

# Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

April 30, 2020, Electronic Meeting

The Board Meeting will stream live at <https://youtu.be/r7PWxlWU82M>

## AGENDA

**Thursday, April 30, 2020, 9:00 A.M.**

- |   |                      |
|---|----------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda<br>– Byron Bateman, Chairman  | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 2. Approval of Minutes<br>– Byron Bateman, Chairman   | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log<br>– Kevin Albrecht, Vice-Chair  | <b>CONTINGENT</b>    |
| 4. DWR Update<br>– Mike Fowlks, DWR Director  | <b>INFORMATIONAL</b> |
| 5. Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2020<br>- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator                 | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 6. Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2020<br>- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator                             | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 7. R657-37 CWMU Rule Amendments<br>- Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator                     | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 8. 2020 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations<br>- Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator      | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 9. Management Bison Hunts – Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit<br>- Brad Crompton, Assistant Wildlife Manager SE       | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 10. Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy Revisions<br>- Darren DeBloois, Game Mammals Program Coordinator | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 11. Cougar and Bear Rule Amendments<br>- Darren DeBloois, Game Mammals Program Coordinator                      | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 12. Other Business<br>– Byron Bateman, Chairman   | <b>CONTINGENT</b>    |

Details of the specific recommendations can be found at [www.wildlife.utah.gov](http://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 DeBloois  
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**  
**January 7, 2020, DNR Boardroom**  
**1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah**  
The meeting will stream live at [https://youtu.be/l7r95y9B6\\_o](https://youtu.be/l7r95y9B6_o)

**Thursday, January 7, 2020, 9:00 am**

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

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

**Utah Wildlife Board Meeting**  
January 7, 2020, 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 Kevin Albrecht 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 December 4, 2019 Wildlife Board Meeting.**

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

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Bret Selman and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we maintain the unlimited resident pursuit permits as is; restrict non-resident permits to two pursuits per restricted units and unlimited on the others; and institute the 16-dog limit statewide – maintain the 8-dog limit in the summer pursuit and the 16 in the take permits.**

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

**MOTION: I move that we add an ethics course for the online bear orientation and institute an online pursuit ethics course prior to purchasing a permit.**

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Bret Selman and tabled for further discussion later in the meeting.

**MOTION: I move that we increase the statewide-recommended bear permits by 25% on all units except for Beaver, Boulder, Book Cliffs, Cache, and Chalk Creek units. Permit numbers would increase by 50% for these units.**

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

**MOTION: I move that we table the previous motion on bear permit increases, present the other agenda items, and then revisit the motion after lunch when the board gathers more information and the Division**

**recalculates permit numbers.**

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Bret Selman and failed 3:4. Bret Selman, Wade Heaton, and Donnie Hunter voted in favor. Randy Dearth, Kevin Albrecht, and Karl Hirst opposed. Byron Bateman broke the tie in opposition of the motion.

**MOTION: I move to withdraw the original motion and move to approve the Division's revised permit numbers that include the three units in the upper harvest: Beaver, Book Cliffs, and Chalk Creek units.**

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

**MOTION: I move that we do nothing on the units that have 10 or less permits; increase permits by 25% on the Beaver, Chalk Creek, and both Book Cliff units; and increase permits by 10% on the remaining units. The Board will also defer to the Division to determine the permit distribution among the available seasons on units that have crowding issues: the La Sals and San Juan.**

The following motion was made by Kevin Albrecht, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the balance of R657-33 Black Bear and R657-10 Cougar Rule Amendments as presented including the red line correction on the eight-dog limit for both the summer pursuit and restricted summer pursuit seasons.**

4) **Wolf Management Plan (Action)**

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

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Wolf Management Plan as presented by the Division.**

5) **Brine Shrimp COR Rule Amendments (Action)**

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

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Brine Shrimp COR Rule Amendments as presented by the Division.**

6) **Prohibited Species Variance Request (Action)**

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

**MOTION: I move that we approve Mr. Elwood Longnecker's variance request for Pacific white leg shrimp.**

**Utah Wildlife Board Meeting**  
January 7, 2020, DNR Auditorium  
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah  
Attendance

**Wildlife Board**

Byron Bateman – Chair	Karl Hirst
Kevin Albrecht – Vice-Chair	Donnie Hunter
Mike Fowlks – Exec Secretary	Randy Dearth
	Wade Heaton
	Bret Selman

**RAC Chairs**

Central – Brock McMillan  
Southern – Brayden Richmond  
Southeastern – L Kent Johnson  
Northeastern – Dan Abeyta  
Northern – Justin Oliver

**Division Personnel**

Robin Cahoon	Paul Gedge	Teresa Griffin	Roger Kerstetter
Ashley Green	Mike Christensen	Dax Mangus	Wyatt Bubak
Mike Canning	Staci Coons	Riley Peck	Chad Bettridge
Jason Vernon	Thu Vo-Wood	Guy Wallace	Dave Beveridge
Miles Hanberg	Greg Hansen	Jim Christensen	Matt Briggs
Chris Wood	Marty Bushman	Kent Hersey	Paul Washburn
Kevin Bunnell	Faith Jolley	Covy Jones	Bruce Johnson
Ben Nadolski	Darren DeBloois	Austin Grimes	Rick Olson
J Shirley	Kim Hersey	Phil Gray	
Justin Shannon	Lindy Varney	Torrey Christopherson	
Kenny Johnson			

**Public Present**

Bryce Pilling	Mat Farnsworth – UHA	Marne Hone
Jesse Painter	Cory Huntsman – UHA	Dee Young
Jamie Newman	Troy Justensen – SFW	Paige Anderson
Tyler Farr	Brian Perkes	Joni Wirts
Sadie Young	John Ziegler	Jared Zierenberg
Chet Young	Ron Frank	Mike Nix
Jason Binder	Paula Richmond	Sheri Morgan Perkes
Margaret Pettis	Alan Hone	Mark Scott
Don Leonard – GSL Brine Shrimp Cooperative		Kerry Scott
Brian Bitner – UT Wool Growers Assoc.		
Sundays Hunt – Humane Society		

**Utah Wildlife Board Meeting**  
January 7, 2020, DNR Auditorium  
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah  
[https://youtu.be/l7r95y9B6\\_o](https://youtu.be/l7r95y9B6_o)

- 00:00:17** Chairman Bateman called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, reviewed the meeting procedures, and had the Board and RAC members introduce themselves.
- 00:02:01** **1) Approval of Agenda (Action)**  
The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.  
**MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda as presented.**
- 00:02:23** **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 December 5, 2019 Wildlife Board Meeting.**
- 00:02:45** **3) Old Business/Action Log (Contingent)**  
Chairman Bateman asked Drew Cushing, aquatic section chief, to give an update on the premium fishing areas action log.
- 00:04:53** **4) DWR Update (Informational)**  
Mike Fowlks updated the Board on habitat, aquatics, and wildlife accomplishments and undertakings. Covy Jones and Kent Hersey addressed predation and predator management challenges.
- 00:24:48** **5) R657-33 Black Bear and R657-10 Cougar Rule Amendments (Action)**  
Darren DeBloois presented the rule amendments for black bear and cougar.
- 00:39:49** **Board/RAC Questions**  
The Board asked for clarification on resident/nonresident pursuit tag, dog limit recommendation, qualification for pursuit tags.
- 00:42:58** **RAC Recommendation**  
All RACs passed the rule amendments with varying stipulations and opposition.
- 00:48:32** **Public Comments/Division Clarification**  
Public comments accepted at this time.
- 01:22:32** The division clarified the conservation permit numbers.
- 01:27:11** **Board Discussion**  
The board chair summarized the motions.

- 01:29:00** Restricted Pursuit Permits  
The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Bret Selman and passed unanimously.  
**MOTION: I move that we maintain the unlimited resident pursuit permits as is; restrict non-resident permits to two pursuits per restricted units and unlimited on the others; and institute the 16-dog limit statewide – maintain the 8-dog limit in the summer pursuit and the 16 in the take permits.**
- 01:37:16** Pursuit Ethics Course  
The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.  
**MOTION: I move that we add an ethics course for the online bear orientation and institute an online pursuit ethics course prior to purchasing a permit.**
- 01:40:37** Bear Permit Allocation
- 01:57:23** BREAK – technical difficulties
- 02:02:34** Bear Permit Allocation (continued)  
The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Bret Selman and tabled for further discussion later in the meeting.  
**MOTION: I move that we increase the statewide-recommended bear permits by 25% on all units except for Beaver, Boulder, Book Cliffs, Cache, and Chalk Creek units. Permit numbers would increase by 50% for these units.**  
The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.  
**MOTION: I move that we table the bear permit increase discussion until the board covers all other agenda items and then revisit the discussion to address specific bear tags.**
- 02:17:45** **6) Wolf Management Plan (Action)**  
Kimberly Hersey presented the plan.
- 02:22:26** **RAC Recommendations**  
All RACs, except Northern RAC, unanimously passed the management plan. Northern RAC had one abstention.
- 02:24:08** **Public Comments/Division Clarification**  
Public comments accepted at this time. No clarification at this time.
- 02:25:10** **Board Discussion**  
The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.



**MOTION: I move that we approve the Wolf Management Plan as presented by the Division.**

**02:25:34 7) Brine Shrimp COR Rule Amendments (Action)**  
Martin Bushman presented the rule amendments.

**02:35:10 Board Questions**  
Karl Hirst asked about the reaction and reception of the changes from brine shrimp owners.

**02:35:42 RAC Recommendations**  
All RACs unanimously passed the amendments.

**02:36:25 Public Comments/Division Clarification**  
Public comments accepted at this time. No clarification at this time.

**02:37:37 Board Discussion**  
The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Brine Shrimp COR Rule Amendments as presented by the Division.**

**02:38:10 8) Prohibited Species Variance Request (Action)**  
Staci Coons presented the request.

**02:39:28 Board Questions & Discussion**  
The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve Mr. Elwood Longnecker's variance request for Pacific white leg shrimp.**

**02:40:26 LUNCH**

**03:46:46 5) R657-33 Black Bear and R657-10 Cougar Rule Amendments (Action) – continued**  
The board resumed the bear tag discussion. The Division presented the adjusted allocation.

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Bret Selman and failed 3:4. Bret Selman, Wade Heaton, and Donnie Hunter voted in favor. Randy Dearth, Kevin Albrecht, and Karl Hirst opposed. Byron Bateman broke the tie in opposition of the motion.

**MOTION: I move to withdraw the original motion and move to approve the Division's revised permit numbers that include the three units in the upper harvest: Beaver, Book Cliffs, and Chalk Creek units.**

The following motion and amendment was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Donnie

Hunter and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we do nothing on the units that have 10 or less permits; increase permits by 25% on the Beaver, Chalk Creek, and both Book Cliff units; and increase permits by 10% on the remaining units. The Board will also defer to the Division to determine the permit distribution among the available seasons on units that have crowding issues: the La Sals and San Juan.**

The following motion was made by Kevin Albrecht, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the balance of R657-33 Black Bear and R657-10 Cougar Rule Amendments as presented including the red line correction on the eight-dog limit for both the summer pursuit and restricted summer pursuit seasons.**

**04:05:20 9) Other Business (Contingent)**

Karl Hirst requested the Division actively update and make the public aware of the many changes to the big game proclamation that occurred in the last board meeting. The Division acknowledged that it is already in the works.

Justin Shannon asked for clarification on the bear permit increase in respect to the three-year plan and the effective implementation date of the increase.

The Board stated they will continue to adjust the bear plan despite the three-year plan cycle and will do so until deer population improves.

**04:10:08 Meeting adjourned.**

# Utah Wildlife Board Electronic Meeting

April 10, 2020

Salt Lake City, Utah

The meeting will stream live at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VeMQeGoXvKs>

**Thursday, April 10, 2020, 10:00 am**

- |  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda  | <b>ACTION</b>     |
| – Byron Bateman, Chairman  |                   |
| 2. R657-57 Division Variance Rule Amendments in response to COVID-19 | <b>ACTION</b>     |
| – Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator                       |                   |
| 3. Other Business  | <b>CONTINGENT</b> |
| – Byron Bateman, Chairman  |                   |

Recommendations can be viewed at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

Public Comment will be accepted until 11:59 p.m. on Thursday, April 9.

**Utah Wildlife Board Electronic Meeting**  
April 10, 2020  
Salt Lake City, Utah  
**Summary of Motions**

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

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

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

2) R657-57 Division Variance Rule Amendments in response to COVID-19 (**Action**)

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

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Division Variance Rule R657-57 as presented with the addition that limited entry hunts occurring prior to July 1, 2020, are included in the season extensions due to COVID-19**

**Utah Wildlife Board Electronic Meeting**  
April 10, 2020  
Salt Lake City, Utah  
Online Attendance

<b>Wildlife Board</b>		<b>Presenter(s)</b>
Byron Bateman – Chair	Karl Hirst	Lindy Varney
Kevin Albrecht – Vice-Chair	Donnie Hunter	
Mike Fowlks – Exec Secretary	Randy Dearth	
	Wade Heaton	
	Bret Selman	

**Public invited to join online:** <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VeMQeGoXvKs>

DRAFT

**Utah Wildlife Board Electronic Meeting**  
April 10, 2020  
Salt Lake City, Utah  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VeMQeGoXvKs>

- 00:00:08** Chairman Bateman called the meeting to order. He called the roll and confirmed that all board members were present with exception of Donnie Hunter.
- 00:01:23** **1) Approval of Agenda (Action)**  
The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously. Donnie Hunter was not present during this vote.  
**MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda as presented.**
- 00:03:09** **2) R657-57 Division Variance Rule Amendments in response to COVID-19 (Action)**  
The Division posted the rule amendments at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/online-board.html> for review and comments.
- 00:03:26** **Technical Difficulties**
- 00:11:39** Chairman Bateman recapped and confirmed the presence of all board members including Donnie Hunter. The Division received one public comment in support of the rule amendments.
- 00:12:36** Lindy Varney presented to the board.
- 00:16:33** **Board/RAC Questions**  
Karl Hirst asked for clarification on the limited entry variance option and those who drew with low bonus points.  
Mike Fowlks addressed opportunities for the public to surrender their limited entry permits for points and refunds.
- 00:19:12** **Board Discussion**  
Karl Hirst attempted to make a motion, with a second from Randy Dearth; however after further discussion including history of season extensions, legalities, criteria, and time limits, Karl amended his motion.  
The following amended motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.  
**MOTION: I move that we approve the Division Variance Rule R657-57 as presented with the addition that limited entry hunts occurring prior to July 1, 2020, are included in the season extensions due to COVID-19.**
- 00:28:50** **3) Other Business (Contingent)**  
None. The next board meeting is April 30, 2020.
- 00:30:42** Meeting adjourned.

April RAC Meetings  
Video Conference  
**Summary of Approved Motions**

- 1) Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2020

**CR**

**MOTION:** Further reduce the deer permits on the Cache unit by an additional 800 for a total decrease of 1,600 from 2019 permit numbers. (Reduce permits from 5,800 to 5,000 in 2020).

**Passed: 9-1**

**MOTION:** Increase the permits on the Henrys Mountains archery only hunters choice hunt by 1 (1 nonresident and 2 resident (1 to max points and 1 random)).

**Passed: Unanimously**

**MOTION:** On the Zion BHS unit, keep permits at the same number as 2019.

**Passed: Unanimously**

**MOTION:** Accept the remainder of the Bighorn Sheep recommendations as presented.

**Passed: Unanimously**

**MOTION:** Keep the Nebo limited entry permits at the 2019 level of 47.

**Passed: 9-1**

**MOTION:** Recommend late season limited entry muzzleloader permits at .5% on all units with a minimum 5 on units that won't reach 5 (.5% permits or 5 (whichever is greater) to follow the Mule Deer Committees initial recommendation).

**Passed: Unanimously**

**MOTION:** Recommend the wildlife board adjust the Nebo limited entry elk unit to be managed at 5.5 to 6 year old age structure and direct the DWR to look at other elk units that are chronically underperforming.

**Passed: Unanimously**

**MOTION:** To accept the remainder of the DWR's recommendations as presented.

**Passed: Unanimously**

**NR**

**MOTION:** I move that we accept the Bucks, Bulls and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2020 as presented with the exception of the Cache Deer Unit, which will be reduced by an additional 800 permits than that recommended by DWR.

**Passed: Unanimously**

**SR MOTION:** To accept the Division's permit recommendations for General Season and Limited Entry Buck Deer as presented, with the amendment to reduce the Cache General Season Buck Deer permits by 800.

**Passed: Unanimously**

**MOTION:** I move that we accept the remainder of the Division's recommendations as presented.

**AMENDED MOTION:** I move that we amend the motion and accept the remainder of the Division's recommendations as presented but add one resident Bison archery permit on the Henry Mountains (for the total of two) and reduce the Kaiparowits West Desert Bighorn Sheep permit numbers back to what they were in 2019.

**Passed: Unanimously**

**SER MOTION:** I move that we reduce the overall number of general season buck deer permits from 1,300 to 1,000

**Passed: Unanimously**

**MOTION:** to decrease general buck deer permits on the Nine Mile from 1,650 to 1,350

**Passed: 11-1**

**MOTION:** to drop the buck deer permits on the San Juan, Abajo from a 500 decrease to an 850 decrease.

**Passed: 11-1**

**MOTION:** to decrease the Cache buck deer permits by 800

**Passed: 10-2**

**MOTION:** to add one bison resident archery tag on the Henry Mountains.

**Passed: 11-1**

**MOTION:** to decrease the San Juan/Abajo unit late season muzzleloader hunt to 5 permits

**Passed: Unanimously**

**MOTION:** to accept the remainder as presented.

**Passed: Unanimously**

**NER MOTION:** to accept the division's recommendations as presented.

**Passed: Unanimously**



- 2) Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2020

**CR, SR, NER**

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

**Passed: Unanimously**

**NR**

**MOTION:** I move that we accept the Antlerless Permit Recommendation for 2020 as presented

**Passed: Unanimously**

**MOTION:** I move to accept the boundary change for the East Canyon, Davis, North Salt Lake Boundary as presented.

**Passed: Unanimously**

**SER**

**MOTION:** I move that we reduce the antlerless tags on the Book Cliffs to a total of 150 tags, with no more than 15 being in the roadless area.

**Passed: 7-5**

**MOTION:** to accept the remainder of the recommendations

**Passed: Unanimously**

- 3) R657-37 CWMU Rule Amendments

**CR, NR, SR, NER**

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

**Passed: Unanimously**

**SER**

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

**Passed: 11 in favor with 1 abstention**

- 4) 2020 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations

**All RAC's**

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

**Passed: Unanimously**

- 5) Management Bison Hunts – Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit

**CR, SR**

**MOTION:** To accept the Division’s recommendations as presented.  
**Passed:** Unanimously

**NR**

**MOTION:** To accept the Management Bison Hunts-Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit as presented.  
**Passed: 10-2**

**SER**

**MOTION:** To accept the Management Bison Hunts-Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit recommendation as long as it is revisited yearly.  
**Passed: Unanimously**

**NER**

**MOTION:** To accept the Management Bison Hunts-Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit as presented.  
**Passed: 10-1**

- 6) Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy Revisions

**CR**

**MOTION:** To accept the Division’s recommendations as presented.  
**Passed: 7-3**

**NR, SR, NER**

**MOTION:** To accept the Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy Revisions as presented.  
**Passed: Unanimously**

**SER**

**MOTION:** To accept the Division’s recommendations as presented.  
**Passed: 11-1**

- 7) Cougar and Bear Rule Amendments

**CR, NR, SR, SER**

**MOTION:** To accept the Division’s recommendations as presented.  
**Passed: Unanimously**

**NER**

**MOTION:** To accept the Division’s recommendations as presented.  
**Passed: 10 in favor with 1 abstention**

# Central Region RAC Meeting

## Video Conference

### April 7, 2020

The meeting streamed live at <https://youtu.be/szS2clrQga0>

**Tuesday, April 7, 2020, 6:00 pm**

- |   |                      |
|---|----------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda<br>– Brock McMillan, RAC chair  | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 2. Approval of Minutes<br>– Brock McMillan, RAC chair   | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 3. Wildlife Board Update<br>– Brock McMillan, RAC chair   | <b>INFORMATIONAL</b> |
| 4. DWR Update<br>– Jason Vernon, Regional Supervisor  | <b>INFORMATIONAL</b> |
| 5. Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2020<br>- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator                 | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 6. Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2020<br>- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator                             | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 7. R657-37 CWMU Rule Amendments<br>- Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator                     | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 8. 2020 CWMU Anterless Permit Recommendations<br>– Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator       | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 9. Management Bison Hunts – Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit<br>– Brad Crompton, Assistant Wildlife Manager SE       | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 10. Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy Revisions<br>– Darren DeBloois, Game Mammals Program Coordinator | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 11. Cougar and Bear Rule Amendments<br>– Darren DeBloois, Game Mammals Program Coordinator                      | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 12. Other Business<br>– Brock McMillan, RAC chair   | <b>CONTINGENT</b>    |

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

**Central Region RAC Meeting**  
April 7, 2020  
Springville, Utah  
**Summary of Motions**

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

The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Mike Christensen and passed 7 in favor and 2 abstentions (Christine Schmitz, Danny Potts) due to not attending the previous meeting.

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

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

The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Mike Christensen and passed 7 in favor and abstentions due to not attending the previous meeting.

**MOTION: To approve the minutes of the December 3, 2019 Central Region RAC meeting.**

3) Bucks, Bulls and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2020 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Mike Christensen and passed 9 in favor and 1 opposed (Josh).

**MOTION: Further reduce the deer permits on the Cache unit by an additional 800 for a total decrease of 1,600 from 2019 permit numbers. (Reduce permits from 5,800 to 5,000 in 2020).**

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

**MOTION: Increase the permits on the Henrys Mountains archery only hunters choice hunt by 1 (1 nonresident and 2 resident (1 to max points and 1 random)).**

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

**MOTION: On the Zion BHS unit, keep permits at the same number as 2019.**

The following motion was made by Ken Strong and failed for lack of a second.

**MOTION: Drop the number of tags on the Fillmore/Oak Creek to 10 from the recommended 14.**

The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Ken Strong and was then withdrawn by Ben.

**MOTION: Drop the number of permits on the Fillmore/Oak Creek to 10 from the recommended 12.**

The following motion was made by Josh Lenart, seconded by Christine Schmitz and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: Accept the remainder of the Bighorn Sheep recommendations as presented.**

The following motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Ben Lowder and passed 9 in favor and 1 opposed (Chris).

**MOTION: Keep the Nebo limited entry permits at the 2019 level of 47.**

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

**MOTION: Recommend late season limited entry muzzleloader permits at .5% on all units with a minimum 5 on units that won't reach 5 (.5% permits or 5 (whichever is greater) to follow the Mule Deer Committees initial recommendation).**

The following motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Eric Reid and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: Recommend the wildlife board adjust the Nebo limited entry elk unit to be managed at 5.5 to 6 year old age structure and direct the DWR to look at other elk units that are chronically underperforming.**

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

**MOTION: To accept the remainder of the DWR's recommendations as presented.**

4) Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2020

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

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

5) R657-37 CWMU Rule Amendments (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Josh Lenart and passed unanimously.

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

- 6) 2020 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Eric Reid, seconded by AJ Mower and passed unanimously.

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

- 7) Management Bison Hunts – Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit (**Action**)

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

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

- 8) Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy Revisions (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Eric Reid, seconded by Steve Lund and passed 7 in favor and 3 opposed (Christine Schmitz, Danny Potts, Luke Decker).

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

- 9) Cougar and Bear Rule Amendments

The following motion was made by Steve Lund, seconded by AJ Mower and passed unanimously.

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

**Central Region RAC Meeting**  
April 7, 2020  
Online Attendance

**RAC Board**

Brock McMillan – RAC Chair  
Christine Schmitz  
Danny Potts  
Eric Reid  
Ken Strong  
Ben Lowder

AJ Mower  
Michael Christensen  
Luke Decker  
Steve Lund  
Josh Lenart

**Wildlife Board**

Karl Hirst  
Randy Dearth

**DWR Personnel**

Jason Vernon  
Riley Peck  
James Christensen  
Greg Hansen  
Jason Robinson  
Jace Taylor

Rusty Robinson  
Covy Jones  
Darren DeBloois  
Brad Crompton  
Dale Liechty  
Kent Hersey

**Public invited to join online:** <https://youtu.be/szS2clrQga0>

**Central Region RAC Meeting**  
 April 7, 2020  
 Springville, Utah  
<https://youtu.be/szS2clrQga0>

<b>00:00:10</b>	RAC Chair Brock McMillan called the meeting to order. He called the roll of RAC members and indicated which UDWR personnel were present on the broadcast. He explained the process that there will be no live presentations or public comments taken during the meeting.
<b>00:23:50</b>	<p><b>1) Approval of Agenda (Action)</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Mike Christensen and passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda as presented.</b></p>
<b>00:23:50</b>	<p><b>2) Approval of Minutes (Action)</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Mike Christensen and passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the January 7, 2020 Wildlife Board Meeting.</b></p>
<b>00:11:45</b>	<p><b>3) Wildlife Board Meeting (Informational)</b></p> <p>RAC Chair Brock McMillan updated the RAC.</p>
<b>00:05:18</b>	<p><b>4) DWR Update (Informational)</b></p> <p>Jason Vernon updated the RAC on all regional activities.</p>
<b>00:13:38</b>	<p><b>5) Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2020 (Action)</b></p> <p>A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: <a href="https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html">https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html</a>.</p>
<b>00:20:25</b>	<p><b>Public Comments</b></p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation</p>
<b>00:21:33</b>	<p><b>RAC Questions</b></p> <p>The RAC members asked about an additional tag on the Henry bison archery, Nebo elk unit not at objective, Manti general season deer permit numbers, late season muzzleloader tags and the difference in numbers by unit, and Thousand Lakes general season.</p>
<b>00:48:35</b>	<p><b>RAC Discussion</b></p> <p>The RAC discussed an archery bison tag, Zion sheep tags, Nebo elk tags, Newfoundland ewe sheep transplants, late season limited entry deer hunt, and the Cache general season deer fawn loss.</p>



**01:09:07**

Bucks, Bulls and OIAL Permits

The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Mike Christensen and passed 9 in favor and 1 opposed (Josh Lenart).

**MOTION: Further reduce the deer permits on the Cache unit by an additional 800 for a total decrease of 1,600 from 2019 permit numbers. (Reduce permits from 5,800 to 5,000 in 2020).**

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

**MOTION: Increase the permits on the Henrys Mountains archery only hunters choice hunt by 1 (1 nonresident and 2 resident (1 to max points and 1 random)).**

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

**MOTION: On the Zion BHS unit, keep permits at the same number as 2019.**

The following motion was made by Ken Strong and failed for lack of a second.

**MOTION: Drop the number of tags on the Fillmore/Oak Creek to 10 from the recommended 14.**

The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Ken Strong and was then withdrawn by Ben Lowder.

**MOTION: Drop the number of permits on the Fillmore/Oak Creek to 10 from the recommended 12.**

The following motion was made by Josh Lenart, seconded by Christine Schmitz and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: Accept the remainder of the Bighorn Sheep recommendations as presented.**

The following motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Ben Lowder and passed 9 in favor and 1 opposed (Christine Schmitz).

**MOTION: Keep the Nebo limited entry permits at the 2019 level of 47.**

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

**MOTION: Recommend late season limited entry muzzleloader permits at .5% on all units with a minimum 5 on units that won't reach 5 (.5% permits or 5 (whichever is greater) to follow the Mule Deer Committees initial recommendation).**

The following motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Eric Reid and passed unanimously.

