

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

January 7, 2020, DNR Auditorium

1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

The Board Meeting will stream live at https://youtu.be/l7r95y9B6_o

AGENDA

Tuesday, January 7, 2020

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda
– Byron Bateman, Chairman | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
– Byron Bateman, Chairman | ACTION |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log
– Kevin Albrecht, Vice-Chair | CONTINGENT |
| 4. DWR Update
– Mike Fowlks, DWR Director | INFORMATION |
| 5. R657-33 Black Bear and R657-10 Cougar Rule Amendments
– Darren DeBloois, Mammals Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 6. Wolf Management Plan
– Kimberly Hersey, Mammal Conservation Coordinator | ACTION |
| 7. Brine Shrimp COR Rule Amendments
– Martin Bushman, Asst. Attorney General | ACTION |
| 8. Prohibited Species Variance Request
– Staci Coons, Wildlife Board Coordinator | ACTION |
| 9. Other Business
– Byron Bateman, Chairman | CONTINGENT |

Details of the specific recommendations can be found at www.wildlife.utah.gov

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:

Each Board Meeting until completed – Target Date – Bighorn Sheep MOU Report

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log that the Division give a progress report on the management plan’s lethal removal process and MOU at every board meeting until it is completed.

Motion made by: Karl Hirst
Assigned to: Jace Taylor
Action: Under Study
Status: To be presented at every board meeting until completed
Placed on Action Log: November 29, 2018

Spring 2020 – Target Date – Bear Issues

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log that the Division reconvene the working group to explore better solutions on the spring hunt, number of hounds in the field, and non-resident permit challenges.

Motion made by: Kevin Albrecht
Assigned to: Darren DeBlois
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: January 10, 2019

Fall 2020 – Target Date – Premium Fishing Areas

MOTION: To have the division look into the possibility of designating premium fishing areas - that allow artificial flies and lures only- to have increased license requirements and fees and to bring the information back during the next recommendation cycle.

Motion made by: Byron Batemen
Assigned to: Randy Oplinger
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: September 27, 2018

Wildlife Board Assignments

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
December 5, 2019, DNR Boardroom
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
The meeting will stream live at <https://youtu.be/Dlcc40gd4r0>
Revised December 2, 2019

Thursday, December 5, 2019, 9:00 am

- | | |
|---|----------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda
– Kevin Albrecht, Vice-Chair | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
– Kevin Albrecht, Vice-Chair | ACTION |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log
– Kevin Albrecht, Vice-Chair | CONTINGENT |
| 4. DWR Update
– Mike Fowlks, DWR Director | INFORMATIONAL |
| 5. Town of Castle Valley Request
– Alice Drogin, Town of Castle Valley | ACTION |
| 6. Statewide Deer Management Plan
- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator | ACTION |
| 7. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2020 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments
- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator | ACTION |
| 8. CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2020 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2020
- Chad Wilson, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator | ACTION |
| 9. Proposed rule amendments to address point creep, lost opportunities and equity in the hunt drawing process
R657-42 – Fees, Exchanges and Surrenders
R657-57 – Division Variances
R657-62 – Drawing Application Procedures
- Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator | ACTION |
| 10. Big Game Application Timeline
- Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator | INFORMATIONAL |
| 11. CWMU Advisory Committee Membership
– Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief | ACTION |
| 12. Other Business
– Kevin Albrecht, Vice-Chair | 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
December 5, 2019, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Summary of Motions

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

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda.

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

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the October 3, 2019 Wildlife Board Meeting.

3) Town of Castle Valley Request (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we continue with the 1999 agreement between Castle Valley City and UDWR to limit hunting on the 1400 acres to primitive weapons: muzzleloader, shotgun, and archery.

4) Statewide Deer Management Plan (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Wade Heaton. Motion was withdrawn after a discussion about restrictions for hunters.

MOTION: I move that we adjust the word 'skull plate' to 'clean skull'.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we direct the Division to create a definition of clean skull for importation from a CWD state that is less restrictive for hunters.

The following is the proposed rule language: R657-5-42(1) (e) skulls or skull plates with antlers attached, so long as all brain matter and spinal column material is removed;

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst and failed for lack of a second.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Statewide Deer Management Plan as presented with adjustment of the skull language.

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we modify language for the last season muzzleloader hunt to include "...from a minimum of 5 late season muzzleloader tag and up to a maximum of 0.5 tags and anything in between".

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed 3:2. Karl Hirst and Randy Dearth opposed.

MOTION: I move that we eliminate the set 11 units and 18 units attached to each buck to doe ratio categories from the deer plan.

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton and failed for lack of a second.

MOTION: I move that we change the objective from 15-17 to 14-18 with an overlap for the upper class at 18-22.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed 4:1. Wade Heaton opposed.

MOTION: I move that we keep the deer management plan at 5 years rather than extend it to 7 years as recommended.

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously after an amendment to the motion.

MOTION: I move that we accept the balance of the Statewide Deer Management Plan as presented by the Division.

The following amended motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Bret Selman and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we amend the previous motion to include a change in language from the word "achieve" to "work toward" as it has been for the past five years.

5) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2020 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we apply the same clean skull language applied in the Statewide Deer Management Plan to address CWD in the Rule Amendments.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we combine the Willard Peak mountain goat seasons into one season, providing a longer season date.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the balance of the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2020 Season Dates, Application Timeline, and Rule Amendments as presented by the Division.

- 6) CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2020 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2020 **(Action)**

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Bret Selman and passed 3:2. Karl Hirst and Randy Dearth dissented.

MOTION: I move that we approve Junction Valley's change as presented by the Division including the 640 acres with the additional public permit.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed unanimously. Bret Selman and Wade Heaton recused themselves from the vote. Kevin Albrecht voted in order to maintain a quorum.

MOTION: I move that we approve the remainder of the 2020 CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers and Landowner Association Permit numbers as presented by the Division.

- 7) Proposed rule amendments to address point creep, lost opportunities and equity in the hunt drawing process. **(Action)**

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we add the general season landowner and general season landowner appreciation permits to the exceptions list.

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Donnie Hunter and failed 2:3. Randy Dearth, Karl Hirst, and Bret Selman opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the balance and include private landowner antlerless elk permits on the exceptions list.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we continue with the dedicated hunter program as it is and give the Division a year to evaluate combining the dedicated hunter program as a hunt choice in the general season draw and report the findings to the Board.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the balance of proposed rule amendments for R657-42, R657-57, and R657-62 as presented by the Division.

8) CWMU Advisory Committee Membership (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Bret Selman and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the CWMU Advisory Committee Membership as presented.

DRAFT

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
December 5, 2019, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Attendance

Wildlife Board

Byron Bateman – excused
Kevin Albrecht – Vice-Chair
Mike Canning – Exec Secretary
Karl Hirst
Donnie Hunter
Randy Dearth
Wade Heaton
Bret Selman – 12:25 p.m.

RAC Chairs

Central – Ben Lowder
Southern – Brayden Richmond
Southeastern – Trisha Hedin
Northeastern – Brett Prevedel
Northern – Kevin McLeod

Division Personnel

Robin Cahoon	Paul Gedge	Teresa Griffin	Roger Kerstetter
Ashley Green	Mike Christensen	Dax Mangus	Wyatt Bubak
Justin Dolling	Staci Coons	Riley Peck	Chad Bettridge
Jason Vernon	Thu Vo-Wood	Guy Wallace	Dave Beveridge
Miles Hanberg	Greg Hansen	Randy Wood	Matt Briggs
Chris Wood	Marty Bushman	Jim Christensen	Paul Washburn
Kevin Bunnell	Faith Jolley	Jace Taylor	Scott Dalebout
Ben Nadolski	Covy Jones	Kent Hersey	Kristen Hare
J Shirley	Chad Wilson	Phil Gray	Austin Grimes
Justin Shannon	Lindy Varney	Steve Newren	Xaela Walden
Kenny Johnson	Bryan Christensen	Adam Wallerstein	Brad Crompton
		Torrey Christopherson	Sarah Seegert

Public Present

Robin Steinman	Michael Christensen	Tim Pilling
Pam Hackley	Darren West	Curtis Steinman
Colleen Thompson	Scott Jensen	Richard Jordan
Brock McMillan	Richard Hansen	Joshua Lenart
Riley Hutchinson	John Lodder	Chris Perkins
Bryce Pilling	Todd Hinkins	Ben Marolf
Alice Drogin – Town of Castle Valley		Cory Huntsnar
Harry Holland – Town of Castle Valley		Riley Hutchison
Ron Camp – RMEF		Justin Atkinson
David Jordan – Southern UT Deer Alliance		Nadene Hinkins
Sterling Brown – UT Farm Bureau		Ken Clegg
Todd Black – Rangelands for Wildlife Foundation		Phil Crowther
Ash Jenkins – West Ridge CWMU		Mike Keim
Troy Justensen – SFW		Kurtley Peterson
Jeremy Anderson – MDF		
Wade Garrett – UT Farm Bureau		

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
December 5, 2019, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
<https://youtu.be/Dlcc40gd4r0>

- 00:00:20** Vice-chairman Albrecht called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, reviewed the meeting procedures, and had the Board and RAC members introduce themselves.
- 00:01:46** **1) Approval of Agenda (Action)**
The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed unanimously.
MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda as presented.
- 00:02:06** **2) Approval of Minutes (Action)**
The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously.
MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the October 3, 2019 Wildlife Board Meeting.
- 00:02:25** **3) Old Business/Action Log (Contingent)**
None.
- 00:02:44** **4) DWR Update (Informational)**
Mike Fowlks updated the Board on Law Enforcement section staffing, potential swan season closure, deer captures, Mineral Mountain sheep status, species down listing, and aquatic projects to improve fisheries.
- 00:07:36** **5) Town of Castle Valley Request (Action)**
Alice Drogin and Harry Holland presented the request.
- 00:31:11** Greg Hansen and Chris Wood presented the Division's concerns.
- 00:39:28** **Board/RAC Questions**
The Board asked about Federal land boundaries within the city, clarification on hunting designations, and hunting activity in the area.
The RAC wondered why it was not presented at all RACs since it could impact hunters from around the state.
The Board asked about firearm incidents, city ordinance/authority with public lands.
- 00:49:54** **RAC Recommendation**
Southeast RAC approved the request with a compromise.
- 00:51:16** **Public Comments/Division Clarification**
Public comments accepted at this time. No clarification at this time.

01:04:13 RAC Comments

Comments were accepted at this time.

01:07:41 Board Discussion

The board discussed the city boundary issues and expressed sympathy for their situation. They also noted Castle Valley has local control and should look into that to address their challenge.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we continue with the 1999 agreement between Castle Valley City and UDWR to limit hunting on the 1400 acres to primitive weapons: muzzleloader, shotgun, and archery.

01:16:11 6) Statewide Deer Management Plan (Action)

Covy Jones presented the management plan.

01:49:31 Board/RAC Questions

The Board and RAC asked about limited entry objectives and addressing objectives, carrying capacity approach, how changing language may affect the management plan, CWD elimination and strategies, and predator management to address population decline.

02:03:40 RAC Recommendations

All RACs passed the statewide deer management plan with varying dissent and stipulations.

02:15:33 Public Comments/Division Clarification

Public comments accepted at this time. No clarification at this time.

02:44:16 Board Discussion

The chairman summarized the RAC motions. The Board discussed the motions, reviewed the management plan process and potential challenges should some of these motions pass.

02:56:25 The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Wade Heaton. Motion was withdrawn after a discussion about potential undue burdens to hunters.

MOTION: I move that we adjust the word 'skull plate' to 'clean skull'.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we direct the Division to create a definition of clean skull for importation from a CWD state that is less restrictive for hunters.

The following is the proposed rule language: R657-5-42(1) (e) skulls or skull plates with antlers attached, so long as all brain matter and spinal column material is removed;

02:59:42 Plan flexibility discussion.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst and failed for lack of a second.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Statewide Deer Management Plan as presented with adjustment of the skull language.

03:03:13 Advisory committee comment.

03:05:10 Late season muzzleloader discussion.

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we modify language for the last season muzzleloader hunt to include "...from a minimum of 5 late season muzzleloader tag and up to a maximum of 0.5 tags and anything in between".

03:16:42 Opportunity vs. quality experience discussion.

03:20:48 San Juan/Abajo Unit discussion.

Bret Selman arrived at 12:25 p.m.

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed 3:2. Karl Hirst and Randy Dearth opposed.

MOTION: I move that we eliminate the set 11 units and 18 units attached to each buck to doe ratio categories from the deer plan.

03:28:14 Widening the buck-to-doe ratio and flexibility for biologists.

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton and failed for lack of a second.

MOTION: I move that we change the objective from 15-17 to 14-18 with an overlap for the upper class at 18-22.

03:41:21 Management plan cycle.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed 4:1. Wade Heaton opposed.

MOTION: I move that we keep the deer management plan at 5 years rather than extend it to 7 years as recommended.

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously after an amendment to the motion.

MOTION: I move that we accept the balance of the Statewide Deer Management Plan as presented by the Division.

The following amended motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Bret Selman and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we amend the previous motion to include a change in language from the word “achieve” to “work toward” as it has been for the past five years.

03:57:26

LUNCH

05:00:26

Justin Shannon gave a brief explanation of the Division’s process to address the unit-by-unit plans.

05:02:10

7) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2020 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments (Action)

Covy Jones presented the agenda item.

05:18:36

RAC Recommendations

All RACs passed the 2020 BBOIAL recommendations with varying opposition and conditions.

05:24:44

Public Comments/Division Clarification

Public comments accepted at this time. No clarification at this time.

05:27:46

Board Discussion

Vice-chairman Albrecht summarized the RAC motions. The Board discussed the Green Valley opposition, Willard Peak, and CWD skull language.

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we apply the same clean skull language applied in the Statewide Deer Management Plan to address CWD in the Rule Amendments.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we combine the Willard Peak mountain goat seasons into one season, providing a longer season date.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the balance of the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2020 Season Dates, Application Timeline, and Rule Amendments as presented by the Division.

05:34:20

8) CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2020 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2020 (Action)

Chad Wilson presented the 2020 plans and permit numbers.

05:42:44

Board/RAC Questions

The board asked for clarification on tag determinations.

05:45:21 RAC Recommendations

Southern RAC unanimously passed the permit numbers. Northeastern RAC passed the recommendations 6:1. Northern, Central, and Southeastern RACs passed the permit numbers with stipulations.

05:50:01 Public Comments/Division Clarification

Public comments accepted at this time.

06:00:24 The Division provided more information and clarification.

06:03:50 Board Discussion

The board discussed late applications and hard deadlines. As CWMU operators, Wade Heaton and Bret Selman recused themselves. Greg Hansen provided guidance on their choice to abstain.

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Bret Selman and passed 3:2. Karl Hirst and Randy Dearth dissented.

MOTION: I move that we approve Junction Valley's change as presented by the Division including the 640 acres with the additional public permit.

06:14:27 Roan Cliffs discussion. The operator proposed a variance request and further discussion ensued.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed unanimously. Bret Selman and Wade Heaton recused themselves from the vote. Kevin Albrecht voted in order to maintain a quorum.

MOTION: I move that we approve the remainder of the 2020 CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers and Landowner Association Permit numbers as presented by the Division.

06:39:55 9) Proposed rule amendments to address point creep, lost opportunities and equity in the hunt drawing process (Action)

Lindy Varney presented the rule amendments for R657-42 – Fees, Exchanges and Surrenders, R657-57 – Division Variances, and R657-62 – Drawing Application Procedures.

07:02:43 Board/RAC Questions

The board asked about dedicated hunter, preference points exceptions list, and clarification on the 30-day surrender.

07:05:31 RAC Recommendations

All RACs passed the proposed rule amendments with varying dissent. All RACs, except Southern RAC, had some provisions.

07:10:26 Public Comments/Division Clarification

Public comments were accepted at this time. No clarification from the Division.

07:14:49 Board Discussion

The Board discussed work-related exceptions, two youth any-bull group applications, and landowner tags.

07:19:12 Landowner tags discussion.

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we add the general season landowner and general season landowner appreciation permits to the exceptions list.

07:23:39 Private landowner permits discussion.

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Donnie Hunter and failed 2:3. Randy Dearth, Karl Hirst, and Bret Selman opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the balance and include private landowner antlerless elk permits on the exceptions list.

07:30:36 Combining dedicated hunter into general season discussion.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we continue with the dedicated hunter program as it is and give the Division a year to evaluate combining the dedicated hunter program as a hunt choice in the general season draw and report the findings to the Board.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the remainder of rule amendments for R657-42, R657-57, and R657-62 as presented by the Division.

07:33:38 10) Big Game Application Timeline (Informational)

Lindy Varney presented the application timeline.

07:45:10 11) CWMU Advisory Committee Membership (Action)

Justin Shannon presented the committee membership.

07:47:56 Board Questions/Discussion

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Bret Selman and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the CWMU Advisory Committee Membership as presented.

07:48:48 12) Other Business (Contingent)

None.

07:49:11 Meeting adjourned.

DRAFT

Regional Advisory Council Meetings

December 2019

Summary of Motions

R657-33 Black Bear and R657-10 Cougar Rule Amendments

CRO Motion: To oppose the restricted pursuit season and implement the 16-dog limit.

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Motion: To ask the DWR to enhance the bear orientation course by including a pursuit ethics section.

Motion Passes: Unanimous

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

Motion Passes: 5-1

NRO Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board reject the proposal for restricted Spring Bear pursuit.

Motion Passes: 5-4 Abstain:1

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the 16 dog pursuit limit portion of the rule.

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the remainder of the rule changes.

Motion Passes: 8-1

Motion- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the remainder of R657-33 Black Bear and R657- 10 Cougar Rule Amendments as presented

Motion Passes: Unanimous

SRO Motion: To accept the proposal with the exception of limiting spring pursuit on the Book Cliffs, San Juan and LaSal

Motion Passes: 7-1

SERO Motion: To leave resident spring pursuit permits as unlimited and over the counter

Motion Passes: 10-3

Motion: To accept 16 dog limit on pursuit season

Motion Passes: 12-1

Motion: To not restrict non-residents in pursuit but to make it mandatory to do an online training and survey

Motion Passes: 8-5

Motion: To accept the remainder of the DWR's recommendations

Motion Passes: 12-1

NER Motion: that spring pursuit stays as is, including unlimited permits for residents and non-residents

Amended Motion: to leave the spring pursuit as is, with the exception if the Wildlife Board decides to implement the restricted pursuit that the Book Cliffs is included in the limited entry with 75 tags as recommended by the DWR

Amended Motion Passes: Unanimous

Motion: To accept the Division's recommendation of adding five more tags to the Boulder unit as presented.

Motion Passes: 6-2

Motion: to accept the Division's proposal about the 16-dog limit as presented

Motion Passes: 7-1

Motion: To accept the remainder of the plan as presented

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Wolf Management Plan

CRO, SRO, SER, NER

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

Motion Passes: Unanimous

NRO **Motion:** Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Wolf Management Plan as presented.

Motion Passes: For: 8 Against:1

Brine Shrimp COR Rule Amendments

All RACs

Motion: To accept the Brine Shrimp COR Rule Amendments as presented.

Motion Passes: Unanimous

RAC AGENDA – December 2019



- | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|
| 1. | Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure
- RAC Chair | |
| 2. | Approval of Agenda and Minutes
- RAC Chair | |
| 3. | Wildlife Board Meeting Update
- RAC Chair | INFORMATIONAL |
| 4. | Regional Update
- DWR Regional Supervisor | INFORMATIONAL |
| 5. | R657-33 Black Bear and R657-10 Cougar Rule Amendments
- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 6. | Wolf Management Plan
- Kimberly Hersey, Mammal Conservation Coordinator | ACTION |
| 7. | Brine Shrimp COR Rule Amendments
- Martin Bushman, Asst. Attorney General | ACTION |

Meeting Locations

CR RAC – Dec. 3rd 6:30 PM
Wildlife Resources Conference Rm
1115 N. Main Street, Springville

SER RAC – Dec. 11th 6:30 PM
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main St., Green River

NR RAC – Dec. 4th 6:00 PM
Brigham City Community Center
24 N. 300 W., Brigham City

NER RAC – Dec. 12th 6:30 PM
Wildlife Resources NER Office
318 North Vernal Ave, Vernal

SR RAC – Dec. 10th 6:00 PM
Cedar City Middle School
2215 W. Royal Hunte Dr, Cedar

Board Meeting – Jan. 7th 9:00 am - Tuesday
DNR Boardroom
1594 West North Temple, SLC

Motion Summary

1) Approval of Agenda

The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Steve Lund and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the agenda as written

2) Approval of Minutes

The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Steve Lund and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the minutes as written

3) R657-33 Black Bear and R657-10 Cougar Rule Amendments

The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Ken Strong and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To oppose the restricted pursuit season and implement the 16-dog limit.

The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Joshua and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To ask the DWR to enhance the bear orientation course by including a pursuit ethics section.

The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Ken Strong and passed 5 to 1.

MOTION: To accept the balance of the Division's recommendations as presented.

In Favor: Ben Lowder, Scott Jensen, Ken Strong, Steve Lund, Eric Reid

Opposed: Joshua Lenart

4) Wolf Management Plan

The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Ken Strong and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented.

5) Brine Shrimp COR Rule Amendments

The following motion was made by Scott Jensen, seconded by Ken Strong and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented.

Central Region Advisory Council
1115 North Main St, Springville – Conference Room
December 3, 2019 ☞ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Brock McMillan, Chair
Ben Lowder, Co-Chair
USFS (Karen Hartman) not voting
Eric Reid, BLM
Steve Lund, Elected Official
Ken Strong, Sportsmen
Joshua Lenart, Sportsmen
Scott Jensen, At-Large

Members Absent

Jacob Steele, Native American
Christine Schmitz, Non-consumptive (excused)
AJ Mower, Agriculture (excused)
Danny Potts, Non-consumptive
Mike Christensen, At-Large (excused)

Others Present

Jason Vernon, Central Region Supervisor
Marty Bushman, Assistant Attorney General

1) Approval of the Agenda and Minutes (Action)

Brock Mcmillan, Chair

This is awesome! I love seeing this much interest in the topics we have tonight. My name is Brock McMillan. I'm the chair of this RAC. I'll start by reading the form letter that the state gave me. Basically, this letter says, this is a public forum and we're going to be civil. So, we're going to treat each other with respect and listen to everybody's comments. We're going to listen to everybody's input and we're going to be respectful to others people's opinions. No rude comments, booing, yelling, whooting, snickering, etc. If it persists the offender will be asked to leave. I hate reading that kind of stuff. The framework that we'll have tonight, if you have a comment on one of the recommendations, you need to get one of these cards off of the table outside the door, fill it out and hand it to someone on the end so that we make sure you get representation. From here on out we'll have a representative from the DWR stand up and give a presentation. The RAC will have an opportunity to ask questions to the representative and then the public will have the opportunity to ask questions. We'll then have a period of public comment. So, during the question time, it's just questions. For clarification, additional information and stuff like that, that is not the time to get up and make your comment about whether you're in favor or opposed to something. After the question session, we'll have a comment section. That is when you can get up and you can make your case for what you think. After that section the DWR will have an opportunity to clarify their recommendation based on the questions and comments they received and after that we'll have RAC comments and we'll have motions on whatever needs to be done. We'll proceed from there. First, I'd like a motion to approve the agenda. I'd also like to acknowledge that Mike Christensen, AJ Mower and Chris Schmitt are excused tonight and Karen Hartman is here representing Luke. She will not be a voting member but she will represent the views of that constituency. We don't have a wildlife board update because the wildlife board meeting is on Thursday. So, we will move to the regional update. Let's do introductions. We'll start with Josh. Thank you. I'll turn it over to Jason for the regional update.

VOTING

Motion was made by Ken Strong to accept the agenda and minutes as written

Seconded by Steve Lund

Motion passed unanimously

2) Wildlife Board Meeting Update (Informational)
Brock McMillan, Chair

No board meeting

3) Regional Update (Informational)
Jason Vernon, Central Regional Supervisor

Welcome everyone to our meeting this evening. It's good to have so many representing here. I've got a couple of things I'd like to go over. The first topic is just a quick regional roundup. I have two items.

Ben Lower – I don't think we voted on the agenda and minutes.

Brock McMillan – I'm nervous because there are so many people here. Ken made the motion that we approve the minutes. It has a second. Ok it passes unanimously. Thank you.

Jason Vernon – Thanks Brock. In our wildlife section, we're right in the middle of deer classifications. Our biologists have been out on the winter range looking for deer. They are counting the bucks and does and fawns. That will continue for another couple of weeks. I think they have noticed that right after the storm deer are starting to be pushed down a bit. Prior to this last storm they have been up pretty high. So, we're waiting to get those deer down and get some good counts on them.

One thing from our aquatics section, starting in January they will be putting together a management plan for the Strawberry Reservoir. The last management plan was put in place in 2014. They are five-year plans and so, it's time to renew and update that plan. That'll start in January then run through about June and hopefully have the final product in June. Hopefully all of our RAC members were able to see all the comments. I know there were still some issues with people receiving e-mails when they didn't want to. We'll work through that. I'll review those results at the beginning of the public comment period. One of the things we did talk about and the RAC asked me to look at was identifying additional times to meet throughout the next year. Maybe earlier than 6:30 pm. I sent out the doodle poll and pretty much everyone was available at 5:30 or 6:00. There was one person who misunderstood the question and put it in backwards. So, I guess I'll just throw it out there. I'll recommend that maybe next year we meet at 5:30. Is that reasonable to everybody?

RAC Member – Would that be 5:30 on Tuesday?

Jason – Yes.

RAC Member – That would be tough for me.

Ben – I've heard comments from the public and some of them have a hard time getting here by 5:30 because they work until 5:00.

Jason – How about 6:00, would that still be tough?

RAC Member – I could do 6:00.

Ben – I think that's a better time.

RAC Member – 6:00 works for me but to give the public time, I like the 6:30 schedule. It makes it later for a lot of guys to get home but it gives guys an opportunity to get here too.

Ben – I like splitting the difference at 6:00. I think that's reasonable but I'm not opposed to staying at 6:30 either for that very reason. I don't want to discourage the public from being here.

RAC Member – I think two other RAC's meet at 6:00. I prefer to move it to 6:00 just for people getting home earlier. We've had some pretty late meetings over the years.

Ben – That said, the Southern Region also often meets at 5:00 like the last meeting. I did not attend that meeting but from what I heard, it was more attended than this.

Jason – Alright all those in favor of 6:00? That looks unanimous. So, we'll go ahead and I'll let Staci know for next year we'll meet at 6:00 and have her change that on all of our agendas. Of course, if that ends up not working, we can also adjust that later. Thank you everybody for going through that. That's all I have unless there are any questions from the RAC.

Brock – I would like maybe from the region, everybody to know that's here, maybe you need to announce we're in the middle of deer captures. They're welcome to come at any time. From today until the 22nd of December there are deer captures going on somewhere in the state. People are welcome to attend.

Jason – What I'll do for our RAC, I think our first captures are on December 15 for the Central Region and they span from Sanpete County up to Spanish Fork Canyon, out onto the Oquirrh's and Stansbury's. I'll send out that schedule and try to keep it somewhat updated. Those dates change a bit because of weather and all kinds of different things. Like Brock said, it's very appropriate if you'd like to attend those and participate in those.

RAC Member – Will those captures be hauled back to a central location on all of them or is there some places that they won't be?

Jason – All of these will be hauling them back to a central location. So, we have collars on animals right now in the field we'll give those points to the pilots and they'll go capture the animal, transport them back to a landing zone, we'll do the work on them and then cut them loose from there. It's really just driving a truck to a spot and waiting for the animals to come to you.

Ben – I attended one of these in March in Spanish Fork Canyon and it was very educational. It was good to see what the biologists are doing and I learned a lot just in seeing what they are actually doing on those captures. If anybody is interested and has the time, I'd definitely recommend doing it.

Brock – If you need to use the restroom, it's out the door right over here down this hall. OK, I'll turn the time over to Darren for his presentation.

VOTING - INFORMAL

Motion was made to change the meeting times for 2020 RAC meetings from 6:30 pm to 6:00 pm for time to arrive on time for those who work until 5:00 pm.

4) R657-33 Black Bear and R657-10 Cougar Rule Amendments 6:43 pm Darren DeBloois, Mammals Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Ken – Yes Darren, if you cut back to 10% on the non-resident, how many permits is that cutting out?

Darren – We don't know how many non-residents are pursuing on the La Sal's but based on the feedback from people on the ground, it's a lot. I think it's probably at least half the number if not more. Again, 60 non-residents in the state, we don't ask them where they pursue. It's an oversight in our sample. We need to do it. It'd be a significant decrease.

Ken – And would they be assigned to a specific unit or is it statewide?

Darren – They would have to choose a unit. They could pursue other places in the state but if they wanted to pursue one of those units, they have to choose the unit and then draw the pursuit tag.

Ben – First, regarding the restricted pursuit season, what is the motivation behind this?

Darren – Utah is one of the few states left where you can pursue with dogs and that's attracted a lot of non-resident attention to Utah. Some guys are bringing in lots of dogs, they're training dogs, they're selling dogs. It's a business. So, people on the ground identified that as one of the concerns. It was never intended, this is an opportunity for houndsmen to train dogs and get out in the field, it's not necessarily an opportunity for non-residents to come in and make a living. Especially to the point that it's causing a conflict. We tried to find a way, we can get into legal weeds if we need to but, in order to limit recreational non-resident pursuit, the easiest way of doing that under our current system is to set up a draw system. Be generous for residents so that most residents have an opportunity to go most years but it allows us then to limit the number on non-residents that can come in and do that on those units. Again, they can still go to the Boulder, they can go anywhere else in the state and pursue but they'd be limited on those units. That's true for residents as well.

Ben – You eluded to a couple land management agencies, Forest Service and SITLA asking us for these restrictions as well. I think you answered on of my questions, they are not enforcing their camping limit or their dog limit but we have commitments that they are going to start. Are they restricting other user groups on the landscape?

Darren – They need to enforce the same rules for everybody. In the spring it is primarily pursuers on those units but they do to a lesser extent in the summer I would say. It's more of a regional question. I think they enforce the rules the same across the board.

Brock – I think Ben's question is, are other users being asked to reduce their use or just sportsmen?

Ben – You eluded to one of the reasons being resource damage due to the number of dogs in camp. I'm struggling to reconcile this so help me understand how a pack of dogs in camp has a bigger impact than an elk hunter with a string of horses or a sheep herder with 300 sheep or a cattleman with a cattle allotment?

Darren – I think it is a fair point.

Steve – Just a quick question on these areas, in the group are there any permittees or any ranchers that were involved in the discussion at all? Do they have a "dog in this fight"?

Darren – There were some concerns raised with trespass down there. Dogs running off on to private property and people trespassing to go retrieve dogs and we discussed that but the rules are currently sufficient to prosecute and law enforcement will prosecute.

Steve – What about permittees?

Darren – Permittees usually don't come on until later in the year after the season is over. So, this is an effort again, we're hearing complaints but we want to get everybody in the spring that we felt had a vested interest into a room and try to work through the issues.

Brock – If the USFS enforced their current rule how much of this problem would be solved with that one change?

Darren – It is hard to say, we have commitments on both sides but our effort was to try to be as conservative as we could and still... I think the Forest Service felt like maybe we came down on issuing too many permits but we felt like, let's try all of these things and see what it looks like.

Ben – Mr. Chairman I have another question. When I asked you about the motivation what I got out of that was non-residents are coming here with giant packs of dogs to train and sell and make a business of it. Would the Forest Service, enforcing the rules that they committed to and maybe even a different combination of a dog limit, address that concern without going to a restricted pursuit season?

Darren – I think maybe it is worth saying that at the core it's really a social issue. So, this is a perfect forum to hash this out. As far as we can tell, there's not really any resource issues or biological concerns, this is just people management. Again, we came to a consensus in the group. Not everybody got what they wanted but this is what we came up with to try to address the concerns that we hashed through over two days. If after public input, the RAC feels like there are some other ways to go and we'll let you know if there are some issues logistically.

Brock – What evidence is there that bears are causing problems on the Boulder? We have evidence on some other units and you're not doing anything there but I don't know of any evidence on the Boulder.

Darren – We've been conservative with those permits and I have been relying on our folks down in that region. They felt like after seeing and being in the field and looking at deer numbers that they want to try a multiple pronged approach. So, this is one of the things that they would like.

Brock – So low deer numbers after two years of drought is the reason? I'm conflicted personally because we just put a three-year plan in and I want to know what the reason is here.

Darren – This is something the region has brought up. I think it came up in their Big Game round of RAC's and they've been meeting with stakeholders and felt like this was a recommendation they needed to make in order to address concerns that they have down there.

Josh - I wanted to follow up on one of Ben's questions. You talked about strengthening the language around unethical/fair chase issues. Can you speak to that a little more? Is it guys that are treeing a bear and then running to grab a new pack of dogs and chasing it again an hour later, a day later? I would like you to speak more about that.

Darren – Part of what brought this up is there were a couple specific cases where chasing a bear to the point it can't climb a tree and dogs laying into them. The intent was always in the rule. Once you tree a bear, you're done. You can't continually chase the same animal over and over again. We felt like the language that we're recommending tonight really makes that clear. It doesn't change the spirit of the rule but we just spell it out. If you chase an animal repeatedly to the point that it can't escape, that's illegal.

Scott – Why is the last portion of that sentence need to be there? “A person may not pursue a single bear or lion in repeated pursuits.” Isn't that adequate? Why does it have to state such that it renders the animal physically unable to escape? Isn't doing it once enough? I don't know this. Do you pursue bears multiple times? Is that common practice?

Darren – I don't want to create the impression that this is something that everybody is doing so we need to... this is something that a minority of people are doing but without the language in the rule, law enforcement can't charge.

Scott – It seems to me that if you leave it as “repeated pursuits” that's pretty clear. Two is more than one, that's repeated. If you start getting into “Physically unable to escape.” That's a judgement call. I would exclude the judgement call and leave it as repeated because if you chase it twice, you're done.

Questions from the Public

Chet Young - How many officers were down on that training on the La Sals this spring?

Darren – I'm not sure. I know they had a lot of folks in the field but I don't know how many.

Chet Young – It was around 18 or 20 I can't remember the exact number. How many hound-related citations were given during that training?

Darren – I don't know. I doubt our law enforcement guys here would know. We can look it up for you.

Chet Young – I was just asking because I couldn't see it on the list that was hound related other than the two trespassing.

Darren – I think that is fair, I just don't know the answer.

Chet Young – On the deer mortality in raising bear tags, how come Hal Black studied bears for so many years for the Division of Wildlife, that was his job for 30 years and all the time I spent with Hal, he told me that bears have such a minimal impact on deer that you can't even put a percentage to it. There's not enough for a percentage. How do we...

Darren – I think that's fair. I think bears contribute very little to overall mortality but they do at times of the year and we have seen in Utah some of these new studies key in on fawns and use that as a food resource early on. I think some of the thinking is, if we can save a few and we don't have a hard winter then that's more points ahead. You're right and Hal's right. Bears typically have very little impact on overall mule deer numbers. We're trying a lot of things to address it.

Chet Young – We've been in the drought, deer herds are down everywhere, if we do this and increase bear tags down there and reduce the bear population and the deer herd comes back because we're out of the drought, what are the chances of, now we can do this statewide because look what it did down on the Boulders?

Darren – I think we need to be clear about what the literature says and make sure people understand what's likely to work and what's not.

Jason Binder – I didn't see anything about the 2-year waiting period, did I miss it?

Darren – I'm glad you brought that up. The way things are currently set up is, if you draw one of these pursuit tags then you incur a two-year waiting period and bonus points are also a part of it. So, I talked to licensing about that. We're issuing a lot of permits and the thinking is that, we might go undersubscribed after a couple of years. Now if you're on a waiting period, you can always buy a tag over the counter, it just resets your waiting period. Licensing felt like from their standpoint, that would be the easiest way to tackle it. It doesn't require an expensive reprogramming of our draw system. That's the way they prefer to handle it but if you've got some suggestions then we're open to it.

Scott Jensen – That's one of the recommendations to add a two-year waiting period?

Darren – That’s currently how we do it. I’m glad Jason brought that up.

RAC Member – And which permits is that for? Just the limited pursuit?

Darren – It was actually something that was passed last year. They requested for those units that we have a bonus point, if you do have a bonus point there is a two-year waiting period associated if you draw the tag.

RAC Member – This is just the summer pursuit season?

Darren – This would be any restricted, so spring and summer. It’s currently in place for summer but we have much fewer permits. This is a little bit different situation in that there would be a lot more permits available.

Jason Binder – What was the main reason to start the restricted summer pursuit season?

Darren – It was the same sort of situation except it was multiple user groups and conflicts between hikers and backpackers. There are a lot of people that use that mountain so, when you have packs of dogs running around there is bound to be some conflict.

Jason Binder – I remember it being because of non-resident. Why can’t we exclude non-residents off of those three units and let them hunt the rest of the state?

Darren – That gets into the legal concerns about limiting non-residents so, if you want Marty to get into that we certainly can.

Jason Binder – My other concern is that we’ve been faced with this problem for two years, we had to do the restricted pursuit during the summer. Non-residents was the issue, why hasn’t the state done something about being able to regulate non-residents without regulating the residents and making us suffer for the problems that non-residents have caused?

Darren – I guess the short answer is the way the our system is set up, in order to without making statute and major changes in the way that we pursue bears drastically, in order to limit non-residents, the easiest way is to do a restricted pursuit permits with generous numbers of permits for residents that by default limits non-residents. That’s why we’re recommending that.

Jason Binder – So after the board approved the three-year management plan last year, when the proclamation came out there was an extra 30 premium tags issued in the state, can you tell me what has happened with those 30 tags? Have they been removed this year or did they stay in the general pool?

Darren – I’m not aware of any additional permits other than what was recommended to the board. If that’s a mistake, let’s talk about it.

Colton Belliston – It seems most of this is made by non-residents. I think we’ve come to an agreement on that. We’re talking restricted pursuit for residents and non-residents but it seems so difficult to make it so we can have it just for non-residents have to have a pursuit. You know they have to draw that tag. We have other states that already do that, why can’t we? The way has already been paved, why can’t we do what they are doing?

Darren – It’s problematic to have a limited entry draw that singles out non-residents.

Colton Belliston – But other states do it and it works.

Darren – In order to do that we’d have to make some big program changes. This would be the easiest way to do it but there are other ways it could be done.

Colton Belliston – Wouldn’t we maybe agree that sometimes the easiest way is not the best long-term solution on this?

Darren – There are other ways to address it.

John Ziegler – I was surprised to hear you say there is no required ethics section on the tag or licensee. If it's so simple, why don't we as a state make anybody who is licensed to pursue an animal or hunt an animal, make sure they know what the ethics of a pursuit hunt is?

Darren – One is you can't enforce ethics. So, you can make it mandatory and people will go through the motions. They either have ethics or they don't. I think my preference at first would be to put something together, make it available and give people opportunity to get it in front of their eyes but on the back end of making something like that mandatory there are a lot of enforcement ramifications that come with that. What if they don't take it? Sometimes is a little more pragmatic to start with something that is voluntary and make sure it's available rather than force people to do it.

John Ziegler – I'm not sure what you mean by force.

Darren – An ethics course. Most guys that do this, do it ethically. They are passionate about the animals. They care about bears and lions and they want to do it ethically. It's really a small majority and generally people that don't do it ethically, it doesn't matter if you make them take an ethics course. They won't care. That's where I'm coming from John.

John Ziegler – I understand but reinforcing the ethical hunt versus the unethical cheaters out there, I think you should never miss an opportunity.

Darren – We are all about encouraging that but I don't know that we need to make it mandatory.

Ben – RAC – Can I ask a follow-up clarification question? Darren, when a hunter applies for a bear tag, they have to take a bear orientation course does it apply to...

Darren – It's not mandatory for bears. It is for lions.

Ben – It is mandatory for bears. My question is, does that not apply to pursuit permits?

Darren – That's a good question.

Ben – So, in order to obtain a pursuit permit, you do have to take a bear orientation course. It's not an ethics course but if that's the case then we might be a little ahead of this game already.

