearson seconded. Motion carried

VOTE: 9:1 Pass

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
----------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------

Rusty Aiken Verland King Dave Black William (Gene) Boardman Wade Heaton Brian Johnson Nick Jorgensen Sean Kelly Craig Laub Tammy Pearson Brayden Richmond Riley Robert Michael Worthen	Johnny Neil Mindi Cox Jessica Von Woert Blair Stringham Covy Jones Randy Larsen Kent Hersey Jim Christensen Mike Wardle Phil Gray Phil Tuttle Jim Lamb Vance Mumford David Smedley Kevin Bunnell Heather Talley Paul Washburn Mark Ekins Teresa Griffin Josh Pollock Cody Evans Kyle Christensen Lynn Zubeck	Donny Hunter Steve Dalton	Harry Barber
--	--	------------------------------	--------------

Dave Black called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. There were approximately 39 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. Dave Black explained RAC meeting procedures.

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

Kevin Bunnell: Yes, thank you Dave, given the length of our agenda tonight, I'm going to forgo the regional update unless there is specific questions from, from members of the RAC. Other than to mention there is a meeting tomorrow night here in Cedar City from 5 to 7 that the BLM is hosting to take comment on, or to present I think the process on the RMP Amendments for sage grouse that some might be interested in attending. That is over at Festival Hall. Also make note that we have had some changes in my front desk staff. Mindi Cox who is here is our new office manager and Johnny, and Johnny I'm not sure I know your last name, that's how new you are, Johnny Neil is at our front desk now as well. Appreciate them being here and with that in mind, for members of the RAC, please make sure that you speak into the mic clearly tonight. We have a long agenda and to be able to keep Mindi and Johnny and Phil up to date so that we have good minutes of the meeting we're gonna have to make sure that we stay organized on this end so, at the end of each agenda item Dave, let's just check with them and make sure that we've got, we're all on the same page before we move onto the next agenda item.

The other thing on the agenda is the Wildlife Board update, the last time we met as a RAC we talked about the Hunter Education Rule Amendments, the Fur Bearer Rule Amendments, Bobcat Harvest Recommendations, Cougar Recommendations, The Beaver Management Plan, Expo Permits, and the really main point of discussion with all of those was, was with the Fur Bearer Rule Amendments and some regulations on trapping and the distance that was allowed around a structure. To, where people could trap without having to worry about marking traps and that sort of thing. The original recommendation was 100 feet. That was amended to 600 feet or the recommendation that came out of our RAC was 600 feet and that is ultimately what the Wildlife Board accepted. Other than that I think most of the rest of our recommendations from that meeting passed as they were presented.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)

Craig Laub made the motion to accept the agenda and minutes as presented. Braydon Richmond seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Waterfowl Recommendations & Rule Amendments - 2018 (action)

-Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: I don't see any questions from the RAC, do we have any questions from the audience on this one particular item? Okay, we haven't received any comment cards on this item, do we have any comments from the RAC? Looks like we're ready to entertain a motion.

Questions from the Public:

Dave Black: Any questions from the public?

NONE

Comments from the Public:

NONE

Dave Black: Any questions or comment cards?

RAC discussion and vote:

Mike Worthen made the motion to accept the Waterfowl Recommendations & Rule Amendments-2018 as presented Tammy Pearson seconded. Motion carried unanimous

R657-19- Taking of Non-game Mammals Rule Amendment (action)

-Jessica Van Woert, Utah Prairie Dog Wildlife Biologist

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Thank you. Any questions from the RAC?

Tammy Pearson: Yes, so have we exhausted all measures to fight this to the Supreme Court and beyond?

Jessica Van Woeart: So PETPO, the group that originally filed this lawsuit with the Fish and Wildlife Service, they've actually gone to the Supreme Court, with the State I believe have filed an Amicus Brief or? I'll let Kevin take it.

Kevin Bunnell: So, they have filed an appeal to ask the Supreme Court to hear it, in all reality its unlikely that they will because the Circuit Court, 10th Circuit Court decision out of Denver was in line with the 5 other Circuit Court decisions and so it's, when you have all the Circuit Courts agreeing, it's unlikely that the Supreme Court will take up the case. But, it has been filed and maybe they'll you know maybe they'll hit a home run.

Tammy Pearson: So, my next question would be, there is a complete revamping hopefully of the endangered species rule, with our current administration and I'm wondering if we can wait on this?

Kevin Bunnell: Um,

Tammy Pearson: I mean I'm not trying to say we don't need to be in compliance I'm just saying would we have another opportunity to,

Kevin Bunnell: Um this certainly wouldn't preclude us from taking advantage of any future opportunity, and which we would do but we need to be in line with what the current rules are and that's all that this current proposal is asking.

Tammy Pearson: Agree.

Dave Black: Any other questions? Gene.

Gene Boardman: Yeah, who's filing the lawsuits that get, got this overturned? Is it the US Fish and Wildlife Service or is it an environmental group?

Jessica Van Woeart: So, it was PETPO, People for the Ethical Treatment of Property Owners, a group out of Iron County who initially sued the Fish and Wildlife Service and then the Fish and Wildlife Service went and appealed the decision that had happened in the US District Court.

Gene Boardman: Ok.

Kevin Bunnell: So, Gene it is the Federal Government that appealed the decision and got it changed back.

Gene Boardman: Um, the other question I've got is, isn't there enough prairie dogs on public land to sustain the prairie dog situation?

Jessica Van Woeart: Currently we haven't met the recovery goal so the Fish and Wildlife Service in their recovery plan wants to have 1,000 spring counted adult prairie dogs in each recovery unit. We have the

West Desert in Iron County, the Paunsaugunt up in Garfield County, and then the Awapa Plateau and we have not reached 1,000 for 5 consecutive years. However, the Paunsaugunt is on the way towards reaching that goal.

Dave Black: Another question? Go ahead.

Tammy Pearson: One more question. So I know that the original rule was counts on private property or grounds that were not federal, that you could not count the animals, is there, with us reversing this back to the federal rule does that now allow you to count all dogs or does it still restrict you to federal ground?

Jessica Van Woeart: No, its old, the only dog, we count every prairie dog colony, however, the ones that are credited toward recovery are the ones that are found on public and protected lands so and that's still been through the process, prairie dogs were still listed as an endangered species out on the federal protected lands, even when that court case happened, so we're just back to a full endangered species act across the board of land ownership.

Tammy Pearson: So, does this still restrict private property owners and you guys coming and trapping the and moving them out?

Jessica Van Woeart: No, this doesn't and actually we're working towards a better plan with the Fish and Wildlife Service to allow a little bit more flexibility with that hopefully coming in the next trapping season, so this is just putting the rules back into place how they were before just so that we are meeting the endangered species act regulations and federal regulations.

Tammy Pearson: Ok.

Kevin Bunnell: And Tammy I will mention that there is a parallel effort going on by the State to put together enough data that we think is convincing and compelling and when we have that, all of that data put together our hope is to be able to file for the species to be de-listed. You don't have, you know a recovery plan is just, it isn't a regulatory document, we feel like we can make the case that prairie dogs are secure in the State and once we have all that information put together our intent is to file for the species to be de-listed, regardless of what the recovery plan says.

Tammy Pearson: I appreciate that.

Dave Black: Thank you Tammy. Good questions. Any other questions? Do we have any questions from the public? I don't see any comment cards, do we have any comments from the RAC? Mike?

Questions from the Public:

NONE

Comments from the Public:

NONE

RAC discussion and vote:

Mike Worthen: I just like to recognize how much work that the DWR has put into this, first developing the plan that replaced the old habitat or the ACP, the Habitat Conservation Plan, worked great until it was overturned and they are working really hard right now trying to mesh that into this new general plan that hopefully will allow de-listing and move forward so I just want to make sure we note that.

Dave Black: Thank you. Craig?

Craig Laub: I will concur with Mike and say it was a sad day when the prairie dogs were turned back over to the feds cause they didn't do nothing with them for 30 years.

Dave Black: Thank you. I'm ready to entertain a motion.

Craig Laub made the motion to accept the R657-19- Taking of Non-game Mammals Rule Amendment as presented. Tammy Pearson seconded. Motion carried 10 and 1 abstention Unanimous.

**Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL 2018 Season Dates, Application Timeline (action)
-Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Thank you Covy. I'm sure there will be a lot of questions from the RAC. I have 2 to start with. You mentioned with the late muzzleloader hunt it was in conflict with the management plan that we have in place. Can you tell us what that conflict is?

Covy Jones: Yeah great, thanks for bringing that up. In the statewide plan, the statewide plan, it allows for these types of hunts. But, it allows for this hunt to occur on the higher end of the general season unit so the ones that are managed for 18 bucks, 18 to 20 and then the language in the plan states that it allows for that to occur on units that are exceeding that objective, so that are over 20. And like I said before, what we found is that really sends a mixed message.

Dave Black: Can you explain that a little bit more too?

Covy Jones: Sure, so the message it sends is that if a biologist doesn't follow a plan and makes management recommendations to have that unit above what we agreed to manage it for, then they are rewarded with a limited entry hunt. And, what we want to do is manage to the plan, manage to what we've agreed to, and we feel like we can still offer this opportunity without having negative, or any population impacts.

Dave Black: Ok thank you. My second question is on the cactus buck hunt, maybe you mentioned this but have you decided or will it be decided in the future, will those, will that hunt be a limited entry hunt where you burn premium points or?

Covy Jones: It will be a limited entry hunt yes, you will have to burn limited entry bonus points to hunt that hunt. But it's not a premium limited entry hunt it's just a limited entry hunt.

Dave Black: Ok thank you. Ok I'll open it up to the RAC for questions.

Wade Heaton: Covy I'm just wondering if this is a typo on the season dates for hunters with disabilities, you've got it listed as the early any-weapon hunt, it says, maybe go back one slide to your last slide, early any-weapon deer. Isn't that supposed to be October 8th through October 9th?

Covy Jones: Yup.

Wade Heaton: Okay, it seemed early to me, I was just.

Covy Jones: Thanks Wade good catch.

Dave Black: Okay, other questions? Okay, go ahead Rusty.

Rusty Aiken: On the elk recommendations for the 3 hunts, so there is a total of 15,000 elk permits over the counter?

Covy Jones: That is correct, there is a total of 15,000 spike permits available and 15,000 any bull permits available.

Rusty Aiken: There has been a lot of comments on our emails that people are concerned that we are limiting opportunity, if a person can buy 3 tags then that limits 2 other people from buying permits, is that gonna happen, is that what they are doing?

Covy Jones: No, it wouldn't deduct 3 permits from the quota, it would deduct 1. So, when, when you go in and when a hunter has the opportunity to buy one of these and they choose to buy one of these, it wouldn't deduct, he is 1 person and 1 permit.

Rusty Aiken: So, it's only counted as 1?

Covy Jones: It is only counted as one.

Rusty Aiken: Ok, one other thing, on the early hunt, rifle hunt that you are that is the 5 days, is that a soft opener or is that started beginning on a Wednesday, Thursday?

Covy Jones: It is not a Saturday.

Rusty Aiken: The 10th isn't a Saturday?

Covy Jones: It's a Wednesday.

Rusty Aiken: So, you will always start it on that Wednesday?

Covy Jones: It's the way that fit best with the season dates.

Dave Black: Okay, Gene.

Gene Boardman: On having an early deer rifle hunt, what is going to be the breakdown on the tags?

Covy Jones: Gene that is a good question, we haven't gone through that yet. What I can say is that the plan allows for some variation from the number set aside, the 60 2015, we will, we don't know exactly what that breakdown will look like yet. But, we intend to move some pressure and possibly add some opportunity as well.

Gene Boardman: Doesn't that create kind of a problem for when the, the applications go in?

Covy Jones: We always set numbers in the Spring.

Gene Boardman: We always do but I don't know, it needs to have a percentage or well anyway, looks to me like it could be a problem that's gonna cause people to not draw for what they think they should because the tags went the other direction.

Covy Jones: I guess what I would say Gene is I can understand that concern. When, when you put in now you are allowed multiple choices and those choices don't have to be different units they can be the same unit and different hunts. And hopefully that accounts for some of that.

Braydon Richmond: I have kind of a follow-up question for Gene's question. The question is the application dates and this is a question we get every year and I just wanted if you could answer publicly for us. Why can't we move the application period back so, I understand why we can't move the recommendations forward cause we're still waiting on counts. Why can't we move the application period back so we could have those numbers prior to the applications?

Covy Jones: You know we have Phil Gray here who is probably a little better at answering that question. You are welcome Phil.

Phil Gray: Hi, Phil Gray, License Coordinator in the Salt Lake Office. Can you repeat the question for me please just so I understand?

Braydon Richmond: So, the common concern is we don't know the numbers until after we apply and it does affect what you would do in some situations, so the question is, why can't we move the application period, later in the year after we have the numbers?

Phil Gray: There is a very small turnaround time for us to get those numbers to the draw contractor, get everything tested and make sure its gonna run right. So, we've already got, right now it's about a 2-week window, between when we find out what the permit numbers are and when the draw actually happens, besides that, a lot of tradition. We've applied early in the winter for a long time, my understanding, this is well before my time, but the way I understand that it was, it was set at that time because that's when people are applying for time off from work so they can actually go on these hunts in the Spring. So, if we, if we adjusted the application dates, it would take a massive effort to educate everybody on it and of course we would miss somebody and to be quite honest, the State would freak out. Not saying that it's not possible but,

Braydon Richmond: I was gonna say it seems like we do a freak out commonly.

Phil Gray: Did that answer your question? It may not be the answer you wanted but

Braydon Richmond: I guess since you asked me that I'll answer. I didn't get any meat out of that answer, it seemed like opinions and maybe pie in the sky answer.

Phil Gray: Yeah, I understand what you are saying. Again, it's not my specialty, that's just the way I understand it.

Brandon Richmond: (off mic).

Phil Gray: I'm gonna keep my mouth shut from now on.

Dave Black: Riley?

Riley Robert: A couple of questions. Thank you by the way, you guys do a great job, first one on the, the splitting the seasons. How do dedicated hunters fit into this? Do they choose or do they just get to hunt both, now they get 4?

Covy Jones: So dedicated hunters no matter how many days they hunt they still can only harvest 2 deer every 3 years and so, we just weren't concerned that its, nothing in the rule that would preclude them from hunting this other hunt, so there is some units where I guess they get a bonus.

Riley Robert: Follow up on that are you concerned at all with the over-crowding and now you are taking some of the, maybe the over crowdedness from the general deer, but now you are putting that right back onto an elk? You've got the same hunters out there, I mean isn't there some concern there, aren't we just swapping one for another?

Covy Jones: We've heard some of those concerns of, what will this look like on top of the general season elk and the truth is, is its one of those things we're willing to try and take some feedback and see if, does this work, is it a good thing, again, if you refer back to the study, a lot of our hunters said this is something that we would like to see, please, please let us try this. When we asked on the survey it was overwhelmingly positive. It, there will be a possibility of elk hunters out there that overlaps those season dates, so, I don't think we'll know until we try it.

Riley Robert: Alright. 2 more questions and then I'm done.

Kevin Bunnell: Riley let me just add to that, there is a difference in scale on the number at least of tags available, maybe that equates to the number of hunters on the ground and maybe it doesn't but there's about what 15,000 elk hunters, rifle elk hunters and about 60,000 rifle deer hunts so you are putting them on top of a hunt but it's a hunt that has much fewer tags to begin with.

Covy Jones: And that is a good point Kevin, I was looking, the Manti unit alone, 9,000 deer hunters. And Statewide, 15,000 elk hunters. So, it is different.

Riley Robert: Um, have you, what does the biologists say as far as your buck to doe ratio, ratios on our late muzzleloader, I mean we're talking less than a handful of permits on the units, I mean do we have 15 right now that we've tried this on, have we seen any decrease other than the one unit? I think you

mentioned that we had the one unit that we had that fell back below, have any of the others, have you seen any change in the buck to doe ratio?

Covy Jones: The number of deer that are taking these permits is so small we wouldn't pick it up in our classification. It really is again 15 units, 165 permits, they are not 100% success, so it's very, very few animals. It's not something, if we want to talk about would you see an individual, sure there are individual deer that are harvested but it's not something that is biologically significant.

Riley Robert: Alright and my final question on the recommendation on the multi-season elk, maybe it's a two-part question, do we have a problem killing elk in Utah and do we need to, to present, is it mainly because of opportunity or is this, are we getting overpopulated here?

Covy Jones: Where this, you know this is mainly bull harvest so it's not to address any type of population issues, it's saying we have a resource out there and we can offer more opportunity on that resource to hunters who love to hunt and if we have that resource and we have the ability to offer opportunity without negatively impacting those populations, why not? There are safe guards in the plan where if harvest success exceeds 20%, it says we reduce permits for the next year. And frankly we're not concerned.

Riley Robert: Do you have any projections on harvest on that, I mean I know that's a tough one?

Covy Jones: Yeah, that is really tough, that's tough to get a, I can say I don't think it will go above 20%.

Riley Robert: Okay, thank you.

Dave Black: Verland?

Verland King: I guess I am just a dumb cowboy but I can't, I was wondering why do you have a date where you can't sell your head or your horns? I don't understand what the issue would be, if you bought the tag and harvested it legally, so?

Covy Jones: I must be a dumb biologist because I have the same question.

Verland King: Alright.

Covy Jones: The reason, the rationale behind this is, if you are correct, if you harvest legally, that's great and it won't hurt to wait a little while to sell that, that head. But if you harvest illegally, it forces the individual who harvests to hold onto that a little longer and allow law enforcement time to possibly build a case or start to look into that, so that's why it is outside the season of the normal hunt dates.

Dave Black: Craig?

Craig Laub: I was just wondering would that 3, adding the extra hunts onto the, will that hurt your over time could it hurt your big bull population because more often, more times those (inaudible) kill more spikes?

Covy Jones: So, you are worried about the increase in harvest success on spike units? I, honestly that's

not, not been an issue. We have areas in the state where we've had spike harvest for a long time, harvest success is low, 15%, 12%?

Unknown: Yeah 15, 16%.

Covy Jones: 15, 16% harvest, hunting spikes is tough. The, the hunters that get out there and get after it and know how to hunt elk, seem to get it done, and a lot of guys put a lot of effort in and don't, that harvest success is just doesn't seem to go way up.

Gene Boardman: 15-16% harvest, is that 15, 16% of the hunters or 15, 16% of the spike elk?

Covy Jones: Good question, that's 15-16% of the permits, so of the hunters. Spike harvest is a good thing. It's important that there is a few ranchers up there, I can see them and I don't think any one of you would run your bull to cow ratios at 1-1, spike harvest allows us to manage populations and to not manage all of our harvest through antlerless harvest and it helps keep those bull to cow ratios in check on these units where we manage for an older age class bull.

Phil Gray: Hopefully I've got a better answer for you Mr. Richmond, there is a lot of logistics to do with it too on the timing of the hunt, so we basically have hunts starting the first week, near the first of April, mitigation hunts beginning then as well, so we also have to allow time for over the counter general bull elk, any remaining permits left from the draw, any remaining antlerless permits left after that draw, as well so all of those things determine your eligibility, whatever you drew in the big game or antlerless draw, determines what you may or may not be eligible for come July, so if we waited till April, beginning or mid-April to get those permit numbers in and open the draw, run it for 6 weeks, we are pushing up on a very narrow time window to run the draw, make sure there are no errors, make sure all the billing that goes through with that as well, a lot of peoples cards are declined or missing or canceled at that time so we have to go back and make sure we get all of the money for the permit fees as well. So, it just creates a much shorter, more complicated timing window between once permits are issued from the draw and when permits for the general stuff go over the counter.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you. Appreciate that. I guess my comment, and well its not comment time but since we're talking, I guess my comment to that would be Utah does have one of the earliest draws out there so it would appear to me that it is feasible but I do, saying that its feasible isn't to say that its not difficult, I can see that it would be difficult, its just a common question we get and I can see the reason behind the question cause if you are trying to figure out what to apply for, it would sure be nice to know what's available.

Phil Gray: Yeah, understandable.

Dave Black: Tammy.

Tammy Pearson: Hey stranger, its your favorite commissioner. So, the units this year, or the last 2 years on your late muzzleloader, how many units did you do and how many permits did you issue?

Covy Jones: 15 units and 165 permits.

Tammy Pearson: That was the current so if you moved that to all units, then, all general units, what is

your increase in permits?

Covy Jones: I can tell you that it, we've committed to always keeping these limited and in the plan again it says you know, very, very few quantity of limited permits. I, I'm hesitant to throw a number out.

Tammy Pearson: Oh, come on do it.

Covy Jones: I just, I don't think we can yet. But I can tell you that they would always be limited. Realistically again, you know as long as in Utah we choose to have 2 systems, its our job to try and legitimize both systems, and that's what we're really trying to do is say, okay, we try to provide all the opportunity we can on general season, on general season units and we also have to try to provide opportunity in limited entry. It is much less. But we have to try to provide some.

Tammy Pearson: So, if you were going to increase that, so you'd go from 15 units to what?

Covy Jones: 29 total units.

Tammy Pearson: 29 units?

Kevin Bunnell: Some of those are limited entry, it would be closer to 25.

Covy Jones: 25, okay 25 total units.

Tammy Pearson: So, you would, so the recommendation, even though it is against the plan, is not to limit it to the units that are barely making the minimum, its to allow it on all units then?

Covy Jones: So, it's to allow it on all units that are meeting the minimum buck doe ratios.

Tammy Pearson: So, you still, but,

Covy Jones: You still have to meet the minimum, so if you are not above 15 you wouldn't qualify.

Tammy Pearson: So that is what you're saying Kevin is its possibly not gonna be 29 it would come back down to 25 because they are not all meeting the ratio?

Covy Jones: They are all meeting what Kevin is saying is some are already limited entry units.

Kevin Bunnell: Yea I think the 29 and,

Unknown: (off mic).

Kevin Bunnell: 29, so it is 29 general season.

Covy Jones: So, it is 29 general season units. I'm sorry.

Tammy Pearson: Ok.

Kevin Bunnell: Typically, Tammy a lot of those hunts have 5 tags so if you added 14 and each had 5 you would add 70 tags. As kind of a ball park figure.

Covy Jones: But again they could be more if the unit has a population that will sustain more.

Tammy Pearson: K what has your success rate been? 100%?

Covy Jones: No. About 60, I knew it was in the sixties, about 66%. So a D if you were in school.

Tammy Pearson: So, what is the comparison between that then and your regular season?

Covy Jones: Regular general season or regular?

Tammy Pearson: General season?

Covy Jones: General season. So, are we comparing this against all three, so this is when it gets tough because do we compare across from general season muzzleloader or do we compare to general season archery muzzleloader??

Tammy Pearson: All of the above. Just ballpark it.

Kevin Bunnell: The best comparison is probably with rifle.

Covy Jones: Yeah, straight across from the rifle and they vary, they vary quite a bit. It depends on the unit. Some units are actually higher on the rifle hunt than they were on this hunt. Some are lower but overall its general season rifle, Kent? 47% success. We're making him work for his money tonight. Thank you, Kent.

Dave Black: K. Riley?

Riley Robert: Ok just a follow up on that, hopefully this doesn't make anybody's head spin but when we are talking about all general season, have we looked at doing that on the limited entry as well? A late muzzleloader and if not why?

Covy Jones: We haven't looked at that Riley but we would be willing to take that back and look into it.

Dave Black: Okay, that is a good question. Brian?

Covy Jones: So, part of the reason is it would offer, it might offer displacement of tags on those units, so it moves permits around. Remember, most of these limited entry populations are much smaller, much more controlled, already managed for much higher buck doe ratios and so, it, it, it doesn't, it might not provide additional permits. Does that answer your question?

Brian Johnson: Alright now I've got a question. I've been trying to be quiet. We just spent 40 minutes saying its not gonna change, not gonna cost us biologically to do this, and now all of the sudden we're like we;; you know what now this one here is a little bit special and I get they are special units so we, I think it's a great idea to throw some more tags at some of these if we're talking 5 tags, now Wade is over

here and gonna smack me because he gets mad if I start talking about a tag on the Paunsaugunt but I'm just wondering if biologically if we're talking about 50 deer per 100 does, if 5 is gonna make a difference in November, but I don't know. That's something that you obviously said you'll look into, so.

Covy Jones: We will look into it but, but lets acknowledge that they are not the same.

Brian Johnson: Absolutely. I do have a question. General season, general season deer tags, how many do we give out?

Covy Jones: How many last year? 86,000. Somewhere in that neighborhood.

Brian Johnson: 86,000? K, that's fine and how many people didn't draw tags? About 70?

Covy Jones: How many applications?

Brian Johnson: How many applications came up dry?

Covy Jones: 130,000 last year? 106,000?

Brian Johnson: It's higher than that I think it's,

Unknown: (Off mic).

Brian Johnson: Okay and then just another question, we cut tags I don't know how many years ago with the promise to give them back when opportunity came back and I get that how many tags in the 80's, just roughly ballpark did we have.

Kevin Bunnell: 300,000.

Brian Johnson: How many? That's what I thought. And crowding is an issue at 86,000. Just, just a question. You don't have to answer me cause it's a social question. And that's fine just something to think about.

Covy Jones: Brian is it a question or is it a statement cause if it's a question I'll answer it.

Brian Johnson: Yeah, it's a question, I mean yeah let's talk about it.

Covy Jones: There's crowding, there's perceived crowding, and, and they are the same. Lets remember that the deer hunt is not what it used to be in the 80's. Who knows how many permits there were out there that were sold where that individual never went out and hunted. Fair point. So, it's not exactly the same and it's a difficult comparison to do.

Brian Johnson: (off mic). And I guess, and I guess the point I wanted to bring with this and I guess I should have done it in the comments section is that, that it is, crowing, crowding, actual crowding and perceived crowding in your opinion is the same thing right because the complaint is the same.

Covy Jones: Yeah.

Kevin Bunnell: I think Brian its worth acknowledging that the reason this is coming is because we've heard about it several years through the public process, so we're responding to what the feedback that we're getting.

Brian Johnson: (off mic).

Covy Jones: Brian we expect you to be difficult.

Brian Johnson: You know and I'm just glad I didn't let you down.

Dave Black: Wade go ahead.

Wade Heaton: Yes please, Covy just a quick question on the cactus buck hunt. Which I am a big fan of. I do have one little concern though about our description of the hunt. And my question is have we come up with a description of the hunt or the requirements of a qualifying deer? And let me just follow you down a little farther is my opinion is the description needs to be full velvet if a bucks got a little piece of hanging dried velvet I don't know they ought to qualify. Have we come up with a description, if not, when do we.

Covy Jones: We have come up with a description and Wade I present that in the rule change and I think that's a better time to probably address this. But I will address it.

Dave Black: K Tammy it looks like you have more questions.

Tammy Pearson: Might shut me down too cause its kind of a similar question but, so with the cactus buck hunt, what about those bucks that don't have horns? Or don't, or only have one horn. We're pretty famous of those over Minersville way.

Covy Jones: So, the cactus buck hunt will only happen on the Paunsaugunt this year. We, we know that we have areas in the State where we have antlerless bucks, the the Vernon has quite a few antlerless bucks.

Tammy Pearson: Can we put them in as just a freebie? Like a freezer buck or I mean?

Covy Jones: That's a different problem and probably would be difficult to solve.

Tammy Pearson: No, I'm from Minersville, I have a Minersville tag.

Dave Black: Ok, any other questions from the RAC?

Covy Jones: Can I say one more thing because I don't want the public to be confused with the, the hunt recommendation on the cactus buck is not to solve a problem. We understand that there are things that contribute to that, we've done some research, it's probably disease related, it's not to solve that problem or change that problem, its to provide an opportunity on something that currently isn't contributing, (inaudible) landscape but it isn't contributing to the population so it's just opportunity.

Gene Boardman: Is this one hunt gonna clean up most of the cactus bucks, will it be a, do you think it will be sustained, another 150 tags next year and the following year or?

Covy Jones: That's a good question Gene, a lot of that depends on how, how this is happening and really I think its probably sustainable, there appears to be quite a few of these on the Paunsaugunt, in the Paunsaugunt area, I assume that it will be an annual hunt. If there are no cactus bucks obviously there won't be a cactus buck hunt but.

Gene Boardman: I didn't hear you mention it in boundaries and changes and so forth, is there going to be a sheep hunt on Oak Creek?

Covy Jones: Um, I think we will probably hear from maybe the, the crowd on that one.

Tammy Pearson: Sorry one more, okay and this was my other question on your, is this where you are talking about once in a lifetime stuff?

Covy Jones: Yes.

Tammy Pearson: Ok so, or are you talking about, ok, so did you have any changes in the bison program anywhere, boundary changes or numbers or, I didn't see that.

Covy Jones: No, no number changes, no boundary changes in the bison.

Kevin Bunnell: We're not talking about numbers right now but we're not creating any new seasons or anything like that for bison. Number, numbers will be presented in the Spring.

Tammy Pearson: Ok I'm new here. Sorry.

Dave Black: There is not a bad question. We're going to open up to questions from the audience. Please when you come to the microphone, use the microphone in the center and please state your name, make sure that you limit this to a question and we have time for your comments later and make sure you fill out a comment card. So, if you have a question to clarify the presentation, we'd like you to come forward. Thank you.

Questions from the Public:

Lee Tracy: Lee Tracy, Enoch. We have covered an awful lot of ground so I have more than one question. Are those early any-weapon hunt additional tags or are they pulled out of the unit quota?

Covy Jones: Yes. It depends on the unit Lee. We're trying to distribute crowding and also manage the buck to doe ratios that we've agreed to manage to. So, there is a possibility that we would add permits to a unit that is over, chronically over objective and this will allow us to do that.

Lee Tracy: Alright, another question you quoted a price for that multi season elk tag at \$150 bucks, is that resident or non-resident or is there a difference?

Covy Jones: That is the resident price and yes there is a difference. That's the resident price.

Lee Tracy: Would those tags be available to non-residents?

Covy Jones: I don't know what the price is on the non-resident? They are available to non-residents, I don't know what the price is right now.

Lee Tracy: Ok thanks. Well that's enough for now. Thanks.

Mike Twitchell: My name is Mike Twitchell, I'm from here in Cedar. I just have a question or 2 about our current elk management plan. Now this isn't necessarily in regards to the presentation that you gave today but if you'll forgive me I think that this is probably the most appropriate part of the meeting to ask this question. Um, previously in the elk management plan, I believe its 2 years old now, passed in 2015, and part of that provision allows the State and the Division to decide units that are chronically over objective on elk numbers to allow muzzleloader hunters to have an either sex choice just like the archery hunters do. Is there a reason why that hasn't been implemented yet?

Covy Jones: We have discussed that internally, and, and you are right, that is part of the plan. There are a lot of plans that just the timing isn't right or, there are other complications that we have run into again, what Phil stood up here, one of the things is I'm proud of the fact that as a State Agency we can be pretty reactive and make changes relatively quickly. Anybody who is used to dealing with the you know other government it can be difficult but we've discussed it internally, we haven't made any decisions yet.

