

# Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

April 28, 2022 Eccles Wildlife Education Center  
1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington, Utah

The Board Meeting will stream live at [https://youtu.be/S7T2dcO\\_6n4](https://youtu.be/S7T2dcO_6n4)

## AGENDA

**Thursday, April 28, 2022, 9:00 A.M.**

- |  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda<br>– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman  | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 2. Approval of Minutes<br>– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman   | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log<br>– Randy Dearth, Vice-Chairman  | <b>CONTINGENT</b>    |
| 4. DWR Update<br>– J. Shirley, DWR Director  | <b>INFORMATIONAL</b> |
| 5. Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022<br>- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator                         | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 6. Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022<br>- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator       | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 7. Once-in-a-Lifetime Permit Recommendations for 2022<br>- Riley Peck, OIAL Species Coordinator            | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 8. Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2022<br>- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator                        | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 9. 2022 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations<br>- Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 10. Bighorn Sheep Season Dates for Conservation Permits<br>- Justin Shannon, DWR Deputy Director           | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 11. Other Business<br>– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman   | <b>CONTINGENT</b>    |

**Wildlife Board Motions**

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

Fall 2022 – Target Date – Progress on changes to statute for the poaching of a swan

**MOTION: I move that we ask the division to look into changing statute to reflect a 7-year waiting period for poaching a swan and have the division report back. This is to be placed on the action log.**

Motion made by: Karl Hirst  
Assigned to: Wyatt Bubak  
Action: Under Study  
Placed on Action Log: December 2, 2021

Fall 2022 – Target Date – Possibility of a 3-year season structure for Big Game seasons and hunter orange regulation reforms

**MOTION: I move that we ask the division to look into a 3-year season structure for big game season dates and the possibilities of hunter orange regulation reforms (including amount required, what other states allow etc.) This is to be placed on the action log.**

Motion made by: Bryce Thurgood  
Assigned to: Covy Jones and Wyatt Bubak  
Action: Under Study  
Placed on Action Log: December 2, 2021

Fall 2022 – Target Date – Establish a Technology Effectiveness Committee

**MOTION: I move that we ask the division to establish a Technology Effectiveness Committee to form a structural process to address and outline issues relating to the use of hunting technologies. This committee should set a long term plan to address issues such as weapon success and restrictions, use of guides/scouts, use of range-finders and other technology, and any other issues that the committee deems necessary. This is to be placed on the action log.**

Motion made by: Wade Heaton  
Assigned to: Derrick Ewell and Gabe Patterson  
Action: Under Study  
Placed on Action Log: January 4, 2022

Fall 2022 – Target Date – Possibility of issuing 2 pt. or smaller buck deer tags to youth hunters

**MOTION: I move that we direct the division through the action log, to look at issuing 2pt. or smaller buck deer tags to youth hunters. That in the four-year period, between 14-18, they would have the potential to be guaranteed at least one hunt for a 2pt. buck and that those tags would not take away from any of the other tag allotments but be in addition to the tags already issued. We would ask the division to look at the impact that it would have on licensing and the herds as well as future youth hunters. Kevin Albrecht included with the action log item that the addition of a survey be used to see what that need is.**

Motion made by: Karl Hirst  
Assigned to: Lindy Varney and Covy Jones  
Action: Under Study  
Placed on Action Log: January 4, 2022

**Utah Wildlife Board Meeting**  
**January 4, 2022, Eccles Wildlife Education Center**  
**1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington, UT 84025**  
The meeting will stream live at <https://youtu.be/Xeah.WIUU4E>

**Tuesday, January 4, 2022 - 9:00 am**

- |  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda<br>– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman  | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 2. Approval of Minutes<br>– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman   | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log<br>– Randy Dearth, Vice-Chairman  | <b>CONTINGENT</b>    |
| 4. DWR Update<br>– J. Shirley, DWR Director  | <b>INFORMATIONAL</b> |
| 5. Emerging Technologies Survey Results<br>– Wyatt Bubak, Law Enforcement Chief  | <b>INFORMATIONAL</b> |
| 6. Big Game R657-5 Rule Amendments<br>- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator   | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 7. Furbearer Season Dates and Bobcat Permit Recommendations<br>- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator                          | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 8. Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 Revisions for 2022-2023<br>- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator                       | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 9. R657-33 Black Bear Rule Amendments and Recommendations for 2022<br>- Chad Wilson, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 10. 1:00 p.m. Time Certain – Board Hearing<br>Eskelsen Orchards LLC<br>- Kyle Maynard, Assistant Attorney General              | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 11. Other Business<br>– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman   | <b>CONTINGENT</b>    |

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

### Wildlife Board Motions

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

#### Fall 2022 – Target Date – Progress on changes to statute for the poaching of swan

**MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to look into changing statute to reflect a 7-year waiting period for poaching swan, and have the Division report back. This is to be placed on the action log.**

Motion made by: Karl Hirst  
Assigned to: Wyatt Bubak  
Action: Under Study  
Status:  
Placed on Action Log: December 2, 2021

#### Fall 2022 – Target Date – Possibility of a 3-year season structure for Big Game seasons and hunter orange regulation reforms

**MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to look into a 3-year season structure for big game season dates, and the possibilities of hunter orange regulation reforms (including amount required, what other states allow, etc.). This is to be placed on the action log.**

Motion made by: Bryce Thurgood  
Assigned to: Covy Jones and Wyatt Bubak  
Action: Under Study  
Status:  
Placed on Action Log: December 2, 2021

**Utah Wildlife Board Meeting**  
January 4, 2022, Eccles Wildlife Education Center  
1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington, UT 84025  
**Summary of Motions**

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

The following motion was made by Bryce Thurgood, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously.

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

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

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Gary Nielson and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the December 2, 2021 Wildlife Board Meeting.**

3) Big Game R657-5 Rule Amendments (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Bryce Thurgood, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed 3-3 with Chairman Albrecht voting in favor. Karl Hirst, Wade Heaton and Bret Selman opposed. Bryce Thurgood, Randy Dearth and Gary Nielson were in support.

**MOTION: I move that we make it illegal to place, maintain, or use trail cameras (transmitting or non-transmitting cameras) from July 31st – December 31st for the take or aid of taking big game animals on public or private property.**

**Exemptions are agriculture operations using cameras for the monitoring, take of nuisance animals, or in cases of depredation on active agriculture operations by operators or their agents on public or private ground. An employee or authorized agent of the state of Utah or Federal Government are exempt.**

**A person may not use any night vision device to locate or attempt to locate a big game animal from 48 hours before any big game hunt in the area through 48 hours after any big game hunt ends in the area.**

**Engage in the sale or purchase of trail camera media, including images, video location, time, or date data to aid in the take or attempted take of big game.**

**Engage in the sale, purchase, distribution or storage of media, including images, video, location, time, or date data, collected from a device identified in subsection (A) to aid in the take or attempted take of big game.**

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

**MOTION: I move that we ask the division to establish a Technology Effectiveness Committee to form a structural process to address and outline issues relating to the use of hunting technologies. This committee should set a long term plan to address issues such as weapon success and restrictions, use of guides/scouts, use of range-finders and other technology, and any other issues that the committee deems necessary. This is to be placed on the action log.**

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Bryce Thurgood, and pulled prior to a vote.

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

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, and died for lack of a second.

**MOTION: I move that we deny the Division's proposal concerning hunter orange.**

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

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

- 4) Furbearer Season Dates and Bobcat Permit Recommendations (**Action**)

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

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

- 5) Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 Revisions for 2022-2023 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Bret Selman, seconded by Wade Heaton, passed 4-2 with Karl Hirst and Randy Dearth opposed.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Northern Region Advisory Council's proposal to allow the take of collared lions in areas where the study has ended.**

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Bryce Thurgood and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the remaining recommendations, including the Southern Region Advisory Council's request to ask the Director to align the cougar spot and stalk season dates with the harvest objective season dates.**

6) R657-33 Black Bear Rule Amendments and Recommendations for 2022 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Bret Selman and fails 4-2 with Bryce Thurgood, Karl Hirst, Randy Dearth and Gary Nielson opposed.

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

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Gary Nielson and passes unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve as presented from the Division, with the exception of leaving the season dates the same as last year, and to ask the Bear committee to meet and review the season date concerns.**

7) Board Hearing – Eskelsen Orchards LLC (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Gary Nielson and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we interpret the statute 23-16-4-3(C)(i) to mean that property owners will be compensated for full replacement value of actual damage or loss by big game animals. In this particular case, we interpret that loss to be the actual cost paid of the trees damaged. We authorize the division to pay a total of \$4,187.61 to the petitioner. We believe the legislature intended for the damages to be limited to the actual loss. The "or will be damaged" phrase is affected by too many variables and impossible to be determined consistently. We interpret the statute discussing future loss to mean when the crop would have been taken to market in the year the damage occurred. We request the legislature to clarify the statute for its inconsistencies.**

8) Other Business (**Action**)

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

**MOTION: I move that we direct the Division through the action log to look at issuing 2pt. or smaller buck deer tags to youth hunters; that in the four-year period, between 14-18, they would have the potential to be guaranteed at least one hunt for a 2pt. buck, and that those tags would not take away from any of the other tag allotments, but be in addition to the**

**tags already issued. We would ask the Division to look at the impact that it would have on licensing and the herds, as well as future youth hunters.**

**Kevin Albrecht included with the action log item that the addition of a survey be used to see what that need is.**

DRAFT

**Utah Wildlife Board Meeting**  
January 4, 2022, Eccles Wildlife Education Center  
1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington, UT 84025

Attendance

**Wildlife Board**

Kevin Albrecht – Chairman	Karl Hirst
Randy Dearth – Vice-Chairman	Gary Nielson
J. Shirley – Executive Secretary	Bryce Thurgood
	Wade Heaton
	Bret Selman

**RAC Chairs**

Central – Brock McMillan
Southern – Brayden Richmond
Southeastern – Kent Johnson
Northeastern – Brett Prevedel
Northern – Justin Oliver

**Online and In-Person Division Personnel**

Robin Goodman	Paul Gedge	Teresa Griffin	Morgan Larson
Ashley Green	Mike Christensen	Dax Mangus	J.D. Abbott
Mike Canning	Staci Coons	Guy Wallace	Danny Summers
Miles Hanberg	Paige Wiren	Matt Briggs	Eric Miller
Kevin Bunnell	Kyle Maynard	Torrey Christophersen	Heather Bernales
Ben Nadolski	Lindy Varney	Jim Christensen	
Jason Vernon	Riley Peck	Rusty Robinson	
Wyatt Bubak	Blair Stringham	Phil Gray	
Justin Shannon	Covy Jones	Jordan Ence	
Kenny Johnson	Chad Wilson	Todd Morgan	

**Public Present**

Kevin Norman	Rep. Casey Snider	Cody Bassett	Walter Szarek
Matt Farnsworth	Cory Huntsman	John Ziegler	Todd Eskelsen
Daniel Luke	Wade Garrett	Troy Justensen	
Angela Wonnacott	Rep. Mike Schultz	Andrew Eskelson	

**Legal Counsel and Hearing Examiner**

Mike Bagley	Charles Lyons
-------------	---------------

**Utah Wildlife Board Meeting**  
January 4, 2022, DNR Auditorium  
1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington, UT 84025  
[https://youtu.be/XeaH\\_WIUU4E](https://youtu.be/XeaH_WIUU4E)

- 00:04:49** Chairman Albrecht called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, and asked the Board and RAC chairs to introduce themselves.
- 00:06:09** **1) Approval of Agenda (Action)**  
The following motion was made by Bryce Thurgood, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously.  
**MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda.**
- 00:06:32** **2) Approval of Minutes (Action)**  
The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Gary Nielson and passed unanimously.  
**MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the December 2, 2021 Wildlife Board Meeting.**
- 00:06:62** **3) Old Business/Action Log (Contingent)**  
There was no old business or action log items to review at this time.
- 00:07:05** **4) DWR Update (Informational)**  
Director J. Shirley gave updates on all the Division sections: Administrative Services, Aquatic, Conservation Outreach, Habitat, Law Enforcement and Wildlife. The Director asked the four newly sworn in conservation officers to introduce themselves. Chairman Albrecht recognized the newly appointed Lake Powell fisheries biologist who replaced retired Division employee Wayne Gustaveson. Chairman Albrecht also directed the public who were present to fill out a comment card should they want to make a comment.
- 00:14:00** **5) Emerging Technologies Survey Results (Informational)**  
Law Enforcement Section Chief Wyatt Bubak summarized the survey results presentation that was posted on the Division's website.
- 00:17:06** **Board/RAC Questions**  
Neither the Board nor RACs had any questions.
- 00:17:45** **6) Big Game R657-5 Rule Amendments (Action)**  
Big Game Coordinator Covy Jones reviewed the presentation that was posted on the Division's website.
- 00:30:24** **Board/RAC Questions**  
Chairman Albrecht thanked the Division for making post-RAC tour changes to the rule.

The Board asked questions about the proposed big game rule changes' effect on the taking of cougar and bear. The Board noted the extent to which this agenda item had gone through the public process. The Board asked for clarification on the proposed transmitting trail camera ban recommendation as it related to cougar and bear hunting, and for clarification on the rule change regarding the selling of trail camera data. Chairman Albrecht recognized the two Utah State legislators who were present.

The RACs did not have any questions at this time.

**00:37:07 Public Input**

Director Shirley summarized the online public input on this agenda item.

**00:38:48 RAC Summaries**

All RACs passed the Division's recommendations with varying dissent and stipulations.

**00:46:24 Public Comments/Division Clarification**

Public comments were accepted at this time. No clarification was given at this time.

**01:05:10 Board Discussion and Questions**

Chairman Albrecht thanked the public for all the communication the Board received on this agenda item, and summarized the RAC recommendations. The Board discussed the proposed trail camera ban beginning and end dates.

The Board expressed concern about the social aspects of the issue of trail camera use in Utah, discussed the scope of how input on this issue was solicited, and talked about the idea of fair chase as it may apply to the use of trail cameras during big game hunting seasons. The Board asked about the challenges of enforcing baiting laws. The Board suggested reviewing all technology used in hunting, and discussed banning only transmitting trail cameras versus banning the use of all trail cameras during a designated season. The Board also discussed the impact that a seasonal banning of trail cameras might have on the guiding business, the pros and cons of trail camera use in general, and the potential challenges of enforcing a trail camera ban. The Board noted feedback solicited from the State of Nevada about the effectiveness of their trail camera law.

Assistant Attorney General Kyle Maynard clarified the scope of Nevada's trail camera law.

The Board asked for clarification on the motion. The Board also expressed the hope that the state legislature consider all trail camera use, not just trail cameras used for the take or aid of taking big game animals.

The Division gave the Board guidance regarding the language of the motion.

The Board discussed the details of the motion, the enforcement of the motion if passed, and non-consumptive trail camera users.

The following motion was made by Bryce Thurgood, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed 3-3 with Chairman Albrecht voting in favor. Karl Hirst, Wade Heaton and Bret Selman opposed. Bryce Thurgood, Randy Dearth and Gary Nielson were

in support.

**MOTION:** I move that we make it illegal to place, maintain, or use trail cameras (transmitting or non-transmitting cameras) from July 31 – December 31st for the take or aid of taking big game animals on public or private property.

Exemptions are agriculture operations using cameras for the monitoring, take of nuisance animals, or in cases of depredation on active agriculture operations by operators or their agents on public or private ground. An employee or authorized agent of the state of Utah or Federal Government are exempt.

A person may not use any night vision device to locate or attempt to locate a big game animal from 48 hours before any big game hunt in the area through 48 hours after any big game hunt ends in the area.

Engage in the sale or purchase of trail camera media, including images, video location, time, or date data to aid in the take or attempted take of big game.

Engage in the sale, purchase, distribution or storage of media, including images, video, location, time, or date data, collected from a device identified in subsection (A) to aid in the take or attempted take of big game.

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

**MOTION:** I move that we ask the division to establish a Technology Effectiveness Committee to form a structural process to address and outline issues relating to the use of hunting technologies. This committee should set a long term plan to address issues such as weapon success and restrictions, use of guides/scouts, use of range-finders and other technology, and any other issues that the committee deems necessary. This is to be placed on the action log.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst seconded by Bryce Thurgood, and pulled prior to a vote.

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

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth failed for a lack of a second.

**MOTION:** I move that we deny the Division's proposal concerning hunter orange.

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

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

Game Mammals Coordinator Darren DeBloois summarized the presentation that was posted on the Division's website, and noted that the Board were sent letters that corrected some of the tables that were in the presentation.

**02:12:00 Board/RAC Questions**

The Board asked for clarification on the justification for the season dates, and for general clarification on the recommendations.

There were no questions from the RACs.

**02:13:16 Public Input**

Director Shirley summarized the online public input on this agenda item.

**02:13:15 RAC Summaries**

All RACs passed the Division's recommendations with one stipulation.

**02:14:58 Public Comments/Division Clarification**

Public comments were accepted at this time. No clarification was given at this time.

**02:16:48 Board Discussion**

There was no discussion from the Board.

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

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

**02:17:34 8) Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 revisions for 2022-2023 (Action)**

Game Mammals Coordinator Darren DeBloois summarized the online presentation that was posted on the Division's website.

**02:18:59 Board/RAC Questions**

The Board asked about the overlap on units.

The RAC asked about the number of collared cougars that are on hunting units but that are no longer being studied, and asked about aligning the spot and stalk and harvest objective seasons.

The Board asked the Southern RAC chairman to reiterate that region's motions.

**02:23:47 Public Input**

Director Shirley summarized the online public input on this agenda item.

**02:24:47 Public Comments/Division Clarification**

Public comments were accepted at this time. There was no clarification given at this time.

**02:30:51 RAC Summaries**

All RACs voted to pass the Division's recommendations with varying stipulations.

**02:32:47 Board Discussion/Questions**

The Board asked about the 3-year term of protecting collared cougars that the Board had previously voted to enact, asked if data could still be collected from collared cougars even after the study was over, and asked if a hunter in the field could tell whether or not a collar on a cougar was still working and active. The Board also discussed the validity of protecting all collared cougars, regardless of whether or not the cougars were within a study area. The Board asked how many cougars currently are collared.

The following motion was made by Bret Selman, seconded by Wade Heaton, passed 4-2 with Karl Hirst and Randy Dearth opposed.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Northern Region Advisory Council's proposal to allow the take of collared lions in areas where the study has ended.**

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Bryce Thurgood and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the remaining recommendations, including the Southern Region Advisory Council's request to ask the Director to align the cougar spot and stalk season dates with the harvest objective season dates.**

**02:45:47 9) R657-33 Black Bear Rule Amendments and Recommendations for 2022 (Action)**

Game Mammals Coordinator Darren DeBloois summarized the online presentation that was posted on the Division's website.

**02:49:16 Board/RAC Questions**

The Board asked questions about the conflict between houndsmen and bait hunters, asked for clarification on the focus on the particular proposed units and the proposed season date changes.

There were no questions from the RACs.

**02:57:47 Public Input**

Director Shirley summarized the online public input on this agenda item.

**02:58:59 RAC Summaries**

All RACs passed recommendations with varying dissent and stipulations.

**03:02:44 Public Comments/Division Clarification**

Public comments were accepted at this time. No clarification was given at this time.

**03:06:49 Board Questions and Discussion**

Chairman Albrecht reviewed the RAC summaries. The Board discussed having the Bear Committee address the conflict between houndsmen and bait hunters, and also discussed not shortening the hound hunt season end date. The Board also stressed the need to take action on this agenda item.

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Bret Selman and failed 4-2 with Bryce Thurgood, Karl Hirst, Randy Dearth and Gary Nielson opposed.

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

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Gary Nielson and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve as presented from the Division, with the exception of leaving the season dates the same as last year, and to ask the Bear committee to meet and review the season date concerns.**

**03:16:03 LUNCH**

**04:06:30 10) 1:00 p.m. Time Certain – Board Meeting Eskelsen Orchards (Action)**

Chairman Albrecht took appearance of counsel. Assistant Attorney General for the Division, Kyle Maynard, read stipulations for the record.

**04:10:16** Chairman Albrecht asked the hearing examiner, Assistant Attorney General Charles Lyons, to present.

**04:19:48** Chairman Albrecht turned the time over to Mr. Todd Eskelsen to outline his request for compensation from the State for fruit orchard trees lost due to depredation. Mr. Eskelsen's son, Andrew Eskelsen, explained the valuation model the Eskelsens used to arrive at the dollar amount that they were requesting for depredation to their orchard's fruit trees.

**04:56:49 Board Questions**

The Board asked questions about the data used to create the Eskelsen's valuation model. The Board asked how old the trees lost to depredation were, and if the grower, in anticipation of future loss, could order additional trees when making a yearly purchase of trees from a nursery. The Board asked what year the trees were lost, how many of the lost trees had been replaced, and what species of trees were lost.

Assistant Attorney General Kyle Maynard objected to some of the points being made by Mr. Eskelsen, asked Mr. Eskelsen clarifying questions, and argued the Division's position on this issue.

**05:33:54** Mr. Eskelsen made final comments, and Andrew Eskelsen rebutted the Division's evidence. Mr. Maynard then made final comments.

**05:52:17 Board Questions**

The Board asked about measures that were taken to mitigate depredation, if Mr. Eskelsen had received any payment for his losses, and if Mr. Eskelsen had taken advantage of using depredation permits. The Board asked about fruit tree loss in the history of the orchard's operation, and how much it might cost to erect a fence around the orchard.

**06:00:57 BREAK FOR DELIBERATION**

**07:33:36 Board Discussion**

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Gary Nielson and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we interpret the statute 23-16-4-3(C)(i) to mean that property owners will be compensated for full replacement value of actual damage or loss by big game animals. In this particular case, we interpret that loss to be the actual cost paid of the trees damaged. We authorize the Division to pay a total of \$4,187.61 to the petitioner. We believe the legislature intended for the damages to be limited to the actual loss. The "or will be damaged" phrase is affected by too many variables and impossible to be determined consistently. We interpret the statute discussing future loss to mean when the crop would have been taken to market in the year the damage occurred. We request the legislature to clarify the statute for its inconsistencies.**

**07:35:02 11) Other Business (Contingent)**

The Board asked if agenda items, such as hearings, could be listed as a last agenda item rather than having to occur at a specific time.

The Division asked for clarification on the motion passed about collared cougars.

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

**MOTION: I move that we direct the Division through the action log to look at issuing 2pt. or smaller buck deer tags to youth hunters; that in the four-year period, between 14-18, they would have the potential to be guaranteed at least one hunt for a 2pt. buck, and that those tags would not take away from any of the other tag allotments, but be in addition to the tags already issued. We would ask the Division to look at the impact that it would have on licensing and the herds, as well as future youth hunters.**

**Kevin Albrecht included with the action log item that the addition of a survey be used to see what that need is.**

**07:37:55 Meeting Adjourned**

**Wildlife Board Work Session**  
**Eccles Wildlife Education Center, Farmington UT**  
**March 31, 2022 9:00 am**  
<https://youtu.be/X8P9hJSgos8>

1. Mule Deer

- Targeted yearling hunts - Big game staff and BYU
  - Present the survival rates on 0-6 month old fawns, 6-18 month old fawns, and 18-30 month old animals by sex. This will allow us to clearly identify what is being lost during each time frame.
  - Explore options to increase hunting opportunities for bucks - staying with the status quo, yearling buck hunts only (possibly for youth and first time hunters), private lands only yearling buck hunts, etc. Discuss the downsides to antler point restrictions.
  - Yearling Buck Hunt (spike or 2 point) - What would the hunt structure look like? What does that hunt look like for the hunter that waits to draw the mature buck tag? How long will their wait be? What will the buck to doe ratio be? Will the hunt quality for mature bucks be any different than it is now?
- Mule Deer summaries by region - Regional Wildlife Managers
  - Managers will take 10-15 minutes each to present regional summaries on current deer trends/observations in the region - this is not a unit by unit summary
- Statewide Update on what we learned from captures and research - Kent and BYU
- Wildlife Tracker demonstration - Jesse Shapiro
  - Mule deer movements and corridors and interactions with predators

2. Technology Committee - Derrick Ewell and Gabe Patterson, co-chairs

- Committee make up and schedule
- What topics should the committee tackle first? Could include hunting big game with all three weapon types, scopes on muzzleloaders, etc.
- Survey needs

3. Mitigation/Depredation Hunts - Chad Wilson

- 72 hour notices (new changes via the legislature)
- Provide a summary of depredation payments, permits/vouchers issued, challenges for each district or region, and how many animals are harvested with these permits/vouchers.

4. Elk Hunting Strategy – Covy Jones

- Provide an update on the statewide elk committee
- Highlight major issues the committee will be asked to discuss (e.g. ensuring private landowners in any bull units can hunt elk on their property)

5. Point System - Lindy Varney

- What it would look like if we merged LE and GS points
- Issues with going away all points given the investment of so many hunters for decades

6. Price Increase - Kenny Johnson

- Share the fee process with the Board but no details to announce at the present time.

7. Urban Deer Transplants - Chad/Covy/Ginger

- Division concerns with moving urban deer and disease risks

8. Hunters Safety Discussion - Gary Cook

- Can we streamline hunters' safety?
- Do we still need the mandatory shooting requirement?

**Utah Wildlife Board Working Meeting**  
Eccles Wildlife Education Center  
1157 South Waterfowl Way  
Farmington, Utah 84025  
Attendance

**Wildlife Board**

Kevin Albrecht – Chair	Bryce Thurgood	Gary Nielson
Randy Dearth – Vice-Chair	Wade Heaton	Bret Selman
J. Shirley – Exec Secretary	Karl Hirst	

**Division Personnel**

Riley Peck	Staci Coons	Mike Christensen
Kenny Johnson	Kyle Maynard	Dax Mangus
Wyatt Bubak	Chad Wilson	Jim Christensen
Chris Wood	Gabe Patterson	Kent Hersey
Kevin Bunnell	Mike Wardle	Covy Jones
Lindy Varney	Kim Hersey	Gary Cook
Phil Gray	Jessie Shapiro	Miles Hanberg
Ben Nadolski	Derrick Ewell	Ginger Stout
Paige Wiren	Brad Crompton	

**BYU Research Professors**

Dr. Randy Larsen  
Dr. Brock McMillan

**Public**

Dan Potts      Kyle Coombs      Justin Oliver

**Utah Wildlife Board Working Meeting**  
March 31, 2022, Eccles Wildlife Education Center  
1157 South Waterfowl Way  
Farmington, Utah 84025  
<https://youtu.be/X8P9hJSgos8>

- 00:13:00** Chairman Albrecht called the meeting to order.
- 00:15:03** **1) Mule Deer (Informational)**  
Big Game Projects Coordinator Kent Hersey gave updates on the status of statewide mule deer populations.
- 00:23:20** **Board Questions & Discussion**  
The Board asked about historic statewide deer population numbers, and what kind of data confirms current population estimates. They asked about neonate and doe summaries, and about the relationship between range conditions and adult survival rates.
- 00:28:51** Wildlife Manager Jim Christensen presented a summary of current deer trends and observations in the Northern Region.
- 00:39:10** **Board Questions & Discussion**  
The Board confirmed that deer are doing well in the Northern Region. The Board asked about the impact of predator control efforts and about winter range conditions in the Northern Region.
- 00:46:59** Wildlife Manager Dax Mangus presented a summary of current deer trends and observations in the Northern Region.
- 01:01:40** **Board Questions & Discussion**  
The Board asked if incentive for cougar take on the Book Cliffs could be increased, asked about the feral and stray horse population on the Book Cliffs, asked about feral cow population. The Board offered to assist with efforts to help big game populations in the Book Cliffs. The Board thanked the Division for their comprehensive work on the Book Cliffs.  
The Board commented on the difference between managed forests now and 50 years ago, and how the overall difference affects deer populations in those environments.
- 01:12:39** Wildlife Manager Rusty Robinson presented a summary of current deer trends and observations in the Central Region
- 01:20:46** **Board Questions & Discussion**  
The Board asked about the impact roads and highways have on deer movement in the Central Region, and asked if funding should be moved from habitat projects to highway projects. The Board noted that sportsmen could be allies when forest work

that may seem contrary to overall forest health needs to be implemented.

**01:27:50** Wildlife biologist Mike Wardle presented a summary of current deer trends and observations in the Southern Region.

**01:37:40 Board Questions & Discussion**

The Board asked about the impact of drought on adult body fat, asked if efforts to take coyote could be coordinated to mitigate fawn mortality. The Board asked for clarification on Pine Valley causes of death statistics, and asked about potential positive impacts of predator management. The Board commented on statistics from the Paunsaugunt unit. The Board acknowledged the complexity of wildlife management. The Board asked for more in-depth information on the Pine Valley unit, and voiced recognition of the cyclical trends of habitat conditions and wildlife populations. The Board discussed how to best set management objectives to alleviate significant swings in deer populations.

**01:56:44** Wildlife Assistant Manager Brad Crompton presented a summary of current deer trends and observations in the Southeastern Region.

**02:06:20 Board Questions & Discussion**

The Board discussed the carrying capacity of units, and the influence that the social aspect of hunting has on permit allocation decisions. The Board asked about the overall decrease in cougar harvest in the Southeastern Region, and in the state in general.

The Board asked how gathered data should shape permit allocation numbers.

The Board iterated something about the social aspect of something about the youth draw. The Board asked about the breeding age range of male deer.

**02:13:29 Break**

**02:29:32 Board Discussion**

The Board stressed the importance of recruiting new hunters.

**02:30:53** BYU professor Randy Larsen gave a presentation on data collected from wildlife captures, neonate studies, body condition information and harvest rates.

**02:46:30 Board Questions & Discussion**

The Board wondered if targeted yearling hunts could be successful. The Board asked if knowing ahead of time which other segment of the population a targeted yearling hunt might affect is possible. The Board asked how a targeted yearling hunt might be achieved. The Board suggested that a survey about a yearling hunt would be useful. The Board stressed that creating opportunity for youth to hunt yearling bucks could help with hunter retention, and that creating the opportunity would have more of a social impact than a biological impact. The Board asked about the virility

of yearling bucks. The Board asked if targeting yearling bucks would later affect the three to four-year-old population. The Board differed on their opinions of how popular a yearling hunt would be. The Board suggested that a yearling permit could only be granted twice during the youth hunter age span. The Board reiterated how important a survey would be to solicit public opinion. The Division spoke about antler point restrictions.

**03:17:06 Break for Lunch**

**03:51:23** GIS Specialist Jessie Shapiro gave a demonstration of the Division's Wildlife Tracker database.0

**04:10:50 Technical Issues**

**04:29:44** GIS Specialist Jessie Shapiro continued giving a demonstration of the Division's Wildlife Tracker database.

**04:33:33 Board Questions & Discussion**

The Board thanked the Division for the presentation.

**04:35:016 2) Technology Committee**

Wildlife biologist Derrick Ewell and Sergeant Gabe Patterson gave updates on the status of the Technology Committee members and schedule. Sergeant Patterson asked if the committee should consider air guns. Wildlife Program Manager Riley Peck updated the Board on the 2022 legislative bill that directs the Wildlife Board to designate the species that may be hunted with an air rifle.

**04:38:17 Board Questions & Discussion**

The Board posited that The Board voiced that it would be prudent to consider compromises when discussing banning various technologies. The Board pointed out that restricting certain technologies will undoubtedly disappoint some people, while satisfying others.

The Board commented on the kinds of questions they receive from the public regarding technology, and opined on the role of government regulation of technology. The Board discussed the value of equitable compromise.

**04:56:16 3) Migration/Depredation Hunts (Informational)**

Chad Wilson gave updates on mitigation and depredation legislative changes, and provided a summary of depredation payments, permits and vouchers issued, challenges for each district or region, and how many animals are harvested with permits and vouchers.

**05:03:36 Board Questions & Discussion**

The Board asked what the differences are between permits and vouchers, and the explanation for the difference between the total permits and vouchers issued and the number of animals harvested. The Board asked if there is anything that can be done

to lessen the harvest of does. The Board noted the board's role regarding mitigation and depredation issues as dictated by statute. The Board echoed the Division's recommendation that hunters get involved with helping landowners fund solutions to their depredation issues.

**05:19:47**      **4) Elk Hunting Strategy (Informational)**

Big Game Coordinator Covy Jones gave a presentation on the 2022 statewide elk plan committee.

**05:26:17**      **Board Questions & Discussion**

The Board suggested providing incentives for private landowners to have elk on their property without taking permits out of the public pool, as well as adjusting the hunt dates or modifying the types of hunts. The Board asked if statewide elk populations are meeting their population and/or unit objectives. The Board asked about increasing the number of permits, and also asked that future surveys ask more and a wider variety of questions and that a greater number of people are surveyed. The Board stressed that it is important to consider what future impact decisions made now will have.

**05:39:24**      **5) Point System (Informational)**

Licensing Coordinator Lindy Varney gave a presentation titled, "Overview of the Point System."

**06:15:53**      **Board Questions & Discussion**

The Board noted that there is no clear answer to the issue of taking measures to try and increase applicants' success in drawing a permit. The Board said that the proposed change would be very controversial. The Board recalled what deer hunting in Utah was like decades ago.

**06:31:43**      Big Game Coordinator Covy Jones outlined the potential outcome of merging the two point systems.

**06:35:29**      **Board Questions & Discussion**

The Board advocated for merging the two point systems.

**06:37:41**      **Break**

**06:49:14**      Lindy Varney concludes her presentation.

**06:50:57**      **Board Questions & Discussion**

The Chairman advised the Board to consult Lindy Varney when unsure about issues regarding licensing. The Board suggested considering all options, and implementing as many as are feasible, rather than thinking one option only could positively impact or fix a very complex problem.

**06:53:06**      **6) Price Increase (Informational)**

Administrative Services Section Chief Kenny Johnson presented the need for increases in the Division’s fee structure.

**06:56:43**      **Board Questions & Discussion**

The Board suggested reviewing the structure of fees on an annual basis. The Board asked what fees were being considered to increase, and what percent of revenue of big game is applications, and what percent is permits?

**07:00:32**      **7) Urban Deer Transplants (Informational)**

Wildlife veterinarian Dr. Virginia Stout gave a presentation that highlighted general concerns with transplanting urban deer. Covy Jones further explained the Division’s perspective on transplanting urban deer.

**07:16:28**      **Board Questions & Discussion**

The Board expressed concern about chronic wasting disease (CWD) how much attention/resources.

**07:19:01**      **8) Hunters Safety Discussion (Discussion)**

Hunter Education Coordinator Gary Cook gave a presentation titled, “Hunter Education Program.”

**05:50:26**      **Board Questions & Discussion**

The Board commented on the high caliber of hunter education instructors. The Board asked how long the new online program takes to complete, if the class requirements could be made easier to fulfill, and if Nevada removed the live fire exercise component in the state’s hunter education program.