Mike Wilson – I want to follow up on Chet's question. I would like us to get an answer. All of the 20 officers that we had in La Sal this spring for 5-6 days that I remember maybe more, how many violations were issued and what were they issued for and were they resident or non-resident? We've got to have that kind of data to make decision that you're putting up.

Darren – We can't do that right this second. We don't have that information right now

Mike Wilson – You've made decisions and proposals without that kind of data.

Darren – We had officers in the room.

Mike Wilson – And they said nothing about it?

Darren – It's not all about violations and citations. It's about what they experience on the ground too.

Mike Wilson – We invited them to come tree and no-show. I have a pretty good relationship with them down there. I think we need an answer to that question.

Cory – Would five trespassing permits sound about right for the wildlife related tickets? That's what we had on the GRAMA request. There was one unlawful take of wildlife but the rest were: driving on a suspended license, tobacco possession of a minor, failure to register a vehicle, nothing wildlife related.

Darren - I 'm glad you know that. Thanks Cory.

JASON VERNON SHARED SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ONLINE

This is for the Central Region. The question was, “after viewing the presentation about the proposal for amendments to the black bear and cougar rules, did you support, oppose or are you neutral?” There were 28 people from the Central Region that responded. 28% were supportive, 72% opposed the proposal and there were none that were neutral comments for that.

Comments from the Public

Colton Belliston – So out of all the units that we have in the state to chase bears in, we’re taking about two particular units. Both of these units happen to be on the Colorado border, Colorado residents don’t have the opportunity to chase bears. I know a lot of people who come over from Colorado. It might make some houndsmen mad but, there are a ton of people that are coming from out of state and they really take advantage of those couple of units that we have there. So, by restricting pursuit to the residents because of issues that happened with non-residents, we’re really taking the bullet for it and we didn’t even do anything wrong. The other part of it is, just as Cory was talking about with these violations. None of these are really wildlife related. I don’t know how we can take such a big stance on changing residents into having to draw a permit to hunt these couple of units. There’s really not any evidence that it’s even deserved. We don’t deserve that. Some of the numbers that he mentioned about non-residents, you know they are talking about maybe in the works of around 60 non-resident people hunting on each one of those units, each one of those guys probably has at least five dogs. That’s 300 dogs right there. That’s a lot of pressure. That’s going to add a lot of people. If we can get rid of that and put them on a draw system, I think that’s going to severely lessen all of these complications that we’re having. Not only is it going to change the amount of people on the mountain, you’re going to not be running the bears so much. You’re not going to have all the pressure from so many people where you’re having to feel like you need to get up and hunt hours before you’re supposed to because you’re not going to have as much pressure from the people. Other things that it will help is going to relate to resources, roads and everything like that. It’s going to decrease. If we do something with the non-residents, that’s going to help every single one of those things. Last but not least is adding the bear tags on the Boulder unit doesn’t make a lot of sense. None of our animals are really doing well. We’ve been coming out of a drought. Darren mentioned after the deer hunt, they noticed the deer numbers weren’t doing so well. Can we maybe relate some of that issue to the deer hunters? Why do the bears always have to take the hit for that? That’s all I have. Thank you.

Scott Olson – We really appreciate the support the bear hunters. We had 50,000 sheep scattered on these mountains between ? and Strawberry. Our guys are killing between 20 and 30 bears up there. We would like to see those tag numbers increased a little bit... (he is not speaking into the microphone, can’t make out what he is saying.) I talked to one of the trappers and they say these... these guys want to increase their chances of getting a bear and going to some of these higher elevations and these places that take a little more time and effort to get a bear. I know a particular unit where we had a bear killed, all of the bears killed on our unit were mature bears. There were no young bears killed that year at all.

Corey Huntsman – Utah Houndsmen Association – I want to thank the chair and the RAC members for this opportunity to have our voices heard. I’d also like to thank Darren and the biologists for the thankless job that you do. It seems like they are constantly getting their guts kicked in by the houndsmen or the deer hunters for too many lions or not enough. The Utah Houndsmen Association supports the division’s recommendation with a couple modifications. The first being the limited pursuit on the La Sal, San Juan, Book Cliffs. We do not support any restrictions on residents at this time. Second, we do not support any tag increase of any kind during the three-year management plan. It was voted on and passed by the wildlife board last year. I was fortunate enough to be a part of that discussion group that they put together for the bears and I’m extremely grateful that they form these groups so that we can have a voice that is heard and make an attempt to come up with a conclusion. It was kind of interesting to hear first hand from

the Forest Service, Trust Land biologists, wildlife board and law enforcement guys what the actual complaints were. I think there were some valid complaints. I do believe that we can greatly reduce most of these issues with the proposed ethics course. We'd like to see it mandatory. Personally, I think it would help. The 16-dog limit I think will help a lot and policing ourselves internally. We've already met with the DWR law enforcement and briefly discussed ways to work with them to help identify and reduce infractions. The one thing in the UHA really debated heavily were non-residents. In the discussion group, non-residents complaints were brought up quite a bit. Well the entire problem certainly wasn't caused by them. We do believe at this time it would be best to restrict non-residents from pursuit permits from the La Sal, San Juan and Book Cliffs. With the division's recommendation of 75 permits for the La Sal, San Juan and Book Cliffs, we fear that every houndsman will put in family members and friends to up their odds of drawing. I believe right now we should put 85-100(?) on La Sal. So, if each of those guys are putting in four people, their kids and wives, it's going to put our odds of drawing about 20% and if we add the two-year waiting period that's going to be every six years to draw a pursuit permit. UHA recognizes that there are hound related issues on the spring bear pursuit that need to be addresses. We do not feel that restricting residents hunting opportunity is warranted yet. We ask that we try a two-year ethics course, restricted dog limits and reduce tags by limiting non-residents from the three big units. If the affected parties are still seeing the same issues, we're open to discuss limited draw on the pursuit. However, we're confident that these changes will be enough. That's just on the non-residents, like we said just the three big units.

Jesse Painter – This was written by my friend Jeremy Farmer(?) “This is as unfair to houndsmen and sportsmen. I don't see any government agency limiting how many deer hunters I can have in camp or how many horses I can bring to the mountain, only hounds. This is nothing short of discrimination against a single group of sportsmen. The issues brought up are mostly fabricated and in some single instance these do exist, the individual should be dealt with. A shotgun approach such as this is not warranted or right. If resource damage is truly an issue, then why do we not limit the deer hunters to no more than two ATV's per camp and limit the duck hunters to one retriever per group? Or elk hunters to five horses or five saddles? Maybe the DWR should consider treating houndsmen as equals to other big game hunters and stop singling us out and stop restricting our traditions and opportunities to utilize our public land and resources.” Thanks.

Sundays Hunt – Utah State Director of the Humane Society – Good evening, my name is Sundays Hunt. I'm here representing myself and I'm the Utah State Director of the Humane Society of the United States. On behalf of our supporters and myself, I submit the following comments regarding the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources amendments to the black bear and cougar rule. As well as the proposal to extend Utah's wolf management plan for the additional 10 years. The HSUS supports DWR's efforts to increase an ethic of fair chase during black bear and cougar pursuits with hounds as well as limit hound hunting of cougars and bears in the La Sal, San Juan and Book Cliffs units. Calling off hounds while an animal is exhausted and or not capable of escaping are basic principles that we believe every black bear and cougar hunter should be abiding by. However, we believe a limit of 16 hounds is still far too high and does not adequately represent and effort to increase fair chase for these iconic native animals. Hunting cougars and black bears with hounds can lead to harm for all animals involved in this practice. Additionally, cougar kittens have been attacked and killed by hounds in Utah and hounds harm non target wildlife such as mule deer and big horn sheep. At the very least we believe hunters should be limited to no more than eight hounds for all black bear and cougar hunting seasons to align with the current limit of eight hounds during restricted summer pursuits. Furthermore, we are opposed to the increase in bear baiting and spot and stalk permits. Bear baiting is counter to the notion of fair chase and we are extremely concerned with the DWR's continued use of this practice. Baiting makes bears more vulnerable to hunters ensuring an uneven playing field. Toxic baits are also fatal to bears, pets and other wildlife. In addition to lacking fair chase, baiting bears can be highly problematic as baited bears become food conditioned and grow accustomed to human smells at bait sites, increasing the conflicts. Bait sites draw a host of different

species which can create a potential for disease transmission between them like rabies. Bait sites also concentrate bears of different ages and sizes making small bears subject to predation by larger ones. The DWR's proposals and additional five bear baiting permits and 30 spot and stalk permits on the Plateau Boulder unit because of declining mule deer population in the area, however, this targeting of black bears is misguided and unwarranted. In several recent studies that involved predator removals, those actions generally had no affect on mule deer herd numbers. That is because access to adequate nutrition is the key factor in mule deer dynamics, not predatory elimination. Instead of killing more black bears, the DWR must address the primary causes of mule deer decline if they want to boost the population. That wasn't everything I had but my time is up.

Eric Cockayne – I just want to voice my support in the suggestions that came from the Utah Houndsman Association. I support no restrictions on our local hunters in the pursuit season and also to stick to the three-year management plan that has been in place. I think that if we can see that through, we'll learn more rather than jumping to a conclusion. Let's put this management plan and see how it works.

Chet Young – Ten years ago we gave up the fall pursuit season. We used to run our hounds out in the big hound season. During the fall it conflicted with the big elk hunters. It was a compromise more than anything and the houndsmen got the spring to hunt. So, we've given up a lot in our pursuit. I think most of us would rather be out in the fall hunting. Then we've got the summer training season. At first, it was all good and then we got restrictions on San Juan, La Sal and the Book Cliffs, down to 20 tags per unit or however it's broken out. There was this big theory that we were running bears into town so, San Juan and La Sal split so we only get five tags on San Juan for a three-year period then we only get five tags on La Sal for a three-year period then it rotates. There really hasn't been a study or any proof that we were running bears into town. So, by making these restrictions, are we headed down that same road? Are we only going to get three tags once we get these restrictions? I've been talking with Darren and he said he is talking about maybe getting the 20 tags back on San Juan and La Sal during the summer training. There were conflicts with the bait hunter in the spring. There was a good compromise made back then. Ben Lowder was a big part of it with the Bowman's Association and some of the tags were moved into the summer bait season and took from the houndsmen. A great compromise but I'm still trying to wrap my head around where our restrictions are coming from down there. If we had 20 officers on La Sal during the biggest weekend of the bear hunt down there in the spring, they wrote 18 citations a couple were trespassing. Yes, some of them were probably hound related. But that was on an individual basis, not on a whole group of guys. With that many officers in the field, there should have been... how many citations if it's big enough to be here fighting to keep our pursuit down there the way it is? I stand behind the Houndsmen Association's recommendations from tonight. Thank you.

Jason Binder – I agree with the rest of these guys. It doesn't seem fair that we're taking this all out on resident houndsmen when non-resident houndsmen are causing the majority of the problems. If you guys to decide that you want to put us on restriction, I'd like to see you do away with the two-year waiting period. I think if residents are going to be restricted, we should at least be able to have the chance to put in and go down there every year. We should be able to at least put in and have a shot. Ever since the summer training season started, it's been going on since 2010, I've had the opportunity to draw one time. It's going to become a big problem where guys that are raising hounds, I've had hounds for over 30 years and I won't even be able to draw a tag to go hunt the premium areas to train dogs because you can't train dogs hunting on the Wasatch. The other thing I'd like to address and I'd like you guys to look in to, on February 22nd, after the draw period was put out for the bears, I was able to get my hands on a proclamation and the DNR voted for a certain number of tags at the wildlife board. When the proclamation came out, there were 30 tags that are normally in the conservation pool but the tags that are supposed to be taken out for the conservation tags were put back into the general pool so, there was an additional 30 premium tags put out for the general public to draw. I actually spoke to Darren about it, he may not remember our conversation. I also called Carl Hurst that was our representative from our area

and due to the fact that the proclamation was already out and the draw was about to take place, they couldn't do anything about those 30 extra tags. I'd like this board to make a motion to investigate those tags and make sure that they got removed because we had a substantial increase in bear permits last year and then 30 extra tags on top of it and now, we're wanting to increase 50 more on the Boulder. I think the three-year management plan needs to work its course and see where we're at before we keep increasing tags because that was the whole purpose of having the management plan.

Clarification: Darren – I think I know what Jason is talking about now. We tried to point this out during the process. Traditionally what we used to do... so, permits that went to conservation and expo permits were subtracted from our recommendation at the board. A couple of years ago we wanted to be consistent across all draws so, I'm pretty sure I pointed out to the board that the permits we're recommending is what is going to go in the proclamation and that we're not going to be subtracting. So, that does amount to some additional tags. I thought we were clear during the process that those permits wouldn't come off. So, I apologize Jason, I didn't quite follow what you we're talking about but you are right about that. That does kind of a net increase.

Ben – So if I heard you right, this happens with big game as well? That was not my understanding. My understanding was the opposite.

Darren – The Board votes and sets conservation permits every three years. On big game, talking to Justin what he wanted to do is make sure... that's a process in and of itself and when we come back later and recommend permits those recommendations don't take into account conservation permits at that time. We recommend what we're recommending to go into the guidebook.

Ben – Thank you for the clarification.

Darren – Covy would be better at answering that but that is my understanding. We want to all get on the same page that way. Let me just say about huntsmen in general, we got some lion studies going in the state right now. I would be impossible to do without houndsmen helping us to catch and collar lions. I just want to reassure the houndsmen that are here tonight that our intent is not to unduly restrict what they do. We support what they do and we support the activities that they participate in and appreciate the help and feedback that they give us. Again, this is an effort to address some specific concerns and so obviously we're open to whatever the RAC decides.

RAC Discussion

Scott – So just a point of clarification. There have been several suggestions to limit non-resident permits in some fashion but doing so without creating a draw system for residents. Is there no way to, based on trending three-year averages to say, there are typically 88 permits on this unit so we're going to cap non-residents and eight and still leave residents over the counter? Is that a possibility?

Darren – I hate to commit to anything without Lindy being here but I think we could figure out a way to work through it. It could have implications for our contract with the company who completes the draw and it's unusual.

Scott – So could the non-residents also be first come first served so it didn't have to go through the draw system?

Darren – That might be an option too.

Ben – Have we investigated how Idaho does their non-resident program and if that's an option here?

Darren – We would have to change the system up but what Idaho does is they have unlimited pursuit permits for residents statewide and then they have 70 non-resident permits. It's not a pursuit permit it's a hound handler permit. So, it's a little different than what we've got. In order to be in control and to be running hounds, everybody in Idaho has to have a hound-handler permit then they limit the number of those that are available to non-residents with exceptions for guides which is similar to ours. We talked

about that in the group. We hashed that out. We felt like we had something similar in Utah with our restricted pursuit that would suffice. So, that's where we came down. It would just be a matter of changing how we do things.

Ben – Still on clarification, I feel there has been a lot of finger-pointing at non-residents. I talked to a non-resident today from Colorado that pursues on the La Sal every year and I'm taking him at his word for this because I haven't seen the data but he told me in the GRAMA request that there were no citations to non-residents when law enforcement pushed those down in the spring. Can anybody speak to that? I'm getting a whole bunch of...

Darren – So social issues are tough Ben because you get feedback and you have to take it at face value but then you have to sit down and hash through it. So, it's difficult to put metrics on things. There is a general feeling that at least in the group that non-residents were an issue that needed to be addressed. It's the only game in town for them and so a lot of them come over. It's had to quantify that at the end of the day. So, that's why we felt like it's also a people issue. There are a lot of users in the field at that time of year. When the group sat down and talked about it, that is what we felt like was a possible solution to it. I don't know if that answers your question or clarifies it. Again, sometimes you have to take peoples word for it and try to come to a compromise.

Brock – I have a follow-up on that, so you said the group had a consensus but one of the group members here was not in consensus. How much consensus was there among the group?

Darren – There was a fair amount of consensus until they went back to their groups. They met and they had discussions internally and then they have a process that they go through too. So, they wanted to make sure that their group was represented not just the individuals in the group. That's just the nature of the game sometimes. We tried to come to something that everybody could live with at the end of the day.

Ken – One quick question, we go to 10% for non-residents. Is that so we don't have to change the program? What would happen if we cut it down to 5%? I'm just curious because most of the complaints that I got were about the non-residents taking away from the residents and if Colorado doesn't allow pursuing, that's Colorado's problem not Utah's and the residents shouldn't have to absorb the non-residents just to keep them happy.

Darren – My understanding is with talking with the group, Greg Hanson, one of our assistant AG's was part of the discussion, is the safest ground to be on is to be consistent with what your common practices are. So, right now when we limit the number of permits available, we limit non-residents to 10%. So, that is why we are recommending 10%. Having said that, Greg said, as long as we're providing opportunity for people who have a commercial interest in doing this activity (guides and outfitters), which we do, they have to have a permit and they can guide a person that has a pursuit permit, that person could be a non-resident to come in and make a living that way. As long as we don't violate that, that we legally set the percentage of non-residents where we want from zero to whatever. But the division feels like just to be consistent with what we do on all of our other systems let's start with 10%. We feel like that will be a significant reduction to what is probably already going down there.

Ken – So if we go to 10% on the non-residents on the Book Cliffs and that, it's going to limit quite a bit for the non-residents?

Darren – Again, 60 non-resident pursuit tags in the state but these are the premium units and that's where people want to go. I can't tell you what the actual numbers are because we don't break them out that way but I suspect it will be a significant limitation. They can go somewhere else.

Marty Bushman – Utah Attorney General's office – Darren did a great job of describing the issue I just might add one thing. That is, legally for recreational pursuit we could carve non-residents right out of the equation if we so chose. But a lot of times, you do things one to be consistent with how you are with others to eliminate people who may try to sue you. If you don't have to defend a lawsuit it's always a

better way to go because there is never a sure outcome and it's always expensive. So, this would probably be in that category. We're looking at 10%, one is it keeps us consistent with how we operate elsewhere. It's less likely that somebody may look at it and try to challenge us because we've taken such an extreme position of carving every non-resident out of it. So, it's a little bit risk management. Even though legally we should be able to eliminate non-residents from the recreational. Now once it's guiding and commercial, privilege and immunities clause in the U.S. Constitution limits our ability to significantly discriminate against non-residents in the pursuit of a job or income.

Ben – Are we at a point where we can start discussion? I think this non-resident issue is a great place to start in the restricted pursuit. It was a surprise to me to learn that we could do that legally. I didn't expect that. With that said, Houndsman Association, take note, I'm going to call you out here for a minute. I'm a little frustrated with your recommendation. The reason why is not because you oppose the restricted pursuit season but it's because that you are opposed to that and you want to eliminate non-residents off of those units. Regardless of whether we have a legal ability to do that, I fundamentally have a problem with that. I don't like that. I don't like saying we're just going to eliminate non-residents entirely. If there truly is a non-resident issue and I'm not sure that there is, I think this restricted pursuit recommendation is the best way to address it. I still don't know which way to go on this. I have several frustrations with this and I'll call out the fact that we approved a three-year guidebook last year and now we're back here having this battle and that's frustrating and I hate that. I'm not so sure we can't address some of these concerns a different way. If the issue truly is non-residents, I've had several conversations with houndsmen both resident and non-resident over the past week and a lot of them have told me there is not an issue. There's just not an issue down there. I'm not hearing that here tonight. Tonight, I'm hearing it's a non-resident issue and if that's the case, then I think the DWR nailed it but that's not the feedback I'm receiving and the personal conversations I'm having. So, I'm conflicted. I've heard suggestions and some of them here tonight, going over the counter instead of the draw, I think there is merit to that if we restrict this. I had a good conversation with Darren yesterday about all of this. I'm hearing two different things from the houndsmen. I'm hearing, "we're never going to be able to draw this again, it's going to take several years." To Darren's concern is that next year, nobody is going to draw because everybody is on a waiting period. I don't think that the programming is a good reason to force the two-year waiting period. I kind of throw that argument out. That's the wrong reason to do a two-year waiting period. I'd love to hear what other people have to say.

Joshua – I want to follow up on two of Ben's points. I echo your, I wouldn't call it frustration but the fact that the houndsmen took a serious stance against this restricted pursuit if the issue is non-residents this seems like the vehicle for limiting the number of non-residents without excluding them because I don't support that at all. I hunt Brown's Park and you're going to see a Colorado, Wyoming and a Utah truck in the same parking lot every single time and I think the limitation sounds totally justifiable but full exclusion I can't get behind. I do think the restricted pursuit works for that so, that's why I'm sort of confused on that point. My second point is, the division is looking to recommend these tag increases on the Boulder. I was really happy to see the division take a three-year stance as well. I sat through the last three rounds of this where we were fighting every RAC over how many bears and this seemed like a way to address a lot of conflicts. There is one exception with this. That is, you're justifying this increase for mule deer and I have a hard time getting behind that. The gentleman's comment about depredation increases, I personally hate to see Wildlife Services take bears and large predators, I'd like to see a hunter do it every time. So, if we're farming out 200 bears to Wildlife Services for depredation issues, I would get behind a change there but it's a lot harder for me to do it for mule deer on one off year. The third point, another gentleman mentioned the ethics course. This is arguably the biggest RAC next to big game and there is a lot of optics on killing predators and I think if you're going to go through the act of creating a course, why wouldn't you make it mandatory? To me it just seems like, at this point I could probably take the Wasatch extended archery ethics course blindfolded but I still go through it. I still see the picture

of the deer bleeding down the back of the pickup truck and it reminds me that I should be mindful of it. So, I think if you're going to take the trouble then making it mandatory wouldn't be a bad idea.

Ben – Follow up on the ethics course, I actually really like the idea of an ethics course for this but as we learned, everybody that gets a bear tag, pursuit or kill, does go through the bear orientation. Maybe that's not far enough. I don't know that, just thinking though this, we already have the bear orientation course maybe rather than an additional ethics course, that just gets revamped a little bit.

Ken – I agree with what Josh and Ben have said. The only problem I see with an ethics course is to me, for instance a quagga muscle is an ethics course and I take one every year for fishing, doesn't mean that people follow the ethics of anything and that's the problem. If people take a course and they don't follow the rules, we need a penalty there much bigger than people can understand because it's really easy to take an ethics course and then say, screw it I'm going to do what I want. I agree that there needs to be ethics and I agree with what they said on an ethics course. I just think it needs to be enforced in a stronger manner.

Ben – Just thinking through this, I'm conflicted on what to do here because we've had a lot of public presence here and I acknowledge that and that's very valuable. What I'm hearing from the public is to oppose the restricted pursuit but eliminate non-residents and I just can't get behind that. Is the DWR recommendation, right? Maybe not. Is the Houndsman recommendation, right? No, I don't think it is. But I haven't heard any other compromise. I've got some ideas for compromise but I haven't heard any comments here that would support the ideas I have.

Scott – How do you feel about the 10% limit on non-residents?

Ben – I think if you are going to limit non-residents, that's exactly where you go. Precedence is set across everything else we have.

Scott – So, just based on three-year average sales of residents, you set a number for non-residents as 10% of that.

Ben – I don't think you can do that. I think if you're going to restrict, you've got to restrict. This is my opinion but...

Scott – Through the draw?

Ben – It doesn't have to be through a draw. I'm ok with over the counter. We put a cap on elk tags, we sell those over the counter. So, I'm not opposed to that. In fact, I've received a lot of e-mails suggesting that. We've also suggested requiring making pursuit permits pick a unit. I haven't heard that here tonight but I've received a lot of e-mails about that. I don't know if that's a good answer or not.

Brock – To me the compromise is to make it over the counter. Maybe make it 79 permits, 10% is still going to be seven. Almost everybody that wants one from the state can get one every year and we don't have people waiting two years to get a tag. I don't like the two-year waiting period because if there are only 88 people used on the most heavily used unit, the first year, 79 of those 88 get a tag and the next year there are only seven left to go into the draw. It just doesn't make any sense to me. I hate restricting sportsmen and not restricting the other user groups so I don't know.

Ben – I think I could get behind a lot of what you just said. The other idea that has come to mind is somewhat of a compromise. A thought just triggered again, we're one year into a three-year guidebook and I hate that we're having this conversation right now. So, part of me is like, maybe let's address this

with a dog limit and just oppose the restricted pursuit season entirely but try to address some of the concerns with the dog limit.

Ken – My thoughts on this are, and I’ve talked to several people and this year has been a different year. Scott Olsen talked about the 30 bears that they killed up there along the Wasatch that the trappers have got. We went in in a drought, into the fall last year, we came out with a big winter and those bears were hungry and they are going to be doing a whole lot of odd things that they usually don’t do. So, it’s just a whole different year this year and a lot of it is because of the weather. That’s just my feelings.

Brock – I agree and I think that’s what we’re seeing in the deer populations and some of this conversation is about the deer population. I do think that when deer populations get low, predators have the ability to keep them low so, I’m not saying that predators are not... When ungulate populations are doing great, I don’t think they have a lot of effect.

Ben – Brock, I think I’ve reconciled this enough, I’m ready to make a motion. I’d like to carve a couple things out here. I don’t want to do the whole recommendation in a blanket sweep. I would move that we oppose the restricted pursuit season and at the same time implement the 16-dog limit. My reasoning behind that, really what threw me over the edge here is the fact that we’re one year into a three-year guidebook. Let’s kick this can down the road until we’re ready to address it in a three-year guidebook again.

Ken – Was the 16-dog limit, is that something that we already have in the Forest Service?

Ben – My understanding is that’s a camping limitation by the Forest Service that hasn’t been enforced.

Ken – It hasn’t been enforced but I think the Forest Service needs to enforce things more. I got a ticket this year for camping one day because I camped two weeks before. If it’s already a rule with the Forest Service, that...

Ben – The information that I’ve gathered from various conversations, this only exists on La Sals.

Joshua – Was there no limit on dogs before?

Ben – Currently, there is not limit on dogs except for on the summer pursuit season. There is a limit of eight.

Brock – So, Ben’s motion is to oppose the restricted pursuit and implement the 16-dog limit.

Ben – The Houndsmen supported that 16-dog limit.

Brock – Ken seconded it. Any discussion? I kind of like this motion because I think that I want to go down this we just implemented that three-year plan and I don’t want to tinker with everything every year. I do understand emergencies. So, if we have predator problems somewhere that’s an emergency, we have the predator management plan that should trigger and go into effect. Is that right, Darren? So, when that triggers, and goes into effect we have a plan there when it should happen. I know the Boulder is hurting. I know the Abajo’s are hurting and I know the Book Cliffs are hurting and I know the Cache is hurting this year. I think that’s an artifact of drought in the South and two severe winters out of the last three in the North. I think predator control can be part of that in all of those units but it seems, Boulder and not the other ones?

Ben – Brock, if I may, my motion doesn’t address the Boulder issue yet. I did that on purpose.

Brock – Any other discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Five in favor and one abstain.

Ben – Can we get a reason for the abstention?

RAC Member – I don't know if it's a federal lands side of it from my end. I don't know, I'm not clear enough on that one to go one way or the other. I don't know if that's valid or not. If I have to go one way, I would probably be, for. You talked me into it.

Brock – You always have the right to abstain, I think. Ben's question is good because we'd love to understand the reasoning.

Ben – The reason I bring that up is because it happened a couple times at the last meeting when you were absent. We had a couple abstentions and I'll clarify again the reason for an abstention is for typically a conflict of interest. Marty, correct me if I'm wrong. That's typically defined as a financial interest of you or associates or family.

RAC Member – You're fine, Ben and I can go for that. I think that a lot of the questions since I'm new to this and wasn't involved with the three-year plan the first time, I think that that is a valid point. So, I support that. I think the 16 dogs, I can support that too.

Ben – Mr. Chairman, I have another motion. Regarding the discussion concerning an ethics course, I'd like to move that we ask the DWR to enhance the current bear orientation course to address some of these pursuit ethics issues.

Brock – So, Ben has motioned that we enhance the current bear orientation course to include a pursuit ethics section. Is that correct? Josh seconds. Any discussion?

Ken – The only point that I am a little concerned about is, it's nice to have an ethics course but if it doesn't have any teeth in the back of it I don't understand what the point is. We can all take an ethics course and nod our heads and pat ourselves on the back for it but if somebody's intention is to violate that ethic regardless of where there are, where is the teeth in this ethics course?

RAC Member – My understanding of strengthening the language in the management plan is to allow law enforcement to do just that. That's why that language was changed, right?

Ben – Well, we haven't addressed that portion of the recommendation yet.

RAC Member – But that's kind of the...

Ben – Yeah and I agree with you that if a person is going to be unethical, they are going to be unethical. So, to answer your question as to why, I think its due diligence on our part to provide education. I think that's warranted and I think it's a good thing.

Ken – I agree with you on that. I still think if we're going to go to the effort of an ethics course there needs to be something punitive if somebody violates it.

Ben – For me, how do you regulate ethics? I don't have an answer to that.

Brock – I think Josh's comment was good though. He thinks of the blood running down the back of the truck every time he thinks of this. I think it makes everybody a little more aware of how other people may

be perceiving what we're doing. When I was a kid, we'd strap the deer on the front hood of our truck to bring it home. Now that's really not appropriate anymore because you want to be respectful of people that don't appreciate that. So, we used to go up and down main street honking so people could see it. OK, we have a motion on the table. Anymore discussion? All in favor? Unanimous again. Any other motions?

VOTING

Motion was made by Ben, seconded by Ken to opposed the restricted pursuit season and implement the 16-dog limit.

In Favor: Ben, Scott, Ken, Steve, Eric, Joshua

Opposed:

Abstained:

Motion passed unanimously

Motion was made by Ben, seconded by Joshua to ask the DWR to enhance the bear orientation course by including a pursuit ethics section.

In Favor: Ben, Scott, Ken, Steve, Eric, Joshua

Opposed:

Abstained:

Motion passed unanimously

Ken – Can I ask Darren a question? Mr. Olsen talked about 30 bears that were killed by the government trappers. Is there any way that you could take a waiting list on bear tags for those that didn't draw and when an incident came up with that, let them go after the bear?

Darren – Nuisance and depredation, there are three options. The landowner can solve the problem, Wildlife Services can solve the problem or the division can have a hunter go and take the bear. So, that would be something we could work at a regional level to do. Sometimes it's difficult to get a hunter that can go at the spur of the moment. Sometimes they don't want to take it if it's not a big bear. It's certainly something we can do and we would rather see a hunter take a bear than have Wildlife Services take them all. Maybe just an education thing, reaching out to producers and letting them know that if they have problems, contact the region and maybe we can get a hunter up there and if we can't we'll let Wildlife Services handle it. We need to handle the problem. We can't let it go on.

Joshua – Does it make sense for the lion hunters to take an ethics course or is it the same 20 people that are going to take a version of the same course twice?

Ben – I think it's absolutely warranted to have them take an ethics course. However, I don't think this is the meeting to do that.

Brock – OK. I'm open to other motions relative to the recommendations that we've heard.

Ben – Mr. Chairman, I don't know that I'm ready to make a motion concerning the Boulder tag increase but I'd like to have that discussion.

Brock – Let me tell you what I think. We are studying this on the Book Cliffs right now and what I do know on the Book Cliffs this year, bears took 20% of the fawns that hit the ground. So, it is possible that bears have a population affect when populations are depressed. Having said that, I have not idea what is going on the Boulder. It seems like there are units that we know things about that we're not doing anything on and the unit we don't know anything about we are recommending to do something on. So, I'm conflicted too.

Scott – I like the idea of bringing these emergency situations forward as often as is needed. This is something that we talked about in this mule deer plan, is we wanted to provide a mechanism to respond rapidly. This is just that but I don't see any data to support it. If we had data on fawn mortality and adult female mortality that supported that then I'd be all over it. I don't see that so I can't support it.

Ben – Darren, I'm assuming this recommendation is coming from the biologist within the region?

Darren – Yes. Sometimes in the absence of data, you need to make management decisions and recommendations and we don't have any data on the Boulder. We don't know if bears are impacting. You make an educated guess; we know on the Book Cliffs whether the Book Cliff is similar. I mean, the Boulder is kind of a desert unit but it's a lot further south and it's probably a drought related issue and the Book Cliffs is... Yeah, it's just an educated guess in an attempt to address a problem that's been brought up.

Ben – Do we have anyone here tonight that can speak to the deer conditions on the Boulder?

Ken – What kind of problems do we have on the Boulders?

Darren – Mainly just a deer herd that seems to be struggling. So, again we don't have the advantage on the Boulder's that we do on some of these other units where we've got really good collar data. We've got bears and lions collared. So, there is a lot of local concern about what is going on and the region is being responsive to those concerns. Again, we're recommending bears tonight but I'm sure there will be other recommendations as we move forward to see what we can do. Maybe part of that is getting some collars out. We put a lot of collars on so I don't want to promise anything.

Brock – So you promise collars are going on the Boulder next week. 125 of them.

Darren – I didn't know that.

Ben – So, we've got data coming is what you are saying.

Brock – Here we're only taking about maybe seven bears. I don't think that does anything to a bear population but that is seven bears.

Ben – That was my next question. Can you talk about the bear populations?

Darren – That is difficult to do. What we know statewide based on our population model that I've talked about in the past, it appears that the rate of growth is considerably leveling out. We only have estimates through 2018 but it looks like the growth rate is kind of hovering around one which is essentially a static population. It's been above one for several years. So, it looks like bears have been growing and growing and we're starting to level out statewide. It's tough on units where we don't have a lot of bears harvested to say anymore than what the state trend it.

Ben – I don't know the Boulder unit so I don't know what we're currently issuing. What are we currently issuing on the Boulder and what is the success rate on those spot and stalk tags?

Darren – It was 10% and the reason for the recommendation of five in the bait season is that's like 67% success. That's why we put it in that season. It's the most likely season to get some with the fewest number of tags.

Ben – So Brock was right on, 6-7 bears is what we would expect to be killed with this tag increase.

Scott – It looks like there is 41 permits for that unit across the three different seasons. 24 on the spring LE, 12 summer LE and 5 fall LE.

Darren – So, the 12 and we're recommending an additional five? So that would be 17.

Scott – There is 20 of the spot and stock.

Ben – Is there's 5 during the summer season as opposed to the spring season, is that to target bears during that fawning season?

Darren – No, it's based on success rates and how can you increase the permits the least amount and have the most affect.

Brock – If we really want to help the deer herd immediately, you'd put them in spring because the fawns are really only susceptible to bears for the first three weeks of life. So, by the end of June, you're putting the affect off for a year is there is going to be an affect.

Ben – What's the typical fawn drop date?

Brock – I don't know of the Boulder. On the Monroe which is right next to it, it's June 14th.

Ben – That would be the summer season.

Darren – Brock is right. You're kind of giving yourself a year effect. Any affect's you have are taken place yearly. The strategy here is to try and reduce bear numbers no necessarily hitting bears while they are eating fawns.

Brock – I am fine with that with. I'm just surprised that we're only doing it on this unit with the data we have.

Darren – We asked all of the regions because this came up if they had any concerns and everybody else felt like they took this into account with the three-year recommendations and they were comfortable where they were. This units, we've been kind of conservative and the region felt like, for example, we have one parameter in, one out we could have changed by as much as 10 permits. I think we only recommended and increase of five. We don't take the spot and stalk into account because it's such a low success. We're still within the plan. They could have recommended it last year but you're point is well taken about the three-year guidebook.

Ben – Mr. Chairman, the deer committee that we had this year, there was a lot of talk. We've never really discussed deer and elk in the mountain lion and the bear meetings and through the deer committee, we discussed it a lot. We need to start having those discussions in these meetings because they impact. What we decide here will impact ungulates. Given the concerns across the board we had last month about the status of the deer population, I think I'm kind of inclined to support this tag increase. I still share the frustration with the three-year guidebook but since it's here, that's where I'm leaning.

Ken – There seems to be an abundance of bears down on the Boulders so I don't know that it's going to hurt anything. It'll give us a chance especially with the collaring going on to learn a little more information.

Brock – We're only collaring adults and bears do very little for adults. So, we're not going to learn very much if anything.

Ken – You’re collaring deer?

Brock – Yes.

Ken – You need to collar bears too.

Brock – We don’t need a motion on that because we can accept it with the remainder. Are there other motions that would go contrary to what the recommendation is from the DWR?

Scott – I want to look at this wording. I’m not certain that it needs to be changed, let me find it here. This is 4A on the sheet that was handed out. “A person may not pursue a single bear or lion in repeated pursuits such that it renders the animal physically unable to escape.” I think the second portion of that, “such that it renders the animal physically unable to escape.” Exactly specifies the issue that you’re trying to prevent. My concern is that it becomes a judgement call. If you stop the statement at “a person may not pursue a single bear or lion in repeated pursuit” I think it’s very clear. My recommendation on that would be to scrub the last portion of that sentence. I don’t feel super strong about it. I just think it’s clear.

Darren – I think the reason that we were so specific is because, sometimes you’ll tree a lion and it’ll bale and I don’t think we want to necessarily preclude someone in that situation from continuing to pursue especially if they have a harvest tag. We want to be very specific about what we’re talking about and that is, pursuing these animals to the point where they are not capable of climbing a tree and they are just going to get stretched by the dogs. That was the intent.

Joshua – Darren, I have one more question for you, when you increased the quotas on the Boulder, have you increased the quota on the Boulder two years prior?

Darren – We increased them the last time we did recommendations but we increased them less than what the plan would have allowed.

Joshua – But did you increase them the year before as well? Because it seems like everything has gone up consistently for the last two years.

Darren – That was one of the reasons we suggested going to the three-year guidebook. The main reason is the plan says that is what where supposed to do. We have been increasing. Overall, we’ve increased bear permits quite a bit in the state in the last 5-10 years.

Joshua – I guess I want to see this three-year plan go for at least a year and I can support this increase.

Darren – I take it back. It’s been 16 until last year.

Joshua – 16?

Darren – So, it’s been stable. They increased it to 20.

Joshua – Since 2016?

Darren – Yeah. So, we did increase it the last time. Sorry about that.

Joshua – I would like to see this plan go one year without having to fight over these units knowing it has been increased is helpful. I have a hard time with this one.

Ben – Mr. Chairman, I’ll make the motion that we accept the balance of the plan as presented.

Brock – We’ve got a motion that we accept the balance of the plan from Ben and a second from Ken Strong. Any discussion? All in favor? Five to one, it passes. While Kim is coming up, I want to thank all the people that came and commented tonight.

Motion was made by Ben, seconded by Ken to accept the balance of the Division's recommendations as presented.

In Favor: Ben, Scott, Ken, Steve, Eric

Opposed: Joshua

Abstained:

Motion passed 5 to 1

5) Wolf Management Plan
Kimberly Hersey, Mammal Conservation Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Scott – Can you go back to your second slide? So, there where it says, the state law, there is a request that the USFSW removal is found in portions of Utah that are listed. Is that what currently happens? What currently happens to wolves that are found in Utah?

Kim – If a wolf is found in the delisted portion of the state, first of all we get a lot of sighting, we'll send a biologist out to try and find information to see if they can confirm it or not. The few radio collared animals that have made it into Utah seem to be dispersing fairly quickly. You'll see them one day. They may never be seen again. So, we try to gather information on repeated sightings to try to figure out if wolves are establishing. If they were to be established, or start to look like they are establishing in that delisted portion, we'd have those removed. If we see the same thing in the listed portion of the state, we don't have the management authority to remove those animals so, we'll request that the Fish and Wildlife Service take care of them.

Scott – How often does this happen? Has it happened at all?

Kim – I think to my knowledge in the listed portion we've asked once and it did not happen. I think the animal was never seen again.

Ken – Are you aware what Colorado is doing on the Western Slope?

Kim – Yes. He's referencing Colorado is currently in the signature gathering phase to put a ballot initiative that would be voted on next November to introduce wolves in the Western Slope. So, if something like that were to happen, I think that would certainly trigger assumptions of our plan have changed and we'd need to reconvene to address those issues.

Eric – Some clarification where it says, the state law prevents the establishment of wolves in any delisted area, which would be the I-15/I-80 section, then the plan is saying, I guess the plan kind of contradicts itself where it says to allow them to be considered established for maybe two years?