Mike Twitchell: Ok is there any single contributing factor as to you know this is really the reason why we're holding back on that?

Covy Jones: Yeah one of the things we've talked about is that it, we're always trying to provide opportunity and that might limit opportunity. When you offer one tag to harvest both, when you can provide an opportunity to multiple hunters, one to go and spike hunt with his muzzleloader and another hunter to go and harvest a cow, so there is a concern there. Would this strategy limit hunter opportunity, and it possibly, it could.

Mike Twitchell: Ok thank you.

Dave Black: Ok, I don't see further questions, do you have a question?

Chris Isom: I am Chris Isom, I'm from Hurricane, have you guys considered maybe changing up the muzzleloader rifle ratios to address the crowding, maybe giving a higher percentage to muzzleloaders? And, why not do that?

Covy Jones: We have. When the plan was re-written we actually did that and we've adjusted some of those ratios, especially here in Southern Utah, the feedback is still, it is still too crowded on some of these and we prefer not to adding additional permits and so we, we have done that, it felt like it wasn't probably enough.

Chris Isom: Ok second question how many, have we had in these units where we are concerned about safety, have we had any injuries in those units from crowding cause it seems to me, like it seems like so far all the injuries I see are inner party.

Covy Jones: That's a really difficult question to answer.

Chris Isom: It shouldn't be too hard but, if you don't know that's fine.

Covy Jones: I don't know if any of the injuries were because of crowding.

Kevin Bunnell: Paul? Where is, do you want to comment, have we had any hunter related accidents, or what on units in the Southern Region during the rifle deer hunt or what, what problems have we had?

Paul Washburn: We have had some hunter related accidents but none on our general season deer units at least in the last 2 years and none in the Southern Region at all.

Covy Jones: And we hope to keep it that way.

Dave Black: Ok we will move to the comment section. One of the things that we'll ask when you come up is a number of these have a very common theme, I've been reading through these. If you are in agreement with the person who has already come up, and you just want to state that you support those comments, that would be fine without having to say the same things but we do want to hear from each of you, please make sure that you give us your name. Also, we have several comment cards that are from the same person on one item, on that one item you'll only get the allotted time of 3 minutes and so, even though you may have filled out more than one comment card, when you come up we're going to cut that off to 3 minutes. If you see my hand come up that will give you about 30 seconds to wrap up. We apologize we're just trying to move this through. Most of the other RAC's have taken over 5 hours to get through this agenda that we have and so we're just trying to move this meeting along, so. The first will be David Virostko and I apologize if I don't say your names right and they will be followed by Stanton Gleave.

Comments from the Public:

David Virostko: Hi I am David Virostko and I just wanted to take a few minutes to encourage the Paunsaugunt stag hunt that has been presented by Josh. I live on the unit so I'm there 365 days a year. I proactively spend 200 days a year out in the hills. I can tell you it's, it's been an epidemic for a long time the stags that we have. When we first presented the, the friends of the Paunsaugunt when we first presented the management hunt I was screaming anything with velvet, lets kill it back then and got shot down kind of. So, I've been for this for a long time. I hunt multiple states a year, multiple areas a year, just got back from 12 days in New Mexico, I never saw one stag, we do have a problem over there and that's, I don't know what it's from, I don't know if we can cure it, I don't know if it needs to be cured but um, just like Covy said, the opportunity, to kill some of these deer, to burn some points, to get people out in the hills, that's why I fully support it and I would just encourage you guys to think hard and long about it and when you decide to vote on it. Another thing that hasn't been brought up yet tonight, just through the rumor mill is the 9 days of the Paunsaugunt and rifle hunt, I know its been talked about discussing pushing it to the last 9 days of October and as a guide and an outfitter there, someone who spends multiple days on the unit, I would encourage that as well. It's not, not to increase maybe our harvest age class or anything like that but to give a little opportunity, it's a tough hunt, it really is. Guys burn a lot of points to come here and the common words I hear is I can't believe I waited this long for this type of a hunt and because of the migration because it can be difficult like a year like this like where

it was a tough 9 days, I feel bad for those guys that waited that long when an extra 2 or 3 days does make a difference there, it really does. So, I would encourage you guys when that comes up for discussion to go for it cause its, it's a good thing it really is. It will improve hunter satisfaction, I can promise you, its not gonna 180 the thing but it's definitely increase guys that waited 15 plus years to put a Paunsaugunt tag in their pocket so anyway that's all I have to say tonight, appreciate everything you guys do.

Dave Black: Thank you David. So, after Stanton we'll have Travis Roundy.

Stanton Gleave: Hello I am Stanton Gleave I represent the Paiute County Ranchers. I'm just here with the same, same story I've had for I guess 10 or 15 years and that is those elk are trying to destroy us as ranchers over there. Every year they get worse, I don't know for how many years we've been telling you and telling you something needs to be done with those its gonna end up in a bad deal if you don't take, start reducing those things, they, it don't matter where they are at, they are on some ranch. You know they just go move them somewhere or someplace else but the fact is that all that land has got a right on it, a grazing right. Grazing allotments is tied to those ranches and that's the only way we survive is with that right. And we can't, it, its not gonna keep working I mean those elk on the Monroe Mountain have, think this 1970 and not an elk there today over 1,000 of them on there and that feed it don't even get up to the stubble height that is required by the forest and all summer it's just ridiculous and that leads to one other deal I want to tell you about is the cougar problem. This last year I lost over 800 lambs, 811 lambs on Mt. Dutton to cougars mainly and that's another problem and I've complained about it and nothing gets done. If you would solve that cougar problem and those coyote problem that would solve your elk problem, you'd get a deer herd back and when the deer herd comes back you don't need all those elk. I'm old enough to see when ranchers managed, you know they say people call themselves managers but there has not been a manager around for 40 years. Ranchers used to manage the country and there was deer and there was sage hens and there was pheasants. But my gosh you've got to manage it, you can't act like third grade girls whoever the manager is has got to be managers. Those predators have got to go. And if they don't go its all gonna come to a head there you know, those counties have got commissioners in them and they've got Sheriffs in them and they've all took an oath to protect my property, and I it might have to get to that I don't know it might have to go back to that. Do you have a question?

Dave Black: Thirty seconds.

Stanton Gleave: Well that's good enough. I want to tell you too those, those elk wouldn't be quite so bad if they was even any good for anything. The last time I went hunting them I took one old bull home and I made the mistake I took him in the basement there and I skinned him and put the meat in the freezer. My gosh he stunk so bad in that house I went down the next day and throwed that hide and head out and got rid of him but the next week it still stunk bad down there so I went down and throwed the meat out to the dog and he wouldn't even eat him. The next week it still stunk and I went down and there was a picture of the dirty bugger and when I throwed that out I could live in the house again. And anyway you need it is serious over there in Paiute County, dead serious on those elk. We need something done, thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you Stanton. So, we have Travis Roundy followed by Lee Tracy.

Travis Roundy: Thanks for the opportunity to say a few things. I would just like to tell you I am in support of the proposed changes to the Paunsaugunt rifle hunt dates. I think we do need to change those and make em so they are the last 9 days of the month of October, like David Virotsko said we've got a

migratory herd that's rolling on down through the country and it happens during that hunt and these guys that are burning all these points are having a heck of a tough time trying to get something quality out of that. I think if we could change that to those last 9 days I think it would definitely give them a fair shake when they burn all those points all those years waiting for it so I fully support that and I also fully support the cactus buck hunt. I think that's an awesome plan and I hope it goes through. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you. So, Lee followed by Bryce. Lee we're gonna limit you to 3 minutes.

Lee Tracy: Again, multiple issues. I'll probably be able to get it in 3 minutes though. First of all I do not support that muzzy hunt. That late muzzy hunt on the general unit. For one thing it sets a precedent that I don't, you know and most of the people I know don't appreciate. It also is contrary to not only the State-wide mule deer plan but the unit-wide mule deer plan. And I don't think it necessary as a limited entry unit. I don't object to the hunt itself or the timing, I just object to it being a limited entry hunt on a general unit. You could have that muzzy hunt as a general hunt. The multi-season elk tags I do support that but I'm going to give you a little additional option. Its been some time since I talked to the last Wildlife board but 2 of the members of that board said that they would explore the option of having some more extended archery hunts. And, currently we have now in the Southern Unit, 3 of those hunts, that are multi-season elk hunts and late muzzy hunts and early rifle hunt. 3 of those units that are no more than 10 miles from my backyard or my front yard for that matter. Yet, I have to drive 260 miles to hunt extended archery and extended archery, expanded extended archery hunts would not only solve the problems that we are talking about, they wouldn't add anymore tags and I implore the RAC to take that information to the current Wildlife Board and with that being said those early weapon deer tags I, I support that but again, the extended archery hunts. Thanks.

Dave Black: Thanks Lee. So, we have Bryce followed by Josh Jennings.

Bryce Pilling: Thank you Mr. Chairman, RAC members. Bryce Pilling, Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife. We support the Divisions recommendations on the season dates. In addition to that we would like to ask the DWR to create a sheep hunt on the Oak Ridge for 2018. And also in addition to that we would like them to create 2 new archery hunts for sheep. One on the Zions and one on the (inaudible). Both have large populations and last year the Wildlife Board passed an archery hunt for bison and goats and we feel like it would just provide more opportunity, target animals that have been passed up by rifle hunters and put more hunters through the point system. And I believe that's all that I have. If you have any questions I would be glad to answer them.

Dave Black: Bryce has this gone to any of the other RAC's do you know?

Bryce Pilling: Oh I forgot to mention that, both the previous RAC's, the Northern and the Central passed this unanimously.

Dave Black: Thank you. Josh will be followed by Jeremy Hargis.

Josh Jennings: Hello my name is Josh Jennings and I am here representing the Friends of the Paunsaugunt. I just want to say that the Friends of the Paunsaugunt does fully support the Divisions request for velvet cactus buck hunt in November on the Paunsaugunt. And we also support the proposal for the Paunsaugunt rifle dates to be standardized to the last 9 days in October. And as somebody that lives on the Paunsaugunt, and see what type of unit it is, it is referred to as a premium limited entry hunt

not just a limited entry, its premium limited entry. And a few days shift on that hunt is, it's not gonna make it the best hunt in the world but it will make it so that it's a little bit better for everybody that hunts that hunt because it's a migratory hunt. The last couple of years it has fallen a little later in the season and its helped a little bit and I think its one of the tougher hunts you can go on, I mean if somebody is going to be burning 15, 18, 20 points on this hunt, to have a couple more days later in October, is gonna make a big difference for them to have a, to have a type of quality hunt that they would expect on the Paunsaugunt. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you. So Jeremy will be followed by Rylan Orton.

Jeremy Hargis: My name is Jeremy Hargis and I live down in St. George and I have never been to one of these before but my family has really been enjoying hunting. I just represent myself and my boys and we love the idea of the elk hunt and the extended opportunities. Elk hunting is hard and it's a great opportunity to give us more chances to do that. But the thing that I'm concerned about is the price tag for that going from \$50 to \$150 and you are still only harvesting one animal from that if you get one. Really makes it, I feel like that caters to professional hunters, guides, outfitters, who can afford to do that, have all the time off to do that, but those of us who work and you know we make, it's a pretty big sacrifice as it is to take that time off to get out there and to go hunt, to have a few more options for that really makes it nice, but to have to pay that all the sudden now I'm not just paying \$150, I've got 3 boys, that price becomes very it just isn't going to work for us. So I love that but I just ask that you consider you know the average guy like myself, I don't have any big backing, I don't have any you know political clout or nothing, I'm just working and love to hunt and love the opportunities that we have and I think that Utah is one of the best states in the West for giving elk hunting opportunities and this idea is fantastic apart from the price tag of it that I feel like is cutting out people like me that have family and friends who would love to do this, and caters to the outfitters and the professionals that have the time and the resources. To really exploit that so I just love the idea, would love to try to do archery hunting but if I have to choose, I'm only going to choose one at that price but I'd love to do the others but with our family we just can't do that. So,

Dave Black: Thank you. So, Rylan to be followed by Allen Wood.

Rylan Orton: I realize I missed my question period but I actually had a question for the Division and its in regards to the late season muzzleloader hunt and is the quality of bucks, I know you guys count in November, right for the numbers on that? Is the quality of bucks taken into consideration on that?

Covy Jones: When we classify? Do we do quality or inches or? We look at, buck doe ratios and buck doe ratios they closely mimic, the higher that ratio is, they mimic, they end up with more adult bucks, so the higher it is the more adults there are, the more adults there are the more big bucks there are, and we do break it down into you know a mature buck or a yearling buck but we don't necessarily evaluate quality so that's the level. The level is kind of up here and we don't break it down to this many 28" bucks, this many 26", 146 bucks.

Rylan Orton: I guess my only concern with it is for the first couple of years you are not going to see a big effect I don't think, as far as your age class goes in the deer. I love to hunt general season units and the opportunity to kill a big buck on a general season I feel like is pretty fair but I feel like with that late season hunt I do get worried that that age class will go down and it will be harder to kill a 180" deer and that's you know I'm a dedicated hunter for that reason so I can hunt on all 3 hunts, I like to be able to

hunt one deer. I know that there are several people that are the same way that hunt the same area and I feel like that age class maybe could go down. I'm all for opportunity but I do get worried about that so I that was just my only concern that I wanted to express.

Dave Black: K thank you. So Allen will be followed by Heath.

Allen Wood: My name is Allen Wood, I'm from Minersville if my voice will hold out. I'm against that late muzzleloader hunt also. I mean you've got a buck, he's made it through 3 hunts, he doesn't get big by being stupid, and now you are going to kill him when he's the stupidest or he's thinking of something else other than hiding. And the quality again, you know my family is all hunters, my friends, the example we have, there was a buck in our area, we hunted, a lot of us hunted for 4 years straight, nobody could kill him during the hunts. This another year we got, (inaudible) there is always that chance you are going to get him, well that late muzzleloader hunt last year he made it through all of them again, the 4th year that I know of, he got shot, and so the quality of bucks, if you got 235 and you do 66% kill rate (inaudible) there is 155 bucks that were probably more quality bucks, nobody is going to shoot a (inaudible) at that time hopefully, but the chances for the regular permit holder in the general season to shoot a big buck is going to go down and as time goes on you know, 10 years, 5 years, whatever that number of deer of quality bucks is gonna go down. And just the end, couple of your cattlemen, when it comes to breeding season, I don't sell my biggest bull off, right before breeding season, well we are killing our biggest quality bucks off right at breeding season when we really need them there to pass that good gene on. Thanks.

Dave Black: K thank you, so Heath will be followed by Tyson Cannon.

Heath Burchinal: Good evening, my name is Heath Burchinal and I am from St George. First I just want to start off by throwing out my support for the 2 rifle hunts and also for the elk hunt, the 3 elk hunts but my concern is for those that are dedicated hunter, by allowing them to hunt all 4 hunts, and I am a dedicated hunter, I'm concerned that it is going to increase the demand for that tag and therefore making it more difficult to draw the dedicated hunter later on. Right now I think its on the average 2 or 3 years before you can draw so that's my concern. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you good point. Tyson will be followed by Jesse Hatch.

Tyson Cannon: Tyson Cannon from St George. I'm in favor of that early season rifle hunt but I think we need to take some pretty extreme cautions on tag numbers. That could really hurt a deer herd if we throw a rifle hunt that time in the season. And then as well on the dedicated, we're just allowing 4 basically hunting 4 hunts, its just non stop pressure all the way through October with the muzzleloader and then an early season rifle and then a late season rifle so I'm not sure if the (inaudible) season, rifle season or but I think its just going to put a lot of pressure on the bigger bucks, your dedicated hunters are looking for the bigger bucks anyway, so, that's it, thanks.

Dave Black: K thank you, Jesse will be followed by Mike Twitchell.

Jesse Hatch: Jesse Hatch, Panguitch, Utah. I'd be against the elk hunts and having people buy one elk tag and hunt. I mean if you put, you give people more time, more opportunity, by average you are going to kill more elk, I guess that brings me to another point. I feel like we already have enough spike cow elk, big bull hunts so as it is we are waiting 15, 20 years for a tag, also a 5-year wait, after that, you are going

to hunt an elk maybe once, twice in a lifetime in this state. I feel that throughout these conservation programs that we have we keep selling all these tags for a lot of money, why don't we ever up the objectives? I mean, we do all these projects, we put millions of dollars on the ground, and we never up the objectives of our elk, you know, I didn't want to bring this up tonight with the cattlemen but on the Boulder Unit alone there is 10,959 cattle that graze that unit. That's just on the forest, that's not on BLM land, that's just on the forest. There's 4192 head of sheep also on that unit alone. We get a management for 1500, I just, I just want to see where our dollars are going as sportsmen with these conservation tags and if we can't up our objectives I don't understand why, why we have them programs in place, deer, elk, any of it. I mean if our numbers are high we can have more hunts, if they are low we can't and I feel right now by giving people more opportunity with these hunts, you are killing more elk that people are waiting a lot of years to hunt and to have a good hunt. Thanks.

Dave Black: Thanks. So Mike you will be followed by Will Talbot.

Mike Twitchell: Mike Twitchell I'm actually representing 2 different entities tonight. First and foremost is the Utah Bowmen's Association. We're grateful for the time and effort that goes into the studies to the thought and the planning that goes into these plans. And the Utah Bowmen's Association supports this plan with an addition. We would really like to support the SFW in the 2-new archery only big horn sheep hunts. We haven't heard a lot about that tonight, I know that its been addressed in other RAC, in the other RAC's, also in addition to that a new big horn sheep hunt on the Oak Creek unit. Representing myself, in regards to the questions that I asked a little bit earlier. You know in the spring we talked about elk numbers and we talked about how the, the addition of more hunters and the addition of more tags doesn't kill more elk necessarily and we go into a great deal of effort in trying to meet our objective numbers through elk harvest, through cow harvest. We open up the cow elk hunt to if you have a tag for basically anything, on that mountain you can hunt a cow elk at that same time. But at the same time, the small amount of hunters that have a muzzleloader tag are not allowed to hunt them, those same cows and, and it just seems to me that if we have a tool in our belt to meet that goal then we ought to use it I can't help but think there are 2 things that I feel on this. One is that I don't think that they would have a huge impact, if we have 15,000 permits only a certain percentage of those go to muzzle loader hunters and even at that there is only a certain percentage that would probably kill a cow. There is handful that may not feel like they want to shoot a cow but would rather have a spike. So I think that the numbers there would be low. The other thing is that, that is a concern with the multi-season hunting is if, if and I'm speaking for myself and I'm looking at probably buying one of those tags, I'm gonna hunt that hunt on the archery hunt, I'm gonna hunt that hunt on the rifle hunt, then I'm gonna hunt it on the muzzleloader hunt. Well the muzzleloader hunters don't get a whole lot to choose from after the archery hunters and the rifle hunters have taken their take out at the pool and so for them to have an opportunity to take a cow and if we are over objective anyway, it just seems like it all kind of makes sense. So I, we've already passed it, the Big Game Board passed the elk plan, I would recommend and invite the RAC to vote on that as part of the plan tonight to have them go ahead and look into that further and come to some sort of action on those units that are chronically over objective. Thank you.

Dave Black: So Will to be followed by Chris Isom.

Will Talbot: Thanks for letting me address you. I'm Will Talbot, Paiute County Commissioner, one concern I would have with, I agree with the 3 hunts on the elk, would be that, would be the price increase, you know they are only taking one animal, they are spending more time and gas out there, I know many families in my county alone that depend on killing that elk for their meat for the winter. You

take me for instance, I have 4 girls that love to hunt, I love to hunt myself so I'm not going to leave myself out, I buy 5 tags, you do the math on that by the time you buy your combination and all that license, that's a pretty big hefty fee. I, really oppose that fee but I do like the 3-hunt thing. Just a comment from what somebody else said. I run about 1500 head of them sheep on the Boulder Mountain and between the 3 herds, over 700 lambs were gone, so yeah there is a problem. A big problem so thanks.

Dave Black: Thank you, Chris you'll be followed by, lets see Chris you have 2 cards, we'll just, Jason will be next.

Chris Isom: Yes, anyway thanks for letting me have a say here, I'm not, I'm really hesitant to be in support I don't say I'm lightly unsupportive of the, the early rifle hunt particularly on Pine Valley and Zion. I'm also familiar with the Salt Lake area and I think it makes more sense up there, its not a migration hunt, I have some, I share some of Mr. Johnsons concerns that, I lost my train of thought, I'm sorry, and I guess that has more to do with the muzzleloader thing, I'll get to that. But, if we don't make those numbers very high I think we should be concerned about managing for crowds in that, that's what it was, we used to have almost 300,000, now we're below 100,000 and people are still complaining and we're not seeing any injuries that we know of and I just feel like if we only do like 20%, early season, its not going to take pressure off Utah Hill, its not going to take pressure off the Sands, you are still going to have a ton of pressure. I've seen pressure move a lot, in my short time, I mean when I was younger Kolob used to have really high pressure, Smith's Mesa used to have really high pressure, now it's all in the Sands, and that's kind of shifted, on Pine Valley a lot of people are hunting out on Utah Hill now, once upon a time people used to hunt Browse, if we could kill out some cougars out there maybe we some of that pressure would move back but I'm really especially with, you know Mr. Boardman said we need to know some percentages and I agree with that you can't make some good decisions regarding this early rifle hunt if we don't know the percentages. But if the percentages are low its not going to make a difference on the crowds and if its high you are just going to cause another, another set of problems. I would hate to see these if you have a material amount of tags in these higher areas, due to migration would get pushed, they might start, anyway, those are my thoughts, thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you so looks like our last comment card is Jason Aiken.

Jason Aiken: I'm Jason Aiken from Cedar City. Appreciate everything that everybody has done here tonight at the Division, I really appreciate the recommendations that have been made here tonight, I really like the new split hunt for deer. That's been talked about quite a bit over the last many years, I'm glad that we are seeing you know those type of opportunities take place. The multi-season hunt for the elk, I really like that idea, I wonder about the price a little bit on that but at the same time I can also appreciate that \$150 is also still pretty cheap, for an elk talk considering if I went to Colorado it would cost me \$700 so, other than that I appreciate everything that they've done, I also support the recommendations that SFW has put together and hopefully I can draw me a sheep tag. Thanks.

Dave Black: Thank you. We are going to close the comment portion from the public now. We'll turn time over to the RAC. Before they do that, I get to speak first since I'm the chairman.

RAC discussion and vote:

Dave Black: Before we do that lets summarize the items that we've heard today. We had people stand up

a number in support of the Paunsaugunt stag hunt. I just want to add to that, that proposal came from the Southern RAC. I would think that would be a no-brainer for us. Cause it originated here and we wanted to see that hunt here and we had those here that support that stag hunt. There was a proposal or a comment to make the Paunsaugunt rifle hunt in the last 9 days of October ever year. We had 3 people that stood up in support of that. We've heard that there are too many elk and too many cougars. And, too many coyotes as well. We just had a RAC meeting, our last one that we had was on the cougar management plan and numbers and we try to address that every year, that's a very difficult one. And we did increase the tags as much as we could. We had people stand up that are not in support of the muzzle loader deer hunts, the late muzzleloader deer hunt, there was 3 of those that came tonight. We had 5 in support of the multi-season elk tags, we also heard a discussion of more extended archery opportunities and also some concerns at least from 3 people that the price is too high for that multi-season elk tag. One person was not in support of the multi-season elk. We had 2 that were in support of the recommendations in general, we had a presentation from the, or recommendation from the SFW group to open a sheep hunt on the Oak Creeks, we had 3 in support of that. And also to add an archery hunt for sheep on the Newfoundland in Zion units and we had 3 in support of that. We had 3 in support of the early deer hunt. But there was some concerns expressed to be careful with the numbers. And there is some concerns about dedicated hunters being able to hunt all 4 hunts. We had one stand up that was not in support of the early deer hunt. We had one sportsman that indicated that we should consider increasing the elk objectives and we had one in support to implement the either sex muzzleloader for elk. Take a comment first, do you have a question? I'll give you second. I was just trying to be a summary. I guess, there is a number of things that I've thought about quite a bit as this was come out, I think there is a need to try to get into the oh shoot, if I can get my comments straight here. So, on the late muzzleloader deer hunt, I think that's a great opportunity. Anybody that draws that hunt that should be like drawing you know, on a premium unit off these general seasons. We do need to, we have the point creep issue and I think that's a great way to address point creep and I would be in support of the late muzzleloader deer hunt. The, as I said I think the cactus buck hunt on the Paunsaugunt that's a no-brainer, we should be able to support that with not a lot of discussion. The, early season weapon, any-weapon deer hunt. I was at the Board meeting when this was brought up as an action item and when they suggested this they recommended that we try that on 2 units in the State. And, not 8, and 2 of the units are included here, one was the Pine Valley Unit and I believe the other one was the Zion but there was only 2 units that came out of that suggestion. I think that's a great opportunity on some units, I would disagree that it may not be so great on all of them and I realize and I understand very well the guys that are you know not in my backyard and I've been a proponent of overcrowding issues on the Panguitch Lake Unit but I would be against an early hunt on the Panguitch Lake Unit, I think we're pushing the animals way too much already, and the Panguitch Lake Unit has a very strong elk hunt component. During the elk hunt, the spike elk hunt, its already in my opinion its overcrowded for the spike elk hunters, they are there, they are pushing it really hard, we try to put deer hunters with spike elk hunters, I don't know that either one of them are going to be happy, also that week that they wanted to do the hunt is the week that the ranchers have to have their cows off the mountain and so that's what I'll be doing that week is we'll be out gathering cows and we'll be in the middle of the spike hunters and the deer hunters. There is a social concern that hasn't been addressed and I'm surprised, you know we've always had an opening of the deer hunt and in St. George it's not a been deal anymore, you don't even see anybody wearing orange. But over in Panguitch it's a big deal. They have a deer hunters ball, they let the kids out of school the first Monday to hunt deer. This has been a tradition. We start doing multi-season dates we just stop that tradition, when is the opening of the deer hunt. The other thing is, it's a big social event for us. When we go camping with our family for the opening of the deer hunt, we have 4 siblings that are there but those siblings are now grandparents and everybody that comes there is about 30 of us.

And, that social event will be changed because of second, you know if you draw your second choice on the Panguitch Unit, we won't be there at the same time and I guess we will be there gathering cows at the same time. But, I think that there is some social aspects that it makes sense to change these things but we're changing a lot of things that happened in communities that have looked forward to these things for a long time. We are changing traditions and I think it should be considered. Also on the Panguitch Unit, we had a pretty substantial fire this last year. I don't know that we really understand what the impacts have been on the habitat, on the animals and I would be in favor of a split hunts in several of the units but not the Panguitch Lake Unit. As far as the elk hunts and being able to hunt with, multiple times, I don't really have an opinion on that other than the emails that I have received as the RAC chairman and for a while they were pretty even, those opposed and those against, I think with the ones that have come in the last few days, they are probably more against the hunt than were opposed at least in what I've read and a lot of those concerns were again we are pushing those animals too hard already and we're just gonna keep pushing them even more. And so that's my comments. I'll open it up to the rest of the RAC and I'll let Brayden go first.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you. I do kind of have a question and then some comments and I want to get my question out first because it will help I think maybe some of the discussion at least in my head. One of the hot topics for this which we all knew was gonna be these late muzzleloader hunts. In the other RAC's as I understand it this was voted kind of split and has gone both ways, but one thing that I'm not clear on is if this doesn't pass, are, are we recommending that we get rid of the ones that are currently existing also so if this doesn't, if we vote this late muzzleloader down, are we just voting down just the additional late muzzleloader hunts or are we voting down all the late muzzleloader hunts?

Covy Jones: You would be voting down the recommendation to add this to the rest of the units that are meeting, not that currently are.

Brayden Richmond: K, thank you, and that may be something that, and its probably too late at this point but I guess I would be interested to see the people that are against what they would think about that, if the proposal should be that we actually even go retroactive and get rid of the existing, I guess I just don't know. So let me make my comments. That late muzzleloader, kind of an interesting one. I feel like I could intelligently argue that one both sides of the coin. And there is people that are pretty passionate on both sides of the coin. My thoughts there are this is a public process and in my opinion, the public spoke, they had their chance and they spoke, maybe not what I would personally do but I'm leaning towards going with the public on that. On the other ones, I guess my one other comment is, or actually let me ask one more question, any reason that the Division didn't propose the sheep hunt on the Oak Creek? Do you have any reservations about that?

Covy Jones: I appreciate you asking that question Brayden, the reason was we didn't have the data at hand. So, between the time when recommendations were due for the process, and now, we actually have some data in hand, I can say that we actually would be in support of that hunt.

Brayden Richmond: So that should be a no-brainer then.

Covy Jones: A no-brainer, definitely in support of the hunt and if you want specifics on the data, Dave is here and he can give that.

Brayden Richmond: My last comment would be I do look forward to hearing Wade's input on the dates

on the Paunsaugunt. We've got some support here tonight and we did talk about that as a RAC a year ago, I know that Wade is the member of the RAC that is more invested there and so I look forward to discussing that a bit more but that also seems like, something that we've wanted in the past. Thank you.

Dave Black: K, Riley?

Riley Robert: I've actually got quite a few comments. First and foremost just thank you to all of you who came out and commented tonight. This is a public process and we really appreciate that also to all of those who sent multiple emails and are willing to get involved. There is no change that is going to take place if we're not willing to step up whether we are for or against that so thank you for that, thank you for that time, we appreciate you being here. My first thought is on the elk and I don't know that I'm in support of that and I think to be honest it's probably because of a phobia that I have because we issued out so many tags and the way that the elk plan is right now anyway. And so I don't know that there is anything specific about it, but something about it makes me uneasy. I don't have an issue with the price, I think that if you are going to get to hunt 3 hunts, you pay for that, we go out as dedicated hunters you pay a higher price and you even have to, we're required to have work hours, I don't think that the price is an issue at all. However, there is something about that, that does make me quite uneasy and I don't have any specifics on harvests or how many spikes are being killed but what I do know is there is a lot of them and that's always a concern. The cactus buck issue, I think that is a no-brainer, I think that these animals are out there, they are not getting killed, they need to be, in fact, I think that it's a great door that gets opened and hopefully in the future there is a lot of the smaller ones, the ones that look like they've got top ramen on top of their head, that maybe aren't even gonna get killed in this hunt, there is some opportunity there in the future so I think this is a great door that gets open. Splitting the rifle hunt I am a proponent for that. I think that it's a good opportunity but again I don't know all the details on that. I think that there are both social and real pressures to have that. One thing that I want to mention and both, both with the early season or split season, also the late muzzleloader hunt, it, it seems like sometimes we're a little weird in Utah, we are okay with using a 1000-yard gun to hunt premium elk in the middle of the rut, but as soon as we start talking about adding a few tags, even close to the rut on a general deer unit, we lose our minds. I would like to just point out, this is a renewable resource, these are, this is not grandma's hope chest that we are throwing away, we can make changes in the future if we need to, to fix this if something goes array. I think that and trust and appreciate the Division for the time that they have put into this and would fully support a late muzzleloader hunt and think it's a good idea for multiple reasons, especially with point creep and opportunity and those things and still don't believe that it's going to affect the buck to doe ratio enough that we are going to see it and if it does, we fix it. We come back and we have this meeting again and we change that if we need to. I really like the idea of the set date on the Pauns with those end dates and would also be in favor of that. I really like that idea and obviously with the sheep hunts, think that those are also a great idea. Again, would like to thank the Division for all the time and effort that they put into it and really appreciate that especially Covy that's a tough one.