**07:48:00**      Meeting adjourned.

**Regional Advisory Council Meeting  
April 2022  
Summary of Motions**

- 1) Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022 (**Action**)
- CR       **MOTION: To accept the DWR recommendations as presented with the exception to increase the Pine Valley buck deer permits from 1,700 to 2,000.**  
**PASSED: Unanimous**
- NR       **MOTION: I move that we accept Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022 as presented.**  
**PASSED: Unanimous**
- SR       **MOTION: I move that there be no permit increase on the Fillmore and Plateau/Boulder units; and reduce the permit increase from 500 to 250 on the Panguitch Lake unit.**  
**PASSED: 7-2**
- MOTION: I move that we asked the Division of Wildlife Resources Board to evaluate the fairness of how Lifetime License Permits are allocated, and survey Lifetime License holders to understand what their expectations are.**  
**PASSED: Unanimous**
- MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Buck Deer Permit recommendations for 2022 as presented by the division.**  
**PASSED: Unanimous**
- SER      **MOTION: I move that we accept Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022 as presented.**  
**PASSED: Unanimous**
- MOTION: To recommend that the Wildlife Board investigate the distribution or the allocation of lifetime licenses.**  
**PASSED: Unanimous**
- NER      **MOTION: To accept as presented from the Division with the exception of Beaver, Fillmore and Panguitch Lake in which case the permits would be reduced according to the recommendations of the SFW.**  
**PASSED: 4-3**

2) Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022 (Action)

CR, NR, SER

**MOTION: I move that we accept Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022 as presented.**

**PASSED:** Unanimous

SR

**MOTION: I move that we increase the bull elk permits on the Beaver unit from 51 to 76 and distribute the additional permits proportionally with the current recommendation.**

**PASSED:** 6-2, 1 abstention

**MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn permit recommendations for 2022 as presented by the division.**

**PASSED:** Unanimous

NER

**MOTION: I move that we accept Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022 as presented.**

**PASSED:** 6 in favor, 1 recusal

3) Once-in-a-Lifetime Permit Recommendations for 2022 (Action)

CR

**MOTION: Accept the DWR recommendations as presented with the exception to decrease the Nine Mile, Jack Creek bighorn sheep permits from 3 to 2 and to increase the North Slope/South Slope, High Uintas Central (archery) mountain goat permit from 1 to 2.**

**PASSED:** 7-3

NR

**MOTION: I move that we accept Once-In-A-Lifetime Permit Recommendations for 2022 with the exception of decreasing the Nine Mile Jack Creek Bighorn Sheep to 2 permits.**

**PASSED:** Unanimous

SR, NER

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Once in a Lifetime Permit recommendations for 2022 as presented by the division.**

**PASSED:** Unanimous

SER

**MOTION: To reduce the Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep permits on the Jack Creek Unit from 3 to 2.**

**PASSED:** 6-3

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Once in a Lifetime Permit recommendations for 2022 as presented by the division.**

**PASSED:** Unanimous

4) Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2022 (**Action**)

CR, NR, SER

**MOTION: I move that we accept Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2022 as presented.**

**PASSED: Unanimous**

SR

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Antlerless Deer recommendations for 2022 as presented with the exception of the public doe hunts on the Pine Valley unit. (No doe hunts on the Pine Valley unit).**

**PASSED: 8 in favor, 1 abstention**

**MOTION: I move that we accept the remaining Antlerless permit recommendations as presented by the division.**

**PASSED: Unanimous**

NER

**MOTION: I move that we accept Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2022 as presented.**

**PASSED: 6-1**

5) 2022 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations (**Action**)

CR

**MOTION: I move that we accept 2022 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations as presented.**

**PASSED: 7-3**

NR, SR, SER

**MOTION: I move that we accept 2022 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations as presented.**

**PASSED: Unanimous**

NER

**MOTION: I move that we accept 2022 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations as presented.**

**PASSED: 6-1**

# Central Region RAC Meeting

## Video Conference

April 5, 2022

The meeting streamed live at <https://youtu.be/L1tUjKmL9xs>

### Tuesday April 5, 2022 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 Meeting Update<br>– Brock McMillan, RAC chair   | <b>INFORMATIONAL</b> |
| 4. Regional Update<br>– Jason Vernon, Regional Supervisor   | <b>INFORMATIONAL</b> |
| 5. Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022<br>- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator                            | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 6. Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022<br>- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator          | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 7. Once-in-a-Lifetime Permit Recommendations for 2022<br>- Riley Peck, Once-in-a-Lifetime Species Coordinator | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 8. Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2022<br>- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator                           | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 9. 2022 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations<br>- Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator    | <b>ACTION</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 5, 2022  
Springville, Utah  
**Summary of Motions**

1) Approval of Agenda

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

**MOTION: To approve to approve the agenda as presented.**

2) Approval of November 30, 2021 Minutes

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

**MOTION: To approve the minutes of the November 30th Central Region RAC meeting as transcribed.**

3) Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022

The following motion was made by Jim Shuler, seconded by Chase Crandall and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: To accept the DWR recommendations as presented with the exception to increase the Pine Valley buck deer permits from 1,700 to 2,000.**

4) Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022

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

**MOTION: To accept the DWR recommendations as presented.**

5) Once-in-a-Lifetime Permit Recommendations for 2022

The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Ken Strong and passes 7-3.

**MOTION: Accept the DWR recommendations as presented with the exception to decrease the Nine Mile, Jack Creek bighorn sheep permits from 3 to 2 and to increase the North Slope/South Slope, High Uintas Central (archery) mountain goat permit from 1 to 2.**

6) Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2022

The following motion was made by Jim Shuler, seconded by Josh Lenart and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: To accept the DWR recommendations as presented.**

7) 2022 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations

The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Jim Shuler and passed 7-3.

**MOTION: To accept the DWR recommendations as presented.**

**Central Region RAC Meeting**  
April 5, 2022

**RAC Members**

**Attending**

Brock McMillan – RAC Chair  
Chase Crandall  
Eric Reid  
Ken Strong  
Scott Jensen (online)  
Jim Shuler  
Michael Christensen  
Josh Lenart  
Ben Lowder  
Luke Decker  
Danny Potts

**Absent**

AJ Mower  
Steve Lund

**Wildlife Board**

Gary Nielsen

**DWR Personnel**

Jason Vernon  
Chad Wilson  
Covy Jones  
Matt Briggs  
Rusty Robinson  
Rod Nielsen  
Wes Alexander  
Dale Liechty  
Morgan Hinton  
Jason Robinson (online)  
Scott Root

Total public: 9

**Public invited to join online: <https://youtu.be/L1tUjKml9xs>**

**Central Region RAC Meeting**  
 April 5, 2022  
 Springville, Utah  
<https://youtu.be/L1tUjKmL9xs>

<b>06:08:00</b>	RAC Chair Brock McMillan called the meeting to order. He called the roll of RAC members and indicated which UDWR personnel were present. He explained the process that there will be no live presentations or public comments taken during the meeting.
<b>06:11:15</b>	<p><b>1) Approval of Agenda (Action)</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Ben Lowder and passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda as presented.</b></p>
<b>06:11:15</b>	<p><b>2) Approval of Minutes (Action)</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Ben Lowder and passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: I move that we approve the November 30 minutes as transcribed.</b></p>
<b>06:11:40</b>	<p><b>3) Wildlife Board Meeting (Informational)</b></p> <p>RAC Chair Brock McMillan updated the RAC.</p>
<b>06:13:00</b>	<p><b>4) DWR Update (Informational)</b></p> <p>Jason Vernon updated the RAC on all regional activities.</p>
<b>06:24:10</b>	<p><b>5) Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022 (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>06:24:30</b>	<p><b>RAC Questions</b></p> <p>The RAC members asked about permit decreases, fawn survival rates, winter survival rates, and population objective, drought conditions.</p>
<b>06:58:45</b>	<p><b>Public Comments</b></p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p> <p><b>Public Comments</b></p> <p>Troy Justesen, SFW - Need to take the opportunity and enjoy the resources that is there. Thanks to the Division for presenting recommendations to chapters throughout the state. Support the recommendation with the exception of Beaver, Fillmore, and Panguitch Lake unit recommendations.</p> <p>Eric Moss – Thank the RAC for your service. Would like to see mandatory harvest reporting on all species and all permits to help make better recommendations.</p> <p>Brian Hoover – Thank the RAC for their time and efforts. Appreciates all the efforts being made to collect more data in order to biologists to better manage herds. Supports the recommendations.</p>

<p><b>07:06:10</b></p>	<p><b>RAC Discussion</b></p> <p>The RAC members discussed the possibility of hunters being required to report harvest and e-tagging harvested animals, SFW recommendations for southern region units, buck-to-doe ratios and the availability of data.</p>
<p><b>07:19:12</b></p>	<p><b>Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>MOTIONS</b></p> <p>The following amended motion was made by Jim Shuler, seconded by Chase Crandall and passes unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To accept the DWR recommendations as presented with the exception to increase the Pine Valley buck deer permits from 1,700 to 2,000.</b></p>
<p><b>07:29:07</b></p>	<p><b>6) Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022</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>
<p><b>07:29:45</b></p>	<p><b>RAC Questions</b></p> <p>The RAC members asked about Central Mountains/Nebo elk age objective, population size, and bull to cow ratio. The RAC also asked about pronghorn population numbers on Parker Mountain, Beaver elk permit numbers, upper end age classes for elk, and new boundary recommendations (antlerless hunts).</p>
<p><b>07:40:05</b></p>	<p><b>Public Comments</b></p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p> <p><b>Public Comments</b></p> <p>Troy Justesen, SFW – Supports the Division recommendation. Glad to see the Parker pronghorn population coming back.</p>
<p><b>07:42:53</b></p>	<p><b>RAC Discussion</b></p> <p>The RAC members discussed moving elk permits on Wasatch to the mid-season,</p>
<p><b>07:44:53</b></p>	<p><b>Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>MOTIONS</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Eric Reid and passed unanimously</p> <p><b>MOTION: To accept the Division’s recommendations as presented.</b></p>
<p><b>07:45:35</b></p>	<p><b>7) Once-in-a-Lifetime Permit Recommendation for 2022 (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>

<p><b>07:45:58</b></p>	<p><b>RAC Questions</b>          RAC members asked about archery permit recommendations and harvest success rates, Oak Creek sheep permit numbers,</p>
<p><b>07:49:37</b></p>	<p><b>Public Comments</b>          Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.  <b>Public Comments</b>          Troy Justesen, SFW – Supports the recommendation with the exception of Jack Creek and commented on archery permit hunt recommendations for OIAL species.</p>
<p><b>07:52:48</b></p>	<p><b>RAC Discussion</b>          The RAC members discussed average age of rams the Jack Creek unit, mountain goat permit numbers on the North Slope High Uinta, and high elevation drought issues with sheep.</p>
<p><b>08:06:38</b></p>	<p><b>Once-in-a-Lifetime Permit Recommendation for 2022</b>  <b>MOTIONS</b>          The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Ken Strong and passed 7-3. (Eric, Mike and Josh oppose)  <b>MOTION: Accept the DWR recommendations as presented with the exception to decrease the Nine Mile, Jack Creek bighorn sheep permits from 3 to 2 and to increase the North Slope/South Slope, High Uintas Central (archery) mountain goat permit from 1 to 2.</b></p>
<p><b>08:12:50</b></p>	<p><b>8) Antlerless 2022 Permit Recommendations (Action)</b>          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>
<p><b>08:12:56</b></p>	<p><b>RAC Questions</b>          The RAC members asked about elk population objective numbers and antlerless permit recommendations, private property elk permits, Pine Valley doe survival, private land, Wasatch/Current Creek elk population, and La Sal unit management.</p>
<p><b>08:26:40</b></p>	<p><b>Public Comment</b>          Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.  <b>Public Comment</b>          Troy Justesen, SFW – Support the recommendations excluding the Pine Valley unit.</p>
<p><b>08:28:20</b></p>	<p><b>RAC Discussion</b>          The RAC members discussed the minimal effect of 600 doe permits on the overall deer</p>

	population.
<b>08:29:12</b>	<p><b>Antlerless 2022 Permit Recommendations</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>MOTIONS</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Jim Shuler, seconded by Josh Lenart and passed unanimously</p> <p><b>MOTION: To accept the DWR recommendations as presented.</b></p>
<b>08:29:59</b>	<p><b>9) CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations 2022 (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>08:30:06</b>	<p><b>RAC Questions</b></p> <p>The RAC members asked if CWMU permits were not set in management plans with CWMUs and if CWMU permit numbers are already maximized, is there push back from operators for cow tags, and how to increase antlerless permits and public opportunity on CWMUs. RAC also asked about harvest rates for cows versus bulls on CWMUs, and public lands included within CWMUs.</p>
<b>08:40:24</b>	<p><b>Public Comment</b></p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p> <p><b>Public Comment</b></p> <p>No public comments from audience.</p>
<b>08:41:32</b>	<p><b>RAC Discussion</b></p> <p>The RAC members discussed the fact that land changes hands and the possibility of more supportive landowners in the future, concerns that CWMUs are not providing the access they should be, and the process for CWMU permit recommendations.</p>
<b>08:56:16</b>	<p><b>CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations 2022</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>MOTIONS</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Jim Shuler and passed 7-3. (Luke, Mike and Scott oppose)</p> <p><b>MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented.</b></p>
<b>08:57:45</b>	Meeting adjourned.

# Regional Advisory Council Meeting

April 6, 2022

The meeting will stream live at <https://youtu.be/b3refWkjcUI>

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. Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022 **ACTION**  
- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator and Regional Wildlife Manager
6. Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022 **ACTION**  
- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator and Regional Wildlife Manager
7. Once-in-a-Lifetime Permit Recommendations for 2022 **ACTION**  
- Riley Peck, OIAL Species Coordinator and Regional Wildlife Manager
8. Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2022 **ACTION**  
- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator and Regional Wildlife Manager
9. 2022 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations **ACTION**  
- Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator

CR RAC – April 5th, 6:00 PM  
Wildlife Resources Conference Room  
1115 N. Main Street, Springville  
<https://youtu.be/FH6nAFmZMnQ>

SER RAC – April 13th, 6:30 PM  
John Wesley Powel Museum  
1765 E. Main St., Green River  
[https://youtu.be/u\\_6rOzDPIF8](https://youtu.be/u_6rOzDPIF8)

NR RAC – April 6th, 6:00 PM  
Weber County Commission Chambers  
2380 Washington Blvd. Suite #240, Ogden  
<https://youtu.be/b3refWkjcUI>

NER RAC – April 14th, 6:30 PM  
Wildlife Resources NER Office 318  
318 North Vernal Ave., Vernal  
[https://youtu.be/M\\_e6VKb9nqQ](https://youtu.be/M_e6VKb9nqQ)

SR RAC – April 12th, 6:00 PM  
DNR Cedar City Hunter Conf. Room  
405 University Blvd., Cedar City  
<https://youtu.be/IcMURU7yyVo>

Board Meeting – April 28th, 9:00 AM  
Eccles Wildlife Education Center, Farmington Bay  
[https://youtu.be/aYbg\\_MlzxLk](https://youtu.be/aYbg_MlzxLk)

**Regional Advisory Council Meeting  
Summary of Motions**

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

The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by Ryan Brown and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Agenda and Minutes.**

2) Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by Kevin McLeod and passed

**MOTION: I move that we accept Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022 as presented.**

3) Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Brad Buchanan, seconded by Ryan Brown and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022 as presented.**

4) Once-in-a-Lifetime Permit Recommendations for 2022 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Brad Buchanan, seconded by Mike Laughter and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept Once-In-A-Lifetime Permit Recommendations for 2022 with the exception of decreasing the Nine Mile Jack Creek Bighorn Sheep to 2 permits.**

5) Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2022 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by Paul Chase and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2022 as presented.**

6) 2022 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Mike Laughter, seconded by Kevin McLeod and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept 2022 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations as presented.**

DRAFT

**Northern Regional Advisory Council Meeting**

April 6, 2022

Attendance

**RAC Members**

Justin Oliver – Chair  
Kevin McLeod – Vice-Chair  
Ben Nadolski – Exec Secretary

Ryan Brown  
Brad Buchanan  
Jaimi Butler  
Paul Case  
Randy Hutchison

Matt Klar  
Emily Jensco  
Mike Laughter  
Darren Parry  
Nikki Wayment

**Board Member**

Bryce Thurgood

**RAC Excused**

David Earl  
Junior Goring  
Casey Snider

**Division Personnel**

Jodie Anderson  
David Smedley  
Dave Rich  
Chad Wilson  
Sydney Lamb  
Jim Christensen  
Covy Jones

Mike Christensen  
Mike Kinghorn  
Brooklyn Evans  
Brock Thornley  
Sydney Lamb  
Xaela Walden

## Regional Advisory County Meeting

April 6, 2022

Attendance

- 00:05:38** 1) Chairman Justin Oliver called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, reviewed the meeting procedures.
- 00:05:29** 2) **Approval of Agenda and Minutes (Action)**  
The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by Ryan Brown and passed unanimously.
- MOTION: I move that we approve the Agenda and Minutes.**
- 00:07:13** 3) **Update from past Wildlife Board Meeting by Ben Nadolski**  
Work session March 31<sup>st</sup>. Links on website to view.
- 00:08:27** 4) **Regional Update- Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor (Informational)**  
Habitat new employee update. Opening within the division for an impact biologist. Cinnamon Creek WMA. New employee in Wildlife Section. Wolverine capture. Survey opportunities. Willard Bay walleye egg collection. "State of the Lake" meeting regarding Bear Lake. Columbia spotted frog surveys. Great Salt Lake historic low elevation. Waterfowl phragmites mowing, Teal Lake project, Rotenon treatment at Howard Slough.
- 00:25:57** **Questions from RAC Members**  
Impact biologist job description. Cinnamon Creek WMA proposal. Male wolverine.
- 00:29:22** 5) **Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022(Action)**  
Presentations could be viewed at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>
- 00:29:50** **Questions from RAC Members**  
Disconnect on numbers proposed and how those numbers are obtained using the management plan. Concerns and clarification on increase of permits on Cache unit. Population objective and buck to doe ratio. Northern Utah deer growth.

**00:47:07 Electronic Public Comment Report by Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor**

15 responses, 13.3% strongly agree, 40% that somewhat agree, 0% neither agree nor disagree, 13.3% somewhat disagree, 33% strongly disagree. Comments about the Cache unit and regarding reducing tags. Doe tags on East Canyon. Partnership with the Forest Service. Decrease in tags but increase in late muzzleloader. Reducing buck to doe ratio for better quality.

SFW supports recommendation with the exception of: Fillmore general season permits to 1,000. Beaver general season 800 permits total. Panguitch Lake increase to 250. Funding meeting for 4.6 million for projects in Utah.

**00:58:41 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

Recommendation on the Cache and understanding data. Permit recommendations on general season deer and management plan for 7-year period. Following the system and the plan. Permit adjustments in the southern region. Number of antlerless deer units closing. Harvesting and detrimental effects not a problem as long as you have enough bucks. Demand and supply data. Extended archery season being its own hunt.

The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by Kevin McLeod and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move we accept Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022 as presented.**

**01:17:50 6) Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022(Action)**

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

**01:18:15 Questions from RAC Members**

Bull classifications on different units, sex ratio and average age. Managing quality and more desirable units. Hams unit success rates last year. Pronghorn success at Parker Mountain. General season youth any bull elk hunt opportunity. Northern Utah CWMU's and private property landowners to consider taking more elk. Wasatch shift in tags.

**01:29:43 Electronic Public Comment Report by Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor**

16 responses. Fewer tags and more limited entry permits. Northeastern region issue for North Slope Daggett. Concern about overlap of general season and limited entry

units. Disagreement with unlimited youth permits for elk. SFW support recommendations on this item.

**01:31:54 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

Success rates on hams hunts, 37%-66%. September archery 0%-100%. Paper published regarding elk using private lands for refuge and how to facilitate reliving pressure. Public input for elk management plan.

The following motion was made by Brad Buchanan, seconded by Ryan Brown and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022 and presented.**

**01:40:17 7) Once-in-a-Lifetime Permit Recommendations for 2022 (Action)**

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

**01:40:43 Questions from RAC Members**

No questions.

**01:41:20 Electronic Public Comment Report by Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor**

SFW supports the divisions recommendations with two exceptions: Recommend 2 tags on Jack Creek. Recommend Oak Creek limited entry deer permit stay the same as last year.

10 responses. 4 neither agree nor disagree, 3 somewhat agree, 3 strongly agree. Question about impact of drought at high elevation for these species.

**01:49:53 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

Statewide sheep plan and sheep tag drop from 3 to 2. Concern about taking away from public opportunity. Migratory nature of the herd. Utah Archery Association has concerns on central mountain goat archery tag and adding one to bonus draw with 1 tag not going to high point holder. Permits on OIAL and limited entry. Agenda item in the future to discuss parameters of the auction tags.

The following motion was made by Brad Buchanan, seconded by Mike Laughter

and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept Once-In-A-Lifetime Permit Recommendations for 2022, with the exception of decreasing the Nine Mile Jack Creek Bighorn Sheep to 2 permits.**

**02:02:23 8) Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2022 (Action)**

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

**02:02:40 Questions from RAC Members**

Cache antlerless herd objective and tag increase. Logic behind antlerless hunts focus and objective.

**02:06:57 Electronic Public Comment Report by Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor**

13 responses. 8% strongly agree, 25% somewhat agree, 25% neither agree nor disagree, 16.7% somewhat disagree, 25% strongly disagree. Killing elk on private lands on CWMU's. SFW supports division recommendations with exception of no doe hunts on the Pine Valley. Statewide auction for governor's tag and sportsman's tag. Information given to RAC members in a timely manner. Recommendation for not allowing doe hunt suggested. Pine Valley doe permits harvest to alleviate damage.

**02:21:37 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by Paul Chase and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2022 as presented.**

**02:23:10 9) 2022 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations (Action)**

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

**02:29:35 Questions/Comments from RAC Members**

Morgan South Rich, East Canyon and Chalk Creek over objective and ways to improve cooperation in harvesting more cows. Information on elk moving to refuge areas.

**02:26:33 Electronic Public Comment Report by Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor**

9 responses. 55% neither agree nor disagree, 22% somewhat agree, 11% strongly agree, 11% strongly disagree and 0% disagree. Comments regarding increase CWMU units by 1 cow tag.

CWMU Association support divisions recommendation. Cooperative unit with the state and public. Working with biologists to address antlerless need. Better communication and involvement in the future. CWMU program and accountability system.

**02:37:50 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

CWMU units that take in BLM land.

The following motion was made by Mike Laughter, seconded by Kevin McLeod and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept 2022 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations as presented.**

COVID present in wildlife and effects.

**02:43:18** Meeting adjourned. Motion to Adjourn: Made by Kevin McLeod, seconded by Ryan Brown.

DRAFT

## **Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting**

**April 12, 2022**

**6:00 p.m.**

### **Attendance**

#### **RAC MEMBERS**

Austin Atkinson	Tammy Pearson	Bart Battista (Virtual)	
Gene Boardman	Brayden Richmond	Craig Laub	
Verland King	Chad Utley	Nick Jorgenson	Chuck Chamberlain

#### **Division Personnel**

Teresa Griffin	Kevin Bunnell	Adam Kavalunas
Covy Jones	Kent Hersey	Lindy Varney
Denise Gilgen	Alyssa Jackson	Donnie Hunter
Kyle Christensen	Mike Wardle	Jason Nicholes
Brandon White	Jonathan Perez	Ryan McNiff
Vance Mumford	Ian Montgomery (DWR grad student)	
Chad Wilson	Phil Tuttle	Levi Watkins
	Jordan Ence	Justin Shirley

#### **Wildlife Board Members**

Wade Heaton (virtual)

Kevin Albrecht (Chair)

**00:00:00 1) Welcome**

**(Informational)**

Chairman Brayden Richmond called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, reviewed the meeting procedures, and had the Board and RAC

Members introduce themselves.

**00:05:13 2) Approval of Agenda and Minutes**

**(Action)**

The following motion was made by Tammy Pearson, seconded by Chuck Chamberlain.

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

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**00:05:56 3) Wildlife Board Meeting Update by RAC Chair**

**(Informational)**

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you. Okay, let's go to the Wildlife Board meeting update. From our last meeting to now there's been several meetings. Some of you may be aware that there were some meetings, probably the biggest thing. Well let me just go through the Wildlife Board meeting, then we'll talk about the other meetings, but in the wildlife board meeting, there was a motion that would make it illegal to place or maintain or use trail cameras, transmitting and non-transmitting from July 31st to December 31st for the taking or aid of taking big game animals on public or private property and that motion passed. There was another motion to establish the technology working group. I believe that group is at least assigned at this point and it's running, so that motion was approved in the past. There's another motion to approve the remaining recommendations that passed. There was another motion to deny the division's proposal concerning Hunter Orange, and that died for the lack of a second. There was a motion to approve the remaining, and that passed. Just trying to find if there's any more changes. There was a motion to accept the northern region's advisory councils proposal to allow the take of collard lines in the area of the study, and that passed, and then a motion that we approve the remaining recommendations of the southern division's advisory council and asked the director to align the spot and stock dates with the harvest objective dates, and that passed unanimously, so that was a motion made here by Austin. Motion that we approved the remaining as presented, that passed. A motion that we interpret the statute to mean that property owners will be compensated for full replacement value of actual damage or loss by big game animals, that passed unanimously. Then there was also some direction to ask the division through an action law to look at issuing a two point or smaller buck tags to youth hunters, that passed unanimously. So, after that meeting there was a second meeting that was called to discuss the trail cameras further. After a lot of discussion, a lot of input from the public, I think most people are aware that that again passed. In fact, it passed with a wider margin from the first time, and just last week I believe the wildlife board had a working meeting which was broadcast. Hopefully

everyone had a chance to watch that. I think the information there was really really good. If you haven't had a chance, I'd encourage you to so that's available, you can go onto youtube and watch that, but they did discuss that last motion of the two point or smaller bucks for youth tags. That was an interesting discussion. Again, that meeting was really good. I think it'd be well worth your time to watch that if you haven't, a lot of good information presented, a lot of data that we have now that we haven't had historically, and what they're doing with that data. Any questions on that wildlife board meeting update? Okay, I'll turn it over to you, Kevin, for the supervisor update.

**00:09:54 4) Regional Update**

**(Informational)**

**-Kevin Bunnell, SRO Regional Supervisor**

**Kevin Bunnell:** Okay, I'll just give you a brief update on what's been going on in the southern region. In the last little bit I'd like to thank the managers, they each put together a couple of slides here for me to update on what's going on in each section. Mike, can you go to the next slide? We'll start with our wildlife section. Next slide. I'll leave this one up for just a minute. Teresa put this slide together, this is a portion that covers most of the Pine Valley unit. That is the movement of our deer just in the last 30 days, pretty interesting. The data that we're getting from the collars that we have where we're able to track animals at almost real time and if you look at the length of some of these lines on how far these animals are migrating from from winter range and starting to congregate back up on the mountain now. We still have some mortality that's occurring, but our survival rates so far this year are higher than last year, which is encouraging. We're continuing to collar more deer when we have opportunities, started to do our spring range assessments, and we do have some deer and elk deprivation issues around the region, but I will say that for the most part landowners are good to work with and they realize that our deer populations are down right now and are working well with us to try to avoid mortality where we can. Next slide. So we did fly 4 of our units here in the southern region here in the last year; the Fillmore, Beaver, Southwest desert, and Panguitch lake and you'll see some of that data or you saw some of that data rolled into our recommendations. Turkeys are behaving themselves a little bit better than they have in the past, so we'll see if that holds. We did some duck banding out at clear lake. We have a graduate intern Ian Montgomery, who will be doing a Master's degree on the sheep down in Zion national park in a project that's a cooperative project between Division of Wildlife and Utah State and the National Park Service. I think we've visited all of the bear dens that we're going to be able to get to this year and not surprisingly based on the weather conditions that we had last year, production was down in our bear population. Lots of early mornings this time of year with Sage Grouse lek counts, and counts appear to be up, not everywhere but in general our counts are up. Pinion Jays, this is something that we're going to be watching very closely. They were recently petitioned through the Fish and Wildlife service to be listed under the Endangered Species Act. This has the potential to affect our watershed restoration initiative in a pretty large way. On the positive side, we do have really good data that I think will help us to work and we're collecting more data to

help inform that decision. Rabbit surveys are going on, we do have RHD Rabbit hemorrhagic disease in which counties? Teresa in the region. Washington and..?

**Teresa Griffin:** Iron, Wayne, and [unable to make out

**Kevin Bunnell:** Okay, so a few places across the state and two of the places where it's been detected is here in the southern region, so that's something that we're watching closely. And then our prairie dog counts are going on right now, I will update you, the conservation strategy for prairie dogs is about complete and we anticipate sometime within the next 12 months making a formal proposal to the Fish and Wildlife service for a species status review, which will be followed by, we hope, a petition to delist Utah prairie dogs. We feel like we have the data to support delisting that species and removing it from the endangered species under the protections of the Endangered Species Act. Next slide, please, Mike. Aquatics. Big fish, I guess, is the theme here. Those pictures on the left are from just a week ago from Newcastle reservoir. Those are both wipers that are 10 pounds plus. The picture on the right, I think, is at Otter Creek and again, really big wipers that they're catching in the nets so far this year. Let's go on to the next slide. Ok so, Gill net surveys are underway right now. At Otter Creek, the trout population we were pretty worried about. I think Otter Creek got down to 15% capacity at its lowest point last year and that was pretty scary on how it would impact that fishery. They seem to have come through it pretty well, I think the regulations that we put in last year to reduce the fish population have helped and they're in good shape right now, and again some really large wipers. Minersville, the trout numbers and size are down again from previous years. Again, that was done purposely last year because of how low the water was. Wipers again at Minersville are doing good and some really big fish at Minersville as well, and I already mentioned Newcastle. Trout numbers are really low as expected but wipers are doing really well and now is the time of year when people are out catching them, mostly at night. Next slide, please. From our Washington County field office a big victory there recently with the virgin spinedace, been a cooperative effort for over 25 years and they again were able to prevent the federal listing of that species, it's been listed twice and both times we've been able to provide the data to preclude the listing as just some gee wiz stuff. The spinedace when they first started working on them under a conservation strategy were at about 60% of their historic range. We've been able to increase that out to 90% of the historic range that they currently occupy. To accomplish that in a situation with the development of what's going on in Washington county and how precious water is is a real testament to partnerships between the state and particularly Washington county and the Washington county water conservation district. Let's go on to the next slide. This just kind of shows you if you can see that dark lines on the map following the streams are where spinedace were distributed where we started and then the more of what looks like a blue highlighter with the wider lines, that's the current distribution of virgin Spinedace. Let's go on to the next slide, please. Our habitat section. Verland will probably recognize those pictures of Bicknell bottoms. Let's go to the next slide. Some ongoing projects we are just finishing up the bottoms habitat management plan, I think you'll see it on the agenda in may, lots of pinyon Juniper removal projects wrapping up for the year and we're just gearing up for next year's habitat work with all the funding processes between habitat council and the Watershed Restoration Initiative, and we did have our meeting with all of the conservation groups last week I think it was and the conservations groups contributed \$4.3 million during that meeting to go to

wards habitat projects in the state. I think that's the highest we've ever had. Covy, is \$4.3 million the highest we've had in a single year? I think it is.

**Covy Jones:** That's what KSL said today. Let's say yes.

**Kevin Bunnell:** By about a million dollars. Okay. Great partnerships that we have here in the state and we appreciate those and just some reminders that we still have some road closures on our WMAs that'll be being lifted April 30th. Next slide, please. From our outreach section, a lot of work with kids in the local communities right now, that picture on the right is from our Special Needs Fishing Day. That's a cooperative effort between the division and Southern Utah Anglers, they bring all of the kids from the local schools that are in special needs programs at Sullivan pond, and we bring a bunch of fish in and they have a whole bunch of volunteers and you can see the impacts of that that's a once in a lifetime kind of experience for some of those kids and it's pretty cool to go experience. So let's go to the next slide. So I mentioned the free special needs fishing day, we've also had a lot of NASP programs going on the national archery in the schools, the western regional for that program will take place at the end of this month and then there'll be a YHEX state tournament for that's the youth hunter education state competition May 13th and 14th up in Logan. We are expecting a significant increase in dedicated hunters this year, just because we cycled a whole bunch out last year that were in the third year of the program and there'll be new people coming in this year. Fewer than there would be because we're recommending less tags than we've had in the past but there'll still be an increase in the number of dedicated hunters this year. I think that's it, but let's check. So that's all I got, I'm happy to help answer any questions.

### **RAC Questions**

**Gene Boardman:** You got a rabbit survey going. Are they finding any rabbits at all?

**Kevin Bunnell:** You know what, we are just getting started with that process right now, no data yet really to report, yeah, so we're just getting started with that. Ask me at our main meeting Gene and I'll give you an update.

**Gene Boardman:** I think it's a big problem. I haven't seen a rabbit all Spring.

**Kevin Bunnell:** They are certainly down. They were – rabbit populations fluctuate. They were up 3 or 4 years ago and I'm hoping we're hitting bottom and we'll start rebounding, but they're definitely lower. We're in the low part of the cycle right now.

**Gene Boardman:** If we had the rabbits I remember maybe the Coyotes would have something besides the flaunts to eat.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Maybe so.

**Craig Laub:** There's more than there was a year ago.

**Kevin Bunnell:** So maybe we hit bottom last year and are starting to come back. Well, we'll have some data to report on that in May I hope, so. Any other Questions?

### **RAC Comments**

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Kevin. I just want to add a comment. We've seen this before in this presentation today you've talked about the efforts and success of keeping things off the federal list, and I think just a huge thanks and congratulations to the division for that. That's a lot of work and it's very, I don't think we understand the significance of being able to do that and what the division does to do that, so I just want to thank you for that.

**Kevin Bunnell:** We've got Kim Percy here in the audience, take the opportunity to thank her, she's one of the ones that leads that program for our agency.

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, well thank you Kim, thank you. It really is a big deal and we appreciate it, so thank you. Go ahead.

**Tammy Pearson:** I would second that if it was a motion. I can tell you in my world in the political world, talking to other county commissioners, talking to our western region, which is the 13 western states, Utah by far is leading out on every single thing. Period. I mean, there's just no question. I mean, if we just start talking success stories, start talking those kind of stories, like hunting wild horse in Beryl, like prairie dog, like sage grass, those kind of things, those are huge, and it's on a larger scale and some of us get stuck in tunnel vision, I call it. So you're only seeing one little portion of the picture but on a grander scale, on a western region is huge what Utah is doing in DNR and DWR and amen. I think you guys are doing a great job and I appreciate you.

**Kevin Bunnell:** You picked the right meeting to come to, Kim.

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, let's go ahead and move in to the first action item on the agenda tonight, the Buck Deer Permit Recommendations. Let me just remind everyone of the flow and the process during this. So first, the RAC will ask questions to the division, then questions from the public. After that we'll get comments from the public. Let me pause that. We appreciate the public that's here. We wish there were more. Please take this opportunity. If you made the effort to come here, we want to hear what you have to say. Decisions are made and heard off of what the public says in these meetings, so please take the time to comment, we want your comments and appreciate you being here. After comments from the public, we'll hear comments from the RACs, the RACs then will entertain motions. RACs will discuss the motion and then we'll have a vote and move on to the next agenda item. On this first item I would like to pause before we get it underway, go out of order a little bit. We used to do presentations, now the presentations are online. We hope that everyone has had a chance to watch those, and we hope that we all took notes as we watched those. Having said that, I would like to ask if we could just get a summary, let me back up. Talking maybe a little bit too much. When I got on the RAC, there was an idea

out there that you get on the RAC to be involved in two meetings, the meeting in December and this meeting. These are the two meetings you get on the RAC for. Since being on the RAC I understand and acknowledge the importance of all the RAC meetings in the process, but I still think that this is the most involvement from the public is these two meetings, so having said that I would just like to get a little more background before we dive into questions, and I'm wondering if you can just talk specifically to our area, this region, and what's going on in the deer, or just a brief overview if you don't mind. I know in the working meeting there was some really good information that would be beneficial before we got into questions if that's okay.

**00:25:27 5) Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022  
(Action)**

**-Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator and Regional Wildlife Manager**

**Kevin Bunnell:** I'm just waiting to see who wins the arm wrestle between Teresa and Covy.

**Covy Jones:** Yeah, we could go through permits in the southern region real quick and if you want to I can just present that part of the presentation again. I can share it, I'm already on the meeting.

**Brayden Richmond:** Yeah and I think even more than the presentation, Covy, is I know there's some reason for why you came up with what you came up with in the presentation, some of the 'why's I think will be very valuable.