Kim – Sorry about that. This right here, the state law is the Wolf Management Act. And what the Wolf Management Act was put into place where there was partial delisting in the state. The Wolf Management Plan, was written with the idea that the entire state would be managed and we would have the authority statewide. When the partial delisting came, the legislature came in and put this Wolf Management Act in place that said, we won't manage to the wolf management plan until we get the statewide delisting. So, that is why there is that conflict there.

Eric – So there is no management as far as looking for any established animals. I mean, if a wolf comes into the delisted area it's to be removed if you can find it. Is that correct?

Kim – Essentially. We're not going to chase around a lone wolf but if there is evidence of pair formation, the law directs that.

Ken – We went ten years then we upped it for five more, now are we going back to ten?

Kim – Because we expected things to change in five years and they didn't. I sure wish we would have got for ten last time.

Joshua – Does the current management plan in the listed or delisted allow for any breeding pairs?

Kim – Yes it does. It's the interim period from wolves just entering the state to the two established.

Steve – How far south of I-80 have you had any documented sightings?

Kim – The farthest South documented wolf was an animal that showed up on the North rim of the Grand Canyon and then moved back North through Utah.

Steve – Within the state of Utah as far down as the Manti La Sals? Or further south?

Kim – This animal was killed down by Beaver and we know that there is remote camera footage of it crossing an underpass near Kanab. It was south of the state then came back north.

Questions from the Public

John Ziegler – Who determines why part of the state is delisted and part of it listed? By listed I assume, protected.

Kim – This is all under the Federal Endangered Species Act. That small portion of Northern Utah was included in the Northern Rocky Mountains state population segment. So, this was a decision by the Fish and Wildlife Service to include that as part of that Northern Rocky Mountains population while it excluded the rest of the state.

John Ziegler – So Fish and Wildlife Service doesn't recognize state borders but recognizes ? regions? Is that what you are saying?

Kim – Sometimes, in this instance.

John Ziegler – But Josh asked about whether the current management results in perhaps in reproducing pairs of wolves. Doesn't what you presented indicate that the management plan right now, if it's in a delisted area the DWR removes the wolf and if it's a listed area the US Fish and Wildlife has to remove the wolf until such time the entire state is delisted? How likely is the state to be delisted given the critical environment of that wolf population?

Kim – March of last year there was a Fish and Wildlife Service submitted a draft rule to delist all wolf populations throughout the continental United States. So, that rule could be finalized at any time within a year of that period and at that point management authority would be transferred to Utah. It will be litigated.

JASON VERNON SHARED SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ONLINE

For the Wolf Management Plan that Kim just presented, we had 66% that were neutral on the proposal, 17% supported it and 17% opposed it.

Comments from the Public

None

RAC Discussion

Brock – Any comment from the RAC? Let’s hear it Josh.

Josh – I’m going to keep my thoughts where they belong.

Ben – I move to accept as presented.

Brock – I have a motion to accept as presented and a second. Any discussion? All in favor? Unanimous. Thank you, Kim. Next is Marty Bushman.

VOTING

Motion made by Ben, seconded by Ken to accept the Division’s recommendations as presented.

In Favor: Ben, Scott, Ken, Steve, Eric, Joshua

Opposed:

Abstained:

Motion passes unanimously

6 Brine Shrimp COR Rule Amendment **Martin Bushman, Asst. Attorney General**

Questions from the RAC

Scott - Is there a limit on harvest that can be done on a COR?

Marty – There is not on an individual COR but there is an unusual limit on brine shrimp. It’s based off of modeling that was done years ago of trying to leave enough brine shrimp in the Great Salt Lake to create enough production for the following year. I think its 21 cysts per liter of water. So, when they are surveying the Great Salt Lake during the harvest season it hits an average of 21 cysts per liter of water. They take samples all over the South arm of the Great Salt Lake. They shut down the harvest for everybody. Then if it starts to pick up again, if it’s still within the season they will open it back up.

Scott – What is the season?

Marty – It’s October- January 31. The nicest times...

Joshua – How long is the COR? You said it has to have at least five years left of the COR?

Marty – One year, oh not the COR. So, if you’re going to transfer a COR without the whole company, and you don’t have equipment, you’ve got to have a contract with another entity that is going to provide harvest operations. That contract has to be assignable to the person that is acquiring the COR and it has to have at least five years on it.

Scott – Initially, there were 79 CORS issued because that number was pulled out of a hat. It was the magic number.

Marty – It was scientifically derived. It was before my time.

Scott – I’m just curious why we’re just not retiring COR’s. I mean if it’s a monetary thing, why don’t you just retire COR’s and give one or two out? If it’s the entire entity and resolve the whole issue? You give one to the co-op and one to the other group.

Marty – The co-op doesn’t technically, it’s their members that hold the COR’s. The co-op is just performing services for those COR holders. As far as why have we stayed at 79? Back in the 1990’s it was determined that that was the number the division was comfortable with that we wouldn’t see overharvest. In other words, getting ahead of the headlights because in the ‘90’s and early 2000’s there

were a lot of boats out on the lake and they could pull in a lot of product very rapidly if conditions were right.

Scott – Why would a single entity have more than one COR?

Marty – They would have more harvest boats out. We have to have a COR for each harvest boat or shore harvest. There are some that will rake the dry eggs off of the sands on the shore and process them there.

Scott – So a COR is effectively tied to a harvesting piece of equipment?

Marty – Well, a better one would be a harvest location, not so much the equipment. You're going to claim a location where you're going to harvest you have to have a certificate of registration for that location.

Scott – Is that person restricted to that location or is it mobile?

Marty – I don't know how much you want to learn about this.

Scott – I know nothing about it. None of it makes sense to me.

Marty – They tend to float to the surface of the water, sometimes through the water column, the conditions get right usually later in the year they float to the surface and then the wind blows and it forms what they call streaks. That middle picture there, the dark is the product and they put oil boom (?) around it to corral it. It doesn't form big globs. It's usually long streaks so, they'll put a boom around that and then pump it off the surface of the water. Once that location is marked they have a protection that other people, 300 yard radius around it that other companies can't come in and try to harvest part of that streak. It's a whole different world than hunting and fishing. They have some very unique processes in how it's harvested and a little bit different than hunting and fishing. There is no daily bag limits.

Steve- How does the royalty work?

Marty – The royalty is based off of raw harvest weight. Its 3.5 cents per pound, 335 shares? Over a million dollars. That's set by statute, we don't change that in rule.

Eric – Did you say how many are in the co-op and how many are their own entities?

Marty – 66 COR's are held by the co-op, 11 are held by Ocean Star international that is not in the co-op. Ocean Star and the Co-op right now are harvesting on the lake.

Questions from the Public

None

Comments from the Public

Don Leonard – I'm chairman and CEO of the Great Salt Lake brine shrimp co-operative which was formed in 2006 for the purpose of allowing the local Utah based industry to be able to effectively compete against foreign resources. 99% of our product is sold in Asia, South America, Europe, outside the U.S. and our competitors' product is produced in Russia, China, Uzbekistan, so we're competing against product that is produced at a much lower price. It costs about half as much to produce foreign product as it does here in the U.S. because of labor costs, regulatory costs, etc. So, the co-op was formed in 2006 to try and get those economies to scale to allow us to be able to compete with those foreign sources. I'm here for one reason only and that is to endorse and express support for the rule changes that Marty has conveyed as a recommendation from the DWR. I'm happy to answer any questions. I ask for your support and thank you for your service. And to add my knowledge about bears and hounds has multiplied.

JASON VERNON SHARED SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENT ONLINE

We had 79% that were neutral on the proposal, 10% opposed and 10% supported.

RAC Discussion

None

Scott – I'll make a motion to accept the recommendation as proposed.

Brock – Any discussion? All in favor? It's unanimous. We are adjourned. Thank you.

VOTING

Motion made by Scott, seconded by Ken to accept the Division's recommendations as presented.

In Favor: Ben, Scott, Ken, Steve, Eric, Joshua

Opposed:

Abstained:

Motion passes unanimously

Meeting adjourned: 9: 05 pm
In attendance: 43 public, 10 DWR employees, 8 RAC members
Next board meeting: January 7, 2020, 9:00 am, DNR boardroom, Salt Lake City
Next RAC meeting: Tentatively - April 2020, 6:00 pm, DWR Central Region Conference Room

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

5

Date 2-4-19

Name Chet Young Phone Number 435-671-7255

Address 2175 E main canyon road wallsburg ut 84082

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Bear

COMMENTS I do not support the DNR's proposal.

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

5

Date 12-03-19

Name Jason Binder Phone Number 435-671-0637

Address P.O. Box 217 Wallsbury Ut 84082

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? #5 Bear Recommendation

COMMENTS I do not support restricted pursuit on
Lasal, San Juan, book gifts.

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date Dec 3, 2019

Name Cotton Belliston Phone Number 801-669-0210

Address 130 South State Street, UT

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? All

COMMENTS _____

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date _____

Name Scott Oka Phone Number 471-1573

Address 836 Wigg Halla Sp Fork

Who are you representing? self group Wool Growers

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? _____

COMMENTS trapped great job
more bears pay

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date 12/2/19

5

Name Cory Huntsman

Phone Number 801-875-5367

Address 1786 Bryan Rd

Who are you representing? self group Utah Handsman Association

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Bears

COMMENTS _____

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date 12-3-19

Name Jessi Painter Phone Number _____

⑤ Address _____

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Bear

COMMENTS _____

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

5

Date 12/3/2019

Name Sundays Hunt Phone Number 801-455-8118

Address 4965 S. Holladay Pines Ct.

Who are you representing? self group HSUS

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Black Bear + Cougar Rule + Utah's Wolf

COMMENTS Management Plan 10 Yrs.

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

5

Date 12/3/19

Name Eric Cockayne Phone Number 801) 834-4278

Address 4158 Grizzly Gulch, Taylorsville UT 84129

Who are you representing? self group

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Bear

COMMENTS I would like to add my support to the Utah Houndsman Associations Response to the proposed changes to the bear seasons

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

5

Date Dec 3, 2019

Name Sadie Young Phone Number 435-671-5920

Address 2285 E Main Canyon Road Wallburg VT. 04092

Who are you representing? self group

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Number 5

COMMENTS I do NOT support the DNR's proposal.

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date December 3rd, 2019

Name Shyann Young Phone Number 435-671-6672

Address 2285 E Main canyon rd walsburg, ut 84082

Who are you representing? self group

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Bear

COMMENTS I do not support the DNR's proposal.

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

5

Date 12/03/2019

Name Robert Olson

Phone Number 435-469-0057

Address 31750 N. 11500 E. Fairview, UT 84629

Who are you representing? self group

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Bear

COMMENTS I do not support the DNR's proposal.

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date 12-3-19

Name Don Leonard Phone Number 801-560-1200

Address 1750 S. 2450 S., Ogden, UT

Who are you representing? self group GSL Brine Shrimp Cooperative

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? # 7 Brine Shrimp COR Rule

COMMENTS _____

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

7

**Northern Regional Advisory Council
December 4, 2019
Brigham City Community Center
Brigham City, Utah**

Draft Meeting Minutes

Meeting Begins: 6:00p.m.

RAC Present

Ryan Brown- At Large
Paul Chase- Forest Service
David Earl- Agric.
Christopher Hoagstrom- Noncon.
Emily Jenco- BLM
Aaron Johnson_ Sportsman
Matt Klar- At Large
Mike Laughter - Sportsman
Kevin McLeod- At Large
Kristin Purdy- Noncon.
Casey Snider- Elected

DWR Present

Jodie Anderson
Hayley Smith
Justin Dolling
Randy Wood
David Beveridge
Jim Christensen
Darren Debloois
Ben Nadolski
Martin Bushman
Devin Christensen
Jordan Hastings
Roger Stringham
John Luft
Kyle Stone
Kimberly Hersey

Wildlife Board

Bret Selman

RAC Excused

Junior Goring- Agric
Randy Hutchison- At Large
Justin Oliver-Chair
Darren Parry-Shoshone Nation

RAC Unexcused

Agenda:

Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure
Approval of Agenda and November 13, 2019 Minutes
Wildlife Board Update
Regional Update
R657-33 Black Bear and R657-10 Cougar Rule Amendments
Wolf Management Plan
Brine Shrimp COR Rule Amendments

Item 1. Approval of Agenda

-Mike Laughter, Vice-Chair

Agenda Approved

Item 2. Approval of November 13, 2019 Minutes

-Mike Laughter, Vice-Chair

Minutes approved as circulated.

Item 3. Wildlife Board Update

-Justin Dolling, Regional Supervisor

Wildlife Board has not occurred.

Item 4. Regional Update

- Justin Dolling, Regional Supervisor

Outreach- Fishing guidebooks have arrived.

Great Salt Lake Program- 19 trumpeter swans have been harvested. Utah has a swan hunt, so it is not illegal to harvest trumpeters but do have a threshold of 20. If we reach that limit, the season is closed down.

Brine Shrimp- Harvesters have harvested a little over 34 million pounds of brine shrimp cysts from the Great Salt Lake. Record year for that industry.

Wildlife Section- Trap nuisance turkeys throughout Cache Valley, Mountain Green and Bountiful. Disease testing with elk at Hardware Ranch.

Habitat- Flying seed on fire scares in West Box Elder County. Continue running bulldozer scalper to plant brush on the WMA's as long as the weather allows. Feel like relationship with UDOT is strong and they are receptive with working with us on wildlife crossing.

Law Enforcement- Working on several wildlife cases. Beginning winter range patrols and also antler gathering patrol work.

Aquatics- Bonneville white fish spawn is happening at Bear Lake. Goes through the 3rd week in December.

Justin Dolling is retiring. Ben Nadolski will be replacing Justin after the first of the year.

Aaron Johnson- Have we ever closed the swan hunt down in the past?

Justin Dolling- We never have. Our quota use to be 8 but because trumpeter swans are doing so well and have reached their population objective, that allowed us to liberalize the swan hunting season. The hunting boundary increased as well as the permits offered. The quota on trumpeters went from 8 to 20 now.

Item 5. R657-33 Black Bear and R657-10 Cougar Rule Amendments

- Darren DeBlois, Mammals Program Coordinator

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Aaron Johnson- Concerns about the language in the rule changes. It says: "An individual may not pursue a bear with more than the maximum number of dogs allowed in a single pursuit regardless if the individual owns or controls the dogs encountered in the field". The way I read that, if I turned out 8 dogs and my friend turned out 8 dogs, that is our 16-dog limit. If I'm at the tree and his dog comes into the tree and that makes 17 and we have encountered another dog in the field, am I doing to get a citation?

Darren DeBlois- You would have to work that out with law enforcement.

Aaron Johnson- Because that happens all the time. Dogs get split up and you didn't do anything wrong and another guys dogs come in.

Darren DeBlois- As always, our officers have discretion and it would be a matter of working through it.

Aaron Johnson- Is the AG's office here?

Darren Debloois- Yes, Marty is here.

Aaron Johnson- Am I reading that wrong?

Darren Debloois-No.

Aaron Johnson- So I could get a citation.

Darren Debloois- Correct.

Aaron Johnson- So I am just relying on the discretion of the officer.

Darren Debloois- Right.

Aaron Johnson- Back to the 3-year plan, why so many changes? Can you go into more detail?

Darren Debloois- We are addressing some very specific things on specific units. We felt like we are making conservative recommendation to address concerns brought to us. We did tell the group that there is a public process after their meeting which is what this is. Our effort was to try and address the concerns in a way that works under our current framework. We are issuing a lot of tags to residents to avoid restricting a lot of people. The concern was to look at non-resident pursuit to see if that is the issue?

Aaron Johnson- Have you ever been to the La Sals, San Juans or Bookcliffs hunting?

Darren Debloois- No, I work with the region down there.

Aaron Johnson- Do you have any personal knowledge of overcrowding by 88 people on one mountain range. What is too many people on the mountain range at one time.

Darren Debloois- Again, I am relying on the folks down there to explain what the issues are. It is not just a crowding issue; the forest has come to us with resource concerns.

Aaron Johnson- My concern is that I think there was 369 bear pursuit permits issued during the spring. Is 300 too many on a mountain range. You are saying 88 is too many.

Darren Debloois- If land management partners are coming with concerns and law enforcement are coming to us with concerns, we have to address it.

Aaron Johnson- Can you tell us what those concerns are?

Darren Debloois- I listed them.

Aaron Johnson- Which are?

Darren Debloois- Too many people, too many dogs and the non-resident concern. They are all interlinked.

Aaron Johnson- Someone speak up from the Forest Service. 88 people.

Darren Debloois- Plus the hunters.

Aaron Johnson- Is 400 deer hunters on that mountain too many? I think they give 400 tags for the archery hunt, rifle hunt and muzzleloader hunt?

Paul Chase- We are not hearing complaints about that. We have to address concerns when they arise. This is an effort to address those concerns.

Aaron Johnson- Could these concerns be biased?

Darren Debloois- I can't speak to that.

Aaron Johnson- Were there any citations issued by the Forest Service for habitat damage or anything like that?

Darren Debloois- I don't work for the Forest Service so I don't know what they cited. We do have some data.

Aaron Johnson- Can you address that from the Forest Service.

Darren Debloois- They didn't send me any comments, so I don't know what was going on down there. I have the same packet you got. They did not contact me at all.

Aaron Johnson- Any other sportsman groups that have specific restrictions from the Forest Service? Does the La Sal Mountains have specific restrictions.

Darren Debloois- They have a camping.

Aaron Johnson- That is for everybody. Is there any specific law against deer or elk or anything like that?

Darren Debloois- I don't know.

Aaron Johnson- This isn't Darren's fault. How many people in this group you put together were part of the bear committee that has been going on for years and years?

Darren Debloois- The bear committee gets disbanded after we do the plan so there is not an active bear committee. I think Dustin Mitchell was part of the bear committee.

Aaron Johnson- Would it be fair to say this group was very new as a bear discussion group.

Darren Debloois- We selected them because we felt like they were experts on the unit. We had local hunters that knew the unit and we had a couple reps from the houndsmen board. We had local Forest Service and our regional folks.

Aaron Johnson- Anyone on the board that is familiar with what has been addressed in the past or with things agreed upon?

Darren Debloois- That is my job.

Aaron Johnson- Did you address that in the past bear committees, that never restricting spring pursuit had come up with all those people?

Darren Debloois- This is a separate issue and an attempt to address specific concerns. What we are recommending tonight is a social solution to a social problem.

Aaron Johnson- Nothing to do with science.

Darren Debloois- It is not a resource issue. It is about people management. This is what this committee is set up to address. I would suggest that the committee take it apart and if you have concerns, let's work through it.

Aaron Johnson- These complaints you keep referencing, what are the complaints? Too many people? Who are the complaints coming from, the Forest Service?

Darren Debloois- Forest Service is concerned about what they are seeing with wet roads and closed roads.

Aaron Johnson- Are we going to limit the horn hunters that are there before the houndsmen.

Darren Debloois- I don't manage that stuff. All I can do is address bear stuff.

Aaron Johnson- You are making a restriction against a sportsman hunter.

Darren Debloois- We are trying to allow the most opportunity for residents on the unit while addressing the concerns about non-resident numbers. I guarantee everyone came out of that meeting not quite getting what they wanted. We certainly compromised.

Aaron Johnson- Does the Boulders recommendation have anything to do with science?

Darren Debloois- Certainly, we have seen a decline in deer numbers on that unit.

Aaron Johnson- It is because of bears?

Darren Debloois- We don't know. The recommendations fall within the plan guidelines for permit adjustment. We have increased bear permits on that unit for 5 years. We added the spot and stock tags last time. Sometimes, if you don't have the data, you have to make an educated guess. This is an effort to address several things and bear is one of the things they wanted to try and address.

Aaron Johnson- It was so important last year that we went to this 3-year data so that we did not keep changing numbers year to year.

Darren Debloois- Again, that is why we are only talking about one unit.

Aaron Johnson- So important on this unit to do that. You said it would have to be an emergency.

Darren Debloois- There are some very serious concerns on that unit. Especially after the deer hunt this year. We felt like we needed to address it now.

Aaron Johnson- As an emergency

Darren Debloois- Yes.

Christopher Hoagstrom- Besides the bears, can you tell us what the other things?

Darren Debloois- There is habitat component. They feel they are good on lion tag numbers where they are. They are going to be collaring deer next week so we will have more data on bears and will be able to answer some of these science questions and what might be going on. We may make adjustments after that. Sometimes, as a biologist, you don't have the convenience of having all the answers and try to make a professional adjustment about what might help.

Aaron Johnson- You are restricting spring pursuit for residents and non-residents.

Darren Debloois- The reason that we are doing it this way is because it is a system we currently have in place. We have a way to limit the number of non-residents who participate in an activity under a restricted pursuit season. We wanted to be liberal with resident permits. Most residents, at least based on where they self-select, will have an opportunity to draw. The waiting period is another thing and I would encourage the RAC to talk about that.

Aaron Johnson- Your restricting residents and non-residents on the big 3. You have set a number that, you think, most people can obtain.

Darren Debloois- Right. If you don't draw a tag, you can still pursue anywhere else in the state.

Aaron Johnson- This is in order to curb complaints or overcrowding issues.

Darren Debloois- Right.

Aaron Johnson- A lot of it from non-residents?

Darren Debloois- That is what came out of our meetings. First of all, there are a lot of people here and what the houndsmen said is that they feel like it is a non-resident issue. Residents are not causing the problem. This is the way to limit non-resident.

Aaron Johnson- Why are we not just limiting non-residents?

Darren Debloois- This gets to administration. The more novel solutions you come up with, the more likely we are to get litigated when we restrict non-resident participation. This is a system we have in place. We already do it. We are not making special restrictions on non-residents. This is how it is going to be on these units. There are certainly other ways to get at this. The primary concern is limiting non-residents that have some kind of business or livelihood interest. This would not do that, if you are a guide or outfitter, you can still guide a resident that has a permit. This is strictly a recreational limitation. This will address the concerns made by the committee. There may be other ways to restrict non-resident participation. The cuter and more creative we get, the more likely to cause problems.

Aaron Johnson- We have talked for years about bears. This has come up every year. This non-resident question.

Darren Debloois- Right.

Aaron Johnson- It has been discussed every year in the bear committee meeting. Why is it so important that we change it this year? At least for 10 years, I was told it was not a problem. Explain why when the bear pursuit numbers went down this year, they had an overcrowding problem this year.

Darren Debloois- I think you nailed it. This has been a chronic problem year after year. This is an effort to try and address it. If it is not popular and if people don't like it, it is social.

Aaron Johnson- Is it fair to say it is a perceived problem by some?

Darren Debloois- That is what we were trying to get at in the committee? The sense in the committee is that this is a real concern. That is the opinion of the committee.

Aaron Johnson- I have a problem with stacking a committee from people that are worried about their own back yard. I think that will come up a lot here. It is perceived problems. Is there any way to measure this? How many is too many because if we set a number now and we don't solve these perceived problems, what do we do next?

Darren Debloois- My philosophy is to do little things first. In my estimation, this is a pretty conservative recommendation to try and address a problem. We are doing several things at once. We are limiting the number of dogs. We are limiting the number of non-residents and maybe that is all it will take. That is my recommendation to the RAC.

Aaron Johnson- I have to question the motives here.

Emily Jensco- Can you go back to the slide of the members of the committee that was formed and walk us through that one more time?

Darren Debloois- From the DWR we had myself, regional manager, district biologist, law enforcement lieutenant for one meeting and the sergeant for the other meeting. We had 2 Forest Service representatives from the La Sal National Forest. One SITLA member and 2 local houndsmen. One is local and lives there, the other is from Tooele but hunts there quite a bit and was suggested that we include him because he knew the issues. Also, 2 board members.

Aaron Johnson- Are any of these complaints documented?

Darren Debloois- The reason we put the committee together was to get to the bottom of it. If you are asking if we have certain complaints on certain dates. We have a little bit of that. The email I saw today said they had about 10 complaints this year, mostly trespass.

Aaron Johnson- When you say this year, what are you talking about?

Darren Debloois- This last season. Last spring. We talked about this before the season started this year. Mostly trespass. Dave has a breakdown of citations. We are not saying houndsmen are breaking the law, that is not the problem. There are a lot of people and it is hard to police. You have one law enforcement officer on the unit. Everyone on the committee had the opportunity to question if it was real or not. I did tell them there was a public process and that needed to play out too.

Aaron Johnson- This is a perceived problem with no documentation?

Mike Laughter- Didn't we just address that?

Aaron Johnson- No, we didn't. I asked if there was any documentation. Is there any documentation?

Darren Debloois- There is a little bit, but I don't have that at my fingertips. It is mostly about the people in the area on the unit and this is what they are telling me.

Aaron Johnson- It would be legal to restrict non-residents and unrestricted residents. Does that make sense?

Darren Debloois- You could do that in principle.

Aaron Johnson- Legally.

Darren Debloois- Legally that could be done. Logistically, it is more difficult. The reason we are recommending this is because we currently have a system in place. It does not mean it is the only way it can happen and are open to suggestions if you feel like there is a better way to go. It would not be illegal.

Aaron Johnson- The reason I ask is because I think it has been asked for years and years and was told it was not illegal. Did any laws change Marty?

Martin Bushman- Recreational pursuit we can carve out entirely. taking such extreme measures when it is inconsistent how we deal with non-residents else where in the system, it makes you more vulnerable. Hard facts make bad law. Judges sometimes give a sympathetic fact and are willing to part from the law to do an outcome that they think is just. For the situation it might be but for the state law it is not. We try to not take everything to the edge of authority, and this is a compromise. 10% is how we deal with big game and other ones and think that is a safe place to be to avoid litigation. If we are talking about commercial pursuit like guides or photographers, that implicates the privilege and immunity clause that says each state will afford the same privilege and immunity to citizens of another state. Our courts included that into making a living. That is one of those privileges that is protected. If we discriminate against non-residents coming into our state and the ability to make a living through commercial pursuit, we are going to run into problems. We worked that out

about 10 years ago and said people who guide needs a guide license, not a pursuit permit. We can then deal with residents how we want. I think 10% is a good place to be. It is consistent with our practice.

Aaron Johnson- I agree with everything you said. The question is if its illegal to limit non-residents and not limit residents.

Martin Bushman- Yes. In this instance, it may not be a good idea to carve non-residents.

Aaron Johnson- Because of a potential lawsuit from a non-resident.

Martin Bushman- It invites someone to challenge you. When you take extreme positions, it is more likely to get challenged. It is more likely to get a judge sympathetic to those facts and you get a bad decision.

Darren Debloois- These are all discussions we had during the process and made recommendations based on all this feedback.

Aaron Johnson- When you buy a pursuit permit, you buy it for the state of Utah. You don't pick an area?

Darren Debloois- Right, except for summer.

Aaron Johnson- How did you determine the number like 88?

Darren Debloois- Every year we do a survey pursuer and that is how it broke out. We usually lump everyone together. 88 was the total number of people selected over 5 years. High is about 100, low is about 54.

Kristin Purdy- I was looking for information that justified the limit of 16 dogs. You did cite the fact that the Forest Service limits it to 16 dogs. This number of 16 is simply to align the rule with the Forest Services policy. There is no particular guidelines of what the right number of dogs is. It could be 8 or 17.

Darren Debloois- It was partly to align with Forest Service but also, we sat down with houndsmen and there was concern about this concept of chasing an animal to the point that it is no longer capable of getting away. This is a minority occurrence but does occur. This helps when our officers make a case on something like that, they can enforce it. We felt like we needed a pack size restriction but also felt like that was not necessarily to the concern we had with fair chase and ethical practices which is why we added language about pursuing an animal past exhaustion. Most houndsmen don't use 16 dogs to pursue but may want someone else to come. It also allows to train pups.

Kristin Purdy- You also had input from the houndsmen that 16 would work? You were considering to align with Forest Service but in discussion with houndsmen, they felt this was a good number?

Darren Debloois- Yes, we were just going to do it on the La Sals but decided to do it statewide.

Public Questions

Troy Justensen- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Can you tell us what the central RAC decided on and what the discussion was?

Darren Debloois- We had a lot of the same discussions. They made 3 motions. The first was to table restricted pursuits and leave things status quo and go with the 16-dog pack size limit. They also voted to include an ethics portion in the current mandatory bear orientation program. The rest was to accept the balance as presented. They discussed it for a while.

Troy Justensen- Would you please recap for me.

Darren Debloois- Except for restricted pursuit, they passed what we are recommending tonight. In addition, they want a mandatory portion for the bear orientation course on ethics.

Troy Justensen- Was there a considerable amount of houndsmen there last night?

Darren Debloois- Yes.

Troy Justensen- What was the mood?

Darren Debloois- There is some concern about restricted pursuit so I know we will talk more about that tonight.

Houndsmen do a lot of hard work for us. We appreciate everything they do. The division supports the sport and we don't have any intention of trying to get rid of the use of hounds to hunt bears and lions.

Troy Justensen- Aaron, I am not a houndsmen. You talked about having experience with the units in asking if you have ever been there. I take it you had experience in hunting them?

Aaron Johnson- On every one of them.

Troy Justensen- I would like your opinion on crowding and concerns that have been raised.

Aaron Johnson- I spend 30 days on the Bookcliffs every year. There is no one that has taken more people to kill a trophy animal than me. I don't see another houndsmen because I go where the crowds are not. Do you see deer hunters and is it overcrowded? This perceived problem of overcrowding is from the people who sit on the road. 88 people on a mountain range is too many? It is ridiculous and yes, I have the exact same experience on the San Juan and La Sals. Can you imagine if this passed? I could go hunting every 3 years. This is a perceived problem.

Sierra Nelson- Utah Wool Growers- Recommendations page.

Jeremy Smith- Why can't we do a statewide and limit non-residents? In Idaho, they do 70 non-resident tags. In specific units, they do percentage and that is it.

Darren Debloois- We could. Doing that causes problems with our licensing system. It costs money to re-program. If the RAC wants to do something different, they can recommend that to the board. We are recommending this system because it is p[rogrammed and in place. We are not doing something erratically different that sets a precedence for other things.

Jeremy Smith- On the 16-dog limit for lions, I think it is pretty excessive.

Darren Debloois- You are not required to use 16 dogs, but you could. We felt like the houndsman community could work through this. We had a lot of different opinion and this was the compromise.

Cameron Adams- I spent 10 days on the La Sals this year hunting bears. You are saying that you can't regulate everyone because there is lack of officers, right?

Darren Debloois- That was one of the concerns that the law enforcement raised down there. It was difficult to police with a lot of dogs and people. The committee decided this was an issue with non-residents coming in.

Cameron Adams- The public has to take a hit because we won't hire another law enforcement. I did not see one law enforcement in 10 days.

Darren Debloois- With the recommendation, we try to limit residents as little as possible and try to address the problem. At the same time, restricting non-residents at a lower level. This is our recommendation and if folks have different ideas then please bring them forward.

Shawn Smith- Where are people going to hunt? If you can't draw one in every three years.

Darren Debloois- Aaron do you want to answer that?

Aaron Johnson- It is a problem. Are we just going to push the crowds somewhere else?

Shawn Smith- What is going to happen next year? Your going to complain about overcrowding in a different unit.

Darren Debloois- We offered extra opportunity on the San Juan and Bookcliffs. If you don't get your first choice on the La Sals, we are offering 25 more permits than what people currently go to the San Juan and Bookcliffs. You are likely to get a second choice.

Shawn Smith- What happens to everyone else who doesn't draw, they are going to go to a separate unit?

Darren Debloois- Right. You can pursue anywhere else in the state. We don't think, beyond these three units, it is going to be an issue.

Kevin McLeod- My understanding is that this all has to do with pursuit, not with hunting.

Darren Debloois- Right. It may be helpful to realize that at the same time these pursuit permits are available, there is also hunting permits. They are all on the mountain at the same time. This is 88 permits with their entourages and dogs.

Perceived or real, that is what the public process is for.

Public Comment

Tyler Farr- Utah Houndsmen Association- Supports the DWR bear hunting recommendations except for the following: Does not support restricted pursuit, spring season. Several complaints from San Juan, La Sal and Bookcliffs. Dog limit recommendations would address complaints as well as the mandatory ethics course. Leave spring season as is and allow us to work on the perceived issues within our own ranks. Concerned for our members residing in the southeast corner of the state, not being able to pursue bears. The division has stated concerns about the numbers of non-residents for the spring season to train dogs. We ask that non-residents be excluded from San Juan, La Sal and Bookcliffs pursuit. We do not support any tag increases while in the 3-year cycle.

Tyler Farr- I have been involved with UHA since 2013 and been to many meetings. We always ask if there are any complaints or issues with the spring season. Since 2013 through 2018, we have asked Darren and the biologist before, if there has been any complaints or issues. The answer has been that there are no issues. There was an incident in the spring of 2018, and I feel like, because of this issue, this has been brought up.

Sierra Nelson- Utah Wool Growers Association- This year was not the worst bear year because there were other types of food for bears. The population of bears in the state is going up. Anything you can do to help keep pressure on them is important to us. Recommendation to increase permits to 17 for bait season and 15 for spot and stock, I hope it will help. I hope you give more. There needs to be some flexibility built into the plan. Support recommendations of the division.

Appreciate the increase in tags. Agree with ethics course and think it is a great start.

Troy Justensen- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- We do not support restrictive pursuit. We support the 16-dog limit as well as the increase in permits on the Boulder.

Justin Lindsay- In full support of the UHA and their proposal.

Tyler Farr- Although I am against restricting bear hunters to pursue, the plan that the division is proposed on a limited draw is not going to work. We already have that on our summer restricted pursuit seasons and if you want to know more, I'm sure Darren will explain. La Sal, Bookcliffs and San Juans have two 2-week periods in the summer during July where

houndsmen can put in and draw that unit and have an opportunity to chase bears in July. If I put in me, my wife, kids and my dad, the allotment gets flooded. There are going to be a lot more than 88 people, it will be almost 400. If you take away and start restricting residents, it is going to devastate everyone who owns a hound dog and spends all year taking care of them, not to use them.

Online Comments

Justin Dolling- We had a total of 17 comments for all 3 topics. For bear, there was 50% support for the division recommendation, 28% were opposed and 22% were neutral.

Aaron Johnson- You said you had 17 comments for bears.

Justin Dolling- No, 17 comments that were focused on the northern region. All 17 individuals commented on all 3 topics.

Aaron Johnson- Do you know the number from the other regions and what those percentages were by chance?

Justin Dolling- I don't.

Aaron Johnson- I read through them all and I know there was a lot more than 17. There were pages and pages. I don't want to misspeak but I think it was 60% opposed. If you have those numbers but I can tell you what I remember.

Justin Dolling- I am also on that mail server and I received 17 comments for the northern region. I didn't have access to the other parts of the state, so I don't know what came in there. Do you have access to that?

Aaron Johnson- I think I saw a pie chart of opposed, not opposed or neutral. I know it was more than 17 comments.

Mike Laughter- It was quite a few more.

Aaron Johnson- Like in the hundreds. I don't know what I have access to but what I remember was like 60% of the state opposed to the bear proposal.

Justin Dolling- I think you are getting mixed up with the other recommendations. There were over 100 of the other recommendations but I saved all of them and put them in a folder and counted them.

Aaron Johnson- I'm not trying to misspeak. Maybe Mike and I are confused.

Justin Dolling- Regardless if there was 17 or 100, the results show that 50% support the recommendation, 28% are opposed and 22% are neutral. Statewide, 61% were opposed.

Aaron Johnson- That is what I was asking.

Justin Dolling- 33% were in support and 6% were neutral.

Aaron Johnson- I'm sorry, I probably misspoke. Those were the numbers I was looking for, the statewide numbers.

Justin Dolling- That is statewide but for our region, those were our results.

Aaron Johnson- I did extra credit work and read the statewide comments.

Matt Klar- Can you tell us why there has to be a waiting period on this draw?

Darren Debloois- A lot of the things that you do as a state agency and Marty spoke to this, you try to be consistent. For bears, if you draw any kind of bear permit that is associated with a bonus point. If you don't draw in a 2-year waiting period. It is just a logistical question and could do something different if we want to.

Paul Chase- How many spring pursuit permits are sold each year to resident and non-resident?

Darren Debloois- Statewide, I would have to look up resident, but it is about 62 non-resident. Most of those folks are going to the La Sals and the balance are mostly going to the San Juan and Bookcliffs.

RAC Comment

Kristin Purdy- We had several of our commenters in the package that we were describing talk about their concern for hunts or pursuits with dogs and how they interfered with other hunts that were occurring at the same time. This is perhaps the information you were asking for. The data supporting this idea. Three different people mentioned pursuit hunt for bears or lions interrupted or destroyed the opportunity with elk, turkey and mule deer archery season. We may not hear from all of the hunters that have that concern but there are at least 3 comments in our comment package we received. Regarding the investment that a houndsman makes in order to be able to pursue his sport, the issue is that after all of the investment and training with dogs and making sure they are trained and taken care of to pursue the sport. That is not the justification for the sport. The important thing is that the population of the game animal is healthy and secure. It is not about the effort put into training and grooming his kennel of dogs.

Aaron Johnson- Those are some great comments. There is no deer or elk hunt in the spring. We are talking about restricting the spring. There is a turkey hunt. It is possible or likely that this one person was molested by the dog hunts.

Kristin Purdy- One comment was specifically archery hunt which starts mid-August.

Aaron Johnson- That does not have anything to do with the spring pursuit. To address that, a couple of years ago the sportsman groups with Darren, proposed season dates that would restrict the bear hunting so that each sportsman group would have days were are not on the mountain. We voted here on the RAC and accepted that plan. Four of the RAC's

accepted it and the Wildlife Board accepted it. One member of the wildlife board, the only opposed, called for a re-vote and they re-voted and did not accept it. We tried to address that to resolve any conflicts with an archery hunter. It took me 16 years to draw my tag on the La Sals. The thing I remember the most is being harassed from law enforcement down there. There were soliciting complaints in preparation to bring this proposal. For 8 years, they had zero complaints on the spring pursuit. I don't think there is a problem with overcrowding. I don't see one person when hunting the Bookcliffs. Don't restrict my opportunity. I believe the southeast region and forest service is anti-hound hunting. This new committee had no one who knew much about it. In my opinion, it was stacked from that region. This is an anti-hound hunting agenda. I have filed complaints and spoke to the chief and apologized for officers submitting complaints. How can the complaints not be documented? The produced 3 complaints from 90 and I have a problem with that. This is a perceived problem by some. There is not a problem down there. 88 people is too many? How many go for the deer hunt? Environment is not being impacted by 16 dogs. One houndsman was cited for having dog poop in the mountains. None of the biologists have been in agreement with restricting resident pursuit, this is the first time it has come up. If you make restrictions and take away houndsmen, and this is the step in that direction, in a few years there will be more restrictions. Doing away with hound hunting will not decrease the take of sheep. You cannot control a bear population with spot and stock or bait hunting. This takes away opportunity. SFW does not support the restricted pursuit. I appreciate that the sportsmen would do that.

Mike Laughter- You don't have any opposition here. We get it and you've made your point. When you're ready to make a motion, you would have the support.

Emily Jencso- The 2 houndsmen that were on the committee, are they active members of the UHA?

Darren Debloois- One was the vice president.

Aaron Johnson- Both are on the hound association board and are new members.

Darren Debloois- The other two we chose because they knew the area.

Emily Jencso- So, there were 4 total. Do you think the recommendation that the committee put together was a potential solution?

Darren Debloois- I think we were asked to try and address concerns. We put the committee together and used that to formulate our recommendations, knowing we still had this public process to go through. This is a social issue. If this was a resource issue, you would probably see different types of recommendations. This is something the RAC can decide one way or the other and will not harm the resource on the La Sals. It is a people issue.

Aaron Johnson- People issue or non-opportunity issue.

Paul Chase- I keep hearing it is more of a non-resident issue. Is this something we can address?

Darren Debloois- The houndsmen on the committee felt like that was the problem. Everybody agreed there were a lot of people and maybe they are all on the roads.

Paul Chase- I'm not familiar with this unit so I'm trying to get to the bottom of it.

Darren Debloois- It may just be a lot of people on the roads driving around and Aaron is probably right. If you get off the road, as with anything, there are less people. Roads are an issue for the Forest Service, especially in the spring.