	<p><b>MOTION: Recommend the wildlife board adjust the Nebo limited entry elk unit to be managed at 5.5 to 6 year old age structure and direct the DWR to look at other elk units that are chronically underperforming.</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Ken Strong and passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To accept the remainder of the DWR's recommendations as presented.</b></p>
01:44:35	<p><b>6) Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2020 (Action)</b></p> <p>A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: <a href="https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html">https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html</a>.</p>
01:44:50	<p><b>Public Comments</b></p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p>
01:45:47	<p><b>RAC Questions</b></p> <p>The RAC asked about the difference between public and private tag numbers and the Newfoundland ewe hunt.</p>
02:00:30	<p><b>RAC Discussion</b></p> <p>RAC members liked the ewe sheep hunt.</p>
02:01:51	<p><b>RAC Discussion</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Ben Lowder and passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented.</b></p>
02:03:26	<p><b>7) R657-37 CWMU Rule Amendments (Action)</b></p> <p>A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: <a href="https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html">https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html</a>.</p>
02:03:26	<p><b>Public Comments</b></p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p>
02:04:21	<p><b>RAC Questions</b></p> <p>The RAC asked about the new language.</p>
02:07:24	<p><b>RAC Discussion</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Josh Lenart and passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented.</b></p>

02:09:21	<p><b>8) 2020 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations (Action)</b></p> <p>A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: <a href="https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html">https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html</a></p>
02:09:53	<p><b>Public Comments</b></p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p>
02:10:16	<p><b>RAC Questions</b></p> <p>None</p>
02:10:25	<p><b>RAC Discussion</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Eric Reid, seconded by AJ Mower and passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To accept the Division’s recommendations as presented.</b></p>
02:13:06	<p><b>9) Management Bison Hunts – Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit (Action)</b></p> <p>A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: <a href="https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html">https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html</a>.</p>
02:12:11	<p><b>Public Comments</b></p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p>
02:12:39	<p><b>RAC Questions</b></p> <p>The RAC asked if there is access with the Old Wilcox Ranch and if this hunt is a onetime hunt or if it will be an ongoing hunt.</p>
02:15:09	<p><b>RAC Discussion</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Ken Strong and passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To accept the Division’s recommendations as presented.</b></p>
02:16:58	<p><b>10) Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy Revisions (Action)</b></p> <p>A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: <a href="https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html">https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html</a>.</p>
02:17:13	<p><b>Public Comments</b></p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p>
02:17:40	<p><b>RAC Questions</b></p> <p>The RAC asked if we are managing at carrying capacity or population objective, where do coyotes fall in the plan, are herds managed at carrying capacity so wouldn’t this rule always be in effect, and the new legislative statute on cougar</p>

	management, questions about new coyote research, and responsiveness of Wildlife Services.
<b>02:32:25</b>	<p><b>RAC Discussion</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Eric Reid, seconded by Steve Lund and passed 7 in favor and 3 opposed (Christine Schmitz, Danny Potts, Luke Decker).</p> <p><b>MOTION: To accept the Division’s recommendations as presented.</b></p>
<b>02:35:37</b>	<p><b>11) Cougar and Bear Rule Amendments (Action)</b></p> <p>A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: <a href="https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html">https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html</a>.</p>
<b>02:35:49</b>	<p><b>Public Comments</b></p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p>
<b>02:37:53</b>	<p><b>RAC Questions</b></p> <p>None</p>
<b>02:38:05</b>	<p><b>RAC Discussion</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Steve Lund, seconded by AJ Mower and passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To accept the Division’s recommendations as presented.</b></p>
<b>02:40:16</b>	Meeting adjourned.

# Northern Regional Advisory Council Meeting

April 8, 2020

The meeting will stream live at [https://youtu.be/bKNsT\\_cNlgU](https://youtu.be/bKNsT_cNlgU)

1. Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure  
- RAC Chair
2. Approval of Agenda and Minutes **ACTION**  
- RAC Chair
3. Wildlife Board Meeting Update **INFORMATIONAL**  
- RAC Chair
4. Regional Update **INFORMATIONAL**  
- DWR Regional Supervisor
5. Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2020 **ACTION**  
- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator and  
- Regional Wildlife Manager
6. Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2020 **ACTION**  
- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator and  
- Regional Wildlife Manager
7. R657-37 CWMU Rule Amendments **ACTION**  
- Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator
8. 2020 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations **ACTION**  
- Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator
9. Management Bison Hunts – Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit **ACTION**  
- Brad Crompton, Assistant Wildlife Manager SE
10. Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy Revisions **ACTION**  
- Darren DeBloois, Game Mammals Program Coordinator
11. Cougar and Bear Rule Amendments **ACTION**  
- Darren DeBloois, Game Mammals Program Coordinator

**CR RAC** – April 7th, 6:00 PM  
<https://youtu.be/szS2clrQga0>

**SER RAC** – April 15th, 6:30 PM  
<https://youtu.be/MkcXQHR5qVA>

**NR RAC** – April 8th, 6:00 PM  
[https://youtu.be/bKNsT\\_cNlgU](https://youtu.be/bKNsT_cNlgU)

**NER RAC** – April 16th, 5:30 PM  
<https://youtu.be/TxkkGlepZqc>

**SR RAC** – April 14th, 5:00 PM  
<https://youtu.be/CMvGe-8DbXY>

**Board Meeting** – April 30th, 9:00 AM  
<https://youtu.be/r7PWxlWU82M>

**Northern Regional Advisory Council Meeting  
Summary of Motions**

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

The following motion was made by Ryan Brown, seconded by Mike Laughter and passed Unanimously.

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

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

The following motion was made by Mike Laughter, seconded by Ryan Brown and passed Unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the December 4, 2019 Northern RAC Meeting.**

3) Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2020 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Matt Klar, seconded by Mike Laughter and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Bucks, Bulls and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2020 as presented with the exception of the Cache Deer Unit, which will be reduced by an additional 800 permits than that recommended by DWR.**

4) Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2020 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Kevin McLeod, seconded by Ryan Brown and passed Unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Antlerless Permit Recommendation for 2020 as presented.**

The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, Second by Matt Klar and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move to accept the boundary change for the East Canyon, Davis, North Salt Lake Boundary as presented.**

5) R657-37 CWMU Rule Amendments (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Matt Klar, seconded by Randy Hutchison and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the R675-37 CWMU Rule Amendments as presented.**

6) 2020 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Matt Klar, seconded by Randy Hutchison and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept 2020 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations as presented.**

7) Management Bison Hunts – Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Matt Klar, seconded by Kevin McLeod and passed For: 10 Opposed: 2. Darren Parry and Randy Hutchison

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Management Bison Hunts-Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit as presented.**

8) Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy Revisions (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Kevin McLeod , seconded by Matt Klar and passed unanimously .

**MOTION: I move that we accept Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy Revisions as presented.**

9) Cougar and Bear Rule Amendments (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Ryan Brown, seconded by Randy Hutchison and passed unanimously. *Aaron Johnson was not present to vote on this item.*

**MOTION: I move that we accept Cougar and Bear Rule Amendments as presented.**

**Northern Regional Advisory Council Meeting**  
April 8, 2020  
Attendance

**RAC Members**

Justin Oliver – Chair	Ryan Brown	Aaron Johnson
Mike Laughter – Vice-Chair	Paul Chase	Matt Klar
Ben Nadolski – Exec Secretary	David Earl	Kevin McLeod
	Christopher Hoagstrom	Darren Parry
	Randy Hutchison	Kristin Purdy
	Emily Jensco	Casey Snider

**Board Member**

Randy Dearth

**RAC Excused**  
Junior Goring

**Division Personnel**

Jodie Anderson	Paul Gedge
Hayley Smith	Mike Christensen
Jim Christensen	Staci Coons
Dave Rich	Marty Bushman
David Smedley	Ashley Green
Covy Jones	Eric Anderson
Kent Hersey	David Beveridge
Darren Debloois	Jace Taylor
Brad Crompton	
Chad Wilson	



DRAFT

## Regional Advisory Council Meeting

April 8, 2020

Attendance

[https://youtu.be/bKNsT\\_cNlgU](https://youtu.be/bKNsT_cNlgU)

- 00:00:06** Chairman Justin Oliver called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, reviewed the meeting procedures, and had the RAC members introduce themselves.
- 00:09:49** **1) Approval of Agenda (Action)**  
The following motion was made by Ryan Brown, seconded by Mike Laughter and passed unanimously.  
**MOTION: I move that we approve the Agenda.**
- 0:10:47** **2) Approval of Minutes Action)**  
The following motion was made by Mike Laughter, seconded by Ryan Brown and passed unanimously.  
**MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the December 4, 2019 Northern RAC Meeting.**
- 00:15:55** **3) Update from past Wildlife Board Meeting by Justin Oliver**  
Black bear and cougar rule amendments passed unanimously. Online ethics bear course prior to purchasing permit passed unanimously. Statewide recommended bear permits. Balance of black bear and cougar amendments including red lion correction passed unanimously. Wolf management plan passed unanimously. Brine shrimp COR rule amendments passed unanimously. Special species variance request passed unanimously.
- 00:21:16** **4) Regional Update- Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor (Informational)**  
Update on outreach, habitat, aquatics, wildlife, GSL ecosystem and law enforcement. Discussion regarding the Bighorn Sheep transplant on Antelope Island.
- 00:41:04** **5) Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2020 (Action)**  
Presentations could be viewed at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>
- 00:41:52** **Electronic Public Comment Report by Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor**  
Public comments accepted at this time. 50% support, 17% neutral and 29% oppose proposal.
- 00:42:39** **Questions from RAC Members**  
RAC wondering if the additional 800 permits are a good idea? Covy Jones clarification about recommendations on the Cache Deer Unit. Concerns about sheep numbers addressed.
- 01:02:51** **RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**  
Concerns about the Cache Unit and considering a reduction of 800 permits.

- 01:06:03** The following motion was made by Matt Klar, seconded by Mike Laughter and passed unanimously.
- MOTION:** I move that we accept the Bucks, Bulls and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2020 as presented with the exception of the Cache Deer Unit, which will be reduced by an additional 800 permits than that recommended by DWR.
- David Earl was not participating for the vote.*
- 01:11:04** **6) Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2020 (Action)**
- Presentations could be viewed at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>
- 01:11:31** **Electronic Public Comment Report by Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor**
- Public comments accepted at this time. 54% support, 17% oppose, 29% neutral. Issue with boundaries.
- 01:14:58** **Questions from RAC Members**
- Clarification on boundaries and access. Clarification on proposed youth sheep hunt on Newfoundland. Antlerless permit number discussion. Deer mortality and depredation consideration to install fencing.
- 1:17:23 Due to technical difficulties, David Earl left the meeting*
- 01:32:57** **RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**
- The following motion was made by Kevin McLeod, seconded by Ryan Brown and passed unanimously.
- MOTION:** I move that we accept the Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2020 as presented.
- 1:36:15 Meeting Break**
- 1:45:11 Meeting Resumes**
- 1: 45:49 Clarification on Boundary Recommendation and Motion**
- The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, Second by Matt Klar and passed unanimously.
- MOTION:** I move that we accept the boundary change for the East Canyon, Davis, North Salt Lake Boundary as presented.
- 01:49:15** **7) R657-37 CWMU Rule Amendments (Action)**
- Presentations could be viewed at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>
- 01:49:38** **Electronic Public Comment Report by Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor**
- Public comments accepted at this time. 54% support, 4% oppose, 42% neutral.

**01:50:03 Questions from RAC Members**

No questions.

**01:50:21 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

No clarification or discussion at this time.

The following motion was made by Matt Klar, seconded by Randy Hutchison and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept R657-37 CWMU Rule Amendments as presented.**

**01:52:22 8) 2020 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations (Action)**

Presentations could be viewed at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

**01:52:46 Electronic Public Comment Report by Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor**

Public comments accepted at this time. 54% support, 42% neutral, 4% oppose.

**01:53:12 Questions from RAC Members**

No questions.

**01:53:37 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

No clarification or discussion at this time.

The following motion was made by Matt Klar, seconded by Randy Hutchison and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept 2020 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations and presented.**

**01:55:26 9) Management Bison Hunts – Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit (Action)**

Presentations could be viewed at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

**01:55:56 Electronic Public Comment Report by Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor**

Public comments accepted at this time. 50% support, 42% neutral and 8% oppose.

**01:57:05 Questions from RAC Members**

Access and economic impact. Bison plan and conflict on 9-mile range unit. Goal on population objective. Rule changes to allow for over the counter bison hunt this fall. Bonus points and permits. Hunter/Indian conflict.

**02:14:20 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

Opposed to not creating an objective plan. Against eliminating Bison. Private property owners, depredation and the inability to manage the herd as it migrates. Want to keep bison from coming across the river.

The following motion was made by Matt Klar, seconded by Kevin McLeod and passed.  
For: 10, Opposed: 2. Darren Parry and Randy Hutchison

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Management Bison Hunts- Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit as presented.**

**2:21:33 10) Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy Revisions (Action)**

Darren Debloois presented revisions.

**2:22:07 Electronic Public Comment Report by Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor**

Public comments accepted at this time. 58% support, 12.5% opposed, 29% neutral.

**2:22:28 Questions from RAC Members**

Background on House Bill 125. Big game permits and tags. Cyanide traps. Reducing predators. Lion licenses.

**2:29:17 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

No clarification or discussion at this time.

The following motion was made by Kevin McLeod, seconded by Matt Klar and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy Revisions as presented.**

**2:36:21 11) Cougar and Bear Rule Amendments (Action)**

Presentations could be viewed at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

**2:36:39 Electronic Public Comment Report by Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor**

Public comments accepted at this time. There was a technical glitch, but it has been opened back up for public comment.

**2:38:12 Questions from RAC Members**

Statute trumps our rule. Our rule needs to align with the statute.

**2:39:50 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

No clarification or discussion at this time.

The following motion was made by Ryan Brown, seconded by Randy Hutchison and passed unanimously. *Aaron Johnson was not present to vote on this item.*

**MOTION: I move that we accept Cougar and Bear Rule Amendments as presented.**

**02:42:19 12) Other Business (Contingent)**

Clarification with bucks and bulls. Two people were unable to vote. David Earl was not on. Casey asked to vote yes. Unanimous for RAC members present.

**02:46:38** Meeting adjourned.

DRAFT

**Regional Advisory Council Meeting  
April 14, 2020**

**Attendance**

**RAC MEMBERS**

Brayden Richmond – Chair  
Chad Utley  
Riley Roberts  
Austin Atkinson  
Sean Kelly  
Gene Boardman

Tammy Pearson  
Nick Jorgensen  
Verland King  
Bart Batista  
Craig Laub  
Dan Fletcher

**Division Personnel**

Kevin Bunnell  
Phil Tuttle  
Mindi Cox  
Denise Gilgen  
Covy Jones  
Brad Crompton  
Greg Hansen  
Jason Nicholes  
Vance Mumford  
Kent Hersey  
Seth Decker

Levi Watkins  
Staci Coons  
Teresa Griffin  
Cody Evans  
Chad Wilson  
Darren DeBloois  
Wade Paskett  
Kyle Christensen  
Jace Taylor  
Michael Wardle  
Michael Christensen

**Wildlife Board Members**

Wade Heaton

**Southern Regional Advisory County Meeting**  
**April 14, 2020**

**05:00:11** Chairman Brayden Richmond called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, reviewed the meeting procedures, and had the Board and RAC members introduce themselves.

**05:07:23 1) Approval of Agenda (Action)**

The following motion was made by Tammy Pearson, seconded by Nick Jorgensen. Motion passed, Dan Fletcher abstained.

**MOTION: I move that we approved the agenda and minutes as presented.**

**Brayden Richmond:** We'll do a roll call vote now.

**Austin Atkinson:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Bart

**Bart Battista:** Bart Battista, yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Gene

**Gene Boardman:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Riley

**Riley Roberts:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Chad

**Chad Utley:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Nick

**Nick Jorgensen:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Sean

**Sean Kelly:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Verland



**Verland King:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Craig

**Craig Laub:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Tammy

**Tammy Pearson:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Dan

**Dan Fletcher:** Dan Fletcher, abstain

**05:07:23 2) Approval of Minutes (Action)**

The following motion was made by Tammy Pearson, seconded by Nick Jorgensen. Passed 11 for, Dan Fletcher abstained.

**MOTION: I moved that we approved the minutes of the as presented.**

**05:09:18 3) Update from past Wildlife Board Meeting by RAC Chair, Brayden Richmond (contingent)**

**Brayden Richmond:** I'm going to quickly go through the action items at the meeting. The motion that we maintain the unlimited resident pursuit permits as is, restrict one non resident permit to two pursuit on restricted units and unlimited on the others and restrict the 16 dog limit state wide, maintain the 8 dog limit in the summer pursuit and the 16 take permits. This was made by Karl, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously. The next motion was, I move that we add an ethics course for the online bear orientation and institute an online pursuit ethics course prior to purchasing a permit. That motion was made by Wade Heaton, and seconded by Bret Selman, and that was tabled for further discussion. The next motion, I move that we increase the statewide recommended bear permits by 25% on all units except for the Beaver, Book Cliffs, Cache, and Chalk Creek units and permit numbers would increase by 50% for these units. That motion was made by Kark Hirst and seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously. Oh I was reading the list wrong, this one was tabled, sorry, I knew that was wrong as soon as I said that. So that one was tabled, there was a lot more discussion if you watched the meeting, and then the motion was made, I motion that we table the motion on the bear increase and present the other agenda items and then revisit the motion after lunch when there's more information and the Division recalculates numbers. You know Kevin, this would be easier if you weren't scrolling while I was reading. That's alright, that motion was made by Carl Hurst, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimous. After lunch when they came back the motion was made to withdraw the original motion and move to approve the Divisions revised permit numbers that included the 3 units in the upper harvest bear Book Cliffs and Chalk Creek units. That motion was made by

Wade Heaton, seconded by Bret Selman and failed on a vote of 3-4. The next motion was that they do nothing on the units that have 10 or less and increase permits by 25% on Beaver, Chalk Creek and Book Cliffs units, and increase tags by 10% on the remaining units. The Board would also deter to the Division to determine the permit distribution among the available season on overcrowding issues on the La Sals and San Juan. That motion was made by Karl Hirst and seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed unanimously. The next motion was to accept the balance of R-657-33 Black Bear R-657-10 Cougar rule amendments as presented including the red line rule amendments on the 8 dog limit on both the summer pursuit and restricted seasons pursuit, that motion was made by Kevin Albrecht, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously. The next motion was to approve the Wolf management plan as presented by the Division, that motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Randy Dearth, and passed unanimously. The next motion was to accept the Brine Shrimp COR rule as presented by the Division, that motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously. I believe the last motion was to approve the variance request for Pacific White Leg Shrimp, that motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed unanimously. For those that watched the Board meeting, the bear discussion was, a lot of information, if you have any questions I'd encourage you to go back and watch that, there's some good information in there. Anything else we should add in there Kevin? Ok next item on the agenda would be the regional update, and I'll turn that over to Kevin.

**05:13:49 4) Kevin Bunnell, Regional Update (Informational)**

**Kevin Bunnell:** Thanks Brayden. I'll try to be brief, but it's been a while since we've met so I do have a number of updates I'd like to give you. First with our wildlife section, we'd like to welcome Levi Watkins to the region, he's our new wildlife biologist in the Loa region so he'll cover the Boulder, Thousand Lakes, and Parker Mountain. The biologists have been busy, they are in the process of finishing up sage grouse wet counts. I would encourage anybody who hasn't had the chance to experience that to get out and do it. We were in the middle of our Pronghorn flights when the Covid-19 restrictions hit. We were able to finish up a few of the units but had to discontinue others because of the closeness of people in the planes. So we'll get back to those as soon as we can. We are starting to see some elk come down into farm lands and we're working hard with landowners and our landowner specialist to alleviate those problems and we've got the annual Utah Prairie dog census and populations look at least stable there. Moving onto our aquatics section, they're probably the section that is continuing on as business as normal because so much of their work is in small groups and out in the field. They've been doing their gill netting surveys. They've surveyed Otter Creek, New Castle, Minersville, and Piute so far and things look really good in terms of fish populations. We've even had some large trout in Piute Reservoir and haven't been able to do anything in Piute for so long because the water levels have been so low. Ice is starting to come off at the higher locations, within the next week we should see open water at Panguitch, Kolob, and then Fish Lake is probably 3-4 weeks out before we have open water at Fish Lake. If you're not aware, Lake Powell is currently closed to all boats and access. We're working hard with Arizona and the National Parks service, when

the time's right, to do something with Lake Powell. From our habitat section, they're just wrapping up last year's treatments. Again, the southern region is setting the standard for the state in terms of habitat treatments. We treated over 70,000 acres primarily with pinyon juniper removal. About 15,000 acres of prescribed fire to improve aspen. 200 acres of rabbit brush mowing. A lot of water developments including guzzlers, ponds, and pipelines, and several other miscellaneous projects. With our outreach section, if you could help us spread the word that we have some dedicated hunter projects that are still available. We've set up some projects that specifically allow people to follow the social distancing guidelines. Including doing some bitter brush planings. I hope that everybody is excited, and this is another one that hit at just the wrong time so it's been hard to get the word out but, we now have a completely online option for hunters ed including the field day that people can do independently, so hopefully we can get the word out with that. From our admin section, if you're not aware we gave people the option to turn in bear and turkey tags, to surrender those and get their points back, so with those we had 78 spring bear and 363 spring turkey permits surrendered with the online process. There were some additional permits that were surrendered through the mail that we don't have an accounting for yet. I don't think those will add drastically to those numbers. Law enforcement, we have several personnel changes. We've hired Brandon White who was our former conservation officer in Beaver will now be our new Sargent over in the Panguitch area and over that crew. Then we'll be getting new officers in Wayne County, Julie Sabattis is just finishing up her training now and will be going to Wayne County. Then our Fillmore district will have another brand new conservation officer by the name of Stetson West, who will be taking over the Fillmore district. Those two will both hit their districts around the first of July, and then be in their field training process for another 3-4 months after that. Law enforcement has been really busy helping State Parks with law enforcement activities due to all the county closures and different regulations that are going on around the state right now. We've also been helping some of the counties that have recreation orders to enforce those. AIS is working trying to track down boats coming off Lake Powell that haven't been sealed. As everything was kind of in chaos for a while. We're making progress there. Unless there's questions, that's all I've got Brayden.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you, any questions from the RAC?

**05:19:43 5) Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL Recommendations for 2020 (Action)**

Presentations could be viewed at

<https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

**05:20:09 Electronic Public Comment Report by Kevin Bunnell, Regional Supervisor**

**Kevin Bunnell:** Okay, for the first agenda item, which is the BBOIL, we had a total of 29 people give comments through the online system which frankly is a little lower than I expected. For comparison we had about 90 which is three times as much for the November RAC. Of those 29 people, 31% of those which comes out to

be 9 people supported the recommendation, about 45% or 13 people opposed it, and the remainder were neutral. As I'm sure many of you did I went through all the comments to try and summarize those. There were a few people that were frustrated or didn't support the proposal because they didn't want cuts in permit numbers, but there were about twice as many that wanted to see more permits cut. If I had to summarize the comments it was probably about 2-1 in that direction. There were also some miscellaneous comments on sheep and some other things that I'm sure you read. I think I'll leave it at that Brayen.

### **05:21:35 Questions from RAC Members**

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you. Now, we'll move to questions from the RAC. I've toyed with this on whether we should do roll call questions or let you speak up. Maybe what we'll do is roll call for the questions, so I'll go down the list and call one by one to see if you have questions. So if you have a question try to say it clearly and precise, and if you don't have a question just respond with "no".

**Austin Atkinson:** Yeah, I do have a question. The hunter satisfaction rating seems to be pretty low on the Beaver/Southwest Desert/Fish Lake and I understand those are general season units, but I'm wondering how that's being received by the department and how that's being received to these recommendations. I feel like a lot of those comments came from Sportsmen that hunt in the Beaver and Southwest Desert so I'm wondering how the department is reacting to that. in these recommendations?

**Covy Jones:** So, I guess that question is for me more than anything, is that correct? Ok, so we do always look at hunter satisfaction and we care. We want to have satisfied clients and we want to provide a good experience for folks that hunt. One of the things is that hunter satisfaction is always highly correlated with harvest success. You could almost get rid of hunter satisfaction and close your eyes and look at harvest success and it's pretty close to that same. Especially when you've had high harvest success. When you look at some of the units you've talked about, the Beaver for example, the Beaver has had extremely high harvest success, if you look at the past 5 years almost 44% almost 45, 41, 37, and a lot of those years buck/doe ratios that were exceeding the management objective, 22/15 and 24/16. When we look at this we knew last year that we would have frustrated hunters because it dropped from 37% to 24%. So one of the ways we try to address that is to manage to the plan which means cutting a lot of permits, and on a lot of these units in Southern Utah, on the ones we know we lost deer, we cut permits to address that. So I don't know if that's exactly what Austin, the other data plays into that. You can look into hunter satisfaction, but you can also look at harvest success ratios and it all works together. So we took it into account and we cut permits where we needed to.

**Austin Atkinson:** Thank you. Can I ask a quick follow up question on that. For the Southwest Desert it seems like the population that is being used here seems pretty status quo at about 3,000 so we're not seeing a permit change on the Southwest desert and that seems very concerning with sportsmen that I've talked to. I

don't personally hunt that unit but those that have (brief lost connection). I'll just restate that, the survey numbers on the Southwest Desert for deer is sitting at about 3,000 deer estimated population, so we're not changing the recommended tags for general season deer are still at 800 and most of the sportsmen I've talked to are concerned that's staying the same, wondering what are they doing wrong or why these survey numbers are still showing flat. Are we surveying Nevada deer, what is going on there?

**Covy Jones:** Well, I think I can answer part of that. First of all last year was a hard hunt for a lot of reasons. Even in areas where we had a lot of deer there were a lot of reasons why it just wasn't a great hunt. The timing wasn't great, a lot of hunters were frustrated with the moon phase and all the stuff that goes into this and some animals we found were just not in their usual spot. When we came back to classify, we found a lot of deer in the traditional ranges but they were slow. This is including the Division biologist that have hunted in the same spot too, a lot of folks were frustrated last year. But I think I'm going to turn part of this over to Jason, but if the RAC will allow me, and Austin if you'll allow me to tell you a little bit of how we did deer recommendation this year, and how the new plan allows us to take into account some other data and be a little different. Is that ok, Mr. Chair? Is that ok, Austin?

**Brayden Richmond:** Yeah, if you could, I watched this presentation on the other RACs and I think it was very beneficial. And I apologize for that disruption, I thought I could sneak away and grab my phone which was charging across the room and I messed that up.

**Covy Jones:** It was awesome Brayden. Okay, so I'm just going to present my screen, but this may not be specific to Southwest Desert as much, but I'll allow Jason to speak to that as well. Will everyone let me know when they're seeing this? (Yeah, it's there) Since this question was specifically on Southwest Desert and why we're not cutting numbers there, if there are any other units that RAC members want to see we can go to them. So the old plan allowed us to take into account both buck/doe ratios and trend. We've always known that these general season units are driven by those yearling numbers, by that fawn crop. So as important to the number of deer on the landscape are what your fawn/doe ratios are. and then what your fawn survival is. Looking back, that's what the Division was retroactive, right? Because we'd miss that fawn drop, and according to that plan, we'd have to wait until that showed up in the buck/doe ratio in the following year and a few years. This, the new plan, allows us to look at everything more holistically. So let's look at Southwest Desert, and the buck/doe ratios we've had for the past 5 years. We've had last year being 20.4, so at the very top end of the objective. Fawn/doe ratio is again either a little lower, being a desert unit, we'd like to see this number be about 60, but they're pretty stable and consistent with the exception of 2018 where they dip there a little bit. Last year at 50 fawns per 100 does. Population estimate, which is what you brought up Austin, and all the population estimate really is, is the metric of we know we had this much harvest. On this unit we don't have actual collars on the unit we can't collar every unit, we have a representative unit that we're pulling that data from, this is the Pine Valley, so based on survival, harvest, and buck/doe ratios after we

determine the population estimate. It's basically a calculator saying if you had this many deer and you harvested this many, you would have had to have at least this number of deer to have this buck/doe ratio after. And then monitor fawn survival. Again, some units we have collars on the unit, very labor intensive, we collar over 800 deer a year, spend most of December, some of November and even go into January trying to get this done for the hunt. So that's the data that we've had, the data we've always used. Then we wanted to take into account how many permits we've been historically issuing, what harvest looks like on those particular units and then percent success. I can see Kevin in the background there, I hope you guys are staying 6 feet apart. Now this is where it gets a little more predictive, we looked at all this data, and this last year as we caught deer and looked at body condition scores, we predicted what survival would look like. We've got some pretty good survival curves, and Kent Hersey has those ready to go, we can show some of those and show what we use to predict survival, but it's basically how fat these animals are and we can look at that and get a pretty good guess on what survival is going to look like. So on this unit we can look at it and predict we're going to have about 90% doe survival, 60% fawn survival, which is not out of the realm of possibility. In 2015 we had 90% fawn survival as our variable, adult doe survival obviously, but it's possible to have high survival in fawns. We're looking like we should come into those numbers now. With all that data taken into account, if we issue 800 permits, under high success, we'd be just below what we're managing for. But for average/low success we're within the range, even exceeding the range, and that's the rationality that we have explaining the recommendations we have this year. These numbers in fact, again, they're highly driven by the number of fawns, those yearling bucks, when I say fawn here I mean a 6 month fawn we collar in December, then it will be a year and a half by the time the hunt comes around. When that number drops, we really have to cut permits, and so far on this unit our fawn/doe survival looks like we can handle the number of permits that are out there. Is there any other unit, while I have this up, is there any other unit the RAC would like to ask or have concerns?

**Brayden Richmond:** Yeah, Covy, would you mind pulling up the Beaver unit? That continues to be what we have the most feedback on in our region.