Dave Black: Sure, sorry, Wade, go ahead.

Wade Heaton: So I want to split my comments up into 2 different comment periods for fear of getting winded but I, first want to just echo what Riley said. That, really do appreciate everybody that shows up. We appreciate the emails, we listen to everybody but it takes 10 minutes to write an email and it takes several hours and a half a day of your life to come here so I appreciate those that are willing and passionate enough to come here and spend time with us. It does make a difference. Second is I don't

want to keep Brayden waiting on this other issue so, I do want to share some ideas. Friends of the Paunsaugunt made a proposal that we standardize the rifle, the any-weapon season dates for the Paunsaugunt. And I think that they've laid out a couple of pretty good arguments. I'm 100% behind this idea, and for the same reasons, it's a premium limited entry hunt, hunting that thing for 20 years, the common theme I hear with guys on the rifle hunt is wow, this is not what I expected. It's the Paunsaugunt, there is giants behind every bush, and the truth of it is that hunt can be very tough and I hate to see guys spend 15, 20 years waiting for a hunt and then come down and be that disappointed. It will make a difference if we can standardize and hunt those last few days in October, those of us that have hunted that for years, we don't even start, we don't even hunt the first 3 or 4 days of the hunt because we know how valuable the tail end of that is and it will make a difference to 81 guys who have waited a long time to draw that hunt. I do think its something that we do need to do and make a valuable difference. But I would, I am curious, we haven't heard from the Division on that I would be curious t hear from them or the biologist or someone there.

Covy Jones: So the one thing that we have in State code is we cannot open a hunt on a Sunday and so standardizing the tail end can affect the front end. It would also affect the (inaudible) buck hunt and possibly this velvet buck hunt as well so you put one thing into play and you affect several others. What, I'd be willing to do, if we wanted to say this hunt will always run through the end of October, would be to say, there might be some days when these hunters get an 8-day hunt. And it opens on a different day and so there is a trade off there. And so that's, that's the trade off.

Kevin Bunnell: Josh do you want to comment on as the biologist over that area what your thoughts are on that idea?

Josh Pollock: Yeah like Covy says, you know it would affect that, it would only affect it about every 7 calendar years, you know our calendar goes back so we lose a day basically every year and so I think back to 3 years ago when it was the earliest that it will ever be, it was a very rough hunt and then the very next year it was the very latest that it will ever be and then it went back to the 30th, I believe was the closing date and the amount of phone calls and the kind of information I received on it, was the guys that were able to hunt until the 30th instead of ending on the 25th or whatever it was, they had a much better hunt. Same with this year, it was a pretty tough hunt, you know some of the desert its 80, 80 something degrees and so some of those deer are only moving for a few hours a day so they kind of need a reason to get up and move a little bit and by moving that hunt back, it would do that, the whole entire herd migrates, we have a GPS study that's going on right there with collars and it seems like those bucks, every day the does move first but those bucks kind of just steadily file in so the odds of getting a better buck later on in the hunt, for hunters is better the longer they wait. I don't see any issues with that recommendation.

Dave Black: K, thank you Josh. Gene.

Gene Boardman: On the split deer hunt, my big concerns is its going to screw up bonus points and people that should be drawing might not because the allocation went the wrong way for them. I'd like to suggest one remedy and that's that you just put in to hunt for the unit and then after its been drawn, you can pick between the early hunt and the late hunt and it wouldn't take any effort, just fix it so they mark early hunt or late hunt and hit send on the email and that way you won't get a proportion one way or the other but at least everybody would have the same equal chance on the draw.

Covy Jones: Yeah, Gene I think there are 2 things that I would answer on that. One, and Kevin brought this up, its only a first year issue because after that you can look back every year and see what percentage of permits were allocated to which season date and so the first year it could be an issue. The second thing I would add to that is, you, you can still choose the same unit both hunts so if you are concerned about it you put your first choice as the early or you put your first choice as the late and then you put your second choice as the early or the late. The fix that we implemented last year in the preference point draw system, it really is negligible now because if you draw a tag, you use those points. So, I guess I don't share those same concerns for those reasons.

Gene Boardman: Ok, it is a big concern to us we've got used to drawing every other year now and I'm starting to hear some rumblings about people who isn't drawing every other year, they are going 2 years without a tag, and uh, I don't think we want to go there. I, we've, we have put up with going every other year, that was a, that hurt when we quit going just about every year to every other year. And its going to, its going to hurt a lot, its going to reduce the number of people that will apply and after they've been rejected too many times.

Dave Black: Thanks Gene. Sean.

Sean Kelly: The Fish Lake and the Dixie National Forest supports the Divisions recommendation of the early general season deer hunt. I think it's a pretty innovative approach to try to provide a quality experience to the folks hunting on the forest. With the realization that its kind of an experiment and probably a little bit of a work in progress. I imagine there will be some adjustments made. The only issue that we could foresee is that we've always tried to keep the activity during the opening weekend of all the hunts to a minimum, or have no activity, October, September, those are our big times to do range improvements and habitat projects, and its getting harder and harder to avoid activity on that opening weekend and with the addition of another hunt it will be almost impossible. Across both forests, across all hunts, we're probably going to overlap sometime and so we'd like to work with the Division and try to notify hunters before that happens, if it does, but hopefully it won't disrupt too much but that will be an issue going forward a little bit. With regard to the big horn sheep on the Oak Creek, we've talked to the biologists there, we support that, he seems comfortable with the numbers there based on his last flight and we'd like to support them with that. With the rest of the recommendations, you know we tend to manage habitat, and how animals are killed or harvested, we tend to support the Division, whatever their recommendation is, but we also support the management plan, and I'm a little bit unsure whether the late season muzzleloader actually matches the, what's in the State-wide mule deer management plan, Covy kind of alluded to that a little bit, I'm still not clear if that is the case. With the rest of the recommendations, we support the Division.

Dave Black: K, thank you, Craig and then we'll go to Verland after Craig.

Craig Laub: K I just have some concern about the early deer hunt because you got the, it will be in the middle of the muzzleloader elk hunt, and if you got a big bull tag, the last 2 years over to the Boulder it has been a mess, the muzzleloader deer hunters have been coming in there with cow tags, and then you turn a bunch of rifle deer hunters in there with those guys that's waited 15, 20 years to draw a big bull tag, its gonna be a mess and so I'm against that.

Kevin Bunnell: Craig just for clarification it will not overlap any limited entry elk hunts. The muzzleloader elk hunt happens during the muzzleloader deer hunt time and this would happen during the

general season rifle elk hunt. It would not overlap any limited entry elk hunts.

Craig Laub: No, you got the muzzleloader limited entry going on when that takes place. Yeah you do.

Kevin Bunnell: I don't think so but Covy will you check that?

Covy Jones: No it wouldn't overlap any limited entry hunts.

Craig Laub: And the other thing I am against the late muzzleloader elk or deer hunt.

Dave Black: Thanks Craig, Verland.

Verland King: Alright this proposal by SFW for this sheep hunt, Oak Creek and then they mentioned a couple other, is it, are they all the same? Same unit or?

Kevin Bunnell: Verland so it is the, we currently don't have a hunt on the Oak Creeks for sheep, we introduced the sheep there probably five years ago and that herd is just getting to the point to where now that we have the data we feel like we can have a hunt there for the first time. So that's one proposal, the other is to add an archery hunt for the Newfoundlands which are out on the West side of the great Salt Lake up in Northern Utah, its one of our more robust sheep populations so it already has hunts on it and they are proposing that we add an archery hunt there which it hasn't had in the past and then to do the same thing for the Zion Unit which is in one of our larger sheep units, they currently have rifle and muzzleloader tags available but they are proposing that we add an archery hunt to those 2 units as well. So there is 3 different proposals there.

Verland King: Ok so is that something they just pull out of the blue or are they looking at your data to go on that?

Covy Jones: Kevin I can speak to that. So what I would say is last year at the Board, in fact it came to the RAC's to do this, to have some once in a lifetime archery hunts, when it got to the Board, the Board said okay we'll do it on 2. They did it on bison in the Henry Mountains which we have the data back on and also mountain goats in the Uintah's. We can support this recommendation up front we can say it didn't do anything to the draws. But on the back end, with success rates, if they are lower, they could over time potentially affect the number of permits that could be allocated to those hunts. What I can say is we can support it but we would prefer to support it and let this ride for 3 years. Lets see what it actually does, don't add any new ones for the next 3 years, and then look back. On the mountain goat hunt it was zero success, so both permits, both the archery and the once in a lifetime neither one were harvested, and both were I'm sure pretty excited to draw that permit but after they realized how hard that hunt was in the comments, they both seemed to regret that hunt. The bison hunt was a different story on the Henry's. We've heard back from 9 of the 10 hunters, and we know that of those, 6 harvested, we know 3 did not and there is one we don't know, so its either 60 or 70% harvest success rate there and the comments there were very different. They really enjoyed that hunt. Even the individuals who didn't harvest really enjoyed their time on the mountain.

Verland King: Okay well I just really appreciate you going through the process and maybe just not jumping here in the RAC and where, where we don't really know a lot of times if the, you know the studies or the science has been done on that and so that was why I brought that up and the other

(inaudible, responding to someone off mic) and since the Boulder Mountain was brought up on how many heads of cows and sheep and elk, I feel like I've got to make a comment and my comment will be the same as you've heard time and time again is the ranchers on these permits have put a lot of time, a lot of money a lot of energy, maybe its not counted in dollars like other groups can say oh we put so much money on the ground but the money has been spent there, those livestock animals are permitted there, like Stanton will tell you it is a private property right, in the 70's when I was growing up on the Boulder Mountain there wasn't any elk there, and we've been told time and time again by DWR that you can't count elk, they are just hard to count, so 1500 head is a nice number but we all know it may not be very accurate, thank you.

Dave Black: Brian.

Brian Johnson: Just a couple things and I kind of harassed you a little bit about 300,000 tags versus 86,000 tags, as far as the early season rifle hunt I don't care one way or the other if we do it as long as we understand that people are still going to complain about crowding. If you have an opening, people are going to complain about it because people hunt the opening. So you've got 2 kinds of complainers, you got the guys that road hunt and they are going to complain because somebody else is on the road and the you've got someone who hikes a mile and sees another orange hat and he says oh man he's in my canyon, its not your canyon, its public land, just embrace the orange, love the pumpkin patch, just pull up your pants and just know that there is going to be other people in the mountain, it's okay. But like I said, this is a great opportunity, its great, I'm all for it, I think it's a good idea and I love that the idea that we're disguising it under hunter pressure that's great too. We can disguise it however you'd like, but I like it, its good, I think its great that dedicated hunters can hunt all 4 and I think its great if kids draw a rifle tag, they get to hunt both rifle hunts, this is fantastic, and they get to hunt the other 2 so if they draw late rifle or early rifle they get to hunt all 4. Its great for kids. I think it's fantastic. I think the other thing is we've got an elk problem. These ranchers are saying we've got an elk problem, we've talked about private land tags that we've opened up on a lot of units down here saying if its private property you can buy a tag and you can kill em . I like Mr. Twitchell's idea saying you know what, if you've got a muzzleloader tag, why not open up another avenue to kill another elk on these units that have private land tags. These are units, that were chronically, chronically over objective on, why don't we just open up that tool, you know pull one more screwdriver out and say you know what, there is only, there is only 15% of the guys that are buying muzzleloader tags anyway, lets let them if it's the end of the hunt and we can get one more cow off those units, lets do it. To me it seems,

Tammy Pearson: Is that a freezer cow?

Brian Johnson: If you are from Minersville, if you are from over home you get a bonus cow. I mean I used to, when I first moved down here I thought it was just the South of I-70 rule, I didn't know any different, you know it was the first time I shot from the truck, I didn't know. But, but like I said I think that there are a lot of good ideas kicking around here and one thing I want to bring up is, if you think the Division or the RAC's or the Board isn't afraid to change something if its detrimental, like these muzzleloader hunts, these late season muzzleloader hunts, I mean we've gone from 300,000 deer tags to 86,000, the Division, the RAC and the Board is not afraid to change things. If these end up being detrimental do you think for a minute that Donny Hunter is going to say lets keep doing them cause we did them last year. No, if they are detrimental that Board is going to change it. That's the beauty of this system guys is we have the chance to try some new things and I think that we try some of these new things, that's just my take, I think that there is mechanisms in place to stop this, we're not burning

grandma's hope chest so I think we should go for some of this stuff.

Dave Black: Sure, Tammy.

Tammy Pearson: I have more than my 2 cents worth here. I've got a handful of comments. #1, and if it's a Minersville deal cause we're all blood thirsty and we do love to hunt but every, every single person that has come to me and has talked to me about this, except for one or two that drew the tag, but were completely against the late muzzleloader on general. And I can't remember who suggested it, why don't we do the late muzzle on the limited entry units instead of the general season. I kind of like that idea because I'm never going to draw out for it so, but if we're talking about like Allan Wood talked about, letting these big deer do their breeding and they've made it through these other hunts, then why are we killing them when they are stupid. So, and I, kind of feel the same way about the elk on that. I totally agree with your bonus cow, like on the units where we are completely over objective, I think that that is something that needs to be considered and like Kevin said when he told me put my money where my mouth is so we put in for the cow tags finally. And we're still eating on them extra freezers but good thing because we didn't have any luck on the general bull or the spike elk hunt this year so. So the other thing on that late muzzleloader, I don't mean to beat that one to death but, especially where it conflicts with the management plans, I, I like management plans, I like trying new things too but I think if we make a plan we need to try and at least align ourselves with that. And stick with that. I like the idea of new opportunities but I'm also a rancher. I'm on the ground 365 days a year in Millard County, Beaver County and Iron County and a lot of these different units and I really worry about changing and adding new hunts and new dates because I see animals that are extremely stressed and it worries me and I'm not talking about livestock, I'm talking about your different species of you know, (inaudible) deer and I don't know that antelope are stressed but I have not seen that they seem to have plenty of get up and go on my place but the elk some of the elk some of the deer for sure, so those are, those are my comments.

Dave Black: Thank you. Wade

Wade Heaton: Going to throw my round 2 in. So, I really believe I mentioned before I am a fan of this velvet, this cactus buck hunt on the Paunsaugunt, its something that we have been addressing for a long time, we've done some studies this last little while, learned a lot about them and this is definitely the right approach, so, I do think that we need to do that. 2 other things I want to mention with regard to some of the deer recommendations, these have, this has been in the works for a while. Probably 2 or 3 or 4 years in some cases. And obviously on the late muzzleloader hunt, that was kind of a cool creative idea somebody came up with, that it is not affecting the herd biologically. Its really not. I've spent a lot of time on general season units these last 10 years and we have some huge deer on general season units. The few deer that are getting killed and we are talking single digit numbers, for these units, the few deer that are getting killed, the few big deer is not impacting the herd for that unit, it's not, it's just a cool creative idea that allows some people to go out and have some fun, helps with the bonus points, allows opportunity, just to me it's a step in the right direction. And to couple with that, the other early rifle hunt, early any-weapon hunt has been proposed, same exact concept, you know regardless of reasoning for it, it's a great idea. Its creative, its something new, its out of the box, it gives people more options, and I agree with our chairman, we've had a lot of cool traditions in the past that I hate to see some of them go away as well, but these are good ideas. Things we need to try and just see if it will help our herd, see if it will help our hunters, I mean I agree with Mr. Roberts renewable resource, and we can do some fun interesting different things with it and if it doesn't work we'll scratch it and start over again but I'd love to see both of those ideas passed tonight.

Kevin Bunnell: Can I just remind everybody that we are on agenda item 3 of 11 and we're almost 3 hours into this meeting. You can also, I think we need to get there soon.

Dave Black: Ok, we are ready to entertain a motion but we are going to break these up individually. We're not going to take one main motion. We're going to talk about each of these in groups so we're going to talk first about the additional late muzzleloader deer hunt. Adding units so I will entertain a motion regarding that.

Mike Worthen: K, I can support the cactus buck, that's a no brainer. And I can support the early deer hunts and I can support the last 10 days of October for the Paunsaugunt for the cactus buck or for the limited entry. I do have some questions about the late muzzleloader because the comments that I've heard from the public that have contacted me and it just depends on who they are, I've talked to a couple guys that drew out that and of course they are all for it and I probably would be too if I had drawn out but I've also talked to a lot of them that have concerns, we're killing these big bucks and I can see that 5 bucks out of a unit isn't gonna make any difference if it spread out over the unit. And of course those bucks that are gonna get killed are probably those that are close to a road or have pretty good access to them because that's where a lot of the deer will come down into. So I'm a little split on that and then on the 2 deer hunts I really don't have a problem with that, I don't think we're gonna kill any. I remember back on the muzzleloader back when we instituted that, there was some concern, you know are we, are we opening the door to where it's going to be wide spread and it appears because we're going to allow this in all the units it is so that is a concern that I have also so I'm still struggling with that one. I do represent the public at large and so I have to listen to what's been said.

Dave Black: Rusty.

Rusty Aiken: I like the proposal of the Fish and Game, that's why we had the 30 units was to have some difference strategies and I appreciate that, I support the 9 days on the Paunsaugunt, the stag hunt, the big horn sheep on the Oak Creek an also the archery for the sheep on the Zion and the Newfoundland. I have a question for that, is that going to be a separate hunt, a season date hunt and additional tags or included in the hunt?

Covy Jones: For the Newfoundland and Zion? It would be a separate hunt.

Rusty Aiken: With additional tags?

Covy Jones: We haven't decided exactly how we are going to divide up those permits yet, I don't know if it will be additional or we'll pull some out. Well the Oak Creek is a separate item so those are,

Rusty Aiken: Thank you.

Dave Black: K, Alright so the first item then that we're going to entertain a motion on will be the recommendation for adding early season any-weapon deer hunts.

Brayden Richmond made the recommendation for early riffle hunt Wade Heaton seconded 8:3 motion carries.

Cactus buck hunt on the Paunsaugunt and the 9-day hunt being held on the last 9 days of October, with the caveat that it could be an 8-day hunt if first of the 9 days is a Sunday. Rusty Aiken made the motion for later season hunt Brian Johnson seconded. Unanimous

Late muzzle loader hunt Riley Robert made the motion to approve as purposed. Rusty Aiken seconded 5:6 fails

Mike Worthen: If the muzzleloader hunt fails, does that mean that last years hunts will still be in place?

Dave Black: Yes. These are just the additional.

Kevin Bunnell: Is there 11 RAC members? If so then we are good.

Dave Black: Okay motion fails. On the Oak Creek and the sheep hunts.

Brian Johnson: Maybe entertain a new motion. These units, what if we were to pass a, what if I were to propose a motion to have an extended muzzle loader season on all the units that are managed for 18-20 bucks for 100 does, not all the units lets just pick up the higher end objective.

Brian Johnson: made the motion to add the late muzzle loader hunt for units that managed 18-20 bucks Rusty Aiken Seconds 5:6 fails

Tammy Pearson: Question, define extended.

Brian Johnson: Well not extended, I meant the later, the late muzzleloader. The same dates they already proposed, (off mic, inaudible)..

Dave Black: Do we have any further question or discussion?

Brian Johnson: I'm not afraid to strike out.

Dave Black: Okay, okay were going to address the Oak Creek hunt, the sheep hunt. Only the Oak Creek.

Oak Creek sheep hunt Brian Johnson made the motion that we have a hunt. Riley Robert seconded 10:1 carries.

Rusty Aiken: Yeah, I would like to add the archery.

Dave Black: K, we won't skip over that but we will address that separately.

Tammy Pearson: K so question, is this just a rifle tag, or a rifle hunt I should say and you will do due diligence on, on your specifications because we're not voting like yeah today, we're going to have a hunt, you still have to do all of your recommendations and that?

Kevin Bunnell: So this would put a hunt on the books and people would apply for, we would specify the number which is probably going to be 1 or 2, its gonna be low in the Spring when we do permit numbers.

Tammy Pearson: Okay you guys supported it to begin with, all I am saying is all the planning and all the workup to that vote has already been done?

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah we have a sheep population there, what happened Tammy is when we had to have recommendations due we hadn't had a chance to fly the Oak Creeks to check on the sheep population. In the interim, we've flown, I think they counted 67 sheep which is higher than what they expected with a number of class 3 and class 4 rams which are those that would be desirable by hunters and so based on the information that we have now, we are comfortable with proposing having a hunt on the Oak Creeks for sheep.

Tammy Pearson: Okay, so I'm not trying to be a thorn in your side, I'm just what I'm trying to clarify, this was part of the management plan when you put sheep on the Oak Creeks originally and, this was fully the intended,

Kevin Bunnell: Yes it was fully intended to be a hunted population.

Tammy Pearson: And I knew that I just wanted to clarify that so.

Kevin Bunnell: all the I's are dotted and T's are crossed As long as the Wildlife Board approves it we're ready to go.

Dave Black: K, all those in favor.

Adding additional archery hunts to Newfound and Zion Sheep units Rusty Aiken make the motion
Brayden Richmond seconded 10:1 carries

Multi-season elk hunts Braydon Richmond make the motion as presented with the exception of the cost from 150 to 100 seconded Brian Johnson 8:3 carries

Kevin Bunnell: Let me tell you what the implications of that are, so we can, we can pass that but as a Division we don't have the authority to set permit fees, that's done through the legislature so if this passed, the \$150 price tag would be there for now, but you could say and request that it maybe be reduced in the future but that could not happen for this first year.

Braydon Richmond: Perfect that's actually probably more what I would want to do anyway is request that we look at it.

Phil Gray: And we can definitely do that but I would like to remind the RAC that all of these fees were brought through the RAC and board process at this time last year before we ever went to the legislature and negotiated this so they have already been voted on.

Kevin Bunnell: They may not have known that they accepted it but they did and now that its in front of you its easier to kind of see so you could still go ahead where you are going Brayden.

Braydon Richmond: I am actually more comfortable with that language anyways to accept as presented and ask to look at that fee.

Dave Black: K and we have a second right? Second by Brian. Do we need discussion? All those in favor. 8. Opposed. 3. Okay, motion passes 8 to 3.

Brian Johnson: I would like to add one more thing there if we can. I really think that we need to be, I would like to make a motion that a muzzleloader elk hunter on a unit that sells private land tags has the option to shoot a cow along with a bull, be it spike or any bull depending on what unit he is on. Not and, or. So it would be just like an archery unit, so basically the units that are chronically over objective, that are selling the private land tags for, that a muzzle loader could shoot a cow or a bull with his muzzleloader tag.

Rusty Aiken: I will second that motion.

Kevin Bunnell: Hold on hold on just a moment. Let me make sure we got things right here. So there is 2 different types of elk tags. There is a private lands only elk tag, or there is draw tags that are on units that are over objective. Those are 2 very different things.

Brian Johnson: The units that have the private land tags, those units are chronically over objective, let's start with,

Kevin Bunnell: Not necessarily, those units are units that have a lot of private land, is what they are.

Brian Johnson: Okay so, so that's a great point they do have a lot of private land.

Kevin Bunnell: Covy jump into this if you are seeing issues coming up.

Brian Johnson: I would just like to see a way, I'd like to see a way that we could have muzzleloader hunters shoot cows or bulls cause I don't think its gonna be an impact and I think it's, let's say statewide then.

Covy Jones: We've talked about this before and like I said the concern we have is we do have hunts right now that are muzzleloader cow hunts that overlap that season. Not everywhere but they exist. And so we are providing more opportunity now and what we're concerned about is there is a cap on those permits at 15,000 and we could limit that opportunity and there is a tool in place right now to be able to sell or put a cow tag in the draw and do the same thing.

Kevin Bunnell: And those aren't going under(inaudible) that's really been our issue is if we were offering cow tags that people didn't want, then that makes a great case for that but right now when we offer cow tags, we have more than enough people that want them,

Covy Jones: Exactly.

Brian Johnson: And the resource still isn't getting damaged so I'll just redo my motion, I would like to motion that muzzleloader elk tags can shoot either a cow or a bull just like the archery units, on all units.

Kevin Bunnell: So, so that's, so the way that it is in the elk management plan, is exactly like that but for units that are over objective. Do you want to follow the elk plan or do you want to make it different.

Brian Johnson: I'm okay with the elk plan

Kevin: So to implement,

Brian Johnson: So to implement the elk plan,

Kevin Bunnell: Relative to muzzleloader hunters being able to kill, having an either sex tag.

Brian Johnson: Absolutely, yep.

Kevin Bunnell: Can we make that the motion?

Dave Black: So do we have a second?

Braydon Richmond: Could we repeat that motion?

Kevin Bunnell: Okay so to implement the strategy in the elk, in the Statewide elk plan to allow muzzleloader hunters to kill either, to have an either sex tag on units that are over objective.

Dave Black: So we have a motion and a second?

Gene Boardman: Um first of all, why muzzleloader? If I were to decide to go muzzleloader, I would probably, it would probably be an upgrade by the time I bought one and a scope and for the way that they are hunted now, it would probably be an upgrade over my rifle.

Brian Johnson: The reason I'm thinking muzzleloader is just cause there is a small percentage of people who buy the muzzleloader tag. It comes out of the 15,000 and I think that if we're gonna start it will be a small impact to start that way. And I've just heard from a couple of ranchers that say we are over objective, lets find a way to kill elk so I'm just trying to find a way to kill elk.

Gene Boardman: You are suggesting a way to kill elk that's for sure. I'm just, I'm just having a hard time voting muzzleloader on a lot of things because there isn't any difference between muzzleloader and the repeating rifle except the rifle repeats. And most people are out there to make a one shot kill anyway. It's not like the old days when we used to hunt with (inaudible), and the scopes that could be bought, (inaudible), shoot anything. Its just a problem with me.

Dave Black: Okay so we have a motion. Thank you Gene. The motion is to implement the strategy in the elk plan to allow muzzleloader hunters to kill either a cow or a bull during the general season muzzleloader elk hunt on units that are objective.

Brian Johnson: I would like to make a motion that muzzle loader shoot cow/bull like archery on over objective units Mike Worthen seconded 7:4 carries

Wade Heaton motion to approve the rest as presented Brayden Richmond seconded. Unanimous.

R657-5- Taking Big Game Rule Amendments (action)
- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Any questions from the RAC?

Braydon Richmond: I think this is a dumb question but I want to make sure it is. We still do allow cross bow, or people to use crossbows during archery season with the certificate?

Covy Jones: Correct. They can get a COR to use a crossbow if they have a disability.

Dave Back: Gene do you have a question.

Gene Boardman: Okay um I'm trying to figure out why you want to go down to 30 lbs on a bow but the crossbow requires 125 lbs. They, the mechanics are pretty much the same on the 2. Why, why, that's a big difference.

Covy Jones: That's a really good question Gene, they are quite different and one the crossbow you can draw and cock and lock the crossbow and the draw length, the overall draw length of a crossbow is a lot shorter and so you have a very short period to get that kinetic energy out of the push of the string. Does that make sense? And so that's why the 125 lb draw. And the way you draw the crossbow is also very different, there is a couple different mechanisms but it is all mechanized. Either with a crank or with a rope and so you are allowed to cock and leave it whereas with a bow you have to draw in the field and so it, it is quite different.

Gene Boardman: Okay the other thing is on hunter orange, sometimes you've got like 20 antelope hunters out there looking for a 14 or 15" buck on a quarter of the State of Utah, required hunter orange, but we don't require hunter orange for muzzleloaders that are every bit of, have every bit of distance and lethality of rifle.

Covy Jones: Yeah and again I would come back and say that whenever you are in the field, be safe, be smart, we always recommend that you be safe and wear hunter orange, but with muzzleloader our recommendations are that is the choice of the hunter. If you feel like there is a safety issue or are concerned about density, then you have the option of either wearing or not wearing hunter orange.

Dave Black: K any other questions? Rusty.

Rusty Aiken: Um I think its great you are allowing camo or an option for camo or hunter orange on CWMU's. Is there any hope of premium units, the Paunsaugunt and the Henry's? Everybody is doing it, lets make it an option, is that a possibility?

Covy Jones: Um you know really this is a social issue, that said, there are concerns and we keep pushing back from the other side too.

Rusty Aiken: There are limited tags, they are looking for big horned animals and its, everybody is doing it, there is an orange hat on the dashboard, to keep em legal but I think its time to allow that as well, but

just my comment.

Dave Black: Any questions from the audience? We have one comment card from Mike Twitchell.

Questions from the Public:

Mike Twitchell: Again Mike Twitchell just supporting the Utah Bowmen's Association, we would just like to acknowledge and agree with the Divisions recommendations for the plan as follows. Thank you.

Comments from the Public:

Dave Black: Any comments from the RAC?

RAC discussion and vote:

Braydon Richmond: I want to comment on the crossbows. We do have an option on the archery hunt to get a COR and be able to hunt the archery hunt with a crossbow, however, you are still one of the rules in there is that you have to have a one power scope, last year or a couple of years ago we got rid of the one power scopes for muzzleloaders and the same reasons in my mind apply to the crossbow and now that you don't have them with muzzleloaders its real tough to even find a company that makes them, try to get a one power scope. Let me address what Gene asked about crossbows a little bit to help those that don't understand crossbows. Where you said why do crossbows require higher poundage. Crossbows are a less efficient tool, you would not hunt with a crossbow if you could pull a regular bow. Crossbows are a very difficult weapon to hunt with. They are actually dumbing down the archery equipment, they aren't an advantage, they are a disadvantage. They are a difficult weapon, they are a cumbersome weapon, and those that are getting the COR have physical limitations otherwise they wouldn't get it but then we are handicapping them with the one power scope. Typically its older people, that they have bad eyesight. For the same reasons we changed the muzzleloader, I think we need to change the archery rule if you get a COR, let them put a scope on that thing.