Paul Chase- It sounds like there is already a 16-dog camp limit down there.

Darren Debloois- Right, they haven't been enforcing it, but they have it on the books and have agreed to start enforcing it.

Aaron Johnson- Turning out 16 dogs on an animal is fine. But the 16-dog camp limit, I have a major concern with. There is no group of sportsmen that is more regulated or harassed by the Forest Service in that region. There are special regulations for this group of hunters. We have to decide if that is ok or not. DWR sicked STLA on me. They looked at the camp and saw how clean it was but were called by fish and game to come and harass me. Asked that they call him when making a complaint which they didn't. I hope this board would not accept it. I have problems with all of it and the wording is not good. I'm ok with helping law enforcement so criminals can be prosecuted. Putting all discretion in the officer's hands is not a good idea. Oppose restricted pursuit for anyone. Houndsmen are not ruining roads, it is the horn hunters and I am not against horn hunting. The roads are ruined by other outdoor enthusiasts' months before houndsmen hunt bears. We set a 3-year plan last year and here we are. I agree with Sierra. We voted on the 3-year plan and I don't see the emergency issue. We should vote on each of these issues and not make it one big confusing motion.

Motion

Motion- Aaron Johnson- Recommend the Wildlife Board reject the DWR proposal for restricted spring bear pursuit.

Second- Ryan Brown

Discussion on the motion

Emily Jencso- Will you read the numbers one more time for the northern region.

Aaron Johnson- We have just northern region.

Emily Jencso- I wish it was. Can you still read them to me one more time please?

Justin Dolling- How would you like me to present them? For the northern region or statewide?

Emily Jencso- Just the northern region.

Justin Dolling- Bear proposal rule and amendments, those that live in the northern region, 50% supported the proposal. 8% opposed the proposal and 22% were neutral.

Motion Passes: For: 5, Against: 4, Abstain:1

Matt Klar- I don't support either way. I don't think we have enough information to make an informed decision.

Paul Chase- Give weight to what committee has gone through and the 50% support in the northern region.

Kristin Purdy- I think the restrictions are appropriate. We have had more feedback that requires restrictions, so I am in favor of them.

Kevin McLeod- The division did their due diligence in putting a committee together and getting that input. The recommendations came out in a fair and concise way. I think it was thought out pretty well.

Emily Jencso- I echo what Kevin and Paul said. The northern region had more support. I wish those rule changes we received with the polling number by the rule changes. I did hear a lot of opposition to the restricted pursuit.

Motion

Motion- Aaron Johnson- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the 16-dog pursuit limit portion of the rule.

Second- David Earl

Discussion on the Motion

Ryan Brown- In accepting that, are we also accepting the change in the rule book? Or is the change in the rule book separate?

Aaron Johnson- Yes, its separate.

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Motion- Aaron Johnson- Recommend the Wildlife Board not to accept the remainder of the rule change.

Matt Klar- Can we suggest modification of the wording?

Aaron Johnson- I'm going to make it real clear and you can present it how you want. I don't want to write their laws for them here. I recommend we do not accept the remainder of the rule change because there is that one portion where some guy is going to get a ticket who did nothing wrong. If they want to address it in the future, that is fine. I think it will become too confusing. If you have a suggestion. Concerned about the 16-dog limit and the risk of getting a ticket for not doing anything wrong if another hunters dogs pursue the same bear I am pursuing.

Emily Jencso- Darren did address that earlier and said it was at the discretion of the law enforcement officer.

Aaron Johnson- My problem with that is that some officers will cite you. Officers need discretion but I don't think that law is written good. I hope they would look at that better.

Justin Dolling- If you are going to make that kind of recommendation, you need to add language you would feel comfortable with.

Aaron Johnson- I make a motion not to accept the remainder of the rule change. Not the remainder of the DWR bear proposal but the remainder of the rule change. We are only accepting the 16-dog limit. Does that make sense.

Darren Debloois- Yes, I am probably thinking about this different. In my mind the part of the 16-dog limit includes language about conglomeration of dogs arriving at a tree. The only way to enforce this in the field is by counting heads at a tree or watch people turn dogs out or gathered up on the road. Again, officers have discretion and they will have to sort things out. If anyone wants to speak on how to make decisions on that kind of stuff.

Aaron Johnson- We've had discussions, but the concern is how to enforce it.

Darren Debloois- This is a hard sport to regulate. The options are to do the best we can and try to make professional judgements that regulate things to the point we feel like we are protecting the resource. Or, we don't allow the activity and that is not something we want to do. You have to deal with things as they are in reality.

Aaron Johnson- I don't want this to drag on. Withdraw the motion. I hope I don't get cited because a friend comes along with his dogs on accident to my tree and we are both in trouble.

Motion

Motion-Aaron Johnson- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the remainder of the rule changes.

Second- Paul Chase

Discussion on the Motion

Kristin Purdy- My brain has gotten very fuzzy by the collective noun of “remainder”. I would like a list of what the remainder of the rule changes are so that I am clear on what I am voting for or opposed to.

Darren Debloois- You are voting on changes which include: The 16-dog limit, which you have already voted on. There is some language about how we determine 16 dogs in the field and that is included. It also includes the language on pursuing a bear or lion.

Kristin Purdy- The 16-dog limit is not on the table. We voted on that already. So that is not part of the remainder. We start with the verbiage that allows the law enforcement officer to make his judgement.

Darren Debloois- Right, the next thing would be this language of a person may not pursue an animal to the point of exhaustion. That has been in there. The intent has been there but felt like we needed to clarify that. The other is that a person must make reasonable efforts to call off dogs from a lion quartered and held at bay. That should be the balance of the rule changes.

Aaron Johnson- They are written really good its just that one sentence that will get some guy cited.

Ryan Brown- We are starting with the concern about the rule and in this vote, we are going to be voting to accept the remainder.

Mike Laughter- The remainder of the rule changes.

Ryan Brown- Including the concern about extra dogs showing up at the tree.

Motion Passes: For: 8 Against:1

Ryan Brown- I am still hung up on the vagueness of that one sentence in the law. I would hate to be the guy who is there with his dogs and this scenario has been presented. That is something that concerns me.

Motion

Motion- Aaron Johnson-Recommend the Wildlife Board not to accept the bear tag increase on the Boulder Mountains. Wait for the 3-year average.

Motion Failed due to lack of a second.

Motion

Motion- Aaron Johnson- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the remainder of R657-33 Black Bear and R657-10 Cougar Rule Amendments as presented.

Second- Kevin McLeod

Discussion on the Motion

Kristin Purdy- Proposal to not increase the number of bear permits until we get to 3-year average. Do we understand why the deer herd is doing so poorly in that area?

Darren Debloois- We think we know some factors. Drought is a contributor. The concern is significant enough that we would like to try multi-prong approach there.

Kristin Purdy- Do we know that predator kills are a factor?

Darren Debloois- We don't have data on that. We do know that bears can key in on neonatal fawns in the spring. We don't have any evidence on this unit.

Kristin Purdy- We are trying to manage without data that describes what the problem is.

Darren Debloois- You have to make an educated guess sometimes and take data from other areas and do things that we feel might help in a situation that you feel like you can't wait.

Emily Jencso- There is no proposed changes to the deer permit numbers in that unit this year? I know that is a tough question.

Darren Debloois- Deer tags will not be posted until spring. Those types of discussions would happen between now and those recommendations. They are looking at a lot of things.

Emily Jencso- Are you already having those discussions with big game biologist regarding that unit?

Darren Debloois- Yes, we talked about his concerns and they will make recommendations for deer accordingly.

David Earl- What is the remainder of the plan we are voting on?

Aaron Johnson- The Boulder and ethics course.

Darren Debloois- What we said was more informational but we will get with houndsman and do that. The central region voted to make that mandatory orientation. That is not our recommendation. If the RAC wants to do it that way, you can make a motion. Right now, we are just going to make it voluntary but push it out so it is not something you have to come to an office. You would get it in your email when you buy a tag. You can't enforce ethics but make the materials available.

Aaron Johnson- If we try to make that ethics course happen this year, the draw is right around the corner, and we will rush it. Let's put together an ethics course going forward.

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Item 6. Wolf Management Plan

- Kimberly Hersey, Mammal Conservation Coordinator

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Aaron Johnson- What states have current wolf plans?

Kimberly Hersey- Currently the only area in the US that is fully delisted is the northern rocky mountain distinct population. That includes all of Montana, Wyoming and Idaho. It also includes that small portion of Utah as well as eastern Oregon and eastern Washington.

Aaron Johnson- I read the plan that you helped write. Are the other states similar? Did you take their plans and mirror it or do you even know?

Kimberly Hersey- The biggest difference between the plan and those states is that they have large established wolf populations. They included different things to manage through hunting and population quotas. A lot more specific information than us.

Aaron Johnson- Do all those states currently hunt wolves?

Kimberly Hersey- Idaho, Montana and Wyoming do. But not Oregon and Washington.

Mike Laughter- I read the plan. It talks about mitigation or compensation for livestock owners. Where does that money come from?

Kimberly Hersey- It comes from the same pot of money as cougar and bear depredation.

Mike Laughter- So sportsman dollars, right?

Darren Debloois- That fund is about \$300,000 dollars and half is sportsman dollars and the other is general fund money. It compensates for wolf, bear and lion damage first. If we don't spend the whole budget, then eagles would also be part of that. It gets more complicated after that.

Mike Laughter- If you exceed that amount, that's it?

Darren Debloois- It is prorated. We added enough to get it up to \$300,000 because we had to prorate it a couple years in a row. We have had some wolf depredation in that last little while.

Kristen Purdy- Is there any limit to the number of times the wolf management plan may be extended?

Kimberly Hersey- I would think at some point, we would reach the threshold that there has been enough legal and biological changes to revisit the plan.

Kristen Purdy- if we vote to extend it for another 10 years, the concern is this plan will get sort of fuzzy. It was created in 2005 and the conditions have not come to pass, which is why we are extending it. Any thought that there would be a rewriting of the plan if it appears as though the species is going to be delisted for all of the geographic area.

Kimberly Hersey- I think if a delisting happened and made it through the judicial review, we would want to get people together and decide if it was time to revisit the plan at that time.

Public Comment

Troy Justensen- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Support the division recommendations in extending this plan for 10 years.

Online Comment Summary

Justin Dolling- Northern Region: 61% support, 22% oppose and 17% are neutral. Statewide: 41% support, 26% oppose and 33% are neutral.

RAC Question

Aaron Johnson- How do the livestock guys feel about this plan. I assume they would have an opinion.

David Earl- We support it. The depredation money is there. It has worked in the past.

Motion

Motion-Emily Jencso-Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Wolf Management Plan as presented.

Second-Christopher Hoagstrom

Motion Passes: For: 8 Against:1

Aaron Johnson- I don't like the idea of having wolves here. I know we need a plan but I don't want wolves.

Item 7. Brine Shrimp COR Rule Amendments

- Martin Bushman, Asst. Attorney General

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Kristin Purdy- Why are we specifying that there must be 5 years remaining on the contract?

Martin Bushman- We are using this as a surrogate of physical equipment. If it had 6 months, that is not much. It was a period of time we felt was long enough that represented enough value that we can call it equipment.

Kristin Purdy- It is arbitrary. There is a gut feeling that 5 years ought to be enough.

Martin Bushman- There is nothing scientific or legal about it. We just thought it was a good period of time.

Public Comment

Don Leonard-Great Salt Lake Cooperation- Needed to find ways to more effectively compete against foreign sources produced at a cost far below what it takes for us to produce the product here. Endorse the changes that have been recommended by the division. Ask for unanimous support.

David Earl- When a brine shrimp egg is hatched, does it grow?

Don Leonard- It does but the value of the product is providing baby food for baby shrimp and for fish hatcheries. We are taking that egg and processing to manage and control the hatch. It is hatched and fed to shrimp and fish and hatcheries.

Online Comment Summary

Justin Dolling- Northern region: 39% support, 11% opposed, 50% neutral. Statewide: 22% support, 20% oppose and 58 % are neutral.

Motion

Motion- Aaron Johnson – Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Brine Shrimp COR Rule Amendments as presented.

Second- Paul Chase

Motion Passes- Unanimous

DRAFT

**SOUTHERN REGION RAC MEETING
CEDAR CITY MIDDLE SCHOOL
2215 W. ROYAL HUNTE DRIVE
CEDAR CITY, UT**

December 10, 2019 6:00 p.m.

1. REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

MOTION: Craig Laub made the motion to approve the agenda as presented. Seconded by Tammy Pearson.

VOTE: Passed unanimously.

2. R657-33 BLACK BEAR AND R657-10 COUGAR RULE AMENDMENTS

MOTION: Craig Laub made the motion to allow year-round hunting on bears and cougars without limits on tags. Seconded by Tammy Pearson.

VOTE: Failed 3 in favor; 5 opposed (Sean Stewart, Sean Kelly, Nick Jorgensen, Gene Boardman, and Austin Atkinson)

MOTION: Craig Laub made the motion to open the summer season 1 week earlier and allow 2 weeks of overlap between the spring and summer seasons. Seconded by Tammy Pearson.

VOTE: Failed 4 in favor; 5 opposed Chairman broke the tie (Riley Roberts, Gene Boardman, Austin Atkinson, Sean Stewart, Sean Kelly)

MOTION: Austin Atkinson made the motion to accept the recommendations with the exception of only implementing limited entry spring for non-residents on the LaSal, San Juan and Book Cliffs units, with tags set based on 10% of the 3 year average of total pursuit on the 3 units and pursuit to remain over the counter residents.

VOTE: Failed for lack of second

MOTION: Gene Boardman made the motion to accept the proposal with the exception of limiting spring pursuit on the Book Cliffs , San Juan and LaSal. Seconded by Austin Atkinson.

VOTE: Passed 7 in favor; 1 opposed (Sean Kelly)

3. WOLF MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION: Tammy Pearson made the motion to pass the Wolf Management Plan as presented. Seconded by Nick Jorgensen.

VOTE: Passed unanimously.

4. BRINE SHRIMP COR RULE AMENDMENTS

MOTION: Craig Laub made the motion to pass Brine Shrimp COR Rule Amendments as presented. Seconded by Sean Kelly.

VOTE: Passed unanimously.

CEDAR CITY MIDDLE SCHOOL
December 10, 2019 6:00 p.m.

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Gene Boardman Riley Roberts Verland King Craig Laub Sean Kelly Austin Atkinson Sean Stewart Tammy Pearson Nick Jorgensen	Kevin Bunnell Johnny Neil Andrea Gifford Denise Gilgen Dan Ruggiero Paul Washburn Darren DeBloois Mike Christensen Cody Evans Jason Nicholes Josh Carver Teresa Griffin Martin Bushman	Donnie Hunter	Brayden Richmond Bart Battista Chad Utley

Riley Roberts called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. There were approximately 27 interested parties in attendance in addition to RAC members, members of the Wildlife Board, and Division employees.

Welcome and Introduction Appreciation

- **WELCOME, RAC INTRODUCTIONS AND RAC PROCEDURES – Riley Roberts**

Riley Roberts: We will start tonight with the approval of our agenda and the minutes from our last meeting. Has everyone had the opportunity to look at the agenda? Is there anything that might be added to that? If not I'd entertain a motion.

- **APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES**

MOTION to approve the agenda as presented.

Craig Laub

Tammy Pearson, second

Passed unanimously.

Riley Roberts: Alright it actually has the Wildlife Board meeting update from the Chairman, the Chairman is not here. I'm actually going to pass that along to Kevin, so Kevin will actually take agenda item three and four.

- **WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING UPDATE (OLD BUSINESS) – Kevin Bunnell**

Ok I'll just hit the highlights from the Board Meeting. On the statewide deer plan the Southern RAC had voted to add a third tier of 21-25 bucks per 100 does. There was a motion that recognized that by the Board, it wasn't exactly that, but it would have extended buck to doe ratios a little bit higher, that did not pass. Although there was a motion made. The restrictions on transporting deer with CWD from skull plates to skulls as was recommended from this RAC was passed. The plan was reduced from a seven year plan down to a five year plan and that's the basic highlights on the deer plan. Bucks and bulls similar. They addressed the skull plate issue again. On the CWMU management plans there was a lot of discussion on a single CWMU that isn't in our region in the southeastern region, it took quite a bit of time, but everything essentially passed as presented there. On the point creep issue, that passed with the one exception that the agricultural community asked that the landowner appreciation deer permits, that people don't lose their points if they redeem one of those, and that was passed with those being exempted from that. That's probably the highlights of a pretty long meeting. If there are specific questions I'd be happy to try to address anything else.

Riley Roberts: Do we have any questions on any of that? Gene?

Gene Boardman: Yeah somewhere it alluded to the unit plans were to be done by region, one region every year. I was wondering where the southern region was on that?

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah that is a good question Gene. There was a motion by the Board relative to the statewide plan that instead of the statewide management plan dictating the buck to doe ratios for each unit, those would be done at the unit level. We do those plans on a five year rotation based on when our habitat crew is in a certain region, and the southern region is in that rotation right now. You'll see deer unit plans from the southern regions within this coming year. So we're up to bat in that rotation right now.

Gene Boardman: So uh will that be discussed in the April meeting then?

Kevin Bunnell: Uh I don't know if it's going to be April, but it's going to be sometime within the next year. Now the buck to doe ratio will be set in the unit plans but they'll still be in the two choices the 15-17 or 18-20. I don't know that it's going to make much of a difference in the southern region because all of our units are already at the 18-20. I suspect in other places in the state some of their units that are currently 15-17 will jump up to 18-20 as a part of that process, I don't know that it's going to have much of an impact here.

Riley Roberts: Any other questions? Tammy.

Tammy Pearson: What was the decision on the five year to seven year?

Kevin Bunnell: It was reduced to five year.

Tammy Pearson: Sorry I missed that. You probably said it but I was writing stuff down.

Kevin Bunnell: I did but I'll say it again.

Riley Roberts: We will go into the regional update.

- **REGIONAL UPDATE – Kevin Bunnell**

It seems like we were just here and I gave a pretty extensive regional update at the last RAC meeting so I'm going to be really brief tonight. I mentioned last time that our wildlife crew was out and just beginning deer captures at that time, so far they have captured about 150 deer and collared them in the region. Over the next couple of weeks they'll do another 150 and then there will be some additional elk captures and things later in the spring. That's where we're at there. From our aquatics section, we have ice forming on a lot of the reservoirs, we're not aware that we have safe ice anywhere yet. I was told we had some people out on Panguitch Lake over the weekend, but that ice has since come off the lake. I would give it another couple of weeks before you get out on the ice. Paul are you aware of anywhere that we do have safe ice? (No..) And that's all I have unless we have other questions.

Riley Roberts: Alright moving right along then, if there's no other questions we'll get to item number five and that's an action item. We'll turn the time over to Darren.

- **R657-33 BLACK BEAR AND R657-10 COUGAR RULE AMENDMENTS–Darren**

DeBlois, Mammals Program Coordinator.

See Slideshow

Riley Roberts: Thank you Darren. We will now open it up for the RAC if there are any questions for Darren. Austin?

Questions from the RAC:

Austin Atkinson: Can I just ask a question for clarification for myself and some of the RAC. Could you explain the process of pertaining a spring pursuit permit? What an individual has to go through to obtain that permit? Can multiple members of his family hold permits? Just a little bit about that.

Darren DeBlois: I can so right now in the spring we don't have any restrictive pursuit units in the state. So it's and over the counter permit that anyone can buy and that includes non residents. There's no cap on those permits. So when we talk about the numbers that go to the La Sals those are just people that buy a permit and decide to go. The answer is yes, anyone can buy one so multiple folks in the party could buy permits, and that seems to be the case too. A lot of those folks hunt together so they're in groups, not just 88 people spread out amongst the landscape. It's groups of people pursuing together.

This is just about the pursuit season. In addition to those pursuers on the La Sals in the spring, there's an additional 44 hunters so they'd be on the landscape as well. Again they may be in a party, you could have someone who has a kill tag, a few folks that have pursuit tags. The average pack size is about eight. Some of those are the same dogs, it's not like 722 dogs, but it's still a fair number of dogs out during the hunt. Does that answer your question?

Austin Atkinson: Yeah I think so, I'll just ask one more, what is the restriction or requirement for someone running with dogs in camp? Does everybody have to have a pursuit permit?

Darren DeBlois: If you are going to handle dogs, you need to have a pursuit permit. In order to obtain that permit you have to take our bear orientation course. Actually, no, I don't know if you have to do that for pursuit, do you? Not for over the counter, but you do if you draw a kill tag, ok so these are just over the counter they can go buy.

Craig Laub: I've got a couple of questions. Ones on the 16 dog. Is that per houndsmen or animal?

Darren DeBlois: For animal. So the most....

Craig Laub: (inaudible)

Darren DeBlois: The max is 16 so if it's more that 2-3 folks they would have to combine dogs up, the max would be 16.

Craig Laub: The other question was on the hunting hours, so they can't turn their dogs loose before daylight?

Darren DeBlois: It's a half hour before sunrise.

Craig Laub: Basically the same on the others. In the evening they've got a bear or cougar treed at dark what's the situation there?

Darren DeBlois: Maybe I'll have law enforcement address that.

Paul Washburn: Yeah that's a complicated situation. It kind of depends case by case. If they're pursuing the bear after legal hours then yeah, but we also realize that it's not like you can hit a magic button and all your dogs come running back right at the same time. We try to have some practicality on how that's applied, but yes it is legal hunting hours does apply even with hounds situations.

Craig Laub: Cause I could see a conflict in these short winter hours and by the time you catch up with your dogs it could be dark.

Paul Washburn: For sure and that is a situation that we do bump into.

Kevin Bunnell: Craig I think the clear violation would be if somebody released dogs after the legal hunting hours. That's where it would be a clear cut case, other than that it's pretty difficult.

Riley Roberts: Verland.

Verland King: My question is on the 16 dog. Under the slide other action it says FS will enforce a 16 dog per camp limit. Now you're talking about 16 dogs pursue..

Darren DeBlois: One of the things that came up in discussion was I think initially it was thought that the Division had all these answers to concerns that we discussed that the Forest Service if they were concerned about the number of dogs in their camp they had management authority over the land. That's not something that the Division regulates. We can regulate how many are pursuing. It's a reg. they currently have in place but they haven't been enforcing it, so they said they'll start doing that.

Riley Roberts: Tammy.

Tammy Pearson: Okay so we'll go back to the Beaver and Beaver West unit. Is that not something that you revisited as far as headcounts on cats?

Darren DeBlois: Uh so for lions just quickly, just FYI mainly cause this did come up at the Board meeting, we just put sheep on the Minerals, bighorns, and we have had lions kill last I heard three. Kevin have you heard more?

Kevin Bunnell: I should have addressed that in the Board meeting update. So Director Fawlks did address that at the beginning of the meeting and what he said was the Board didn't address it as far as the Board meeting, but what we will continue to remove lions that are taking sheep by using Wildlife Services. In some ways they're maybe the best tool for that because they are going after the specific cat. And under Mikes authority as the director, he has the authority to declare an emergency season open, and what he said is if we get to a point where it's needed, he will exercise that authority on the Mineral Mountains.

Darren DeBlois: So what we'd do is open a hunt and set a new quota. And then we'll also reevaluate this summer if we need to raise permits or raise the quota again, we'll look at that.

Tammy Pearson: Well I just want to make sure we're on record. Because I know last year, according to the plan we could double it, so we went from three to six, and if we could do that again, I'd double it again.

Darren DeBlois: We are obviously concerned and that is under our predator management plan so that would be a possibility.

Kevin Bunnell: And typically we'd be addressing cougars and stuff in June instead of December.

Darren DeBlois: But we didn't want to wait all that time.

Kevin Bunnell: In the meantime Mike's got that emergency authority and if he needs to use it he will.

Riley Roberts: Any other questions? Austin.

Austin Atkinson: One other question, you mentioned on the La Sals about 22% out of the permits last year were non-residents. Was it the same on Book Cliffs and San Juan or less?

Darren DeBloois: Its less and the reason, maybe just one other thing I should mention, the typical number of folks that have chosen to hunt those, the average on the Book Cliffs and San Juan is about 60. So what were trying to do is allow enough permits for people if they don't get their first choice on the La Sals to switch. The Book Cliffs specifically we're concerned that if a non-resident can't pursue on the La Sals they'll go to one of these other popular units. So if we put a limited entry scenario in place we can then keep it 10% sub quota on those units as well.

Austin Atkinson: And could we be double counting some of those guys? They can pick up an over the counter permit on these units, right?

Darren DeBloois: They could hunt multiple units, and we did look at that, it's kind of in the mix. When you try to distill these numbers down, it gets complicated because people can hunt multiple units. But what we did was we looked at anyone who said they hunted the La Sals at some point in the season, and it's a small percentage of folks we surveyed that hunt multiple units. Most of them go to one and stay there.

Austin Atkinson: Thank you.

Riley Roberts: Gene.

Gene Boardman: Um it doesn't say in your presentation here whether these permits, if you place a number on them whether they'll be draw or over the counter.

Darren DeBloois: It would be draw. It would be the same system that we have for the summer restricted pursuit season but there would be a lot more permits available. There currently is a restricted pursuit season on those three units for the summer season, so we'd do it the same way.

Riley Roberts: Tammy.

Tammy Pearson: Sorry one more question I forgot. So I've been trying to keep track of the deer counts on the Beaver as well. Are you going to revisit that? Last I heard...

Darren DeBloois: I am gonna have to defer to an expert.

Teresa Griffin: And what is your specific question about the deer classification?

Tammy Pearson: Well just like what you revisited the plateau on the Boulder/Kaiparowits because of Mule deer population and the decline of that, that you would up the permits on that. So considering, I'm asking that you consider that again cause the initial counts, I'm not sure if he's done with his tallying or whatever on the Beaver unit, but it sounds to me like the counts are down.

Teresa Griffin: So you're talking the classification the buck to doe and fawn ratios or the overall population objective?

Tammy Pearson: Just the overall population. If when that tally is finished whatever, if you think that's going to be upping permits on bears and lions? Same as what you've got your recommendation here on

that.

Teresa Griffin: Yeah we're still gathering that information so until it came that say our fawn survival was way down, then we may look at whether it's cougars or bears, we can always consider doing a predator management plan for the unit. And next week around the 20-22nd of December we are going to put some radio collars on the Beaver unit on deer so then we can respond immediately if there's a mortality and we can determine if we've got coyotes, bears, lions, and that will give us some more information. Does that answer your question?

Riley Roberts: Any other questions from the RAC? Verland.

Verland King: I think I heard you say if we do limited entry then there would be a two year waiting period for...

Darren DeBloois: Right, there would be a bonus point, two year waiting period. We are offering a lot of permits in the.. for example if a lot of people are in a waiting period any remaining permits would go over the counter. If you're on a waiting period you can buy a permit over the counter, but this will be a little different than a lot of our limited entry hunts in that usually the interest outstrips the availability and we'll have to see how that works out.

Riley Roberts: If there are no other questions from the RAC we'll now have the questions from those in attendance tonight. I will remind you that this is a question portion, we'll have the comment portion in a moment. Again, if you would like to make a comment and have not filled out a card, please do so and you can hand that to the gentleman there and he will bring it up. If you have a question please come up to the mic and state your name, ask the question. Again, this is just the question portion, not the comment.

Questions from the Public:

Brian Johnson: Brian Johnson from Enoch, Utah. Why did we pick the Boulder to up those spot and stalk tags? Just wondering why that unit specifically?

Darren DeBloois: Um its one that there were concerns raised about it, specifically after the deer herd this year. We did ask all the other regions, how do you feel about where you are with bear tags? Do you feel like you want another opportunity to revisit that and the Boulder was one where we felt like we should take another look.

Brian Johnson: So we had people that had a bad deer hunt and we just asked if we could kill more bears? And the biologist were like yeah we have more here.. Is it one of those things where we're trying to give some opportunity and we said hey the Boulders can handle the pressure and the deer hunting was bad so let's give it a shot?

Darren DeBloois: Yeah I would say it's both. We haven't increased permits on the Boulder in about five years. We did increase them last year but it was primarily in that spot and stalk hunt. So there was a little bit of opportunity to increase last year and we felt like we could do it now. And again this is just one part of a big puzzle. We don't have a lot of data on how significant of a problem bears are, but this is sort of let's throw everything at it and see.

Brian Johnson: Okay thank you.

Jared Higgins: Hi I'm Jared Higgins representing myself. I just have a question for Darren. I read an article that said there is a major spike in bear conflicts this year. Is that true?

Darren DeBlois: Im tempted to.. There was an article about that. We did see more especially along the Wasatch Front than we did last year. But it was less than it was the year before. It looks like we had a hole somewhere in the last couple of years and most of these were young male bears, two year old bears, so we'll see how things go. Typically when headlines..

Jared Higgins: I just wanted to know if that was true or if that was something somebody put out there?

Darren DeBlois: We did see about a doubling from the year before, and the year before most of our incidents were actually in southeastern Utah with the drought, mainly agriculture stuff.

Jared Higgins: So my follow up question to that, ever since I've had hounds, 20 years, there slogan has always been a fed bear is a dead bear. So with the addition to all these bait hunts, do you feel like coincides with these spikes in problems? The bears becoming dependant on that food?

Darren DeBlois: I don't think that we have any strong evidence of that in the literature or anything else, but I have read that concern. But we do have regulations about how close you can be to camp grounds and waterways to try to prevent bears from being drawn to those conflict areas.

Jared Higgins: Yeah I just think a bear after they eat on a bait for so long they'll wander around and maybe be more prone to come into something like that. And that's kind of been Utah's stance for a long time until they introduced these hunts.

Darren DeBlois: One good thing about the baiting opportunities is the hunter can see a bunch of different bears and be selective, so there's definitely that advantage. We are sensitive to that and it's something that we could look at. We've got a lot of collared bears now and we can start detecting where they've been and back track if we've got some problems. Right now we're not seeing that.

Jared Higgins: Thank you.

Kevin Bunnell: Darren can I add just a little bit to that? Most of the data on baiting bears and bears that have been conditioned. Bears become conditioned to a location, not the type of food. So they'll come back to the spot, not necessarily looking for whatever they ate, whatever kind of food they found. They certainly do become conditioned to that spot, they'll come back for years after that if they found food there.

Dustin Clark: Dustin Clark, Cedar City Utah. Darren do you have the numbers for the harvest percentage on the Boulders for the past five years? Everyone I've talked to said bears harvested in percentage were the worst last year.

Darren DeBlois: I would have to look them up.

Dustin Clark: Could we look them up so we can see them? I'm just curious on that.

Teresa Griffin: So it kind of depends what (just total numbers). Overall for all the hunts combined, it was 29%. Off the top of my head it was 58% for the summer season, spot and stalk in the fall the new one was only 10%. Overall for all the seasons combined I could look it up for you.

Dustin Clark: What about the previous year?

Teresa Griffin: It was 52%, so it was down quite a bit overall was 52% in 2018 for all hunts.

Dustin Clark: And this last years was?

Teresa Griffin: 29% and I think the addition of those additional 20 spot and stalk did drag that average down a little bit.

Dustin Clark: I understand that but I'm curious as to why we're raising it so many on the unit if it's going downhill?

Liz Odell: Liz Odell, I live just five miles across the border in Fredonia so I do hunt Utah a lot. So my question is about raising the amount of bear tags in the Boulder. Just curious because what I'm hearing is the deer population is going down but nobody really knows why, so we're just going to kill more bears? That's what I hear, that's what it looks like. If I was going to make the most basic public perception, that's what it sounds like. So I'm just curious though is the concern for the deer population in potential for possible needing to limit hunting opportunities until the numbers increase? Or is the concern for the actual survival for the deer herd itself?

Darren DeBloois: Let me address the bear part, and then maybe Teresa can talk about the deer stuff. This is one of those instances where we don't have a lot of hard data on that unit, but we have seen on the Book Cliffs bears sort of targeting in on fawning areas. So what we're doing here is we're using our best professional judgement. Again I don't know if that necessarily the driving cause, the drought I'm sure has a lot to do with it too. It's just one thing we can do in addition to habitat work and some things.

Teresa Griffin: We are trying to gather additional information. We are out there right now the last few days and then the next few days. We're putting 125 satellite collars on deer on the Boulder. So then we'll be able to better detect what's going on with the population. Whether we've got again coyotes, cougars, bears, the timing of when we're losing a lot of these animals. So we are trying to do everything we can. We're working on a lot of habitat improvements over on the Boulder. We've got a lot on the plate. So we are trying to do the best thing we can for the deer herds also.

Riley Roberts: Alright thank you. We will move on to the comment portion. We have quite a few comments. Again, on the comment portion, state your name, where you're from, who your representing. You do have three minutes if you're representing yourself, five minutes if you're representing an organization. I will read the first comment from Paige Anderson: In my six years of hunting I've never been stopped and asked to show my pursuit tags to confirm there are any in place.

Comments from the Public:

Kevin Bunnell: So Paige had indicated that she didn't want to come up.

Riley Roberts: Alright our first comment will be from Brian Johnson.

Brian Johnson: Brian Johnson, Enoch Utah. I'm representing Utah Archery Association for just a second. They would like to support the Divisions proposal. Basically saying, hey we have a three year plan, let's just stick with that with the exception of the exhaustion rule. They're ok with that change. Now I'll take that hat off but the Brian Johnson hat on. I would like to ask the RAC to do the same thing we've done for the last five years and that is let's vote on this summer pursuit, let's extend the season two weeks early and let those hunts overlap. I understand that there is a concern for conflict, that concern is that a houndsmen will run off somebody's bait. If you don't want to bait early and have a houndsmen run off your bait, don't do it. So it seems like a lot of rules. If a person doesn't want a houndsmen run off his bait, it doesn't matter. I've baited a lot guys, I've baited in Idaho, I've been very vocal about this because I'm very passionate about it, and I've had hounds run off my bait and it doesn't matter, the bears come back. It's ok, they just run through, they chase them around and they come back. You guys are houndsmen right? You've all run off a bait before. Being honest the bear just comes back. It's conditioned to an area not necessarily the food. So it's going to come back. As a guy who hunts over bait, it's not a big deal. Now if the guy doesn't want to, he just chooses not to. All I'm saying is it's a win win if somebody wants to hunt a little bit early and he's willing to take the chance, just ask you to extend that hunt two weeks early. This RACs asked for it and we've passed it probably 5-6 years in a row. For the ranchers, it's a win win we can kill more bears. Anyways thank you.

Riley Roberts: Next is Kasey Yardley.

Kasey Yardley: Thanks for the opportunity. I just wanted to address a little bit on the pursuit of the La Sals. I've hunted Idaho my whole life, since I was a little kid, and doing that I've always had to draw either a pursuit, what they call a hounds hunter permit, or I'd have to be a licensed guide in that state. I've done it my whole life. My dad hunted a unit up there for 35 years. I think that we need to do something with the non-resident hunters. They need to have to draw that tag. It didn't affect me, I usually hunted every other year and if I didn't, I hunted under a guide. I think that's important. I think these non residents should, if we're going to let them pursue in our state then they should have to draw a hounds hunter permit or you know. And I don't think they should have as many of them as the residents. And another thing I wanted to touch on, was the lions on the Mineral Mountains. I know that we just put the sheep out there and I was born and raised on the mountains in Beaver, I've hunted those mountains my whole life. What we're doing right now isn't right. They've got a six lion quota on that unit right now. Well four lions, unless I'm wrong, I could be wrong. Four of the lions that they killed weren't even on the same unit of the sheep. They were out on the bald hills, they weren't even on the Mineral Mountains. So we need to put our heads together a little bit. If we're going to kill these lions, for hell's sake let's kill the right lions. If you want ten lions killed over there, I'm all for killing lions if they need to be killed. But right now they're not. They're picking on the lions that aren't even the right cats. So either split that unit on hwy 21 and make it a different unit or something. Cause somethings gotta be done. The way we're managing it right now makes absolutely no sense. We killed two lions, maybe three but I think two. Was it three? They overkilled then. So three lions and they put all that money into putting those sheep here for hell sakes let's think about it and let's do it right. Anyway, thank you.

Riley Roberts: Thank you. Alright, Dustin Clark.

Dustin Clark: Um I agree with almost everything Kasey said as far as the cougars on Mineral Mountains and sheep. My biggest concern is going with the increase on units. Why should we limit our residents when I can go over to the San Juan Mountains, camp for a week, and I will see more out of state trucks than I will in state trucks. And those guys are out of states that come in 10-12 of them with 30-40 dogs and they run the mountain and those are the ones that I think are causing the problems, not the residents. And if we do this pursuit permit on these units, it's not only going to hurt our residents, but also the outfitters. Outfitters that can't go train their dogs that live in those areas. So to become a good outfitter to have good bear dogs, you've got to train. You can't just focus on well I have one client on the San Juan Mountains, I can go catch one bear and I'm done. I have to travel four hours to go train my dogs. It doesn't seem fair to hurt our residents and our in state outfitters. I already addressed my issue with the Boulder tags with my questions. Thank you.

Riley Roberts: Thank you. Jared Higgins.

Jared Higgins: Jared Higgins, and I'm representing the Utah Houndsmen Association. I'm just going to read this proposal. I apologize, I'm a better houndsmen than reader, and I'm not even a very good houndsmen. Respected RAC and Wildlife Board Members, The UHA supports the DWRs bear hunting recommendations except the following changes. The UHA does not support the restricted pursuit spring season. We think that the dog limits are going to kind of cure up all of the problems we're having down there. It's more of a dog problem, too many dogs, too many people. By limiting that we feel like it's going to clear up on it's own. The UHA does not support any tag increase because of the three year cycle. We voted in this cycle, let's see it through. Let's see where it ends up and increase it in three years when we're supposed to. We'd like to thank Darren and the DWR for the willingness to meet with the UHA regarding this years bear recommendations. UHA would also like to thank those that serve on the Board. We are thankful to have our voice heard in the input process. Thank you for reading and considering this proposal.

Riley Roberts: Thank you. Liz.

Liz Odell: Liz Odell, Fredonia. I came to Arizona for my state where we pretty much lost all our hounding. I'll tell you it kind of sucks to have to keep moving to run your dogs. I may not be a resident of the state but only by a few miles living in Fredonia. It seems to me the idea of limiting out of state houndsmen from drawing a pursuit tag is a solution to the current problem. I don't believe it will solve anything as a full solution. I've heard people say it isn't fair that out of state hunters can get any of these tags, but if we're doing things by fairness tags should be given to the people actually residing in those units and drawn for every else afterwards. If we were doing things by fairness than all other states would also be permitting out of state hunters as well. What I see is the current problems could be solved by simply enforcing the current laws. People are already piggy backing on others pursuit tags including the summer draw pursuit and that needs to stop. It's not just non-residents doing this. The already existing rules regarding camping limits and camping with animals should be enforced. In doing so would solve a great deal of this current issue. I think the idea of needing to pass an ethics course for drawing a pursuit tag is a great idea, I would say it would possibly be a good requirement for pertaining any pursuit tag. If a person passes the course and knows the rules and understands the idea of the ethics we need to promote to save this opportunity now and for the future, and they have absolutely zero excuse for doing the wrong thing after. Thank you.

Riley Roberts: Thank you Liz. Wade.