**Covy Jones:** Absolutely. The Beaver was the first one of these we did, we built a sheet, put the formulas in it and it was the one where we had a little bit of sticker shock when we saw what we were going to have to cut to get into the population of managing for. We've lost some deer on the Beaver, I don't think that's a surprise for anybody. We topped out at about 15,000 deer a few years back and we've trended steadily downward to now we're estimating about 12,000 deer on that unit. The survival on the Beaver, we did put some collars out this year, but this survival is data from the Monroe. As you can see, deer have struggled there, adult doe survival you always want to be at about 85%, 71 is terrible for lack of a better word. We've had really poor survival over the last few years on these units, and it shows up in the buck/doe ratio eventually right, as you continue to harvest, you drop that as you have fewer deer on the landscape. Also your fawn/doe ratio has been a little bit lower the last few years and fawn survival below 50%, except for last year which is a struggle. Taking all that into account and predicting this year, deer came in fat they looked good, so we feel like we have a good chance of hitting that west wide average

of 85% of doe survival, and if we look at the last update that Randy sent out, on the Monroe we're at 90% right now. So a good overall winter survival. On the Beaver itself where we have collars, 25 of the 29 deer alive were 86%. So as we come out and with that prediction here, which means we know we'll be somewhere in the low/average success, so cutting from 3,000 to 2,100 permits we hope to come right at the bottom of the 18...

**Brayden Richmond:** Covy, you lost me a little bit there, you said the body fat was good, but it was my understanding that the Beaver had horrible body fat.

**Covy Jones:** You're right, but horrible is the wrong word, it wasn't as good as we saw in some of the surrounding units.

**Brayden Richmond:** Wasn't it the second worst in the state?

**Covy Jones:** For that latitude it was bad, yeah. I'm sorry, I did miss speak there, you're right. Fairly moderate winter though, things are looking good, looking like these numbers are good solid numbers. On all these we did, I feel like we probably missed the boat on one of them, and that's the Cache. In the past, we had it right looking at past years and survival curves, but in the past three weeks the fawns on the Cache started to tip over, so we were estimating this at 60% now it's 45%. So to come into the buck/doe ratio managing for the lower buck/doe ratio we probably would need to cut an additional 800 permits. I feel like I'm taking up a lot of time, I don't want to take up any more time. Jason, I think the other thing we need to mention is on the Southwest Desert, we're still above the management objective on the buck/doe ratio. I guess I'd ask Jason if he had anything he needed to add to that since this really is a regional thing.

**Jason Nicholes:** Yes, thank you Covy. I would say on the Southwest Desert this year I did see fewer deer during my deer classification out there. I typically see about 500 deer classified in November/December postseason classification. This year I did classify a little over 250 deer. In my opinion I think the deer are still there, this year we did have a good pine nut crop on the Southwest Desert and we did have a good distribution of water with the moisture that we had from the previous year. Springs that were running that haven't ran in several years with the drought that we had previous. So, I think that the deer population on the Southwest desert is stable, and as Covy said our post season buck/doe ratio is above its objective. Thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Austin recommended and I think I'd like to take his recommendation based on species, so I think the deer probably have the most questions, so let's start with deer then we'll circle back for elk, and then maybe do antelope and OIAL. So let's run though deer and keep the focus on deer for just a minute. Austin do you have any other questions on deer?

**Austin Atkinson:** Uh, no just a thanks on showing me that document, I appreciate that, and it helps all of us see how all of those numbers come to be, so thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Bart, any questions on the deer portion?

**Bart Battista:** Uh, no questions, I do like seeing that other metrics are being used to come up with permit numbers.

**Brayden Richmond:** Gene Boardman, any questions on this portion?

**Gene Boardman:** Uh, yes, I do have a question. I'd like to pull up the general season buck deer general application slide.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Gene are you asking for the slide from the online presentation?

**Gene Boardman:** That's correct.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Is that something we can do Covy?

**Brayden Richmond:** Covy, we can't hear you, I think you're muted.

**Covy Jones:** Sorry, I was trying to get myself to present at the same time and unmute myself. Gene, here it is.

**Gene Boardman:** Okay, apparently it doesn't take in your recommendation to cut 10,000 permits this year for 2020.

**Covy Jones:** Yeah, no, no Gene, that's a fair point, this is just a consistent line since about 1994 we've been between 97,090 so you're right. This shows it at about 90,000 permits and we're recommending well below that this year.

**Gene Boardman:** So, that's going to drop your draw success rate down to about 10-12%, and it will increase your unsuccessful rate by the same amount.

**Covy Jones:** Yeah, that's correct. And honestly, depending on where you're at, and which RAC and which region, Kevin summarized this, but we've been criticized for cutting too much or not cutting enough so I feel like if everybody is a little upset it must be the right place to be.

**Gene Boardman:** You're a Big Game Manager, but the question to the Department is, does anybody consider what this does to which tiers of hunting applicants? What it does to them, for instance you've got 4 tiers. Lifetime hunters get all their permits, dedicated hunters basically get all their permits, so the cut is always on everybody else. I'd just like to hear, I don't think it's going to happen this year. I think that's how it will be cut, but I'd just like to hear that it's being considered that everybody has a little skin in the game.

**Covy Jones:** I don't know if there's anyone from licensing on the call or not, Lindy if you're listening or watching I'd appreciate your input on this, but fair



criticism, our lifetime holders invested years and years ago but everyone else is percentage based. So when the dedicated hunter percentage base fills, they don't draw that either. So that's as fair as we can make it is to make it percentage based but I understand the frustration. I think a lot of folks will be frustrated when they don't draw.

**Brayden Richmond:** Any additional questions Gene?

**Gene Boardman:** No that will cover deer I think.

**Brayden Richmond:** Riley?

**Riley Roberts:** No, I don't think so. I had several, but I think I'll hold off for a minute and see what the other questions are then maybe I'll chime back in.

**Brayden Richmond:** Okay, Chad?

**Chad Utley:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Nick?

**Nick Jorgensen:** (no response)

**Covy Jones:** It just popped up and said Nick has left the meeting, you must have done something to frustrate Nick.

**Brayden Richmond:** I saw him reach up to push a button on his phone, he must have pushed end. So hopefully he'll rejoin us in just a minute. Sean, do you have any questions?

**Sean Kelly:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Verland?

**Verland King:** Yeah, I have one. We've talked about the presentation he's showing us these numbers going down. What do you attribute that to? That some of those were going down before that bad drought. Was it predators, or was it something else?

**Covy Jones:** Verland, that just depends on the unit. That's a really good question really. Some of these units we saw a big spike at about 2015-16 we saw them go up. And as we kept monitoring deer we saw skinny deer and then we saw them slowly start to drop back off. We saw them spike in 2015-16, body fat went down just like I'm sure you saw in the livestock industry, then skinny deer don't have healthy fawns, they also don't survive well. As they started to go back down, go back down, we lost on the Monroe unit for several years until we hit just last year and it was crazy how we built deer in a lot of these places, we built predators too. So that take by predators, as the deer population dropped down below in one year it went

from the primary source in mortality being malnutrition and other factors to primarily being predators, it actually switched. So it's a really complicated question to answer but as we saw deer fall off at a few units in the state we saw that quickly switch from malnutrition to predators. As we built predators when we built deer. That's why we reacted so quickly on these units to remove predators because we have too many on the landscape. Does that answer your question Verland?

**Verland King:** Yeah, pretty good. Did you see a difference in the elk too at the same time, did they follow the same thing as the deer?

**Covy Jones:** So, yeah, yeah, it's a little different with elk, they're just a little more resistant and resilient than deer. What we saw was I think in bison and in elk was, or bison calf ratios are 15 calves/100 cows and we saw our cow/calf drop too. So survival wasn't as affected as much but pregnancy rates just feel off and they just didn't have any calves. So they were a little different, as far as predators, we do have some predation from lions on elk, but we haven't found it to be a significant factor.

**Verland King:** Alright, that's good, thanks.

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, let's jump back to Nick. Nick, do you have any questions? We lost you last time.

**Nick Jorgensen:** I don't have any questions, but I sure appreciated Covy's presentation. It was an eye opener for me and I think we struck a real good balance. I know it wasn't the comment section, but felt like I wanted to say that.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Nick. Craig?

**Craig Laub:** Uh I don't have any questions, I have comments on the Pine Valley when we get there.

**Brayden Richmond:** Tammy?

**Tammy Pearson:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** And Dan, any questions on the deer piece? Ok, let's change over to elk then.

**Dan Fletcher:** No questions.

**Covy Jones:** Mr. Chair? One more thing, I didn't show the Pine Valley on that sheet that we built, and it's a really good example. Would you be ok if I showed the Pine Valley to the group?

**Brayden Richmond:** Ok, let's look at it quick, I think it would be good to see and I think those online would be interested to see.

**Covy Jones:** Ok, let's switch over to the Pine Valley. This is one where if we just look at the data you know we're above the buck/doe ratio, we have great survival, we're right there at 59 fawns/100 does, a lot of things looking at just that old data we'd almost recommend an increase. Then as we dug into it a little bit we do have a stable population on the Pine Valley and look at this rec with what's coming in, estimating 60% fawn survival with 90% adult survival which isn't out of the question, and average success it should come in right at 19.3 without increasing or decreasing any permits, and that was the rationality behind the Pine Valley rec. That's where it came from. Sorry for that interruption, I feel like this is one everyone has a lot of focus on, probably wanted to know where that recommendation came from. Jason looked at the data and felt like this was a good spot to be.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you for showing that, I'm sure there's interest in that unit online. Ok let's circle back to elk, Austin we won't keep you at the top of the list all night, but maybe for the first agenda item.

**Austin Atkinson:** That sounds good. I do have some questions about the Beaver elk, they're kind of related to antlerless as well, but while we're issuing so many cow tags on the Beaver and so few bull tags, I was wondering is there an easy way to see how many spikes are being taken off of that. Is there somewhere we can see cow harvest, spike harvest and bull harvest all together to see how this is affecting this harvest. Is that a tool that is available, or is that being used?

**Covy Jones:** Uh, we do use that, yes. We do take into account all harvests when we do that. But as you know we recommend bull permits and cow permits differently. When we're looking at it, yeah we always say, well we're pulling off this many spikes and when we get our harvest data we get our spike data by unit. Mike, would you like to take this one to answer why you're recommending the permits you are on the Beaver?

**Mike Wardle:** This is Mike Wardle, I'm the biologist over the Beaver. The main reason is that we're within our age objective for bull permits, so like Covy mentioned, with LE bull tags we manage based on the average age of harvested bulls from the last year. Since we're in that age objective, we were towards the top end of it, I felt that there was an opportunity there to increase bull tags. I do have the numbers and I can pull up the numbers for spike harvest and stuff, but really when it comes to that LE bull tag we're looking at the average age for harvested bulls.

**Covy Jones:** Mike, just so we provide the information why don't you continue looking that up for Austin and we can display that. Also Austin, any information you'd like to see we can get that to you as well.

**Austin Atkinson:** Yeah, I think my question will come more when we get to the antlerless section, so if he wants to find that data I can ask my question when we get to the antlerless section. Thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright Bart, questions on the elk?

**Bart Battista:** None.

**Brayden Richmond:** Gene?

**Gene Boardman:** Uh, yes

**Kent Hersey:** This is Kent, we killed 89 spikes on the Beaver last year.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you, go ahead Gene.

**Gene Boardman:** My question is on the tags on the Mount Dutton on the bull elk. The recommendation is to reduce it by 4. Looking at it and the Panguitch Lake the recommendation is to leave the Panguitch Lake the same as it is but the 3 year average is higher than the Panguitch Lake. So I'd just like justification on cutting tags on the Mount Dutton Herd.

**Covy Jones:** Kyle, would you like to take that one?

**Kyle Christensen:** Gene, the reason we cut permits on the Dutton is we had a significant age drop in 2019 and the population decreased. The reason we left the Panguitch the same is although the 3 year average age on the Panguitch is a little bit lower, we've been trending higher every year. Our 3 year age is a little bit lower, but I think if we keep where we're at we're going to come in at an age where we want it to be. Does that answer your question?

**Gene Boardman:** Okay, thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Riley?

**Riley Roberts:** Just a clarification, what is our allocation on non-resident tags on elk? Is it like 10%?

**Covy Jones:** Yeah, Riley, it is roughly 10% and that's on everything statewide. We obviously decide whether we're going to have a non resident hunt or not in November and then we come around and issue permits now. So there are some cases where that percentage gets a little out of whack and we have to fix it the next year, but we aim for 10%. We issue 1, but we don't issue 2 until 15. Does that make sense?

**Riley Roberts:** It does, so for example if there was something that may have been a little out of whack this year in the numbers that would hopefully be taken care of in the coming years, or this year was a make up for last year or something?

**Covy Jones:** Yeah, so if you look at bison on the Henry's that's the perfect example. We said we'd have some non resident permits in those, and when we offered that hunt we had to have those. Then when we got the data all together we realized we had such poor calf/cow ratios we had to cut permits. We

had some hunts with very few permits that wouldn't qualify for non resident permits, the next year they'd get shut off.

**Riley Roberts:** Alright, perfect. Thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Chad?

**Chad Utley:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Nick?

**Nick Jorgensen:** No questions. Thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Sean?

**Sean Kelly:** No questions on elk.

**Brayden Richmond:** Verland?

**Verland King:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Craig?

**Craig Laub:** Uh, yeah, I got a couple questions. On the Southwest Desert, some people I talked to were a little concerned when you do your count out there with the elk you're counting the Nevada elk, cause during hunting season they're doesn't seem to be as many elk there. You were talking about collaring some to see where those elk are at, do you have any information on that?

**Covy Jones:** Jason, do you want to take that one?

**Jason Nicholes:** Sure. We have collared elk on the Southwest Desert. We've collared them from Hamlin Valley to Pine Valley and most recently over on the Frisco and Shanti ranges. Elk from that Hamlin Valley area move over into Nevada. Some of them have come back, but there are some that have stayed in Nevada. When we did collar elk in Hamlin Valley it was within a week of our last survey, so those elk that we collared in Hamlin Valley were the ones that moved to Nevada and didn't come back. I do feel that our last population estimate was a little bit high due to the Nevada elk that didn't come back. So I hope that answers your question.

**Craig Laub:** Yeah, and that's kind of the feeling that people that hunt there a lot, including me, that the elk numbers are not as high as the estimates. My other question deals with the Boulder. The Boulder on the east end probably doesn't go over to the west end of winter, they probably winter on the east end, and I was wondering if that's skewing the number of elk on the Boulder if you count that whole big mountain as one unit instead of splitting it. Because the cow units you split east/west so I was wondering if that would

be advantageous to cut that hunt on the east and west, just split that unit for hunting?

**Covy Jones:** For bulls specifically?

**Craig Laub:** Yeah for bulls.

**Covy Jones:** So, Levi, you should probably answer this, but this is a question we get statewide, why do we do this on different units, and really we do this on cows to force individuals in areas where we need to get the harvest. Bulls, it's more of a recreational opportunity to get meat and trophy hunt as well. So we're less concerned about forcing pressure into areas, but it's obviously something we can look at and consider moving forward, see if there are areas we should split up. We really started to do this in big horn sheep, to direct pressure into areas where we wanted and it allowed us to offer more permits, when you can force someone into areas that don't get hunted. Craig, that's not something we're looking at right now, but it's something we could look at moving forward. Do you have anything to add to that Levi?

**Levi Watkins:** The only thing I would add is, where with bulls managing to an age objective. We're not really looking at where bulls are in the winter when we're counting them, but it's a harvested age. That's kind of where our recommendation is coming from there where antlerless is managed a little differently.

**Craig Laub:** Alright, thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Tammy?

**Tammy Pearson:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Dan?

**Dan Fletcher:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Okay, let's do the bulk of the recommendation so antelope and OIAL species. Austin, any questions?

**Austin Atkinson:** Yes, I do have a question on recommendations for sheep. We got quite a few comments on sheep. One question is, would it be possible when we receive these recommendations to also see the number of permits that are allocated for conservation in the same table or to see statewide permits next to all of the unit recommended permits so we can see all the pressure being put on these sheep units? Is that a possibility or will that always remain separate?

**Covy Jones:** No, Austin that's actually a really good question. It's a possibility, sometimes we do it to try to not confuse people because it is a little

more complicated like you said, as there are conservation groups, there are expo permits. We do take all of those into account in one way or another when we're talking about permits. The wild card is the statewide guys, but there's not a lot statewide, there's two for deserts and two for rockies. When we look at harvest and recommend permit numbers we recommend a number of sheep to be harvested and then we take into account conservation permits in addition to that, and then as per rule, we deduct expo permits after. So we can get you any information you want there though, we want to be forthright and give any information folks would like to see.

**Austin Atkinson:** One quick follow-up question. On the San Juan desert sheep it shows that 2 hunters did not kill and we're increasing permits from 3-5. The question for the biologist or for Jace would be, are we increasing permits because those hunters didn't fill, is it simple math is that, or is there something else going on with that population?

**Covy Jones:** It's more complicated than that. We divided that unit up and added more units to force hunters into pockets of sheep that aren't being hunted. They're hard to get to, they're hard to hunt, but we added San Juan River, San Juan North, we still have Lockheart, San Juan South. So we divided it up and said these sheep aren't being hunted. So we do our census and see there's nobody coming in here to the point where this last year on one of these units we were doing our best to get hunters to the rams, because we do care we want someone to have that once in a lifetime experience so we try to walk that ethical line. If we know there are sheep in areas we try to help hunters. Anybody who has a permit and calls, it's not exclusive. So we had an 8 year old ram die because it didn't get harvested. So we have sheep in these areas, flights look good, numbers look good, but they're hard to hunt. Jace, you probably have something to add there if I missed something there, please answer.

**Jace Taylor:** Not much to add, maybe some numbers might help, Austin. So last year 2019 there were 3 permits that were added to the San Juan South. What was called the San Juan South last year was more than what we're calling the San Juan South this year. So it included the river portion and a little bit of what's now the north. So like Covy was saying, the way it's split up, there are now 2 permits for the San Juan South, there's one permit for the San Juan River, and there's 2 permits in what's called the San Juan North. So that's where you're getting that number 5, but really it's more micro divided than before with more area that's available, and more direction on where those hunters can hunt. So we feel like yes it's a bigger number but there's more area, and because we're directing some of those hunters to different places we think that the pressure will be fine the sheep that are in there. That's a good question though.

**Austin Atkinson:** Thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, Gene?

**Gene Boardman:** Yes?

**Brayden Richmond:** Any questions on the rest of the recommendations?

**Gene Boardman:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Riley?

**Riley Roberts:** I think that most of my questions were answered. I think Covy answered those with the non resident, we had a lot of comments that came in, I think we all saw those on the number of non resident tags and the RAC, Board, and Division looking at those and trying to make it work for everybody. I think those questions have been answered, but I hope everybody saw those and read through them. I appreciated everybody that sent those and everybody watching on Youtube, thank you. We did go through those and read them and they weigh on our minds.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you Riley. Chad?

**Chad Utley:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Nick?

**Nick Jorgensen:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Sean

**Sean Kelly:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Verland?

**Verland King:** I got a question. On the example that Covy gave earlier, he brung up bison. That number's down because of what they're seeing. So why do you adjust hunt numbers based on calf crop when you don't count those until yearlings?

**Covy Jones:** Is Wade on this call? I know Brad is here too, but I thought Wade was maybe going to listen in tonight for the Southern Region?

**Wade Paskett:** Yeah, I'm here.

**Covy Jones:** Would you take Verlands question?

**Wade Paskett:** Yeah, you bet. So, in the management plan Verland, that you've sat on in the past the population objective is based upon adults' postseason. So we know those alves that were born this past year will be available as adults in this upcoming season. an adult is considered a buffalo that is 1 year of age and older. So those calves that we're basing the recommendation on will be a year and a half old during this next hunt, this upcoming 2020 hunt.



**Covy Jones:** But, Verland, I think some of this might be a discrepancy in how we manage wildlife and how the agricultural community manages them. We're not trying to be sneaky, we're not trying to do anything that.. we're trying to be upfront and we can verify this information and we're going to come in under the population objective that we're managing for with this current recommendation. I know that there's a pinch down there on the Henry's, I know this drought hit everyone really hard. We really hit those bison really hard for a couple of years and we're pulling back on that to allow that to recover, especially with the poor cow/calf ratios.

**Verland King:** Alright, you can move on then, no other questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Craig?

**Craig Laub:** No, I don't have any questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Tammy?

**Tammy Pearson:** No questions here.

**Brayden Richmond:** Dan?

**Dan Fletcher:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** I do have one additional question, Covy, on those buffalo, and maybe you could defer it. On the buffalo archery, this is a comment we all got. There are 2 archery tags, one of those is going to a non resident. Is there a reason why we did 2 instead of 3 so we could have 1 go to the highest points and 1 random? By just having 1 it just goes to a random permit.

**Covy Jones:** Yeah, we heard that, it was brought up in the Central Region RAC as well. Wade, again, you're on the line, but it wouldn't be detrimental to increase that to 3 to give a tag to the bonus point there. If that's the direction the RAC wants to go, that's not something we'd fall on our sword on. We probably will reevaluate the timing of that hunt. If we keep an archery hunt out there because it's not doing what we wanted it to do, it's still moving those bison earlier. So you may see a time change, or the hunt go away or something, but for this year the hunt is there and it's on the books, it's not going to hurt. Is that correct, Wade?

**Wade Paskett:** Yeah, that's absolutely correct adding another tag to make up for the non resident going to a public hunter would be just fine.

**6:00:00 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

**Brayden Richmond:** Okay, thank you. Let's move onto the comments section. On the comments section we're going to do the same format as the roll

call, but what I think we may want to do on this comments section is if your comment aligns with someone else's try to speak up so we can lump the topics together. Let's start with the deer, then the elk, then we'll approach the balance. So, Austin, do you have any comments on the deer?

**Austin Atkinson:** My one comment on the deer would be that now we are allowing late muzzleloader hunts on all general units, we need to keep in mind what that does to LE units that exist inside that general season unit. An example is that Cache/Crawford hunt where guys applied for that hunt and now there will be muzzleloader hunters in there right before them hunting the general season unit. Some concern there from sportsmen that are seeing these late muzzleloader hunts and how their impacting and I think next year we're going to have to look at these late muzzleloader hunts, how many permits are being issued and how they're affecting that unit as a whole. That's my comment to the RAC about LE deer.

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, Bart, any comments on the deer?

**Bart Battista:** Mine was along the same lines. We're decreasing permits, but then we're increasing late muzzleloaders, I wasn't quite sure why.

**Brayden Richmond:** I think we heard that quite a bit, as the muzzleloader was a bit of a concern. We can look at that in our recommendations if we want to. Gene?

**Gene Boardman:** Uh, yes, as far as late muzzleloader, everytime we get a new idea for a new hunt it starts out with 3-5 units, then it goes to 8-9, then it goes everywhere. We're getting a lot of hunts out there on all these units. Austin asked about a lot of permits on the sheep in particular. I've been asking about this on all the big game for a while. We need to know how many dog gone permits are going out. The pay to slay people never gets cut, but it's the same people that are going to get cut on the reduction of deer tags, that always take the cuts. At least it ought to be laid out so everybody can see it. Now on the cuts that they recommended, the southern region is taking the brunt of it, 16% of the tags on the Southern unit and a couple of the individual units it's a pretty high percent. Now I'm in agreement with the cuts because I think they've got to be made. As far as the permits go and the hunter satisfaction and how many hunters are going to lose with these big hunts, it's a toss up between cutting hunting opportunities, or losing them because they go out and can't find any deer, it will probably be about the same. I'm betting that landowner permits aren't being cut and the paid to slay, we've got a lot of pay to slay in the dedicated hunter program. They can buy points, that's pay to slay. So they won't be cut, but the same group gets cut whenever there's a cut. That's my comment on that. Thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Gene. Riley?

**Riley Roberts:** Yeah, I support the recommendations. I support the late muzzleloader hunts, I think it's a good thing. This is a renewable resource, that's what we're talking about here. It's our obligation as RAC members and the

Division to try and manage that resource and I think we're doing a good job of it. But I think some of these recommendations that we've made in the past are good things and they're middle ground for a lot of the sportsmen and are partners in Ag, Forest Service, and BLM, I think we're all coming together to some of these things really well. There's not a perfect science to this so you've got a lot of smart people doing really hard work behind the scenes and I think the numbers we saw last year with our total herds; these cuts had to happen, and as we saw from most of the comments, a lot of them were wondering if we were being aggressive enough. I think it's a good start, a good middle ground and we have to kind of see what the summer holds, hopefully the feed holds and we're all out of quarantine and we're all able to be out in the hills and the fawn crop and everything holds. I'm in support of the Division and I appreciate all their hard work and the recommendation.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you Riley. Chad?

**Chad Utley:** No comments.

**Brayden Richmond:** Nick?

**Nick Jorgensen:** I'd like to support what Riley just said about the Division. I read through all the recommendations and the work, there's a lot more science and than guesswork by far. I think there's a favor to those who want to cut tags and increase them or have them remain the same. Thank you for all your work, appreciate it.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Nick. Sean?

**Sean Kelly:** Yeah, we'd like to support the Divisions recommendations also. I want to commend them on putting out those collars, it's really nice to have that solid survival data when making these hard decisions. We support the recommendations.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Sean. Verland?

**Verland King:** Yeah, I'd support the recommendations, and maybe think there should be a few more cuts because the deer population is hurting in the area that I live in. So I'd support a bigger cut.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Verland. Craig?

**Craig Laub:** Yeah, the people I've talked to, well first of all I support the cuts of the antlerless on the Pine Valley, we don't want to get to the point of some of these other units that have dropped off so bad. I guess my other comment would be on other people who have paid a lot of attention to the deer herd here as they're concerned about the buck tags. I mean Pine Valley has become kind of a premium area for general season tags, and they'd like to see it stay that way, so

they're concerned about the buck tags and that late muzzleloader hunt in particular, killing some big bucks. That's my comments.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you Craig, Tammy?

**Tammy Pearson:** I'm following suit as these guys do. I like the recommendations. I think we could have done a few more cuts on the Beaver, possibly Southwest. Cause we've got our boots on the ground and we're seeing that low number, not only on the herd size but the harvest itself. In general I do support the cuts. I do get a lot of comments, there are still a lot of people that aren't sold on that late season hunts, they're not too happy about that, and I wasn't too sure about putting them on every unit, I only have two units, but I'm not too sure about the rest of them. That's my comment.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Tammy, Dan?

**Dan Fletcher:** We support the recommendations too and appreciate the Divisions efforts with telemetry work. I think it would be nice to have a little bit of telemetry on the Southwest unit, specifically Pine Valley and Hamlin Valley. Hopefully that will be considered in the future.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Dan. Any additional comments that you'd like to have on the deer portion? And then we'll move onto the elk. Speak up quickly.

**Austin Atkinson:** Brayden, this is Austin. I would like to bring up SFWs position for the Cache general deer to cut an additional 800 permits. I know that was passed in the Northern Region RAC and was discussed in the Central Region as well, that they wanted to cut an additional 800 so they would have a total cut of 1,600 permits for Cache general deer and I think that's more than warranted for what they're asking for up there.

**Brayden Richmond:** Covy it sounds like the Division supports that?

**Covy Jones:** Yes, we would support an additional cut of 800 permits. After we ran those numbers, we're working hard to manage to what we agreed to manage in the deer plan. We're trying to be more proactive than we've ever been.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you. Any additional comments?

**Craig Laub:** More of a question, Brayden. I agree with the cuts we're going to make, what impact does that make to the budget for the department?

**Covy Jones:** It's scary when you start asking biologists about budgets, we can't even balance our checkbooks. Obviously Wildlife is funded by hunters and fisherman, but that's not our primary concern. But that's not our primary concern. Truth is, our primary concern is to manage these populations how we've agreed to manage them to have a robust population to ensure success into the future. So we know we're going to take a hit on this, but that's not the primary concern. The

primary concern is what have we agreed to manage to? Kevin, anything to add to that?

**Kevin Bunnell:** I'm back. Covy I would have answered that the same way you did. It will have an impact on our budget. As an agency we're about 90% self funded which is different than any other state agency. Which comes with some real advantages, but it also comes with these kinds of issues when our populations are low and we cut tags it impacts our budget. But it's what we've agreed to do. Luckily the Division has managed very well fiscally, we have a bank account that we can draw on in time when we need to do this. While it will affect our budgets, it's what we need to do.

**Covy Jones:** And just to add one more thing to that Kevin, when we were making these cuts nobody even brought up the budget. Everyone talked about what's the right thing to do, what have we agreed to do. Then we've got some folks we've hired to worry about money, we'll let them worry about money, that's their job.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you Covy, appreciate that, and Kevin. Any additional comments before we move onto elk? Alright, let's hear comments on elk. We'll go in the same order. Austin, comments on elk?

**Austin Atkinson:** I'm trying to make sure I jump quick enough and change gears here. I do not have any comments on elk at this time.