Wade Heaton: I'll be fast sorry guys. 2 quick things. One is I agree with Rusty on the orange issue. We've talked a lot about this for premium limited entry units. Our reasoning for orange is obviously safety. And on premium limited entry units, there is so few people in the field it really does not apply. Secondly on this issue, on a selfish note I agree with the Division, I think it's a great idea, its proactive it makes a lot of sense, it will also drive a little bit bigger wedge between the public and CWMU's if we threw on premium limited entry units, it would be a little more palatable I think so I do kind of like that idea. Second, is this cactus buck thing, the definition, sorry Covy, I completely understand where the Division is coming from. This is a tough problematic detail orientated thing, I kind of helped go through it on the management hunt, it is borderline, it's a law enforcement issue, it's a let's not ruin people's lives kind of issue, my concern is this, there is a fairly high percentage of the older age class deer, the trophy bucks, on these units, the Paunsaugunt, that when we kill them on the rifle hunt, they've got strips of velvet on them and unless we get a little more specific which I know there is a danger in doing that and I totally understand why you guys landed where you did, I'm just concerned, dial up the (inaudible) and I see a piece of velvet hanging on that 210 buck and I just hate to see that, that's not the intent of the hunt, is that going to be an exception, hopefully, but I would much rather see us land somewhere in the middle, I understand the full velvet concern, I totally get that and retract that, but I have a concern with this maybe equally if we can land somewhere in the middle, hate to put a percentage on it, I don't know

how to fix it exactly, the wording, but this wording does worry me.

Dave Black: Thank you. Rusty.

Rusty Aiken: How about significant? That's Tammy's fix. Significant velvet.

Brain Johnson: I think the intent, the intent is these bucks that don't ever shed their velvet. I mean, I get what you are saying with 5% shed lets not ruin a guys life but if you say 50% you are going to cover the intent. And I'm telling you if a Division officer is out there measuring inches of horn and inches of stripped velvet and you are at 49%, that guy probably should have been dialing up the (inaudible) and not shooting the darn thing at 50%. I mean you tell me Wade, I mean he can't just say anything stripped because you can buff that on a fence post. But I think 50% is, I'm telling you right now if I had that tag and I saw a piece of velvet hanging off that 210 buck, who is gonna lay off that trigger in this room, not one of you. You are gonna look at the letter of the law and say I'm safe I'm putting that on my wall.

Dave Black: Ok, Gene.

Gene Boardman: Uh this is a little off the what what has been presented but I think this is an area where I think we need to bring it up and that is the bonus point preference point situation. It, in the first place, I don't know that looking at it is gonna change anything, people have got a lot invested in that, years, and dollars, to get 18, 20 points and they need to keep em. We're also getting into a situation where people are getting too damned old to hunt by the time the points roll up and we're getting starting to get a spread on the general deer season that in my mind and in the publics mind that I represent just isn't acceptable. So I what I want to suggest is that we ask for an action item on the point systems to be discussed in the future.

Dave Black: Well if you would like to make a motion on that Gene we'll see if there is a second and we'll vote on that for an action item.

Gene Boardman: If that would be okay I move that we make the bonus point preference point system an action item to be discussed and evaluated at a future time.

Dave Black: Do we have a second? Okay we have a second from Tammy.

Gene Boardman: motions for bonus points to be discussed at another time. Second by Tammy 9:2 Pass

Braydon Richmond: I kind of hate to do this but I do want to make a comment here because I'm actually pretty emphatic on this. I think Utah has the best system out there. I love the Utah system. 50% of tags you can earn and 50% are random. I just don't think it gets better than that, if you look at other states, that are 100% random or 100% preference, both of those suck. So, I love the Utah system, I can draw the first year I put in for Henry's or I can earn it by doing my whole life. I think we have the best system going, I don't want to mess with it.

Gene Boardman: I agree that we have the best point system and it's the fairest but I think that it needs to be looked at particularly in the preference point area.

Brian Johnson made the motion to accept the R657-5- Taking Big Game Rule Amendments as

presented with language of 50% velvet and one power scope on crossbow Rusty Aiken seconded. Motion carried

Brian Johnson motion: to accept as presented with the exception that the definition of a cactus buck should be 50% or more coverage to antlers, and remove the 1 power scope limitations on the crossbows when a COR has been issued, and to remove the restriction of hunter orange on premium limited entry units 10:1 passes

**R657-71- Removal of Wild Mule Deer from Domesticated Elk Facilities (action)
- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Any questions from the RAC?

Questions from the Public:

None

Comments from the Public:

None

RAC discussion and vote:

Craig Laub made the motion to accept the R657-71- Removal of Wild Mule Deer from Domesticated Elk Facilities as presented Rusty Aiken seconded. Motion carried Unanimous

**Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan (action)
-Randy Larsen, Wildlife Research Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: K do we have any questions?

Verland King: So I'd like to know why there is no committee that has input into this like?

Randy Larsen: Yeah so we did not form a committee on this plan or the moose plan. I think some of the thinking was maybe the prong horn weren't as controversial as deer or elk, I know that could probably be debated, we did seek input from both the sporting public and also Farm Bureau for example and this public process is part of the effort and so we are certainly interested in seeking public comment here or comment from the RAC and so, yeah.

Verland King: Okay so when you are looking at reintroduction or transplanting some in a new area, how do you look at having an EA done or have studies done, hearings with local people to see what they want done?

Randy Larsen: Yeah that a great question, so I think Josh, we've got one herd unit that we're proposing a reintroduction for, Josh do you want to address that in terms of? (Inaudible) reintroduction for a specific unit if we plan any?

Verland King: Does the DWR own any (inaudible)?

Josh Pollock: You know I would assume Randy says we're going to do unit wide plans, (inaudible) of these and so when we go to do that we would do just like we did with the deer plan I would assume and have some open house type events that people could come and talk about those when we do that. I would assume that's what we're gonna do.

Randy Larsen: The other thing I would say on that is all of those reintroduction or release areas have been submitted to the State Office through what they call the RDCC process. Which is at the governors level so that list of sites for release was submitted through that process for comment through,

Verland King: What do those letters stand for?

Randy Larsen: Regional Development Coordinating Committee. That's a governors office,

Kevin Bunnell: So anything that is submitted through RDCC goes to all of the counties for instance, it also goes to all of the federal agencies, to, for comment. Tammy as a county commissioner she would see that often I would assume.

Tammy Pearson: So I am not sure if this is a question, so you have not coordinated possibly with county level besides the Division and maybe these NGO's, did I see Rocky Mountain Elk and SFW maybe and Bureau? So, I guess my question is why is the Division not coordinating through the county resource management plans?

Randy Larsen: So I think the answer there is we are proposing here a 10-year plan for the State, a State-wide level plan and then as part of that plan in the next year, 2018, we would develop unit level plans that I think would be more appropriately dealt with at the County level,

Tammy Pearson: So more site specific or unit specific?

Kevin Bunnell: And Tammy let me comment just a little bit more on that. We're not sure where we stand with the County Resource Plans to be honest with you.

Tammy Pearson: You're in the bullseye.

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah the Wildlife Board is the, is the regulatory board that has the authority to regulate wildlife. And its in the legislation that was passed that created the County Resource Plans it states that very clearly and so we know that they are going to play a role at some point, we're not sure we're all gonna learn as we go forward on what role those play cause I don't, its not clear at this point.

Tammy Pearson: Well I will just speak from a County level then.

Kevin Bunnell: I'm sure you have your opinion on how it should go.

Tammy Pearson: We're clear as how we'd like it to be on a county level. So my question is, or suggestion is maybe that we pursue this and there is local coordination and cooperation all of those different things that we ask of our federal partners that we should also be able to expect from the State whether it is the Division of Wildlife or DNR or whoever. So that's, my question.

Kevin Bunnell: And I think that this will be a work in progress.

Dave Black: K, Verland.

Verland King: Okay so this sounds like this is up in the air, why do a 10-year plan when maybe it's premature to do a plan at all? Is there a law saying you have to do it or I mean it seems like at least on my level, I talked to Mr. Black (inaudible) today he said our resource management plan says 1500 antelope in the county. Your plan says 1500 antelope on Parker Mountain which is mostly in the county but you don't take into account how many antelope are down on Robber's Roost and down around Hanksville and that so, so seems to me like maybe we, maybe we are getting the cart before the horse here but maybe you've got legal obligations.

Kevin Bunnell: That's a good illustration of exactly why we are going to have to learn as we go and there is going to be some bumps in the road because we, according to State law we take our direction from the Wildlife Board, not from the County Resource Management Plans and there is gonna be some times when those things conflict and I'm not sure how those are going to be worked out.

Mike Worthen: In fact I was just up in Salt Lake today attending a Commission, a public land commission meeting with the legislature and that issue, very issue came up how, how are the State agencies going to coordinate or use this plan and what do we do when there is conflicts and so that is still being worked out. I think like was said it is just going to kind of evolve as we go along, how this all comes out.

Randy Larsen: And I would say that we have tried hard to write the State-wide plan with quite a bit of leeway to allow for flexibility for different regions that have different issues that could be address in that unit level planning phase.

Kevin Bunnell: There aren't any population numbers or anything in the State-wide plan.

Randy Larsen: Right it would just be, the State-wide population objective would be the sum of those units that would be developed over the next year plus.

Tammy Pearson: I don't want to keep making statements. I think that we might get to this and I don't want to kill this either but, so as one who is personally affected by wild horses and extremely affected by wild horses, personally and county and our whole Southern Region, and this is also you know a big issue now with wildlife, I think that all of these need to be in this plan you need to do the assessments, while I agree with everything you are doing there needs to be assessments, there needs to be numbers put to this, objectives, but also an exit strategy, a significant exit strategy on keeping those management numbers down, just like you know we're trying to do with any other population on any other species so that would be my ask I guess,

Dave Black: K, we're getting there. Any other questions or comments? We're ready to entertain a motion, if you want to do that Tammy?

Kevin Bunnell: So Tammy to address your concern what I would suggest is that you ask that the unit plans, so this Statewide plan requires that unit plans be made for every unit. And that's where population objectives will be set. So, if I was sitting in your chair I would ask that the Wildlife Board require the unit plans be coordinated at the local level.

Braydon Richmond: I have been really trying to figure out if I really want to make this comment because its not going to be popular with my neighbors. But I represent sportsmen so I'm going to try and represent sportsmen here. Let me give you the counter concern that I have with your concern. The counter concern I have is I have sat in several of these meetings and several of these unit plans and sportsmen are not fairly represented. By far the voice is cattelman and farmers with one or 2 sportsmen. And sportsmen should have a voice on public land I really have a concern with that. I've been in multiple meetings now where there has been 2 sportsmen and over 30 people in the room and sportsmen should have a voice on public land.

Kevin Bunnell: And that's why I said at the local level, not with the counties cause there is a lot more concerns rather than just county government that need to be part of that conversation.

Dave Black: K, Gene do you have a comment?

Gene Boardman: I heard you mention a slight increase in antelope tags, how about a large increase in antelope tags?

Randy Larsen: Yeah let me, so back in 2008-2009, when these age data came through we averaged 3.7 years age on these harvested animals so we're talking about if the age objective harvest or if the age of harvested animals is the same, it's a little bit of an unknown, its been a decade, but if it were the same we're talking about shifting the age, average age of harvested animals down a full year, down somewhere between 2 and 3, maybe 2.7. For example, if we did that, we've averaged about 750 permits, buck permits in the state, the last few years, back in the napkin calculations we might be 80 to 100 additional permits would be what we would sort of forecast that would be subject to a lot of factors, crowding, and all kinds of stuff but that's sort of the best guess right now.

Gene Boardman: Okay it seems like we're always filling, when tags have to be cut they have to be cut aggressively but when there is to be increased we use extreme caution. And, also it looks to me like on the antelope, maybe this age objective nobody has ever asked me for the age of the antelope that I have killed so I don't know where you are getting the ages on em, but on elk, I hate the dang gone age objective. It takes away from sportsmen opportunity. Now maybe with what you've told here age objective will work for us in the antelope but whenever anybody says age objective it kind of raises the red flag.

Dave Black: Thank you Gene. I think with the new age objective its in favor of the sportsmen and the ranchers, it gives it more opportunity and we can remove more animals from the field so I think that is kind of a win/win that way but,

Riley Robert: I would just like to remind the rest of the RAC members that this is an overall State plan

that is being presented to us, this is not a discussion on numbers or objective or that time, this is just an overall plan for antelope and I know that this is going to be a personal comment and I might get in trouble for this but I'm a long ways away from home and I would hope that we can keep our comments focused on the item and the agenda at hand so that we can move through this.

Dave Black: I think we're ready to entertain a motion. Tammy do you want to do that?

Kevin Bunnell: To ask the Wildlife Board to, to require the Division to coordinate unit plans at the local level.

Unknown: (off mic).

Braydon Richmond: Correct me if I'm wrong but doesn't that go against the legislature if it doesn't require us? I don't think it's a bad idea but do we really want to lock ourselves into being required to?

Dave Black: Alright we have a motion and a second, all those in favor?

Questions from the Public:

Comments from the Public:

RAC discussion and vote:

Tammy Pearson made the motion to accept the Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan for 2017 as presented Verland King seconded. Motion carried 10:0 1 Abstention

**Statewide Moose Management Plan (action)
-Kent Hersey, Big Game Projects Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Thank you. Any questions? Do you have a question?

Shaun Kelly: Kent years passed prevailing wisdom was if you sent a moose off of Highway 6 you kind of sentenced it to a long lingering death, I mean what has changed in that, I noticed Beaver is on the transplant list now.

Kent Hersey: I think what has changed is that Colorado has had some good success on the Grand Mesa population. I don't think we have really good data as to what went on South of Highway 6 on the Mantis so I think we need a lot more information to see what it takes to get these moose population established and thriving and it seems like elevation might have a component so at the Beaver we have some more of that high elevation habitat and so it might be possible.

Shaun Kelly: Yeah if I remember Fish Lake has that too and we sent a lot of moose to their death on the Fish Lake, anyway, your moose, I guess you guys do what you want but I wouldn't have my expectations set too high. If you put them down there in the Beaver but anyway that's like I said, your deal.

Tammy Pearson: Okay so that's my question. What are you clarifying as the Beaver.

Kent Hershey: I will let Dave speak to more specifics but we're looking at the North Creek and Three Creeks area. Other ones Dave?

David Smedley: Merchant Valley.

Kent Hershey: Merchant Valley as well. Again this is just a potential list in the transplant or in the State-wide plan, with the development of a unit plan would have to take place because this is a new population so that would be the specifics to be worked out as to numbers and specific locations and what may or may not be done.

Dave Smedley: Those are just kind of the areas that we've looked at as potential sites for it and if, as it progresses if that happens we'll go into the plan and look into it further and look into the process with it.

Dave Black: Thank you. Okay. Any further comments?

Riley Robert: I'll make a motion that we accept the plan as presented.

Questions from the Public:

Comments from the Public:

RAC discussion and vote:

Riley Robert made the motion to accept the Statewide Moose Management Plan for 2017 as presented Wade Heaton seconded. Motion carried Unanimous

NR Deer Management Plans (action)

-Jim Christensen, Northern Region Asst. Wildlife Manager

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Questions? Comments? Entertain a motion?

Questions from the Public:

Comments from the Public:

RAC discussion and vote:

Braydon Richmond made the motion to accept the NR Deer Management Plans for 2017 as presented Wade Heaton seconded. Motion carried Unanimous

CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2018 (action)

-Mike Wardle, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Any questions?

Tammy Pearson: One quick one, what is your acreage on prong horn on for a CWMU's?

Mike Wardle: 5000. Yeah 5000 for deer and prong horn and 10000 for elk and moose.

Dave Black: Wade?

Wade Heaton: Chairman I need to recuse myself from the vote on this. I'm associated with one of the CWMU's but my comment would be that everything just looks great.

Dave Black: Thank you we appreciate your comment. I just have one question. I believe there is an action log item at the Board level that was going to look at CWMU's on units that only have one public permit, to see if there was a way that we could come up with to burn some of the preference points, I was wondering if there had been any progress on that?

Mike Wardle: Covy do you want to address that since you were involved in that more?

Covy Jones: Yeah so we've looked into this and we intend to present this to the Board but this is the action log item on 2 permits 1 year, so we realized that in talking to some of the CWMU's that at first it seemed like it might be a very positive thing and then we ran it past more CWMU's, especially deer, and the end result would probably be a decrease in public opportunity. There are several CWMU's out there right now that do the 9 and 1 split, and they get so they have 1 permit and have 9 to sell, and they are hydrating their permits so they only sell 1 or 2. But every year they get 9 and 1. So they sell 2, they take 1 public hunter and they feel like that is sustainable over time, they are harvesting about 3 deer. But the feedback that we got is that if you, if you, if we have to have 2 public hunters one year and we are harvesting 4 or 5 deer that is not sustainable so we will change our permit request and instead of having 3 public hunters in 3 years, we'll scale way back and you will end up with 2 public hunters in 3 years. And so evaluating it that way we said maybe this isn't a good thing and at the end of the day what we what is public opportunity on private land and it might not work.

Dave Black: Does it apply for elk too or can you do one and not the other?

Covy Jones: The discussion was a little different on elk, it becomes different to manage data bases when they are different and changing and moving and turning hunts on and off. We would prefer that it were consistent.

Dave Black: K thank you. Any further questions or discussion. I'll entertain a motion.

Questions from the Public:

Comments from the Public:

RAC discussion and vote:

Rusty Aiken made the motion to accept the CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2018 for 2017 as presented Riley Robert seconded. Motion carried 9:0 1 Abstention

**Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2018 (action)
- Mike Wardle, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Thank you. Any questions? Comments? Motions?

Wade Heaton: I better recuse myself from this as well. I'm affiliated with some landowners associations.

Questions from the Public:

Comments from the Public:

RAC discussion and vote:

Tammy Pearson made the motion to accept the Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2018 as presented Verland King seconded. Motion carried 9:0 1 Abstention

**R657-67- Mentor Rule Amendments (action)
- Phil Gray, Licensing Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Thank you. Any questions?

Mike Worthen: And uh I would assume that we are still requiring the youth to have a hunter education and go through that process?

Phil Gray: Correct, yes, yep they have to have hunter education but they do not have to have a hunting license.

Tammy Pearson: So my question would be, so all regular requirements like with your bobcat, your trapping license all those different things everything applies to your youth?

Phil Gray: Correct so there is wording in the rule that says youth who is otherwise eligible to hunt so you've got to be 12 to hunt big game, you've got have satisfied hunter ed for harvest education, all of those other requirements.

Dave Black: I just had a question on the timing so if Grandpa draws a tag do you apply for the mentor program after he draws or do you have to apply for it before?

Phil Gray: Yes they do have to have a permit in possession before they can apply.

Dave Black: Do we have any other questions? We do have one comment card.

Gene Broadman: Has this program has it been completely thought out that there isn't opportunity for profit or rent a kid?

Phil Gray: The concern was there and that was one of the reasons that the legislature insisted upon the immediate family member on the first go around on this. We do not believe that is going to be an issue, but again, it, the rule does make it clearly illegal to do that, when somebody applies if they are not the immediate parent or guardian of a youth then they have to sign an affidavit stating that they are not receiving compensation to take a youth on a hunt and the parents also have to swear that they are not providing compensation. So if it does turn out that they are doing that, we have some legal recourse to go after them.

Dave Black: Okay, thank you, we do have the one comment, Lee?

Questions from the Public:

Comments from the Public:

Lee Tracy: Three years ago when this issue came up, I was opposed to the way it was written and the reason is because well there is a lot of reasons but the once in a lifetime tags and the limited entry tags are very difficult to get, yet, what happens with this program is that the youth can go hunt but he is allowed also to apply for a point. So, if, if a youth decides he wants to hunt moose for 6 years he can kill 6 moose and end up with 6 points. This allows, the ways its written now it allows it opens too many doors for misuse. I won't use the word abuse but misuse of the program. For instance there is no definition in the field at this particular section that might be something that the Wildlife Board needs to look at but the definition of what is a field is anywhere that has potential for the species they are hunting except an established camp site and an enclosed vehicle. So if the mentor takes all 4 of his kids in an open ATV, those kids are in the field. Is he mentoring them? Maybe only one of them has possession of the rifle but at what point does, do they change hands? The first one that sees the buck gets to shoot him? Whichever one that happens to be? It also as Gene has pointed out lays open some issues with (inaudible) if that was he was saying. I would support the changes most of the changes but I still object to the once and a life time limited entry hunts being included because that will just add to the point creep like you wouldn't believe. Maybe not right now but 20 years from now, those kids will never be able to draw a once in a lifetime tag. Thanks.

RAC discussion and vote:

Dave Black: Comments from the RAC?

Riley Robert: I have some of the same concerns that Lee does, I mean there is always an opportunity for misuse or abuse and this is one where there, for some reason this one gives me a little bit of heartburn and I'm not opposed to this by any stretch but it does seem to open up a lot of different facets where it could be misused and at the same time I don't know that its flexible enough because this is the future hunters of the State of Utah and that's what we're trying to develop here and that was the purpose of this program to start with. That being said and I don't even, and this is open for discussion by the way this next comment because I don't even know how this happens but if there is a youth that does not fill their tag, lets say it was an archery tag, didn't get that opportunity to fill, right now it's not a possibility once

they have a tag for that species even if they didn't have the opportunity, how do we, how do we tack that onto the mentor program as well, where we're now opening it up to anybody who has the note that says that they can hunt with them, how do we give them that opportunity to hunt if they have not fulfilled that tag and is that even a possibility?

Kevin Bunnell: I think the answer to that is you have them apply for a rifle tag cause then they can hunt all 3 seasons.

Riley Robert: Correct now if they don't do that, so the individual for example you have a young man who is 12 years old, doesn't get a rifle tag, has an archery tag, does not fill that tag, right now he is not allowed to use his father or parent or whoever this individuals mentor tag, is that something that we can tack onto this or is that a completely different?

Phil Gray: If I could under the proposed rule changes, they would be able to do that. So, so right now, for all intensive purposes, a mentor authorization acts as a permit. So our front counters, every, every application comes in they look to see if a youth already has a permit that would disqualify them, so you get 3 cow elk, or 2 cows and a bull, 1 buck deer, 1 prong horn, of either species, they check and make sure if they qualify, if they don't they says sorry, you can't apply. So now what we would do is regardless of the permits they've been issued they can still get 1 buck deer or 1 cow elk mentor authorization per year. So one species authorization per year regardless of any permits they might already have.

Riley Robert: Perfect. You already fixed it and I wasn't paying attention. Thank you.

Dave Black: Do we have any other questions?

Gene Broadman: I like the program the way it first came out and I thought it worked pretty good but I think you are going for a bridge too far on all the all the stuff that you are putting into it now. I think we were better off the way it was and that there is a opportunity for abuse and I can see where maybe in some circumstances it would help but they, you just got too much in it. Too many different ways. Lets just stay where we were.

Dave Black: K, thank you. Tammy?

Tammy Pearson: Okay so my question would be, you've already done it for 3 years, correct?

Phil Gray: This is the third year.

Tammy Pearson: So okay, and personally my own family has done this and its been awesome but I'm not trying to cheat the system either so it was kind of out of the box when those questions came up.

Dave Black: K, ready for a motion.

Brian Johnson made the motion to accept R657-67- Mentor Rule Amendments as presented Tammy Pearson seconded. Motion carried 9:1 Pass

2018 Southern Region RAC Locations & Start Times Schedule (action)

-Dave Black, Chairman

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Public:

Comments from the Public:

RAC discussion and vote:

Dave Black motions for wildlife board for consideration of regulation of spike units

Second: Riley Roberts 2:8 Fails

Other Business

-Dave Black, Chairman

Dave Black:

Meeting adjourned at 10:07 p.m.

SERO RAC Meeting 11/15/2017

28 members of the public in attendance

17 DWR employees

RAC members present – 11 – Trish Hedin, Darrel Mecham, Kirk Player, Jace Guymon, Eric Luke, Kent Johnson, Helene Taylor, Darren Olson, Jeff Christensen, Todd Thorne, Lynn Sitterud (left at 9:00 pm)

RAC members absent - Sue Bellagama, Gerrish Willis, Dana Truman

Meeting Duration 6:30pm – 10:00 pm (3.5 hours)

Location – J W. Powell River History Museum

Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2018

- RAC questions
 - None
- Public questions
 - None
- Public Comments
 - None
- RAC comments
 - None
- RAC motions
 - Motion – Accept recommendations as presented by the Division.
 - 1st – Eric Luke
 - 2nd – Kirk Player
 - Result – Pass unanimous

R657-19 – Taking of Non-game Mammals Rule Amendment

- RAC questions
 - Is the state planning on an appeal? Answer – yes
- Public questions
 - None
- Public Comments
 - None
- RAC comments

- None
- RAC motions
 - Motion – Accept recommendations as presented by the Division
 - 1st – Kent Johnson
 - 2nd – Helene Taylor
 - Result – Pass Unanimous

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2018 Season Dates, Application Timeline

- RAC questions
 - Darrel Mecham – Are there buck in the full rut during the Muzzle loader hunt?, Why are people with 17 points burning points?
 - Trish Hedin – Where did the recommendation for the late season muzzle loader hunt come from?
 - Darren Olsen – For the deer hunts, are these tags in addition to the current number?
 - Eric Luke – Are these additional permits?
 - Helene Taylor – Why is it just muzzle loader?
 - Eric Luke – Do you see potential for the early season hunts and the public wanting an early hunt in every unit? How many tags for the late season Muzzle loader hunt and how is it distributed through the state? Is it based off the number of regular tags? Is there any concerns about much higher success rates and what it could do to the number of big bulls?
 - Kirk Player – Where did the three elk season recommendation come from?
 - Kent Johnson – Would the elk spike archery hunt still be either sex?
 - Darrel Mecham – Is there any thought on the bison in the Thompson, Floy areas? What are you going to do when this becomes a huge program?
 - Jeff Christensen – Several questions on bison hunt? Aggressiveness on bison in Range Creek? Why weren't other entities involved to gathering input? What gives the DWR the right to give the numbers? Why can't we have more tags? Why the access issue was not stated in the guidebook? What is projected success rate? What is the rest of the bison success rates for the rest of the state? What is the DWR doing to prevent the transmission of disease to other animals and humans? What are the bison doing to the critical habitat for deer and elk?
 - Helene Taylor – What is the percentage of the bison herd being tested?
- Public questions
 - None
- Public Comments
 - Coby Hunt – Emery County Farm Bureau – Bison coming through the fences. Thanks for the help working with the Indians. Boundary change on Manti nebo for deer (Green River to Woodside) let them hunt Green River and Desert – Also asking for late season muzzle loader for deer in the Bookcliff area.

- Dallas Leo – Utah Bowmans Association – Support DWR Recommendation -
- Butch Jensen – Utah Cattleman – Tavaputs ranch owners – Concerned about brucellosis. Concerned about bison crossing river eating elk and deer and cattle habitat. Concern in Desolation Canyon boundary. Like board to have a discussion to not have a hunt.
- Cory Vetere – East side – Bison winter on his blm permit – upset about the bison
- John Vetere – Upset about Henry Mountains and all the people and the management buck hunt. There are too many permits and hunts
- Troy Justensen – SFW – Support recommendations with 2 exceptions. Start archery only hunts on Zion and Newfoundlands. Wants to open permits on the Oak Creek to have a hunt. Support the muzzle loader and multi-season elk hunts

- RAC comments
 - Eric Luke – What is the Bookcliff unit for objective?