Wade Hollerman: Hi I'm Wade Hollerman, I'm from Cedar. I'm a second generation houndsman and an avid houndsman at that. I've been an avid houndsman for 21 years, and I've been an outfitter in the state of Utah for nine. Hounds are not only my passion but a way of life. I'm here today to state my concerns on the recommended changes. I'll start by saying within 21 years of having hounds, I've hunted or pursued bears on the La Sals every year. I have had zero conflicts of any kind with any other houndsmen or any other recreating on the La Sals. Also with those 21 years I've camped with two non residents every single year who have hunted the La Sals since 1990. In the past 10 years I've spent 20+ consecutive days on the La Sals. Again with all my time spent those 20+ days I've not heard nor seen any conflicts. To my knowledge there haven't been any previous complaints until the last year. Memorial weekend of 2019, 20 officers were doing what we call a training day on the La Sals. This is one of the busiest weekends of all recreation of all big three. To my knowledge the only tickets that were wrote were a couple of trespassing tickets where a group of houndsmen treed a bear on private property and went and retrieved their dogs and recieved a ticket for retrieving their dogs, and a tobacco ticket. I feel like if there were any conflicts with any other hunters or any other recreational users, there would have been some problems on this weekend. And I'd hope that if there was conflict the person or persons involved would be reprimanded not the houndsmen as a whole population. When I hunt on the La Sals or any other units, if I stay for 25 consecutive days I would catch at least 20 bears. In my opinion this shows there are plenty of bears and room for everyone else. During the weekdays I see a limited amount of houndsmen, I can usually pursue multiple areas of the mountain. This is not the same on the weekends, it means I'll just hunt in a harder area to avoid who I call the Utah weekend warriors. I believe this is where most of the complaints are coming from. I personally believe the complaints are sour houndsmen complaining about other houndsmen that are getting out hunting. Another change that has been discussed is a 16 dog/bear limit in camp and on a bear. For me this is a hard pill to swallow cause not every dog in camp gets hunted every single day. Some dogs can only hunt a couple of days, some can hunt the whole time you're there. So we rotate through them. So also while their pursuing a bear, it's a gray area, cause if I start a bear, and put 16 dogs on a bear, (I'm going to have to ask you to wrap it up Wade) Alright, if they cross the road and I only have 12 can I put four more dogs with those 12 while the other four are not on the bear anymore, they're behind, cause by GPS you can tell that. Another thing I wanted to say is the numbers they have 75 residents and 7 non-residents and an 88% average but those numbers don't match up. I'm trying to jump through this. I'll just finish. As you can see these numbers do not match and do not give everyone the opportunity to obtain a tag like the Division believes. These numbers, if they go to a draw plus a waiting period we would limit the summer pursuit. I personally only drawn on the summer pursuit season one time in nine years, and I don't want to see the spring pursuit go down the same path as the summer. If we were to draw each houndsman would put in multiple times flooding the system making it even longer. Limiting the dogs and limiting the hunters on the mountain, I believe is an anti hound and anti hunting move. If it passes it's a stepping stone going downhill over regulating houndsmen hunting through the footsteps of other states that have lost all hound hunting privileges.

Riley Roberts: Thanks Wade. Alright Garth Jensen.

Garth Jensen: I'm not a houndsman, I don't claim to be, but I can really echo a lot of the sentiments that Wade just said right there. What I just saw in this proposal was over regulation in my opinion to what is already rules on the books that probably could be enforced to solve a lot of these problems. Any time that I hear more regulations coming in on houndsmen, it just makes me cringe a little bit because it just

seems like a step pulling back and then we get into this state where we have in Colorado and states like that where they've outlawed hound hunting. Now they've got an overpopulation of bears and they can't take care of that problem because they no longer have the ability to run hounds and effectively take those bears. The other regulation that kind of had me concerned was the exhaustion. I haven't heard anyone else really touch on very much. It seems like a gray area for a law to say past the point of exhaustion. Because in theory what you're trying to do is run that animal til you can get him exhausted enough to go to a tree, a cave, whatever really. Hopefully they would use some good judgement with going forth in this rule if it passes, or enforcing that law. It just seems like there are a few too many regulations being put into place where they already could enforce some of the laws that are already in place would love the problem.

Riley Roberts: Thank you. Bryce.

Bryce Billings: Thanks Riley, Bryce Billings SFW. We support the Divisions recommendation with one exception and that's limiting the spring time pursuit. I'd like to thank Darren for all his work. Thank you.

Riley Roberts: Thanks Bryce. Scott.

Scott Stubbs: Scott Stubbs, Wool Grower. I support. When I talked to all of my neighbors in this business we're just having a lot more conflict with bears. So I definitely support if there's anyway to increase the pursuit to try to keep them stirred up a little, that would keep them off of us, and any more harvesting we could do because we're definitely having more conflict with bears. Thank you.

Garth Carter: I always thought if I had to pick a group of people that knew what was going on in the field, I'd pick a houndsmen. When I worked for the Division for 20 years if I ever had questions about the local wildlife I'd pick up the phone and call a houndsmen. Next guy I'd call would be a trapper. So I have deep respect for the houndsmen. What I'm going to recommend is no slight towards them, but it's a fear I have running out of deer. What I see right now on the winter range, and as I call all the other sportsmen I know around southern Utah, and I'm hearing the same thing, that we've got 10% of normal on the winter range it scares the heck out of me. With that in mind I'm going to recommend and I hope somebody on the RAC will recommend this so you can vote on it and it will be on the record. I'm going to recommend an unlimited tags for southern Utah for bears, I'm going to recommend unlimited tags for southern Utah for lions, and I'm going to recommend a 365 day season and this is not an usual season. Nevada has it, Arizona has it, Colorado just went to unlimited bear tags this fall. I think we need this. We're not going to eliminate the bears, we're not going to eliminate the lions. I think we need this as a safeguard til we figure out what's happening with our deer. Thank you very much and I appreciate you guys being here and the effort you put forward. I know it's not easy and I know you're being pulled at from every side and thank you.

Riley Roberts: Thank you Garth. Thank you to all of those that had comments. I will ask Kevin if he will summarize the comments. Also many of you may be participants in this, the RAC received many emails, we did send out surveys just like we did with the previous RAC with the deer management plan so we do have that information as well, we'll ask Kevin to summarize that also.

Kevin Bunnell: Okay, Utah Archery Association doesn't support making changes outside the three year cycle except they do support the exhaustion rule change as presented. We heard an ask to begin the

baiting season two weeks earlier, which would create an overlap with the hound season. We heard support for eliminating non residents, and support for not eliminating non residents, there have been comments on both sides of that issue. There's comments to not limit the pursuit permits on the three units from the UHA, SFW and some individuals. We have heard support for requiring the ethics course for both pursuit and hunting. Then an ask for unlimited tags for bears and lions with a year round season.

Riley Roberts: And the online, do you have that information?

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah sorry. The online comments that we received on this one first from a statewide basis. There was 58% of the people that watched the presentation online expressed support for the proposal from Darren. 33% opposed the recommendation and 8% were neutral. Specifically from the southern region, we had 33% support, 61% did not support, and 6% neutral. We had far fewer comments this time, we had 12 people comment online whereas with the last RAC we had about 75.

Riley Roberts: Thanks Kevin we will now open it up to the RAC for comments.

Comments from the RAC:

Austin Atkinson: I'll make a comment. Many of you know I'm a proponent for guys getting tags and everyone having an opportunity, but as we just finished a lengthy meeting here last month about opportunity and we need more animals so we can hunt more, I see a restricted pursuit season as a cut in opportunity to many of Utah's longest residents. Those that enjoy the landscape the most. I think it would be wrong of us to approve a restriction on residents, especially I think we could come up with a non-resident draw or limited entry system for non residents and we could base it off a 10% cap on a three year past average on how many spring permits were sold or something like that. But I don't think that we're to the point where we need to cut these permits back. I understand the recommendation was for 75, which yes at face value that says there's enough for everyone, but we know how draws work and all the ways that people will use their friends and family members and everyone who's ever touched a tag to put in for a permit and screw the system up and now we're in a mess. So I think we have to do away with the implementation of the resident pursuit limited entry draw. That's my comment to the RAC here.

Riley Roberts: Thank you Austin. Other comments from the RAC.

Sean Kelly: Yeah obviously the San Juans are on the Forest I represent, but when we get a lot of people on the landscape in the early spring, it's pretty hard on the infrastructure, especially roads. I imagine some of these issues is maybe what generated some of these complaints, but we appreciate the Division of Wildlife for addressing those and there's some hard decisions that's going to have to be made. If it gets to where the road damage is severe enough, we'd hate to close anything. A lot of times we'll have gated roads we can't open until they dry up anyway, and that's one of the concerns I have I guess about Brian's proposal with opening the hunt two weeks early. People know that they might have to have restricted access in that time depending on the conditions. I guess it's always a tough issue and we tend to vote in favor of opportunity and in this case we're supporting the Divisions recommendation. I understand people don't want to lose that opportunity, but I also didn't hear any solutions.

Riley Roberts: Thanks Sean. Any other comments? Verland.

Verland King: I understand the problem with the roads and stuff with the spring and stuff. I don't think it's the houndsmen that cause the problem, it's the shed hunters. From the livestock point of view, and from being on the ground and making a living off of it, there is too many bear and lion out there and there wouldn't be anything wrong with what was commented earlier from the public about an unlimited bear and lion tag and a 365 day season. That's something that sooner or later is going to have to take some consideration because these houndsmen are the only thing that regulates them and their not real good at it in my point of view cause they maybe let the ones go that do the killing of the livestock. And everyones excited about killing these lions that are killing these bighorn sheep, but you have a lion or bear that kills a domestic sheep and it's like pulling teeth to make sure you get the right one when you guys jump on the bandwagon and kill three or four. I'm all for it, but it ought to work the same way on domestic. I think we're pretty soon going to be to the point with the lion and bear population out there and I'm coming off the Boulder Mountain, Fish Lake and Thousand Lake area in the Henry's. We need to figure out a way to get the numbers down and this would be a good way to do it.

Riley Roberts: I know you're waiting Tammy, go ahead.

Tammy Pearson: I'm biting my tongue. I think everyone had a lot of valuable things to say, the best thing I heard was Garth's proposal. The unlimited numbers on the lions and the bears and I'd support that. I'd like to make that motion.

Riley Roberts: I'll wait a moment, we still have a couple of comments. Nick.

Nick Jorgensen: I just wanted to mention that I really appreciated all the comments this year. You gave us a lot to consider. You gave us a lot of time to think about it before we got to this meeting. Hopefully it means we make some more intelligent decisions. From what I'm hearing, and I'm not the expert on this, but this is my own personal opinion, I think regardless of which side of this you fall on, we should all be out to pursue the same thing. I hear a lot of emotions that seems to govern somebody's opinion. Whether it be houndsmen, somebody that would like to see an open season. I don't know how much science we have on it, but I think the DWR does as good of job as anybody in trying to decide what we should do. And I don't think we should overreact and just open season on bear for 365 days There are so many things that I keep hearing that affect predators. Animals are killed, domestic animals that are attacked, but there are so many reasons why that must be and I think one of them is we mentioned that we had a bad year, a dry dry summer and not a great winter. Weather has a lot to do with it and predators is a big issue that we're talking about tonight. Yes I know they're there and I agree that they kill things that we don't want killed, but I just wish there was a way to get around some of the emotion, and that's hard, and to come up with something other than this happened so we should do this. I don't know if that makes any sense or not.

Riley Roberts: Thank you any other comments from the RAC? Verland.

Verland King: All this online stuff is good. It plugs up my email. I have to spend a little more time deleting stuff. To me it's interesting that statewide you have a 58% support, 33% opposed. When you get to the southern region, it's just the opposite, and I think we need to take that into account the other RACs meet and I haven't got time to go to all of those or figure out what they talked about, but on southern region, 33% supported and 61% opposed this plan. I'm not sure what the demographics of the people that get online and watch this video are. I haven't watched it yet, but I'm not too computer savvy

so I probably wouldn't be able to find it anyway. The people that have got on and did it 61% did oppose it and I think we need to take that into account.

Riley Roberts: Thanks Verland. I just have one comment from me as a representative of sportsmen. I represent all sportsmen, houndsmen are sportsmen. Sometimes I think that we cross, make this division and put this line in the ground and that's not accurate. So I do think there is an issue in the state with predation, there absolutely is, I think that our fawning and calving areas for our herds are suffering. I think we have a lot of biological impacts from the droughts over the last few years and the winters that have impacted our herds as well. But it would be very hypocritical as a sportsman to put any more any more value on a deer than a houndsmen would a bear or a lion. I would hope that we just take that into consideration as we're making our motions this evening. Again, I am not saying one way or the other that I support or don't support anything that's been said tonight, and luckily I don't have a vote tonight as I get to act as Chair. That being said, I would hope that the RAC would remember and take that into consideration as you're making your motions and casting your vote this evening. At this point I would entertain a motion.

RAC discussion and vote:

Craig Laub makes a motion to year round hunt on bear and cougar and two-week overlap on spring and fall

Craig Laub makes notion to allow year round hunting on bears and cougars Tammy Pearson seconds

Craig Laub: I'd just add a little bit to that. The reason why I say that is we've had the \$50 deal on coyotes for three or four years, I don't know how long. We're still having trouble with coyotes, we haven't killed all the coyotes even with the higher bounty. Coyotes are getting harder to get cause they've gotten smarter, they're still getting there. I agree with Garth that we can't kill all the bears and cougars. They'll get smart.

Austin Atkinson: My input to this discussion would be I am a proponent for more opportunity like I spoke about and I think that this is something that we can look into in the future, and if I understand it correctly we are in this three year plan and this would not be the time to abolish the entire guidebook for cougar and bear. Is that correct? I'm new to this, if you will. Could someone help me out there?

Kevin Bunnell: Certainty that proposal would be outside both the bear and cougar plans, but it is a motion that is on the table.

Riley Roberts: Any other discussion on the motion?

Verland King: You know we have been talking about this for several years and when we talk about the bear and the lion and you ask Darren how many we have, it's based on some formula and basically they don't know how many we have in Utah. They have their best guess and that's all it is, and it's low, it's a low number for what there is out there. I think even doing unlimited tags and year round hunts you won't kill all the bears and lions. Like Craig said it hasn't worked on the coyotes and you know the deer herd has got, they winter kill, we've got to deal with that through management. These predators don't

winter kill, they have very few, they have nothing that attacks them unless it's each other. The lions will do that and bears too. How it is the population is getting too big and it needs to be managed and this is one way we can try it. We talked about the incidents of bear contact and yeah you read about it on the Wasatch Front, but it's happening to us down here all the time. Used to never see a bear and now you'll be out riding and you'll see one or two a summer out there in the middle of the day. So this motion Craig has done is something that could make a difference. I think we should pass it and send it up to the RAC and let them know that it's a concern and possibly a way to make a difference on this. Thank you.

Riley Roberts: Other comments? Go ahead Nick.

Nick Jorgensen: I don't know, to make that jump to year round seems pretty extreme all at once. As Verland says we don't know how many bears and lions are out there so how can we make a decision that is that extreme until we have all the information. So to me it's almost, and I understand the concerns of the ranchers and farmers, I do, but from a non-consumptive point of view that's an awful big switch. I can't support this.

Riley Roberts: Go ahead Austin.

Austin Atkinson: I will just say real quick, a charge to us as RAC members and all the sportsmen. I hope that we all intend to hold the Divisions feet to the fire if you will on surveys and counts and accuracy as good as we can get. I commend them on using technology and everything they're doing, but I think we are all expecting more transparency on predator numbers on deer numbers and make some changes and short order. And I think these meetings coming up with deer numbers and bucks and bulls are going to be very interesting and very telling if they are doing what they say they're going to be doing. And I look forward to that as we discuss predators and other species.

Riley Roberts: And I guess my comment would be, I've been to quite a few of these meetings and the southern region is notorious for just throwing stuff out there. And hoping that it makes its way up. We actually have a pretty good reputation with that. My concern is that we've got a lot of smart individuals that have spent a lot of time and we're not as bad off as we think we are on everything. I am not a doom and gloomer on anything. I'm a realist, I'm not a pessimist, I'm not an optimist. The reality is our herds are struggling right now, there's no question about that, but to be able to support a motion just off the cuff I can't do that without a lot more information. Even though I think it's something that needs to be addressed and I failed to recognize one of our Board Members, he showed up before, so we appreciate you being here. Even if this did make it up to them, I think there are different ways to get their attention and let them know we've got some concerns rather than throwing out a motion that really isn't on the agenda. Again, that's the RACs decision to do that, and again I don't get a vote tonight, but I could not support that motion that's present. That being said if there's no more discussion on the motion, we do have a motion and a second, I'll call for a vote.

MOTION to allow year-round hunting on bears and cougars without limits on tags.

Craig Laub

Tammy Pearson, second

Failed 3-5 (Verland Tammy Craig for) (Nick Jorgensen, Austin Atkinson, Gene Boardman, Sean Kelly and Sean Stewart opposed)

MOTION to open the summer season 1 week earlier and allow 2 weeks of overlap between the

spring and summer seasons.

Craig Laub
Tammy Pearson, second
Tie 4-4

Chairman breaks the tie.

Failed 4-5. (Nick Jorgensen, Verland King, Tammy Pearson and Craig Laub for)((Austin Atkinson, Gene Boardman, Sean Kelly and Sean Stewart, Riley Roberts opposed.)

Darren DeBloois: So just to be sure we're clear, it already overlaps as a week between spring and summer. Are we talking one week earlier, we taking three weeks overlap?

Kevin Bunnell: One week earlier is what it's been in the past, so two weeks overlap.

MOTION to accept the recommendations with the exception of only implementing limited entry spring for non-residents on the LaSal, San Juan and Book Cliffs units, with tags set based on 10% of the 3 year average of total pursuit on the 3 units and pursuit to remain over the counter for residents.

Austin Atkinson
Failed for lack of a second

Austin Atkinson: How I understand it Darren, is we have the numbers of how many pursuit permit holders claim they hunted in that unit, correct?

Darren DeBloois: Yeah we could get that. That's something we could do. There are some legal and logistical concerns but go ahead and vote with how the RAC wants to vote.

Austin Atkinson: With running a non resident only limited entry?

Darren DeBloois: A couple of things. I don't know if this is necessarily going to affect your vote, but when we do things that are unrepresented we open ourselves up to some legal concerns in terms of non-resident hunters feeling like they're being treated unfairly. One of the reasons we recommended what we recommended is it's something that we currently do. But what you're proposing is not something we could logistically do. There's some licensing things we'd have to work through too but I think you're ok.

Austin Atkinson: It would just remain over the counter for residents.

Darren DeBloois: Essentially we'd be setting up a non resident only draw, which again is unprecedented, but again is not logistically impossible.

MOTION to pass R657-33 Black Bear and R657-10 Cougar Rule Amendments as presented with the exception of only implementing for Limited Entry for Non-Residents on the La Sal and Book Cliffs units.

Austin Atkinson
Failed for lack of a second

Tammy Pearson: On our online support or whatever and considering the comments that were here today, 61% were against the proposal. Are there certain aspects to that other than what was voiced here today that they were specifically against, or was it just in general?

Kevin Bunnell: Let me clarify, I think I led you astray. No that's right. So it wasn't any more specific than just the whole presentation. We'd have to go into the individual comments to discern what they didn't support. I didn't print out the comments so I can't give you a sense of that right now. But yes it was 61% opposed, 33% support, and 6% stayed on the fence and were neutral. And that's for the southern region. Compared to a statewide basis it was just about the opposite of that. It was 58% in support and 33% opposed.

Riley Roberts: If I might comment on that Tammy, maybe this will help, I would submit that the majority of the emails that we received were probably much similar to what we heard this evening and the main concern was that on the San Juan the La Sal, the same concerns that we've heard this evening.

Tammy Pearson: That's just what I was going to say, that's what I remember. I didn't try and take a tally or whatever. So I think a lot of the concerns that I can see are the increase on plateau and Kaiparowits. I think that's 30 additional spot and stock, I think those are the kind of questions.

Kevin Bunnell: You know what Tammy? I told you backwards. This is new to me, the whole online thing, I've got.. statewide it was 60% opposed and 33% supported. In the southern region it was 60% supported and 33% opposed. I gave you the numbers backwards. My apologies.

Riley Roberts: I do hope that with those new numbers that we can propose a motion.

MOTION to pass R657-33 Black Bear and R657-10 Cougar Rule Amendments as presented with the exception of limiting the we do not put limits on the pursuit on the San Juan, La Sal, and Book Cliffs units.

Gene Boardman
Austin Atkinson, second
Passed 7-1 (Sean Kelly opposed)

Verland King: So does that make those tags unlimited?

Kevin Bunnell: Yes that would keep it as it is now on those three units with unlimited spring pursuit for both residents and non residents, is that correct Aaron?

Austin Atkinson: Just to continue the discussion in addition to that we're also passing all the other changes, 16 dog limit, we understand that the Forest Service and Sitla are going to enforce their camp restrictions hopefully a little bit better, so there are other things that are being passed to hopefully assign some of the problems that are being reported in that portion of the state even though we have this exception to keep it as is for the number of permits.

Riley Roberts: Thank you. Tammy.

Tammy Pearson: I would support that, if we also added the Beaver West unit as an unlimited. No I know pursuit, I'm talking about kill tags.

Riley Roberts: This is particular to pursuit.

Kevin Bunnell: The motion is for the overall presentation. So this would end the discussion on this item.

Riley Roberts: Alright time for a vote.

Sean Kelly: Would you please read that again to me? What motion we're voting on.

Kevin Bunnell: The motion is to accept the proposal with one exception, to not limit spring pursuit on the Book Cliffs, San Juan, La Sal units. Everything else in the proposal is being supported.

Riley Roberts: Alright now I will call for a vote.

- **WOLF MANAGEMENT PLAN–Darrin DeBloois, Mammals Program Coordinator.**
See Slideshow

Questions from the RAC

Riley Roberts: Thank you Darrin. Questions from the RAC?

Verland King: I'm taking Tammy's smartass approach. That last sentence on the last slide where they'll most likely settle without conflict, where's that?

Darrin DeBloois: That's a good question. So the plan recognizes that's a component that there would have to be no conflicts.

Verland King: That's with wildlife too, right?

Darrin DeBloois: Correct, it takes all those things in. Correct.

Riley Roberts: Darrin, you and I talked just briefly before the meeting. Could you tell the rest of the RAC part of the reason for what the plan is, I know the plan purpose is there, but can you explain that a little to so they understand why we have the plan and the delisting and...

Darrin DeBloois: One of the things that Riley and I talked about before is in order to see a delisting states have to have a plan in place. If we don't have any regulatory strategy, that actually hurts our case in terms of delisting. So we have to have a current plan, that's why we're asked to renew it.

Riley Roberts: Thank you.

Tammy Pearson: So question. If I understand this right, the only thing that is delisted is above I-80 right? So it's just a small portion of the state?

Darrin DeBloois: Yeah, the actual delisting area is bigger than that, but for Utah.

Kevin Bunnell: It goes from I-80 to I-15 and up I-15 to I-84 and out up to Idaho. So it's essentially Rich County, a little bit of Summit and Wasatch Counties and a little bit of Box Elder and Cache Counties.

Tammy Pearson: Okay, outside of the area wolves are still protected, but DWR is going to be removing any of those that we find?

Darrin DeBloois: No, we will request that Fish and Wildlife Service remove.

Kevin Bunnell: So the way this works Tammy, cause I lived this for the first 10 years of my career. When we have a wolf that comes in, we write a letter to the Fish and Wildlife saying come and get it and they write a letter back saying no. And that's the way it's worked. But we haven't had any establishment.

Tammy Pearson: So you don't call your friends in Beaver County?

Riley Roberts: Alright any other questions from the RAC? Gene.

Gene Boardman: So this is the plan. What you've got here is a legal requirement and we don't have a problem, we've just got something that will give us an opportunity to organize once we get a problem. Is that what we've got?

Darrin DeBloois: I think it's a good plan, but at this point until wolves are delisted this is kind of a formality. We're just extending it, it's expired, we need to extend it.

Kevin Bunnell: This plan has been on the shelf for 15 years waiting for wolves to be delisted. Alls we're asking is we can keep it on the shelf for another 10 in case they are delisted in that time and then we'll be...

Riley Roberts: Verland.

Verland King: So that area of Utah that is delisted, this plan is in place?

Darrin DeBloois: No, because the state legislature is directed the Division that until they are delisted in all of the entire state, that we will ask for wolves to be removed from the state.

Kevin Bunnell: And we have the authority to prevent establishment in that area that it's delisted, right? (Right)

Riley Roberts: Alright, we will have any questions from those in attendance.

Questions from the public

Robert Tait: My question is I'm still confused on when the delisting issue. Delisting means that they've been established in the state?

Darrin DeBloois: No, so delisting is a Federal action and as far as I know Kevin they've met all of their recovery goals so the wolves are on the list to be delisted, but obviously this has been tried a few times and it just seems to get tied up....

Kevin Bunnell: Listing and Delisting is a reference to the Endangered Species Act which is a Federal law. So right now they are listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act. Delisting would remove them from the ESA and give management opportunity back to the state of Utah.

Robert Tait: And in order for that to happen there would have to be a population of wolves in the state to no longer be considered endangered in the state, is that correct?

Kevin Bunnell: No because they don't look at it on a state by state basis, they look at it as a range wide of wolves as a species not wolves in Utah.

Robert Tait: Okay, that's good to know. Thank you.

Riley Roberts: Any other questions. Alright, we do have just the one comment card, that's Robert Tait. Alright you have three minutes Robert.

Comments from the public

Robert Tait: I probably have gained most of the information that I need. My interest in commenting in tonight's meeting stems from an experience in a recent elk hunting trip. At considerable expense myself and two friends were transported by horse back into a drop camp in south central Idaho. Past success with a local outfitter guided our decision as to where to go. After four days of hiking, glassing, and waiting at wallows, I seen more wolves than I did elk, deer or moose. On the third day of the hunt a pack of six wolves trotted past the wallow where the three of us were hidden. The next day we ran into a local hunter who has hunted this drainage for a number of years. He described how on his last hunt into the area in 2017 as he hiked the ridges he would glass on any given day 30-40 mature bulls. The minute we told him we'd seen wolves he said that's it, I'm out of here. He proceeded to tell us the areas he had hunted where the introduction of wolves had decimated or driven the elk out. He told us the number of outfitters that have been driven out of business because of this problem. My father was a sheep rancher who was plagued year after year by predation of coyotes and cougars, not so much wolves because there were few wolves around at the time. I may have seen the last wolf killed in the north fork drainage in southern Utah when a cousin showed up in mid 40's with a dead wolf hanging from the rack of his truck. I was probably 10 years old at the time and I saw how happy my father was when he saw the animal. I saw first hand the effects that predation had on my father's life. When I first saw the agenda for this meeting my original thought was to collect some side research on the effect of wolf packs on populations of deer, elk and moose, and then I read the updated June 15, 2019 contract report by the DWR for Big Game Forever, and I think if that's correct, that a contractor has worked with you on developing a wolf plan?

Kevin Bunnell: No, that's a separate issue, that's a lobbyist that the legislature has hired to lobby back

Congress not part of this issue.

Robert Tait: Okay, I see. That's on the DWR website, and I would recommend that anybody that is interested in this issue read that plan, that article that is extremely research based and well put together. I love being outdoors and viewing wildlife as much as I enjoy the hunt. It was amazing to see that pack of wolves in Idaho, however, that experience has not changed my passion to protect deer and elk hunting for my posterity. I probably can go on record with believing that the only good wolf in deer and elk country, is a dead wolf. But I realize that I'm not the only person in today's diverse society as I stated earlier to have a dog in this fight. Hopefully we can avoid the mistakes that have been made by other western states before the already fragile elk population is decimated. Thank you for your time. And I'm sighting information from this study the effects of wolf population on big game animals in Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, and Montana.

Riley Roberts: Thank you and that was well prepared, that was exactly three minutes. If there are no other comments from the audience, are there any comments from the RAC? Gene.

Comments from the RAC

Gene Boardman: I have a question I forgot to ask, is there any threat to the southeast of Utah from the Mexican wolf?

Darrin DeBlois: Kevin probably knows more about that issue than me.

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah, I represented Utah along with Marty Bushman from our Attorney General's office in a group that the Fish and Wildlife Service put together to create a management plan or recovery plan for the Mexican Wolves. My marching orders in participating in that plan was to make sure that Mexican Wolves were not recovered in the state of Utah. Because their native range does not extend into Utah. We were successful in our charge there. The recovery plan keeps them within the historic range of Mexican wolves to about I-40 if you're familiar with Arizona and south of there. So there is no recovery efforts or quotas or anything with Mexican wolves in the state of Utah.

Riley Roberts: This is one that I think most of us.. We may think we have different issues, which we do, with predation, wild horses, invasive species, but wolves is one the majority is on the same page. With that being said if there are no other comments from the RAC I would entertain a Motion.

MOTION to accept the Wolf Management Plan as presented.

Tammy Pearson

Nick Jorgensen, second

Passed unanimously

- **BRINE SHRIMP COR RULE AMENDMENTS**—Martin Bushman, Asst. Attorney General.
See Slideshow

Questions from the RAC:

Riley Roberts: Go ahead Austin.

Austin Atkinson: Quick question. Does that still prevent or protect somebody with a COR from reselling that for a higher value, are we going to get into price gouging on that or is that not even a concern?

Martin Bushman: Yeah, so that is what we're trying to do here is having that contract to go with it should prevent them from selling it to the highest bidder, it would just allow them to renew it at the 15,000. The other thing is we're not just selling them off every year, they've got to have that five year contract. Largely this would be an internal thing. This just limits who can buy it, it doesn't matter who can sell it, it's a way that they can sell it, it doesn't limit who can buy it, it limits how they can sell it, it allows them to sell it.

Kevin Bunnell: So is it fair to say that these rule changes are designed.. that the industry has evolved to a more efficient industry, and we're making rules to catch up to the evolution that has already taken place in the industry?

Martin Bushman: Yes, so this rule was written in the early 90's, the co-op was formed in the mid 2000's. So we've got about 15 years where whoever came up with the original rule never saw a co-op, because there were originally 32 companies out there fighting for space. There are now essentially two.

Riley Roberts: Any other questions from the RAC? Alright, we do have one comment card. Tim Hawks.

Kevin Bunnell: I guess you can ask a question too Tim because we didn't have a question period.

Questions from the Public:

Comments from the Public:

Tim Hawks: I'm here on behalf of the Brine Shrimp industry. I just wanted to express on behalf of that industry our support for this rule change. Our appreciation to Kyle and the Division for working with the industry to really update the rule to reflect the reality of the business environment today in the Brine Shrimp industry. I know this is really down in the weeds. We really appreciate your time and attention and service in this regard. If you have any questions about the industry generally, or about this rule change in particular I'm more than happy to weigh in and talk about them or talk to you after the meeting wraps up. Thank you.

Comments from the RAC:

Riley Roberts: Thank you. Any comments from the RAC? I would entertain a motion.

RAC discussion and vote:

MOTION to accept the Brine Shrimp COR Rule Amendments as presented.

Craig Laub

Sean Kelly, second
Passed unanimously

- **Other Business -Riley Roberts, Chairman**

Riley Roberts: Thank you for that. It was informative. It's always amazing with stuff like that I'm not familiar with some of the things you learn, especially when you're talking the pounds that were harvested. I looked at Kevin and said there were probably not that many pounds of mammals harvested in the state last year. Alright the last item is just informational for the RAC. This is the 2020 RAC schedule. You can look down through that if there are any issues you think off the top of your head.

Kevin Bunnell: So we have the opportunity, or we have the opportunity as a RAC to change the schedule for next year if you would like. The way it's currently, this just reflects what we did this year, that we would have the April and May meetings in Beaver, August in Richfield, the September meeting in Hurricane, and the November and December meeting in Cedar City. That reflects what we did this year. Is there any desire to change the locations of any of those RAC meetings?

Austin Atkinson: I did have a question. Sean and I were actually talking earlier. Is there any possibility of getting one on the other side of the mountain? Get some of those folks involved.

Kevin Bunnell: Sure we can hold them where this body decides to hold them.

You can't change the date, right?

Kevin Bunnell: No, the date can't be changed, that's set by the Board schedule. The starting times and the locations if there's a desire. I can't think that we've had one in Panguitch or in Kanab in my time. But certainly those would be options.

Riley Roberts: And do we have to decide that right now?

Kevin Bunnell: Yes.

Nick Jorgensen: May 19th in Brian Head, is that on the other side of the Mountain?

Kevin Bunnell: No. The other requirement is there needs to be a venue, but I think we could find a venue in most places.

Riley Roberts: And I'm okay with the way that it is it's just something I'd like to look into. I'll be a little more prepared next time.

Kevin Bunnell: I would say that this has evolved this way over time based on attendance and participation and that's why they are where they are.

Austin Atkinson: I was going to ask about starting times. I know some of these meetings that go really late, like 7:00 seems late, but is that strictly for travel time for us and members? Has that kind of been a consensus?

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah we try to, I think the desire would be to start all of them later in the evening for the convenience of the public, so they can come participate. That's the reason why we have the meetings. But there's a recognition that some of the meetings, particularly the April and November meetings are very long agendas typically, that's when we deal with big game stuff and those meetings go long, so we've opted over time to start those meetings earlier so we have time to work through the agenda. The 6:00 start time in December has been kind of a tradition in the southern region just because of how early it gets dark and traveling late at night, it's really just a convenience. It's what the RAC has decided to do over the years.

Riley Roberts: Verland.

Verland King: I look at that Hurricane meeting, I have a hard time getting there. I don't know if they have it there because it's closer to half the RAC or whatever, it seems like we probably didn't have a quorum there did you?

Kevin Bunnell: We didn't.. I don't know if that was in Hurricane. That's the first time that's happened. The reason that that meeting exists in Hurricane is we've heard a lot of feedback in the past about St. George is the largest population center in the southern region and to have one meeting down there.. we've had requests to have at least one meeting down there because it is the largest population center in the southern region. That's how that meeting came to be.

Verland King: Well as long as we keep having the fish there, I guess we're ok.

Riley Roberts: All right, if there's no discussion on changing that then.. do we have to have a motion on that Kevin?

Kevin Bunnell: No, as long as there's agreement within the RAC we'll just keep it the way it is and that's how we'll run it for the next year.

Riley Roberts: Alright, perfect, our next meeting will be April 14th.

Meeting adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

Southeast Regional Advisory Council

**John Wesley Powell River History Museum
1765 E. Main
Green River, Utah**

Dec. 11, 2019

Motion Summary

Approval of agenda and minutes

**MOTION: To approve the agenda and minutes as written
Motion passed unanimously**

Motion to leave resident spring pursuit permits as unlimited and over the counter

**Motion Passes/Failed: 10; Passed
Opposed: 3
Abstaining:**

Motion to accept 16 dog limit on pursuit season

**Motion Passes/Failed: 12, Passed
Opposed: 1**

Motion to not restrict non- residents in pursuit but to make it mandatory to do an online training and survey

**Motion Passes/Failed: 8, passed
Opposed: 5**

Motion to accept the remainder of the DWR's recommendations

**Motion Passes/Failed: 12, Passed
Opposed: 1**

Motion to Accept the Renewal of the Wolf Management Plan

**Motion Passes/Failed: Passed, Unanimous
Opposed:
Abstaining:**

Motion to accept the Brine Shrimp Amendments

**Motion Passes/Failed: passed, unanimous
Opposed:
Abstaining:**

Southeast Regional Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell River History Museum
1765 E. Main
Green River, Utah

Nov. 20, 2019 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Trisha Hedin, Chairman
Kent Johnson, Vice Chairman · Public at large
Steven Duke, Public at Large
Lynn Sitterud · Elected official
Scoot Flannery · Sportsmen
Chris Wood, DWR Regional Supervisor
Gerrish Willis
Brad Richman
Eric Luke
Darren Olsen
Todd Thorne
Jeff Christensen
Kirk Player
Jace Guymon
Dana Truman

Members Absent

Helene Taylor

Total public attendance

28

Others in attendance

DWR personnel:

7

1) Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure

- Trisha Hedin, Vice chairman

Introductions:

Trisha Hedin: So we're going to go ahead and get started. Thank you so much for coming to the southeastern regional RAC meeting. It's really important to have the public here and we're all excited to have you all show up for various agenda items. The way that this process works is you will have a presentation by the Division of Wildlife after that the RAC will be able to ask questions to the biologist that is presenting. After that we take questions from the audience. There is also a clarification period so if the biologist is asked to clarify items with him or her. Then after that, we will have comments. If you want to make a comment, and you're allowed three minutes if you're an individual, five minutes if you're an organization, you need to make

sure you've turned in one of these comment cards. They are in the back and you can just bring them up and give them to Chris. Then you will be allowed your comment period. After that we are going to take comments from the RAC and then at that time the RAC will begin to deliberate. I'll make a couple overall statements tonight. I'm going to chew on the RAC specifically. One we're not speaking into the microphone, so it's torturing Aaron, so we have to speak into the microphone. That also goes for the audience.

Aaron Bott: The microphone isn't for us, we can hear each other, it's for the recording.

Trisha Hedin: We have an issue specifically with abstentions with our RAC and we can't keep doing that. So if you're abstaining because you have a conflict of interest then you need to state that, but other than that, you've got to choose a side. (And that comes from our Board coordinator) Basically I'm getting chewed on so.. I just want to say that overall tonight I think that it's really important that we have some agenda items that pertain specifically to the southeast region, so I'm really glad that we have individuals here to speak to that and I think that we as a RAC really need to take this meeting seriously each agenda item, because I think our voice is going to be very heavily weighted if that makes sense. That agenda item hasn't done much at the other meetings because it doesn't pertain to them, but I think it really pertains to us so I think we really need to be serious about that.

Eric Luke: I just received a text. There's a crash on Hwy 6 so some of our RAC Board members are held up in traffic.

2) Approval of Agenda and Minutes

VOTING

Motioned by: Kent Johnson

Seconded by: Eric Luke

Motion Passes/Failed: Passed. Unanimous

Opposed:

3) Wildlife Board Meeting Update

- Trisha Hedin, RAC chairman

Trisha Hedin: I kind of scratched out a number of things, the meeting did go long. We did start at the Castle Valley item that was on the last agenda meeting and what was decided by the State Board was to go back to the 1999 statute which was allowed muzzleloader, shotgun, and archery and that was unanimous. So basically...

Chris Wood: I just what to say – I encourage you to watch the Youtube videos. I won't do this all night, I promise. I thought the Board did a really good job to show understanding but also understand the public issue. After the decision was made and they were leaving and they took it really well and they were in good spirits. They understood and thought the Board did a really

great job. They felt listened to.

Trisha Hedin: Yeah I think they did a great job. I think the presentation was great, I think the Board was again, dealt with them in a very empathetic manner, but it came down to it's a lot of public land that they were attempting to put that on. As far as the deer management plan, there were a couple of things that stood out. There was a motion to change the verbage from skull plate to clean skull, basically clean of brain matter. Covy was going to clean that up and make that appropriate. Basically that if you kill a deer in Colorado and you want to bring it across that night, you wouldn't be able to. You could bring the skull plate if you cleaned that up. There was a motion and it basically said with the late muzzleloader hunt and the minimum would be five our up to .5 and I think that was the verbiage that we used and that was what passed unanimously. This was a big one and I might have Chris solidify this, but there was a motion that was put on the Board. There were 11 units and I believe we're one of them. There was a 15-17 buck/doe ratio, then there's 18 units that are 18-20 and those numbers, if I'm saying it correctly, were removed.

Chris Wood: It's my understanding that the plan assured that balance of opportunity with a higher buck to doe ratio. The Board removed that assurance so what that means from my understanding is unit plans will come through the RAC and the Board process and that is the time to decide our buck to doe ratios for each individual unit. So wanting to keep balance is not surety in the plan anymore. It will be decided in the RACs.

Trisha: It was rough. I'll tell you the deer management plan went on for three hours. That was rough. Let's see, as far as bucks, bulls, once in a lifetime there was really nothing that stood out to me except for we were attempting to remove that extended archery in the Green River Valley, and that was not passed. We're stuck with it.

Chris Wood: We have spoken to some Green River residents and I didn't understand at the Board meeting either, but basically it's all private land, so they're worried about trespass. So Brad's going to try to work with those that make the proclamation and guidebook and make sure that's listed in the guidebook so people know that the Green River Valley is I think 100% private lands.

Trisha Hedin: There was that CWMU that was brought to the table for us to evaluate. That reached the Wildlife Board they did not give them their variance for the year. So they'll have to come back to the table next year.

Chris Wood: Although I also heard that on the way home that they came to an agreement amongst each other so I think there is some partnership there. Not exactly sure how it fell out, but I heard that on the way home.

Trisha Hedin: Yeah, it's Days of our Lives. And then I did not stay for the remainder of the point creep by Lindy, I was not given a summary of the motions by today. I attempted to watch the video, I just couldn't do it. Kevin, is there anything that stood out about the point creep?