**Covy Jones:** Sure, yeah. Let's do that. When we can go through the recommendations that we've been having questions on from other RACs, too, it primarily some southern region deer recommendations. For that, though, because a lot of these are Mikes and Kyles, I guess Mike, Kyle, do you guys wanna come up and then we'll go through what you're being asked, is that good? Okay, so it's no secret that we've seen significant drought that has affected the southern portion of the state more than the rest. Now, that's not to say that it hasn't affected the rest of the state, but it's really affected the southern end of the state, and where we start to pick up drought a little bit more, monitoring specifically deer is in a body condition, so when we go out and catch in the fall, we take a few metrics that relate back to total body fat in does, right, and that total body fat we see when it's down it leads to reduced survival and reduced recruitment and we've seen both of those show up in populations, in a lot of the populations down here. Because of that, starting 3 years ago, we made significant cuts in deer permits, and if we look at it, it's just rough numbers here, modeled population estimates, we've reduced about 25% in total deer, but about 50% in buck deer permits, and you may ask "why?" why is the sharp reduction in buck deer permits as compared to the reduction in deer and the reason why is because especially in the general season you take into account that recruitment, so it's not just the number of deer on the landscape, but it's the number of bucks in the landscape and the number of bucks coming into the system, and when that's reduced in a general season unit, in order to manage the buck to doe ratios we've agreed to, you've gotta cut quite a lot, so again, roughly, if you look across all the units about a 50% cut in permits and about a 25% reduction in overall deer numbers broadly based. Some of the units this year and the rationale behind a lot of that is

I guess backing up again another step. Previously in mule deer plans, we would only take into account buck/doe ratio, possibly trend, and then the 3 year average in the last year, and make decisions based on that, so mule deer management, really, that's mule deer management everywhere there is mule deer does it like that and what that leads to is a very retrospective look about on mule deer and looking back to see here's where we are and putting in next year's permits. Since 2013, when we started to collar deer and get real survival estimates across the state, we knew we had better data, so we rewrote the deer plan in 2019. We asked to be able to incorporate some of that data. So now we don't just look back, right, we don't just look at how did it go the last time? What do we pull off? What do we have? And then project forward, but we take into account in addition to the Buck/Doe ratio, what is the Fawn/Doe ratio, what was fawn survival, what was adult survival, and then we look at conditions and then predict forward. Now the silver lining across the state if there is one and if we can get some more rain this spring, which I think everybody's hopeful but the silver lining is that last year was some of those late fall rains a lot of does lost their fawns when they came in because it was so dry in that May and June, but when they came in that fall, those fall rains led to a lot of fat deer and when we look at the estimates, we had some of the fattest deer on the landscape since we started recording in 2013, so deer looked good, but Fawn/Doe ratios were down. So that leads to, if we don't have those fawns, then it'll be your yearling bucks coming into the system, it leads to some pretty good decreases in areas. Other areas we didn't need to make those decreases because we already had made those decreases previously. Specifically Jason, looking at the Pine Valley, we had the ability when we reduced the Buck/Doe ratio, looking at what it needs to be to get back up into the management plan, we had to make a pretty standard cut. This is where I always have a pause, now what the recommendations that we are making is to manage the agreed number of bucks on the landscape after we had them. And this isn't, it's not a biological threshold, but it's what the division agreed to with the public and the management plan, so that's the rationale behind the cuts. With the right conditions, we'll grow deer and we'll grow deer with more buck hunting or less buck hunting, but we need the right conditions. In combination with where we need predator control, continued predator control, and the other things that are impacting the deer populations. Okay, so that was a more broad overview, but it really speaks to this region of what we've seen. We've seen low Fawn/Doe ratios with low survival this last year, really fat does, this winter, so far survival is great. We're lined up to come in with the highest survival rates of fawns and doe's we've had since we started to monitor in 2013. If it stays on trajectory and we can't always speak with surety but it looks really good. Are there any specific questions, Brayden, that I could answer, or is that kinda what you wanted me to cover or did I miss the boat completely.

**Brayden Richmond:** No, that's really good. I do think if you could again just lightly touch on it but I think we're gonna get questions on it, so maybe address the cuts in pine valley, another one would be why we aren't seeing similar cuts on the Beaver, I know in one of the other RACs you gave a very good explanation on that, which I think is helpful, and I guess any similar information on specific units.

**Covy Jones:** Okay, on this part I probably will ask the biologist to come up. They love this meeting and I talk too much and they don't talk enough and they get super excited. But I'll bring up some of the data on the Pine Valley and I'll display it on the screens. Jason will do the Pine

Valley first, okay, and we'll bring out your RAC and then we can talk about the why behind it. Let's look at the cache. Alright Jason do you wanna go over some of this, then?

**Jason Nicholes:** So, as Covy said on the Pine Valley as well as a lot of the units in the southern region we had poor fawn production as well as poor fawn survival. The Pine Valley is one of our units where we're monitoring a little bit more closely, we do have GPS collars on the units, so this is real data that comes directly from the Pine Valley. Adult survival 77%. Average in the west is about 85%, so that's below normal. 32% survival on fawns where normal is probably in the 50-55%. Our production is also down on the Pine Valley, 34 fawns per 100 does were normal where the Pine Valley is usually 58-60 fawns per 100 does, so that low survival, low production, we're not producing a lot of yearling bucks that will be coming in to the population and therefore they won't be there to hunt this year and we've had to significantly reduce permits so let's see if I can.. Okay, so you can see here on this graph our success was down last fall, we had 24.3% success on the 4100 permits that we had last year, so that helped that lower success that being said we still ended up with 16 bucks per 100 does post season, so you can see there 34 fawns per 100 does that's what we had last year, and the 5 year average is 48, so even the 5 year average is below normal. I've projected that we'll have higher adult survival and fawn survival this year. 82% and 48% with the better range conditions and higher precip that we're having right now, hopefully it carries through. So, with the reduction of 2400 permits from the 4100 down to 1700 and we do expect a little bit lower success this year, we'll probably be somewhere between that low to average success, which will bring us back up to 18 bucks per 100 does which is the management objective.

**Covy Jones:** So, there's a lot that goes into this. If anything so far looking at what were done we probably underpredicted survival, right, it looks like survival is higher than this, so that's a good thing, but this proactive recommendation gets us back to where we need to be in the management plan. So that's one. Any questions for Jason while he's up here on the Pine Valley? Just might as well wrap this one up Keith doesn't want to get up and down and up and down so from the RAC?

**Brayden Richmond:** That's almost too easy but it doesn't look like...

**Covy Jones:** Alright. So a lot of questions around the state, mostly the Beaver and the Pavant, and so we can go through some of those same data, but Mike put together a visual representation to help show this and I think it's worth showing. Mike did something that's worth showing, good job Mike. Alright Mike, do you want to talk through your rationale here?

**Mike Wardle:** So this slide you're looking at right here is our Buck/Doe ratio for the last 10 years. As you can see we climbed from 2012 to 2016. We were actually quite a bit above the objective, and we've been on a steady decline after that. The big push we've heard back in the other regions is why aren't we cutting more permits so we're recommending to cut 200 tags and this slide explains some of their reasoning why. So this is the number of permits we've had in Beaver over the last 10 years. So you can see just back in 2018 we had over 3000 permits and in 2021 we were down to 1400 and we're recommending 1200 this coming year so that's 58% I think if I'm remembering right? 52%. 52% decrease in 3 years, so that's why I didn't recommend

a heavier decrease. We've already cut tags really hard on the unit and if you look, let me show you on the Pavant, there's something similar on the Pavant where I know there was other feedback in the other regions. We were all the way up to 2500 permits in 2018 and we cut those down to 1200 which again is 52% and then immediately if you look in 2019 the Buck/Doe ratio responded to that cut in permits and came back to within the objective. So I'm hopeful with the Beaver if you look at the Buck/Doe ratio I'm hopeful that in 2020 that was our inflection point and we're starting to come back in our Buck/Doe ratio. And we're not saying that we think the Beaver mule deer herd is recovered and where it should be, what we're saying is that we don't need to completely stop hunting to get our buck/doe ratio back to within the management objective.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Mike. That's really good. That's exactly what I wanted to show because I saw this before as this year, it looks like Pine Valley is taking a drastic cut that some of the other units aren't but if we come back over and combine the last 5 years, they've all taken drastic cuts.

**Covy Jones:** Yeah and I think the most important part I wish these two graphs would show better together is that the inflection point from 13.2 to 14.8 came after these two big cuts, so we're trending the right way and an additional few hundred permits will get us there faster, but the worry is that if you overcut and overshoot the management objective for bucks, not for deer but for bucks, we're gonna be back here asking for more permits in a unit when the sentiment is gonna be well there aren't as many deer, well there aren't, you're right, and there are more bucks than we agreed to in the management plan.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Covy.

**Mike Wardle:** On the Beaver we do have fawn collars the last 2 years, and last year at this time of year our fawn survival was already at 56%, we had really poor fawn survival, this current year we're actually at 90% fawn survival so we're hopeful that that will continue through the year and that we can have better fawn recruitment this coming fall.

**Austin Atkinson:** Can I ask Mike a question? Why? On the fawn survival.

**Mike Wardle:** I think a lot of it I should've included this on the graph, but when we went and collared adult females this past year they were fat and I think a lot of it had to do with the monsoons and the fawns that did survive through the summer got that same boost before the winter time and hopefully that's gonna carry them through.

**Covy Jones:** Austin, even though we had few fawns, fewer fawns come in state-wide and fawn weights weren't super surprising we didn't notice as much as an uptick in average fawn weight as we did in doe body condition, our total in just the body fat on the does, that really showed up, but fawn survival has been really high statewide. This is the graph that shows statewide. and this darker orange line right here that's starting to pair with this red line, we've got a good chance at coming in and being the highest or second highest year of fawn survival since we started to monitor heavily in 2015 I would say is when you can really look at this so the 2014-15

line this line is not as, there's not as much data backing up those 2014-15 line as the 2015-16 lines and more appropriate line. This website that I have up here it's open to the public, it's worked together with BYU Ecology lab, anybody can log onto this website, look at deer survival rates, look at body condition scores, any metric that we take on deer in our collaborative survival study with BYU it's here and it's updated frequently, so if you want to know what kind of body condition your unit came in at this last year, this is fawn survival but at the top you go to survival, adult females, you can look at what survival looks like, you can pick your year, you can pick your unit, you can look at cause specific mortality, it's not only what percent or what rate are they surviving at, you can look at what killed them and what percent is being taken by what animal. So this is the kind of stuff that helps inform and educate the decisions that we make when you see it on permits. Okay.

**Brayden Richmond:** That was perfect, thank you. Let's go ahead and open up questions from the RAC.

### **RAC Questions**

**Austin Atkinson:** I have all sorts of questions.

**Brayden Richmond:** I should start saying next time I'll say Austin and then the remainder.

**Austin Atkinson:** I guess where I'm not a biologist, nor do I track the weather like I should, but when I see your state-wide survival graph that makes sense to me. We're dealing with a giant sample, okay, we can see a trend state-wide, but when we look at a unit that is just jumping extremely up and down on these rises and valleys I have to say is our sample too small? Is the model working or should we not be putting as much focus on that data where we're talking about two dozen fawns or I don't know what size of sample I'm looking at so I don't know where as a non biologist, can you help me understand that?

**Covy Jones:** Absolutely. That's a really good question. You've gotta walk the line of what's financially feasible with, where could this data start? So on our unit we collar at least 20 fawns per unit. Could it be better at 40 or 50, sure, is it feasible? Ehh, it's already a workload and there's a lot of money that goes into this. The other thing is, fawn survival will jump like that. So when you look at mule deer populations really monitor adult survival and then fawn survival is this and that's west wide whether you have a large sample of a lot of fawns or a small sample because that first year is completely driven by what weight they come in at and how heavy the winter is and if you're gonna lose deer, you're gonna lose deer that are either fawns, yearlings show a higher susceptibility to mortality as well, but then 2-7 or 8, you have your prime deer, they survive at a pretty consistent rate, and then you end up with older than that are also highly impacted by weather, but if you look at your adults that's why we can look at it and say that westwide average is about 85% on adult deer, fawn survival is it really depends on that year.

What I'm trying to say is that we could collar a lot more fawns and you'd still have highly erratic fawn survival depending on the climate. They're just the ones who are more susceptible to that, and predators, too, which is another thing that I wanted to bring up. They're susceptible to coyotes, we showed in our Bookcliff study that they're highly susceptible where you overlap a lot of summer range to bears, high bear density, they're eating fawns, cougars are eating a lot of fawns, bobcats taken a few fawns. That's even before we get into the fall classification.

**Austin Atkinson:** Okay, so on the Pine Valley and maybe back to Jason, what is killing our fawns there and I didn't look at the numbers you just showed cause it's hard to look at them on the screen, but is it cougars, is it predators, is it just the drought? As an outsider I'll say it's hard for me to understand pointing to the drought on everything. There's plenty of water and there's millions of dollars on habitat so why are the deer going down? That's the question.

**Covy Jones:** Do you want to start on fawns and then go to doe's?

**Austin Atkinson:** Yeah, fawns and does on Pine Valley, specifically.

**Covy Jones:** Do you want us to display this again? It's hard to see, just tell you? Probably. I'm not the tech guy, Tammy, I just click on stuff. These data are collected in the field by biologists, so when you look at this data, this data is collected by Jason. Yes. It's the one in Dixie.

**Jason Nicholes:** Okay, so cost on fawns you can see the bottom line here on this graph right here, this is for 2020-21, and the first I guess the answer to your question is all of the above. We had a fawn taken by a cougar, some taken by coyotes, some were malnourished, some even were hunter harvest, yearling bucks that we collared, we had one wounding loss, and one unknown so all of the above. One thing I would add to that, is that these ones that were taken by predators, every one of these deer that I retrieved the collar from in the field we do a field necropsy and part of that field necropsy is looking for any sign of predators or anything like that, but I break a femur bone on every one of those deer to look at the condition of the bone marrow and even though it may have been taken by a coyote or a lion, a good share of those taken by predators were in poor body condition and that may have contributed to them being taken by a predator and that poor condition is directly related to the drought conditions.

**Brayden Richmond:** Let me just clarify what you said there, to make sure. But, in Pine Valley it already has the highest percentage of malnutrition caused fatality and you're suggesting that it's significantly higher cause if the predators had not got them then they would've died anyways from malnutrition.

**Jason Nicholes:** Correct.

**Brayden Richmond:** So it not only is already the highest, but it would've been higher.

**Jason Nicholes:** Right. They still would have died but it would have been more attributed to malnutrition. And that was a call that I made in the field, in that moment. That day when I collected that I could have called it a malnutrition, but since there were signs of predation, I attributed it to predation.

**Covy Jones:** And then this is the adult survival and I guess one thing too, just, this is a statewide perspective, just sometimes you look at things and say there's not much difference between 85% and 75%, it's a B versus a C, it's a huge difference. When you start to look at populations and adult survival, you can't... It gets really tough to grow deer when you ever get below 85% adult survival, almost impossible at that point, so to grow deer you need a combination of factors. 60 fawns per 100 does, especially on a desert unit, that's a great number to start with if you can hit that in the fall. 85% of adult-doe survival, if you have those 2 things you can lose half your fawns over the winter and you'll have no growth no loss, so anything above that is a positive growth rate and anything below that is negative, you're losing deer on the landscape.

**Jason Nicholes:** Alright, this one's a little harder to see more units have we don't have as many units with fawns so a little bigger graph, but on the pine valley again we had some attributed to lion predation, some to malnutrition, more to coyotes than anything on the unit, some to roadkill, some unknown, and again, every one of these I'm looking at the bone marrow and some of these probably could have been attributed to poor body condition, malnutrition.

**Austin Atkinson:** And Jason, is that predation from cougars, that orange marker?

**Jason Nicholes:** It is. Zion tends to have a higher cougar predation year after year. I think the issue we have on Zion is several issues. We have – Zion National Park is a refuge for lions, we have a lot of private land that is a refuge for lions, it's hard to kill lions.

**Covy Jones:** When you're talking about adult deer, this kind of tells us now the Pine Valley you'll always have some coyote take on adult doe's on Pine Valley. They don't come into winter in as good of body condition but they also don't have the decline that you see in the northern units, either, but when you start to see this kind of coyote predation it points to the fact that you've had poor recruitment for years and it takes that pretty bell curve of average age and it starts to shift it towards the older end. So older, less body fat, harder to escape a predator. So lions, they will kill anything, old, young, fat, skinny they don't care, but coyotes usually take the weaker animals, just the way they kill.

**Austin Atkinson:** Yeah, more questions. Um, has the division looked at some of these proposals that came in and ones specifically from SFW to not support the beaver increase in tags, Panguitch lake not increasing as much and do you have a statement on that at all?

**Covy Jones:** In general, again, I can speak on the units but it comes back to we put together a diverse committee, we wrote a management plan, we took it to the public process, and we're making very proactive recommendations to that plan, so our concern is that you can cut those permits, but we don't want to do that same yo-yo, we're making aggressive cuts to get the buck/doe ratio that we've agreed to. We don't want to end up at 22 or 24 or 26 next year and come back and say hey we gotta add permits, and have people saying that the deer aren't there. Yeah, we're not saying that deer herds have recovered in Southern Utah, we're saying that this is what we've agreed to manage to and they're going to recover or not regardless of the

number of buck permits on the landscape, we're not hitting some kind of biological threshold, it won't save the population by not offering that hunting opportunity.

**Brayden Richmond:** Any additional questions from the RAC? Go ahead Gene.

**Gene Boardman:** On the Beaver Unit how many tags have you offered, or recommending?

**Covy Jones:** On the Beaver unit?

**Gene Boardman:** Yeah.

**Covy Jones:** We are recommending to cut it 200 from 14 to 12

**Gene Boardman:** Okay, 1200 tags. Is that 1200 tags that go into the draw? All 1200?

**Covy Jones:** What do you mean Gene? What are we getting at here?

**Gene Boardman:** What we are coming down to is you cut tags, you cut the draw tags, but I'm wondering is, do you cut the landowner tags proportionately?

**Covy Jones:** So, the 600 landowner tags are appropriated by the region. That rule, do you want to take this one, Kevin?

**Kevin Bunnell:** So Gene, I know what you're talking about. We're going to continue to issue doe tags in situations where we have depredation. That changes because the deer population is lower, we're issuing fewer of them than if we're issuing if deer population is high, but it's not proportional, we cut public tags by this much so we're cutting depredation tags by this much, it's driven by how much damage is being done at the time, so that's why we do it, and like I said, most of our land owners know our deer population is down and they'll tell us that they don't want to kill deer this year, but by law we're required to reduce depredation if it's going on and in some cases that means killing some deer. Now I will tell you, last year with all of the, I can't remember how many it was, it was a couple hundred depredation tags on the Beaver unit, we only killed 35 deer.

**Covy Jones:** Kevin, what about the buck, I think he's talking about the buck general season tags, and that rule.

**Gene Boardman:** What I want to know is there's a couple of ways that land owners can get buck tags, are those tags cut proportionately with the tags that are available to the public?

**Kevin Bunnell:** They will be. So the landowner rule is you'll see in May the revisions, we did a committee where we completely went through that rule. As of right now, there's 600 landowner permits issued on a regional basis and we sell out all of those on the southern region. They're not done on a unit by unit basis, they're done by region. The proposal that you see in May will directly link the public tags to the private tags so that if there's a decrease in the public tags there will be a proportional decrease in private landowner tags, so that's not in this year's

recommendation but if our proposal passes in the way that the committee recommended then we will begin doing that next year.

**Gene Boardman:** Okay, we will begin doing it next year, but we haven't done it in the past?

**Kevin Bunnell:** No, that's been a set number of 600, it's been that way for 20 years.

**Gene Boardman:** Yeah, so the landowner tags have remained the same while the public draw tags have been dropped on the Beaver unit by 2/3s.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Now, but that cuts both ways, there have been times like 2014, 15, 16, where we were increasing tags significantly on the Beaver unit and there was no increase on the private side.

**Gene Boardman:** Okay. Well I'm glad to see that it'll be looked at differently.

**Kevin Bunnell:** They will be linked again if the proposal that you'll see in May passes then they'll be the proportions will stay the same.

**Covy Jones:** And Gene, just one more thing, to make sure everybody understands, we don't get to make recommendations like that without having it in a rule that again goes through a public process. Does that make sense? So I feel sometimes like we're being held to a question or a standard and we can't just adjust those or take those away or move those because we want to and if the agency ran that way I mean there are a lot of people who are already frustrated by us but if we did whatever we want whenever we wanted, there would be way more people frustrated too, so we are bound by rule, management plans, state law, and when you see something from us, that's what it comes from and if there's frustration from that then let's work on the process, but what we're presenting on this meeting is public draw permits.

**Brayden Richmond:** I do think that was really good clarification and also just to point out, that we will be discussing the landowner rule in May. I would hope that there's a lot of discussion on that. I think there's a lot of people interested in that so that'll be interesting to see what comes forward and where it ends up.

**Austin Atkinson:** One more question on the harvest surveys, now that we're getting down to general season units that have very low amount of tags, like sub 1000 tags on a lot of these in our region, I feel like if we're talking about how many bucks are gonna be post hunt, how many are gonna be on the landscape, how many bucks we're actually taking becomes a more important number, and last time we talked about harvest surveys they were pretty low. Is that correct and do we feel, are we going mandatory harvest reporting? I'll just say that on general season here and why not now?

**Covy Jones:** Yeah, so this is something that we've frankly pushed back on for years and said no, we're random sample and we can project, it's good enough and the truth is in a lot of cases it probably is, and we also live in a time where we can do this so I can tell you that we're headed in that direction so I will tell you we are headed that direction absolutely. Like, we're headed in

the direction where everyone gets a harvest survey postseason. It's gonna take some rule changes to make it mandatory, but my goal is by this fall that we're surveying everyone and also in the fall that we're putting in place the rule change to make it mandatory moving forward, so yeah, we're headed that direction, Austin. At the end of the day, the Buck/Doe ratio still drives a lot of this, so the harvest survey is just additional data, and I feel like we're at a time where it's time to make the change. We've been kinda waiting for tagging and hoping that played out and there's been some complications but this is a change that we're gonna work hard on these next few months and work to implement.

**Kevin Bunnell:** So, I have to ask with that little "Where is Jay?". What would the response have been if the director wasn't in the room, Covy?

**Covy Jones:** Oh no, he just, I get a drink I say at the end of the day, so I wanted to make sure I was going to get my drink.

**Austin Atkinson:** Just to follow up to that. I don't know that I've ever got a general season harvest survey, but are we doing tooth age samples on any random sampling on general season deer and does the survey tell us if they shot a yearling buck or a 4 point buck or estimated age or any of that data, I guess when it comes back and says that we killed 600 deer, what did we kill in general season, what should we assume from that?

**Covy Jones:** So, age class of deer we collect through check stations spread across the state. Now we avoided you on purpose with harvest surveys because of who you are. No, I'm just kidding, I understand the thought and the sentiment, with current technology it's frustrating and I think statistics are one thing and I think people think, it's a comfort thing too if people know everybody's being asked if they harvested. There's gonna be frustration in our role if you don't complete a mandatory harvest survey, it's in statute, there's a fee and before you apply you have to pay that fee, so Lindy is the other person, she's online right now, so Lindy is there anything that I missed on this or anything that you want to clarify?

**Lindy Varney:** No, you've got it right. There's, you know, just remember when we go mandatory there is a \$50 late fee for those who don't comply and as Covy said that's a statute fee to change that amount, but Covy and I are working towards it to get this in place because this is what the public wants to do.

**Covy Jones:** But frankly, if there's no penalty in the form of a fee, it's not really mandatory, so this makes it so that it actually works, theoretically. We'll see.

**Brayden Richmond:** Go ahead Tammy.

**Tammy Pearson:** So quick question, just for clarification, so the only thing that isn't mandatory is limited entry?

**Covy Jones:** Limited Entry, Once-in-a-lifetime, and that's antlerless we send it to everybody, so but it, Lindy correct me if I'm wrong, antlerless is not mandatory, but everybody gets sampled.

**Lindy Varney:** Correct, yeah, it's a non-mandatory survey that they can go onto their profile and fill out, but it's not required. And you know, we get some back, but we don't get everyone that draws and their data.

**Covy Jones:** And honestly Austin from a biologist perspective, the antlerless one is probably the one we're more excited to get mandatory. We've also started to age a lot of our antlerless population to look at age structure, which is super interesting, so.

**Brayden Richmond:** Any other more questions from the RAC?

**Bart Battista:** Hi, my question was on do you use the 3 year buck/doe average to determine whether they will raise the recommended permits because it looks like in the Fillmore and the Panguitch area that's not the case, and just curious why in those two instances.

**Covy Jones:** Yeah, so Bart just to answer the question and then I'll let Kyle talk specifically about Panguitch lake, we use a lot of things. We use the 3 year average, we use the trend, we look at the last year and weigh that pretty heavily. We look at doe survival and we look at fawn survival and recruitment, so we look at all of those things and then we predict based on harvest what we should be at post season, and on the panguitch lake, we made some pretty steep cuts and overshot the buck/doe ratio so we know we've gotta increase a bit or we're gonna end up further and more out of accordance with the plan.

**Kyle Christensen:** Yeah, no. Covy said everything I was gonna say when we redid the mule deer plan in '19 we agreed to not just look at our 3 year average but more at survival rates and that's what the panguitch is, I went from 3,400 permits in 2017 to 1,200 last year and I have to own up to that a bit I overshot on the reduction and we went from last year at a 13 bucks per 100 doe to almost 21 in the last year so it responded very well to the cuts and I was also conservative with the increase so with average success this fall and with survival data that is probably pretty low with what I feel like we're gonna see this year I bet you we're gonna be at 21 or 22 bucks this postseason this year on panguitch/

**Covy Jones:** And I don't think overshot is fair. I think you had the tools to make a really aggressive recommendation and you did, and for years let's just be honest, we knew that the public process was gonna cut permits so we'd make a recommendation where we'd come through and cut a little bit and when it was a little higher knowing it would cut through the public process so when we rewrote the plan we said we're done with this, we don't want to play this game anymore with the public, where we recommend hedging our bets where we just want to make the most honest recommendation we can when we bring it to the public process and that lets us defend it more easily, it's the best recommendations we can make according to the plan.

**Brayden Richmond:** Anything more Bart?

**Bart Battista:** That's all, thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Bart. Additional questions? Okay, so let's open it up to the public.

## **Public Questions**

**Donnie Hunter:** So, on the Panguitch unit, we've had our buck/doe ratio on the west side and the east side has always been, there's been quite a gap. Sometimes the west side pushes that buck/doe ratio up where you've got a higher average and we're offered more tags because of that, am I right?

**Kyle Christensen:** Yeah, you're definitely right there, we kinda have two herds on that unit, the west side summers and then they'll go down on the parowan front and a lot of those deer on the east side will migrate down to the Zion or the Paunsaugunt, some will stay and the east side of the unit is a lot more accessible, it doesn't have a lot of private land, a lot of roads. You get a lot of hunting pressure on the east side where on the west side those deer during hunt they're somewhat inaccessible on private ground, steeper terrain, so it just gets hunted a little harder with a few more bucks harvested, so post season there's a higher buck/doe ratio on the west side than the east side.

**Donnie Hunter:** Sure, and we've got some things in our plans haven't we that maybe help that situation?

**Kyle Christensen:** Yeah, I definitely think there could be some things done to help.

**Donnie Hunter:** It's been going on for a long time so we probably need to look at it. Thank you.

**Garth Jensen:** Uhm, on the Pine Valley I had a question as far as the model that you're using to recommend the permits now versus 3 or 4 years ago. When we started that early season hunt, a lot of the feedback we got from the RAC meetings was don't increase the permits when we were recommending permit increases from the Pine Valley, now it seems like there is a more aggressive approach because you have more data and you can adjust that cause I know back then it sounded like the buck/doe ratio was high so you had to manage for buck/doe ratios and it called for permanent increases and now we're having a big reduction and is that because you're using different language like your fawn/doe ratios, your survivability and not just the buck/doe ratio?

**Covy Jones:** It allows us to be more proactive and less reactive, if that makes sense.

**Garth Jensen:** So, is that right? Did we have to increase permits cause at that time we had a high buck/doe ratio?

**Covy Jones:** Yeah. Even if you would've been doing it this way then, we still would've recommended an increase because you were sitting at 24 bucks per 100 does and 60 fawns per 100 does and pushing it every year, it was 4 over for several years, 2-4 over.

**Garth Jensen:** Okay. So that's why now there's a huge decrease. I mean obviously there's been drought, but you said if you were using the same model you did then you would still have the same permit reductions now?

**Covy Jones:** No, no, no. Not the same permit reductions, but we would've had the same increases probably. The reductions if you are just looking at 3 year average and '16 is your last year it wouldn't have triggered as much of a cut, so this is more just to annually manage that buck/does ratio.

**Garth Jensen:** Got it, thanks.

**Brayden Richmond:** Any additional questions from the public? Alright we'll go ahead.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Maybe we should've just left Garth up there.

**Brayden Richmond:** Yeah, you want to come back up Garth? And then next will be Russell Todd.

### **Public Comments**

**Garth Jensen:** So, basically my comment is, I feel like you kinda addressed some of it when you talked about the private landowner tags when you looked at the different units and you noticed an issue with the fluctuating tag permits and didn't seem like it came off as fair to have the same amount of permits for private land owners as when you're adjusting the draw. So it seems we're coming to a head on lifetime license holders, and I know people hate to bring this up, but when you have the thousand lakes turned into a general season unit, everyone flocked that unit and it got to the point where there was hardly anybody who could draw a tag in that unit without 10 or 11 points. Now we're seeing a shift to Pine Valley and now that we've got 1,700 permits, we're gonna have probably 500 lifetime license holders grab out of that pot, so realistically by the time you get done taking out lifetime license holders, 20% for youth, you're probably under 1,000 units for the public that go into the draw for Pine Valley realistically. So, what I'm saying is I think that's probably something that needs to be addressed instead of kicking that can down the road cause sooner or later we might run the issue where everyone wants a Dutton tag, but there's not enough Dutton tags to go around for lifetime license holders, so I guess that's my comment is we probably need to address that sooner than later and figure out something to do with that.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you. Russell, and then next will be, that's it. So those are the only 2 comment cards for this agenda item.

**Russell Todd:** I'm Russell Todd. I'm representing Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife, SFW. I'd just like to say thank you to the board first of all for your time, we know this takes a lot of time

and effort, and the division for their time and effort, too. Do you want me to address one unit at a time, is that how you do it?

**Brayden Richmond:** Yeah, I'm not sure I understand your question, so right now we're doing the buck/deer permits, then we'll do elk, then once in a lifetime, so right now just buck on all units.

**Russell Todd:** So, the Division is recommending an increase of permits on Fillmore general season buck unit of 200 permits, so 1,400. SFW recommends cutting permits by 200 for a total of 1,000 permits. They're showing the 3 year average buck/doe ratio is still at 17, under objective of 18-20. On the Beaver unit, the division is recommending cutting from 1,400 to 1,200 on the Beaver. SFW recommends a cut of 400 for a total of 800 permits. Again, showing the 3 year average being very low, being 14 with the objective being 18-20. Panguitch lake, the division recommends to increase by 500 permits, SFW feels that we should only do 250. The 3 year average to the buck/doe ratio is low at 16, unit objective is 18-20. We understand that last year's average made a bit of a jump, but we don't feel that we need to make that big of a jump. On the Fillmore, this is limited entry, we feel that no tag increases should be made on that unit, and there was a recommendation on the Pine Valley unit that SFW does not support harvesting any does at this time on the Pine Valley and I must say these recommendations are done by individuals who live on the unit. This is their backyard and this is what they feel would be a proper recommendation. So just sit in consideration, thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Russell. Alright, we'll move to comments from the RAC. Let me just make a quick, okay we're gonna have one more comment. We're gonna go onto elk, elk is next. If you want to talk about deer, now is the time.

**Garth Carter:** My name is Garth Carter, I'm representing myself. There's, I'm really conflicted with a lot that's going on, and what I don't see. What I've heard for the first time is our deer numbers are down by the division. I don't think I've been to a meeting before cause everything in the past was about the management objective, so when you say management objective, the lay person thinks you're where you wanna be with the deer population. That's not true. You're not at carrying capacity. Carrying capacity is the amount of animals that can be on the range year after year without hurting the range. You're not even at 10% carrying capacity but you never use those words and you never discuss how to bring the deer back, it's all about the buck/doe ratio. You can have your sample sizes, your buck/doe ratio, you could count 50 deer, but if you've got 20 bucks per 100 does out of that then you're gonna have a big hunt! It's not about the number of deer, it's about a ratio, it doesn't make sense. When you don't include and manage for the mortality factors and I never hear that. This group and the division ought to be talking about the mortality factors at the same time we're talking about hunter mortality factors. What can we do to bring our deer back if you're below carrying capacity, which we are! We've spent millions of dollars on habitat work and we've done hundreds of thousands of acres, and we have probably less than 5% utilization on our browse, but we talk about a ratio of 15 bucks and your sample sizes, when I worked for the division from the 70s-90s we had to have a sample size of 200 does before we have a valid sample size of buck/doe or buck/fawn I'll bet you don't have 200 does in any of yours. It just frustrates me cause we're going down the same

road. We're cutting tags because, justifiably because we have less deer. Now what we do is, a kid is gonna get a tag as a youth and not get another tag until he's 25. We don't have to worry about the anti hunters putting us out of business, we're putting ourselves out of business. When our children and grandchildren don't get the chance to hunt, to see animals, they're gonna go snowboarding. They're gonna go to their devices. We're putting ourselves out. One of the biggest problems is bears and cougars are not managed by the same group. They're your biggest mortality factors that you can do something about, but this group doesn't manage those.

**Brayden Richmond:** Garth, that's time. Thank you. Alright, any additional comments we didn't get cards for? Okay, let's turn it over to comments from the RAC.

### **RAC Comments**

**Brayden Richmond:** Go ahead, Verland.

**Verland King:** I agree with the last speaker to a degree, y'know you can't you're looking at 2 different things you're looking at numbers on a landscape and you're looking at a ratio and it's hard to make the ratio work as far as numbers, but as far as carrying capacity, the rains last year last summer really helped. If you asked me last fall if the deer were getting enough to eat, they were and now they're fat and pregnant and if things keep going and we get some rain it'll be great, but even though a lot of those projects have been done, a lot of times there is no water to go with it and those projects are just winter range and so there's a lot of factors and when it comes to carrying capacity as far as the deer, I mean they're down because there hasn't been carrying capacity during this drought and we see it in the livestock, we see it not so much in the elk, but that's something that we can't really do much about it's mother nature and it's a drought, but I think there's some flaws in the system, but every time we try to tell them we need to change it they come up in legislation this is how it's gotta be done so basically our hands are tied a lot of the time.

**Brayden Richmond:** Go ahead Austin.

**Austin Atkinson:** Alright, I got a few comments. First of all, applying for hunts in Utah before we have the tag numbers is a total disaster, and this year is a perfect example of that. Luckily, next year there is hope to have tag numbers recommended before we apply, so here's fingers crossed that that works timing. I've questioned my participation on the RAC a lot over the last couple of years as I got into this process and I enjoy it, but there's a lot better things that I'd like to be doing on all these nights that I spend on committees and driving and listening and reading comments, it's really neat, but I want it to have merit and so when I think about what is the point of a Regional Advisory Council, I really want the division and the public to get behind our RAC and say this is what we want to do in our region and we expect to be given a voice at the

Wildlife Board level and at the state level for what we want to live with. A couple of years ago, we tried to push a higher buck/doe objective on the Pine Valley, we got shut down on the board level. I really want to go back to let the region sink or swim with how they want to do it. The Cache unit is nothing like the Pine Valley, not even close, might as well be in a different country, so I really want the public and the RAC to be able to say this is what we're okay with, this is what the biologists say and we're gonna get behind him and we're gonna sink or swim this year and if we'll take the tag cuts we'll take it together. I don't think the northern region should be the only ones talking about the Pine Valley, we need to talk about it, and we need to make the decision, so I appreciate all the data you shared with us, I want it to be more specific to our region cause I don't wanna sit here and just be agreeable with what the division says. We're not biologists, I don't understand all the data you share with me, I can't wrap my head around it, and I don't study it every day, but if we're gonna represent like I represent the public, I intend to bring this is what the public wants, this is what my comments say and we're gonna fight you for it and we're not gonna be agreeable, we're gonna go and say we want the cuts, let's do it, let's vote and move on, but I really want everyone to hear that I need your comments and I need participation if we're gonna make this system work. Otherwise, this is just another stop along the division's tour of the state if you will and I don't want it to be that.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Austin. Tammy.