- RAC motions
 - Motion – Removing the 9 mile unit from the Bookcliffs Wildhorse bench hunt.
 - 1st – Jeff Christensen
 - 2nd – Helene Taylor
 - Result – Pass: For 6 - 4 against Kirk, Jace, Eric, Darren

- RAC motions
 - Motion – Request the wildlife board to look into a long-term solution for bison leaving going into Range Creek
 - 1st – Kent Johnson
 - 2nd – Jeff Christensen
 - Result – Pass: Unanimous

- RAC motions
 - Motion – Request of the board to change the boundaries of the South Manti unit to include South of the Price River to I-70
 - 1st – Kent Johnson
 - 2nd – Jeff Christensen
 - Result – Pass: Unanimous

- RAC motions
 - Motion – Accept the SFW recommendation of the OILT Big Horn hunts, Oak creek Big Horn sheep as proposed
 - 1st – Eric Luke
 - 2nd – Darrel Mecham
 - Result: Pass: Unanimous

- RAC motions
 - Motion – Add the late season LE Primitive weapon hunt for the South Bookcliff unit
 - 1st – Eric Luke
 - 2nd – Kent Johnson

Result – Pass: Unanimous

- RAC motions
 - Motion – Accept the remainder of DWR recommendations as presented
 - 1st – Eric Luke
 - 2nd – Darrel Mecham

Result: Pass: 8 For 2 against Todd Thorne, Helene Taylor

R657-5 – Taking Big Game Rule Amendments

- RAC questions
 - Helene Taylor – Was there data for mortality on wounds on animals that were not harvested? In your opinion, would it increase mortality?
 - Eric Luke – Why do we want to lower that weight? Where did it come from?
Question about allowing younger kids to hunt, what is the purpose? Is there separate points for Ewes versus Rams? If there is a little bit of velvet on an antler, will that be considered a velvet buck?
- Public questions
 - None
- Public Comments
 - None
- RAC comments
 - Trisha Hedin – commented on draw weight and opposes the change
 - Eric Luke – opposes the draw weight, any velvet needs to be reworded
- RAC motions
 - Motion – Accept recommendations excluding: Leaving the draw weight at 40 lbs
 - 1st – Eric Luke
 - 2nd – Helene Taylor
 - Result – Pass : 9 for 1 oppose Darrel

R657-71 - Removal of Wild Mule Deer from Domesticated Elk Facilities

- RAC questions
 - Helene Taylor – Are there elk getting out if deer are getting in?
 - Kent Johnson – Does the division check to see if the deer are there or work with the operator?
- Public questions
 - None

- Public Comments
 - Kelly Hymas – Utah Elk Breeders and Hunting Parks – In favor of new rule to allow hunting ranch owners, family, staff to remove deer from the facilities.
- RAC comments
 - Trish Hedin – DWR is working hard to alleviate the issues
- RAC motions
 - Motion – Accept the recommendations as presented by the Division
 - 1st – Kirk Player
 - 2nd – Darren Olsen
 - Result – Pass: Unanimous

Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan

- RAC questions
 - Eric Luke – How many more tags statewide?
 - Kent Johnson – Is the division wanting the populations to grow?
 - Eric Luke – Why a 10 yr plan versus a 5 yr plan? Will the division be open to a boundary change for the N. San Rafael unit?
- Public questions
 - None
- Public Comments
 - None
- RAC comments
 - None
- RAC motions
 - Motion – Accept recommendation as presented by the Division
 - 1st – Kirk Player
 - 2nd – Darrel Mecham
 - Result – Pass: Unanimous

Statewide Moose Management Plan

- RAC questions
 - None
- Public questions
 - None
- Public Comments
 - None

- RAC comments
 - None
- RAC motions
 - Motion – Accept recommendations as presented by the Division
 - 1st – Kent Johnson
 - 2nd – Kirk Player
 - Result – Pass: Unanimous

NR Deer Management Plans

- RAC questions
 - Kent Johnson – Is the division going to look at transplanting does off those units that are over objective?
 - Eric Luke – Do you have any data on the Chalk Creek and Cache for fawn survival?
- Public questions
 - None
- Public Comments
 - None
- RAC comments
 - None
- RAC motions
 - Motion – Accept recommendations as presented by the Division
 - 1st – Todd Thorne
 - 2nd – Eric Luke
 - Result – Pass: Unanimous

CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2018

- RAC questions
 - Jace Guymon – Why are there an increase with those on the Manti?
 - Eric Luke – Are the CWMU's looked at separately from the public permits or are they together? How are the overall numbers looked at with population objectives?
- Public questions
 - None
- Public Comments
 - None

- RAC comments
 - Eric Luke – CWMU's are keeping the elk on the private lands which means less elk for the public hunter. Seems like the numbers should be separated. Some operators are really good and others are not.
 - Jace Guymon – CWMU's purposely don't hunt to allow for a refuge. People are not satisfied with the days given to hunt or the areas allowed to hunt.
- RAC motions
 - Motion – Accept recommendations as presented by the Division
 - 1st – Jace Guymon
 - 2nd – Todd Thorne
 - Result – Pass: Unanimous

Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2018

- RAC questions
 - None
- Public questions
 - None
- Public Comments
 - Mark Hill – Bookcliff Landowner Association – Disagrees with the division recommendations. Substantial damage from other animals such as bison. Asks to keep the tags the same.
 - Julie Hansmire – Ranch North of cisco, Appreciate landowner elk and deer permits. Appreciate the compensation. Objectives need to be thought of by the division. Ask to maintain the 9 elk and 3 antelope.
- RAC comments
 - Eric Luke – if they lost land 3 years ago, why did the division not change permits.
 - Darrel Mecham – Where do we win with this one? Animals destroying, at what point do we win.
 - Kent Johnson – agree to keep the permits to what they are now.
- RAC motions
 - Motion – Accept the recommendations as presented with an amendment to leave the permits as it is currently.
 - 1st – Kent Johnson
 - 2nd – Jeff Christensen
 - Result – Pass: 8 for 1 against Darren Olsen

R657-67 – Mentor Rule Amendments

- RAC questions
 - Darren Olsen – Didn't understand the 4 youth?
- Public questions
 - None
- Public Comments
 - None
- RAC comments
 - None
- RAC motions
 - Motion – Accept the recommendations as presented by the Division
 - 1st – Eric Luke
 - 2nd – Helene Taylor
 - Result – Pass : 8 for 1 against Darren Olsen

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Junior High School
189 South 1470 East, Springville
November 7, 2017 @ 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 2018

MOTION: To amend the Scaup season hunt dates for the northern zone waterfowl season
(October 26, 2018-January 19, 2019)

Failed 4 to 6 (Alan, Christine, Ken, Danny) (AJ, George, Joshua, Mike, Jacob, Brock)

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

R657-19 Taking of Non-game Mammals Rule Amendment

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

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2018 Season Dates, Application Timeline

MOTION: To follow the current mule deer management plan in accordance to the limited entry
muzzleloader tags and not accept the recommendation presented by the Division to
implement the late season muzzleloader hunt

Passed 8 to 2

MOTION: To add the Oak Creek Unit as a new Bighorn Sheep hunt and to add archery only
hunts to the New Foundland Mountain and Zion Units Bighorn Sheep hunts

Passed unanimously

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

R657-5 Taking Big Game Rule Amendments

MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented
Passed 10 to 1

R657-71 Removal of Wild Mule Deer from Domesticated Elk Facilities

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

Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan

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

Statewide Moose Management Plan

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

NR Deer Management Plans

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

CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2018

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

Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2018

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

R657-67 Mentor Rule Amendments

MOTION: To maintain the wording of "immediate family members" in the mentor description
Failed 3 to 8 (Mike, Ben, Jacob)(George, Christine, Danny, Ken, Brock, AJ, Alan, Joshua)

MOTION: To have the youth surrender permit if they have multiple tags of same species Passed
9 to 2

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

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY OF MOTIONS
Utah Wildlife Resources Office, 318 N Vernal Avenue, Vernal
November 16, 2017

5. Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2018 ACTION

MOTION to accept as presented from the Division
Passed unanimous

6. R657-19 – Taking of Non-game Mammals Rule Amendment ACTION

MOTION to accept as presented from the Division
Passed unanimous

7. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2018 Season Dates, Application Timeline

MOTION to accept multi season elk hunt as presented from the Division
Passed five in favor and two opposed

MOTION to **NOT** accept the limited entry late muzzleloader deer hunt
Passed five in favor and two opposed

MOTION to accept early season rifle deer hunt as presented from the Division
Passed unanimous

MOTION to accept SFW proposal to the Division for Oak Creek California Big Horn
Sheep hunt
Passed six in favor and one opposed

MOTION to accept SFW proposal to the Division for the New Foundland California Big
Horn Sheep Hunt
Passed six in favor and one opposed

MOTION to accept the SFW proposal to the Division for the Zion Desert Big Horn
Sheep hunt
Passed unanimous

MOTION to accept **ACTION Item** for Wildlife Board to take a look and discuss season
date change for archery deer hunt during the rut.
Passed six in favor and one opposed

MOTION to accept remainder of presentation from the Division
Passed unanimous

8. R657-5 – Taking Big Game Rule Amendments ACTION

MOTION to accept as presented from the Division with the exception to maintain the 40lb draw weight on archery equipment

Passed five in favor and two opposed

9. R657-71 - Removal of Wild Mule Deer from Domesticated Elk Facilities ACTION

MOTION to accept as presented from the Division

Passed unanimous

10. Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan ACTION

MOTION to accept as presented from the Division with an amendment to review or reword the livestock and pronghorn conflict of the plan.

Passed six in favor and one opposed

11. Statewide Moose Management Plan ACTION

MOTION to accept as presented from the Division with an amendment to make a slight language addition regarding pink eye and that it occurs naturally as well as due to any irritant to the eye.

Passed unanimous

12. NR Deer Management Plans ACTION

MOTION to accept as presented from the Division

Passed unanimous

~~**13. Mineral Mountain Bighorn Sheep Management Plan**~~

~~**MOTION** to accept as presented from the Division~~

14. CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2018 ACTION

MOTION to accept as presented from the Division

Passed unanimous

15. Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2018 ACTION

MOTION to accept the Diamond Mountain Land Owner Association Variance to allow each landowner or groups of landowners to manage who they allow on their individual land areas

Passed unanimous

MOTION to accept an additional Elk tag to three corners Land Owner Association

Passed four in favor and three opposed

MOTION for Book Cliffs Landowner Association with an amendment to increase elk permits from three to six

Passed four in favor and three opposed

MOTION to put a committee together to look at the Bison issue in Nine Mile

Passed six in favor and one opposed

16. R657-67 – Mentor Rule Amendments ACTION

MOTION to accept as presented from the Division with the exception that youth be limited to one antlered animal per species

Passed five in favor and one opposed

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

Utah Wildlife Resources Office, 318 N Vernal Avenue, Vernal

November 16, 2017

NER RAC MEMBERS PRESENT

David Gordon, BLM
Randy Dearth, NER RAC Chair
Joe Arnold, Public At-Large
Dan Abeyta, Forest Service
Ritchie Anderson, Agriculture
Daniel Davis, Sportsman
Brett Prevedel, Public At-Large
Boyde Blackwell, NER Regional Supervisor
Ron Wopsock, Ute Tribe

NER RAC MEMBERS EXCUSED

Brad Horrocks, Agriculture
Andrea Merrill, Non-consumptive
Tim Ignacio, Ute Tribe

WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS

Kirk Woodward

UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT

Clint Sampson, NER Wildlife Biologist
Amy Vande Voort, NER Wildlife Biologist
Eric Miller, NER Law Enforcement
Dax Mangus, NER Wildlife Manager
Shay Farnsworth, NER Landowner Specialist
Kyle Kettle, NER Predator Specialist
Randall Thacker, NER Wildlife Biologist
Brandon White, NER Law Enforcement
Randy Scheetz, NER Sargent
Tonya Kieffer, NER Outreach Manager
Val Fiorelli, NER Wildlife Rec Prog.
Specialist
Amber Stuart, NER Office Specialist
Rori Shafer, NER Office Manager
Derrick Ewell, NER Wildlife Biologist
Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program
Coordinator
Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator
Randy Larsen, Wildlife Research Coordinator
Kent Hersey, Big Game Proj. Coordinator
Jim Christensen, NR Asst. Wildlife Manager
Phil Gray, Licensing Coordinator
Mike Wardle, Public Wildlife/Private Lands
Coor.
Greg Hanson, Assistant Attorney Gen for
DWR

- **WELCOME, RAC INTRODUCTIONS AND RAC PROCEDURES** – Randy Dearth

- **APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES**

MOTION to approve agenda

David Gordon

Brett Prvedel, second

Passed unanimously

MOTION to approve minutes

Dan Abeyta

David Gordon, second

Passed unanimously

- **WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING UPDATE – Dan Abeyta**

Director Fowlks updated the board on August 31st and talked about some litigation of introduction of Mountain goats to La Sal Mountains. I'm not sure where they are at with that but the DWR is paying Sitla for that access. Byron Batemen who is a Board member recently attended a WAFWA (Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies) meeting in Vail Colorado, some of the discussion was wildlife migration across state boundaries. A few property acquisitions that the DWR has made were the Sun Ridge WMA, a couple thousand acres also in Ogden valley 55,000 acres and Fish Creek below Scofield reservoir were the three named. a couple construction projects going on. A nature center in Springville being built and in Southern Utah a storage facility.

The action items were that discussed and voted on, the hunter education amendments were voted on and those all passed unanimously. The fur bearer rule amendments, there was a lot of discussion like there was at this RAC in mid August, a couple motions made on that agenda. The first motion was to table that item until we could get more effective parties involved. That came to the table with a vote of 3 to 3. The second motion was to accept as presented with the 600 ft rule on private property that was tied until chairman Woodward helped with his vote which passed 4 to 3.

The Furbearer and Bobcat harvest rule passed unanimous. A lot of good discussion cougar recommendation that passed unanimously. A lot of public comments and concerns there. Beaver management passed unanimous. There were a couple of other action items that were not discussed at the RAC here. Which was the expo audit report and permit allocation.

- **BOARD MEETING UPDATE– Boyde Blackwell**

Wildlife Board met Sept 28 and addressed 7 action log items. They were given presentations on the early rifle deer hunt, Limited entry deer hunts on general hunt units, velvet only deer hunts, cow elk hunts, shed antler gathering hunting, mountain goats on Deep Creek and mountain goat transplants. Annual report which was approved unanimously. They then moved to the number five action which was the conservation annual report, it passed. They also moved to the new 2018 RAC and Board dates. I am not sure if they are online, but you will be able to see that soon. They also purposed to create a furbearer trapping rule work group which would be made up of citizens and different interest groups to take a look at the furbearer trapping rule. That was created and passed unanimously as well.

- **REGIONAL UPDATE – Boyde Blackwell**

Our aquatics folks are rapping up season work and winterizing their equipment. We will be having them come in and give a report on our December RAC meeting. They will address the old

fort pond and give a presentation on the progress. We and have staked it out and prepared to dig the ponds. It's going to be really cool and provide a place for kid to ride their bikes to and fish. Natalie Boren had done a really great job and worked really hard on that project and its well on the way.

Our Wildlife section is in the middle of deer classifications we may probably not in the December RAC but the following RAC get some information as to what they have seen and counted.

Our Habitat section is wrapping up their habitat improvement projects for this year and already planning for next year. They had a meeting this week with the wildlife section to take a look at where they are going to be working and what projects they have coming up.

Our Law Enforcement our working on this year's cases. They have been working really hard. They are getting ready for deer unit saturation patrols.

Basically that's a quick version of what's going on.

Randy Dearth: I am excited about that fishing pond. It's going to be great for our area.

- **Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments for 2018** - Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program Coordinator

See Slideshow

Questions from the RAC:

None

Questions from the public:

None

Comments from the RAC:

Dan Abeyta: Can you talk to us a little bit about pintails; have their numbers been declining for a while now?

Blair Stringham: Yeah since the seventies, we had some dry years which affected all the water fowl. They have trended up and down but for the most part they haven't been really good the last ten years. The duck and all populations have been one hundred percent above the average. Pintails have hovered thirty percent below average for a good thirty years. They could just be

moving around, outside of where the surveys were done. Part of it may be survey related and part of it may be the reduction in prairie grass lands, habitat and survey combination.

Randy Dearth: We really do appreciate you helping with the crane issues, I know you guys are doing what you can and have listened to us.

Ritchie Anderson: I can see the crane dates and that's good. Has the DWR request more tags for this area thru the flyway program?

Blair Stingham: We have, our harvest is based on our percentage of crane habitat throughout the state. It's broken up between all the pacific flyway states that have sand hill cranes. So we only get percentage of those permits based on how well the population is doing. The last couple years we have been trending upward and so we've increased from one cranes harvested in our state to two hundred and sixty this last year. So its trending upward due to the population doing better but it could potentially go back down if the population goes back down. It's not necessarily how much we can ask from Fish and Wildlife Services, it's based on a model set through the flyway process. We have worked with them to get people out here depredation permits. One landowner was successful this year in pertaining those this year that is always an option for landowners. They could go that route if they can't get hunters on their property.

RonWopsock: For every body's health, West Nile is here. A lot of our young hunters are out there in the field. Found it here in all of our communities and that's something to be aware of. Over on our side from Ft Duchesne to Whiterocks. For me I think that's important, a safety measure. We have pounded the Governor and asked for help, more funding so that maybe we could work jointly with Duchesne and Uintah for spraying and all that. So you're talking about waterfowl here and I think it's important. I just want to share that with you; we did our best on our side and need support from you as well. I just want make everyone aware.

Randy Dearth: Thank you.

MOTION to accept the Divisions recommendations as presented.

David Gordon

Joe Arnold, second

Passed unanimously

- **R657-19 – Taking of Non-game Mammals Rule Amendment** - Greg Hanson Assistant Attorney General assigned to the DWR

see slideshow

Questions by the RAC:

Randy Dearth: I know we had a lot of landowners in the southern part of the state tickled when they could take some of the prairie dogs and help themselves. Can they still do that and what does that mean to a landowner?

Greg Hanson: There are still some mechanisms available to private landowners under the federal program. The state largely administers the federal program for the Fish and Wildlife Service. There are some, they call them incentive take permits. There are some options under the federal program that is now effective. The big benefit we saw under our state program was a lot more flexibility and availability for permitting options to remove Utah prairie dogs from subdivisions, golf courses, cemeteries areas where private properties want to develop their land. We are working with fish and wildlife service's to move forward but we are back under federal frame work right now.

Dan Abeyta: Was this a turf battle, is that what happened or was there a biological reason for fish and wildlife to take back jurisdiction?

Greg Hanson: Fish and wildlife service was forced to take back jurisdiction by the Tenth Circuit Court discussion. The private landowners who initiated this litigation challenged the endangered species act under commerce clause authority. So there was a constitutional challenge. District court judge found their position persuasive but when it was appealed the Tenth circuit over turned the District court decision and vacated the district court judge's ruling. I hope I properly answered your question. There is quite a bit of tension between landowners and some of the restrictions that occur when species get listed.

Randy Dearth: I think it's a fact that the Utah prairie dogs do not exist in the northeast region.

Greg Hansen: It does not.

Randy Dearth: So this does not affect any of our landowners. We have a different species of prairie dogs.

Questions from the public:

Ken Young: When did you say that expired?

Greg Hansen: The tenth circuit decision came out and then there was a period for appeal that ran for a while. In Aug 27th 2017 authority returned back to federal government for regulation of the Utah prairie dog

Ken Young: So it has expired then?

Greg Hansen: Yes it has

Comments from the public:

None

Comments from the RAC:

None

**MOTION by Brett Prevedel to accept the Divisions recommendations as presented.
David Gordon, second
Passed unanimously**

- **Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2018 Season Dates, Application Timeline** - Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator

see slideshow

Questions by the RAC:

Randy Dearth: You mentioned that the limited entry muzzle load goes against the mule deer plan. I guess my question is that this particular item was discussed quite a bit. We finally settled on the 18 to 20 buck to doe ratio, why does the Division want to do that this year and not in 2019 when that plan is revised?

Covy Jones: I understand we have people that put a lot of time and sacrifice in these plans and have a lot frustration. I think the reason why is we were asked by the board to look into the possibility of extending that. We came back and felt like we could and make that recommendation. This one's going to be tough for the RAC. There's a lot on you guys for this one, but can we do it? Yes, is it going to have a biological impact? No, it is really a social issue on this one.

Randy Dearth: The mountain goats were put on La Sal three years ago. I guess were doing so well? How is that population doing out there?

Covy Jones: We have about seventy goats out there the population is growing and sustaining. There is a great reproduction. We saw nannies with kids super exciting. It's sustainable so now it's time to start a hunt.

Randy Dearth: How did the folks down in the southeastern feel about this? There wasn't a lot of anti folks there?

Covy Jones: They approved the hunt as well. Very little discussion on this.

Ritchie Anderson: On the late season Limited entry muzzleloader hunt, will those permits be coming out of the total tags for the general season, correct? They will be in addition too?

Covy Jones: No, that is misconception. We make our general season recommendation based on buck to doe ratio. We would never pull those permits back out. This recommendation changes things, instead of exceeding and it would be meeting. If you ever fall below we would cut that hunt out. Eighty

Ritchie Anderson: The cost on a limited entry tag obviously going to be higher? And how much higher?

Covy Jones: Yes, eighty. And in addition to that you have to use your bonus points.

Ritchie Anderson: And the cost of a general season tag?

Covy Jones: Forty dollars

Brett Prevedel: On point use you mentioned you tried to increase tags and you got opposition? The early season rifle. You initially tried to increase general season deer.

Covy Jones: I think we are confusing two recommendations. This is currently allowed in the plan, units that are exceeding objective and on those units when we tried to increase general season we were met with some opposition. That's the mixed message, the public came back and said we don't want you to increase permits because then you might meet buck to doe ratios and take that hunt away. That's why we feel like we are sending a mixed message by saying exceeding. What we want to say is manage the unit appropriately between 18 and 20 and 15 and 17 and manage this hunt without any biological impacts.

Brett Prevedel: The original mule deer plan was to increase general season tags to manage a buck to doe ratio.

Covy Jones: We are not managing buck to doe ratio with these limited entry hunts.

Daniel Davis: What is your harvest success on the late season muzzleloader hunt so far?

Covy Jones: About 70 percent.

Daniel Davis: What's the typical general season on these units? Overall, no rifle.

Covy Jones: 44 percent.

Daniel Davis: What about the multi season elk, we talked about this last year when it came up about establishing a Dedicated Hunter method where we hunt all these seasons. When will the process be defined on how those permits are obtained? Will it be a first come first serve or a dedicated hunter where there is some benefit towards Wildlife and where do go on the process deciding that issue?

Covy Jones: It will be on a first come first serve. When we approved the agency about the dedicated hunter program we are running at capacity and we would have to add employees. It's a

great program but we felt like we would go a different way. So the way these permits will be administered is they will come right out of the cap. Currently in the plan there are 15,000 spike permits and 15,000 any bull permits and when you went to purchase the permit you elect either a rifle spike or an archery or muzzleloader or you could say I want an multi season spike permit. Either way it would be deducted from that quota.

Joe Arnold: On the buck to ratios with the extra seasons is there any consideration given for age class or is it just buck to doe ratio? Both of them, is there an age consideration

Covy Jones: Which one are we talking about? The limited entry muzzleloader hunt or the additional early rifle hunt? With deer we don't manage under an age class what we know is we manage at a buck to doe ratio.

Ritchie Anderson: On the limited entry late season muzzleloader there is not a biological reason for the hunt?

Covy Jones: This is social, trying to legitimize two systems, currently we have fifteen of these units statewide and we are issuing 165 permits and we have hunters that are burning up to seventeen bonus points on one of these.

Dan Abeyta: My first question is on the multi season elk hunt, how did this go over in the other RAC's across the state

Covy Jones: All four passed

Dan Abeyta: Was there much discussion of concern on overcrowding on the muzzleloader elk season? I have talked to a few hunters and they hunt muzzleloader elk and can be in field with not a lot of pressure. Was there any discussion on the increased hunting pressure?

Covy Jones: There has been some concern about crowding and comparison to deer hunting, the best example I can think of is on Manti unit we offer 9000 deer tags and we are talking state wide 15,000 spike tags and sure you might feel the possibility of a few additional hunters out there during the season but we need to get over that. Hunting is something that we all love and we get asked to provide more opportunity. It's a weird thing to ask for more, I want more opportunity but I don't want my neighbor to have more opportunity. The only way we are going to find out if it works is to try it.

Brett Prevedel: Dax, when we discussed this issue you told me like 80 percent of the hunters hunt rifle, is that correct?

Dax Mangus: On the any bull South Slope, yes.

Brett Prevedel; So that's where they all are is over there. Is there a crowding concern?

Covy Jones: The other thing I didn't answer currently this could in some ways reduce crowding. Currently when you purchase an archery permit those won't deduct from quota. Some who hunt archery will want a multi season permit and then it would be.

Daniel Davis: I know permit numbers will come up after the year. Basically is it a tit for tat? Say we do 5000 of these permits it will remove 5000 from the any bull and 5000 from the spike because the archery is unlimited so that wouldn't matter?

Covy Jones: Now if you purchase one of these it would come out of the quota but all 15,000 would be available in any bull and 15,000 spike.

David Gordon: So just to clarify it is possibility that all 15,000 could be sold at \$150.00 so every hunter out there who bought one could hunt all three seasons, correct?

Covy Jones: There is that possibility but I don't see that happening.

David Gordon: I don't see that either but that is what you're saying?

Question from the public?

Blake Betts: I am a dedicated hunter. You are talking about this new rifle hunt early. I'm a dedicated hunter I want to hunt all four seasons. What are your thoughts on that?

Covy Jones: Congratulation

Blake Betts: I just wanted to make that clear to the RAC that there will be more hunting pressure.

Covy Jones: Dedicated hunters are a very small portion of the permits. They are still only allowed hunt two of the three years. There is no rule that precludes them from hunting both rifle seasons.

Kyle Young: On the comments earlier on the Paunsaugunt unit you describe this cactus head buck, what's the freak of nature that they are not reproducing?

Covy Jones: It's not genetic its disease related and they don't produce viable sperm.

Kyle Young: Buck its self it's a genetic problem then the doe would carry same characteristic

Covy Jones: There have been other studies done where they relate this to disease. It affected the genitalia.

Kyle Young: They are proposing to reduce all cactus head bucks in the units reported.

Covy Jones: This proposal is not trying to eliminate cactus but its trying to say there are deer here on the landscape that cant breed that doesn't contribute and Paunsaugunt aren't harvesting these bucks but provide the opportunity to hunt these bucks.

Ken Young: Talking about the sheds, legally taking heads and antlers. That season date was?

Covy Jones: Legally being able to purchase and sell?

Ken Young: Maybe I misunderstood, sorry.

Tim Ruffle: Out of Roosevelt, I saw you pull the dates up there of the early season extensions I am just wondering if you're preserving R657-12 the five day early hunt and then get to hunt with the youth on the any bull unit? How are your dates going to affect that?

Covy Jones: We didn't change anything there. The one difference here, if you look up the early any weapon deer, that's only a two day extension where as the rest are exactly like they have been. The reason that's only a two day extension is because it's a five day hunt. It would have been a three day but it would have opened on a Sunday and in Utah we can't do that.

Tim Ruffle: I think the rule that was put into place in 2004 and 2006 is that they would always provide a 5 day early season to it.

Covy Jones: I spent a lot of time looking thru that rule. What it did say is on shortened hunts we wouldn't have to provide any extension. So we came back and tried to find some middle ground and say need to provide an extension here and work with our hunting public.

Tim Ruffle: So just on that early season you would have two days but on the later season it would still be a five day extension? What does it do on that any bull hunt in the middle of September does that stay the same? You've introduced someone that is disabled that has bought that any bull tag; do you now add a season extension for all three seasons?

Covy Jones: We didn't make any other changes, that's what I can say.

Daniel Davis: So were talking late season muzzleloader on general season units, was there any discussion on doing this on limited entry units that meet or exceed their buck to doe ratio?

Covy Jones: We haven't had that discussion internally. The reason why is because most of those units were able to meet the objectives and meet the demand. The intent of this is to address limited entry point creep and that wouldn't help on those units. We started to talk about this.

Daniel Davis: A lot of the limited entry units tend to run above buck to doe ratios

Covy Jones: A lot of them were currently close, we have a wider range and if we provide extra opportunity there we can provide it and season is already established. Our hunters love a late season hunt on some of those. It wouldn't have the same effect point creep. Moving permits and not adding.

Brett Prevedel: Could you please clarify the dedicated hunter discussion that Blake was talking about hunting all four seasons. It's a limited entry hunt?

Covy Jones: So on the early season rifle hunt this proposed. No, not a limited entry hunt those are two different proposals. The early season rifle hunt is to address buck to doe ratios, and this would use preference points not bonus points and is in areas we are having a hard time managing the objectives. On the dedicated hunter program you would have the ability hunt early and late season.

Clark Timothy: On that early deer hunt is that splitting the number of tags?

Covy Jones: That's a good question, yes possibly in some cases were we are far exceed buck to doe ratio you could see some additional permits and also some split back out of the later hunt.

Jerry Slaugh: How do you determine a cactus buck?

Covy Jones: We will go over that in the next presentation, we had to write it in rule but to simplify it, it is a buck covered in velvet they never shed and according to season dates by the wildlife board.

Ritchie Anderson: How are the deer numbers, state objective, total numbers are we above total or are we under and how about and elk? The state kind of run chronically over on elk? Where are we at on objective right now?

Covy Jones: Elk right at objective in some of these units we have struggled to manage but the last plan gave us more tools to manage better state wide. With deer statewide so it's a summary of the unit objectives. Statewide deer doing well and better than we have for several years. We are below the statewide objective however.

Joe Arnold: For the dedicated hunter elk multi season so the Book Cliffs has a spike only, correct? During limited entry hunts will that be available to hunt with archery in the limited entry area or was that only open bull units?

Covy Jones: It's for either spike or any bull units it would qualify.

Joe Arnold: So that puts a lot more people in limited entry units?

Covy Jones: Possibly or again archery hunters that wouldn't be coming out of the quota know would if they choose this. We don't know how it's going to shake out but can adjust.

Clark Timothy: On the three seasons elk hunt is that proposed to be one year trial and readdressed next year?

Covy Jones: That the great thing about recommendations is that we can propose and change every year. All big game hunt structure and season dates changed its not proposed as a one but can be discussed next year.

Kyle Young: On your spike hunts that you conduct statewide in our 28 limited entry units. These spike tags have sold over the counter. This is the eighth year they have run this hunt. The 15,000 tags. The wear and tear on the country and animals the numbers do not sustain the satisfaction. Our elk herds are depleted, how can justify to keep running these hunts"

Covy Jones: I don't know how deep you want me to get into this but biologically spike hunting is good. It's one way to control cow to bull ratios and still provide good limited entry quality and not have to harvest up to control populations on cow hunting. Spike harvest is a good thing on limited entry units.

Randy Dearth: You're not seeing downward turn in mature bulls?

Covy Jones: Do we want to discuss specific units? We have units in the state, the Manti unit?

Randy Dearth: Let's just say the Book Cliffs. We've had for how many years now, eight? Any downward turn there?

Jake Huber: Do you guys track the 15,000 tags and where those people go on spike hunts? How many are going to the Book Cliffs verses the other units?

Clint Sampson: Last year there were 868 spike hunters that harvested 249 spikes, the success rate was 29% compare that to statewide average of 15% and the age objective on the bulls, the Bitter Creek south unit was 7.8 years of age. Year before that was 7.6 and the year before that was 7.9. So we are still maintaining high age. The road less dipped a little bit starting in 2014 7.9. In 2015 was 7.5 and last year was 7.3, we have also cut permits slightly to try and bump that age back up.

Daniel Davis: So every spike hunter was surveyed on harvest and location?

Covy Jones: We use boot strapping statistics to get those estimations but is very accurate.

Mike Church: On this 3 bull hunt what's the weapon requirement? Does it qualify for the extended archery season?

Covy Jones: Yes.

Comments from the public:

Kyle Young: In concerns of our limited entry units pertaining to the hunts they have got. It got 40 years of wildlife building of a management program to hold hunt unit mostly the Book Cliffs here we have wild horses and buffalo unit that is designed for buffalo. The Book Cliffs road less are my biggest concerns. The numbers are getting in there higher and bear problem, more and more increase that is getting to be a threat. I have got an outfitter business and worked for two of them. I've been out there for 48 years on number they have for these spike tags that are hunting out there are taking wear and tear on both of these units and tax dollars to build a trophy style of

hunt. We have hunting pressure beyond limitations of the deer and elk both and I don't like it. I disapprove

Blake Bess: Representing the sportsman I would like to address the RAC on the limited entry muzzleloader buck tags. I believe the DWR is getting greedy and not following the management plan, these units they are proposing these extra hunts on are hammered down and they don't need any more pressure. They need to stick with the plan.

Jake Huber: I kind of want to propose for the Uintah Basin extended archery hunt about four year ago they shrunk the boundary. There is nowhere for public hunters to hunt elk and it's hard to get landowners to let you on their property. Then you also have elk in Roosevelt and Neola area that are problem elk. I would like to propose the boundary back to old boundary just for elk that would allow sportsmen opportunity.

Dax Mangus: The purpose of that hunt is to elevate conflicts with wildlife, elk especially on private lands on low elevations. The best time to hunt elk on public is your mid August to September during the general season dates, the reason we don't have that up on the public lands areas is because those are areas that are ok to have there to winter and stay there. This is designed to target on private property and the purpose is to help landowners on private lands and with that I realize there is not a lot of opportunity to hunt but that is not the purpose. This is to depredate agricultural crop lands.

Randy Dearth: Do we have any landowners that are having issues and paying depredation fees that we could get the word out to the archery hunters?

Dax Mangus: There may be some cases that would allow but now we have the private land only cow tags that are valid on private lands in our units that would give more opportunity. They are any legal weapon hunts. Most of the landowners that are having a serious problem with elk are able to use those to harvest elk. Some landowners don't want fire arms on their property and are not comfortable with that. We do have some landowners that problems so we address those with the private lands only tags or depredation, mitigation permits and vouchers are typically what we use.