Kevin: They passed those.

4) **Regional Update**

- Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor

If you haven't it might be worth going back and watching the Board meeting. Kevin was there. He couldn't make motions, but he made great discussions.

Trisha Hedin: He did a great job, it was rough.

Chris Wood: Good evening, glad everyone's here. Welcome Todd, you were stuck in that traffic so glad to see you. Merry Christmas, thanks for spending a night in December here with us. I know this is a very busy time of the year. I want to thank everyone from the public that came and the RAC members who came to serve. On your way out there's a Christmas present for the RAC members. I feel like I just saw you like a week or two ago, but I guess it's been about three weeks maybe. I feel like you should still be mad at me from the last meeting we had, it was rough. Thanks for coming again to serve. I'll just do a real quick update. We're doing a lot of the same things this month that we were doing last month. We're doing our recaptures, you can see some pictures here. Always beautiful pictures by the way, the screen doesn't do it justice. They were taken by Aaron Bott. So our habitat and aquatics sections, we're doing restoration work. Planning for the upcoming year. This is the time of year that we work with our partners to write proposals, and put them in a computer database to be reviewed and funded. Our aquatics section is working on deciding what they want to do in the upcoming year to keep them busy throughout the spring and summer and fall. This is a beautiful photo Andrew just took a few weeks ago, we're doing our capture work with mule deer. Capturing does, fawns and bucks. We're trying to understand their conditions and their migration routes. Later in the winter as we catch them we'll monitor pregnancy rates as well. Then for our outreach and law enforcement; outreach is working on some wildlife fencing projects. Our law enforcement officers are working with bison hunts and some trapping cases going on. And that is the picture proof that I do leave the office sometimes. There's our capture schedule, we've done a few of those. Those are subject to change a little bit. We're going back to the La Sals between the San Juan and Book Cliffs. Again if you're interested in helping out with any of these captures, it's a really nice day in the field. They bring in the deer, they tether them to the helicopter and bring them to the station area. We'll take blood and measure their fat and age them. It's a really good time. If any one is interested talk to me and I'll just make sure we keep you updated on the schedule so nothing has changed, as weather happens. And that's all I've got. Questions? Thank you.

Trisha Hedin: Ok Darren, we're going to have you present our black bear and cougar rule amendments.

5) **R657 Black Bear and R657-10 Cougar Rule Amendments**

- Darren Deblois, Mammals Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Trisha: Thank you. Do we have any questions from the RAC for Darren?

Kent Johnson: I do have one question, with going to restricted pursuit on the La Sals, San Juan, Book Cliffs.. I'll rephrase the question. Is this going to move the problem of non residents staying too long and chasing animals, is this going to move the problem to a different mountain?

Darren: I guess that's always a possibility, I don't know how to answer that...

Kent: I have a comment too, but I'll save that for the comment period.

Darren: One other thing I should add too, Kent, that I thought you were going to ask but didn't mention, part of this limited entry season does, and I know this will come up tonight so I better mention it. It does include a two year waiting period, and a bonus point system, so again, I'm sure that will come up in conversation, so everyone is on the same page to begin with.

Trisha: I have a question, is there anyway to eliminate non resident hunters all together in those three units?

Darren: That was part of our discussion, there's a couple of concerns that Marty and Greg have some concerns about doing something that's unprecedented. So we're safer legally if we do something that we currently have in place. But, having said that, when it comes to recreational activities, they feel like legally we could curtail non resident pursuit as long as we're not affecting guides and outfitters. And we handle that by allowing them to pursue. Again, the long answer is we picked a strategy that was least likely to see legal challenge, but that doesn't mean there aren't other ways we can do it.

Kent: Was it taking about restricting non residents to an apply period? Restricting hunts statewide?

Darren: Yeah. One of the things that came up is the Idaho model. So in Idaho in order to use dogs in the field you have to have a hound handler permit, and those are unlimited for Idaho residents, but they have a cap for non residents, 70 permits. It is a strategy we could employ, it would require us to go through the legislature to create a new permit and we'd have to come up with a new system. We could do it that way. That's probably a three year in the future proposition, so again we chose this to try to be timely. That's an option too.

Eric Luke: I've got a couple questions. With the Forest Service law of 16 hounds in camp, are DWR conservation officers able to enforce those regulations, or would that have to be enforced by Forest Service?

Darren: It would have to be enforced by the Forest Service. That's my understanding. If I'm wrong, somebody let me know. Yes I can see heads nodding.

Eric Luke: Okay. This is a question for the conservation officers in that area that are dealing with this, but where are the conflicts happening? Are they in the camp grounds? Along the roads? Are they out in the field where they're chasing? Where are the majority of the conflicts happening?

Trisha: You can't be yelling from the back.

Adam Wallerstein: I'm Adam Wallerstein. It is kind of a broad question as far as where the problems are stemming from. I think a lot of the problems that we've had lately are primarily trespass. Whether it be intentional or not, trespassing to retrieve dogs that's been a major problem. Certainly the camping stuff is for the respective agencies. I'd say my primary complaint was trespass this year.

Eric Luke: Okay. Next question, and this may be for someone else but what's the impact? You look at 75 permits and 16 hounds. That's 1,200 dogs per unit. Then add on the 40 some odd kill tags that's over 1,800 dogs on the same unit. Obviously they're not all going to be there at the same time, but the timing of this... The peak of this time when the majority of this is happening is two or three weeks in May, right? That is right at the beginning of fawning and calving season. How much impact do these hounds have on... I do know I've done enough studying to know that those three units have some of the lowest fawn recruitment in the state. Obviously the high numbers of predators and bears is one of the primary reasons for that, do we have any idea the kind of impact the houndmen and dogs, that number of them, are having on our fawns?

Adam Wallerstein: That's a great question, but I don't think I would have the answer or anyone here has the answer to that. Great question.

Darren: Specifically in the deer range, if anyone knows it, it would be Dustin. So while he's on his way up, I'll throw a couple more numbers at you just in terms of what you're talking about. Again, we see an average of 8-9 pursuers with a pack size average of a little above 8. Those aren't always individual dogs and individual dogs pursuing alone. So it's them grouping up. When we ask them how many dogs are in their group, that's what they tell us. So when you do the math that's 722 dogs, but it's not, it's some number less than that. So even with a 16 cap people aren't tending to take that many, although, there are some handful of individuals that have 30-40 so it's my understanding that some of the concern is these camps with big numbers of dogs. And the Forest can speak to that.

Dustin Mitchel: Dustin Mitchel, wildlife biologist for La Sal and San Juan. So our peak fawning is in mid-June and peak calving is in early June. We have the spring harvest season, and we went this route about five years ago when we switched and had the summer bait only hunt because the houndmen wanted it reversed from what it is. But we went with the June bait only hunt to get rid of that problem. We're not really impacting the fawns and calves. As you said we may be impacting the fawns and calves especially on the Manti or something, these southern units it's pushed back a little further. So it really shouldn't have much of an impact for fawns and calves for running dogs.

Trisha: Okay.

Scot Flannery: You answered a couple of my questions already, but you said there were 20 non residents generally on the La Sals, do you have that number for the San Juan?

Darren: No. But I think we might be able to get to it. Statewide there are 60 non-resident permits on average and so 20 on the La Sals the remainder of the permits are split between the San Juan

and Book Cliffs. It's probably sixes, what's left is probably split between those two units. It varies from year to year but I think that's a good guess.

Darren Olsen: One or two questions. Spring pursuit on your slide it says, limit the number of dogs that can be used. Can you clarify that a little more? To be used, does that mean they can have more in their possession they can't turn out?

Darren: Yes, 16 would be the limit that can be actively pursuing the animal. In order to switch dogs out they would have to remove some dogs from that chase, regain control and take them back before they could add. So the max when you arrive at the tree should be 16.

Darren Olsen: And you brought up the meeting that was held with the DWR, Forest Service personnel, houndsmen, and Sitla. I remember after that meeting you with some of the houndsmen there we talked about an 8-12 dog limit, and now I see in this proposal we're back to 16.

Darren: So in the meeting we were talking 12 to 16. It was split, half the group voted for 12 and half the group voted for 16. I think our overall objective here was to try to address the problem but be as minimally invasive to the status quo as possible, so we elected to go with that higher number. But we did talk about 12 and we have had people bring up smaller numbers than that as well.

Trisha: Jace.

Jace Guymon: Regarding the Book Cliffs, what was the reasoning between bumping it in with the La Sals and the San Juan?

Darren: There are the three most popular units in the state, Book Cliffs, La Sal and San Juan and we felt like if we limit it on those two units then we'll just see people shift to that third. So it's primarily a preemptive...

Jace: So is the main issue? Is there interaction with the general public non hunters like recreationalist?

Darren: In the spring, we could have some of our local people speak to this, but my impression from the group is it was mostly houndsmen and probably some antler gatherers. But there doesn't seem to be a conflict between users, there's just a volume of people. The roads in the spring is an issue with the Forest, trespass is an issue. That isn't necessarily limited to the spring, but just the volume of people with dogs is our concern.

Jace: Thank you.

Trisha: Okay. I'm not trying to dissuade these sweet people from asking questions, I just want to say we have quite a few steps.

Eric Luke: So with that Darren, if that's the primary concern, the number of people, yet the

number of permits we're allowing is more than the average people that have been there on those units. So how is that diminishing the problem?

Darren: Again one of the concerns raised is that they felt like the people problem was primarily a concern of non residents who tend to bring more dogs, and stay longer. So this is still not changing a lot, but it's doing a lot of little things that we hope will add up to alleviate some pressure. So eliminating dogs, enforcing the camping rule, enforcing the number of dogs. Maybe shift a few guys out of the La Sals into those other units. We didn't want to be too draconian, but see if we could make a difference.

Trisha: Okay. I think we're moving on. So at this point we'll take questions from the audience. What I'd like you to do is, if you want to ask a question we'll just line up here by the microphone. Just make sure you state your name and you speak clearly into the microphone. I also want to make sure you understand what a question is. So we're going to have a comment period, so make sure you come up with a question. I do know the difference, I'm a teacher. So if you have some questions then come on up and again, clearly state your name.

Question from the audience

Carolyn Daily: I'm Carolyn Daily. I live in the Foothills in the La Sals. I have a question as to how you came up with the 75 as a number for the permits for this pursuing and how you come up with 44 animals as I understand can be killed a year? And what percentage is that of the total population?

Darren: The permits are set according to a formula in our black bear management plan. We look at the number of females that are taken during the three years previous to the recommendation cycle. We also look at the number of the older age class of the animals taken. So we're trying to make sure in order to maintain a stable population, we have 40% or less females so we're not taking all the females off the mountain. We want to make sure there are older adults to maintain breeding. The pursuit is a little bit different, we do look at our harvest statistics but we do rely on our local biologist to determine the kind of numbers people can pursue on these units. The intent here is more of a capture and release kind of thing. They can pursue a bear and then they have to let it go, and that's the same for lion.

Carolyn Daily: You didn't answer what the populations are.

Darren: Oh. So we, because of the numbers we don't estimate the populations by unit, but the statewide population trend has been up the last ten years. We may start to see some leveling off, but we have seen some healthy bear population, growing population over the last decade or so.

Carolyn: How do you know 44 is the proper amount to kill then?

Darren: It's based on the number of females and the number of adults in the harvest.

Rick -: My name is Rick. I'm a non-resident houndsmen. My question is that I want to know

how many tickets were issued to residents vs. non residents.

Darren: Law enforcement can answer that. Our recommendations tonight are not a reaction to law breaking, our primary concern is just the volume. We're not saying the houndsmen are out there breaking the law right and left. I know that law enforcement has some of those numbers.

Roger Kerstetter: Roger Kerstetter, I'm Ltd. of the southeastern region. Like you to preface this conversation, we wrote about 19 tickets this year. We can break some of those out, some of the data is here, but not all of the data is broken out. I'm just looking here. This year it looks like we had 19 violations on the La Sal Mountains, 11 of those have an indicator that they are bear related. The officer reported down bear as the activity. It looks like the majority of them this year were residents. Or at least it shows a resident address.

Darren Golesby: Darren Golesby I'm from Grand Junction Colorado, non resident, obviously. How many of the pursuit permits statewide, I know you said 60 non resident, how many total? How many total pursuit permits statewide?

Darren: I'd have to look it up.

Darren Golesby: Okay. As far as how you said x amount of hunters per unit, per San Juan, per Book Cliffs, per La Sal. What data do you use to know the specific unit? Personally, I hunt several.

Darren: So when we do our survey we asked people where they hunted. So some people hunt multiple units, so what we did when we calculated these numbers was if a person indicated they handled the La Sals we counted them.

Darren Golesby: Okay, cool. Then last one, have you done an actual count on non hound related recreationalist? Specifically to the La Sals?

Darren: If it's not hunting related, no we wouldn't. If you're curious on the spring, the only users I think would be maybe shed hunters and that's something we don't track.

Darren Golesby: Ok, thank you.

Cash Sway: My name is Cash Sway and I'm a hounds hunter/cattle runner. Midlife houndsmen, I started about five years ago. My question is was there in the discussion group, was there any effort to divide the number of pursuers up? Maybe split the time period to give more houndsmen a chance to hunt at different times?

Darren: Yeah. I actually threw that out as an option and it wasn't popular. So we did, yeah.

Cash: With what field?

Darren: Mostly the houndsmen felt that if we split it early and late that early part of the hunt does not go great and people would not be interested in hunting it.

Cash: It just looks to me like it would be a good chance to sell more permits, more revenue. The ones that wanted it worse would apply for the later ones, the others would take a chance. But why does it hurt?

Darren: It definitely is a strategy we could talk about.

Guy Webster: Guy Webster. First do you have any expectations on the applicant number for these three?

Darren: I think given human nature, I think once you perceive something as scarce, people are probably going to put in for as many opportunities as possible. I expect to see a fair amount of folks putting in grandma, mom and sister and brother.

Guy Webster: Next question, on these three units, with the three year waiting period, what's your recommendation....

Darren: This is the waiting period issue that we talked about. What happens is if the unit goes unsubscribed any remaining permits would go over the counter so it would be a first come first serve over the counter. Oh, by the way, if you're on a waiting period you can get one of those tags. It will restart your waiting period, but once they go over the counter it's open to everybody.

Guy Webster: Is there any legal reason why we would have to have a waiting period?

Darren. No. Licensing again. This comes back to setting precedent. It's logistical and no there's no reason. We prefer to do what we normally do, but I don't think there's any legal reason we couldn't waive.

Guy Webster: Okay. Is there a way to get better questioning on pursuit and harvest referring back to Eric's question on the amount of dogs. Myself and my son, two pursuits three hunters, we would be counting those numbers five times? Is there a better way to question that so we're not showing five times the amount of dogs on the mountain?

Darren: Yeah, Guy. In fact we've talked about trying to tighten that up so we have better answers. Again, people do group up so we can't just.. We know how many people pursue there, but trying to add dogs based on average pack size and..

Guy Webster: And number of contacts on those big threes, do you have any idea what that number is?

Darren: Yeah I think they probably have a number.

Guy Webster: And second with that I'd like to know how many trespasses.

Roger Kerstetter: I'll start with your second question first. For this year, 2019. It looks like there are eight citations for trespassing this year.

Guy Webster: Can you explain why this one shows five?

Roger Kerstetter: I don't know I'm looking at the GRAMA request we sent to...

Guy Webster: I have it right here. How about the overall number of contacts?

Roger Kerstetter: I don't know off the top of my head.

Guy: 1,016. So..

Roger: But all of those contacts may not be bear related.

Guy: We're talking five or maybe eight, how many different instances was it? Was it isolated with multiple people? Contacts in my line of law enforcement means a citation. But a citation for a warning may involve 4,5,6 people.

Roger: Right, the contacts are the number of people that are contacted, not the number of citations.

Guy: But do you know what number of instances trespassing. Was this one instance where five different individuals all receive a citation on one dog retrieval?

Roger: Well, we did have a case on the saturation control where we wrote 11 citations on a weekend and a large percentage of those situations were to one group of houndsmen, yes.

Guy: Well what were those citations?

Roger: We had five trespassing, one hunting without a permit that was a warning. We had three registration violations, we had one warning for use of tobacco and we had one failure to display a license plate.

Guy: Can you verify to me the current regulations on (inaudible) of a person without a harvest permit. The current regulations about the actual houndsmen themselves. A pursuit permit with a resident or non resident. Does the proclamation not already allow that?

Darren DeBloois: That's correct, so the guide doesn't have to have a permit. Again, that's the crux of this interstate commerce concern that the office has. Quickly when we were asked how many statewide permits 524 statewide pursuit permits. That included spring/summer.

Jessy Lin: Hello, I'm Jessy Lin. There's 30 more spot and stock permits for the Boulders and five more bait hunts. How come there was no hound opportunity in that?

Darren: The reason we chose those to put those during the bait season is that's the most successful season on Boulder. So you could add five more bears during that season than the hound season.

Jessy Lin: If they are going off of success rate could they raise it a couple more spring tags where it's a little harder for the houndsmen to give them a better chance of harvesting?

Darren: We could do that. Again, this is a response primarily to mule deer numbers. So we want to make sure that primarily we want to provide some opportunity in the fall when a lot of people are in the field, but again the success rate isn't high so we focused on the most effective season. That was our strategy, but of course the RAC can consider other things.

Trisha: Do you have a comment card? Because if you do have a recommendation that would be a really good time during comment.

Cathy May: Cathy May from Colorado. My husband has hounds. He comes over to hunt. My question to you is, he said one of the members from this RAC the one who's deciding all these new regulations you're deciding to eliminate the non residents and all that kind of stuff; he's one of the Board members of your Wildlife Board and a Board member of the RAC. Do you think that's a conflict of interest for him to be making those?

Darren: We had two Board members on the committee. Byron Bateman and Kevin Albrect. We also had folks that represented houndsmen on the Board.

Cathy May: Do you think that is a conflict of interest for a resident houndsmen that's going to vote on the Board

Darren: I think the Board has an interest in this discussion, I don't think so.

Cathy May: Ok. So there were 524 pursuit permits statewide and 60 of those are non residents. Do you think the non residents are creating more of an impact than residents?

Darren: Most of those permits are choosing these three units. And again, most of our discussions were that seems to be the concern. In our recommendation, again, the discussion covered from totally eliminating non resident pursuit on those units to recommending to do what we do with everything else when there is a limited number of permits, they get 10%.

Cathy May: So do you think the non-residents have more of an impact on the units than the residents do.

Darren: That was what was represented by folks that hunt the unit, yes.

Cathy May: And why do you think that? What do they do that impacts the ground more than the residents that outnumber them?

Darren: So the concern is that there's a lot of people. That non residents are disproportionately picking those units to come pursue. So in an attempt to reduce the overall numbers we're recommending a reduction to the non resident tags. Non residents can still pursue other units in the state without limit, it would just be these three.

Cathy May: So we have been told there has been a long varied law on the books by several houndsmen that are guides that are long retired. They told us that we need to look it up, that there is a long varied law that says that anyone in the state of Utah can pursue to train their dogs at any time in any area that has pursuit seasons.

Darren: If you're a guide or outfitter..

Cathy: I know what it says now in your book. They said that there is a law that says that a guide can do that.

Darren: I'm not aware of any statute of law that would allow that, no.

Trisha: We now move into any clarification from the RAC. Not comments, we now have a couple new steps in this process, so are there any clarifying questions from the RAC?

Darren Olsen: Yeah, I know there has been some discussion the non resident numbers. Is there a limitation to 10% or can you speak to that?

Darren: 10% is a rule of thumb that we use for other hunts and this comes back to the point I made earlier about maintaining precedence. So the reason that we're recommending 10%, one is we didn't feel like we wanted to totally eliminate non residents on the unit, and 10% is the number we used for other limited entry opportunities. That is not something that is set in rule for statute. Just conventions.

Eric Luke: So with the non-residents, as far as the actual hunting permits they still get 10%. That's the way it stands? What we're talking about here is strictly the pursuit.

Darren: Right.

Trisha: Darren, do you want to give anything else to clarify or law enforcement, biologist? Anything you want to add at this time?

Darren: I think we're ok, but if we get an opportunity after comments if something comes up, I'll pop up.

Comments from the audience

Trisha: Ok. So I'm starting in on comments. So keep in mind, if you represent an organization or an agency, you have five minutes. If you are just an individual you have three.

Eric Luke: Do you have a hot date or what?

Trisha: No. I'd like to go to bed. I've had some late nights dealing with this. So let's do Tanner Holiday, San Juan, Houndsman.

Tanner Holiday: Alright, like she said I'm Tanner Holiday. I'm representing San Juan Houndsmen Association. And myself obviously. Third generation houndsmen, I've been around a long time, as far back as I can remember I've been chasing hounds around the mountain with my grandpa. I come from a lot of knowledge, a lot of time and effort. I've heard that these are little recommendations that have very little impact. These recommendations could have huge impact. I only have six dogs myself, but there's a chance I have to put in for a pursuit, I'm from Blanding, If I put in for a restrictive pursuit that has a waiting period of two years, you're telling me I might have the opportunity to pursue bears to train my dogs once every three years? That's a huge impact. That concerns me as I'm not going to be able to justify to keep my hounds around to chase a few cats in the winter. I can't afford that, and every houndsmen in here knows that they can't afford that either. I'm concerned because I have kids that love it, I want to see it carry on through more generations. We have talked about the problems that we have. There are too many pursuers, talking about non residents and the number of dogs. There's rules that are in place already with the Forest Service, a 16 dog limit. If those were actually enforced, we'd take care of non residents that were coming here.. I think we can all agree we've seen non residents come here with more than 100 hounds. It's a huge problem, I've seen it myself and it leaves a huge mess for camping sites. I think we agree with that. But if you enforce the 16 dog limit that is already in place that keeps the non residents coming up with 100 dogs. It takes care of that problem. We don't need to do what government does best, govern to govern for no reason. I think the rules are in place, we as an organization strongly oppose the restricted pursuit for the spring and any other regulations here simply because the rules are in place. We don't need to do what government does best and that's overregulate. Thank you.

Cash Jewks: I'm a local houndsman. I live in Castle Dell over here and I would say I'm probably the majority of houndsmen. I work a full time job. I have a family. I get to hunt some weekends. To see a few bad apples come from bad apples come from out of state, and I'm not saying all of them because I know a lot of them take care of the place just as good as the people who love to hunt there. But there are a few out of staters that come in for a living to train dogs and kill bears, and they ruin it for the majority. The few are killing us and now we're having to put on all these restrictions on.. Like the Blanding kid, he's going to be able to hunt bears every three years if that. It really impacts the majority of these houndsmen because of the few bad apples of the minority. Like he was saying I just feel that the residents and the majority that's being impacted here, we should have the opportunity to continually train our dogs in our own state and our own home towns. Thank you.

Trisha: Thanks Cash. Next Tyler Tuttle.

Tyler Tuttle: I'm Tyler Tuttle from Orangeville, UT. I've grown up here in Orangeville and my parents have been here for 30 years. The privilege of running hounds, it's a great opportunity for families and friends to get together and share as a family. I watch my two young girls, they have the opportunity to have the love that I have for the hounds. I hate to see any changes to the hounds.. We're already restricted bad enough. And these three units down here on the southeast corner, they kind of govern what happens statewide. For the Manti, it ruins the family event. You're putting 16 dog limit, it's more of a family thing for me and my friends. We don't have a lot of complaints on the Manti. Statewide thing is.. the restricted pursuit is just a bad idea. I think that it's better for families as a group to let us have opportunity. So that's all.

Trisha: Next Cash Lin. Thank you Tyler.

Cash Lin: I appreciate the RAC and the Board and everybody doing the best they can trying to solve this problem. I know everybody has an opinion and you can't make everybody happy. One of the things I wanted to bring up, there seems to be a great interest in hound hunting, and it seems to be increasing. This overcrowding seems to be happening and I think it has a lot to do with technology, GPS. In that thought of mind, I wondered if the Division could look more towards creating more opportunities for these hounds pursuing rather than trying to limit them. Obviously it's exciting for people, it's growing. If it's not hurting the resource you mentioned the overcrowding problems, yet you have eight citations on a whole mountain? That's not a lot of citations, considering I can see the overcrowding problem. I've been down there, I can see it's got to be dealt with, but I really think we need to look at maybe making more opportunities. And everything's been about loss for the houndsmen. I mean even on this Kaiparowits/Boulder there could have been something done to throw some hound hunting opportunity in there, but there wasn't. You're saying it's because you wanted to do it in the most effective time of the season, well then another guy is saying that part of the season is when we should have the houndsmen in there.. or we shouldn't have hunting in there because it's fawn mortality. I've been hunting now for about five years now, been on about 50 hunts, and I haven't witnessed one deer mortality, and I say that with all truthfulness. I've hunted with several different guides. So say what you want, I don't think that's a problem either.

Trisha: Thank you Cash. Next, Jessy Lin.

Jessy Lin: I just have to start, I agree with a lot of things that have been said here tonight. Putting a restriction on those three units, it could turn into like he was saying everyone's saying it's a little thing, but it's probably going to have a lot more effect than they let it out to be. We hunt on the Manti, it's close to home, but we love going down to the San Juan for a weekend or two, the La Sals and Book Cliffs and seeing that. But as far.. I didn't want to be up here in the first place, I just wanted to voice an opinion. I got hounds when I was probably 12 or so, I just got a hound and I started doing it. Now I've got two little girls and I take them with me and it's a fun family event. I've got some friends and that's what we look forward to on the weekend. Going down on the La Sals and stuff we kind of make a trip out of that in the spring and we'll go down for a weekend here or there. There is the complaints on overcrowding and stuff but you know a lot of these guys from Colorado and stuff they're close and they don't serve as much of a problem as the people back east and clear up north and stuff and if they do come down with 100 dogs and they camp there for a month, they're not there for a couple of days so I can see how that would make a lot of people wonder what is going on here and that is an issue that we need to look into. As far as restricting us, the guys who work like Cash said. That's going to be a big downfall. The outfitters they don't draw for a pursuit they'll probably get a hunter down there and they'll get to hunt it anyways. I think the only people this will have an effect on is just your average guy who just does it because he loves it. Wants it to spread, and it is spreading, technology like they said, it's becoming a lot more popular thing. I don't just support houndsmen, I support any kind of hunting there is. I'd probably buy more tags than just the average deer hunter, or the elk hunter or something. I buy bobcat tags, furbearer tags, lion pursuit, bear pursuit. It's a big chunk of money out of my pocket. I don't have a lot of money, but it's something I love to do. I'd hate

to see more confrontation on other mountains then it will get restricted there and I'd hate to see that. 100% I want to be ethical, I want the houndsmen to be represented as an ethical group. Everybody kind of see's it as wild and stuff, but there's a lot of work and there's a lot of love that goes into it. So I'll just say that.

Trisha: Thank you Jessy. Next Chris.

Chris Haskle: I just want to say thanks to you guys for listening to all of our concerns. I'm a local resident of San Juan county. We moved to San Juan county because we loved bear hunting so much. We changed our life and moved there from Utah county. My family has been in hounds almost 50 years. I have four generations now, I have a two and a half year old grandson who's as crazy about the hound dogs as his mother is. So I'd hate to see you guys restrict. My family has fought hard and long. Probably one of the oldest houndsmen in this group is my husband on the back row and his dad. It's sad to me that you assume that since there are so many houndsmen on the mountain that we're all bad. We're not. There's a few bad apples that take it away from everyone else, but restricting our ability to do what we love and like someone said trying to feed hound dogs, I don't know if you guys know the financing part of it, but one bad of dog food that's a 50 lb bag lasts me about four days. I have eight dogs. I hope you guys take into consideration what you're doing to the families of this community by impact. It's not just a lot of wild kids on the mountain, this is families of generation after generation of houndsmen that appreciates the mountain and try to take care of the mountain the best they can. As a San Juan county houndsmen association member, and my family, I strictly oppose the restricted pursuit. Thank you.

Trisha: Thank you Chris. Next Garret.

Garret Golesby: Ok once again, Garret Golesby. As far as my credibility to talk about this, Colorado allows more non-resident hunting than any state in the western United States. In 2019, 19% of deer hunters were non-resident, 23% of elk hunters were non resident. Colorado welcomes these non residents because obviously economy boots, revenue gains and promoting the sport overall. As far as my personal experience with the spring hunt, as I said I'm from Grand Junction, I hunt the Book Cliffs and La Sals. Depending on where I go it's a one to three hour drive. I don't really camp because my work schedule is all over the place, so even with my long drive every morning, I rarely have trouble finding a bear to chase everyday. And I've truly never run into enough houndsmen for me to shy away and not want to come back. Overall I've truly had a great experience with the spring bear hunt. As far as the resource damage I challenged who ever thinks that during that last month of May there's only houndsmen on the mountain, specifically on the La Sal. Take a drive on the loop road that last week of May; it is a freaking mad house with recreationalist, houndsmen, shed hunters, you name it. It's been a long winter, everybody is getting out, and I can assure you that to every hound truck, I would challenge that there are 50 trucks to every hound truck on the mountain; or vehicles I should say. So no way non resident hound hunters or hound hunters in general cause any more disturbance than others in general, or non hunters that stay for extended periods of time. You have these groups coming to Moab for standard recreation and it is not uncommon to see 20 people in camp and I guarantee they are not the ones that care about the wildlife, they're not the ones that care about the resource that we have, and they do not take as good of care of the country as any hunter does and I can

guarantee that. So as you guys said there's bad eggs in any walk of life, as far as breaking the law non resident, resident, if they're a bad person they're going to do it. So I feel that some of these changes are based on hypocrisy and emotion and it's just not ok. If you apply, have applied, or will apply in the future for any species in any state I feel like there's no leg to stand on with this subject as far as against non residents and honestly against houndsmen in general. All in all as hunters in this time in the world we have a lot bigger fights to fight than discussing an imaginary line in the desert. So that's my two cents.

Trisha: Thank you Garret. Next we have Scott Watson.

Scott Watson: My name is Scott Watson I'm a Forest Service law enforcement on the Manti/La Sal. I've lived in Sanpete county, I'm the only Forest Service on the Manti/La Sal, that includes Moab also. I used to live in Monticello and I moved north. At times I cover Ashley, Fish Lake and the Manti, just depending on staff. So just kind of give a background on me. I've got a lot of friends here, I have a lot of friends that use hounds. I get a lot of phone calls with folks talking about 50 dogs in this camp, 100 dogs in this camp, this trailers been there for two months. I can't say, I don't usually get into the weeds on how many are in state and out of state, I really don't care. I would say that I only wrote a few tickets this year and most of them were for 14 day camping. I didn't spend a lot of time patrolling down in Moab/Monticello so I didn't make a lot of contacts, didn't get to deal with some of the other underlying issues, I just don't have time. I know that some groups want the Forest Service to solve the problem, the 14 days and the 16 hounds, but we can't do it by ourselves. We have impacts on La Sal Loop. As people were asking questions. On the La Sal Loop we get a concentrated number of houndsmen and we kind of run into some issues there because it's adjacent to private lands. Seen some trespassing, and I've seen some large groups there. Get some complaints about the public about camps being there all summer, you know from spring through the whole pursuit, just can't camp there. We re seeing dogs on trails without handlers. We had a couple of folks talk about new technology with GPS. What we're seeing is folks turn dogs out with a collar on them and just waiting until the collar stops and just hoping the dog comes back and if not they go find the dog. Sometimes the dogs get lost, people take dogs, and it's just a mess, we get complaints about that all the time. People call me and say they're missing a dog, and there's not a whole lot I can do about that. We've had dogs down in the roadless area following our staff around, because they don't know where their owners are, so they find people and just wander and hope that they might get back to their owners. Another big impact here besides the La Sal Loop and this one does pertain to large groups coming in a train. We'll get 50-100 dogs out there and it does leave an impact on the ground. I can go into that camp and tell you if there were houndsmen camping there because theirs dog food scattered, dog feces everywhere that doesn't get picked up, that's not something you think about picking up. We used to have a lot of problems near Pipeline on Monticello, but we're not seeing it as much. We get all kinds of complaints but most of them aren't criminal, people complaining they see dogs, people complaining they see cow, people complaining they see whatever, it is what it is. We can't please everybody, we're a multiple use agency and we can't cater to everybody. I think I'm about out of time but I appreciate the opportunity to share.

Trisha: Thank you Scott. So next we have Carolyn Daily.

Carolyn Daily: Thank you for the opportunity to speak to the council. The subject of hunting in

general and bears in particular is something I feel very passionate about. I can see I'm kind of a minority right now, but I'm going to say what I think. I really appreciate that the council has ethical concerns of the hunting of bears and lions with large packs of dogs, and proposing limitations on this. I think it's about time. It's too bad that the ones that have been in place have not been enforced. While it is understandable that a few dogs are helpful with tracking a bear, to me it is cruel and inhuman to allow large pack to chase, corner, and terrorize them until a hunter comes and shoots them point blank. What type of sport and skill is this for a hunter? I think that it is unbelievable that they think this is an exposition of their manly prowess. I think allowing the use of 8 dogs is already too many, and 16 is unthinkable. Please try to limit it to 12 like other people were suggesting. Bears are very much like us. They feel fear and pain and are loving and protective of their young, just like we are. They generally keep to themselves and generally do not bother humans. I live near the La Sal mountains and it's thrilling to site a bear. We get 3 million visitors a year to the Moab area. Many of them foreign and from big cities that seek wildlife experiences and seek large american mammals as well as our beautiful canyon country. Seeing these kinds of animals is a rare experience now. I have a personal experience I'd like to relate. Two years ago a baby bear cub was living in the Pat Creek area who was orphaned in the fall when it's mother was killed by hunters. Although it was pathetically skinny, it miraculously survived the winter without it's mother having been able to teach it den making skills. That little bear sadly disappeared in spring while hunter with dogs were camping near the Pat Creek picnic area. It broke my heart. I'd like to remind you that this is going to be 2020, not 1820 and in 200 years our Wildlife Resources have essentially been decimated compared to original populations. Even in the late 1980's when I lived briefly at Pat Creek Ranch, there were large herds of 50 or more deer in the winter. Now there is only a handful. I submit that bears, deer and other wildlife are valuable resources and we need to have the emphasis be on their protection rather than killing them. They want to live as much as we do. I think it's shameful that in the 21st Century we still do this and I'm appalled that it's become a family activity where you teach your children that it's fun to pursue and kill animals. Protect our wildlife as much as you can.

Trisha: Thank you Carolyn. Guy.

Guy Webster: Guy Webster representing Utah Houndsmen Association. First we agree with the DWRs recommendations with a few exceptions. We absolutely do not support the restricted pursuit. There was a lot of discussion from our Board with that. A lot of calls from our members and non members. Several reasons for that. First of all, we're still going to allow the same amount of people on the mountain, people are just going to have to draw a tag for it. The people from Blanding won't be able to hunt more than once every three years, and that's just absolutely absurd. The three year waiting period is something that's not needed. If there does end up being a restricted pursuit we hope that's definitely eliminated. We're going to stars seeing multiple people put in for one tag. I can currently go buy a pursuit tag. My wife can go with me, I can take a friend with me, and we're on my tags with my dogs and I'm able to do it. But if this happens everyones going to have their friends, wives, fathers, mothers, aunts, uncles, next door neighbors put in. There's still going to be the same amount of people, the same potential for conflict and problems on the mountain. Which you're not exactly going to have the responsible person that raised the dogs and stuff like me. We don't agree with the tag increase on the Boulder, we went into a three year cycle, we don't see this as an emergency situation. We think a lot of this could be addressed with the dog limit and the language change, clarifying the

language. The other problems that's going to come up and I hate to bring it up because I don't think you guys even realize it. If you're going to put a restricted pursuit on the San Juan/La Sal that's a harvest objective on lion. That hunt does not end until the end of May. Any person that wants to violate can go get a lion pursuit permit and be down there with their dogs anyway. Say their running lions. We've got a law enforcement nightmare out there. It will happen, guarantee it will happen. It's the piggy back, we're still going to have multiple people in big camps on one pursuit permit. It's just going to be limited to 16 dogs. We take the 16 dog limit and maintain it as it is. We hope that you don't put any restriction on pursuit, that's our biggest goal, but if you do and you're forced to make it, we hope to just do with that and just eliminate the non residents. We feel like with the UHA we have a duty here to our members in the state first and foremost go give them the opportunity to go get their dogs on the mountain and try to eliminate the problem that way. First and foremost we ask you to go ahead and say let's try the 16 dog limit, go ahead and start enforcing the dogs and camping limits, and see if that stuff will be effective. UHA is also working with Kevin and we are trying to implement better ethical behavior. Both in our meetings and website postings. We talked about putting together fliers. To get a bear pursuit permit do it similar to the bear harvest you have to go on and do an online thing. It would be similar to the antler permit. You have to do an online ethical training before you get a permit. These are the things we're trying to do to eliminate these problems. Please don't put a restricted pursuit on us at this point of time. Give us a chance to try to do what we can to eliminate the problem without making a bigger problem than what's necessary. Thank you.

Trisha: Cody and then Bryce Billings.

Cody Webster: Cody Webster. I primarily hunt the Book Cliffs and Manti, a little bit La Sal. But I did have the opportunity to spend two years on the La Sal building the Loop Road so I've got to kind of see that as an innocent bystander. There's just as big of a problem with non hunters. There's a lot of vandalism. To say the impact down there is just hunters, I think is a little reckless. I am strongly against any restrictive pursuit. As a lot of guys have said it's a family activity and if you restrict it you're going to end up with a lot of people putting in and you're not going to end up with the responsible people. You're also going to end up with some groups that may acquire five of those tags and that leaves five other groups without a tag and they're going to be forced to try to piggyback on the group that does have the tag. I think if we leave it the way it is with the 16 dog limit. If we enforce that, if we enforce the camping rules that will take care of a lot of our problems. And I really don't think the Book Cliffs needs to be lumped in with it. We say the problem is trespassing, well I'm pretty sure there are zero trespassing problems on the Book Cliffs. There is one landowner up there and I talk to him regularly and him having trespass with dogs was not a concern to him. Thank you.

Trisha: Thank you Cody. Next, Bryce.

Bryce Billings: Bryce Billings, Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife. We support the Divisions recommendation with expectation of limiting the spring pursuit permit. Thank you.

Trisha: Thank you. Bret.

Bret Guymon: First thing that I'd like to say is that guy back there needs a little more help. At

least with that amount of area. Which kind of leads into my next point which is I think the 16 dog limit. It's been mentioned that these are small things, small changes. I think they are very impactful changes. I think most of the things that I hear are number one, the number of dogs pursuing bear. The 16 dog limit takes care, you know vastly helps to take care of that issue. Secondly, the amount of time that people spend in an individual campsite. So I think that along with these restrictions that are really restrictions coming out of the process that the Division has thoughtfully put together. I think there needs to be enforcement that needs to go along with this otherwise this is going to fall flat on its face. I think that's enforcement from our DWR officers, that's enforcement from our Forest Service. That guy needs more help. If he's covering that amount of acreage there's no way he can do that effectively. I don't know how to go about doing that, but I think that's something to look into. Maybe complain to the powers of the Forest Service that those guys need a little more assistance. Secondly I've heard a lot of folks say that a lot of the complaints that are being levied are houndsmen complaining about houndsmen. Almost maybe not quite as bad as the complaints I hear about spike elk hunters and deer hunters. But my point there is there's always going to be hunters complaining about too many hunters on the mountain. If it's houndsmen complaining about houndsmen, big deal. It's not the recreationalist primarily complaining about houndsmen. So I support the restrictions. I believe the key to all of this is enforcement. To the DWR officers, if someone is breaking the law, they should be ticketed. Hands down, no question about it, they should be ticketed. If we have guys out on the freeway speeding we don't take away everyone's cars, we don't create more restrictions, we have the officers go out and issue more citations. That's what we do. This is no different, if guys are breaking the law, they should be cited. I'm opposed to any restrictions for residents on the spring pursuit. Thank you.

Trisha: Thank you. Cathy.