**Tammy Pearson:** I guess we got to go on down the row. I wanna make a couple of comments on this. I agree with you, Austin, you ask way more questions than the rest of us combined and it was my job to shut you down tonight but that's okay you were asking good questions. Some of the comments that I always say, the landowner permits are there for a purpose. Land owners probably give more than anybody as far as providing water, providing access to the fields or property or whatever else and always the livestock permittees and those people who are maintaining the water rights, the water access areas, the fencing, all of that goes towards the health of the wildlife and I don't think there's well I shouldn't speak for everybody but as far as a landowner permittee I would much rather have a much larger deer herd than I would of horses or elk, I still think there's a huge impact on mule deer from elk, I think that's a large driving force, at least in my life these guys that came in from Beaver county would probably attest to that as well, but I've been on the range for 40 years down here in Beaver county and I've seen a drastic reduction in the deer herds specifically, and I agree with Garth on numbers in general, I'm not sure that the management objective, the ratio, I've never quite, I mean I understand it but the numbers itself, I mean we've lost our deer herd compared to what we had back when I was a kid so I'm not sure how we accomplished that, but there's a lot of impact. The droughts made a huge impact on permittees, on the landscape in general, and I think the only thing it hasn't impacted is the horses, they just seem to flourish no matter what, but anyways I'll shut up.

**Craig Laub:** Uh, I think number one the drought, I mean we keep blaming it on the drought but there is a drought, if we've had good moisture the last 3 years we wouldn't be in this situation, you think back to '15-16 I think southern Utah was at its carrying capacity cause in the hay fields and everywhere else we were getting overrun, and I agree with Austin, I hope we can get the permitting process moved back to after this meeting cause I feel like one hunt that needs to be done away with, which is gonna be hard to do cause people have already put in for it is the late

muzzleloader hunt in Pine Valley. Last year they killed some big deer on that and now there's no deer left, so.

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

**Gene Boardman:** I've mellowed out a bunch in this last year and the reason I have is because I took two ride-alongs with the biologists, and I learned a lot and found out that they're pretty good at figuring this stuff out. When I was young, they used to run advertisements in the outdoor magazines. Beaver mountain had the largest mule deer herd in the world. In those days, we had one 11 day hunt, it was red, we didn't use orange then, but there was red on every rock on the landscape. We killed a lot of deer. We killed them with rifles with open sights and damn cheap scopes, and we shot a lot of bullets among all those people who were sitting on every rock on the landscape, and it was pretty wild, but it was just one 11 day, and people ask me what's changed on the Beaver since the big herds that you knew and what's now? I said two things I can point to that's changed in Beaver is there was no freeway and there were no elk.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Gene. Go ahead Austin.

**Austin Atkinson:** So, I've looked at the general draw sequence of how that's gonna work and what these tag numbers actually do when we cut the Pine Valley for example and I found that most of the public that I've talked to don't understand the draw of how that's gonna work. What it's gonna turn into is lifetime license holders get their permits first, which is gonna come right off the top of our quota which on average is 500 tags in Pine Valley alone, so if we approve 1700 and we go down to 1200 right out of the gate, and then we have our 15% for dedicated hunters, however we're running off of the old quota, so for 2022 if we approve this there will only be one dedicated hunter permit per residence and one for non residence and that's it, which is the baseline. So there are a lot of guys holding the bag now who applied for Pine Valley cause they will not draw in, and then when you trickle down to youth and everything else and as there was a comment before, we're gonna be looking at under 1000 public draw permits for Pine Valley, so it's a drastic cut for everybody, more so than it looks on the numbers so I think on the RAC we need to talk about the specific comments that have come in by unit and ask are we okay with this or not. The comments I received, the majority says they're okay with the Pine Valley cuts. They'll stand behind the biologists and we're gonna ride this out and see but realize that there may be an increase when it jumps back like we're seeing now and it's really easy to cut tags in these meetings cause a lot of people who speak out want an opportunity at a big buck, they want to see 4 points, so maybe we're okay cutting until you don't have the opportunity to hunt in the field, it's gonna feel a lot different, and Pine Valley is trending up to be just as hard as a limited entry to draw, but I think everybody is okay with this cut for this year and that's really all we can change. Comments on the Beaver making a bigger cut, I think we need to address that as a RAC if we're gonna go with that and same with Panguitch lake if we're not jumping up the increase by 500. If anybody else has comments on that.

**Brayden Richmond:** Let me comment to those, Austin. I agree. I think I've had overwhelming support to go with the division's numbers on Pine Valley, that drastic of a cut makes me nervous. That's a lot of opportunities you just outlined but it does feel like that's what the public

wants and what the biologist recommends. On the Beaver, I am concerned that the additional cut there didn't take into account the previous years' cuts, if you look over the past several years the beaver has had drastic cuts. I'd be much more hesitant to go along with that recommendation on the Beaver I think we've cut. If I remember correctly, the last 5 years we've cut over, if we, if the recommendations go as presented we'll cut close to 60% of the tags on beaver. So it's similar to Pine Valley. The other one I don't know, that I can speak to. Panguitch Lake as well, so I maybe will hold off on that one additional comment. I, I want to make and I'm processing this one a little bit. I want to back up to Garth's comment and it's something that I've thought about a lot, especially coming into this RAC. And with the discussion we've had the last year on trail cameras and I think it's kind of the same. We spend a lot of time. A lot of time and energy on issues that don't increase the deer herds does and fawns increase the deer herd. And I think it's a fair comment. But right now, we're talking about how many bucks do we want to kill? And I think it is important to separate that in our mind. However, I probably, I probably share some of that frustration. That maybe we aren't spending the time talking about what we can do to actually impact the herds just a comment. Bart, sorry.

**Bart Battista:** No, that's what I get for being at home. Now, I think I generally agree with a lot of the comments that were there, especially Austin's comments about, you know, getting feedback, you know it's definitely would appreciate if the local community would provide more feedback directly to me so that I can advocate for it. I understand, you know, I think I understand how the division makes their recommendations, but it does seem that where we chase the numbers on some of these units. When we over good this year, lets just increase or lets just decrease. So we should look at those long-term trends, because at the end of the day, you know whether we talk body fat, mortalities, it's things like that right? It's you know, it's what's on the landscape that, what's their own account that matters, right? Those other factors decide what causes mortality, what's you know, you know how healthy the herd is, but you know, what is there? You know that's the truth. That's that's you know where the rubber meets the road and so I don't think we should be chasing these numbers. Hey, we're good this year. Let's ramp it up. Let's ramp up the permits or we're bad this year. Let's ramp down the permits. We look at those long trends, those long term trends. That is my comment, kind of repeating what I said in my question. Thanks.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks, additional comments? Go ahead, Verland.

**Verland King:** Uh, we're talking about these lifetime permits. How many, when did we stop issuing those?

**Austin Atkinson:** Ninety-four.

**Verland King:** Ninety-four. Do we know how many in the state? We probably don't know who all died.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Lindy, how many lifetime holders do we still have?

**Lindy Varney:** We have around 4,000 that get a deer permit throughout the state.

**Verland King:** Alright, so when you're calculating 500 that's just pulling a number. Okay, last year. Alright, that's what I need to – No, I moved back to Utah in 88 and didn't know that I could get a lifetime permit until it was too late but it's okay.

**Brayden Richmond:** I hope my dad's not listening, but some of us had better parents than others. I missed out too, Verland.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Yes, Tammy thank you. That's one thing Brayden and I were just discussing. We forgot to do the review of the online comments. Uhm, if you don't mind I will do that now.

**Brayden Richmond:** Yes, please do.

**Kevin Bunnell:** So on this agenda item, or topic, we had 39 comments through the online process. Of those, about 60% agreed with, in general, with the division's recommendations. That leaves about 40% that either, there was only five percent that were neutral so we had about a 60/40 split overall. As I read through all of the comments, it's very similar to what we heard tonight. There was a general appreciation for the cuts on the Pine Valley. There was some frustration over the Beaver unit, some comments on the Panguitch Lake, some people expressing frustration over how many permits are being cut just because of the lack of opportunity and how difficult it's going to be to draw a tag. But as Brayden and Austin said, in terms of their personal comment the online comments pretty well mirrored what we've heard here tonight and in the comments that you guys have had offline. But in general about a 60/40 split in terms of support and not support.

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

**Gene Boardman:** I could go out and enjoy the Panguitch Lake unit or any of the other units just as much without going there to hunt deer. But to tell you the truth if there isn't a tag in the family, I'm not going to get there. And so we need to keep the hunt going and we need to keep the hunters going. The deer population will go up and down. I think that there's some movement that we need to recognize, that hunters are being a little selective and letting some of the young bucks go. I know that Tammy's outfit does that and my outfit this year let him go. The cougars have to have something to eat. I think that, that's a thing that's coming along that we need to be aware of. We can put the tags out there and there's people that are going to let those young bucks go and go home without filling a tag.

**Brayden Richmond:** Any additional comments? Are we ready to – go ahead Nick.

**Nick Jorgensen:** I'm going to take a stab at saying this. I'm not sure how to come but, the comment that I have is that I think subjective comments should count. I think we take them into account but, you know, when we drive all those against science, you know, we sometimes tend to lose out. What I'm trying to say is, somebody that's hunted an area for the last 40 years, they've hunted the unit and they're saying there aren't any deer on the hill. They probably know what they're talking about and I'd like to be able to think that when we do things like tag

reduction that we might consider that as well as science. Science is important. So, when I saw the comments and I saw more people agreeing, you know, with cuts in this particular time period then I've seen before. And so I think the majority of hunters go along with cuts that we're making, I just don't know how much they weigh against the science and maybe somebody could explain that a little more to me.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Nick. I think perhaps we're ready to start looking at recommendations on individual units, if anyone wants to make a motion.

**Austin Atkinson:** I'll make a motion then going along with what Nick said. I think relying on the biologists and relying on the division is great and we're going to continue to do that. But to your point, those guys that are actually out there hunting, if the only thing we can manage is buck deer permit numbers, that's about all we can decide on. We need to make it a hunt that the public is okay with, our constituents that we represent, is okay with. And that's about all we can do. So, I'll make a motion for no increase on the Fillmore general season permits, no increase on the Plateau Boulder/Kaiparowits general deer unit and only an increase of 250 on the Panguitch Lake general deer.

**Brayden Richmond:** Sorry, we have a motion by Austin. Do we have any seconds?

**Bart Battista:** I second.

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, I think that Nick was maybe the first to the mic on that one. So second by Nick. Any additional discussion on that motion?

**Kevin Bunnell:** Yeah, I'm going to read you the motion to make sure I got it right. Uhm, so Austin the motion is to have no increase in permits on the Fillmore, the Plateau Boulder and then only reduce the increase on the Panguitch Lake from 500 to 200. 250?

**Brayden Richmond:** I thought you said 250.

**Kevin Bunnell:** That's why we're reviewing this because I was typing stuff earlier. Okay.

**Brayden Richmond:** Any additional discussion?

### **RAC Discussion**

**Chuck Chamberlain:** Yeah, I guess I'm not sure I agree with those. Like, I looked further back at the data, the permits and you know, Fillmore at 1,400 we're still only at 60% of what we were in 2018 on the Panguitch Lake Unit they're still at 1,700. We're just over half of what we were in 2018 and on Plateau Boulder we're still at about 60% of what we were so those numbers are still compared to what we've done in the past. They're still only, they are still almost half of what they were. So, I mean, when I put that into perspective I kind of think that maybe we're providing some opportunity without too much risk. So, I guess that's where I sit.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Chuck. Additional discussion? Go ahead Gene.

**Gene Boardman:** I pretty much agree with that and actually Covy emphasized at the beginning we're not just using the reactive way we've done it in the past. But the biologists have been looking at real data now so I'm inclined to go with the biologists recommendations on this one tonight.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Gene. Alright.

**Austin Atkinson:** I'll comment a little bit on why these are. Just from comments that came in from constituents and some of them are splitting the difference of their request as well rather than all the way down splitting it halfway for a happy medium. I realize it has lost opportunity and it's nowhere near where we were a few years ago. But, I will say on those units I know firsthand the deer herd is nowhere near where it was at the same time. So hunter satisfaction I feel like we don't survey it well but it does come into play and we need to consider what that experience is.

**Brayden Richmond:** Go ahead Gene.

**Gene Boardman:** I'll agree pretty much with what you said. We've got a little different opinion. I don't think that it's going to be terribly wrong if we go with Austin's motion or if we go with what the biologists are. I don't think either way's going to ruin the whole management plan. Just that, I lean the other way.

**Brayden Richmond:** Okay. I think we're ready to take a vote. Oh, Verland go ahead.

**Verland King:** Seemed like we've all got our pet peeves on our hunting spots but that Boulder Plateau is a prime example of what we talked about earlier. It's you know, you're buck to do ratio last year was 21. I think that's low from what I've seen around my place. So it's high, so that's saying we need to hunt more bucks. Uhm, the problem is, like what we talked about, the deer herd is low in numbers. So but, like talked about in the presentation, you don't have to have a big buck to breed those doe's. Those young bucks will do just fine. So that's the thing that we got to keep in mind, that even if we kill this is, you know, this is bucks. This is not an antlerless hunt or anything but you could kill that many and still have enough doe's and hopefully with some rain you'll get an increase in the herd.

**Brayden Richmond:** I think that is well said, Verland, thank you. I think we are ready to go to a vote on this. We've got a motion and a second. Kevin, do you want to read that motion one more time so we're clear?

**Kevin Bunnell:** Okay, so the motion and I re-worded it a little bit to make it a little bit more clear. No permit increases on the Fillmore or Plateau Boulder units and reduce from 500 to 250 on the Panguitch Lake. Is that correct?

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, let's go ahead and do this by a raise of hands. I think with just one person online, Bart, we'll look out for your vote so we catch you. But all in favor raise your hand? Opposed? So, it passes, what is that?

**Kevin Bunnell:** Six to two.

**Brayden Richmond:** Six to – seven to two. Alright, so we've got a motion on three of the units. Is there any additional motions we want to make on the addition, no units, I guess on any other units. We can make motions on central, we like, so. There's no jab Kevin, there's no jab there.

**Kevin Bunnell:** I think there was.

**Brayden Richmond:** I think we should increase all central units to the highest buck to doe ratio. That would be my motion. Any additional motions we want to make before we accept the remainders presented? Go ahead.

**Austin Atkinson:** Just a quick question. As far as addressing lifetime license permits process, general season and limited entry, all of that. Is that legislation? Does anything need to come from this point as a recommendation from the RAC? Or should we stay out of that at this point?

**Covy Jones:** So, there is legislation in place about lifetime license holders and Lindy can probably speak to that better than I can. But if the RAC wants to make a motion to ask us, I mean, you can ask us to look into things or to do whatever. But there is legislation, that is in legislation. Lindy, you want to add something to that?

**Lindy Varney:** Yeah, so it is a statute that says they're entitled to a general season deer permit. Now how we allocate them is in rule so you can definitely have us look into it. But, in statute, it says they are entitled to a general season deer permit.

**Brayden Richmond:** Well, So Austin. I guess a comment I'd make there and I've made that comment before is as a RAC we make recommendations to the Wildlife Board. They're the ones that put into action. And so, I do think as a RAC we take the opportunity to pass what we'd like the board to consider. And I don't think we need to be too cautious on limiting that because we are not making policy. We're simply requesting the board to consider it.

**Tammy Pearson:** And with all due respect, I'm not sure the Wildlife Board has ever approved anything we've recommended so I think it's pretty wide open. No offense Wade, Donnie.

**Brayden Richmond:** Just to be clear on this last one, they went with Austin's recommendation on cougars that he'd been pushing.

**Tammy Pearson:** Well predators are a different issue. So here's my question, statement and all of that all together I guess. On the landowner permits, what are you calling it? The ones that always have the permits.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Lifetime license holder.

**Tammy Pearson:** Lifetime license. There's no kind of split or quota on them on any particular unit, it's just open, first-come first-serve kind of thing right?

**Kevin Bunnell:** Yes. So, lifetime license holders, whatever they apply for is the first thing that comes off the top of each unit. Lindy, correct me if I'm wrong but I think that's how the process works.

**Lindy Varney:** Nope, you've got it Kevin. They're the first ones that get taken off the top of the quota. We've never had issues where lifetime license holders have taken up, you know, all of the quota for a unit. Uhm, it's only been the recent couple of years like Pine Valley where they take a good, not a good chunk but, a higher percentage than what they normally do. Usually lifetime guys take about five percent to eight percent of the quota.

**Brayden Richmond:** Correct me if I'm wrong but, I was under the impression that Thousand Lakes was almost exclusively lifetime license holders.

**Lindy Varney:** Back in the day it was, but they've kind of mellowed down. But still a good chunk go to lifetime guys on the Thousand Lakes.

**Brayden Richmond:** So, I think the concern is still valid where we're getting our tags so low in some of these units. I think it's a legitimate discussion.

**Tammy Pearson:** So my recommendation or proposal, whatever you want to call it, is no different than your dedicated hunter or your percentage of non-resident. I think we should assign sort of a percentage to, you know, each unit that can only be allowed to those lifetime permit holders or something to that effect. Or at least bring that into the discussion at some point.

**Brayden Richmond:** I'm going to ask you to say that one more time in form of a motion, if that's what you want to do.

**Tammy Pearson:** Yeah, what I said in the form of a motion.

**Brayden Richmond:** What you said was not a motion. You gotta clean that up.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Tammy let me try and put that into motion language for you.

**Tammy Pearson:** Please do.

**Kevin Bunnell:** That we ask that, or the Southern RAC asks the division to evaluate the fairness of how lifetime licenses are allocated because that's the sandbox we can play in, is how they're allocated. We can't, by statute they're said they can get a permit. Does that sound like what you said? Okay.

**Austin Atkinson:** Kevin, can we add a survey in there? Let's survey the lifetime guys. What they want to do, where their region's at, all of that. I feel like we could use more data on what they expect and what they want.

**Brayden Richmond:** My suggestion here, let's keep the motion as concise as we can. Again, this is – we're asking the board to look at this. And so I think if we keep this as concise as we can, you can add some wording to the survey but, let's leave it as concise as we can. And we can communicate with the board what we're asking there. We happen to have the chair here, I'm sure he will take this and run with it. No, this is not on the agenda, you're correct. I would, Garth, I would suggest that this motion, again, we aren't passing policy. We're asking, from the RAC, we're asking the board to look at this in regards to the buck permits which are on the agenda. So, I think we're within parameters. I guess what I would say is, would it be out of line to allow public input here? I don't know that I'm opposed to that.

**Kevin Bunnell:** I mean, it's not following process but if you'd like to take some. Good. Let me read the motion as I've interpreted it to make sure that it fits what you're asking. Uhm, ask the DWR to evaluate the fairness of how lifetime licenses are allocated and survey lifetime license holders to get a better feel for what they expect. Does that capture what you were asking for too? Austin? Okay.

**Brayden Richmond:** Do you know what I'm going to suggest here Garth? I'm going to suggest communication directly to the board on this. Again, we're asking the board to consider our recommendation and I would just ask maybe some direct communication there, I think may be the best way to approach that.

**Verland King:** I second it.

**Brayden Richmond:** Okay, so this motion has a first or this motion was made by Tammy and it was seconded by Verland.

**Tammy Pearson:** Craig first.

**Brayden Richmond:** Yeah, actually I think Craig was first. So, any additional discussion on this one? Okay, again let's vote. We'll do it by a raise of hands, all in favor? Motion passes unanimously. Alright, any additional motions on the remaining units?

**Austin Atkinson:** I move that we accept the remainder of the general season and limited entry buck deer as presented.

**Brayden Richmond:** Okay, we have a motion by Austin to accept the remainder as presented and a second by Verland. Additional discussion on that? Alright, again. All in favor? Opposed? Sorry, Bart, you're in favor or opposed? You were late on the draw in both.

**Bart Battista:** I'm in favor.

**Brayden Richmond:** Great, thank you. So it passes unanimously. The joys of technology. We've got to slow it down just a little bit for you.

**Bart Battista:** There's kind of a right time to display.

**Brayden Richmond:** That's what you get for living in Kanab.

**Bart Battista:** I know

**Brayden Richmond:** On AOL connection out there. Alright, let's move on to agenda item number five, Elk.

**Covy Jones:** Mr. Chair, before we move on. If I took a second to address something?

**Brayden Richmond:** Yeah, please do.

**Covy Jones:** We appreciate these meetings. I've never looked at recommendations as a win lose. It's not our recommendation as a win and anything else as a loss. It's not the way it works. And I appreciate the comments from the public. However, when members of the public or constituents make accusations about our data and assume, uhm, the number of deer we classify. You know, just as an example – we were accused of having small buck-doe ratios or small sample sizes and our sample sizes on the Pine Valley are over 2,000 deer. I'm going to go back through our samples, they're all high and statistically valid and relevant. So if there are questions about our data or what we're doing to grow deer herds, you know, I presented a website tonight that shows cost specific mortality on most of the populations across the state. We have unlimited mountain lion harvest on most of the deer herds across the state. In addition to habitat work, in addition to coyote control, we have more data and we're doing more to actively manage deer than in the history of the division. You know, I just sat down in a meeting the other day with Guy Wallace, who has worked for us for several years. Guy was here when Garth worked here. And the changes in technology and the amount of data, and good data we have, uhm, it's completely different. You know, somebody brought up Jim Carpowitz's study that he did on the Book Cliff's years ago for his master's degree and was asking about the data gain there and what we learned there. He used VHS collars and we get more data on an individual animal in a day now than Jim was able to get through his whole master's. And that's not a knock on Jim. It's just that we have better tools and so if there's comments that's fine. But, if they're accusations and concerns about the data or how we manage, I would appreciate at least the ability to address those. And we presented a lot at the last RAC and board meetings and if the RAC wants it informational, on what we're doing, ask for that. We'd love to come present it again. So, thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Covy, thank you. You know I'll just leave it at that, maybe I won't comment. Thank you. I've had a request to take five minutes. So, let's take a five minute break and reconvene.

**The following motion was made by Austin Atkinson, seconded by Nick Jorgensen.**

**MOTION: I move that there be no permit increase on the Fillmore and Plateau/ Boulder units, and reduce the permit increase from 500 to 250 on the Panguitch Lake unit.**

**Motion passed 7 to 2. (Gene Boardman & Chuck Chamberlain opposed)**

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

**MOTION: I move that we ask the DWR to evaluate the fairness of how the lifetime license permits are allocated and survey lifetime license holders to get a better feel for what they expect.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**The following motion was made by Austin Atkinson, seconded by Verland King.**

**MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Buck Deer permit recommendations for 2022 as presented by the division.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**The following motion was made by Austin Atkinson, seconded by Nick Jorgensen.**

**MOTION: I move that there be no permit increase on the Fillmore and Plateau/ Boulder units, and reduce the permit increase from 500 to 250 on the Panguitch Lake unit.**

**Motion passed 7 to 2. (Gene Boardman & Chuck Chamberlain opposed)**

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

**MOTION: I move that we ask the DWR to evaluate the fairness of how the lifetime license permits are allocated and survey lifetime license holders to get a better feel for what they expect.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**The following motion was made by Austin Atkinson, seconded by Verland King.**

**MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Buck Deer permit recommendations for 2022 as presented by the division.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**02:13:30 6) Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022 (Action)**

**- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator and Regional Wildlife Manager**

**RAC Questions**

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, we're on to agenda item number 6 which is Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn. Uhm, I think we'll just move right into questions on this. Let's get some really good questions while Covy's gone. He's back already. Okay, we'll just move right into questions on elk and pronghorn. Questions from the RAC?

**Austin Atkinson:** I've got a question. Bull Elk, Pronghorn, that's where we're at, right? Okay. How is our model for survivability, production, success and everything for elk if you compared it to deer. I feel like we're getting better with the deer model or at least you guys have more confidence in it. But where would you say we're at for elk?

**Covy Jones:** Kent's on here too and I'll probably ask him to speak to some of this as well. But, survival on adult elk is real easy to predict, right? Yeah, we're starting to learn new things about calf production and so when we model elk, they're really tough to model. That's why we do that attempt to census every three years. Some units model really well and some units don't model as well. We thought this may be due to ingress and ingress and in some cases it may be and in other cases.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Speak English.

**Covy Jones:** Okay.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Elk migrating on and off different units.

**Covy Jones:** Good job Kevin, that's why we keep him here. So yeah, in some cases it may be and in other cases we may be over predicting at times or under predicting cow, calf ratios. Uhm and some of that is what we're learning is that we've had consistent cow-calf ratios over the years. When you sample in the field, they're highly consistent. When we sampled elk on the book cliffs and looked at actual pregnancy rates, uhm, it varied a lot based on body condition and age and some other factors. And so with elk, we get our eyes on them every three years. We attempt too. Uhm, and that's how we true whatever errors we have in the model. Kent what would you add to that, please?

**Kent Hersey:** Yeah, um, the lights horrible. Uhm, Thanks Covy. The biggest thing I'd add is, as Covy said, our survival is really consistent. Every time we've done a study it's been about 94% and the variation around that is in a bad year, you'll get 92, a good year you'll get 96 and that seems to hold regardless of what population we've been monitoring. Uhm, the one thing we're really starting to understand more is that age structure plays a lot into this. Some of these populations we have book cliffs as an example as well as our desert, populations appear to be really old aged populations or relatively old age compared to some of the populations where we've hunted pretty heavily like the Wasatch. So, what we're seeing with that is productivity is a lot less on these older populations and it doesn't necessarily show up in our pre-season cow-calf ratios but where we do see it is in our pregnancy rates and we're just starting to understand how variable that is in trying to incorporate that and get annual data on that, is something that we're gonna start looking at. Uhm, we can do that through catching an animal and actually getting it in hand and getting a pregnancy test or we're able to start doing that looking at GPS caller data and the movement of that animal predicting what the number of elk that were pregnant based on looking at how they move. We can actually tell with pretty good accuracy whether they had a calf or not. So, we'll try and incorporate that. But to go back to your main point, Austin. They should be very easy to model, the reality is they haven't been and we're trying to get an understanding of exactly what variables are causing the issues with modeling them. So no, we don't have a ton of faith but we do have a God of faith in our account. So, every three years we do get a good estimate of what's there and we're working on improving that.

**Austin Atkinson:** I guess I'll follow up with a specific question about that model. So, I'm looking at the Beaver and the Panguitch Lake, right. In the population estimate from 2020 to 2021, we lost 25% of the elk. So, I say, is it because we finally got a count so last year's numbers were irrelevant or is our model really that messed up? Because I know it wasn't a one hundred percent kill on the bull and the cow hunts. So how is our model so much lower, this year?

**Mike Wardle:** I apologize Austin, I missed most of your question. Would you mind re-stating it?

**Austin Atkinson:** Yeah, so on the Zion, no, I'm just kidding. Okay, so the Beaver and the Panguitch Lake, population estimates from 2020 to 2021 are 25% lower. That just because we had a count and so just ignore last year's population? We're trying, I'm trying to understand how that model works and why it's up and down on an animal that I'm told doesn't die and is very consistent.

**Mike Wardle:** So, I think modeling elk populations is hard. Um, models don't take into account immigration or emigration off of the unit, right? Like, if we hunt elk hard on the North end and we push elk somewhere else, the model doesn't account for that. Unless we have caller data or something else to help us with that. Also, and maybe Covy could talk more to this, we're learning more about reproduction of elk and how different ages can, did you already talk about this? Oh, gosh, sorry.

**Brayden Richmond:** It sounds like you guys printed a textbook before you got here saying "Say this".

**Mike Wardle:** Sorry, I'll pay attention better next time.

**Kent Hershey:** Mike, you flew Beaver this year correct? Or this year?

**Mike Wardle:** Correct, it was the first of February.

**Kent Hersey:** So, yeah, that Austin, the reason for the decline is that, that was a flight and we adjusted it down towards the flight. Why we were over predicting the last couple years, I can't speak too. Mike, I don't know if you can or not, but as we alluded to we're trying to address that's exactly what we're looking at. What was causing the model to over predict, what can we adjust in it and what variables are blowing it up so that we can fix that and get better data on it. Mike, can you address this? Do you know why, a best guess as to why we over-predicted?

**Mike Wardle:** Um, best guess is maybe we had elk move. I-70 is a pretty permeable barrier off the north end. A lot of those permits were piled onto the north end. And maybe we moved elk. You know, we have some with collars on the Wasatch and other places that elk respond to heavy pressure, that could be part of it. Maybe we overestimated production. I think that those two things are probably factors that could have done that.

**Covy Jones:** I would actually say that those two things are probably, that's what I was going to say. What we've seen with the drought is that pregnancy rates can vary and have varied. And so, that's probably, if I had to point my fingers at two things it would be production and then pressure. Kyle, Panguitch, same thing?

**Kyle Christensen:** Yeah, same thing we've talked about. The last three years I've had, last year I went down to 475 but I've had 500 plus cow tags on the unit. I think we distributed elk. Uhm, and same thing, it was a fly year. Through the same year as Mike was and so those were some predicted survival numbers. We don't have collars on the Beaver or the Panguitch lake so Mike and I, we kind of also made a model together and those were model numbers of what we were predicting it to be and then flew it. That's what the actual count was.

**Austin Atkinson:** So my next question is, can we get like a blue indication on these surveys when you actually fly it and count it? Or some indication that this is a flight count and not a model? Is that...

**Covy Jones:** I actually think that's a really good recommendation. Like, just let the public know this year was a flight year on these units. And when I say we fly every three years, we try really hard to fly every three years. If it's a poor snow year, you just spend a lot of money and time in the air to get a poor count. And so we do have to wait for conditions but we can always strive to get a flight every three years. That's something we can do. That's not hard to say, "Hey, this is a model number. This is an actual number." And as we get more collars out, the model will true. I mean, that's what's happened with deer. The model's just trued over time and it's better every year. We can do that with elk, it's going to take a little time.

**Brayden Richmond:** Go ahead Chuck.

**Chuck Chamberlain:** Yeah, you mentioned you were pretty confident with your flights but they really need some snow cover is that correct, to get a good count? It's just kind of logistically, walk me through, like if we're on the Panguitch Lake unit, how much time do you spend in the air? And how much ground are you covering? And, you know, are you pretty confident with that?

**Kyle Christensen:** Yeah, so the Panguitch we flew about 18.75 almost 19 hours of total air time in the air. And we try to grid stuff out. Most of the time we're flying anywhere from half mile to three quarter patterns and we fly really well that way. So we cover, I feel like, the area really well.

**Chuck Chamberlain:** Okay, thanks.

**Brayden Richmond:** Is it alright if I answer that too, just based on my experience? So, I had the opportunity to fly this year and it was very impressive how tight those grids were. They really do go to an effort to cover the land. In the flight I was on, I don't feel like there was any pockets that we didn't go into or areas that we couldn't see. So, there's still sight-ability issues, right? They can be huddled up under a tree, you just can't see them but it was impressive how tight that do fly these units.

**Covy Jones:** Well and for us the more accurate the data the better we are moving forward. There's no incentive at all to have inaccurate data. No matter what we do in almost all situations, sportsmen are always going to want more and there's some conflict with AG where they may want less, right. And nobody's wrong there. It's not that anybody's bad or wrong but there's no incentive for us to provide the wrong number either way so we attempt to have the most accurate survey data we can have.

**Tammy Pearson:** So, I've flown with Jason a couple of different times. And, granted it's, it's BLM, it's West Desert, out on your place Gib. It's not for the faint of heart, I mean, honestly. You've got to have a bucket handy possibly but I told him I couldn't do it this year because we were during the legislative session. But, is there any chance that you can pull up that grid? Just as an example somewhere, even if it was an old one? Uhm, because I think what these guys are telling, and I'm just saying, just for fact what he's saying, there isn't a pocket that you don't – the first time I flew five or six years ago I told Jason, I said, "Can we count horses too? I'll go with you if we can count horses." So we were doing that and he sent me a grid with that and we, you know, we mapped that all out and had horses, every kind of critter you could see whether it was sage grouse or something flying, or coyotes, or eagles. We were marking everything.

**Covy Jones:** Jason has it here and I'm not sure how we share it. Mike, just hold it in front of the camera, maybe? I mean, will that work? It's just on an ipad. Which camera Mike, tell us what to do? Oh, you just emailed it to me.

**Tammy Pearson:** Cause honestly I think if you show everybody, it makes more sense just to see that grid.

**Brayden Richmond:** I was going to say, to Austin's point, of you know, highlighting the ones that are actual counts vs. modeled counts and I think supplying a little more information to the public of how do you get these counts. That's all great information.

**Covy Jones:** Yeah, no..

**Brayden Richmond:** The confidence I had in the counts on elk after flying was significantly higher than my confidence before flying.

**Covy Jones:** If Wade Paskett's online. If you guys aren't nice we'll make you go on a sheep flight on the San Rafael. What do you think of that Wade? That's hours and hours and hours of. So Here's an example of flight lines. This is from the Beaver and I can share my screen and show this. Looks like I might have gone out of the meeting. Oh, that's a different one. Whose is that? Southwest Desert. But I mean, it would look that same, so obviously it's contoured where, you know, there's an elevational gradient that you're usually wasting your time to fly above but, is there anything you'd add to that Jason?

**Jason Nicholes:** Yeah, I would say on the Southwest Desert where there isn't a whole lot of elevational, of course the Indian Peak range, the Wah Wah range, we're bumping up against snow in the higher elevations just like we are on other units and if we fly so high, say up to 9,000 feet, and we're not seeing elk tracks, we're not going to waste our time flying above that. So, we're going to stay down below. If it's steeper terrain we might contour it. If it's more flat terrain, we're doing more gridding. And as Kyle said, you know, we try to keep an interval, you know, to half/three quarters of a mile or so wide and we've got observers seeing out all sides of the helicopter. So yeah.

**Brayden Richmond:** Go ahead.

**Austin Atkinson:** Okay, I'll jump on another question. Mt. Dutton has a recommended increase of two permits. Overall. But then when I look at the distribution on what hunt it's on, I've had constituents reach out to say, "This isn't fair. They're taking my archery permits and they're putting them on rifle hunts." How does that happen? And what determines when we make adjustments? I feel like if it's a proportion, it should move. Everybody gets permits on each weapon. Or why are we stealing from one and going to the other?

**Covy Jones:** That's a really good question. So, this last year one of the things that I brought up was in the new big game database that we made. Big game database – it goes back to the proportion set in the management plan. So, when we talked with all of them, we talked with the biologists after we set these numbers and said okay, what reasons did we have for this, that and the other? Do you still have those same concerns? And when we went through and found they didn't still have a lot of those same concerns for the original split, for example, on the Wasatch, it was a crowding concern. So we moved those weapons out, but we introduced a midseason hunt on the Wasatch. So with that additional hunt, we didn't have those same concerns and so we just went back to the plan splits. Now, those splits can be adjusted through this process. If there's concern or frustration, there's an allowance in the plan to change those. To allocate to different weapon types. But when the split were developed it's trying to better mirror the demand for the permits, right.

**Austin Atkinson:** To go along with that, is it the biologists? Is it fair for me to say the biologists is okay with and recommended these? Or when you went demand, are you now going the licensing route?

**Covy Jones:** So, what I'm trying to say is we went back to the recommended splits that were in the management plan we agreed to and brought through the public process. Uhm and when we brought that up, there were major concerns over going back to those splits, the plan is seven years old. They've been changed throughout the plan for one reason or another and nobody felt like there was a valid reason to leave it where they were, it was okay to move them back. And if there was an adjustment that needed to be made, it would be brought up here.

**Austin Atkinson:** Next question. It's been said, I mean time and time again we say if we harvest bucks it doesn't hurt the population, right. It's a surplus, that's why we're killing bucks. So I have a question about the Parker Mountain Pronghorn hunt. Why is that still closed? I am trying to remember why we closed it and if it's just bucks, why is that not a hunt?