Austin Burton: I'm an elk hunter I love everything about it. Wish it was the good old days. Those numbers are down and we need to get them back. I wished managed the elk more like the deer. I'm fine with elk and I'm fine with the first come first serve. Even with the numbers they said at 15,000 any bull tags. 66% of those people of the general rifle that puts at 9000 some odd tags, with 16% success rate that leaves 8316 people that will hunt the muzzleloader season when that's over. That's a ton of added pressure and another thing is to create this opportunity but saying oh you got a buck tag, here is two cow tags. Those elk get one to two days break we keep adding these elk hunters that's one of the issues I'm fine with the dedicated hunter elk tag I'll be the first to buy the tag. My issue is we don't regulate numbers rather than just opening it up and see what the public does We need some sort of safety net because once they open this rule is

passed we can't take it back. Sportsman get to buy the tags and they are going to hunt the elk however they are going to do it. We need to be more hesitant on elk like we are with the deer because of the numbers and try things out slowly. As far as we need to kill more elk? Ok let's create a public land private land. Let's let you kill cows during the deer hunts, all of them including this new one you just proposed. That means elk are going to be hunted there which is an any bull season time anyway. I'm fine with hunting the elk; I know the numbers are over objective. I see lots of elk there's tons of numbers, but the issue we have in our region is when we push them we all know where they go and that isn't where the public can hunt them. The other thing I want to say is I wish we would divide our elk units into units and quit hunting them across the whole state where every Tom, Dick, and Harry can run from Southern Utah to Northern Utah and hunt where ever they want rather than making people stick with whatever tag they bought. That's just something I wanted to get off my chest. Thanks.

Randy Dearth: Appreciate that, thank you Austin.

Troy Justinson: Sportsman fish and wildlife. On behalf of our membership we are here to support the division's recommendations. There are two real sticking points, one was the late additional units on the muzzleloader, our biggest concern is the permit numbers. We ask the division when they address that they keep the permit numbers low. I've traveled the RAC's from Southern, to Southeastern, to here tonight, one of the biggest concerns is if we are hunting these things in the rut it isn't a hunt. We hunt about every species in the state during the rut we hunt the majority of our bull tags with our most effective weapon in the rut; same with moose and with Big Horn Sheep. As long as we keep these permit numbers low we'll be alright. We've got to provide opportunity for people to hunt that's why we're all here. For too many years we've been too restrictive in growing our resource. One day it's going to be gone and we need to take advantage of it especially to get those youth out there to hunt. Concerning the elk hunt, the neat thing about it is if it doesn't work we'll come back in here next year and change it, let's try it for a year let's see if we get that crowding. Beyond the divisions recommendations I passed some papers out and we want to recommend three additional things. Last year we proposed some archery only once in a lifetime hunts. This year we'd like to propose limited entry archery only hunts for Desert Big Horn Sheep and California Big Horn Sheep. The units would be the Zion, the deserts and the Newfies for the California Big Horn. These are units in the state that boast some of our highest populations related to these species. They are not the prime dates to hunt, you're hunting with a bow and permits would be minimal. Last year the board approved the Mountain Goat and the Bison, this year we'd like to add the Sheep to it so we've asked this RAC specifically to vote on this measure. It's supported by all five major conservation groups here in the state. In previous RAC's it's been unanimous. The other one is the Fillmore Oak Creeks we put California Big Horns on that unit roughly about six years ago, the population has grown. We believe it has a hunt able viable population according to the division survey. We've asked this RAC to recommend to the wildlife board that we open that next year to hunting; it would be a rifle hunt. Thank you very much.

Randy Dearth: Thank you Troy

Brett Prevedel: Troy is that additional tags or moving tags is it specified?

Troy Justinson: No it's not specified.

Randy Dearth: Could we get somebody from the division to come up and address that Oak Creek?

Covy Jones: There is a quick turnaround between when we have to have the RAC packet turned in and then our fall flights. We hadn't done a survey on the Oak Creeks yet but between then and now we surveyed that population; it was a super windy day, all the biologist got sick, but we have a hunt able population. We've got several class three rams and a few class two rams. There is a hunt able sustainable population there and we would be excited to recommend that hunt.

Randy Dearth: Thank you. Any issues with the archery hunting of the Big Horn, California or Desert?

Covy Jones: We've discussed this one internally as it's gone through the RAC process and we don't have any issues with it. When we implemented these two hunts last year when the wildlife board asked us to for the bison and mountain goats, for the bison hunters it was a great experience. We know that either 60-70% harvested. There were 10 hunters in the field, we contacted nine of those; six we know harvested, three we know did not, then there's just one we haven't gotten a hold of yet. They all loved the hunt, it was great. Mountain goat hunters didn't have quite the same experience, it was a tough hunt and neither hunter was able to harvest. The goal here is to add opportunity to once in a lifetime experience, it didn't do anything to draw odds but we haven't done it long enough to see what it's done to success rates. That could influence permit numbers over time. We could support adding this to the Zion and the Newfoundlands. We ask that we do it on these units for the next three years then let us look at it. Let us see what it does with success rates and what additional opportunity it's able to add or if it's the same. We could support it.

Randy Dearth: Thank you.

Jerry Slaugh: Representing the Utah Bowman's Association. The UBA supports the recommendations of the division as is with consideration of the permit numbers for the late season and easing into those and taking that process slowly. Also we're in favor of the additional once in a lifetime archery units. Hopefully that's successful and people have enjoyed that. The last thing is finding opportunity along with trophy and satisfying both ends of the spectrum for hunting. UBA believes that primitive weapons such as archery can achieve and satisfy both ends of the objective there with the lower harvest rates. Thank you.

Randy Dearth: Thank you Jerry.

Clark Timothy: I have a lot of archery friends, so I'm speaking for archers I guess. Every other state that has elk has their archery season in September, starting very early September or August 28-29th, runs through September and typically ends maybe a few days before the end of September. I would like to request that Utah does that for the archers. We do have a low success rate, it's not like the rifle hunt in the rut. That would be my request along with a lot of archer friends of mine.

Randy Dearth: Thank you, appreciate that Clark. Covy what would that do to us?

Covy Jones: That is a difficult question to answer, that's something that those who write these state wide plans could address. A structural plan like that would be made with a committee and a plan and then run through the process. It's not something that we are unaware of, there could be positive sides. I'm an archery hunter and this could be positive in some aspects and negative in others. There is a lot to weigh out there, more than we probably have time for tonight.

Randy Dearth: Thank you.

Jake Huber: You guys talk about how you want to increase opportunity, my last comment was about the Uintah Basin extended archery hunt for elk and wanting to expand it. I can't understand why you can't go ahead and increase the opportunity for the sportsman to have their old boundary back. You're allowing everyone to hunt three seasons to increase opportunity because we aren't killing enough elk. I don't understand why this would be an issue to let the extended archers hunt to the Forrest service line like you used to allow.

Randall Thacker: This hunt was intended to be a private lands hunt. It was created to manage depredation on private property. There are places that are public on the hunt and there is not a lot of elk there, that's for sure. There is an abundance of elk across the private property, all the way across the unit for the most part. Creating one area that is public land would put a lot of hunting pressure on that area and then push elk onto the private and create a bigger problem than it would be solving. The intention of this hunt was to address the problem of elk on private property not on public property. That's not the intent of that hunt.

Randy Dearth: Thank you Randall.

Comments from the RAC:

Ritchie Anderson: When a management plan is established such as on mule deer, bison, whatever. Through that planning process am I correct in saying there is a public comment period as well as all the stake holders are brought in, to address their concerns to establish that plan?

Randy Dearth: Typically there is 30 or so people that are from all walks of life participating in the different plans and RAC process.

Daniel Davis: I've got a question clarification South Slope Yellowstone buck to doe ratio post 2016?

Randall Thacker: 21

Daniel Davis: South Slope Vernal?

Randall Thacker: 17

Daniel Davis: And the North Slope?

Amy Vande Voort: 20

Daniel Davis: Now are those all managed currently at 15-17?

Randall Thacker: Only in Vernal, the others are 18-20.

Randy Dearth: So they are at plan?

Daniel Davis: They're at plan, I can recall years ago we were managing for less than that through the RAC and Board process we were able to push for permit reductions, increase our objectives. Am I opposed? As a sportsman, somewhat. But I do have faith in the system, each region can come forward like this and if we have a specific unit to address that we're worried about then we can mitigate those permit numbers in the process. Does that mean every unit? That's where I'm torn, sitting on these management plans there's a lot of time invested. I understand it was directed by the wildlife board to get everybody's input so it can go against plan. That's part of what the board can do.

Randy Dearth: The beauty of the plan the way I see it when the numbers are up you can harvest more deer because we know that if you have even three bad winters in a row those numbers are down and at that point there's no tags or there's less tags.

Daniel Davis: I guess I'm just torn on why they're not happening on the limited entry units at the same time I guess. If we are providing opportunity, eliminating point creep, and things like that. We've all got the emails about potential management being focused towards limited entry since there's a limited entry hunt tied to that unit. I don't know if that's a standing argument. I don't know if everybody else got that and considered it.

Ritchie Anderson: On the limited entry late muzzleloader hunt, I'm not sure if I'm for it or against it. My issue with it is there is a management plan and to vote for that hunt kind of goes around the stake holders and the participants in that plan. They invested a lot of time and effort into that plan. They had concerns and issues at the time, that's how the plan is. I don't know if I'm for or against the hunt, at this point I would be against the hunt just because it goes contrary to the plan, that that plan was going to be reviewed in '19, and redone in '19 so we are only looking at a couple of years. I don't think as a RAC member I want to vote against those stake

holders and those people that participated in that plan. It may be a good idea, it may be a bad idea, I don't know. That's not what I'm basing my decision on. My decision is based on the time and effort of the stake holders that accepted the ramifications of that plan at the time.

Randy Dearth: Thank you Ritchie.

Daniel Davis: Would it be possible if we could break these topics out into separate subjects? Then address motions separately?

Randy Dearth: Yes, we definitely have three motions that I see right now. Of course we have the division's proposal; we've got the two that SFWs presented. But the division proposal we can address separately. Obviously the deer is a big one, maybe the multi season elk one. If anyone has any other ones you'd like to see separately let me know.

Ron Wopsock: The discussion we are having here, on our side we are trying to manage. On our lands the game gets pushed back and forth. Our herd numbers are down. This year we had to cut our numbers down. As of November 1st we had an extended muzzleloader elk we had to shut down. What's happening to us west of Book Cliffs our elk herd is way down. We used to have 5,000-7,000 head of elk. We don't have that anymore. We tell our people if we don't manage for our future, it changes even more. We do realize after introducing the buffalo in the southern unit there in Hill Creek that they've multiplied. A lot of them in Oak Springs over into the Book Cliffs side could be 800-1,000 head. And those drainages are isolated and hard to get into. On the west side because of the pressure our people put on them, we're forcing them across the river. Once they cross the river we have the state introducing their hunts. We feel that isn't fair. Those are our buffalo we introduced them. We are trying to work something out with the state to push them back. Maybe there is a compromise there in the Northern region in Altona, Altamont and all those areas, if the snow gets to where it did last year, they come into the communities. As we go along I think there is room for compromise here. We used to have a cow elk hunt on the reservation. If there is something we can be done to push the buffalo back we are going to do that. That's what we want to do. The buffalo to us is a sacred animal. We work very hard to make that happen. I'm the one that re introduced the buffalo. It was over an axis fight we had with the state from Oak Springs going over to Sitla lands up there. We know there is an abundance of buffalo in Henry Mountains and on Antelope. We made the deal to allow access. Now we have to manage them. And we thought we could keep them at 200 adult, but in that area down there it's pretty hard to get into. They just blew up on us. But we have that problem with the wild horse and the cattle down there too. A lot of our people get very upset when they go to their favorite hunting ground and there's wild horses. Some of your people, I'm not blaming your people, our people are guilty too, go back to that area and horses are laying there. Those things do happen. For us management is important that's why we shut our hunts off November first. Mule deer isn't what it used to be, bull elk isn't either. Sometimes the elk mate a little earlier, first part of September. If you watch them like I follow them the biggest bull is going to have his choice first then the rag horn. The mule deer won't pay attention to you November first

through the 20th. That's their mating season. We're trying to manage on our side; we think that's really important. We've got to have better reports and management with the state. We allow the state to come on and collar a lot of our animals and we don't know the end results. What's going on with the mule deer and the elk? If we work hand in hand, because the animal doesn't know any boundary they will go back and forth. And like I said with the snow, if it snows up high guess where they are going to be, in the communities. Bad reports there about somebody going in and wiping some of those cows out. I just want to share that with you because on our side we are trying to manage. On our side we still have those that will go out and poach. If we are all respectful to ones land base, we are going to be all right. We all live in this basin so I just wanted to share that with you.

Randy Dearth: Thank you, we appreciate that Ron. Let's talk about these one at a time so we can make a motion on it. Let's talk about the limited entry deer late season muzzleloader. How else do you want to divvy up the divisions proposal? The elk multi season and the limited entry muzzleloader deer.

Daniel Davis: I think it would be more clear to address the proposal made by the other organizations concerning the big horn.

Randy Dearth: Do we want to break the divisions up any other way?

Dan Abeyta: What about a motion to accept it how it was presented, as a whole?

Covy Jones: Speaking from experience it gets very confusing.

Daniel Davis: If we did that then the motion would fail I think we should address some of these topics a little bit more clearly and get our point across instead of just having a recommendation that fails.

Ritchie Anderson: We can amend a motion with our concerns, can we not?

Randy Dearth: We can, yes.

Covy Jones: What we've seen in a lot of the other RACs is to handle them separately and once you get past the controversial ones is to make a motion for the balance.

Randy Dearth: Thank you. Other than what we've talked about is there any you want to do other than what we've talked about which is the elk multi season, the late season muzzleloader deer, the three for the sportsman fish and wildlife, is there any other ones out of the division that other regions wanted to bring out?

Covy Jones: I believe the other RACs handled the early rifle separate as well.

Randy Dearth: Let's talk about these one at a time. Let's start with the elk multi season.

Brett Prevedel: I was opposed to that when I read it, but I talked to the biologist and looked at the reasoning behind it and the fact that the vast majority of hunters are rifle hunters now and that's where most of the concern was, the crowding on the Book Cliffs. What we hear from all the spike hunters that they are unhappy with all the crowding. I've changed my opinion on it, if it moves some of the hunters to the muzzleloader and a few to the bow hunters I think it will help the current conflicts were having without having an effect biologically so I'm in favor of it now. I'm in favor of it how it's proposed with the multi season.

Randy Dearth: Which means they can hunt all three, each person can hunt all three.

Daniel Davis: I'd have to agree I was a little more on the fence before but here is where I'm still on the fence. As a sportsman opportunity trumps everything. To be able to be in the field as many days as possible, we are all pretty greedy with that and we become our own enemies I'm a little surprised on the archery standpoint where you do have that duel season at the same time you're going to see that added pressure from those rifle hunters, taking that opportunity as well moving onto other methods. A lot of feedback I get is the biggest competition on archery season is another spike elk hunter fighting over a water hole. I would like to see it almost regulated by unit. Break it out by population of each unit establish your percentage to what each unit holds to the overall and apply your permits to that unit so when you buy you tag that's the unit you hunt. I don't have to worry about everybody running up somewhere when it's a hot year versus when it's really dumped up there I'm going to go up this direction. I think we need to find focus a little bit better, I don't know how we would go about that right now that's probably an elk plan discussion.

Brett Prevedel: That turns it into a limited entry and limits opportunity as opposed to having tags and being able to buy five or six of them. Right now you can, in that period before it sells out that's what it's there for if you didn't draw a limited entry tag.

Daniel Davis: They would still be sold over the counter it is an opportunity hunt but you deviate your pressure. There is a lot of perception about over pressuring units on certain hunts at certain times and you experience a few of those and that's a lot of the feedback I got from the people I represent and what I'm here for. Not to limit the opportunity but to diversify that stress.

Brett Prevedel: I get those same emails and that's why I was concerned about the Book Cliffs, but then I saw that it was the highest success rate for spikes in the state and the age class for limited entry bulls is holding level and that's kind of what swayed me back the other way.

Joe Arnold: I may have a question for Dax, with the point about more rifle hunters maybe going into the muzzleloader hunt in the Book Cliffs that would be a rut typical time for deer. What's the residual effect on elk hunter's muzzleloader hunting spike in the Book Cliffs potentially on the deer herd at that time, any ideas there?

Dax Mangus: Very few people hunt the muzzleloader hunt. The deer seem to be pretty oblivious to people driving around out there. I don't foresee that it would interfere with the deer rut. We have a really high buck to doe ratio down there in the Book Cliffs limited entry unit. I think a bunch of guys driving around with muzzleloaders on their side by sides probably isn't going to affect the deer.

Daniel Davis: I've got one more. I'm trying to wrap my head around this. If we have 15,000 rifle and 15,000 muzzleloader could that potentially push 30,000 people to one season?

Covy Jones: No because they are separated by the election of either..

Daniel Davis: So when I show up at the door to purchase a three permitted process I'm potentially taking the opportunity away from two other people to hunt?

Covy Jones: No it's for one. It wouldn't take out three permits it would subtract one. It's one permit for three seasons.

Brett Prevedel: Is it like the dedicated hunter three animals in two years?

Covy Jones: No, this would be sold annually. It's an annual thing instead of a guaranteed for three years. So right now if you're an archer and you go buy an annual tag that doesn't go into the quota. I think this helps address some of the crowding concerns because if you switch it would. Right now this quota of 15,000 only applies to rifle and muzzleloader and if someone went to buy an archery tag it still wouldn't apply to the quota. But if an archer were to switch to a multi season tag, those would apply.

Randy Dearth: If I buy a spike permit for the extra money, I can hunt a spike during the archery hunt, during the any weapon hunt, and during the muzzleloader hunt. And if I decide I want a more mature bull, an any bull I can spend the extra money and hunt each one of those hunts.

Covy Jones: Correct, but as you come into the office you have to elect, just like you do today, if you want a spike or an any bull.

Randy Dearth: So virtually we could have as much as 30,000 people at one time hunting archery, or hunting muzzleloader, or hunting any weapon.

Covy Jones: No, because they are separated. So on your spike units theoretically you could have 15,000 people and on your any bull units theoretically you could have 15,000 people. They do not overlap. The overlap is just on archery, currently if you buy an archery tag you can hunt any bull or spike so to not confuse our customers we tried to keep that aspect the same. So during the archery season you would be able to hunt a spike unit or an any bull unit then when you go into the rifle season you'll go into your lane. So if I purchased a spike permit I could only hunt spike units; if I purchased an any bull permit I could only hunt any bull units at that point.

Ritchie Anderson: I just wanted to reiterate my comments before on the planning process on the late limited entry muzzleloader deer hunt. I think we have to be really careful as a board to go outside the planning process. There is a reason that was set up, probably for liability and litigation reasons; to help dissuade litigation. There will be times in emergency situations or biological situation where we may have to act outside of a plan.

Randy Dearth: Thank you Ritchie. Other discussion on the elk multi season plan? Let's hear a motion on the elk multi season issue.

MOTION to accept the elk multi season as presented.

Brett Prevedel

David Gordon, second

Passed five in favor and two opposed

Randy Dearth: Let's talk about limited entry late season deer Ritchie just spoke about, what else do you want to talk about on this particular issue? I feel you Ritchie I was on that plan, I'd hate to see it changed.

MOTION to NOT accept the limited entry late muzzleloader deer hunt.

Ritchie Anderson

Daniel Davis, second

Passed five in favor and two opposed

Randy Dearth: Let's jump to the early season rifle deer.

MOTION to accept early season rifle deer hunt as presented from the Division.

Daniel Davis

Brett Prevedel, second

Passed unanimously

Randy Dearth: We have a few from the SFW that they are recommending, let's go to the California big horn sheep first. They are recommending we have a hunt on the Oak Creek unit, it's a new hunt it's not associated with archery it is an any weapons type hunt.

Daniel Davis: You're going to split the Oak Creek from the two archery hunts?

Randy Dearth: Yes, we'll do each one separately.

MOTION to accept SFW proposal to the Division for Oak Creek California Big Horn Sheep Hunt.

Daniel Davis

Joe Arnold, second

Passed six in favor and one opposed

Randy Dearth: Next one let's talk about the California Big Horn Sheep on the Newfoundland Mountain. That is an archery hunt only.

Brett Prevedel: I want to know the division's plans if that is to come out of quota, if this were approved?

Covy Jones: We do permits in the spring so it's a tough one to comment on. What I can say is we can support the recommendation to try this.

Brett Prevedel: What did we do last year when we gave them bow tags, does anybody remember?

Covy Jones: I believe the bison was different. With the bison they were additional permits with the Mountain Goats they were removed from the current permits. We manage different populations and different species differently.

Joe Arnold: Would you change that now due to the success ratio of each one?

Covy Jones: I think we would give a few years to play out and see what happens. I don't want to speak for regional biologists, if you want to ask that question, Randall is here.

Randall Thacker: We base our permit numbers on counts and we don't set those permit numbers until spring. We contacted the hunters who hunted this year both of them said they would never recommend that hunt to anybody it's going to be an interesting decision.

Daniel Davis: How many points did they use?

Randall Thacker: One hunter had 17 points and he turned it back, he did not take the hunt. The other guy had five points, and the other guy who received it after it was turned back had four if I remember right.

MOTION to accept the SFW proposal to the Division for the New Foundland California Big Horn Sheep hunt

Daniel Davis

Dan Abeyta, second

Passed six in favor and one opposed

Randy Dearth: The third one we need to talk about is the Desert Big Horn Sheep on the Zion and that's an archery hunt only also.

MOTION to accept the SFW proposal to the Division for the Zion Desert Big Horn Sheep hunt.

Dan Abeyta
Daniel Davis, second
Passed unanimously

Randy Dearth: Clark Timothy brought up the possible season change for the archery folks putting it more in rut. Our bow hunters are a little disadvantaged.

MOTION to accept ACTION item for the Wildlife Board to take a look and discuss season date change for archery deer hunt during the rut.

Randy Dearth
Daniel Davis, second
Passed six in favor, one opposed

Boyde Blackwell: Are there any specific dates you want?

Randy Dearth: Just during the rut, other states do it during then, so a part of the rut or the middle of the rut is when it should be. They may not do anything with it or they might, I don't know.

MOTION to accept the remainder of presentation from the Division.

Daniel Davis
David Gordon, second
Passed unanimously

- **R657-5 –Taking Big Game Rule Amendments** - Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator

see slideshow

Questions by the RAC:

None

Questions by the Public:

Jake Huber: On your cactus bucks you say any velvet. I've seen a lot of really big deer that have strips of velvet clearly visible if you look close enough. What's going to keep someone from killing one of those deer? Especially since that's a November hunt isn't it?

Covy Jones: It's a mid-late November. We understand that that's a possibility were honestly not concerned. But that's why we've included this language here that says mandatory check ins. We want to see if that's what's happening and if it is we'll adjust.

Jerry Slaugh: On the crossbows is that still just indicative of those that qualify for crossbows. Are you making a proposal to allow crossbows?

Covy Jones: No, the way its written here is that crossbows that are considered any legal weapon are not approved during the archery season. Unless you have a disability and then you can get a COR. And I believe that is what you're referring to; this doesn't change any of that.

Jerry Slaugh: I have a question on the multi season elk. I'm just, like a lot, still trying to wrap my head around that. Right now as is we issue 15,000 spike tags and 15,000 any bull tags and then unlimited archery and let's throw out a number of 12,000 archery tags. How many of those archery tags, spike tags, and any bull tags become multi season tags. Or are you talking additional multi season tags?

Covy Jones: There won't be any additional tags when you purchase a tag you will be able to choose if you want to hunt rifle, muzzleloader or multi season.

Jerry Slaugh: So all 15,000 any bull tags purchased can have the opportunity to choose multi season?

Covy Jones: Yes.

Jerry Slaugh: The other question is it looked like if you buy a spike you can then go to an any bull?

Covy Jones: It's exactly the same way for archery as it is right now. We didn't make any changes.

Jerry Slaugh: So really if you say half of the people chose to get the multi season tag, 7,500 people choose the multi season tag. Say half the archers dropped. So there's 6,000 archers hunting cause they switched to the multi season hunt. There will be a great increase during the archery hunt.

Covy Jones: Or there's a possibility of less crowding too.

Jerry Slaugh: I'm just going to put it this way, I bought an archery elk tag this year and now I'll buy a multi season, so I'll still be archery hunting.

Covy Jones: So you'll now subtract from the quota where as previously you didn't.

Jerry Slaugh: What quota? The 15,000? Where I didn't take from it before.

Covy Jones: Yes. Last year there were 30,000 and an additional 12,000 archers, so really 42,000.

Jake Huber: It says you can kill a spike bull or a cow. There are some units where you're not allowed to shot a cow. Book Cliffs is one of the units where you're not allowed to shot a cow. You might want to try to clarify that more with the tags in hand. I didn't know that. I was out

there hunting, luckily I didn't see anything out there to hunt but I didn't find out until after. Might want to clarify that on your tags that there are some units that are not either sex.

Covy Jones: There is limited space if text we can put on the tags which is why it's on the hunter to have the field guide book.

Comments from the public:

None

Comments from the RAC:

Daniel Davis: I struggle with the 30lb weight limit on archers.

Randy Dearth: You're thinking there's a lot of deer running around out there with an arrow stuck in them that we can't find; that what you're thinking?

Daniel Davis: I don't want to say that as an archer but that's the public perception right? Again it's a struggle of opportunity. Were at the point now where how many left over permits do we have? We get Box Elder archery you can get those over the counter cause nobody wants to hunt it so they sit back and wait for the extended to open. I struggle with the 30 lb weight reduction. Simply from being an active participant in archery clubs and watching these youth shoot just as much as these grown adults do and at 30 lbs it's all about shot placement and at 50 yards is 30 lbs going to be enough to carry a 50 yard shot? This is one of those that we need to be careful with. You need to maintain your effectiveness of the weapon as well. I struggle with it.

Randy Dearth: I'll be honest when I read that it really bothered me too bothered me too, just because I know it takes quite a bit of kinetic energy to punch a hole through one of those things.

Daniel Davis: You've got a 12 year old with an 18" draw length and its pretty tough to make a 300 grain arrow, I will say that.

Joe Arnold: What is the purpose for dropping it? Opportunity for folks that can't pull 40 lbs?

Covy Jones: Sure there's a couple. Utah's the only one that has the 40 lb so we're the red dot. Archers coming in are unaware of that requirement. Also it would allow youth and small framed females to enter the sport; they struggle to pull back that 40 lbs. There's a lot more than kinetic energy in archery you can draw a 70 lb bow have flex in your arrow at 20 yards your porpoising and hit with less kinetic energy you would with a 30 lb bow at 20 yards because your arrow is not porpoising; and the energy is back behind the arrow. So there is a lot more to archery, kinetic energy and punch; some of it is stiffness of the arrow what it hits. At the end of the day we felt like if an individual does have an 18" draw there is some ownness back on the hunter. You can stick an individual with a 40 lb recurve and they still only draw 20" we couldn't site them for it because it says right on the bow it's a 40 lb bow even though they are only drawing 25 lbs.

Daniel Davis: That bow can also be bought to reach that peak weight at their draw length. So how could that be not site able?

Covy Jones: The typical recurve is poundage at 28 so if you draw 29 or 30 it's above that.

Randy Dearth: I know with my grandkids that archery hunt; their equipment isn't as good as their fathers or mine. Their equipment cost a little less, their arrows aren't as good they are more hand me downs and I don't think that's very non typical. You buy your children or grandchildren cheaper stuff to try out to see if they are going to like it instead of the top of the line stuff to begin with. When I read this I disagreed with it, I was hoping I would hear something that would change my mind.

Daniel Davis: The ownness on the hunter is like Mr. Huber's example he needs to know if it's a cow legal unit or not. Just like if I go to Colorado they don't have to post if it's private property it relies on the individual if I'm going to go somewhere it's your obligation to know.

Covy Jones: You can hunt elk with a 22 Hornet; it's a center fire rifle. Is it a good idea? Put the ownness back on. This is very similar.

Brett Prevedel: Same as shooting muzzleloaders 300 yards, or 700 yards.

MOTION to accept as presented from the Division with the exception to maintain the 40 lb draw weight on archery equipment.

Daniel Davis

Dan Abeyta, second

Passed five in favor and two opposed

Ritchie Anderson: Is there any data from other state on increase of wounded animals? Is there any data to say that the draw length or a certain poundage is going to matter on wounded animals?

Covy Jones: We do collect on wounding loss; we could ask other states what that looks like for them. I don't have it with me here tonight.

- **R657-71 – Removal of Wild Mule Deer from Domesticated Elk Facilities** - Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator

see slideshow

Questions by the RAC:

Randy Dearth: When I first read this it reminded me of Hurricane that had a deer problem. What is going to stop an elk rancher from shooting that deer or still doing what he was charged with doing?

Covy Jones: That's the perfect example I don't think that ended very well for him. I think there are plenty of safe guards that are in place that say you can't charge for this. They understand this, when the operators asked us for this they understand that if this turns into a hunt it will get investigated, they'll get charged as poaching and this ability will get taken away. Then they are back into the same spot they were in before with minimal tools left to deal with this. We go out with Leslie and the facility operators every year in June we walk the fences we tell them, hey we found trouble spots, can you fix them? And they say absolutely they fix them then the COR is issued. We are in a spot with these facilities and how they are being run that I don't have those concerns. If it does, we have some pretty good law enforcement officers and they'll help us work through that.

Joe Arnold: How long is the process for the COR if somebody calls and asks for that?

Covy Jones: The practical application the way I see it working is when we go out and inspect the fences we would make sure the fences are good and we'd ask them how many deer they have inside. Then we would issue that COR and get that to them by the first part of August before we start to do removals and agricultures in other areas. I don't see it as being a long process it's pretty streamlined and efficient and affective that way. We'll come back and do this every year, and if it's a problem every year then we can have a different conversation.

Randy Dearth: Has there been any conversation about having the rancher notify the division before they take the deer; just so they have an idea when they'll be bringing those carcasses in?

Covy Jones: In the rule it requires them to take all precautions to make sure the meat is fit for donation and disease testing. I think they all understand what that means. They have to get it to us promptly.

Ritchie Anderson: I'm assuming that the owner operators have been consulted about this. Not much opposition from the owner operators?

Covy Jones: I think there one here that will make a comment, but they asked for this. This was a team effort.

Questions from the public:

None

Comments from the public:

Doug Betts: We are a domesticated elk ranch facility. This is a bonus for us; it helps us get rid of any extra disease that comes into our place. Our elk right now are disease free. They don't have any CWD, no nothing. Any chance of CWD comes from outside, from wild deer game, so we don't want them in our facilities. This is a way for us to get rid of them and get them out of our hair. So yes, we've asked for this. This is something that will be a great help for us.

Randy Dearth: Thank you.

Comments from the RAC:

None

MOTION to accept as presented from the Division.

David Gordon

Joe Arnold, second

Passed unanimously

- **Statewide Pronghorn Management Plan** – Randy Larson, Associate Professor at BYU

see slideshow

Questions by the RAC:

Dan Abeyta: In those units where pronghorn are struggling, is that attributed to any one certain thing or is it a combination; its it attributed to habitat or lack of water or what?

Randy Larsen: Of course it's going to be combination of things. A lot of the units we view as struggling are in the west desert. There are issues with habitat; there are feral horse competition some, just lots of different things.