**Brayden Richmond:** Bart?

**Bart Battista:** Neither do I.

**Brayden Richmond:** Gene?

**Gene Boardman:** No comment.

**Riley Roberts:** No.

**Chad Utley:** No.

**Brayden Richmond:** Nick?

**Nick Jorgensen:** (Brayden: I think you mouthed no, if I'm a lip reader)

**Brayden Richmond:** Sean?

**Sean Kelly:** No comments.

**Brayden Richmond:** Verland?

**Verland King:** No comments.

**Brayden Richmond:** Tammy?

**Tammy Pearson:** No.

**Brayden Richmond:** Craig?

**Craig Laub:** No comment.

**Brayden Richmond:** Dan

**Dan Fletcher:** No comment.

**Brayden Richmond:** Boy, that was easy on elk. We need to bring up spike hunts or something to get some conversation. Let's jump into the remainder of the OIAL recommendations. Austin, any comments on the remainder?

**Austin Atkinson:** I do have some comments, I think they mainly are going to revolve around desert sheep. As we manage the species, a sheep tag is a very special thing. Those that get the permit usually expect a special experience if you will. I think it's in the best interest of a sportsman and the State of Utah, to manage a couple of the units for I'd say, higher quality or higher trophy potential. I know this has been requested by quite a few different groups and by sportsmen themselves, if you want to have that experience, and have a higher chance at an older class sheep, then these units might be for you. If you want an opportunity hunt, or where we can offer more permits then these units might be better for you. I understand that's why we have that gap in the sheep plan, say 30-60% of the estimated class 3 and class 4 available. So it's been brought up that maybe the Zion Unit and maybe the Kaiparowits West Units have the highest trophy potential, so let's try to manage those as such by recommending lower permit numbers, closer to the 30% still within the guideline, and leave the other units to manage for the 40-60% of estimated rams. I'd like to see how that's received by the RAC or if there's discussion further about treating all units the same or if we set aside some units. It's much like we do with elk with a higher age class for some units, can we do the same with sheep to keep auction tags high, to keep revenue coming in from applicants wanting to apply and to keep Utah at the forefront of sheep conservation.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Austin. Bart?

**Bart Battista:** I have no comments, although it was interesting what Austin said though.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you. Gene?

**Gene Boardman:** I'm not too concerned about the trophy hunters having to have a bigger trophy. I go into a Cal Ranch or IFA and I see all these heads hanging on the wall cause they shot a trophy that was too big to hang in their dang

house. So, I'm not really into that, however, I don't think I'd oppose it today if the RAC decides to go that way.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Gene. Riley?

**Riley Roberts:** I've been waiting for a Gene comment for several months. Thank you Gene, it made me smile. I needed that in my quarantined room down here. I don't have really any comments, but I would respond to Austin and say, I wouldn't be opposed to that either there is a slight concern especially in the area I live in, I'm in the area of the west and some of those same things that Austin has talked about have been brought up by sportsmen and I think it would be beneficial if it was kept within the management plan and on that lower end of the spectrum. We could accomplish some of the things we want to as sportsmen and still be within the mandates set forth by the Division.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Riley. Chad?

**Chad Utley:** No comments.

**Brayden Richmond:** Nick?

**Nick Jorgensen:** No comment.

**Brayden Richmond:** Sean?

**Sean Kelly:** Yeah, we support the Divisions recommendations and really appreciate the aggressive numbers on the Oak Creek big horn in proximity to that domestic sheep property to the north. We're really concerned about disease issues and if it's not next to a bunch of big rams. We support the recommendations.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you Sean. Verland?

**Verland King:** Yeah, I've got a comment. It sounds like we've already got some units that are producing some big sheep if there was an 8 year old dying of natural causes. If these guys want a trophy they should put in for those units. They're harder to hunt, but that's part of the deal. Comment on the pronghorn over here on Parker Mountain, I see that we're not hunting any. That's the thing about pronghorn, they're subject to hard winters so I'm not going to complain about antelope this time. A couple of big winters took care of that. They'll be back. The elk is a big problem here, I've got cow elk encroaching on my farm that I've never had before, so I think we need to hunt more elk and see what we can do for that. They've got no natural.. a lion will kill an elk every now and then, so I'd like to see more hunting of the elk. I think we waste a lot of resources trying to grow horns. And I guess that's my comment.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Verland. Craig?

**Craig Laub:** I don't have any comments, I'm good.

**Brayden Richmond:** Tammy?

**Tammy Pearson:** Yeah, my only comment, I did like, I guess it was Austin that made the comment about Zions. My only concern with down there is the crowding. I think we were having some population issues and having them in the town so I worry about cutting the tags back on that and not being able to control the population. I think that we need to be really aggressive on these other ones. I'm looking forward to the hunts on the mineral mountains, we're having a hard time keeping those sheep on the unit and up on the mountain to begin with, so if we're starting to see those issues in Oak City then I'm all for adding some more tags there and being aggressive with that. Other than that I support the recommendations.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Tammy. Dan?

**Dan Fletcher:** I support the recommendations, no more comment.

**Brayden Richmond:** I do have a comment myself on this topic, and I understand once we get done, Covy has some information to share on the sheep. I want to talk about the sheep and the buffalo. I'd really like to see and support the SFWs recommendation, actually I guess it wasn't SFW, it came from a public comment on establishing the Kaiparowits West as more of a trophy sheep unit. I think that unit really lends to that, it's very isolated, those sheep don't have a whole lot of places to wander and I don't think you really have to worry on that unit. Zion does have a little concern, we had that disease there just a couple of years ago and it doesn't seem like we are able to maintain that population very well. Among those same lines I'm very happy and excited to see what the Division is doing on the Oak Creeks, those are a California big horn, they don't carry the same potential as the other sheep and we are upping the tags quite a bit. I like the strategy that we up them where we can, maybe on Kaiparowits West or some of these other units we could look at turning them into more of a trophy type hunt with an older age class, so that's something I'd like to see. My other comment I'd like to see is we should really look at that archery buffalo hunt to adding one more tag to it so we have a point tag and a random tag. Those are just my couple of comments when we come to recommendation. Covy you had some comments to share on the sheep, correct?

**Covy Jones:** Yeah, so I just wanted to show the group. So the Division kind of did this exercise that you're talking about, looking at the different units and the risk to those units and then in addition to the rest of the units where we should manage them for. One of the problems we have is when we have high ram/ewe ratios there is a lot more potential for those rams to wander, and when they wander they end up in trouble, causing conflict and potentially bringing back disease. We did this exercise when the plan came through, it wasn't set up like it was in the elk plan, but let me show you.. Jace put together this graph today and Jace be ready to speak as well please. This isn't every desert big horn unit in the state, but it is a lot of them. So the plan should be coming up again right now. The



plan allows us to do a couple of things in the way we present big horn. It's a pretty wide range. We can offer 30-60% of class 3 and 4 rams, so mature and  $\frac{3}{4}$  curled to a full curl. Or 15-25% if total rams counted on the unit. So the scale isn't exactly the same but it depends on age class and how we allocate those. When we did that we created a slider. On the right hand side is if we are offering the very top of the unit, the most permits we can offer. The left hand side is if we're offering at the very most restrictive we can offer for the unit. As we see these units and again they may not line up with everything sportsmen or hunters want to see, but we took everything into consideration. Maybe we got some of them wrong, maybe we need to continue to work with groups to say hey, West is the better unit to have more trophy hunts on, but as we look at that, we're pretty conservative in the plan on almost all of our sheep units. Not even hitting into the green or upper end there until we hit San Rafael. Even on the Henry's where we're trying to be more liberal we're right there in the middle and the Kaiparowits and some of these units, even the Zion is on the conservative end. So I just wanted to share that with the group. Jace did you have anything you wanted to add?

**Jace Taylor:** No, I wouldn't add much. I would say that when you look at this red to green scale here, recognize in the statewide management plan that we extended the parameters where we could offer or extend permits, so just because we aren't all the way to the very right doesn't mean that we really need to be. WE just expanded the parameters to give our biologist more flexibility and ability in offering permits if there is a situation where they need to be very liberal or very aggressive permit recommendations. So that's one thing. The way that this shakes out here is that essentially 55% of the permits that we are giving or recommending for this next year are going to be on units that we're managing more liberally, hunting more aggressively. 45% of them will be on units where we are hunting more conservatively. If you wanted to take that and apply it to trophy potential or apply it to the size of the rams, half of the permits are going to be managed for older rams, half are going to be managed for younger rams, that's about how that shakes out. That's all I'd add.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you, if there's no additional comments, I'd like to entertain a motion at this time. What I'd like to do on the motions, just to reiterate what we've done in the past is making motions on changes you'd like to see on the plan and then the final motion would be to take the final portion of the plan as presented. Any additional comments, or would we want to start entertaining a motion? We can do this the same way we did our comments, start with the deer, go to the elk, and then move to the remainder. Go ahead Gene.

**Gene Boardman:** Yeah just on general comments on the whole thing, particularly sheep, sheep country is pretty hard and you're kind of planning on a sheep hunter being in the prime of life, but with the point system, by the time you draw a sheep tag and it goes to with elk and other big game, by the time you draw you have to have a gun rack wielded on your walker or your wheelchair. You just can't cover that country and you're not going to stay into getting the full curl ram or the 375 elk because you're too dog gone old to cover the country. Thanks.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Gene. Anyone want to take a stab at making a motion on the deer portion, if there are any changes. If there are no changes we want to ask for then we can wait and just accept the Divisions recommendations.

**Riley Roberts:** Mr. Chair, is there a way that you can sum up some of the comments.

**Brayden Richmond:** So, in this format, we kind of address this going in, we sent out an email to the RAC members a couple of weeks ago asking them to read the comments, we're asking the RACs to represent the comments they received and...

**Riley Roberts:** I'm sorry, just to be clear, just the RAC comments please?

**Brayden Richmond:** Oh, yeah, thanks Riley, yeah we can do that, in fact I'll give it to Kevin so we can kind of summarize that.

**Riley Roberts:** Thank you.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Alright, I have the comments down by the people that made them, so that's how I'm going to go through them. Austin expressed some concern about Southwest desert deer permits and the late season muzzleloader hunts and the impacts they may be having on limited entry hunts. He would like to see us address the SFW recommendation on the Cache, and then just brought up the idea of managing the Zion and Kaiparowits West units for desert big horn sheep more conservatively than the others. Gene expressed a general concern about cutting 9,000 permits statewide, but later I believe expressed that he sees the need for that. We had a couple of comments about needing to know the total number of permits including conservation permits, that's something we can address here in recommendations. Brayden would like to see us add 1 resident archery tag to the bison so there is 1 that is available to the highest point holders, and one that goes into the random draw. He's also supportive of establishing the Kaiparowits West as a trophy unit. At the same time supports the increase of the sheep tags on the Oak Creek. Riley expressed that he supports the recommendation but expressed that he has some interest in Austin's comments relative to big horn sheep. Nick has expressed support, Sean has expressed support, Verland has expressed support but has also said he would support more cuts in deer tags, he's not supportive in cutting desert big horn sheep tags. Craig expressed support in not reducing the number of tags on the Pine Valley. Tammy has expressed general support, but has also indicated that she would support more cuts to deer tags. Dan has indicated that the BLM supports the recommendations. Those are the notes I've got, hopefully that captures what everybody said.

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, we'll entertain a motion, again if anyone is ready.

**Austin Atkinson:** Chairman, this is Austin. I can make a motion about the deer section. I move that we accept the department's recommendations for General Season and Limited Entry Buck Deer with the amendment to reduce the Cache General Season Buck Deer permits by an additional 800.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you. So we have a motion, do we have a second?

**Tammy Pearson:** I would second that.

**Brayden Richmond:** Tammy seconded that motion. Do we have any additional comments? Ok, we'll go to a roll call vote then. Again, ok we're making sure we have the motion correct here, then we'll go to the vote.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Austin, the motion is to accept the recommendation for deer, but reduce the Cache General Season by an additional 800 permits.

**Austin Atkinson:** Yes

**Brayden Richmond:** Bart?

**Bart Battista:** Yes

**Brayden Richmond:** Gene?

**Gene Boardman:** Yes

**Brayden Richmond:** Riley?

**Riley Roberts:** Yes

**Brayden Richmond:** Chad?

**Chad Utley:** Yes

**Brayden Richmond:** Nick?

**Nick Jorgensen:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Sean?

**Sean Kelly:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Verland?

**Verland King:** Yes

**Brayden Richmond:** Craig?

**Craig Laub:** Yes

**Brayden Richmond:** Tammy?

**Tammy Pearson:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Dan?

**Dan Fletcher:** Yes.

**06:45:49** The following motion was made by Austin Atkinson, seconded by Tammy Pearson. Passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the department's recommendations for General Season and Limited Entry Buck Deer with the amendment to reduce the Cache General Season Buck Deer by 800 permits.**

**Brayden Richmond:** Let's jump over to elk. We didn't have much of a discussion on elk, I don't know if anyone wants to ask for something different in the plan or if we want to move on.

**Kevin Bunnell:** I'm not seeing anything I think we should move on to sheep.

**Brayden Richmond:** Ok, let's move on to sheep, we can go past that and incorporate that into the remaining. Any recommendations dealing with the sheep. I'd entertain a motion, with once in a lifetime and antelope.

**Verland King:** I just want to make a comment, so this bison we talked about archery tags and there was a comment made that it's not working out like we wanted it to, and our experience is it's been pushing the bison on the winter range sooner. Maybe we ought to just remove those, if that's all it's doing we didn't want it to do that.

**Brayden Richmond:** Maybe we can ask Covy to comment on this, but my understanding is we've already passed the season dates for the year so this would be something we'd need to change next year, not something we could do this year. Covy, do you have any comments to that?

**Covy Jones:** No, that's correct. We've already offered that as a hunt, but Verland, I think you'll see a change either in season dates or a change in that hunt this November and let's work with Wade to get that. You're right, deer worked well and the bison stayed up high, the next year when they felt the pressure from the archery hunters they dropped down on the winter range and that's not what we were trying to accomplish. We were trying to get the harvest without pushing them on to the winter range. So I think you'll see a change in that this fall.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you. Anyone like to make a motion?

**Craig Laub:** I'd make a motion to accept the remainder of the Division's plan as presented.

**Brayden Richmond:** So you're making a motion to accept the rest of the plan as presented, is that correct?

**Craig Laub:** Yes.

**Nick Jorgensen:** I would second that.

**Brayden Richmond:** Ok, we have a motion and a second, Nick has seconded that. Any additional comments?

**Austin Atkinson:** Chairman, this is Austin, I'd like to have a comment on that motion that if we'd like to get that additional Henry Mountains permit, or any sheep permit changes into that we would have to make an amendment to get that through.

**Brayden Richmond:** Would you want to make that amendment, or are you asking if anyone else would like to?

**Austin Atkinson:** I can make that amendment if that's the easiest way to go about it.

**Verland King:** Why would we want to add another tag if it's not doing what we wanted it to do in the first place. That would be my comment on that.

**Brayden Richmond:** I don't think adding the tag is hurting or helping the reason for that archery hunt, adding the tag is for those that put in for that archery hunt down there with a lot of points thought they had a chance to draw with their high points. By adding 1 tag we're providing that opportunity, would be my comment Verland.

**Verland King:** So, if you have one tag, you take it out of the general season then?

**Brayden Richmond:** No, I'm not asking to decrease the other tags, I'm just asking to increase one tag. Verland, I'm asking to kill another buffalo.

**Verland King:** Well, I don't want you chasing them on the winter range earlier.

**Brayden Richmond:** I just don't see that one tag would have that great of an impact on that. Maybe Covy could speak to that. Do you think one tag is going to impact that?

**Covy Jones:** I don't and Wade is on the line and he loves to talk. So Wade do you think that adding one permit, what kind of impact do you think that would have.

**Wade Paskett:** Uh, no, you know, I mean it could potentially have some impact, but I think the impact would be minimal. I think where we had 20 permits and now we're down to 3 permits, and so I think just the one permit, potentially you're going to have a few more four wheelers out there moving bison around, but I don't think we're going to have near the pressure that we had last year, so that's why I think we're saying that adding just one more permit would be a greater benefit than not having it. I don't think that that one permit will make or break the bison going down there

earlier. To make your point, I do, we've talked about this at length that those bison are going out on the winter range earlier because of the pressure and we will be addressing that come our November recommendations for hunts.

**Verland King:** Alright, so you add another tag, but you don't take it from the general season, you just make the new one.

**Wade Paskett:** Yes, that's correct, it is adding an additional tag to the numbers already recommended.

**Verland King:** Would it help to put that hunt at the end of the year instead of early?

**Wade Paskett:** Yeah, that's one of the options that we'll be looking at, but we can talk about that when those November recommendations come along for those changes in hunt point structure.

**Brayden Richmond:** Just a reminder Verland, the 2020 season dates were set in the Board meeting from the November RACs. So the 2020 dates are already set.

**Verland King:** So are we setting numbers now, then?

**Brayden Richmond:** Yes that's what we're doing, this RAC is to set the numbers.

**Austin Atkinson:** Chairman, if I could make a quick comment on that. Verland, just to remind everyone, I bring this up about every meeting. This is strictly a housekeeping item is how I see it because it's our backward system of setting the hunts to people can apply and setting our permit numbers later so we need to add a permit which allows a bonus permit to be given in the draw. Really, that's the reason this amendment has come up.

**Brayden Richmond:** And I'm perhaps making too many comments here, but Austin, I'd really like to echo that. I think last year we saw some real examples of numbers changing drastically from the time we applied to when the hunts were drawn and this year it's even worse. So I echo your comment and concern there. I have brought that up many times myself. I don't know that we ever had an actual motion to amend, I think we discussed it, but Austin, did you make a motion to amend?

**Austin Atkinson:** No I didn't. Can I make an official motion right now?

**Brayden Richmond:** Yeah.

**Austin Atkinson:** I move to amend the motion on the table to add one resident archery Henry Mtns Bison Hunter's Choice for a total of two permits. And I would also like to amend the permits available for the Kaiparowits West Desert Sheep not to increase those permit numbers for 2020.

Seconded by Riley Roberts.

**Brayden Richmond:** Any further discussion?

**Austin Atkinson:** Yes

**Bart Battista:** Yes

**Gene Boardman:** Yes

**Riley Roberts:** Yes

**Chad Utley:** Yes

**Nick Jorgensen:** Yes

**Sean Kelly:** Yes

**Verland King:** Yes

**Craig Laub:** Yes

**Tammy Pearson:** Yes

**Dan Fletcher:** Yes

**MOTION** to add one resident archery Henry Mtns Bison Hunter's Choice for a total of two permits. And I would also like to amend the permits available for the Kaiparowits West Desert Sheep not to increase those permit numbers for 2020.

**Austin Atkinson**

**Riley Roberts, second**

**The amendment Passes unanimously.**

Accept the remainder as presented.

**Brayden Richmond:** Let's go back to the initial motion to accept the remainder as presented. Are we ready for a vote on that? Any additional comments?

**Kevin Bunnell:** So, actually now we are voting on an amended motion and the amended motion is to accept the balance as presented, but add one bison archery tag on the Henry Mountains and reduce the Kaiparowits West permit numbers back to what they were last year

**Brayden Richmond:** Okay, so everyone follow that? Let's take a vote on that.

**Austin Atkinson:** Yes

**Bart Battista:** Yes

**Gene Boardman:** Yes

**Riley Roberts:** Yes

**Chad Utley:** Yes

**Nick Jorgensen:** Yes

**Sean Kelly:** Yes

**Verland King:** Yes

**Craig Laub:** Yes

**Tammy Pearson:** Yes

**Dan Fletcher:** Yes

**Brayden Richmond:** Passes unanimously.

The following motion was made by Craig Laub, seconded by Nick Jorgensen. Passed unanimously after being amended.

**MOTION: I moved to accept the remainder of the Division's recommendations as presented.**

The following motion to amend was made by Austin Atkinson, seconded by Riley Roberts. Passed unanimously.

**MOTION TO AMEND: I move that we amend the motion and accept the remainder of the Division's recommendations as presented, but add one resident Bison archer permit on the Henry Mountains (for a total of two) and reduce the Kaiparowits West Desert Bighorn Sheep permit numbers back to what they were in 2019.**

**Covy Jones:** Brayden, can I just add one more thing? Just before we move on I want to add one more thing and that is the RACs.. there's two things, we're working hard to be predictive, there's not always going to get it right with deer. We might miss it every once in a while, but we're using all the data we have now. I want everybody to remember that we're working hard to be a little more proactive with that. And 2, as we come and make these cuts, our biggest cut was 46% almost 50% permits on a unit and a lot of these subunits were between 20-30 up to 46% of the permits were cut. And we're going to come back to the RAC with big increases when times are good and not leave.. you can't stockpile these animals. You have good times and bad times and ultimately deer populations are driven by climate. So there are years where we missed the boat and left a lot of animals out there and you're going to see recommendations for big increases when times are good too and I just wanted to get that on the record.



**Brayden Richmond:** I appreciate that Covy, and I'd hope that we support that when those times come. Thank you. Let's take a 10 minute break. Let's meet back at 7:10 and resume.

**07:10:13      6) Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2020 (Action)**

Presentations could be viewed at  
<https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

**Brayden Richmond:** We're going to start back up with the Antlerless Permit Recommendations. We'll start with Kevin for a review of the electric comments we got.

**07:10:51      Electronic Public Comment Report by Kevin Bunnell, Regional Supervisor**

**Kevin Bunnell:** Okay, so in typical Southern Utah style, the comments on our antlerless were exactly split. 31.03% support, 31.03% oppose, then we had about 38% of the people that were neutral.

**Brayden Richmond:** You know Kevin, I've really liked it as we've started using these comments and the graphs to show the comments we get back. I think it's good for everyone to see that there are a lot of split feelings and split approaches. This one is interesting how it's split so evenly. Alright, let's go to the question section for the RAC, and again we'll do it in a roll call format. On this one I don't think I'm going to break it into deer, elk and other, we'll just approach it all in one piece. I think we'll start at the bottom of the list and go up this time so we'll start with Dan. Any questions Dan?

**07:11:35      Questions from RAC Members**

**Dan Fletcher:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Tammy? Did we lose Tammy?

**Tammy Pearson:** No, I'm here. Sorry, my mic was off. I have no questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Craig?

**Craig Laub:** I have no questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Verland?

**Verland King:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Sean?

**Sean Kelly:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Nick?

**Nick Jorgensen:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Chad?

**Chad Utley:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Riley?

**Riley Roberts:** No.

**Brayden Richmond:** Gene?

**Gene Boardman:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Bart? Did we lose Bart?

**Brayden Richmond:** Austin, nobody has any questions, so I guess it will just be you.

**Austin Atkinson:** I guess I'll start. I do have a question. I have experience, probably too much experience, with this Beaver antlerless elk hunt. So I'd like to ask why the Beaver East has new hunts or did we kill too many in Beaver North? I understand 2019 harvest reports so I'm curious how this Beaver East hunt came about when I understood before we were trying to curbe the Beaver East population by targeting the Beaver North unit.

**Covy Jones:** Mike do you want to take that one?

**Mike Wardle:** The goal is to get to objective... (inaudible) ...We were looking at 26%... (inaudible)...

**Covy Jones:** Really quick, just a suggestion. Mike, you may need to turn your camera off, it feels like your internet is a little slow, we're only catching every 3rd word.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Go ahead and start over Mike.

**Mike Wardle:** Hopefully you can hear me better now. Sorry, it's not the best wifi. The hunts where we limited the hunters to the Beaver North unit, we had much lower success rates than the hunts we had on the Beaver East. Last year our last year we were in the 20% range, the hunts we had on Beaver East were

between 50-70%. So the thinking is if we open it up more to the Beaver East boundary we can harvest more and get to objective quicker.

**Austin Atkinson:** Okay, thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Bart we skipped you, did you have any questions on the antlerless?

**Bart Battista:** No, I do not.

**07:17:02 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

**Brayden Richmond:** Okay, we are going into comments. I'm going to lead with a comment on this one because it goes right off of Austin's question, and Mike and I have talked about this. I know where Mike is coming from. The reason we initially split that hunt is because the southern end of the Beaver mountains is much more accessible, you're not getting the complaints on it, like you are on the North end from landowners or private property issues and the North end held more elk. Now the reason your success rates, in my opinion, are lower on the northern end is because it's much harder to access the elk. It's big country with not as many roads and as we all know when elk get shot at they move and they get away from the roads, so I have some real concerns with this, I was the one that pushed initially to get that split instead of hunting them on the south end of Beaver so I have some concerns now that we're going unit wide again. The majority of people hunting cow elk on the Beaver will hunt them on the south end where it's easier access, so this is a concern for me. Let's go through the roll call again with comments. Dan, comments on the antlerless agenda item?

**Dan Fletcher:** No comment.

**Tammy Pearson:** No.

**Craig Laub:** No comments.

**Verland King:** No comment.

**Sean Kelly:** No.

**Nick Jorgensen:** No comment.

**Chad Utley:** No comment.

**Brayden Richmond:** Riley, do you have any comments? Maybe we lost Riley. Gene?

**Gene Boardman:** Uh, I've got a comment. Were cutting permits quite drastically on all the species on the Mnt. Dutton plateau Parker Mnt. Do we have a problem there?

**Brayden Richmond:** Gene, just to make sure, you're asking a question here right? So you're looking for a response?

**Gene Boardman:** Yeah, I'd like a response on that.

**Covy Jones:** One of those is Kyle the other is Levi. Kyle, Levi, do you guys want to take those?

**Kyle Christensen:** Yeah, Mount Dutton right now we're significantly under objective. We flew the unit this year, we came in roughly at about 1,100 elk. Our objective range is 1,500-2,000 so we're just trying to let the elk bounce back and get within our objective.

**Gene Boardman:** You're way short on antelope there too.

**Kyle Christensen:** What was that Gene?

**Levi Watkins:** I'll jump in there on antelope. On the Parker we've had the past 2 years low fawn/doe ratios so we're not getting the recruitment to build up the population where we've had the hard winters and some dry summers so we're below and that's why we've cut permits on the pronghorn Parker does.

**Brayden Richmond:** Riley, are you back on? Any comments?

**Riley Roberts:** Yeah, no comments.

**Brayden Richmond:** Bart?

**Bart Battista:** No comments.

**Brayden Richmond:** Austin?

**Austin Atkinson:** I'll make another comment about Beaver North elk. With my help my family was responsible for quite a few kills on the Beaver North this past year, so I have quite a bit of experience in that unit and I'm concerned that maybe some things not working as far as getting us to that objective on that unit. We offered 980 antlerless permits on that unit last year, and I know success is low, but we still can't get that under objective, so now they're recommending 450 antlerless permits for this year and I'm questioning how we're going to get that under objective. My experience is maybe the bull/cow ratio is way out of whack and because we're only killing 33 bulls and 89 spikes, we're just not going to be able to get that under objective unless we kill more bulls, and I understand that doesn't work with the elk plan, but it's a unit in our area that I have concern with how we've tried throwing cow elk tags at it and it's not working to get under

objective. So that's my comment on that. And I do have another comment as far as sheep, if we can hear that now. There is a new ewe sheep hunt that is falling under the antlerless, if I understand this, it's creating a new section of hunt which will create a new application and a whole new bonus point structure. These would not be preference points, these would be bonus points, for Rocky Mnt. ewe big horn sheep hunt with 10 permits is what's being recommended. We did receive comments from SFW and other constituents that ask that we direct the Board change that into a transplant and try to move some sheep off the Newfoundland Mtns. But I would like to voice my support for the statewide biologist Jace Taylor and the work they've done. Where moving sheep is expensive, sometimes the best thing to do is offer a hunt and shoot them. So that's my comment on that new hunt.

**Brayden Richmond:** In the Northern RAC the other night Jace addressed this, and I wonder if it would be wise to have him address it for our RAC also. I thought that his comments were at least worth hearing. Jace, would you address that?

**Jace Taylor:** Yeah, sure thing. So, we have the Newfoundland Mnt unit is reaching the population unit which is a great thing, it's really exciting to have a bighorn sheep unit that's reaching it's population objective. We've done translocations in the past on that unit and moved ewes and we could do that now, there's one location we could take them to and that's the Stansbury Mnts, the other option is to hunt them, hunt the ewes. The pros and cons like Austin mentioned in moving the ewes to the Stansbury's would take some money. It would take quite a bit of time, it's not the easiest space we'd have to deal with Dept of Defence airspace restrictions, and also long ferries and then move the animals and then quite a bit of time goes into one they make it to the Stansbury's. Another con is moving sheep always involves a level of risk, risk of pathogen transmission. Every time we've taken sheep to the Stansbury's a few of them leave the mountain and wander into places that have potential for risk of pathogen transmission. To varying degrees, sometimes it's just a couple, sometimes it's more than that. Sometimes we have to go remove those animals or catch them and bring them back to the mountain. So considering those pros and cons we figured it would be best to hunt the ewes on the Newfoundland Mnts. The Stasbury is not in desperate need of big horns and we feel like the money we would save, but probably more important the time we would save, the risk we would avoid. It's probably more important to go ahead and hunt those ewes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Jace. Any additional comments on the Antlerless permit recommendations? And if not, we'd entertain a motion. Ah, yeah, thanks Kevin. Let's summarize the comments that have been made.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Okay, this will go pretty quick. The only comments is there has been some concern expressed in general with the cow elk recommendations on the Beaver. We've heard support for the ewe hunt on the Newfoundland Mnts. Concern for the level of cuts on the Dutton for elk and the

Parker pronghorn in terms of cow and doe hunts out there. Again, some more concern in eliminating the Beaver North calendar or at least reducing the numbers on that North hunt on the Beaver unit. And that's it.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Kevin. Again, any additional comments or we would entertain a motion at this time.