**Levi Watkins:** There you go.

**Covy Jones:** Oh I'm not sharing it, do you want to share it?

**Levi Watkins:** Yeah if you could share it.

**Covy Jones:** I'll have to join it, yeah.

**Levi Watkins:** Oh, sorry.

**Covy Jones:** It's fine.

**Levi Watkins:** Um, I just kind of want to share part of the story of the history. So, this is a graph going back to 2000. Oh, is it up there yet? Do I need to share a screen? Sorry, I didn't click on that. Thank you Covy. Okay, so, uhm. Pre-2004 we were above our objective and we were getting around to where we had over 3000 Pronghorn and so, through some different things that happened we decided to bring them down to objective. So those two lines on the bottom, the red line is the total number of permits we were issuing and the purple line is the total number we were removing off of the unit between captures and permits. And so we started, in 2004, to really start to issue a lot of permits and we're removing a lot of animals. And that kind of peaked, they tried to do it over five years. But in that five year period we were having fawn rates in the 70's and 80's and so they were reproducing. We were taking in those years around 900 animals a year off that unit and so we were hitting them really, really hard. And that kind of peaked in 2009 where we removed one thousand one hundred animals off of the Parker that year but, between the hunts and trapping them. So just kind of have that in mind, that for five years, we had tons of pressure for that size of a population. I mean, tons of doe permits, tons of buck permits. We hunted them super, super hard to get them down to that objective and it changed their behavior. And so, it changed their distribution on the landscape as well. And so kind of fast forward to now, where we're at the past couple of years. You can kind of see, we've been just below that objective that we kind of been bouncing there and as hunters were out,

there success rates for the limited entry Pronghorn. And because we changed the distribution, hunters went from seeing 3,000 animals when they'd get that permit and being out on the Parker and that's a lot of Pronghorn. We have never had another herd in the state that has quite reached what the Parker was. So the hunters were used to seeing that many animals on the landscape. We hunted them super hard. We were moving them out as fast as we could. Then you go to now, where a lot of them are up in the trees. I saw a doe Pronghorn by Lower Bounds Reservoir, which is crazy. There's not Pronghorn habitat anywhere near that, but they'll be up in the trees. So I think it's, hunters weren't seeing what they were used to seeing and so if a certain percentage are up in the trees and someone who had the tag in 2000 got the tag two years ago, they would go out on the Parker Plateau and they probably would only see a hand full of Pronghorn, even though we have a lot there, the perception is that they were not there. And success rates were really low and through some of the public process, they felt like we needed to try to redistribute those Pronghorn from the trees and try to push them back down. So we've tried that and it's been somewhat effective. I mean, any time you're hunting an animal, they're going to respond to pressure but we also didn't want to put so much pressure that it was a horrible hunt. We didn't want to go from one horrible hunt to another horrible hunt. So it's something we're looking at. We have the Pronghorn there and part of it is that it's not like it used to be. And so I think some of that is helping the public understand and hunters as they draw that. We're not going to manage to 3,000 Pronghorn because our objective's at 1,500. And so there's never going to be what people were seeing in the past when they've gotten that permit. And so we're in a different place, we train the Pronghorn to be different. I mean, if you think about removing 1,000 animals, we probably removed every dumb animal on the unit. And so you've got really spooky animals that are distributed differently. So we tried to hunt them a little differently to redistribute them kind of in their core habitat and I just kind of wanted to share some of the history. Covy, did you have anything else to add to that?

**Covy Jones:** No but, when we get done with this, we need to go back to Elk because I misspoke and this is why I shouldn't speak for biologists on their districts. So, we need to correct that. Now, does that answer your question on Pronghorn?

**Austin Atkinson:** I think so. It sounds like we're resting the unit and let the coyotes eat them. Is that fair to say?

**Covy Jones:** Fair point.

**Kevin Bunnell:** So Austin, maybe something that's lost in this is we don't have the tradition Parker hunt, we replaced it with another one. So we are hunting the same population but, in a little bit different way. Partially to help move them back into the traditional area.

**Covy Jones:** But Austin makes a fair point too. And that is, this isn't a re-grow the herd thing, it's a re-distribute Pronghorn thing. So that's a fair point. I think it wouldn't be – Do you want to address the Dutton?

**Kevin Bunnell:** Let's do a comment on Pronghorn before we go back to Elk.

**Verland King:** I just want to vouch for what you're saying. They're in the trees higher on the mountain and the hunter's satisfaction has gone down because in the past, they were driving, they'd road hunt them. Now you can't. You'd have to have a long rifle to pick them off the road but we appreciate you getting down closer to your objective. That 3,000 deal's ugly.

**Kyle Christensen:** Sorry Austin. I was a little bit confused there for a second. The reason the split on the Dutton was changed, four years ago, actually went through the RAC process but they had recommended we take some permits off of the late hunt and re-distribute them. So, they were just late hunts that were pulled off and re-distributed through the rest of the permits. Yeah.

**Brayden Richmond:** Got more Austin?

**Austin Atkinson:** Yeah, one more question about elk. September archery and the HAMS. We have no management objective for age, is that right? And how do we feel about those hunts? I feel like we've kind of forgotten about them. I know you wanted them any-bull units, most of them but, did we do a good job? I don't even know what the success was on those.

**Covy Jones:** It depends on the unit. I was looking at success rates on them the other day and it's like low success and it depends on whether it was September, Archery or HAMS. But I mean, one of them was like zero percent success. Mostly it was like in the low 30's to high 60's. Not as successful as a traditional limited entry hunt. Not the best limited entry units. Something you might expect and you have restrictions on weapon type. So, all of those factors probably contribute to that. There is a written management objective. I did find re-reading the plan, I remember, we went back and forth on whether or not to put one in there. It's a very low age objective. They're offering some opportunity on limited entry. It really depends on how we want to go with this. I think this is one of the things that we'll address this plan of was this a good idea? Do we like it? I wish we had another year's data. Frankly, I wish we had at least two year's data instead of one. When we work through this with the committee but obviously, you'd offer more opportunity if they were general season. I don't know that that's the right decision or the wrong decision but, we're being asked to meet both the limited entry and general season demands and they're meeting that limited entry gap right ow. Or helping to.

**Tammy Pearson:** So, while we're on the subject of the HAMS, can I ask you what the success rate on the new unit out on – I don't know what you call it but, out on Frisco. Because that would have been like the middle of our range. I know that we saw a huge amount of traffic. I know there wasn't that many tags out there. But like, the impact itself, just the hunters, the people that were scouting, the trail cameras.

**Covy Jones:** So that's Southwest Desert North HAMS unit.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Jason's standing behind you to answer that question.

**Covy Jones:** Oh he is? Good job Jason. I was going to ask Kent to do it, so Jason you're here.

**Jason Nicholes:** My Numbers are not going to be perfect because I don't have them right here in front of me but, we did have better success on the archery, on the September archery. Uhm, we had 8 permits on the HAMS portion of the hunt and September archery was about 90 to 100 percent about 40% on the HAMS part. Average age of harvest was 8.7.

**Austin Atkinson:** One more question. I was wondering if Mike could share a little bit about the Beaver flights specifically? So I can speak to that later. I understand we got a good count, we kind of talked about that but could you share bull-cow ratios, sideability, mature bulls, a little bit for context on the Beaver.

**Mike Wardle:** Yeah, you bet. So again, we flew from the end of January to the first of February. We had some pretty decent snow. So the objective on the Beaver is 1,050 total elk. Our population projections based on flights was about 860 elk. We counted, we observed a total of 644 elk, cows and calves. We observed about 350 and bulls were 294. So, when you combine all those numbers, the bull-to-cow ratio based on that was 64 bulls for every 100 cows. And that's if you consider sightability to be the same for bulls and cows. Typically it's a lot harder to see bulls from the air just because they're in smaller groups or they're off by themselves. Or as cows are in big groups. There are tons of tracks, you can find them. So if you consider that sightability might be lower than cows, that could push that ratio closer to, like, a one-to-one ratio. So, a lot of bulls. Of those bulls we classified 70% of them as mature. So, a mature bull is anything that looks like a mature five point or bigger. So, a lot of mature bulls.

**Brayden Richmond:** Additional questions? Go ahead Gene.

**Gene Boardman:** Yeah, Covy in your presentation, you said that bulls meet max potential at about six years old. So, why are we having eight year old class units?

**Covy Jones:** The average age is more of a surrogate for quality on the landscape and these older age class units are definitely hard to manage. I'm not going to tell you they're not but it's because there's a demand for a certain quality of bulls on some units. And when you manage for an average age of 8, 7.5 to 8, you end up with more bulls and more potential for that bull to be on the landscape. And what I mean is, your average bull is also never bigger than about 330 inches. Regardless of his mature age, right. He's going to hit 330 inches and that's what he is. You know, it's the difference – human potential is very similar, right? No matter how bad I would want to play on some professional basketball team, I'm not even going to be able to play point guard, right? And so I just don't have that potential whereas others with the height or athletic ability or whatever else. So when you're trying to manage based on quality, age is a great surrogate but it doesn't tell the whole story and what an average age of 7.5 to 8 means is that there are a lot of bulls out there to sort through and the chance that one has that potential is higher. It also means that there's probably, I don't know if this is a great, right word. Waste is not the right word. It's just a different way to manage like you're harvesting less through hunter harvest and more dying through natural means.

**Brayden Richmond:** Covy, I wanna add just a comment. Just clarification for everybody on this too. Just so everybody is aware, that the Elk committee is meeting this summer, over the next several months. So questions like this Gene, these will be great questions to bring forward to that Elk committee and how we want to look at this going forward.

**Covy Jones:** And I don't want to feel like I was defending the age classes we have. I was just trying to say why. Like, is it right or wrong? It just is, right now at least.

**Gene Boardman:** Okay.

**Brayden Richmond:** But if we want to change it, that opportunity is coming. I believe.. Is that posted? Can you see it?

**Covy Jones:** Yeah, if anyone wants to reach out to me after I can help them get ahold of their contact or representative.

**Brayden Richmond:** So yeah, they can share all the names on that committee with you if you're interested.

**Gene Boardman:** I'll add something. Austin Atkinson is on that Elk committee. Like the Beaver, is the division, mainly the big game management, willing to soften or adjust what's been chiseled in stone on Zion? About age objective and herd objective. I really want to know because we've got the Beaver and the Elk committee is coming up.

**Brayden Richmond:** Gene, can I address this real quick and then see if you have another question? Because I think this is something we get confused about as a RAC. Is the division comes with their presentations based on the plan that was done by committees and the RACS and the boards approved through the process. So the division is coming basing their recommendations on the current plan. Your question again, would be to alter the plan, which they'll be addressing over the next few months. I don't know if that helps or not but, I think that's something that we confuse is that we want the division to come with recommendations or proposals outside of the plan. That's not what the division does. We ask that of them a lot but that's not how it works.

**Gene Boardman:** The committee is going to look to the division for their recommendations or they're going to get their recommendations whether they look to them or not.

**Covy Jones:** Gene, we just had our first meeting with the committee. This is the statewide committee, so this doesn't set population objectives. Those are unit committees and those follow the year after the statewide committee. And if individuals, local individuals, want to be involved with those, we'd love to have them be involved with those. We'll work through that next year. And on the statewide committee, we set up how we hunt bulls. And just really quick, if we're willing to change and evaluate things, I think the committee we have is pretty diverse and looking for some change. And the board actually asked us to look really hard at changing how we manage elk if it means addressing some of these issues. So, I don't think anyone on the

committee is set that we're doing everything the exact right way. They're willing to look at a lot and make some change. And Kevin, what would you add to that?

**Kevin Bunnell:** I would just add Gene, on the Beaver in particular. Managing any kind of a ungulate population with a one-to-one, sex ratio isn't a healthy population. So, the fact that we have data on the Beaver in particular, that that's kind of where we're at. I think it begs at least some consideration of whether it's appropriate to continue managing that one the same way we have been. So I'm sure that will be discussed, whether it comes out, I'm not sure. But there's certainly data that indicates that there's some discussion that needs to take place.

**Covy Jones:** I wish Justin were here because it was at a meeting a couple weeks back when I asked, there were some ranches in the room and some sportsmen when I said, "Would anybody manage their cows, their cattle, at one bull per cow?" Justin raised his hand and he said, "Well it depends." I said, "What do you mean 'it depends' Justin?" He said, "Well, if I only had one cow, then I would need one bull." So, but I think outside of that is it's not productive and we understand that managing for that extreme quality can hinder production.

**Gene Boardman:** Okay, we're not going to answer that and we're not going to do anything because the elk committee started to meet now. We're not going to have any big changes. But if we don't mention it in these meetings and if it's not put out to the public then.. Bleh, I'll save the rest for my comments.

**Covy Jones:** And Gene, the RAC just went in a different direction than the division's proposal and decreased several deer units. If there's concern like this where the RAC comes in and if there was an increase above what we recommend on elk permits, we would obviously understand that.

**Brayden Richmond:** Go ahead Tammy.

**Tammy Pearson:** We're going to beat this to death on the Beaver unit, but uhm. So my question was, why aren't we doing a bigger increase in the bull tags? Because I saw there, I think it was a very slight increase.

**Mike Wardle:** Cause I was nervous that I'd be hanging from the stoplight in Beaver. We recommended an increase of 13. So we're going from 38 to 51. Which at that low of numbers is a fairly decent increase. Why we haven't in the past, is simply because we've been trying to manage to that average age.

**Tammy Pearson:** Don't sit down, don't get.. Uh, so on that success rate. Previously, so you went from 38 you said? To 51?

**Mike Wardle:** Yes, that's what we're recommending this year.

**Tammy Pearson:** Okay, so on 38 tags last year, what was your success rate?

**Mike Wardle:** I can pull that up.

**Tammy Pearson:** Cause I agree with Verland. I think there's way too many road hunters.

**Mike Wardle:** It's pretty high honestly, for limited entry elk. And on the Beaver, these guys are waiting 20,25 to 26 years and it's pretty high but I'll pull it up. Five years, I got it now. My computer's thinking.

**Kent Hershey:** Mike, I got it. If you want me to chime in.

**Mike Wardle:** Oh yeah, if you got it that'll be great.

**Kent Hersey:** So the Archery was 89 percent, the two rifle hunts were, one was low 90's, 93 on the early and the late was upper 70's. So, average out to be about 85. Muzzleloader was 100% and I didn't look up multi-season yet but I imagine that was 100%. Yeah so, average them all out you're looking at around 90% upright, something like that.

**Brayden Richmond:** Should we let Mike sit down yet Tammy or do you have another question? Are you ready to ask more questions? Any other questions from the RAC? Alright. Let's open it up to questions from the public. Before we start questions, just a reminder that as of right now we don't have any comments on the Elk or Buck Pronghorn permits. So if you have comments, please turn your cards in. Uh, questions..

### **Public Questions**

**Kevin Bunnell:** That was for Antlerless Elk and that will be coming up in a minute Gibb. If you have a comment on the Bulls, we can add that to your card if you'd like.

**Brayden Richmond:** Okay, we will bring you up on this item then. If anybody else wants to talk on Elk and Pronghorn, please submit a card and your comments will be heard. Let's go ahead and start with questions, questions from the public?

**Steven Yardley:** I just wanted to ask a little question on the Beaver from one of the biologists, like... You were talking about how the potential for the elk to reach more than 330 is pretty low but in cow herds we have pure bred. We are always selecting a lot of times, the outliers, to kind of breed up to improve the overall production of the animal. Unfortunately, with the idea of getting a trophy bull, that's the bull you want contributing to the gene pool, right? So with the Beaver and kind of the situation that you're managing for and wanting to get these big bulls. Has there been any thought or idea of having a sub. Like, 320's or 300 bulls so they can't hunt a trophy unit. They can hunt the trophy unit but not the big bulls so that some of those decent sized bulls that are still going to be a great opportunity for some of the young hunters to get and hunt them? And put a few more bull tags out there?

**Covy Jones:** That's actually a really great question. It's something that we've done in the past with manageable years and years ago and what ended up happening is on average, folks were just killing younger bulls. So, it's hard to determine for hunters on the landscape. And you know, I would agree with you that hunters are always aiming for that top end every year but that bull's had the opportunity to breed for several years before he's harvested. And so, as far as genetic variation, the other way it doesn't get detected in a wild population like this. Now, like you said, in a closed-out population, they can select for those things. You're talking about optimum nutrition, big antlers and in these private elk herds they grow monster, monster elk but in a wild population. There's just too much. You just can't select for it like that. That's a fair point though and a fair question. Like issuing permits to harvest, for example, rag horns. That's what we're attempting to do with spike permits. And when we tried it before, people were just harvesting younger bulls. Not old bulls that didn't reach that potential.

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, if there are no more questions, we'll go to comments. First comment card from Pete Yardley.

### **Public Comments**

**Pete Yardley:** One of my comments is to Covy. You might have to hang me cause I should draw this year. But I mean, on the Elk, you think your numbers went down by 25% because you have one bull to one cow? You're bulls aren't reproducing. Only a few of them. I mean, that's kind of my thought on it. I do agree with what they're wanting to do because you had a better trophy bull unit ten years ago when you had one bull for like 10 cows, And now you have basically selected for the worst genes because all of the really good bulls they pulled out every year and you just keep leaving the pools that are just kind of moderate in there that nobody wants to kill. So that's my comment. But I do appreciate Brayden and them for what they have done on some of the cow hunts. To help mitigate the problem areas but I think it needs to be looked at as a forest on a rangeland help issue where the problems are when they do them, because some of these cow hunters we were having last year when they were hunting them up on Big Flat, that's not really problem elk, that's just a cow elk to kill. Thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Pete. Next Gib. I think that's it, right?

**Kevin Bunnell:** Yeah, that's all I've got on this agenda item and then I need Gib's back for antlerless elk.

**Gibb Yardley:** What?

**Kevin Bunnell:** I was just getting your card back so I could call you back up when we do Antlerless Elk.

**Gibb Yardley:** So what are we talking on now? Elk?

**Brayden Richmond:** Pronghorn.

**Gib Yardley:** Okay. I've been to these meetings ever since they've had them. And as long as they've had them, I've always heard about the excess of Antelope on the Parker Mountain. Always. They couldn't kill enough to get rid of them. They've trapped a lot of them and they've prepared them and they've turned a lot of them loose on us. We've got thousands that hunt, I shouldn't say thousands but, many many hunters and over 1,000. They're on the North Divide right next to my private property. I've spent thousands of dollars reseeding that area. Last year we had 100 of them that camped right in there on our private ground, on our private reseeding. And the Fish and Wildlife Services said, "Well, we may better have a special hunt on them." I told them I will unlock my gates and let everybody come on and hunt the things. They issued permits only to people that had already had permits and that hadn't got one in the regular permit. There were about three or four people to hunt 100 head they never even fazed or made a dent in them. I think that out there on that North Divide, they ought to take 300 head of those. There's a thousand of them there, they ought to take at least half of them off because they're overrunning the place. And I'm really serious about that. We've had them – My summer range is over at Asay Creek up here on top of this mountain. We've had them seen over there when we've never seen them before. They're turning them over there. I don't think we need to be transplanting the things all over the whole country. And on Elk, we run on this mountain. My family got the first permit up here in 19 and 8. These mountain ranges and all of our ranges are sacred to us. They've been in our family forever and we want our kids and grandkids to keep running on them. We love these ranges, we love this mountain and we love our desert. But there are so many Elk that when we get up there on the mountain – well just the other day, my son, that just stopped and talked to you, was up on Asay Creek. Our main summer range. 40 head of Elk there when there wasn't one green sphere no place, they're going to move high. Last summer in the drought, we kept our cattle off for one month before we turned them out. So we'd have plenty of feed.

**Brayden Richmond:** Gibb, we're out of time, can you wrap it up?

**Gibb Yardley:** No, I've got a lot more I need to tell you because you need to hear what I've got to say.

**Brayden Richmond:** We're going to give you more time on Antlerless Gib. Just finish it off, we're good. Finish it off.

**Gibb Yardley:** Okay, well we need to take a lot more Elk off this mountain up here. Because when we get up there with our cattle, they've been there when the first braided green grass shows up and we don't have any feed. It looks like a herd of sheep has been there. We need, and I absolutely was shocked at what you said on the Beaver. One bull for every cow, that's unbelievable. That's the most poor management of anything that could ever be. They ought to have one bull for every ten cows. You need to have more bulls but we've got to get rid of a lot more cows up there. And then, out on the West Desert.

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, you've got to wrap it up a little quicker.

**Gibb Yardley:** Okay, well the trouble is with so many of these hunts you're letting so many permits out but a lot of the time with these cow permits they only get half the animals. You don't get a cow for every permit that's issued. Okay.

**Brayden Richmond:** We're going to give you another but we're going to take off your time from this one so you only got a minute left next time Gib.

**Gibb Yardley:** You're going to hear what I've got to say because I've been here, I'm 89, just turned 89 years old. I've been here a lot longer than any of the rest of you and you need to hear a little of my wisdom.

**Brayden Richmond:** Yeah, we'll get back to it in a minute. Thank you Gib, we appreciate it. Alright, I think that's all the comments from the public. Oh, now we'll go to the email comments Kevin.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Alright, we had 22 people that indicated whether they agreed or disagreed with the recommendation on this one. It's about 65% overall, in agreement, not a lot of just written comments on this topic. But about a 65 to 35 split on those that agreed vs. disagree.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Kevin. I guess we'll go to comments from the RAC. Before we start comments from the RAC I guess I want to just reiterate. Let's be a little cautious on getting sidetracked on this. We do have the Elk committee convening this summer. Please take your comments to them on what we can change in the plan. What we're talking about today, our permit numbers and other discussions okay but let's just be cautious on it because the Elk committee will meet and they can change the plan at that time. So get in touch with the Elk committee if you want additional changes there. They'd be the best resource. Comments from the RAC. Go ahead, Chuck.

### **RAC Comments:**

**Chuck Chamberlain:** Yeah, I want to help them with the Beaver problem. I never kill a bull elk so I'm thinking we should take the tags up on that. I would double that, I would go to 76 tags and not just go up to 13. I would double and try and get more opportunity for people who want you know that 330 bull with my bow is pretty nice. I wouldn't mind that at all.

**Brayden Richmond:** Well if we double the elk tags on the Beaver, this may be the first time that Pete fights us on killing Elk if he's ready to draw this year. Thanks Chuck, any comments from the RAC?

**Tammy Pearson:** I'm kind of heading that same way Chuck. Cause I'm a rancher, I know the cow to bull ratios. That's not a healthy herd, that's not healthy management and I know we've accomplished a lot on the cow tags and that kind of stuff. But considering the drought and

impending impacts on our livestock community and everything else, I'd suggest that we do that too. Whether we open it up, you know, Pete can get his tag drawn this year. But I'm not sure how you would stretch that out, you know, on opportunity. But I know myself, it took me a long time to draw and I finally had to go to archery to get it drawn but that's an opportunity for also, your point creep you know, to open that up. I think a lot of people have been waiting in line a long time to draw that Beaver tag.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Tammy, Gene go ahead.

**Gene Boardman:** Back several years ago there were 30 tags on the Beaver. 30 cow tags on the Beaver for every bull tag and nobody was upset with that. We have a herd objective, so we kill cows to meet the herd objective. We have an age objective, so we don't kill bulls to meet the age objective. And that's what's got us into the problem that's on the Beaver and besides that it's really wrecked the opportunity for a lot of people to go out and kill an Elk. I was talking to a biologist that said he had to call and someone gave him hell about how they've waited 20 years to draw the tag and the biggest thing they could find was only 370 points. Gosh, it just breaks my damn heart. And just too much has gone into trophy hunting. We've got to get more into the opportunity for people to go out and kill those Elk. There have been some sad things about trophy hunting and some stories that aren't too pretty. Like, how the spider bull was killed and the ox buck was hunted. That doesn't quite shine a good light on trophy hunting. And those are the ones I know about. That'll do.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Gene. Other comments? Go ahead Austin.

**Austin Atkinson:** I'll try to keep this brief. Uhm, as we think about what we're going to change with Elk, not just in permit numbers but, as the public and those members here think about what they're going to submit to the Elk committee. I'm finding comments that are coming in on how we manage Elk are really determined by how many bonus points you have for Elk and it's very skewed depending on where you sit in the mix. If you're a spike hunter you want the spike tags the same forever. If you're any-bull, don't touch my any-bull and then if you've got 20 points, don't touch these tag numbers because I want that 370 bull. And so, we've created a sense of entitlement and most of it is based around point creep and the situation we're in. So yes, Is the Beaver totally out of whack? My comments are, yes. I personally have hunted the Beaver, have been responsible for helping people kill a lot of cows up there and it's sad to be a big bull hunter to kill a cow that's pregnant in January. But if you're on the other side and want cows dead, that's great. But now look at us. We've got all these bulls we can't touch and we don't know what to do. So I'm conflicted on raising these permits because we said we were going to manage that age objective and we must to keep our current point structure, to keep those applicants happy. We could handle 200 bull permits and be fine unless you're the ones that applied for Beaver, you would hate it, right. So I'd have a hard time saying let's double or triple the permits for this year. I think the plan will change a lot of that and I hope a total restructure comes out of how we manage Elk but I don't think just jumping the permits as much as I want to kill some of those bulls is the answer. Another comment I have, just about age objective, is personally I struggle with the age objective. I hunt a lot of bighorn sheep and they're not easy, but much easier to tell how old they are on the hoof. There's very few of us, if any in this room,

that can tell how old a bull elk is on the hoof. And so we're finding hunters that don't know how to pick out the age objective they're supposed to. They don't know the repercussions there are if they shoot just a spike on the last day of their limited entry hunt because they can and that's what's got us to this point. So I'm hopeful we see more changes. I don't see a lot personally out of the current tag recommendations to change those quotas.

**Brayden Richmond:** Additional comments? Let me make a quick comment on the Beaver, and that's what a lot of our comments have been on. I probably tend to agree with what Austin said. We are going to – the Elk committee is convening, the Wildlife Board has asked the Elk committee to really look at substantial changes from what I'm hearing. That at a minimum will be discussed heavily. I think this year to go in and double or triple the tags on the Beaver – if we were going to stick with the current plan for the next several years, I think more could align better. But if we're going to change the plan next year and perhaps address some of this, I'm inclined to go with the division's recommendations. I don't think doubling would hurt at all but at the same time I do have some empathy for those with 25 points that thought they were putting in for a premium tag this year again. Next year, the other change is we'll know the recommended permits prior to putting in and I think that's a substantial change also. I think we just need to be cautious this year for those that believe what they put in for and we don't want to change it on them too much.

### **RAC Discussion**

**Mike Wardle:** Mr. Chair, can I add just one thing that I should have mentioned earlier. One of the factors that led us to the situation we are in on the Beaver is we were significantly above population objective years ago. And we increased cow harvests substantially and that's a big part of the discussion that hasn't really been brought up. I just wanted to make sure it was clear that the bull to cow ratio isn't simply because of age objective, right? And managing towards an age objective. There's other factors like this significant cow harvest that influences that bull to cow ration.

**Brayden Richmond:** Mike, I really appreciated that comment. In fact that's the other comment I wanted to make. In fact that was the other comment I wanted to make. I think there is a misconception out there that what happened on the Beaver was an accident, it wasn't an accident. It was very intentional and done over the last five years. It needed to be brought down below objective, it was brought down below objective and it was done intentionally. And I guess I would even go as far as to say we appreciate your effort there, Mike. I know you've taken some bullets for that but you've done your job and you've done what you've been asked to do so good comment, thank you.

**Tammy Pearson:** And, I did mention that in my last comment. And, like I 100% agree. That's been a heartburn from us, it's been asked of, you know, from my county specifically to reduce the population on that. And we voted for it consistently to manage that, it was not an accident. But in that same respect, I think for you to have a healthy herd, I don't think having one year of a permit increase is going to hurt anything. I think it's going to help because you're not going to grow that cow population overnight or in a year or two either. You're not going to solve that issue. So as a livestock producer, I think of just a healthy herd alone. I would suggest an increase in bull tags.

**Brayden Richmond:** I think we're ready to go to motions. And, again, let's do it similar to what we have done. Let's make motions on units specifically and then we'll follow up with the remainder as presented. So, if anyone wants to make a motion on any unit, specific.

**Chuck Chamberlain:** I'll make a motion after I make my last comment okay. My last comment is that if we increase this by double we're actually talking about 20 more bulls we're killing cause that's 25 bulls over what they're asking. So you're talking another 20 bulls out of 300 and something 70% are mature. So I agree, I don't think we're going to do – I think we'll still be within our objective of seven and a half to take because we are at 8.4 right now. So my motion would be to increase the tags on the Beaver unit. This is the only one I'm proposing to change to 76 tags and you would just proportion those out. What you would end up doing is doubling the archery, doubling that early any legal weapon late, muzzleloader and multi-season. You just double each one of those or the DWR can change that however they want.

**Brayden Richmond:** I would suggest you end your motion, your recommendation. We don't want to allow them to change it however they want. That causes confusion.

**Tammy Pearson:** I'll second that.

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, so we have a motion from Chuck and a second from Tammy. Any further discussion? You ready Kevin?

**Kevin Bunnell:** Yeah, so the motion is to increase the bull tags on the Beaver unit from 51 to 76 and distribute the tags proportionally with the current recommendation.

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, so we have a motion and a second. Let's go ahead and vote. All in favor with the raise of hands? Keep them up. Are you up or down Craig? Okay, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 in favor. Opposed? Two opposed. And are you abstaining? Alright, Dan's gong to abstain.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Did we get Bart?

**Brayden Richmond:** Oh, yes, Bart was in favor.

**Kevin Bunnell:** So it was 6, 3, and 1?

**Brayden Richmond:** Yes, I think we got the reasons for the people that abstained, or I mean voted against. Did you want to comment on why you abstained? No comment? Okay. Any other motions on additional units?

**Verland King:** I move we accept the rest of the recommendations as given.

**Tammy Pearson:** I second.

**Brayden Richmond:** So, we have a motion to accept the remainder as presented. A second by Tammy. Any additional discussion? Okay, call for a vote. All in favor? Opposed? Is that a yes or are you abstaining against?

**Kevin Bunnell:** I'm calling it a yes.

**Brayden Richmond:** We are 99% unanimous.

**Dan Fletcher:** I always wanted to be that one percent.**Brayden Richmond:** You made it. Alright, thank you.

**Tammy Pearson:** Just one more reminder for Wade if he's still on or if he hasn't dozed off yet. This is up to the Board to approve this is just our recommendation right? Okay.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you, let's move on to the Once-In-A Lifetime permit recommendations. Did you have some things you wanted to say before we get going? You look like you're geared up and ready to go.

**The following motion was made by Chuck Chamberlain, seconded by Tammy Pearson.**

**MOTION:** I move that we increase the Bull Elk permits on the Beaver unit from 51 to 76 and to distribute the additional permits proportionally with the current recommendation.

**Motion passed 6 in favor, 2 opposed (Gene Boardman & Chuck Chamberlain) and 1 abstention (Nick Jorgensen).**

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

**MOTION:** I move that we accept the remainder of the Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn permit recommendations for 2022 as presented by the division.

**Motion passed unanimously.**

- Riley Peck, OIAL Species Coordinator and Regional Wildlife Manager

**Riley Peck:** Yeah, I mean I'm excited. I'm ready to answer any questions. So, no, I think that we hear how elk and deer go and the recommendations that we make and the once in the lifetime are quite literally a different animal, but due to our populations across the state and the small numbers that we have, the recommendations we make very, you know, very small there not as drastic we're talking about at times single permits, one or two, so it's a different animal, but I'm ready to answer any questions or comments that you may have.

**RAC Questions:**

**Brayden Richmond:** Okay, I'll start off with a question this time just to throw Austin off. So my question would be on the Uintah's Mountain Goat. I know you've had this question before, but we're just decreasing the tags significantly, but more significantly on the Archery tags. Is there a reason why the recommendation wasn't two Archery tags? wasn't, you'd have one in both pools, the bonus and the preference points.

**Riley Peck:** Uh, I don't know we, I don't know that we have a very good explanation for why that was discussed. I mean, I don't love to stand up and say that sometimes we just have an oversight. I like when most often we have the ability to offer two permits and so the bonus points do enact. And so Brayden, I think that uh, we looked at the recommendation and uh, tried to split that up, most of our pressure, our desire, the popularity of that hunt comes from the Any Legal Weapon. And I think that's where the decision was made to put most of the hunts to base that along with where most of our applications go. Ah, it is a social thing is how we hunt them and so if you were interested in adding that to it, it is less of a big deal on adding a single permit to that Mountain Goat hunt than it is not to. So,

**Brayden Richmond:** You would have no concerns.

**Riley Peck:** I would have no concerns.

**Brayden Richmond:** Okay, thank you.

**Riley Peck:** Any, you know. Bringing that up with the Regions before, understanding this has been a question before they were similar in feelings as I am.

**Brayden Richmond:** And then I have one additional question. Just a general question on, I know there's been a lot of discussion up on the working group. Still, there we go, getting lots of feedback now. On, several years ago, I don't remember when it was, but we went through the RAC's to add Archery tags to Once In A Lifetime. It didn't get approved that year, it came back. They wanted some additional information. That ended up getting approved. And a lot of that discussion stemmed around

if we could increase opportunity without increasing harvest, there's some, there's some benefit in that and we felt like Archery is the tool to do that. And, so the discussion at the time was if you put those Archery permits in in units where you'd have lower success rates, you could have more permits, move people through the pool, um, without impacting quantity. But as we moved into that, what we didn't really see that. We saw almost 100 % with Archery, and uh, the whole principle behind that decision of lowering success rates didn't pan out. So, the question is, are we, are we, looking, and I guess I would add to that that last year with the Buffalo we did see that. In fact, in fact, it was interesting, it was presented that well if we offer a hunt in January no one will kill so we don't want to do that. Well, wait a second. That's exactly what we want to do. We want to have a lot of permits where no one kills. So, I'm just kind of curious to hear where we're at today. Why are we not pursuing, or, or, my perception is that we're not pursuing those Archery tags on and lowering those success rate. It seems as though we're giving those tags where there's going to be a high success rate

**Riley Peck:** You know, I think there's multiple parts to that answer. I think that when that recommendation did come out, it was that we wanted to give those opportunities to an Archery hunter without taking away from a hunt that already existed so we looked at those opportunities and, and it's not doing that, we moved that into January, and then it becomes very difficult when you're offering a permit that feels almost like zero percent success. I get that we're giving somebody a chance, but if the animals are off the range, or not there at a certain time, then there's not much of a chance. And, so in regards to that Bison hunt that you're talking about, uh, the animals that they saw were just not there at the time and so, the hunter's perception was that we were offering them kind of a Giraffe tag. And, and, they had kind of a chance, but the animal wasn't there. And so, we're trying to keep the integrity of giving some the opportunity, it may be a very low chance, but we want to give somebody a chance. And so, how we balance giving them an opportunity and providing them a chance for success is, is a difficult one, one, that we spend a lot of time thinking about. When we think about that in terms of Archery, sometimes the season makes quite a large difference. It's not just the weapon type. When you put that in I mean and so that is going to be consistently looked at. The recommendations that are made and are passed and fall when the hunt structure is, I think, a good balance with that. And so, where we then add additional tags, I guess, is the discussion where we're at today.

**Brayden Richmond:** Let me ask a follow up question there.

**Riley Peck:** Uh-huh.

**Brayden Richmond:** Going back to this Buffalo, and maybe I misunderstood it. What was the success rate on it? How many Buffalo were harvested with Archery in that January?

**Riley Peck:** In that January? I don't, I think that we could have some help on that if Kent's online. Kent, are you there? Generally there, we can look

**Kent Hersey:** I am here, but I don't, the data I have doesn't have that hunt because it went too long. So, I have to find that new file I guess.

**Brayden Richmond:** My understanding is was there were Buffalo harvested, multiple Buffalo harvested, so it did exactly what it wanted to do. I guess I would maybe contend a little bit that it was exactly what we wanted.

**Riley Peck:** And that, and that might be a very fair point, Brayden.

**Wade Paskett:** Yeah, I can answer that.

**Riley Peck:** Yeah, please Wade.

**Wade Paskett:** So on the, on our mandatory reporting it was 25% success with four (4) harvested.

**Brayden Richmond:** 25% with Archery gear is above the national average.

**Wade Paskett:** Which is actually two (2) harvested. Sorry, there were four (4) reported. So,

**Brayden Richmond:** Okay, so, I won't beat that dead horse. That's my questions. Other questions from the RAC?

**Austin Aksinson:** I have a question. Desert Bighorn. There's no disease on the Zion. Yet, we continue to cut tags. Is it fair to say they're all just in the park? We've pushed them all out and out and they're no longer ours?