Cathy May: Cathy May, Colorado. Firstly, I'd like to say we're opposed to any changes made to the spring pursuit. This license should be over the counter. I'm going to give some background on us. Every since.. became the Utah state lion and bear control man when he returned from WWII he moved from Salina Utah to Vernal in 1951.... He worked in Vernal and then moved to Moab where he retired. He's been a resident of Utah his entire life and has been an outfitter from High School to now. And like other houndsmen said, he's had hounds all his life. He's still calling hounds at 71. If you add that restriction on there and you start limiting it and putting the wait time on it, he's not going to be able to enjoy those hounds, we're going to have to get rid of them because we won't have enough tags to go. I can trace most of our hounds family back to 1975. The dogs came from Bruce's dad. We got married in '77 and I've been hunting with hounds with him ever since. I have the freedom to go again, my kids are raised, I was able to hunt every day of the spring pursuit season for the last five years. In that time we've only had one dog in our tree that didn't belong to our bunch. We've never had any conflict with any hunters. We were in favor of the.. so people would stop driving by our camp with barking dogs at 3 in the morning. We never leave camp before daylight. We never have trouble finding a bear to run every day except during the drought of 2018. This summer is the first time we've ever hunted the summer season. We had 5-6 camps of residents camped all around us, we never saw any of them in the field except for two different days. We had no conflict with any of them, everyone had their own place to hunt. When they did the 16 dog law a few years ago, when the DWR send out the bear regulations, I called the Forest Service in Moab and asked them about

the 16 dog rule in the La Sals and they told us that they wanted 16 dogs max per tag in each camp. As long as they weren't all bunched together, they were fine with having all three of us in camp, 16 dogs max for each one of us. The ranger also told me at that time that they didn't have a problem with the 14 day camping rule in the spring as it was usually just the houndsmen out there in the Forest and better than the hunters moving from one place to another making more camping spots. So that's what we always went with. When we pulled into our camp we had to clean up all the trash from the hunters, we clean up all the pits, all the fire pits have beer cans and stuff like that, we pull it all out. We always get a porta potty for our camp and we pack out all of our trash, we clean up all of our dog manure and... we're just opposed to having it changed. Just some background for you. And Bruce has been hunting all his life.

Trisha: Thank you Cathy. That is all of the comment cards from the audience. Now we'll move to comments from the RAC. Want to go first Scoot and I'll go after you.

RAC comments

Scoot Flannery: Sure, so sounds like we're going to have the same amount of pursuers in the field regardless. It also sounds like by restricting it we're hurting the local hunters in my opinion, who we count on to harvest the mountain lions each winter. The majority of the lions are killed by the local hound hunters. They're not going to keep their dogs if they're only able to hunt every third year. It's not like the other hunts where you can draw every third year and it's great. It's a time commitment. It's daily. They have to be out training their dogs every single year. In my opinion I would strongly oppose limiting the number of pursuit permits you can have there. I think the 16 dog limit takes care of the majority of issues they see in the field.

Trisha: So the comment I want to make is I'm from Moab, I've spent unfortunately not as much time in the La Sals anymore because I absolutely can't stand it, overrun. I don't at all think the comments that are being made are placing the blame on houndsmen for the conflicts that are occurring. I think there are tons of different conflicts that are occurring between user groups. I think what we're trying to do is trying to mitigate further issues and trying to step up as a user groups and trying to see what we can do to mitigate our impacts. That's the way I feel about it. I don't think there's any placing blame. I'm a supporter of hound hunting. I'm a sportsman. I'm worried that if across the American West there's a changing political agenda going on and I think in order to preserve your sport you've got to be willing to compromise a little bit and I think the La Sals is one of those places that if we have to compromise a little bit we may have to compromise because that area is changing politically. You might be fighting an uphill battle. And Darrell Meacham used to say this repeatedly. That's one of the things he used to say again and again and I wish he was here tonight. So I guess that's just my, I don't really have anything I'd like to recommend, I just want us to try and look specifically at the La Sals and the little strange pocket that is an uphill battle.

Eric Luke: I've got a few comments. Number one, it's really sad that a few bad eggs ruin it for everybody. I think the majority of the houndsmen out there, resident and non resident are pretty good people, however we do have a big problem. Like you just mentioned, things are changing. Number one, I think we all have to understand that what we're talking about tonight is recreation. It's about houndsmen training their dogs. It's nothing to do with management tools.

it's not hunting, non residents can still come in and hunt. They still have 10% of the tags available to them. But I feel very strongly that we should not be entertaining pursuit for non residents. They've lost it in their state because of the changing political things, and are we willing to lose the sport here in Utah? I've talked to numerous people about this, I've spent hours on the phone talking to houndsmen to conservation officers to Forest Service people, to try to get enough information to make a good decision. We do have a problem. As I gathered my information, most of the problem stems from a few individuals, mostly non-resident, who are bringing in numerous amounts of dogs to train them to generate money. They're making money training dogs. I think that's a real sad thing that we're risking losing the sport of hound hunting and pursuit by allowing that. And I hate to say this but the only way to really curtail that, number one the 16 dog limit. If it will be enforced, which the Division has no way to do that other than the pursuit, the dogs out running, the dogs in camp we have to rely on the Forest Service. He needs more help, there's no question about that. I think that if we limit the number of non residents that can come in and pursue, we limit the majority of the problem.

Trisha: Thank you Eric. Jace.

Jace Guymon: So you're right about that getting ahead of the issue, compromise a little bit. Like our Forest Service officer said, he spent very little almost no time on the La Sals, which is probably our number one unit with issues, because of all the other users. People who aren't particularly for hunting. And the San Juan has become the same. So at bare minimum I think we should exclude the Book Cliffs from lumping it in because it simply does not have the same issues. It's sportsmen that are using the Book Cliffs, it's not anywhere near the same level of San Juan and La Sals. Personally, I don't think we need all these restrictions, I think the 16 dog limit will, as several of the houndsmen have said, accomplish a lot of what we're looking for. Plus enforcing the 14 day camping limit, those two things. Based on all these restrictions are allowing the same amount of hunters on the mountain, it's not fixing anything. So if we are looking to get ahead of the issue and make a little compromise I think San Juan and La Sals are the two that are our worst. They need the most help, so excluding the Book Cliffs is a good option. Or even having our Forest Service focus on those where those are the issue units, having more officers on those units specifically. If we can't afford to hire more officers, have them focus on those units.

Kent Johnson: Trisha bailed for a minute. I've got a comment or two here myself. I received an email from an individual who's done a bunch of research looking at different issues and one of them was GRAMA requests for law enforcement contacts specifically on the La Sal mountains, and there were no local hunters that were cited for anything. One of the things he did bring up which I thought was interesting in his research was a traffic counter on Geyser Pass and through the spring and the summer and bring 20,000 vehicles across the Geyser Pass in just a fraction of the year. I've been up there on the La Sal Mountains, I used to hunt the La Sals myself. I avoid it like the plague. It's one of the most beautiful mountain ranges you'll ever go on, it's incredible country, but it's just completely packed with people. If you want to pick any given weekend on the La Sals, it's worse than Memorial weekend on the Manti. And that's just any given Saturday. I think that a lot of the problems, if I'm correct Darren, was Sitla and Forest Service concern over impact issues. I don't believe that hunters are the impact. I believe we have a genuine problem with user impact in general. And I don't believe that hunters or houndsmen are the impact. I've been told an antidote and I don't have data but I've been told that there are non

resident groups that come in with huge amounts of dogs. I was told a couple of years ago that one group from Georgia that came in they had 60 dogs in their camp. And they stayed for an extended period of time. Now that camp with 60 dogs and however many people. That area was probably stomped to nothing and probably stayed that way for the remainder of the year. So I sympathise with the folks from Western Colorado, they come and chase in Utah, they function similarly to residents, they live in the Grand Junction area, and they just take day trips into the La Sals or the Book Cliffs and they're really not part of the impact, and I feel badly to restrict them, but I do believe that we probably need to restrict non residents on the pursuit and I'm very much opposed to limiting residents on the pursuit. I don't think we need to be doing that. The Forest Service is understaffed and that's a huge issue. The Federal Government has no clue how to spend money, it's congress people that we're talking about. That goes into my comment that we're really not effectively enforcing the rules that are already on the books. And like it's been mentioned before, government, when nobody is obeying the rules, we make more rules. That's just ludacris. We just need to look at enforcing the existing regulations as you've got a 14 day camping limit on Forest, you've got a 16 day camping limit on Sitla. You've got 16 dogs in your camp for the Forest Service, I don't know anything about Sitla, I don't know if they have a restriction in camp. (14 days) 14 days for camping, but no restriction on the dogs? (correct.) So there's some things that can be done. Personally, and I'll probably make a motion to this effect later, but I'd like to see restrict the non residents and take away the 10%.

Darren Olsen: As the Forest Service Rep. on this RAC and just knowing these conflicts, I think there's been as we've discussed, for a while now there is a lot of conflict. This is a challenging issue. Many good points have been brought up and 3 million visitors in the Moab area a year, 20,000 plus people using Geyser Pass and places like that. A lot of the impacts are not coming from the general houndsmen, but it's those with large number of dogs, leaving those in camp, the impact of those camps and that kind of thing. I think we've heard some good things tonight that I think are worth pursuing. On my training where there's been other conflicts in the past there has been a requirement for that and I think that's a good idea to make sure people understand those and are required to go through that training. So I think that split season, some other ideas that are out there, there have been some good ideas, it's just a tough issue from a Forest Service standpoint, as you heard from our law enforcement, he can't be everywhere, he can't do everything and we're looking for some help from the state on this issue. And to help this issue in the future and restricting the number of hounds and requiring people to follow the 16 dog possession in camp, if you're in pursuit.

Kent Johnson: I have a quick question for Law Enforcement. You might know this issue Guy. Can state and county law enforcement enforce Federal regulations on Federal land?

Guy Webster: Yes. It's not very common, but it can. If I'm not mistaken they have Forest Service employees that are not law enforcement that could probably enforce and look into camping regulations, just like they do on the wood permits. I worked for the Forest Service at one time as a firefighter and I can look into the camping and 14 day limit. They do have help available if I'm not mistaken.

Todd Thorne: That was going to be my comment, where it sounds like there some enforcement issues, not necessarily in the law enforcement but with working with the county and having an

agreement with Federal agencies to have the DWR and local sheriffs work with the Forest Service to see if they can have some kind of interlocal agreement like Guy was saying to help enforce some of those issues. If its an enforcement issue and you only have one Federal officer to drive around and enforce it, it's not possible. But if you have local county sheriff and DWR working with the Forest Service to help some of those issues, I think can help some of our problems.

Darren Olsen: And I'll just comment along with these comments that yes we do have some other employees that are able to issue tickets for us as protection officers. To me, and I think to many of us at the Forest Service, we feel like the 14 day camping limit that's our restriction that's across all, whether you're out hiking or hunting or whatever use. The challenge we have here with this hunting specifically it is a hunting issue, it is houndsmen and dogs, and that's why we're asking for help with the number of dogs. We wouldn't expect people to take upon our wood permits or camping because that's across all users, but this one is we feel is directly related to hunting.

Eric Luke: But isn't the regulation 16 dogs in camp? That's a Forest Service regulation, not a DWR regulation, correct?

Darren Olsen: Yes. As far as I understand it, yes.

Gerrish Willis: This might sound like I'm preaching to the choir for the second or third time, but the problems especially in the La Sals are kind of unique to any other area in Utah outside the Wasatch Front in my opinion and I've lived all over the state. And houndsmen need to realize that the reason all these people from Colorado want to come here is because they're prohibited. And the reason they're prohibited is because things change and people's perception of hunting has changed and the houndsmen here in Utah don't see that a change is coming, we're going to end up just like Colorado. We'll be traveling to Nevada or someplace else. I really like the idea of not allowing any permits, especially for the pursuit in the La Sal for out of staters. The number of people that are up there I think there's no real easy way for people to regulate a mountain biker or a hiker or a skier. All these other people up there and the problems are getting worse every year. Everytime there's a bad experience with a houndsmen, no matter who's at fault or what the situation is, it's always going to come back that the houndsmen is wrong. So I say keep your head down low, try to educate your people, practice ethical hunting as much as you can. But it's going to come down to, if you don't do something, you're going to lose your sport. And you'll be just like the people coming over here from Colorado saying we want a piece of the pie, you're going to be doing that with some other state. I don't know why Darren had an idea of DWR doing some enforcement with this problem. But he can't cover 3-4 National Forests and 5-6 Ranger Districts and be effective. The citations you're seeing being reported are not truly a reflection of the violations we're having up there. It's that one guy is not going to be able to find too many violations. Although I'm sure he can go hard. I think that if the Division could write in the regulation to give Division enforcement authority for some of the things we're talking about, whether it be in the number of hounds that are actually being used in hunting, regulated at camp, or guys that are driving down the road with their hounds in the back of their truck or whatever. If we could write the regulations so the Division could have some enforcement, it would alleviate some of the problems of the Federal government stopping the Forest Service from hiring any law

enforcement people. If they could be more like partners when it comes to enforcing. As far as the spring hunt, that is the time that I have seen the most use as far as a non hunting use on the La Sal Mountains it's just nuts up there. And I don't see how throwing a bunch of houndsmen hunting during the pursuit on top of that mix is being a good thing for your sport. I think it's going to end up backfiring and you're going to lose something. I'm not sure how I'm going to hunt on the restricted hunt, but I would say anything that we can do to alleviate some of the interactions between hunters, not just houndsmen, but hunters in general and other recreationalist is going to do a lot to keep your sport alive.

Trisha: Ok let's take a couple more comments but at some point I think we need to start making motions as we do have a couple more agenda items.

Scot Flannery: The only comment I would have is, we talked about the Bears Ears issue and the Book Cliffs and having those conflicts. We talked about the La Sals and having those conflicts because of ever growing recreation. I think it's not a good precedence or a good idea for us to say that hunting is always going to be the one that gives up and loses out because I promise you they're coming after the Book Cliffs next. There's no way those conflicts aren't going to arise and everytime we as hunters say ok we're going to be the ones giving up what we have to make room for everyone else. I don't think that's a good move for us to make.

Gerrish Willis: Can I just address that quickly? I agree with you that that's probably going to be the trend over time. But what you're talking about is politics. The change in political whim of the people that's going to affect it more than anything else and it might take a while. The point I'm trying to make is anything that you can do to alleviate conflict with other recreationalist out in the field is going to help the situation. And if that means in certain situations you're going to put out a certain type of hunt or whatever if that's what you need to do, you need to decide whether if losing the small battle is worth winning the big picture of the war. I can't tell you on that but I can see the political trends and what's going to happen is we're going to end up just like Colorado if things stay the way they are.

Scot Flannery: I understand that, and that's why I think that the 16 dog goes a long way to address these issues and gives up that part of the battle.

Eric Luke: The perfect solution is just not let anybody else up on the mountain until July. I just mean other than the hunters.

Steven Duke: I won't say anything that hasn't already been said other than it's really refreshing for me to see this lady from Pack Creek come and have a safe place to be able to speak her mind. Because I think that really that's what sportsmen need to do, we need to build connections with people. We need to have less conflict, and the reason I say that is because in the long run, it will let us stay in our sport longer. So, I am thinking of the houndsmen in San Juan County, I see very little of the pack that they have. I rarely see them, they do their thing, they do it ethically, I want them to keep doing it forever, but we're not going to be able to do it forever unless we're in the position to avoid conflict and we talked about impact on.. and it's not just citations, it's sometimes just visual. So many campers and so many dogs it's hard for a lot of people to swallow honestly, even as a supporter of the houndsmen.

Trisha: So I'd like to start entertaining some motions. Oh yes, Chris.

Chris Wood: This is a new part of the process I just have to summarize the public survey that was out. There's two different stats that are out. I'll read one for the entire state and one that's just for the southeast region. For the entire state the question was asked, do you support the proposal form the DWR? 61% opposed, 32 % supported, and 5% was neutral. Southeastern region specifically, 72% opposed, 27% supported and 0% was neutral.

Trisha: Alright.

Kent Johnson: (Motion)

Trisha: I'm going to ask Darren on that, does that at all change what we're doing? Because my understanding, maybe I'm wrong, that we're already at 10%. Am I wrong about that? But that 10% happens to come down here.

Darren DeBloois: So I'll try to answer this quickly. My understanding of the motion was to keep resident permits status quo. So if you're a resident in the state of Utah you can go purchase a permit, and pursue anywhere in the state you want to, but statewide, we'd look at how many permits were sold..

Kent Johnson: 10% of the previous year would be put into a draw for non residents.

Darren DeBloois: I don't do math in my head but if we sold 600 permits... I don't think you would change the number of non residents, unless you limit it on those units to where they all go. We could do it unit by unit, we could look at the numbers of the units where people go. The only other thing I'd add is we do this on a three year cycle so maybe take the three... I'm sorry, I don't want to...

Kent Johnson: Let's amend that, keep the first part of it on for the residents. (can you just state the entire new motion?) Ok I can do that.

Motion Spring Pursuit Residents Unlimited Over the counter

Motioned by: Kent Johnson

Seconded by: Kirk Player

Motion Passes/Failed: 10; Passed

Opposed: 3

Abstaining:

Jace Guymon: Can I make one comment? Just a suggestion to see if it sways at all. With the non resident issue there's a lot of people from Nevada/Arizona all of our neighboring states. They come here and by the sounds of the issue it's more people back east, people bringing in huge lots of dogs to train them and that's the issue. So my personal feeling is we shouldn't restrict it yet, making the 16 dog and camping the focus would solve our problems, but I would like to see a survey, so if we did an online orientation course mandatory and have that include where their

from. Then we can get a better idea, whos coming from where, how many people, how many dogs their bringing, have that in the survey. Ask a question about how many dogs they bring in general. I think something like that would point us in a lot better direction that just cutting them off, just a personal opinion.

Kent: That's a thought. Darren, is this something the Division would entertain?

Darren: Ideally, we'd probably bring something back when we do recommendations on the three year cycle so that would give us some time between now and then to..

Kent: You've got two years left so we could collect data for two years and then come back with a recommendation.

Darren: Sure, that's an option.

Jace: I understand we're in the middle of a cycle right now and we have to try these new recommendations. If we're going to pile on new recommendations, anytime you give something to them, unfortunately we never hear back, so if we give this up we'll never have non residents getting to come hunt again. It will always slowly get worse, unfortunately that's the issue we're facing with more and more people, more and more use. Every part of the state is advertising more. So basically it's going to keep growing and like I said hunters are always the ones taking the fall. Pretty soon we are going to be out of our...

Trisha: Ok I'm going to keep moving this, so let's talk about dogs.

Motion to accept 16 dog limit

Motioned by: Eric Luke

Seconded: Kent Johnson

Motion Passes/Failed: 12, Passed

Opposed: 1

Motion to not restrict non- residents in pursuit but to make it mandatory to do an online training and survey

Motioned by: Jace Guymon

Seconded: Todd Thorne

Motion Passes/Failed: 8, passed

Opposed: 5

Motion to accept the remainder of the DWR's recommendations

Motioned by: Kirk Player

Seconded: Jace Guymon

Motion Passes/Failed: 12, Passed

Opposed: 1

Gerrish Willis: Everybody I'd like to amend the motion in two ways, one is to say the number of dogs running and in camp, we'll change the regulation so the Division can enforce that rule to

help the Forest Service or BLM out. And the second is to eliminate spring pursuit in the La Sals in entirety.

I think that's already within our legal capabilities, I don't think we need to vote on that.

Gerrish Willis: Ok my motion will be to amend the motion to eliminate spring pursuit on the La Sal altogether.

I think it's cleaner to not include the amendment part because he'd have to agree to make an amendment.

Trisha: So just a second motion. Failed for lack of a second.

7) **Wolf Management Plan**

- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Trisha: I'm eating chocolate.

Darren: That's fine. I think I would be too.

Trisha: Any questions from the RAC?

Eric Luke: Can you go back to the first part where you're talking about the plan. Keep going. State law directs to prevent establishment of wolves in any delisted areas until they the entire state is delisted. So until the entire state is delisted that means you'll prevent the establishment of any wolves statewide?

Darren: If wolves are delisted then this plan would come into effect. Utah would gain management authority. The plan as it's currently written says that we would allow two packs to establish as long as there aren't conflicts, social, biological, or legal conflicts.

Jace Guymon: Quick question on that line. So in the plan it says that wolves were historically in Utah, so in my mind that was just justification for it. But in my mind we're talking about an entirely different breed of wolves so obviously I'm 100% against wolves coming to Utah, is there any way that if Utah ever does decide to allow wolves that we could look into bringing in our own wolves from down south the small kind that won't kill everything?

Darren: A couple of things here, all we're asking is to just extend the current plan, because it's expiring. Until wolves are delisted, the plan won't go into effect. If wolves are delisted, I'd suspect we'd look at the plan again and see where we were in terms of what kind of population we have. This was written in 2005 so really what we're asking is just to maintain the status quo. But obviously these kinds of conversations would occur either at the direction of the Division

director or the Board, etc.

Darren Olsen: Sorry, I know you said it, just to clarify, how many years are you saying to extend it for ?

Darren: Ten.

Eric Luke: So it wouldn't come back to the RAC for another 10 years?

Darren: Unless it was delisted, then it would come back. The other thing that is probably worth mentioning, when the service or courts looks at delisting, it really matters whether the state has a management plan in place or not. If we don't they essentially say well you don't have a plan to manage them, so no. That's a possibility so we want to make sure we have a plan.

Trisha: Are there any questions from audience? Ok, no comments, do I have comments from the audience?

Dana Truman: I have a question. Last time it was extended for five years, and this time you're requesting it 10, what is the reason?

Darren: Just so we don't have to keep coming back and asking to extend it. Like I said they're proposed for delisting and not everyone is aware of how this goes, so again, this is just an opportunity to get it renewed for a period of time but in the case the delisting occurs I suspect that we'd be sitting down with the plan and actually looking at it again. I'm not Kim so she may scold me afterwards.

Jace Guymon: So if we approve this plan does that mean that we're safe for 10 years? All the hippies that just signed that 2 million signatures in Colorado can't come here and do the same thing to us?

Darren: Wolves on all levels will be considered by state government on all managements. You can see where the legislation is directed.

RAC comments

Motioned by: Kent Johnson

Seconded by: Todd Thorne

Motion Passes/Failed: Passed, Unanimous

Opposed:

Abstaining:

- 8) Brine Shrimp COR Rule Amendments
- Kyle Stone, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Trisha: Any questions?

Jeff Christensen: (pointing at Eric Luke) Don't you dare! (laughs)

Question from the audience

Comments from the audience

Tim Hawks: Good evening everybody and thanks for sticking it out. I know this is an obscure issue involving an obscure industry, but it is an important industry for the state. Royalties from brine shrimp go on to fund a lot of habitat work around the state and it supports a lot of jobs. Thanks for sticking it out, I simply want to express support for the proposal and appreciation for the Division, Kyle, and the Attorney General's office for working with the industry and making sure the rules conform with the reality of today's industry. That's what this rule does so we support it. If you've got any weird questions about brine shrimp I'm happy to stick around and answer them. Thanks again for your attention tonight.

RAC comments

Jace: That's a lot of money, I think we should look into getting more brine shrimp farming going.

Motion to accept the Brine Shrimp Amendments

Motioned by: Brad Richman

Seconded by: Jace Guymon

Motion Passes/Failed: passed, unanimous

Opposed:

Abstaining:

Adjournment

9:15 pm

The next Wildlife Board meeting will take place on January 7, 2020 at 9 a.m. in the Department of Natural Resources Board Room, 1594 W. North Temple, in Salt Lake City.

The next Southeast RAC meeting will take place in April. 2020 at 6:30 p.m. at the John Wesley Powell River History Museum, 1765 E. Main, in Green River.

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

Utah Wildlife Resources Office

318 N Vernal Avenue, Vernal

December 12, 2019

- **WELCOME, RAC INTRODUCTIONS AND RAC PROCEDURES- Brett Prevedel**

For those of you who just came in, if you want to speak tonight, you need to grab one of these green cards, fill it out and bring it up to me and I'll call you by name. Please do, we'd like to hear from you. I'd also like to recognize Randy Dearth in the back row, a member of the Wildlife Board.

- **APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES**

MOTION to approve the agenda as presented.

Brad Horrocks

Natasha Hadden,second

Passed unanimously

MOTION to approve the minutes from the last meeting.

Jeff Taniguchi

Brad Horrocks,second

Passed unanimously

- **WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING UPDATE- Brett Prevedel**

Brett Prevedel: I'm going to move onto tonight's agenda. The first thing on the agenda tonight is an update of the Wildlife Board meeting, which we attended last week. If you remember the majority of the Wildlife Board discussion was on the mule deer plan. I'll tell you kind of what happened then I'll go through the motions given a little. It was a reasonable compromise and many of them didn't like all aspects of it but they all felt like it was a good plan. To present it to the Board like that and then all the politics started. There was a lot of trying to change the mule deer plan, for lack of a better way to describe it. I guess in my opinion watering it down somewhat. I'll tell you what changes they made. Before I do that I'll tell you about the Castle Valley, we didn't see that. There was a town that was just for the southeastern RAC and there was a long discussion with the residents of Castle Valley that wanted to limit hunting in an area of their city limits, but they wanted the DWR to do that rather than pass an ordinance. After about an hour and a half they made the motion that the DWR would not change the current rules that would allow for muzzleloader, shotgun, and archery in that area. If the town wants to prohibit hunting they can go a different route for Castle Valley which is a small town east of Moab, about 30 miles. They got into the statewide deer management plan and also with the management plan and the CWD appendix. We hadn't discussed it out here in the northeastern

RAC. There was a lot of concern about not being able to bring deer heads in with the skull plate because of the thought that people wanted to have european mounts and use the whole skull. There was a motion that they adjust that skull plate terminology to clean skull and the DWR is going to work up some language in both of the plans to take care of that CWD in testing positive states. So it's Wyoming and Colorado. Then the deer statewide management plan was discussed and the first motion was to approve it as written, and it failed for lack of a second. Then the discussion proceeded to the late season muzzleloader tag which had a lot of interest in the general season deer units. If you remember out here in the northeastern RAC we recommended that they reduce that to 5 tags to .5% of the total tags. The recommendation was .5% of the total tags that was presented to us. And we chose to trim it down a little bit. None the less that passed, well I'm not sure if it was exactly as it was presented, but what passed was from a minimum of 5 tags up to a maximum of .5 tags. So it wasn't set at .5 there was that ability to set it between them two numbers. And I'd assume that would be set in the spring when all the other permits are set. Then there was another motion to eliminate the set number of units that are in each deer buck to doe ratio class, there were 11 of them in the 15-17 and 18 of them in the one above that 18-20. I don't really know exactly what the driving force was there, but it did pass 3-2. Then there was a motion to adjust the age classes to a wider range, both of them, instead of a three year range, to broaden them out, and that failed also. Then there was a motion to make the deer management plan to a five year plan instead of a seven year plan as was proposed and that passed 4-1. Then there was a motion to accept the balance of the plan as presented by the Division and that passed unanimously. Then after that was done, there was a motion to amend the previous motion to soften the language, if you remember they wanted to achieve the age class, so what that meant was in certain units in the state, primarily in southern Utah, where they're in an 18-20 goal for the buck/doe ratio, they're consistently at 22-23-24 and it meant there was going to be a lot of tags this year and it raised a lot of concern. So there was a motion to amend that instead of achieve, which meant it wouldn't have had to happen all at once, to work towards that age class. That did pass unanimously. There was some more discussion on the clean skull plate that I mentioned earlier, and that passed. The Willard goat hunt they did combine the two hunts as recommended by the Division. The CWMU management plans were presented and there wasn't much controversy and it did pass 3-2 as presented. There was discussion, remember the one unit that had the public land inside the boundaries? There was quite a bit of discussion on that and the motion was made to allow that to happen, leave it inside the boundary of the CWMU it had 640 acres of public land for that. So it did pass 3-2 to allow that amendment that was requested by that CWMU. Then there was some discussion about, remember when we were talking about losing your preference points for buying a buck tag or putting in for general season? Basically any buck tag you got took away your preference points, not bonus points for limited entry, but preference points for general season. If you bought one over the counter, like if there's any archery hunters in the room that buy a tag somewhere else and use it to hunt extended archery, that is still available, but you would lose your preference point. That was the proposal and there was quite a bit of discussion about moving things into the exempt list, there was a motion to add

general season landowner and general landowner appreciation permits to the exemption list. So land owners wouldn't lose their preference points for hunting on their own property, and that passed unanimously. Then there was a motion to put antlerless private land antlerless elk tags in that category and that failed 2-3. Then there was a discussion, we had the discussion about the dedicated hunter program, and the motion was to continue the dedicated hunter program as it is and give the division one year to evaluate combining the dedicated hunter program as a hunt choice in the general season draw. They weren't quite ready to go with the recommendation on that. That I believe was all the changes that were made to the deer plan. Everything else, there was one other motion on the CWMU on the membership of the committee and that passed unanimously. So it was an interesting and very long Board meeting. Everybody appreciated the DWR they had to explain everything ten times and explain everything five times and didn't quite get what they'd hoped, but they put a lot of work into it and did a really good job. Miles I'll turn it over to you for a regional update.

- **REGIONAL UPDATE - Miles Hanberg**

Alright, there's been quite a bit of work going on lately. Our biologists are beginning to wrap up our post season deer classifications. That's wrapping up right away, but we've been really busy last week with deer captures. We've been capturing deer with net guns from helicopter. We captured 50 does up on the South Slope of the Uintas last week. And also 35 deer out in the Book Cliffs. These were all fitted with GPS collars to track migration patterns and movements, but also allows us to collect a lot of survival data on adults and our fawns. We'll find out what those percentages are, it helps us to better model our populations, and helps us better to find what's limiting some of these populations as well. We're going to be launching a new collar project here later in December, it's going to be in the Wasatch East unit, so we'll be capturing deer in the Tabby Mountain, Avintiquin, and some maybe on the Anthro area. That's mainly going to be to learn the migration patterns for some of those deer in that area. In January we're also going to be capturing 30 pronghorn up in the Three Corners unit to try to get a better idea of what those migration patterns are and what those pronghorn populations are using Wyoming and Utah and how that interface all works together. I can't remember the exact number but statewide in the month of January I think they'll be over 800 deer captured throughout the state and fitted with GPS collars, and it's some pretty interesting information. This winter we'll be collaring some additional cougars in the book cliffs. This is part of our study with USU to really look at the survival of cougars and get a better idea of how many cubs are being born each year and what the survivorship is on cubs. In addition it's looking at whether or not cougars and bears, what kind of interaction is going between them, if cougars are having to kill more frequently because bears are coming in scavenging the carcasses before they've had a chance to feed on them. That's another part of that study that's going on as well. In the spring we're going to be capturing more deer, elk, and bison in the Book Cliffs as part of a fawn/calf survival study. We capture them and put a transmitter in the cows and the does and once they give birth it triggers a response in the mothers collar and lets us know a birth has taken place. Then folks are able to get

on the ground right away and collar these newborn fawns and calves to see the survivorship on them. This will be the second year in the Book Cliffs and learning some more information about what's going on with our fawns and calves out there. We'll also be doing a survey for our Book Cliff bison herd this winter to get a better idea about how the population is doing this year. In our outreach section they're going to be hosting a Christmas bird count this Saturday in Ouray. This will be the 15th year that's been at Ouray and it starts at 8 am at the visitor center down there. We'll also be hosting some ice fishing clinics here in January and some of those will be on the ice. We don't have dates set as we determine how the ice will be here in the next couple of weeks. Those are things that have been ongoing and things that are coming up. We have a busy season coming up in the new year.

Brett Prevedel: Ok, thank you. Tonight's topic, we're not quite going to roll into it yet, but I want to talk about the procedures. If you want to talk you need to... So the Division will present their information to the whole group without questions or comments during the presentation, then there will be an opportunity for the Board to ask questions. Then there will be the opportunity for anyone in the room to come to the mic and state your name and ask a question. Then the Board will have discussion. Then the group, if you fill out a card can say what you feel about it or what you recommend, you can give your position on it. It's very important that we keep the meeting civil and there's a lot of differing opinions and a lot of diversity of people on the Board and in the room. I ask you to keep it civil. It will be limited to three minutes of talking and if it crosses a line I'll just say that you're time is up. So I hope you appreciate that. You're welcome to speak your mind. Then the Division will have an opportunity, if they need to clarify something, the biologist will have an opportunity to clarify that and at that time we'll proceed with motions and a vote. Tonight's topic is just talking about pursuit, so a lot of comments came in and some of them are related to harvest, and bear hunting and the seasons and that's not the topic. We have the bear management plan that in effect that we passed last year that's in effect and deals with harvest strategies and harvest also, cause it's a three year average right there. So we just need to keep in mind that what we're talking about tonight is the proposed rule amendments to the plan related to the chase seasons, or pursuit seasons. Matt Farnsworth, are you here? Ok I'm glad you're here because I don't want to speak about your letter. There was a letter that came from the Utah Houndsmen Association to all the RAC members and it made some assumptions about the Book Cliffs data that we're finding out about the collaring study and the birthing devices that we can go tag fawns and calves before their 12 hours old and then track their survival which we've never been able to do. And I appreciate your comments and your interest in that, but I need to clarify that the Book Cliffs, the one year of data we have, and then we're going to accelerate that next year, shows that the deer go to nearly the same area, it's a fairly big area the summer range 300,000 acres and 90% of the deer are fawned within two weeks. There was no, the theory being if you have a poor conditioned deer herd and the fawning spreads out over a month it give the predators more opportunity to eat the fawns because they're more vulnerable when they're young, but if the fawns are all born at a quick interval within two weeks, they're so many there that they have a better chance of survival. There's no indication that the condition of the deer is affecting the fawning period in the Book Cliffs. We have put the data out, it's fairly significant predation on the fawns, over 50% in their first few weeks of life. The elk they do have a more spread out calving season and the assumption could be made that that's more opportunity for predators, but we were talking about that and we really don't know if that was last year following

a drought that caused that, or if they've always been spread out in the Book Cliffs. The other thing that elk are doing is they are calving all over the place. They're not concentrating like the deer. So we're finding that out also. So that's just to clarify a few things and I'm not an expert on the date from the Book Cliffs or anything like that, but I am on the team that's working on that and the assumption is they're probably jumping the gun that the condition is causing these things, because we're definitely not ready to say that. So I appreciate it. Ok Darren DeBloois is going to present the black bear and cougar rule amendments for the Division.

- **R657-33 BLACK BEAR AND R657-10 COUGAR RULE AMENDMENTS**—Darren DeBloois, Mammals Program Coordinator.

See Slideshow

Brett Prevedel: Ok, does the RAC have any questions?

Brad Horrocks: Maybe if we go back there, you said you had a way of telling when people come in to buy a non resident tag vs a resident?

Darren DeBloois: So we try to think of a lot of different ways you could address number, the problem you have, and the reason that Marty and Greg which are our Attorney General representatives. There is some concern about treating non residents differently than you treat residents. Primarily it's a concern with a commerce clause. We addressed that a little bit in the, if you're a guide or outfitter and a non resident, you can guide somebody that has a permit to pursue or hunt. But if you start to do things to curtail non resident activities that are different. It's standard in Utah that if you have a limited entry hunt that you give 10% to non residents. If you start to do other things that are different than that, it increases our risk of being sued by folks that may not live in the state. So we felt like our best option was to offer an opportunity that's within the sideboards of how we operate with non residents in the state and that's why we're recommending a restricted pursuit hunt. Having said that, there may be other options and we certainly talked about them, but we went with this way because of concerns with the GA's office.

Brad Horrocks: I guess help me understand, so if I'm a non resident and walk in here and buy a bear tag, pursuit tag. Is it the same price as a resident?

Darren DeBloois: No, it's more.

Brad Horrocks: Ok, so you are clarifying that they are a non resident. So help me understand what you are saying about the residents and the non residents, having a time separating them.

Darren DeBloois: One of them is you just say no non residents for pursuit in Utah

Brad Horrocks: We'll we can't do that, and I'm not suggesting that.

Darren DeBloois: Or Idaho does something, they have a different kind of permit for people that are using hounds. They have unlimited, it's called a hounds handler permit, so in order to run hounds in Idaho you have to have one of those permits. If you're a resident, it's unlimited you

can go get a permit. It's similar to our pursuit, but it's a little bit different than that. So you have to have that permit then a tag for hunting. But they limit the non residents to 70. That's something that we talked about, it would require the legislature to implement. We'd have to recommend it to the legislature to go through and that would probably be about a three year process. We decided that this is a mechanism we have in place, let's recommend for non resident permits. Again, they're only self selecting about 69 residents go to the La Sals, we're recommending 75 permits, and only seven of those will go to non residents.

Brad Horrocks: So there will be a limited amount that goes to.. What is the cost between the non resident and the resident on the bear pursuit tag.

Darren DeBloois: Off the top of my head, what is it, like \$80.. For a non resident, it's like, I'll look it up while we're talking.

Brad Horrocks: And just out of curiosity can somebody look up.. It was about 10 years ago when I went to Idaho, can you look up what they're charging now for a non resident to go to Idaho?

Darren DeBloois: I can find that, but I'd have to find it.

Brett Prevedel: Are you suggesting that maybe the cost could limit?

Brad Horrocks: I know that when I went up there 10 years ago in Idaho it was \$450 for me to go up there.

Darren DeBloois: So, pursuit..

Brad Horrocks: And I think other states are limiting us, by the cost already..

Brett Prevedel: So you would say that would be a possible tool to limit non residents by making it...

Darren DeBloois: So for bear limited entry, it's \$308. Restricted pursuit \$135 and a resident is \$30.

Brad Horrocks: Resident is \$30 and a restricted pursuit for a non resident is what? (\$135)

Dan Abeyta: Darren could you address the waiting period? Does it affect other bear seasons or is it just for this spring pursuit?

Darren DeBloois: My understanding talking to licensing is it would just pertain to these units, the restricted pursuit units. It was something that passed last time, we didn't used to have a waiting period associated with pursuit and a bonus point and we were asked to do that and we recommended it and it passed. So that's a relatively new thing. This is the 5th meeting out of the RACs so this is the last one and we have had some questions about waiving that. I did talk to licensing, again this is one of those things that isn't impossible to do, but their suggestion was the more we can be consistent with what we do across the board and not set new precedents, the

better off we would be. It does make it a little bit less palatable, I'm sure you'll hear about that from the folks here tonight. The way it works is if you are on a waiting period... the concern here is with so many permits that people draw out and then they'll be on a waiting period and you'll be undersubscribed the following year or the third year, if that happened, any remaining permits would be available over the counter. If you're on a waiting period you can buy a permit over the counter if they become available. The secondary concern with this is when you make something scarce, human nature is to put everybody in they can think of to draw tags, even though there's a lot, we may increase demand. So that could be something that we'd see. I'm sure we'll hear about that tonight. I don't want to steal anybody's thunder but maybe we'll get it all out on the table to begin with.

Brett Prevedel: So the way you understand it, it would affect the summer pursuit season also if you drew a spring pursuit?

Darren DeBloois: I think it probably would, yeah. I don't know for sure I'd have to check.

Jamie Arrive: So you're saying it will be limited to 75 permits, what is it now? How many permits do you give out currently?

Darren DeBloois: Right now it's unlimited, so for spring pursuit whether you're a non resident or a resident you can just go pay your \$30 or your \$135 and just go in the spring. So this would be giving a limited number. But people self select, so they tell us after the fact where they went and it averages at about 89. The high on the La Sals is probably 100 and the low has been 67, but the average has been about 89.

Brett Prevedel: Jamie, this proposal is to include the Book Cliffs with the 75 which is more than they've been issuing in the Book Cliffs, but it's the concern that the demand would shift to the Book Cliffs. So the Book Cliffs numbers are over the last five years have averaged 63, and the non resident permits have averaged 19% of the 63, so the new proposal would have on the surface, plenty of permits, but the non resident would be cut from 19% to 10%. There's been an average of 12 non resident hunters in the Book Cliffs, so just keep in mind the Book Cliffs, this proposal, unless something odd happened with demand shifting from the La Sals, there's plenty of tags there for what the demand has been the last five years, and then some. We're talking a 63 average and when you lose those non residents that average is going to go down, so you're probably talking 15 extra ones right now if everything stayed the same.