Questions by the public:

None

Comments from the public:

None

Comments from the RAC:

Ritchie Anderson: Just a couple concerns here. It says you'll encourage public land managers to manage spring livestock grazing in crucial pronghorn fawning areas to promote forbes growth for lactating females. I don't know that all of the ownness should be put on the permittees to manage around that. I think the Division should consider where their pronghorn is as well in the spring time and in grazing areas that's crucial to permittees try to not have a lot of pronghorn population; in those areas that's critical for ranchers and spring grazing. I think there needs to be a two way street there. Right now it sounds like the ownness is going to be put on the permittees to manage around the pronghorn; I think there could be some ownness put on the DWR saying they will manage the pronghorn. When is the late gestation, early lactation period for pronghorn?

Randy Larsen: It depends on where you're at and the elevation. They typically drop fawns a little earlier than mule deer. So a lot of times in May.

Ritchie Anderson: Ok, because in your management plan that's stated as a concern that livestock with interfere with the late gestation early lactation period. If livestock are in that area your plan states that females will go to undesirable locations for their calving and create a burden. There again I think some ownness needs to be put back on the DWR to manage so there is not large pronghorn population in critical grazing areas. That's hard to do because they overlap a great deal. I'm a little jumpy after what the Big Horn Sheep has done to the sheep herds throughout the west and the conflict there's been there. I think a lot for the DWR managers and for the ranchers this probably isn't going to be too big of an issue but there's other groups that like to pick at these things when they are mentioned in management plans; so I think the wording needs to be a little different. I don't know who you consulted with in agriculture and cattle men on this plan, but I'd like to know who that was.

Randy Larsen: We work with the Farm Bureau at the Salt Lake Office. We are certainly open to some word smithing. That's part of what we're doing here is seeking additional public input.

Ritchie Anderson: If I could I'd like to make an amendment to the motion.

MOTION to accept as presented from the Division with the amendment to review or reword the livestock and pronghorn conflict plan.

Ritchie Anderson

Dan Abeyta, second

Passed six in favor and one opposed

- **Statewide Moose Management Plan** – Kent Hersey, Big Game Project Coordinator

see slideshow

Questions by the RAC:

Brett Prevedel: You said you're getting natural mortality when they should be at their prime; it's not natural if there should be a prime is it? What's killing them?

Kent Hersey: When I say natural mortality it's not hunter caused, or not human caused. Sometimes winter sick is an issue, sometimes they are just in extremely poor condition. We don't know why exactly, just disease or something like that. Not always able to tell exactly why, can just tell it's extremely malnourished.

Questions from the public:

None

Comments from the public:

None

Comments from the RAC:

Ritchie Anderson: In the management plan, I don't mean to sound like I'm nit picking. It does say that pink eye is a disease of cattle and that's true it is a disease of cattle; but pink eye can also occur naturally within the moose. I did consult with a vet on this, any irritant to the eye can cause pink eye. So I would like a language change there. I don't see a conflict with the DWR or ranchers there on that, but there are groups that would like cattle removed from the ranges that would use this document, use that statement to say look the DWR says they are getting pink eye from the cattle. If there is an outbreak of pink eye in the moose they are going to say you have to get your cattle off because you're causing pink eye in the moose and this document is evidence of that.

Kent Hersey: That certainly wasn't the intent.

Ritchie Anderson: I know that wasn't the intention, and I don't think it would be much of a change at all. Just to help us with some liability issues just say that pink eye can also occur naturally or any irritant to the eye.

Kent Hersey: It would certainly be amendable to that.

Daniel Davis: What was the time frame for the data collected on the antler spread slide?

Kent Hersey: As early as 1986-2015. These are hunter submitted measurements.

Daniel Davis: To me that prime looks to be six years old.

Kent Hersey: It certainly hits its peak at six that's why we went that way intentionally, what we found was even with big cuts in permits we still weren't finding that. So what we feel is by going to four you still have big antlers, bigger than what the average is at six. We feel like there will be a lot more opportunity than at six. It will minimize the loss of natural mortality.

Joe Arnold: What's the length of this plan? I don't know if I saw that.

Kent Hersey: It's a ten year plan essentially. It doesn't really have an end date in ten years, we plan to review it within that time frame and bring any needed changes.

Joe Arnold: So both of the last two plans are ten year plans, is that typical?

Kent Hersey: These are a little longer. Typically for deer and elk because of the interest in the public and a little more controversy those are five year plans. But for moose and for pronghorn those are being proposed as ten year plans because there is not as much need for change.

Daniel Davis: What would that data look like if it was just the last 15 years?

Kent Hersey: I haven't specifically looked at it, but I imagine it would look very similar. There has been a decline in the early 70's and this was done in 2015. The data point showed an average of maybe one inch less which wasn't significant. I would expect that the trend would be extremely similar max spread. I would expect minimal difference.

Randy Dearth: Help me understand, did you say that right now we are trying to manage about a six year old?

Kent Hersey: It's for a range of about 4-6. I have some data that will help at the end of the slide show. This is where our average age has been recently, this is just straight age. You can see pretty much regardless of what we've done with permit levels we were right between that 4-5. Even with the 6 we were never able to achieve. Units where guys wanted to add opportunity they couldn't because where the plan says you manage from 4-6 you need to be exceeding six to suggest an increase on permits. Because we were never near that, that wasn't an option. Even if we had 4-5 we would rarely have an increase. Depending on what the numbers come back for this year maybe increase on one of the units in the state.

David Gordon: I motion to accept as presented by the Division

Joe Arnold: Second

Ritchie Anderson: I'd like to amend the motion that we approve the moose management plan with just a slight language adjustment in the pink eye section. And that language would be that pink eye also occurs naturally as well as any irritant to the eye.

Daniel Davis: Does anybody feel any different about the ten year side of this? That's pretty binding.

Brett Prevedel: I have some concerns about the once in a lifetime, that they are maybe taking the quality down. But that slide is a 1985- present and it seems to show that maybe that won't happen. That reflects there have been no bulls taken over five years old?

Kent Hersey: This is state wide average so there certainly have been some bulls. A few years we've come close to five and that was during the extreme population peaks.

Brett Prevedel: That was my concern, when its once in a lifetime it's different than the antelope. It's a 25 year draw or whatever.

Kent Hersey: If I could comment on the ten year plan. The last plan was a nine or ten year plan as well. We haven't been doing this every five years. The last time the plan was placed was the first time we had an official state wide plan. It's kind of how we set it up last time and it worked fairly well.

MOTION to accept as presented from the Division with an amendment to make a slight language addition regarding pink eye and that it occurs naturally as well as due to any irritant to the eye.

Ritchie Anderson

Brett Prevedel, second

Passed unanimously

- **NR Deer Management Plans** – Jim Christensen, Northern Region Assistant Wildlife Manager

see slideshow

Questions from the RAC:

Randy Dearth: Could you go back to the slide increased antlerless hunts units 5, 6, 7. You're doing that because you had fawn loss?

Jim Christensen: We're over population objective currently but we have not calculated in the past winters survival yet because we are still losing deer right now. At the end of the year we will calculate the entire years worth mortality.

Randy Dearth: And during our permitting time we'll figure out the number of permits.

Jim Christensen: Yes, once we redo those estimates. We have not accounted for all that loss yet. We are anticipating population reductions. So it could be that we don't need to issue any more antlerless permits. Other than that we use to address agriculture depredation issues. In a lot of areas we can focus on those target areas of agricultural concerns and we can remove enough antlerless animals that way to limit our population.

Questions from the public:

None

Comments from the public:

Ken Young: Everybody may laugh at this but I'm a little bit old and senile but I thought this particular subject was going to cover this particular area, Book Cliffs. So with that I'm going to withdraw my comment with a couple of exceptions. I want to thank Ritchie for the things he caught in there on the live stock; that is very, very important. We need to work together with the livestock gentlemen. That's what settled this country. Also I want to thank Ron Wopsock for his comments on the wild buffalo, and the meaning it means to the tribe. We went to school together and I know what it's like for the tribal members and the hardships that they have. We need to work closely with them in our relationship. Again, they were a big part of settling this state, making it what it is. I want to thank them.

Randy Dearth: Thank you Ken.

Comments from the RAC:

None

MOTION to accept as presented from the Division.

Brett Prevedel

David Gordon, second

Passed unanimous

- **CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2018** – Mike Wardle, Private Lands Public Coordinator

see slideshow

Questions from the RAC:

Randy Dearth: On all these increases that we are seeing do those individuals qualify as per the existing rules?

Mike Wardle: So the rule states that it's a cooperation between the Division of Wildlife and the land owner. It provides us a lot of leeway, and these are recommendations that both us and the operator agree on.

Randy Dearth: My concern is that two years ago I was at the board meeting and there was a CWMU operator that got up, asked for more permits so he got as many as his neighbor did. Because his neighbor was getting something that he wasn't and they had the same acreage. The board denied it because he didn't qualify for it. And somehow in the past the neighbor had got approved for more and it didn't seem fair. Then the next action item the landowner got up and wanted some permits that he didn't qualify for and they gave them to him. So the board at that time asked the division to go back and make sure that everything was being distributed equally. My gut feel is that didn't happen, that's why I ask that question. Is the ones we are actually increasing do those people qualify for it so that their neighbors aren't going to come to the board and complain and want more themselves?

Mike Wardle: I think that's a valid concern. I think it varies so much on each person's CWMU the rule is written with so much flexibility for that purpose. You'll notice with the LOA rule that its different, it's stricter. With these CWMUs we are typically more conservative with permits both us and the operators in some cases because they want to manage for a high quality experience, this is a limited entry experience. So these permit numbers are fairly pretty conservative. I don't know if that answers your question I apologize if it doesn't.

Covy Jones: We did present on that to the board. We came back and we evaluated every CWMU; where they were at and why they were where they were. And made sure there were good objective reasons. I think Randy you pointed out something that is very very important that is with the Division at lot of times, what I've learned is there is a couple things that keep us safe and that is being fair from an objective. As long as we stay fair from an objective and apply that across the state, sometimes it hard to say no when you want to say yes. But that's what keeps us safe, and I think we are running that way with the CWMU program.

Randy Dearth: So you're comfortable that those two landowners that were next to each other that it was fair for both of them? The way that that was?

Covy Jones: We came back and evaluated that and worked through that. We did increase his permits the next year. We came back to the board and recommended an increase there. So we worked through it with him and came to an equitable number. It was Ash Jenkins, and said alright Ash how do we get some middle ground here? This is what's going on, this is why we recommended what we did. He picked up some acreage and that CWMU has since changed so that example is not the same. We did work through it with him.

Daniel Davis: State objectives on a state wide harvest; let's just jump right into the moose for example. We have an overall age objective. Do these CWMUs and their harvest count into those objectives? Are they part of these formulas that are put together?

Mike Wardle: I believe so, yes.

Boyde Blackwell: Yes they are, they have to send in their teeth and they get thrown in with everything.

Questions from the public:

None

Comments from the public:

None

Comments from the RAC:

MOTION to accept as presented from Division.

Dan Abeyta

Daniel Davis, second

Passed unanimously

- **Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2018** – Mike Wardle, Private Lands Public Coordinator

see slideshow

Daniel Davis: If a sportsman was to acquire one of these land owner permits, is the land owner required to allow that sportsman to hunt on that property?

Mike Wardle: Yes.

Joe Arnold: Like the Book Cliffs elk, if you go to that slide, nine is requested, three is qualified, what was given in the past if nine is requested and three is qualified; what considers qualified?

Mike Wardle: The way that we look for how many they qualify for is based on acreage of habitat. For simple numbers say that there's 10,000 acres of deer habitat within a unit and within an LOA they have 2,000 acres. So they have 20% of the habitat within their LOA so they qualify for 20% of the permits. So if there is ten permits they qualify for two. In the past with the Book Cliffs elk that may be your answer if you understand that better.

Clint Sampson: In the past we have recommended six permits and this year we are sticking with what the LOA qualifies for which is three. In the past we have recommended six and they were awarded nine by the wildlife board and this year we are just sticking with the numbers.

Randy Dearth: I think, Clint correct me if I'm wrong, but the Book Cliffs LOA actually lost the some of the Mustang property to a CWMU two years ago. And that's why they didn't qualify for more than previous, is that correct?

Clint Sampson: Yes, that's correct. Before that property came out it qualified for more. Not nine.

Randy Dearth: Not quite nine, but I remember them getting more than.

Clint Sampson: Yeah I think it was roughly around 22,000 acres left that. The decrease led to three permits.

Joe Arnold: But that CWMU was specifically deer, right? The Mustang.

Clint Sampson: Yeah deer, there is also elk

Joe Arnold: Yeah we had a discussion about that even though there's a lot of elk out there they said there's no elk out there.

Clint Sampson: Yeah I remember that conversation. And I'm a believer now. But it was classified as an elk habitat and deer habitat when they left but it was rangeland.

Joe Arnold: So was that CWMU still classified as a deer?

Clint Sampson: It's deer and pronghorn. They are up for renewal after one more year so then we'll address that.

Ritchie Anderson: So when they were receiving nine permits what did they qualify for?

Clint Sampson: I think it might have been five or six before Mustang pulled out. It might have been a little bit over five. If its ever over we always round up.

Joe Arnold: Let's just say that six are not awarded; do six go into the public draw as far as the overall quota for the Book Cliffs? If you're going to harvest so many animals do those go back into the quota?

Mike Wardle: Yes these permits come directly from the public draw.

Brett Prevedel: I was curious about the Diamond Mountain one where its talking about a variance, but we aren't reflecting any variance.

Boyde Blackwell: I think we can get into that when we address the comments.

Questions from the public:

Troy Justinson: Sportsman Fish and Wildlife. Can you tell me what the purpose of these LOA's are? Why are we giving these tags to these landowners?

Mike Wardle: One of the biggest things is to create a partnership with landowners. There are areas in the state that without landowner caring about wildlife and having an incentive to having them on their property our wildlife populations would dwindle greatly. And this is a way to provide an incentive for the landowners to keep wildlife on their property and to manage their property in a way that allows healthy wildlife populations.

Troy Justinson: Do they qualify for damages if they are an LOA?

Mike Wardle: No they do not.

Troy Justinson: Personally I think the landowner system broke. Basically if you look at the Book Cliffs right there having experience with what tags sale for that's over 100,000 dollars in tags. I guarantee there's not that much damage out there. I'm all for the landowner program but I think once we talked about this before, we stick to a plan and a rule so what they qualify for should be what they are awarded. Thank you.

Jake Huber: Why was the Book Cliffs awarded nine when they only qualified for five or six last year? Also if they got nine last year and they qualify for three does that mean that six more are going to go into the public draw?

Mike Wardle: If the tags stay the same then yes.

Randy Dearth: To help answer your question why, when Mustang pulled out they had three tags that they didn't ask for so the Wildlife Board went and awarded those to the Book Cliffs that year. Just because they could I guess. They requested them and the Wildlife Board approved it.

Jessie McKee: Maybe you can tell me if my numbers are right here. Did the deer get cut on the association? It went from 21-12 when Mustang pulled out correct? Clint Sampson: 13

Jessie McKee: Ok so it went to 13. And then on the elk they went from 12-9? So they were getting 12 years previous and it's slowly going to what they are getting now. So my question is how old is this rule?

Mike Wardle: I don't know if I know the answer to that honestly.

Dax Mangus: I'll just give a little bit of history background on it. Back in the day Gary Sprouse owned the ranch that Bart Hill owns now the Sweet Water Ranch as it's known now. When Gary Sprouse owned that ranch he went and petitioned the Wildlife Board. At that time they qualified for like 4-5 bull tags. He went and petitioned the Board for additional bull tags, said they should get more based on the elk on their private lands. The wildlife board granted that at that time. Then over the years the permit numbers didn't get adjusted a lot they were at ten for a long time. Then it was about 2009 or 2010 there was a pretty substantial reduction in permits in the Book Cliffs and that year they went from 10-9. They stayed at 9 for quite a while. Then after Mustang left it reduced what they qualified for down to about three permits. When we made the recommendations that year we tried to stick with the old permits with a proportional reduction on the acreage they lost; that's why we recommended six permits cause we were trying to kind of stay true to what the Board had awarded Gary Sprouse historically. Then after it went through the Board, they decided to award him the nine permits instead of the six that we recommended. But after that there was some discussion with the board with regard to CWMU allocations and LOA allocations and how that's done and trying to be fair and equitable. So this time around we've recommended the number based strictly on acreage that the association owns. Maybe that explains the history on this one and how the permit numbers have fluctuated.

Brett Prevedel: I'm still trying to determine the reason the CWMU and the landowner association. These lands would qualify for CWMU if they had?

Mike Wardel: There is larger acre requirements for the CWMU they have to have 5,000 acres for deer or pronghorn. 10,000 acres for elk or moose. I'm not sure entirely on the acreage for LOA's but I know for LOAs what we're doing is looking at the percentage of private land with in a unit. In order to qualify they have to have over 50% of the private land that exists in the unit has to be in the landowners association. The CWMU the acres have to be contiguous.

Ritchie Anderson: I'm just trying to get the logic behind previously you awarded more vouchers than what was qualified for. And there was some logic behind that, what has changed the logic or what's the difference.

Mike Wardel: That wasn't our recommendation that is what was approved by the Board.

Questions from the public:

None

Comments from the public:

Clay Mcheachnie: Representing Burt Delamburt LOA. I guess the numbers being brought up, I think the reason the Book Cliffs was unique was the amount of elk that the private land owners had on private as opposed to other areas. Main Canyon alone 200-300 head a night from April to November. We're talking Willow Creek area we could have 200-300 in Willow Creek alone in the hayfields. We're talking about an elk population that's on 4,800 head and we are dealing with 10% on our 2,000 acres just by ourselves. That's not counting Mark Hill's property which is substantially bigger than ours. At any given time those two land owners on the North Slope could be shouldering 15-20% of the herd for eight months of the year. On top of that when they were factoring in their acreages, there's 100,000 acres plus of no man's land, uninhabitable land from Buck canyon down to the river. I think they kind of factored in the use, what the landowners were really putting up with. I know there have been comments made about what the land owner tags are really worth what we're getting for them. That's always been a point of contention but our ranch alone we put in 200,000 acres in range improvement the last six years. 60,000 out of pocket, a lot of that is government funded but we are doing projects on public land to increase range for cattle, for elk, for wildlife. So there are a lot of numbers that get thrown around I think the predecessors here understood the value of the private property because out in the Book Cliffs we have the water, the private land holds the water, holds the best feed. I don't really know what else to say other than that. I appreciate your time. I've been here a long time so everything I thought about saying I've pretty much forgot at this point.

Randy Dearth: Is Burt's property part of Mark Hill's property? Are you guys apart of the LOA in the Book Cliffs? So you guys are joined together out there? Ok.

Clay Mcheachnie: Yes.

Randy Dearth: So you would be a part of that nine requested three qualified.

Clay Mcheachnie: Yes. And those numbers have changed a lot over time. I've been there 16 years at one point we got 15 elk tags. Then it went to 12, then nine, and then three. As it shrunk our ability to shoulder the load and our desire to support everyone's hobby and recreation shrinks with it. As a landowner, a rancher, we have to be able to pay our bills support ourselves first, before we can take care of everybody else and their recreation.

Ritchie Anderson: Do you have bison on private property?

Clay Mcheachnie: We have a lot of bison. We have just on our Seep Ridge property, any given day we could have zero or 60 head like it was through the winter last year.

Ritchie Anderson: Are they creating any damage or taking any habitat?

Clay Mcheachnie: They are bison; they damage everything they look at.

Ritchie Anderson: Do you receive any bison tags to help mitigate that damage?

Clay Mcheachnie: We wish, and that is something we've talked about with the Division of Wildlife. A little history on it, we actually had our own bison herd for a little while and there was non formal donation we made to the Division when they brought theirs. We were never compensated for that. All the spike hunts end in November that pressure has pushed them on to us because they are fleeing the public land, especially in October and heading to private land.

Ritchie Anderson: Do you see the bison number increasing, decreasing staying the same on your private?

Clay Mcheachnie: On private we are seeing quite a bit more. They come and go. They tear our fences down; we got to deal with it. It depends on the time of year. In the spring time on Winter Ridge we can have a big herd. They don't come into Main Canyon a lot. Last winter when they were doing bison counts we had a herd of 200 show up down in the hay fields in Willow Creek for a few days. They don't stay long and they like to move.

Ritchie Anderson: Is it more valuable for you financially to have the forage and the range the bison and the elk are consuming or elk permits?

Clay Mcheachnie: It's way more valuable for the forage. When you look at that last year Burt got a percentage of one elk permit and I know they can sell for upwards of 15 grand but when you don't get one they don't sell for very much. We're getting cow elk tags too but they sale for \$350.00 most of the time I'm giving those away to family. They don't cover the damage. Not even close when you're talking about shouldering a herd of 500 head of elk, it's just a lot of elk.

Mark Dickenson: I'm a chairman of the Three Corners LOA up in Browns Park. We thank the RAC for the opportunity to come and comment. Our associations request is to stay with the historic five tags that we've been getting ever since this LOA came about. That was probably in the late 1980's. I'm sure Boyd was probably around for that as well as Charlie Greenwood. There's a good working group up there and a good association with the DWR. The amount of habitat work that has been done improving it with the DWR, the BLM, the landowners and the ranchers themselves; the one thing we still have up there is the ongoing depredation and that is a major concern. Up in that area you're always going to have the ice cream spots. You're going to have the water, the agriculture, the meadows. A lot of the summer country is of course private and then you've got the agriculture spots. So the depredation goes on day in and day out and that's a give and take that's something that I think the people realized when we set up this organization. You've got to take care of one another and take care of the foundation that takes care of those animals. That is our request to maintain those five permits for that LOA and I thank you guys for your time.

Ritchie Anderson: Do you have a rough estimate of how much money you've put into water projects and habitat projects?

Mark Dickenson: I sure don't have a rough estimate on that, but I think a feature that is extremely important is I had a great grandfather come there in 1885 and being able to maintain that resource and trying to make it better than what you found it. Whether it's through water or the mechanical means being in cooperation with the Division or the BLM and take the junipers down. That all adds in to make that resource more productive. And we leave it better than what we found it. I guess my point, and I don't want to sound like a bragger or anything, that's not me. But when I talk about my great grandfather, or two different great grandfathers being there, that's important to us. We help sustain that resource and we help sustain the elk herd as well

Ritchie Anderson: Basically you wouldn't have survived as an operation without maintain habitat that's both been affiant to you and wildlife, correct?

Mark Dickenson: That's correct. I think another thing that is important as well is Dax came to us when I was representing the grazers at that time and my cousin Alex Redousavics was a chairman of the LOA. A population fluctuates like a lot of populations. With it increasing, being able to increase that population up there. There has been a lot of habitat work done. You should be able to increase that because you should be able to spread that out to the public. It's not just the landowners that benefit from improving that resource, the public needs to benefit from that; the hunters need to benefit from that. And that's that partnership that we all strive for to make that better.

Ritchie Anderson: And you still support that increase.

Mark Dickenson: Yes sir, we wanted to grow that population up to 700.

Ritchie Anderson: Have you had any land fall out of your LOA?

Mark Dickenson: No we haven't.

Randy Dearth: Did you get five last year?

Mark Dickenson: Yes sir.

Randy Dearth: So you're not asking for an increase?

Mark Dickenson: No we're asking for the same historic number we've had since the LOA formed.. Boyd you'd have to help me there, 1986? Somewhere in there.

Boyde Blackwell: Yeah, it's been quite a while.

Boyde Blackwell: I have a question for Dax. What have the permit numbers done?

Dax Mangus: Maybe Amy can answer that best.

Amy Vande Voort: The permit numbers have been decreasing the past four or five years just because the age objective has been trending down. This year with the decrease permit numbers for the public we qualified them to have a decrease of one.

Boyd Blackwell: When you decrease numbers for the overall public, we also decrease numbers for the LOAs for the following year?

Amy Vande Voort: Yes. After that discussion keeping it based on straight acreage we decided to keep it based on acreage for all the LOAs.

Jessie McKee: I'll try not to echo what Clay said too much but there are a lot of these old land owners that used to get more that seems to be trending downward looking at the requested and the qualified there. The other thing I wanted to touch on real quick was the price of tags was mentioned and I just wanted to throw some numbers back out there. This year I built a little bit of fence up on Seep Ridge which we replace every year due to the buffalo which there is nothing that comes from the buffalo. And that's a fence that's fine, that's the country we are in, there's buffalo. That was about \$1,200.00 getting it usable and that's an every year cost on one section maybe a quarter of a mile. Meantime those elk that come in whether its Willow Creek or Main Canyon, they can get into a stack yard and it happens from time to time and it don't take 300 head of elk to do a lot of damage in the stack yard. So my point is, you get them into something important like that. Ritchie asked if we'd rather have the grazing ground or the tag and the grazing ground is always the answer there. We enjoy the wildlife and partnerships and things like that but I think that there is a little bit of a ridiculous number to ask these landowners in that area and these other guys as well I assume they are in the same situation. For what we have on our small amount of property, what we grow, what we could do if that elk wasn't there. We'd be putting up a lot more hay, we'd probably be selling hay, stuff we've never done. So you go down to three, I have a real hard time. Between us and Mark Hill's place, three tags doesn't even sound remotely close to what we should be on. I don't know how that rule is or how that goes or what they take into account. But I'm going to say the previous boards had it up there, when you take all of those other things into account which it looks like they did at the time. I know you guys already touched on it, we continue to get more and more animals and this is kind of the only way, you can't just look at your elk numbers you have to look at your bison, your goats, whatever else are in the area. Right now the elk and deer are the only way we get a little compensation out of those so keep that in mind. And one other comment I want to make before I forget is Clint I seen you on TV with your deer hunt, the mentor hunt with Mathis, that was pretty neat, so good job to DWR for putting that on it looked like everybody had a good time with that.

Gordon van Dyke: Represent Mark Hill in the LOA. It's going to sound a lot like what these guys are saying but the Book Cliffs are a very unique mountain range. The water, 90% of the water on my side is on our private. That puts all the wildlife on us. Especially this year. Have you guys been to the Book Cliffs? Can you name one pond that has water in it? If it does it's

because we hauled it. We hauled over 40,000 dollars worth of water. That's just in the fuel costs. That's not trucks, people, man power. We ran two water trucks all summer. I watered 60 head of your buffalo for five months and I'm still watering them. They are on our private right now. We pump water to them. If we don't they would move which would be good for me if they would move, but they aren't going to move. So the Book Cliffs are super unique and that's why the tags have stayed at nine, they haven't gone back to three. The Division has to say they can't recommend more than three. They've been told you aren't going to do it; you're going to stay to your guidelines. If it doesn't fit into your equation you can't offer more tags. We have the acreage to do a CWMU but it doesn't connect. When we lost Mustang Fuels, we lost 25,000 acres out of our association. What we didn't lose is, they didn't take the elk with them. We feed so many elk. We have 300 head on us for six months. They're there every night. Guys go and shoot them, they shoot at them they are back by dark just like clockwork. We donate tags so these guys can take out underprivileged youth or veterans. They've filmed them. So we try to give back. So it's just a super unique mountain range. That's why the boards have recommended to keep the tags the same instead of dropping them. Cause this is the only compensation we get. To water your buffalo, to water your elk, to water your deer. To maintain all the water lines all the fences; I mean buffalo, fences, they don't know what a fence is. That comes out of our pocket. How much fence will \$100,000.00 fix? I bet we spend \$30,000.00 a year on fencing supplies, for the deer and the elk. And this is the only compensation that we get back.

Ritchie Anderson: Your total number of permits that you've been receiving have declined, is that correct?

Gordon van Dyke: They've declined. I've been here for 12 years and worked for Oscar when he had it and I've managed it for Mark Hill while he's had it. When I first came I think the elk tags were about 12 the first year I came, the next year we stayed at ten for a couple years, and the last three years I want to say have been the nine tags.

Ritchie Anderson: Has the pressure on your private land increased or decreased?

Gordon van Dyke: Oh it goes up every year. What we didn't have ten years ago was buffalo. I mean everybody loves their buffalo, that's fine. Buffalo run like a herd of sheep. You don't get 5-6 of them, if you do they are bulls by themselves. If not you've got 30-40-50 so you've got a bunch of buffalo. So it's definitely increased. And it's going to get worse, we know that.

Ritchie Anderson: Would you say a bison eats more, less, the same as cattle?

Gordon van Dyke: They are probably right about the same. And their water, on a hot day they'll drink 45 gallons of water.

Ritchie Anderson: So if you just fed 60 head of bison on your private property, and you could have run 60 head more cattle, do you know what that would have generated this year?

Gordon van Dyke: I don't know the numbers exactly, but it would have been..

Ritchie Anderson: It would have been about \$55,000.00 you could have generated.

Gordon van Dyke: Yeah. And not had to haul 15 loads of water every day. I'm not going to knock the Division. They've done water projects out there, they put in guzzlers. But we are currently changing some of our private waters to put them on public lands so we can run some water lines. Water isn't there so we have to take it from our private property and transfer it to the public lands so we can put in water lines and we're doing that right now. We've got projects in the work, we're looking at spending more than 200,000 in the next two years on water projects. Some of that is grant money, about half, the rest is personal funds.

Ritchie Anderson: You're not anti-wildlife?

Gordon van Dyke: No, I love it.

Dave Chivers: I'm the president of the Diamond Landowners Association. We've been an association for 22 years. We're requesting a variance from the law R657-43-8. Reason for this request, and we've had this request for variance ever since we've been a landowners association. We own approximately 86,000 acres of the ground on Diamond Mountain that's inside of this limited entry unit which is about 35% of the property up there. There's 156 landowners and if we were to take a public hunter for every landowner tag that we got, we'd have 75% of the hunters on 35% of the property. Does anybody have any questions? As late as it is I've cut that down as short as I could for you.

Randy Dearth: The LOA requires public hunters to have access and the waiver you're asking for is that you don't have to have the public hunters. Even though, correct me if I'm wrong, you do allow some public hunters on your property if they draw a tag to hunt, some of the landowners will let them on their property.

Dave Chivers: Of course. This year for instance I had one elk tag that I got for my property and we allowed three public hunters to hunt there. That's just elk alone. We had two deer tags this year, which is an exception, I usually have one, and we allowed four public hunters on. We do lots of water projects on there to try to improve the water project habitat on public ground. We've spent between \$190,000-200,000.00 of our own money and the Division has partnered on one or two of the projects? Three of the projects. And that's all been done one public ground not on public ground that doesn't count toward any of the projects that's been done on private property.

Boyde Blackwell: In addition to what Dave has said is he is here according to the rule. The rule states if you want to request this specific variance you need to come and you need to talk and present it. That's why Dave is here and that's why he's been here every year that I can remember. It's a rule that asks for a variance that allows them, I guess to be more choosy

regarding who they let onto their properties up there. It's a variance request that they have to allow, if they get ten permits they have to allow ten hunters to hunt on their property up there. That's what Dave is doing. I believe that clarified what the rule is for public access.