**Craig Laub:** Pretty quiet, I'll make a motion to accept the recommendations as presented. Seconded by Tammy Pearson.

**Brayden Richmond:** Any further discussion? We'll call for a vote. Austin?

**Austin Atkinson:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Bart?

**Bart Battista:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Gene?

**Gene Boardman:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Riley?

**Riley Roberts:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Chad?

**Chad Utley:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Nick?

**Nick Jorgensen:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Sean?

**Sean Kelly:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Verland?

**Verland King:** Yes

**Brayden Richmond:** Craig?

**Craig Laub:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Tammy?

**Tammy Pearson:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Dan?

**Dan Fletcher:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Motion passes unanimously.

The following motion was made by Craig Laub, seconded by Tammy Pearson. Passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 202 as presented.**

**07:27:42**      **7) R657-37 CWMU Rule Amendments (Action)**

Presentations could be viewed at

<https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

**07:27:54**      **Electronic Public Comment Report by Kevin Bunnell, Regional Supervisor**

**Kevin Bunnell:** Yeah, let me start with just a general comment that this is the most agreeable that I've ever seen this group. You're going to ruin your recommendation if you keep going as you are. On the CWMU rule, the majority from people in our area were neutral on the proposal, because we don't have a lot of CWMU's in Southern Utah, that was about 69%. 24% supported and 7% were opposed to the proposal.

**Brayden Richmond:** I think we could really throw everybody off Kevin if we came in with like 4-5 motions on the CWMU rule. Any questions? I'll start again with the list here. Dan, any questions?

**07:28:37**      **Questions from RAC Members**

**Dan Fletcher:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Tammy?

**Tammy Pearson:** You're just waiting for a snide remark from me, is what you're doing. No, I don't have any questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Craig?

**Craig Laub:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Verland?

**Verland King:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Sean?

**Sean Kelly:** No questions.

**Nick Jorgensen:** No questions.

**Chad Utley:** No questions.

**Riley Roberts:** No.

**Gene Boardman:** No.

**Bart Battista:** No.

**Brayden Richmond:** Austin?

**Austin Atkinson:** One quick question for Chad if he's available. Can you tell me how CWMU's... they are required to send in teeth samples, or have the option to send in teeth samples so they can be aged. As far as the surveys go for classifications, do they do those for CWMU's or not?

**Chad Wilson:** Yeah, so the biologist if that's in their area they'll sometimes sample that as part of theirs. But the CWMUs also have an opportunity, a lot of them will hire out people to do classification for them. I don't think all of them do, but there is opportunity there and a lot of them do keep track of that on their land.

**Austin Atkinson:** So this rule change would be probably a direct result from requests from CWMU operators?

**Chad Wilson:** If you're talking about we're allowing them to manage toward a higher buck/doe age class, no it was a clarification. It wouldn't really be worth the limited entry hunt if we were forcing them to manage for lower buck/doe ratios and see similar quality as the general season hunt. So somebodies going to use their limited entry tag, or limited entry points we want them to have the ability to harvest a higher quality animal.

**Austin Atkinson:** Okay, thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Sorry, I was muted there. We'll start with Dan on the comments.

**Dan Fletcher:** No comments.



**Tammy Pearson:** The reason we're so agreeable is because we have to look at ourselves on the camera so we're trying to get this through as painlessly as possible. I think we're good on this, I'm ready to make a motion whenever everybody's done.

**Craig Laub:** No comment.

**Verland King:** No comment.

**Sean Kelly:** No comment.

**Nick Jorgensen:** I know this will surprise you, but I don't have any comment.

**Chad Utley:** No comment.

**Riley Roberts:** No comment.

**Gene Boardman:** No.

**Bart Battista:** No.

**Austin Atkinson:** No comment.

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, we'll entertain a motion, Tammy.

Tammy motions to accept as presented, Verland King seconded.

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

**Brayden Richmond:** Any additional discussion? I wouldn't think so. We'll go ahead and go to a vote.

**Austin Atkinson:** Yes.

**Bart Battista:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Gene, I think your muted Gene.

**Gene Boardman:** Yes.

**Riley Roberts:** Yes.

**Chad Utley:** Yes.

**Nick Jorgensen:** Yes.

**Sean Kelly:** Yes.

**Verland King:** Yes.

**Craig Laub:** Yes.

**Tammy Pearson:** Yes.

**Dan Fletcher:** Yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Motion passed unanimously.

**07:32:24 RAC Discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

The following motion was made by Tammy Pearson, seconded by Verland King. Passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's 2020 CWMU Antlerless**

**07:33:47 8) 2020 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations (Action)**

Presentations could be viewed at  
<https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

**07:34:02 Electronic Public Comment Report by Kevin Bunnell, Regional Supervisor**

**Kevin Bunnell:** Okay, this one is very similar, I'm looking at the wrong one there, just a minute. Almost identical to the last one, the majority of people, 72% neutral. Then we had 17% support and 10% opposed.

**Brayden Richmond:** Someone wanted to make a comment before we started here, I didn't catch who that was.

**Chad Wilson:** Mr. Chairman that was me, I just had clarifications, actually some corrections to make real quick. The numbers we presented we believed were correct during my presentation, but we have found since the last RAC that some of them were off. Hopefully you can see this, let me know if you can see this? (Yeah we can see it). Since the last RAC meeting this is some of the changes we have found. The Heaston East, somehow it got messed up last year that it was only 10 permits, but our database reverted it back to 50 permits. So it should be back to 8 private 2 public. Roan Cliffs, we had it as 10, should be 6 public permits. Indian Head, Jump Creek, those are all in the Southeast Region. They all should have been lower, and it was caught like I said after that last

permit like I said. So you see on the bottom the number that changes that to. So essentially we just dropped a few more numbers on that. This is what we'd present to the Board.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you Chad, I appreciate that. That will help us. Questions from the RAC, let's start at the top again with Austin, any questions Austin?

**07:36:02      Questions from RAC Members**

**Austin Atkinson:** No questions.

**Bart Battisa:** No questions.

**Gene Boardman:** No questions.

**Riley Roberts:** No questions.

**Chad Utley:** No questions.

**Nick Jorgensen:** No questions.

**Verland King:** No questions.

**Craig Laub:** No questions.

**Tammy Pearson:** No questions.

**Dan Fletcher:** No questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** I feel like we should have done questions and comments all together. We'll do comments now. Let's just do a general rather than a roll call on this one. Any comments on Agenda 8. If there's no comments we'd entertain a motion.

The following motion was made by Chad Utley, seconded by Tammy Pearson. Passed unanimously.

**MOTION: To accept the proposal as presented by the Division.**

**Austin Atkinson:** Yes.

**Bart Battista:** Yes.

**Gene Boardman:** Yes.

**Riley Roberts:** Yes.

**Chad Utley:** Yes.

**Nick Jorgensen:** Yes.

**Sean Kelly:** Yes.

**Verland King:** Yes.

**Craig Laub:** Yes.

**Tammy Pearson:** Yes.

**Dan Fletcher:** Yes.

**Motion passes unanimously.**

**07:37:25 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

The following motion was made by Chad Utley, seconded by Tammy Pearson and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the 2020 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations as presented.**

**07:38:23 9) Management Bison Hunts – Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit (Action)**

Presentations could be viewed at  
<https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

**07:38:30 Electronic Public Comment Report by Kevin Bunnell, Regional Supervisor**

**Kevin Bunnell:** Yes, on this one there were 31% of the comments were in support, 10% opposed, and 59% neutral.

**Brayden Richmond:** And I think what I'll do again is just kind of open it up at this point instead of doing a roll call. So if there are any questions, please speak up.

**07:38:48 Questions from RAC Members**

**Tammy Pearson:** Yeah, so seeing how this is totally confusing to me and I got three different devices here turned on and I can't get back to the original information on the bison hunts will you refresh us a little on that or pull the chart up?

**Brayden Richmond:** Brad, will you mind just giving us a real quick summary on what we're doing on this hunt?

**Brad Crompton:** You bet, I could pull up the presentation, but I think we can do it briefly. If you need to look at something I could pull it up. Basically we're asking the RAC to make some rule amendments that would allow for an over the counter bison hunt specifically on the Nine Mile range. This over the counter hunt would be something that you would lose your bonus points if you purchased the permit, but you would be able to purchase that type of permit in subsequent years. That's kind of the short version of what we're doing. What we're trying to do is address lots of bison migration off tribal lands from the east side of the Green River on to the Nine Mile Range where we don't have a management plan, population zero. We're trying to use sportsmen to be a tool to reduce that population and push the bison back to reservations lands.

**Brayden Richmond:** Do you have any additional questions there Tammy?

**Tammy Pearson:** No, I just wanted to make sure I was remembering it right. So I appreciate that. Is this hunt going to be able to be on private property? I guess with permission probably.

**Brad Crompton:** Good question, the Nine Mile Range Creek unit does have a lot of private land, however where these bison end up are primarily on public lands. The issue isn't really private land access, it's just the terrain is very difficult terrain, the bottom of Desolation Canyon and the Roadless. This will be a very, very difficult hunt and why we did this over the counter hunt is so we get the right kind of hunter, the few that can really do this, cause it's not for the faint of heart. It will be rather difficult for most folks.

**Tammy Pearson:** So are these over the counter tags, are they something that... Because I know it's a migration problem mostly, so when they migrate over there is it going to be one of those that you guys, or the property owners or the ranked permittees see the buffalo they can actually.. or is it a timed hunt, is it a specific time? Or is it going to be when they are available?

**Brad Crompton:** What we tried to do is make it as flexible as possible so the season framework is August 1st- January 31st, every possible day we can hunt a big game animal in the state. That way if something did show up on some private they could go buy a tag and shoot a bison. But the vast majority, 99% of the bison show up in late October, early November and stay the winter. So there is really a narrow window of opportunity in October/November before the snow keeps you out of the country. That's where most of the harvest will happen, probably November.

**Tammy Pearson:** Okay, thanks.

**Brayden Richmond:** Bart you had a question?

**Bart Battista:** I did. So how long have the bison been going there?

**Brad Crompton:** 10-15 years. It's been consistent. They've been here every year for the past 10-15 years.

**Bart Battista:** Okay, and you said primarily, in the video and the packet, that basically they're impacting on grazing and forage. This is, you just said, primarily on public lands, is it state land or BLM land that it's on?

**Brad Crompton:** The majority of it is BLM land, state land as well, and there are some private parcels.

**Bart Battista:** Essentially this is the new management plan, correct? What we're doing here.

**Brad Crompton:** Not necessarily. Creating a management plan is acknowledging bison on this unit and that is something all the people involved, private landowners, BLM, public land grazers, things like that, there really isn't a stomach for bison right now so we're just managing to zero for now. Will we harvest all the bison? Probably not, but it may push them back and make it a place they don't feel welcome.

**Bart Battista:** If they are naturally migrating, I was wondering, you said it was the Ute Indians that consider this "their herd"? Is that what you were saying?

**Brad Crompton:** Excuse me.

**Bart Battista:** If we take it to zero how's that going to impact what's on the Tribal lands? It's not like they're going to see it as a boundary, they're still going to go, right?

**Brad Crompton:** This is just a small portion of the total bison that live most of the year on Tribal lands over there. It's a population that's grown lately and since they've grown so much they're starting to disperse to other areas. This area isn't the only place they migrate off of Tribal lands, to the north and south as well. It's a complex relationship with the Tribe, they have management authority over those bison most of the year.

**Bart Battista:** If this place is difficult, is there another place to get there? I'm not familiar with the area and it's obviously not here, but is there a better place to have the hunt? Or is it straight from private lands into Desolation Canyon? Is there somewhere that would be easier to meet your objectives?

**Brad Crompton:** It would be great if there was somewhere by a road or something, but they go straight in. They swim the river into the bottom of Desolation Canyon.

**Covy Jones:** And Bart, I want to make it clear too that our goal is not to decimate this population or have negative implications for the tribe. Our goal is to create enough pressure to stay on the unit where they are managing for bison which in this case is Tribal lands. They are managing for bison. We are not at this point, so bison rarely respond to pressure.

**Bart Battista:** Right, and there's no stomach among landowners private or public to have bison in this area?

**Covy Jones:** At this point.

**Bart Battista:** Ok, thanks.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Bart. Any additional questions?

**Austin Atkinson:** Chairman, Austin here, I have a question. Any time we create a hunt where there are significant consequences for waiting periods, cause if you purchase this permit I understand your bonus points are void and you can no longer apply for bison again in your lifetime simply because of purchasing the permit. So my question is, if you purchase this permit at a DWR office, is there a waiting period? So can I go out there on the Range Creek and then they're swimming across the river so my buddy is driving into Price to buy a permit and bring it back to me. Like is there a 72 hour waiting period or anything discussed along those lines?

**Brad Crompton:** I don't know that I know the answer to that, do you Covy?

**Covy Jones:** There isn't a waiting period associated with the purchase for this permit. There with others like cougar permits and other things, there is a waiting period, with this permit there is nothing in the rule that states any period of time before you could hunt.

**Austin Atkinson:** Okay, a follow up question, are we able to turn that tag back in and surrender it 30 days before the season starts and have that waiting period reversed? I know it starts August 1st so that would have to be July 1st, but if someone gets excited and buys it, could they turn that back?

**Covy Jones:** If it followed the current rule, yes they could. The problem is you would probably buy it within the 30 day period if that makes sense. Part of this will be an educational video they'll have to watch to know all the consequences of buying this permit. And there's two sides to this too; 1- as long as we have this permit, you can buy it every year, even after your waiting periods are revoked, you can buy it every year. The other part is this is exactly the same way that we handle moose on CWMUs, conservation, expo permits, there's such a demand on the system and I'm sure you're aware of that Austin, such a demand on the system you know we looked at only if you harvest, only this or only that, but the truth is, you're getting an opportunity to hunt bison and you're not being forced it's your choice. Folks with points on another species who know they'll probably never get a chance to hunt bison will probably take advantage of this. Even if you have a few bison points you might take advantage of it then.

**Austin Atkinson:** Yeah, thank you for answering that. One other question, are we aware of licensed guide services that can go down the Green

River, do you know if the BLM issues any permits to guide services that could potentially exploit this hunt or take advantage of that?

**Brad Crompton:** Hunting guides per say, not necessarily, but there's plenty of river runners out of Moab and that would be the bigger issue is being able to run the river to get to some of these bison. There are guides in the area which will be helpful because horses or a raft will be pretty necessary in these hunts.

**Austin Atkinson:** Thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Any additional questions?

**Verland King:** Yeah, these Bison are all Tribal Bison, or is there anything from the Book Cliffs that spill over that way?

**Brad Crompton:** I don't know for certain. The vast majority of them are Tribal bison, it is possible that some of the Henry Mountain bison mixed in with some of those Tribal bison and moved in. The collar data that we have, we captured some of them and collared them and they've all been staying on Tribal land. None of the ones that we originally released on public land on the Book Cliffs have come this way and come to the Range. Most of them have ear tags where they've been rounded up by the Tribe.

**Verland King:** I just want to comment, I think this is a good thing to eliminate that herd. I know the ranches in that area are having a lot of impact from it. I don't see being able to do much with them. That's the problem with bison, you've got to be careful where you put them, sooner or later they'll cause some problems.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Verland. Any additional questions? And we'd also open up for comments at this point.

**Gene Boardman:** Gene here, I've got a question. You're wanting to change the rule. Is there any likelihood that this rule will apply somewhere else or it will be a rule that we're not really going to be happy with in a couple of years?

**Brad Crompton:** It could apply somewhere else. Unforeseen place where bison show up on a unit where there isn't a management plan and causing impact so we could ask the RAC and Wildlife Board to implement it on some other unit. Unforeseen impacts are unfortunately unforeseen so I don't know. It's new terrain.

**Covy Jones:** And Gene, that's exactly why we did this. It's kind of a 2 step process. 1, the rule change allows us to call a management plan bison hunt, and 2, we're asking you to approve a management plan bison hunt in the Range Creek area. We could end up with bison coming off the Book Cliffs or the Henry's and going places where we don't have a management plan and at that point we may ask the Board and the RAC to approve another hunt to push those



animals back. So the answer is, it's a tool we could use in the future and maybe a good thing if we get in a situation with a little bit of trouble.

**Bart Battista:** Doesn't the new rule say that the management bison may be established by the Wildlife Board in areas where management objectives are for zero bison? So you can basically do it anywhere once it's approved.

**Covy Jones:** That's correct. We'd have to come back to the Board through the RAC process and ask them to establish that hunt, but that's correct.

**Bart Battista:** If there's zero bison.

**Covy Jones:** If we have a zero bison management plan, yes.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Hey Covy, this is Kevin, the only thing I'd add to that is it can apply to any place you have an objective of zero but the other ingredient you have to have bison coming into that area. Right now this is the only place that applies.

**Covy Jones:** Yeah, that's correct, Kevin, and that's why we're only asking for this year at this point.

**Tammy Pearson:** So, I'd like to make a comment, I think this is a great opportunity and allows the flexibility for these types of issues. Like you said it's going to be a special kind of hunter that gets in there and gets the job done hopefully and creates that pressure to get them out of there. Those guys are having a lot of trouble and I think they'll appreciate the help.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Tammy. That would be my comment also, I'm excited that the Division is looking at different approaches and thinking outside the box. I'm excited that this opportunity is coming up and hopeful that some guys and gals make their dreams come true.

**Austin Atkinson:** Mr. Chair, can I make a comment here. I agree it's a good thing, we know bison are one of the smartest animals to respond to pressure, and hopefully we can curb them to do what we want them to do and not cross that river. I still have concern about, we need to keep people honest with the process of getting a permit and I don't know if it's a waiting period we should consider, but with a steep tag fee of \$513 for a resident, I just have concerns about maybe enforcement issues that could come up there. Let's keep them honest if we can.

**Brayden Richmond:** Are there any additional comments? I'd also entertain a motion at this time.

**Verland King:** Yeah, I've got a comment. The only way you're going to move those bison is in a backpack or however you move them off dead. We've learned on the Henrys that you can't haze them, you can't fence them, they go where they want to go. You won't be able to put a lot of pressure on them, the

only ones that move off there permanently will be the ones that they haul off. I like this thing we're talking about doing. I think it needs to be increased like that on the Henry's to where there's zero. You know they say there's 30 heads of (inaudible).. An over the counter tag for that for someone that wants to hunt the country, I think they ought to make it for more than just bison, maybe elk, maybe wildlife that have a zero..

**Brayden Richmond:** Vernon, and Covy, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think on the Henry's you can buy an elk tag over the counter and go hunt them.

**Covy Jones:** If you have a buck or a bull tag it's an antlerless control unit. So, what we're trying to do there is not add pressure and push bison and animals around from a lot of hunters on the mountain, but if you have a buck or bull tag or OIAL permit you can buy a cow tag and harvest that animal too. Primarily those are the folks that do harvest down on the Henrys.

**Brayden Richmond:** Okay, thank you. Any additional comments?

**Tammy Pearson:** Would you entertain a motion? I'd make a motion that we accept the recommendations of the division as presented. Seconded by Verland King.

**Austin Atkinson:** Yes.

**Bart Battista:** Yes.

**Gene Boardman:** Yes.

**Riley Roberts:** Yes.

**Chad Utley:** Yes.

**Nick Jorgensen:** Yes.

**Sean Kelly:** Yes.

**Verland King:** Yes.

**Craig Laub:** Yes.

**Tammy Pearson:** Yes.

**Dan Fletcher:** Yes.

**07:58:23 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

The following motion was made by Tammy Pearson, seconded by Verland King. Motion passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's Management Bison Hunts on the Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit recommendations as presented.**

**07:59:21 10) Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy Revisions (Action)**

**07:59:31 Electronic Public Comment Report by Kevin Bunnell, Regional Supervisor**

**Kevin Bunnell:** Yes, this is managing predator wildlife species. Again the majority of the people were neutral, which actually kind of surprised me, 28% opposed, and 15% supported this proposal.

**Brayden Richmond:** Those are really strange public comments to me, I'm really surprised on this one.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Yeah, I am too. I read the comments and the written comments are mostly in support of this concept.

**Brayden Richmond:** Strongly supportive I would say. Kind of an interesting one. Alright we'll open it up to questions from the RAC.

**08:00:15 Questions from RAC Members**

**Craig Laub:** In looking at the presentation, I was surprised the number of deer the cougars kill, and what my question is, you're talking about a mature cougar killing 50 deer a year or something like that?

**Darren DeBlois:** Complicated answer, but generally across the west if you average it out between males and females with kittens they generally kill a deer a week. They kill other things too, but that seems to be a rough estimate and it seems to hold true to some of the studies we've looked at here in Utah as well. They do eat a lot of deer and that becomes significant when deer populations are way below what the habitat can support. Generally they'll either slow population growth, or in some cases they may inhibit the deer population from growing over a significant amount of time. That's definitely what we're looking at.

**Brayden Richmond:** Darren, again you made some great comments in the Northern RAC and I was wondering if you'd summarize that again. You discussed in that one that this agenda item is simply to align with legislation that has already passed. You're not asking for anything additional, you're just aligning with legislation that has passed, correct?

**Darren DeBlois:** That's right, this and the next agenda item are both due to legislation that has passed this session. In addition to that, as Covy pointed out earlier, we've got a lot of good data on our big game population, especially our deer population and we feel like it's really important that we use that data on this. So it's both things. The legislature requires us to do 4 things in statue. One is we need to determine whether predators are having a detrimental effect on a population. Secondly, we need to remove predators if that's the case. The third thing that we're not addressing directly with this, but you'll see as we move forward that the legislature wants us to provide an opportunity for big game hunters to take predators in the fall. The final thing is we need to report back to the legislature each year on how we're doing. So that's what came out of it, and that's really what's driving this.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Darren. Additional questions? Bart, go ahead.

**Bart Battista:** Yeah, so I have a question. It says in the recommendations that if determination is made that the predators are the cause of the population decline. How do you tease out predators or just too many hunting permits?

**Darren DeBlois:** There's a couple of things we'll be looking at. Ballard did a paper in 2001, they actually did a review of literature in the West. There's certain conditions under which predators can have a detrimental effect on a mule deer herd. One of the things we'll be looking at is where the herd is in relation to carrying capacity on the range. The closer that herd is to what the landscape can support, the less effect predators will have. There will be some other cause of loss of mortality or they'll over shoot the capacity of the range and damage the range and you'll get a pretty hard drop off. So that's one instance and that's one thing that we'll be looking at. That doesn't always necessarily relate to the management objective. Sometimes those are closely aligned and sometimes they may not be, so we need to look closely at that. The other part of this is if you're going to do predator management, you've got to be aggressive. So you really need to work hard to reduce the densities. I'm not talking about eliminating all the predators on the landscape, but if you don't eliminate enough, you won't see the results you're looking for.

**Bart Battista:** I remember there's a 70 percent reduction and when you have those areas that have a very small population it would seem that, are we going to couple increased predator permits with decreased hunting permits as well? It seems to be doing both, but if we wanted to increase opportunity, even in these lower population areas, you maintain opportunity for hunting but with so we're just going to increase predator tags. It seems like we should do both increased predator tags and bite the bullet and decrease opportunity like we're doing in some of these areas now.

**Darren DeBlois:** Right. I think in the terms of the predator management plan, there would be two instances where we would see that. One would be when we've had a significant drop on the prey species without a correlation drop in predator numbers. And that is what we've seen recently. We see these environmental die-offs caused by drought and hard winters, but predators especially lions don't react immediately to that prey base, in fact in some studies we see they can maintain their numbers and still take

the same number of deer 8 years out. That's an instance where we'd want to get in and manage that population down. The other scenario that we mentioned in the policy, and what Covy mentioned earlier, is if we anticipate a large die off, trying to be predictive, we can see the body condition of the animals going into winter and we anticipate significant losses, we'd want to get permits out there that same winter rather than waiting a whole calendar year. And really those are the two instances for this policy that we'd be looking at. But again the policy relies on us making the determination that the predators are the issue and that would be largely the responsibility of a district biologist who knows what's going on in his unit and can make justification on why predators are the issue.

**Covy Jones:** And Bart, I think we can do a better job at answering your question too, and really it depends. I think the sentiment is that predators shouldn't take the brunt of all this right? We should look at reducing mule deer permits where we can, and we definitely agree with that. The problem is, if it's a population issue, it will not help increase that population.

**Bart Battista:** And I understand that completely, yes. I understand there is going to be a lag in predator population response to diminished prey. I get it completely, and we're going to have to take some active management measures. I just wanted to make sure we're considering both options.

**Covy Jones:** That's a very fair point Bart. If we're increasing predator tags it would make sense to almost always reduce antlerless permits in the area.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you Bart. Any additional questions?

**Gene Boardman:** Gene here. Yeah I've got a question. Was this legislation absolutely necessary? Didn't the director of the DWR have this authority in the first place?

**Darren DeBlois:** Largely, yes. In fact he exercised that authority this winter when he reopened some units that were closed and reopened some quotas. The legislation gives the Division some direction. Obviously after last year's deer hunt there was quite a bit of public sentiment to make sure that we were doing this, so the legislation does put these requirements in statute that is a little bit of a level above our rules. But this policy has been in place since.. mainly what we did in the policy was add this new data that we got and use that to help us make decisions.

**Tammy Pearson:** Is this comment or question time?

**Brayden Richmond:** We're still on questions, we'll get to comments soon, I'm sure. Any additional questions? Alright Tammy, we're ready for your comment.

**Tammy Pearson:** I just wanted to say that during the legislative session there was a huge push to have that language in there and I think the intent from talking to Rep. Albrecht was that this gave the Division more support in statute to

do what needed to be done. They were getting a lot of grief from some of the other groups that would live to see more predators and a lot less hunters, and cattlemen, and livestock on the mountains. I really want to commend the legislature for getting this passed, it was pretty controversial, but I think in the end it will help the Division do what they need to do and take care of these predators.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you. Any other comments?

**08:13:10 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

**Gene Boardman:** Gene here, I want to go back to the question. With all this ferber with predator control, it's up to everything and everybody. Is it still against the law to kill kittens and cubs and nursing cats and nursing sows?

**Darren DeBlois:** Yes, we didn't change those rules.

**Brayden Richmond:** Any additional comments? If not I'd entertain a motion. I want to see someone new make a motion.

**Tammy:** That's what I was going to say, come on guys.

**Riley Roberts:** I'll make the motion to accept as presented.

The following motion was made by Riley Roberts, seconded by Sean Kelly and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy Revisions as presented.**

**Austin Atkinson:** Yes.

**Bart Battista:** Yes.

**Gene Boardman:** Yes.

**Chad Utley:** Yes.

**Riley Roberts:** Yes.

**Nick Jorgensen:** Yes.

**Sean Kelly:** Yes.

**Verland King:** Yes.

**Craig Laub:** Yes.

**Tammy Pearson:** Yes.

**Dan Fletcher:** Yes.

**Motions passes unanimously**

**08:14:29 11) Cougar and Bear Rule Amendments (Action)**

Presentations could be viewed at  
<https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

**08:14:45 Electronic Public Comment Report by Kevin Bunnell, Regional Supervisor**

**Kevin Bunnell:** Yes, this one looks more like the comments that you read that would lead you to believe in terms of support. This is 55% supported the proposal, 10% opposed, and 34% were neutral.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Kevin. And this is a separate agenda item so let's open it up to questions even though we may have covered some of the questions we had already. Any questions from the RAC?

**08:15:10 Questions from RAC Members**

**Nick Jorgensen:** Remind me again the difference between 10 and 11. I'm fading.

**Brayden Richmond:** Darren, would you mind?

**Darren DeBlois:** Yes, this may help with the discussion too. This one more than the last one changes our role to directly reflect the House Bill 223. So that statute trumps our rule. This is just an amendment to the rule to reflect that statute. So really hopefully that makes it easy for everybody, but we did need to make the changes.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you. And I apologize I probably confused that last agenda item with my comments a little bit. They're still very related. Any additional questions? Any comments? I'd entertain a motion if we don't have any questions or comments.