**Riley Peck:** Uh, I think the park brings a different dynamic. I'm not positive that we can say with all surety that there is no disease on the Zion. And, so with all those dynamics, uh, involved, we are seeing you know, sheep disappear, go different places and so, uh, I don't know how to answer that question completely. Because I, I, do believe to some extent that they're they're, that we do see sheep on the Zion.

**Kevin Bunnell:** I think Jason has a response to that.

**Jason Nicholes:** Um, our population is down and we do the have benefit of having collars on that unit for several years so we have been tracking the cost specific mortality. Uh, a significant part of our cost specific mortality has been due to lions, like deer. We've lost a lot of sheep to lions. Now, that being said, I don't know if they've killed all of them. We've killed a lot. Also with hunters, I think we may have overharvested too, so, that older age class Ram. So, therefore, we've reduced permits.

**Austin Atkinson:** And to follow-up with that Riley. Um, remember a couple of years ago we talked about, we wanted a trophy unit if you will for sheep. A lot of the guides and applicants wanted that. And so we moved it essentially from the Zion to the Kaiparowits West. Is that why we're seeing the extreme cuts from the Kaiparowits West because we want to fall lower in that model? Closer to 30% of the Ram scene or can you speak to that at all? Why we're seeing that cut there?

**Riley Peck:** So, I think, I think we can answer that.

**Jason Nicholes:** Kyle is outside. Maybe he can answer that. Oh, here he is.

**Riley Peck:** I was just going to say I think we can answer that a little bit better with the Biologists.

**Kyle Christensen:** Sorry, I was talking outside. What was your question?

**Austin Atkinson:** So, Rocky Sheep in the Nine Mile. No, I'm just kidding. Uh, Kaiparowits West. Why the extreme cuts?

**Kyle Christensen:** Because

**Austin Atkinson:** Is it because that's our trophy unit per se?

**Kyle Christensen:** Just the total Rams counted. So, we survey every three years. And um, there was a total of Rams, mature Rams, Class III and above, we take 12% of that and there was 42 Rams counted and so 12% of that was uh 5.04, so we rounded to 6 permits.

**Austin Atkinson:** And, last question of the Jack Creek. The same thing is there is to cut one of those tags back. And then we've received comments or sorry, to keep the same tag amounts and they've said no, you need to cut it back because of all the extra permits, the Conservation, Statewide, the Sportsman's tag, they can all hunt that too, I mean, right?

**Riley Peck:** I think I think on the Jack Creek that is one of them that they want to have a trophy unit on. I think Sheep hunters look at that as being one of those locations. We pull up the data on the Jack Creek and the current recommendation of staying the same falls right within the management plan. If you were going to cut back to two permits, uh, the management plan says anywhere from 2.1 permits to 4 and so I think if you could round down that'd still fit within the management plan and if you wanted to have your trophy unit that's, I think, we could make an argument that that would be acceptable and don't we don't have too much heartburn with that.

**Brayden Richmond:** Any other questions from the RAC? Alright, we'll open it up to questions from the public. Again, reminder, I don't think we have any comment cards on this one from the public. So, if you want to submit a comment card, please do so. And, we'll open it up to questions from the public. Alright, no questions, we'll come back to the RAC. Comments from the RAC?

**Public Questions:** None.

**RAC Comments:**

**Brayden Richmond:** And, I'll just go ahead and continue on with my comment here. Covy, I would well, I guess I'm just asking the RAC. I can't make a motion here. I would ask us to

consider asking, there was a lot of push and a lot of desire to get those Once In A Lifetime Archery Permits. But, the discussion at the time was to have those in areas with lower success so we could increase opportunity. It seems like we've lost a little bit of that and then we're looking at the Henry's as a failure when I think it should be viewed as exactly what it was intended for. I would ask us to maybe reemphasize what the original request was, and continue down that path. Uh, let me speak specifically on Sheep. I think, I think, we could make some small Archery units on Sheep where you'd have very little success, timbered Sheep and pockets that just don't ever get hunted. And we could really increase opportunity for these animals that people will never ever draw unless we figure out a way to get more permits. We had a late comment card. Russell, where are you? Is he out in the hall? I saw you, I thought you were running up to give the card and we moved to quick. We'll allow you to come back and comment here.

### **Public Comments:**

**Russell Todd:** Okay, there's just a recommendation representing SFW, again. Recommendation, what Austin talked about with the Jack Creek. We're recommending as SFW, to keep that at 2 (two) or reduce it to 2 (two) permits based upon comments that were received before. Uh, Statewide tag, um, Sportsman tag, other people that can hunt it. We feel that unit doesn't have the sheer number of Sheep to keep it at three (3). So...

### **Comments from the RAC (Cont)**

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Russell. We'll come back to the RAC with additional comments from the RAC. Go ahead Austin, Tammy. I'll let you guys fight it out. Whichever one gets it.

**Tammy Pearson:** I, I was just going to say on your late season Archery on the Bison. We had a Beaver County boy that drew out for that and uh, down on the Henry's, and it took him until the very last day to get that done. But, he says we had a ball, about killed ourselves, it was a hard hunt, and he didn't get a monster bull out of that, but he was tickled. Totally happy about it.

**Austin Atkinson:** Okay, so my comment is to go exactly against SFW's recommendation there on the Jack Creek. I'll justify it a little bit. You're talking three tags, total in the public draw which means two go to the bonus point guys which is going to mean 23 points this year and one goes random. If they cut that back to two permits, then only one goes to bonus point at 23 points and one goes random, so everybody's still got a shot, but no, it's not going to fix point creep, but we are way too conservative on saving these Sheep. I'm a proponent for let's kill them. We've got them, we've got access. If it fits within the plan, let's kill the Sheep. And I love Sheep, I love Big Sheep. But, I feel like it's pandering a little bit too much to a small group of Sheep enthusiasts. I'll say that. I respect them and I love Sheep as much as them, but I also

want to see people behind dead Sheep. And, we can only do that if we give more permits, so I want to push the plan and I'll vote for this as much as I can. Push the limits, and let's give as many Sheep permits as much as we can. It's the only thing Sheep are good at is dying.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Austin. Go ahead Gene.

**Gene Boardman:** I'll go along with uh, Austin's recommendation. I realize that uh, other people see it a different way and they're trying to conserve the animals or trying to conserve the opportunity, but it smacks of uh favoring the high money permit. And though they say that they may or may not hunt there. I suspect the high money permit has already ah, been purchased and an outfitter obtained. So, I'm just, that's that's where I come from. I just, ah, it whether it does or not, it looks like they're pandering to a high money permit.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Gene, Tammy go ahead.

**Tammy Pearson:** You've got to give me a one, one moment to be a smart aleck. I used to raise sheep, purebred sheep for the big winter herds. And that's one of the main reasons, because I'm not that kind of a Sheep killer. But, uh, I was concerned about the Big Horns coming into Beaver County because we're a huge winter, winter range for sheep and that. But, I learned the hard way and, and several and a lot of money paid to veterinarians, and, and two separate veterinarians told me, I'm not coming to your place to doctor your buck that's sick because I only know the three (3) S's: Sick sheep, four (4) S's: Sick sheep seldom survive. And then the other good thing another vet told me, and Verland probably does this too - wasn't from you, said that sheep are only looking for a place to die. So, I, I agree with increasing those tags.

**Brayden Richmond:** Any additional comments? Alright, I'd entertain a Motion. Go ahead, Verland.

**Verland King:** I know one vet that doctor's sheep.

**Kevin Bunnell:** That wasn't a motion.

**Brayden Richmond:** You got that down Kevin?

**Kevin Bunnell:** No.

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright. Anyone want to make a motion? Go ahead Chuck.

**Bart Battista:** I'll second.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Who was the second from? For the ladies from, okay.

**Brayden Richmond:** From Bart, I guess Bart got the second.

**The following motion was made by Chuck Chamberlain, seconded by Bart Battista:**

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Once In A Lifetime Permit recommendations for 2022 as presented by the division.**

**Passed unanimously. (Roll call vote).**

**03:39:50 8) Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2022  
(Action)**

**- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator and Regional Wildlife Manager**

**Brayden Richmond:** On to the one we've all been waiting for, right? Antlerless. Alright, uh, Covy, do you have anything you want to start us out with? Or do you want to just go right to questions?

**Covy Jones:** Let's just go to questions, yeah.

**RAC Questions:**

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, questions from the RAC on the Antlerless permit recommendations.

**Covy Jones:** Austin, we know you have some.

**Brayden Richmond:** Questions from Austin, and then we'll go to the RAC for additional questions.

**Austin Atkinson:** So, personally, I'm a little tired of getting comments about these 40 Pine Valley deer, doe deer, permits were giving.

**Covy Jones:** Yeah.

**Austin Atkinson:** So, my question is, what do we have to do to get rid of those completely? Who do we have to pay? Like, how do we raise money?

**Covy Jones:** I've actually said that. Like, so, I think about the depredation issues across the state and when they've gone away, is when Sportsmen have sat down with Landowner's and solved the problem. Because we're going to continue to, we're going to continue to respond to code. In this instance, we hunt them at a time when we're trying not to catch those migratory mountain deer. I mean, the dates on these hunts are August 1st thru the 17th. We're killing those local deer. We're not killing deer that are available to to hunters, most hunters. Is that fair? Um, and if, if we can't do it through a public draw or public hunt and there's still that conflict there, and the Landowner asks for us to help reduce his or alleviate his damage as it says in code, we're going to work to do that. And so for us, it's, it's, it's when it becomes a problem of I need your help alleviating this damage. If there is no problem, then there is no reason to have this hunt on Antlerless Deer in that area at this time, if that makes sense. So,

that's what it is. Jason, I've taken this from you. I mean this is your hunt, so I want to make sure you have the ability to speak here. But, not but, and, um, if we weren't offering these permits through the public we'd probably either have to do it ourselves or offer more vouchers until there's not a problem. So, Jason, what would you add to that?

**Jason Nicholes:** Uh, I would agree with that assessment. Also, I mean, 20 tags in, in the New Harmony area is, is going to be like 10 dead deer. Um, in the Enterprise area, it's going to be like 16 to 80% success. Um, New Harmony's like 98% private land now on that hunt and it's ag fields, so we're looking at resident deer. Same thing in Enterprise. They're not contributing significantly to the population. So...

**Austin Atkinson:** Is it fair for me to ask how many, could we put a number on how many Antlerless Deer are killed in the Pine Valley on Mitigation, Depredation, Landowner? Is that a fair number to ask? I think the public is asking, looking at this saying those are 40 very valuable Does and a population that's struggling. How do we put a number on that? Can we get that number?

**Jason Nicholes:** So, um, for last year? Um, yeah I do. So, the Enterprise hunt last year that early hunt we did have 35 permits on it and they killed um, 28 deer there. So yeah, it was 80% success. Um, total on the Pine Valley last year, was about 55 deer on the public hunts and

**Austin Atkinson:** And the depredation, mitigation?

**Jason Nicholes:** Depredation, mitigation, um, we looked at those today, do you have that? 97 deer on depredation, mitigation were harvested. So, 150 deer between the public hunts and the depredation mitigation permits last year.

**Covey Jones:** We, we do have areas in the State where this has gone away when and, and I just, I feel like I keep beating this drum, but it's because it's the only time I've ever seen it really work. And that is when you can get Landowners and Sportsmen in the same room and work together and mitigate that damage a lot of landowners are really reasonable and receptive and I've seen it work for Elk on the Wasatch. I've seen it work in a lot of different areas.

**Austin Atkinson:** While we're on the topic. Can anyone speak to the proposed solar farm on the Dammeron Valley Vejo side. Do we need to talk about that as it relates to our Deer herd as a total? Or is that way too early in the planning phase to even bring it up?

**Jason Nicholes:** I mean, it's pretty early in the planning phase. There's, they're still looking at doing public process meetings and taking comments and all that. As far as I know, they haven't had any meetings yet. We have reached out to the BLM and made sure that we can be part of that process. Um, they are looking at a 7,000 acre area, right now they're saying probably only 2,000 acres of that would possibly be developed. That being said, it's not only a migration corridor, it's a destination winter range. I would estimate 15-20% of the Pine Valley Deer winter in this area.

**Tammy Pearson:** We're looking at this on a, on a state level specifically, but specifically on solar panels that BLM are proposing, we've got a couple of them. We got them blocked during the Trump Era, not to get into politics. But during the Trump Era, we got the solar farms blocked because they're sending out grazing cancellations. Our Grazers, the first month that the new Administration went in, they sold that permit or the bid out on that and it's going to be a huge impact not only on grazing but also wildlife. And so we've been protesting it. We, our County, specifically our Grazers, our Grazing working groups sent a lot of comment letters in, the Trump Administration paid attention to that, the State paid attention to that, um, you know, we held it off for four or five years. And now, we're starting all over. So, I guess what my question is, on this, is this strictly BLM? This is public lands that this is proposed on?

**Jason Nicholes:** This is all public land, yes.

**Tammy Pearson:** Not good. Okay.

**Jason Nicholes:** Um, I guess I would add too, some of the areas there in Beaver County, we did collar Pronghorn specifically to gather data about those areas this winter, so...

**Brayden Richmond:** Any additional questions on the Antlerless recommendations? Oh, go ahead Gene.

**Gene Boardman:** Now, on the Antlerless Private Lands tags. In 2021, there was authorized 8,810 tags, but there was only 3969 sold. Uh, this year you're authorizing a couple hundred more. But uh, what's the, what's the need for authorizing so many tags and selling not quite so many tags?

**Covy Jones:** You know it's funny Gene. We had the exact same question, only in reverse, in the Central Region last week. And that was, why would you let these tags run out on our unit? And that's the answer to this question, too. Why would you let these tags run out when they are so valuable? This is, this is one of the tools that came out of the last Elk meeting that has changed tolerance in elk statewide. And, and a lot of it in the Basin and Northern Utah, but really everywhere, because what it, what it does it provides a tool where a Landowner if they don't want Elk on their property they can get one of these tags, or have somebody they know get one of these tags, and then not harvest those animals, but apply pressure to push them off. And it's one of the tools that's allowed us to actually increase population objectives the last time that we brought around objectives. So, the reason why is because we don't want them to sell out. If they sell out and there's a problem, then it comes back to come get your Elk. Tolerance goes way, way down. Right? But when they're able to either harvest, or apply pressure with hunters and push those animals out or areas where they're not desired, certain times of the year, it increases tolerance for those animals. That's why.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Gene. I think, remind me Covy. I know I watched something recently. I don't remember which meeting it was in over the past few months, but there was a good discussion on this with a lot of data. Was it the working group last week? Is that were you talked about this?

**Covy Jones:** Yeah, we've talked about it, working with, we just, they just finally, we finally published the study we did on the Wasatch.

**Brayden Richmond:** So, I would recommend Gene, you could watch that working group meeting and they really dive into this with some good information if you want to learn more.

**Gene Boardman:** I watched it.

**Brayden Richmond:** Did you? Good.

**Covy Jones:** It puts the elk back on public land.

**Brayden Richmond:** Yeah, it was good information that you presented in a longer format than we have here. Other questions? Alright. Questions from the public? Again, bring your cards forward now if you have them.

### **Public Questions:**

**Russell Todd:** I can just give a little bit of insight on the solar panel. Are we okay with that? Or do you not want to do that?

**Brayden Richmond:** Ah,

**Russell Todd:** It'll be short.

**Brayden Richmond:** Yeah.

**Russell Todd:** Okay, I've researched this a lot just because this is in my area and I've presented it at a couple of banquets. Um, it is 7,000 acres. I know it's been said its 2,200 acres that they want to use solar panels. You have to remember the 7,000 will be fenced off. It's not going to be 2,200 okay? And, they have had one meeting with the BLM. And, they have looked at the site. Um, it is going to drastically affect that deer herd that comes off the Pine Valley. They're either going to have to find a way around it, they're going to relocate. That is very crucial to our deer herds. So, I would suggest anybody who wants to reach out to that company, I have phone numbers, emails, I have everything that you need to get. So, I would suggest that. Thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks, Russell. I, maybe just a quick comment on that. This is just a little off agenda, but it is critical. We had a comment, what are we doing to help our herds? Guys, this is what we can do to help our herds. This is critical. 20% of the wintering habitat. I would plead with everyone to get involved in this. We talk about, what can we do? Here's something we can do. Alright, let's get back on track soon, but go ahead, Tammy?

**Tammy Pearson:** I'll just make a quick comment. Um, what's really frightening to me is, um, is um, I'm, I'm all for economic development, these kinds of projects on private lands, but it's really scary that the mentality going forward is it's coming on private land that we have no, we have no

control over that. And, so that's going to eliminate, I mean, we're talking about opportunities, our deer herds, antelope, whatever. This is going to block you off from that access from any kind. Eliminate multi-use on public lands.

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, questions on Antlerless from the public? Comments?

**Public Comments:**

**Gibb Yardley:** Am I going to make another comment?

**Brayden Richmond:** One minute, Gibb.

**Gibb Yardley:** Alright.

**Brayden Richmond:** You already, no we'll give you your full three (3) minutes. In fact, you're first. Come on up, Gibb. Three (3) minutes. I'm cutting you off this time.

**Gibb Yardley:** I would like to recommend that Beaver County give 300 antelope permits in addition to what they've already got, which I don't think they have many. But, we've got way too many antelope. I think we should take 300 off. And then, how many elk is there on the Panguitch Lake unit? I've never seen those figures. I must have got here too late to get the papers. But, how many elk are on the Panguitch Lake unit?

**Kevin Bunnell:** Kyle's coming up to answer that Covy.

**Kyle Christensen:** We just flew this winter and we counted 840.

**Gibb Yardley:** Well, I think about three-fourths of them get up on my summer permit and I think that we, how many of do you recommend to take off of that?

**Kyle Christensen:** We've got 90 total permits with those private lands, only.

**Gibb Yardley:** With this drought that doesn't even phase them. You need to take off about four times more. You people have all got to give this drought more consideration. It's serious. We have to keep our cows off because we don't have the feed. And you've got to take more of these elk off during these droughts. And I think you need to take more than that off the Panguitch Lake and that's our recommendation. Oh, and one more thing and then I'm through. Is that

**Brayden Richmond:** You've got another minute and a half Gibb. We aren't even close to cutting you off.

**Gibb Yardley:** Well, I want to say that, uh, there's uh, the State of Utah has a deal that is you get a group of 10,000 acres, that they will let you have private elk permits to sell, right?

**Kevin Bunnell:** Yes, it's called the CWMU program.

**Gibb Yardley:** And it's a darn good program. But, I know that some places they've increased that over around Price they're getting 10 times more over there than we're getting. We've only had, we've only had about 10 in the Panguitch Lake unit. I'm a part of the unit. They've cut it down to four (4), that isn't right. They ought to increase it, especially in this drought. I think you should increase those private land permits. Thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Gibb. Next we've got Steve Yardley. Then after that, Gary, nope, sorry, that's the last one, I keep grabbing his. Just Stephen. That's the only other comment we have on this. Did he leave? What's the deal with that? Gibb, did your boy leaves you here. He need more sleep than you?

**Gibb Yardley:** I don't know, I can't figure it out either, hell.

**Brayden Richmond:** Does he put in a good eight (8) hours a day? I mean, is he going home at six (6) to take a nap? How does this work? Thanks, thanks Gibb. Alright. Comments from the RAC? Man, I ask every time, do you got your card up, I think we should just not allow it. Okay, go ahead.

### **Public Comments (Continued)**

**Russell Todd:** Well, basically my comments just kind of in line with Antlerless Deer and uh, I know we always say that Buck harvest doesn't dictate population. And I get that. But, going back and looking some of the Antlerless Deer harvests we've had in the past, you know, during from 2015, and I just went over and I took the amount of permits and went off the harvest statistics that the division has online And, they really ramped upped the Antlerless harvests after 2015, and I guess that's in line with, I guess they they figured they had too many deer on the landscape at that point in time and they were trying to reduce some of them numbers. But, where we're at now, I mean, just looking over some of the permit numbers I have in 2015, on the Pine Valley had 49 Doe permits, 80 in 2016, 336 in 2017, 415 in 2018, which 100 of those were two-Doe permits, which was probably the early season hunts more over in the Pine Valley and some of those areas or not Pine Valley, but New Harmony. But yet in 2019, 336 Doe permits, then they started cutting them back to 135, then down to what we have now. But along with that, but I mean, that's we talk about what bad shape we're in for, for the amount of animals we have on the landscape, but we have to remember a lot of the Does were taken off of the landscape during that time frame. And, according to them, like, it's hard to raise a fawn to get to maturity, to like to get it to that one year old state that's the most critical time. But when we have a fair amount of animals on the landscape, maybe we should look at getting some more Does, giving them an extra jump and getting them to maturity or least two year old. So they can carry over in. But, it just really seemed like we really ramped it up. I know just here South of town, I mean, just on the Zion alone, we had a number of years where they issued 150 permits just out here South of town you can't find deer out there, there anymore on the Winter

range. They're just there not there. So, just something to think about, keep in mind when we go through and I'm glad to see that a lot of these Doe permits have been cut back. But just something, a little reflection I looked at.

### **RAC Comments:**

**Brayden Richmond:** I appreciate it, thank you. Alright. Comments from the RAC? And let me I'm actually going to start off. I actually have a question. Could we, I know we have this in our packet, but I don't have my whole packet printed off. What are the, what is the objective for Antelope on the Beaver unit? Where are we at? And how many tags are we issuing there?

**Covy Jones:** Thanks Mike.

**Mike Wardle:** Did you ask about Cow Elk Brayden? Sorry, I was in another hallway meeting.

**Brayden Richmond:** What's up with you guys and hallway meetings tonight? Yeah, the Antlerless Pronghorn on the Beaver, the objective, where we're currently at, how many we have on the unit, and then what are permits are.

**Mike Wardle:** Gotcha. So, um, we flew this in 2021. So, not this past Winter, but about a year ago. Uh, we counted 223 Pronghorn on the unit. So very few. Let me pull this up. In the 2018 flight, the time that we flew it before that, we estimated the population of 634. As I've been out doing my Pronghorn classifications in the Summer, the Fawn to Doe ratio have been awful the last few years. Production has really slowed down from drought. And, we've definitely seen that Buck to Doe ratio has increased a lot so we've recommended an increase in the Buck permits, but I recommended a decrease in the Doe tags.

**Brayden Richmond:** And, sorry if I missed it objective, isn't the objective 600?

**Mike Wardle:** Objective is, I have on here 850, 800, but I want to say it's 650. I'll double-check on that.

**Brayden Richmond:** Actually, I think you're right. I think 800 is right. Um, and how many Antlerless permits are we recommending this year? None? I thought

**Mike Wardle:** Let me pull it up. We're way below objective.

**Brayden Richmond:** Okay. But our counts, we're at, we're a third of objective. Okay, thank you.

**Tammy Pearson:** Can I ask him a question? Please?

**Brayden Richmond:** We can ask questions during our comments, yes. Go ahead.

**Tammy Pearson:** It, our, I know Antelope also are migratory because I have the same increase across the highway. So, your unit, the Beaver unit, what's your unit on that, remind me? What's your boundaries on that?

**Mike Wardle:** So that Highway 20, or sorry, what is the one that goes through Minersville?

**Tammy Pearson:** 21

**Mike Wardle:** 21 is the Southern border, um and then all the way to the Black Rock Road.

**Tammy Pearson:** Okay, Black

**Mike Wardle:** Sorry, and then also, the Bald Hills.

**Tammy Pearson:** Okay. Alright.

**Mike Wardle.** Yeah.

**Tammy Pearson:** A lot of movement back and forth. There's no freeway to block that.

**Mike Wardle.** Correct.

**Tammy Pearson:** And, that's the same comment we've had before on and my granddaughter drew out on one last year and we were clear out on our Summer range and that's where the Antelope are now.

**Mike Wardle.** Yeah, they've definitely shifted um, the places they're using. To Gibb's point, we had Pronghorn on his property um right there just above Minersville Reservoir and above Adamsville and um they used to not be there as much. So, Pronghorn have definitely moved. And with depredation situations like that we can be more surgical. Like Gibb mentioned, we had a depredation hunt and we can do that kind of stuff for private land issues.

**Brayden Richmond:** Go ahead Verland.

**Verland King:** So, on the Parker Mountain, what's, what's your count on the Antelope there? And when I say Parker Mountain, I mean Dixie National Forest and the BLM and

**Levi Watkins:** We, we, flew that this year. We fly that every year. Our estimate was 1,100.

**Brayden Richmond:** I know that Chuck has a letter he has that he wants to read from the Forest Service and then Craig you mentioned you wanted to speak on this so, Chuck, if you want to go ahead representing the Forest Service.

**Chuck Chamberlain:** You bet. This is a letter from uh the Forest Supervisor, the Dixie and Fish Lake National Forests, so both forests. It says, Dear Brayden Richmond, Chair of the Southern Region RAC, the Dixie and Fish Lake National Forest would like to voice support for the recent efforts taken by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources to manage **ungulate** populations in the Southern region during the current prolonged drought. We value our partnership with the DWR and their use of Antlerless Elk hunts wherever possible to assist us in the successment management and protection of Aspen regeneration and other sensitive resources. These efforts appear to have been successful in helping to disperse Elk from areas

that needed protection from heavy utilization. In response to drought conditions over the last three years, our forests have used various tools to manage the impacts of domestic livestock. Where appropriate, we have reduced the number of livestock allotted on the forest and/or delayed the allotment use. We are closely watching drought conditions again this year with the possibility that livestock use may need to be adjusted again. We ask the RAC to also consider drought and drought recovery as recommendations are developed for wildlife management. In particular, we recommend that Antlerless permits on the Monroe Mountain not be reduced as currently proposed. We have numerous efforts underway to improve forest and rangeland health on Monroe Mountain and we are working closely with Range Permittees to better manage impacts of livestock grazing. A reduction in Antlerless permits at this time, during ongoing drought, will not be helpful to these efforts. Sincerely, Michael Elson and Kevin Wright.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you. Before I go to you Craig, Covy would you mind addressing that a little bit? This is another thing I'm not sure people are aware of. But, for the last several years in the drought we do come back to the Wildlife Board and ask for permits to be adjusted for current conditions of drought. Would you just mind just addressing that quickly?

**Covy Jones:** Yeah, I can, I can, address that and then, is Vance, oh I see him. I'd hate for Vance to, he's spent the whole RAC back there comfortable without standing up once and he loves the Monroe. So, uh, it's in the Elk plan, it's one of the things that it directs Biologists to do. Is, that regardless of whether or not we're below the population or how far below we are of the population objective to bring back and to consider drought conditions and then at the August Board, and, and we, because of the timing of it, we skip the RAC process which is good and bad because then the RAC's don't know that we do this and we've done it every year we've had a drought. We bring back several, usually several hundred additional Antlerless permits take them to the Board and say we propose these increases on these units to address these types of issues. And we do this because we don't know what, what Spring and Summer moisture are going to look like yet. Obviously, we have, we have, modeled estimates and but, we don't know for sure so that's why we do it like that. We do take it seriously. We do care. Like, it matters - for wildlife and for Permittees. We're in this together, so, um, when we have to remove Elk and Elk or Bison or whatever it is, we've been really very aggressive. And, Vance, you can probably comment specifically to the Monroe.

**Vance Mumford:** So, on the Monroe we have two antlerless hunts. One is the Koosharem Valley for depredating Elk and I cut that because it hasn't been a really big issues. The one that they're probably referring to is the Rock Springs hunt, we have that specifically to protect Aspen tree regeneration. 20 permits, I think, the last couple of years up there at Rock Springs. We don't kill a lot of Elk, but we, we help keep Elk out of there, right? By hunting pressure. We had it split. Part of it was in August, we closed it during the Archery and Muzzleloader hunts and open it back up in October. Um, this year we had to shorten that season just to our October dates and so I didn't want 20 permits in there just in October. I didn't think it would be a good hunt for the people that drew that tag. That many people on that short hunt date. That's why

we cut it. We could, we could you know put 10 more tags on there to bring it up to 20. I don't know how, if it would be much more effective though. And then on the Fish Lake, I think we did 200 private land only hunts last year in response to the drought and uh this year I don't think we'll need that. Everything's greening up real well. And it wasn't a really effective hunt, just because of the private property, didn't, wasn't really conducive to the harvest on the Fish Lake. So.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you. Go ahead Craig.

**Craig Laub:** Uh, I've got kind of a little statement and then a question for Covy here. Uh, Covy made a statement earlier on that we're getting a bunch of Elk, Cow Elk that are not, getting too old to produce. That's, that's kind of bothered me a little bit. I don't know, any way to remedy that

**Covy Jones:** And, that really depends on the unit.

**Craig Laub:** Yeah, you said it was some units.

**Covy Jones:** Yeah, it is. It's a, it's a, units were below the population objective, specifically the Book Cliffs. Now, we've never hit the population in the Book Cliffs. We've never had a reason to hunt Cows in the Book Cliffs, now, we're recommending cow permits and everyone's wondering why we're doing that when we're so far below the population objective. And the reason why is because is because it's drought conditions, forage condition, and age. So it's a very complex issue, but we know we have too many mouths on the landscape and a lot of those mouths are too old to be beneficial. Yeah. We've harvested Elk that were 27 years old. That's tooth data counted rings. And one was actually older than that this year. So, they're old, some of them. Caught several of them that are 20 plus.

**Craig Laub:** That's old elk. Old wildlife, yeah. The other comment I just had is, I have a friend that the contract to gather up the dead deer on state highways around Zion, not around Zion, but around Pine Valley area. And, I'm just curious how many, I mean he had last December when I talked to him, he had, when I talked to him last, and I should have called him before he came to this meeting tonight and I was going to and I forgot to, he had over a hundred deer killed on the highway. And, I was just wondering, how that compares. I mean, we was talking, you know, about not, nearly all those are Does, and that's not counting the Bench Highway there by Newcastle or down Beryl Highway because there's dead deer there that he doesn't have the contract to gather up.

**Covy Jones:** Yeah, Jason, have you picked up any road kill along the Pine Valley specifically? Um, roadkill collared deer?

**Jason Nicholes:** One.

**Covy Jones:** One? So,so, its, statewide. Highways are a problem. Some areas are more of a problem than others. But, there a problem for several reasons. Uh, not just for roadkill. One is that they block habitat, right? It changes home ranges. Blocks habitat, makes it so they can't

have the ability to get nutrition they otherwise would. On average, statewide, we're losing about one to two percent of our deer on highways. Uhm, it's, it's probably not as, as far as cars go, it's not with the driver, but then there's the safety, the human safety issue. So, there's a lot of reasons why we should fence and create overpasses and create connectivity. Not just because they're killing deer there, but because you can probably provide more nutrition, increase population, home ranges and, and possibly size. There's all these good reasons to do it. So, yeah we do care about highways. Although, on average, they probably don't drive populations based on car data we have their major blockers. Wildlife Tracker, if you bring up Wildlife Tracker, and Highway 6, like it is there. Like they come off down that, lined up there and are along the highway all winter long. When, you know, maybe they're on the wrong side of the canyon and can't get to those South facing slopes that are bared off and expend more energy and end up dying from malnutrition. Whereas, if they could cross that road and get up on that South facing slope and spend less energy and be warmer they'd have a higher survival rate. So, it's a complex issue that we need to keep working on. It's one that we've made a lot of progress on, one that we can continue to make more progress on too.

**Brayden Richmond:** Good. Any more comments? Gene go ahead.

**Gene Boardman:** On the Doe Antelope. We are taking pretty much taking almost two Does for every Buck that taken in the state, but most of them are taken on mitigation more so than, than permit than public draw. Doe Antelope, that's a fun little hunt. Uh, there's no pressure and you don't have to worry about uh, how long the horns are or anything. It's just a fun little hunt. If we could push that mitigation to uh, the youth somehow it sure would be a good deal.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Gene. Go ahead Austin.

**Austin Atkinson:** I'll make a comment on the Beaver cow elk. It's interesting, I've hunted the Beaver Cow Elk every year for the last five (5) years either with friends or family. I didn't kill them all, I promise. But, uh, it's interesting, we were above objective, above objective and so we kept increasing these Cow tags and then we said do a Beaver North only and then it opened a Beaver East. And, we're saying they're not here. You know, we've, we feel like we're killing all the Cows out. Now we get a good flight survey and oh, man our numbers are way down, so we go from almost 400 Cow tags to down to 10. Alright, it's an extreme jump. Okay, so trying to mitigate the social aspect of this is tough. Um, how it looks to the public is you've been screwing up the last few years. And so, I feel like we need to change that perception somehow. I need the division to change that, to realize that we're trying to be proactive or we're trying to be reactive and these numbers may jump up next year, but you cut a very big opportunity hunt of 400 permits down to 10, that's a that's huge, what's going on, from my position. Now, I always cut them open and see if they're pregnant and they're generally pregnant with Bulls as we know. But, uh, that's part of the hunt. I, I like the challenge. It's got to be one of the toughest Cow Elk hunts in Utah.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Do you score those Bulls?

**Austin Atkinson:** It depends on how late in February. I mean in January I kill them.

**Brayden Richmond:** Austin, I just want to see your emails tomorrow. You wanted to increase Sheep tags among your Sheep hunter friends, you're killing Bulls on Beaver with your Cow hunts,

**Austin Atkinson:** There only this big.

**Brayden Atkinson:** What was the other one tonight? I just want to, if you could could just CC me on your emails.

**Austin Atkinson:** My comment is that we've got to normalize this a little bit or justify these ups and downs so we can understand is the objectives wrong, or are the cuts right are the cuts wrong. I don't want it to look like the Biologists or the division doesn't know what they're doing with this herd. We need to change something and I know a lot of that will come through the Elk committee. But, it's, it's concerning uh, for those I talked to the Landowners up there and they want more Cows dead and they're going to look at these 10 permits and they're going to say you've lost your minds. We need to kill more of them and the hunters are saying the exact opposite. So, it's a struggle.

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, any additional comments? Let's go ahead and entertain a motion. I think we've already doubled the time of any of the other RAC's haven't we Kevin?

**Kevin Bunnell:** Yeah, they were all at three and we're at four and a half.

**Brayden Richmond:** Yeah, that's okay, we've had some good discussion. But, uh, we would entertain a motion on this one. Go ahead.

**The following motion was made by Austin Atkinson , seconded by Tammy Pearson.**

**MOTION:** I move that we accept the Antlerless Deer Permit recommendations for 2022 as presented with the exception for the public Doe hunts on the Pine Valley unit. (No Doe hunts on the Pine Valley unit).

**Motion passed 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Chuck Chamberlain).**

**The following motion was made by Chuck Chamberlain, seconded by Tammy Pearson.**

**MOTION:** I move that we accept the remaining Antlerless Permit recommendations as presented by the division for 2022 as presented by the division.

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**04:18:57 9) 2022 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations  
(Action)**

**- Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator**

**The following motion was made by Craig Laub, seconded by Nick Jorgensen.**

**MOTION: I move that we accept the 2022 CWMU Antlerless Permit recommendation as presented by the division.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Covy Jones:** Mr. Chair, before I sit down to, I just want to tell this RAC. Thank you like the questions that we get here drive a lot of thought and discussion and I really appreciate the time that you all take and I appreciate the RAC. And no and is specifically awesome. I appreciate the questions. They're they're good. Thank you.

**Brayden Richmond:** We do appreciate that. I made a joke about how long we're going, but I also think these are important to really be thorough.. These are important RAC's. So, last item CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations. Questions from the RAC?

**RAC Questions:** None.

**Brayden Richmond:** Questions from the public? This, this is a little bit of a joke in the, I talked to the northern RAC chair and he goes, you guys never care about CWMU's so that's because we don't have CWMU's in the Northern. This is a big discussion so is there any questions from the public.