Darren DeBloois: Right, the way we were looking at it was it would add opportunity for people as a second choice to draw the Book Cliffs or San Juan if they didn't draw their La Sals tag. Again, our strategy was to try to be generous with resident tags and try to insure that as many residents can draw those tags as possible while still addressing some of the concerns that came up in the group.

Dick Bess: Darren, question for you. Where currently if we're correct these pursuit tags are not unit specific, correct? So my question is, how are you coming up with the numbers of how many people are.. Other than a survey, is it a survey?

Darren DeBloois: It's a survey. We do a survey after the fact so we survey people with those permits and ask them where they went.

Dick Bess: So only if they answer the survey correctly..

Darren DeBloois: If they answer correctly, yeah.

Daniel Davis: Yeah, I've got a question. So where's the legal issue by limiting a couple of units of non residents, but not preventing opportunity in the rest of the state?

Darren DeBloois: I don't want to paint the picture that legally it's not possible, Daniel. I think what Marty and Greg were saying is the more you stay within the sideboards of what you usually do, the more secure you are legally. And Greg and Marty said this, that doesn't mean you couldn't do any number of other things. The primary concern is that internet commerce clause, but that really doesn't apply to recreational pursuits. So in those cases, we're not in danger of violating any of those judgements in there. At least that's how I they explained it to me. I guess, long answer, I guess that's a possibility of something we could look at. The reason we didn't recommend it is because of what our attorneys recommended to us.

Daniel Davis: In the long term I guess, limited entry you would consider it 10%, and that's standard across all big game. However, if it wasn't limited entry, and you could set a residence because there is none, correct?

We could, it makes us a little bit nervous. So for example we could say, and this came up at a couple of RACs, I don't think it passed at either one, we could look at the three year average, so when we do our plan, on three year rotation, we look at what our average pursuit was the last three years total for the La Sals and cap non residents. That would create a non resident only draw for those units, and again, it's something we don't do at the present, it's not that we couldn't do it, it just sets a new precedent. I don't know if we would be at risk of some other hunt, some other species, people saying well you do it over here, and then it just makes our regs even more complicated. But it's not impossible.

Daniel Davis: Thank you.

Jamie Arrive: I have one more question. How many collars do we have on the Book Cliffs on bears?

Darren DeBloois: Three.

Jamie Arrive: Do you have any higher numbers on the La Sal.

Darren DeBloois: Actually, we have some on bears that are around the La Sals, we don't have any that are actually on the mountain. We are going to put some effort in to actually get more on the mountain.

Jamie Arrive: Alright. So my concern and I know Daniel he kind of last years gave me some

information, but my concern would be if the shift, if it does happen and we see an increased number of people, are we going to see a lot of bear movement, lion movement, are they going to come over to our trust lands?

Darren DeBloois: That's a question that we don't have any hard data on. I'd only be speculating. It would be really good to get some more collars out, just kind of see how bears respond. Typically, I was talking to Tom Smith from BYU a little bit. He does bears all over the world and he felt that in most cases the bear doesn't even know it's being chased until the dogs get pretty close, and then they go up a tree and when everything over, it's over, and they kind of go back to what they normally do. It's an interesting question, I don't know if we have an answer for you.

Questions from the public:

Darren DeBloois: I've got to add one other thing quickly before we get into questions. I don't want houndsmen here tonight to feel like the Division doesn't support houndsmen. We couldn't manage in the state without people who had well trained dogs. This is on the hunting side. Also we've been given a ton of support with these studies, these lion and bear studies to some degree, and also a nuisance. So we support these traditional uses. This isn't about trying to curtail hound hunting in the state, it's about a very specific issue. We're happy to hear everybody's input and are comfortable with however the RAC votes on it.

Daniel Davis: Mr. Chair, I have one more question, is that ok? (Yes) My question is this, you have it proposed as limited entry with all the rules that just passed in the big game, to keep it all status quo like you mentioned earlier and consistent. Everything that passed with the 30 day turn back rule and all that stuff to retain your bonus points, and things of that nature, would that be applied? Because if I'm not mistaken it's like a two week period from the time you know whether you drew and opening day.

Darren DeBloois: I know they made some changes, and honestly Daniel I'm not sure how that would apply to this. I'd have to talk to licensing. I'll have to admit I wasn't listening that closely when Lindy did her presentation...

Brett Prevedel: The changes they made is if it's closer than 30 days and you don't have a medical reason or exemptions, then you would not get your point for that year and I believe..

Darren DeBloois: My guess is that is not specific...

(inaudible)

Brett Prevedel: The prior rule you could turn back your licence the day before the hunt and they were having trouble getting them reallocated. So there was lost opportunities because people kept their bonus points.

Darren DeBloois: To find an alternate it was tough.

Brett Prevedel: So they would not earn their point for that year if they turned it back within the 30 days. They'd lose that.

Darren DeBloois: I think it would be safe to assume that would apply.

Daniel Davis: So even though the results are less than that time frame, we would still, in this situation that is presented, not have an opportunity to forfeit.

Darren DeBloois: Yeah we'd have to look at that. I'm glad you brought it up, I hadn't thought about that.

Daniel Davis: Thank you.

Brett Prevedel: Ok, I'm going to switch the order and do comments from the public and then come back to final comments from the RAC. Matt Farnsworth is the only card I have, if anyone else wants to make a comment you still have time to put your name on a card.

Matt Farnsworth: I'm Matt Farnsworth, I'm representing Utah Houndsmen Association. I'd like to thank Darren, you've gone above and beyond with involving the UHA in the discussion with the working group along with law enforcement with some issues. I sent an email to most of you, and over the last five, this will be the fifth, RAC meetings I've kind of picked up on a trend of confusion, so instead of rehashing exactly what is in that email, I'm just going to point out a couple of things. First off, speaking to the restricted pursuit, you guys have all picked up on the consequences of going to this restricted pursuit in the spring. A two year waiting period was pitched as, you have an opportunity to hunt every year, we're going to give plenty of tags, everybody is going to get a tag who wants one, if not there will be plenty of tags left over in other units. With the waiting period you're going to be three years at best. Another consequence of that, summer pursuit. If you draw your spring pursuit, the way the rule is written now, you're not going to hunt the summer pursuit. So you draw a Book Cliffs tag every three years for the spring pursuit, I don't get to even put in for the summer pursuit on those three years. We have some good data for the summer pursuit. Starting off it's very easy to draw, we draw it every year, and it gets a little bit tougher so I put all of my friends in that will go with me. Now I'm sitting on five points, I've never drawn in. When I do draw it I have a two year waiting period. So a 14 years I get to hunt it twice. I wanted to remind everybody, this isn't go out and kill a bear, it's take your dogs, your family, chase a bear take a picture of it, let it go. What opportunity are we missing? Our proposal is to leave the status quo for the residents. We buy a tag over the counter for the spring hunt, we hunt anywhere in the state, summer hunt stays the same, we have to draw the restricted pursuit. For the non residents we're asking that you limit them or restrict them from the big three units, Book Cliffs, La Sal, and San Juan. As far as a legal stuff goes, I attended those meetings and there's no legal reason we can't. There's some concerns about it and yes I understand those concerns. But it is very familiar to what we have in place already. Think about bighorn sheep. There are certain units that don't allow non residents to come hunt bighorn sheep. No different than the bears. We are welcoming the non residents, you can come anywhere in the state that you want, except for these three units. They want to come to Utah? Cool, let them come to Utah. We don't want to give up our resident opportunity because non residents have been causing a problem. As for the extra tags on the Boulders. When the three year plan

was pitched, it was pitched on the premise of science. We need those three years to pertain accurate data to see what our predators are doing. Yes, there was an emergency clause. Right now there is absolutely zero scientific data that bears are causing any problems with the deer herd on the Boulders. There's no studies, no data, it's all gut feeling. We ask that you stick with the three year plan. You voted for it, the Board voted for it, the Division asked for it, we supported it, please stick with that plan? Does anybody have any questions for me from the houndsmen perspective on the email we sent out? Is there anything I can clarify for anyone on the Board? Thank you for your time.

Brett Prevedel: Thank you Matt. I just want to say is what we do hear as one of five regions and it's been eye opening to go to the.. Dan's been to a bunch of Wildlife Board meetings, but we need to make specific recommendations and whatever we agree on, we need to be active and speak up. Because they will take the five different opinions and then they will compromise or they will decide which one they are going with. Even though right now maybe we don't have an issue with the Book Cliffs. When we come out of this we need to make specific recommendations as the northeastern RAC otherwise we may be doing damage control on the Book Cliffs in two years. Miles is going to take a minute to talk about public opinion.

Miles Hanberg: Sure, I think most of the RAC members are probably aware of the process that we talked about time. So the public knows, presentations are available on our website a couple of weeks before the RAC members start the RAC meetings. So you have the opportunity to view the RAC meeting and as part of that there is a time you can submit an online comment to these proposals. You can voice your support, or if you're neutral, or if you're opposed and leave a comment for these items. So we get that and summarize that information. The RAC members are able to see what your specific comments are. We get an overall idea of what the public idea is on these proposals. So with that for this bear proposal statewide there were 32.9% of the people supported the proposal, 5.7% were neutral, 61.4% were opposed to the bear plan. One thing I might mention with the people that are opposed, large number were houndsmen that didn't want to have the restrictions, but I also noticed there were quite a few people who just didn't agree with hound hunting that opposed the plan. So you had a little bit of a compounding factor with that. In the northeast region, we didn't have a lot of electronic comments submitted, in fact it was only four. So I'll just say what those were. We had one person that supported the plan as presented and three that were opposed.

Brett Prevedel: Can you talk a little bit about the other RACs? Why don't you take that Darren?

Darren DeBloois: I can give it to you in a nutshell. I think just really quickly all four so far have voted to not go to restricted pursuit. We've had some really good discussions. Southeastern had a lot of the people there, the other RACs weren't able to hear, but they did pass the remainder. So I guess the overall trend... there have been some things about the ethics course, some people would like to see that be apart of the mandatory... so if you're going to hunt bears you have to take a mandatory orientation course online before you get your tag. You don't have to do that for pursuit now, but they'd like to see that implemented. I think one RAC voted on that. We're proposing to put something together to make it mandatory but not just rely on someone to come into our office and pick something up, it's something you'd give to people as they got permits.

Brett Prevedel: So when you said they did not support the limited entry, is there any cap on the numbers?

Darren DeBloois: No, so all four so far have voted to remain in status quo.

Brett Prevedel: So right now there's no caps anywhere?

Darren DeBloois: No, it's come to whoever wants to buy a tag.

Brad Horrocks: What did they do on the non residents? They left it status quo, all four of them so far, so no change.

Brett Prevedel: I guess without sounding like I'm going to swing the vote, we don't know what the Wildlife Board is going to do. And I would highly recommend at least make some type of recommendation about the Book Cliffs so we don't end up with the fall out of what the Wildlife Board chooses to do. So when we get to the point of a motion, it could even be IF limited entry is imposed THEN we recommended this. It can even be more of an open ended motion but we need to make our voice heard on the Book Cliffs or we may regret it. So comments or position of the Board members. I'd like to hear what people are thinking. So unless I'm really putting you on the spot, I'm opening it up for any of the RAC members to really voice an opinion about what they think about what they've seen.

Brad Horrocks: I think I understand what you're saying in the recommendation that we just want to clarify it, even though we could make the motion to stay at status quo, but in turn if it does go to a limited entry type deal then we would limit the non residents. Is that basically what you're saying, just so we cover both ends of our spectrum. Because when we go to Salt Lake they're going to do what they want to out there and we may not end up with what we really wanted.

Brett Prevedel: I'm not, they try to listen to the RACs I didn't mean to say that this input isn't value to them, but they're going to get different opinions from all over the state and I saw that on the last meeting drastically. So yes, I guess that's what I'm saying Brad.

Daniel Davis: I'd like to voice some concerns. So as an active participant in this pursuit, there are a lot of flaws as mentioned by UHA. Right down to the waiting period, undersubscribed to be in a desired opportunity to the point where me, my wife, my kids, my brother, my dad, all of a sudden start putting in for it and those permits don't land in the hands of the houndsmen that are trying to train their dogs, trying to spend that quality time with their families, and actually go underutilized. Because if that person that drew the permit say doesn't have vacation, doesn't have whatever, it doesn't get utilized so therefore removes that opportunity from the people that are actively trying to obtain those. The issue I brought up earlier about losing bonus points, I thought about that heavily especially after the Wildlife Board meeting and what was passed there. That's a huge concern because it doesn't even give us the time frame allotted to retain our bonus points. And only getting to hunt them units and take opportunities is pretty long. We're in a situation here where up north were restricted by the season, being spring, the snowfall, the wet conditions, there's a lot of time to the Forest doesn't even open. When it does, you know the units get relief. A lot of people go up to the forest it's a little bit cooler up there not as hot sometimes.

So my concerns with these restricted pursuits is there's too many flaws, it's not written well and it would be hard to follow. So that's where I stand on that, I don't think it should be opposed. I do feel, and we've talked about it three or four years now, I was in one of the groups at one time that non residents have been identified as an issue. It's been a concern for several years now that non-residents create a lot of this stuff. We have people coming into the state bring in 30-40 dogs at a time, and it brings back to law enforcement issue. We're creating rules and more rules but these rules are being created because we don't have law enforcement necessary. Not saying they're not doing their job, it's just not enough I guess. So to create more of these rules, it's kind of shooting ourselves the foot. I mean I'd actually like to see a little better enforcement on what's actually out there, and see that enforcement take place. Because adhering to the rules that are written would get the consequences desired. However when those non residents come in, for lack of better terms, they just wipe their backside with us and walk away. They don't have to stick around and deal with the consequences that we're sitting here dealing with tonight. They can come back when they want, how they want, it's not an issue. I myself don't feel we're limiting anybody any opportunity by keeping them out of them units. Seeing what they do and how they conduct themselves, they really don't care. A lot of the ones I see are the ones that are turn out before daylight, head to camp before breakfast, or head to camp for breakfast, right at daylight, laughing at you as your heading down an old track that's already been ran and treed. It's frustrating from our perspective, and we'd like to see.. I would like to see more control on them non-residents that have that. We try to report that to the Division, and I'd like to encourage all houndsmen to do the same damn thing. It's frustrating. I hear a lot of talk about they're doing this, and somebody doing that, but if you ain't willing to turn them on, then that's what you're asking for. So that's that's where I stand.

Brett Prevedel: So I understand what you're saying, as is on residents and a new system to limit the non residents, or just enforce existing rules that are in place?

Daniel Davis: At least enforce the current system that's in place.

Brett Prevedel: Still leave it unlimited on non residents. Anybody else on the RAC like to weigh in?

Dick Bess: I'd just like to concur with the leave it as it is. To me everything we've heard, the lack ok... I mean the Forest Service is using the Division to monitor problem on the Forest Service with too many dogs, which they have laws in place but apparently they're not charging people. I think if they would do better with managing the Forest Service lands and cite people that are doing things wrong, instead of punishing these guys. I've always been one that hates to see the majority lose something because there are a select few that are not following the rules. So I'd like to see, even stiffer.. The Forest Service and DWR start managing stiffer punishment for people that are not following the rules as far as hours, but I don't want to change anything to keep these guys from being able to pursue.

Brett Prevedel: Darren, can I ask you a question? Even though it's over the counter, you know we had a lot of comments, first come, first serve, but why can't you put a cap on that?

Darren DeBloois: We could. If the RAC wanted to go that way we could. Again, the only

concern is setting new precedence.

Brett Prevedel: We don't have the situation where.. I mean we have that now on private lands elk, there's 400 available as soon as they're gone, they're gone.

Darren DeBloois: You could. I talked to licensing after the first few RACs and kind of saw where things were going and we talked about saying the non resident pursuit tag is invalid on those units. It could be as easy as that. It would still be over the counter, they could come buy it but they wouldn't be able to pursue there. So that's up to the RAC I guess. The other option is..

Brett Prevedel: Has there been some discussion on just capping the number?

Darren DeBloois: Yes, in the RACs themselves, we'd have a proposal where you'd take a three year average and cap the non residents on those units based on that.

Brett Prevedel: They didn't want a cap on the residents?

Darren DeBloois: Right, residents would be unlimited. So there's options to look at.

Jeff Tanaguchi: How hard would it be to propose an increase in fees for out of staters? We went to South Dakota and paid that much to hunt pheasants.

Darren DeBloois: That is actually another idea that came up during the process. I think if you really wanted to discourage them you'd have to raise it to the point I don't think we'd probably see support in the legislature. I mean significantly. But that would be a legislative action to change a fee, it needs to go to the legislature and we're probably talking three years down the road to do something like that. But we could recommend it, sure.

Dan Abeyta: Darren, question on the Plateau/Boulder/Kaiparowits. The comment that was made about not having scientific data about the dwindling deer herd down there. That concerns me a little bit. I wonder, is there data? Or are there other factors that are causing the decline in deer? And if so, what is being done?

Darren DeBloois: I think this is part of a multi prong effort down there, and so, we have seen on the Book Cliffs, we got data on the Book Cliffs, we have seen one years worth of data where we see bears key in on fawns in the spring and bears are really good at knowing where resources are during the year. We don't have that kind of data on the Boulder, so we're relying a little bit on that. But as a biologist you don't always have the data you with you had, so you try to make an educated guess about things that might contribute. This is bears and deer probably a minor part, but again it is something that would be within the boundaries of the plan and having been revisited the region felt like maybe they should have recommended an increase last year in light of what they're seeing down there. So that's why we're recommending the change now.

Dick Bess: Miles, are they doing any deer captures on the Boulder?

Miles Hanberg: Yeah, I believe so, it's all over the state.

Dax Mangus: They're doing it this year, Dick, they're planning on putting collars out and we do have collars on the Boulder too, so we'll have data moving forward, but we don't have anything hard right now.

Brett Prevedel: Ok, if everybody has stated their concerns or their opinions, I would open it up to a motion. And if we need to break this up as we have in the past, feel free to do so.

MOTION that spring pursuit stays as is, including unlimited permits for residents and non residents.

Daniel Davis

Brad Horrocks: I'd like to see in case something happens, that if the state comes down and says we're going to put a limited number of tags on this that we'd have something to cover us Daniel for the non residents. I don't know what your thoughts are there.

Daniel Davis: So I think regardless we can't dictate how they're going to make their motion and vote. We've seen that pretty clear last.. Well anyways, the only thing we can do is voice our concerns, that if it does go limited entry that it follows the states recommendation, because if we make that part of our motion, and that doesn't follow the other four regions in the state, all we could do is ask Mr. Chair to voice those concerns, that if they were to consider limited entry to keep it in those regards. I don't know.. We could include it in a motion, but then it gets pretty convoluted, because right now the rest of the state has left it pretty status quo.

Brett Prevedel: I agree, but I'm not 100% confident that... they don't take a.. They don't say, ok it's 3-2 we're going to go along with that. They're pretty independant up there, you would think that if the whole state recommended the same thing, they would go with that.

Daniel Davis: Mr. Chair, can I amend my motion?

Brett Prevedel: I feel strongly that Commissioner Horrocks comment you know could be built in there, if we prefer to leave it as is, then it's just another line. However, if the Wildlife Board imposed limited entry in the southeastern region, then we would like it be consistent through the Book Cliffs.

Daniel Davis: Sure, with that Mr. Chair can I amend my motion?

Brett Prevedel: Yes.

MOTION to leave the spring pursuit as is, with the exception if the Wildlife Board decides to implement the restricted pursuit that the Book Cliffs is included in the limited entry with 75 tags as recommended by the DWR.

Daniel Davis

Natasha Hadden, second

Passed unanimously

Brad Horrocks: I don't know how we'd add it in there, but I'd like to really express our feelings to the state Wildlife Board that we don't want this to go to limited entry. That's just a comment..

Brett Prevedel: And we have the opportunity in every subject, and Dan's going to be representing us in January in this one, we have an opportunity to speak on the topic before they vote, is that adequate? (yes) Ok so we have a motion, and a second.

Brett Prevedel: Ok are there any other parts of that? We've got this Plateau/Boulder/Kaiparowits issue that we can deal with and then the pack size, but if nobody has a concern about that we can just.. In fact we could approve the remainder of it as is, but that would mean this Boulder and pack size, those were the only two changes, right? So is there any desire to break out the pack size issue or the Boulder/Kaiparowits?

MOTION to accept the Divisions recommendation of adding five more tags to the Boulder unit as presented.

Brad Horrocks

Jeff Tanaguchi

Passed 6-2

Daniel Davis: Sure I'll go on the record to state, this three year management plan was put in place. Again, the data is not there and had there been a concern for an emergency I feel like there would be a lot more support for it. Kind of shocked that when the public gets up and speaks their mind they're always addressed with, well it's not that cycle it's on a three year cycle so those changes can't be made for another three years. I find it hard to see that we hold the public to that statute but the state goes against that.

85:45: I'd just like to say that if the data was there, I would support it. Where they don't have the data, they're just collaring some animals now, I just can't support it.

Brett Prevedel: Ok thank you. That leads us to, does anyone have a concern about the dog limit? If there are no concerns about that change we can accept the remainder of the plan as presented. If someone does have a concern, speak up.

Daniel Davis: I have a concern. Again, it's a law enforcement issue. I feel it's a lack of enforcement thereof. So if I could make a motion, Mr. Chair.

MOTION to exclude the 16 dog limit, and leave the dog limit as unlimited.

Daniel Davis

Brad Horrocks, second

Failed 2-6

Jamie Arrive: Can I get some clarification? As far as the dog limit you say it's unlimited and then you hear people say, people bring so many dogs, 30 dogs, 40 dogs in. What is a standard?

Darren DeBloois: There may be two things that you're confusing. The Forest has a restriction on dogs in camp, and that's their regulation, we're not voting on that tonight. What our proposal is,

the largest number of dogs you can set loose on a bear or lion is 16. That's the limit. So you can't put any more than 16 on the ground in pursuit, whether you're hunting or pursuing. We also would amend the lion to include the same restriction so a person couldn't say, well I'm chasing lions, I can have 20 dogs. So that's what we're recommending, that's what you would be voting on. Limit to 16 or leave it unlimited.

Jamie Arrive: Ok, Daniel how many dogs are standard? Do you need more than 16 dogs?

Daniel Davis: There is no standard. I'll speak a little bit to heritage and past time. A lot of these guys right here that I've turned dogs loose with, most of them sitting in this room, there's a social aspect to it, just like there is for everything else. Everything we participate in. There are times when you are intending to harvest an animal, you have a dog fall out. You have dogs that aren't on their A game that day, they slow down, and can't stay in and put the pressure on that animal. Animals get strung out. You're able to move in and release some more dogs to try and stop that animal sooner. With the way this is written, as Darren stated, you couldn't have more than 16 dogs on the ground. So if there were dogs that feel out of the race, they're sitting at the water hole cause they're heated up, and you're trying to put more pressure on the animal to try to harvest that animal, you're restricted now. You've got 2-3 dogs which is very dangerous for the dogs. It's dangerous if they're at bay and have them cornered, it's dangerous for humans to come in and watch as well, so it's very limiting in that factor too. The way it was stated in this presentation is it had a lot of concern for the Forest Service, but a lot of outfitter camps keep 10-15 head of horses. I don't see issues with the landscape being 5-10 head of horses on the Forest in a pen. So to me it takes a lot of that social aspect out, that a lot of people do and participate with.

Brett Prevedel: There was the ethical one that was in this one right? The incidents that you've had a few of. You did make sure we knew they were very isolated.

Darren DeBloois: I think that there are probably two aspects of that recommendation. One is just the number of dogs riding around and just being released in the field. So we try to put some cap on that. The average pack size on the La Sals is eight for pursuit. That's just informational. The other aspect of this is really just an ethics and fair chase concern. Our law enforcement folks, we sat down with Matt and some of the houndsmen and talked about this, and we had concerns about some cases and some of the video that floats around there. Demographics in Utah are changing and I'm concerned about keeping this as a sport. I think putting some common sense limits on pack size is probably a wise thing to do in the long term. And we did meet with the houndsmen and came up with a compromise, and there were folks in the discussion that wanted it to be quite a bit less than that. We tried to find a number that would still allow houndsmen, I don't want to speak out of turn either Matt, feel free to correct me. But those were the two aspects of this and why we're recommending it.

Brett Prevedel: Do you want to speak Matt? Go ahead.

Matt Farnsworth: I'd just like to say that we were included on all these discussions and number range from 1-unlimited. 16 dog limit, when that came about, the reason we agreed to that was to help the Forest Service out. Houndsmen Association has always had a very proactive, we'll do

what we can to help resolve issues now rather than letting them get bigger down the road. The 16 dog limit coincides with the Forest Service laws, so if I have my 16 dogs at camp and I can only take 8 of them with me, I leave eight of them back at camp and they bark all day long and wake up the people back at the campground, and it causes more problems for us. So that was the reason behind it. The social aspects are absolutely true. I take my eight, my buddy takes his eight, my other buddy takes his four, who gets to turn out? Ok you turn out your three, I'll turn out my two and before too long we have our shoes off standing in the snow trying to figure out who has what out. Dan brought up some very good points. That's kind of the background story about where we came up with the 16 dogs.

Brett Prevedel: Thank you.

Dick Bess: Brett can I just tell these guys why I voted the way I voted? Can I do that? (yes) The reason why I voted for the 16 dog limit is for you guys. There's a public perspective out there and as Darren said, I don't want you guys to lose this. And it can happen so easy. I mean the bad thing of it is, there is a handful of people that will abuse it if it's unlimited. And if that perspective is out there and people start to.. There's a lot of social media out there now and you guys don't want to lose what you've got here. It's a good thing and it is a family thing. I was a houndsmen for 20 years and I know how fun it is. But everybody can turn loose a few dogs and still have that same thing, and that's the reason why I voted for what I voted. It's nothing against any of you. I like to have as many dogs at the tree as anybody, but I just think that right now we just need to be careful.

Brett Prevedel: Would you like to turn that into a motion? We already had a motion and we voted against leaving it unlimited..

Dick Bess: That was my motion I voted for the 16 dog limit.

Brett Prevedel: But that was on the previous motion, you voted against an unlimited. So would you like to make a motion that you accept the Divisions proposal?

Dick Bess: Sure.

MOTION to accept the Divisions proposal about the 16 dog limit as presented.

Dick Bess
Jeff Tanaguchi, second
Passed 7-1

MOTION to accept the remainder of the plan as presented.

Daniel Davis
Natasha Hadden, second
Passed unanimously

- **WOLF MANAGEMENT PLAN**–Darrin DeBloois, Mammals Program Coordinator.
 See Slideshow

Brett Prevedel: Thanks Darren, I'll start off with a question. The state legislature directive part, have you done that in the Uintas with the wolves?

Darren DeBloois: Yeah, so Kevin Bunnell is our southern region supervisor, he was intimately involved with this process. What usually happens is we detect a wolf, we send a letter to Fish and Wildlife Service requesting that they remove the wolf, and typically they don't.

Brett Prevedel: So you just go through the motions, you do what you're directed to and I can't imagine that they go out there.

Darren DeBloois: So far they've been transient, they'll show up and they kind of move through. They just haven't taken hold.

Brett Prevedel: Ok, thank you. Any other questions?

Jamie Arrive: Maybe not quite a year ago it was brought to my attention that the state of Colorado was looking into reintroducing wolves, do you know if that happened?

Darren DeBloois: I know it hasn't happened, but it's in discussion. It certainly would affect Utah if that happens but I don't know a lot of the details on that. Maybe Dax does.

Dax Mangus: Dax Mangus Wildlife Program Manager. Right now in Colorado there is a citizen initiative, they're collecting signatures on a petition, trying to get enough signatures to put it as a ballot initiative to reintroduce wolves in Colorado.

Darren DeBloois: If I'm not mistaken Dax, that will be something that if they get enough signatures that it would be on the ballot in November.

Daniel Davis: Darren I've got a question. So by the states definition of delisting, what does that allow the state to do?

Darren DeBloois: Management would fall to us, so we'd manage wolves like we do any other wildlife, we'd be responsible. Without going through the whole plan, what the plan in a nutshell says is we'd need to consider a lot of factors about where or if we allow wolves to establish. The plan does say two packs. But there are also some caveats about conflict. So that would have to be looked at, that would be part of the equation. Does that answer your question?

Daniel Davis: I guess where I'm going is what prevents the state from delisting statewide?

Darren DeBloois: It's a Federal decision whether it's delisted. So unless the Fish and Wildlife Service makes a decision to delist wolves, they retain management authority. Although, technically they're delisted in the north part of the state, the legislatures directed us to put the responsibility on Fish and Wildlife Services to handle those things.

Jeff Tanaguchi: If they confirm wolf kill is there a compensation? Is it by the DWR or the Federals?

Darren DeBloois: We've had a few over the years and we compensate them. It's the same if a lion or bear took livestock. We'll compensate up until that fund is exhausted, and then we'd have to prorate. But the wolf depredation is included in that compensation program.

Brett Prevedel: Are there any questions from the public?

Questions from the public:

Quin Labrum: I have actually come across many of wolf tracks in the Uintas. Amazingly Farm Creek, Pole Creek region area and I have seen the tracks and I'm pretty sure I've called Dax on it every time, and they've sent investigators out to come look at them and they were wolves. So there is some here. So yeah.

Brett Prevedel: Thank you. I have photos of the same wolf tracks in the same drainage. Ok, I guess we don't have any card from the public. So comments from the RAC.

Comments from the RAC:

Brett Prevedel: And remember we're just voting to extend the wolf plan, no changes. I'd entertain a motion.

MOTION to approve the extension of the wolf management plan for ten years.

Natasha Hadden

Jamie Arrive, second

Passed unanimously

Dax Mangus: Mr. Chair, Dax Mangus. Just a little point of clarification. We have had a documented sighting across the South Slope of the Uintas, but we do not at this time have any knowledge of an established breeding pack of wolves, so I just wanted to make that clear.

- **BRINE SHRIMP COR RULE AMENDMENTS**– Kyle Stone, Great Salt Lake Ecosystem Biologist.

See Slideshow

Brett Prevedel: I have one comment card from the Great Salt Lake co-op. And it said they couldn't attend the meeting, but they wanted to express industry support for the rule change, and thank the DWR and the AGs office for working with them on the rule change on this matter. Brine shrimp get a bad wrap.. I'm from Hooper so I know what a brine shrimp is.

Kyle Stone: Yeah you do know. And we find that it really does on the regulation. So being able to knock those cyst numbers down actually help to produce more brine shrimp each year.

Brett Prevedel: So it's not an overharvest concern, it's actually a benefit.

Kyle Stone: Yeah, so the population actually naturally booms and busts, so we've gone from this model to this model where we have a dampening on the fluctuations but they're overall higher is what it seems to be. We're actually doing a better job of allowing more bird use on the lake.

Brett Prevedel: Comments, questions?

Dan Abeyta: Kyle, how many jobs are supported by the brine shrimp fishery on the Great Salt Lake. Do you have any idea on that, or revenue?

Kyle Stone: I would be speculating on the number of jobs. I do know that they're issued a primary stanager card, and alternator stanager card and 12 assistant cards, so just per the COR there are at least 15 people who have jobs directly. Then there's all the people who have to have a card to accompany the product. Then there's all the processing, the shipping. And I mean the GSL produces currently about 40% of the world market for aquaculture usage. So this is a global concern. If the world does not get brine shrimp egg, world does not eat fish.

Jeff Tanaguchi: I have a question on, does the Division get any revenues on any of the CORs?

Kyle Stone: Yes, so that \$15,000 licensing fee that goes directly to fund the GSL ecosystem program. We get a portion of that. Another portion of it goes somewhere within the Division, and they are kind of cryptic about where that goes, I don't know. But then there's also that 3 ¼ royalty tax, and a very large portion of that goes to endangered species mitigation fund. So it does generate quite a bit of money for the Division every year.

Brett Prevedel: Is that bigger than the 15,000, that percentage?

Kyle Stone: It comes out about the same, I want to say because the licenses at \$15,000 are about 1.1-1.2 million dollars, then the royalty fees the past couple of years have been taxed on over 30 million pounds, or very near that. So 30 million times 3 ¼ cents averages about a million dollars.

Brett Prevedel: Any questions? Any comments? Alright I would open it up to a motion.

MOTION to accept the presentation as presented.

Jeff Tanaguchi

Natasha Hadden, second

Passed unanimously

MOTION to adjourn.

Brad Horrocks

Dick Bess

Passed unanimously



GARY R. HERBERT
Governor

SPENCER COX
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

BRIAN STEED
Executive Director

Division of Wildlife Resources

MICHAL FOWLKS
Division Director

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 19, 2019

TO: Utah Wildlife Board

FROM: Staci Coons,
Wildlife Board Coordinator

RE: Variance Request from Elwood Longenecker for the personal growing of Pacific Whiteleg Shrimp.

ANALYSIS

The division evaluated the merits of the request based on the criteria established by the Wildlife Board in R657-3. Based upon the criteria established by the Wildlife Board, the analyses and recommendations of the division are as follows:

- 1. The health, welfare, and safety of the public** - The division expressed no concerns over health, welfare, and safety of the public.
- 2. The health, welfare, safety and genetic integrity of wildlife, domestic livestock, poultry and other animals** - The division had no concerns with possible impacts on wildlife or domestic animals.
- 3. The ecological and environmental impacts** - The division had no concerns with ecological or environmental impacts.
- 4. The suitability of the facilities** - The division had no concerns with the suitability of the proposed facilities.
- 5. Experience of the applicant for the proposed activity** - The division expressed no concerns with the level of experience or education of the applicant for this proposed project.
- 6. The ecological and environmental impacts on other states** - The division had no significant concerns with impacts of this request on other states.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The division, after careful evaluation, recommends that the request be approved.



8. REGIONAL OFFICES

APPLICATIONS MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL OFFICE WHERE THE PRIVATE POND IS LOCATED.

REGION

NORTHERN REGION
515 E 5300 S
OGDEN 84405
(801) 476-2740

COUNTIES

BOX ELDER, CACHE, DAVIS, MORGAN, RICH, SUMMIT, WEBER

CENTRAL REGION

1115 N MAIN
SPRINGVILLE 84663
(801) 491-5678

JUAB, SALT LAKE, SANPETE, TOOELE, UTAH, WASATCH

NORTHEASTERN REGION

152 E 100 N
VERNAL 84078-2126
(435) 781-9453

DAGGETT, DUCHESNE, UINTAH

SOUTHEASTERN REGION

319 N CARBONVILLE RD, STE 1
PRICE 84501
(435) 613-3700

CARBON, EMERY, GRAND, SAN JUAN, WAYNE

SOUTHERN REGION

1470 N AIRPORT RD
CEDAR CITY 84721
(435) 865-6100

BEAVER, GARFIELD, IRON, KANE, MILLARD, PIUTE, SEVIER, WASHINGTON

9. In many instances, other agency (federal/state/county/ city/municipal) laws covering live possession of animals or groups of animals, pond/facility location, water rights, etc. may be in effect. If local laws (city/county) restrict live possession of any zoological animal, written permission from the local entity granting authority to possess such animal must be submitted with this application for a COR. THE APPLICANT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR COMPLYING WITH SUCH LAWS PRIOR TO SUBMITTING A COR APPLICATION.

If a federal permit is required for the activity applied for herein (U.S. Fish & Wildlife or U.S. Department of Agriculture, etc.), submit with this application either a copy of the permit or a copy of your application for the federal permit.

10. Enclosed is legal tender in the amount of \$10, which is a nonrefundable handling fee. A \$100 nonrefundable risk assessment fee must also accompany the application. Make checks payable to:

DIVISION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES

Cashing your check or accepting money from you neither implies issuance or denial of a certificate of registration.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I HAVE READ AND AM FAMILIAR WITH THE RULES PERTAINING TO THE ACTIVITY(IES) APPLIED FOR AND THAT I ACCEPT ANY AND ALL LIABILITY RESULTING FROM THE ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION. I FURTHER CERTIFY THE INFORMATION SUBMITTED IN THIS APPLICATION FOR A COR IS COMPLETE AND ACCURATE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF. I UNDERSTAND ANY FALSE STATEMENT HEREIN MAY RESULT IN THE APPLICATION BEING DENIED.

Date

12/13/19

Applicant signature





July 2, 2019

Miami Aqua-culture, Inc.
Daniel Spotts
3300 S Congress Ave., Suite 4
Boynton Beach, FL 33426
USA

Case: 19-577

E-mail: dan@miami-aquaculture.com

Dear Daniel Spotts:

The PCR tests you requested for the detection of WSSV, IHNV, TSV, YHV, IMNV, AHPND/EMS, and NHP-B have been completed. One jar of *P. vannamei* (ID No. Tank P3; Lot P74) arrived on June 21, 2019 in good condition. The sample was collected from Miami Aqua-culture Inc. on June 17, 2019. Representative samples from this jar (approx. 30mg) were collected for DNA and RNA extractions. WSSV, IHNV, TSV, YHV, IMNV, AHPND/EMS, and NHP-B were not detected in the samples tested. The tests were completed on July 2, 2019.

A summary of the tests and results is provided on the following page. A hard copy of this report will be mailed to you. If there are any questions regarding this case, please feel free to contact us.

UAZ Policy on certification: This report provides our findings on the samples submitted to our laboratory for examination, health status evaluation, disease diagnosis, or pathogen detection. It is our policy and intent to perform the most appropriate assay(s) for the determination of the health/pathogen status of all specimens submitted to our laboratory. However, this report in no way constitutes a stock or facility "certification" or a "certificate" of health/pathogen status for the sample(s) tested or for the stocks, or facility, from which the sample(s) were derived.

PCR: disclaimer: This report provides our findings on the samples submitted to our laboratory for pathogen detection. The PCR assay used by this laboratory for the detection of shrimp pathogens is a research tool. The results should be considered as experimental and tentative. Whenever possible, PCR results should be confirmed by alternative assay. This report in no way constitutes a stock or facility "certification" or a "certificate" of health/pathogen status for the sample(s) tested or for the stocks, or facility, from which the sample(s) were derived.

The UAZ Aquaculture Pathology Lab is a OIE (Office International des Epizooties or the Organization or World Animal Health Organization) Reference Laboratory for Taura Syndrome and a U.S.D.A. A.P.H.I.S. Approved Laboratory for export testing for White Spot Disease, Taura Syndrome, Infectious Hypodermal and Hematopoietic Necrosis, Infectious Myonecrosis, Yellowhead Disease, Acute hepatopancreatic necrosis disease, Crayfish plaque (*Aphanomyces astaci*), White tail disease (*Macrobrachium rosenbergii* nodavirus), and Necrotizing hepatopancreatitis (Hepatobacter penacid).

Sincerely yours,

Michelle Garfias
Research Specialist

Arun K. Dhar, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Aquaculture Pathology Laboratory Director



Tests Requested:

WSSV, IHNV
 TSV, YHV, IMNV
 AHPND/EMS, NHP-B

Sample Type:

PL's
 PL's
 PL's

Species:

P. vannamei
P. vannamei
P. vannamei

Protocols:

Real time WSSV: qPCR protocol by Durand and Lightner (J. Fish Dis. 2002, 25:381-389)
 IHNV: PCR described by Tang et al. (Virus Research, 2006, 118: 185-191)
 Real time TSV: RT-PCR protocol described by Tang, et al. (J Vir Methods, 2004, 109-114)
 Real time YHV: qPCR protocol described by Aranguren, et al. (DAO. 2012, 98:185-192)
 Real time IMNV RT-PCR: modified from Andrade, et al. (Aquaculture. 2007, 264: 9-15)
 Real time AHPND/EMS: qPCR method developed from Han et al. (Aquaculture 2015, 442: 12-15)
 Real time NHP-B: qPCR protocol developed by Aranguren et al. (Dis Aquat Org. Vol. 131: 49-57, 2018)

Table: PCR and RT-PCR results

UAZ #	Sample Ref	WSSV	IHNV	TSV	YHV	IMNV	AHPND/EMS	NHP-B
19-577	<i>P. vannamei</i> ID No. Tank P3 Lot P74	Not Detected						

Conclusion: WSSV, IHNV, TSV, YHV, IMNV, AHPND/EMS, and NHP-B were not detected in the samples tested.