**08:16:31 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

The following motion was made by Chad Utley, seconded by Bart Battista and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Cougar and Bear Rule Amendments as presented.**

**Austin Atkinson:** Yes.

**Bart Battista:** Yes.

**Gene Boardman:** Yes.

**Riley Roberts:** Yes.

**Chad Utley:** Yes.

**Nick Jorgensen:** Yes.

**Sean Kelly:** Yes.

**Verland King:** Yes.

**Craig Laub:** Yes.

**Tammy Pearson:** Yes.

**Dan Fletcher:** Yes.

**Motions passes unanimously**

The following motion was made by Chad Utley, seconded by Bart Battista and passed unanimously.

**08:17:31      12) Other Business (Contingent)**

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you everybody. This went really well. You never know what technology will do in meetings but this went really well, very few problems. I appreciate everyone's efforts, I appreciate you taking the time to do this, and I appreciate the public that was there watching. We look forward to the day when we can have more interaction and enjoy the public comments a little bit more. With that we'll adjourn the meeting.

**08:18:58      Meeting adjourned.**



**SOUTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING  
APRIL 15, 2020  
SUMMARY**

**1) APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES**

The following motion was made by Kent Johnson, seconded by Garrish Willis and passed 12/12.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda and minutes.**

**2) BUCKS, BULLS, AND OIAL PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2020**

The following motion was made by Kent Johnson, seconded by Gerrish Willis and passed 12/12.

**MOTION: I move that we reduce the overall number of general season buck deer permits from 1,300 to 1,000.**

The following motion was made by Jeff Christensen, seconded by Lynn Sitterud and passed 11/1.

**MOTION: I move that we decrease general buck deer permits on the Nine Mile from 1,650 to 1,350.**

The following motion was made by Scoot Flannery, seconded by Kent Johnson and passed 11/1.

**MOTION: I move that we drop the buck deer permits on the San Juan/Abajo from a 500 decrease to an 850 decrease.**

The following motion was made by Eric Luke, seconded by Darren Olsen and passed 9/3.

**MOTION: I move that we decrease the Manti buck deer permits by 500.**

The following motion and amendment was made by Dana Truman, seconded by Kirk Johnson and passed 10/2.

**MOTION: I move that we decrease the Cache buck deer permits by 800.**

The following motion was made by Eric Luke, seconded by Lynn Sitterud and passed 11/1.

**MOTION: I move that we add one bison resident archer tag on the Henry Mountains.**

The following motion was made by Eric Luke, seconded by Lynn Sitterud, and failed 9/3.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the bighorn sheep permit numbers on the Stansbury, Fillmore, Oak Creek, Kaiparowits, Zion Desert Bighorn, and the Jack Creek Units as presented by SFW.**

The following motion was made by Scoot Flannery, seconded by Kent Johnson and passed 12/12.

**MOTION: I move the San Juan/Abajo Unit late season muzzleloader be decreased to 5 permits.**

The following motion was made by Dana Truman, seconded by Brad Richman and passed 12/12.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder as presented.**

**3) ANTLERLESS PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2020**

The following motion was made by Kent Johnson, seconded by Jeff Christensen and passed 7/5.

**MOTION: I move we reduce the antlerless tags on the Book Cliffs to a total of 150 tags, with no more than 15 being in the roadless area.**

The following motion was made by Todd Thorne, seconded by Dana Truman and passed 12/12.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the recommendations**

**4) R657-37 CWMU RULE AMENDMENTS**

The following motion was made by Kent Johnson, seconded by Todd Thorne and passed 11, with one abstention.

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

**5) 2020 CWMU ANTLERLESS PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following motion was made by Brad Richman, seconded by Dana Truman and passed 12/12.

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

**6) MANAGEMENT BISON HUNTS – NINE MILE, RANGE CREEK UNIT**

The following motion was made by Eric Luke, seconded by Jeff Christensen and passed 12/12.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the recommendations as long as it is revisited yearly.**

**7) MANAGING PREDATORY WILDLIFE SPECIES POLICY REVISIONS**

The following motion was made by Jeff Christensen, seconded by Brad Richman and passed 11/1.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the recommendations presented.**

**8) COUGAR AND BEAR RULE AMENDMENTS**

The following motion was made by Todd Thorne, seconded by Scoot Flannery and passed 12/12.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the recommendations as presented.**

- 6:32 Chairman Trisha called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, reviewed the meeting procedures, and had the Board and RAC members introduce themselves.
- 6:39 Approval of the Agenda
- Kent Johnson: Motion to approve
- Garrish Willis: Second
- Motion Passed (12/12)
- 18:42 Approval of the Minutes  
The following motion was made by and seconded by and passed.  
Motion: I move that we approve the minutes.
- 6:40 Update from the past Wildlife Board Meeting by RAC Vice Chair
- 6:44 Regional Update
- 6:51 Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2020
- Public Comment Report by Chris Wood
- 6:58 Questions from the RAC
- 7:10 RAC Discussion/DWR Clarification and Motions
- 7:17 Questions from RAC Members
- Jeff Christensen: Can I see the Nine Mile Unit?
- 7:22 Steven Duke: How confident are you in your success rate?
- 2:24 Scoot Flannery: Is it possible to cut more on the Elk Ridge?
- 7:27 Eric Luke: If you change fawn survival rate, how much does that change your buck to doe ratio on your harvest?
- 7:30 Darren Olsen: Do we have any counts that would skew that?
- 7:37 Dana Truman: Is now a good time to address the buck to doe ratios?
- 7:39 RAC Discussion

7:40 Kent Johnson: I am concerned

7:45 Scoot Flannery: Can I comment

7:45 Eric Luke: Yeah. Two big concerns...

7:48 Kirk Player: Yeah. Just to add to Eric...

7:50 Todd Thorne: The comment with the Manti that I have....

7:51 Dana Truman: I was wondering what the other RACs said....

7:52 Jeff Christensen: Sorry to butt in...

7:55 MOTIONS

7:55 Kent Johnson : I'd like to make a motion that we reduce the overall number of general season permits from 1,300 to 1,000

Garrish Willis: I'll second

Motion: Unanimous

7:58 Jeff Christensen: General season 1650 to 1350 on the Nine Mile

Motion Passed (11/1)

8:01 Scoot Flannery: I'd like to make a motion to drop the tags on the San Juan Abajo from a 500 decrease to 850.

Motion Passed (11/1)

8:03 Eric Luke: Motion to cut the Manti general season deer tag by 500

Darren Olsen: Second

Motion Passed (9/3)

8:06 Dana Truman: Motion to ask for an additional 800 deer decrease on the Cash

Kirk Johnson: Second

Motion Passed (10/2)

8:08 Eric Luke: Motion to add one bison resident archery tag  
Lynn Sitterud: Second  
Motion Passed (11/1)

8:17 Eric Luke: Motion to accept SFW recommendations...

8:19 Brad Richman: I don't feel comfortable  
Motion Failed (9/3)

8:22 Scoot Flannery: Motion on the late season San Juan Abajo to reduce the tags to 5

8:23 Motion Passed (12/12)

8:25 Dana Truman: Motion to accept the remainder as presented  
Brad Richman: Second  
Motion Passed (12/12)

8:27 Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2020

8:27 Public Comments read by Chris Wood

8:27 Questions Regarding Antlerless

8:34 Kent Johnson:

8:41 Kent Johnson: I've got a question for anyone regarding feral horse

8:44 Motions

8:44 Kent Johnson: Reduce the cow tags in the Book Cliffs to 150 and 15 in the roadless area  
Jeff Christensen: Second

8:48 Motion Passed (7/5)

8:50 Todd Thorne: Motion to accept the remainder of the antlerless recommendations  
Dana Truman: Second

8:55 Motion Passed (12/12)

8:56 CWMU Rule Amendments

8:56 Public comments read by Chris Wood

8:58 Questions from the RAC

8:58 Steven Duke: Are you pulling teeth?

9:00 Motions

9:00 Kent Johnson: Motion to approve the recommendations  
Todd Thorne: Second  
Motion Passed (11; one abstention)

9:02 CWMU Antlerless Recommendations

9:03 Motion  
Brad Richman: Motion to accept the recommendations  
Dana Truman: Second  
Motion Passed (12/12)

9:05 Management Bison Hunts – Nine Mile Range Creek

9:05 Questions

9:06 Dana Truman: What was the rationale to start the hunt in August?

9:08 Eric Luke: What's the thought process to having unlimited over the counter tags?

9:14 Comments from the RAC

9:14 Jeff Christensen: We are willing to try this.

9:17 Dana Truman: Clarification on the Once in a Lifetime

9:25 Eric Luke: Do you want to make this a year by year basis

9:26 Motions  
Eric Luke: Motion to support Bison Hunt as long as it is revisited yearly  
Jeff Christensen: Second  
Motion Passed (12/12)

9:27 Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy Revisions  
Questions

9:28 Steven Duke: Concerns about COVID-19 effecting the bear hunt

9:30 Comments or Clarifications

9:30 Jeff Christensen: Do we have preference for using aerial...

9:37 Motions  
Jeff Christensen: I have a motion to support the recommendations  
Brad Richman: Second  
Motion Passed (11/1)

9:38 Cougar and Bear Rule Amendments

9:39 Questions

9:40 Comment

9:40 Gerrish Willis: I wish the Legislation would stay out of wildlife biology

9:41 Motion  
Todd Thorne: A motion to accept  
Scoot Flannery: Second  
Motion Passed: (12/12)

9:42 Motion to adjourn the meeting

9:43 Meeting Adjourned



# Northeastern Region RAC Meeting

## Video Conference

April 16, 2020

The meeting streamed live at <https://youtu.be/TxkkGlepZgc>

**Thursday, April 16, 2020, 5:30 pm**

- |  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda<br>– Brett Prevedel, RAC chair   | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 2. Approval of Minutes<br>– Brett Prevedel, RAC chair  | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 3. Wildlife Board Update<br>– Brett Prevedel, RAC chair  | <b>INFORMATIONAL</b> |
| 4. DWR Update<br>– Miles Hanberg, Regional Supervisor  | <b>INFORMATIONAL</b> |
| 5. Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2020<br>- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator                | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 6. Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2020<br>- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator                            | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 7. R657-37 CWMU Rule Amendments<br>- Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator                    | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 8. 2020 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations<br>– Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator     | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 9. Management Bison Hunts – Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit<br>– Brad Crompton, Assistant Wildlife Manager SE      | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 10. Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy Revisions<br>– Darren DeBlois, Game Mammals Program Coordinator | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 11. Cougar and Bear Rule Amendments<br>– Darren DeBlois, Game Mammals Program Coordinator                      | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 12. Other Business<br>– Brett Prevedel, RAC chair  | <b>CONTINGENT</b>    |

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

**Northeastern Region RAC Meeting**  
April 16, 2020  
Vernal, Utah  
**Summary of Motions**

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

The following motion was made by Dan Abeyta, seconded by Brad Horrocks and passed unanimously.

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

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

The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Brad Horrocks and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: To approve the minutes of the last Northeastern RAC meeting.**

3) Bucks, Bulls and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2020 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Brad Horrocks and passed unanimously. 10 in favor and 0 opposed.

**MOTION: Accept the Division's recommendations as presented.**

4) Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2020

The following motion was made by Brad Horrocks, seconded by Dan Abeyta and passed unanimously. 10 in favor and 0 opposed.

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

5) R657-37 CWMU Rule Amendments (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Rebekah Jones and passed unanimously. 10 in favor and 0 opposed.

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

6) 2020 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Ritchie Anderson and passed unanimously. 11 in favor and 0 opposed. (Jeff Tanaguchi joined the meeting just before this agenda item).

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

7) Management Bison Hunts – Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Brad Horrocks, seconded by Dan Abeyta and passed 10 in favor and 1 against. Jamie Arrive from the Ute Tribe opposed

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

8) Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy Revisions (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Dan Abeyta, seconded by Natasha Hadden and passed unanimously 10 in favor and 0 opposed.

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

9) Cougar and Bear Rule Amendments

The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Jeff Tanaguchi and passed 10 in favor and one abstention (Daniel Davis).

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

Motion to adjourn meeting was made by Brad Horrocks and seconded by Ritchie Anderson. Passed unanimous.

**MOTION: To adjourn meeting.**

**Northeastern RAC Meeting**  
April 16, 2020  
Online Attendance

**RAC Board**

Brett Prevedel – RAC Chair  
Ritchie Anderson  
Jamie Arrive  
Daniel Davis  
Brad Horrocks  
Mike Smith

Dan Abeyta  
Joe Arnold  
Dick Bess  
Natasha Hadden  
Rebekah Jones  
Jeff Tanaguchi

**Wildlife Board**

Randy Dearth

**DWR Personnel**

Miles Hanberg  
Randall Thacker  
Amy VandeVoot  
Greg Hansen  
Clint Sampson  
Jace Taylor  
Tonya Kieffer-Selby  
Staci Coons

Dax Mangus  
Covy Jones  
Darren DeBloois  
Brad Crompton  
Derrick Ewell  
Kent Hersey  
Chad Wilson

**April 16, 2020**

**00:00:15**

Chairman Brett Prevedel called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, reviewed the meeting procedures, and had the Board and RAC members introduce themselves.

**Brett Prevedel:** I'd like to start by welcoming the RAC members and we'll start with a roll call of who's there, if you'd just turn on your mikes and say your name. Say yes if you're here.

**Dan Abeyta:** Yes.

**Ritchie Anderson:** Yes.

**Joe Arnold:** -

**Brett Prevedel:** I believe Joe is here, I've seen him on the screen, so we'll skip over that.

**Joe Arnold:** Yes.

**Jamie Arrive:** I'm here.

**Brett Prevedel:** And I assume Julius Murray is not?

**Jamie Arrive:** That is correct.

**Dick Bess:** Yes, I'm here.

**Daniel Davis:** Yes.

**Natasha Hadden:** I'm here.

**Brad Horrocks:** Yes.

**Rebekah Jones:** Yes, I'm here.

**Mike Smith:** Yes, I'm here.

**Jeff Tanaguchi:** -

**Brett Prevedel:** Has Jeff logged on? Ok, we will move ahead without Jeff, we're not sure if he's going to make it or not. We'd like to welcome the DWR staff, especially those that went through all the work of providing the presentation for the public and all the RAC members. And you did an excellent job on that. They will be available to answer questions through the meeting, and those that presented for each respected topic are Covy Jones, Chad Wilson, Brad Compton, Darren DeBloois,

Riley Peck, and I believe Marty Bushman and Greg Hansen are present at their questions on the legal side of things. The DWR personnel are also available on the broadcast for the RAC to ask questions. We'd like to also welcome the public on Youtube. They do not have the opportunity to speak, but they presented comments with a process that went through the DWR website. We have them and at each topic as we discuss them we will bring up the comments, address them and discuss them. We'd like to welcome Randy Dearth from the Wildlife Board. With that I believe we can start the agenda.

**00:04:08**      **1) Approval of Agenda (Action)**

The following motion was made by Dan Abeyta, seconded by Brad Horrocks and passed unanimously.

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

**Dan Abeyta:** Yes.

**Ritchie Anderson:** Yes.

**Joe Arnold:** Yes.

**Jamie Arrive:** Yes.

**Dick Bess:** Yes.

**Daniel Davis:** Yes.

**Natasha Hadden:** Yes.

**Brad Horrocks:** Yes.

**Rebekah Jones:** Yes.

**Mike Smith:** Yes.

**Brett Prevedel:** Has everyone had the opportunity to review the minutes from the last meeting that were emailed out? If so I would entertain any suggested edits at this time. Ok, if there are none, I'd entertain a motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting.

**00:06:12**      **2) Approval of Minutes (Action)**

The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Brad Horrocks and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the January 7, 2020 Wildlife Board Meeting.**

**Dan Abeyta:** Yes.

**Ritchie Anderson:** Yes.

**Joe Arnold:** Yes.

**Jamie Arrive:** Yes.

**Dick Bess:** Yes.

**Daniel Davis:** Yes.

**Natasha Hadden:** Yes.

**Brad Horrocks:** Yes.

**Rebekah Jones:** Yes.

**Mike Smith:** Yes.

**Brett Prevedel:** We will now move to the update from the Wildlife Board and Dan Abeyta attended that meeting in January. He's going to take a few moments now and update the RAC on the previous Wildlife Board meeting.

**00:07:29 3) Wildlife Board Meeting (Informational)**

Dan Abeyta updated the RAC.

**Dan Abeyta:** Thank you Mr. Chairman. The action item on R-657-33 Black Bear R-657-10 Cougar rule amendments were broken up into 3 separate motions, so I'll just go that direction here. The first motion, which was passed unanimously by the Board, was a motion to add an ethics course for the online bear orientation and institute an online pursuit ethics course prior to purchasing a permit. Again that passed unanimously. Secondly, and there was much discussion over this, as we had in our own RAC meeting, but secondly the next motion here, which also passed unanimously is as follows; the motion that was made is on those units that have 10 or fewer permits that there would be no change to those units with 10 or fewer permits. There would be an increase of permits by 25% on the Beaver, Chalk Creek and both the Book Cliff units. On all the other remaining units there would be a 10% increase. Also it was voted on that the Board will defer to the Division of Wildlife to determine the permit distribution among the the available seasons on units that have some crowding issues. If you remember correctly we spend a lot of time talking about the La Sals and the San Juans, so in particular those two units. That was the second of the three motions that passed. The final one on this bear and

cougar topic was that, and this one also passed unanimously, was that we accept the balance of the proposal that the Division made. We accepted as presented, including, there was a red line correction on the 8 dog limit for both the summer pursuit and restricted summer pursuit seasons. That was everything for bears and cougars. The next action item was a wolf management action plan, and that passed unanimously. The next item was a COR rule amendment for brine shrimp, that passed unanimously, and that was amendments that the Division presented on that. The last one was on a prohibited species variance request and that passed unanimously as well; it has to do with Pacific White Legged Shrimp. Mr. Chairman, that's all I had to report on.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, thank you. We'll now move onto a report from Miles Hanberg the Regional DWR supervisor and he will provide us an update.

**00:11:14**      **4) DWR Update (Informational)**

Miles Hanberg updated the RAC on all regional activities.

**Miles Hanberg:** Alright, thanks Brett. I'll give a brief update on a few things that have been going on in the Region. As you all are very much aware Covid-19 has had an impact on what we've been doing, but we've been able to get out and do a lot of work in the field still, and for a lot of our biologist I don't think it's had a major impact on our work load, but certainly we're limiting the amount of people in our office at a time to try to follow social distancing and things of that nature. One of the things along those lines is we're trying to encourage the public as much as possible to utilize our online resources as much as possible for buying permits and those types of things to limit the amount of traffic coming in and out of offices. Those options are out there and we encourage people to take advantage of those. With Covid-19 it's delayed some of our seasonal staff hiring on some of our different programs, so we're anxious to see if we can get through this virus situation so we can get some of our seasonal staff on board. For right now we're kind of holding off on those for at least this month. That's had a little bit of an impact, but our folks are staying busy out in the field. So to give some updates on our sections, in our law enforcement section Officer Brandon White is leaving us, and he's heading to the Southern Region, he took a promotion as a Lieutenant down there in the Panguitch area. His position will be refilled by Ray Windsor, he's going to be coming here shortly to fill that Book Cliff conservation officer district that was vacated by Brandon. We're starting to gear up to cover boat ramps and things for our AIS coverage this year. We've already started coverage at Flaming Gorge just to make sure that we can prevent any spread of AIS. Incidentally Lake Powell was shut down for launching. There were some boats that left Lake Powell that have been tagged, that have been instructed to dry for at least 30 days. We're verifying at Flaming Gorge that none of those boats launch within that drying period window. That as well as any AIS potentials in other states that may try to come to Flaming Gorge specifically. A lot of AIS lines in law enforcement. We've hired George Dimick as the AIS specialist. He's replacing Jessica Wooten who left to pursue some other career opportunities just in the last few months. Our Wildlife section has been busy, out in the field doing LET counts, and also starting on spring deer classifications. Those numbers have been going well, I understand that our deer survival is looking pretty good this year, both the adults and our fawns. So that's some good news from our Wildlife section. Our aquatics section just completed a Walleye Spawn from Starvation Reservoir. It was a pretty small effort this year due to Covid-19 but they did get some eggs collected from Starvation. Those eggs will be treated and sterilized and then those



fish pass the test for sterility that we restock into Red Fleet Reservoir. Our aquatics staff is also gearing up to do our wild egg takes for places like Lake Canyon and Sheep Creek. Those will be egg takes for Colorado River Cutthroat Trout. Our habitat section is working closely with some of our partners on the Strawberry River to work on restoration and emergency stabilization efforts. As many of you know the Dollar Ridge fire had a profound effect on the watershed of the Strawberry River. So there's a lot of interest to get some stability in that Riverbottom for a variety of reasons and we have folks that are working closely on that effort to make sure we can get some good habitat improvement in the process. Unfortunately, with Covid-19 a lot of our outreach events have been cancelled, at least the month of April into May. We had some cool events this year with a mountain goat watch over at Rock Creek. We had goats there for people to see. Unfortunately we had to cancel those, but our staff remains busy working on other things and planning future events. One thing I'll mention with outreach is we are still able to take dedicated hunter projects on. Those projects will definitely have social distancing parameters associated with them. The last thing I wanted to mention, we've given an update to each RAC meeting the last year, given an update on our Book Cliff working group. That group is a multi agency group approach with ranchers, wildlife agencies, wildlife groups, anyways, this group was put together to look at aggressively some of the issues with habitat, deer and elk populations. That group met for about a year and we've come up with a pretty good plan and strategies, and activities that we've identified to begin implementation. The group will continue to meet semi-annually to go over what's in plan, what we need to work on. But we have a lot of activities in the works for this current year. So we're anxious to get those implemented and try to make a difference for rangelands and watersheds in the Book Cliffs. So, I'd like to thank Brett Prevedel, he's helped facilitate that group and we really appreciate his time and move that route forward. I think that's all that I have to share for a regional update tonight, unless we have any questions.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thanks Miles. Any questions from the RAC regarding Miles? Ok we will roll into the next agenda item. These are the items that had the videos from the specialists at DWR that you've all seen. The way that we'll do this is I'm going to.. The first one is Buck, Bulls, and OIAL recommendations. I will just briefly summarize the changes. Then I will turn it over to Miles for a summary of the public comment that has come in. Then we will open it up for questions and all the DWR biologists and specialists are on this call, so you can address them to the local biologist or the individual who did the presentation, however you wish to do it. Then after some discussion we'll move on to trying to come to a consensus and take a vote. Any questions on that process?

- 00:19.02**      **5) Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL Permit Recommendations for 2020 (Action)**  
A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: <https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok for general season deer units the summary is there were no recommended increases on any units. 10 units had no change recommended on the number of permits. 19 units had a recommendation of decreases on permits. The total

permits being recommended are 80,725 which is a 9,175 permit reduction from 2019. On the premium limited entry hunts, which is the Henry Mountain and the Paunsaugunt there are no recommended changes, that's for the LE permits and the management permits. The new hunt we had, the handgun, archery, muzzleloader, shotgun units that we did in the fall, they did pass at the Wildlife Board meeting. They've limited them. There were 3 units if you remember right and one of them was a portion of the Book Cliffs and there's a recommendation to have 5 permits in each of the three units for a total of 15. We're recommending 100 LE deer permits in increase overall. The spike bull elk, and any bull elk, the season is remaining at 15,000 spike permits and 15,000 bull permits which is no change from the past. The youth bull elk permits is recommended at 500 which is no change. The summary of all the LE bull elk permits is virtually the same, but it's 2,938 was the previous number and it's 2,943 now. As we move toward our region there were some recommended changes so we can address them individually. There was a recommendation to increase 86 buck pronghorn permits which gives the state a total of 1,147. Recommend adding 10 bull moose permits, which will give the state a total of 107. Bison permits were recommended to reduce bison permits significantly from 242 to 115, and I know we'll address that later in the agenda also. Bighorn sheep, an increase of 10 from 56-66. Desert bighorn sheep increase 13. The only other thing was the Rocky Mountain Goats were basically stable, a recommended decrease of 4 which is from 126 to 122. With that I'll turn it over to Miles for the public comment. The process on this is they had an opportunity to review the same presentation that you did from the specialist and I believe you all saw the comments come in individually. But, Miles will summarize this for us regarding the Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL.

**00:22:58 Electronic Public Comment Report by Miles Hanberg, Regional Supervisor**

**Miles Hanberg:** Alright, thanks Brett. It's a little surprising, in this region we only received 10 electronic comments, that's a little lower than I would have expected. So keep that in mind with the state that's not a huge sample size. Nonetheless 40% of the respondents supported the BBOIAL recommendations, 40% were neutral, and 20% opposed the proposal. You all had a chance to look at those comments, so I won't get too much in depth. Some mentioned they'd like to see some reductions in units that there weren't reductions or make more reductions that weren't recommended. That's the bulk of the comments that I was able to decipher. I'll turn it back to you Brett.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, we also had a few letters come in. The Mule Deer Foundation (MDF) was in support of the recommendation. The Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife (SFW) had a few specific recommendations, I'll just read through them so you know what they were, in regards to the BBOIAL. They were recommending less of an increase on the Fillmore/Oak Creek bighorn sheep unit, they were recommending 10 instead of 14. Stansbury Mountain bighorn sheep unit, they would recommend leaving it at 3 instead of going to 5 which was recommended. Zion bighorn desert sheep, they were also recommending they stay at 2019 numbers. Kaiparowits West and East desert sheep, they were recommending a different distribution of the permits on the East and West instead of the way it was recommended. And then they were opposed to the ewe hunt for the bighorn sheep that was proposed on the Newfoundland Mountains. Jack Creek Mountain bighorn, they recommend leaving the permits at 3 as in the past. I believe that's all their comments on the bucks and bulls. Generally I think they were all the way

opposed to increasing tags, and there was a slight increase on all those units. The Utah Archery Association (UAA) sent a letter in. They supported the recommendations with one exception, and that was the bison Henry Mountains archery permit which has only 2 permits recommended. One is a non resident and one is a resident and the bonus point would not come into play if there was only one tag, so they were recommending there be 2 tags so one could go to the random draw and one to the bonus point. I believe that was all the letters. We got some other letters regarding antlerless, but with that we will open it up to questions from the RAC.

### **00:26:59 Questions from RAC Members**

**Dan Abeyta:** I have two questions. My first question is the significant reduction on bison permits, the permits for this year. From 242 permits down to 115. I know that went up quite a bit last year, or at least it seems like it increased quite a bit last year, so I guess I'm just looking for the rationale behind that increase, I might have missed that.

**Covy Jones:** Yeah I can speak to the Henry's if someone else wants to speak to the Book Cliffs. On the Henry's, you're right, we did get into those bison, we hit them pretty hard the last couple of years because of the drought and some other things, but the other thing we saw on the Henry's Dan is our cow/calf ratios were some of the poorest we've ever seen. With this drought we saw it impacted deer with survival and we saw it impacted bison differently in our cow/calf ratio. We ended up with 14 calves/100 cows. We had to seriously reduce permits on the Henry's. Anyone from the region, Clint or Dax can speak on the Book Cliffs.

**Clint Sampson:** Ok, I'll give it a shot, you guys may want to turn your volume down because I don't know how loud to talk into this thing. And I'm kind of jealous of Covy's camera angle on the side. That's pretty classy, how many camera men do you have over there, like 3 or 4? Anyway as far as Book Cliffs bison, Dan, it basically came down to trying to find new strategies to harvest bison in the right areas. So last year we had extremely high success in our hunts. We put a hurt on those herds that are easily accessible in the roaded area and the majority of our bison population is kind of residing in the roadless in the fall. So if we kept our numbers where they were last year we would continue to wipe out those herds that were easily accessible in the roaded area. So as you can see if you look at our new hunt structure, we have a lot of new hunts, a lot of new ideas to try and take advantage of bison where they are and not continue to put the pressure on where we could damage trying to grow a healthy herd across the unit.

**Dan Abeyta:** Clint, another question, did the proposal from the SE region on the over counter bison tags, I know we haven't gotten to that in the agenda yet but, that proposal, did that factor into the proposed decrease in bison tags on the Book Cliffs?

**Clint Sampson:** No. And Covy would be able to speak on that on a statewide level, but that's a separate issue I think that you're asking about there.

**Covy Jones:** Clint you nailed it, they're different bison. I understand you all have that big Book Cliffs bison unit out there, but they're different bison that are crossing the river that are coming in there.

**Dan Abeyta:** Thank you. The other question I had was related to the increase of Rocky Mountain Sheep permits. Which units were those on? Which regions or units on the 10 increase permit proposal?