**Public Questions:** None

**Public Comments:**

**Brayden Richmond:** We don't have any comment cards. Oh we do. Gary Webb. Well when I grabbed all my yes, I forgot about them when I got to. Gary Webb. I appreciate it.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Yes. Gary Webb

**Gary Webb:** I actually represent the CWMU Association board so I'm glad. We're very happy to be here. We're here to show support to the division's recommendation, we support the whole hardly. And just a quick fun fact about the CWMU's that you say that a lot of them are up in the north and there are a lot of them. There's a hundred and thirty six of them. In the state. 14 of them are here in this region. But overall the program, I was talking to Chad about it. Looking at the acreage 2.3 million private acres in the CWMU program in the state. It's incredible. The relationship that that the private landowners have with the division of wildlife. It's, it's just a it's something that to talk about and so we're here in support, we're going to be at all the RAC meetings representing the CWMU's, so we're available and appreciate the cooperation.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Gary. That is the only comment card we have. I would just add to what you said. Okay, I personally, I miss the huge component of the CWMU program. I just viewed as widely successful, I think it's done great things for the state, and thanks for all the work on that. Any other comments from the RAC on the permit recommendations for the CWMU?

**RAC Discussion:** None.

**00:00:00 Questions from RAC Members:** None

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you, with that we are done. When is our next meeting?

**Craig Laub:** May 17<sup>th</sup>

**Brayden Richmond:** May 17<sup>th</sup>, where at?

**Kevin Bunnell:** I think in Richfield

**Brayden Richmond:** May 17<sup>th</sup> in Richfield

**Kevin Bunnell:** Yep, May 17<sup>th</sup> in Richfield. Let me double check.

May 17th at Richfield six o'clock.

**Brayden Richmond:** We decided six o'clock for all our meetings.

**Kevin Bunnell:** It will be at the DNR building there in Richfield by the airport.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you, meeting adjourned.

**The following motion was made by Austin Atkinson, seconded by Tammy Pearson.**

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Antlerless Deer recommendations for 2022 as presented with the exception of the public doe hunts of the Pine Valley unit. (No doe hunts on the Pine Valley unit).**

**Motion passed 8 in favor, 0 opposed and 1 abstention (Chuck Chamberlain).**

**The following motion was made by Chuck Chamberlain, seconded by Tammy Pearson.**

**MOTION: I move that we accept the remaining Antlerless Deer permit recommendations as presented by the division.**

**Passes Unanimously**

**04:22:11 Meeting adjourned at 10:22 p.m.**

**Southeast Region RAC Meeting  
Hybrid Conference  
April 13, 2022**

The meeting streamed live at <https://youtu.be/FH6nAFmZMnQ>

**RAC AGENDA – April 2022**



- |    |   |                      |
|----|---|----------------------|
| 1. | Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure<br>- RAC Chair   |                      |
| 2. | Approval of Agenda and Minutes<br>- RAC Chair   |                      |
| 3. | Wildlife Board Meeting Update<br>- RAC Chair  | <b>INFORMATIONAL</b> |
| 4. | Regional Update<br>- DWR Regional Supervisor  | <b>INFORMATIONAL</b> |
| 5. | Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022<br>- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator and Regional Wildlife Manager                   | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 6. | Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022<br>- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator and Regional Wildlife Manager | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 7. | Once-in-a-Lifetime Permit Recommendations for 2022<br>- Riley Peck, OIAL Species Coordinator and Regional Wildlife Manager      | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 8. | Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2022<br>- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator and Regional Wildlife Manager                  | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 9. | 2022 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations<br>- Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator                         | <b>ACTION</b>        |

Hybrid Conference  
April 13, 2022  
**SUMMARY OF MOTIONS**

**1. Approval of Agenda & Minutes**

The following motion was made by Eric Luke, and seconded by Dana Truman and passed unanimously, 9/9.

- **MOTION: To approve the agenda and minutes as presented.**

**2. Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022**

The following motion was made by Scoot Flannery and was seconded by Charles Fisher, and passed unanimously, 9/9.

- **MOTION: To accept the recommendations as presented by the DWR.**

The following motion was made by Scoot Flannery and was seconded by Dana Truman, and passed unanimously, 9/9.

- **MOTION: To recommend that the Wildlife Board investigate the distribution or the allocation of lifetime licenses.**

**3. Bull Elk Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022**

The following motion was made by Kirk Player and was seconded by Todd Thorne, and passed unanimously, 9/9.

- **MOTION: To accept the proposal as presented by the DWR.**

**4. Once in a Lifetime Permit Recommendations for 2022**

The following motion was made by Eric Luke and was seconded Scoot Flannery, and passed, 6/3.

- **MOTION: To reduce the Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep permits on the Jack Creek Unit from 3 to 2.**

The following motion was made by Steven Duke and was seconded by Darren Olsen, and passed unanimously, 9/9.

- **MOTION: To accept the remainder of the recommendations as presented by the DWR.**

**5. Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2022**

The following motion was made by Dana Truman and was seconded by Sunshine Brosi, and passed unanimously, 9/9.

- **MOTION: To accept the recommendations as presented by the DWR.**

**6. 2022 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations**

The following motion was made by Charles Fisher and was seconded by Eric Luke, and passed unanimously, 9/9.

- **MOTION: To accept the recommendations as presented by the DWR.**

Southeast Region RAC Meeting  
April 13, 2022  
Attendance

**RAC Members Attending**

**Kent Johnson, Chairman**  
**Eric Luke**  
**Scot Flannery**  
**Sunshine Brosi**  
**Dana Truman**  
**Steven Duke**  
**Charles Fisher**  
**Todd Thorne**  
**Daren Olsen**  
**Kirk Player**

<b>18:33:00</b>	RAC chair Kent Johnson called the meeting to order. He called the roll of RAC members to indicate who attended the broadcast.
<b>18:34:18</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Approval of Agenda and Minutes</b> (Action)</p> <p>The following motion was made by Eric Luke, and seconded by Dana Truman and passed unanimously, 9/9.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To approve the agenda and minutes for the Southeast Region RAC meeting.</b></p>
<b>18:35:00</b>	<p><b>7. Wildlife Board Meeting</b> (Informational)</p> <p>Scot Flannery updated the RAC with Wildlife Board decisions.</p>
<b>18:42:00</b>	<p><b>8. DWR Update</b> (Informational)</p> <p>Chris Wood updated the RAC on all regional activities.</p>
<b>18:49:00</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022</b> (Action)</p> <p>A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: <a href="https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html">https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html</a></p>
<b>18:49:00</b>	<b>RAC Questions</b>
<b>19:20:00</b>	<b>Public Questions</b>
<b>19:30:00</b>	<b>Public Comments</b>
<b>19:38:00</b>	<b>RAC Comments</b>
<b>19:40:00</b>	<p>The following motion was made by Scot Flannery and was seconded by Charles Fisher, and passed unanimously, 9/9.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To accept the recommendations as presented by the DWR.</b></p>
<b>19:44:00</b>	<p>The following motion was made by Scot Flannery and was seconded by Dana Truman, and passed unanimously, 9/9.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To recommend that the Wildlife Board investigate the distribution or the allocation of lifetime licenses.</b></p>
<b>19:52:00</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Bull Elk Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022</u></b> (Action)</p> <p>A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: <a href="https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html">https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html</a></p>

17:52:00	<b>RAC Questions</b>
20:16:00	<b>Public Questions</b>
20:16:00	<b>Public Comments</b>
20:34:00	The following motion was made by Kirk Player and was seconded by Todd Thorne, and passed unanimously, 9/9.  <b>MOTION: To accept the proposal as presented by the DWR.</b>
20:17:00	<b>Once in a Lifetime Permit Recommendations 2022</b> (Action)  A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: <a href="https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html">https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html</a>
20:17:00	<b>RAC Questions</b>
20:25:00	<b>Public Questions</b>
20:34:00	<b>Public Comments</b>
20:39:00	<b>RAC Comments</b>
20:44:00	The following motion was made by Eric Luke and was seconded Scoot Flannery, and passed, 6/3.  <b>MOTION: To reduce the Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep permits on the Jack Creek Unit from 3 to 2.</b>
20:47:00	The following motion was made by Steven Duke and was seconded by Darren Olsen, and passed unanimously, 9/9.  <b>MOTION: To accept the remainder of the recommendations as presented by the DWR.</b>
20:48:00	<b>Antlerless Permit Recommendations 2022</b> (Action)  A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: <a href="https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html">https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html</a>
20:48:00	<b>RAC Questions</b>
21:12:00	<b>Public Questions</b>
21:12:00	<b>Public Questions</b>

<b>21:18:00</b>	<b>RAC Comments</b>
<b>21:34:00</b>	<p>The following motion was made by Dana Truman and was seconded by Sunshine Brosi, and passed unanimously, 9/9.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To accept the recommendations as presented by the DWR.</b></p>
<b>20:48:00</b>	<p><b>CWMU Recommendations 2022</b> (Action)</p> <p>A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: <a href="https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html">https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html</a></p>
<b>21:45:00</b>	<p>The following motion was made by Charles Fisher and was seconded by Eric Luke, and passed unanimously, 9/9.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To accept the remainder of the proposal as presented by the DWR.</b></p>

**Northeastern Regional Advisory Council Meeting**

**April 14, 2022**

**6:30 p.m.**

**Division of Natural Resources Building**

**318 N Vernal Ave.**

**Vernal, UT**

**Summary of Motions**

*\*See Attached\**

**00:00:00**      **1) Welcome**      **(Informational)**

*Chairman Brett Prevedel called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, and asked for introductions from the Board and RAC members.*

**Brett Prevedel:** Hello I'd like to welcome everyone out to the Northeastern Utah Regional Advisory Council meeting for April 14th, 2022. I'm Brett Prevedel. I'm the current chair of this group.

I'll take a moment to let them introduce themselves. Start down on the end with Dusty.

**Dusty Carpenter:** Dusty Carpenter with the BLM.

**Daniel Davis:** I'm Daniel Davis, Sportsman's Rep.

**Natasha Hadden:** Natasha Hadden, Forest Service

**Miles Hanberg:** I'm Miles Hanberg. I'm the Regional Supervisor for the Division of Wildlife Resources.

**Brad Horrocks:** Commissioner Brad Horrocks, elected officials.

**Mike Smith:** Mike Smith, I represent the non-consumptive wildlife users.

**Ritchie Anderson:** I'm Richie Anderson.

**Brett Prevedel:** And I believe Joe Arnold is joining us remotely. He's representative of the public at large. I'd like to welcome the Division of Wildlife personnel here and Miles already introduced himself. So, with that, I believe we can go into the agenda. Have you had an opportunity to look at the agenda? I need a motion to approve tonight's agenda if so.

**00:01:31**      **2) Approval of Agenda**      **(Action)**



upheld, and actually one of the wildlife board members actually changed the vote in favor of the ban so it was not a tie vote. So instead of three to three, with the chairman breaking the vote or breaking the tie, it was four to two to uphold the original motion. So where we're at right now is it's illegal for trail cams from August 1<sup>st</sup> to January 31<sup>st</sup> for the aid and take a big game. And then all the other technology issues.

There was some discussion about hunter orange, and they recommended a change in the rules. We didn't have that locally. That was a wildlife board issue and so I'm not really sure I understand exactly what the changes were. Does anyone, law enforcement or anyone have that what they approved there on the hunter orange do you know?

**Miles Hanberg:** I'm trying to remember.

**Torrey Christopherson:** The first five days in the youth those archery hunters that were not having to wear hunter orange during the first five days.

**Miles Hanberg:** OK. Yeah, that's correct. It took me a minute to think about that.

**Brett Prevedel:** So, the current rule said that if there's a hunt going on in the area?

**Torrey Christopherson:** Correct. If there's a centerfire charge hunt going on in the area, they are supposed to have hunter orange on. This was to make an allowance for those that overlap the youth hunt.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you for clarifying that.

The Furbearer and Bobcat recommendations were approved as presented.

There was a Northern Region Advisory Council proposal to allow the take of collared lions in areas where the study has ended. That passed.

There were some motions about aligning season dates for the harvest objective and the spot and stock on Cougars and that passed.

There was a motion regarding the way that damages are calculated for landowners, getting damage from big game. And I know there was a follow up on that with some state statute that said it can only be the current loss that's compensated. There was some discussion. There was some application for losses from orchards for future years because of the damage that been done to the trees by the big game. So that that is shaking out through the rules that it's just the damage that was done at the time, not perceived future damage.

And I believe that was that was the bulk of it most of the time was spent talking about the technology issue, there was a follow up item where on the action log, they're gonna work with the DWR to establish a technology effectiveness committee to try to stay ahead of the technology, which is moving faster than we can address annually in these meetings, so they're going to try to have a committee that gets a little ahead of the game on that. That's a fair way to say it.

I believe that's what happened at the last Wildlife Board meeting and their follow up public meeting.

Miles, if you'd take a moment and talk about regional update?

00:10:06

#### 4) Regional Update

(Informational)

**Miles Hanberg:** Sure. So first of all, Natasha Hadden, formally with BLM and on the RAC, but now she is the Forest Service Rep. Dan Abeyta had served just over eight years as the Forest Service Rep, so he's passed that torch over to Natasha now, so she gets to be back with us again. Tim Ignacio is here with us tonight. He's with the Ute Tribe. And Tim, you're welcome to sit up here in the front with the other RAC members, but Tim's the representative for the Ute Tribe.

With that, I'll talk about a few things. I won't spend a ton of time. I know we're going to have a lot of discussion tonight, but you know right now it's a busy time of year is everyone is ramping up to do field work. We're also scrambling to budget and get work planning efforts planned for this next year and so it's a really busy time of year for the Division of Wildlife and for many of us it's a busier time of year now than even during the hunting season.

But I'll just highlight a few things that's going on around the region and I apologize, I had a PowerPoint ready for this and I left my flash drive. I didn't quite have enough time to go retrieve it. So, you just get to hear me talk tonight and not any auto visuals. So, I had some cool pictures to show you, but we'll try to do better next time.

Our aquatics folks are busy right now. It's a time of year when they really start to ramp up a lot of sampling. One of the big efforts going on this spring is down at Pelican Lake, they're doing some carp removal efforts as those carp come into spawn right now. That's a good time to be able to target them in shallow water and do some removals on those. I saw a picture I was going to show you of a carp that was removed out there last week. It was approaching 8 or so pounds. So, there's some big, big fish. That's one of the cool things with this carp problem. If we have a problem, just as well make some lemonade out the lemons that that presents. But we're going to be looking at doing some tag incentivized programs to where if you catch and remove one of those carp, there would be a cash reward. So, it's kind of kind of bittersweet to catch one of these types of fish and then tag and turn it loose when we're trying to get rid of them. But in the end, it actually ends up resulting in an increase of removals by doing those kinds of programs. We've done that with burbot at Flaming Gorge for a number of years with the Burbot Bash and other programs, so I guess we're just encouraging anglers. Carp are a lot of fun to catch. They fight hard. Bow fishermen, anybody can go down to Pelican Lake and do removals for us. Pelican Lake is a place where we still are trying to work on water quality. It's full right now, but with these wind events, some of those exposed shorelines, especially in the South, we're getting a lot of turbidity into that lake from the wave action. We've implemented a few programs with the reef ball structures. I think I might have shown a picture at the last RAC meeting. We're going to have to do a lot more of those kinds of things to try to keep that turbidity down. And it's really interesting. Aerial photos from this spring that showed some of that after some strong wind events and different things of how the turbidity spread across the lake for a site feeder like a bluegill, they need to be able to see and have good clean water. So, it really impacts those species.

I've also been doing gillnetting on Tiger Muskies in tiger muskie waters. We do have some tiger muskie in Pelican Lake to help control carp right now, but we have good success and caught a number of large tiger muskie out of places like Cottonwood Reservoir, I think some of those were 34 to 35 inches, so they're big trophy fish. It's a really a good opportunity for folks in the basin to go. It'll target those. I think it's somewhat of an underutilized resource around here considering the size of some of those fish. It's also the time when our native aquatics folks are ramping up efforts. They're doing a lot of

pikeminnow sampling on the Green River right now, and they'll be busy doing that for the next few weeks.

Our wildlife folks, it's the time of year when sage grouse are strutting. They're out doing sage grouse surveys. Unfortunately, we can't make it to all of our leks due to snowdrifts and snow right now, but so far, the good news is leks count seem to be improving this year and sage grouse populations tend to be somewhat cyclical. Looks like we're on the upswing of those populations right now. So, we'll see how that data closes out. But the good news is, it looks like those populations are around the uptick.

We also are spending a lot of time right now dealing with depredation damage with elk, particularly along the South Slope with the spring conditions, a lot of those elk try to come into folks' fields and so our folks are spending a lot of time trying to address those issues.

We had a mountain goat viewing event, I think two weeks ago now over at Rock Creek and so we had over 150 people attend that event. It was a good success for people. A lot of people come out from the watch front to attend that, and people are just itching to get outdoors, especially after a long winter.

We're also kind of promoting a loon watching here in the region. This is one of the best places in the state to actually see loons as they're moving back north on their migration, so places like Steinkaker reservoir, you can see them. Starvation, just different reservoirs around the region. You'll be able to see loons. For those of you who may have not been out listening to them, they have a really distinctive call. It's really pretty interesting, but it's a good time to see them as they move back north into Montana and Canada, even upwards towards Alaska.

Habitat folks remain busy really ramping up work as we're able to get in the field now just finished some aprons on some guzzlers out in Pleasant Valley area to try to help out pronghorn out there. Also really preparing to do a big project in May where we'll be flying in materials for a number of guzzlers over on the East Fork fire and then also on the Dollar Ridge Fire replacing some guzzlers that were destroyed by those wildfires. But also, while they're in the business, add a couple of guzzlers in those areas too. The feed is great in those burns. So, if we can add a little bit of water, we will really get some good use out of that in those areas. And lastly with the habitat, it's the time of year where we've been really busy proposing projects and trying to line up funding sources for those and that's looking really good right now. Looks like we'll have a lot of work to do this next fiscal year.

Anyhow, that's I think the quick and dirty update with some of the things that are going on in the region and again anybody on the RAC is welcome to come out with some of our biologists and our staff at any time to see some of these things and participate.

So, with that, that's the conclusion of my update, unless anybody has any questions.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you, Miles.

I forgot to talk a little bit. The procedure for the public that's here, if you want to talk. I don't think we got the cards set up, but at each topic, I'll give you the opportunity if you want to come up, please state your name, and you can have 3 minutes. How's that sound, alright? We'll discuss each issue and then we'll ask for comments during each issue.

**00:18:15**

**5) Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022**

**(Action)**

So, with that we can roll into item number five on the agenda, which is the buck deer permit recommendations. I don't see Covy here. Justin? Dax, are you going to be the presenter on this?

**Dax Mangus:** I'm Dax Mangus. I'm the Regional Wildlife Program Manager. I'm filling in for Covy. As you know, the presentations are online. I can hopefully answer especially region-specific questions. If we've got questions from other parts of the state, I can take a stab at those. And we've also got Riley back here in person and I think Kent Hersey may be calling in virtually if we need help as well.

**Brett Prevedel:** So, we have the tables that were available online. In general, the division is recommending a slight to moderate reduction in buck deer tags, though some places in the state are doing better than others and it may not be a reduction across the board and so I'd open that up for questions for Dax from the RAC.

**Dax Mangus:** I guess I can give you just a little overview, kind of the big picture. You know, we make our recommendations for the deer permits based on our management plans and the criteria and the management plans. How we hunt buck deer is separate from how we really manage deer populations. There's a lot of room between, like the biological sideboards for how many bucks you have on the landscape. It's really more of a social measure of quality by having, you know, more bucks left after the hunts tends to create a hunt that, you know, fewer tags, higher quality animals, higher success rate. By quality, I mean, antler size, less opportunity, fewer tags on units that are managed for higher buck to doe ratios on units that are managed for lower buck to doe ratios. It's the opposite of that. You know more tags, more opportunity typically younger animals or animals with smaller antlers. And we have a variety of different types of deer units in the state and the recommendations that the biologists have made are based on the direction that the plants have directed them to manage those. You know that opportunity in our region. We're in a drought cycle and our deer populations have declined and so, on most of our units, we've made adjustments. We're continuing to make adjustments just because there are fewer deer available. So, we have to reduce permits on some of those units to stay at the buck to doe ratio objectives in our plans. A couple of our units are pretty stable. Stayed about where they are. It's kind of a mixed bag, but generally the trend overall is you know populations are down a little bit in the state. Probably most likely due to drought and then permits recommended adjustments are based on that.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. Just a brief on the general buck deer. I'll just briefly go through the ones that are in the region here. Nine Mile, not technically in our region, but I'll list that one off also. Nine Mile's recommendation last year was 1650, this year it's 1500 slightly down. North Slope is recommended to stay the same at 2400. South Slope Bonanza Vernal is recommended to stay the same at 1200. South Slope Yellowstone's down 100 from 1400 to 1300. And then Wasatch Mountains East is recommended to stay the same. So, in our region, there are not a lot of changes in the general buck deer. And I think that's fairly consistent with the limited entry buck deer also with the exception of probably the Book Cliffs, right?

**Dax Mangus:** Like most of our general season deer units, were pretty close to where we wanted to be. Pretty minor adjustments, just a few percent here and there, a little bit more aggressive adjustment in the Book Cliffs going from 264 permits last year limited entry deer permits in the Book Cliffs to 200 recommended this year. And again, that Book Cliffs unit is one where that decline is really that we're seeing it more than about anywhere else anywhere else in our region is just an arid unit, limited summer range, and the drought impacts seem to be really taking a toll on that unit.

**Brett Prevedel:** And as you see on the agenda, we're going to do the buck deer first, both limited entry and general as far as motions and then we'll move into the elk and pronghorn. Are there any questions after hearing that, from the RAC? Any comments from the RAC? How about the public, you want to address the buck deer?

Please, please step up and you can ask a question. If you do have a card, I'll sure take it. Thank you.

**Ray Thomas:** Actually, here kind of representing SFW, Sportsman Fish and Wildlife, so. They sent me this to read off here. I guess so. They said "SFW supports the division's recommendations with the following exceptions: Filmore General Season Buck Deer - The division recommended increasing permits by 200 to 1400 total permits. SFW recommends cutting permits by 200 for a total of 1000 permits. The three-year average buck to doe ratio is still at 17 and the unit objective is 18 to 20. Beaver General Season Buck Deer - The division recommended a cut from 1400 to 1200. SFW recommends cutting an additional 400 tags for a total of 800 permits. The three-year average buck to doe ratio is very low at 14 and the unit objective is 18 to 20. Panguitch Lake General Deer - The division recommended to increase by 500. SFW recommends an increase of only 250. The three-year average buck to doe ratio is low at 16 and the unit objective is 18 to 20. We understand last year's buck to doe ratio made a big jump, but we don't want to run with just that number. That is why the deer plans run three-year average. Fillmore Oak Creek Limited Entry - Buck deer no tag increase. That's it.

**Brett Prevedel:** What was the number recommended on the Panguitch Lake one, was that 1450? Is that what I heard you say?

**Ray Thomas:** Panguitch Lake was the division recommended increased by 500. SFW recommends an increase of only 250K.

**Brett Prevedel:** So that would be 14.

**Ray Thomas:** Yeah, 1450.

**Brett Prevedel:** OK, thank you. JC, were you wanting to comment on this topic? Okay. So with that, is there any more discussion from the RAC on buck deer, either general or limited entry? You've heard the recommendations from Sportsmans for Fish and Wildlife, which deviates. It's consistent that it is recommending less tags than the division on the three units. And if everybody is comfortable, I'd entertain a motion of where we'd like to go with this.

00:26:52

Motion was made by Brad Horrocks, seconded by Ritchie Anderson.

MOTION: I'd make a motion that we accept the division's recommendations with the exception of Beaver, Filmore, and Panguitch Lake.

Motion passed 4 to 3.

**Brad Horrocks:** Mr. Chair, I'll make a shot at it. Looking at the numbers there and I have a tendency to agree with SFW's recommendations. I'm looking at three-year average, what they presented there and I'd make the motion that we go with what the permit numbers were from this presenter.

**Brett Prevedel:** And on the remainder of the packet as are you saying those DWR? Recommend what was in the packet?

**Brad Horrocks:** Yes, recommend on the remainder.

**Brett Prevedel:** We have a motion on the table to accept the Division's recommendation, with the exception of Beaver, Fillmore, and Panguitch Lake in which case the permits would be reduced accordingly to the recommendation from the Sportsman's for Fish and Wildlife. Do we have a second on that motion?

**Ritchie Anderson:** I'll second that.

**Brett Prevedel:** OK, so we have a motion and we have a second. I do not see Joe on there, so we'll just vote here locally. We have a motion and second I'll take a vote. All in favor? Show of hands. All those opposed? Motion passes 4 to 3. OK. Thank you. We will now move into the bull elk and buck pronghorn recommendations. You want to give a brief summary of that, Dax?

**00:28:43          6) Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2022          (Action)**

**Dax Mangus:** Yep. So, for Pronghorn, we manage based on average age of harvested bucks. It's two and a half to three. We have the hunters send in teeth and cut the teeth and look at the cementum annuli, the growth rings, they put down a ring during periods of nutritional shortage. And so we look at the harvest, the age of harvested bucks after the hunt and then make a recommendation. If we're above that age objective, we would recommend an increase. If we're below it, we'd recommend a decrease. And so that's what we've done. In some portions of the state, even though they're a little bit over the age objective, they're documenting really poor fawn production. And so they're not making as big of increases on some of the units that they're over in some parts of the state. In our region, we've been pretty consistently over that age objective and we've also had a lot of issues with pronghorn, especially in our AG areas like Ouray Vallen and Pleasant Valley. And so we've pretty consistently recommended fairly substantial increases based on the fact that we've been over the age objective, have really high buck to doe ratios, and have a lot of conflicts on private AG lands. On elk - again, we manage our elk units based on average harvested age of bulls and we've got different units with different objectives and again we send those teeth into the lab and get them aged, and then make recommendations to adjust permit numbers you know up or down or keep them the same depending on what those ages are doing on those units in our region, most of ours are pretty minimal adjustments.

The Book Cliffs unit again, overall that whole unit seems to be struggling and we've seen that age on harvested bulls continue to go down for the for the Bitter Creek South unit. So recommending about a 25% decrease there to go from 100 permits to 75 permits. We made really substantial cuts in the roadless area for the Book Cliffs as well. It's managed for the highest age objective and we're recommending adding one permit back into the roadless just because there was a conservation permit we hadn't accounted for last year. We had to make an emergency change and add that permit, but it's a fairly low number. We did see the age jump back up in the roadless area this last year, but it was a pretty small sample size.

Most of the other units in our region are fairly minimal adjustments. The Nine Mile Anthro unit is managed in a different way. It's an archery hunt the whole month of September and then a HAMS hunt, HAMS stands for handgun, archery, muzzleloader or shotgun, with no optics allowed. We have a HAMS

hunt that's later, like in October and into November. Last year was the first year we had that hunt, the idea behind that hunt was that by restricting to more primitive weapons, we could issue more permits, and provide more opportunity. On the archery hunt, success rates were about where they normally were during the HAMS portion. We actually had pretty high success rate and ended up harvesting about the same number of elk as we had harvested in the past on that unit. So we're recommending an increase on the Anthro of 10 additional permits during the archery hunt. 10 additional permits during the HAMS hunt to try to continue to give a little more opportunity there.

That's about it for elk recommendations. It's kind of an overview of elk recommendations in our region.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you

**Brad Horrocks:** Mr. Chairman, I need to declare a conflict of interest with the South Slope Diamond Mountain unit on the landowner up there. So. OK, I've been told two different ways and maybe I don't know how the division's always done with. I've been told as long as you declare, you can still vote, and I've been told that you can't, so I don't know how we've handled that. Miles, do you know? I've been given two answers. The Uintah County Attorney said once you declare, you can. But then I checked with somebody besides the county agent and they said no, you can't, as far as something outside of the county. So I'm not quite positive.

**Brett Prevedel:** I would probably just not vote on this issue 'cause we have a quorum without you. That'd be the cleanest. That'd be my recommendation, unless you feel strongly that you want to vote.

**Brad Horrocks:** No, I'm good.

**Miles Hanberg:** The Attorney General office has said that if there's a conflict or even a perceived conflict, they shouldn't vote. That's the direction we've got from them.

**Brett Prevedel:** OK, thank you. Just a brief summary. As Dax mentioned, there's a pretty significant reduction in the Book Cliffs from 100 to 75. The Little Creek roadless, we've had a big reduction last year and it's fairly stable from 7 to 8. So, it's up one tag, but that's down from historic numbers. I'm just browsing through the ones in our region. The North Slope Three Corners is recommended to stay the same at 25 tags. And the South Slope Diamond Mountain that we just discussed. It's actually recommended that we increase 6 from 61 to 67. And Wasatch Mountains kind of lapse over into our area. There's a fairly significant increase there. That should be the same as I just looking at the wrong column. It's recommended to stay the same at 948. And then as Dax mentioned on the HAMS hunt, the recommendation was 20 and 20. Last year, 20 archery and 20 HAMS. This year, the recommendation is 30 and 30. I'd open that up to discussion from the RAC or questions for Dax. Everybody is quiet this evening.

**Tim Ignacio:** I've got a question. Why didn't we do this a long time ago? I was just asking Dax why we didn't do this four years, five years ago?

**Dax Mangus:** So like I mentioned, we managed those age objectives. I was looking at you know Book Cliff ages and really if you look at the three-year average versus year to year, we really didn't drop below the three-year average in the Book Cliffs until two or three years ago which is when we started cutting permits. We've cut them pretty aggressively. We're down to less than half of what we were given four or five years ago. We'll do what we gotta do to try to manage, you know, that older age class bulls and it's

hard sometimes trying to catch up with wild populations. Sometimes you end up with a surplus number of bulls. So it doesn't show up in your data until the declines really kicked in a little more. But yeah, we're trying to make fairly aggressive cuts to get back to where we need to be.

**Brett Prevedel:** I saw some numbers, in our Book Cliffs meeting. You know there's still issues with the pregnancy rates and there's some other factors coming into this. There's a drought. and the pregnancy rates and there's some caution moving forward. Because, it doesn't look like there's a real boom of calves coming along.

**Dax Mangus:** We've been pretty concerned about the Book Cliffs for a few years now, and we did a pretty intense study for the last three years looking at, you know, collaring neo-nates, newborn elk calves, looking at pregnancy rates and some of the data that we've got through that study is pretty concerning. We're seeing a lot of those elk are quite old. Pregnancy rates seem to oscillate quite a bit. A lot of those cows are not breeding back the following year, a lot of cows will be pregnant and then will not be pregnant in the next year. A lot of our cow elk, we're seeing pregnancy rates jump from you know in the 50% range to the 80 mid 80% range kind of bouncing back and forth every year. A lot of that stuff is really unprecedented and hasn't been documented in elk before. So, we're facing some, interesting and hard challenges in the Book Cliffs. We've got a working group put together that you know, I know Dusty and Brad have been really involved in that worked on that and some of these other folks here as well and you know that it's a challenge and we're working on it and it does feel like we're playing catch up a little bit, but we're trying to get there.

**Brett Prevedel:** Any questions from the RAC? Do you want do you have a question? Go ahead, Daniel.

**Daniel Davis:** I do. What was the harvest success on the Spike Elk Hunt for the rifle season when it went to the five day?

**Dax Mangus:** I pulled the numbers up just today the data is not all completely finalized yet. It will be, you know, when it comes out in the annual report. But ballpark it was, it was right around 20-21% for the rifle spike in the Book Cliffs which is a little bit higher for hunters that were in the roadless area, but a lot of those folks tend to end up going guided or there are a lot of folks around with Flying J Outfitters in there, but which is pretty close to what the statewide average was for success rate, so.

**Brett Prevedel:** There were fewer hunters for some reason. Last year on the Book Cliffs spike hunters, so the percentage of take was similar, but the harvest number was down, I believe from the previous year?

**Dax Mangus:** So I went through that data again, Brett. We had, and this is this is still in draft form, it might be you know if you see a final report and it's plus or minus it's you but the latest version of the data I've got we had 509 hunting spikes in the Book Cliffs they harvested 103 spikes for 20% overall success.

**Brett Prevedel:** That's pretty consistent with what I was saying 'cause in the past, we had around 1000 the first year:

**Dax Mangus:** It's been between 800 to 900 pretty consistently.

**Brett Prevedel:** But the numbers were down. So the take was around 100 that one year we maxed out at about 200 spikes out there, so the actual number was down considerably on the number harvested. And it was just related to less hunters I think.

**Dax Mangus:** One of the things, too, is we're looking at those pregnancy rates and in those years when you have 50% pregnancy, you know that fall, your hunting the year before calves as yearling, yearling bulls. But you know, if we had 50% pregnancy, a year and a half from there when you hunt in the fall, you know that whole age cohort, there's about half as many animals as there is when you have a year when you have 87% pregnancy. If you want to time the years when you decide to hunt spikes in the Book Cliffs, you need to time it a year and a half from the spring, when we only have 50% pregnancy. This coming fall should be a pretty good one in the Book Cliffs because it'll coincide with one of those cohorts where we had 80 something percent pregnancy rates whereas last fall 2021 coincided with a cohort where we only had about 50% pregnancy in our cow elk. That can be driving some of the success and just the abundance and what hunters are seeing with regard to that urleen age class, when you have a, you know a 40% plus change in pregnancy rates from year to year. So you kind of almost want to hunt spikes in the Book Cliffs every other year and time it with those years when that cohort's going to be more abundant.

**Brett Prevedel:** And we can have some more discussion about that when we talk about the antlerless tags because of the age class, which the division feels, and the BYU studies indicate, that the age of the cows is a contributing factor there. I want to discuss one issue on the Anthro HAMS hunt. If you remember how that happened, we'd had kind of a disagreement with the Division and they'd recommended it went to a general season. And this RAC had unanimously recommended that it stayed limited entry. So we went to the Wildlife Board with the two extremes of opinion and it was just a disagreement. That was fine, but the wildlife board chose to, we didn't. Nobody recommended a HAMS hunt on either side. That was their attempt to come up with some middle ground and I was there and the discussion went that this will give us an opportunity to maybe get some more preference points gone by providing some opportunity. And will wait two years until the elk committee meets and let them make the decision. But in the meantime, we'll go with the HAMS hunt. Their vision was it would do two things: It would provide more opportunity to help with some of the preference point issues, and it would harvest more bull elk to maybe take the top age class off that unit in case it goes general, so that limited entry preference points could be used to harvest some animals. So last year, this RAC approved the 20 and 20 and we ended up taking, Derek, almost exactly the same amount of elk as when it was limited entry. It probably didn't achieve a whole lot more opportunity either. I don't know how many limited entry tags we had, but it went up maybe slightly. The division's trying to be proactive, and they recommended 30 and 30 this year. I would throw out, and this is not biologically supported. This is the politics of, it's going to go general, we ought to provide some opportunity in the meantime. I would ask the RAC if there was interest in maybe recommending a few more tags. I spoke with Joe, and his opinion was, you know, he'd be very comfortable with 40 and 40 as a recommendation from the RAC.

**Brad Horrocks:** Would they be HAMS?

**Brett Prevedel:** There's the 30-day bow season. That was when we say 30 and 30, there's 30 tags that are currently archery, and then there's 30 in the month of October that are HAMS. I'm asking the question of the rack of whether we want to make a recommendation to maybe do a little more and achieve what the Wildlife Board was hoping for.

**Brad Horrocks:** Does anybody know how many points does it take to draw that unit last year with the bow? You know, I like that idea.

**Brett Prevedel:** Last year archery was fairly reasonable. It was six or seven points.

**Brad Horrocks:** They're talking about going to a general season. If it looks like it's going to go that way, I'd rather try to eliminate some of the points out there before it does.

**Brett Prevedel:** That's going to be a decision of the elk committee that starts meeting in a year from now. Is that correct Dax?

**Dax Mangus:** The elk committee is underway. They've started meeting and Daniel's on the committee from our region.

**Brett Prevedel:** I know everybody opportunity. I mean I expect it to come around again because it's providing opportunity for more general season areas for elk is a big issue. I'm not speaking for the division, but you know I expect it to go that direction. I was at the Wildlife Board and it was kind of a interim-type motion. Anyway, I'll just leave that if somebody is interested in making that part of the motion, that's fine. If not, that's fine also.