Troy Justinson: Sportsman Fish and Wildlife. Gentlemen what you've heard here tonight is why the system is broken. We can't allocate tags based on land mass. These permits should be going to the people that shoulder the most animals. We should have a system similar to Nevada where you go in and you actually count the animal and that's who gets the tag. I'm not opposed to these livestock operators receiving tags and compensation as long as it's justified. Now I'm more familiar with the Paunsaugunt LOA than I am with here. That association makes about \$400,000.00 a year off of those permits. I know that some of those people in the association say wildlife never sets foot on that property. We need to be rewarding the individuals that are friendly to wildlife, that have wildlife on their property. Now you ask if you hate wildlife, let me tell you at SFW is livestock friendly, we've never asked for cows to be removed from the range. We've dumped well over \$200,000.00 a year on the Book Cliffs for different projects. We want to continue. Rancher, hunters, we're all the same, we're really the same family. We don't want you guys to go out of business. We want to help where we can; we understand there are some conflicts. The system is broken, it needs to be fixed. The division needs to go in and look at a better way to allocate these things to reward those people that are shouldering the weight. It's a travesty that Burt is only getting a third of an elk tag for what he says the houses there. My question is how is the association dispersing that money though? You guys got to have some compensation. Anyway, it needs to be looked at, needs to be fixed. Going back to a plan that we currently have, I take my hat off to the Division to sticking to it. Similar to the plans we mentioned earlier, we have a plan we need to stick to it. But it needs to be addressed and fixed in the future to help these guys out. Thank you.

Ritchie Anderson: Are you familiar with how Nevada does it on their counts? Do they get a percentage? Is it a count on the entire number of animals on the area?

Troy Justinson: It's been a while since I've been involved with Nevada, but the last time I was there, basically the landowner can choose. He can tell the division the two times a year he wanted them to come out and count animals, and they would come out and count and then there was a percentage based on what was used in the fields. You'd probably have to tweak that model to figure out what would work, but as far as just land mass, it's wrong. I don't think it really addresses the situation and takes care of the people that need to be taken care of. So something along those lines is where it needs to be tweaked to where it's actually animal use not just land mass.

Ritchie Anderson: I don't think we would be opposed to looking at that.

Troy Justinson: You out to be in favor of it.

Jerry Slaugh: I'm just curious more or less in becoming familiar with the landowner scenarios. I guess that's why you come to these meetings. From someone that doesn't have a dog in the fight. Meaning I don't own any land, any cattle, so I don't do that, I don't see that. I do see a lot of cattle on the public land. And what I do notice is the ponds that are on the side of Seep Ridge Road they are tore up. And it's not from the elk and deer. And I'm wondering with the LOA, and I'm just curious, are we looking at trying to get as many tags as possible to try to compensate for damage cattle do, on your own property? I'm trying to figure that out because I do know some places that spring off into a deep canyon that elk come to, seems to be pretty nice. Spring right off the side of the road that cattle do come to get tore up. So I'm just kind of curious, do the fields down in the valley not get tore up and the fences not get tore up, down in the valley where there are no elk and deer? They are all pristine? So I'm trying to figure out if we are trying to ask for so many tags to compensate for even the damage your own cattle do? Anyways, I'm just trying to become educated. Thank you.

Clay Mckeachie: The numbers that I was quoting you come from a time of the year when we don't even have cattle from April- November, that's our turn out dates. So the numbers that we are shouldering are exclusively elk, exclusively private property from April to November when they leave when the cattle come back in. I know out on the range the areas that you are talking about where you're seeing along the road, you're seeing cattle there, you're assuming that all the damage is done by cattle, and some of it is. But a lot of the damage that we are seeing, like Gordon's hay field, we're talking about a 300 acre piece of property down at the very North end of Willow Creek, it can have 200-250 head on it, we're talking about one elk per acre. And as far as irrigated acres, what is it, about 150 acres? I mean we are talking about numbers that are ridiculous. WD could tell you, he's there, he hunts it, I hunt it. Sorry I shouldn't tell people where we go, but the numbers are so great in those areas for elk. Cattle damages things too.

Jerry Slaugh: And that's all my question was, is it possible that the cattle on the public range are pushing elk onto your property on the time that they aren't on your property?

Clay Mckeachie: It's definitely possible. A lot of the times, and I think a lot of ranchers see this is where we graze there is a lot of elk right behind. Because we are mowing the grass down and what is coming up is green fresh grass. We do a lot as far as spreading the elk out.

Comments from the RAC:

Boyde Blackwell: How many guzzlers did you put in the Book Cliffs the last four years?

Clint Sampson: 40 to 45

Boyde Blackwell: How much do they cost?

Clint Sampson: I know last year we did 21 guzzlers in the Book Cliffs alone. The year before that I think was a little bit less 17, and the year before that was probably pretty close to that 17

number. We kind of joke internally about how much work we put into the Book Cliffs compared to other parts of our region that aren't as important. Each one of those tanks holds 15,000 gallons of water. The cost on those are anywhere between \$5,500-7,500.00.

Boyd Blackwell: Is that water being shared or is it fenced off?

Clint Sampson: A handful are fenced off mainly for wild horse impact stuff.

Randy Dearth: So you said 1,500 gallons, is that per year?

Clint Sampson: That just depends on how much it rains. Each spring every one of them will be full; then periodically depending on water. Which Gordon points out we wish it rained more. Because once they are empty they are empty, but when they are full they can really help spread out the animals impacts across the range land.

Boyd Blackwell: Thank you, there were just a lot of numbers and figures thrown around, I just wanted to put that in too.

Clint Sampson: And if you look at just the amount of acreage we've treated, joint projects, those kind of things. Also other water projects, I know Clay has worked with Sitla. Gordon and I kind of threw a water project together, kind of a Hail Mary. How much did we get funded for that, 65,000? All those springs out on McCooks.

Ritchie Anderson: I can understand the argument of going to the qualified vouchers. However the RAC previously and historically has gone above that. I don't think the logic behind that has gone away. I don't think the conditions on the ground have decreased, in fact I think it has increased with the introduction of more species. I don't know, I guess what I'm thinking here is, what financially is the most valuable thing? Is it more valuable to hunters and to everybody alike to keep these numbers at historic levels, well they really aren't historic because they've been coming down. Is it more valuable personnel wise and financially to allow them at history levels, or recommended levels unless they want to change their request. Or is it more expensive for the landowners to say we're giving you your 72 hour notice and not except the vouchers? I think it would be a lot more expensive for them to go the 72 hour route. I think we can look at some changes, I think it's a good suggestion and do it different. I don't have any opposition to that. In the meantime due to the conditions on the ground and the historic precedent that's been set. The cost it could cost the DWR to try to manage a different route than managing the landowners tag it would be better off to keep it as is until we review the system.

Joe Arnold: I just kind of lobby a little bit for the LOA having been benefited the last five year on the Vernon deer tag. I think whether that makes me obtained from being able to vote. I've bought a deer tag for the last 5 years and I'm sitting on 24 points in the state of Utah, 12 elk, 12 deer. That's probably not a lot of wise chose in splitting up my points; I'd probably have a good tag by now. I think that it's also creating some opportunity. You may say it's there because we

are giving too many land owner tags. I just returned from New Mexico on a private land only so I think that's something to consider as well that there are private land only hunts in Colorado and in New Mexico and other places and if we're talking about really trying to help the landowner and the private land maybe there is a private land only and no one can hunt that unless they have access to private land and that doesn't give them access to public land. Just an option to throw out there. I think we should stay with the requested vouchers that have been in the last five years, ten years. I think it provides some opportunities for those who have the resources to hunt those places. Help the landowners recoup some of those costs and provide myself some opportunity. We are all a little bit selfish in what we are looking for in our hunts at times. That's my comment that I think we should stay within the requested vouchers. I know that the Division has their job to qualify vouchers, but I don't know if that formula is as good as what was presented in the past.

Ron Wopsock: I'm going to go a little further, for us and the private land owners; you know what I see because my family originated out of Colorado. We've been here for hundreds of years and we have a lot of respect for the land and that's what some of you in Utah, and even the RAC should really take a look at private land owners and help them. I say that because the state does nothing but take our land from us. What I see with all the hunts going on is we have the private land owner asking for some help here. These are your people. Take care of them too. Water is how we believe is the giver of life. That's very important, and our animals the same way. What I hear here tonight is why are we still stuck on the same page here. I think this RAC Board should be more supportive of our landowners. Take into consideration how and what they suffer. The state charges a lot for their hunting permits. All they are asking for is some help, whether it's installing more guzzlers or to control some of the game that comes onto the land and destroys it. About a mile up Lapoint road, and what my people kept telling me and my dad told me and I didn't believe it until I saw it. There was about 300 head of elk, I've got about a 40 track field and I grow hay and my neighbor has hay over there and the guy in the middle has hay. They picked on the guy closest to the river and this guy right here, Tim, he's my neighbor. And it just about wiped all his hay out. What kind of help do we get? I'm thinking some of you might get help, I don't know that. The elk came further over to my hay stack, and those bulls and those cows wiped it out. I told my wife I'm going to grab my shotgun, I'm going to go down there and scare them away. My neighbor has a big old Rottweiler and I'm thinking that dog is going to go chase after those elk, but he went over and stood by the fence where they come over every day about 4 o'clock and he just sat there and watched them come over to my haystack. Jump the fence and they have at my haystack. My people believe that the animals were people at one point in time and especially dogs. So I got my shot gun and fired about 4-5 shots in the air and they jumped over the fence and when about 100 yard and there was about 200 head. So I'm thinking where did that dog go? Dog was nowhere to be found so I heard a bark and in between them elk came that dog. And it was like hey these are my friends let them eat the hay. So that's what I did. And for me I haven't been to a RAC meeting for a long time. We've got to change something here. And we have to really look at the people, cause a lot of the people have put certain people in office. You can't forget these people that are sitting here complaining here. And what they are

complaining is very true. They are asking for some help from the RAC Board here. Make some changes, make some positive changes. I think that's important, we live with it every day over on our side. So I just want to share that, that I'm listening to you and I'll talk to my appointee. Be supportive, that's all your asking. Take a good look and it's time to change some of the things that are happening.

Randy Dearth: I'm thinking right now there are two or three different motions we need to discuss one at a time. We have the Diamond Mountain LOA variance. I personally think that the LOA plan is somewhat broken; we need a plan that looks at the number of animals on the property not the acreage. Something we out to talk about and see if we ought to make a motion on that. I think it will help alleviate the problems we have been hearing tonight with these vouchers. So I think that would help that down the road. Then of course we have the Divisions recommendations. And if we want to make motions on changing one or more of these vouchers requested, that's one or two or three more motions there. I think we should talk about these one at a time. Let's start with the Diamond Mountain LOA, requested a variance to allow public not necessarily on their property. Not be forced to allow public on their property. This is something that has been approved several years running, since day one. And this is a three year variance. They won't be back for three more years if we allow this, if we don't they are going to be back next year. True story Dave?

MOTION to accept the Diamond Mountain LOA variance to allow each landowner or groups of landowners to manage who they allow on their individual land areas.

Brett Prevedel

Ritchie Anderson, second

Passed unanimously

Randy Dearth: Lets work on the Three Corners right now they requested five, qualify for four.

Daniel Davis: I've got a question for the LOA up there. Are you familiar with if the populations did decrease that would have an effect on the permits as well; with the permits coming and going?

Mark Dickinson: I was not familiar with that mainly because it's been five permits ever since the LOA started. And within the last 30 something years that population has done what all populations do.

Randy Dearth: How many tags are the public getting cut in that area due to the population decrease?

Amy Vande Voort: Right now we are currently at 36 permits, last year we were at 40 so we've been cutting 10% for a couple of years in a row now. It used to be around 50. When you factor info landowner permits it will be 40. So we are down 50-40.

Randy Dearth: Down 50-40. Thank you.

MOTION to accept an additional elk tag to Three Corners LOA.

Ritchie Anderson

Ron Wopsock, second

Passed four in favor and three opposed

Randy Dearth: Let's talk about the Book Cliffs elk.

Brett Prevedel: I'm familiar with a few of these CWMU units, Little Red Creek, Sand Creek. Similar sized units and they have quite a few tags with quite a few less elk.

Randall Thacker: CWMU tags are good for only private land; LOA tags are good for the whole unit.

Brett Prevedel: Ok I see that's the big distinction there.

Randy Dearth: Ok they requested nine, the qualified for three, the Division requested last year they get six. They approached the Board to keep their nine. They lost some of what they qualified for, and Mustang has not requested any of those additional tags.

Brett Prevedel: Mustang leaving is the difference between the six and the three?

Dax Mangus: The difference is the acreage lost honoring the old recommendation that took into account disproportionate wildlife use on private lands. So that's what that six recommendation came from. It's a proportionate decrease based on the acreage that left when Mustang left the association. Three is based on straight acreage and does not take into consideration disproportionate wildlife use on private lands.

MOTION for Book Cliffs LOA with an amendment to increase elk permits from three to six.

Dan Abeyta

Brett Prevedel, second

Passed four in favor and three opposed.

Randy Dearth: We need to talk about the LOA management plan. In order to get these guys the tags they really deserve, I think the plan needs to be fixed. I totally agree with the landowners. They deserve the tags they reasonably apply for, but the system is screwed up.

Daniel Davis: When you're in the LOA, we're going to go back to the Book Cliffs, if that landowner wants any compensation it's got to be depredation or he has to join an association and be compensated by other means. Is that appropriate? So does an association have to consist on certain amount of acreage?

Boyde Blackwell: The landowners have to make up 50% of the land on the unit.

Daniel Davis: Then at that point the state just steps away and lets the association divide the permits?

Boyde Blackwell: Yes the association divides the permits or decides on where the money goes.

Randy Dearth: Help me if I'm wrong but they've got to have some kind of written plan on how they are going to divvy up.

Daniel Davis: Who approves that plan? Is it something the Division has to approve or does it go through somewhere else?

Mike Wardel: That something that's decided among the LOA.

Joe Arnold: Otherwise they wouldn't join if they didn't get a part, then they wouldn't get that 50%. Everybody has to be on the same team.

Boyde Blackwell: I don't think the Wildlife Board would be opposed to asking the Division to look at the rule. I'm not sure the last time the rule was revised. Every one of our rules has a revision date that it has to be looked at and I don't know where that one is, but if it's at the right spot I don't think the Wildlife Board would be opposed to asking the Division to go back and look at the rule. I can't speak for the Board.

Daniel Davis: Is this process simpler for the Division to just say here you take care of it. Is that kind of how it is? That's what it seems to me is here landowners we'll give you this but you manage it because we want to step out of the way versus if you have mitigation in the valley you're going to mitigate it by landowner by impact.

Mike Wardel: I would say it's simpler in some ways, in some ways it's not. Typically landowners who are in LOAs are compensated at a higher rate. I would also add that compared to depredation programs, that's not true across the board but for the most part.

Daniel Davis: But their compensation comes from permits right?

Mike Wardel: Yes they are selling permits to be compensated. In the depredation program they are compensated purely based on damages they are receiving.

MOTION for the DWR review the land owner permit rule according to animals versus the number of acres.

Ritchie Anderson

David Gordon, second

Passed unanimously

MOTION to accept the rest of the presentation as presented by the Division.

David Gordon

Dan Abeyta, second

Passed six in favor and one opposed

Randy Dearth: Mike we need you back.

Ritchie Anderson: I'm sorry I know it's late but I have to do this. We need to address some bison on the West side Desolation Canyon, Range creek, Nine Mile Anthro area. There is a hunting unit created over there and I guess I have some questions, the DWR intends to zero those numbers or have zero numbers there?

Mike Wardel: I think this would be better addressed by Covy, is he here? Oh he's gone.

Dax Mangus: Maybe I can help Ritchie, I think Covy wasn't feeling well. Our intent is not to actively manage for bison on the other side of the river. We do not have a management plan in place for the Nine Mile unit. Our objective for that area would be zero.

Ritchie Anderson: So whose bison are they?

Dax Mangus: When the bison are on State lands they are under the jurisdiction of the State.

Ritchie Anderson: They are under the jurisdiction of the State, where are they coming from.

Dax Mangus: Mr. Wopsock might be able to answer that. I believe a lot of them might be coming from the reservation lands.

Ritchie Anderson: So is there a protocol? I'm assuming if they are coming from reservation lands the DWR would like them to go back to reservation land?

Boyde Blackwell: We just ask them politely and they pack up and go.

Dax Mangus: We've worked cooperatively with the Ute Tribe for years we've tried a lot of different things. They've herded animals with helicopters, we've herded animals with helicopters. The Tribe has captured animals and sent them to slaughter. We've had depredation hunts; this year we had a proclamation hunt where we had 50 tags that include that unit. Yeah it's been a major effort for years to try and reduce the animals that are going over the river. I know the Tribe has been talking about fencing projects. It's been an issue that we've tried to be responsive to and we've tried a lot of things.

Ritchie Anderson: Is there a protocol that we alert the Tribe when we have bison coming off the tribe?

Dax Mangus: We communicate regularly with the Tribe, I don't know that we have a formal protocol but we do communicate regularly with the Tribe when we have these issues.

Ritchie Anderson: Ok are they given a certain period of time to remove those animals?

Dax Mangus: This is a tricky situation. We have a lot of respect for the Ute Tribe and we respect the value they place on bison as a sacred animal and important animal to the Ute Tribe, but we also understand there is a lot of concern when we have bison in places that we don't have an approved management plan. So we've worked really hard to find a balance there and a way to handle those bison in a way that is sensitive to the Ute Tribe, but also acknowledges that the Division wants to not have bison in places where we do not have an approved bison management plan. So you're asking great questions, but they are tough questions; and I don't know if the answers are maybe as black and white as you want them to be.

Ritchie Anderson: I don't expect them to be black and white, I don't know if that's why I'm asking the questions. So I guess I'm wondering there's no management plan and the goal is zero. There's no protocol to notifying the Tribe, there's no time limit to remove those animals. So right now there are bison where they shouldn't be.

Dax Mangus: We have hunters hunting them right now.

Ritchie Anderson: So has the Tribe been asked to remove those bison currently?

Dax Mangus: Not right now. In years past, yes. Not right now. Right now we still have a hunt going on and we are taking the opportunity to harvest some bison with hunters. Harvested bison don't come back the next year.

Ritchie Anderson: I agree. Is there a time frame where your goal is to have them zeroed out?

Dax Mangus: This is an issue that..

Ritchie Anderson: Knowing that you'll have to zero them out more than once.

Dax Mangus: If we continue to have bison that cross the river I can't guarantee that we won't have new bison cross the river next year. So it's going to be an ongoing project that we are committed to work on the issue as long as we need to.

Ritchie Anderson: I don't know how we get to zero under the current management scenario. Even at this moment in time. How do we ever get to zero even for a week at a time, or a month, or a year under the current scenario?

Dax Mangus: In the summer I think it gets pretty close to zero. So it's a seasonal issue, there may be a handful that are there year round, but it seems to be a seasonal issue. When they show up we are going to work on it right now. The plan is to use hunters as long as we have access and then when we don't have access anymore and can't get in there due to snow and roads I think we look at other options; like looking at helicopter, capturing them so it's an issue that's a priority to us that we are currently working on.

Ritchie Anderson: I'm not asking the questions to try to put the blame on anybody. I'm trying to figure out what's the answer to zero? These guys can't go remove their bison if they aren't asked

to go remove their bison. So in some ways as the hunting season is currently constituted its tying the hands to getting to zero because you can't sell tags for a hunt that you don't have any animals on. So the goal or the objective to getting to zero, if you get to zero the hunt ends. What's the incentive to getting to zero, as long as you have a hunt there isn't an incentive to get to zero? And the way the hunts constituted I don't see, are the hunters going to take the females and the small animals? The hunters aren't going to take those animals. I know you have the authority because I looked at the law, but do you have the approval for DWR personnel to remove or kill those other animals?

Dax Mangus: I don't know the answer to that right now, that's not the plan right now.

Ritchie Anderson: Wouldn't be appropriate for the DWR personnel to have that go ahead?

Dax Mangus: If need be.

Boyde Blackwell: There's currently discussions guarding that underway at this time with the SE Region. I really don't know all the people involved in that because it involves the other region. Not in our region. We are handling it different in our region at this time.

Dax Mangus: That is not a standalone hunt it's included in the boundary with a hunt that we have in the Book Cliffs. So it's not a hunt on a unit where we don't have a management plan. Its including a portion of the unit where we don't have a management plan in the hunt because we felt like hunter harvest is a permanent solution. Bison that are harvested don't come back. If you herd them with a helicopter, they do, they come right back. So a hunter harvest is a permanent long term solution.

Ritchie Anderson: I agree. So could the hunt be changed to where is more of a depredation type hunt, open season type hunt where in those areas you sell tags over the counter until those animals are gone with the understanding that those animals are hunted until they are gone.

Dax Mangus: I don't think we currently have any hunts like that available. I don't know that would be an option at this time.

Boyde Blackwell: That would have to through internal discussions.

Dax Mangus: And maybe even legislative approval.

Ritchie Anderson: The problem we have is we have some ranchers in that area that are getting hit pretty hard. They are currently not going to be able to use one of their winter pastures they said that bison have beat them to it. They can't use it and they said there really isn't much left for elk there. So I don't know, Ron, how much time if you were given notice by the DWR how much time would you need? I know it depends on the area but, seven days? Three days? Five days?

Ron Wopsock: Yeah, we've been working on an agreement. That agreement is as soon as they go cross somebody was supposed to tell us. Somebody did tell us there's at least 200 head and

more coming, Range Creek. We would like to take that opportunity, and we are going to use helicopters again and push them back over on our side. Now we don't want to fight with you. We've done all of our fighting in court and we are on top of it. We don't want to do anything to you. We can do a lot of things. We all live in this Basin, we do, and what affects all of us the most is the air quality that is here. We worked really hard along with Sitla. And whatever we do with oil and gas we all benefit from it. We should be practicing be a good neighbor. So the wildlife issue and the buffalo issue for us is very important. Just like these landowners that are complaining, the RAC Board, you need to listen. You can stand there and smile all you want and talk to your buddy over there all you want, I know Mike. I'm going to tell you that if we lock horns, we'll lock horns. Don't forget on the other side of the river it's still el compadre. So our biologist is supposed to be here tonight, not here. The director is not here. So for me when I go back to meet with the council I'm going to hold some people accountable. This meeting is important. The only one that couldn't be here is my appointee here. So this is all important. We'll make every attempt to push them back. We can't prove it but somebody sometimes pushes them over on a helicopter too. And we did have the footage ten years ago. Not only that but they chased a big buck and a big bull elk over. That's important and what I want you to know especially law enforcement if anything happens on the reservation that's our responsibility. That's no different than if we catch a non tribal member doing something on our reservation we turn it over to you guys. That's your responsibility. But when you start to come down start to harass some of our Tribal members for violations that happen on Tribal Trust land, it's not your responsibility that's our responsibility. That's important because you have to respect our jurisdiction just like we do you. I didn't want this to come to this, but like I said we live in this basin, let's be that good neighbor, work together. This RAC board has got to listen to these landowners. Public lands versus Tribal Trust lands. Tribal Trust lands, they are not public property, they are not. It belongs to us, what little we have left. And the game that is there we are doing our best to manage. If somebody is listening here then give us a little time. I know our biologist was trying to get a crew together and push them back over. Your helicopters on our land, I was once a CO and we caught a state helicopter on Tribal land. You didn't even have an access permit. You put a collar on a mule deer, a nice four point; we never got the report on it. So when those things happen we have mistrust. I'm just airing a concern there just like you.

Dax Mangus: I appreciate that Mr. Wopsock, and I'll tell you the Division is committed to continuing to try to have a cooperative relationship with the Ute Tribe. We're happy to come sit down and talk through some of these issues and some of these concerns with you. We'd love to continue doing cooperative research, and collaring animals, and sharing data and looking across land jurisdictions. We would love to do that, we want to do that, we've done it in the past with great success and great results. You're right we all live in this basin and we all care about these resources. Thank you.

Ritchie Anderson: Just a couple more questions, I committed to some ranchers to do this. Ron do you understand that these bison that are coming off of the Tribe are causing a lot of damage to

some of the range and stuff that these ranchers pay for and it's damaging their livelihood as well. I think at some point everyone has to understand that if you push them back and they keep coming back sooner or later those numbers are going to have to be to zero at some point in time; whatever means that may take. There needs to be a time limit of how much time it takes to remove them, one. If they keep coming back kind of third time's a charm type deal on those particular bison. Because the way its constituted it just can't go on, there has to be a different scenario than what is constituted. Whether those animals are captured and removed or whether those animals are killed. One way or another they have to be removed because the rancher is paying a huge price for this, a huge price. As a matter of fact they are the only ones getting zero benefit from it. They are getting zero benefit. The DWR has a hunt; the sportsman get a hunt, the Tribe is getting extra range land there. The DWR doesn't have to create a management plan apparently.

Boyde Blackwell: An exact plan was presented with those exact proposals a year ago. And was rejected.

Ritchie Anderson: By who?

Boyde Blackwell: The Tribe.

Ron Wopsock: Who was it presented to?

Boyde Blackwell: It was presented to the business committee.

Ron Wopsock: I was there and it wasn't presented.

Randall Thacker: Yes it was, you were there and that's when we brought up the elk trade off and that possibility and it's never gone anywhere.

Ritchie Anderson: Well I don't know what was presented, and what wasn't, but we are coming to a time line. That is a limited entry species but the 72 hour time line still applies is that correct? 72 hours notice and they can destroy them.

Mike Wardel: It's a once in a lifetime species.

Covy Jones: 72 hour notice only applies for private land and cultivated property, not range land.

Ritchie Anderson: The thing is we need to set a date of when those animals are going to be zeroed. I and Jeff Christensen, Butch Jensen will come up with a committee. We will set meetings if you guys want, to address it. And we'll spear head that if you want. DWR, Tribe, State RAC Board, whatever, we don't care. We'll spear head it we'll put it together, we'll come up with times and locations. With the agreement that we're working to zero.

Randy Dearth: Do you want to make that into a proposal, that we approve? So that it's official.

Ritchie Anderson: I think we've got to do it. The way we're going right now it's just not moving forward and so we'll help bring that together.

Randy Dearth: Are you going to make a proposal to put a committee together to review this to find a permanent solution?

Ritchie Anderson: Yeah, I would like to make that. We don't have to do it as a motion though?

Ron Wopsock: You really need to know what you're doing.

Ritchie Anderson: I know.

Ron Wopsock: Yeah, and you don't, you really don't. I'm angered; I'm going to be honest with you. So here we go again. It could mean access, all the above. You know we had an agreement, we did. We went over and we pushed those buffalo back. What I'm hearing from you is as soon as they come over you want to kill them, wipe them out. That's what I'm hearing from you.

Ritchie Anderson: No we need to come up with a time frame that's appropriate.

Ron Wopsock: That's what I'm hearing. 72 hours? Come on.

Ritchie Anderson: No that was referring to private land owners.

Ron Wopsock: I'm not going to sit here and take that. So if we are going to deal with this then let's have at it. Those buffalo belong to us. It's no different than in 1972 when we planted the Big Horn Sheep, now look at it. Call a point of order and I'll shut up.

Ritchie Anderson: I think you misunderstood.

Dax Mangus: Just to clarify, you're including the Ute Tribe in those discussions?

Ritchie Anderson: Correct, that's correct.

MOTION to put a committee together to look at the Bison issue in Nine Mile.

Ritchie Anderson

David Gordon, second

Passed six in favor and one opposed

- **R657-67 – Mentor Rule Amendments** – Phil Gray, Licensing Coordinator for the DWR

see slideshow

Questions from the RAC:

Randy Dearth: Go back to the one where it says one mentor may have up to four individuals per permit. So say grandpa takes grandchild A one weekend, pays his \$10.00. Then does he have to go back, surrender that pay another \$10.00 to get grandchild B?

Phil Gray: Currently yes.

Randy Dearth: What is this proposal doing?

Phil Gray: This proposal is going to be that grandpa can come in, say that I'm taking child A and child B and C and D. He can take all four of them at once; he can take one at a time. We are not limiting him to identifying just one upfront. We're not making grandpa pick his favorite grandchild.

Randy Dearth: Ok, but only one of them can carry a gun?

Phil Gray: Right.

Randy Dearth: Ok. Now go a couple slides further again. Ok so say a young man draws a general season deer tag, and dad draws a limited entry tag can that young man now hunt two elk, or two deer?

Phil Gray: Yes, he can hunt his general season hunt and go with dad on the limited entry hunt.

Randy Dearth: Can he still harvest dad's elk?

Phil Gray: Yes.

Randy Dearth: Ok, that's what I thought. That doesn't feel right. I like it, I like the idea of it. I love the mentoring program but allowing two in one year seems wrong because nobody else can.

Phil Gray: All points and waiting periods apply to the permit holder and not the youth.

Questions from the Public:

Jake Huber: What if dad has a general season tag and the youth has a general season tag; could the youth essentially kill two deer in the same unit same year, same season?

Phil Gray: Yes.

Comments from the Public:

None

Comments from the RAC:

Dan Abeyta: I'll go ahead and make a motion if we are ready for that.

Joe Arnold: I'll second.

Randy Dearth: Real quick, what did the other regions do with this?

Phil Gray: Central Region made a motion to approve it with the amendment that they would only be allowed one buck or bull or once in a lifetime species per season. Every other RAC accepted it as presented.

Randy Dearth: Central did that, the other three RAC's took it as presented.

Phil Gray: That is correct.

Daniel Davis: But I could see that if it wasn't one o'clock in the morning too.

Phil Gray: It was not.

Boyde Blackwell: We're the only ones past 10:30.

Daniel Davis: I will cover some concerns, it's been addressed though. Number one was allowing them to mentor anybody is fine, but they have the disclaimer of the monetary in exchange; cause you could see where that could lead up to right? So that's been addressed it's going to have to be managed if it happens. Allowing two buck deer, two bull elk, nobody else is allowed that. I firmly feel that if they get that opportunity that year, to have two in one year that's getting greedy in my opinion. They've got the opportunity, I'm all about opportunity if it's there give it to them, but to go to that extent. I'd like to make an amendment to that motion. That the youth be limited to one species, one animal of each species in opportunity in one year.

Phil Gray: Can I make a suggestion?

Daniel Davis: They can kill a bull or a buck or cow.

Phil Gray: The way the Central RAC worded it was one antlered animal in each big game species per season. So you wouldn't get into the mix up of cows and bulls.

MOTION to accept as presented from the Division with the exception that youth be limited to one antlered animal per species.

Daniel Davis

Ritchie Anderson, second

Passed five in favor and one opposed

MOTION to adjourn at 12:48 am.

David Gordon

Brett Prevedel, second

Passed unanimously