**Covy Jones:** On Rocky's specifically?

**Dan Abeyta:** Yes, on Rocky's specifically.

**Covy Jones:** Let me bring that up on the RAC packet real quick. A lot of those were across the Oak Creek where last time we flew the Oak Creeks we counted 70 rams and Jace, correct me if I'm wrong, but over 30 of those were class 3 or class 4 rams which is what we're trying to harvest. Basically that was flight data that shows we have a lot more sheep on that unit than we anticipated. They've grown, they've done well, and that's a unit where we're worried about having too high ram/ewe ratios and having rams leave. There's a lot of possibility for disease surrounding the unit so we're managing to the lower objective to keep all the rams on the unit safe. A Lot increase there, Jace are there any other big increases?

**Jace Taylor:** That's the only big increase. The Pilot Mountains, we alternate years with Nevada, that was in Nevadas hands last year, it's in Utah's hands this year. Small increases and small decreases among the rest of them. The only significant one is the Oak Creek one. We had a new flight, as Covy said, counted 70 rams, 38 of them were class 3 and 4 which is basically rams that are 6 years old and older and that's the significant increase going from 4 permits last year going to 14 permits in 2020.

**Dan Abeyta:** I see, so none of those 10 Rocky Mountain permits are in the NE region?

**Jace Taylor:** Increases, no not as far as increases. You have the North Slope units, we divided the units last year, there was one unit up there in North Slope that had 5 permits, it was split into 2 units this time around and they're offering 2 permits in 1 and 3 in the other, so that's still 5 permits. The Avintiquin isn't being hunted, so no, none of those permits... and Dax or any of the biologists if I'm missing something jump in, but I don't think any of the increases are in the NE region.

**Brett Prevedel:** We're actually down about 5 tags in the NE region on the Rocky Mountain Bighorn summary.

**Dan Abeyta:** Thanks a lot guys.

**Brett Prevedel:** Any other specific question from the RAC? I'll just take a moment and if there's no questions on the hunts I'll go over the changes that are in the NE RAC. On the general season buck deer, just looking at the units that are out here in the NE region, on Wasatch Mountains East no recommended change. There was a reduction on the South Slope Vernal. There was a reduction on the South Slope Yellowstone. And on the Nine Mile which is in the other region, but still out here there were no recommended changes. North Slope had a recommended reduction also. So there

were no increases, a couple that stayed the same and 4 units that decreased. That's general season buck deer. Any questions on that?

**Brad Horrocks:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go back to, what did the RAC.. down there where they were increasing those sheep tags, what did that in the Region that RAC is in, did they have their meeting yet, and if so, how did they vote?

**Covy Jones:** That was in the Southern Region. Correct me if I'm wrong Kent, you were on that call as well, after they heard the explanation of why, not Kent, Jace, they didn't' make a motion to change it, they left it alone.

**Jace Taylor:** I can summarize. In the four previous RACs, the Central Region did take one of those recommendations from SFW with the Zion unit and they made a motion and passed to keep the permits the same as they were in 2019, which is actually an increase from what we're recommending in 2020. Then, the Northern Region did not do anything, the Southern Region had one motion that passed for the Kaiparowits West unit to go to 12 permits which is what we offered last year opposed to the 14 which is what we're recommending for 2020 and the SE Region did not make any motions on bighorn sheep permits.

**Brad Horrocks:** Thank you.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, if there are no questions related to that or the general season buck deer, I'll just briefly summarize the LE deer in our region. South Slope Diamond Mountain has a slight increase. The Book Cliffs has a fairly significant decrease on all of the hunts, archery, muzzleloader and any weapon. And I guess that's really the only LE units we have out here, so Diamond Mountain is a slight increase and Book Cliffs is a fairly significant decrease in recommendations. Any questions from the RAC on LE buck deer? Ok, the HAMS hunt I mentioned was recommended 5 tags for each of the 3 units and one of the units is the Book Cliffs Floy Canyon unit at 5 tags. Then on the LE bull elk permits summary, the Book Cliffs there's a recommended reduction, about 20% reduction on all the hunts related to the LE bull elk. Nine Mile/Anthro is recommended to stay the same. Diamond Mountain is recommended to stay the same. Wasatch Mountains also recommended to stay the same. So the summary is there are some fairly significant changes in the Book Cliffs, and everything else is recommended to stay as it was. If I missed anything, feel free to jump in DWR employees.

**Daniel Davis:** I have a question, if you don't mind.

**Brett Prevedel:** Yes, go ahead. When you guys jump in will you say your name so when they take minutes they know who's speaking?

**Daniel Davis:** Yes, this is Daniel Davis. Would it be possible to let Covy show us how he modeled the general season deer units they have going right now?

**Covy Jones:** Absolutely, I can do that. As long as Daniel and everybody knows this wasn't just me. This was the biologist, this was bigger than me. This started with the new deer plan, when we did the new deer plan we said we want to take into account all the data that we know, you know? So 5 years ago we really started to gear up and change our data and incorporate more into our general season units. These units are

highly driven by an adult survival rate. In the past, and this is very similar to other wildlife agencies across the west, we've only been able to use buck/doe ratios. And it still is a great metric and it is still the primary way we manage and have some indication of quality and harvest and know what's going on in the landscape. So, it looks like Dax and Kent and people a lot smarter than me were able to incorporate a lot more data. So we put into the plan that we take into account adult and doe survival. Let's take one of the units we're looking at there. Randall I hope you're ok with us using one of your units, if you have any comments on this after we'd appreciate that Randall. We built this sheet and it takes into account the same data we've always used, the last 5 years of buck to doe ratios. Then we look at fawn/doe ratios, we take that into account as well. Well you know this is a buck/doe 18/20 unit, so at the top end of it. Fawn/doe is a little low, we'd like to see that at 60, we're just almost to 50 so a little low this last year, not terrible. With adult survival last year it was 67% and fawn survival at 24, we know we lost a lot of deer, this is the estimate I'm highlighting right now, we went from 9,800 to 7,000. So we need to take into account what that means for buck permits. The way we did that is we had everybody look at what was going on in their units and their collars early based on a few criteria. Based on weight, and fat indices and fawn weight, what survival is going to look like. Honestly on a lot of these I think we really hit the mark. We are taking more data than we've ever taken for these recommendations and Kent would you like to say anything about how we got it and what we're predicting for survival or show anything on that?

**Kent Hersey:** Happy to if the RAC is interested.

**Covy Jones:** It's a key component.

**Kent Hersey:** Ok, so as Covy mentioned, and kind of went over what data we were using, the other part of that instead of using the data we had from the past, the other part of that to get this right is to project it forward. So I'll start presenting my screen here and show you that. Ultimately what we're looking at is a couple of things, basically as Covy said that fawn survival and fawn/doe ratio. That ratio we already know, so the next we've got to figure out what that fawn survival is. The way we go about doing that is we've been GPS collaring adults and fawns since 2014 on the South Slope and with that we're collecting the overall fawn weight. And what we're seeing is that fawn weight is one of the biggest drivers of what that fawn survival will be. It's not just the fawn weight, you can have a heavy fawn and a hard winter and we'll still see low survival. So it's the combination of fawn weight with the winter severity. if you look at some of this and we'll go specific on the South Slope, this is the row of fawn weights here and you can see early on we had really high weights and they have gone down a little since then, but overall we've done really good with the South Slope with weight. This past year we averaged 67 pounds which is pretty good, up a little bit from the previous year, but you can see even with the decent whites last year with that hard winter we're down 24%. The previous year was a really light winter we're at 68 pounds and at about 75%. So you can see it bounces all over the place. What we need to do is figure out what ultimately that is. So what we do is we have these plots over time, the x axes here is days since December 1st. We start our collaring projects in December, and that's how we standardize everything and that's basically when we consider them entering winter, and that's when we collect the data. On the South Slope every line represents a year of survival, and the hard winter we've had, this green line represents the year '16-17, and the winter of '17-

18 is this blue line. You can see how the fawns don't make it through winter very well, we get out to this day 100-120, it's that March 10-20th time frame, and they just gradually died during that and then level off once they get past that. On the better winters we've had really great survival and this is very adequate and all good survival for fawns. This year on the pink line we're currently sitting at 71% as a whole and that's actually been lower on the east side of the unit, we're a little better than that when we look at the Yellowstone numbers specifically, I just have it on a pool basis. So ultimately what we look at is where we're at with that survival and the trends and once we get to this point we expect to level off and do really great and end up right at that 70% rate, which is why we have it there on the sheet.

**Covy Jones:** Perfect, then I'll show you what that translates to in the recommendation, Kent, if you'll switch back. So what that translates to is the most proactive deer recommendation we've ever made, and we feel very comfortable that we've made the appropriate cuts and this is where the Division is. Randall and all the biologists worked really hard to make sure they got these right. So making this cut under this survival estimate, and the adults are surviving much better in this estimate, I believe we're at the high 90's (98). 98% adult doe survival. When we had a lot of mortality we had a lot of the older animals die, so we have a lot of prime age animals right now. Anyway, we may come in even higher than this on survival. But under that recommendation with average success, which is what we should anticipate when populations are down a bit, we're going to come right into the buck/doe ratio. So there's a lot of work put into this and we feel really comfortable with our general season recommendations where they are. Now, nothings perfect, and we're going to look back on this in a year and see where we hit the mark, where we missed the mark, but this is a lot more proactive than just looking back on buck/doe ratios to adjust. Now we're looking forward and we can do that because of the data we have. I hope that is informative for the RAC. If you have any questions, please call your biologist and they'll talk these numbers over with you, what they did and how they did it.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you, appreciate that. That was very informative. If there's no other questions from the RAC I'll move on. Just a summary of the bison tags. Clint I'd like you to jump in here if I say something incorrect. In the Book Cliffs it was mostly a redistribution of tags to the roadless area because of the very successful harvest in the road area. Slight reduction on all, most of them statewide, the biggest reduction of bison tags was in the Henry Mountains, so we're down on the recommendation a little bit, but there is still a significant amount of tags in the roadless area including some new hunts in the roadless area. Is that accurate Clint, to say it that way?

**Clint Sampson:** Absolutely, sounds great.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, bull moose, there was very little recommended change in the NE region, it's pretty much stable. Mountain goat is the same, we have some units that do real well and some units that have a token amount of tags in there and there's very little recommended change in the NE unit. Then we already talked about the bighorn sheep, so I will not revisit that, unless there's specific questions. Are there any more questions from the RAC specific to the presentation or numbers?

**Jamie Arrive:** Alright, I was just kind of curious on the harvest success for the 2019 season for moose in the Wasatch and the South Slope Yellowstone? Because we see decreases in some of these areas for buck and bulls, but the moose hasn't changed, so I was wondering if that was because it was a low harvest, or just the populations were doing great?

**Covy Jones:** Kent or Randall do you have that data?

**Kent Hersey:** I will get it.

**Brett Prevedel:** Randall, I know you're on here, do you want to address in general feelings on moose on the South Slope?

**Randall Thacker:** Sure, on the Yellowstone last year we were at 75% success on the hunts last year, which out of the 4 hunters that went that's essentially one that didn't harvest. The Wasatch Mountains, let me bring it up here on my stuff.

**Kent Hersey:** I can speak overall. Overall we harvested 159 bulls in the state with 173 hunters. So very high success. Unlike deer, moose don't mind hard winters, it actually can be helpful, especially in these southern units where we have winter tick issues, you can actually see the effect of fewer ticks the following year after a hard winter, so overall moose are pretty stable, slightly growing in the state.

**Randall Thacker:** Jamie, in the South Slope Yellowstone it did fit right in.. We manage our bull permits on average age in harvest and they're right where we want them to be right now so that's part why we set those numbers. If we had adjusted those numbers it would have been based on the average age of harvest from last year.

**Jamie Arrive:** Perfect, thank you.

**Brett Prevedel:** Joe Arnold, did you have a question?

**Joe Arnold:** Yeah, and maybe not right for this particular time but, this data is all gathered and it's quite late before it's gathered, yet we put in for the permits in February, is there something that maybe.. the Oak Creek unit, if someone is sitting on a bunch of bighorn sheep points that this data is gathered, presented and passed before we put in for it so there could be some higher success ratio on those particular units and we're putting in for units that are decreasing before we're even approved. I don't know the answer, I'm just wondering if that's something that's talked about, because these are for 2020 permits, right?

**Covy Jones:** No Joe, that's correct and it's a fair criticism. The timeline of how everything works out, we have the draw before we have recommendation decisions in. We're working on it, I know Lindy presented a couple of different ideas to help adjust that. I'm not as involved in the draw process, we're the biologist, we do the biology. There's a lot more to the draw process that I'm probably not very well equipped to speak on. If there is any way we can have them be more synchronous, we're working towards that, and may be able to move that way in the future, but it's more complicated than that.



**Joe Arnold:** Ok, I know the data has to happen, the winter has to happen in order to see the survival rates and that, so I'm just wondering if maybe the draw could be pushed back a little bit to where they don't have to take place until the fall. Just a thought going forward.

**Covy Jones:** That's fair and we'll continue to take that into consideration.

**Brett Prevedel:** That's a good point Joe. I had the opportunity to see a presentation by Lindy up at the Wildlife Board meeting and how everything comes together for the year with the applications on collecting the money and analysing it, putting out the draw results and still having the 30 day window for people to turn back tags and she literally had 3 days between January and July that were not fully occupied with timelines. It's fairly complicated, I had no idea until I saw that.

**Joe Arnold:** Thank you.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, let's try to get this rolling along and I would open this for discussion if anyone has any ideas of whether they want to proceed with it. Let's not have a motion right now, let's have your thoughts on the BBOIAL how we want to proceed and move on RAC members.

**Brad Horrocks:** You know I'd like to make a comment. It seems like the most complaints that I've received about any of the units we have around here is the Book Cliff elk unit. And I'm just making that comment that the quality of the deer and elk out there seems to be the number one complaint I receive. Just making a comment.

**Brett Prevedel:** I believe on the elk, Clint, you and I had that discussion and that's why you reduced the recommended tags, is that correct?

**Clint Sampson:** Yes Brett it is, absolutely. We're hearing a lot of the same things Brad, we're pouring a lot of resources into the Book Cliffs right now when it comes to habitat projects, especially when it comes to all the collaring that is going on out there too. We're learning a lot as far as production and trying to jumpstart the deer and elk herds out there.

**Brett Prevedel:** There's about a 20% reduction recommended in both bull and buck tags throughout all the different hunts on the Book Cliffs. Any other comments from the RAC?

**Daniel Davis:** I guess I've got more of a question to start off with the first, and anybody can answer this, if you would. Have we ever seen a trend where we have been able to monitor any of these animal weights leading up to hunting season? You know they're gearing up for winter, once they get through the hunting season they get some pressure. I know we're doing a lot of resources to collar and stuff like that but, the perception is there's a lot of pressure during that time frame, particularly with the Book Cliffs. Do we have any idea what those body conditions tend to do, is there any impact on those by chance?

**Covy Jones:** That's hard to get at Daniel, but I would answer it this way. A lot of times when we harvest bucks in October, mature bucks still have really a lot of fat on them, so even though they've been hunted from August all the way to October, they're putting on fat, putting on fat. It seems like the thing that really burns fat on bucks, and if any biologist wants to jump in after this I'd appreciate it, but it seems like the thing that really burns fat on bucks is the rut. So it's less pressure from humans and more that desire to breed, that competition to breed. By December, they're skinny, they've lost all that fat they had when you harvested them in October. Is there anyone else who wants to add to that? Any other thoughts?

**Kent Hersey:** I'd come at it from a doe component as well since that was what we were collecting the fat on in December. The reality is how does work is there in the skinniest shape in the April/May time frame and they're not gaining weight in that time frame because they're in the third trimester they're putting the final energy into the fetus development and then after they give birth they're still not putting on weight in the spring like the bucks do. They're putting that energy into lactation and the more energy they get, they don't put it into themselves, they put it into that fetus. They'll have heavier fetuses at birth and the heavier fetuses at birth gives them a better chance that they'll survive. Then they'll spend all summer producing milk for their offspring to take care of their offspring more than themselves. They don't get a chance to put on weight until those fall months. Again, as Covy said it's not so much the pressure from hunters and moving them around that's causing weight gain or anything like that, it's the quality of the forage and the overall whether they have those fawns or they don't have any and what they have going on in their life cycles during that time of year.

**Daniel Davis:** So the more critical time frame for the doe/cow/fawn/calf survival then is going to be the springtime. This ability this little bit that's coming out through the winter then, correct?

**Kent Hersey:** It's everything. The data shows that the fatter they can be in December, the fatter they'll become in March in spring, and the fatter they are in spring, the fatter their offspring will be and the heavier they'll be going into winter. So it's a year round cycle and there's lag effects. So if you have a really hard winter, if you noticed on that South Slope Yellowstone data we had low fawn/doe ratios this year and that likely, we can't say specifically there, but we saw it on the Cache unit where they were really poor, really hard winter, those fawns were really small when they were born. That contributed to lower fawn weight. Some of this stuff is out of our control, those hard winters take a big toll, those droughts take a big toll. But what we can control with making good habitat and making sure there's forage out there really pays dividends and it kind of can have benefits all year round. It's generally when they're using the most energy is in that wintertime period and that's when we try to restrict activities on WMAs and stuff like that to try and give them a break because they are fighting nature and they're going to lose weight regardless and if we can keep that to a minimum the better off we're going to be.

**Covy Jones:** And I think just to make Kent's point, the reason we see higher mortality in the spring is because they didn't have enough fat reserves in December to make it through that spring and everything else that happens, but it's complicated Daniel,

but you're right, we do have the potential to lose a lot of animals in the spring, they may not just have enough gas to get through.

**Randall Thacker:** Daniel, to chime in on that. Last year on this Yellowstone it was that late late spring, we had deep snow until June on some of our winter ranges last spring. That was the factor last spring, the resources weren't available to them, there was no early green to help them recover from the winter losses.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. Any other comments from the RAC? If not, we'll move into requesting a motion on Bucks, Bulls, OIAL tags.

**Natasha Hadden:** This is Natasha, I'd like to make a motion to pass the Bucks, Bulls and OIAL proposal as presented today.

**Brett Prevedel:** We will take a vote on that.

**Dan Abeyta:** Yes.

**Ritchie Anderson:** Yes.

**Joe Arnold:** Yes.

**Jamie Arrive:** Yes.

**Dick Bess:** Yes.

**Daniel Davis:** Yes.

**Natasha Hadden:** Yes.

**Brad Horrocks:** Yes.

**Rebekah Jones:** Yes.

**Mike Smith:** Yes.

**01:03:24** The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Brad Horrocks. Passed unanimously.

**MOTION: To pass the Bucks, Bulls and OIAL proposal as presented.**

**01:04:40 6) Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2020 (Action)**

Presentations could be viewed at  
<https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

**Brett Prevedel:** We'll move into the Antlerless Permit Recommendations. A brief summary of our region, there's not many doe tags in the region, but there was the new hunt on South Slope which was 100 permits, 2 deer each permit, and that was a targeted hotspot for Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD) to try and take the density of the deer down. On the other units there are a few tags out in Nine Mile that are not in our region technically, but there are a few out there and there are really no other antlerless deer tags in the NE region that I can see. Doe pronghorn, I believe the pronghorn are doing well and there are some pronghorn tags. There's 20 out on South Slope Bonanza/Diamond Mountain, and there's about 20 up on the North Slope, I believe that's similar to prior years, I don't have the prior years data. Then on the antlerless moose hunt there are 10 tags on the North Slope, and I believe that's consistent with prior years, is that correct Amy?

**Amy Vande Voort:** So the North Slope moose permits are actually in the Northern Region, they're in the Summit sub unit, they're not in our region. But I believe they've had cow moose permits there in the past.

**Covy Jones:** It is consistent Brett, that's no increase or decrease on that.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, then there's the bighorn ewe hunt that had a few comments come in in opposition of it on the Newfoundland Mountains. Which is a new hunt, which is recommended 10 tags for bighorn ewes. Then antlerless elk, there's a few here in the region, one is the new cow elk hunt on the Book Cliffs which I'm going to ask Clint to talk about briefly, and the other cow elk tags are consistent on the South Slope and the Diamond Mountain. North Slope/West Daggett we had some comments come in, they've been cut significantly, and I believe they're fairly content with the recommendation, but there was a petition signed by pages of people to get that reduction in and I know Amy and Dax met with the concerned individuals up there and they share the same concern and the recommendation is very low numbers and they're also muzzleloader hunts to have low success, so I believe they've addressed that concern. And, with that I will let Miles talk about the public comments on the antlerless.

#### **01:08:49 Electronic Public Comment Report by Miles Hanberg, Regional Supervisor**

**Miles Hanberg:** Ok, again, not a lot of respondents on the online comments for this region, but those who did respond, 40% of those opposed the proposal as presented, 30% supported, and 30% were neutral. I think the comments that Brett brought up just a minute ago were some of those issues, some of which were mentioned in those online comments, one of which being the Book Cliff cow elk hunt. So I think that's pretty straight forward based on the amount of data we received from the public on this one.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. Clint, would you discuss that antlerless elk hunt on the Book Cliffs, and your rationale?

**Clint Sampson:** So a lot of it is coming down to what we've learned since we started to collar elk down in the Book Cliffs. This year, thankfully, we had a lot higher pregnancy rate than we had last year. It was up in the high 80's compared to the mid 50's which is what we had last year. So that's encouraging, and I know this is kind of a tough

sell because we are quite a bit under objective when it comes to the Book Cliffs elk herd and we could be butting up against our carrying capacity possibly, but the other thing we learned with our elk study last year is we have some old cows out there in the Book Cliffs. We're trying to increase the productivity so all the elk that hopefully get harvested this year we can age their teeth and try to find out if maybe this is an effective way to bring down the age of the cows, the ones that aren't producing, that aren't adding to our population anymore, maybe try to bring that down and create more of a positive reproductive rate down in the Book Cliffs because it is still a little bit of a mystery why we're not growing elk at the rate we should according to our models. We have cut.. it does show a significant increase when it comes to public draw permits, but we have scaled back on the amount of private depredation antlerless permits we give in the Book Cliffs too, so it's not quite as drastic as it looks seeing it on paper with the 225. I'll leave this open to Dax too, he was very helpful when it came to this recommendation as well.

**Dax Mangus:** Yeah, maybe I'll just share a couple of additional things. We had a pretty good conversation about this hunt recommendation with the SE Region RAC. Some of the things that came up, you know the work done by the Book Cliffs committee, and looking at the forage utilization on our summer range specifically especially in the Book Cliffs are some of the things that came and we looked at quite a bit here. We definitely have a lot of demand for a pretty limited amount of forage and like Clint mentioned we're seeing body conditions, and pregnancy rates, and age class in elk that are concerning. There's some research out there that shows that pregnancy rates really drop off in elk once elk get older than 9 years old. We're talking pregnancy rates on cow elk younger than 9 in the 90% range, and pregnancy rates on cow elk older than 9 in the 60% range. So we saw a lot of old elk, low pregnancy rates and some of the things we saw indicated that we might be coming up to the carrying capacity. We might have more demand for habitat than we have out there. Some of the things we're trying to do is maybe temporarily reduce numbers and get a better idea of what's going on. Are we really approaching a carrying capacity issue, and if we are we don't want to do long term habitat damage. We also want to see the age structure we have in that area. You can make the analogy if you were a cattleman and you had a bunch of old cows that weren't making calves anymore and you had a limited amount of feed, limited amount of pasture, those would be the ones you'd sell to the beef market and make burger out of those cows and keep your younger cows that are more productive. So it's a combination of things, but it's managing that population, it's managing that age class, and I think it could help us answer some questions and tell us what are the limiting factors to that population out there. Another thing that came up in last night's meeting, if you look at our modeled population numbers for the Book Cliffs elk population it's 1,000 less this year than it was the year before and actually that's more of a model correction than it is a drop in actual population. As we're getting better and better data we're realizing some of the metrics we were using in the past were not accurate. So you know that elk population is not necessarily dropping like crazy, it's just kind of stagnant. If you look at the model number it looks like it's dropping, but it's not. That was a model correction.

**Brett Prevedel:** Dax, that herd objective has never been reached and it might not be exactly where we want it, is that correct?

**Dax Mangus:** We're still looking at that and I think there's a lot things we can do to increase available habitat for elk in the Book Cliffs. We've done a lot of habitat

work, a lot of water development and we are seeing, if you talk to sportsmen or guys that spend a lot of time in the Book Cliffs, we are seeing some more elk in the lower elevation areas where we've done a lot of that water development. So I don't know that the population objective is necessarily unavailable, but I think that it might take some work and creativity to get there and that's just part of what we're looking at. Everything is on the table and we just want to make sure we manage these populations' responsibility and don't do long term habitat damage in some of these really high demand, high use areas.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, thank you. Amy, could I put you on the spot to explain the West Daggett situation a little bit and what's going on with the herd? I didn't know much about it until this week and I know the RAC would be interested in what you've got going on up there for elk permits.

**Amy Vande Voort:** Sure. For the elk up there we're below objective on our winter counts, and we have been for a few years. So this year to address the concerns of the hunters that we had, we cut out all the late season hunts so we don't have any more left in December or January. We did keep the muzzleloader hunts that are earlier in the year that have low success and we did keep the hunts that were around Greenvale Junction just because those help to keep the elk pushed off the highways so you don't see a lot of roadkill or vehicle collisions along there. Also from what we see there are elk up there, we have a ton of summer range, and it's more summer range in West Daggett than there is winter range. So we have elk there in the summer and earlier in the hunt, it's just they've been being pushed off during the winter, so we cut back on all those late season hunts and we're hoping the elk will stay there now instead of leaving. Then one other thing I can add too is about 5-6 years ago we had 3 radio collars on cow elk on the Greendale herd and the elk aren't dying they're just leaving the unit. What we saw when the hunt started is that they just left. Once they started getting pressure they left to the Vernal unit, then come spring they came right back to the North Slope. So the elk are still there, they're just leaving the unit when we do our winter counts.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, thank you. One other interesting thing I learned up there is these private lands tags which you've recommended a significant cut to, they were not typical private lands tags up there, isn't that right? They were more organized?

**Amy Vande Voort:** Some of them were typical private lands tags, some of the land owners did get more organized. We've been looking at the harvest the past couple of years and adjusting the private land only tags to what we see we need for to get for the harvest. We're hoping these 40 tags will cover what we need, but if not, if we get a lot of landowners requesting vouchers next year we may increase them again so we're not doing all the paperwork for the depredation program.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. What I was referring to for the RAC, is there were 120 tags there last year, but there was an organized.. it was kind of an outfitting situation as opposed to a depredation. It was perfectly legal, but they were using that as an available hunt for access and clients. We haven't seen that where we have the private lands tags in the Uintah Basin that I'm aware of. Thank you Amy. We've already addressed the public comments, any questions or comments from the RAC?

**Jamie Arrive:** I just have a question, in regards to the antlerless deer permits on the South Slope. I just want to get some clarification on that from Randall, I want to get some understanding if it's to maintain population numbers?

**Brett Prevedel:** Are you talking about the new hunt, the 100 tags? (Yes) Randall do you want to address that, or Dax?

**Randall Thacker:** Sure, I'll take a start at it and Dax can add in if he would like. Yeah Jamie, it's not to maintain the population, we hope to actually reduce some deer density down there. If you've seen the boundary it's just the area around Myton towards Roosevelt and also includes Pleasant Valley. In the last four years we've had 6 positive CWD samples come in from there where we hadn't seen any in that area before. So we're getting a little concerned at that area having a high deer density which it does there are quite a few agricultural deer down there, so we've had some complaints from some agricultural folks down there that are getting some depredation concerns. We've also had a lot of folks comment that they get a lot of roadkill type situations down there too. Our hope is to start this off as an experiment to see if we can reduce the deer density a little bit down there. They are resident deer and they don't leave that area hardly at all, so we are hoping to target them. We'll also be sending a letter to every one of those 100 people that do get those tags to strongly encourage them to take those animals in to get tested for CWD. We hope to get a really good sample for that area for the CWD monitoring to see if it really is a problem or if it's just a fluke that it's been showing up there the last few years. We really hope to get some increased samples from it and see what's going on there.

**Jamie Arrive:** Perfect, thank you.

**Brett Prevedel:** Covy, could I ask you to address the bighorn ewe hunt? There were some comments and it just seems as valuable as they are it's surprising to see that.