**Brad Horrocks:** Daniel, what are you hearing on that?

**Daniel Davis:** From the low down I've got from the people that have hunted. There was some sentiment shared last week as well at the meeting, but it's been a well-received idea and those that participated in the hunt really enjoyed it.

**Brett Prevedel:** The HAMS?

**Daniel Davis:** Yep. And they really liked it. It actually ended up being a pretty quality experience in that manner. So, I would be a little leery basically, doubling the amount of people out there from what it was.

**Brad Horrocks:** What are you hearing on going to general season?

**Daniel Davis:** No. So, it's being brought up in committee. It's going to be talked about, but we didn't go into any discussion yet on what everybody wants to do. We talked about goods, bads, and everything up to today. And then we're going to move forward with some data and go from there. But as far as doing away with that or going back to general season, I've never heard any discussion on that.

**Brett Prevedel:** Could you repeat what you said about increasing opportunity for HAMS?

**Daniel Davis:** It's been well received by the sportsman and a lot of people actually enjoy it and want to see more opportunity. So now it's a balance of, OK, if it goes that route when, where and how but meet the demand of the general public on general season units so that's part of what the committee is going to have to dance with. But there's no talk about, I've not heard any rumblings about, these HAMS units this year going back to general.

**Brad Horrocks:** Just Anthro and that's when we're talking about correct, the Anthro? You know there's a chance that it's going to go back to a general season. I would like to see us increase the tax. I guess we really don't know that. But your feelings, "Bryce," was that there's little rumbling that it might.

**Brett Prevedel:** I don't want to speculate what the elk committee is going to do, but that was the position of the division going into this, that that's a prime candidate for more opportunity and same with the West Desert. There was a group of them, there was a cash unit and the West Desert and Anthro. And if they're going to provide more general season opportunity, that's the likely candidates.

**Dax Mangus:** One of the big directions to that statewide committee is to try to find places where we can get more opportunity for general season out hunting. You know the any bull permits just the demand for those has been so strong they've been selling out super quick. So that is, we're definitely getting way ahead of where the committee is at with this at this point. But I do think you know, those are things that are on the table that, that committee is going to be looking at or their units out there where there's potential to change the management strategy on those units to provide more general season hunting opportunity. And the Anthro checks a lot of the boxes as far as the criteria that we have. That's why the division recommended it being in any bull unit a couple years ago. It checks a lot of those boxes on criteria.

**Brad Horrocks:** Your thoughts was to go 10 more tags than what the division has offered on both the units?

**Brett Prevedel:** They've recommended an increase from 20 and 20, to 30 and 30 and I'm throwing out the option that there's probably opportunity, not biologically, but just with all the things that are going on out there to provide a little more opportunity or make a recommendation to the Wildlife Board. Joe, I discussed it with him, he's sick and he couldn't make it tonight. He was going to come, but he's sick and he said he would be comfortable with a little more increased to 40 and 40 if the RAC wanted to do that.

**Dax Mangus:** And I think the division would be fine with that as well. On these HAMS hunts, it's still kind of a new thing. We're still kind of feeling it out to see where we go, but you know, the direction from the board and the intent of these hunts is to give more opportunity. I don't think the division would object if the RAC decided to go more. I think that's fine as well.

**Brad Horrocks:** What's the success they had last year. Do you have that offhand?

**SPEAKER:** 65 for the HAMS and then archery is like 20-25% ish.

**Dax Mangus:** So it's actually fairly decent. That's in the normal range for our limited entry archery elk hunts.

**Brett Prevedel:** And it was a tough year and with the water situation out there last year on Anthro. So that's pretty good success.

**Brad Horrocks:** What's your feelings, Dax, are due to that? If we give another ten tags on top of what the division has been offering, would it devastate that unit bad enough if we went back and made it a general season or went back to that, we kept it a limited entry unit, would it? Would it take two or three years to recover by adding that many more tags or what?

**Brett Prevedel:** You know, do you have a feel for that, Derek?

**Tim Ignacio:** I don't think in a year or two you could make cuts and be right back where you needed to be. I mean, you're talking if 25% success and you put 10 more out there, you're only going to be killing two, maybe three more elk on the archery. It's not going to make significant impacts to that population.

**Brett Prevedel:** Does the public have any comments on this?

**Daniel Davis:** I want to speak to that a little bit, Brett, if you don't mind how you bet. So my concerns with that is, the more tags we give, then why didn't it just go general, right? So to provide that limited entry opportunity, right, they're increasing 10 with the thought being discussed now is doubling that. So

you're basically doubling the amount of tags that are out there. That elk herd is not very big. You're talking about 1100 head, I believe is a total population. And so now when you take the amount of hunters that were there last year and recommend doubling that now the competition, the quality, the opportunity with the primitive weapon. You start to defeat that objective. 10 I think is a great step, and taking a couple more bulls is OK, but then you double the amount of people that was there last year. You going to start diminishing that limited entry opportunity. If we're trying to develop opportunity, then it should have just stayed general in that case, but that's not what we had a consensus on was to keep it somewhat of a higher quality hunt.

**Brett Prevedel:** I understand that. They have compensated by making the long seasons the whole month for the bow hunt, including the rut in the HAMS structure. Then pretty much the whole month of October, isn't it, Derek? So it's a six-week HAMS portion and a four week. Specifically to that unit, there's a long time and a lot of space. I know water availability changes that because if it's a poor water year, a lot of the elk leave and also concentrates the hunters on the few sources they're left. So depending on the year, on a drought year what you're describing I think would be very accurate. And on a really good year it's a big area.

**Daniel Davis:** When you get into September and the archery on everybody is going to hunt the rut. You're going to use the rut to your advantage so, typically, a lot of people don't hunt that early. They're going to wait and hunt that prime time. In retrospect, as an archer, that's what I prefer to hunt. And that's the big sentiment. Now with the HAMS side of that hunt getting that later season when elk start migrating in there, and then bulls start coming off the Wasatch in different places like that, then people find those times where they want to go out and hunt in a higher demand. Now, they get long times to do it, but they all seem to be there at the same time. Whether it's 45 days or nine days, it just seems to be Saturday and Sunday seems to be the hot ticket on a five-day hunt. Later on in the season it dwindles off and then winter comes and they all run out there again.

**Brett Prevedel:** So I just have concerns about that myself, but and nothing says it has to stay even either. Everything is on the table as far as that goes, Tim?

**Tim Ignacio:** I'd like to add to that too. I'd take a increase of five because you guys are forgetting on this side of the fence you guys got us hunting. So, you know, a lot of tribal members are starting to hunt that more, you guys ain't even counting the ones that are being killed on our side. So the herd might even be smaller than you think. And the quality ain't there no more. So why would you even call it a limited entry hunt anymore and take somebody points when he's not even got a chance of killing a 350 bull. That's my opinion.

**Ritchie Anderson:** Dax, I've got a quick question is that is that herd, is it under objective over objective? Where we at on numbers on that one?

**Dax Mangus:** It's over objective, but it's tricky one where we have a winter objective and a little bit depends on the time of year. We definitely have documented a lot of movement of elk become across from the Wasatch that Aventiquin unit of the Wasatch, some winters that we have a good enough amount of snow that we should go and fly. A lot of those years will have more elk on Anthro because a lot more have moved over in the winter, during the summer. It's probably a lot closer to actually just being at the objective. So it a little bit depends on the time of year. That's why most of our cow hunts are quite late in the year and some of our cow hunts even straddled both the Aventiquin and the Anthro

unit even though they're two separate units, just because we know those are the same mail elk. Is that fair Derek? Is that accurate?

**Ritchie Anderson:** In your age objective on your bulls is it about where you want it?

**Dax Mangus:** That's one of the reasons we recommended moving the Anthro unit to a general season unit because the age objective was just kind of bouncing all over the place. You know one year would be 8, the next year would be 5. Then we'd have pretty small sample sizes. Success rate was varying a ton year to year on the archery hunt. In the HAMS hunt designation that it's in now, there isn't necessarily an age objective associated with the unit.

**Brett Prevedel:** And I believe the HAMS hunt is not really intended to be a trophy hunt, is that correct? It's kind of an opportunity hunt.

**Dax Mangus:** So you know, within our current way we hunt elk in Utah, we've kind of got everything running the spectrum from, you know, spike hunts to, you know, a limited entry tag on the Boulder or the San Juan or you know, one of those units that seem like kind of a premier trophy hunt unit and we've got a little bit of everything in between. You know, we've gotten any bull hunt. Then the HAMS hunts would probably be, you know, the beginning of what you'd call like, a limited entry type hunt. It's got the lowest criteria with regard to, you know, age or a trophy potential. So you know, there's a diversity. Not every unit could, can or should be managed the same as the San Juan. And we probably shouldn't manage every single unit in the state the same way we manage, you know, the any bull hunt units as well. So there's diversity, it's on the lower end of the trophy, you know, kind of that limited entry part of the scale, it's on the lower end of that. The lowest end of that.

**Brett Prevedel:** JC, did you have a comment? Thank you.

**JC Brewer:** I'm a little guy. Got bring this down a ways. On the spike hunt, it's been kind of mixed in with the with the bull hunt here. You give some numbers on the Book Cliffs kill ratio last fall. It's easy to understand: you reduced the length of the hunt from 13 days to five days. You reduced the number of hunters that went out there and hunted that five days better than half. And so that means you killed better than less than half of the spikes that you normally would. I think easy to understand the numbers that he just gave us about 20% and only taking about half the spikes been taken. The question I have is because you reduced the number of days that we was allowed to hunt in the Book Cliffs last year down to five, you did reduce the number of hunters. Is that going to continue this year? I'm hearing all kinds of ugly rumors about that hunt being hammered some more and that disturbs me a little because we're already about as hammered about as hard as we can get without starting to get a lot of public protest. That's one of them. Probably one of those publics that's going to protest's going to be me. We need to have some kind of an opportunity somewhere for us folks who just want to buy a tag and take a grandkid out and introduce him to hunting. That's about the last place that you can buy an over-the-counter tag is the spike hunt, and we're getting beat down and beat down and beat down on the Book Cliffs spike hunt, which is where I grew up. That's my hunt. That area we're getting beat down beat down pretty hard and I'm feeling it's just a little bit unfair.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. So the seasons are set in our November meeting. And the hunt that was approved in the Book Cliffs for spikes was at the full length season this year. Yeah, whatever the regular hunt is. That is what the season is this year. It was not shortened by motion, like the previous year. I

didn't want to drag this on forever, but I still don't really have a feel on the RAC of how we want to go on this one. If there's any more questions or any more discussion, let's have it now. And then I'll open it up.

**Miles Hanberg:** Mr. Chair, I'll talk about the public online comments here for just a minute. There's only six people responded on the bull and buck pronghorn. Zero strongly agreed. Two of them somewhat agreed. Zero either agreed or disagreed. Two somewhat disagreed. Two strongly disagreed. So yeah, people are kind of across the board on this, but a pretty small number of people actually commented.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. And that's on the whole bull elk and pronghorn. Anymore discussion? Anyone want to have any? OK, now that I've muddied up the whole proposal, I'm opening it up to a motion.

**Brad Horrocks:** You know Mr. Chair, with your feelings on the Anthro unit, I think I'm going to throw it out there just for grins. For the motion to just go ahead and I'd like to make the motion on that Anthro unit that we do raise those up to 40 at another 10 on each, on the archery and the HAMS, both as we discussed. I feel like it's kind of worth the chance if there's a chance to go to an open season unit general season. You know, if we can eliminate some points out there, I like that thought. But I'd like to make that as a motion if that makes any sense.

**Brett Prevedel:** So this is a side motion. Aside from the packet we have a motion to increase the HAMS permit numbers on the Anthro unit from 30 and 30 as recommended to 40 and 40. Do we have a second?

OK, for lack of a second, that motion will not proceed.

And I will open it up to an alternate motion.

01:03:15

Motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Ritchie Anderson.

MOTION: I'd like to make a motion to pass the elk [and pronghorn] portion of the packet as recommended by the Division of Wildlife

Motion passed 4 to 3.

**Natasha Hadden:** I'd like to make a motion to pass the elk portion of the packet as recommended by the Division of Wildlife.

**Brett Prevedel:** Do you want to include the antelope? The pronghorn.

**Natasha Hadden:** Yeah. And the pronghorn. Sorry.

**Brett Prevedel:** As presented by the division. OK, we have a motion. Do we have a second?

**Ritchie Anderson:** I'll second it that.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ritchie seconded that. All in favor? All opposed? Motion passes 6 – 0.

**Brad Horrocks:** Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make comments if I could, while we're on the elk units. Dax I would sure like to see a map of the Book Cliffs with an overlaying of when bear season's on, cougar season's on, deer season's on, elk season's on, spike unit's on. I've made this comment before. I feel

that the Book Cliffs' elk and deer numbers, we have got to give those animals a break somewhere along the line. I'd like to see a study, or maybe there has been, but I'd like to see something. You stick 11 to 12 hundred spike elk hunters out there. Last year was the least amount of complaints that I've had on the Book Cliffs since I've been a commissioner. Whether it was the spike hunt, I couldn't tell you. But I was being called and called and called. I feel like we've got to give them a break to help the elk have a chance to get bred, to carry their calves and same with the deer. I'd like to see something on that, somebody's a lot smarter than me to say if I'm up in the air about what I'm saying or talking about. But anyway just my comment.

**Brett Prevedel:** I think that's a good comment and then you know, we all know Anthro and the Book Cliffs, the oil activity has a significant impact on the disturbance, and so it's not only hunters, it's all the changes that are that are occurring. I mean us that know Anthro, that's been the big issue, there's roads everywhere now in Anthro and they used to be pretty remote. And that's why that unit has changed from a premier unit in the state to all this debate we're having or what to do with it. You know, that's a big factor. That's not the whole reason, but that's a big factor. Thank you. Dax.

**Dax Mangus:** Commissioner, we can get you dates if you need. I appreciate the concern for the Book Cliffs. There's a lot of folks really concerned. I'm happy to hear you had less complaints this year. We got a lot of folks that are working really hard from, you know, a lot of different partners, not just the division, to try to do things to address issues down there. And we have cut a lot of permits on the limited entry hunts as well for bucks and bulls, you know. We're seeing some real progress on some things that I think will pay off and we have a ton of study data, you know collar, GPS collar location data and we can look at some of those things and we've looked at some of those things on some other units in the state as far as, you know, if hunting pressure and disturbances pushing animals around and moving them, you know we have the information to look and answer some of those questions.

**01:06:58      7) Once-in-a-Lifetime Permit Recommendations for 2022      (Action)**

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. We'll now move on to the number item 7. Once-in-a-lifetime permit recommendations. Riley Peck is here to give us a brief overview and then we'll ask questions.

**Riley Peck:** Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. And Dax did a fantastic job kind of giving an overview of how we make recommendations and manage for elk and deer and pronghorn. And once in a lifetime species are kind of all across the board. We manage everything from the number of older age rams for bighorn sheep to total population objective on bison. It's a number of adults for mountain goats and an overall population objective for bison. So we kind of hit the entire gamut for once in a lifetime species. Our populations are much smaller. They're much less abundant across the state. And so instead of seeing sometimes hundreds, if not thousands of permit fluctuations. We are down to single digits, you know 5-6 at times and so our recommendations reflect that today with only one very small exception. All of the permits that were recommended follow within that plan for their specific species. So it's kind of the update and I'd be happy to take any questions or hear any comments or anything you'd like on the ones in lifetime species.

**Brett Prevedel:** Your recommendations are pretty much stable, aren't they? With the exception of a few units?

**Riley Peck:** With the exception of a few units, we have altered very little from years past, and that's what I say. Sometimes even when we make changes with once in a lifetime species, they can be as few as one or two permits as compared to the past.

**Daniel Davis:** Yeah, except for Chuck Creek goats.

**Riley Peck:** Goats are one of those that you know, I think that we've talked about the drought and even though there are high elevation animal, we are seeing some issues with goats and to our best guess, drought is the driving factor in those in the high elevation Alpine habitat we are we're seeing that they can be impacted and so our recommendations are reflective of that, so yes.

**Brett Prevedel:** Would you or Randall like to just discuss the work you're doing on the goats for the RAC, just so they know what you're doing with the collars and trying to figure out what's happening on the Uintahs.

**Randall Thacker:** Sure. Randall Thacker, biologist for the north, on the south slope of the Uintah's. Our goats here had been doing quite well historically. They've really been doing well, but the last four or five years, we've seen them take a turn and not do quite as well. And actually about 10 years now total. If we go back to when they first from when they kind of peaked out on us. And so we were able to go out this fall and catch and radio collar 30 goats across the Uintahs, the South Slope, and we're really excited to get that information on that. We don't have any great survival data for goats across the Uintahs or anywhere else. You know if you don't have collars on we haven't had the data. So the survival data gives us an indication of what. These GPS collars that we have, they're just like the deer gives us the opportunity to find out what's killing the individual animals so we can get it, gather some of that information as well as a survival rate throughout the year, both billies and nannies were collared across. And so we did have a few of those collars that failed on us. And so we went back out and put a couple more colors back on in just about a month and a half ago to try and fill some of those gaps back in. A couple of collars I guess they had bad batteries. So we can't figure out sure what it is, but a couple of them did kind of fail on us, but we do have our first collars on the Uintahs, the first GPS collars we've ever had on the Uintahs. Even the radio collars we had had, the data was quite old in that 80s or 97 to 98, and in 2000 were the last ones we had collared. They only last a few years and so we hadn't information on what the survival rates really were doing out there on our goats. And we also have some questions, we count these goats on the Uintahs from with the helicopter, of course is how we get our trend counts. And then we fly these usually in August or even early September depending on the year depending on weather and helicopter availability stuff. But we do those flights and we've noticed last few flights that some of the goats at least are starting to utilize the trees a lot more than we saw when they were first turned loose on the Uintahs. They used to stay up on top of the ballies a lot more and be a lot more available and easier to see. So our site ability we believe was higher, you know in the past as these goats, and I think particularly on drier years like this last year when we flew on drought years when it gets so hot and dry, we think that some of them are brought a higher percentage of them are dropping down into the trees to find areas that are probably got a little more vegetation left, little more shade, little cooler areas that kind of stuff, they're going to find more feed and so that may be contributing to our counts and so we wanted to get the collars on that will facilitate us the next time. We will be putting a few more on again next year is our plan we just met with Riley today to discuss that. We'll try to keep enough collars on there too that when we do flag in a couple of years here into our next count will have some collars will be able to check and see what our site ability is. But because

these collars are GPS collars, we can tell whether those trees, literally it comes down to the accuracy on these collars is amazing. It's within 15 to 20 feet usually, and especially if it's in the open and we'll be able to tell us how much they're utilizing the trees and when we fly would be able to go back and look at it the next day and say, OK, we missed two collared goats in that area because they were in the trees or not, you know. So we'll be able to see some of that and that'll really help. I'm really excited to get the collars on and get the information we can get from these. We've also had kind of an interesting thing. We've had two of our goats in the mouth of Whiterocks Canyon. We had six goats that we got had collared that had moved down in there for the winter. We've had two of them killed by lions in the last month and a half down there. And that's, you know, kind of interesting to know. Goats usually hang out in pretty remote, rugged country, of course, but they usually stay out of the trees a lot. That group of goats moves down into the trees a fair amount right there, and we're seeing that maybe predation is if we've got that. So two of the six collars in that area have been taken out by lions. I think we've got a lion that's learned how to how to hunt goats when they drop down in the trees there so that's something we will be kind of keeping an eye on and maybe there's some management changes we can do there or something to address some of these things. So it'll give us a lot of good information. We're excited to have the radio collars on. I think it's going to be a really good project.

**Brett Prevedel:** They drop down the streets quite a bit more than a lot of the other goats do, and I think that makes him vulnerable. There's some that just stay there year round down. They aren't all coming down from up above, are they there? Yeah, there are some that just stay there a number of years ago.

**Randall Thacker:** I know Brett had mentioned that he'd seen in that area had been up to 30 goats for a couple of years there that we had hanging in that area. And now there's eight or ten.

**Tim Ignacio:** I counted probably 20 hanging out right there. I haven't been up there recently. That was back during the hunting.

**Brett Prevedel:** Sorry to interrupt your presentation. I thought that would be interesting for that. That was fantastic.

**Riley Peck:** Wasn't interrupting at all. I appreciate that.

**Brett Prevedel:** Any questions for Riley from the RAC?

**Ray Thomas:** This is from the SFW again. Nine Mile Jack Creek, Rocky Mountain Bighorn sheep unit. Division recommended three permits SFW recommends 2 permits reason being generally sportsman tag and the statewide tag hunt this unit, and we feel like this is too much pressure for the number of sheep on this unit.

**Miles Hanberg:** OK, online comments with only four people commented on this, three of them somewhat agreed. One of them strongly disagreed.

**Brett Prevedel:** Anymore discussion from the RAC? I would entertain a motion.

01:16:30

Motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Brad Horrocks.

MOTION: I'll make a motion to accept the once-in-a-lifetime proposal as presented from the Division of Wildlife.



**Brett Prevedel:** There is quite a bit of concern that the calving rates or the pregnancy rates being so low, when we looked at that the other day, the age class of the elk, it was nearly half of the cows out there were ten years old. It's not exactly known, but 12 years old, probably about at the end of the most elk's productive age. It's kind of an odd thing that you need to hunt more elk to get more production, but that's really what's going on out there.

**Dax Mangus:** We've documented cow elk as old as 27 years old. And we actually document a lot of old elk in the Book Cliffs based on captured elk and aging those. Average age in the Book Cliffs is 12. Average age on the other units in the state where we've captured elk was nine. Through the harvest data we're seeing the same thing on. We've been starting to send out tooth packets some of our analyst cell counters. Then we are starting to document and tease some of this out of the data that these older cows are much less likely to be pregnant and very unlikely that they're going to breed back and be pregnant two years in a row. So once you get to that point where we have an elk population that if the average age is 12, you know that means probably half of them are older than that and a lot of those cows are not having a calf and they're still there. They're still living. Once they survive to adulthood, they're survival is pretty high. It's pretty good, but they're not producing anything. They're just consuming, consuming feed and not producing calves. So that's part of why even though we are under the overall population objectives for the Book Cliffs, we want to continue to try to harvest some animals and lower that age class and also our population objective is probably not a reasonable response, but at this point in time just because of the condition out there and the prolonged drought, drought effects.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. Any other discussion? OK, I would open it up for motion.

**Miles Hanberg:** Just a second. I'm sorry I've got to summarize the public comments again. Six respondents on this: one strongly agreed, once somewhat disagreed, 3 somewhat disagreed, and one strongly disagreed. The bulk of the discussion was surrounded the Book Cliff cow hunts.

**Brett Prevedel:** On the strongly disagreed?

**Miles Hanberg:** It was just the specific comments they were talking about increasing the Book Cliff cow hunts and permits and asking, the comments were concerned about increasing those on Book Cliffs.

**Brett Prevedel:** Yes

**Ray Thomas:** SFW again. For the Pine Valley unit. SFW does not support harvesting any doe deer on the Pine Valley.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. What is the recommendation there, Dax?

**Dax Mangus:** Maybe someone could help me out and look it up. 40 and it's pretty specific hunt boundary around some AG areas where we have some conflict. Nowhere in the state of Utah are we harvesting does at like a unit wide level to try to reduce deer populations. We do have several doe hunts across the state. We have several in this region, but they're pretty strategic, pretty surgical to try to target animals. You know resident animals that spend a disproportionate amount of time on private lands or that are causing damage to crops or that may be animals that have a high rate of disease. Those are the instances in the cases where we harvest and doe deer, a lot of places in the state we harvest cow elk to manage populations, almost nowhere in the state are we harvesting doe deer to reduce populations. It's ery strategic, very surgical to try to address specific issues.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you.

**Ritchie Anderson:** Brett. I've got a question for Dax and it's probably what the public have a question on. How are you going to monitor the age of cows that are killed out there in the Book Cliffs where you would like to target the older cows, which I understand. How are you going to monitor that to see if the hunt has the desired effect?

**Dax Mangus:** So we've been sending tooth packets, tooth envelopes to all of our hunters and asking them to send in teeth that we get aged at the lab. I wish there was a really specific way that we could age cows and have hunters specifically target. We want to target the old ones that have the yellowish gray hair instead of the, you know, blondes only no brunettes, redheads. That's just not possible. I could see the law enforcement guys getting nervous when I even mentioned something like that. Only harvesting a certain age class of cows. But it's a good question and it's a tricky one. We're trying to figure out what's the best way to do this. We do know if we have a population that is skewed toward an older age class, generally, the harvest is going to take older, more older age class animals just because that's what's available and that's what's there. I wish we had a better, more precise way to target older cows, but right now we don't. We just have to continue to monitor ages on harvested cows and then we're going to be monitoring ages on multiple units around the state and then we can compare that and see if we're making progress in the meantime, while we all kind of keep our fingers crossed and hope for some rain and for some conditions that allow all this other work that's taking place in the Book Cliffs to kick in and start helping out.

**Brett Prevedel:** Any other discussion from the RAC?

**Daniel Davis:** I've got a question, Mr. Chair. So was this year a flight year for the deer counts on Pine Valley and, I'm trying to remember the other one that had a substantial population decrease. Pine Valley, Zion were the two.

**Dax Mangus:** So we don't count, deer. We don't do aerial counts for deer, but we have really intensive monitoring. We have better data on deer now than we than we've ever had. We have, you know, a lot of these units. We have really significant sample sizes of collars on adult does, and fawns so we can get really good survival data and plug that into our models. And I know some people are uncomfortable with models as a way to you know, figure out your deer populations. But a model is a function of the inputs. It's a function of the data that you put in. And we have really good data that we're able to use and put in those models. And then when our biologists go out and do their postseason classification and collect on the ground data from deer, you know, we can compare and reconcile those numbers and see if they're tracking with what the models predict we should see. And they're getting tighter and tighter. They're getting better and better. Our biologists classify a pretty substantial sample of deer on those units. And on the Pine Valley unit, the biologist down there classified over 2000 deer using his postseason classifications in November. So it's definitely the sample size combined with the collared data. You know, we're we're feeling really good about the way our deer populations are modeling these days. And we had seen on those units specifically the Pine Valley and Zion units that we had no fawn recruitment, you know, we just weren't growing new fawns. And our does were getting older and older, and we finally just hit that tipping point where the does all started dying and there was no, up and coming age class to replace them. And so that we've seen, you know, pretty precipitous declines on those units. Again, those are a couple of units in the southernmost driest, hottest part of the state, and the drought seems to be hitting there exceptionally hard.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. Any other discussion. OK. I would. I would open up for a motion.

01:28:57

Motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Daniel Davis.

**MOTION:** I'll make a motion to accept the antlerless permit recommendations as presented by the Division of Wildlife

Motion passed 6 to 1.

**Natasha Hadden:** I'll make a motion to accept the antlerless permit recommendations as presented by the Division of Wildlife.

**Brett Prevedel:** We have a motion to accept the antlerless permit recommendations as presented by the division. Do we have a second?

**Daniel Davis:** Yeah, I'll second it.

**Brett Prevedel:** We have a motion and a second all in favor? All opposed? Motion passes 6 to 1.

**01:28:48**      **9) 2022 SWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations**      **(Action)**

**Brett Prevedel:** Well, that will move into our last item. Chad made it all the way to Vernal, had to wait till the very last minute. Chad Wilson is private land's public wildlife coordinator, and he'll give us a brief overview of the 2022 CWMU Antlerless permit recommendations.

**Chad Wilson:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. So really, on this word, there's a 20. Let's see 21, either renewal applications or change applications, or new applications that are being voted on, which would be a total of 47 total private permits and 216 public permits.

**Brett Prevedel:** The division didn't have any... the applications were all approved?

**Chad Wilson:** Yeah. And those applications, the, the renewals and the new applications were approved in the fall.

**Brett Prevedel:** OK. So this is just the numbers?

**Chad Wilson:** Yep.

**Brett Prevedel:** Questions from the RAC.

**Ritchie Anderson:** I mean, I don't really have a question, but I do have a comment. I've been involved in some discussion with folks on the landowner voucher program and how they look and how CWMUs look. Chad, I don't think we need to do it tonight, but maybe in one of your next presentations or something you do online, I don't think the public really understands to a large degree, this CWMU program and how those tags are distributed and how they get those numbers. Maybe just at a future time if you could maybe take a few minutes in one of your presentations and better explain that cause I I don't think I fully understand it a lot of the time, and just talking to folks, they don't understand how those numbers are derived and like say I don't know that we need to do it tonight, but maybe in one of your presentations if you could educate again.

**Chad Wilson:**

Yeah, that that's a fair comment and it is, it is a challenge even for us at times. And just to disclose, we will be opening the CWMU rule up and maybe tightening some of that up. So probably next year at this time or when the CWMU rule comes through there that I hope that that's a lot clearer on that process.

**Brett Prevedel:** Chad, we do, we do kind of briefly over on the antlerless permits, talk about the public versus private portion of the typical.

**Chad Wilson:** Yeah. So you see a majority of them come to the public. I'm just going to pull up my presentation so I can work off of that. So there's different splits a lot of times they'll choose a 90/10 split and we don't have a ton of pronghorn or deer tags. So this is mostly out, but they'll choose a 90/10 split the majority of the time. Sometimes we see the 80/20, but if they choose that 90/10 split, 100% of those tags will go to the public, the antlerless tags. If they choose like an 80/20 then it's a 40/60 with the 60% going to the public. So it's I guess the benefit for the public there is you know we don't, they don't get as many antlered tags, but when it comes to antlerless they get the bulk of them.

**Brett Prevedel:** If they want more bull tags to sell. Then then they give more public antlerless tags the public gets a better a higher number of them. Nearly 100%. You called it a 90/10.

**Chad Wilson:** It's 90/10 on the bulls on the but on the antlerless it's 100%.

**Brett Prevedel:** So in general, The CWMU program though it's always taken tweaks by Chad for various situations is very popular, right?

**Chad Wilson:** Yeah. Yeah. It's a good program. That that's pretty well received.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. I don't want to have any discussion on it tonight, but Chad's also the you know, he's a private lands coordinator, so next month, you'll see him again because we'll be dealing with the landowner association rule, and he's really looking forward to coming to Vernal.

**Chad Wilson:** I can't wait to be back.

**Brett Prevedel:** So we'll see quite a bit of Chad next month, Miles, what do we, what do you have for comments on this one?

**Miles Hanberg:** Only three people commented. One strongly agreed, one somewhat agreed, and one strongly disagreed.

**Brett Prevedel:** OK. Is there any other questions? Alright, I would entertain a motion.

01:35:05

Motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Brad Horrocks

MOTION: I'll make a motion to accept The CWMU numbers as presented.

Motion passed 6 to 1

**Natasha Hadden:** I'll make a motion to accept The CWMU numbers as presented.

**Brad Horrocks:** I'll second it.

**Brett Prevedel:** We have a motion and a second to accept 2022 CWMU list permit recommendations as presented by the division. All in favor? All opposed? Motion passes 6 to 1. And is there any other business Miles? Oh, you do update them on the officers?

**Miles Hanberg:** Dan Abeyta had been our vice chair until he's left. So that leaves that vice chair position vacant. So I wanted to give everybody a heads up tonight. We need to have somebody else take that role. So I would ask anybody to send me nominations for somebody that could be the vice chair that you'd like to have that be and then we can take a vote and take action on that at our next meeting. So you know, so just email me or shoot me a text. Give me a call who you'd like to nominate to be vice chair and we will take care of that business next meeting.

**Natasha Hadden:** What are their duties?

**Miles Hanberg:** Duties essentially, if Brett's not able to make the Wildlife Board meeting or this meeting, they would fill in in his behalf.

**Brett Prevedel:** You have to cover the Wildlife Board on all hunting seasons. When I'm not available to go and all holidays when I'm on vacation.

**Brad Horrocks:** Have you ever missed one?

**Brett Prevedel:** Yes, Dan actually would cover for me probably two or three times a year. So it is a significant commitment and so they need to be aware of that. I'm kind of flaky. With that, is there anything else? All right, I would look for a motion to adjourn.

**Brad Horrocks:** I motion to adjourn. Anybody disagree with that?

**Natasha Hadden:** I second

**Brett Prevedel:** We're out of here. Thank you. Thank you to the division and the public that attended.

## NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

Utah Wildlife Resources Office, 318 N Vernal Avenue, Vernal

April 14, 2022

- WELCOME, RAC INTRODUCTIONS AND RAC PROCEDURES—Brett Prevedel

### ● APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

MOTION: To approve agenda-Daniel Davis

2<sup>nd</sup> Brad Horrocks

Passed unanimously

MOTION: To approve minutes-Brad Horrocks

2<sup>nd</sup> Natasha Hadden

Passed unanimously

### 5. Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2022

MOTION: to accept as presented from the Division with the exception of Beaver, Fillmore and Panguich Lake in which case the permits would be reduced according to the recommendations of the SFW-Brad Horrocks

2<sup>nd</sup> Daniel Davis

Passed 4-3

### 6. Bull Elk and Buck Pronghorn Recommendations

MOTION: to recommend 40 HAMS tags and 40 archery tags on the Nine-Mile Anthro elk hunt unit. Brad Horrocks

Failed due to lack of second.

MOTION: to accept as presented from the Division-Natasha Hadden

2<sup>nd</sup> Ritchie Anderson

Passed 6-0-1. Brad Horrocks recused himself

7. Once in a Lifetime Permit Recommendations

MOTION: To accept as presented-Natasha Hadden

2<sup>nd</sup> Brad Horrocks

Passed Unanimously

8. Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2022

MOTION: to accept as presented by the Division-Natasha Hadden

2<sup>nd</sup> Daniel Davis

Passed 6-1

9. 2022 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2022

MOTION: to accept as presented by the Division-Natasha Hadden

2<sup>nd</sup>-Brad Horrocks

Passed 6-1

Meeting adjourned @ 8:10pm

<u>NER RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:</u>	<u>UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:</u>
Daniel Davis, Sportsman	
Dusty Carpenter, BLM	Chad Wilson-Priv/Pub Land Coordinator

Natasha Haden, Forest Service	Rose Fedelleck, NER Office Manager
Brett Prevedel NER RAC Chair	Tonya Kieffer, NER Outreach Manager
Mike Smith, Non-consumptive	Dax Mangus, NER Wildlife Manager
Brad Horrocks Elected Official	Pat Rainbolt NER Habitat Manager
Ritchie Anderson, Agriculture	Randall Thacker, NER Wildlife Biologist
<u>UTE TRIBE</u> - Tim Ignacio	Amy VandeVoort, NER Wildlife Bio
	Miles Hanberg, NER Regional Sup. Derrick Ewell
	Dallon Christensen
	Riley Peck
	Matt Fackrell



## State of Utah

SPENCER J. COX  
*Governor*

DEIDRE M. HENDERSON  
*Lieutenant Governor*

## Department of Natural Resources

BRIAN C. STEED  
*Executive Director*

### Division of Wildlife Resources

J. Shirley  
*Division Director*

## MEMORANDUM

Date: February 28, 2022  
To: Wildlife Board  
From: Justin M. Shannon, Deputy Director  
Subject: Season-date extensions for bighorn sheep conservation permits

Season dates for conservation permits are established in the conservation permit rule (R657-41). In 2021, the Utah Wildlife Board approved season dates for 15 area bighorn sheep conservation permits that began and ended at the same time as public-draw bighorn sheep permits.

Historically, bighorn sheep conservation permits have received a season-date variance that allows hunters to begin their hunts on the same date as public-draw hunters and end their hunts on December 31. This variance has been in place for over 15 years.

In 2021, the DWR wildlife chief nor the conservation organizations requested this variance for the 2022-2024 bighorn sheep conservation permits. In an effort to stay true to historical practices, DWR extended the season dates for these conservation permits for the 2022 season to December 31, and we are requesting the Wildlife Board approve a variance for the bighorn sheep conservation permits for the 2023 and 2024 seasons as well.

Moving forward, DWR plans on changing bighorn sheep season dates in R657-41 to avoid this oversight in future years.