**Covy Jones:** I would love to. I will address it but also Jace is on the line so I'll ask Jace to jump on at the end of it. So, what we have is we have 3 California bighorn units in the state. We have one on the Oak Creeks, one on the Newfoundland Mountains, and one on the Stansbury Mountains. The populations on the Oak Creeks and Stansburys are both doing great. So we're left with the population on the Newfoundlands which are doing almost even better. They're approaching the population objective, there are a lot of sheep out there. So we have to start to manage that number. So transplanting is always an option, right? We can transplant those to the Oak Creeks, but that doesn't really make sense because we have a lot of issues there as well, and I guess when I say issues I mean potentials for disease. Or we have the Stansbury's. But every transplant we do is a risk for bighorn sheep. And we're learning more and more every time. Everytime we transplant bighorn sheep it seems like you end up with a lot of sleepless nights because it seems like they just go off like popcorn the first couple of days. Now that we've really invested in collars to see what they're going to do, when we move them to a new unit we really don't know what they're going to do. And what I'm trying to say is everytime we move them we assume a lot of risk because if one of those sheep goes down and gets into

an area with disease and comes back, it will kill off that whole herd. Specifically on the Stanbury's not very many years ago within 3 weeks we lost upwards of 90% of that population. We had 1 animal bring back disease and we lost 90% of that population. Now that wasn't from a transplant, per say, but what we do know is everytime we transplant we increase the risk that one of those animals will wander off. That's one of the factors we look at. Another factor is the time and effort to capture them on the mountains is really hard. It's all military restricted airspace, that's where the airforce goes and practices. So, we plan a capture and we work out all the details to get into the restricted airspace, then they decide they have a training event and they cancel our capture and we've got to go back. Sometimes it's cancelled for an hour, sometimes it's cancelled for a day, sometimes it's cancelled for a year. So as we approach the population objective bringing sheep off the Newfoundland mountains can be really really tough to coordinate. So between the additional risk and the complications of capture on that range, it makes more sense to harvest those animals. Ewe hunting is something we're going to have to get used to as a state as we start to reach population objectives to maintain healthy herds. I think it's just the first place we're reaching that and it brings some hesitation with it, but really it just makes more sense. Jace do you have anything to add?

**Jace Taylor:** Nope, nothing really to add. Translocations are a very valuable tool and have been very successful for us in the state. In this case we don't think it's worth the time, the money, and worth the risk in this situation, so we'd rather hunt them. I will add this, just like Covy said, I think this is something to be excited about. The fact that the Newfoundland Mountains has a population objective of 350 and we're approaching that and reaching that, that's exciting. You look at a lot of other western states and I know this is our first ewe hunt, but many other western states have ewe hunts. Some even harvest more ewe than rams and it seems like those people get a good number of applicants so people have a good experience, you know, so I think this is an exciting thing. Many other times we will do transplants because it's worth the time, worth the money, worth the risk, in this situation we don't think it is. We're excited for this and hope Utah are as well.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. Are there any more questions or comments from the RAC regarding the antlerless permit recommendations?

**Brad Horrocks:** If you wanted to put in for one of those ewe tags, how does that work on your points system? Is it totally different from your ram? Do you acquire points for it? How does it work?

**Covy Jones:** First of all Brad I'd just like to say that I love the doll photo there. Turn it back, it's way better to look at that. I'm just kidding. Hey there's another sheep, the next RAC meeting is at Brad's office, can everybody agree to that? Alright, it's a completely separate point system. It's a point system if you draw one of these ewe tags it's a 5 year waiting period before you can draw again. It's not like nanny goat or cow moose, there's not a lot of sexual dimorphism between a cow bison and a nanny goat so with bighorn sheep a ewe is very different from a ram so it uses a separate point system. Limited entry, 5 year waiting period to get back in.

**Brad Horrocks:** Thank you.



**Brett Prevedel:** Ok I would entertain a motion on the antlerless permit recommendations or any alteration you'd like.

The following motion was made by Brad Horrocks, seconded by Dan Abeyta. Passed unanimously.

**MOTION: That we accept the Division's Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2020 as presented.**

**Dan Abeyta:** Yes.

**Ritchie Anderson:** Yes.

**Joe Arnold:** Yes.

**Jamie Arrive:** Yes.

**Dick Bess:** Yes.

**Daniel Davis:** Yes.

**Natasha Hadden:** Yes.

**Brad Horrocks:** Yes.

**Rebekah Jones:** Yes.

**Mike Smith:** Yes.

**Brett Prevedel:** That's unanimous. That's the hardest part of our agenda, it should speed up from here. Do we need to take a short break or should we keep plugging through? Everybodies good?

**01:30:04      7) R657-37 CWMU Rule Amendments (Action)**

Presentations could be viewed at  
<https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok the next item on the agenda is the CWMU rule amendments. Chad are you on with us?

**Chad Wilson:** Yes, I am.

**Brett Prevedel:** So I don't have to look for it in my packet could you summarize briefly? Hello Jeff.

**Jeff Tanaguchi:** Hello Brett, sorry I'm late. But I'm in.

**Brett Prevedel:** Jeff Tanaguchi has joined the meeting.

**Chad Wilson:** A lot of the changes were just housekeeping, but probably the one worth speaking about is we're allowing cow reciprocal tags, the ability for that to happen on CWMUs. The other part was clarifying language that we don't have to manage on a general season unit. If that CWMU is a general season unit they can manage to a higher quality, like a higher age class of elk, or a higher buck/doe ratio for deer. There were a couple more, now that you put me on the spot.. Just made some clarifications that the public hunters would never go beneath that minimum threshold, specifically on pronghorn, that was kind of overlooked before.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, so how did you, in the past, on the quality or age class of the animals, did you collect data from the harvested animals on the CWMU or how did you..

**Chad Wilson:** No, this really isn't going to change how we've been practicing it, it just clarifies it in rule, this is how we've been handling those units all along.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok. Miles was there any public comment other than the pie charts? Would you like to address them?

**01:32:07      Electronic Public Comment Report by Miles Hanberg, Regional Supervisor**

**Miles Hanberg:** The public comment was 30% support of the proposal, 70% was neutral, no one opposed the proposal in this region. I don't recall any specific comments.

**01:32:36      Questions from RAC Members**

**Brett Prevedel:** I don't either. Are there any questions by the RAC? Or Comments? Ok, on the first CWMU item which is the rule amendments I would open it for a motion. Item 7 on the agenda.

The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden , Rebekah Jones, seconds. Motions passed unanimously.

**MOTION: to accept the presentation as presented by the Division.**

**Dan Abeyta:** Yes.

**Ritchie Anderson:** Yes.

**Joe Arnold:** Yes.

**Jamie Arrive:** Yes.

**Dick Bess:** Yes.

**Daniel Davis:** Yes.

**Natasha Hadden:** Yes.

**Brad Horrocks:** Yes.

**Rebekah Jones:** Yes.

**Mike Smith:** Yes.

**Jeff Tanaguchi:** -

**Brett Prevedel:** Are you with us Jeff? Jeff is not with us momentarily. I saw his computer logged off.

**01:34:35 8) 2020 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations (Action)**

Presentations could be viewed at

<https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

**Brett Prevedel:** So we'll move on to the next item which is the CWMU Antlerless Permit recommendations. In summary on that, There were some renewal applications and some change applications that went through the Wildlife Board. We do not have to address the changes on them There's 66 CWMUs with antlerless permits for the 2020 season. Then they have a table, 90% most all of them in the state choose the option to be 90% public, 10% private on the antlerless tags. So there are 189 tags that are available to the CWMUs and there are 1089 that will go to the general draw. That's the antlerless. Then I guess I don't have the numbers for you on the other one. On the regular tags on the bucks and bulls. Do you have anything to add on that Chad? Or anything that's come up in the other RAC meetings?

**Chad Wilson:** Yes, I do. The antlered was already passed in the fall, which is why you're not seeing those. There are a couple of corrections that I need to make that have come up since, the last 2 RACs have heard this, the first 2 have not. We just got some clarifications on these numbers, the actual numbers for this are what you see on this graph. The Heaston East should be 40 less cow elk tags and these 3 Ronan Cliffs, Indian Head, and Jump Creek are supposed to be less elk tags on that. So it brings the new totals you see down there 172 private, 1,033 public and 1,205 total tags.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, thank you. This is a real positive program, isn't it? The 90/10 split.

**Chad Wilson:** Yeah, the public really gets the benefit of these antlerless tags. You can see how many public tags there are compared to private.

**Brett Prevedel:** Yes, thank you. Any questions or comments from the RAC?

**01:37:20 Questions from RAC Members**

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, I will open it up for a motion regarding the CWMU antlerless permit recommendations for 2020.

The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Ritchie Anderson. Passed unanimously.

**MOTION: to accept the CWMU Antlerless Permit recommendations as presented by the Division.**

**Dan Abeyta:** Yes.

**Ritchie Anderson:** Yes.

**Joe Arnold:** Yes.

**Jamie Arrive:** Yes.

**Dick Bess:** Yes.

**Daniel Davis:** Yes.

**Natasha Hadden:** Yes.

**Brad Horrocks:** Yes.

**Rebekah Jones:** Yes.

**Mike Smith:** Yes.

**Jeff Tanaguchi:** Yes.

**Brett Prevedel:** We're on a trend here, we're having a lot of yes's tonight.

**01:39:11**      **9) Management Bison Hunts – Nine Mile, Range Creek Unit (Action)**

Presentations could be viewed at

<https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

**Brett Prevedel:** The next item is the management bison hunts on the Nine Mile/Range Creek unit. I would like Dax or whoever.. actually Brad. It's in the other region. Brad Crompton just to give us an overview of that please.

**Brad Crompton:** You bet. I work in the Southeast region. The short version of this is that we're asking the RAC and the Wildlife Board to allow changes to the rule to allow for over the counter bison hunting opportunities. Then specifically ask for a hunt this fall on the Nine Mile/Range Creek unit. This is to address some bison issues on this unit where bison migrate to there each winter. Quite a lot of concerns over private landowners and public land grazers with forage availability for their livestock and things like that. So we're trying to address that issue. Also, there's no management plan on the Nine Mile/Range

Creek unit so the population objective is 0, we're trying to manage to that objective. This strategy is meant to be super flexible, so if bison show up, it makes it very easy for the hunter to purchase a tag and harvest. I don't believe we'll harvest a ton of bison but it may act to push a lot of bison back to tribal lands. It will be very, very difficult. Very remote, mostly roadless, a very, very difficult hunt, and hunters lose their bonus points when they purchase this tag.

**Brett Prevedel:** And I believe that means they lose their ability to put in for bison once in a lifetime tags. Is that correct?

**Brad Crompton:** Right. Maybe one more thing I might add is prior to purchasing this permit they have to take an online education course about it, just so they know all the ramifications about it. It's a very difficult hunt with likely very low hunt success. And that they'd lose their points and wouldn't be able to put in for a Henry's our Book Cliffs bison tag anymore. But, the flip side is, they could purchase this sort of tag and they could hunt the following year, as long as this hunt is available.

**Brett Prevedel:** Even if they're successful?

**Brad Crompton:** Even if they're successful.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, are there questions from the RAC for Brad?

#### **01:41:48 Questions from RAC Members**

**Daniel Davis:** Are these going to be either sex permits or are they going to be cow or bull choice or are they going to be cow permits only?

**Brad Crompton:** That's a good question. Once again just to maximize flexibility we make them hunters choice so you can shoot a cow or a bull.

**Brad Horrocks:** I've heard some conversation about maybe letting people use helicopters to haul people in and out and their animals. Is that still a possibility?

**Brad Crompton:** Most of that area down there is wilderness area in the Emery county portion of that. So helicopters can't land in wilderness areas. Really I don't know that there's a whole lot of opportunity for helicopter sort of hunting. The main access points are floating the river, floating Desolation Canyon. Or there's some very rugged roads that get into lower or upper Range Creek and then it's walk in from there, horseback or on foot. So yeah, it will be difficult.

**Brett Prevedel:** Everybody got a good understanding on what's being proposed?

**Daniel Davis:** What, when we talk about Range Creek, we look at a lot of these hunt maps and hunt tables, but which map can we base this demographic on to be more precise to the Range Creek? Currently there's nothing for the bison, anyone have a suggestion on what map might reference that better?

**Brad Crompton:** If I understand your question right, where specifically are we talking about? Is that what you're talking about?

**Daniel Davis:** Yes, basically the boundaries of where this hunt would take place. Currently there's nothing listed under the bison, so if you know when you look at antlerless elk and elk, things do vary.

**Brad Crompton:** Yeah, good point, you could reference the any bull for the Nine Mile/Range Creek, it's the same hunt boundary. Which is Nine Mile Creek over to Hwy 191, and Hwy 6 down to I-70. It's a very large area, however the bison are only in a very small part of the unit. These bison aren't unit wide, they're just in the southeast corner of the unit.

**Brett Prevedel:** Jamie, did you want an opportunity to speak? I thought you might.

**Jamie Arrive:** Yes. I just have a question and I want to get clarification, I think you might have already mentioned this. If they buy the permit, they're eligible in years after this to apply for the other bison permits within the state. Is that correct?

**Brad Crompton:** Correct, they lose their OIAL bison points. However, this is a different type of permit and they could buy this permit in subsequent years. They lose their opportunity to apply for a OIAL bison tag.

**Brett Prevedel:** Joe, did you have a comment? I thought you might have for a moment.

**Joe Arnold:** Yes, I'm just curious about, do you feel like with offering that, so me as a OIAL non-bison person, do you feel like you'll get a lot of traction there because they are going to lose their bison points? I mean it just doesn't seem like it would be appealing to the bison people and it would be appealing to all of us that have other OIAL areas, like goats or sheep or moose. Is that right? Anyone can apply for this hunt, correct?

**Brad Crompton:** Correct, correct, you can just go buy one over the counter. yeah you hit on a good point. I think folks with 20 bison points most likely have no interest in buying this tag because they're waiting for another one. Really the goal for this is just maximum flexibility so we really get these tags in the hands of the few hardy people who know what they're doing down there. Again, know the country, have access to horses. Those few. Hopefully the education course will deter a lot of the folks who don't really know what they're getting into.

**Covy Jones:** And Joe, if I could add, one of the things we looked at doing this several ways, if you harvest you lose your points, if this, if that, what we came back to was consistency. So right now, if you buy a conservation permit for any species, if you draw an expo tag for any species, if you draw a moose permit on a CWMU, any of those things where you buy that permit over the counter, you lose your ability to put in for the draw for that species. And it's just because it's so rare. So the way we've done it in Utah is if you've had the opportunity, you lose your points, and this would be your

opportunity. Now, you can buy a conservation permit year after year, you can buy a moose permit year after year, you'd be super lucky if you drew an expo permit year after year, but it's just consistent with everything else we do. So that's the rationale behind why we recommended it this way.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. Any other questions from the RAC?

**01:48:32 Electronic Public Comment Report by Miles Hanberg, Regional Supervisor**

**Miles Hanberg:** Before you get too far on this one Brett I can go ahead and outline some of the public comments.

**Brett Prevedel:** Sorry about that, I forgot you.

**Miles Hanberg:** On this one 40% of the respondents opposed it, 40% supported it, and 20% were neutral. Certainly some of the people thought it was beneficial, it's not an actual bison unit and there's been a lot of issues with that. Other people felt like we need to have more bison in the state of Utah. That's kind of the range that the comments came from. I think in the presentation Brad certainly discussed some of the ramifications for having bison over there. That's a summary on the public comments.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you.

**Jamie Arrive:** I did want to make one comment. This is a problem that has its own committee, similar to the Book Cliffs committee. There is a Nine Mile bison committee that the Tribe participates on. I have a bison manager that oversees our bison program and this did come up in a vote and I kind of just want to put it out there that we didn't support this. The Ute Tribe bison management program didn't support this. Just kind of want to put it out there that it was brought up in the Nine Mile bison committee meeting. Thanks.

**Brett Prevedel:** What was the position of the Nine Mile committee overall?

**Brad Crompton:** The overall committee voted to go forward with this sort of proposal. There were several, I don't know all of them, representatives from the Ute Tribe opposed it. Also there was a property owner the Utah Museum of Natural History also opposed, there could be some additional trespasses on that property. There were several people that opposed it, it wasn't unanimous.

**Brett Prevedel:** Can the area be accessed without crossing their property?

**Brad Crompton:** Portions of the area, yes. There's significant areas where bison reside that aren't on the museum properties, but the museum property, there's a lot of bison in there as well. There is a program through the museum where you can get access permits and walk in there, online.

**Brett Prevedel:** How did SE RAC vote on this?

**Brad Crompton:** It passed last night. Covy was it unanimous? I don't recall.

**Covy Jones:** I believe it was unanimous. They had a lot of discussion on it and I understand there is some hesitancy. We're trying to manage this the best we can to represent the majority of the committee. So we're sympathetic and understand. It's the best we can do to manage for 0 bison, which is what we've agreed to do at this time.

**Joe Arnold:** Is there a quota? Is there a harvest objective, how many tags will be sold? Any of that?

**Brad Crompton:** No, it's just open. In the presentation it was kind of a line. There's a pretty narrow window of opportunity due to the weather and terrain. The weather will kind of induce this quota pretty quickly when you just can't get there anymore. But we won't limit either harvest or permit sales.

**Dan Abeyta:** I've got kind of a comment, maybe even a question. As I understand this Brad, if this is a successful hunt, this is kind of in reaction to what animals are doing which isn't desired, but if this hunt is successful this would actually possibly keep the bison where we want them? Is that correct?

**Brad Crompton:** Yeah, that's the goal, we've found on the Henry Mountains they respond to hunting pressure and they go where the people with guns are not. We put some pressure on them, they go back to the Tribal lands where they ought to be in this case.

**Dan Abeyta:** So if this is successful, this hunt could go away?

**Brad Crompton:** Yes.

**Brett Prevedel:** Anybody else want to speak on the RAC?

**Ritchie Anderson:** I just had a question for Jamie. What would the Tribe, or what's their proposal for the elk in this area? Or what would they like to see with the elk in this area?

**Jamie Arrive:** We don't have a say on what happens in this area because it's off of our Tribal exterior boundary, and that's part of the problem. But as for elk, I don't believe we have a stand on that.

**Brett Prevedel:** I believe he was referring to bison, weren't you Ritchie?

**Ritchie Anderson:** Yes. Strictly on the bison, what was the Tribes proposal for the mitigation of the bison in the Range Creek area?

**Jamie Arrive:** So we've gone over this through the Nine Mile committee and we've outlined some of the things we'd like to see. We've done hazing, we've always done hazing. We're also working to improve 2 of the main winter range areas where they do winter. We've reduced the pressure on our hunts on the tribal lands in hopes that



they'll stay where they're supposed to be. We're also working on fencing. Our hope is that we can get them on our side, but I know the stance on this has been that we don't want them hunted. We're hoping to try to do some of those measures. We haven't been successful with the hazing as far as them.. we do push them back over but they do end up back over there. The last time we push them is usually in the spring.

**Ritchie Anderson:** Ok, thank you.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok if there are no other questions or comments I would open the item up of management bison hunt in Nine Mile/Range Creek unit for a motion.

The following motion was made by Brad Horrocks, seconded by Dan Abeyta. Passed 10 in favor, 1 opposed.

**MOTION: to accept the presentation as presented by the Division.**

**Dan Abeyta:** Yes.

**Ritchie Anderson:** Yes.

**Joe Arnold:** Yes.

**Jamie Arrive:** No.

**Dick Bess:** Yes.

**Daniel Davis:** Yes.

**Natasha Hadden:** Yes.

**Brad Horrocks:** Yes.

**Rebekah Jones:** Yes.

**Mike Smith:** Yes.

**Jeff Taniguchi:** Yes.

**Brett Prevedel:** Motion carries. We will move on to item 10.

**01:57:43 10) Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy Revisions (Action)**

**Brett Prevedel:** Darren, do you want to take a brief moment and just summarize that for us?

**Darren DeBlois:** Sure. We're recommending this for a couple of reasons, and normally we don't take policies around whenever we have things that pertain to predators we feel like it's a good idea to get public input. The first thing was when we were going through the mule deer plan, and looking at all this new really good data that

Covy presented earlier we felt like it would be time we revisited this policy and used some of that data when we are looking at whether predator management is necessary or not. The second part of this is the legislature passed some new statute this season that requires that the Division director does certain things. One is to determine whether or not predators are limiting prey populations. Secondly allowing big game hunters to take big game to take predators in the fall. There's a reporting requirement, but primarily we had to be responsive to that legislation and Covy and I sat down with several others and tried to come up with some guidelines with our district biologist on how to determine if predators are limiting, and what to include in the plan if it was necessary to reduce predator density. That's what you see there, the main body of the document didn't change a lot. What really changed were the parameters for mule deer and bighorn sheep, when a unit would qualify for these types of things. Then we had prescriptions for predator species for how you would reduce those densities if we were to implement a plan.

**Brett Prevedel:** Sorry I was muted, thanks Darren. Miles, do you want to address the public comments on this item?

**01:00:29      Electronic Public Comment Report by Miles Hanberg, Regional Supervisor**

**Miles Hanberg:** Sure it was an even split between all the categories at 33.3% opposed, support and neutral on the proposal. Not a lot of strong feelings.

**Brett Prevedel:** And Darren, on the next item, the cougar and bear rule amendments, is that incorporated in this, or is it separate?

**Darren DeBloois:** It's separate. It's more of a house keeping thing and we can go over that when we get to that point. There are several things we have to do in order to meet the statute that was passed. One is we need to determine when we're seeing top down pressure on a prey population. Secondly, if we see that pressure we need to do something about reducing predator densities. Those are the two key things we're trying to address in the policy.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, thank you. Questions from the RAC?

**02:01:45      Questions from RAC Members**

**Daniel Davis:** In this policy it kind of highlights some population density data, more specifically to the bighorns being what 90% population objective. Just like we talked earlier about the Newfoundland unit, if we begin losing sheep to tag on those units are we at that 90% objective? And is that a limiting factor from getting to that 90% objective?

**Darren DeBloois:** Those are the questions that we'd want our district biologist to answer, Daniel. We actually on purpose left a bunch of flexibility here rather than a one size fits all trigger. We wanted to give our district biologist guidance, so if you're the biologist in charge of that sheep herd, you'd want to do a couple of things. you'd want to determine if, for example, that lions are the problem. We know from

literature that if you get an individual lion that keys in on a sheep herd they can be fairly devastating, especially if that herd is a new transplant for example, and the numbers are low. With sheep you typically would be a little more aggressive than with other species, especially if you have cause specific mortality. For most of our transplants we've got good collar data, we go in when we see a sheep die and figure out what's going on. But in general we'd want to get some side boards but it would be up to the district biologist to write a plan and say here are my concerns here and this is what I'm going to do to address it. Does that answer your question?

**Daniel Davis:** It does. Duly noted to the new transplanted stuff, that's for sure what I'm more concerned about, starting to perform population reduction tactics on a herd, then implementing all these other predatory type restrictions. So yeah, you did answer that. I appreciate it Darren.

**Covy Jones:** Daniel, I think that's a valid concern. It would be weird to reach a population objective and start to employ ewe hunts and also predator reduction at the same time. I don't see a scenario where we would do that, I never want to say never, but I don't see a scenario where we would do that. There are some areas where there aren't any deer, we do have the desert units where there aren't hardly any deer and those are different.

**Daniel Davis:** Yeah when they're the singular source of prey, absolutely I agree. The next question I had is being familiar with (inaudible) and kind of what that states, it authorizes specific tactics and if the Division chooses to utilize some of those tactics is that going to go through the public process as part of the plan? And we're going to kind of keep this out for the sportsmen specifically?

**Darren DeBloois:** What we say in the policy Daniel, is we actually rank our preferred methods of reduction and sportsmen are always going to be our #1 go to. So if we need to reduce densities we'll try to do it using sportsmen. Secondarily down the line we'd look into using Wildlife Services, and probably as a last choice would be to have the Division go in and do some removals. The only time I can foresee that is if we just can't meet the quotas or if we have an area that is so rugged that people don't want to hunt it. But we can do a lot in terms of setting up hunts to target specific areas with sportsmen, so that will always be the first choice.

**Daniel Davis:** You may not be the one who is able to answer this, but no, you did answer that. That was good, thank you.

**Brett Prevedel:** Any other questions or comments from the RAC? Ok, so the first item on this topic is the managing predatory wildlife species policy revisions. So that would be the item I would entertain a motion for.

The following motion was made by Dan Abeyta, seconded by Natasha Hadden. Passed unanimously.

**MOTION: to accept the presentation as presented by the Division.**

**Dan Abeyta:** Yes.

**Ritchie Anderson:** Yes.

**Joe Arnold:** Yes.

**Jamie Arrive:** Yes.

**Dick Bess:** Yes.

**Daniel Davis:** Yes.

**Natasha Hadden:** Yes.

**Brad Horrocks:** Yes.

**Rebekah Jones:** Yes.

**Mike Smith:** Yes.

**Jeff Taniguchi:** Yes.

**Brett Prevedel:** It's unanimous, so we'll move onto the cougar and bear rule amendments, Darren, if you'll just briefly summarize that for us.

**02:08:21      11) Cougar and Bear Rule Amendments (Action)**

Presentations could be viewed at

<https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

**Darren DeBlois:** Yes, so that's a second piece of legislation that passed, that mirrored our current rule, but it changed a couple of things. One is it extended the window of time that a livestock producer can deal with a predator that is getting in and killing livestock. It went from a 72 hour window to a 96 hour window. The second real change is it provided for the Division to issue depredation tags for bears. We've already done this for lions and we had a system for bears when they get into agricultural crops, so if they're eating melons or sunflowers or something like that you can issue depredation tags. Now that would include a bear that's killing sheep for example. That's in statute now. Statutes always trump rules, so these changes to the rule are just a mirror to what the statute did and it's primarily a housekeeping exercise honestly

**02:09:55      Questions from RAC Members**

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok thank you. Any questions from the RAC? I noticed, Darren, there was a provision in there that no monetary value could be obtained by the landowner in a depredation situation.

**Darren DeBlois:** Right, yeah.

**Brett Prevedel:** That was added, a new provision. Questions or comments from the RAC? Ok, Miles did we have separate comments for this or is it under the same umbrella?

**02:10:30 Electronic Public Comment Report by Kevin Bunnell, Regional Supervisor**

**Miles Hanberg:** It's a separate comment. So in this case there were 10% opposed, 40% were neutral, and 50% supported the proposal. I don't recall any specific feedback on this one either.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, if there's no other discussion I'd entertain a motion on the cougar and bear rule amendments.

The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Jeff Taniguchi. Passed unanimously.

**MOTION: to accept the presentation as presented by the Division.**

**Dan Abeyta:** Yes.

**Ritchie Anderson:** Yes.

**Joe Arnold:** Yes.

**Jamie Arrive:** Yes.

**Dick Bess:** Yes.

**Daniel Davis:** Abstain.

**Natasha Hadden:** Yes.

**Brad Horrocks:** Yes.

**Rebekah Jones:** Yes.

**Mike Smith:** Yes.

**Jeff Taniguchi:** Yes.

**Brett Prevedel:** Do you want an opportunity to say anything Daniel? Or do you want to go ahead with that?

**Daniel Davis:** I was hoping to reach out for a point of clarification real fast. The question came up right at the last second and I apologize. With those depredation tags, is that proprietary to private property, or does that encompass BLM and Forest ground as well?

**Darren DeBlois:** It includes all properties, but it would only apply in chronic situations, so if a person is losing livestock year after year and they've been working on the problem and they haven't been able to solve it. This is how we handle it with lions at least, we'd issue those depredation tags. And they may be able to come in proactively and remove a couple of bears before they put sheep out, but that would be up the district biologist and the region to work with the producer and typically we limit those to time and space in order to make sure that we're actually getting the, in this case, the bear that's causing the damage. It's not a tool to reduce population sizes, it's to try and deal with a specific animal causing a specific amount of damage.

**Daniel Davis:** Thank you.

**Brett Prevedel:** Miles, did you have anything you wanted to add? Not to this topic, just in general?

**Miles Hanberg:** I just really appreciate the RACs participation in this new process. It's great that we had every RAC member attending the meeting tonight on this call. I think it went pretty well. Again, I'd just like to thank everyone on the RAC for their time and dedication and working through this process with us.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. I'd like to thank all the work, especially the people behind the scenes, at the DWR that put on all this technology for us that's worked really well. Thanks to all the biologists and everyone who was in attendance to answer all the questions. Any other comments from the RAC?

**Brad Horrocks:** I was wondering what the population objective for the Hanberg home is going to be?

**Miles Hanberg:** It's capped out. It's maxed out now, it's at carrying capacity.

**Brad Horrocks:** Congratulations, Miles.

**Miles Hanberg:** Thank you.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, that's a good way to end this meeting, everybody smiling. I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

**MOTION to adjourn.**

**Brad Horrocks**

**Ritchie Anderson, second  
passed unanimously**

**Dan Abeyta:** Yes.

**Ritchie Anderson:** Yes.

**Joe Arnold:** Yes.

**Jamie Arrive:** Yes.

**Dick Bess:** Yes.

**Daniel Davis:** Yes.

**Natasha Hadden:** Yes.

**Brad Horrocks:** Yes.

**Rebekah Jones:** Yes.

**Mike Smith:** Yes.

**Jeff Taniguchi:** Yes.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you everyone, and thank you anyone that visits this viewing from the general public. We appreciate all our comments, and welcome them anytime. With that we'll sign off. Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 07:47 pm